



SIGn Journal of Social Science

E-ISSN: 2745-374X

jurnal.penerbitsign.com/index.php/sjss/article/view/v7n1-014

Vol. 7 Issue 1: June – November 2026

Published Online: October 16, 2026

Article Title

Implementation of the Student Entrepreneurship Development Program: Institutional Capacity in Higher Education and the Sustainability of Student Ventures

Author(s)

Alamul Huda*

Universitas Esa Unggul, West Jakarta City, Indonesia || alamul08@student.esaunggul.ac.id

*Corresponding Author

Surryanto Djoko Waluyo

Universitas Esa Unggul, West Jakarta City, Indonesia || surryanto.djoko@esaunggul.ac.id

Harits Hijrah Wicaksana

Universitas Esa Unggul, West Jakarta City, Indonesia || harits@esaunggul.ac.id

Agung Edi Rustanto

Universitas Esa Unggul, West Jakarta City, Indonesia || agung.edi@esaunggul.ac.id

How to cite:

Huda, A., Waluyo, S. D., Wicaksana, H. H., & Rustanto, A. E. (2026). Implementation of the Student Entrepreneurship Development Program: Institutional Capacity in Higher Education and the Sustainability of Student Ventures. *SIGn Journal of Social Science*, 7(1), 243-262. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjss.v7i1.798>



This work is licensed under a CC BY-4.0 License

ABSTRACT

The Student Entrepreneurship Development Program (SEDP) combines financial assistance and entrepreneurship development support to advance student ventures. This study examines SEDP implementation based on problem tractability, the ability of policy provisions to structure implementation, and nonstatutory variables. The analysis focuses on institutional capacity in higher education and the conditions supporting student venture sustainability. A descriptive qualitative approach was employed. Data were collected from January to June 2026 through interviews with officials from the Directorate of Learning and Student Affairs, SEDP administrators at Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha (Undiksha) and Universitas Muslim Indonesia (UMI), and student financial assistance recipients. Regulations, program guidelines, and implementation reports provided secondary data. The analysis followed Mazmanian and Sabatier's policy implementation framework. The findings indicate increasing entrepreneurial interest alongside difficulties in marketing, resource management, and balancing business activities with academic responsibilities. Selection, funding, mentoring, and reporting requirements organize program implementation through administrative and developmental functions. Undiksha has prior experience in entrepreneurship development and provides supplementary funding, whereas UMI coordinates student affairs administration with business incubator services. A synthesis of informant accounts links budget efficiency measures to adjustments in the coverage of entrepreneurship development services and monitoring activities. Limited mentoring duration further indicates a need for post-funding support. Administrative arrangements, institutional support capacity, and students' business management capabilities constitute interconnected conditions for maintaining student venture operations.

Keywords: *Entrepreneurship Development; Institutional Capacity; Policy Implementation; Student Entrepreneurship Development Program; Student Venture Sustainability.*

INTRODUCTION

Student entrepreneurship development is part of higher education policy concerning business skills, innovation, and graduates' economic independence. Higher education institutions provide educational activities, facilities, financing, mentoring, and business networks that student entrepreneurs need. Research in higher education has identified positive relationships between the material, social, and cultural components of entrepreneurial ecosystems and student innovation ([Hindarsah et al., 2025](#)). Research on university incubators in Germany has also identified the roles of organizational capacity, leadership in institutional change, and partnerships in developing entrepreneurship support services ([Karahana, 2024](#)). These findings show the importance of institutional capacity in providing support that matches students' business development needs.

Indonesia's national entrepreneurship policy includes Presidential Regulation Number 2 of 2022 and Presidential Regulation Number 12 of 2025. Within higher education, program provisions regulate administrative responsibilities, implementing institutions, and student entrepreneurship assistance instruments. Presidential Regulation Number 38 of 2026 was promulgated on July 2, 2026, following the January–June 2026 data collection period. Accordingly, this study examines the operational arrangements in effect during the data collection period. Presidential

Regulation Number 38 of 2026 represents a subsequent development in national entrepreneurship policy.

The Student Entrepreneurship Development Program has operated since 2022, providing financial assistance and entrepreneurship development support to students who have developed prototypes or established businesses. The 2025 SEDP Guidelines emphasize innovation and building a supportive entrepreneurial ecosystem. The 2026 guidelines distinguish between the Early Stage and Growth Stage according to product development, market conditions, and business operations (Sukino et al., 2025; Sukino et al., 2026). The Directorate of Learning and Student Affairs administers the program nationally, while higher education institutions prepare proposals and organize entrepreneurship development activities. The ministry establishes requirements for recipient selection, fund utilization, evaluation, and business networking activities. Higher education institutions perform their responsibilities according to their authority and participants' needs. The relationship between national program arrangements and institutional services is therefore central to examining SEDP implementation and its contribution to student venture development.

Entrepreneurial intention, readiness to establish a business, entrepreneurial skills, and business management capabilities are distinct constructs requiring different measures. Research involving SEDP grant recipients found positive relationships between experience and innovation and entrepreneurial intention, as well as between entrepreneurial intention and startup readiness. Entrepreneurship education had no statistically significant effect on entrepreneurial intention in the model examined (Chai & Soelaiman, 2024). Research conducted at Universitas Riau found a positive and statistically significant effect of SEDP participation on student entrepreneurship, including knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Azhari et al., 2025). Another study found no statistically significant partial effect of SEDP participation on entrepreneurial spirit when financial management was included in the analysis, although the two variables had a statistically significant joint effect (Restanti & Pradikto, 2025). Practical learning and mentoring have also been associated with students' entrepreneurial orientation (Efendi & Yana, 2026). Differences in research constructs and designs demonstrate the importance of examining entrepreneurship development benefits in relation to business management needs, rather than relying exclusively on program participation.

