

INSTITUTIONAL DETERMINANTS OF LECTURERS' INTEREST IN EXTERNAL RESEARCH GRANTS: EVIDENCE FROM AN INDONESIAN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION

I Dewa Ketut Suharjana 1*

¹ Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Ganesha, Indonesia

Email: 1idewa@stieganisha.ac.id

Corresponding Author : *) idewa@stieganisha.ac.id

Received: 10 June 2026

Revised: 25 July 2026

Accepted: 29 July 2026

Published online:

Abstract

This study examines institutional determinants of lecturers' interest in participating in external research grants at STIE Ganesha, Indonesia. Addressing a gap in research that often treats institutional support as a broad construct, the study differentiates between general institutional conditions and grant-proximal operational support. A quantitative survey was conducted using a saturated sample of 38 permanent lecturers and analyzed using multiple linear regression. The results show that leadership support ($p = .821$), research facilities and infrastructure ($p = .565$), and internal grant management ($p = .578$) do not demonstrate significant unique partial associations with lecturers' interest. In contrast, Research and Community Service Institute (LPPM) support has a positive and significant association ($B = 1.009$; $t = 5.307$; $p < .001$). The overall regression model is statistically significant ($F = 13.725$; $p < .001$), with an Adjusted R^2 of .579. These findings suggest that proximal, grant-specific institutional support such as funding information, proposal mentoring, pre-review, and administrative facilitation may be more salient to lecturers' grant-participation interest than general institutional support. The study contributes to higher-education research governance by distinguishing operational research-support mechanisms from broader institutional resources and by identifying LPPM support as the strongest unique institutional correlate within the model.

Keywords:

Leadership Support; Research Facilities; Internal Research Grants; LPPM Support; External Research Grants; Lecturers' Interest.

INTRODUCTION

Research is a core component of the Tri Dharma Perguruan Tinggi and is increasingly central to academic career development, institutional reputation, and knowledge production. External research grants are particularly important because they expand access to research resources, collaboration, and wider academic networks (Haryanto et al., 2023; Jayaun, 2025). Yet lecturers' participation in competitive external funding remains uneven, with barriers including limited grant information, proposal-writing capability, institutional support, and research facilities (Huda et al., 2025).

At STIE Ganesha, these challenges are institutionally relevant. Previous studies have highlighted the role of LPPM in research administration and information dissemination (Azzara & Siregar, 2026), while Tafsiruddin and Zainuddin (2025) identified facilities and funding utilization as important constraints in research-resource governance. These findings indicate an empirical gap: institutional resources may be available or perceived positively, yet lecturers may not respond equally to different forms of support when deciding whether to pursue external grants. The theoretical gap concerns the level of proximity between institutional support and the target behavior. Leadership support represents broad organizational encouragement; facilities provide enabling research resources; internal grant management offers an internal funding mechanism and learning environment; and LPPM support provides direct, grant-specific assistance. Transformational leadership reasoning suggests that encouragement and institutional direction can strengthen academic motivation, whereas research-support and resource perspectives imply that access to infrastructure, funding mechanisms, information, mentoring, and administrative facilitation can reduce barriers to research engagement. Integrating these mechanisms permits a more differentiated test of whether general institutional conditions or proximal operational support is more strongly associated with grant-participation interest.

Accordingly, the research gap is threefold. First, prior studies cited in this manuscript tend to examine research performance, barriers, funding, or institutional support separately rather than comparing multiple institutional determinants within one model. Second, empirical evidence remains mixed regarding whether general resources and leadership translate into grant-seeking interest. Third, the Indonesian single-institution context offers a setting in which the operational role of LPPM can be distinguished from broader organizational support. The contribution therefore extends beyond contextual novelty: the study tests the proposition that support located closer to the grant-application process may have greater explanatory relevance than general institutional support.

Based on this framework, the study proposes five hypotheses: H1: Leadership support has a significant association with lecturers' interest in external research grants. H2: Facilities and infrastructure have a significant association with lecturers' interest in external research grants. H3: Internal grant management has a significant association with lecturers' interest in external research grants. H4: LPPM support has a significant positive association with lecturers' interest in external research grants. H5: Leadership support, facilities and infrastructure, internal grant management, and LPPM support jointly form a statistically significant regression model for lecturers' interest in external research grants.

This study therefore aims to examine the unique and joint associations of leadership support, facilities and infrastructure, internal grant management, and LPPM support with lecturers' interest in pursuing external research grants at STIE Ganesha. Its practical objective is to identify

which institutional support mechanism should receive priority in research-capacity and grant-participation strategies.

METHOD

This study employed a quantitative, causal-associative survey design to examine the relationship between four institutional predictors Leadership Support (X1), Facilities and Infrastructure (X2), Internal Grant Management (X3), and LPPM Support (X4) and Lecturers' Interest in Applying for External Research Grants (Y).

