



Agustinus Purna Irawan <agustinus@untar.ac.id>

[IJTech] Revise initial screening manuscript #IE-2464

2 messages

IJTech <noreply@ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id>

Tue, Mar 12, 2019 at 8:16 AM

Reply-To: "noreply@ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id" <noreply@ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id>

To: linag@ft.untar.ac.id

Cc: maslin.kl@utm.my, yuri@ie.ui.ac.id, habibahharon.kl@utm.my, j.reyes@derby.ac.uk, asrilsyamas@yahoo.com, fransjusuf42@gmail.com, agustinus@untar.ac.id

*Screening result : Revise*

Dear Mrs. Lina GOZALI,

I am writing to you regarding the manuscript **#IE-2464** entitled "**BUSINESS INCUBATOR PERFORMANCE FACTORS OF INDONESIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES** " which you submitted to International Journal of Technology (IJTech).

After we made an initial screening we found some problem including:

1. Unsuitable Format
2. *We use the font of Times New Roman size 12 pt 2. After making a revision of your font, please reduce the pages, the maximum of the paper length 10 pages*

We recommend that this manuscript be revised in order to proceed to peer review.

You must respond to this revise and resubmit request before **19 Mar 2019**, after which point we will presume that you have withdrawn your submission from International Journal of Technology (IJTech) Online System.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Nyoman Suwartha
nsuwartha@eng.ui.ac.id
Managing Editor
International Journal of Technology (IJTech)
p-ISSN: 2086-9614
e-ISSN: 2087-2100
<http://ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id/>

IJTech is currently indexed in SCOPUS and Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI) Thomson Reuters

IJTech <noreply@ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id>

Tue, Mar 12, 2019 at 2:59 PM

Reply-To: "noreply@ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id" <noreply@ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id>

To: linag@ft.untar.ac.id

Cc: maslin.kl@utm.my, yuri@ie.ui.ac.id, habibahharon.kl@utm.my, j.reyes@derby.ac.uk, asrilsyamas@yahoo.com, fransjusuf42@gmail.com, agustinus@untar.ac.id

*Screening result : Revise*

Dear Mrs. Lina GOZALI,

I am writing to you regarding the manuscript **#IE-2464** entitled "**BUSINESS INCUBATOR PERFORMANCE FACTORS OF INDONESIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES** " which you submitted to International Journal of Technology (IJTech).

After we made an initial screening we found some problem including:

1. High Similarity/Plagiarism Rate


We recommend that this manuscript be revised in order to proceed to peer review.

You must respond to this revise and resubmit request before **19 Mar 2019**, after which point we will presume that you have withdrawn your submission from International Journal of Technology (IJTech) Online System.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Nyoman Suwartha
nsuwartha@eng.ui.ac.id
Managing Editor
International Journal of Technology (IJTech)
p-ISSN: 2086-9614
e-ISSN: 2087-2100
<http://ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id/>

[Quoted text hidden]

 **2464.pdf**
3286K



Agustinus Purna Irawan <agustinus@untar.ac.id>

[IJTech] Editor Decision

1 message

IJTech <noreply@ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id>

Wed, Nov 6, 2019 at 4:33 PM

Reply-To: "noreply@ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id" <noreply@ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id>

To: linag@ft.untar.ac.id

Cc: maslin.kl@utm.my, yuri@ie.ui.ac.id, habibahharon.kl@utm.my, j.reyes@derby.ac.uk, asrilsyamas@yahoo.com, fransjusuf42@gmail.com, agustinus@untar.ac.id



Decision Result : Revise

Dear **Mrs. Lina GOZALI**

We have finished the review and made decision on your manuscript entitled [**BUSINESS INCUBATOR PERFORMANCE FACTORS OF INDONESIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES**] which was submitted to International Journal of Technology.

We have decided that your manuscript **Need to be Revised**

We also send you the review result from the reviewers. Here is the detail review result:

Notes from Editor:

Please revise according to the reviewer's comment and it is suggested to include at least 2 relevant IJTech articles as references

Reviewer (1)

Introduction:

The introduction does not explain clearly how importance of the research conducted. The objectives of the research should be describe on the introduction

Methodology:

Although the methodology approached is quite clear, but there is lack of explanation why the researcher choose that method. It should be supported by literature review.

Results and Discussion:

Actually the results of the study are very interesting, but in this part still lack of discussion.

References:

Its good

Other:

Originality	4 (above average)
Technical	4 (above average)
Methodology	3 (average)
Readability	3 (average)
Practicability	4 (above average)
Organization	4 (above average)
Importance	4 (above average)

Additional Comment:

Attachment File:

-

Reviewer (2)

Introduction:

1. Abstract in the article is different from the abstract given on the first page of manuscript submission.
2. Gap of research is unclear.
3. List of four measurements by Kaplan and Norton in last para of introduction is not uniformed using double quote for learning and growth perspective, non double quote for other three perspectives.
4. Figure 1 was not referred in text of manuscript without any explanation.
5. Literature is lacking to explain on the variables/attributes measured/assessed.

Methodology:

1. Provide the survey question/survey structure in Appendix or in main manuscripts.
2. The validation of methodology is not explained.

Results and Discussion:

The findings should relate back with the objectives and previous researches in literature reviews.

References:

Accepted.

Other:

Originality	4 (<i>above average</i>)
Technical	3 (<i>average</i>)
Methodology	3 (<i>average</i>)
Readability	4 (<i>above average</i>)
Practicability	4 (<i>above average</i>)
Organization	4 (<i>above average</i>)
Importance	4 (<i>above average</i>)

Additional Comment:

Minor revision.

Attachment File:

-

Please login into application <http://ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id/login> for more detail.

You must respond to this revise and resubmit request before **13 Nov 2019**, after which point we will presume that you have withdrawn your submission from International Journal of Technology (IJTech) Online System.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Nyoman Suwartha
nsuwartha@eng.ui.ac.id
Managing Editor
International Journal of Technology (IJTech)
p-ISSN : 2086-9614
e-ISSN 2087-2100
<http://ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id/>

IJTech is currently indexed in SCOPUS and Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI) Thomson Reuters



Agustinus Purna Irawan <agustinus@untar.ac.id>

[IJTech] Editor Decision

1 message

IJTech <noreply@ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id>

Fri, Jan 10, 2020 at 4:11 PM

Reply-To: "noreply@ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id" <noreply@ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id>

To: linag@ft.untar.ac.id

Cc: maslin.kl@utm.my, yuri@ie.ui.ac.id, habibahharon.kl@utm.my, j.reyes@derby.ac.uk, asrilsyamas@yahoo.com, fransjusuf42@gmail.com, agustinus@untar.ac.id, benny.tjahjono@coventry.ac.uk, ssusanto@unpar.ac.id, iveline.annemarie@trisakti.ac.id, kiwi.mlw@gmail.com

*Editor Decision on #R1-IE-2464 : Accepted***Ms ID #R1-IE-2464**

Title : PERFORMANCE FACTORS OF SUCCESSFUL BUSINESS INCUBATOR FOR INDONESIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

Author(s) : Lina GOZALI, Maslin Masrom, Yuri Zagloel, Habibah N. Haron, Jose Arturo Garza-Reyes, Astril Syamas, Frans Daywin, Agustinus Irawan, Benny Tjahjono, Sani Susanto, Iveline Anne Marie, Harry Kusuma Aliwarga

Dear **Mrs. Lina GOZALI** ,

Greetings from Depok,

The editorial board is delighted to inform you that your paper entitled "PERFORMANCE FACTORS OF SUCCESSFUL BUSINESS INCUBATOR FOR INDONESIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES" has been accepted to be published on IJTech. At the present, we are conducting further necessary action to complete the publication process.

On behalf of IJTech, we appreciate your intention and willingness to publish your work with IJTech.

Warmest regards,

Dr. Mohammed Ali Berawi
maberawi@eng.ui.ac.id**Editor in Chief**

International Journal of Technology (IJTech)

p-ISSN: 2086-9614

e-ISSN: 2087-2100

<http://ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id/>

IJTech is currently indexed in SCOPUS and Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI) Thomson Reuters



Agustinus Purna Irawan <agustinus@untar.ac.id>

[IJTech] Notification Payment for Publish #IE-2464

2 messages

IJTech <ijtech@eng.ui.ac.id>

Mon, Jan 13, 2020 at 3:10 PM

To: linag@ft.untar.ac.id

Cc: maslin.kl@utm.my, yuri@ie.ui.ac.id, habibahharon.kl@utm.my, j.reyes@derby.ac.uk, asrilsyamas@yahoo.com, fransjusuf42@gmail.com, agustinus@untar.ac.id, benny.tjahjono@coventry.ac.uk, ssusanto@unpar.ac.id, iveline.annemarie@trisakti.ac.id, kiwi.mlw@gmail.com

Dear Mrs. Lina GOZALI,

On behalf of the Editorial Board, We are pleased to inform you that your paper entitled: PERFORMANCE FACTORS OF SUCCESSFUL BUSINESS INCUBATOR FOR INDONESIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES has been accepted to be published in International Journal of Technology (IJTech). **Congratulation!**

In order to ensure the readability and the quality of the journal, Starting from 1st of January 2020, all accepted articles to publish will be subjected to article processing charge (APC) of **US\$ 200 (around IDR. Rp. 2.740.000)** for Regular Publication (Covers the review process, line editing, layouting, DOI deposit, printing, and shipping cost).

You can make a payment via bank transfer (please noted that transfer fees may be additionally charged and become the responsibility of the sender) addressed to :

Bank : Bukopin
Branch : BUKOPIN kas FT UI Depok, Indonesia
Swift Code : **BBUKIDJA**
Acc. Number: **422 105 1810**
Acc. Name: **Nyoman Suwartha,ST.MT.**

We appreciate it if you can confirm your payment (along with the receipt of transfer) no later than 3 days after this email submitted. Any confirmation can be submitted by email to ijtech@eng.ui.ac.id. We look forward to receiving your confirmation at your earliest convenience.

--

Kind regards,
Secretariat IJTech
International Journal of Technology (IJTech)
ISSN : 2086-9614
<http://www.ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id>

Lina Gozali <linag@ft.untar.ac.id>

Wed, Jan 15, 2020 at 12:34 PM

To: IJTECH Journal <ijtech@eng.ui.ac.id>

Cc: Maslin Masrom <maslin.kl@utm.my>, Prof Yuri <yuri@ie.ui.ac.id>, Habibah Haroen <habibahharon.kl@utm.my>, Jose Arturo Garza-Reyes <j.reyes@derby.ac.uk>, Asril Syamas <asrilsyamas@yahoo.com>, Frans Jusuf <fransjusuf42@gmail.com>, Agustinus Purna Irawan <agustinus@untar.ac.id>, benny.tjahjono@coventry.ac.uk, ssusanto@unpar.ac.id, iveline.annemarie@trisakti.ac.id, Kiwi UT <kiwi.mlw@gmail.com>

Dear Prof Editor,

I already made payment of USD 200,- to your bank account.
Please kindly find attached my money receipt of transfer.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Thank you very much.