Previous SEDP research has examined productive grant utilization and mentor assistance (Syarifah et al., 2024). Other studies have examined difficulties in developing business proposals related to prospective customers, products, resources, and marketing (Toyib et al., 2024), as well as innovation management from planning through product marketing (Nurjanah, 2025). Research on university incubators in India found that general support services and access to intellectual resources did not consistently address the specialized needs of circular economy startups (Kambanou et al., 2025). Research on student agribusinesses in Kenya examined

relationships between motivation, behavioral characteristics, and economic, social, and environmental sustainability (Nakiganda et al., 2025). Longitudinal startup research identified the roles of founder commitment, teamwork, and incubator mentoring in business resilience (Utomo et al., 2025). These studies identify two relevant issues for SEDP implementation: students' ability to apply entrepreneurship development support in business operations and institutional capacity to provide services appropriate to different stages of venture development.

Policy implementation studies in other sectors offer comparative perspectives on how resources and coordination affect program implementation. Personnel and facility constraints have been found to hinder the achievement of policy objectives despite implementers' commitment (Said et al., 2024). Cross-sector coordination and external stakeholder involvement influence tourism policy implementation (Syahrial et al., 2025). In community empowerment programs, material assistance and improvements in recipient capacity constitute distinct outcome dimensions (Rasyid et al., 2025). The importance of continued mentoring and monitoring following the distribution of assistance has also been documented in fishing community empowerment (Hidayat et al., 2025). Research on plantation standard implementation identified substantive achievements among some recipients alongside institutional support constraints (Azizah et al., 2026). These cross-sector findings demonstrate the importance of resource adequacy, institutional coordination, and service continuity in policy implementation. For SEDP, these considerations are relevant to examining the relationship between program requirements and institutional support for student ventures.

SEDP scholarship has primarily addressed entrepreneurial intention and readiness, financial assistance utilization, proposal preparation, and entrepreneurship development practices. Incubator research has examined institutional support for startups, while policy implementation studies have emphasized authority, resources, and coordination. This research gap concerns the relationship between national SEDP requirements, higher education institutions' capacity to organize entrepreneurship development services, and students' needs to maintain business operations. Administrative implementation includes selecting recipients, disbursing funds, reporting, and evaluation. Substantive entrepreneurship development concerns students' abilities to manage products, marketing, and finances and to obtain support after funding ends. These functions are examined through the experiences of national program administrators, higher education institutions, and student financial assistance recipients. The study explains institutional capacity in implementing program requirements while responding to the operational needs of student ventures.

The analytical framework includes problem tractability, the statute's ability to structure implementation, and nonstatutory variables affecting implementation (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1983). Policy communication and organizational resources

provide supplementary concepts for examining implementers' actions (Edwards, 1980). Policy content, institutional characteristics, compliance, and implementer responsiveness further inform the interpretation of relationships between program requirements and recipients' needs (Grindle, 2017). This study analyzes SEDP implementation through these three principal groups of variables and explains the relationships among ministerial arrangements, institutional capacity in higher education, and conditions that support or constrain student venture sustainability. The Directorate of Learning and Student Affairs serves as the principal institutional research setting. Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha and Universitas Muslim Indonesia are examined as implementing universities, while students' experiences provide evidence concerning the needs of program recipients. The analysis encompasses program provisions, implementer activities, and conditions affecting student venture development.

METHOD

This study employed a descriptive qualitative approach, with SEDP implementation processes as the unit of analysis (Creswell, 2013). These processes encompass national program administration, entrepreneurship development activities undertaken by higher education institutions, and the experiences of student financial assistance recipients. The analysis followed three groups of variables: problem tractability, the statute's ability to structure implementation, and nonstatutory variables (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1983). These variables were used to examine program provisions, organizational actions, students' capability development needs, and institutional conditions associated with continued business operations.

Data were collected from January to June 2026. The Directorate of Learning and Student Affairs was the primary research setting, while Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha and Universitas Muslim Indonesia were examined as implementing universities. Primary data were obtained from the Head of the Student Affairs Working Team and the ministry official responsible for KMBK, SEDP administrators at both universities, and student financial assistance recipients from the two institutions. Informant accounts were organized according to institutional position, affiliation, and subject matter. Students' experiences from both universities were treated as one source group, consistent with the scope of the available accounts. Information combining statements from several informants was presented as a synthesis of their accounts, with attribution distinguished from individual informant statements.

Primary data were collected through open-ended interviews conducted via Zoom and in person at the Directorate of Learning and Student Affairs. Ministry-level interviews covered program objectives, information dissemination, proposal selection, funding, entrepreneurship development, monitoring, and evaluation. Interviews with university administrators addressed previous entrepreneurship

development activities, organizational resources, business incubator services, and student mentoring. Student accounts concerned the benefits of financial assistance, marketing, business management, academic responsibilities, and mentoring needs. Distinctions among information sources were maintained during data categorization and presentation (Sugiyono, 2025).