The population consisted of all 38 permanent lecturers at STIE Ganesha. Because the population was small and accessible, saturated sampling was applied; consequently, all 38 permanent lecturers were included as respondents (Suriani et al., 2023). This definition is used consistently throughout the manuscript; academic administrators were not treated as a separate respondent category.

Data were collected during March–April 2026 using a closed-ended questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The instrument structure reported in the results comprises five constructs with 5 items for X1, 5 for X2, 5 for X3, 6 for X4, and 8 for Y, totaling 29 items. Because the original draft stated 24 items, the authors must verify this total against the original questionnaire before final publication. Construct operationalization is summarized in Table A below.

Item validity was assessed using Pearson Product Moment correlations against an r -table value of .320 ($N = 38$; $\alpha = .05$). Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha with .70 as the minimum reference threshold. Multiple linear regression was then used to estimate the unique association of each predictor with lecturers' interest. Residual normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity diagnostics were examined before hypothesis testing. The t -test evaluated H1–H4, while the F -test evaluated whether the regression model containing X1–X4 was statistically significant as a whole (H5). Adjusted R^2 was used to assess explained variance while accounting for the number of predictors.

The previous draft stated that a 1,000-sample BCa bootstrap procedure had been conducted, but no bootstrap coefficients or confidence intervals were available in the reported results. To avoid unsupported statistical reporting, the bootstrap claim has been removed from this revised manuscript. It should be reinstated only if the original SPSS bootstrap output is available and can be reported completely.

All analyses were conducted using SPSS version 21. The study is limited by its small sample and single-institution setting; therefore, the findings should be interpreted as institution-specific evidence rather than broadly generalized causal effects.

Table 1. Operationalization of Research Variables

Construct	Operational Definition	Indicators	Items	Source	Scale
Leadership Support (X1)	General institutional encouragement and direction supporting lecturers'	Leadership encouragement; policy support; motivation; recognition; research direction	5	Haryanto et al. (2023)	5-point Likert

	research engagement.				
Facilities & Infrastructure (X2)	Availability and adequacy of resources that enable research and proposal preparation.	Research facilities; digital/physical access; workspace/resources; supporting infrastructure	5	Tafsiruddin & Zainuddin (2025)	5-point Likert
Internal Grant Management (X3)	Perceived quality of institutional management of internal research funding.	Access; procedures; fund management; accountability; usefulness as research support	5	Tafsiruddin & Zainuddin (2025)	5-point Likert
LPPM Support (X4)	Direct operational support provided by the research and community service institute.	Grant information; proposal mentoring; training; feedback/pre-review; administration; submission facilitation	6	Azzara & Siregar (2026)	5-point Likert
External Grant Interest (Y)	Lecturers' willingness and intention to participate in external research grant opportunities.	Interest; willingness; readiness; intention to search/apply; participation orientation	8	Huda et al. (2025)	5-point Likert

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Research result

Respondent Characteristics

This study involved 38 permanent lecturers at STIE Ganesha. Respondent characteristics were analyzed based on gender, age, education level, academic rank, teaching tenure, study program, and experience in receiving research grants. These characteristics are important for providing an overview of the backgrounds of the respondents who served as the data source in the analysis of factors related to lecturers' interest in pursuing external research grants.

Table 2. Respondent Characteristics

Characteristics	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Man	28	73,7%
	Woman	10	26,3%

Education	S2 (Magister)	35	92,1%
	S3 (Doktor)	3	7,9%
Teaching Experience	0–3 years	2	5,3%
	4–6 years	17	44,7%
	6–9 years	8	21,1%
	>10 years	11	28,9%
Study program	Bachelor's Degree in Management	29	76,3%
	Bachelor's Degree in Accounting	5	13,2%
	Master's in Management	3	7,9%
	Master's in Accounting	1	2,6%
	Yes	29	76,3%
	No	9	23,7%
	Total	38	100%

Source: Compiled, 2026

Based on Table 2, the study respondents were predominantly male (28 individuals, or 73.7%), while 10 were female (26.3%). Regarding education, the majority held a Master's degree (35 individuals, or 92.1%), whereas three respondents held a Doctoral degree (7.9%). This composition indicates that most respondents possess a postgraduate educational background relevant to conducting research activities and submitting grant proposals.

In terms of teaching experience, the largest group of respondents falls within the 4–6 year range (17 individuals or 44.7%), followed by those with over 10 years of experience (11 individuals or 28.9%), the 6–9 year group (8 individuals or 21.1%), and the 0–3 year group (2 individuals or 5.3%). This composition indicates that the respondents are predominantly lecturers with relatively substantial teaching experience, thereby possessing practical experience in conducting academic and research activities.

