e-ISSN: 2503-3360
p-ISSN: 2085-4323

JURNAL BINA PRAJA
Journal of Home Affairs Governance

ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE

Implementing the Red and White Village Cooperative Program in North Bengkulu

A CIPP Evaluation

Inka Winarni Mufdhalifah [1], **Mala Sondang Silitonga** [1], **Reza Al Hapiz** [2]

[1] Politeknik STIA LAN Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia

[2] Universitas Bengkulu, Bengkulu, Indonesia

inka001@brin.go.id

OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Mufdhalifah, I. W., Silitonga, M. S., & Al Hapiz, R. (2026). Implementing the Red and White Village Cooperative Program in North Bengkulu: A CIPP Evaluation. *Jurnal Bina Praja, 18*(3), 507–520. https://doi.org/10.21787/jbp.18.2026.3299

Submitted: 11 May 2026
Accepted: 26 June 2026
Published: 18 November 2026
Published Online: 18 November 2026

© The Author(s)

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Abstract: The Red and White Village Cooperative program aims to strengthen village economies through community-based cooperative development. We evaluated the early implementation of the program in North Bengkulu regency, Indonesia, using the context, input, process, and product evaluation model. We took a descriptive quantitative approach, drawing on questionnaire data from 10 purposively selected cooperative administrators representing eight cooperatives. Data were analyzed using frequencies, percentages, and mean scores for the context indicators, whereas categorical responses were analyzed descriptively. The context evaluation yielded a mean score of 2.27 (moderate), indicating that respondents generally perceived the program as relevant to local needs, although half reported that communication of program objectives was incomplete. The input evaluation identified basic institutional arrangements alongside constraints related to management experience, access to capital, and local government assistance. The process evaluation revealed variations in decision-making mechanisms and financial record-keeping practices, although most respondents reported regular financial disclosure. The product evaluation showed that 80% of respondents indicated that their cooperatives had not yet begun business operations, and that perceived improvements in members' welfare varied. These findings suggest that formal cooperative establishment has not consistently translated into operational activities or demonstrable economic benefits. Strengthening management capacity, access to capital, technical assistance, and institutional support is necessary to improve operational readiness and program implementation.

Keywords: Red and White Village Cooperative; program implementation; program evaluation; CIPP model.

1. Introduction

Cooperatives are strategic institutions for promoting economic development based on the principles of mutual cooperation and collective self-reliance. In Indonesia, cooperatives have a strong constitutional foundation in Article 33 of *Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945* [1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia], which emphasizes an economic system based on collective endeavor and the principle of kinship. This constitutional foundation is further reflected in *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 25 Tahun 1992 tentang Perkoperasian* [Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 25 of 1992 on Cooperatives], which establishes the legal framework for cooperative development and recognizes the role of cooperatives in strengthening the national economy.

Within the framework of village development, *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 tentang Desa* [Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 6 of 2014 on Villages] provides a legal foundation for strengthening village development based on local potential and community participation. The same commitment to village development is reflected in the *Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional* [National Medium-Term Development Plan] 2025–2029, which emphasizes village economic development, community empowerment, and the strengthening of local economic institutions. In this context, cooperatives can serve as institutional mechanisms for mobilizing local economic potential and supporting community-based economic development.

In line with national policy priorities, the government seeks to strengthen village economies through the *Koperasi Desa/Kelurahan Merah Putih* [Red and White Rural/Urban Village Cooperative] (KDKMP) program. The program is intended to accelerate local economic development by promoting inclusive, productive, and sustainable cooperatives. Cooperatives can support inclusive economic activities and provide collective responses to changing economic and social conditions (International Labour Organization, 2017). Beyond institutional and economic factors, social capital also contributes to cooperative development by facilitating coordination, collective action, and member participation (Putnam, 1993, 1995). Together, institutional and economic factors and social capital are relevant to strengthening institutional legitimacy and supporting the long-term sustainability of village cooperatives.

The implementation of the KDKMP program is supported by several national policies. *Instruksi Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 9 Tahun 2025 tentang Percepatan Pembentukan Koperasi Desa/Kelurahan Merah Putih* [Presidential Instruction of the Republic of Indonesia No. 9 of 2025 on the Acceleration of the Establishment of Red and White Rural/Urban Village Cooperatives] mandates the accelerated establishment of rural and urban village cooperatives and closer coordination among the relevant ministries and agencies. *Keputusan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 9 Tahun 2025 tentang Satuan Tugas Percepatan Pembentukan Koperasi Desa/Kelurahan Merah Putih* [Presidential Decree of the Republic of Indonesia No. 9 of 2025 on the Task Force for the Acceleration of the Establishment of Red and White Rural/Urban Village Cooperatives] establishes a task force to coordinate the acceleration of cooperative establishment across sectors. Furthermore, *Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 12 Tahun 2025 tentang Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional Tahun 2025–2029* [Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia No. 12 of 2025 on the National Medium-Term Development Plan 2025–2029] provides the broader national development policy framework for strengthening village economies and community empowerment.

Collectively, these policies demonstrate the government's commitment to promoting cooperatives as instruments of local economic development.