Best regards,

Lina Gozali

[Quoted text hidden]

Lina Gozali IE 2464 pembayaran 200 usd.pdf
1673K



Agustinus Purna Irawan <agustinus@untar.ac.id>

[IJTech] Editor Decision

1 message

IJTech <noreply@ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id>

Mon, Jan 13, 2020 at 3:11 PM

Reply-To: "noreply@ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id" <noreply@ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id>

To: linag@ft.untar.ac.id

Cc: maslin.kl@utm.my, yuri@ie.ui.ac.id, habibahharon.kl@utm.my, j.reyes@derby.ac.uk, asrilsyamas@yahoo.com, fransjusuf42@gmail.com, agustinus@untar.ac.id, benny.tjahjono@coventry.ac.uk, ssusanto@unpar.ac.id, iveline.annemarie@trisakti.ac.id, kiwi.mlw@gmail.com

*Editor Decision on #R1-IE-2464 : Accepted***Ms ID #R1-IE-2464**

Title : PERFORMANCE FACTORS OF SUCCESSFUL BUSINESS INCUBATOR FOR INDONESIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

Author(s) : Lina GOZALI, Maslin Masrom, Yuri Zagloel, Habibah N. Haron, Jose Arturo Garza-Reyes, Astril Syamas, Frans Daywin, Agustinus Irawan, Benny Tjahjono, Sani Susanto, Iveline Anne Marie, Harry Kusuma Aliwarga

Dear **Mrs. Lina GOZALI** ,

Greetings from Depok,

The editorial board is delighted to inform you that your paper entitled "PERFORMANCE FACTORS OF SUCCESSFUL BUSINESS INCUBATOR FOR INDONESIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES" has been accepted to be published on IJTech. At the present, we are conducting further necessary action to complete the publication process.

On behalf of IJTech, we appreciate your intention and willingness to publish your work with IJTech.

Warmest regards,

Dr. Mohammed Ali Berawi
maberawi@eng.ui.ac.id**Editor in Chief**

International Journal of Technology (IJTech)

p-ISSN: 2086-9614

e-ISSN: 2087-2100

<http://ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id/>

IJTech is currently indexed in SCOPUS and Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI) Thomson Reuters



Agustinus Purna Irawan <agustinus@untar.ac.id>

[IJTech] Editor Decision

1 message

IJTech <noreply@ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id>

Mon, Jan 13, 2020 at 3:11 PM

Reply-To: "noreply@ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id" <noreply@ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id>

To: linag@ft.untar.ac.id

Cc: maslin.kl@utm.my, yuri@ie.ui.ac.id, habibahharon.kl@utm.my, j.reyes@derby.ac.uk, asrilsyamas@yahoo.com, fransjusuf42@gmail.com, agustinus@untar.ac.id, benny.tjahjono@coventry.ac.uk, ssusanto@unpar.ac.id, iveline.annemarie@trisakti.ac.id, kiwi.mlw@gmail.com

*Editor Decision on #R1-IE-2464 : Accepted***Ms ID #R1-IE-2464**

Title : PERFORMANCE FACTORS OF SUCCESSFUL BUSINESS INCUBATOR FOR INDONESIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

Author(s) : Lina GOZALI, Maslin Masrom, Yuri Zagloel, Habibah N. Haron, Jose Arturo Garza-Reyes, Astril Syamas, Frans Daywin, Agustinus Irawan, Benny Tjahjono, Sani Susanto, Iveline Anne Marie, Harry Kusuma Aliwarga

Dear **Mrs. Lina GOZALI** ,

Greetings from Depok,

The editorial board is delighted to inform you that your paper entitled "PERFORMANCE FACTORS OF SUCCESSFUL BUSINESS INCUBATOR FOR INDONESIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES" has been accepted to be published on IJTech. At the present, we are conducting further necessary action to complete the publication process.

On behalf of IJTech, we appreciate your intention and willingness to publish your work with IJTech.

Warmest regards,

Dr. Mohammed Ali Berawi
maberawi@eng.ui.ac.id**Editor in Chief**

International Journal of Technology (IJTech)

p-ISSN: 2086-9614

e-ISSN: 2087-2100

<http://ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id/>

IJTech is currently indexed in SCOPUS and Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI) Thomson Reuters



Agustinus Purna Irawan <agustinus@untar.ac.id>

[IJTech-IE-2464] Result of Line-editing of the Paper

1 message

IJTech <ijtech@eng.ui.ac.id>

Mon, Jan 20, 2020 at 11:39 AM

To: linag@ft.untar.ac.id

Cc: maslin.kl@utm.my, yuri@ie.ui.ac.id, habibahharon.kl@utm.my, j.reyes@derby.ac.uk, asrilsyamas@yahoo.com, fransjusuf42@gmail.com, agustinus@untar.ac.id, benny.tjahjono@coventry.ac.uk, ssusanto@unpar.ac.id, iveline.annemarie@trisakti.ac.id, kiwi.mlw@gmail.com

Dear Mrs. Lina GOZALI,

We have conducted line editing for your paper as part of the publication process in IJTech. Enclosed, please find the receipt order and the comments from the line editor indicated by the character in color besides black.

We would like to ask you to complete the following:

1. Please make necessary revise the paper accordingly to the line editor comments.
2. Please complete detail information for the name of the author(s), and affiliation of each author(s). Please refer to Guideline for Author to write the affiliation section

After the revision complete, please send it back to ijtech@eng.ui.ac.id or by reply to this email, no later than **January 21, 2020**

We will proceed to the next step (Layouting, Final proof & Copyright) of the revised paper before printing.

We are looking forward to receiving your revised paper soon.

--

Kind regards,

Secretariat IJTech

International Journal of Technology (IJTech)

ISSN : 2086-9614

<http://www.ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id>**R1-IE-2464-2019111210531.docx**

287K

PERFORMANCE FACTORS ~~OF FOR~~ SUCCESSFUL BUSINESS INCUBATORS INFOR INDONESIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

ABSTRACT

Scaling the performances of business processes is already a main concern for both faculty and enterprise players, since organizations are motivated to grasp the productivity stage. Employing a performance achievement framework to for the relationship of between business incubator success factors will guarantee connection with a commercial schemes, which support the a high level of performance indicators in successful business incubator models. This research employs the a quantitative method approach, and with the data are analyzed using the the IBM SPSS version 23 and Smart PLS version 3 statistical software packages. Applying Employing a sample of 95 incubator managers from 19 universities which geographically operated in Indonesia, this exhibitit is shown that the image of business incubator factors' image shows has a positive effect on the incubator's performance. Theis study investigates thea relationship between the incubator's performance and business incubator success factors in Indonesia. The result are as follows: It was found that Information TechnologyIT, as part of the business incubators's facets/abilities, partially supports their performance of business incubator; that the eEntry cCriteria supports directly support to the performance of business the incubators; that mMentoring nNetworksing also supports the performance of business incubator, with a good infrastructure systems of infrastructure as a moderating factor; that fFunding supports the performance of business incubators, also with good infrastructure systems of infrastructure as a moderating factor; and that uUniversity rRegulations and gGovernment sSupport and pProtection enhance the performance of business incubators, with credits and rewards as a moderating factor. And In addition, a variety of indicators from the local context affiliate positively to promote a community that highlighted the incubators' strategies.

Keywords: Successful Business Incubator, Indonesian Public Universities, Incubator Performance Factors

1. INTRODUCTION

The Commercialization passage such as "If you cannot measure it, you cannot manage it" or "What is measured, improves" (P-Drucker, 2006) are occasionally challenged due to notas they are not significantly measurable to a significant extent (Ryan, 2014). Nevertheless, that help the incubator managers to scaling their company's performance and successful factors: tools (such as: gapping from quantitative to qualitative and from financial to non-financial), supports the study of thea business activityies performance dimension (Van Looy and Shafagatova, 2016). However, the a performance framework ineline to support the business process strategy and performance factors have needs to be selected and conducted-employed (Shah et al., 2012).

Sometimes, the optimized performance measurement framework used is the bBalanced sScorecard (BSC) developed by Kaplan and Norton (1996, 2001), which given provides four measurement methods to of business performance: (1) the financial perspective; (2) customer perspective; (3) internal business process perspective; and (4) learning and growth perspective.

Commented [SG1]: "Measuring"?

Commented [SG2]: "improve"?

Commented [SG3]: OK to delete "which geographically operated"?

Commented [SG4]: sentence not clear, especially "affiliate positively" and "a community that highlighted"

Commented [SG5]: "commercial sayings" maybe?

Commented [SG6]: do you mean the "sayings" are not measureable?

Commented [SG7]: "that help" not clear. Maybe "they help", but what would "they" refer to?

Commented [SG8]: "measure"?

Commented [SG9]: "factor tools" not clear

Commented [SG10]: "gapping from" not clear

Commented [SG11]: what "supports"?

The role of ~~Business Incubator p~~Performance ~~f~~Factors in ~~the~~ successful ~~of~~ business incubator~~s~~ has received increased attention across several disciplines in recent years. During the last decade, the performance of business incubator~~s~~ has been at the center of much attention. Many ~~business incubators~~ are currently trying to achieve the best performance in the intense competition ~~in the current period~~ to be successful. The purpose of this research ~~was~~ is to assess the extent to which these ~~business incubator~~ performance factors ~~were~~ are important for success ~~inful~~ business incubator~~s~~ in Indonesian ~~p~~Public ~~u~~Universities. ~~Theis~~ research will greatly help ~~business~~ incubators to achieve their best performance so that ~~it~~ they can help their tenants to perform.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Service ~~i~~Innovation has been widely accepted as part of ~~thea~~ strategy to generate more advantages for business player~~s~~, particularly SMEs. Therefore, it is safe to conclude that business player~~s~~ which employ and ~~appliance~~ apply the latest innovation~~s~~ and activities as part of their ~~repetitious routine~~ actions~~s~~; will have ~~higher~~ greater chances of ~~importantly~~ significantly upgrad~~ing~~e their performance ~~at~~of company level. This will ~~constantly~~ consistently equip them with the basic economic and financial resources needed to maintain the growth of the~~ir~~ service innovation. By generating new ~~assistance~~, which ~~do not~~ may have not recently existed in the business, ~~even~~ SMEs ~~are able to~~ can obtain the urge ~~conditions~~ to employ extreme innovations. ~~Thus~~ In this way, they can ~~conquer~~ beat their main business rival~~s~~, as well as significantly ~~upgrad~~ improve their business performance.

