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ABSTRACT

Integrating two different systems between higher education and pesantren (Islamic boarding schools), Pesantren-based Higher Education (PTBP) is alleged as an ideal Islamic higher education model considering its critical role in the process of integration-interconnection of science and Islamic teaching. Like other Islamic higher educations in Indonesia, PTBP represents poor organizational performance, particularly in research productivity and quality. Since research performance has the most considerable portion in the higher education performance evaluation both nationally and internationally, this study attempted to explore the factors that possibly improve lecturers’ research performance at PTBP, categorized into the level of the individual, institutional and resource factors. This study involved 84 lecturers at 7 PTBP in Bogor, Indonesia, selected based on the stratified random sampling and voluntary sampling method. The collected data was analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling-Partial Least Square (SEM-PLS). The results showed that only research competence positively affected research performance at the individual level, but not for work motivation and time management. Research culture and academic leadership insignificantly affected research performance. However, only high-performance work practice (HPWP) at the institutional level positively affected research performance. Meanwhile, collaboration networks at the resource level positively affected research performance, but not for university research funding. The managerial implications are further discussed in this study.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-SA license.
1. INTRODUCTION

Despite the fact that Islamic Higher Educations (PTKI) development in Indonesia statistically increased, precisely of those Islamic Private Higher Education institutions (PTKIS), these developments are not directly proportional to their educational quality (Warits, 2017) and are consequently often viewed as second-class universities (Mashudi, 2020; Muqoyyidin & As’ad, 2020; Wahid et al., 2019). Besides, PTKIS in Indonesia has often been criticized since it adhered to the old paradigm that only represented a teaching-based university (Muqoyyidin & As’ad, 2020; Muqoyyidin, 2016) and was not competent in building research culture seriously (Husni, 2017). Meanwhile, the top world-class universities have long been research-based, so they excelled in leading, producing as well as developing science and technology (Bonaccorsi & Secondi, 2017; Cheng & Huo, 2010). Nationally, most universities consistently on the top tier (such as UGM, UI, IPB, etc.) possessed an excellent research performance (SINTA, 2021). PTKIS institutions’ lag in research and knowledge development worsened their position to compete with other excelled universities.

Among the others, research performance has the most considerable portion in the higher education performance evaluation (Javed et al., 2020; Bonaccorsi & Secondi, 2017; Frenken et al., 2017) both nationally (DIKTI Kemendikbud) and internationally (Times Higher Education, Shanghai Ranking, QS World Ranking, Webometrics, etc.). For instance, Times Higher Education (THE) rated research and citation performance as more than 60% of the total assessment (Times Higher Education, 2020). Meanwhile, The Directorate-General for Higher Education (Dikti Kemendikbud) assessed 25% on output indicator (number of indexed scientific publications per lecturer 30% and research performance 40%) and 30% on outcome indicator (innovation performance 25%, number of citations per lecturer 25%, number of patents per lecturer 15%) (Dikti Kemendikbud, 2020). Indeed, the extensive portion of research and scientific publication performance will significantly impact the overall higher education performance.

On the other side, Most PTKIS are managed by pesantren (Mashudi, 2020; Saifuddin, 2013). Indeed, the development of PTKIS cannot be disconnected from Pesantren, regarding that numerous PTKIS were founded by Pesantren (Husni, 2017; Setyawan, 2016). According to the literature, PTKIS institutions managed by pesantren are referred to Pesantren-based Higher Education (Zarkasyi, 2017; Bali, 2017). Pesantren-based Higher Education (PTBP) integrated both higher education and pesantren education systems (Zarkasyi, 2017) to respond to global challenges (Thoyib et al., 2020; Tohet & Eko, 2020; Bali, 2017) and is alleged as an ideal Islamic higher education model considering its critical role in the process of integration-interconnection of science and Islamic teaching (Halil & Anwar, 2016; Tohet & Eko, 2020; Husni, 2017). However, despite the fact that many Muslim scholars claimed PTBP as an ideal Islamic higher education, the fact showed that PTBP institutions’ inability (as part of PTKIS) to compete with other higher education is undeniable. Moreover, this integration-interconnection conception is impossibly established without positioning research as an academic basis. Research is essential in producing integrative science (Husni, 2017). Thus, PTBP institutions needed to improve their research performance to improve overall institutional performance and ultimately increase competitiveness (Javed et al., 2020; Artés et al., 2017; Edgar & Geare, 2013).

University research performance is highly reliant on their lecturers as the primary human resource in higher education (Javed et al., 2020; Artés et al., 2017; Edgar & Geare, 2013). Unfortunately, lecturers’ research performance at PTBP institutions is deficient (Husni, 2017; al Idrus, 2016). Research by Afandi (2020) concluded that PTBP institutions required a particular managerial strategy to improve lecturers’ performance in research and scientific publications. It is critical to identify the factors that possibly influenced research performance in formulating strategy. Unfortunately, to the best of the authors’ knowledge, no previous studies specifically explored the factors that improved lecturers’ research performance in PTBP institutions. Most previous studies solely investigated this issue through a qualitative-descriptive approach without formulating the alternative strategy to be implemented. Therefore, this study further endeavored to develop a strategy to enhance lecturers’ research performance on several PTBP institutions in Bogor, West Java, which is part of the Coordinator of...
Islamic higher education (Kopertais II). The number of PTKIS institutions in Bogor is the highest in Kopertais II (22 institutions). Specifically, PTKIS with pesantren-based status (PTBP) spread in Bogor amounted to 7 institutions. Table 1 below displays that the PTBP institutions in Bogor represented poor performance viewed based on accreditation status (Accredited as C). Further, the SINTA ranking (Science and Technology Index) below showed that most of the research and scientific publications performance of PTBP in Bogor is deficient.

