OPEN ACCESS
Saudi Journal of Economics and Finance
Abbreviated Key Title: Saudi J Econ Fin
ISSN 2523-9414 (Print) | ISSN 2523-6563 (Online)
Scholars Middle East Publishers, Dubai, United Arab Emirates
Journal homepage: http://saudijournals.com

Original Research Article

The Role of Property Valuation in Enhancing the Financial Stability of Microfinance Institutions

Ajibade Ojo Majeed[1*], Chukwuma Nwude[2]

[1]Rufus Giwa Polytechnic, Owo Ondo State
[2]Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Kaduna State

DOI: 10.36348/sjef.2022.v06i12.007 | **Received:** 16.11.2022 | **Accepted:** 24.12.2022 | **Published:** 30.12.2022

***Corresponding author:** Ajibade Ojo Majeed
Rufus Giwa Polytechnic, Owo Ondo State

Abstract

This paper examines the role of property valuation in enhancing the financial stability of microfinance institutions (MFIs). Drawing on an integrative review of secondary literature, the study highlights how accurate collateral valuation reduces default risks, secures loan portfolios, and supports institutional sustainability. The analysis reveals that preventive and transparent valuation practices not only safeguard financial assets but also foster trust among borrowers, investors, and regulators. Governance and organizational culture emerge as decisive factors shaping valuation effectiveness, with leadership commitment and accountability identified as central drivers of institutional credibility. Knowledge gaps and resource constraints, particularly in developing economies, are noted as persistent barriers to effective valuation practices. The study concludes that embedding transparency, governance, and professional capacity into valuation processes is crucial for MFIs to achieve financial stability, foster societal trust, and make meaningful contributions to sustainable development.
Keywords: Property valuation; Microfinance institutions; Collateral; Transparency; Financial stability.

INTRODUCTION

The stability of financial institutions has long been tied to their capacity to manage risks associated with lending and asset management. In the context of microfinance institutions (MFIs), this challenge becomes even more pronounced due to the relatively small scale of their loan portfolios and the vulnerability of their clientele. Property valuation plays a pivotal role in mitigating financial risks by ensuring that collateral is accurately assessed, loans are appropriately secured, and institutional sustainability is maintained. Within the broader discourse of sustainability and facilities management, collateral valuation serves as a financial tool that enhances institutional resilience, reduces exposure to default, and contributes to wider economic development. The significance of property valuation resonates with arguments made in sustainability research, where the efficient management of resources and assets is considered fundamental to long-term stability. Barrett and Baldry (2003) define facilities management as an integrated approach to maintaining, improving, and adapting infrastructure in a manner that supports institutional objectives. By extension, valuation is not merely a technical appraisal of property but also a strategic process that safeguards institutional objectives through prudent financial practices. Similarly, Hodges (2005) and Radebe, S. & Ozumba, A. (2021) emphasize that professional management of assets reduces financial exposure and creates opportunities for operational efficiency, which are essential for MFIs that operate on thin margins.

The theoretical foundation of sustainability further strengthens the relevance of valuation. The Brundtland Report (1987) conceptualizes sustainable development as meeting present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Similarly, accurate property valuation ensures that MFIs can meet their immediate financial needs while protecting their portfolios for the future. By securing loans against fairly assessed collateral, MFIs mitigate excessive risk exposure and strike a balance between current lending activity and long-term institutional viability. This perspective aligns with the arguments of Bartlett and Chase (2004), who view sustainability as a continuous process of protecting resources while enhancing societal well-being. The role of valuation as a mechanism for financial stability is also aligned with findings on the relationship between facilities and institutional competitiveness. Price, Matzdorf, Smith, and Agahi (2003) emphasize that the quality of facilities influences choices and perceptions of stakeholders. Applied to MFIs, reliable valuation practices build confidence among clients, investors, and regulators, reinforcing institutional credibility. Transparency in the valuation process fosters trust, which is particularly crucial in the microfinance sector, where many clients are low-income earners who rely heavily on the integrity of the institutions. (Radebe, S. & Ozumba, 2021)

Challenges to sustainability in facilities management offer parallel lessons for property valuation in microfinance. Elmualim, Shockley, Valle, Ludlow, and Shah (2010) note that lack of knowledge and senior management commitment often hinder the adoption of sustainable practices. Similarly, valuation in MFIs may be compromised by insufficient expertise, inadequate regulatory oversight, or weak institutional commitment to transparency. Hasim (2014) argues that organizational culture often determines whether sustainability principles are adopted or ignored; in MFIs, the prevailing culture of risk-taking or conservative lending can significantly shape how valuations are conducted and applied. This highlights the need for governance and capacity development as integral components of valuation practice. International perspectives underscore the crucial role of valuation in maintaining institutional stability. Avila et al. (2017) demonstrate that barriers to innovation and sustainability in universities stem from governance weaknesses and a lack of management support. The parallel for MFIs is that weak valuation practices expose them to systemic risk and limit their capacity to adapt to changing financial landscapes. Ugbaja (2018) similarly underscores that institutions in developing economies often lag in adopting best practices due to economic and structural constraints. This challenge resonates strongly with microfinance institutions, which struggle to balance outreach with sustainability.