The KDKMP program aims to accelerate the establishment, development, and revitalization of 80,000 rural and urban village cooperatives across Indonesia (*Instruksi Presiden Nomor 9 Tahun 2025*). However, the establishment of cooperative institutions does not necessarily indicate their operational readiness or effectiveness. Successful implementation also requires adequate human resources, institutional capacity, infrastructure, financing, and community participation. Therefore, evaluating the program solely by the number of cooperatives established may overlook important challenges affecting their actual operations and sustainability. Recent studies on the KDKMP program have highlighted institutional capacity, management competence, governance, member participation, and business readiness as key factors in translating cooperative establishment into effective operations (Koni et al., 2026; Nur et al., 2025; Santika et al., 2026). Cooperative performance is supported by sound governance, management capacity, member participation, collective action, and innovation (Barlian et al., 2026; Jamaluddin et al., 2023; Kusmiati et al., 2023; Muryani et al., 2022). Civic engagement and active participation among community members also contribute to the effectiveness and sustainability of collective institutions (Putnam, 1995). In village cooperatives, such social capital plays an important role in encouraging member participation, strengthening institutional legitimacy, and supporting long-term sustainability.

The success of public policy programs depends not only on policy design but also on effective implementation. Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) emphasized that policy implementation is influenced by several factors, including available resources, interorganizational communication, the characteristics of implementing agencies, and the social and political environment. Similarly, Pressman and Wildavsky (1984) highlighted the potential gap between policy objectives and actual outcomes arising from the complexity of implementation processes. Hill and Hupe (2002) further explained that policy implementation is a dynamic process shaped by interactions among actors and the local context.

To assess such implementation comprehensively, many evaluation studies of policy and public administration use the context, input, process, and product (CIPP) model developed by Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007). Recent systematic reviews of its use in education have confirmed that the model covers program needs, resources, implementation processes, and outcomes (Edriati et al., 2026; Riawan et al., 2025; Wulan et al., 2026). The CIPP model is particularly suited to programs in their early stages because it helps identify gaps between program objectives, available resources, implementation processes, and initial outcomes. It can also provide feedback for continuous program improvement (Zhang et al., 2011).

North Bengkulu regency, particularly Air Napal and Arma Jaya subdistricts, provides a relevant setting for evaluating the early implementation of the *Koperasi Desa Merah Putih* [Red and White Village Cooperative] (KDMP) program. We focus on eight village cooperatives located in these two subdistricts. Although the program is intended to strengthen village economies through cooperative development, its implementation faces challenges related to institutional readiness, management capacity, access to capital, and business operations. The problem addressed in this study is therefore the extent to which the formal establishment of these cooperatives has been accompanied by adequate resources and effective implementation processes and has begun to translate into initial outcomes.

Although previous studies have examined the role of cooperatives in local economic development, most have focused on economic performance, institutional capacity, or cooperative governance in general. Limited research has specifically evaluated the implementation of the KDMP program as a state-led village economic intervention. We address this gap by applying the CIPP model to the early implementation of the KDMP program, providing descriptive empirical evidence on how program objectives, institutional and resource readiness, implementation processes, and perceived outcomes align. Social capital theory is employed as a complementary interpretive perspective to contextualize selected implementation challenges, rather than as a separately measured analytical framework.

Accordingly, we aim to evaluate the implementation of the KDMP program in North Bengkulu regency using the CIPP model, with particular attention to program relevance, institutional readiness, implementation processes, and perceived outcomes. The findings are expected to provide practical insights for strengthening cooperative management and improving program implementation at the local level.

2. Methods

We used a descriptive quantitative survey to examine the implementation of the KDMP program as perceived by cooperative administrators. The aim was to provide an empirical account of program implementation and to identify gaps between program plans and actual results. The study was conducted in North Bengkulu regency, Bengkulu province, Indonesia, and focused on eight village cooperatives under the KDMP program located in two subdistricts: Air Napal and Arma Jaya. The cooperatives in Air Napal subdistrict were located in the villages of Air Napal, Selubuk, Pasar Kerkap, and Pasar Tebat, and those in Arma Jaya subdistrict in the villages of Sidodadi, Pagar Banyu, Pematang Sapang, and Pagar Ruyung. Data were collected through a questionnaire administered to 10 cooperative administrators representing the eight cooperatives.

The study involved 10 purposively selected respondents: three cooperative chairpersons, four secretaries, and three treasurers. They were chosen for their direct involvement in cooperative management and their knowledge of the establishment, institutional arrangements, operational processes, and implementation outcomes of the KDMP program.

Given the limited number of respondents and the purposive sampling approach, the findings are intended to provide a descriptive account of program implementation among the cooperatives studied rather than statistical generalization to the broader population of village cooperatives.

Primary data were collected using a structured questionnaire covering cooperative institutional conditions, resource availability, program implementation processes, and initial program outcomes. Secondary data were obtained from relevant regulations, government reports, and the literature on village cooperative development.

Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, organized according to the four dimensions of the CIPP model (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). The model was applied to examine the relevance of program objectives to community needs, the readiness of institutional and financial resources, implementation processes, and initial program outcomes. Given that the KDMP program was still in its early implementation stage, the evaluation primarily served a formative purpose by identifying implementation gaps and areas requiring improvement. The four evaluation dimensions were defined as follows:

- Context: evaluates the relevance of program objectives to community needs, stakeholders' understanding of the program, and communication of cooperative objectives.
- Input: assesses institutional readiness, management capacity, financial resources, and local government assistance for program implementation.
- Process: examines program implementation mechanisms, cooperative decision-making, financial disclosure, and financial record-keeping practices.
- Product: evaluates initial program outcomes, including business operational status, perceived business performance, contribution to members' welfare, and implementation constraints.

Table 1. Operational Variables of the Context, Input, Process, and Product Evaluation

Dimension	Evaluation Focus	Indicators
Context	Program relevance	Alignment with community needs; understanding of program objectives and benefits; communication of cooperative objectives
Input	Institutional and resource readiness	Institutional documentation; management experience; initial capital sources; local government assistance; capital constraints
Process	Program implementation and governance	Decision-making mechanisms; financial disclosure; financial record-keeping systems
Product	Initial outcomes and perceived benefits	Business operational status; perceived business performance; contribution to members' welfare; overall program implementation

Source: *Developed from the study questionnaire indicators (2026).*

The descriptive statistics comprised frequency distributions, percentages, and mean scores. Questionnaire items were classified according to their measurement characteristics. Ordinal items with clearly ordered response categories were assigned numerical scores ranging from 1 to 3, with higher scores indicating more favorable program implementation conditions. Nominal and multiple-response items, such as types of cooperative business, sources of capital, and operational constraints, were analyzed using frequencies and percentages without numerical evaluation scores. Open-ended responses were analyzed descriptively to provide additional information on program implementation challenges.

The mean score for each ordinal indicator was calculated by dividing the sum of the respondents' scores by the number of valid responses. Mean scores were calculated only for the eligible ordinal indicators in the context dimension, and the overall context score was obtained as the arithmetic mean of its three indicator scores. This score was classified as low, moderate, or high using equal class intervals. The input, process, and product dimensions were analyzed descriptively using frequencies, percentages, and interpretations of questionnaire responses, without overall dimension scores. This approach ensured consistency between the measurement scale, the characteristics of the questionnaire items, and the interpretation of the evaluation results. The class interval was calculated from the minimum score, the maximum score, and the number of evaluation categories, as shown in (1):

$$I = \frac{S_{\max} - S_{\min}}{k} \quad (1)$$

where I is the class interval width, Smax is the maximum score (3), Smin is the minimum score (1), and k is the number of evaluation categories (3). Substituting these values gives (2):

$$I = \frac{3-1}{3} \approx 0.67 \quad (2)$$

This interval yields the following categories, with boundaries rounded to two decimal places:

- 1.00–1.67 = low
- 1.68–2.34 = moderate
- 2.35–3.00 = high

These categories, also summarized in Table 2, were applied only to the overall context score.

For the input, process, and product dimensions, the findings were interpreted descriptively to identify institutional strengths, resource limitations, implementation challenges, and initial program outcomes among the surveyed cooperatives.

Table 2. Classification of Context Evaluation Scores

Score Interval	Category
1.00–1.67	Low
1.68–2.34	Moderate
2.35–3.00	High

Source: *Developed by the authors (2026).*

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Context Evaluation

The context evaluation assessed the relevance of the KDMP program to community needs, respondents' understanding of program objectives and benefits, and the communication of cooperative objectives to the community. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Context Evaluation Results

Indicator	Mean Score	Category
Program suitability to community needs	2.30	Moderate
Understanding of program objectives and benefits	2.00	Moderate
Communication of cooperative objectives to the community	2.50	High
Overall context dimension	2.27	Moderate

Source: *Primary questionnaire data (n = 10), data processed (2026).*

The context evaluation indicated that the KDMP program was generally perceived as relevant to community needs. From a program evaluation perspective, alignment between program objectives and community needs is a central component of the context dimension (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). Seven respondents (70%) considered the program moderately aligned with local needs, and three (30%) considered it highly aligned. Similarly, seven respondents (70%) reported a moderate understanding of the program's objectives and benefits, and three (30%) reported a high level of understanding. Regarding program communication, five respondents (50%) indicated that cooperative objectives had been clearly communicated to the community, whereas the other five (50%) reported that communication had occurred but remained incomplete. Based on the ordinal scoring applied, the overall context dimension obtained a mean score of 2.27, categorized as moderate.

Cooperatives can serve as instruments for strengthening local economic participation and expanding access to financial services (Birchall, 2013). However, the effectiveness of cooperatives depends not only on their formal establishment but also on member participation and understanding of organizational objectives (Majee

& Hoyt, 2011). Raharja et al. (2020) highlighted the importance of institutional capacity and governance in supporting local economic development.