**Table 1. The Distribution of Pesantren-based Higher Education (PTBP) in Bogor**

| Name of PTBP            | Name of Pesantren       | Accreditation | Institution | Rank of Sinta |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| Institut Ummul Quro Al-Islami | PM Ummul Quro Al-Islami | Good (C)      | IAI         | 4160          |
| Institut Agama Islam Sahid    | PM Sahid                | Good (C)      | IAI         | 1259          |
| STAI Nurul Iman          | PP Nurul Iman           | Good (C)      | STAI        | 2109          |
| STAI Al-Fatah            | PP Al Fatah             | Good (C)      | STAI        | 4764          |
| STAI Al Aulia            | PP Al-Aulia             | Good (C)      | STAI        | 4720          |
| STAI Al Mukhlishin       | PP Al Mukhlishin        | Good (C)      | STAI        | -             |
| STAI Darunnajah          | PP Darunnajah           | Good (C)      | STAI        | 4771          |

Due to these issues, it is essential to analyze the factors that affected lecturers' research performance at PTBP in Bogor. Based on the literature, numerous studies investigated the factors that affected lecturers’ research performance in higher education through diverse perspectives and analysis levels. However, most previous studies only explored these factors partially and unstructured, making it difficult to identify and analyze managerial implication. For instance, the comparative research by Valdivieso et al., (2021) conducted in several Latin American countries only reviewed individual and environmental characteristics on research performance. In the individual-level framework, Valdivieso et al., (2021) dismissed several vital variables such as competence and work motivation. In contrast, Zhao et al., (2021) only examined institutional and environmental factors but missed individual variables, which are critically important to be reviewed simultaneously.

Numerous other studies also explored individual attributes related to research performance. For instance, several of them were found to specifically review attitudes and personality (Pouratashi & Zamani, 2017; Gunawan, 2020; Fukuwawa, 2014), academic age and level (Abramo, D’Angelo, & Murgia, 2016), motivational attributes (Tan et al., 2020; Ringelhan et al., 2013; Zhang, 2014), academic achievement (Ramesh et al., 2017), academic preferences (Zhao, 2017), and individual competence (Devi & Tjahjadi, 2020; Roman, 2021). In addition, several other studies attempted to investigate the resource factor in particular. Some of them included collaboration (Paraskevopoulos et al., 2021; Aldieri et al., 2020; Rahimi et al., 2020; Inayati, 2019; Sabah et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2017; Kim et al., 2014) and research funding (Álvarez-Bornstein & Bordons, 2021; Möller, 2019; Doh et al., 2018). These studies, both specifically reviewing individual and resource factors, were conducted in-depth yet partial, so they fail to provide a more comprehensive understanding in explaining research performance in higher education.

These limitations were confirmed by Heng et al., (2020) and Aydin (2017). Through a systematic literature study, Heng et al., (2020) and Aydin (2017) proposed a more comprehensive and systematic model to review various factors affecting higher education research performance. Heng et al., (2020) compiled these into three levels: individual, institutional, and national factors. Meanwhile, Aydin (2017) divided these factors into individual factors, including demographic variables and personal attributes, and external factors, including institutional-structure variables and resources provided by institutions. However, those two conceptual frameworks are required to be tested simultaneously. Therefore, this study attempts to examine the conceptual framework simultaneously using structural equation modeling (SEM) analysis to fully understand the factors that can affect research performance in a higher education setting.
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Further, these factors are divided into three levels: individual, institutional, and resource. Several variables examined related to individual factors are research competence, work motivation, and time management. Research competence is positively assumed as the most decisive factor in improving individual research performance (Wasfi, Mulyati, & Purwono, 2020). Wasfi et al., (2020) reviewed competencies based on knowledge, skills, work attitude related to research tasks. Other studies found that work motivation positively correlated to academics’ research performance in higher education (Esponilla, 2015; Ringelhan et al., 2013; Karna & Ko, 2013). Esponilla (2015) explored the two most studied dimensions of work motivation, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and found that each of them effectively improved lecturers’ research performance in the Philippines university (Esponilla, 2015). Et last, Tauhed et al., (2019) found that time management skills are the main factor determining a lecturer’s success in accomplishing research tasks. Academics with a high level of research performance have better time management skills than those with low ones (White, James, Burke, & Allen, 2012).

Meanwhile, at the institutional level, this study attempted to examine research culture, academic leadership, and high-performance work practice (HPWP). Previous studies revealed that institutions with a culture that supported research activities tended to possess research excellence (X. Zhao et al., 2021) (Ramezani, Mehn, & Azizi, 2018) (Bai, Millwater, & Hudson, 2013). The research environment at higher education played an essential role in encouraging research productivity in addition to individual and behavioral factors (Dhillon, Ibrahim, & Selamat, 2015). Yulianto & Juwono (2021) and Ramezani et al., (2018) found that a weak research culture led to the lecturers’ low research performance at universities. Furthermore, previous studies proved that leadership is a factor that significantly influenced research performance (Ryu, Hwang, & Choi, 2016). Based on numerous literature, one of the leadership models often studied related to research performance is academic leadership (Geraschenko, 2021; Evans, 2014). Finally, several studies also found that human resource management significantly affected university research performance (Abe & Mugobo, 2021; Kim, 2016; Beerens, 2013). Specifically, high-performance work practice (HPWP) is widely implemented in the higher educational context due to its effectiveness in encouraging numerous positive work outcomes (Boxall, 2018). Some studies, such as Perdomo-ortiz et al., (2020) and Alshaikhmubarak et al., (2020), found that HPWP effectively increased research productivity and performance and further determined academic career success.

Ultimately, several factors examined at the resource level covered collaboration networks and university research funding. Numerous researchers discovered the critical role of collaboration networks in higher education, mainly related to research performance (Badar et al., 2016; Badar et al., 2013). Collaboration and co-authorship have been essential in developing academic research policies (Aldieri et al., 2020). The studies conducted by Paraskevopoulos et al., (2021) Feng (2020), Inayah (2019), and Sabah et al., (2019) revealed that researchers who possessed more collaboration networks and co-authorships are found to possess a higher number of publications and broader impact factors. In addition, several studies showed that funding effectively improved research performance, mainly related to quality, excellence and impact (Alvarez-Bornstein & Bordons, 2021; Doh et al., 2018; Yang, 2017; Mali et al., 2017). Most funded scientific publications were found in the top reputable journals (Alvarez-Bornstein & Bordons, 2021).

To the best of the authors’ knowledge in exploring the literature, no study has systematically explored these factors for their influence on lecturer research performance, specifically those conducted in pesantren-based higher education (PTBP). This study further attempted to analyze the factors that could improve lecturers’ research performance at PTBP, categorized based on individual, institutional and resource levels. Hence, this research is essential to enhance lecturers’ research performance at PTBP institutions.