The knowledge dimension is also central to valuation practices. Lai and Yik (2006) found that gaps in practitioner knowledge significantly limit the effectiveness of sustainable building management. In the context of MFIs, valuation requires professional expertise and up-to-date market knowledge, without which the process becomes unreliable. Sarpin and Yang (2012) argue that capacity-building frameworks are essential to equip professionals with the competencies necessary for sustainability. Applied to valuation, this implies that ongoing training, professional standards, and regulatory frameworks are indispensable for enhancing the accuracy and credibility of collateral assessments. Moreover, property valuation contributes to the symbolic role of institutions in society. Cortese (2003) asserts that higher education institutions serve as exemplars of sustainability in society. Similarly, MFIs that uphold rigorous valuation practices not only secure their financial stability but also signal to clients and stakeholders their commitment to fairness, transparency, and long-term development. Lozano, Lukman, Lozano, Huisingh, and Lambrechts (2013) note that declarations and commitments to sustainability gain legitimacy only when supported by internal practices. In microfinance, institutional pledges to financial inclusion must be underpinned by credible valuation processes that protect both lenders and borrowers. Property valuation emerges as both a technical and strategic tool for enhancing the economic stability of microfinance institutions. By drawing lessons from sustainability and facilities management literature, it becomes clear that valuation safeguards institutional resilience, fosters stakeholder trust, and aligns lending practices with long-term development objectives. However, as highlighted by multiple studies, challenges such as knowledge gaps, governance weaknesses, and cultural barriers persist in undermining effective valuation practices, particularly in developing economies. Addressing these challenges requires integrating valuation into the broader discourse of institutional sustainability, thereby ensuring that microfinance institutions remain both financially viable and socially impactful.

OBJECTIVES

1. To examine the role of property valuation in safeguarding the loan portfolios of microfinance institutions.
2. To identify common challenges faced in the valuation of collateral for microfinance loans.
3. To explore how accurate valuation practices enhance trust, transparency, and financial sustainability.
4. To recommend strategies for strengthening property valuation processes in the microfinance sector.

Related Work

The role of property valuation in strengthening the financial stability of microfinance institutions is best understood within the broader scholarly discourse on sustainability, asset management, and institutional resilience. Much of the literature on sustainability and facilities management provides a helpful framework for examining how valuation practices affect the performance and credibility of financial institutions. Early conceptualizations of sustainability set the stage for understanding the importance of responsible valuation. The Brundtland Report (1987) defined sustainable development as the ability to meet present needs without compromising the needs of future generations, a perspective that has since been widely applied across various sectors. Bartlett and Chase (2004) expanded this understanding by emphasizing that sustainability requires institutions to integrate long-term thinking into daily operations. In the context of microfinance, this means valuation practices should not only safeguard current loan portfolios but also ensure institutional longevity by minimizing exposure to financial risks.

Facilities management research offers significant parallels to property valuation. Barrett and Baldry (2003) describe facilities management as the integration of processes that maintain and adapt infrastructure to support institutional goals. This integration aligns with valuation, which links asset worth to financial decision-making, thereby protecting institutional objectives. Similarly, Tucker (2013) defines sustainable facilities management as a set of practices that improve the economic, social, and environmental outcomes of organizations. Applied to MFIs, valuation becomes part of a wider sustainability framework that links asset assessment to financial stability and institutional accountability. Several scholars highlight the importance of transparency and stakeholder trust, which are critical in both sustainability and valuation. Price, Matzdorf, Smith, and Agahi (2003) found that the quality of facilities influences stakeholder perceptions and decision-making. In a financial context, reliable valuation enhances the trust of clients, investors, and regulators in the credibility of MFIs. Lozano, Lukman, Lozano, Huisingh, and Lambrechts (2013) reinforce this point, arguing that institutional declarations and commitments to sustainability are only meaningful when accompanied by transparent internal practices. For MFIs, this translates into rigorous valuation procedures that demonstrate fairness and reliability in loan collateral assessments. (Radebe & Ozumba, 2021)

