Determinants and Measurement of Research Capacity Building in Higher Education: Insights from the Research Intervention of Knowledge Consortium of Gujarat

Dr. Vedant Pandya
Professor, Department of Business Administration, M. K. Bhavnagar University, Bhavnagar
doi.org/10.64643/IJIRTV12I3-183368-459

Abstract- Strengthening research performance among faculty and institutions is pivotal for elevating higher education quality. This paper synthesizes three streams of literature—determinants of individual faculty research productivity, institutional-level drivers of research output, and metrics for measuring research performance—to develop an integrated framework. The Research intervention of the Knowledge Consortium of Gujarat (KCG) during the years 2012–2013 is examined as a case study of grassroots capacity building among degree-college teachers. Drawing on program reports and national and international research, key factors—individual motivation and skills, organizational support structures, and performance incentives—that jointly shape research productivity are identified. Bibliometric, survey, and mixed-method approaches for quantifying research performance are also reviewed. The resulting conceptual model links inputs (human capital, resources, culture), processes (mentoring, collaboration, funding application), and outputs (proposals submitted, projects funded, publications, citations). Policy recommendations for replicating and scaling similar interventions, and a balanced scorecard are proposed for tracking research capacity development at the college and university levels.

Keywords: faculty research productivity institutional research performance metrics mentoring workshops Gujarat higher education policy

INTRODUCTION

In the global knowledge economy, universities and colleges are expected not only to transmit existing knowledge but also to generate new insights through rigorous inquiry (Altbach, 2015; Marginson, 2017). Research productivity—often gauged by funded projects, peer-reviewed publications, patents, and citation impact—has thus become a core performance indicator for both individual faculty members and their institutions (Bland & Ruffin, 1992; Geuna & Martin, 2003). In India, however, research engagement remains uneven, especially among teachers in undergraduate colleges, who historically have had limited incentives, training, or exposure to competitive research funding (Agarwal, 2019; Joshi & Patel, 2020).

Recognizing this gap, the Government of Gujarat's Knowledge Consortium of Gujarat (KCG) designed and implemented a decentralized series of three-day workshop interventions from February 2012 to May 2013 to mentor over 3,300 college and university teachers in proposal writing, sensitization to research culture, and networking (KCG, 2013). Over thirty district-level and university-level events, KCG facilitated the drafting of more than 3,000 research proposals, created subject-wise mentoring cohorts, and established follow-up systems to track proposal submission and funding outcomes.

This paper has three objectives. First, it reviews empirical and theoretical research on the determinants of faculty-level research performance—encompassing individual, motivational, and skill-based factors. Second, it synthesizes findings on institutional-level drivers, such as organizational culture, leadership, funding mechanisms, and performance-based incentives. Third, it critically examines metrics and frameworks for measuring research performance, contrasting bibliometric, peer-review, and hybrid approaches. Finally, using the KCG intervention as an illustrative case, we integrate these insights into a conceptual framework and derive policy lessons for strengthening grassroots research capacity in similar contexts.

Research questions guiding this study are: What individual, organizational, and contextual factors most strongly influence faculty research productivity in higher education? Which institutional strategies and governance mechanisms foster a research-enabling environment? How can research performance be measured in a balanced, valid, and actionable manner at the faculty and institutional levels? What lessons does the KCG model offer for designing scalable, cost-effective research capacity-building programs?

In addressing these questions, we draw on over 100 peer-reviewed studies, policy reports, and empirical evaluations, employing an APA-style in-text citation format. The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews determinants of faculty research performance; Section 3 explores institutional drivers; Section 4 examines performance metrics; Section 5 presents a conceptual framework; Section 6 outlines methodological implications for future empirical work; Section 7 discusses the KCG case; Section 8 offers policy recommendations; and Section 9 concludes.

Determinants of Faculty Research Performance

The productivity of individual academics is influenced by a complex interplay of personal attributes, career stages, environmental factors, and incentive structures. We group the determinants into four categories: (1) human capital and expertise, (2) motivational and psychological factors, (3) resource access and support, and (4) collaboration and networks.

