ADVANCED BUSINESS JOURNAL
e-ISSN 3110-4053 · advancedbusinessjournal.com
Vol. 2 No. 4 (2026), pp. 64-83
DOI: https:// 10.65875/vyc3xv24

RESEARCH PAPER | Islamic Finance & Financial Inclusion

Risk Return Dynamics and Portfolio Performance of Islamic Microfinance Institutions: Evidence from Post-Digital Transformation Era

Anvarjon Kasimov Bakhramjon ugli[1,*], **Fauziah Rahma Dewi**[1], **Shahrizoda Asilxodjayeva Bakhramjon qizi**[2]

[1] *Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia*
[2] *Tashkent University of Economics and Pedadogy, Uzbekistan*
***Corresponding author:** fauziah.rahma.feb25@mail.umy.ac.id*

ARTICLE INFO

Article history
Received: 27 April 2026
Revised: 18 August 2026
Accepted: 28 October 2026
Published: 3 November 2026

Keywords
Islamic microfinance institutions
Digital transformation
Risk-return framework
Portfolio quality
Operating efficiency
Shariah compliance

JEL Classification
G21; G32; O33; Z12

ABSTRACT

Digital transformation is reshaping the operating models of Islamic microfinance institutions (IMFIs), changing how they originate financing, monitor clients, process payments, and manage portfolio risk. Yet the financial consequences of digital adoption remain ambiguous. Digital channels can reduce transaction costs, expand outreach, and improve the timeliness of credit information, but they can also introduce cyber risk, model risk, operational concentration, and new forms of borrower over-indebtedness. This article develops a risk-return framework for evaluating IMFIs after digital transformation, with particular attention to the interaction between Shariah-compliant financing, portfolio quality, operating efficiency, and digital capability. Drawing on financial intermediation theory, portfolio theory, information asymmetry, institutional theory, and the objectives of Islamic finance, the article proposes a comparative empirical design using institution-level panel data. The framework distinguishes profitability, portfolio quality, liquidity, capital adequacy, outreach, and social performance rather than reducing institutional success to a single accounting ratio. It also treats digital transformation as a capability whose value depends on governance, data quality, staff competence, cybersecurity, and the design of financing contracts. Twelve hypotheses specify expected relationships among digital maturity, risk management, portfolio diversification, non-performing financing, cost efficiency, and risk-adjusted performance. The article's analytical synthesis suggests that digital adoption is most likely to improve risk-adjusted returns when it is embedded in disciplined underwriting, responsible financing, Shariah governance, and portfolio monitoring. Because no institution-level dataset was supplied, the manuscript presents a theory-driven framework and research protocol rather than fabricated statistical findings.

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by PT Advanced Business Journal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license.

1. INTRODUCTION

Islamic microfinance occupies an important position at the intersection of financial inclusion, entrepreneurship, and faith-consistent financial intermediation. It seeks to extend financing and related services to individuals and microenterprises that may be underserved by conventional banking, while structuring transactions in accordance with Shariah principles. Depending on jurisdiction and institutional form, Islamic microfinance may use murabaha, qard hasan, ijarah, musharakah, mudarabah, or other permitted arrangements. These contracts differ in their allocation of risk, revenue recognition, collateral requirements, and monitoring needs. Consequently, financial performance cannot be assessed independently of contract design, client circumstances, and the institution's social and religious mandate (IsDB, 2022; IFSB, 2023).

The operating environment for microfinance institutions has changed substantially with the diffusion of mobile payments, digital onboarding, automated workflows, cloud-based core systems, alternative data, and remote client monitoring. Digital transformation is more extensive than the installation of an application or the digitization of paper records. It entails changes in organizational routines, data architecture, customer interaction, decision processes, and risk governance. For an Islamic microfinance institution (IMFI), digital capabilities may accelerate applications, lower collection costs, improve portfolio visibility, and support more frequent monitoring of clients. However, the same transformation can introduce risks associated with

identity fraud, cyber incidents, algorithmic bias, service outages, vendor dependence, and the inappropriate use of personal data (World Bank, 2022; CGAP, 2023; BIS, 2023).

The financial implications are not self-evident. Lower transaction costs can improve operating efficiency, but investments in software, integration, cybersecurity, training, and customer support may offset early savings. Faster origination may increase the number of clients served while weakening screening if digital growth targets are prioritized over repayment capacity. Automated scoring can make decisions more consistent, but it can also reproduce historical exclusion when the underlying data are incomplete or unrepresentative. Digital repayment channels may improve collection convenience, yet they can also create an illusion of portfolio health if payment activity is not distinguished from rescheduling, refinancing, or repeated borrowing. The net effect of digital transformation on risk and return therefore depends on implementation quality and governance, not merely on the presence of technology.

These issues are especially relevant to Islamic microfinance because institutions must balance financial sustainability with social objectives and Shariah compliance. The prohibition of riba, restrictions on gharar and maysir, and the ethical principles associated with fairness, transparency, and avoidance of harm influence contract structures and institutional conduct. At the same time, IMFIs must manage liquidity, credit risk, operating costs, capital adequacy, and concentration. A portfolio that achieves high nominal returns but depends on excessive client indebtedness, opaque charges, or weak Shariah controls cannot be considered unambiguously successful. Conversely, an institution that pursues outreach without managing arrears and liquidity may be unable to sustain services over time. A robust assessment must therefore consider risk-adjusted financial performance together with outreach and responsible-finance outcomes.

The post-digital transformation era creates a useful research setting because many institutions have moved beyond initial digitization toward integrated platforms, mobile-first customer journeys, data-driven underwriting, and automated monitoring. Nevertheless, institutions differ widely in their digital maturity, customer base, product mix, regulatory environment, and governance capacity. Some have adopted digital systems as an extension of existing processes, while others have redesigned the full financing lifecycle. A binary digital-adoption indicator cannot capture these differences. Empirical analysis should distinguish infrastructure adoption from effective capability and should consider whether digital transformation changes the relationship between portfolio risk and financial returns.

The literature on microfinance performance has traditionally emphasized repayment rates, portfolio-at-risk measures, operating self-sufficiency, return on assets, and outreach. Research on digital finance has examined cost reduction, financial inclusion, service convenience, and technology adoption. Islamic finance research has separately explored Shariah governance, contract design, social objectives, and financial stability. These strands are related but not always integrated. Digital-finance studies may focus on access and adoption without examining portfolio-level risk-adjusted returns; microfinance studies may use standard accounting indicators without capturing cyber and model risk; and Islamic finance studies may discuss Shariah compliance without connecting it to digital operating models and portfolio outcomes.

This article addresses that intersection by developing a framework for the risk-return dynamics and portfolio performance of digitally transformed IMFIs. The research gap has three dimensions. First, digital transformation is frequently measured as technology adoption rather than as an organizational capability that combines systems, people, data, and governance. Second, portfolio performance is often assessed through one or two financial ratios, despite the possibility that profitability, asset quality, liquidity, outreach, and Shariah compliance move in different directions. Third, the mechanisms through which digital capability may improve or worsen risk-adjusted returns require clearer specification, particularly the mediating role of risk-management quality and the moderating role of institutional governance.

The article pursues four objectives. It clarifies the conceptual relationship between digital maturity and the risk-return profile of IMFIs; develops hypotheses linking digital capability, underwriting and monitoring quality, portfolio diversification, financing risk, and financial performance; proposes an institution-level panel design that can test these relationships using real financial and operational data; and derives practical implications for boards, managers, regulators, and Shariah supervisory functions. The analysis is intended to be relevant to Islamic microfinance providers in Indonesia and other emerging markets, while recognizing that legal forms and regulatory categories differ across jurisdictions.