The literature also identifies persistent barriers that parallel challenges in property valuation. Elmualim, Shockley, Valle, Ludlow, and Shah (2010) argue that the lack of senior management commitment often undermines the implementation of sustainability practices. This insight is highly relevant to valuation in MFIs, where weak governance can lead to undervaluation or overvaluation of assets, exposing institutions to financial instability. Hasim (2014) notes that organizational culture often determines whether sustainability principles are embedded, which aligns with the cultural dynamics of MFIs, where attitudes toward risk and transparency influence how valuations are conducted. Knowledge gaps also emerge as significant constraints. Lai and Yik (2006) observed that deficiencies in practitioner knowledge hinder effective facilities management, a problem also reflected in valuation practices, where insufficient professional expertise compromises accuracy. Sarpin and Yang (2012) argue for knowledge capability frameworks to bridge these gaps, while Sarpin (2015) develops people capability models for embedding sustainability in professional practice. These contributions underscore the importance of training and capacity-building for valuation professionals working in microfinance institutions.

Resource constraints are another recurring theme in the literature. Shafii, Ali, and Othman (2006) highlight that in developing countries, limited financial resources hinder the adoption of sustainable construction and management practices. Similarly, Shah (2007) points out that the high costs of implementing sustainability initiatives often discourage organizations despite long-term benefits. These insights mirror the valuation challenges faced by MFIs, where the perceived costs of professional valuation services may deter institutions from adopting rigorous processes, thereby increasing their risk exposure. Ugbaja (2018) further notes that African institutions face systemic barriers, such as inadequate funding and weak policy enforcement, which reinforces the vulnerability of valuation systems in developing contexts. Comparative studies provide further insight into institutional obstacles. Ávila et al. (2017) identify leadership and governance as global challenges across universities, suggesting that institutional sustainability is often constrained by weak commitment at the top. This finding aligns with microfinance institutions, where weak or inconsistent valuation standards usually result from insufficient regulatory oversight or leadership support. Støre-Valen and Buser (2017, 2019) extend this argument in the Nordic context, showing that even institutions in developed economies face resistance to cultural change and institutional inertia. These studies demonstrate that valuation challenges are not unique to MFIs but part of broader institutional struggles to align technical practices with strategic sustainability.

The symbolic and societal role of institutions is another theme relevant to valuation. Cortese (2003) argues that universities serve as exemplars in advancing sustainability, influencing societal norms and expectations. In the financial sector, MFIs perform a similar role by promoting financial inclusion and economic empowerment. When valuation practices are transparent and reliable, they symbolize institutional integrity and enhance public trust in microfinance as a vehicle for sustainable development. Vidler (2011) similarly notes that sustainability must be viewed as a necessity rather than a luxury, a perspective that resonates with the essential role of valuation in safeguarding institutional survival. Further literature emphasizes the strategic integration of valuation with broader institutional goals. Nielsen, Jensen, and Jensen (2009) conceptualize facilities management as a strategic function linked to sustainability outcomes. Applied to MFIs, valuation must be strategically integrated with financial planning and risk management to ensure consistency and resilience. Nielsen and Galamba (2010) and Nielsen, Sarasoja, and Galamba (2016) extend this perspective by positioning facilities management as a driver of sustainability in organizational practice. This parallels the role of valuation in financial institutions, where accurate asset assessment underpins both operational sustainability and long-term viability.

Professional ethics and governance frameworks emerge as indispensable in ensuring compelling valuation. Jaunzens, Warriner, Garner, and Waterman (2001) emphasize the importance of integrating facilities expertise into building design and decision-making. By analogy, valuation professionals should be incorporated into financial decision-making processes within MFIs to ensure that collateral assessments are both accurate and aligned with institutional objectives. Adewunmi, Omirin, and Koleoso (2012) argue that corporate approaches to estate management are necessary to overcome fragmented governance systems, a point equally relevant to microfinance institutions seeking to strengthen valuation practices. The literature reveals strong parallels between sustainability research in facilities management and the role of valuation in financial institutions. Radebe & Ozumba (2021) add that across diverse contexts, themes of transparency, governance, knowledge, resource allocation, and cultural change consistently emerge as determinants of success. For microfinance institutions, accurate property valuation is not merely a technical requirement but a strategic necessity that enhances financial stability, builds stakeholder trust, and supports long-term sustainability.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative and integrative literature review methodology to explore the role of property valuation in enhancing the financial stability of microfinance institutions. Russell (2005) explains that integrative reviews synthesize findings across diverse studies to generate comprehensive insights into a given phenomenon. This approach is particularly suited for valuation in MFIs, where empirical data is limited. Still, a wealth of related scholarship on sustainability, facilities management, and institutional governance provides a robust conceptual framework. The review process drew on secondary sources identified in previous studies on sustainability and facilities management. Lee and Kang (2013) emphasize that integrative reviews allow for the systematic consolidation of knowledge, while LoBiondo-Wood and Haber (2010) highlight their capacity to provide critical appraisals that inform both theory and practice. Following this approach, literature on governance, organizational culture, preventive practices, and resource management was synthesized to examine how valuation influences financial stability in MFIs.