Commented [SG12]: "assistance" in what sense?

Commented [SG13]: "urge conditions" not clear

~~The exploration led~~ Research by Aerts et al. (2007) on the relationship between ~~the~~ filtering process of incubators and performance ~~finds~~ found the coherence between filtering based on activities set with higher tenant survival ~~rate~~. While this is an important indication for incubator managers to understand ~~theat~~ filtering process, it does not demonstrate the application of incubator support, as ~~the~~ filtering process introduces ~~heavy~~ selection factors ~~when~~ compared to ~~an~~ incubator~~s~~ ~~which are~~ not ~~equally~~ filtered.

Commented [SG14]: second part of sentence not clear

Commented [SG15]: "important"? "strict"?

Peters et al. (2004) emphasize ~~on~~ the effect of incubator services, including infrastructure, mentoring and network~~s~~, and on the ~~graduation~~ percentage level of graduation of incubatees. They ~~obtain~~ found that ~~barely~~ simple comparison ~~of~~ types of services offered ~~will~~ was not ~~be~~ enough to highlight the differences in graduation rates among incubators. ~~Rather~~ Instead, they conclude from their investigation that ~~regarding~~ of screening activities as well as literate resource~~s~~ are needed through network~~s~~, and ~~that the~~ relationship ~~among~~ between co-tenant~~s~~ are ~~is~~ the important factors ~~to know~~ in establishing incubator~~s~~' performances in terms of graduation rates.

Mian (1997) advise~~s~~ that performance evaluations also support ~~the~~ program development and sustainability, tenant's firm survival and growth, implication to the University's mission sponsor and the environmental impacts should be noticed into ~~account~~ in order to measure ~~the~~ incubator performance~~s~~. The findings on technology business incubator performance can be observed by studying the incubation process, including the knowledge-sharing process, diffusion of innovation and individual creativity, which is vital for the developmental process of new ventures (Binsawad, Sohaib, and Hawryszkiewycz et al., 2019).

Formatted: Highlight

Commented [SG16]: highlighted part of sentence not clear

The ~~deficiency-lack~~ of perception from ~~the~~ incubatees ~~in-of~~ the future challenge leads to Chan and Lau (2005) to propose an adjusted model to understand the implication of technology firms through their business ~~operation~~. Using previous research ~~and references~~, they ~~found~~ a set of indicators to compare performances from the incubatees' perception. The nine elements consisted of pooling criteria, sharing facilities, coaching and mentoring services, public ~~impress~~, networking, clustering, geographic proximity, finance ~~and~~ and funding support. They ~~identified~~ that the tenants' level of improvement affected the influences of each incubator characteristic on the ~~incubator's~~ tenants.

Commented [SG17]: "the implication of technology firms through their business operation" not clear

Commented [SG18]: "public impress" not clear

It ~~hasis~~ also ~~been~~ identified that the capability to connect start-ups to specific financial sources ~~upgrade-improves~~ the ~~important~~ factors ~~important of-anfor~~ incubators for increase their investments (Van Rijnsoever, ~~Van Weele, and Eveleens et al.~~, 2017). It ~~has also beenis~~ found that ~~being-participating~~ in network events, engaging in referral services and the sheer fact of being ~~linkage-linked~~ to a reputable incubator, ~~place-puts~~ the start-ups in a beneficial ~~stage~~ position, while supporting actions directly ~~targeted~~ at gaining more funding (such as pitch training) have less influence. In spite of that, ~~this-it~~ does not mean that the supporting actions ~~correlated~~ to hit-making, —such as coaching, mentoring, or workshops, —are all in vain. The ~~indicator-of~~ performance ~~indicators for-related to~~ raising funding ~~areis~~ primarily applicable to new business players (Eveleens et al. 2016).

Commented [SG19]: is "hit-making" a technical term in this context?

The important factor ~~of-in~~ incubation is the capability of the incubators to link the networks to ~~the~~ incubatees (Sherman ~~and-&~~ Chappell 1998; Colombo ~~and-&~~ Delmastro 2002; Haapasalo ~~and-&~~ Ekholm 2004; Pena 2004; Bøllingtoft ~~and-&~~ Ulhøi 2005; Chan and Lau ~~&~~ 2005; Hughes, Ireland, ~~and-Morgan et al.~~, 2007). One of the ~~performance~~-important ~~performance~~ factors ~~of-their~~ incubation is the process of governing the incubatees' affiliations. Public incubators, which consist of ~~the~~-regional offices and ~~the~~-universities, represent most of ~~the~~ business facilitators activated within the observed context, but it is even less ~~effective~~. ~~The-U~~universities and the local government play a key role in the development of public policies and contribute to research funding, agreements between universities, incubators and the regional entrepreneurial systems to aid and promote entrepreneurship, economic development and innovations (Corsi, 2014). Finally, the ~~study~~ also finds the 'learning' factor, ~~to beas~~ the foundation of performance (Messegham et al., 2018).

Commented [SG20]: "but it is even less effective" not clear. What does "it" refer to? And "less effective" than what?

Commented [SG21]: which study?

This research ~~has~~ arises because ~~of-the~~previous papers, ~~for example -that have been previously published-according-to~~ Vanderstraeten and Matthyssens (2012). O'Neal (2005), Voisey et. al. (2006), Löfsten and Lindelöf (2001), Mian (1997) ~~and~~, Bigliardi et. al. (2006), ~~shows that previous research has~~ have not used any processed data. Only Lalkaka (2003) ~~showed-indicates five~~5 factors, ~~such-as~~namely public policy, ~~that-which~~ stimulates entrepreneurial businesses and provides ~~the~~ a business infrastructure; private sector partnerships for mentoring and marketing; ~~the~~ knowledge base of learning and research; professional networking, nationally and globally; and community involvement to promote entrepreneurship and cultural change. Stefanovic et. al. (2014) ~~researched~~ found that ~~on-the~~ [mode] developed to measure business incubator performance ~~is-only-a-model~~ was ~~only one~~ that measures financial statements. This research seeks to develop a model that measures the performance factors of ~~the~~-incubator ~~business~~ ~~in-at-the~~ pPublic uUniversities in Indonesia.

Commented [SG22]: which model?

Commented [SG23]: "business incubators"?

3. STRUCTURAL MODEL, PERFORMANCE INDICATORS, AND HYPOTHESES

The factors studied in this research ~~such as~~ include the ~~a~~Abilities of business incubator~~s~~ (Smilor, 1987; Costa-David, 2002; Verma, 2004); ~~i~~Incubator ~~g~~Governance (Campbell, 1989; Verma, 2004; Hannon, 1995); ~~e~~Entry ~~c~~Criteria (Campbell, 1985; Campbell, 1989; Smilor ~~and &~~ Gill, 1986; Costa-David, 2002); Verma, 2004; Hackett ~~and &~~ Dilts, 2004; Hutabarat, 2014); ~~e~~Exit ~~c~~Criteria (Verma, 2004; Costa-David, 2002); ~~m~~Mentoring and ~~n~~Networking (Campbell, 1985; Aerts, 2007; Costa-David, 2002; Verma, 2004; Hackett ~~and &~~ Dilts, 2004); ~~f~~Funding and ~~s~~Support (Costa-David, 2002; Campbell, 1985; Verma, 2004); ~~g~~Government ~~s~~Support and ~~p~~Protection (Smilor, 1987; Mian, 1997; Wilson, 2012; Lee et al., 1999; Chandra ~~and &~~ Chao, 2011; Wolf ~~and &~~ Worf 2017); ~~u~~University regulation~~s~~ (Smilor, 1987; Gibson, 1988; Carayanis, 2006; Mian, 1997; Chandra ~~and &~~ Chao, 2011; Wonglimpiyarat, 2016); ~~and~~; ~~s~~System ~~i~~nfrastructure (O'Neal, 2005; Hackett ~~and &~~ Dilts, 2004; Carayanis, 2006).

The ~~A~~ structural model of all ~~of the~~ factors to be assessed from the performance of ~~a~~ successful business incubator~~s~~ ~~from the~~ ~~in~~ ~~p~~Public ~~u~~Universities ~~of in~~ Indonesia is shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1 A-Structural Model of the Performance of Business Incubators of Indonesian Public Universities

The “Performance-incubator performance framework” section explored-explained that the performance-incubator performance framework should typically determine different performance approaches fromer which performance measurement should-could be further defined. However, we should observe that performance measurement, and (key) performance measurements as phrasing (Dumas et al. 2013).

H1: The greater the focus-is on the performance of business incubators to-be-moderated by the quality of the-facilities, the more likely the business incubator is to be performed due to good quality of-facilities.

- Commented [SG24]: The text in the figure is very small and difficult to read. The figure also perhaps needs some explanation.
- Commented [SG25]: past – ie, you’ve already said this?
- Commented [SG26]: check changes OK
- Commented [SG27]: sentence incomplete
- Commented [SG28]: Maybe “introduce” the hypotheses and explain why/how they have been formulated.
- Commented [SG29]: “is to be performed” not clear – in most of the hypotheses. Maybe “the better it/the business incubator is likely to perform”?

H2: The better the incubator's governance, ~~ais~~ moderated by credit and reward, the more likely ~~the business incubator~~ it is to be performed.

H3: The stronger the enforcement of tenant entry criteria, the higher the probability of ~~the~~ business incubator ~~is to be performing~~ ~~well~~,ed

H4: The stronger the enforcement of tenant exit criteria, the higher the probability of ~~the~~ business incubator ~~is to be performed~~performing ~~well~~.

H5: The better the mentoring and networking of the business incubator, moderated by ~~a~~ good ~~system of~~infrastructure ~~system~~, the more likely the business incubator is to be performed.

H6: The better the funding and support of the business incubator for its tenants is moderated by good system of ~~infrastructure~~, the more likely the business incubator is to be performed.

H7: The better the support and protection from the government, moderated by credit and reward, the more likely the business incubator is to be performed

H8: The better the university regulations ~~are~~is moderated by credit and rewards, the better the initiative programs and projects for business incubator performance (university ~~regulations~~).

H9: The better the system and infrastructure are moderated by ~~a~~ good ~~system of~~infrastructure ~~system~~, the more likely the ~~performance~~ of the business incubator

Commented [SG30]: change OK?