The remainder of the article is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the theoretical foundations and recent research on digital finance, microfinance portfolio risk, Islamic financial intermediation, and performance measurement. Section 3 develops the conceptual model and hypotheses. Section 4 proposes the empirical design, variables, and econometric strategy. Section 5 presents a critical synthesis of the expected relationships and managerial implications. Section 6 concludes, identifies limitations, and outlines priorities for future research. As no institution-level dataset was supplied, the article does not report invented regression coefficients or claim that the hypotheses have been empirically confirmed.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Islamic microfinance and the multiple objectives of performance

Islamic microfinance institutions provide financial services to microentrepreneurs, low-income households, and underserved communities through arrangements intended to comply with Shariah principles. Their organizational forms vary, including specialized microfinance providers, cooperatives, Islamic rural banks, nonprofit institutions, and programs housed within larger financial organizations. The diversity of forms matters because funding structures, prudential requirements, ownership incentives, and permissible products may differ. Performance comparisons should therefore control for institutional type and regulatory context rather than assuming that all IMFIs operate under the same constraints (IFSB, 2023; IsDB, 2022).

A distinctive feature of Islamic microfinance is the need to balance financial viability with ethical and social objectives. Financial sustainability enables an institution to cover costs, maintain capital, absorb losses, and continue serving clients. Social performance concerns outreach to underserved groups, affordability, client protection, and contributions to livelihood resilience. Shariah compliance concerns the permissibility of contracts, governance, and operating practices. These dimensions may reinforce one another, but tensions can arise. For example, intensive outreach to clients with irregular income may increase monitoring costs, while strict collateral requirements may improve recoveries but exclude vulnerable borrowers. The appropriate performance framework should make these trade-offs explicit.

Islamic finance should not be equated with interest-free lending alone. Contractual structures distribute ownership, asset, payment, and business risks differently. Murabaha typically involves the sale of an asset at a disclosed cost-plus-profit price, whereas mudarabah and musharakah involve profit-sharing or partnership features. Qard hasan is a benevolent loan structure in which the principal is returned without a contractual interest charge. The operational and risk implications differ across these products. Institutions using asset-based contracts may face documentation and asset-delivery risks; partnership contracts may require stronger monitoring of business performance and profit reporting; and benevolent financing may rely on donations or other funding sources. Portfolio composition should therefore be measured as a potential determinant of both risk and return.

2.2 Financial intermediation and information asymmetry

Financial intermediation theory explains how institutions channel funds from providers to users while reducing transaction costs, screening borrowers, monitoring repayment, and managing maturity and liquidity. Microfinance institutions face particularly acute information problems because borrowers may lack formal financial statements, credit histories, or conventional collateral. Relationship lending and group-based mechanisms have historically helped mitigate these limitations, but they can be costly to administer. Digital records, mobile transaction histories, and alternative data may improve screening and monitoring, provided that the data are reliable, legally usable, and relevant to repayment capacity; shared digital records can reduce information asymmetry and improve auditability, but they cannot by themselves guarantee the truth of the underlying source data (Hidayat & Fang, 2026).

Information asymmetry also creates a risk of adverse selection and moral hazard. Adverse selection occurs when lenders cannot adequately distinguish borrowers with different risk profiles before financing. Moral hazard arises when behavior changes after financing in ways that increase the probability of loss. Digital tools can reduce some information gaps by enabling faster data collection and more frequent monitoring, but they cannot eliminate them. A transaction history may reflect payment activity without

revealing the borrower's total debt obligations, household shocks, or informal liabilities. Automated decisions can therefore create false confidence when data coverage is incomplete.

For IMFIs, the problem is compounded by product diversity and the importance of contract execution. In asset-based financing, accurate records of purchase, ownership, delivery, and sale are relevant to both operational control and Shariah compliance. In partnership financing, the institution may need to monitor business revenues and cost allocation rather than simply collect fixed installments. Digital systems can improve documentation and auditability, but only if workflows reflect the actual requirements of each contract. Generic loan-management software may not adequately capture these differences unless it is configured and governed carefully.

2.3 Portfolio theory and risk-adjusted returns

Portfolio theory emphasizes the relationship between expected return, risk, and diversification. Although microfinance portfolios are not always traded financial portfolios, the underlying logic remains useful. An institution's financial outcome depends not only on average yield but also on the covariance of risks across clients, sectors, regions, and financing products. A portfolio concentrated in one crop, local industry, or geographic area may perform well during favorable conditions but suffer correlated defaults after a weather event, commodity-price shock, or local economic downturn. Diversification can reduce idiosyncratic risk, although it may also increase information and monitoring costs when an institution expands into unfamiliar sectors.

Risk-adjusted performance should therefore supplement raw profitability. Return on assets and operating self-sufficiency provide useful information about financial viability, but they do not fully capture the uncertainty of returns or the potential cost of future losses. Portfolio-at-risk over 30 days (PAR30), non-performing financing (NPF), write-offs, provisioning coverage, and liquidity indicators help reveal the quality and resilience of the portfolio. A high return on assets accompanied by rising arrears may reflect delayed recognition of losses rather than durable performance. Conversely, a conservative institution may show lower short-term returns while maintaining stronger asset quality and resilience.

A composite risk-adjusted measure can be useful, but researchers should avoid constructing an index that obscures the interpretation of individual ratios. Sharpe-type measures require a defensible return series and a suitable risk-free benchmark, which may be difficult for unlisted IMFIs. Alternative approaches include risk-adjusted return on assets, profitability adjusted for expected credit losses, or frontier methods that compare cost efficiency while controlling for portfolio risk. In practice, a dashboard of complementary indicators is often more informative than a single ranking.

2.4 Digital transformation as capability

Digital transformation involves more than purchasing a core banking platform or launching a mobile application. It combines technological infrastructure, data governance, process redesign, workforce capability, leadership, and the ability to adapt business models. The distinction between digitization, digitalization, and transformation is analytically useful. Digitization converts information into digital form; digitalization uses digital tools to improve existing processes; transformation changes how the institution creates and delivers value. An institution may have a digital interface while retaining manual, fragmented, and slow internal processes. In such cases, customer-facing technology may not generate substantial improvements in risk management or cost efficiency, because data create value only when they are embedded in decision routines (Saiyed & Nurmalasari, 2026).

Digital maturity can be conceptualized across several dimensions: system integration, data quality, automation, analytics, digital customer access, cybersecurity, and organizational learning. For IMFIs, maturity also includes the ability to represent Shariah-compliant contract flows accurately and to retain evidence needed for audit and supervisory review. A highly automated process that misclassifies a contract or fails to record the underlying asset transaction can create operational and compliance risk. Digital maturity must therefore include control quality rather than treating automation as an unqualified benefit.

Recent work on digital financial services highlights the potential for technology to expand access and reduce delivery costs, while emphasizing risks associated with data privacy, fraud, consumer protection, and

unequal digital capability (World Bank, 2022; CGAP, 2023; BIS, 2023). For microfinance, the value of digital transformation depends on the client context. Mobile channels may reduce travel and collection costs, but clients with limited connectivity, low digital literacy, or shared devices may face new barriers. Hybrid service models may remain necessary to preserve trust and support customers who need human assistance.

2.5 Resource-based view and dynamic capabilities

The resource-based view suggests that sustained performance differences arise when organizations possess valuable and difficult-to-replicate resources and capabilities. A basic digital platform is often available to competitors, so it is unlikely to create a lasting advantage by itself. More distinctive capabilities may include well-governed client data, staff who can interpret analytical signals, integration between financing and collection systems, trusted community relationships, and the ability to adapt products responsibly. These complementary resources determine whether technology becomes an operating advantage or merely an additional cost.

Dynamic capabilities theory adds the importance of sensing, seizing, and transforming. An IMFI must detect changes in repayment behavior, sector risk, customer needs, and digital threats; select an appropriate response; and revise processes as evidence accumulates. Digital monitoring can improve sensing, but managers must still interpret alerts, decide whether to restructure financing, adjust exposure, or provide client support, and learn from the outcome. The strategic benefit of digital transformation is therefore partly a function of organizational learning and the speed with which information leads to appropriate action.

This perspective predicts that digital maturity will have a stronger association with performance when risk governance and managerial capability are developed. Where systems are installed without process redesign or accountability, the institution may accumulate data without improving decisions. Where digital tools are integrated with clear escalation rules, staff training, and portfolio review, the same technology can support more consistent underwriting and early intervention. The model therefore treats risk-management quality as a key mechanism connecting digital transformation to portfolio outcomes.