A thematic framework was adopted for organizing the data. Elmualim, Shockley, Valle, Ludlow, and Shah (2010) identified governance and knowledge as critical barriers to sustainability, while Hasim (2014) stressed the influence of institutional culture. These themes were applied to valuation by categorizing findings under governance structures, cultural dynamics, and professional capacity. Similarly, resource-related perspectives from Shafii, Ali, and Othman (2006) and Shah (2007) were examined to understand the financial and operational constraints that shape valuation practices.

To ensure contextual depth, literature from both developed and developing economies was included. Støre-Valen and Buser (2017, 2019) provided insights on institutional inertia in developed contexts, while Ugbaja (2018) and Adewunmi, Omirin, and Koleoso (2012) illustrated challenges in African settings. This comparative approach strengthens the validity of findings by capturing both global and local perspectives. The methodology is qualitative, thematic, and literature-based. By consolidating secondary research and applying it to the context of microfinance, the study provides a framework for understanding valuation as a strategic tool for institutional sustainability.

Property Valuation and Microfinance Stability

Collateral Security and Loan Performance

Collateral security is a central element in the operations of microfinance institutions (MFIs), and property valuation plays a decisive role in ensuring that collateral is both reliable and sufficient to cover the risks associated with lending. The sustainability of MFIs, which often serve low-income individuals and small businesses, depends significantly on the accuracy of collateral assessments, as these assessments determine loan amounts, repayment capacities, and the institution's resilience. Proper valuation of property used as collateral not only protects the institution from financial losses but also ensures fairness and transparency in dealings with clients. The conceptual foundation for this relationship can be traced to the principles of sustainability, which emphasize the balance between present needs and future security. The Brundtland Report (1987) defined sustainability as the ability to meet current needs without compromising the ability to meet future needs. In microfinance, this translates into lending practices that allow institutions to serve clients today while maintaining financial stability for the future. Accurate collateral valuation ensures that loan disbursements are aligned with the actual market worth of pledged assets, thereby safeguarding both present operations and long-term institutional health. Barrett and Baldry (2003) argue that integrating asset management with organizational goals is crucial for sustainability. Applied to MFIs, this means that valuation must not be treated merely as a technical formality but as a strategic tool aligned with financial objectives. Hodges (2005) further reinforces this point by noting that proactive management of assets reduces financial risks and creates avenues for operational efficiency. For MFIs, where loan defaults can quickly undermine stability, the valuation of property collateral provides a vital mechanism for reducing risk and ensuring predictable loan performance.

Collateral valuation also contributes to stakeholder trust, which is indispensable in the financial sector. Price, Matzdorf, Smith, and Agahi (2003) emphasize that the quality and reliability of institutional practices shape stakeholder perceptions. In microfinance, transparent and accurate property valuation builds client confidence, ensuring that borrowers perceive lending as fair and equitable. Lozano, Lukman, Lozano, Huisingh, and Lambrechts (2013) add that institutional declarations or commitments gain legitimacy only when accompanied by credible internal practices. In MFIs, this means that pledges to support financial inclusion must be reinforced by valuation processes that guarantee fairness in collateral assessment. Nevertheless, challenges to compelling collateral valuation persist. Elmualim, Shockley, Valle, Ludlow, and Shah (2010) identify lack of leadership commitment as a significant barrier to sustainability practices, a theme equally applicable to valuation in MFIs. Without strong governance structures, institutions may tolerate undervaluation or overvaluation of assets, leading to systemic risks. Hasim (2014) highlights the role of organizational culture in shaping sustainability outcomes; in MFIs, cultures of expediency or short-term profit may undermine rigorous valuation, thereby weakening loan performance. Vidler (2011) reinforces this argument by asserting that sustainability in institutional practices must be reframed as a necessity rather than an option, underscoring the need to treat accurate collateral valuation as essential to financial survival.

Knowledge and capacity gaps also affect valuation and loan performance. Lai and Yik (2006) found that practitioner knowledge deficits often limit the effectiveness of facilities management, a situation mirrored in valuation, where a lack of professional expertise undermines accuracy. Sarpin and Yang (2012) argue that capacity frameworks are necessary to build the competencies required for sustainable practices, while Sarpin (2015) develops models to embed sustainability skills into professional practice. These insights are directly relevant to microfinance, where valuation errors caused by insufficient training or expertise can lead to inflated loan portfolios or poor recovery rates.