Regarding study programs, the majority of respondents were from the Bachelor's program in Management (29 individuals or 76.3%), followed by the Bachelor's program in Accounting (5 individuals or 13.2%), the Master's program in Management (3 individuals or 7.9%), and the Master's program in Accounting (1 individual or 2.6%). The predominance of respondents from the field of management aligns with the institution's identity as a higher education institution specializing in economics.

A particularly relevant aspect of this study is the respondents' experience in securing research grants. A total of 29 respondents (76.3%) reported having received a grant, while 9 respondents (23.7%) had never received one. This indicates that the majority of respondents possess experience with research grant activities, thereby providing them with firsthand insight to evaluate institutional support, facilities, internal grant management, LPPM services, and their interest in pursuing external grants.

In addition to demographic and academic characteristics, the respondents' experience with research grant programs constitutes vital information for this study. Such experience offers insight into the extent of their exposure to the mechanisms involved in grant application, implementation, and accountability. Consequently, the respondents were further categorized based on their experience with research grant schemes.

Table 3. Respondents' Experience with Research Grant Schemes

Scheme	Frequency	Percentage
PDP	25	65,8%
Fundamental	4	10,5%
Other research	4	10,5%
Others (BRIN, Palm Oil, etc.)	2	5,3%
PKM	2	5,3%

Source: Compiled, 2026

Based on Table 3, the respondents possess experience with various research grant schemes. The PDP scheme was the most frequently reported, involving 25 respondents, whereas the Fundamental scheme and other research schemes involved four respondents each. These findings indicate that the respondents have diverse experience participating in research grant programs, although this experience is relatively concentrated within the PDP scheme.

Given these characteristics, the respondents possess academic backgrounds and experience relevant to research activities and grant programs. This provides an adequate context for the respondents to evaluate institutional support, facilities and infrastructure, internal grant management, LPPM support, and their interest in pursuing the external research grants that are the focus of this study. Furthermore, to ensure the collected data was suitable for analysis, the quality of the instrument was assessed through validity and reliability testing of all statement items.

Results of Instrument Validity and Reliability Tests

Table 4. Results of Instrument Validity and Reliability Tests

Variable	Number of Items	Calculated r range	r-tabel (N=38; $\alpha=5\%$)	Cronbach's Alpha	Information
Leadership Support (X1)	5	0,652–0,837	0,320	Verify from SPSS output	Validity supported; reliability to verify

Facilities and Infrastructure (X2)	5	0,497–0,766	0,320	Verify from SPSS output	Validity supported; reliability to verify
Internal Grant Management (X3)	5	0,716–0,879	0,320	Verify from SPSS output	Validity supported; reliability to verify
LPPM Support (X4)	6	0,695–0,915	0,320	Verify from SPSS output	Validity supported; reliability to verify
Interest in Applying for External Grants (Y)	8	0,710–0,938	0,320	Verify from SPSS output	Validity supported; reliability to verify

Source: Compiled, 2026

The reported item-total correlations range from .497 to .938 and exceed the stated r-table value of .320, supporting item validity. The original manuscript reported an identical Cronbach's Alpha value of .784 for all five constructs despite different item sets. Because construct-specific reliability coefficients cannot be reconstructed from the manuscript alone, Table 3 marks these values for verification against the original SPSS reliability output. Final publication should report a separate Cronbach's Alpha for each construct.

Descriptive Statistics

Tabel 5. Statistik Deskriptif Variabel Penelitian

Variabel	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Leadership Support (X1)	38	17	25	21,76	2,421
Facilities and Infrastructure (X2)	38	12	25	19,11	2,768
Internal Grant Management (X3)	38	13	25	20,13	2,713
LPPM Support (X4)	38	6	30	25,74	4,578
Interest in Applying for External Grants (Y)	38	6	40	33,29	5,977

Source: Compiled, 2026

Table 4 reports descriptive statistics for the five research constructs rather than residual statistics. Mean scores were 21.76 for Leadership Support, 19.11 for Facilities and Infrastructure, 20.13 for Internal Grant Management, 25.74 for LPPM Support, and 33.29 for Interest in Applying

for External Grants. These values describe the central tendency and dispersion of respondents' construct scores and should not be interpreted as regression-residual diagnostics.

Classical Assumption Test

Table 6. Classical Assumption Test

Testing	Indicator	Results	Conclusion
Normality	Normal P-P Plot	The residual points are scattered around and follow a diagonal line.	Normal
Multikolinearitas	Tolerance & VIF	Tolerance > 0,10; VIF = 1,628–2,451	Multicollinearity is not present.
Heteroskedastisitas	Uji Glejser	Sig. for all variables = 1.000 (> 0.05)	Heteroskedasticity is not present.

Source: Compiled, 2026

Before hypothesis testing is conducted, classical assumption tests are performed to ensure that the multiple linear regression model meets the requirements necessary for regression analysis. These assumption tests cover residual normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity as part of the evaluation of the regression model's validity (Kim et al., 2024).