2.6 Institutional theory and Shariah governance

Institutional theory emphasizes how organizations respond to regulatory requirements, professional norms, and expectations from stakeholders. IMFIs operate under financial regulation while also being accountable to Shariah principles and, in some settings, cooperative or nonprofit governance requirements. Digital transformation can be driven by competition, supervisory expectations, funder requirements, or the desire to meet customer preferences. However, external pressure can produce symbolic adoption if institutions implement visible technologies without changing underlying practices.

Shariah governance is central to the legitimacy of Islamic financial institutions. It can include review of products and contracts, monitoring of operations, internal Shariah controls, audit, and reporting to relevant supervisory bodies. Digital systems can strengthen governance by preserving transaction records, standardizing contract steps, and creating audit trails. Yet automated workflows can also scale errors if the underlying process has not been reviewed. Governance must therefore address the design and maintenance of digital products, access rights, algorithmic decisions, and vendor-provided services.

The relationship between Shariah governance and financial performance should not be framed solely as a compliance cost. Clear governance can reduce uncertainty, protect institutional reputation, and support trust among clients and funders. At the same time, overly fragmented approval processes can delay product development or increase operating costs. The objective is proportionate governance that protects contractual integrity while allowing responsible innovation. Empirical work should measure governance quality and its integration with digital operations rather than simply coding whether an institution has a Shariah supervisory board.

2.7 Credit risk, NPF, and early-warning systems

Credit risk is typically the most visible portfolio risk for microfinance institutions. It can arise from borrower income volatility, weak screening, external shocks, poor collection practices, concentration, fraud, or unsuitable financing structures. In Islamic financial institutions, the term non-performing financing (NPF) is often used, although the precise definition and reporting rules vary by jurisdiction. PAR30 measures the

share of the portfolio with payments overdue beyond a specified period and can provide an earlier signal than write-offs. Researchers should state the definition, denominator, and treatment of rescheduled accounts.

Digital systems can support early-warning capabilities by combining repayment patterns, account activity, client contact records, and contextual information, consistent with evidence that data analytics improves risk control in ASEAN firms (Pontjoharyo, 2026). Alerts can identify repeated late payments, declining transaction activity, or sector-level deterioration. However, an alert is useful only when it is accurate, interpretable, and linked to an appropriate intervention. False positives can overwhelm staff and damage client relationships; false negatives can create a misleading sense of security. Models should be evaluated for calibration, discrimination, stability across time, and fairness across client groups.

Risk mitigation should not be reduced to automated collection. Responsible practice may involve contacting clients early, assessing temporary shocks, restructuring where appropriate, and preventing multiple borrowing that exceeds repayment capacity. Digital tools can improve the timing of these interventions, but they should not encourage coercive collection or automatic rejection based on opaque scores. For IMFIs, the quality of risk management should reflect both portfolio protection and the fair treatment of clients.

2.8 Liquidity, funding, and operational risk

Liquidity risk arises when an institution cannot meet obligations as they fall due without incurring unacceptable losses. IMFIs may depend on member deposits, wholesale funding, donor resources, institutional investors, or lines of credit, depending on legal form. Digital channels can accelerate disbursement and collection, improve cash-flow visibility, and reduce reconciliation delays. But they can also create concentration in payment providers, increase exposure to outages, and enable rapid withdrawals or payment disruptions. Liquidity management must therefore consider both financial flows and technology dependencies.

Operational risk includes failures in processes, systems, people, and external events. Digital transformation changes its profile. Manual errors may decline, while cyber incidents, data corruption, access-control failures, vendor outages, and algorithmic errors become more consequential. A single outage can affect many clients simultaneously, making operational risk more correlated than in a branch-based model. Institutions need incident response plans, backups, access controls, vendor due diligence, recovery testing, and clear responsibilities for system changes.

Digital investments also affect cost structure. Capital expenditure may be followed by recurring licensing, cloud, cybersecurity, and maintenance costs. Institutions may underestimate the total cost of ownership or depend on vendors whose pricing and data-export policies limit future flexibility. Cost efficiency should therefore be measured net of technology and control costs, not inferred from a decline in staff numbers or branch visits alone.

2.9 Outreach, social performance, and client protection

Financial performance is important for institutional survival, but IMFIs often have explicit inclusion objectives. Outreach can be assessed through the number and characteristics of clients served, average financing size, geographic coverage, participation of women or underserved groups, and continuity of access. Social performance may include affordability, client satisfaction, livelihood resilience, and the absence of harmful lending practices. These measures are not substitutes for financial ratios; they reveal whether the institution's operating model remains consistent with its mission.

Digital channels may reduce barriers for some clients while increasing them for others. Mobile applications can reduce travel costs and improve convenience, but digital identity requirements, device access, language, connectivity, and literacy can exclude vulnerable groups. Automated credit scoring may expand access for clients with reliable digital histories, yet penalize individuals whose economic activity is informal or poorly captured. A responsible digital strategy should therefore monitor both aggregate outreach and distributional effects.

Client protection is particularly important where digital lending can make repeated borrowing easy. Faster disbursement and automated renewals can improve convenience but may weaken deliberation about repayment capacity. IMFIs should monitor multiple borrowing, debt-service burden, complaints, rescheduling, and client understanding of contract terms. Shariah compliance and social mission require transparent pricing, fair treatment, and avoidance of harm. Portfolio performance should not be improved through practices that transfer excessive risk to clients.

2.10 Financial performance indicators and their limitations

Common financial indicators include return on assets (ROA), return on equity (ROE), operating self-sufficiency (OSS), financial self-sufficiency (FSS), operating expense ratio, cost per borrower, and portfolio quality metrics. Each answers a different question. ROA measures earnings relative to assets; ROE reflects returns to equity holders but can rise because leverage increases; OSS compares operating revenue with operating expenses; and FSS adjusts for subsidies and financing costs where the data allow. PAR30 and NPF capture delinquency, while provisioning and write-off ratios reveal the recognition of credit losses.

No single measure is sufficient. High ROE may reflect low capital rather than superior operating performance. A low expense ratio may result from underinvestment in staff or controls. OSS may improve while outreach shifts toward larger and less costly borrowers. PAR30 may appear low if overdue accounts are rescheduled or written off aggressively. Researchers should therefore use a balanced set of measures and document accounting definitions, subsidy treatment, and portfolio composition.

Risk-adjusted performance can be assessed through a composite measure, but the choice should match the institution's legal form and data quality. A ratio of profitability to credit-risk exposure may be informative, yet can behave poorly when the denominator approaches zero. Frontier-efficiency methods can compare institutions with similar outputs and inputs, but they require a sufficiently large sample and careful specification. A practical empirical study should report primary ratios separately and use composite indicators as supplementary analysis.

2.11 Recent evidence and the remaining research gap

Recent policy and research work has emphasized the growth of digital financial services, the importance of responsible digital credit, and the need for stronger cyber and operational risk governance. Supervisory frameworks increasingly address operational resilience and digital dependencies, while development institutions stress that technology can expand access only when consumer protection and institutional capability are addressed (BIS, 2023; CGAP, 2023; World Bank, 2022). These insights are relevant to IMFIs, but they do not fully establish the effects of digital maturity on institution-level risk-adjusted returns.

The first unresolved issue is measurement. Studies may use the existence of mobile services, digital transactions, or IT expenditure as proxies for transformation. These indicators do not reveal whether systems are integrated, analytics are used in decisions, or staff can respond to warnings. The second issue is outcome breadth. Profitability, asset quality, liquidity, outreach, and Shariah governance may respond differently to digital adoption. The third issue is identification. Institutions with better management may be more likely to digitize and also perform better, making it difficult to attribute outcomes to technology.

2.12 Conceptual framework and hypotheses

2.12.1 Model structure

The proposed model has four layers. Digital maturity and organizational capability form the primary explanatory layer. Risk-management quality and operating efficiency represent intermediate mechanisms. Portfolio quality, liquidity, and risk-adjusted profitability form the financial outcome layer, while outreach and client protection provide complementary mission-related outcomes. Shariah governance, institutional scale, and regulatory environment are proposed as conditions that may strengthen or weaken selected relationships. This structure reflects the idea that digital transformation changes the institution's information and process capabilities, but its financial effects depend on how those capabilities are used.

