East African Scholars Journal of Education, Humanities and Literature
Abbreviated Key Title: East African Scholars J Edu Humanit Lit
ISSN: 2617-443X (Print) & ISSN: 2617-7250 (Online)
Published By East African Scholars Publisher, Kenya
Volume-9 | Issue-7 | Jul- 2026 | DOI: https://doi.org/10.36349/easjehl.2026.v09i07.008

OPEN ACCESS

Original Research Article

Evaluating the Impact of Indonesia's KIP Kuliah Scholarship on Student Academic Achievement: Evidence from a Private Higher Education Institution in South Papua

Maximiliana Dasmedase[1]*, Kridawati Sadhana[1], Wibisono Poespitohadi[1]
[1]Universitas Merdeka Malang, Indonesia

Article History
Received: 28.05.2026
Accepted: 22.07.2026
Published: 23.07.2026

Journal homepage:
https://www.easpublisher.com

Quick Response Code

Abstract: This study examines the magnitude of the effect of the KIP Kuliah scholarship on the academic achievement of students at Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Administrasi Karya Dharma Merauke (STIA KD Merauke), a private higher education institution in South Papua Province, Indonesia. The study is motivated by the persistently high cost of higher education relative to the financial capacity of many academically capable students, and by field indications that a substantial share of KIP Kuliah recipients at the institution have struggled to maintain their required grade point average despite receiving scholarship support. Employing a quantitative, causal-associative design, data were collected through a Likert-scale questionnaire administered as a census to all 81 KIP Kuliah recipients from the 2022, 2023, and 2024 cohorts, supplemented by institutional documentation and supporting interviews. Data were analyzed using Pearson correlation, simple linear regression, the coefficient of determination, and the F-test, following instrument validity and reliability testing and classical assumption testing. The results show a positive and significant relationship between the KIP Kuliah scholarship and student academic achievement, with a Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.553 and a regression equation of Y = 20.692 + 0.142X. The coefficient of determination indicates that the scholarship explains 30.6 percent of the variance in academic achievement, with the remaining 69.4 percent attributable to other factors. The F-test confirms the effect is statistically significant (F = 34.814 > F-table 3.96; Sig. = 0.001 < 0.05), leading to rejection of the null hypothesis. Interpreted through William Dunn's six policy-evaluation criteria, effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity, responsiveness, and appropriateness, the KIP Kuliah program at STIA KD Merauke is found to have been implemented well, though its effect on achievement operates alongside substantial unexplained variance linked to time management, family economic pressure, and psychological adaptation factors identified among recipients. The study recommends strengthened scholarship monitoring, more timely fund disbursement, and complementary non-financial support to help recipients translate financial assistance into sustained academic performance.

Keywords: KIP Kuliah Scholarship, Academic Achievement, Policy Evaluation, Higher Education Financing, Indonesia Smart Program.

1. INTRODUCTION

Education is widely regarded as the primary mechanism through which a nation builds the knowledge, competence, and character of its citizens, preparing them to meet the demands of an increasingly complex world. The fourth paragraph of the Preamble to Indonesia's 1945 Constitution explicitly identifies the intellectual advancement of the nation's life as a foundational state objective, while Law No. 20 of 2003 on the National Education System defines education as a deliberate and organized effort to build an active learning environment and develop learners' potential, personality, and capability. Article 28 of the 1945 Constitution further affirms that protecting, advancing, upholding, and fulfilling human rights, including the right to education, is a core state responsibility. These constitutional and statutory foundations reflect Indonesia's sustained commitment to ensuring that all

***Corresponding Author:** Maximiliana Dasmedase
Universitas Merdeka Malang, Indonesia

citizens, regardless of economic background, can access education of adequate quality.

Within this framework, scholarship policy occupies a strategic position as an instrument for reconciling the constitutional right to education with the economic constraints faced by many prospective students. Indonesia's scholarship architecture rests on several regulatory instruments, including Law No. 12 of 2012 on Higher Education, Government Regulation No. 48 of 2008 on Education Financing, Government Regulation No. 4 of 2014 on the Administration and Management of Higher Education, and, most directly relevant to this study, Minister of Education and Culture Regulation (Permendikbud) No. 10 of 2020 on the Indonesia Smart Program (Program Indonesia Pintar). The KIP Kuliah scholarship, formerly known as Bidikmisi prior to its transformation in 2020, forms part of this Indonesia Smart Program and is directed at students accepted into higher education, including students with disabilities, with priority given to holders of the secondary-level Indonesia Smart Card, students from poor or near-poor families, affirmation-track students from Papua, from frontier, outermost, and disadvantaged (3T) regions, and children of Indonesian migrant workers, as well as students affected by disaster, social conflict, or other special circumstances.

The scholarship's core objectives extend beyond financial relief alone: it is intended to increase learning motivation and academic achievement among economically constrained students, expand access to higher education for academically capable but economically disadvantaged citizens, ensure the continuity of study through to completion, improve both academic and non-academic achievement, generate a positive demonstration effect for other prospective students, and ultimately produce independent, productive graduates with social awareness capable of contributing to poverty alleviation. Because education financing is guaranteed through to graduation within the scholarship period, eligible students, particularly first-generation university entrants from poor or near-poor families, are relieved of the immediate financial anxiety that might otherwise deter them from pursuing study at accredited institutions of their choosing. As one of the private higher education institutions in South Papua Province with a substantial number of KIP Kuliah recipients, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Administrasi Karya Dharma Merauke (STIA KD Merauke) has been entrusted with channeling this educational assistance and supporting its students through the scholarship application and disbursement process.