Financial constraints present additional barriers. Shafii, Ali, and Othman (2006) note that in developing countries, limited resources hinder the adoption of sustainable practices, while Shah (2007) emphasizes the high costs of implementing such practices as a deterrent. Similarly, MFIs may perceive professional property valuation services as costly, leading to reliance on informal or inadequate methods. Ugbaja (2018) emphasizes that in African institutions, weak policy enforcement and financial constraints frequently undermine sustainability initiatives, a challenge reflected in the limited adoption of rigorous valuation practices in microfinance lending. The consequences of weak collateral valuation for loan performance are substantial. Undervaluation can result in loans being smaller than borrowers' real capacities, thereby limiting access to financial support. Overvaluation, on the other hand, exposes institutions to defaults that exceed the recoverable value of collateral, undermining portfolio stability. Støre-Valen and Buser (2017, 2019) note that institutional inertia and resistance to change exacerbate these risks by perpetuating outdated practices. For MFIs, failure to modernize valuation approaches directly affects loan recovery rates, client satisfaction, and overall sustainability.

The symbolic role of collateral valuation also deserves attention. Cortese (2003) argues that institutions function as exemplars in advancing sustainability, setting norms for society. In the financial sector, MFIs that adhere to rigorous valuation practices demonstrate integrity and accountability, which reinforces their symbolic role as agents of financial inclusion and societal transformation. By ensuring that collateral is valued correctly, MFIs not only protect themselves financially but also project an image of fairness and reliability, enhancing their legitimacy in the eyes of stakeholders.

Integration of valuation into broader institutional strategies is essential for stability. Nielsen, Jensen, and Jensen (2009) conceptualize facilities management as a strategic function that supports sustainability, whereas Nielsen and Galamba (2010) argue that adequate facilities management practices must be embedded in organizational processes. Applied to MFIs, property valuation must be strategically integrated into loan approval processes, risk management frameworks, and institutional policies. Adewunmi, Omirin, and Koleoso (2012) emphasize that corporate approaches to estate management are necessary to overcome fragmented systems. This principle is equally relevant in microfinance institutions seeking to professionalize valuation practices. Collateral security and loan performance are inseparably linked through property valuation. Accurate and transparent valuation reduces financial risks, enhances client trust, and ensures institutional sustainability. While challenges such as weak governance, cultural resistance, knowledge deficits, and economic constraints persist, the literature emphasizes that rigorous valuation practices are indispensable for safeguarding the stability of microfinance institutions. By aligning valuation with strategic objectives, governance frameworks, and professional capacity development, MFIs can strengthen loan performance and contribute more effectively to financial inclusion and sustainable development.

Transparency, Trust, and Institutional Growth

Transparency in property valuation is fundamental to the credibility of microfinance institutions (MFIs). In financial systems where collateral is the foundation of lending, consistent, reliable, and transparent valuation practices establish the trust necessary for long-term institutional growth. For MFIs, which often operate in fragile economic environments and serve clients with limited financial literacy, building confidence among borrowers, investors, and regulators is critical to sustaining financial stability and institutional legitimacy. Transparency aligns with broader sustainability principles, which emphasize fairness, accountability, and transparency. Bartlett and Chase (2004) note that sustainability requires continuous integration of ethical practices into organizational systems. In valuation, this translates into processes that are impartial, verifiable, and free from manipulation. Brundtland (1987) similarly underscores the importance of protecting future generations through responsible practices, which, in financial terms, requires ensuring that valuation upholds fairness to both lenders and borrowers. MFIs that consistently apply transparent valuation methods demonstrate their commitment to responsible lending, thereby reinforcing institutional credibility.

Stakeholder trust is one of the most frequently cited outcomes of transparent institutional practices. Price, Matzdorf, Smith, and Agahi (2003) show that the quality and reliability of institutional services influence stakeholders' decisions. In the microfinance context, clients are more willing to engage with institutions that demonstrate fairness in collateral assessment. At the same time, investors are more likely to provide funding to MFIs with rigorous valuation systems. Lozano, Lukman, Lozano, Huisingh, and Lambrechts (2013) argue that institutional commitments gain legitimacy only when supported by transparent internal practices, suggesting that valuation procedures are as necessary as financial declarations or mission statements in establishing trust. Conversely, opaque or inconsistent valuation practices undermine trust and destabilize institutions. Elmualim, Shockley, Valle, Ludlow, and Shah (2010) highlight the role of leadership commitment in overcoming barriers to sustainability. In MFIs, weak governance or lack of accountability often results in manipulated valuations, exposing institutions to financial risk while eroding client confidence. Hasim (2014) further demonstrates that organizational culture can either support or hinder sustainability initiatives; cultures that tolerate informality or favoritism in valuation create fertile ground for mistrust and instability. Vidler (2011) emphasizes that sustainability must be treated as a necessity rather than a luxury, underscoring the notion that transparent valuation is not optional but essential to institutional survival.