The residual normality test is conducted using a Normal Probability Plot (P-P Plot). The analysis results show that the residual points are distributed around and follow the diagonal line. This pattern indicates that the regression model's residuals satisfy the normality assumption, allowing the model to proceed to the hypothesis testing stage (Kim et al., 2024).

The multicollinearity test is performed by examining the Tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values. The test results indicate that all independent variables have Tolerance values > 0.10 and VIF values < 10.00, with VIF values ranging from 1.628 to 2.451. Thus, no signs of multicollinearity among the independent variables were found in the research model. The use of Tolerance and VIF values as diagnostic indicators for multicollinearity is widely applied in multiple regression analysis (Gurung, 2024).

The heteroscedasticity test is conducted using the Glejser test by regressing the absolute values of the residuals against all independent variables. The test results show that the significance value (*Sig.*) for each variable is 1.000, which is greater than 0.05. Consequently, there is no indication of heteroscedasticity in the regression model, meaning the residual variance can be considered relatively homogeneous. The Glejser test is one of the methods that can be used to detect heteroscedasticity in regression models (Firdausya & Indawati, 2023).

Hypothesis Testing

Table 7. Multiple Linear Regression Test Results (t-test)

Variable	B	t	Sig.	Decision
Leadership Support (X1)	-0,076	-0,228	0,821	H ₁ Rejected

Facilities and Infrastructure (X2)	0,188	0,581	0,565	H ₂ Rejected
Internal Grant Management (X3)	0,207	0,561	0,578	H ₃ Rejected
LPPM Support (X4)	1,009	5,307	0,000	H ₄ Accepted

Source: Compiled, 2026

Based on Table 7, the partial test results indicate that Leadership Support (X1) has a regression coefficient of -0.076, a t-value of -0.228, and a significance value of 0.821. Since the significance value exceeds 0.05, H₁ is rejected. Thus, Leadership Support does not have a significant effect on lecturers' interest in pursuing external research grants.

Facilities and Infrastructure (X2) has a regression coefficient of -0.188, a t-value of -0.581, and a significance value of 0.565. A significance value greater than 0.05 indicates that H₂ is rejected. This means that Facilities and Infrastructure do not have a significant effect on lecturers' interest in pursuing external research grants.

Furthermore, Internal Grant Management (X3) has a regression coefficient of 0.207, a t-value of 0.561, and a significance value of 0.578. Since the significance value is > 0.05, H₃ is rejected. Thus, Internal Grant Management does not have a significant effect on lecturers' interest in pursuing external research grants.

In contrast to the three aforementioned variables, LPPM Support (X4) has a regression coefficient of 1.009, a t-value of 5.307, and a significance value of 0.000. Since the significance value is < 0.05, H₄ is accepted. These results indicate that LPPM Support has a positive and significant effect on lecturers' interest in pursuing external research grants. This implies that an increase in LPPM support tends to be accompanied by an increase in lecturers' interest in pursuing external research grants.

F-test and Correlation Coefficient

Table 8. Simultaneous Test Results (F-test) and Coefficient of Determination

Testing	Mark	Sig.	Conclusion
F test (Simultan)	13,725	0,000	Significant; X1–X4 simultaneously influence Y
Adjusted R ²	0,579	—	57.9% of the variation in Y can be explained by X1–X4.

Source: Compiled, 2026

Table 8 shows that the regression model containing Leadership Support, Facilities and Infrastructure, Internal Grant Management, and LPPM Support is statistically significant as a whole ($F = 13.725$, $p < .001$). This model-level result does not imply that every predictor has a significant unique effect. The partial tests show that only LPPM Support is statistically significant when the other predictors are controlled. The Adjusted R² of .579 indicates that the model explains 57.9% of the observed variation in lecturers' interest, while 42.1% remains outside the model.

The Adjusted R^2 value of 0.579 indicates that 57.9% of the variation in Lecturers' Interest in Applying for External Research Grants can be collectively explained by the four independent variables in the model. Meanwhile, 42.1% of the variation in lecturers' interest is explained by other factors not included in the research model.

Research Discussion

Based on the multiple linear regression analysis conducted, this study found that, on an individual basis (t-test), only the LPPM Support variable (X4) had a significant effect on Lecturers' Interest in Applying for External Research Grants (Y), with a t-value of 5.307 and a significance level of 0.000. Meanwhile, the variables of Leadership Support (X1), Facilities and Infrastructure (X2), and Internal Grant Management (X3) showed no significant individual effect (Sig. > 0.05). However, when analyzed simultaneously (F-test), the four variables collectively had a significant effect on Lecturers' Interest, with an F-value of 13.725 and a significance level of 0.000. The Adjusted R^2 value of 0.579 indicates that 57.9% of the variation in Lecturers' Interest can be explained by the four independent variables, while the remaining 42.1% is explained by variables outside the research model.

