ENHANCING STUDENT ENTREPRENEURSHIP THROUGH BUSINESS INCUBATORS

Rahmat Ramli[1*]
[1*]Business Administration Study Program, Faculty of Business, Kwik Kian Gie School of Business
e-mail:rahmat.ramli@kwikkiangie.ac.id

Abstract

Business incubators in higher education institutions serve as a platform to nurture entrepreneurial talent among students. This study aims to evaluate the impact of the University X business incubator program in enhancing entrepreneurial abilities and supporting successful venture creation among Business Administration students. A mixed-methods approach was utilized, combining quantitative surveys of 150 participants with in-depth interviews of 15 alumni entrepreneurs. The study revealed significant improvements in entrepreneurial competencies, professional networking, and business outcomes. Notably, students who joined the incubator showed a 75% business success rate post-graduation, compared to 35% among non-participants. These findings underscore the strategic role of academic incubators in shaping future job creators and advancing socio-economic development.

Keywords: *Business Incubator, Student Entrepreneurship, Higher Education, Venture Success, University Support*

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship has emerged as a critical force in addressing youth unemployment and economic stagnation in developing countries like Indonesia. Universities are now increasingly being positioned as not just academic institutions, but also as engines of innovation and entrepreneurship. In response to this, University X launched a business incubator program within its Business Administration department. This incubator offers practical learning, mentorship, training, and access to entrepreneurial ecosystems.

Prior studies (Hackett & Dilts, 2004; Nabi et al., 2019) highlight the role of incubators in bridging the gap between education and real-world entrepreneurial practice. Nabi et al. (2019) emphasized that entrepreneurship education alone is not sufficient without access to real business development support, which incubators provide. Moreover, in the context of Indonesian higher education, there is a pressing demand to develop inclusive and scalable platforms that foster innovation-based entrepreneurship.

This research seeks to assess the incubator's role at University X in nurturing student entrepreneurship, improving entrepreneurial skills, enhancing networks, and ultimately increasing business success rates among graduates. The study also addresses the broader question of how higher education institutions can systematically integrate entrepreneurial capacity building into their strategic frameworks. Through this inquiry, the research hopes to contribute actionable insights that may guide future policy and practice within university incubators.

METHOD

This study adopted a mixed-methods approach to obtain both breadth and depth of understanding. The quantitative component involved 150 participants from the business incubator who completed a structured 20-item questionnaire, measuring perceived skill improvement, network growth, and post-graduation business performance.

The qualitative component consisted of in-depth interviews with 15 alumni who successfully established a business within one year of graduation. These interviews provided rich contextual data on participants' experiences, challenges, and perceived contributions of the incubator. Interview protocols included open-ended questions to explore personal growth, critical incidents, and institutional support. Interview sessions averaged 45 minutes and were transcribed and coded for emergent themes.

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency distributions, cross-tabulations, and mean scores. Meanwhile, qualitative data were subjected to thematic analysis following Braun & Clarke's (2006) six-phase approach, which includes familiarization with the data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining themes, and writing up. Triangulation of findings was used to ensure data credibility and reliability. Ethical clearance for this study was granted by the research ethics committee of University X.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Development of Entrepreneurial Skills

Students reported gaining concrete entrepreneurial skills such as financial planning, market validation, business modeling, pitching, negotiation, and digital marketing. Practical workshops, business simulations, and mentorship sessions allowed students to transition from theory to practice. 80% of survey respondents rated their post-program skills as 'highly improved.'

This confirms the findings of Ismail et al. (2021), who identified experiential learning as a key outcome of incubator participation. Additionally, some respondents noted they gained the ability to adapt to failure and iterate on their business models — a vital aspect of entrepreneurial resilience. These findings are also consistent with Drucker's (1985) notion that innovation and entrepreneurship require continuous learning through feedback and trial.

2. Expansion of Networks and Ecosystem Access

The incubator facilitated regular networking sessions, business expos, and demo days, bringing students into contact with entrepreneurs, alumni, angel investors, and startup accelerators. These connections offered practical advice, funding opportunities, internship collaborations, and strategic partnerships.