Commented [SG31]: OK?

Commented [SG32]: first part of sentence not clear

Commented [SG33]: necessary to repeat this in brackets?

Commented [SG34]: see above

4. METHODOLOGY

Using a mixed ~~ed~~ method approach, ~~the~~is research involves ~~a~~ sequential timing ~~in~~of the use of several different methods. One approach is ~~first~~ employed, ~~first~~ and the conclusion ~~is~~ used to select the sample to establish the instrument, ~~and~~or ~~to~~ write the analysis for the subsequent approaches. Other applications were used to establish ~~the~~ designs of ~~the~~ differing approaches of equal weight and sequencetial. ~~The~~ sSecond method involveds data collection and procedure ~~strategy~~; ~~f~~First, ~~a~~ qualitative study, ~~and then proceeds with~~followed by ~~a~~ quantitative study. The weight between the qualitative and quantitative studiesty ~~which~~ should be equaly, although in ~~practice~~ one ~~one~~ approach ~~more practically~~is used ~~more~~ than ~~the~~ another.

The decision ~~on~~to choosinge ~~the proper~~an appropriate approach ~~for~~in ~~the~~ a study hinges upon the goals of the research, ~~and~~ ~~It ought to be~~should be determined by the study questions (Marshall, 1996). The mixed-method approach incorporates mixed-methods design, employing both quantitative and qualitative studies. This approach has been utilized in many fields of study, including ~~the~~ social, behavioral, and health sciences (Yin, 2003). Tashakkori and Creswell (2007) defined mixed-methods as research in which the investigator collects and analyses data, integrates the findings, and draws inferences using both qualitative and quantitative approaches or methods in a single study or ~~a~~ program of inquiry. Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) advocated the use of mixed-methods research as the third research paradigm in educational research, and ~~they~~ recognized the importance and usefulness of both ~~quantitative and qualitative~~types of study.

Consequently, the use of ~~the~~ qualitative and quantitative methods ~~was~~ considered ~~to be~~ suitable for ~~to~~ this research. ~~First, it~~ ~~The study first~~ seeks to examine the indicators and ~~the successful~~ factors for business incubators ~~for in~~ Indonesian public universities, ~~secondly, the~~ investigation of ~~successful~~ ~~these~~ factors ~~for business incubators~~, and finally ~~examines~~ the research framework performance through statistical analysis.

Based on various literature ~~reviews~~, the survey questionnaire was constructed and developed into a consolidated survey questionnaire consist~~ing~~ of different measurement scales and questions. Each related success factor was measured using a 1 to 5 Likert scale, ~~which was~~. ~~The Likert scale~~ was incorporated ~~with into~~ the questionnaire, ~~where the~~ and respondents ~~were~~ requested to ~~fill indicate~~ the importance of ~~the~~ factors relative to other~~s~~ ~~factors~~.

Commented [SG35]: "various previous studies"?

~~Further to that, T~~he objective of the study is to distinguish those factors ~~that~~ ~~which~~ have a relatively higher score. ~~The study~~ ~~It then~~ continues with the ~~use of~~ quantitative method using reliability and validity tests, ~~where in which~~ all the ~~successful~~ factors are valid and reliable (Gozali, 2018), research hypotheses tests, and a structural model test. ~~The research uses~~ ~~Cease studies are~~ ~~used~~ as part of the qualitative method to study the differences ~~among between~~ public university business incubators in Indonesia.

The qualitative study was adapted from ~~the~~ literature ~~reviews~~, ~~where the in which~~ business incubator ~~successful~~ factors ~~were~~ identified. The survey questionnaire was constructed and developed from face-to-face interviews with ~~the~~ Indonesian public university~~ies~~ business incubator experts. The survey questionnaire ~~has been~~ ~~was then~~ validated by ten professors from six countries (i.e. ~~United States of America~~ ~~the USA~~, Scotland, Finland, Australia, Malaysia, and Indonesia) (Gozali, 2018). After ~~the validation of survey the~~ questionnaire and ~~completion of the~~ correction process ~~have been carried out~~, the final survey questionnaire was circulated to the respondents via e-mail or conducted face-to-face. ~~The~~ Cronbach's alpha value obtained from ~~the~~ 95 respondents ~~in the results of this questionnaire gives~~ ~~gave~~ a value of 0.98, which shows that the reliability ~~of the~~ results ~~are is~~ quite high.

Commented [SG36]: "from previous research"?

The quantitative study ~~was~~ supported by data from in-depth, one-to-one interviews. The ~~status~~ ~~reliability~~ of the quantitative factors ~~in of~~ the study ~~was~~ assumed ~~to be~~ higher than the qualitative ~~ones~~, since the interviews with the experts were originated on empirical data which ~~was~~ ~~collected~~ ~~had been~~ previously ~~collected~~ (Graff, 2016). The ~~ultimate-main~~ approach ~~is to is~~ ~~utilizing the~~ questionnaires on a large sample ~~as in the form of~~ quantitative data collection, hence the creation of ~~the is~~ survey for the purpose of this research (Denscombe, 2007).

This research examined~~s~~ the results ~~to in~~ identify~~ing~~ the performance of business incubator~~s~~ using the survey questionnaire developed for ~~the is~~ study and the business incubator ~~successful~~ framework (Gozali, 2016).

5. RESEARCH LOCATIONS AND RESEARCH SAMPLE

5.1 Research Location

~~For the actual research, The~~ 95 respondents consisted of business incubator managers from Indonesian public universities, ~~were~~ chosen from the following institutions: Institut Teknologi Bandung, Institute Teknologi Sepuluh Noverber, Andalas University, Institut Pertanian Bogor, Diponegoro University, University of Indonesia, Samratulangi University, Brawijaya University, Airlangga University, Riau University, Udayana University, Gorontalo University, Sebelas Maret University, Jambi University, North Sumatera University, Bandung Technopark, Padjajaran University, and Yogyakarta State University.

5.2 Research Sample

The sample used for ~~the~~ study consisted of business incubator managers in Indonesian~~n~~'s public universities ~~who are~~ involved in the day-to-day operations of the incubators and the graduated tenant companies. ~~As the~~~~In their role as~~ sample or respondents, the business incubator managers would have the necessary insights and experiences of managing incubators, ~~and the~~~~with a~~ relationships between the incubators ~~with the~~~~and~~ tenant firms. The sample for this research consisted of 95 respondents, all of whom ~~were~~ business incubator managers from Indonesian ~~Public~~ ~~Universities~~.

Commented [SG37]: repetition?

6. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

~~The~~ research employs the ~~mixed~~ method approach, and the data are analyzed using the IBM SPSS version 23 and Smart PLS version 3 statistical software packages. After data collection and analysis, the results ~~are~~ shown~~s~~ in ~~T~~able 1.

Table 1 Structural model measurement for the performance of business incubators

Hypothes es	Construct relationship	t stat	p value
H1	Information Technology → Quality of Facility	4.374	0.000
H2	Incubator Governance → Credit and Rewards	0.461	0.645
H3	Entry Criteria → Performance Business Incubator Performance	2.125	0.034
H4	Exit Criteria → Success ful factors	0.997	0.319
H5	Mentoring and Networking → Good System System of Infrastructure	2.686	0.007
H6	Funding and Support → Performance Business Incubator Performance	3.535	0.000
H7	Government Support and Protection → Credit and Rewards	2.309	0.021
H8	University Regulation → Credit and Rewards	3.515	0.000
H9	System Infrastructure → Good System of Infrastructure	1.486	0.138

Commented [SG38]: This would mean "Infrastructure of the system". OK?

~~Only~~ Lalkaka (2003) ~~stated~~ ~~proposes~~ ~~five~~ 5 factors: government support, mentoring networking, infrastructure, community support ~~and~~; sharing knowledge, ~~which~~ will increase ~~the~~ business

incubator performance. Stefanovic et al. (2014) developed ~~model~~ ~~to measure business incubator performance just only~~ by ~~only~~ measuring financial statements. Utama, Pasek, and Mudana et al. (2018) state ~~that~~ business incubator performance depends on office space, tenant rooms, discussion room 1, and ~~a~~ tenant production display room, ~~and with a~~ minimum time requirement for ~~the~~ incubation process. Grapeggia et al. (2011) state ~~that~~ incubator governance, marketing assistance and infrastructure ~~are important~~ for increasing business incubator performance in Brazil. Binsawad, Sohaib, and Hawryszkiewicz, I. et al. (2019) state ~~that~~ the performance of technology business incubators ~~was-is~~ influenced by sharing knowledge and incubator governance, ~~while~~ Zibarzani and Rozan, (2017) stated ~~that~~ mentoring networking and sharing knowledge ~~greatly~~ influences ~~significantly on~~ business incubators performance in supporting ~~the~~ start-ups. Xie, Wu, Zhao, et al. (2011) ~~stated explain that~~ the incubation funding can ~~increase the improve~~ incubator performance but not directly influence the tenants' income.

Commented [SG39]: Lalkaka's model?

Van Looy and Shafagatova (2016) show that the performance indicators from quantitative to qualitative and from financial to non-financial, almost similar ~~with to~~ Kaplan and Norton (2001), ~~which-who~~ takes a four-dimensional approach to organizational performance, ~~from the:~~ (1) financial perspective, (2) customer perspective, (3) internal business process perspective, and (4) learning and growth perspective. Learning is a key indicator for performance, as stated ~~of by~~ Messeghem et al. (2018), Mian (1997) ~~and~~; Binsawad, Sohaib, and Hawryszkiewicz et al. (2019).

Commented [SG40]: "from quantitative to qualitative and from financial to non-financial" not clear. Appears incomplete.

Aerts et al. (2007) developed ~~the~~ screening criteria, or ~~the~~ entry criteria. Corsi (2014) emphasizes ~~ed~~ the roles of ~~u~~University regulations and collaborations ~~into~~ investment, and public policies. Van Rijnsoever et al. (2017) and Eveleens et al. (2016) recommended ~~the~~ funding and support. Van Rijnsoever, Van Weele, and Eveleen et al. (2017), Bøllingtoft and Ulhøi (2005); Chan and Lau (2005); Colombo and Delmastro (2002); Haapasalo and Ekholm (2004); Hughes, Ireland, and Morgan et al. (2007); Pena (2004) ~~and~~; Sherman and Chappell (1998) acknowledged the relationship ~~or~~ mentoring and networking. ~~With All of~~ the above ~~theories, they~~ support ~~all~~ the factors within the findings of this ~~analysis~~.

Commented [SG41]: "between"?

Commented [SG42]: are all the above "theories"?