Academic achievement, understood as the demonstrated outcome of the learning process reflected in behavioral and evaluative change, is commonly measured in Indonesian higher education through the semester grade point average (Indeks Prestasi, IP) and the cumulative grade point average (Indeks Prestasi Kumulatif, IPK). In principle, KIP Kuliah recipients are expected to leverage the financial security the scholarship provides to sustain or improve their academic standing, given that continued eligibility is conditioned on maintaining a minimum cumulative GPA. In practice, however, field observation at STIA KD Merauke reveals a more complicated picture. Table 1 presents the average semester GPA trend for KIP Kuliah recipients across the 2022, 2023, and 2024 cohorts, showing a pattern of fluctuation rather than consistent improvement across semesters.

Table 1: Average Semester Grade Point Index (IP) of KIP Kuliah Recipients by Cohort

Cohort	Sem I	Sem II	Sem III	Sem IV	Sem V	Sem VI	Sem VII
2022	3.15	3.19	3.26	3.20	3.25	3.56	3.24
2023	3.11	3.45	3.33	3.32	3.22	3.29	3.40
2024	3.20	3.35	3.40	3.45	3.36	3.38	3.50

Source*: Public Administration Study Program, STIA KD Merauke (institutional records).*

This fluctuating pattern, rather than the steady upward trend one might expect from scholarship-supported students, motivates closer institutional scrutiny. Field observation further indicates that a substantial proportion of KIP Kuliah recipients at STIA KD Merauke have struggled to maintain the cumulative GPA required for continued eligibility, frequently failing to complete assigned coursework, exhibiting irregular class attendance, and showing limited engagement in extracurricular student activities. Of the 40 KIP Kuliah recipients in the 2021 cohort, for instance, only 6 completed their studies on schedule, a pattern consistent with the fact that KIP Kuliah funding covers only eight semesters for an undergraduate degree; students who fall behind, whether due to thesis delays or additional economic pressure, often find themselves unable to independently finance tuition in later semesters. Recipients from the 2022, 2023, and 2024 cohorts have likewise shown inconsistent attention to their semester-by-semester cumulative GPA, with the number of students maintaining scholarship-eligible status declining over the course of their studies relative to the initial recipient count.

This phenomenon presents an apparent irony: financial assistance intended to catalyze academic motivation and achievement does not appear, at first inspection, to translate uniformly into stronger academic engagement or outcomes among recipients. This raises an empirical question meriting systematic investigation, namely whether, and to what extent, the KIP Kuliah scholarship actually exerts a measurable, statistically

demonstrable effect on the academic achievement of its recipients at STIA KD Merauke, net of the fluctuation visible in raw institutional records. Robert Gagne's learning theory offers a relevant conceptual anchor for this inquiry: according to Gagne, learning outcomes arise from the interaction between environmental stimulation and the learner's internal cognitive processes; in this context, the campus environment, including the financial facility provided through KIP Kuliah, constitutes the environmental stimulus, while the student's learning capability reflects the cognitive process through which that stimulus is, or is not, converted into academic outcomes.

Investigating this relationship carries direct policy relevance. Where the scholarship is shown to have a genuine, significant, positive effect, the finding supports continued and possibly expanded institutional and government investment in the program. Where the effect proves partial or constrained by other factors, the finding highlights the need for complementary, non-financial interventions, such as academic mentoring, time-management support, or psychosocial assistance, to help recipients convert financial relief into sustained academic performance. Accordingly, this study investigates whether the KIP Kuliah scholarship significantly affects student academic achievement at STIA KD Merauke, evaluated within the policy framework established by Minister of Education and Culture Regulation No. 10 of 2020 on the Indonesia Smart Program.

The significance of this inquiry extends beyond a single institution. STIA KD Merauke, as a private higher education institution serving a predominantly Indigenous Papuan student body in a frontier, outermost, and disadvantaged (3T) region, occupies a position where the KIP Kuliah program's success or shortfall carries implications for the broader national policy goal of using higher-education financing to narrow regional and social disparities in human-capital development. If the scholarship demonstrably strengthens academic achievement even in an institutional context marked by limited local economic opportunity and significant first-generation university attendance, the finding offers reassurance that need-based higher-education financing can function as intended in precisely the settings where it is most needed. Conversely, if the observed effect is found to be partial, bounded by a substantial share of unexplained variance, the finding signals that financial assistance alone, absent complementary academic and psychosocial support, may be insufficient to fully convert economic opportunity into sustained educational outcomes for students navigating the particular socioeconomic and geographic challenges of Indonesia's eastern provinces.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Public Policy and Its Stages

Public policy is commonly understood as a government instrument spanning not only the formal state apparatus but the broader governance of public resources. At its core, policy comprises decisions or courses of action that directly govern the management and distribution of natural, financial, and human resources in the public interest, emerging from the synergy, compromise, or competition among ideas, theories, ideologies, and interests within a country's political system. Eulau and Prewitt (1973, as cited in Agustino, 2006) define public policy as a stable decision characterized by consistency and repetition of behavior on the part of both those who make and those who comply with it, while Friedrich (1969, as cited in Agustino, 2006) describes policy as a proposed course of action by a person, group, or government within an environment presenting obstacles and opportunities, intended to achieve a stated objective. Bridgman and Davis (2005, as cited in Suharto, 2007) similarly capture public policy as "whatever government chooses to do or not to do," while Hogwood and Gunn (1990, as cited in Suharto, 2007) frame it as a designed set of government actions aimed at achieving particular results. Bridgman and Davis (2004, as cited in Suharto, 2007) further identify three interlocking dimensions of public policy: as an objective, as an authoritative and legally sanctioned choice of action, and as a hypothesis about cause and effect, in that policy is built on assumptions about behavior and is expected to incorporate incentives and disincentives capable of producing an intended outcome.