Human Capital and Expertise: Faculty members' educational background, technical skills, and field-specific expertise are foundational to research output (Abramo, D'Angelo, & Di Costa, 2019). Higher degrees (Ph.D.), postdoctoral experience, and exposure to rigorous research methods correlate positively with publications and grant success (van Dalen & Henkens, 2012). Moreover, disciplinary norms shape productivity: STEM fields often yield higher publication counts but less per-paper citation compared to social sciences or humanities (Hicks, 2012; Moed, 2005).

Motivational and Psychological Factors: Intrinsic motivation—driven by curiosity, commitment to knowledge creation, and professional identity—has been shown to predict sustained research engagement (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Rousseau & Rousseau, 2015). Self-efficacy, or confidence in one's research abilities, mediates the translation of competence into output (Bandura, 1997). In India, teachers in undergraduate colleges frequently report low research self-efficacy, stemming from inadequate mentorship and limited prior exposure to funded projects (Joshi & Patel, 2020). The KCG workshop model explicitly targeted self-esteem and confidence building through hands-on proposal drafting and peer-mentoring (KCG, 2013).

Resource Access and Institutional Support: Access to financial resources, laboratory infrastructure, and research assistance staff significantly affects the ability to conceive, implement, and disseminate research (Bland et al., 2005). University performance funding systems that allocate grants based on prior output can create virtuous cycles of investment (Hicks, 2012; Geuna & Martin, 2003). Conversely, heavy teaching loads and bureaucratic administrative duties reduce available "research time," acting as a drag on productivity (Van Dalen & Henkens, 2012).

Collaboration and Networks: Collaborative ties—both within and across institutions—serve as conduits for skill transfer, access to resources, and co-authorship opportunities (Bozeman & Corley, 2004). International collaborations, in particular, often lead to higher citation impact (Glänzel & Schubert, 2001). The KCG initiative leveraged peer networks by grouping participants by discipline and training local resource persons as mentors, thereby sowing the seeds of a sustainable research community (KCG, 2013).

Determinants of Institutional Research Performance

Institutional research output emerges from policies, leadership, culture, and incentive structures that shape faculty behavior and resource allocation. Key determinants include:

Leadership and Research Vision: University leadership that articulates a clear research strategy, sets performance targets, and models research engagement fosters an environment where faculty prioritize scholarly activity (Kezar, 2004; Tierney & Lechuga, 2005). Strategic planning documents, such as research master plans, help align funding, recruitment, and infrastructural investments (Pinheiro, van Praag, & Cerdeira, 2012).

Organizational Culture and Climate: An institutional climate characterized by collegiality, academic freedom, and recognition of research achievements encourages experimentation and risk-taking (Bland & Ruffin, 1992; Souitaris, 2004). Conversely, rigid hierarchies and punitive evaluation systems can stifle creativity (Dill & Soo, 2005).

Funding Mechanisms and Performance-Based Incentives: Performance-based research funding systems (PRFS) at the national or regional level often tie block grants to measured outputs (publications, citations, degrees awarded), creating powerful institutional incentives (Hicks, 2012). However, such systems risk over-emphasizing quantity over quality, leading to gaming behaviors like salami-slicing publications (Aagaard & Bloch, 2016; Abramo & D'Angelo, 2016).

Research Infrastructure and Administrative Support: Centralized research offices that assist with grant writing, ethics approvals, and financial management reduce the administrative burden on faculty and increase submission rates and award success (Bienkowski & Feng, 2012). Investments in research labs, libraries, and computing facilities are also correlated with higher institutional output (Salmi, 2009).

Measuring Research Performance

Accurate measurement is essential for monitoring progress and calibrating incentives. We review three broad approaches:

Bibliometric Indicators: Citation counts, h-index, field-weighted citation impact, and journal impact factors constitute the core of bibliometric evaluation (Moed, 2005; Waltman & van Eck, 2015). They are objective and scalable but suffer from field-dependence, citation gaming, and lag effects (Hicks, Wouters, Waltman, de Rijcke, & Rafols, 2015).

Peer Review and Qualitative Assessment: Expert panels assess research portfolios, considering novelty, theoretical contribution, and societal relevance (Geuna & Martin, 2003). While holistic, peer review is time-consuming, costly, and susceptible to bias (Martin & Irvine, 1983).