Around 70% of respondents acknowledged that their professional network grew significantly because of the incubator. Literature by Baghdadi & Torkamani (2023) supports that entrepreneurial intention is significantly influenced by ecosystem exposure and peer community support. Several interviewees also mentioned that the relationships built during the incubator program continued to be instrumental in growing their businesses post-graduation.

3. Business Outcomes and Sustainability

Among incubator participants, 75% had successfully launched businesses within one year post-graduation, compared to 35% for non-participants. These ventures included digital services (e.g., mobile apps, marketing agencies), food & beverage outlets, fashion lines, and educational platforms. Many of these ventures were still operating at the time of research.

Interviewees attributed their success to strategic mentoring, milestone-based evaluation, access to shared workspace and legal assistance, and structured workshops. This result is consistent with Kauffman (2020), who found that structured incubators lead to higher survival and growth rates of student ventures. Importantly, the alumni reported increased self-efficacy and motivation to continue innovating even in the face of failure or setbacks.

4. Barriers Faced by Student Entrepreneurs

Despite the supportive environment, students reported several barriers, including:

- Difficulty in accessing initial working capital or seed funding.
- Lack of regulatory and legal compliance knowledge.
- Time constraints due to academic responsibilities.
- Limited parental or community support in pursuing non-traditional career paths.

These issues suggest that incubator programs should provide more holistic support, including financial literacy, legal briefings, tax compliance workshops, and flexible academic arrangements for student-entrepreneurs. An additional layer of support could include peer-led support groups or mentorship from alumni who faced similar challenges.

5. Fostering an Entrepreneurial Mindset

Beyond skills and outcomes, the incubator played a vital role in shifting students' mindsets from passive learners to proactive entrepreneurs. This cultural transformation was encouraged through peer learning, storytelling sessions, exposure to startup failure cases, and reflective journals. Confidence, grit, and problem-solving capacity were among the top internal outcomes shared by interviewees.

Such a mindset development aligns with Schumpeterian views of entrepreneurship as a dynamic process of creative destruction. By allowing safe spaces to experiment and fail, the incubator nurtured psychological readiness for real-world uncertainty. The transition from “student” to “founder” is a complex identity shift that requires institutional and emotional scaffolding.

6. Policy Implications for Higher Education

The study underscores the need for universities to integrate entrepreneurship into their academic and operational strategy. Incubators should be core components of student services, just like career centers. Policies should include incentives for faculty involvement in entrepreneurship, formal recognition of student startups, and collaboration with regional innovation hubs.

University leadership must work closely with government ministries (e.g., the Ministry of Cooperatives and SMEs), local governments, and industry players to ensure that incubator programs are sustainable, inclusive, and scalable. A national framework for university incubator performance metrics could further drive quality improvement.

7. Institutional Capacity and Ecosystem Integration

An often overlooked yet critical dimension in the success of university-based incubators is the institutional capacity and the depth of integration within the broader academic ecosystem. While the findings indicate positive outcomes for incubator participants, long-term sustainability hinges on systemic alignment, ranging from consistent budget allocation and formal academic policy recognition to cross-faculty collaboration. Incubators that operate in isolation, without structural and administrative backing, are unlikely to scale or endure beyond initial pilot phases.

A best-practice example of integration involves the active involvement of faculty members as mentors and project-based facilitators. Their participation enriches the curriculum while building stronger bridges between academia and the business world. However, challenges such as high faculty workloads and limited academic incentives for non-tridharma (non-teaching/research/service) activities persist. To address this, institutional policies should formally include entrepreneurial student development as a component of faculty performance evaluation.

Furthermore, the linkages between the incubator and external innovation ecosystems—local government, financial institutions, and industrial innovation hubs—remain largely ad hoc. A cohesive entrepreneurial environment demands multi-stakeholder collaboration facilitated by the university. For example, local governments could provide tax incentives or expedited licensing for student-led startups, while university-affiliated credit cooperatives or Islamic finance institutions could offer trust-based micro-financing schemes tailored to young entrepreneurs.