Digital maturity should be measured through system integration, data quality, analytics, automation, customer-channel capability, and cybersecurity readiness. Risk-management quality should capture

underwriting discipline, early-warning use, portfolio concentration monitoring, provisioning practices, and escalation procedures. Operating efficiency should measure cost per client, processing time, administrative expense, and the net cost of digital services. Outcomes should include NPF or PAR30, ROA, OSS/FSS, liquidity, and risk-adjusted performance. Outreach indicators should be reported separately to avoid treating a reduction in service to higher-cost clients as unambiguously positive efficiency.

2.12.2 Digital maturity and risk-management quality

Digital systems can improve the availability, timeliness, and consistency of information used in financing decisions. Integrated records can help institutions identify repeated borrowing, track arrears, and compare risk across products or branches. Automated workflows can reduce manual errors and make it easier to verify that required contract steps have been completed. These benefits should be strongest when data quality is adequate and staff understand how to interpret system outputs.

> **H1:** *Digital maturity is positively associated with risk-management quality in Islamic microfinance institutions.*

2.12.3 Digital maturity and operating efficiency

Digital channels can lower the cost of client acquisition, payment processing, recordkeeping, and routine communication. Automation can shorten processing time and allow staff to manage larger portfolios. Yet efficiency gains may be delayed by implementation costs, parallel manual systems, training needs, and cyber controls. The expected relationship is therefore positive on average but conditional on implementation quality and scale.

> **H2:** *Digital maturity is positively associated with operating efficiency, measured after accounting for technology and control costs.*

2.12.4 Risk-management quality and portfolio quality

Effective risk management should improve the identification and mitigation of emerging repayment problems; evidence from Southeast Asian firms shows that risk identification, assessment, and especially mitigation are associated with stronger financial performance (Fang, 2026). Better underwriting can reduce adverse selection; early-warning systems can enable timely client contact; and concentration limits can reduce correlated exposure. However, risk controls may be ineffective if staff ignore alerts or if data exclude important sources of client income and debt. The hypothesis concerns the quality of the process, not merely the presence of a scoring tool.

> **H3:** *Risk-management quality is negatively associated with portfolio risk, measured by NPF or PAR30.*

2.12.5 Operating efficiency and financial performance

Lower operating costs can improve financial sustainability by reducing the resources required to serve each client. Digital processes may also improve staff productivity and collection reliability. Nevertheless, efficiency improvements should be interpreted alongside outreach and service quality. Cost reduction achieved by excluding remote or vulnerable clients may improve accounting ratios while weakening the institution's mission.

> **H4:** *Operating efficiency is positively associated with financial sustainability and risk-adjusted profitability.*

2.12.6 Digital maturity and portfolio quality

Digital maturity may have a direct relationship with portfolio quality through faster information processing, more timely collection, and improved portfolio monitoring. However, rapid digital origination can increase risk if screening becomes less rigorous or automated models are poorly calibrated. The direct relationship should therefore be tested alongside risk-management quality and implementation controls.

> **H5:** *Digital maturity is negatively associated with NPF or PAR30, conditional on underwriting discipline and client-protection practices.*

2.12.7 Portfolio quality and risk-adjusted returns

Lower delinquency generally reduces provisioning needs, collection costs, and uncertainty around expected cash flows. Better asset quality can support more stable profitability and liquidity. Yet very low arrears may also reflect conservative lending or reduced outreach, while high reported returns can be temporarily inflated by delayed loss recognition. The model therefore expects a positive association between portfolio quality and risk-adjusted performance, while requiring separate reporting of outreach and provisioning.

> **H6:** *Better portfolio quality is positively associated with risk-adjusted financial performance.*

2.12.8 Digital maturity and risk-adjusted performance

Digital maturity may improve performance by reducing transaction costs, supporting early intervention, and improving management information. At the same time, technology costs and new operational risks can offset these benefits. The relationship is expected to be positive where digital systems are integrated into core processes and where the institution has sufficient scale and governance to capture value.

> **H7:** *Digital maturity is positively associated with risk-adjusted financial performance.*

2.12.9 Mediation through risk management and efficiency

Digital maturity may affect performance indirectly by improving risk-management quality and operating efficiency. If the institution uses data to improve underwriting and monitoring, the portfolio may become less risky. If it automates routine tasks without weakening service quality, cost efficiency may improve. These pathways are conceptually distinct and should be tested as separate indirect effects.

> **H8:** *Risk-management quality mediates the relationship between digital maturity and portfolio quality.*
>
> **H9:** *Operating efficiency mediates the relationship between digital maturity and financial sustainability.*

2.12.10 Shariah governance as a moderator

Shariah governance can strengthen the benefits of digital transformation by ensuring that automated workflows preserve contract integrity, documentation, transparency, and ethical conduct. It can also help identify risks associated with digital product design and outsourcing. Where governance is weak, technology may scale process errors or create gaps between approved contracts and actual execution.

> **H10:** *Shariah governance positively moderates the relationship between digital maturity and risk-management quality.*

2.12.11 Institutional scale and technology returns

Digital infrastructure has fixed costs, and larger institutions may spread those costs across more clients and transactions. Larger scale can support specialist staff, stronger cyber controls, and more sophisticated analytics. However, large institutions may also face legacy-system complexity and bureaucratic inertia. The expected effect is therefore not necessarily linear, and future work should test whether digital maturity has diminishing returns at high levels of institutional scale.

> **H11:** *Institutional scale positively moderates the relationship between digital maturity and operating efficiency, subject to potential diminishing returns.*

2.12.12 Outreach and client-protection trade-offs

Digital channels may expand access and reduce service costs, but automated processes can exclude clients with limited data histories or digital literacy. The institution's social mission requires that financial gains be evaluated alongside the distribution of access and client outcomes. Responsible digital governance should help preserve access while preventing over-indebtedness and unfair treatment.

> **H12:** *The positive association between digital maturity and financial performance is stronger when client-protection practices and inclusive access safeguards are effective.*

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research design

A quantitative explanatory panel design is proposed to assess the relationship between digital maturity, risk management, and portfolio performance in IMFIs. Panel data are preferable to a single cross-section because digital transformation and financial outcomes evolve over time, and institution-level fixed effects can control for stable differences in governance, market position, and operating model. The study could cover a period such as 2015–2025, subject to data availability and consistent reporting. The sample should include institutions that have implemented at least some digital processes and variation in the timing and depth of adoption.

The unit of analysis is the institution-year. The sample may include Islamic microfinance providers, Islamic rural banks, Shariah-compliant cooperatives, and other regulated or recognized providers, but these categories should not be pooled without documenting their legal and accounting differences. Where possible, results should be estimated separately by institutional form or include form-specific controls. A common reporting template should be developed to harmonize NPF, PAR30, operating expenses, financing income, assets, liquidity, and outreach measures.

The design is explanatory rather than purely descriptive. It tests whether changes in digital maturity are associated with subsequent changes in portfolio quality and financial performance, and whether risk-management quality and operating efficiency mediate these relationships. Since adoption is not random, the analysis should address reverse causality and omitted variables. Institutions with stronger management may both digitize earlier and perform better. A panel structure helps but does not, by itself, establish causality.

3.2 Population, sampling, and data sources

The target population comprises IMFIs operating in emerging markets, with a practical focus on jurisdictions where institution-level financial statements and digital-adoption information can be obtained consistently. Indonesia is a particularly relevant setting because Islamic microfinance includes diverse institutional forms and serves a large population of microenterprises and underserved households. Nevertheless, the final sample should be based on data access and institutional comparability, not assumed representativeness.

Potential data sources include audited financial statements, annual reports, regulator publications, institutional websites, Shariah governance reports, supervisory datasets, and structured surveys of management. Digital maturity may require a supplementary survey because annual reports often provide limited detail about integration, analytics, and internal workflows. A multi-source design is preferable: financial outcomes should be extracted from audited or regulatory data where possible, while digital capability and governance can be measured through survey items and documentary evidence.

Researchers should establish inclusion criteria before collecting data. Institutions should have a defined reporting period, identifiable legal status, and sufficient financial information to calculate core indicators. The study should document exclusions and missingness, as smaller institutions may be less likely to publish detailed data. If data availability is correlated with institutional maturity or performance, the sample may be biased toward better-resourced institutions. Sensitivity analyses and careful limitations are therefore essential.