From a policy implementation perspective, communication is an important factor in translating policy objectives into practice (Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975). Incomplete communication may limit stakeholders' understanding of program objectives and implementation responsibilities. As Hill and Hupe (2002) emphasized, policy implementation involves interactions among actors and institutional contexts that can affect how policy information is interpreted and applied. Strengthening communication and stakeholder understanding is therefore essential to improving the implementation of the KDMP program.

From a social capital perspective, trust, shared norms, and social networks facilitate coordination and collective action within communities (Putnam, 1993). Previous studies have also highlighted the relevance of social capital and member participation to cooperative development and sustainability (Bianchi & Vieta, 2020; Majee & Hoyt, 2011). In this study, the incomplete communication of cooperative objectives reported by half of the respondents and their varying levels of understanding suggest potential challenges in strengthening collective engagement. However, because trust and community participation were not directly measured, these findings should not be interpreted as evidence of weak social capital. Rather, social capital theory provides a complementary interpretive perspective for understanding why communication, stakeholder engagement, and shared understanding may be important for the long-term development of village cooperatives.

Overall, the context evaluation indicates a moderate level of alignment between the KDMP program and local community needs, as perceived by the cooperative administrators surveyed. Further efforts to strengthen program communication and stakeholders' understanding of cooperative objectives and benefits are needed to support more effective program implementation at the village level.

3.2. Input Evaluation

The input evaluation assessed the institutional and resource readiness supporting the implementation of the KDMP program. The assessment focused on the availability of institutional documentation, management experience, initial capital sources, local government assistance, and capital constraints. These indicators were used to identify the extent to which the surveyed cooperatives had the institutional arrangements, management capacity, and financial resources needed to support program implementation. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Input Evaluation Results

Indicator	Questionnaire Results	Interpretation
Institutional documentation	100% articles of association and bylaws; 30% all four legal documents	Basic institutional documentation was available, but completeness varied
Management experience	50% less than 1 year; 20% 1–3 years; 30% more than 3 years	Management experience varied
Initial capital sources	70% principal and mandatory savings; 20% principal savings only; 10% additional financing sources	Initial capital came predominantly from members' contributions
Local government assistance	50% assistance received; 50% no assistance	Local government assistance was unevenly reported
Capital constraints	100% limited capital	Capital limitations remained a major challenge

Source: *Primary questionnaire data (n = 10), data processed (2026).*

The input evaluation revealed differences between the formal institutional readiness of the surveyed cooperatives and the resources available to support their operations. All 10 respondents (100%) reported that their cooperatives had articles of association and bylaws. However, only three respondents (30%) reported having all four legal documents examined in the questionnaire: a notarial deed, approval of legal entity status, a business identification number, and a taxpayer identification number.

Regarding management experience, five respondents (50%) had served for less than 1 year, two (20%) for 1–3 years, and three (30%) for more than 3 years. Initial capital was derived primarily from members' contributions: seven respondents (70%) reported both principal and mandatory savings, two (20%) reported principal savings only, and one (10%) reported additional financing sources, including government funding and institutional loans.

Local government assistance was unevenly reported: five respondents (50%) indicated that their cooperatives had received such assistance, whereas the other five (50%) reported receiving none. Furthermore, all respondents (100%) identified limited capital as a major financial constraint. Previous studies have similarly emphasized the roles of governance, member participation, access to capital, and institutional support in cooperative performance (Buang & Abu Samah, 2021; Felek et al., 2025; Grashuis & Su, 2019; Sunarwibowo et al., 2025).

In the CIPP model, the input dimension examines the adequacy of the resources, institutional arrangements, and organizational capacity required for program implementation (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). The availability of formal organizational documentation provides an initial indication of institutional readiness. However, effective implementation also depends on management capacity, financial resources, and institutional support.

Previous literature has highlighted the importance of management capacity and access to financial resources in cooperative development (Chambo, 2009; International Labour Organization, 2017). Institutional strengthening is also relevant to supporting local economic development and organizational sustainability (Raharja et al., 2020). Furthermore, Wahyuningtyas et al. (2023) emphasized the importance of cooperative competitiveness and organizational capacity for community economic development.

Overall, the input evaluation indicates that the surveyed cooperatives have basic institutional arrangements in place, particularly articles of association and bylaws. However, incomplete institutional documentation, varying levels of management experience, limited access to capital, and uneven local government assistance suggest that institutional establishment has not been fully accompanied by the resources needed for effective business operations. Strengthening management capacity, completing institutional documentation, improving access to capital, and providing more consistent institutional support are therefore priorities for improving cooperative readiness and supporting effective program implementation.