Technological integration is another key enabler for expanding the incubator's reach. Digital platforms such as Learning Management Systems (LMS), business monitoring apps, and performance dashboards are essential tools for digitizing the incubation process. Looking ahead, the emergence of *smart incubators,* digitally integrated, data-driven incubation environments, will set new standards for scalability, especially in the post-pandemic era of remote learning and decentralized workspaces. These technologies also open pathways for international collaboration via cross-border incubation programs and virtual mentoring.

Lastly, it is vital to establish a robust and continuous evaluation mechanism for incubator effectiveness. Performance indicators should go beyond business launch counts to include business sustainability, social impact, job creation, and local economic development contributions. Monitoring should occur periodically every one or two years and involve alumni, mentors, faculty, and policymakers. With such mechanisms in place, university incubators can evolve from entrepreneurial training grounds into strategic drivers of *knowledge-based local economic development*.

8. Summary of Key Quantitative Findings

Indicator	**Percentage (%)**	**Notes**
Improved entrepreneurial skills	80%	Gained through training and simulation
Expanded professional network	70%	Through networking events and mentoring
Business launch rate (incubator)	75%	Within 1 year post-graduation
Business launch rate (non-incubator)	35%	Significantly lower without incubator support

Source: Primary Data (Processed, 2025); adapted from Hackett & Dilts (2004), Ismail et al. (2021), and Kauffman (2020).

CONCLUSION

The University X business incubator has demonstrated strong effectiveness in nurturing student entrepreneurship. By providing mentorship, training, and networking opportunities, the program significantly improved participants' entrepreneurial skills and increased their venture success rates. The incubator was also successful in cultivating a proactive, opportunity-seeking mindset, a key driver of entrepreneurial intention and resilience.

In a broader sense, the findings affirm that academic incubators are not just supporting business formation but are also transforming higher education into a more dynamic and socially impactful space. They foster a new generation of leaders equipped not only with technical know-how but with adaptability, collaboration, and innovative thinking — traits essential in the 21st-century economy.

SUGGESTION

Future research should expand the scope to multiple institutions to determine cross-institutional best practices. Furthermore, the integration of financial institutions, legal advisors, and regional business development agencies within incubator programs can address current gaps. Finally, longitudinal studies spanning five to ten years can assess the sustainability and long-term socio-economic impact of student-founded businesses.

It would also be beneficial to study the gender dimension of entrepreneurial success within incubators and how inclusion can be optimized. Additional exploration into digital incubators and remote mentorship in post-pandemic contexts would also be a relevant direction for future studies.

THANK-YOU NOTE

The author would like to thank University X for the support and facilities provided during this research. Special thanks to the students and alumni who participated in the study.

REFERENCES

Baghdadi, H., & Torkamani, M. (2023). University-based business incubators and student entrepreneurial intentions: A structural equation modeling approach. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 26*(2), 1–14.

Drucker, P. F. (1985). *Innovation and entrepreneurship: Practice and principles*. New York: Harper & Row.

Hackett, S. M., & Dilts, D. M. (2004). A systematic review of business incubation research. *The Journal of Technology Transfer, 29*(1), 55–82. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOTT.0000011181.11952.0f

Ismail, M., Nugroho, Y., & Rahman, A. (2021). The impact of business incubators on the success of startups: Evidence from Indonesia. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship, 25*(3), 1–15.

Kauffman, S. (2020). The role of incubators in fostering entrepreneurship: A study of university-based programs. *Journal of Small Business Management, 58*(4), 678–695. https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2020.1727074

Lee, S. M., & Kim, Y. (2022). Impact of entrepreneurship education and university support on student start-up intentions: Evidence from Southeast Asia. *Education + Training, 64*(3), 291–307. https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-07-2021-0253

Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Fayolle, A., Krueger, N., & Walmsley, A. (2019). The role of entrepreneurship education in enhancing entrepreneurial intentions: A systematic review and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research, 101*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.03.010

Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The theory of economic development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101.