Secondary data comprised Presidential Regulation Number 2 of 2022 and Presidential Regulation Number 12 of 2025. Program documents included the 2025 and 2026 SEDP Guidelines and the 2024 SEDP Implementation Report, published in 2025 (Dewobroto et al., 2025; Sukino et al., 2025; Sukino et al., 2026). Document review covered policy foundations, implementation stages, administrative authority, fund utilization, and evaluation schedules. The 2024 report was used to describe implementation activities during that year. The 2026 guidelines provided the program requirements applicable during data collection. Presidential Regulation Number 38 of 2026 was used to explain policy developments following June 2026.

Data analysis involved categorizing informant accounts by source and subject, comparing them with policy documents, and interpreting the information through the three groups of implementation variables (Miles et al., 2014). Problem tractability included technical difficulties, variations in needs across venture development stages, and required changes in students' capabilities. Policy structure covered objective clarity, resources, authority, selection, entrepreneurship development, and monitoring. Nonstatutory variables included institutional experience, leadership support, faculty members and mentors, business incubators, resources, and relationships with business actors. Formal requirements were compared with implementation activities reported by administrators and the experiences of student financial assistance recipients. Accounts from multiple informants were synthesized according to shared subject matter while maintaining source attribution. Conditions related to venture sustainability were examined through business management needs, market access, and institutional support after program funding.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Problem Tractability and Development Needs of Student Ventures Receiving SEDP Support

Implementation challenges associated with SEDP arise from differences in venture development stages and the capabilities required of student recipients. Early Stage ventures require product validation and customer understanding, whereas Growth Stage ventures require market development and stronger management capabilities. Students must also manage finances and conduct business activities alongside academic responsibilities. Technical difficulties, target-group heterogeneity, and the magnitude of the behavioral change required

affect policy implementation ([Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1983](#)). The 2026 SEDP Guidelines distinguish the two stages according to product readiness, market development, and business management ([Sukino et al., 2026](#)). Differences in venture development require entrepreneurship support tailored to each group's problems. The implementation challenge involves building students' capabilities from developing business ideas and prototypes to managing operations based on customer needs.

The Head of the Student Affairs Working Team at the Directorate of Learning and Student Affairs reported growing student interest in entrepreneurship alongside continued limitations in market expansion and business scaling. SEDP administrators at Undiksha similarly described increased student entrepreneurship activities, alongside marketing difficulties and challenges in maintaining business operations. These accounts suggest a gap between increased participation and the commercial capabilities needed to run a business. Financial assistance recipients from Undiksha and UMI reported difficulties marketing products and balancing business activities with academic responsibilities. Marketing difficulties involved understanding customers, selecting sales channels, and adapting products. Academic responsibilities limited the time students could devote to business activities. Together, these challenges indicate that entrepreneurship development must address both market management and the organization of business operations during university studies. Growing entrepreneurial interest therefore needs to be accompanied by practical business management skills to support continued operations.

Difficulties in preparing business proposals are linked to the technical capabilities students also need to run their ventures. A study of SEDP participants at Universitas PGRI Palembang identified difficulties in specifying prospective customers, products, resources, and marketing strategies ([Toyib et al., 2024](#)). During business planning, students must identify customer segments, establish product requirements, and estimate resource needs. During operations, they use this information to identify prospective buyers, improve products, and select sales channels. Decision-making requirements vary by the venture's stage of development. Early Stage ventures require assessments of product suitability for customer needs, while Growth Stage ventures need to expand sales and improve operational management. Technical difficulties therefore relate to product characteristics, market conditions, and students' ability to plan business activities. Stage-appropriate entrepreneurship development support is required to address challenges extending from proposal preparation to business management.

The benefits of entrepreneurship development must be examined by distinguishing program participation, entrepreneurial intention, readiness, and business management capabilities. Research involving SEDP grant recipients found

positive relationships between experience and innovation and entrepreneurial intention, as well as between intention and readiness to establish a business (Chai & Soelaiman, 2024). Research at Universitas Riau identified positive program effects on student entrepreneurship in terms of knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Azhari et al., 2025). Another study found no statistically significant partial effect of SEDP participation on entrepreneurial spirit when financial management was included in the model, although the two variables had a statistically significant joint effect (Restanti & Pradikto, 2025). Practical learning and mentoring have also been associated with students' entrepreneurial orientation (Efendi & Yana, 2026). Differences among these findings reflect the constructs and research designs employed. Financial assistance recipients from Undiksha and UMI acknowledged the benefits of funding and mentoring while continuing to experience marketing and time-management difficulties. Their accounts distinguish access to program support from the ability to apply entrepreneurial learning to operational problems. These difficulties indicate a need for practical marketing strategies and business scheduling during university studies.

SEDP financial assistance provides initial support to develop business ideas or prototypes into more competitive ventures. The Head of the Student Affairs Working Team explained this function. A synthesis of ministry informant accounts also indicated that some recipients tended to regard program assistance as their principal source of capital. These differing understandings of funding matter for financial planning, resource allocation priorities, and business revenue development. Financial assistance supports product development and initial activities, while continued operations require working capital management, cost control, and marketing. A case study of Dimension Lab documented productive SEDP grant utilization accompanied by mentor guidance (Syarifah et al., 2024). In policy implementation, the intended benefits and behavioral changes among recipients influence implementation requirements (Grindle, 2017). Accordingly, business resource management training should accompany financial assistance so students can plan expenditures and make decisions based on their ventures' operating conditions.