Public policy is conventionally understood to unfold across three principal stages: formulation, in which a problem is identified and candidate solutions are developed, planned, and evaluated in draft form; implementation, in which the formulated policy is executed, encompassing implementation planning, operational execution, and implementation-stage evaluation; and evaluation, in which the policy's execution is assessed against its stated provisions, outcomes, speed of delivery, targeting accuracy, and fit with community need, generating recommendations that feed back into subsequent policy formulation, a cyclical relationship in which policy reform serves as the transmission mechanism between evaluation and renewed formulation (Sadhana, 2013).

2.2 Policy Evaluation Theory

Evaluation, from the English "evaluation," rooted in "value," is understood by Dunn as the appraisal, rating, and assessment of information relevant to the value and benefit of a policy (as cited in Hayat, 2019). Suchman regards evaluation as a sequence of steps aimed at describing, discovering, and supplying useful information for judging decision alternatives, while Stufflebeam considers it a scientific method for assessing program action to obtain an objective and valid measure

of program attainment, and Scriven defines it as the process of determining the merit, worth, or value of a product (as cited in Mergoni & De Witte, 2022). Synthesizing these perspectives, policy evaluation can be understood as a systematic, scientifically grounded stage involving the examination, description, and assessment of the causes of a policy's success or failure, whether the policy is ongoing or concluded, so as to yield objective and valid information about program or policy attainment. Its purpose is not merely to render a verdict of worth but, more fundamentally, to improve the effectiveness, efficiency, or performance of an ongoing program or policy (Hajaroh, 2019).

Among the various evaluation frameworks available, this study adopts William N. Dunn's six evaluation criteria as its principal analytical lens, chosen for their direct applicability to assessing a bounded, means-tested educational financing program such as KIP Kuliah. Effectiveness concerns whether an alternative achieves its intended results; efficiency concerns the amount of effort, typically measured in monetary terms, required to achieve a given level of effectiveness; adequacy concerns the extent to which a given level of effectiveness satisfies the need, value, or opportunity that gave rise to the problem; equity concerns the fair distribution of effects and effort across different societal groups; responsiveness concerns the extent to which a policy satisfies the needs, preferences, or values of the particular groups it is meant to serve; and appropriateness concerns the soundness of the assumptions underlying a program's objectives (Dunn, 2003). These six criteria, applied jointly, provide a more holistic assessment than measuring statistical effect alone, since a program may exert a significant quantitative effect while nonetheless falling short on distributive fairness or responsiveness to recipients' lived circumstances.

It is worth noting that the broader evaluation literature offers several alternative models, including Tyler's goal-oriented model, which assesses the degree of goal attainment through a sequence of objective-setting, indicator formulation, instrument development, and data analysis; Scriven's goal-free model, which instead examines the full range of a program's intended and unintended effects; the formative-summative distinction, in which formative evaluation tracks a program's in-progress development while summative evaluation renders an end-of-program accountability judgment; the Countenance model, which examines antecedent, transaction, and outcome stages; the responsive evaluation model, oriented toward stakeholder-reported effects in social-policy contexts; the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) model, which links each evaluative stage to a corresponding decision type; the CSE-UCLA model, comprising needs assessment, planning, and implementation stages; and the Discrepancy Evaluation Model, which conceives evaluation as measuring the gap between performance standards and actual performance across a program's input, process, and output. While each of these models offers a valid lens for programs with more complex, multi-stage implementation structures, Dunn's six-criteria framework was selected for its parsimony and its direct fit with a single, well-defined financial-assistance policy whose principal output, academic achievement, is readily quantifiable.

2.3 Scholarship and the KIP Kuliah Program

A scholarship, in general terms, is financial assistance provided to a student to support the continuity of their studies. KIP Kuliah, formally the education-cost assistance program for academically capable students from poor families, is one such government program directed at students who demonstrate strong academic potential but cannot otherwise continue to the undergraduate or associate-degree level because of cost constraints. According to Ministry of Education data, the national number of KIP Kuliah recipients, encompassing both incoming and continuing students, reached 1,044,921 in 2025, with approximately 16,000 recipients across all private higher education institutions in the Papua region under LLDIKTI Wilayah XIV, of which 81 were enrolled at STIA KD Merauke in that year.

The program's benefits center on two components: tuition assistance paid directly to the higher education institution according to study-program accreditation level, with a ceiling of IDR 8,000,000 per semester for programs accredited Unggul/A or international, IDR 12,000,000 for medical programs, IDR 4,000,000 for programs accredited Baik Sekali/B, and IDR 2,400,000 for programs accredited Baik/C; and a monthly living-cost allowance, differentiated across five regional cost clusters and set at IDR 800,000, 950,000, 1,100,000, 1,250,000, and 1,400,000 respectively, based on Central Statistics Agency cost-of-living surveys. Eligibility requirements combine an academic criterion, recent completion of secondary education with demonstrated academic potential, and an economic criterion, verified poor or near-poor family status, established through a prioritized sequence of documentary evidence including possession of the secondary-level Indonesia Smart Card, registration in the Integrated Social Welfare Data (DTKS), or classification within the third decile of the Extreme Poverty Elimination Acceleration Data (PPKE), among other channels. According to the Directorate General of Higher Education (2010), programmatic success is indicated through five key markers: the scholarship-acceptance process, budget allocation per recipient, the fund-disbursement mechanism, scholarship termination procedures, and the sanctions applicable for recipient violations, indicators that directly informed the operational measurement of the independent variable in this study.