2. METHODS

The research method should be included in the Introduction. The method contains an explanation of the research approach, subjects of the study, the conduct of the research procedure, the use of materials and instruments, data collection, and analysis techniques.
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This study used a cross-sectional survey design, conducted at 7 PTBP in Bogor (signed under the Coordinator of Islamic Private Higher Education Region II West Java-KOPERTAIS II). Ninety-seven (84) lecturers from 5 PTBP were involved and selected based on stratified random sampling and voluntary sampling methods. The stratum of PTBP was divided based on institution classification: IAI and STAI. The two (2) selected IAI was Institute Agama Islam Sahid (INAIS) and Institute Ummul Quro Al-Islami (IUQI). Meanwhile, the three (3) selected STAI were STAI Nurul Iman, STAI Darunnajah, and STAI Al-Aulia. Additionally, the questionnaire was distributed using a google-form link to the lecturers from each selected PTBP. At last, 84 Lectures voluntarily completed the questionnaire. The voluntary sampling method is a non-probability sampling design. In this method, the sample frame consisted of selected volunteers that qualified and voluntarily participated in the research (Murairwa, 2015). However, to minimize the bias of respondent variants, this study only involved the lecturers with a minimum of 3 years of employment. The following table shows the distribution of selected institutions and samples for each stratum.

| Name of PTBP         | Population (N) | Sample Target (N) | Sample Acquisition (N) | Proportional Percentage (%) Sample Target | Sample Acquisition |
|----------------------|----------------|-------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Institut Ummul Quro Al-Islami | 41             | 25                | 35                     | 31%                                      | 44%                |
| Institut Agama Islam Sahid | 38             | 23                | 17                     | 29%                                      | 21%                |
| STAI Nurul Iman       | 35             | 21                | 16                     | 26%                                      | 20%                |
| STAI Al Aulia         | 7              | 4                 | 5                      | 5%                                       | 6%                 |
| STAI Darunnajah       | 12             | 7                 | 11                     | 9%                                       | 13%                |
| Total                | 133            | 80                | 84                     | 100%                                     | 100%               |

This study used nine measurement scales: research competence, work motivation, time management, research culture, academic leadership, HPWP management practices, collaboration networks, research funding, and performance. Research competence was measured using the scale developed by Wasfi et al., (2020), including knowledge, skill, and work attitudes. Work motivation consisted of intrinsic and extrinsic developed by Esponilla (2015). Time management measured the degree of an individual’s ability to complete more work and organize time. Meanwhile, the research culture scale was adapted from Jayachandran & Chandrasenan (2021), which contained work conditions, collaboration and sharing, research infrastructure, research policies and agendas, as well as research monitoring and mentoring. Academic leadership included teaching, research, and administrative leadership developed by Perdomo-oritz et al., (2020). HPWP scala adopted from Perdomo-oritz et al., (2020) consisted of training and education, compensation and incentives, performance management, selection, and teamwork.

The collaboration network scale was developed from the study conducted by Paraskevopoulos et al., (2021), Slavova et al., (2016) and Kim et al., (2014), covering internal, local/national, and international collaboration. University research funding is adapted from Doh et al., (2018). Finally, research performance used the scale developed by Retnowati et al., (2018), including research level, publication level, research team role level, and authorship level. Research competence, work motivation, time management, research culture, academic leadership, and management practices of HPWP were measured using the Likert scale. In contrast, collaboration networks, university research funding, and research performance were measured using the ratio scale.

Collected data was then analyzed using structural equation modeling through partial least squares (SEM-PLS) with the help of Smart-PLS to examine the causality relationship between latent variables. Ghozali & Latan (2019) stated that SEM-PLS analysis is a simultaneous equation focused on
predictions to describe latent variables based on indicators. SEM-PLS was used since this research was early exploratory research with a weak theoretical basis (Ghozali & Latan, 2019) and a relatively small sample (84 respondents) (Jaya & Sumertajaya, 2008).

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

2.1. Respondent Characteristics

The characteristics of the respondents in this study were reviewed based on the institution, gender, educational level, academic level, age, and work tenure. The respondents from Institute Ummul Quro Al-Islami are the largest (41.7%). Based on gender, male respondents (72.6%) dominated compared to females (27.4%). In terms of educational level, the number of respondents with master's degrees (S2) also dominated (98.3%) compared to respondents with doctoral degrees (S3) (10.7%). Based on the academic level, assistant professors (asisten ahli) are the most (46%), followed by assistant professors (lektor) (31.4%) and lecturers without an academic level (22.6%)—none of the respondents with the academic level of associate professor or full professor. Furthermore, respondents aged 25-35 (63.1%) and a working tenure around 1-5 years (73.8%) are the largest.

Table 3. Respondent Characteristics

| Characteristic                        | N (128) | Percentage (100%) |
|--------------------------------------|---------|-------------------|
| Institution                          |         |                   |
| Institut Ummul Quro Al-Islami        | 35      | 41.7%             |
| Institut Agama Islam Sahid           | 17      | 20.2%             |
| STAI Nurul Iman                      | 16      | 19%               |
| STAI Darunnajah                      | 11      | 13.1%             |
| STAI Al-Aulia                        | 5       | 6%                |
| Male                                 | 61      | 72.6%             |
| Female                               | 23      | 27.4%             |
| Gender                               |         |                   |
| Master (S2)                          | 75      | 89.3%             |
| Doctor (S3)                          | 9       | 10.7%             |
| Lecturer                             | 19      | 22.6%             |
| Assistant Professor (Asisten Ahli)   | 39      | 46%               |
| Associate Professor (Lektor)         | 26      | 31.4%             |
| Academic Level                       |         |                   |
| 25-35 Year                           | 53      | 63.1%             |
| 36-45 Year                           | 21      | 25%               |
| 46-55 Year                           | 10      | 11.9%             |
| 1-5 Year                             | 62      | 73.8%             |
| Work Tenure                          |         |                   |
| 6-10 Year                            | 22      | 26.2%             |

2.2. Measurement Model Evaluation (Outer Model)

Measurement model evaluation aimed to evaluate the validity and reliability of each indicator in the constructs. The measurement model evaluation was differentiated based on reflective and formative indicators (Hair, Sarstedt, Hopkins, & Kuppelwieser, 2014). Latent variables with reflective indicators consisted of research competence, work motivation, time management, research culture, academic leadership, HPWP, and university research funding. Meanwhile, latent variables with formative indicators covered collaboration networks and research performance.

2.2.1. Measurement Model Evaluation of Reflective Indicators

Measurement model of reflective indicator evaluated through convergent validity based on the loading score of each indicator (n>0.70) and discriminant validity based on the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) score (n> 0.50). Meanwhile, the construct reliability was reviewed through
Composite reliability score (n>0.60) and Chronbach alpha score (n> 0.70) (Hair et al., 2014). The following table showed that the whole indicators possessed a good loading score (>0.70).