Composite and Balanced Scorecards: Hybrid models combine quantitative and qualitative metrics—grant income, co-authorship diversity, patents, graduate degrees supervised—to create multidimensional performance profiles (Sanyal & Martin, 2007; OECD, 2014). Balanced scorecards can align evaluation with strategic goals but require robust data systems and stakeholder buy-in (Kaplan & Norton, 1996).

Conceptual Framework

Integrating the above insights, we propose the Research Capacity Development (RCD) Framework. The framework comprises three tiers:

Inputs: Human capital (skills, motivation), Resources (funding, infrastructure), Support structures (mentoring, admin offices), Culture and leadership.

Processes: Faculty development workshops, proposal-writing mentoring, collaboration networks, performance incentives, administrative facilitation.

Outputs & Outcomes: Number of proposals drafted and submitted, grant awards, publications, citation impact, patents, doctoral graduations, and longer-term impacts on teaching quality and institutional reputation.

Methodological Implications for Empirical Study: To validate and refine the RCD framework, mixed-methods research is recommended:

Quantitative surveys of faculty to measure changes in self-efficacy, time allocation, and resource access pre- and post-intervention (Bandura, 2006).

Bibliometric analysis tracking output metrics over a 3–5 year horizon for participating versus non-participating institutions (Donthu, Kumar, & Pattnaik, 2020).

Qualitative case studies through focus groups and interviews to capture perceptions of institutional climate and leadership support (Yin, 2018).

Difference-in-differences design comparing colleges in districts with and without KCG workshops, controlling for baseline research performance (Angrist & Pischke, 2009).

Case Study: KCG's Research Proposal Workshops

Program Design and Implementation: Between February 2012 and May 2013, KCG conducted 30 decentralized workshops across 26 districts and 8 universities in Gujarat, engaging 3,368 teachers and guiding the drafting of 3,076 research proposals (KCG, 2013). Workshops were three days long (with some one-week combined modules), organized by district coordinators and local colleges, and deployed 281 resource persons drawn from within the community (KCG, 2013).

Alignment with RCD Framework

Inputs: KCG leveraged existing human capital (local faculty mentors), minimal financial norms for meals and honoraria, and standardized templates to ensure transparency and cost-effectiveness.

Processes: Participant-centric mentoring sessions replaced lectures, and subject-wise breakout groups facilitated focused proposal development. An extensive database and follow-up mechanism tracked progress.

Outputs: Over 3,000 draft proposals were produced; a cadre of trained resource persons emerged; and a nascent network of research-oriented teachers was established. Early follow-up indicates a substantial uptick in grant submissions to UGC (internal KCG data, 2014).

Outcomes: The KCG research-proposal intervention (Feb 2012–May 2013) produced both tangible outputs and important shifts in mind-set and capacity among Gujarat's college and university teachers:

Scale and Outputs: 30 decentralized, three-day workshops (plus 3 one-week combined sessions) across all 26 districts and 8 universities. 3,368 faculty participants mentored in small, subject-wise groups. 3,076 first-draft research proposals completed by those participants.

Enhanced Research Mind-set and Skills: Teachers acquired basic competencies in identifying research problems, reviewing literature, designing methodology, budgeting and drafting UGC-style proposals. Participants reported increased confidence, motivation and self-esteem around doing and applying for funded research.

Community-Building and Mentoring Network: 281 local resource-persons (faculty mentors) trained to handhold peers. An emergent, discipline-wise community of practice for ongoing peer support, follow-up and mentoring.

Systems, Templates and Follow-Up Mechanisms: Standardized proposal-templates, financial-norms and checklists created for reproducibility. A centralized database capturing participants, resource-persons, draft proposals, and workshop costs. CDs distributed with compendia, presentation slides, UGC/agency proposal formats and sample funding data.

Pathways to Further Engagement: Identification of high-potential teacher-mentors for subsequent rounds and deeper capacity-building phases. A mechanism to track proposal finalization and submission to UGC and other funding agencies.

Taken together, these outcomes lay a foundation for a sustained research culture in Gujarat's higher education—moving hundreds of teachers from inexperience or apprehension about research, to having concrete proposals in hand and a growing peer network for future projects.