The Influence of Leadership Support on Lecturers' Interest

The research results indicate that Leadership Support (X1) does not have a significant effect on Lecturers' Interest in Applying for External Research Grants (Y), with a t-value of -0.228 and a significance value of 0.821 (> 0.05). Consequently, H_1 which posits that Leadership Support influences Lecturers' Interest in Applying for External Research Grants is rejected. The regression coefficient of -0.076 also indicates a negative relationship, but this relationship is not statistically significant.

These findings indicate that leadership support as measured in this study is not yet a factor that directly determines faculty interest in pursuing external research grants. This result differs from some studies on research engagement and productivity, which suggest that institutional factors play a role in shaping faculty research activities. Research on faculty research engagement indicates that both individual factors and institutional support help explain faculty involvement in research activities (2024).

One possible interpretation of the nonsignificant leadership coefficient is the relatively high mean Leadership Support score (21.76 of 25), which may indicate limited differentiation in respondents' perceptions. However, this study did not formally test a ceiling effect or restricted variance; therefore, this explanation should be treated as a plausible interpretation rather than an empirically established mechanism.

Second, general leadership support is not necessarily synonymous with support directly related to the process of securing external grants. Faculty interest in pursuing grants may be more strongly influenced by technical and operational support such as information on funding opportunities, guidance on proposal development, feedback on proposals, administrative assistance, and facilitation of the submission process. This is consistent with research (Wilkesmann & Lauer, 2025).

Indicating that a professor's decision to apply for third-party funding is closely linked to the need to secure research funding sources. The study also reveals that organizational factors including the involvement of team members in proposal preparation are associated with the frequency of external funding applications.

Third, the findings indicate that LPPM Support (X4) is the only variable exerting a positive and significant influence on faculty interest, with a t-value of 5.307 and a significance level of 0.000. The disparity between the results for X1 and X4 suggests that faculty members may prioritize support specifically tailored to the grant process over general leadership support. In this context, the role of the LPPM as the unit directly managing research activities, funding information, proposal guidance, and grant administration aligns more closely with the practical needs of faculty members.

Thus, these findings do not imply that leadership support is unimportant for overall research development. However, regarding faculty interest in pursuing external research grants, leadership support has not been proven to be an individual determinant of that interest. The managerial implication is that university leadership needs to integrate leadership support with more specific, operational guidance mechanisms facilitated by the LPPM. Through this approach, leadership support moves beyond mere motivation and policy-setting, translating instead into concrete facilitation that assists faculty members in navigating the external grant application process.

The Influence of Facilities and Infrastructure on Lecturers' Interest

The research results indicate that facilities and infrastructure do not significantly influence lecturers' interest in pursuing external research grants ($t = -0.581$; Sig. $0.565 > 0.05$). This finding is quite surprising, given that a previous study by Tafsiruddin & Zainuddin, (2025) identified limited research facilities as the dominant factor, accounting for 46.3% of total research obstacles at STIE Ganesha. From an operations management perspective, facility limitations create bottlenecks that slow down the research cycle and reduce publication productivity.

Nevertheless, several possibilities could explain these findings. First, despite limited facilities, lecturers may have adapted to existing conditions or sought off-campus alternatives, meaning that facility limitations no longer serve as a primary barrier to interest in external grants. Second, the facilities and infrastructure variable in this study measured lecturers' perceptions of available facilities; the mean score of 19.11 out of 25 (76%) indicates that the facilities were rated quite highly. Research in other campus environments has found average facility scores reaching 72.70%, falling into the "high" category. Thus, existing facilities may be deemed adequate, rendering them no longer a significant differentiating factor. Third, research on the impact of campus facilities suggests that facilities providing comfort and security foster stronger emotional bonds between lecturers and the institution thereby enhancing loyalty and commitment yet this effect may not directly influence interest in pursuing external grants.

The Influence of Internal Grant Management on Lecturers' Interest

The research results indicate that the management of internal grants does not significantly influence lecturers' interest in pursuing external research grants ($t = 0.561$; Sig. $0.578 > 0.05$). This finding is intriguing because, theoretically, effective internal grant management should serve as a "stepping stone" for lecturers to pursue external grants.

Previous research by Tafsiruddin & Zainuddin, (2025) found that inefficient fund utilization accounted for 33.3% of the total research-related obstacles at STIE Ganesha. However, the results of the current study show that lecturers' perceptions of internal grant management are high (mean score of 20.13 out of 25, or 80.5%), implying that they consider the management to be satisfactory. In this context, internal grants may no longer be viewed as a "precursor" or

"stepping stone" for external grants, but rather as a standalone funding source. Research on internal funding suggests that without standardization and strategic initiatives, internal funding opportunities risk being overlooked and underutilized by lecturers. Conversely, findings from LPPM UPNVJ indicate that budget efficiency measures have made internal grants more competitive and significantly reduced their availability, thereby encouraging lecturers to more actively seek external funding. However, this incentive does not appear to have directly translated into a significant increase in interest within the scope of this study; other factors such as academic readiness, confidence in proposal writing, and time constraints may play a more dominant role.