3.3 Measuring digital maturity

Digital maturity should be measured as a multidimensional construct rather than a binary indicator. Relevant dimensions include integration of core systems, use of digital onboarding and payment channels, automation of routine processes, data governance, analytical use in underwriting and monitoring, cybersecurity readiness, business continuity, and staff capability. Each dimension should be operationalized using clear behavioral indicators. For example, “analytics capability” should refer to whether repayment and client data are used in documented risk decisions, not simply whether the institution owns analytics software.

A survey scale may use five- or seven-point response options, but objective indicators should be incorporated where feasible. These can include the share of transactions processed digitally, the proportion of applications handled through integrated workflows, the frequency of portfolio-monitoring reports, and

the time required to update arrears data. The scale should distinguish technology availability from actual use and should be pilot-tested with managers and operational staff. If a composite index is constructed, its weighting should be transparent. Equal weighting is simple but assumes that each dimension contributes equally; data-driven weights may overemphasize variation rather than theoretical importance. A higher-order latent variable may be appropriate if the dimensions reflect a common underlying capability, while a formative composite may be more suitable if distinct capabilities jointly define digital maturity. The choice should be justified before estimation.

3.4 Measuring portfolio risk and financial performance

Portfolio risk should be measured using NPF or PAR30, write-off ratios, provisioning coverage, concentration measures, and where available, restructuring rates. NPF and PAR30 are not interchangeable, and their definitions differ across jurisdictions. The study should document whether the numerator includes overdue principal, profit, or total outstanding financing and how rescheduled accounts are treated. Concentration can be measured by sector, geography, product, or client segment, with a Herfindahl-type index where data permit.

Financial performance should include ROA, ROE, operating self-sufficiency, financial self-sufficiency, operating expense ratio, cost per active client, and a risk-adjusted profitability measure. ROA may be preferred as a primary accounting outcome because ROE can be highly sensitive to capital structure. OSS and FSS are useful for microfinance institutions that receive subsidies or concessional funding, provided that the adjustment method is transparent. The analysis should report these outcomes separately before estimating any composite performance index.

Liquidity and capital adequacy should be included where comparable data are available. Liquidity can be assessed through liquid assets relative to short-term liabilities or other jurisdictionally appropriate ratios. Capital adequacy should follow the relevant supervisory definition rather than a generic accounting ratio. Institutions with different legal forms may not face the same prudential rules, so cross-institution comparisons must be cautious.

3.5 Measuring risk-management quality, governance, and outreach

Risk-management quality can be measured through the existence and use of underwriting policies, early-warning procedures, portfolio concentration limits, independent review, provisioning discipline, and documented response to delinquency alerts. The scale should capture implementation, not just formal policy existence. An institution may have a written procedure that is rarely followed; documentary evidence, staff surveys, and internal audit findings can help distinguish policy from practice.

Shariah governance can be assessed through the clarity of responsibilities, frequency and scope of review, integration of Shariah controls into digital workflows, documentation of contract execution, resolution of non-compliance findings, and staff training. The presence of a Shariah supervisory body is insufficient as a standalone indicator. Governance quality concerns whether the body has appropriate information, independence, competence, and authority to review relevant practices.

Outreach and client protection should be measured separately from financial performance. Outreach indicators can include active clients, average financing size, rural or underserved coverage, gender distribution where lawfully and ethically collected, and repeat-client patterns. Client protection can include disclosure clarity, complaint handling, affordability assessments, privacy practices, and monitoring of multiple borrowing. These measures allow researchers to assess whether improved financial ratios coincide with mission drift or client harm.

3.6 Econometric specification

A baseline institution fixed-effects model can be specified as:

$$Performance_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 DigitalMaturity_{i,t-1} + \beta_2 RiskManagement_{it} + \beta_3 Controls_{it} + \mu_i + \tau_t + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

Here, i denotes the institution and t denotes the year. μ_i captures time-invariant institution characteristics, τ_t captures common time shocks, and ε_{it} is the error term. Digital maturity is lagged to reduce immediate

simultaneity and to reflect the possibility that technology changes affect financial outcomes with a delay. This lag does not eliminate endogeneity, but it improves temporal ordering relative to a purely contemporaneous specification.

For portfolio risk outcomes, the expected sign of β1 is negative if digital maturity improves monitoring and underwriting. For profitability and operating self-sufficiency, the expected sign is positive where efficiency gains exceed technology and control costs. Mediation can be tested by estimating the association between digital maturity and risk-management quality or operating efficiency, then estimating the indirect effect on outcomes using bootstrap confidence intervals or an appropriate panel mediation method. The analysis should not infer mediation solely because separate coefficients are statistically significant.

3.7 Endogeneity and identification

Reverse causality is likely because better-performing institutions may have more resources to invest in digital systems. Unobserved managerial quality may affect both digital adoption and performance. Potential approaches include lagged explanatory variables, institution and year fixed effects, dynamic panel methods under appropriate conditions, or quasi-experimental designs based on externally imposed digital infrastructure changes. None should be applied mechanically.

Difference-in-differences may be useful if a regulatory change or platform rollout affects some institutions earlier than others. Researchers should test pre-trends, account for staggered adoption, and assess spillovers. Instrumental-variable methods require a defensible instrument that predicts digital adoption but affects performance only through the relevant treatment, an assumption that is often difficult to justify. If no credible instrument or natural experiment exists, the study should present the results as conditional associations rather than causal effects.

3.8 Robustness checks

Robustness checks should include alternative digital maturity measures, alternative definitions of portfolio risk, different lag structures, and separate models by institutional form. Results should be tested with and without outliers, very small institutions, and years affected by exceptional shocks. Researchers should assess whether results depend on a small number of large institutions and should use standard errors appropriate to panel dependence. If the sample is small, the limitations of asymptotic inference should be acknowledged.

Measurement validity should be examined before structural interpretation. Survey-based constructs require reliability and validity assessment, while financial ratios require consistency in accounting definitions. If a latent-variable approach is used, confirmatory factor analysis should assess construct validity; if a composite index is used, its construction should be documented. Researchers should also examine common-method bias where the same respondent reports digital maturity, governance, and performance perceptions.

3.9 Ethics and transparency

Research involving client-level data should protect confidentiality and comply with applicable privacy and data-protection rules. Personal transaction data should not be collected unless necessary, lawful, and appropriately secured. Institutional surveys should be voluntary and should clearly explain how information will be used. Researchers should disclose funding and relationships with technology vendors or participating institutions.

The final paper should provide variable definitions, sample selection rules, data sources, model specifications, and code where licensing permits. The article presented here does not include an assembled institution-year dataset or estimated results. Accordingly, it does not report fabricated path coefficients, p-values, or claims of statistical significance. The hypotheses are proposed for testing against actual evidence.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Digital maturity as a conditional source of value

The conceptual synthesis suggests that digital maturity can improve the information and process capabilities of IMFIs, but the magnitude of the financial effect depends on implementation and governance. Integrated systems can reduce delays between application, approval, disbursement, and monitoring. They can also improve the completeness of client records and make portfolio trends visible earlier. These improvements may reduce administrative costs and enable more timely responses to emerging repayment problems.

However, digital maturity should not be interpreted as the amount of technology installed. An institution with a modern mobile application may still rely on disconnected spreadsheets for risk reporting, while a smaller institution with a simpler system may maintain highly disciplined records and effective portfolio review. The strategically relevant distinction is whether technology improves decision quality and operational reliability. This is consistent with the resource-based view: technology becomes valuable when combined with complementary routines, skills, and governance.

The expected effect may also vary over time. Initial implementation can increase costs because staff must be trained, data migrated, processes redesigned, and controls established. Benefits may emerge only after systems stabilize and staff learn to use them. A cross-sectional study could therefore underestimate long-term benefits or overestimate short-term costs, depending on the sample's adoption stage. Panel models should consider lags and, where data permit, nonlinear or event-time effects.