Commented [SG43]: These three paragraphs seem to be a list of other researchers' findings, which may be better in the Literature Review sections, rather than Results and Discussion.

Table 2 The Results of performance hypotheses testing

Hypotheses	Description	Result
H1	The greater the focus is on the performance of business incubator moderated by the quality of the facilities, the more likely the business incubator to perform due to good quality of facilities.	Supported Partially Supported (Information Technology and E-com Assistance)
H2	The better the incubator's governance is moderated by credit and reward, the more likely the business incubator to perform	Not Supported

Commented [SG44]: See corrections and comments on pp.4-5 (first listing of hypotheses)

Commented [SG45]: what do these relate to?

Hypotheses	Description	Result
H3	The stronger the enforcement of tenant entry criteria, the higher the probability of business incubator to perform	Directly Supported Directly
H4	The stronger the enforcement of tenant exit criteria, the higher the probability of business incubator to perform	Not Supported
H5	The better the mentoring and networking of the business incubator moderated by good system of infrastructure, the more likely the business incubator to perform	Supported
H6	The better the funding and support of the business incubator for its tenants is moderated by good system of infrastructure, the more likely the business incubator to perform	Supported
H7	The better the support and protection from the government moderated by credit and reward, the more likely the business incubator to perform	Supported
H8	The better the university regulation is moderated by credit and rewards, the better the initiative programs and projects for business incubator on the performance (university regulation).	Supported
H9	The better the system and infrastructure are moderated by a good system of infrastructure, the more likely the performance of the business incubator to increase	Not Supported

Commented [SG46]: "Directly" not clear

The results of the hypotheses analysis at-shown in Ttable 2 as-demonstrated that: information technology (Grapeggia, 2011; Lalkaka, 2003), as part of the abilities of a business incubator, partially supports their performance and that of business incubator; cEntry cCriteria (Campbell, 1985; Campbell, 1989; Smilor and Gill, 1986; Costa-David, 2002) directly supports directly to the performance of business incubator. Mentoring nNetworking (Lalkaka, 2003; Zibarzani and Rozan, 2017) supports the performance of business incubator, with good system of infrastructure systems as a moderating factor and; fFunding supports (Xie, Wu, Zhao, et al., 2011; Van Loooy and Shafagatova, 2016; Van Rijnsoever et al., 2017; and Eveleens et al., 2016) also supports the performance, with of business incubator with good system of infrastructure systems also as a moderating factor. Finally, uUniversity rRegulation (Corsi, 2014) supports the performance of business incubator, with credits and rewards as a moderating factor.

7. CONCLUSION

This research has been ~~done~~ conducted to measure the factors that are critical to incubator performance. The research design ~~of this study~~ employs the mixed methods approach. To conclude, it can be said that comprehensive skimming of references has given provided us with numerous factors which accountable for the success of incubation performance. An important finding from ~~the~~ this paper ~~shows~~ is that information technology, entry criteria, government support and protection, funding and support, mentoring networking and university regulation support the performance of business incubators.

Commented [SG47]: "analysis of previous research"?

8. REFERENCES

- Aerts, K., Matthyssens, P., & Vandenbempt, K. (2007). Critical role and screening practices of European business incubators. *Technovation*, Volume 27(5), pp. 254-267.
- Bigliardi, B., Dormio, A.-I., Nosella, A., & Petroni, G. (2006). Assessing science parks' performances: directions from selected Italian case studies. *Technovation*, Volume 26(4), pp. 489-505.
- Binsawad, M., Sohaib, O., & Hawryszkiewicz, I. (2019). Factors Impacting Technology Business Incubator Performance. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, Volume 23(01), 1950007.
- Bøllingtoft, A., and J. P. Ulhøi, J. P. (2005). "The Networked Business Incubator—Leveraging Entrepreneurial Agency?" *Journal of Business Venturing*, Volume 20(2), pp. 265–290.
- Campbell, C.; Kendrick, R., and Samuelson, D. (1985). Stalking the Latent Entrepreneur. *Economic Development Review*, Volume: 3(No. 2), pp. 43-48.
- Campbell, C. (1989). Change agents in the new economy: Business Incubators and Economic Development. *Economic Development Review*, Volume 7(3), pp. 56-57.
- Carayannis, E.-G., Popescu, D., Sipp, C., and Stewart, M. (2006). Technological Learning for Entrepreneurial Development (TL4ED) in the Knowledge Economy (KE): Case Studies and Lessons Learned. *Technovation*, Volume 26(4), pp. 419-443.
- Chandra, A., and Chao, C. -A. (2011). Growth and Evolution of High-Technology Business Incubation in China. *Human Systems Management*, Volume 30(1-2), pp. 55-69.
- Colombo, M. G., and M. Delmastro, M. (2002). "How Effective Are Technology Incubators? Evidence from Italy." *Research Policy*, Volume 31(7), pp. 1103–1122.
- Corsi, C., & Di Berardino, D. (2014). Assessing The Business Incubator' Performance Referring the Local Development in Italy. *European Scientific Journal, ESJ*, Volume 10(10), pp. .
- Costa-David, J., Malan, J., and Lalkaka, R. (2002). Improving Business Incubator Performance Through Benchmarking and Evaluation: Lessons Learned from Europe. *Materialy*, Volume 16, pp. 28-04.
- Chan, K.-F., and T. Lau, T. (2005). "Assessing Technology Incubator Programs in the Science Park: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly," *Technovation*, Volume 25(10), pp. 1215–1228.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Commented [SG48]: check title

Commented [SG49]: page numbers missing

- Drucker, P.-F. (2006). *Classic Drucker: essential wisdom of Peter Drucker from the pages of Harvard Business Review*. Harvard Business Press.
- Dumas, M., La Rosa, M., Mendling, J., Reijers, H.A. (2013.) *Fundamentals of Business Process Management*. Springer, Berlin: Springer
- Denscombe, M. (2007). *The Good Research Guides*. Berkshire, England: McGraw-Hill Education.
- European Commission Enterprise Directorate General. (2002.) *Benchmarking of Business Incubators*. Center for Strategy and Evaluation Services.
- Eveleens, C.-P., van Rijnsoever, F.-J., & Niesten, E. M. (2017). How network-based incubation helps start-up performance: a systematic review against the background of management theories. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, Volume 42(3), pp. 676-713.
- Gozali, L., Masrom, M., Zagloel, T.-Y.-M., & Haron, H.-N. (2016). A framework of successful business incubators for Indonesian public universities. *International Journal of Technology*, Volume 6(1), pp. 1086-1096.
- Gozali, L., Masrom, M., Zagloel, T.-Y.-M., & Haron, H.-N., Tjahjadi, E. (2018). A framework toward successful business incubator for Indonesian Public Universities: A pilot review. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management* Volume 2018-March, 2018, Pages pp 869-883
- Graff, J.-C. (2016). Mixed methods research. *Evidence-Based Practice*, Volume 47
- Grapeggia, M., Ortigara, A.-A., Bastos, R.-C., Juliatto, D.-L., & Lezana, A.-G.-R. (2011). Analysis by Clustering Factor Performance Business Incubators, *RAI*, Volume 8(1), pp. 64
- Hacketts, S.M., and Dilts, D.M. (2004). A Real Options - Driven Theory of Business Incubation. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, Volume 29, pp. 41-54
- Haapasalo, H., and T. Ekholm, T. (2004). "A Profile of European Incubators: A Framework for Commercializing Innovations." *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, Volume 4, pp. 248-270.
- Hannon, P.D. (1995), Hey, I'm an Entrepreneur Too! The Dichotomous Role of Incubator Managers and their Impact on the Entrepreneurial Process, *Proceedings of the IntEnt95 Conference*, Burbury.
- Hughes, M., R. D. Ireland, R. D., and R. E. Morgan, R. E., (2007). "Stimulating Dynamic Value: Social Capital and Business Incubation as a Pathway to Competitive Success." *Long Range Planning*, Volume 40(2), pp. 154-177.
- Johnson, R. -B., and Onwuegbuzie, A. -J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, Volume 33(7), pp. 14-26.
- Kaplan, R.S, Norton, D.P. (1996.) *The balanced scorecard. Translating strategy into action*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, Boston
- Lalkaka, R. (2003). Business incubators in developing countries: characteristics and performance. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, Volume 3(1-2), pp. 31-55.
- Lee, J. -J., J. -S. Kim, J.S., and H. -K. Chun, H.K., (1999). A Study on the Management and Financial Independence of University Technology Business Incubators (UTBIs) in Information and Telecommunication Industry. *Korean Small Business Review*, Volume 21(2), pp. 185-206.

Commented [SG52]: if book, city of publication needed

Commented [SG51]: city needed, not county/country

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Commented [SG52]: page numbers missing

Commented [SG53]: page range needed

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Commented [SG54]: country?

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Löfsten, H., & Lindelöf, P. (2002). Science Parks and the growth of new technology-based firms—academic-industry links, innovation and markets. *Research Policy*, Volume 31(6), pp. 859-876.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Maldonado-Guzman, G., Garza-Reyes, J.-A., Rocha-Lona, L., & Kumar, V. (2017, September). Service innovation and performance in Mexican service SMEs. In *IFIP International Conference on Advances in Production Management Systems* (pp. 230-239). Springer, Cham.

Commented [SG55]: city?

Marshall, M. N. (1996). Sampling for qualitative research. *Family Practice*, Volume 13(6), pp. 522-526.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Messeghem, K., Bakkali, C., Sammut, S., & Swalhi, A. (2018). Measuring Nonprofit Incubator Performance: Toward an Adapted Balanced Scorecard Approach. *Journal of Small Business Management*, Volume 56(4), pp. 658-680.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Mian, S.-A. (1997). Assessing and managing the university technology business incubator: An integrative framework. *Journal of Business Venturing*, Volume 12(4), pp. 251-285.

O'Neal, T. (2005). Evolving a Successful University-Based Incubator: Lessons Learned from the UCF Technology Incubator. *Engineering Management Journal*, Volume 17(3), pp. 11-25

Pena, I. (2004). Business Incubation Centers and New Firm Growth in the Basque Country. *Small Business Economics*, Volume 22(3-4), pp. 223-236.

Peters, L., M. Rice, M., and M. Sundarajan, M. (2004). "The Role of Incubators in the Entrepreneurial Process." *Journal of Technology Transfer*, Volume 29(1), pp. 83-91.

Ryan, L. (2014). If You Can't Measure It, You Can't Manage It²: Not True. *Forbes*.