2.4 Academic Achievement

Academic achievement denotes a change in behavioral capability or competence accumulated over time as a consequence of a learning situation, rather than of maturation alone, manifested in oral or written problem-solving and measurable through standardized assessment (Sobur, 2006). Winkel similarly describes academic achievement as evidence of a student's learning success or capability in carrying out their studies commensurate with the weight of material covered, while Suryabrata frames it as a term denoting the degree of a student's success in achieving learning objectives following a course of instruction (as cited in Rawi *et al.,* 2022). In Indonesian higher education practice, academic achievement is operationalized through the semester grade point average (IP) and cumulative grade point average (IPK), the latter typically required to remain above a threshold, commonly 3.00, for continued scholarship eligibility.

Academic achievement arises from the interaction of internal and external factors. Internal factors include physiological condition, encompassing general health and sensory capacity relevant to learning modality, and psychological factors such as aptitude, attention, interest, motivation, attitude, intelligence, and personality. External factors include non-social elements, such as facilities, infrastructure, curriculum, and teaching method, and social elements, such as family, school environment, community environment, culture, and religious environment. Beyond academic achievement narrowly defined, non-academic achievement, gained through participation in student activity units (Unit Kegiatan Mahasiswa, UKM) encompassing research, scientific competition, sports, and the arts, is also recognized as contributing to a student's overall developmental profile, with organizational involvement shown to build confidence, public-speaking capacity, and reading habits that can, in turn, reinforce academic performance, provided students manage the competing time demands of coursework and extracurricular commitment effectively.

2.5 Prior Research

Several prior studies have examined the relationship between scholarship support and student academic achievement, providing a comparative basis for the present study. Table 2 summarizes five directly relevant studies.

Table 2: Summary of Prior Studies on Scholarship Support and Academic Achievement

Study	Focus	Key Result
Noviandini (2020)	Effect of Bidikmisi scholarship on learning motivation and achievement among Economics Education students, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta (2015–2017 cohorts)	Positive and significant effect of the Bidikmisi scholarship on learning motivation
Then (2020)	Effect of interest and learning motivation on academic achievement, Sekolah Tinggi Bahasa Harapan Bersama	Significant simultaneous and partial effect of inner urge, social motive, and emotional factors on academic achievement
Sidabutar *et al*., (2022)	Effect of learning motivation on academic achievement, Educational Technology Program, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta	Higher learning motivation associated with higher academic achievement
Yusuf & Sari (2022)	Effect of KIP-K single tuition (UKT) assistance on learning achievement, Economics Education Program, Universitas Muhammadiyah Bengkulu	Significant effect of KIP-K/UKT assistance on learning achievement, coefficient of 18.20%
Jasmine (2023)	Effect of KIP-K scholarship on learning achievement, Educational Management Program (2021 cohort), Universitas Negeri Surabaya	Significant effect of KIP-K scholarship on learning achievement, coefficient of 54.1%

Source*: Synthesized by the author from the reviewed literature.*

These studies converge on a broadly consistent finding: scholarship and tuition-assistance programs tend to exert a positive, statistically significant effect on recipients' academic motivation or achievement, though the magnitude of this effect varies considerably across institutional contexts, from as low as 18.2 percent to as high as 54.1 percent of explained variance. This variation suggests that the strength of the scholarship-achievement relationship is shaped by institution-specific factors, such as regional economic conditions, student demographic profile, and the presence or absence of complementary academic support, factors that the present study, situated in a private institution in South Papua serving predominantly Indigenous Papuan recipients, is well positioned to illuminate.

2.6 Conceptual Framework and Hypothesis

Building on the theoretical foundations above, this study analyzes a single independent variable, the KIP Kuliah scholarship (X), operationalized through five indicators drawn from the Directorate General of Higher Education's (2010) general scholarship provisions, and a single dependent variable, student academic achievement (Y), operationalized through recipients' cumulative grade point average. Table 3 summarizes this operational framework.

Table 3: Operational Framework of Research Variables

Variable	Indicators
KIP Kuliah Scholarship (X) — independent	(1) Scholarship acceptance process; (2) budget allocation per recipient; (3) fund-disbursement mechanism; (4) scholarship termination conditions; (5) violations and sanctions for recipients
Academic Achievement (Y) — dependent	Cumulative Grade Point Average (IPK) of KIP Kuliah recipients

Consistent with Gagne's learning theory and the empirical patterns identified in prior research, this study proposes that the KIP Kuliah scholarship, by relieving recipients' financial constraints and providing an environmental stimulus conducive to sustained study, positively affects academic achievement. This proposition is formalized in the following hypotheses:

H1 (Ha): There is a significant effect of the KIP Kuliah scholarship on student academic achievement.

H0: There is no significant effect of the KIP Kuliah scholarship on student academic achievement.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

3.1 Research Design

This study employs a quantitative, causal-associative design, grounded in the positivist paradigm and intended to test a hypothesized relationship between two variables through statistical analysis rather than to explore meaning inductively (Sugiyono, 2017). The design combines descriptive and explanatory elements: the descriptive component characterizes the implementation of the KIP Kuliah scholarship at the study site, while the explanatory component tests the statistical relationship between the scholarship and student academic achievement.

3.2 Research Site

The study was conducted at Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Administrasi Karya Dharma Merauke (STIA KD Merauke), a private higher education institution in Merauke Regency, South Papua Province, selected because of its direct relevance to the KIP Kuliah scholarship theme and its accessibility for accurate, verifiable data collection.