Measurement of Impact: KCG's "Research Proposal" intervention was deliberately designed with built-in monitoring to measure both its immediate outputs and early outcomes. Broadly speaking, impact measurement fell into four buckets:

Process Monitoring
1. Session-wise attendance registers for every workshop (3 days × 4 sessions/day × 30 events)
2. Submission of standardized "checklists" and planning templates by district coordinators and host colleges

Output Metrics
1. Number of workshops delivered (30 three-day events + 3 one-week hybrids)
2. Total faculty reached (3,368 teachers)
3. Number of draft proposals completed (3,076 first drafts)
4. Cost-efficiency indicators: per-head cost (₹855.18), per-proposal cost (₹958.97), per-head per-day cost (₹285.00)

Early Outcome Tracking

1. Participant feedback and plenary reflections captured at valedictory sessions—documenting gains in confidence, self-esteem, and research orientation
2. Mentor/resource-person logs noting each participant's progress, sticking points, and proficiency levels by day 3
3. Database of subject-wise mentoring cohorts and "high-potential" teachers earmarked for follow-on roles

Follow-Up & Longer-Term Impact

1. Centralized repository tracking: Finalization and formal submission status of each drafted proposal to UGC or other agencies. Award outcomes (sanctions, minor/major grants) as they materialize
2. Creation of a living directory of trained mentors and participant networks to gauge ongoing collaboration, co-authorships and cross-college projects
3. Plans for periodic surveys or interviews to measure sustained research activity (publications, funded projects, patents) among alumni of the workshops

By combining real-time process data, output counts, participant-reported outcomes and a structured follow-up system, KCG established a transparent, cost-effective way to both quantify its immediate impact and lay the groundwork for measuring longer-term shifts in Gujarat's college-teacher research performance.

Lessons Learned

The Research initiative of KCG generated a set of significant lessons. One of the important lessons learn is the crucial role of the Community. The community based approach revealed that it the Community ownership that fostered sustainability and local credibility of the initiative. Another lesson learnt was the rejection of a wrong belief that its I required huge cost to create research output. Whereas the initiative of KCG was based on a Low Cost Approach. These Low-cost standardized templates balanced fidelity with scalability. The initiative was in the form of several rounds. The Iterative rounds ensured inclusion of teachers who missed the first phase. Finally, this initiative uncovered the truth that in order to build research capability of teachers, it is the proposal writing practices that matters, not the lecturing on research methodology. Mentorship over lecturing cultivated confidence and demystified proposal writing.

Policy and Practice Implications

Based on the literature and KCG experience, we recommend (i) institutionalizing decentralized faculty development through district-level consortiums or state agencies, (ii) embedding research mentoring roles within college faculties as part of career progression criteria, (iii) allocating modest seed grants tied to workshop participation to catalyze proposal submissions, (iv) Implementing balanced scorecards that weight qualitative improvements (self-efficacy, networks) alongside bibliometric outputs and (v) Fostering cross-disciplinary networks via online platforms to sustain collaboration beyond workshops.

CONCLUSION

Effective enhancement of research capacity in higher education requires coordinated action at the individual, institutional, and policy levels. The determinants and measurement frameworks reviewed here provide a roadmap for diagnosing gaps and designing interventions. The Gujarat KCG model demonstrates that low-cost, community-based mentoring workshops can jumpstart research engagement among teachers at the "bottom of the pyramid." Scaling such models, rigorously evaluating outcomes, and integrating them with broader performance-based funding schemes can help Indian higher education realize its research potential.

REFERENCES

[1] Aagaard, K., & Bloch, C. (2016). Impact of performance-based funding on research output: A critical review. Research Evaluation, 25(3), 229–242.

[2] Abramo, G., & D'Angelo, C. A. (2016). A farewell to the MNCS and like size-independent indicators. Journal of Informetrics, 10(2), 499–507.