Commented [SG56]: incomplete/unclear

Shah, L., Etienne, A., Siadat, A., Vernadat, F. (2012). *(Value, Risk)-Based performance evaluation of manufacturing processes*. In: INCOM Proceedings of the 14th Symposium on Information Control Problems in Manufacturing, 23-25 May 2012. Bucharest, Romania, pp 1586-1591

Formatted: Font: Italic

Sherman, H., and D. S. Chappell, D.S. (1998). "Methodological Challenges in Evaluating Business Incubators Outcomes." *Economic Development Quarterly*, Volume 12(4), pp. 313-321.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Smilor, R. W., and M.D. Gill Jr., M.D. (1986). *The New Business Incubator: Linking Talent, Technology, Capital, and Know How*. Lexington: Lexington Books.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Smilor, R.W. (1987). Managing the Incubator System: Critical Successful factors to Accelerate New Company Development, *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management* EM-34, Volume (4), pp. 146-156

Stal, E., Andreassi, T., and Fujino, A. (2016). The role of university incubators in stimulating academic entrepreneurship. *RAI Revista de Administração e Inovação*, Volume 13(2), pp. 89-98.

Sutama, I.-K., Pasek, I.-K., & Mudana, I.-G. (2018). Business Incubators Support College Performance. *SOSHUM: Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora [Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities]*, Volume 8(1), pp. 33-42.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Stefanović, S., & Stanković, M. (2014). Entrepreneurial model of franchising. In *International Symposium SymOrg, Faculty of Organizational Sciences. Proceedings* (pp. 560-567).

Commented [SG57]: location?

Tashakkori, A., and Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Exploring the nature of research questions in mixed methods research*, Sagepub, 207-211.

Commented [SG58]: incomplete. Not clear if book or journal.

- Vanderstraeten, J., Matthyssens, P., & Van Witteloostuijn, A. (2012). Measuring the performance of business incubators.
- Van Looy, A., & Shafagatova, A. (2016). Business process performance measurement: a structured literature review of indicators, measures and metrics. *SpringerPlus*, Volume 5(1), pp. 1797.
- Van Rijnsoever, F.-J., Van Weele, M.-A., & Eveleens, C.-P. (2017). Network brokers or hit makers? Analyzing the influence of incubation on start-up investments. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, Volume 13(2), pp. 605-629.
- Verma, S., 2004. *Successful factors for Business Incubators: An Empirical Study of Canadian Business Incubators*. Eric Sprott School of Business, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario. 2004
- Voisey, Pam, Lynne Gornall, Paul Jones, and Brychan Thomas. (2006.) The Measurement of Success in a Business Incubation Project, *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Volume 13(3), pp.454 - 468.
- Wilson, T. (2012). *Review of HE-business collaboration*. Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, London
- Wolf, G., and Wolf, G. (2017). Entrepreneurial university: a case study at Stony Brook University. *Journal of Management Development*, Volume 36(2), pp. 286-294
- Yin, R.-K. (2003). Case study research: design and methods, Applied social research methods series. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. Afacan, Y., and Erbug, C.(2009). An interdisciplinary heuristic evaluation method for universal building design. *Journal of Applied Ergonomics*, 40, 731-744.
- Xie, F., Wu, W. Q., & Zhao, L.-M. (2011, September). Co-integration analysis between performance of business incubator and incubation fund. In *2011 IEEE 18th International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management* (pp. 2028-2031). IEEE.
- Zibarzani, M., & Rozan, M.-Z.-A. (2017, April). The Role of Knowledge Sharing in Business Incubators Performance. In *International Conference of Reliable Information and Communication Technology* (pp. 719-727). Springer, Cham.

Commented [SG59]: incomplete

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Commented [SG60]: page range needed

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Commented [SG61]: check names

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Commented [SG62]: not clear if one or two references. Check format.

Appendix A

The question of the ~~Q~~questionnaire questions

1. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to provide PHYSICAL OR LOGISTICAL FACILITIES: Office Space, Workshop Space, Laboratory, Computers, Conference Room, Meeting Room, Furniture and Equipment Rental, Telephone Equipment, Canteen, Shipping and Receiving, Logistic.
2. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to provide SHARED BUSINESS SERVICES AND EQUIPMENT: Audio Visual Equipment, Mail Service, Photocopy, Electricity, Water, Filling, Clerical Service, Receptionist, Office Hours Answering, Air Conditioner, Cleaning, Maintenance, Custodial Services.
3. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to provide FINANCIAL AND ACCOUNTING CONSULTATIONS: Business Taxes, Risk and Management Units, Government Grants and Loans, Government Procurement Process, Government Contract Preparation, Equity and Debt Financial Agreement, Export Development Assistance, Writing Financial Report.
4. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to provide MARKETING ASSISTANCE. Market Research, Advertising and Media Promotion, Customer Service Training, Pricing Strategy, Product and Image Development, Selling and Distribution Strategy, Business Events, Conferences and Exhibitions, Network to other business support, agencies, and potential clients.
5. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to provide PROFESSIONAL BUSINESS SERVICES AND BUSINESS ETIQUETTE: Pre-Incubation Services, Legal Counseling, Legal Representation, Patent Assistance, Accounting, Computing and Information Services, Book Keeping, Introduction to Seed and Venture Capitalist, Business Angel Network.
6. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to provide MANAGEMENT AND HUMAN RESOURCE ASSISTANCE: Business Planning Skill, Budgeting Skill, Employee or Human Relations Skill, Controlling Skill, Remuneration Packages, Career Path Planning, Public Speaking and Presentation Skill, Training Package for Human Development.
7. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to provide INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND E-COMMERCE ASSISTANCE: E Business or E commerce, E business or E Commerce, Computer & Software Skill, Network Provider, Web Admin, Accessibility.
8. The following criteria relate to the INCUBATOR GOVERNANCE: An Experienced Incubator Manager, A Key Board of Directors, A Noted Advisory Council, Concise Program Milestones with Clear Policies and Procedures, Dynamic and Efficient Business Operation, Good System Operation Procedure of Business Incubator, Vision, Mission, Value and Culture of Business Incubator.
9. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to screen tenants for admission to the incubator (ENTRY CRITERIA). Ability to Create Jobs, Ability to Present a Written Business Plan, Have a Unique Opportunity, Ability to The Firm to be Owned Locally, Advanced Technology Related Firm, Ability of Firm to Present Its Space Needs,

Commented [SG63]: Note that they are not questions below.

Also, if this was the text used in the survey, best to leave it unchanged.

Complementary to Existing Firms, New Start Up Firm, Age of Firm, Affiliated with University, Be Able to Pay Operating Expenses, Business Must Have an Innovative Project, Business Must Demonstrate The High Growth Potential, Social Impact.

10. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to decide when tenants should leave the incubator (EXIT CRITERIA): Time Limit of Tenancy, Space Requirements, Achieved Business Target and Objectives, Fail to Achieved Business target and Objectives, Need More Support that Incubator Cannot Offer.
11. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to provide MENTORING AND NETWORKING: Entrepreneurial Network, Entrepreneurial Education, Tie to a University, Community Support, Affiliation with Key Institutions, Finding the Strategy and Expertise Partner.
12. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to obtain GOVERNMENT SUPPORT AND PROTECTION: Grant or Funding, Good Regulation, Tax Holiday or Protection, Special Stock Market for Startup Company.
13. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to obtain FUNDING AND SUPPORT: Financing Arrangement, Organizational Arrangement, Good Supporting Data, Intellectual Property Protection, Help with Regulatory Compliance
14. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to obtain UNIVERSITY REGULATION: Good University Regulation for Entrepreneurship, Good Entrepreneurship Programs, appointed a Good Business Incubator Manager, Give Credit and Rewards for Business Incubator, Manager, Mentor and Counselor, Evaluation System for Business Incubator Services and social impacts
15. The following criteria relate to the ability of the incubator to provide SYSTEM INFRASTRUCTURE. Integrate Clients in the Largest, Technology Development System, Good Service Provider, High Speed Broadband Internet, Technology Support
16. The management use the following criteria to monitor the PERFORMANCE OF THE BUSINESS INCUBATOR itself. Incubator Occupancy Rates, Number of Companies Graduating from Incubator, Job Created by Tenant/Graduate Companies, Turnover of Tenant/Graduate Companies, Financial Performance of Incubator Itself, Business Incubator Contribution to Society or Local Development



Agustinus Purna Irawan <agustinus@untar.ac.id>

[IJTech-IE-2464] Final Proof reading & Copyright form

1 message

IJTech <ijtech@eng.ui.ac.id>

Mon, Jan 27, 2020 at 10:38 AM

To: linag@ft.untar.ac.id

Cc: maslin.kl@utm.my, yuri@ie.ui.ac.id, habibahharon.kl@utm.my, j.reyes@derby.ac.uk, asriisyamas@yahoo.com, fransjusuf42@gmail.com, agustinus@untar.ac.id, benny.tjahjono@coventry.ac.uk, ssusanto@unpar.ac.id, iveline.annemarie@trisakti.ac.id, kiwi.mlw@gmail.com

Dear Mrs. Lina Gozali,

The editorial boards delighted to inform you that your paper has been accepted to be published in IJTech next Volume 11 issue 1, January 2020.

Congratulations!

We have carried out necessary layouting and editing of your

manuscript. Prior to publication we need your final proof and copyright of the paper. Here is the note from editor:

1. Please provide the corresponding author's telephone and fax number (if any)
2. In page 47 and 52; cited articles of Kaplan and Norton (2001) are not found in the References section. Please clarify or add them accordingly, otherwise to delete them from the body text.
3. In page 49; cited articles of Hutabarat, 2014 is not found in the References section. Please clarify or add it accordingly, otherwise to delete it from the body text.
4. In page 49; cited articles of Gibson, 1988 is not found in the References section. Please clarify or add it accordingly, otherwise to delete it from the body text.
5. In page 49; cited articles of Wonglimpiyarat, 2016 is not found in the References section. Please clarify or add it accordingly, otherwise to delete it from the body text.
6. In References section; listed article of Maldonado-Guzman, G., Garza-Reyes, J.A., Rocha-Lona, L., Kumar, V., 2017 is not found in the body text. Please add it accordingly, otherwise to delete it from References section.
7. In References section; listed article of Stal, E., Andreassi, T., Fujino, A., 2016 is not found in the body text. Please add it accordingly, otherwise to delete it from References section.

Enclosed please find the copyright form and the paper for a final check and please confirm that the article ready for printing.

Any confirmation of the final check should be submitted no later than **January 28, 2020**. Copyright form can be printed, signed, scanned and send by email to ijtech@eng.ui.ac.id.