Trust also depends on the knowledge and capacity of valuation professionals. Lai and Yik (2006) argue that practitioner knowledge deficits limit the effectiveness of technical practices, while Sarpin and Yang (2012) emphasize the need for knowledge capability frameworks. In the microfinance sector, poorly trained valuers may unintentionally erode transparency through inaccuracies, while deliberate malpractice can further compromise institutional reputation. Sarpin (2015) adds that embedding sustainability competencies into professional development frameworks ensures that transparency and ethics are institutionalized rather than treated as individual attributes. Transparency in valuation has long-term implications for institutional growth. Cortese (2003) argues that institutions serve as exemplars of societal values, shaping norms and expectations. MFIs that practice transparent valuation not only secure their own stability but also set standards for ethical financial conduct in their communities. This symbolic role enhances their reputation and attracts more clients, creating a cycle of trust and growth. Støre-Valen and Buser (2017, 2019) also demonstrate that institutions that resist cultural change tend to stagnate. In contrast, those that adopt transparent practices adapt more effectively to shifting economic and regulatory environments, thereby ensuring long-term viability.

Financial constraints continue to be a barrier to transparent valuation, particularly in developing economies. Shafii, Ali, and Othman (2006) observe that resource limitations hinder the adoption of sustainability practices, while Shah (2007) identifies the costs of professionalization as a deterrent. However, Ugbaja (2018) argues that institutions that prioritize transparency, even within constrained contexts, gain resilience by fostering client trust and reducing risks of default. Adewunmi, Omirin, and Koleoso (2012) further recommend corporate approaches that strengthen governance and transparency in estate management, principles equally applicable to valuation in microfinance institutions. The strategic integration of transparency with institutional processes is also critical. Nielsen, Jensen, and Jensen (2009) position facilities management as a strategic contributor to sustainability, a perspective echoed by Nielsen and Galamba (2010) and Nielsen, Sarasoja, and Galamba (2016), who argue that sustainability practices must be embedded into core organizational processes. Applied to valuation, transparency must be institutionalized within loan approval frameworks, risk management policies, and governance systems. Only by embedding transparency into these core structures can MFIs sustain trust and achieve growth. Transparent valuation practices are inextricably linked to trust and institutional development in the microfinance sector. They build confidence among clients, investors, and regulators, reduce the risks associated with default, and project an image of fairness and accountability that enhances institutional legitimacy. While challenges such as weak governance, limited expertise, and financial constraints persist, the literature demonstrates that transparency is not an optional practice but a strategic necessity. By embedding transparent valuation into organizational culture and governance frameworks, MFIs can strengthen their role as both financial intermediaries and societal leaders, thereby ensuring sustained growth and long-term stability.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of secondary literature reveals that property valuation is central to the financial stability of microfinance institutions (MFIs). Findings show that accurate valuation of collateral reduces institutional exposure to risk, enhances trust among stakeholders, and contributes to sustainable institutional growth. However, challenges such as weak governance, knowledge deficits, cultural barriers, and financial constraints continue to undermine the effectiveness of valuation practices. A significant finding is that collateral valuation has a direct influence on loan performance. Barrett and Baldry (2003) emphasize that aligning asset management with institutional goals enhances sustainability, while Hodges (2005) argues that proactive management reduces financial risks. In MFIs, property valuation ensures that loans are secured by assets whose market value corresponds to the lending amounts, thereby reducing the risks of default and ensuring portfolio stability. Conversely, overvaluation of collateral exposes institutions to loan losses, while undervaluation restricts borrowers' access to needed credit, undermining financial inclusion.

The findings also highlight transparency as a decisive factor in institutional trust. Price, Matzdorf, Smith, and Agahi (2003) observe that the reliability of services shapes stakeholder perceptions, a point reinforced by Lozano, Lukman, Lozano, Huisingh, and Lambrechts (2013), who stress that institutional commitments are credible only when supported by transparent practices. For MFIs, transparent valuation processes build client confidence, attract investors, and enhance regulatory legitimacy. On the contrary, opaque valuation practices contribute to mistrust, discouraging client engagement and weakening institutional credibility. Governance and organizational culture emerge as recurring determinants of valuation effectiveness. Elmualim, Shockley, Valle, Ludlow, and Shah (2010) identify weak leadership commitment as a barrier to sustainability, whereas Hasim (2014) emphasizes that organizational culture either enables or hinders sustainable practices. Applied to MFIs, governance weaknesses foster inconsistency and malpractice in valuation, while cultures that tolerate informality undermine the accuracy of valuation. Vidler (2011) reinforces this by arguing that sustainability—and by extension transparent valuation—must be treated as a necessity for institutional survival.