3.3. Process Evaluation

The process evaluation examined how the KDMP program was implemented through cooperative governance and administrative practices. The assessment focused on decision-making mechanisms, financial disclosure, and the use of financial record-keeping systems. These indicators were used to describe the extent to which cooperative management procedures had been implemented and to identify areas requiring improvement. The results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Process Evaluation Results

Indicator	Questionnaire Results	Interpretation
Decision-making mechanisms	50% annual members' meetings; 50% management deliberations	Both annual members' meetings and management deliberations were reported
Financial disclosure	90% regular disclosure; 10% occasional disclosure	Financial information was generally disclosed regularly
Financial record-keeping systems	20% manual records; 50% spreadsheets (Microsoft Excel); 30% cooperative management applications	Digital record-keeping had been adopted to varying degrees

Source: *Primary questionnaire data (n = 10), data processed (2026).*

The process evaluation revealed variations in cooperative governance and administrative practices. Regarding decision-making mechanisms, five respondents (50%) reported using annual members' meetings, whereas the other five (50%) reported management deliberations. However, the questionnaire data do not establish the frequency or effectiveness of these mechanisms.

Regarding financial reporting, nine respondents (90%) reported regular disclosure of financial information to cooperative members, whereas one (10%) reported occasional disclosure. Financial record-keeping practices also varied: two respondents (20%) used manual records, five (50%) used spreadsheets (Microsoft Excel), and three (30%) used cooperative management applications. These findings highlight the need to strengthen financial record-keeping, transparency, and accountability, consistent with previous studies emphasizing the importance of cooperative governance, accounting competence, financial reporting quality, and digital accounting readiness (Budiyah & Suyono, 2020; Hitawasana & Dewi, 2023; Rubiyanty et al., 2025; Setiajatnika & Hidayat, 2026).

In the CIPP model, the process dimension examines program implementation and identifies areas requiring improvement (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). Participatory governance is an important aspect of cooperative management, as member participation and governance practices contribute to cooperative sustainability (Putri et al., 2022). However, effective governance also requires adequate management capacity and administrative systems.

Respondents' reports of decision-making and financial record-keeping practices varied. Although most respondents reported regular financial disclosure, the questionnaire data do not establish the effectiveness of member participation or the quality of financial reporting. Differences in the use of manual records, spreadsheets, and cooperative management applications also suggest opportunities to strengthen administrative consistency and digital capacity. Hidayat (2024) highlighted the potential of integrated information systems to improve transparency, accountability, and organizational governance.

Overall, the process evaluation suggests that basic governance and financial reporting practices have been implemented, although their consistency and effectiveness require further assessment. Strengthening member participation, standardizing administrative procedures, and providing technical assistance for financial management and digital record-keeping may support more effective and accountable cooperative operations.

3.4. Product Evaluation

The product evaluation assessed the reported outcomes of the KDMP program in North Bengkulu regency. The assessment focused on business operational status, perceived business performance, perceived contribution to members' welfare, and respondents' overall assessments of program implementation. These indicators

Table 6. Product Evaluation Results

Indicator	Questionnaire Results	Interpretation
Business operational status	80% not yet operational; 10% recently started; 10% operational	Most respondents reported that business activities had not yet begun
Perceived business performance	50% fairly good; 40% underperforming; 10% not operating	Perceptions of business performance varied
Contribution to members' welfare	40% significant improvement; 30% slight improvement; 30% improvement not yet visible	Perceived welfare benefits were uneven
Overall program implementation	50% suboptimal; 30% good; 20% adequate	Half of respondents considered implementation suboptimal

Source: Primary questionnaire data (n = 10), data processed (2026).

were used to describe the program's initial outcomes and to identify areas where expected benefits had not yet been fully realized. The results are presented in Table 6.

The product evaluation revealed a substantial gap between cooperative establishment and the start of business operations. Eight respondents (80%) reported that their cooperatives were not yet operational, one (10%) reported that business operations had recently started, and one (10%) reported that the cooperative was already operational. Regarding perceived business performance, five respondents (50%) rated their cooperatives as fairly good, four (40%) indicated that business activities were underperforming, and one (10%) reported that the business was not operating.

Perceived contribution to members' welfare also varied. Four respondents (40%) reported a significant improvement, three (30%) reported a slight improvement, and three (30%) indicated that improvement was not yet visible. However, these welfare assessments, like the business performance ratings, should be interpreted cautiously because most surveyed cooperatives had not yet begun business operations. The reported improvements therefore cannot be treated as verified economic impacts without additional evidence.

Regarding overall program implementation, five respondents (50%) considered implementation suboptimal, three (30%) rated it as good, and two (20%) considered it adequate.

Respondents identified several operational challenges related to business capital, human resource capacity, regulations, market access, and member trust. These findings suggest that cooperative establishment has not consistently translated into business operations or perceived economic benefits, highlighting the relevance of business development and cooperative performance to members' welfare (Agusalim et al., 2019; Sari et al., 2025; Toiba et al., 2024; Widyastuti et al., 2026).

In the CIPP model, the product dimension assesses the extent to which a program achieves its intended outcomes and benefits (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). Because most surveyed cooperatives had not yet begun business operations, the program's economic contributions cannot yet be comprehensively assessed against this criterion.

Cooperative sustainability requires adequate organizational capacity, access to financial resources, effective governance, and continued institutional support. The International Labour Organization (2017) highlighted the importance of institutional and organizational strengthening in cooperative development. Sarjiyanto et al. (2024) examined the roles of working capital, social capital, and psychological capital in rural community empowerment. Similarly, Bianchi and Vieta (2020)

discussed the importance of social capital and institutional capacity in supporting cooperative sustainability.