On behalf of editorial boards, we want to express you and your collaborators our deep appreciation for your contribution to IJTech.

We look forward to receiving the copyright form and proofs at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Mohammed Ali Berawi

maberawi@eng.ui.ac.id**Editor in Chief****International Journal of Technology (IJTech)**

p-ISSN: 2086-9614

e-ISSN 2087-2100

<http://ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id/>

2 attachments



Copyright Form - IJTech.pdf

61K



2464-46-57 Performance Factors for Successful Business... (Gozali et al.).docx

272K



Performance Factors for Successful Business Incubators in Indonesian Public Universities

Lina Gozali^{1*}, Maslin Masrom², Teuku Yuri M. Zagloel³, Habibah Norehan Haron²,
Jose Arturo Garza-Reyes⁴, Benny Tjahjono⁵, Agustinus Purna Irawan⁶,
Frans Jusuf Daywin¹, Asril Fitri Syamas⁷, Sani Susanto⁸, Harry Kasuma Kiwi Aliwarga⁹,
Iveline Anne Marie¹⁰

¹Department of Industrial Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Tarumanagara, Jl. S. Parman No 1, Jakarta 11440, Indonesia

²Razak Faculty of Technology and Informatics, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Jalan Sultan Yahya Petra, Kuala Lumpur 54100, Malaysia

³Department of Industrial Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Indonesia, Kampus UI Depok, Depok 16424, Indonesia

⁴Centre for Supply Chain Improvement, Derby Management School, University of Derby Kedleston Road, Derby, DE22 1GB, United Kingdom

⁵Centre for Business in Society, Coventry University, Priory St, Coventry CV1 5FB, United Kingdom

⁶Department of Mechanical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Tarumanagara, Jl.S Parman no 1, Jakarta 11440, Indonesia

⁷Association of Indonesian Business Incubator, Jl. Jenggala 2 no.9, Kebayoran Baru, Jakarta 12110, Indonesia

⁸Department of Industrial Engineering, Faculty of Industrial Technology, Universitas Katolik Parahyangan Jl. Ciumbuleuit No. 94, Gedung 8, Bandung, Indonesia 40141

⁹UMG IdeaLab Indonesia, Jl. Tangkas Baru Komplek Polri Blok E/2, Karet Semanggi, Setiabudi, South Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia 12930

¹⁰Department of Industrial Engineering, Faculty of Industrial Technology, Universitas Trisakti, Jl. Kyai Tapa No. 1, Jakarta 11440, Indonesia

Abstract. Measuring the performance of business processes is already a main concern for both faculty and enterprise players, since organizations are motivated to reach the productivity stage. Employing a performance achievement framework for the relationship between business incubator success factors will guarantee connection with commercial schemes, which support a high level of performance indicators in successful business incubator models. This research employs a quantitative approach, with the data analyzed using the IBM SPSS version 23 and Smart PLS version 3 statistical software packages. Employing a sample of 95 incubator managers from 19 universities which geographically located in Indonesia, it is shown that the image of business incubator factors has a positive effect on incubator performance. The study investigates the relationship between incubator performance and business incubator success factors in Indonesia. It was found that IT, as part of the business incubators' facets/abilities, partially supports their performance; that the entry criteria directly support the performance of the incubators; that mentoring networks also support the performance, with good infrastructure systems as a moderating factor; that funding supports the performance of business incubators, also with good infrastructure systems as a moderating factor; and that university regulations and government support and protection enhance the performance of business incubators, with credits and rewards as a moderating factor. In addition,

*Corresponding author's email: linag@ft.untar.ac.id, Tel.: +62-857-81219980
doi: [10.14716/ijtech.v11i1.2464](https://doi.org/10.14716/ijtech.v11i1.2464)

a variety of indicators from the local context affiliate positively to promote a community that highlighted the incubators' strategies.

Keyword: Incubator performance factors; Indonesian public universities; Successful business incubator

1. Introduction

Commercialization passage such as “If you cannot measure it, you cannot manage it” or “What is measured, improves” (Drucker, 2006) are occasionally challenged as they are not measurable to a significant extent (Ryan, 2014). Nevertheless, that passage help incubator managers to measuring their company's performance and successful factor (such as gapping from quantitative to qualitative and from financial to non-financial), that can support the study of the business activity performance dimension (Van Looy and Shafagatova, 2016). However, a performance framework to support the business process strategy and performance factors needs to be selected and employed (Shah et al., 2012).

Sometimes, the optimized performance measurement framework used is the balanced scorecard (BSC) developed by Kaplan and Norton (2001), which provides four measurement methods of business performance: (1) the financial perspective; (2) customer perspective; (3) internal business process perspective; and (4) learning and growth perspective.

The role of performance factors in successful business incubators has received increased attention across several disciplines in recent years. During the last decade, the performance of business incubators has been at the center of much attention. Many are currently trying to achieve the best performance in the intense competition to be successful. The purpose of this research is to assess the extent to which these performance factors are important for success in business incubators in Indonesian public universities. The research will greatly help incubators to achieve their best performance so that they can help their tenants to perform.

2. Literature Review

Service innovation has been widely accepted as part of the strategy to generate more advantages for business players, particularly SMEs. Therefore, it is safe to conclude that business players which employ and apply the latest innovations and activities as part of their routine actions will have greater chances of significantly upgrading their performance at company level. This will consistently equip them with the basic economic and financial resources needed to maintain the growth of their service innovation. By generating new assistance, which may have not recently existed in the business, SMEs can obtain the urge conditions to employ extreme innovations. In this way, they can beat their main business rivals, as well as significantly improving their business performance.

Research by Aerts et al. (2007) on the relationship between the filtering process of incubators and performance found coherence between filtering based on activities set with higher tenant survival rate. While this is an important indication for incubator managers to understand the filtering process, it does not demonstrate the application of incubator support, as the filtering process introduces heavy selection factors compared to incubators which are not filtered.

Peters et al. (2004) emphasize the effect of incubator services, including infrastructure, mentoring and networks, and on the percentage level of graduation of incubates. They found that simple comparison of types of services offered was not enough to highlight the differences in graduation rates among incubators. Instead, they conclude from investigation

that screening activities as well as literate resources are needed through networks, and that the relationship between co-tenants are the important factors in establishing incubator performances in terms of graduation rates.

Mian (1997) advises that performance evaluations also support program development and sustainability, tenant's firm survival and growth, implication to the University's mission sponsor and the environmental impacts should be noticed into account in order to measure incubator performance. The findings on technology business incubator performance can be observed by studying the incubation process, including the knowledge-sharing process, diffusion of innovation and individual creativity, which is vital for the developmental process of new ventures (Binsawad et al., 2019).

The lack of perception from incubatees of the future challenge led Chan and Lau (2005) to propose an adjusted model to understand the implication of technology firms through their business operation. Using previous research, they found a set of indicators to compare performance from the incubatees' perception. The nine elements consisted of pooling criteria, sharing facilities, coaching and mentoring services, public impress, networking, clustering, geographic proximity, finance, and funding support. They identified that the tenants' level of improvement affected the influences of each incubator characteristic on the tenants.

It has also been identified that the capability to connect start-ups to specific financial sources improves the factors important for incubators for increase their investments (Van Rijnsoever et al., 2017). It has also been found that participating in network events, engaging in referral services and the sheer fact of being linked to a reputable incubator puts the start-ups in a beneficial position, while supporting actions directly targeted at gaining more funding (such as pitch training) have less influence. In spite of that, it does not mean that the supporting actions correlated to hit-making, such as coaching, mentoring or workshops, are all in vain. The performance indicators related to raising funding are primarily applicable to new business players (Eveleens et al., 2017).

The important factor in incubation is the capability of the incubators to link the networks to the incubatees (Sherman and Chappell, 1998; Colombo and Delmastro, 2002; Haapasalo and Ekholm, 2004; Pena, 2004; Bøllingtoft and Ulhøi, 2005; Chan and Lau, 2005; Hughes et al., 2007). One of the important performance factors in incubation is the process of governing the incubatees' affiliations. Public business incubators, which consist of regional offices and universities, represent most of the business facilitators activated within the observed context. Universities and the local government play a key role in the development of public policies and contribute to research funding, agreements between universities, incubators and the regional entrepreneurial systems to aid and promote entrepreneurship, economic development and innovation (Corsi and Di Bernardino, 2014). Finally, the research also finds the 'learning' factor to be the foundation of performance (Messeghem et al., 2018).

This research has arisen because previous papers, for example Vanderstraeten and Matthyssens (2012), O'Neal (2005), Voisey et al. (2006), Löfsten and Lindelöf (2002), Mian (1997) and Bigliardi et al. (2006), have not used any processed data. Only Lalkaka (2003) indicates five factors, namely public policy, which stimulates entrepreneurial businesses and provides a business infrastructure; private sector partnerships for mentoring and marketing; the knowledge base of learning and research; professional networking, nationally and globally; and community involvement to promote entrepreneurship and cultural change. Stefanović and Stanković (2014) found that usually the model developed to measure business incubator performance was only one that measured financial

statements. This research seeks to develop a model that measures the performance factors of business incubator in public universities in Indonesia.

3. Structural Model, Performance Indicators, and Hypotheses

The factors studied in this research include the abilities of business incubators (Smilor, 1987; Costa-David et al., 2002; Verma, 2004), incubator governance (Campbell, 1989; Hannon, 1995; Verma, 2004), entry criteria (Campbell, 1985; Smilor and Gill, 1986; Campbell, 1989; Costa-David et al., 2002; Verma, 2004; Hackett and Dilts, 2004; Hutabarat, 2014), exit criteria (Costa-David et al., 2002; Verma, 2004), mentoring and networking (Campbell, 1985; Costa-David et al., 2002; Verma, 2004; Hackett and Dilts, 2004; Aerts et al., 2007), funding and support (Campbell, 1985; Costa-David et al., 2002; Verma, 2004), government support and protection (Smilor, 1987; Mian, 1997; Lee et al., 1999; Chandra and Chao, 2011; Wilson, 2012; Wolf 2017), university regulations (Smilor, 1987; Gibson, 1988; Mian, 1997; Carayannis et al., 2006; Chandra and Chao, 2011; Wonglimpiyarat, 2016), and system infrastructure (Hackett and Dilts, 2004; O’Neal, 2005; Carayannis et al., 2006). A structural model of all the factors to be assessed from the performance of successful business incubators in public universities in Indonesia is shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1 Structural model of the performance of business incubators in Indonesian public universities

The incubator performance framework section explained that the incubator performance framework should typically determine different performance approaches from which performance measurement could be further defined. However, we should observe that performance measurement and (key) performance measurements as phrasing (Dumas et al., 2013).