Different stages of venture development require different improvements in students' capabilities. Proposal preparation involves identifying products, customers, and financing needs. Operating a business requires revising decisions in response to sales performance, changing demand, and costs. The Early Stage and Growth Stage classifications provide a basis for differentiating entrepreneurship development needs. Target-group heterogeneity and the degree of behavioral change required are components of implementation difficulty (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1983). For SEDP recipients, relevant capabilities include product testing, financial resource planning, marketing strategy implementation, and market-informed decision-making. Developing these capabilities requires learning directly

related to business operations. The distinction between preparing business plans and managing ongoing activities explains why students at different stages require different types of support. The content and intensity of entrepreneurship development activities should match the capabilities students need to run their ventures.

Applying the outcomes of entrepreneurship development activities requires students to use acquired knowledge in daily business management. SEDP recipients reported receiving guidance on product development, marketing, finance, and business strategies. They also described difficulties reaching customers and balancing business activities with academic obligations. These accounts highlight operational problems that require applying acquired knowledge. Marketing knowledge is needed to identify target customers, set prices, and choose sales channels. Financial training concerns cost calculations and working capital requirements. Students must also schedule business activities around their academic commitments. Behavioral change among target groups constitutes an important aspect of implementation difficulty ([Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1983](#)). Within SEDP, the practical application of entrepreneurship development activities is therefore relevant to students' business capabilities. Support aligned with students' actual difficulties is needed to strengthen their ability to make informed operational decisions over time.

SEDP implementation challenges encompass technical business development difficulties, variations in needs across venture stages, and the capabilities students must apply in their businesses. Recipient accounts identify needs for guidance on products, marketing, finance, and business continuity planning. Marketing difficulties and academic time constraints highlight the importance of commercial capabilities and organizing business activities. Administrators' accounts also highlight limited mentoring duration and the need for post-funding support. Financial assistance and participation in entrepreneurship development activities provide initial support for venture development. Subsequent business management requires decisions concerning products, markets, and resource utilization in response to changing circumstances. These needs are directly related to SEDP provisions governing objectives, funding, selection, entrepreneurship development, and evaluation. The adequacy of program instruments therefore depends on their capacity to support entrepreneurship development activities appropriate to students' operational difficulties.

B. Policy Structure in SEDP Implementation: Authority, Entrepreneurship Development, and Evaluation

SEDP implementation is structured around objectives, the allocation of authority and resources, and provisions governing organizational responsibilities. The Head of the Student Affairs Working Team associated SEDP with the youth

entrepreneurship agenda established under Presidential Regulation Number 2 of 2022. The ministry provides guidelines, funding, information systems, and an administrative team, while higher education institutions prepare participants and organize entrepreneurship development activities. The 2026 SEDP Guidelines establish provisions for developing student ventures and strengthening the entrepreneurial ecosystem (Sukino et al., 2026). Clear objectives, resource allocation, institutional authority, and decision-making rules are components of the statute's ability to structure implementation (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1983). These responsibilities establish an operational basis for program implementation at the national and institutional levels. Implementing the program instruments requires coordination across regulatory decisions, participant preparation, funding disbursement, and entrepreneurship support services. The allocation of authority defines responsibilities for participant preparation, funding decisions, service delivery, and assessment of implementation outcomes.

The 2024 SEDP Implementation Report documented eight activities: information dissemination, technical guidance, proposal submission, two mentoring clinics, progress reporting and assessment, the Indonesian Student Entrepreneurship Expo, and final reporting (Dewobroto et al., 2025). The 2026 SEDP Guidelines scheduled information dissemination activities for February, the proposal submission deadline for April, and program implementation from May through October. Progress assessment and the Indonesian Student Entrepreneurship Expo were scheduled after June, following the study's data collection period (Sukino et al., 2026). The 2024 report documents activities completed in that year, whereas the 2026 guidelines establish the schedule for the research year. Program activities comprise preparation, proposal assessment, recipient selection, funding implementation, mentoring, and evaluation. The schedule determines when administrators perform their responsibilities and when progress reports and assessments are required. This distinction between completed and scheduled activities is important for interpreting the chronology of SEDP implementation.

The Directorate of Learning and Student Affairs communicates SEDP information to higher education institutions through program guidelines and dissemination activities. The Head of the Student Affairs Working Team explained that this information includes implementation procedures, schedules, and adjustments based on evaluations of previous program activities. Administrators at Undiksha and UMI attended national dissemination activities and subsequently communicated program requirements to students. Information transmission and clarity are important aspects of communication in policy implementation (Edwards, 1980). A synthesis of administrator and student accounts indicates that universities conducted preliminary selection and provided assistance before proposals were submitted for national assessment. The 2026 SEDP Guidelines

regulate internal institutional selection, including assessments of proposal content and budget plans (Sukino et al., 2026). These preparation and assessment activities demonstrate how university administrators use program information. National dissemination and institutional follow-up are successive communication activities that support prospective recipients' preparation.

National SEDP selection involves reviewing administrative requirements and assessing the substance of proposed business plans. The 2026 guidelines specify internal selection documentation, product readiness, and institutional endorsement before designating recipients (Sukino et al., 2026). The official responsible for KMBK explained that the selection process was designed to be objective by involving reviewers with entrepreneurship expertise. Reviewers also provide feedback on students' business plans. Eligibility assessment and substantive feedback serve different purposes. The former supports recipient selection under program requirements, while the latter helps students refine their proposals. Reviewer expertise is relevant to assessing the substance of business plans. Institutional preliminary selection and national selection involve different implementing parties and authorities. These arrangements link proposal preparation, selection decisions, and subsequent entrepreneurship development needs.