Table 4. Indicator-Loading

| Indicator                      | Symbol   | Loading Score | Conclusion |
|--------------------------------|----------|---------------|------------|
| Research Competence            | KOM      | 0.978         | Valid      |
| Knowledge                      | KOM1     | 0.971         | Valid      |
| Skill                          | KOM2     | 0.965         | Valid      |
| Work Attitude                  | KOM3     | 0.965         |            |
| Work Motivation                | MOT      | 0.885         | Valid      |
| Intrinsic Motivation           | MOT1     | 0.885         | Valid      |
| Extrinsic Motivation           | MOT2     | 0.948         | Valid      |
| Time Management                | MW       | 0.901         | Valid      |
| Degree of an individual's ability to complete more work | MW1 | 0.901 | Valid |
| Degree of an individual's ability to organize time | MW2 | 0.907 | Valid |
| Research Culture               | BP       |               |            |
| Work Condition                 | BP1      | 0.918         | Valid      |
| Collaboration & Research Sharing | BP2   | 0.918         | Valid      |
| Research Infrastructure        | BP3      | 0.883         | Valid      |
| Policy and Research Agenda     | BP4      | 0.937         | Valid      |
| Research Monitoring & Mentoring| BP5      | 0.911         | Valid      |
| Academic Leadership            | KA       |               |            |
| Research Leadership            | KA1      | 0.942         | Valid      |
| Teaching Leadership            | KA2      | 0.947         | Valid      |
| Administrative Leadership      | KA3      | 0.954         | Valid      |
| High-Performance Work Practice (HPWP) | HPWP | | |
| Training and Education         | HPWP1    | 0.923         | Valid      |
| Compensation & Incentive       | HPWP2    | 0.757         | Valid      |
| Performance Management         | HPWP3    | 0.950         | Valid      |
| Selection                      | HPWP4    | 0.866         | Valid      |
| Team work                      | HPWP5    | 0.920         | Valid      |
| University Research Funding    | DANA     | 0.973         | Valid      |

Table 5 showed The AVE, Chronbach alpha, and Composite reliability scores. The overall results of the reflectice indicator measurement model evaluation above showed that the instrument used to measure each variable and indicator in this study possesses a good validity and reliability.

Table 5. The AVE, Cronbach’s Alpha, and Composite Reliability Score

| Variable                     | Cronbach’s Alpha | Composite Reliability | AVE  |
|------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|------|
| Research Competence          | 0.970            | 0.980                  | 0.943|
| Work Motivation              | 0.818            | 0.914                  | 0.841|
| Time Management              | 0.776            | 0.899                  | 0.817|
| Research Culture             | 0.953            | 0.962                  | 0.835|
| Academic Leadership          | 0.944            | 0.964                  | 0.898|
| HPWP                         | 0.932            | 0.948                  | 0.785|
| University Research Funding  | 1.000            | 1.000                  | 1.000|

2.2.2. Measurement Model Evaluation of Formative Indicators

Measurement model evaluation of indicator formative consisted of two stages: analyzed the multicollinearity and the significance value of the outer weight (Hair et al., 2014). The value of
multicollinearity can be observed through the variance inflation factor (VIF) score. VIF score represented the correlation between the indicators and was expected to be low as possible (VIF < 5). In table 5 below, the VIF score of each indicator is below 6.

### Table 6. VIF Score

| Indicator                          | Symbol | VIF Score | Conclusion           |
|-----------------------------------|--------|-----------|----------------------|
| Collaboration Network             | KOL    | 1.054     | Low multicollinearity|
| Internal Collaboration            | KOL1   | 1.802     | Low multicollinearity|
| National Collaboration            | KOL2   | 1.769     | Low multicollinearity|
| International Collaboration       | KOL3   | 1.508     | Low multicollinearity|
| Research Performance              | KP     | 1.395     | Low multicollinearity|
| Level of Research                 | KP1    | 2.281     | Low multicollinearity|
| Level of Scientific Publication   | KP2    | 2.157     | Low multicollinearity|
| Level of Research Tim Role        | KP3    | 2.157     | Low multicollinearity|
| Level of Authorship               | KP4    | 2.157     | Low multicollinearity|

Further, the significance value of outer weight was assessed through t-statistic values (t-statistic > 1.96) and p-value (p > 0.05). Based on table 7, indicator KOL3 on collaboration network construct as well as KP2, KP3, and KP4 on research performance construct are found to be insignificant.

### Table 7. Outer Weight Score

| Indicator → Variable | Path Coeff. | t-statistic | p-value | Conclusion   |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------|---------|--------------|
| KOL1 → Collaboration Network | 0.756 | 3.644 | 0.000 | Significant |
| KOL2 → Collaboration Network | 0.435 | 3.123 | 0.002 | Significant |
| KOL3 → Collaboration Network | 0.116 | 0.496 | 0.620 | Insignificant |
| KP1 → Research Performance | 0.361 | 2.746 | 0.006 | Significant |
| KP2 → Research Performance | 0.273 | 1.205 | 0.228 | Insignificant |
| KP3 → Research Performance | 0.157 | 0.963 | 0.336 | Insignificant |
| KP4 → Research Performance | 0.489 | 1.899 | 0.058 | Insignificant |

According to Hair et al., (2014), formative indicators with insignificant outer weight values must be eliminated. However, in certain circumstances in which the outer weight score is insignificant, researchers are suggested to re-check these indicators’ bivariate score (outer loading) (Hair et al. 2014). Based on table 8 below, indicators KOL3, KP2, KP3, and KP4 showed significant loading values. Therefore, these indicators are maintained to be included in the model.

### Table 8. Bivariate Score (Outer Loading)

| Indicator → Variable | Path Coeff. | t-statistic | p-value | Conclusion   |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------|---------|--------------|
| KOL3 → Collaboration Network | 0.575 | 2.133 | 0.033 | Significant |
| KP2 → Research Performance | 0.696 | 4.024 | 0.000 | Significant |
| KP3 → Research Performance | 0.784 | 5.370 | 0.000 | Significant |
| KP4 → Research Performance | 0.869 | 4.728 | 0.000 | Significant |

### 2.3. Structural Model Evaluation (Inner Model)

In the beginning, we evaluated the structural model through the R-Square score of the endogenous variable. The R-Square showed a predictive degree of certain exogenous variables toward endogenous variables. Based on the rule of thumb, the R-Square score below 0.25, 0.50, and 0.75 is categorized as a weak, moderate, and strong model (Ghozali & Latan, 2019). Based on Table 9, the R-Square score for research performance is 0.800, indicating that research competence, work motivation, time management, research culture, academic leadership, HPWP, collaboration network, and university research funding explained 80 percent of the variance on research performance.
Table 9. Coefficient of Determination (R-Square)

| Variable               | R-Square | R Square Adjusted | Category |
|------------------------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| Research Performance   | 0.800    | 0.779             | Strong   |