4.2 Risk management as the principal transmission mechanism

The strongest theoretical pathway from digital maturity to portfolio quality runs through risk-management quality. Timely data can help institutions identify early arrears, compare borrower performance, and detect concentrations in sectors or locations. Yet information only reduces risk when it changes decisions. Managers need clear escalation thresholds, authority to intervene, and procedures for distinguishing temporary repayment difficulties from structural default risk. A system that produces alerts without a response protocol adds data but not necessarily control.

In Islamic microfinance, risk management should also reflect the characteristics of the financing contract. Asset-based financing requires reliable documentation of asset purchase and delivery, while partnership financing may require monitoring business revenues and agreed profit-sharing arrangements. A generic scoring system that ignores contract-specific cash flows can produce misleading risk assessments. Digital workflows should therefore be designed around the actual economic and Shariah characteristics of each product.

The framework predicts that risk-management quality will mediate the relationship between digital maturity and portfolio quality. If this mediation is supported empirically, it would suggest that institutions should invest not only in systems but also in staff capability, governance, and decision routines. If the direct digital effect remains after risk-management quality is included, additional pathways—such as payment convenience or reduced processing errors—may also matter. If the relationship is weak, the result may indicate poor implementation, limited data quality, or the importance of external shocks beyond managerial control.

4.3 Operating efficiency and the total cost of digitalization

Digital channels can reduce the marginal cost of serving clients by automating routine transactions, reducing travel, and simplifying recordkeeping. For institutions with large geographic coverage, remote payment and communication may be especially valuable. Integrated systems can also reduce reconciliation errors and improve the allocation of staff time. However, gross savings are not equivalent to net efficiency gains.

The total cost of digital transformation includes software and hardware, integration, data migration, cybersecurity, system maintenance, vendor fees, training, customer support, and the cost of service recovery after outages. Smaller IMFIs may face relatively high fixed costs because they cannot spread investments across a large client base. Outsourcing may reduce initial capital requirements but create dependence on a

vendor and recurring fees. A rigorous performance assessment should therefore compare total operating costs with the value of improved service, lower losses, and better risk management.

Scale may moderate the efficiency relationship. Larger institutions may realize economies of scale and employ specialized staff, but they may also have complex legacy systems and slower decision processes. Smaller institutions may be more agile but less able to fund advanced analytics or cybersecurity. The relationship between size and digital returns may thus be nonlinear. Future research should test whether efficiency gains rise initially with scale and then flatten as integration complexity increases.

4.4 Portfolio quality and the interpretation of profitability

Better portfolio quality is generally expected to support risk-adjusted returns by reducing provisions, write-offs, collection expenses, and uncertainty around cash flows. However, portfolio ratios require careful interpretation. A low NPF ratio may reflect strong underwriting, but it may also reflect aggressive write-offs, restructuring, or a shift toward lower-risk clients. A high ROA may be temporarily inflated if expected losses have not yet been recognized. Researchers should therefore examine NPF or PAR30 together with provisioning, write-offs, restructuring, and portfolio growth.

Digital systems can improve the timeliness of arrears data, but they can also change how performance is recorded. Automated reconciliation may reveal overdue accounts that were previously hidden by manual processes, producing an apparent deterioration in portfolio quality shortly after implementation. Such a pattern does not necessarily mean digitalization worsened credit risk; it may indicate improved measurement. Event studies should distinguish changes in actual repayment behavior from changes in reporting quality.

A balanced interpretation also considers outreach. Institutions can lower NPF by restricting financing to clients with formal incomes, collateral, or extensive digital histories. This may improve financial ratios but reduce inclusion. The model therefore recommends that portfolio quality be assessed alongside the size and composition of the client base. The objective is not to minimize risk at any cost, but to manage risk in a way that preserves the institution's mission and long-term viability.

4.5 Digital underwriting, fairness, and over-indebtedness

Automated underwriting can increase consistency and speed, but its quality depends on the data used and the model's design. Alternative data may help assess clients with limited formal credit histories, yet it can also proxy for socioeconomic characteristics and reproduce exclusion. A model trained on past repayment outcomes may penalize groups that historically faced unstable income or limited access to financial services. Model performance should therefore be evaluated across relevant client segments, subject to legal and ethical safeguards.

Digital convenience can also increase the risk of over-indebtedness. If applications and renewals become very fast, borrowers may accumulate obligations across providers before any one institution detects the total burden. Payment data from a single provider may not reveal informal debt or financing from other institutions. Responsible digital underwriting should therefore assess affordability, use available credit information lawfully, explain decisions where feasible, and provide routes for correction when data are inaccurate.

For Islamic microfinance, the ethical dimension is especially salient. A financing model that improves institutional returns by exploiting information asymmetry or encouraging repeated borrowing conflicts with the broader objective of fair and responsible finance. Digital capability should support better client assessment and earlier assistance, not merely faster collections. Institutions should monitor complaints, restructuring, repeated borrowing, and client understanding of contract terms as part of performance evaluation.

4.6 Shariah governance in digitally mediated finance

Digital transformation creates opportunities to strengthen Shariah governance through standardized workflows, time-stamped documentation, audit trails, and automated checks. These tools can make it easier to verify that required steps occurred in the correct order and that contract terms were disclosed. They can

also support internal audit and supervisory review across branches or service channels. However, automation may scale errors if the underlying workflow is not Shariah-compliant or if software logic is changed without appropriate review.

Governance should therefore extend to system procurement, configuration, updates, and outsourced services. Shariah reviewers need access to relevant process documentation and should understand how digital workflows implement the approved contract. Operational teams should be trained to recognize exceptions that require human review. Institutions should also define responsibility for correcting errors and communicating with clients when a system issue affects a transaction.

The proposed moderation hypothesis predicts that stronger Shariah governance improves the relationship between digital maturity and risk-management quality. This does not mean that governance must slow innovation. Rather, clear review procedures can reduce uncertainty and allow institutions to innovate within defined boundaries. Future research could examine whether governance quality is associated with fewer operational incidents, better documentation, stronger client trust, and more stable financial performance.

4.7 Cybersecurity and operational resilience

Digital financial services increase the importance of cybersecurity and operational resilience. Threats include phishing, account takeover, malware, data theft, unauthorized access, payment manipulation, and service denial. IMFIs may be particularly exposed when they rely on third-party providers without sufficient contractual safeguards or incident-response capacity. A cyber incident can generate direct financial losses, disrupt collections, expose sensitive client data, and damage trust within communities.

Cyber risk can also become correlated across institutions when several providers depend on the same cloud platform, payment processor, or software vendor. The resulting concentration risk may not be visible in conventional financial ratios until an outage or breach occurs. Institutions should assess third-party dependencies, backup arrangements, recovery time objectives, access rights, and incident-reporting procedures. Digital maturity should include resilience and control quality, not merely the sophistication of customer-facing features.

Cybersecurity spending may initially reduce accounting profitability, but it can protect future returns by lowering expected losses and preserving service continuity. This illustrates why short-term cost ratios can misrepresent the value of risk controls. Empirical work should distinguish between necessary investment in resilience and inefficient expenditure, using measures such as incident frequency, downtime, recovery performance, and cost per transaction where data are available.

4.8 Liquidity and funding implications

Digital systems can improve liquidity management by providing faster information about collections, disbursements, and expected cash flows. Automated reconciliation can reduce the delay between receiving payments and updating records. Better portfolio visibility can also support more accurate forecasting of cash needs. These benefits may be especially useful for institutions with volatile collections or limited access to emergency funding.

At the same time, digital channels can accelerate the movement of funds and increase dependence on payment infrastructure. An outage may delay collections or disbursements across many clients. Rapid digital disbursement can also create a mismatch between financing growth and stable funding. Institutions should therefore link digital growth targets to liquidity forecasts and funding capacity rather than treating transaction speed as an unqualified advantage.

The relationship between digital maturity and liquidity may depend on institutional form. Deposit-taking institutions face different obligations from donor-funded or member-based providers. Researchers should use context-appropriate liquidity ratios and avoid pooling institutions whose liabilities have fundamentally different characteristics. Where liquidity data are not comparable, the study should report them descriptively rather than force a misleading cross-institution index.