SEDP funding provides resources for business development while establishing accountability requirements. The 2026 guidelines provide for two-stage funding disbursement through higher education institutions: 90% in the first installment and the remaining 10% following submission of the required progress report (Sukino et al., 2026). Financial assistance recipients from Undiksha and UMI reported that program monitoring involved administrative reporting and regular mentoring by faculty members and mentors. Entrepreneurship development activities covered product development, marketing, finance, and business strategies. Research on EcoStove documented product development and marketing support, along with project documentation and innovation management (Nurjanah, 2025). Under program requirements, progress reports serve to document implementation and account for the use of funds. Mentoring provides technical guidance to address the difficulties student entrepreneurs experience. Funding, reporting, and mentoring are therefore interrelated activities with distinct functions and outputs.

SEDP implementation involves institutions and individuals with different responsibilities and competencies. The Directorate of Learning and Student Affairs administers program provisions and national recipient selection. Higher education institutions prepare applicants and deliver entrepreneurship development services. Reviewers assess proposal eligibility, while faculty members and mentors support students in product development, marketing, and business management. The KMBK official's account of reviewer qualifications indicates

the need for expertise during selection. Student accounts of regular mentoring describe the role of specialized guidance during program implementation. Hierarchical integration among implementing institutions, decision-making rules, and the selection of implementing personnel are distinct components of policy implementation structure (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1983). Clear responsibilities are necessary to administer selection decisions, manage financial assistance, and deliver entrepreneurship support within institutional authority. Coordination among implementers also helps align administrative requirements with students' business development needs.

Progress reporting and assessment generate information for accountability and entrepreneurship development services. Administrative reports document program activities and the use of financial assistance. Mentoring allows students and mentors to discuss product development, marketing, finance, and business management problems. Administrative information concerns compliance with program requirements, whereas accounts of business difficulties inform the need for consultation. Compliance and implementer responsiveness are related aspects of policy implementation (Grindle, 2017). Within SEDP, information on venture development provides a basis for determining mentoring content and intensity according to each group's needs. University administrators need to align follow-up support with problems reported by students and the mentoring resources available. Progress assessment thus provides information relevant to accountability and identifying entrepreneurship development needs. Information on funding utilization and marketing difficulties should be considered based on their respective roles in assessing progress.

SEDP implementation outcomes must be distinguished according to their administrative and substantive dimensions. Recipient selection, funding disbursement, report collection, and evaluation activities constitute implementing-agency outputs. Students' compliance with program requirements concerns target-group behavior, while their ability to use mentoring to develop their businesses represents a distinct substantive outcome. The policy implementation framework differentiates implementing-agency outputs, target-group compliance, and policy impacts (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1983). Research on community empowerment similarly distinguishes material assistance from improvements in recipient capacity (Rasyid et al., 2025). The 2026 SEDP Guidelines include the Indonesian Student Entrepreneurship Expo as a promotional and networking activity scheduled after the study's data collection period (Sukino et al., 2026). The exhibition offers students an opportunity to introduce products to prospective partners. Its contribution to business development depends on subsequent action by participating entrepreneurs. Although SEDP establishes instruments from selection to evaluation, substantive outcomes depend on higher education institutions' capacity to deliver services responsive to student venture needs.

C. Nonstatutory Variables: Institutional Capacity in Higher Education and Student Venture Sustainability

Nonstatutory variables affecting SEDP implementation include socioeconomic and technological conditions, stakeholder support, implementer commitment, and support from authorized officials ([Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1983](#)). The Head of the Student Affairs Working Team explained that ministerial leadership support was provided through regulations, guidelines, funding, information systems, and an administrative team. At the university level, entrepreneurship development support is associated with organizational experience, coordination between student affairs units and faculty members or mentors, and business incubator services. Institutional characteristics and implementer responsiveness also influence policy implementation ([Grindle, 2017](#)). Differences in organizational capacity are relevant to analyzing support for student ventures. The experiences of Undiksha and UMI provide evidence of institutional arrangements and entrepreneurship services. Their respective administrators described the resources and service structures available at each university.

Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha has provided entrepreneurship development activities since 2010 through the Student Entrepreneurship Program, training, and business incubation. These activities preceded the introduction of SEDP in 2022. Undiksha administrators also reported supplementary funding and support for product development, marketing, and business model refinement among SEDP recipients. This history demonstrates the institution's experience in organizing entrepreneurship development services. Supplementary funding provides additional financial resources, while technical guidance supports students' product development and business management. Research on higher education entrepreneurial ecosystems has identified relationships between material, social, and cultural factors and student innovation ([Hindarsah et al., 2025](#)). Research on university incubators in Germany has also highlighted organizational capacity, leadership, and partnerships in developing entrepreneurship services ([Karahana, 2024](#)). At Undiksha, institutional experience and resource support remain relevant to addressing specific needs, particularly because administrators continued to report marketing difficulties and challenges in maintaining venture operations.