Social capital theory offers an additional perspective for interpreting these findings. Trust, social networks, and collective participation can facilitate cooperation and collective action (Majee & Hoyt, 2011; Putnam, 1993). However, because social capital was not directly measured in this study, the findings should not be interpreted as demonstrating its presence or absence among cooperative members. Rather, limited business operations, uneven local government assistance, and gaps in program communication point to areas where stronger stakeholder engagement and collective participation could support future program development.

From a policy implementation perspective, the limited realization of program outcomes suggests gaps between policy objectives and implementation at the local level (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1984). Effective implementation depends not only on the relevance of program objectives but also on institutional capacity, resource availability, and operational support. Silaningsih et al. (2022) highlighted the contributions of member participation, creativity, and innovation to cooperative performance. Overall, the product evaluation indicates that the KDMP program remains at an early stage of operational development among the surveyed cooperatives and that its economic benefits have yet to be fully demonstrated. Strengthening access to capital, management capacity, technical assistance for business operations, and institutional support is therefore important for improving cooperative operations and supporting the achievement of intended program outcomes.

4. Conclusion

We evaluated the early implementation of the *Koperasi Desa Merah Putih* [Red and White Village Cooperative] program in North Bengkulu regency using the context, input, process, and product evaluation model. The findings indicate that basic institutional arrangements have been established among the surveyed cooperatives, but operational readiness and the realization of economic benefits remain limited.

The context evaluation yielded an overall mean score of 2.27 (moderate), indicating that respondents generally perceived the program as relevant to local needs, although communication and understanding of program objectives require improvement. The input evaluation identified constraints related to management experience, access to capital, and local government assistance. The process evaluation found that decision-making mechanisms and financial record-keeping practices varied, although most respondents reported regular financial disclosure.

The product evaluation revealed the most prominent implementation challenge: eight of the 10 respondents (80%) reported that their cooperatives had not yet begun business operations. Although seven respondents (70%) perceived improvements in members' welfare, these assessments cannot be interpreted as verified economic impacts.

Accordingly, priority should be given to improving cooperative management capacity, expanding access to capital, providing technical assistance, and supporting sustainable business development. Developing human resource management practices is particularly important for professionalizing cooperatives (Ikram & Hamzah, 2026). In addition, enhancing member participation and engagement may contribute to cooperative performance and sustainability (Arman et al., 2024; Fathi et al., 2026). Better financial management procedures, communication with

cooperative members, and institutional coordination are also needed to support accountability and operational readiness.

This study is limited by its small, purposively selected sample of 10 cooperative administrators representing eight cooperatives and by its reliance on self-reported questionnaire data. The findings should therefore not be generalized beyond the surveyed cooperatives. Social capital theory served only as a complementary interpretive perspective; social capital itself was not measured directly. Future research should incorporate broader samples, objective indicators of cooperative performance, and direct measures of trust, participation, and community engagement to examine longer-term program outcomes.

REFERENCES

Agusalim, L., Karim, M., & Yaddarabullah, Y. (2019). Indonesia Cooperative and Members Welfare: A Panel Data Analysis. *Economics Development Analysis Journal, 8*(1), 9–21. https://doi.org/10.15294/edaj.v8i1.26830

Arman, N. A. A., Adnan, S. M., & Abdullah, W. Z. @ Z. (2024). The Impact of Member Participation on Cooperative Performance: A Systematic Literature Review. *Malaysian Journal of Co-Operative Studies, 20*(1), 61–106. https://mjcs-ikma.com/ojs/article/view/22

Barlian, A., Irwansyah, I., & Irawati, I. (2026). From Governance to Digital Transformation: A Networked Approach to Cooperative Sustainability. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy, 17*(5), 13152–13178. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-026-03344-5

Bianchi, M., & Vieta, M. (2020). Co-operatives, Territories and Social Capital: Reconsidering a Theoretical Framework. *International Journal of Social Economics, 47*(12), 1599–1617. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-03-2020-0135

Birchall, J. (2013). *Resilience in a Downturn: The Power of Financial Cooperatives*. https://www.ilo.org/publications/resilience-downturn-power-financial-cooperatives

Buang, M., & Abu Samah, A. (2021). Co-operative Governance: A Systematic Review of Member Participation. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 11*(10). https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v11-i10/10997

Budiyah, F., & Suyono, E. (2020). Good Cooperatives' Governance and Performance in Banyumas Region. *Kompartemen: Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi, 18*(2). https://doi.org/10.30595/kompartemen.v18i2.7469

Chambo, S. A. (2009). *Agricultural Co-operatives: Role in Food Security and Rural Development*.