The Influence of LPPM Support on Lecturer Interest

The research results indicate that LPPM support (X4) has a positive and significant effect on lecturers' interest in pursuing external research grants, with a regression coefficient of 1.009, a t-value of 5.307, and a significance level of 0.000. These findings demonstrate that the stronger the support provided by the LPPM, the greater the lecturers' inclination to participate in external research grant programs.

These findings can be explained by the role of institutional support in enhancing faculty capacity to access research funding sources. Institutional support entails not only providing information on funding opportunities but also includes guidance, mentoring, capacity building for proposal development, feedback provision, and facilitation of the submission process. Research on access to research funding indicates that a lack of support at both individual and institutional levels is a barrier to securing external funding, whereas mentoring and institutional support can help strengthen researchers' capacity to advance their careers and access funding (Herren et al., 2024).

This mentoring role is also supported by research on grant-writing coaching programs, which indicates that structured guidance can provide individualized direction, boost confidence, offer feedback on proposal components, and assist researchers in approaching the proposal development process more systematically (Levites Strekalova et al., 2025). Furthermore, an evaluation of the grant-writing support program indicates that a combination of workshops, individual mentoring, and proposal pre-reviews can facilitate faculty success in developing and submitting research proposals to secure funding (Veevers et al., 2026).

Thus, the findings of this study confirm that the LPPM serves not merely as an administrative unit managing research activities, but also as a facilitator and catalyst for faculty capacity building in securing external funding. Structured support—ranging from identifying grant opportunities and providing guidance on proposal development and feedback to facilitating the submission process—has the potential to mitigate the obstacles faculty members face when competing for external research grants. Therefore, strengthening the LPPM's mentoring functions and proposal clinics can serve as a crucial institutional strategy to boost faculty participation in external research grant competitions.

The simultaneous influence of X1, X2, X3, and X4 on Y

The F-test indicates that the four-predictor regression model is statistically significant ($F = 13.725$; $p < .001$), with Adjusted $R^2 = .579$. This finding should be interpreted at the model level rather than as evidence that all four predictors are individually significant. Indeed, the partial tests identify LPPM Support as the only significant unique predictor. The central theoretical implication is therefore one of support proximity: operational, grant-specific assistance may be more closely

associated with lecturers' grant-participation interest than general leadership encouragement, facilities, or internal grant management.

These results demonstrate that lecturers' interest in pursuing external research grants cannot be understood through a single institutional aspect alone; rather, it must be viewed in light of the combination of conditions that shape the research environment. Research on academic research productivity indicates that institutional support, research funding, reward systems, mentoring, and information resources are critical factors in fostering research productivity. These findings reinforce the view that the development of research activities requires a supportive institutional ecosystem, rather than merely the availability of individual resources (Ocampo et al., 2022).

In the context of higher education in Indonesia, (Herawati & Aisha, 2026; Prasajo et al., 2025) It demonstrates that the research atmosphere, collaboration, funding, competence, and research output are crucial factors in shaping faculty research performance. The study also emphasizes the importance of institutional support in strengthening the research ecosystem within higher education institutions. These findings are relevant to current research, as an interest in pursuing external grants represents an initial stage in faculty engagement with broader research activities.

Although the research model was significant overall, partial test results revealed that only LPPM (Institute for Research and Community Service) support had a significant impact on faculty interest. Thus, the results do not indicate that all independent variables exert an equally strong individual influence. Instead, the findings suggest that LPPM support is the institutional factor making the most tangible contribution to encouraging faculty interest in pursuing external research grants, whereas leadership support, facilities and infrastructure, and internal grant management did not demonstrate significant individual effects within the model.

These findings regarding the importance of institutional support align with recent research on faculty research engagement, which indicates that institutional support, funding, training, mentoring, and a supportive research culture can facilitate faculty involvement in research activities. Consequently, the research ecosystem needs to be comprehensively strengthened through resource support, capacity building, mentoring, and the creation of a conducive research environment.

Meanwhile, the 42.1% of the variation in faculty interest left unexplained by the model suggests the potential role of other factors. These factors may include individual motivation, research self-efficacy, prior grant-winning experience, workload, time constraints, proposal-writing competence, research collaboration, and the research culture at the study program level. Study (Wilkesmann & Lauer, 2025), for instance, indicates that a professor's decision to seek third-party funding is also linked to motivational and organizational factors. The study found that the need to secure research funding is a key driver for proposal submission, while support from team members during the proposal preparation process is associated with the frequency of submissions.

Therefore, future research should incorporate other individual and organizational factors, such as research motivation, self-efficacy, grant-acquisition experience, workload, proposal-writing competence, research collaboration, and research culture. Expanding the range of variables in this way could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the factors that determine faculty interest in pursuing external research grants.