3.3 Population and Sample

The study population comprised all KIP Kuliah recipients at STIA KD Merauke from the 2022, 2023, and 2024 cohorts, totaling 81 students, as detailed in Table 4.

Table 4: Population of KIP Kuliah Recipients by Cohort

Cohort	Number of Recipients
2022	25
2023	22
2024	34
Total	81

Source*: STIA KD Merauke institutional records.*

Given that the population size fell below 100, this study employed saturated sampling (total census), in which every member of the population was included as a respondent, yielding a final sample of 81 students.

3.4 Data Sources and Collection Techniques

Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire distributed to all 81 sample respondents, using a five-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree = 5, Agree = 4, Undecided = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1) to measure respondents' agreement with statements reflecting the scholarship indicators identified in Table 3. Secondary data were drawn from institutional documentation, including scholarship records and academic transcripts, while supplementary interviews were conducted to obtain contextual information on scholarship administration. Table 5 presents the research instrument grid, mapping each scholarship indicator to its corresponding questionnaire items.

Table 5: Research Instrument Grid for the KIP Kuliah Scholarship Variable

Indicator	Item Numbers	Number of Items
Scholarship acceptance process	1–6	6
Budget allocation per recipient	7–9	3
Fund-disbursement mechanism	10–13	4
Scholarship termination conditions	14–15	2
Recipient violations and sanctions	16–18	3
Total	1–18	18

Source: *Research instrument, compiled by the author (2026).*

3.5 Instrument Validity and Reliability

Instrument validity was tested using Pearson product-moment correlation via SPSS, with an item considered valid if its calculated r-value (r-hitung) exceeded the critical r-table value. For a sample of 81 respondents at a 5 percent significance level, the critical r-table value was 0.216. As summarized in Table 6, all 18 items returned r-hitung values ranging from 0.353 to 0.857, each exceeding the 0.216 threshold at $p < 0.001$, confirming that every item validly measured its intended construct.

Table 6: Summary of Instrument Validity Test Results (Selected Items)

Item	r-calculated	r-table	Sig.	Result
Item 1	0.366	0.216	0.001	Valid
Item 4	0.644	0.216	0.001	Valid
Item 10	0.706	0.216	0.001	Valid
Item 11	0.728	0.216	0.001	Valid
Item 17	0.857	0.216	0.001	Valid
Item 18	0.379	0.216	0.001	Valid

Source*: SPSS output, data processed by the author (2026). All 18 items were valid; full item-level results are available from the author.*

Instrument reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, which returned a value of 0.818 across the 18-item scale, as shown in Table 7, indicating a high level of internal consistency well above the conventional 0.60 threshold for exploratory social-science research.

Table 7: Reliability Statistics of the Research Instrument

Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
0.818	18

Source*: SPSS output, data processed by the author (2026).*

3.6 Classical Assumption Testing

Prior to hypothesis testing, three classical assumption tests were conducted to verify the suitability of the data for simple linear regression. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test returned an Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value of 0.200, exceeding the 0.05 threshold and confirming that the regression residuals were normally distributed. The linearity test, examined through the ANOVA table, returned an F-value of 34.814 with a significance level of 0.001, below the 0.05 threshold, confirming a linear relationship between the KIP Kuliah scholarship (X) and academic achievement (Y). The heteroscedasticity test, assessed through visual inspection of the scatterplot of predicted values (ZPRED) against studentized residuals (SRESID), showed no discernible pattern, with points randomly scattered above and below the zero line, indicating homoscedasticity and confirming that the regression model satisfied the assumption of constant residual variance. Table 8 summarizes these results.

Table 8: Summary of Classical Assumption Test Results

Test	Statistic	Criterion	Conclusion
Normality (Kolmogorov-Smirnov)	Asymp. Sig. = 0.200	Sig. > 0.05	Residuals normally distributed
Linearity	F = 34.814, Sig. = 0.001	Sig. < 0.05	Linear relationship confirmed
Heteroscedasticity (scatterplot)	No discernible pattern	Random scatter around zero	Homoscedasticity confirmed

3.7 Data Analysis Technique

Data were analyzed using SPSS through four sequential procedures. Pearson correlation analysis assessed the strength and direction of the linear relationship between the KIP Kuliah scholarship and academic achievement. Simple linear regression, specified as $Y = a + bX$, where Y denotes predicted academic achievement, X denotes the scholarship variable, a denotes the regression constant, and b denotes the regression coefficient, modeled the direction and magnitude of the scholarship's effect. The coefficient of determination (R^2) quantified the proportion of variance in academic achievement explained by the scholarship variable. Finally, the F-test, based on ANOVA output, tested whether the regression model's explanatory power was statistically significant, with the calculated F-value compared against the critical F-table value at a 5 percent significance level and degrees of freedom computed as $df = N - nr$, where N is the sample size and nr is the number of correlated variables.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Respondent Description and Questionnaire Return Rate

Data collection was conducted over approximately one month, during which questionnaires were distributed to all 81 sample respondents at STIA

KD Merauke. As shown in Table 9, all distributed questionnaires were returned complete, yielding a 100 percent response rate. Respondents were KIP Kuliah recipients from the 2022, 2023, and 2024 cohorts, and were asked to provide demographic information, including name, sex, age, and cohort or semester standing, prior to completing the substantive questionnaire items.

Table 9: Questionnaire Distribution and Return Rate

Description	Number	Percentage
Questionnaires distributed	81	100%
Questionnaires returned	81	100%

Source*: Field data, processed by the author (2026).*

4.2 Correlation Coefficient Results

Pearson correlation analysis, presented in Table 10, yielded a correlation coefficient of 0.553 between the KIP Kuliah scholarship and academic achievement, with a significance value of 0.001, well below the 0.05 threshold. This result indicates a moderately strong, statistically significant, and positive correlation between the two variables.