Edriati, S., Ambiyar, Yasmi, F., & Husnita, L. (2026). Dominasi Model CIPP dalam Evaluasi Program Pendidikan Indonesia: Studi Literatur Sistematis terhadap Model-model Evaluasi [The Dominance of the CIPP Model in Indonesian Educational Program Evaluation: A Systematic Literature Study of Evaluation Models]. *Jurnal Evaluasi Pendidikan, 17*(1), 32–50. https://doi.org/10.21009/jep.v17i1.65711

Fathi, M., Noordin, K., & Mansor, F. (2026). Membership Mechanisms and Member Engagement in Cooperatives: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Business Management and Accounting, 16*(2), 138–155. https://doi.org/10.32890/jbma2026.16.2.1

Felek, W. M., Mengmeng, X., & Yayeh, F. A. (2025). Determinants of Agricultural Cooperative Performance: Evidence From Ethiopia. *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, 17*(2), 52–66. https://doi.org/10.5897/JAERD2024.1427

Grashuis, J., & Su, Y. (2019). A Review of the Empirical Literature on Farmer Cooperatives: Performance, Ownership and Governance, Finance, and Member Attitude. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics, 90*(1), 77–102. https://doi.org/10.1111/apce.12205

Hidayat, M. N. (2024). Enhancing Accountability and Transparency in Local Governance Through Integrated Information Systems: A Case Study of Surabaya City, Indonesia. *Visioner: Jurnal Pemerintahan Daerah Di Indonesia, 16*(3), 228–238. https://doi.org/10.54783/JV.V16I3.1261

Hill, M., & Hupe, P. (2002). *Implementing Public Policy: Governance in Theory and Practice*. Sage Publications.

Hitawasana, P. J., & Dewi, L. G. K. (2023). Pengaruh Kompetensi Sumber Daya Manusia, Pemahaman Akuntansi, Sistem Informasi Akuntansi, dan Sistem Pengendalian Internal Terhadap Kualitas Laporan Keuangan Koperasi di Kecamatan Buleleng [The Effect of Human Resource Competence, Accounting Understanding, Accounting Information Systems, and Internal Control Systems on the Quality of

Cooperative Financial Reports in Buleleng Subdistrict]. *Vokasi: Jurnal Riset Akuntansi, 12*(3), 57–68. https://doi.org/10.23887/vjra.v12i3.65171

Ikram, M., & Hamzah, M. N. (2026). Professionalizing Cooperatives through Human Resource Management: A Systematic Literature Review and Evidence-Informed Implications for Indonesia's Village Cooperatives. *Sinomika Journal, 5*(3), 457–480. https://doi.org/10.47353/sinomika.v5i3.5363

International Labour Organization. (2017, March 16). *Cooperation in a Changing World of Work: Towards a Cooperative Future*. https://www.ilo.org/publications/cooperation-changing-world-work-towards-cooperative-future

Jamaluddin, F., Saleh, N. M., Abdullah, A., Hassan, M. S., Hamzah, N., Jaffar, R., Abdul Ghani Aziz, S. A., & Embong, Z. (2023). Cooperative Governance and Cooperative Performance: A Systematic Literature Review. *Sage Open, 13*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231192944

Koni, W., Sofhian, S., & Niswatin, N. (2026). Institutional Model of Merah Putih Village Cooperatives: SWOT Study and Prototype in Gorontalo Regency. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management (IJSRM), 14*(01), 10223–10249. https://doi.org/10.18535/ijsrm/v14i01.em05

Kusmiati, E., Masyita, D., Febrian, E., & Cahyandito, M. F. (2023). A Study on the Determinants of Successful Performance of Indonesian Cooperatives. *International Journal of Social Economics, 50*(9), 1285–1301. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-02-2022-0078

Majee, W., & Hoyt, A. (2011). Cooperatives and Community Development: A Perspective on the Use of Cooperatives in Development. *Journal of Community Practice, 19*(1), 48–61. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705422.2011.550260

Muryani, E., Gunawan, A., & Halim Yustiyawan, R. (2022). The Impact of Member Participation and Innovation Ability on the Performance of the Cooperatives of Women's Kartini in the District of Driyorejo, Gresik Regency. *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation, 17*(3), 52–58. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-27242022000300052

Nur, S., Ernawati, Saranani, F., Barani, L. S., Anam, S., & Anjasari, M. (2025). Activation of Business and Institutionalization of the Red-and-White Village Cooperatives in the Kolono District, South Konawe Regency. *Indonesian Journal of Community Services, 4*(2), 130–137. https://doi.org/10.47540/ijcs.v4i2.2418

Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. (1984). *Implementation: How Great Expectations in Washington Are Dashed in Oakland; Or, Why It's Amazing that Federal Programs Work at All, This Being a Saga of the Economic Development Administration as Told by Two Sympathetic Observers Who Seek to Build Morals ...* (Number 4). University of California Press.