CONCLUSION

This study examined four institutional determinants of lecturers' interest in external research grants. The partial regression results show that Leadership Support ($p = .821$), Facilities and Infrastructure ($p = .565$), and Internal Grant Management ($p = .578$) do not demonstrate statistically significant unique associations with lecturers' interest. LPPM Support is the only significant positive predictor ($B = 1.009$; $t = 5.307$; $p < .001$). The overall regression model is significant ($F = 13.725$; $p < .001$) and explains 57.9% of the variance after adjustment for the number of predictors (Adjusted $R^2 = .579$). The principal contribution is the distinction between broad institutional support and proximal operational support. Within this setting, support directly connected to the grant process—information dissemination, proposal mentoring, pre-review, administrative facilitation, and submission assistance—appears more salient than general institutional conditions. This interpretation does not mean that leadership, facilities, or internal grants are unimportant to the broader research ecosystem; rather, their unique associations with grant-participation interest were not statistically established in this model. Managerially, higher-education institutions should strengthen LPPM as a grant-enablement hub by institutionalizing funding alerts, proposal clinics, reviewer pools, mentoring, pre-submission quality assurance, and administrative assistance. Leadership and resource investments can be linked to these operational mechanisms so that general institutional commitment is translated into concrete support at the point where lecturers prepare and submit proposals. The study has several limitations. The sample comprises only 38 permanent lecturers from one institution, limiting external generalizability. The cross-sectional design does not establish causality, and the model excludes potentially important individual and organizational factors such as research self-efficacy, workload, prior grant success, proposal-writing competence, collaboration, and research culture. Future studies should employ multi-institution samples, longitudinal designs, and broader explanatory models, and should test whether grant-specific operational support mediates or moderates the effects of broader institutional resources on grant participation. Before final publication, the authors should verify two source-data issues against the original questionnaire and SPSS output: the exact instrument total (the reported construct item counts sum to 29, whereas the earlier Methods text stated 24) and the construct-specific Cronbach's Alpha coefficients. These values should not be inferred or reconstructed without the original statistical output.

REFERENCES

- Azzara, A. S., & Siregar, F. G. (2026). *Kontribusi Mahasiswa Magang dalam Penguatan Program Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat di LPPM STIE Ganesha*. 1(1).
- Firdausya, F. A., & Indawati, R. (2023). PERBANDINGAN UJI GLEJSER DAN UJI PARK DALAM MENDETEKSI HETEROSKEDASTISITAS PADA ANGKA KEMATIAN IBU DI PROVINSI JAWA TIMUR TAHUN 2020. *Jurnal Ners*, 7(1), 793–796. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jn.v7i1.14069>
- Guntoro, D. W., Munandar, H., & Ziaurrahman, M. (2023). Gambaran higher education consumer choice di Provinsi Kalimantan Tengah. *Wiyata Dharma: Jurnal Penelitian dan Evaluasi Pendidikan*, 11(2), 69–82. <https://doi.org/10.30738/wd.v11i2.16556>
- Gurung, D. B. (2024). Regression Model in Social Science Research: The Issue of Multicollinearity, Detection Method, and Solution in SPSS. *SXC Journal*, 1(1), 22–29. <https://doi.org/10.3126/sxcj.v1i1.70871>