Universitas Muslim Indonesia provides SEDP support by coordinating its student affairs unit and business incubator. Administrators reported that the incubator offers consultation on proposal preparation, product development, marketing, business legal requirements, and financial management. The student affairs unit handles program administration, while the incubator provides specialized business advisory services. These arrangements support students during proposal preparation and business operations. Research on university incubators in India found that general support and access to physical and intellectual capital did not consistently meet the specialized requirements of

circular economy startups ([Kambanou et al., 2025](#)). Aligning services with recipient needs is an important consideration in institutional capacity. Undiksha has prior entrepreneurship development experience and provides supplementary funding, whereas UMI coordinates between student affairs administration and incubator consultation. These arrangements illustrate different forms of institutional support for SEDP recipients, shaped by each university's resources and organizational structure.

Student venture development also requires market information and relationships with external stakeholders. Faculty members and mentors provide internal guidance, while industry participants, prospective customers, and entrepreneurship networks support marketing development and business partnerships. The 2026 SEDP Guidelines include the Indonesian Student Entrepreneurship Expo as an opportunity to promote products and engage prospective partners ([Sukino et al., 2026](#)). Students need the capacity to follow up on customer information and potential partnerships identified through networking activities. Research on tourism governance has emphasized the importance of cross-sector coordination and external stakeholder participation ([Syahrial et al., 2025](#)). Research on plantation standard implementation identified substantive achievements among some recipients alongside institutional support constraints ([Azizah et al., 2026](#)). These studies provide comparative perspectives on coordination and institutional support. For SEDP, external relationships matter for market information and business opportunities, while higher education institutions provide guidance that helps students pursue those opportunities.

Budget efficiency measures are associated with the coverage of entrepreneurship development activities, the number of financial assistance recipients, and SEDP monitoring arrangements. A synthesis of informant accounts across institutions identified constraints on entrepreneurship development activities, adjustments in recipient numbers, reduced field-monitoring intensity, and increased reliance on online reporting. On-site monitoring enables administrators to discuss business problems directly with recipients, whereas online reporting provides information about program activities and funding utilization. These mechanisms serve different information needs. Policy implementation resources include personnel, competencies, information, authority, and facilities in addition to funding ([Edwards, 1980](#)). Research on online tax collection in Kolaka found that implementer commitment coexisted with personnel and facility constraints affecting implementation outcomes ([Said et al., 2024](#)). In SEDP, budget constraints and operational adjustments are associated with administrators' capacity to provide entrepreneurship development services and obtain information on venture progress. The allocation of online reporting and on-site monitoring activities should reflect the problems students experience. Technical mentoring

needs remain important when field monitoring is adjusted to available resources.

Institutional responsiveness involves using venture development information to determine appropriate forms of support. Student accounts of marketing and time-management difficulties indicate a need for services aligned with operational problems. Technology serves different functions in customer communication, sales management, and online program reporting. Sales information supports market development, whereas program reports provide administrative monitoring and accountability information. Leadership support and coordination among student affairs units, faculty members, mentors, and business incubators are institutional components of service provision. Implementer responsiveness involves adapting activities to target-group needs ([Grindle, 2017](#)). At universities implementing SEDP, aligning consultation services with issues related to products, customers, costs, and academic responsibilities is an important aspect of entrepreneurship development support. Information on students' difficulties is necessary for aligning mentoring content and delivery with venture development needs.

Continuity of entrepreneurship development services becomes an institutional requirement after the SEDP funding and reporting periods end. Faculty members and mentors provide guidance during program implementation. University entrepreneurship units and business incubators can provide consultation during subsequent stages of venture development. Information on business operations, sales, and financial management is needed to identify further advisory requirements. Program administrators and service units must coordinate to maintain students' access to guidance appropriate to their operational challenges. Research on community empowerment distinguishes the benefits of material assistance from building recipient capacity ([Rasyid et al., 2025](#)). For SEDP, post-funding entrepreneurship support is associated with institutions' capacity to sustain services for student ventures. Coordination among service providers matters because product development, marketing, and financial management needs may change after students complete their program obligations.

Student venture sustainability is associated with the ability to maintain business operations and access entrepreneurship support after funding ends. A synthesis of SEDP administrators' accounts identified limited mentoring duration and recipients' difficulties expanding markets and maintaining their ventures after financial assistance. Business management needs include customer relationship development, cash flow management, product adaptation, and consultation appropriate to changing business conditions. Research on fishing community empowerment highlighted the importance of continued mentoring and monitoring after providing material assistance ([Hidayat et al., 2025](#)). Research involving university-incubated agribusinesses in Kenya found relationships between necessity-driven motivation, behavioral characteristics, and economic, social,

and environmental sustainability. Opportunity-driven motivation did not have a statistically significant effect in that study's analysis (Nakiganda et al., 2025). Longitudinal startup research also identified founder commitment, teamwork, and effective incubator mentoring as key factors in business resilience (Utomo et al., 2025). These findings underscore the importance of entrepreneurial capabilities and institutional support. In SEDP implementation, conditions associated with venture sustainability include business management, market access, and continued mentoring after funding. Distinguishing continued business operations from multidimensional sustainability is important for identifying appropriate information for post-program monitoring.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

SEDP implementation challenges include differences in venture development stages, technical difficulties, and students' capability development needs. Entrepreneurial interest and activities have increased, but marketing, resource management, and balancing time between business and academic responsibilities remain challenges. Early Stage and Growth Stage ventures require entrepreneurship development services aligned with product readiness and market conditions. The policy structure establishes requirements for information dissemination, selection, financial assistance, mentoring, reporting, and evaluation. These instruments regulate authority and accountability, while developing business capabilities requires students to apply entrepreneurship support to operational problems. SEDP implementation is therefore associated with the ability to use selection and monitoring information to make mentoring decisions according to student needs.