Putnam, R. (1993, April 1). The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life. *The American Prospect*. https://prospect.org/1993/04/01/prosperous-community-social-capital-public-life/

Putnam, R. (1995). Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy, 6*(1), 65–78. https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.1995.0002

Putri, C. E. R., Indriani, M., & Indayani, I. (2022). The Role of Member Participation and Governance on Sustainability: Evidence from Cooperatives in South Aceh. *Journal of Accounting Research, Organization and Economics, 5*(2), 147–155. https://doi.org/10.24815/jaroe.v5i2.22186

Raharja, S., Marimin, Machfud, Papilo, P., Safriyana, Massijaya, M. Y., Asrol, M., & Darmawan, M. A. (2020). Institutional Strengthening Model of Oil Palm Independent Smallholder in Riau and Jambi Provinces, Indonesia. *Heliyon, 6*(5), e03875. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.HELIYON.2020.E03875

Riawan, I. M. O., Citariani, N. M., & Lokasanti, I. K. (2025). Efektivitas Model Evaluasi CIPP dalam Program Pendidikan: Kajian Literatur Sistematis [The Effectiveness of the Cipp Evaluation Model in Educational Programs: A Systematic Literature Review]. *Jurnal Evaluasi Pendidikan, 16*(2), 108–115. https://doi.org/10.21009/jep.v16i2.58457

Rubiyanty, I. M., Mubaroq, A. C., & Rafinda, A. (2025). The Effect of Accountability and Transparency on Cooperative Financial Management of Sakra Warih Conventional Consumer Cooperative of Banyumas Regency. *Owner, 9*(1), 491–500. https://doi.org/10.33395/owner.v9i1.2400

Santika, R., Farizki, R., & De Jesus, F. S. (2026). Professional Certification as a Strategy to Strengthen the Institutional Capacity of Village Cooperatives in Supporting People's Economy. *Journal of Economic Development and Village Building, 4*(2), 165–177. https://doi.org/10.59261/jedvb.v4i2.109

Sari, I. M., Nidar, S. R., & Komaladewi, R. (2025). Enhancing Member Welfare in Cooperatives: The Mediating Effect of Business Development. *Jurnal Reviu Akuntansi Dan Keuangan, 15*(4). https://doi.org/10.22219/jrak.v15i4.41780

Sarjiyanto, Mulki, Y. A., & Istiqomah, N. (2024). The Impact of Typology Capital on Community Empowerment Programs: Evidence From Rural Development in Indonesia. *Jurnal Ekonomi & Studi Pembangunan, 25*(1), 17–35. https://doi.org/10.18196/JESP.V25I1.20083

Setiajatnika, E., & Hidayat, U. (2026). Kesiapan Digitalisasi Akuntansi Koperasi dalam Menerapkan SAK Entitas Privat [Cooperative Accounting Digitalization Readiness in Applying the Financial Accounting Standards for Private Entities]. *Journal of Co-Operative, 2*(1), 27–36. https://doi.org/10.32670/jc.v2i1.50

Silaningsih, E., Gemina, D., Habibi, R., & Gemini, P. (2022). Kinerja Koperasi Berbasis Kreativitas dan Inovasi Serta Partisipasi Anggota [Cooperative Performance Based on Creativity, Innovation, and Member Participation]. *Inobis: Jurnal Inovasi Bisnis Dan Manajemen Indonesia, 5*(3), 301–313. https://doi.org/10.31842/jurnalinobis.v5i3.231

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007). *Evaluation Theory, Models, and Applications*. John Wiley & Sons.

Sunarwibowo, R. P., Ikhsan, M., Mahi, B. R., & Wisana, I. D. G. K. (2025). The Impact of External Capital on the Performance of Agricultural Cooperatives in Indonesia. *Journal of Indonesian Economy and Business, 40*(3). https://doi.org/10.22146/jieb.v40i3.10163

Toiba, H., Rahman, M. S., Hartono, R., & Retnoningsih, D. (2024). Improving Dairy Farmers' Welfare in Indonesia: Does Cooperative Membership Matter? *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics, 95*(4), 1003–1019. https://doi.org/10.1111/apce.12471

Van Meter, D. S., & Van Horn, C. E. (1975). The Policy Implementation Process: A Conceptual Framework. *Administration & Society, 6*(4), 445–488. https://doi.org/10.1177/009539977500600404

Wahyuningtyas, R., Disastra, G., & Rismayani, R. (2023). Toward Cooperative Competitiveness for Community Development in Economic Society 5.0. *Journal of Enterprising Communities, 17*(3), 594–620. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEC-10-2021-0149

Widyastuti, K., Gayatri, S., & Mariyono, J. (2026). The Effect of Agricultural Cooperative Performance on the Welfare of Cooperative Members in Central Java, Indonesia. *Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Research, 39*(3). https://doi.org/10.17582/journal.pjar/2026/39.3.219.225

Wulan, M. P., Listyasari, W. D., Santosa, H., & Huda, S. A. (2026). A Systematic Literature Review on the Cipp Evaluation Model in Education: Examining Its Trends, Applications, and Research Gaps. *Journal of Educational Sciences, 10*(3), 307–320. https://doi.org/10.31258/JES.10.3.P.307-320

Zhang, G., Zeller, N., Griffith, R., Metcalf, D., Wiliams, J., Shea, C., & Misulis, K. (2011). Using the Context, Input, Process, and Product Evaluation Model (CIPP) as a Comprehensive Framework to Guide the Planning, Implementation, and Assessment of Service-learning Programs. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 15*(4), 57–84. https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/901