The structural model is further evaluated based on coefficient β and t-value (T-Statistic) through the bootstrapping procedure. Critical ratio scores greater than 1.96 showed the path coefficient is statistically significant at a level p<0.05 (Ghozali & Latan, 2019). Based on Table 10, research competence positively affected research performance (β = 0.412 and t-statistic = 3.004). In contrast, work motivation has negative effect but less significant on research performance (β = -0.027 and t-statistic = 0.252) as well as time management on research performance (β = -0.016 and t-statistic = 0.240), research culture on research performance (β = -0.258 and t-statistic = 1.750), and academic leadership on research performance (β = -0.207 and t-statistic = 1.215). Meanwhile, HPWP positively and significantly affected research performance (β = 0.248 and t-statistic = 1.987) as well as collaboration network on research performance (β = 0.653 and t-statistic = 4.685). Finally, university research funding positively but less significant in affecting research performance (β = 0.076 and t-statistic = 0.685). In conclusion, only hypotheses H1a, H2c and H3a are accepted in this study.

Table 10. Path Coefficient and T-statistic Value (Hypothesis Testing)

| Hypothesis                        | Original Sample (O) | T Statistics (|O|/STDEV|) | Con.     |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|---------|---------|
| Research competence -> Research performance | H1a                 | 0.412         | 3.004   | Accepted|
| Work Motivation -> Research performance | H1b                | -0.027        | 0.252   | Rejected|
| Time Management -> Research performance | H1c                | -0.016        | 0.240   | Rejected|
| Research Culture -> Research performance | H2a                | -0.258        | 1.750   | Rejected|
| Academic Leadership -> Research performance | H2b               | -0.207        | 1.215   | Rejected|
| HPWP -> Research performance       | H2c                 | 0.248         | 1.987   | Accepted|
| Collaboration Network -> Research performance | H3a            | 0.653         | 4.759   | Accepted|
| Univ. research funding -> Research performance | H3b            | 0.076         | 0.685   | Rejected|

Discussion

The purpose of this study endeavored to explore the factors that possibly improved lecturers’ research performance at PTBP, divided into individual, institutional and resource factors. All those hypotheses are assumed to be positively and significantly affected research performance. However, some unexpected results exhibited differently.

The result found that only research competence positively affected research performance at the individual level factor. It’s indicated that the research competence of each lecturer at PTBP institutions dramatically determined the extent of their performance in accomplishing research-related tasks. In contrast, work motivation and time management were less significant in improving lecturers’ research performance at PTBP in Bogor and tended to exhibit a negative relationship. Hence, instead of concerning those two variables, PTBP suggested focusing on their research competencies as the most paramount factor in individual-level significantly would improve lecturers’ research performance.

In response to those findings above, numerous studies found that research competence was indeed one of the most critical factors that determined research performance (Wasfi et al., 2020; Roman, 2021; Yulianto & Juwono, 2021; Devi & Tjahjadi, 2020; Xu & Ye, 2015). The research competencies measured include the degree of lecturers’ knowledge, skills, and work attitudes in accomplishing research-related tasks developed by Wasfi et al., (2020) in measuring researchers’ level of research competence at LIPI, Indonesia. Despite being contextually different, knowledge and skill in completing research duties are both found to be the two most essential facets that must be
improved due to their highest coefficient values. Yet, work attitudes remained consistently cultivated to boost lecturers' productivity in accomplishing research.

Of the three hypotheses proposed on the institutional level, only HPWP positively affected lecturers’ research performance at PTBP. It's indicated that the better the level of lecturers' perception toward HPWP implemented by PTBP institution, the better the level of lecturers' research performance, and vice versa. Contrary, research culture and academic leadership were less effective in enhancing lecturers' research performance and instead showed a negative effect. Their perception of research culture and academic leadership implementation in their respective institutions negatively led to low research performance. The effectiveness of HPWP in boosting research performance is in accordance with previous studies (Perdomo-ortiz et al., 2020; Alshaikhmubarak et al., 2020), stated that HPWP implementation effectively increased lecturers' research productivity and performance at higher education and ultimately determined their academic career success. Boxall (2018) considered HPWP as a strategy that possibly integrated HRM practices with organizational vision. HPWP implementation covered the selection system, training and education, performance management, compensation and incentive, and teamwork culture (Perdomo-ortiz et al., 2020). All management processes above are integrated with the pursued organizational goals and automatically encourage organizational members to maximize their performance (Boxall, 2018).

The collaboration network as the resource factor positively affected lecturers' research performance, but not for university research funding. It demonstrated that the lecturer with a higher level of collaboration network tended to be more productive and exhibited better research performance. In fact, among the others, the collaboration network was the most influential factor in improving research performance. This finding is not surprising, regarding that numerous researchers commenced acknowledging the critical role of collaboration networks in higher education, particularly in enhancing research performance (Paraskevopoulos et al., 2021; Aldieri et al., 2020; Rahimi et al., 2020; Inayati, 2019; Sabah et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2017; Kim et al., 2014) and research funding (Álvarez-Bornstein & Bordons, 2021; Möller, 2019; Doh et al., 2018).

In examining the effect of collaboration networks on research performance in the higher educational context, numerous studies explored various levels, including internal collaboration (Slavova et al., 2016; Aldieri et al., 2017; Hopp et al., 2010), local/national collaboration (Sabah et al., 2019), and international collaboration (Paraskevopoulos et al., 2021; Inayati, 2019; Sabah et al., 2019). In this study, the entire collaboration network above, which consisted of internal, local, and international collaborations, were examined to acquire a more comprehensive understanding. Contradicting with Sabah et al., (2019), this study found that internal collaboration within university scales (between departments, faculties, etc.) exhibited a more prominent role than national and international collaboration due to its higher coefficient score. In contrast, international collaboration showed the smallest role in improving lecturers’ research performance at PTBP.