Table 10: Pearson Correlation Coefficient Results

Variable	Pearson Correlation Value	Significance	Description
KIP Kuliah Scholarship (X)	0.553	0.001	Strong, positive correlation
Academic Achievement (Y)	0.553	0.001	Strong, positive correlation

Source*: SPSS output, data processed by the author (2026).*

4.3 Simple Linear Regression Results

The simple linear regression analysis, summarized in Table 11, produced a constant (a) of 20.692 and a regression coefficient (b) of 0.142, yielding the regression equation $Y = 20.692 + 0.142X$. Because the regression coefficient is positive, the KIP Kuliah scholarship (X) is confirmed to exert a positive effect on student academic achievement (Y); because the associated significance value of 0.001 is below 0.05, this effect is statistically significant.

Table 11: Simple Linear Regression Analysis Results

Indicator	Value
Constant (a)	20.692
Regression coefficient (b)	0.142
Significance value	0.001

Source*: SPSS output, data processed by the author (2026).*

4.4 Coefficient of Determination

The coefficient of determination (R^2), reported in Table 12, was 0.306, indicating that the KIP Kuliah scholarship explains 30.6 percent of the variance in student academic achievement at STIA KD Merauke, with the remaining 69.4 percent attributable to factors outside the model, such as learning method, academic environment, intrinsic motivation, family and peer support, and psychological condition.

Table 12: Coefficient of Determination Results

Indicator	Value	Interpretation
R Square	0.306	30.6% of variance in academic achievement explained by the scholarship variable

Source*: SPSS output, data processed by the author (2026).*

4.5 Hypothesis Test (F-test)

The F-test, presented in Table 13, evaluates whether the KIP Kuliah scholarship (X) simultaneously and significantly affects academic achievement (Y). The ANOVA output returned an F-value of 34.814 with a significance value of 0.001.

Table 13: ANOVA Results for the Hypothesis Test

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	78.684	1	78.684	34.814	<0.001
Residual	178.551	79	2.260		
Total	257.235	80			

Note*: Dependent variable: Academic Achievement; Predictor: (Constant), KIP Kuliah Scholarship. Source: SPSS output, data processed by the author (2026).*

Because the calculated F-value exceeds the critical F-table value (34.814 > 3.96) and the significance value is below α = 0.05 (0.001 < 0.05), the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. This confirms that the KIP Kuliah scholarship has a statistically significant effect on student academic achievement at STIA KD Merauke.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 The Effect of the KIP Kuliah Scholarship on Academic Achievement

The combined correlation, regression, determination, and hypothesis-test results converge on a consistent conclusion: the KIP Kuliah scholarship exerts a positive and statistically significant effect on the academic achievement of recipients at STIA KD Merauke. This finding suggests that as the scholarship program is implemented more effectively, whether through improved acceptance processes, more reliable disbursement, or clearer eligibility conditions, recipients tend to become more motivated to improve their academic standing. The finding is consistent with Gagne's learning theory, in which the campus financial environment functions as an external stimulus that recipients convert, through their own cognitive and behavioral engagement, into observable academic outcomes; the scholarship alone does not mechanically produce achievement, but it removes a key structural barrier that would otherwise compete with students' capacity to focus on their studies.

At the same time, the moderate size of the explained variance, 30.6 percent, indicates that the scholarship is one contributing factor among several rather than the dominant determinant of academic achievement. The remaining 69.4 percent of unexplained variance points toward learning method, academic environment, intrinsic motivation, family and peer support, and students' psychological condition as additional influences worthy of institutional attention. This pattern is broadly consistent with, though somewhat more modest in magnitude than, the 54.1 percent effect reported by Jasmine (2023) for KIP-K recipients at Universitas Negeri Surabaya, and considerably stronger than the 18.2 percent effect reported by Yusuf and Sari (2022) at Universitas Muhammadiyah Bengkulu, suggesting that the scholarship's explanatory power for academic achievement varies meaningfully across institutional and regional contexts, potentially reflecting differences in the socioeconomic profile of recipients, the reliability of local fund disbursement, and the availability of complementary academic support services.

5.2 Policy Evaluation through Dunn's Six Criteria

Interpreted through William Dunn's (2003) six evaluation criteria, the KIP Kuliah program at STIA KD Merauke can be assessed as follows. On effectiveness, the program has succeeded in achieving its stated objective of helping students from economically disadvantaged families access higher education while improving academic achievement, as evidenced by the positive and significant statistical relationship identified above. On efficiency, the tuition and living-cost assistance channeled through the program has reduced recipients' economic burden, allowing them to direct available resources more optimally toward academic engagement rather than income-generating activity. On adequacy, the assistance provided is judged sufficient to meet recipients' basic study-related needs, supporting continuity of enrollment and a reasonable trajectory of achievement improvement. On equity, the program has extended higher-education access more broadly to economically disadvantaged students, representing a deliberate government effort to equalize educational opportunity regardless of recipients' social and economic starting position. On responsiveness, the assistance appears well matched to the needs of economically constrained students, enabling fuller participation in the learning process. On appropriateness, the program has reached students who genuinely satisfy the eligibility requirements for educational assistance, indicating accurate targeting and tangible benefit for students requiring financial support to complete higher education.

Taken together, these six evaluative dimensions indicate that the KIP Kuliah program has been implemented soundly at STIA KD Merauke, consistent with the regression coefficient of 0.553 and significance value of 0.001 reported above. This evaluative reading reinforces the conclusion that the higher the quality of program implementation across these dimensions, the greater the resulting improvement in recipient academic achievement is likely to be.