Nonstatutory variables indicate differences in institutional support among implementing universities. Undiksha has provided entrepreneurship development services since before SEDP and offers supplementary funding. UMI coordinates student affairs administration with business incubator consultation. A synthesis of accounts across institutions links budget efficiency measures to adjustments in mentoring coverage and monitoring. Administrators also reported the need for continued support to address marketing difficulties and maintain business operations after financial assistance ends. The three groups of implementation variables explain relationships among students' needs, SEDP policy arrangements, and institutional service capacity. The findings show the importance of integrating administrative implementation with entrepreneurship development services that respond to students' needs. Venture sustainability is associated with operational conditions supported by financial management, customer access, and continuity of university services. The institutional arrangements identified at the two universities illustrate how organizational capacity and the relevance of consultation services relate to students' business development needs.

The Directorate of Learning and Student Affairs should strengthen the use of progress assessment findings to determine follow-up mentoring appropriate to Early Stage and Growth Stage ventures. Venture development indicators should cover product readiness, marketing, financial management, and business plan implementation. National minimum indicator requirements could help universities identify the needs of individual venture groups. University administrators should assign faculty members or mentors responsibility for entrepreneurship development, coordinate incubator and practitioner services, and schedule activities around students' academic obligations. Online reporting should be used to collect administrative and progress information, while on-site monitoring should prioritize problems requiring intensive technical consultation. This division of functions would support allocating mentoring resources according to business needs. Early Stage assessments should emphasize product readiness and customer understanding, whereas Growth Stage assessments should focus on marketing development and business management.

The ministry and higher education institutions should develop post-funding support through incubator consultations, business networks, and follow-up activities tied to promotional events such as the Indonesian Student Entrepreneurship Expo. Post-funding monitoring could be scheduled, for example, six and twelve months after assistance ends, using indicators of operational status, sales, cash flow, and additional mentoring needs. This information would support service adjustments and improvements in subsequent program implementation. Further longitudinal research is needed to evaluate venture development after funding. Comparative research involving additional universities is also necessary to examine variations in organizational capacity and mentoring arrangements. Assessments of continued business operations could be complemented by measures of economic, social, and environmental sustainability to examine these distinct dimensions in greater detail.

REFERENCES

- Azhari, R. R., Sumarno, S., & Asmit, B. (2025). Pengaruh Program Pembinaan Mahasiswa Wirausaha terhadap Kewirausahaan Mahasiswa. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*, 8(7), 8440-8446. <https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v8i7.8647>
- Azizah, N., Prakoso, C. T., & Saipul, S. (2026). Implementation of the RSPO International Standard: Evaluation of Substantive Success and Systemic Constraints for Oil Palm Smallholders. *SIGn Journal of Social Science*, 6(2), 423-442. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjss.v6i2.669>
- Chai, M., & Soelaiman, L. (2024). Entrepreneurial Intentions and Readiness for Startup among P2MW Grant Recipients. *Jurnal Ekonomi*, 29(2), 185-201. <https://doi.org/10.24912/je.v29i2.2107>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (Third Edition). Sage. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=Ykruxor10cYC>

- Dewobroto, W. S., Kuswinardi, J. W., Safitri, N., Andarwati, S., Ramadhan, A. N., Nasir, M., Haryanto, E. S., Laily, N., Wicaksono, R., Lestari, U., Huda, A., Wiguna, A. T., Ramadhan, A. R., Rahman, F., Arfiah, F., Indra, H. S., Nasrullah, H., Fariha, H. I., & Wahyuni, S. (2025). *Laporan Pelaksanaan Program Pembinaan Mahasiswa Wirausaha (P2MW) Tahun 2024*. Direktorat Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan, pada Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1uLb2mpEzdjjcn6A53SVe1QDqv a1MYsy3>
- Edwards, G. C. (1980). *Implementing Public Policy*. Congressional Quarterly Press. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=nQtHAAAAMAAJ>
- Efendi, S., & Yana, E. (2026). Analisis Peran P2MW dalam Meningkatkan Orientasi Kewirausahaan Mahasiswa. *Edunomic: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Ekonomi Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan*, 14(1), 92-102. <https://doi.org/10.33603/ejpe.v14i1.11851>
- Grindle, M. S. (2017). One: Policy Content and Context in Implementation. In M. S. Grindle (Ed.), *Politics and Policy Implementation in the Third World* (Introduction, pp. 3-34). Princeton University Press. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=X4UrDgAAQBAJ>
- Hidayat, R., Zahratunnisa, F., Azis, L. A., & Amalia, D. R. (2025). Fishing Community Empowerment: An Effectiveness Analysis of a Fishing Gear Assistance Program in Palewai Village. *SIGn Journal of Social Science*, 5(2), 132-148. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjss.v5i2.451>
- Hindarsah, I., Kania, T. N., Diawati, P., & Fahrudin, A. (2025). Strengthening the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem through Innovation: A Case Study of Pasundan University. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies*, 8(1), 1760-1769. <https://doi.org/10.53894/ijirss.v8i1.4801>
- Kambanou, M. L., Hajoary, P. K., & Lindfors, A. (2025). Supporting Start-Ups in the Circular Economy: An Analysis of University-Led Incubators in India. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 29(3), 997-1012. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jiec.70032>
- Karahan, M. (2024). Advancing Sustainable Entrepreneurial Universities: Sustainability Transformations of University Business Incubators in Germany. *Small Business Economics*, 63(2), 575-609. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-023-00860-5>
- Mazmanian, D. A., & Sabatier, P. A. (1983). *Implementation and Public Policy*. Scott, Foresman and Company. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=TqyJ_8m4gYAC
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (Third Edition). Sage Publications. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=p0wXBAAAQBAJ>
- Nakiganda, R. G., Okello, D. O., & Bett, H. K. (2025). Factors Influencing the Sustainability of University-Incubated Agribusinesses: The Role of Stigma Failure, Personality and Motivation in Kenya. *Cogent Business & Management*, 12(1), 2447410. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2447410>