4. CONCLUSION

The results found that various factors affected lecturers’ low research performance at PTBP Bogor. Individually, their low performance was extremely influenced by the extent of their competence in accomplishing research tasks. Thus, it is critical for PTBP institutions to further focus on developing lecturers' knowledge, skills, and work attitudes, primarily related to research duty. Meanwhile, this study also found work motivation and time management insignificantly influenced research performance. Several reasons caused it, one of which was the lecturers’ deviation of paradigm that considered research only as a secondary task in higher education. Given that the measurement of work motivation was un-specificity contextualized to research schemes and most lecturers possessed multiple jobs, it indicated that their low work motivation did not cause the real problem of lecturers’ low research performance, but rather to kind of work is important, and they prioritized. Therefore, institutions must build an ecosystem that could encourage lecturers’ paradigm changes and ultimately engage them in their academic work, primarily those related to research tasks.
Institutionally, the poor implementation of HPWP in PTBP institutions led their lecturers to poor research performance. Institutions must seriously correct their performance management to be more objective, transparency, measurable and fair; encourage lecturers to continually develop their capacities by participating in conferences, seminars, and scientific projects; encourage them to initiate research groups and build teamwork and knowledge sharing culture; evaluate the selection system of upcoming lecturers; and adjust remuneration system based on the academic level, education, as well as performance. However, PTBP institutions must also build and evaluate the research culture in the next few years and discover the leadership model most effective in improving research performance. As the most critical factor, the collaboration network is urgently needed to boost their lecturers' research performance. PTBP institutions are recommended to build collaboration networks, starting from the internal level, such as collaboration between departments and faculties, then gradually continuing to the local/national and international level. Besides, since research funding provided by PTBP institutions are relatively undersized, PTBP institutions are suggested to raise them to encourage lecturers in accomplishing research tasks.

Every research has limitations, including this study. One is related to the online data collection method with a cross-sectional design approach. Future researchers are expected to collect data directly to increase data validation and accuracy, also possibly observe respondents' behavior. In addition, further study is recommended to use a longitudinal study design to understand better causality between variables. This study only explored models with a direct path. Further research is expected to provide a more complex causal relationship by constructing a mediation moderation model. In addition, this study also involved a small sample. Future research is expected to involve more proportional respondents.

Acknowledgments:

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest

REFERENCES

Abe, I., & Mugobo, V. (2021). Low research productivity: Transformation, institutional and leadership concern at a South African university. Perspectives in Education, 39(2), 113–127. https://doi.org/10.18820/2519593x/pie.v39i2.9

Abramo, G., D’Angelo, C. A., & Murgia, G. (2016). The combined effects of age and seniority on research performance of full professors. Science and Public Policy, 43(3), 301–319. https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scv037

Afandi, I. (2020). Workplace Spirituality Dan Performa Organisasi Di Perguruan Tinggi : Studi Atas Institut Agama Islam (Iai) Ibrahimy Genteng Banyuwangi. INCARE: International Journla of Education Resource, 01(01).

al Idrus, S. A. J. (2016). Menakar Peran Pesantren Dalam Mengembangkan Pendidikan Tinggi Menghadapi Era Globalisasi. Jurnal Tatsqif, 14(2), 238–257. https://doi.org/10.20414/jtq.v14i2.31

Aldieri, L., Kotsemir, M., & Vinci, C. P. (2017). The impact of research collaboration on academic performance: An empirical analysis for Russian Universities Luigi. (76408).

Aldieri, L., Kotsemir, N., & Vinci, C. P. (2020). The Effects of Collaboration on Research Performance of Universities: an Analysis by Federal District and Scientific Fields in Russia. Journal of the Knowledge Economy, 11, 766–787.

Alshaikhmubarak, A., Da Camara, N., & Baruch, Y. (2020). The impact of high-performance human resource practices on the research performance and career success of academics in Saudi Arabia. Career Development International, 25(6), 671–690. https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-09-2019-0209

Álvarez-Bornstein, B., & Bordons, M. (2021). Is funding related to higher research impact? Exploring its relationship and the mediating role of collaboration in several disciplines. Journal of Informetrics, 15(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2020.101102

Artés, J., Pedraja-Chaparro, F., & Salinas-Jiménez, M. del M. (2017). Research performance and
teaching quality in the Spanish higher education system: Evidence from a medium-sized university. Research Policy, 46(1), 19–29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2016.10.003

Aydin, O. T. (2017). Research performance of higher education institutions: a review on the measurements and affecting factors of research performance. Journal of Higher Education and Science, 7(2), 312. https://doi.org/10.5961/jhes.2017.210

Badar, K., Frantz, T. L., & Jabeen, M. (2016). Research performance and degree centrality in co-authorship networks: The moderating role of homophily. Aslib Journal of Information Management, 68(6), 756–771. https://doi.org/10.1108/AIJIM-07-2016-0103

Badar, K., Hite, J. M., & Badir, Y. F. (2013). Examining the relationship of co-authorship network centrality and gender on academic research performance: The case of chemistry researchers in Pakistan. Scientometrics, 94(2), 755–775. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-012-0764-z

Bai, L., Millwater, J., & Hudson, P. (2013). Factors that Influence Chinese TEFL Academics’ Research Capacity Building: An Institutional Case Study. Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 22(2), 119–126. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-012-0004-6

Bali, M. M. E. I. (2017). Perguruan Tinggi Islam Berbasis Pondok Pesantren. Al-Tanzim : Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam, 1(2), 645–655. Retrieved from https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/39127

Beerkens, A., & Secondi, L. (2017). The determinants of research performance in European universities: a large scale multilevel analysis. Scientometrics, 112(3), 1147–1178. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2442-7

Boxall, P. (2018). The development of strategic HRM: reflections on a 30-year journey. Labour & Industry: A Journal of the Social and Economic Relations of Work, 28(1), 21–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/10301763.2018.1427423

Cheng, Y., & Huo, D. (2010). Enlightenment and reference: The study on the practice of subject construction of world famous research-based universities. Conference Proceedings - IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, 1102–1107. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSMC.2010.5642347

Devi, F. K., & Tjahjadi, B. (2020). Psychological capital intervening effect on individual competency and educator accountant research Performance in Surabaya. The Indonesian Accounting Review, 10(1), 33–45. https://doi.org/10.14414/tiar.v10i1.1937

Dhillon, S. K., Ibrahim, R., & Selamat, A. (2015). Factors associated with scholarly publication productivity among academic staff: Case of a Malaysian public university. Technology in Society, 42, 160–166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2015.04.004

Dirjen Dikti. (2020). Klasterisasi Perguruan Tinggi Tahun 2020. 12.