5.3 Supporting and Inhibiting Factors

Beyond the statistical relationship, qualitative field observation identifies specific factors that support or constrain recipients' academic achievement. Supporting factors include financial support itself, which helps recipients meet tuition, book, internet, and other academic needs without major economic pressure; high learning motivation, as many recipients feel a responsibility to maintain the scholarship and therefore sustain strong academic effort; family support, which provides the moral encouragement recipients need to persist through their studies; a supportive academic environment, including access to academic advisors, peer learning networks, and adequate campus facilities; and effective time management among students who successfully balance coursework, organizational involvement, and other commitments.

Inhibiting factors, conversely, include continuing family economic hardship that compels some recipients to work while studying, thereby diverting attention from academic tasks; weak time-management skills, particularly in balancing coursework, assignments, organizational activity, and employment; low sustained learning motivation among some

recipients, reflected in reduced discipline in attending and engaging with coursework; limited access to learning facilities, including devices, internet connectivity, or reference materials; unsupportive peer environments that can reduce concentration on academic tasks; and psychological pressure associated with adapting to campus life, including stress or feelings of inadequacy that can affect learning outcomes. These supporting and inhibiting factors help explain why the scholarship's explanatory power, while significant, remains bounded at just under one-third of total variance, and point toward the specific non-financial interventions most likely to strengthen recipients' academic trajectories going forward.

5.4 Comparison with Prior Studies

This study's finding of a significant, positive scholarship effect is consistent with the broader pattern identified in prior Indonesian research on scholarship and achievement, including Noviandini's (2020) finding on Bidikmisi and learning motivation, Then's (2020) and Sidabutar et al.'s (2022) findings on the role of motivation in academic achievement, and the KIP-K-specific findings of Yusuf and Sari (2022) and Jasmine (2023). The present study extends this literature by situating the analysis within a private institution in an Indigenous-majority, geographically peripheral region of Indonesia, South Papua, and by explicitly linking the statistical finding to William Dunn's policy-evaluation framework, offering a more actionable diagnostic for institutional policymakers than a bivariate statistical relationship alone would provide.

It is also worth situating this study's 30.6 percent explained-variance finding within the wider methodological pattern visible across the prior-research literature summarized in Table 2. Studies reporting higher explained variance, such as Jasmine's (2023) 54.1 percent finding, tend to be conducted at larger, more urbanized institutions where recipients face a narrower band of competing economic pressures outside the scholarship itself, allowing the financial variable to account for a larger share of the variation in outcomes. By contrast, the comparatively more moderate effect size identified in this study, alongside the 18.2 percent effect reported by Yusuf and Sari (2022), may reflect the reality that recipients in resource-constrained regional settings continue to face substantial non-scholarship-related barriers, including family economic responsibility, limited access to supplementary learning infrastructure, and the psychosocial demands of adapting to campus life away from home communities, that a single financial-assistance variable cannot fully offset. This comparative reading reinforces the practical implication that institutions operating in similarly peripheral regional contexts should treat scholarship disbursement as a necessary but not sufficient condition for maximizing recipient academic achievement, pairing it deliberately with the non-financial support mechanisms identified in Section 5.3.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1 Summary of Findings

This study examined the effect of the KIP Kuliah scholarship on student academic achievement at STIA KD Merauke, evaluated within the policy framework of Minister of Education and Culture Regulation No. 10 of 2020 on the Indonesia Smart Program. Based on data from a census of 81 KIP Kuliah recipients from the 2022, 2023, and 2024 cohorts, the study finds a positive and statistically significant effect of the scholarship on academic achievement, evidenced by a Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.553, a regression equation of $Y = 20.692 + 0.142X$, a coefficient of determination of 0.306, and an F-test result confirming the model's significance ($F = 34.814 > 3.96$; $Sig. = 0.001 < 0.05$). These results lead to rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis that the KIP Kuliah scholarship significantly affects student academic achievement. Evaluated against William Dunn's six criteria of effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity, responsiveness, and appropriateness, the program is found to have been implemented well at the institution, though the scholarship explains just under one-third of the total variance in academic achievement, with the remainder attributable to learning method, academic environment, motivation, social support, and psychological factors identified through field observation.

6.2 Theoretical Implications

The study reinforces Gagne's learning-theory proposition that academic outcomes arise from the interaction between environmental stimulus and learners' cognitive engagement, demonstrating empirically that a financial-assistance stimulus alone accounts for a meaningful but partial share of variance in achievement. It further demonstrates the applicability of William Dunn's six-criteria evaluation framework to a bounded, quantifiable higher-education financing program, showing how a statistically estimated effect size can be integrated with a normatively grounded, multi-dimensional policy evaluation rather than treated as a standalone empirical result.

6.3 Practical Implications

For STIA KD Merauke, the findings support strengthened oversight and monitoring of scholarship recipients, particularly regarding fund disbursement timeliness, given its centrality among the indicators most strongly associated with recipient survey responses. For KIP Kuliah recipients, the findings suggest the value of channeling scholarship funds deliberately toward academic needs and consciously avoiding uses unrelated to study, so that the assistance reaches its intended developmental effect, alongside active participation in extracurricular activities that build soft skills supportive of both academic and non-academic achievement. For the broader institution, complementary non-financial interventions, academic mentoring, structured time-management guidance, and psychosocial support for

recipients adjusting to campus life, would help convert the scholarship's financial relief into a larger share of explained academic improvement.