Knowledge and professional capacity are equally significant. Lai and Yik (2006) highlight that knowledge gaps reduce professional effectiveness, while Sarpin and Yang (2012) propose knowledge capability frameworks to embed sustainability skills. In valuation, inadequate expertise leads to inaccuracies that compromise loan recovery and financial stability. Sarpin (2015) further suggests embedding competencies through professional frameworks, ensuring that valuation processes remain rigorous and ethical. Economic and resource constraints are also found to hinder compelling valuation. Shafii, Ali, and Othman (2006) note that developing economies often lack resources for sustainable practices, while Shah (2007) points to the deterrent effects of perceived high costs. Ugbaja (2018) notes that African institutions often struggle with funding and policy enforcement, which directly impacts the adoption of professional valuation practices. These findings suggest that even when valuation is recognized as critical, resource limitations restrict its consistent application in microfinance. Findings emphasize the symbolic role of valuation in reinforcing institutional legitimacy. Cortese (2003) argues that institutions shape societal values through their practices, while Lozano et al. (2013) stress that external commitments must align with internal systems. MFIs that uphold rigorous valuation standards not only strengthen their own stability but also serve as exemplars of fairness and accountability in their communities, thereby fostering broader trust in the financial system. Property valuation is both a technical safeguard and a strategic enabler of economic stability in microfinance. Its effectiveness depends on governance, transparency, knowledge, and resources. Addressing challenges in these areas is crucial for MFIs to mitigate risks, foster trust, and achieve sustainable institutional growth.

CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

This study contributes to research by situating property valuation as a strategic tool for enhancing the financial stability of microfinance institutions (MFIs). While much of the literature has traditionally emphasized sustainability in the built environment and facilities management, this paper extends those insights to the financial sector, particularly the microfinance industry, which remains underexplored in valuation research.

One contribution is the framing of property valuation as integral to institutional sustainability. Barrett and Baldry (2003) and Hodges (2005) emphasize the importance of aligning asset management with organizational goals. This study demonstrates how such principles apply to MFIs by showing that accurate valuation of collateral directly reduces the risks of default and strengthens loan performance. This shifts valuation from being seen as a technical exercise to being understood as a sustainability practice. The paper also contributes to the literature on transparency and trust in institutional practices. Price, Matzdorf, Smith, and Agahi (2003) highlight the role of reliability in shaping stakeholder perceptions, while Lozano, Lukman, Lozano, Huisingh, and Lambrechts (2013) argue that institutional commitments require transparent internal systems. By linking these perspectives to microfinance, the study demonstrates that transparent valuation is a mechanism for building client confidence, attracting investors, and reinforcing institutional legitimacy. Another contribution lies in integrating governance and culture into valuation discourse. Elmualim, Shockley, Valle, Ludlow, and Shah (2010) and Hasim (2014) emphasize the role of leadership and organizational culture in sustainability outcomes. This study extends those arguments by positioning governance and culture as mediating factors that determine whether valuation safeguards institutional stability.

Finally, the study broadens the contextual scope of valuation research by focusing on developing economies. Ugbaja (2018) and Adewunmi, Omirin, and Koleoso (2012) demonstrate the systemic barriers faced by African institutions, and this paper highlights how similar challenges shape valuation practices in MFIs. This contributes to diversifying sustainability research by embedding financial and property valuation perspectives within global debates.

CONCLUSION

The analysis confirms that property valuation is a cornerstone of financial stability in microfinance institutions (MFIs). Accurate and transparent valuation of collateral not only reduces the risks associated with loan defaults but also strengthens institutional credibility and fosters long-term growth. As Barrett and Baldry (2003) and Hodges (2005) argue, aligning asset management with institutional objectives enhances resilience, a principle that resonates strongly in microfinance, where small margins and high risks demand rigorous collateral practices. Transparency emerged as a critical determinant of trust. Price, Matzdorf, Smith, and Agahi (2003) highlight that reliability shapes stakeholder perceptions, while Lozano, Lukman, Lozano, Huisingh, and Lambrechts (2013) stress that institutional commitments are meaningful only when supported by transparent practices. For MFIs, this highlights the importance of valuation processes that are impartial and verifiable, thereby reinforcing confidence among borrowers, investors, and regulators.