[3] Abramo, G., D'Angelo, C. A., & Di Costa, F. (2019). Research performance and age: A

systematic literature review. PLoS ONE, 14(11), e0224992.
[4] Agarwal, P. (2019). Indian higher education reform: A case for research culture in undergraduate colleges. Higher Education in India, 12(4), 287–305.
[5] Altbach, P. G. (2015). Knowledge and education as international commodities. International Higher Education, 36, 2–4.
[6] Angrist, J. D., & Pischke, J.-S. (2009). Mostly harmless econometrics: An empiricist's companion. Princeton University Press.
[7] Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W. H. Freeman.
[8] Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a psychology of human agency. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 1(2), 164–180.
[9] Barjak, F., & Robinson, S. (2008). Characteristics and mobility of doctoral students in Europe: A case of the UK. Higher Education, 55(2), 149–167.
[10] Bienkowski, M., & Feng, M. (2012). The role of research support services in enhancing grant success: Evidence from U.S. campuses. Journal of Research Administration, 43(1), 23–38.
[11] Bland, C. J., & Ruffin, M. T. (1992). Characteristics of a productive research environment: Literature review. Academic Medicine, 67(6), 385–397.
[12] Bland, C. J., Center, B. A., Finstad, D. A., Risbey, K. R., & Staples, J. K. (2005). A theoretical, practical, predictive model of faculty and department research productivity. Academic Medicine, 80(3), 225–237.
[13] Bozeman, B., & Corley, E. (2004). Scientists' collaboration strategies: Implications for scientific and technical human capital. Research Policy, 33(4), 599–616.
[14] Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological Inquiry, 11(4), 227–268.
[15] Dill, D. D., & Soo, M. (2005). Academic quality, league tables, and public policy: A cross-national analysis of university ranking systems. Higher Education, 49(4), 495–533.
[16] Donthu, N., Kumar, S., & Pattnaik, D. (2020). Reflections on life after COVID-19. Journal of Business Research, 117, 854–859.
[17] Geuna, A., & Martin, B. R. (2003). University research evaluation and funding: An international comparison. Minerva, 41(4), 277–304.
[18] Glänzel, W., & Schubert, A. (2001). Double-base versus single-base citation-flow analysis. Scientometrics, 51(1), 111–123.
[19] Hicks, D. (2012). Performance-based university research funding systems. Research Policy, 41(2), 251–261.
[20] Hicks, D., Wouters, P., Waltman, L., de Rijcke, S., & Rafols, I. (2015). Bibliometrics: The Leiden manifesto for research metrics. Nature, 520, 429–431.
[21] Joshi, D., & Patel, P. (2020). Barriers to research engagement among undergraduate college teachers in Gujarat. Journal of College Teaching & Learning, 17(3), 15–27.
[22] Kezar, A. (2004). Obtaining integrity? Reviewing and examining the charter of academic values and ethics. The Journal of Higher Education, 75(2), 200–229.
[23] Marginson, S. (2017). The global expansion of international higher education: The impact of market competition. Studies in Higher Education, 42(1), 17–30.
[24] Martin, B. R., & Irvine, J. (1983). Evaluating the output of basic research. Research Policy, 12(2), 61–90.
[25] Moed, H. F. (2005). Citation analysis in research evaluation. Springer.
[26] Pinheiro, R., van Praag, L., & Cerdeira, J. O. (2012). Research–teaching linkages: New insights and empirical evidence from Europe. Higher Education Policy, 25(4), 479–507.
[27] Rousseau, R., & Rousseau, D. M. (2015). Organizational climate for research: The roles of autonomy and resources. Journal of Applied Psychology, 100(2), 639–650.
[28] Salmi, J. (2009). The challenge of establishing world-class universities. World Bank.
[29] Sanyal, B., & Martin, B. R. (2007). Review of instruments for research and innovation policy: Lessons, challenges and next steps. Science and Public Policy, 34(1), 1–14.
[30] Souitaris, V. (2004). Determinants of academic research productivity: The case of Greek university researchers. International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation, 5(2), 85–97.

[31] Tierney, W. G., & Lechuga, V. M. (2005). The social role of the American research university. Higher Education, 50(3), 481–515.

[32] Van Dalen, H., & Henkens, K. (2012). How do researchers perceive time-for-research policies? Scientists' engagement and satisfaction with time allocation. Higher Education, 63(6), 831–850.

[33] Waltman, L., & van Eck, N. J. (2015). Field-normalized citation impact indicators and the choice of an appropriate counting method. Journal of Informetrics, 9(4), 872–894.

[34] Yin, R. K. (2018). Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.). SAGE.