Doh, S., Jang, D., Kang, G. M., & Han, D. S. (2018). Research Funding and Performance of Academic Researchers in South Korea. Review of Policy Research, 35(1), 31–60. https://doi.org/10.1111/ropr.12261

Edgar, F., & Geare, A. (2013). Factors influencing university research performance. Studies in Higher Education, 38(5), 774–792. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.601811

Education, T. H. (n.d.). THE World University Rankings 2020: methodology | Times Higher Education (THE). Retrieved June 28, 2021, from https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/world-university-rankings-2020-methodology

Esponilla, F. D. (2015). Motivators of Research Productivity Level in The Technological University of The Philippines (TUP), Manila Campus. ICMSIT 2015 International Conference on Management Science, Innovation and Technology, (September 2015). Retrieved from http://www.icmsit.ssrnu.ac.th

Evans, L. (2014). What is effective research leadership? A research-informed perspective. Higher
Feng, G. C. (2020). Research Performance Evaluation in China: A Big Data Analysis. SAGE Open, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019901257

Frenken, K., Heimeriks, G. J., & Hoekman, J. (2017). What drives university research performance? An analysis using the CWTS Leiden Ranking data. Journal of Informetrics, 11(3), 859–872. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2017.06.006

Fukuzawa, N. (2014). An empirical analysis of the relationship between individual characteristics and research productivity. Scientometrics, 99(3), 785–809. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-013-1213-3

Gerashchenko, D. (2021). Academic Leadership and University Performance: Do Russian Universities Improve after They Head by Top Researchers? SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3822396

Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & Kuppelwieser, V. G. (2014). Partial least squares konsep, teknik dan aplikasi menggunakan program smartpls 3.0 untuk penelitian empiris. Semarang: Badan Penerbit UNDIP.

Gunawan, C. I. (2020). An analysis of lecturers’ demographic factors affecting research performance in Indonesia. International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147-4478), 9(5), 326–332. https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v9i5.759

Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & Kuppelwieser, V. G. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM): An emerging tool in business research. European Business Review, 26(2), 106–121. https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-10-2013-0128

Halil, M., & Anwar, M. A. (2016). Inovasi Manajemen Universitas Pesantren Tinggi Darul Ulum Sebagai Perguruan Tinggi Alternatif Bagi Masyarakat. DIRÁSAT: JURNAL MANAJEMEN & PENDIDIKAN ISLAM, 2(1), 2527–6190.

Heng, K., Hamid, M. O., & Khan, A. (2020). Factors influencing academics’ research engagement and productivity: A developing countries perspective. Issues in Educational Research, 30(3), 965–987.

Hopp, W. J., Lynch, M., & Stringer, M. J. (2010). Working Paper The Impact of Discussion , Awareness , and Collaboration School Faculty. Social Sciences Research Network, 1164, 1–36.

Husni, M. (2017). Pengembangan Model Keilmuan Ptaei Riset Berbasis Pesantren. ANCOMS: 1st Annual Conference for Muslim Scholars Kopertais Wilayah IV Surabaya Melestarikan, (110), 367–379. Surabaya, Indonesia.

Inayati, T. (2019). New perspectives on the associations between research performance and international academic networks in science & engineering fields. International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering, 9(1), 2548–2552. https://doi.org/10.35940/ijitie.A4997.119119

Index, S. and T. (SINTA). (n.d.). Top 100 Affiliations. Retrieved June 28, 2021, from https://sinta.ristekbrin.go.id/home/topaffiliations

Javed, Y., Ahmad, S., & Khahro, S. H. (2020). Evaluating the Research Performance of Islamabad-Based Higher Education Institutes. SAGE Open, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020902085

Jaya, I. G. N. M., & Sumertajaya, I. M. (2008). Pemodelan Persamaan Structural dengan Partial Least Square. Semnas Matematika Dan Pendidikan Matematika 2008, 118–132.

Jayachandran, J., & Chandrasenan, D. (2021). Institutional Research Culture Scale ( IRCS ): Development and Validation in the context of Universities in Kerala , India. 8 Th International Conference on Research in Behavioral and Social Science, 47–53.

Karna, D., & Ko, I. (2013). Collaboration Orientation, Peer Support and the Mediating Effect of Use of E-collaboration on Research Performance and Satisfaction*. Asia Pacific Journal of Information Systems, 23(4), 151–175. https://doi.org/10.14329/apjis.2013.23.4.151

Kim, T. (2016). Human Resource Management, Organizational Performance, and Publicness: The Case of Korean Higher Educational Institutions. The Korean Journal of Policy Studies, 31(2), 41–69.

Kim, Y., Lim, H. J., & Lee, S. J. (2014). Applying research collaboration as a new way of measuring research performance in Korean universities. Scientometrics, 99(1), 97–115. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-013-1095-4

Abdu Alfah, M. Syamsul Ma’arif, I Made Sumertajaya / Research in Pesantren-based Higher Education: Exploring The Factors Improving Lecture’s Research Performance
Mali, F., Pustovrh, T., Platinnovšek, R., Kronegger, L., & Ferligoj, A. (2017). The effects of funding and co-authorship on research performance in a small scientific community. *Science and Public Policy, 44*(4), 486–496. https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scw076

Mashudi. (2020). Pesantren -Based Higher Education Institutions: The Format of Modern Islamic Education. *TA'DIB: JURNAL PENDIDIKAN ISLAM, 25*(2), 119–135.

Möller, T. (2019). The impact of research funding agencies on the research performance of five European countries – A funding acknowledgements analysis. 17th International Conference on Scientometrics and Informetrics, ISSI 2019 - Proceedings, (2September), 2279–2287.

Muqoyyidin, A. W. (2016). Menuju World-Class Research University Berbasis Khazanah Pesantren Sebagai Distingi Pendidikan Tinggi Islam di Era Globalisasi. *Pesanmtan Management and Development towards Globalization: Proceeding of 1st International Conference of Pesantren UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, (July), 251. Malang: UIN-Maliki Press.*

Muqoyyidin, A. W., & As’ad, M. Z. W. (2020). Internasionalisasi Pendidikan Tinggi Islam Berbasis Khazanah Pesantren. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam, 4*(2), 173–188.

Murairwa, S. (2015). VOLUNTARY SAMPLING DESIGN. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences, 4*(2), 185–195.