Governance and culture further mediate the effectiveness of valuation. Elmualim, Shockley, Valle, Ludlow, and Shah (2010) emphasize the importance of leadership commitment for sustainability, and Hasim (2014) demonstrates that institutional culture can either support or hinder progress. Without strong governance and a culture of accountability, valuation practices are vulnerable to manipulation, undermining financial stability. Findings indicate that knowledge and resources remain persistent barriers, particularly in developing economies. Lai and Yik (2006) and Sarpin and Yang (2012) emphasize the importance of professional expertise, while Ugbaja (2018) highlights that resource constraints limit the institutional adoption of best practices. Addressing these challenges is crucial if MFIs are to fulfill their dual role of promoting financial inclusion and ensuring institutional sustainability. Property valuation is not a peripheral task but a strategic necessity for MFIs. Embedding transparency, governance, and professional capacity into valuation systems will enhance stability, foster trust, and support broader goals of sustainable development.

REFERENCES

- Adewunmi, Y., Omirin, M., & Koleoso, H. (2012). Corporate approach to real estate management in Nigeria.
- Ávila, L., Filho, W., Brandli, L., MacGregor, C., Molthan-Hill, P., Özuyar, P., & Moreira, R. (2017). Barriers to innovation and sustainability at universities worldwide. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 164*, 1268–1278.
- Barrett, P., & Baldry, D. (2003). *Facilities management: Towards best practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Science.
- Bartlett, P., & Chase, G. (2004). *Sustainability on campus: Stories and strategies for change*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Brundtland, G. (1987). *Our common future: The World Commission on Environment and Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cortese, A. (2003). The critical role of higher education in creating a sustainable future. *Planning for Higher Education, 31*(3), 15–22.
- Elmualim, A., Shockley, D., Valle, R., Ludlow, G., & Shah, S. (2010). Barriers and drivers to sustainable facilities management. *Facilities, 28*(3/4), 126–145.
- Hasim, H. (2014). Barriers to sustainable facilities management in developing countries. *International Journal of Facility Management, 5*(1), 23–34.
- Hodges, C. (2005). A facility manager's approach to sustainability. *Journal of Facilities Management, 3*(4), 312–324.
- Jaunzens, D., Warriner, D., Garner, U., & Waterman, A. (2001). Applying facilities expertise in building design. *Facilities, 19*(1/2), 69–76.
- Lai, J., & Yik, F. (2006). Knowledge and skills required for building services engineers in facilities management. *Facilities, 24*(1/2), 90–105.
- LoBiondo-Wood, G., & Haber, J. (2010). *Nursing research: Methods and critical appraisal for evidence-based practice* (7th ed.). St. Louis: Mosby Elsevier.
- Lozano, R., Lukman, R., Lozano, F., Huisingh, D., & Lambrechts, W. (2013). Declarations for sustainability in higher education: Becoming better leaders, through addressing the university system. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 48*, 10–19.
- Nielsen, S., Jensen, J., & Jensen, P. (2009). The strategic role of facilities management in sustainable housing. *Facilities, 27*(9/10), 361–377.
- Nielsen, S., & Galamba, K. (2010). Facilities management in sustainable practice: Bridging the gap. *International Journal of Facility Management, 1*(2), 55–72.
- Nielsen, S., Sarasoja, A., & Galamba, K. (2016). Sustainability in facilities management: An overview of current research. *Facilities, 34*(7/8), 488–500.
- Price, I., Matzdorf, F., Smith, L., & Agahi, H. (2003). The impact of facilities on student choice of university. *Facilities, 21*(10), 212–222.

- Radebe, S. & Ozumba, A. (2021). IOP Conf. Ser.: Earth Environ. Sci. 654 012010.
- Russell, C. (2005). An integrative review: An updated methodology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 52*(4), 377–384.
- Sarpin, N. (2015). People capability framework for sustainable facilities management. *International Journal of Facility Management, 6*(1), 45–56.
- Sarpin, N., & Yang, J. (2012). Knowledge capability framework in sustainable facilities management. *Facilities, 30*(5/6), 217–231.
- Shafii, F., Ali, Z., & Othman, M. (2006). Achieving sustainable construction in developing countries of Southeast Asia. *Proceedings of the 6th Asia-Pacific Structural Engineering and Construction Conference*, 5–6.
- Shah, S. (2007). *Sustainable practice for the facilities manager*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Støre-Valen, M., & Buser, M. (2017). Facilities management and cultural change for sustainability in the Nordic context. *Journal of Facilities Management, 15*(2), 194–207.
- Støre-Valen, M., & Buser, M. (2019). Organizational inertia and barriers to sustainable facilities management. *Facilities, 37*(3/4), 161–177.
- Tucker, M. (2013). Sustainable facilities management in higher education: The role of non-core services. *Facilities, 31*(11/12), 472–489.
- Ugbaja, C. (2018). Barriers to implementing sustainability in African universities: A facilities management perspective. *International Journal of Facility Management, 9*(1), 77–89.
- Vidler, A. (2011). Sustainability in facilities management: From luxury to necessity. *Facilities, 29*(9/10), 389–403.