- Nurjanah, E. (2025). Manajemen Proyek Inovasi Mahasiswa (Studi Kasus EcoStove dalam Program Pembinaan Wirausaha P2MW 2024). *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen dan Akuntansi*, 8(2), 327-335. <https://doi.org/10.57093/metansi.v8i2.383>
- Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 2 of 2022 on National Entrepreneurship Development for 2021–2024 (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2022 Number 3). <https://peraturan.go.id/id/perpres-no-2-tahun-2022>
- Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 12 of 2025 on the National Medium-Term Development Plan for 2025–2029 (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2025 Number 19). <https://peraturan.go.id/id/perpres-no-12-tahun-2025>
- Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 38 of 2026 on National Entrepreneurship Development (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2026 Number 74). <https://peraturan.go.id/id/perpres-no-38-tahun-2026>
- Rasyid, A., Pulubuhu, D. A. T., & Muhammad, R. (2025). The Concept of Community Empowerment versus Community Advancement: A Comparative Study in the Context of Social Development in Indonesia. *SIGn Journal of Social Science*, 5(2), 97-112. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjss.v5i2.430>
- Restanti, I. Y. A., & Pradikto, S. (2025). Pengaruh Keikutsertaan Program P2MW dan Manajemen Keuangan terhadap Jiwa Kewirausahaan Mahasiswa di Universitas PGRI Wiranegara. *Jurnal Manajemen Riset Inovasi*, 3(1), 71-84. <https://doi.org/10.55606/mri.v3i1.3444>
- Said, A. L., Hariyadi, S., & Agusman, Y. (2024). Implementation of an Online-Based Policy for Local Tax and Retribution Collection. *SIGn Journal of Social Science*, 5(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjss.v5i1.345>
- Sugiyono, S. (2025). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D* (Edisi Kedua). Alfabeta. <https://cvalfabeta.com/product/metode-penelitian-kuantitatif-kualitatif>
- Sukino, S., Jobih, J., Ramadhan, A. N., Revindasari, F., Wiwin, J., Nasir, M., Safitri, N., Rustiadi, S., Dewobroto, W. S., Huda, A., Wiguna, A. T., Arfiah, F., Nasrullah, H., Fariha, H. I., & Fajriyah, S. A. (2026). *Panduan Program Pembinaan Mahasiswa Wirausaha Tahun 2026*. Direktorat Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan, pada Kementerian Pendidikan Tinggi, Sains, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia. https://p2mw.kemdiktisaintek.go.id/uploads/downloads/panduan_program_pembinaan_mahasiswa_wirausaha_tahun_2026_1771403502.pdf
- Sukino, S., Jobih, J., Ramadhan, A. N., Wiwin, J., Nasir, M., Laily, N., Safitri, N., Wicaksono, R., Lestari, U., Dewobroto, W. S., Huda, A., Ramadhan, A., Wiguna, A. T., Rahman, F., Arfiah, F., Nasrullah, H., & Fariha, H. I. (2025). *Panduan Program Pembinaan Mahasiswa Wirausaha (P2MW) Tahun 2025*. Direktorat Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan, pada Kementerian Pendidikan Tinggi, Sains, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1BLsuQUTG7D6avZ642q60c9mlmxpUOK58>

- Syahrial, S., Mufti, M. I., Hakim, A., Wijaya, A., & Anjarsari, H. (2025). The Effectiveness of Public Policy in the Management of Sustainable Marine Culinary Tourism. *SIGn Journal of Social Science*, 6(1), 88-112. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjss.v6i1.528>
- Syarifah, T., Maftukhah, W. L., Ardina, Z., & Rahmawati, A. (2024). Analisis Penerapan Hibah Produktif melalui Pembinaan Mahasiswa Wirausaha (P2MW) 2023. *Istismar: Jurnal Kajian dan Penelitian Ekonomi dan Bisnis Islam*, 7(2), 69-86. <https://doi.org/10.32764/istismar.v7i2.4232>
- Toyib, M., Yulaini, E., Rachmawati, D. W., & Pramika, D. (2024). Analisis Tingkat Kesulitan Penyusunan Proposal Program Pembinaan Mahasiswa Wirausaha (P2MW) di Universitas PGRI Palembang. *Jurnal Neraca: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Ilmu Ekonomi Akuntansi*, 8(2), 178-194. <https://doi.org/10.31851/neraca.v8i2.17791>
- Utomo, H., Wirawan, S. K., & Dharmawangsa, S. A. (2025). Fostering Resilience of Prospective Startup Businesses: A Longitudinal Study. *Cogent Business & Management*, 12(1), 2501207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2025.2501207>