Paraskevopoulos, P., Boldrini, C., Passarella, A., & Conti, M. (2021). The academic wanderer: structure of collaboration network and relation with research performance. *Applied Network Science, 6*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s41109-021-00369-4

Perdomo-ortiz, J., Valencia, C., & Durán, W. F. (2020). Effect of High-Performance Work Practices on Academic Research Productivity Effect of High-Performance Work Practices on Academic. *Latin American Business Review, 0*(0), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/10978526.2020.1837632

Pouratashi, M., & Zamani, A. (2017). How faculty members’ personality traits influence their education-research performance. *New Educational Review, 50*(4), 70–82. https://doi.org/10.15804/ner.2017.50.4.06

Rahimi, M., Rahman, A., Yusoff, M., Nor, M., Lail, J., Wahab, A., & Suliman, A. (2020). The Relationship between Educational Transformational Leadership and Teacher Quality at Secondary School: Total Quality Management as Mediator. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 8*(12), 6369–6377. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.081202

Ramesh, P., Reddy, K. M., Rao, R. V. S., Dhandapani, A., Siva, G. S., & Ramakrishna, A. (2017). Academic achievement and personality traits of faculty members of Indian agricultural universities: their effect on teaching and research performance. *Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension, 23*(1), 79–94. https://doi.org/10.1080/1389224X.2016.1202845

Ramezani, G., Mehni, O., & Azizi, N. (2018). Investigate the Barriers and Factors Influencing Inefficiency of Research at Farhangian University: A Grounded Theory Approach. *Journal of Management and Planning in Educational Systems, 11*(2), 27–50.

Retnowati, T. H., Mardapi, D., & Kartowagiran, B. (2018). KINERJA DOSEN DI BIDANG PENELITIAN DAN PUBLIKASI ILMIAH. *Jurnal Akuntabilitas Manajemen Pendidikan, 3*(1), 91–99. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.21831/amp.v6i2.21524 Jurnal

Ringelhan, S., Wollersheim, J., Welpe, I. M., Fiedler, M., & Spörre, M. (2013). Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction as Antecedents of Research Performance: Investigation of Different Mediation Models. In *Performance Management im Hochschulbereich.* https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-03348-4_2

Roman, A. (2021). Research Competencies and Performance of Higher Education Institutions (HEI) Faculty. *International Journal of Research Publications, 78*(1). https://doi.org/10.47119/ijrp100781620211975

Ryu, Y., Hwang, K., & Choi, S. O. (2016). The Factors Affecting Basic Research Performance Funded by Government: ‘Creative Research Program’ Case in South Korea. *Science, Technology and Society, 21*(3), 349–365. https://doi.org/10.1177/097172181661785

Sabah, F., Hassan, S. U., Muazzam, A., Iqbal, S., Soroya, S. H., & Sarwar, R. (2019). Scientific
collaboration networks in Pakistan and their impact on institutional research performance: A case study based on Scopus publications. 

Library Hi Tech, 37(1), 19–29. https://doi.org/10.1108/LHT-03-2018-0036

Saifuddin. (2013). Araah Pengembangan Pendidikan Tinggi Di Lingkungan Pesantren. Holistik, 14(01), 101–123.

Setyawan, C. E. (2016). MENGAGAS MODEL PERGURUAN TINGGI AGAMA ISLAM BERBASIS PESANTREN. Jurnal Komunikasi Dan Pendidikan Islam, 5 no 1, 99–107.

Slavova, K., Fosfuri, A., & De Castro, J. O. (2016). Learning by hiring: The effects of scientists’ inbound mobility on research performance in academia. Organization Science, 27(1), 72–89. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2015.1026

Tan, M., Herberg, J. S., Yap, C., Samarasekera, D. D., & Chen, Z. X. (2020). Understanding factors that motivate research performance and career longevity of science, technology, engineering and mathematics postgraduates. Asia Pacific Scholar, 5(1), 25–45. https://doi.org/10.29060/TAPS.2020-5-1/OA2073

Tauhed, S. Z., Rasdi, R. M., & Ibrahim, R. (2019). The Influence of Networking, Individual Effort, and Time Management on Research Performance of Academics at Malaysian Research Universities. Revista Publicando, 6(19), 100–114.

Thoyib, M., Nurdin, M., & Djohan, M. W. (2020). Leading Islamic University Through Excellent Hinger Pesantren: Challenges, and Strategies in Integrated Curriculum Development. Edukasia: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Islam, 15(2), 315–336. https://doi.org/1021043/edukasia.v15i2.7884

Tohet, M., & Eko, D. (2020). Peningkatan Mutu Perguruan Tinggi Pesantren Melalui Iso 21001 : 2018. MANAGERE: Indonesian Journal of Educational Management, 2(2), 157–170. https://doi.org/10.52627/ijeam.v2i2.37

Valdivieso, P. A., Alecchi, B. A., & Arévalo-Aveillas, D. (2021). Factors that Influence the Individual Research Output of University Professors: The Case of Ecuador, Peru, and Colombia. Journal of Hispanic Higher Education. https://doi.org/10.1177/15381927211008684

Wasfi, S., Mulyati, H., & Purwono, J. (2020). Performance in the Indonesian Institute of Sciences. 18(3).

White, C. S., James, K., Burke, L. A., & Allen, R. S. (2012). What makes a “research star”? Factors influencing the research productivity of business faculty. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 61(6), 584–602. https://doi.org/10.1108/17410401211249175

Xu, A., & Ye, L. (2015). The Influence of Teachers’ Competency on Job Performance in Research University with Industry Characteristics: Taking Job Satisfaction as Mediator. Liss 2014. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-43871-8

Yang, J. C.-C. (2017). A Study Of Factors Affecting University Professors’ Research Output: Perspectives Of Taiwanese Professors. Journal of College Teaching & Learning (TLC), 14(1), 11–20. https://doi.org/10.19030/tlc.v14i1.9968

Yulianto, T., & Juwono, V. (2021). Performance and Factors Inhibiting Research and Scientific Publication of Universitas Terbuka Indonesia Lecturers. 10(1), 28–44.

Abdu Alifah, M. Syamsul Ma’arif, I Made Sumertajaya / Research in Pesantren-based Higher Education: Exploring The Factors Improving Lecture’s Research Performance
Zarkasyi, M. R. (2017). Membangun Budaya Akademik Pada Perguruan Tinggi Pesantren. *Al Tijarah,* 3(2), 65. https://doi.org/10.21111/tijarah.v3i2.1590

Zhang, X. Y. (2014). Factors that Motivate Academic Staff to Conduct Research in Chinese Universities. *Factors That Motivate Academic Staff to Conduct Research and Influence Research Productivity in Chinese Project 211 Universities,* (October), 1–238. Retrieved from http://www.wbiconpro.com/china_con2011.htm

Zhao, L. (2017). *A Team ‘s Internal Complex Scientific Research Networks and Its Research Performance.* 5271–5277.

Zhao, X., Yin, H., Fang, C., & Liu, X. (2021). For the sustainable development of universities: Exploring the external factors impacting returned early career academic’s research performance in China. *Sustainability (Switzerland),* 13(3), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031333