6.4 Limitations of the Study

This study is subject to several limitations. First, it is confined to a single private institution in South Papua Province and to three specific cohorts, meaning its findings cannot be generalized to KIP Kuliah recipients at other institutions or in other regions without further comparative research. Second, academic achievement was operationalized solely through cumulative GPA, a widely used but partial indicator that does not capture non-academic achievement or other dimensions of student development potentially influenced by scholarship support. Third, the cross-sectional survey design captures a single point in time and cannot establish the direction of causality with the same rigor as a longitudinal design tracking recipients across their full period of study.

6.5 Recommendations for Future Research

Future research would benefit from a multiple regression or structural model incorporating the additional factors identified in this study, learning method, academic environment, motivation, social support, and psychological condition, to more precisely decompose the 69.4 percent of variance left unexplained by the scholarship variable alone. Comparative research across multiple institutions and provinces would help establish whether the moderate effect size observed here reflects a general pattern among KIP Kuliah recipients in Indonesia's eastern regions or is specific to STIA KD Merauke's institutional context. A longitudinal design following recipients from initial enrollment through graduation would further permit stronger causal inference regarding the scholarship's role in sustaining academic achievement over the full course of study.

Taken as a whole, the STIA KD Merauke case suggests that need-based higher-education financing such as KIP Kuliah can meaningfully strengthen academic achievement even in a resource-constrained, geographically peripheral institutional setting, provided that financial assistance is understood as one component within a broader ecosystem of academic and psychosocial support, rather than as a self-sufficient remedy for the structural barriers facing economically disadvantaged students.

REFERENCES

- Agustino, L. (2006). Dasar-dasar kebijakan publik. Alfabeta.
- Akbar, M. R., & Mohi, I. (2018). Kebijakan publik: Teori, formulasi, dan aplikasi. Ideas Publishing.
- Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi. (2010). Pedoman umum bantuan biaya pendidikan mahasiswa miskin berprestasi. Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia.
- Djamarah, S. B. (2018). Psikologi belajar. Rineka Cipta.
- Dunn, W. N. (2003). Pengantar analisis kebijakan publik (2nd ed.). Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Ghozali, I. (2013). Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Hajaroh, M. (2019). Paradigma, pendekatan dan metode penelitian kualitatif. UNY Press.
- Hayat, B. (2019). Manajemen dan evaluasi kinerja: Teori dan aplikasi. Prenada Media.
- Halimah, L. (2020). Kurikulum dan pembelajaran di abad 21. Refika Aditama.
- Jasmine, S. F. (2023). Pengaruh beasiswa KIP-K terhadap prestasi belajar mahasiswa Manajemen Pendidikan angkatan 2021 Universitas Negeri Surabaya [Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Negeri Surabaya].
- Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi. (2024). Pedoman pendaftaran KIP Kuliah tahun 2025.
- Mergoni, A., & De Witte, K. (2022). Policy evaluations in education: A comparative analysis of deterministic and stochastic frontier techniques. Education Economics, 30(2), 121–144. https://doi.org/10.1080/09645292.2021.1965082
- Noviandini, F. (2020). Pengaruh beasiswa Bidikmisi terhadap motivasi belajar dan prestasi belajar mahasiswa Bidikmisi Jurusan Pendidikan Ekonomi angkatan 2015–2017 Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta. Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi, 9(2).
- Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia Nomor 10 Tahun 2020 tentang Program Indonesia Pintar.
- Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 4 Tahun 2014 tentang Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Tinggi dan Pengelolaan Perguruan Tinggi.
- Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 48 Tahun 2008 tentang Pendanaan Pendidikan.
- Prabowo, A., Setiawan, B., & Nugroho, R. (2022). Analisis faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi prestasi akademik siswa. Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 7(1).
- Rawi, R. D. P., et al. (2022). Prestasi akademik mahasiswa. Eureka Media Aksara.
- Republik Indonesia. (1945). Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945.
- Republik Indonesia. (2003). Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional.
- Republik Indonesia. (2012). Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2012 tentang Pendidikan Tinggi.
- Sadhana, K. (2013). Realitas kebijakan publik. Universitas Negeri Malang Press.
- Sidabutar, M., Aidilsyah, M. R., Aulia, Y. K., Umari, N. I., Khairi, F. A., Usman, A., & Altan, E. (2022). Motivasi belajar terhadap prestasi akademik mahasiswa. Jurnal Pendidikan dan Konseling (JPDK), 4(6).

- Sobur, A. (2006). Psikologi umum. Pustaka Setia.
- Sugiyono. (2017). Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D. Alfabeta.
- Suharto, E. (2007). Kebijakan sosial sebagai kebijakan publik. Alfabeta.
- Sutama. (2012). Metode penelitian pendidikan: Kuantitatif, kualitatif, PTK, R&D. Fairuz Media.
- Then, W. (2020). Pengaruh minat dan motivasi belajar terhadap prestasi akademik mahasiswa Sekolah Tinggi Bahasa Harapan Bersama. Jurnal STEI Ekonomi, 29(1).
- Yusuf, E., & Sari, W. (2022). Pengaruh beasiswa KIP-K Uang Kuliah Tunggal (UKT) terhadap prestasi belajar mahasiswa Program Studi Pendidikan Ekonomi Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Muhammadiyah Bengkulu. Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi (JUKES), 6(2).

Cite This Article: Maximiliana Dasmedase, Kridawati Sadhana, Wibisono Poespitohadi (2026). Evaluating the Impact of Indonesia's KIP Kuliah Scholarship on Student Academic Achievement: Evidence from a Private Higher Education Institution in South Papua. *East African Scholars J Edu Humanit Lit, 9*(7), 417-428.