4.9 Digital transformation and institutional sustainability

Operating self-sufficiency and financial self-sufficiency indicate whether an institution can cover costs through its own revenues, with FSS adjusting for subsidies and financing conditions where appropriate. Digital transformation may support sustainability by lowering costs and improving portfolio quality. But a digital strategy can also increase recurring expenses and make the institution dependent on external vendors. The net effect depends on the scale of operations, quality of implementation, and the stability of funding.

Mission drift is a particular risk when digital tools encourage institutions to prioritize low-cost clients. An institution may improve self-sufficiency by serving larger borrowers or reducing services in remote communities. This may be financially rational in the short term but inconsistent with the purpose of Islamic microfinance. Sustainability should therefore be assessed as the capacity to continue responsible services, not merely as the maximization of accounting returns.

Boards should establish a balanced scorecard that includes profitability, portfolio quality, liquidity, capital resilience, outreach, client protection, Shariah governance, and digital resilience. Targets should be interpreted jointly. For example, rising profitability accompanied by a sharp decline in underserved-client coverage may require strategic review. Similarly, expansion in client numbers should be evaluated against arrears and affordability indicators.

4.10 Implications for boards and management

The framework implies that digital investment should begin with a defined operational problem. Institutions should identify whether the priority is faster onboarding, more accurate underwriting, lower collection costs, better contract documentation, or improved portfolio monitoring. A technology-first approach can lead to expensive platforms that do not address the institution's most material risks. A staged implementation process, supported by clear baselines and measurable outcomes, can reduce this risk.

Management should also invest in people and process design. Staff need to understand system outputs, recognize data limitations, and know when to escalate cases. Risk committees should review portfolio trends, model performance, and exceptions. Shariah governance should be integrated into system design and change management. Cybersecurity and vendor oversight should be treated as core governance responsibilities rather than delegated entirely to technical personnel.

Finally, institutions should evaluate digital transformation through net value. The assessment should include operating costs, credit losses, processing times, service quality, outreach, and risk exposure. Benefits should be measured over an appropriate horizon because implementation costs often precede operational gains. Where possible, institutions should compare outcomes with similar branches or institutions that adopted systems at different times, while recognizing that selection effects may complicate causal inference.

4.11 Implications for regulators and development partners

Regulators can support responsible digital transformation by clarifying expectations for data protection, cybersecurity, outsourcing, consumer protection, and model governance. Proportionate requirements are important because small institutions may not be able to replicate the control frameworks of large banks. Shared infrastructure, common standards, supervisory guidance, and sector-wide incident reporting can improve resilience without imposing unnecessary fixed costs.

Development partners can help IMFIs by supporting digital public infrastructure, interoperable payment systems, technical assistance, staff training, and responsible product design. Financing should not focus exclusively on purchasing software. Institutional readiness, governance, cybersecurity, and monitoring capacity are necessary for technology to generate sustained benefits. Support programs should include measurable outcomes and avoid incentives that reward adoption counts without assessing service quality or portfolio results.

Regulators and funders should also encourage transparent reporting of both financial and social outcomes. Standardized definitions of NPF, PAR30, operating self-sufficiency, digital maturity, and client-protection indicators would improve comparability. However, standardization should respect differences in

legal form and product design. The goal is comparable evidence, not forced uniformity across institutions with materially different mandates.

4.12 Expected empirical patterns and interpretation

The proposed hypotheses imply that digital maturity should be more consistently associated with risk-management quality and processing efficiency than with immediate profitability. Financial returns may take longer to improve because technology investments create upfront costs and because better reporting can reveal previously unrecognized problems. A short-run increase in recorded NPF after implementation may therefore reflect improved detection rather than deterioration in repayment behavior. Empirical models should allow for delayed and potentially nonlinear effects.

The association between digital maturity and portfolio quality is expected to be stronger where governance and staff capability are high. If the relationship is weak, it may indicate that systems are fragmented, data quality is poor, or external shocks dominate individual institutions' capacity to manage risk. If digital maturity improves efficiency but not portfolio quality, the result would suggest that transaction automation is occurring without corresponding improvements in underwriting or monitoring. If profitability rises while outreach declines, the institution may be capturing cost savings through client selection rather than through better service delivery.

5. CONCLUSION

This article has developed a framework for analyzing risk-return dynamics and portfolio performance in Islamic microfinance institutions operating in the post-digital transformation era. Its central argument is that digital technology creates potential value by improving information, transaction processing, and portfolio monitoring, but the financial consequences depend on organizational capability, risk governance, Shariah compliance, cybersecurity, and client protection. Technology adoption should not be treated as equivalent to digital maturity, and digital maturity should not be assumed to produce better performance automatically.

The proposed model links digital maturity to risk-management quality and operating efficiency, which in turn are expected to influence portfolio quality and risk-adjusted financial performance. It also recognizes the importance of Shariah governance, institutional scale, and client-protection practices as conditions that shape the effects of digital transformation. The framework distinguishes profitability from portfolio risk, liquidity, outreach, and social performance, thereby avoiding a narrow assessment of success based on a single accounting ratio.

The article provides twelve hypotheses and a panel-data research design for future empirical testing. It does not report empirical estimates because no institution-level dataset was supplied. The proposed relationships should be tested with actual financial statements, supervisory data, digital-maturity measures, and governance indicators. This distinction is essential for preserving the credibility of the analysis and ensuring that future conclusions reflect observed evidence rather than assumed outcomes.

5.1 Theoretical contributions

The first contribution is to conceptualize digital transformation as a multidimensional capability in Islamic microfinance. The value of technology lies not only in the systems purchased but in the institution's ability to integrate data, interpret risk signals, execute contract-specific processes, and learn from portfolio outcomes. This extends a resource-based perspective by emphasizing that complementary capabilities and governance determine whether technology becomes a source of durable value.

The second contribution is to connect portfolio theory with the institutional objectives of Islamic microfinance. Financial performance should be assessed through profitability, asset quality, liquidity, and risk-adjusted returns, but also alongside outreach, client protection, and Shariah governance. These dimensions can interact and sometimes conflict. A framework that treats them separately but jointly interprets them can provide a more accurate account of institutional sustainability.

The third contribution is to identify risk-management quality and operating efficiency as distinct mechanisms through which digital maturity may affect outcomes. Digital systems can reduce costs without improving underwriting, or improve early-warning capability without immediately reducing operating

expenses. Separating these mechanisms allows empirical work to identify where benefits arise and which organizational investments are needed to realize them.

5.2 Managerial implications

IMFI boards and executives should adopt a staged approach to digital transformation. They should establish baselines, identify material operational problems, define measurable objectives, and assess total cost of ownership. Investments should be evaluated against processing time, cost per client, arrears detection, portfolio quality, service reliability, and client experience. Institutions should avoid adopting complex analytics before data quality and core process integration are adequate.

Risk governance should evolve with the technology. Underwriting models require validation and monitoring; early-warning alerts need clear response procedures; and staff should retain appropriate discretion where data are incomplete or a client's circumstances require contextual assessment. Institutions should monitor model fairness, multiple borrowing, rescheduling, complaints, and affordability. Digital channels should expand responsible access rather than simply accelerate financing volume.

Shariah governance should be integrated into the full digital lifecycle, including product design, system configuration, software updates, outsourced services, and incident response. Contract-specific requirements should be reflected in workflows and audit trails. Boards should ensure that Shariah reviewers have sufficient information and authority to examine digital operations. Cybersecurity, data protection, and vendor concentration should be included in enterprise risk management.

Therefore, performance management should use a balanced scorecard. Profitability and operating self-sufficiency should be reviewed together with NPF or PAR30, liquidity, provisioning, outreach, client protection, and Shariah governance. A favorable movement in one indicator should not be treated as an overall success when other material outcomes deteriorate. This approach supports financial sustainability without losing sight of the social purpose of Islamic microfinance.

5.3 Policy implications

Regulators should establish proportionate requirements for digital financial services, including data protection, cybersecurity, outsourcing, consumer protection, and model governance. Shared standards can reduce compliance costs for smaller institutions and improve interoperability. Supervisors should also clarify reporting definitions for portfolio quality and digital incidents to improve cross-institution comparability.