- Haryanto, H., Kholis, N., Hadi, S., Apino, E., Asriadi Am, Muh., & Trizkyana, C. K. (2023). Determinant factors affecting the research performance of lecturers receiving external funds. *REID (Research and Evaluation in Education)*, 9(2), 198–209. <https://doi.org/10.21831/reid.v9i2.68457>
- Herawati, T., & Aisha, N. (2026). GROW Coaching as a Strategy to Enhance Personal Commitment in Professional Development a Literature Study. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Manajemen & Bisnis*, 4(3), 203–211. <https://doi.org/10.60023/1stzqt55>
- Herren, S. S., Ioannidou, E., Drake, D., Bernstein, E., Mickel, N., & Fox, C. H. (2024). A Mentoring Network for Diversity in Dental, Oral, and Craniofacial Research. *Journal of Dental Research*, 103(12), 1167–1172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00220345241265664>
- Hidayatullah, S., Saefullah, A., Kohar, A., & Syahreza, A. (2024). Pengenalan Investasi Pasar Modal Bagi Kalangan Mahasiswa dan Pelajar Melalui Seminar Edukasi. *I-Com: Indonesian Community Journal*, 4(1), 298–310. <https://doi.org/10.33379/icom.v4i1.4026>
- Huda, I. U., Karsudjono, A. J., & Sapar, J. F. (2025). *Factors Driving and Inhibiting Lecturers' Interest in Research Activities As The Implementation of The Tri Dharma of Higher Education at STIE Pancasetia Banjarmasin, South Kalimantan*. 4(4).
- Jarantow, S. W., Pisors, E. D., & Chiu, M. L. (2023). Introduction to the Use of Linear and Nonlinear Regression Analysis in Quantitative Biological Assays. *Current Protocols*, 3(6), e801. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpz1.801>
- Jayaun, J. (2025). Peran Kampus Dalam Pengembangan Karir Dan Kewirausahaan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Manajemen & Bisnis*, 3(1), 25–32. <https://doi.org/10.60023/sa967850>
- Kim, J., Kim, D. H., & Kwak, S. G. (2024). Comprehensive guidelines for appropriate statistical analysis methods in research. *Korean Journal of Anesthesiology*, 77(5), 503–517. <https://doi.org/10.4097/kja.24016>
- Levites Strekalova, Y. A., Kavak, S., Caridad Rodriguez, V., Midence, S., Caplan, L. S., Thompson, W., Idris, M. Y., Stiles, J., Pemu, P., Quarshie, A., Baez, A., Salazar Campo, M., & Ofili, E. (2025). Exploring grant writing coaching and its role in professional development of health equity investigators: A qualitative study. *Journal of Clinical and Translational Science*, 9(1), e178. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2025.10080>
- Munk, A., & Czado, C. (2001). *Bootstrap methods for the nonparametric assessment of population bioequivalence and similarity of distributions*. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*. 68(3).
- Ocampo, L., Aro, J. L., Evangelista, S. S., Maturan, F., Yamagishi, K., Mamhot, D., Mamhot, D. F., Calibo-Senit, D. I., Tibay, E., Pepito, J., & Quiñones, R. (2022). Research Productivity for Augmenting the Innovation Potential of Higher Education Institutions: An Interpretive Structural Modeling Approach and MICMAC Analysis. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 8(3), 148. <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc8030148>
- Paais, R. L., & Aedi, N. (2026). Academic ecosystem and change management effects on learning service quality in higher education. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Development (IJED)*, 7(2), 583–597. <https://doi.org/10.59672/ijed.v7i2.6465>
- Prasojo, L. D., Yuliana, L., & Prihandoko, L. A. (2025). Research Performance in Higher Education: A PLS-SEM Analysis of Research Atmosphere, Collaboration, Funding, Competence, and Output, Especially for Science and Engineering Facilities in Indonesian Universities. *ASEAN Journal of Science and Engineering*, 5(1), 123–144. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ajse.v5i1.81224>
- Puspasari, H., & Puspita, W. (2022). Uji Validitas dan Reliabilitas Instrumen Penelitian Tingkat Pengetahuan dan Sikap Mahasiswa terhadap Pemilihan Suplemen Kesehatan dalam Menghadapi Covid-19. *Jurnal Kesehatan*, 13(1), 65–71. <https://doi.org/10.26630/jk.v13i1.2814>

- Safiih, A. R., & Husaini, A. (2025). *The impact of standard operating procedures and turnover intention on employee performance at PT Albany Corona Lestari Tangerang Branch*. (2).
- Saksana, J. C. (2023). *Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan*. Padang: CV Hei Publishing Indonesia.
- Seta Basri. (2026). *Manajemen Kampanye*. <https://setabasri.my.id>
- Sholihah, S. M., Aditiya, N. Y., Evani, E. S., & Maghfiroh, S. (2023). *KONSEP UJI ASUMSI KLASIK PADA REGRESI LINIER BERGANDA*. 2(2).
- Sumin, S. (2022). The Impact of Z-Score Transformation Scaling on the Validity, Reliability, and Measurement Error of Instrument SATS-36. *JP3I (Jurnal Pengukuran Psikologi Dan Pendidikan Indonesia)*, 11(2), 167–181. <https://doi.org/10.15408/jp3i.v11i2.26591>
- Suriani, N., Risnita, & Jailani, M. S. (2023). Konsep Populasi dan Sampling Serta Pemilihan Partisipan Ditinjau Dari Penelitian Ilmiah Pendidikan. *Jurnal IHSAN: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 1(2), 24–36. <https://doi.org/10.61104/ihsan.v1i2.55>
- Tafsiruddin, M., & Zainuddin, Z. (2025). Analisis Prioritas Kritis Berbasis Prinsip Pareto dalam Tata Kelola Sumber Daya Penelitian: Strategi Peningkatan Efisiensi dan Efektivitas Riset di STIE Ganesha. *Jurnal Manajemen*, 4(4).
- Veevers, J., Veevers, J., Reyes, T. M., Kissela, B. M., Ryan, P. H., Knapke, J. M., Blackard, J. T., & Johns, A. (2026). 172 Evaluating grant writing support programs to enhance faculty research funding success. *Journal of Clinical and Translational Science*, 10(s1), 56–56. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2026.10382>
- Wilkesmann, U., & Lauer, S. (2025). Determinants of third-party funding applications in German academia. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 15(sup1), 82–102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2025.2501158>