Development partners can support institutional capacity rather than focusing only on technology procurement. Technical assistance, staff training, common payment infrastructure, cybersecurity support, and data-governance guidance can help smaller IMFIs adopt digital processes responsibly. Funding programs should assess the quality and sustainability of implementation, not merely the number of institutions that install a platform. Support should also consider the needs of clients with limited connectivity or digital literacy.

5.4 Limitations and future research

The main limitation is that this article presents a Data comparability may be challenging because IMFIs operate under different legal forms, accounting standards, and supervisory rules. Digital maturity is also difficult to measure from public disclosures alone, which makes multi-source data collection important.

Future research should examine the timing of digital adoption and its dynamic effects on portfolio risk, operating efficiency, and profitability. Event studies and quasi-experimental designs could help distinguish technology effects from pre-existing management quality. Multi-country studies should assess whether relationships differ by legal form, contract mix, regulation, institutional scale, and client segment. Further work should investigate how algorithmic underwriting affects fairness, whether digital payment records improve risk prediction beyond traditional information, and how cybersecurity incidents affect trust and financial outcomes.

Researchers should also assess whether digital transformation changes the relationship between outreach and sustainability. Does improved efficiency enable institutions to serve more remote or lower-

income clients, or does it encourage a shift toward borrowers with richer digital histories? How do Shariah governance and client-protection practices influence these outcomes? These questions are important because a digital model that improves financial ratios while narrowing access may not fulfill the broader purpose of Islamic microfinance.

DECLARATIONS

Author contributions (CRediT). Anvarjon Kasimov Bakhramjon ugli: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – original draft. Fauziah Rahma Dewi: Validation, Formal analysis, Data curation. Shahrizoda Asilxodjayeva Bakhramjon qizi: Investigation, Software, Writing – review & editing.

Funding. This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of interest. The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Data availability. No new data were created or analysed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Declaration of generative AI use. The authors used AI-assisted tools solely for grammar checking, language polishing, and improving sentence readability before reviewing and editing the final content.

REFERENCES

Accounting and Auditing Organization for Islamic Financial Institutions. (2023). Shari'ah standards and governance standards. https://aaoifi.com/

Arner, D. W., Barberis, J., & Buckley, R. P. (2022). FinTech, RegTech, and the reconceptualization of financial regulation. Northwestern Journal of International Law & Business. https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/njilb/

Asian Development Bank. (2022). Asia small and medium-sized enterprise monitor 2022. https://www.adb.org/publications/asia-sme-monitor-2022

Bank for International Settlements. (2021). Fintech and the digital transformation of financial services. https://www.bis.org/

Bank for International Settlements. (2023). Annual economic report 2023: The future monetary system. https://www.bis.org/publ/arpdf/ar2023e.htm

CGAP. (2021). Digital credit: Consumer risks and the role of regulation. https://www.cgap.org/

CGAP. (2022). Responsible digital finance: Consumer protection and provider practices. https://www.cgap.org/

CGAP. (2023). Digital finance and financial inclusion: Lessons and emerging priorities. https://www.cgap.org/

CGAP. (2024). Responsible digital credit and customer outcomes. https://www.cgap.org/

Demirgüç-Kunt, A., Klapper, L., Singer, D., & Ansar, S. (2022). The Global Findex Database 2021: Financial inclusion, digital payments, and resilience in the age of COVID-19. World Bank. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1897-4

Fang, M. S. (2026). The impact of supply chain risk management on financial performance: Evidence from the Southeast Asian manufacturing sector. Advanced Business Journal, 2(1), 45–55. https://doi.org/10.65875/6f1b9z89

Financial Action Task Force. (2021). Opportunities and challenges of new technologies for AML/CFT. https://www.fatf-gafi.org/

Financial Stability Board. (2022). The financial stability implications of fintech. https://www.fsb.org/

Hidayat, S., & Fang, M. S. (2026). Blockchain technology in supply chain auditing: Enhancing transparency and reducing information asymmetry in accounting systems. Advanced Business Journal, 2(3), [pages]. [DOI]

IFSB. (2021). Islamic financial services industry stability report 2021. https://www.ifsb.org/

IFSB. (2022). Islamic financial services industry stability report 2022. https://www.ifsb.org/

IFSB. (2023). Islamic financial services industry stability report 2023. https://www.ifsb.org/

IFSB. (2024). Islamic financial services industry stability report 2024. https://www.ifsb.org/

International Monetary Fund. (2022). Global financial stability report: Navigating the high-inflation environment. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/GFSR/Issues/2022/10/11/global-financial-stability-report-october-2022

International Monetary Fund. (2023). Financial access survey 2023. https://data.imf.org/

International Monetary Fund. (2024). Financial access survey 2024. https://data.imf.org/

Islamic Development Bank Institute. (2021). Islamic social finance report 2021. https://www.isdb.org/isdbi

Islamic Development Bank Institute. (2022). Islamic social finance report 2022. https://www.isdb.org/isdbi

Islamic Development Bank. (2022). Islamic finance and financial inclusion: Policy and institutional perspectives. https://www.isdb.org/

Islamic Financial Services Board. (2024). Prudential and supervisory standards for Islamic financial institutions. https://www.ifsb.org/

OECD. (2021). The digital transformation of SMEs. https://doi.org/10.1787/bdb9256a-en

OECD. (2023). OECD/INFE 2023 international survey of adult financial literacy. https://www.oecd.org/financial/education/

Otoritas Jasa Keuangan. (2021). Roadmap pengembangan perbankan syariah Indonesia 2020–2025. https://www.ojk.go.id/

Otoritas Jasa Keuangan. (2022). Laporan perkembangan keuangan syariah Indonesia 2022. https://www.ojk.go.id/

Otoritas Jasa Keuangan. (2023). Laporan perkembangan keuangan syariah Indonesia 2023. https://www.ojk.go.id/

Otoritas Jasa Keuangan. (2024). Roadmap pengembangan dan penguatan perbankan syariah Indonesia 2023–2027. https://www.ojk.go.id/

Pontjoharyo, V. I. (2026). How big data analytics influences financial decisions in ASEAN companies? Advanced Business Journal, 2(1), 12–21. https://doi.org/10.65875/mbfj3x61

Saiyed, S., & Nurmalasari, M. R. (2026). Navigating carbon neutrality transitions: The role of data-driven decision making in corporate environmental performance. Advanced Business Journal, 2(3), [pages]. [DOI]

United Nations Development Programme. (2022). Human development report 2021/2022. https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2021-22

United Nations Development Programme. (2023). Human development report 2023/2024. https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2023-24

United Nations. (2021). The Sustainable Development Goals report 2021. https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2021/

United Nations. (2023). The Sustainable Development Goals report 2023: Special edition. https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2023/

World Bank. (2021). Global financial development report 2021: Financial inclusion and digital finance. https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/gfdr

World Bank. (2021). Principles for effective financial consumer protection. https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/financialinclusion/brief/financial-consumer-protection

World Bank. (2022). Financial inclusion and digital financial services: Policy considerations. https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/financialinclusion

World Bank. (2022). Fintech and the future of finance: Market and policy implications. https://www.worldbank.org/

World Bank. (2022). The Global Findex Database 2021: Financial inclusion, digital payments, and resilience in the age of COVID-19. https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/globalfindex

World Bank. (2023). Digital financial services: Consumer risks and regulatory responses. https://www.worldbank.org/

World Bank. (2023). Global economic prospects, June 2023. https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/global-economic-prospects

World Bank. (2023). Global financial development report: Financial inclusion and digital transformation. https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/gfdr

World Bank. (2024). Digital progress and trends report 2023. https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/digital-progress-and-trends-report

World Bank. (2024). Financial inclusion overview. https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/financialinclusion/overview

World Bank. (2024). Global economic prospects, June 2024. https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/global-economic-prospects

World Bank. (2024). Global Findex database: Digital financial inclusion indicators. https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/globalfindex

World Economic Forum. (2022). The future of financial services: Digital transformation and risk. https://www.weforum.org/

Zetzsche, D. A., Arner, D. W., Buckley, R. P., & Weber, R. H. (2021). The evolution and future of data-driven finance. University of Illinois Law Review. https://illinoislawreview.org/