H1: The greater the focus on the performance of business incubators moderated by the quality of facilities, the more likely the business incubator is to be performed due to good quality of facilities.

H2: The better the incubator's governance, as moderated by credit and reward, the more likely it is to be performed.

H3: The stronger the enforcement of tenant entry criteria, the higher the probability of the business incubator performing well.

H4: The stronger the enforcement of tenant exit criteria, the higher the probability of the business incubator performing well.

H5: The better the mentoring and networking of the business incubator, moderated by a good infrastructure system, the more likely the business incubator is to be performed.

H6: The better the funding and support of the business incubator for its tenants is moderated by good system of infrastructure, the more likely the business incubator is to be performed.

H7: The better the support and protection from the government, moderated by credit and reward, the more likely the business incubator is to be performed

H8: The better the university regulations are moderated by credit and rewards, the better the initiative programs and projects for business incubator performance.

H9: The better the system and infrastructure are moderated by a good infrastructure system, the more likely the of the business incubator performance

4. Methodology

Using a mixed method approach, the research involves sequential timing in the use of several different methods. One approach is first employed, and the conclusion used to select the sample to establish the instrument, and to write the analysis for the subsequent approaches. Other applications were used to establish the designs of the differing approaches of equal weight and sequence. The second method involved data collection and procedure; first, a qualitative study, followed by a quantitative study. The weight between the qualitative and quantitative studies should be equal, although in practice one approach is used more than the other.

The decision on choosing an appropriate approach for a study hinges upon the goals of the research, and should be determined by the study questions (Marshall, 1996). The mixed-method approach incorporates mixed-methods design, employing both quantitative and qualitative studies. This approach has been utilized in many fields of study, including social, behavioral and health sciences (Yin, 2003). Tashakkori and Creswell (2007) define mixed-methods as research in which the investigator collects and analyses data, integrates the findings, and draws inferences using both qualitative and quantitative approaches or methods in a single study or program of inquiry. Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) advocate the use of mixed-methods research as the third research paradigm in educational research, and recognize the importance and usefulness of both types of study.

Consequently, the use of qualitative and quantitative methods was considered suitable for this research. The study first seeks to examine the indicators and success factors for business incubators in Indonesian public universities, second investigates these factors, and finally examines the research framework performance through statistical analysis. Based on various literature reviews, the survey questionnaire was constructed and developed into a consolidated survey questionnaire consisting of different measurement scales and questions. Each related success factor was measured using a 1 to 5 Likert scale, which was incorporated into the questionnaire, and respondents were requested to indicate the importance of factors relative to others.

The objective of the study is to distinguish those factors which have a relatively higher score. It then continues with the quantitative method using reliability and validity tests, in which all the success factors are valid and reliable (Gozali, 2018), research hypothesis tests, and a structural model test. Case studies are used as part of the qualitative method to study the differences between public university business incubators in Indonesia.

The qualitative study was adapted from the literature reviews, in which business incubator success factors were identified. The survey questionnaire was constructed and developed from face-to-face interviews with Indonesian public university business incubator experts. The survey questionnaire was then validated by ten professors from six countries (i.e. the USA, Scotland, Finland, Australia, Malaysia and Indonesia) (Gozali, 2018). After validation of the questionnaire and completion of the correction process, the final survey questionnaire was circulated to respondents via e-mail or conducted face-to-face. The Cronbach's alpha value obtained from the 95 respondents gave a value of 0.98, which shows that the reliability of the results is quite high.

The quantitative study was supported by data from in-depth, one-to-one interviews. The reliability of the quantitative factors in the study was assumed to be higher than the qualitative ones, since the interviews with the experts were originated on empirical data which had been previously collected (Graff, 2016). The main approach is to utilize questionnaires on a large sample in the form of quantitative data collection, hence the creation of the survey for the purpose of this research (Denscombe, 2007). This research examined the results to identify the performance of business incubators using the survey questionnaire developed for the study and the business incubator success framework (Gozali, 2016).

5. Research Locations and Research Sample

5.1. Research Location

The 95 respondents consisted of business incubator managers from Indonesian public universities, chosen from the following institutions: Institut Teknologi Bandung, Institute Teknologi Sepuluh November, Andalas University, Institut Pertanian Bogor, Diponegoro University, University of Indonesia, Samratulangi University, Brawijaya University, Airlangga University, Riau University, Udayana University, Gorontalo University, Sebelas Maret University, Jambi University, North Sumatera University, Bandung Technopark, Padjajaran University and Yogyakarta State University.

5.2. Research Sample

The sample used for the study consisted of business incubator managers in Indonesian public universities involved in the day-to-day operations of the incubators and the graduated tenant companies. In their role as sample or respondents, the business incubator managers would have the necessary insights and experience of managing incubators, with a relationship between the incubators and tenant firms. The sample for this research

consisted of 95 respondents, all of whom were business incubator managers from Indonesian public universities.

6. Results and Discussion

The research employs the mixed method approach, and the data are analyzed using the IBM SPSS version 23 and Smart PLS version 3 statistical software packages. After data collection and analysis, the results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Structural model measurement for the performance of business incubators

Hypothesis	Construct relationship	t stat	p value
H1	Information Technology → Quality of Facility	4.374	0.000
H2	Incubator Governance → Credit and Rewards	0.461	0.645
H3	Entry Criteria → Business Incubator Performance	2.125	0.034
H4	Exit Criteria → Business Incubator Performance	0.997	0.319
H5	Mentoring and Networking → Good System Infrastructure	2.686	0.007
H6	Funding and Support → Business Incubator Performance	3.535	0.000
H7	Government Support and Protection → Credit and Rewards	2.309	0.021
H8	University Regulation → Credit and Rewards	3.515	0.000
H9	System Infrastructure → Good System Infrastructure	1.486	0.138

Lalkaka (2003) proposed five factors, government support, mentoring networking, infrastructure, community support and sharing knowledge, which will increase business incubator performance. Stefanović and Stanković (2014) developed a model by only measuring financial statements.utama et al. (2018) state that business incubator performance depends on office space, tenant rooms, discussion room 1 and a tenant production display room, with a minimum time requirement for the incubation process. Grapeggia et al. (2011) state that incubator governance, marketing assistance and infrastructure are important for increasing business incubator performance in Brazil. Binsawad et al. (2019) state that the performance of technology business incubators is influenced by sharing knowledge and incubator governance, while Zibarzani and Rozan (2017) state that mentoring networking and sharing knowledge greatly influences business incubator performance in supporting start-ups. Xie et al. (2011) explain that incubation funding can improve incubator performance but not directly influence the tenants' income.

Van Looy and Shafagatova (2016) show that the performance indicators from quantitative to qualitative methods and from financial to non-financial factors, almost similar to Kaplan and Norton (2001), who take a four-dimensional approach to organizational performance, from the: (1) financial perspective; (2) customer perspective; (3) internal business process perspective; and (4) learning and growth perspective. Learning is a key indicator for performance, as stated by Messeghem et al. (2018), Mian (1997) and Binsawad et al. (2019).

Aerts et al. (2007) developed screening criteria, or entry criteria. Corsi and Di Berardino (2014) emphasizes the roles of university regulations and collaborations in investment and public policies. Van Rijnsoever et al. (2017) and Eveleens et al. (2017) recommend funding and support. Van Rijnsoever et al. (2017), Bøllingtoft and Ulhøi (2005), Chan and Lau (2005), Colombo and Delmastro (2002), Haapasalo and Ekholm (2004), Hughes et al. (2007), Pena (2004) and Sherman and Chappell (1998) acknowledge the relationship between mentoring and networking. All the above theories and models support the factors within the findings of this analysis.

Table 2 Results of performance hypothesis testing

Hypothesis	Description	Result
H1	The greater the focus is on the performance of business incubator moderated by the quality of the facilities, the more likely the business incubator to perform due to good quality of facilities.	Partially Supported (Information Technology and E-com Assistance)
H2	The better the incubator's governance is moderated by credit and reward, the more likely the business incubator to perform	Not Supported
H3	The stronger the enforcement of tenant entry criteria, the higher the probability of business incubator to perform	Directly Supported
H4	The stronger the enforcement of tenant exit criteria, the higher the probability of business incubator to perform	Not Supported
H5	The better the mentoring and networking of the business incubator moderated by good system of infrastructure, the more likely the business incubator to perform	Supported
H6	The better the funding and support of the business incubator for its tenants is moderated by good system of infrastructure, the more likely the business incubator to perform	Supported
H7	The better the support and protection from the government moderated by credit and reward, the more likely the business incubator to perform	Supported
H8	The better the university regulation is moderated by credit and rewards, the better the initiative programs and projects for business incubator on the performance (university regulation).	Supported
H9	The better the system and infrastructure are moderated by a good system of infrastructure, the more likely the performance of the business incubator to increase	Not Supported

The results of the hypothesis analysis shown in Table 2 demonstrate that information technology (Grapeggia, 2011; Lalkaka, 2003), as part of the abilities of a business incubator, partially supports their performance and that entry criteria (Campbell, 1985; Smilor and Gill, 1986; Campbell, 1989; Costa-David et al., 2002) directly support performance. Mentoring networking (Lalkaka, 2003; Zibarzani and Rozan, 2017) supports the performance of business incubator, with good infrastructure systems as a moderating factor and funding (Xie et al., 2011; Van Looy and Shafagatova, 2016; Van Rijnsoever et al., 2017; Eveleens et al., 2017) also supports performance, with good infrastructure systems also as a moderating factor. Finally, university regulation (Corsi and Di Bernardino, 2014) supports the performance of business incubators, with credits and rewards as a moderating factor.

7. Conclusions

This research has been conducted to measure the factors that are critical to incubator performance. The research design employed the mixed methods approach. To conclude, it can be said that comprehensive skimming of references has provided us with numerous factors which account for the success of incubation performance. An important finding from the paper is that information technology, entry criteria, government support and protection, funding and support, mentoring networking and university regulation support the performance of business incubators.

References

Aerts, K., Matthyssens, P., Vandenbempt, K., 2007. Critical Role and Screening Practices of European Business Incubators. *Technovation*, Volume 27(5), pp. 254–267

- Bigliardi, B., Dormio, A.I., Nosella, A., Petroni, G., 2006. Assessing Science Parks' Performances: Directions from Selected Italian Case Studies. *Technovation*, Volume 26(4), pp. 489–505
- Binsawad, M., Sohaib, O., Hawryszkiewicz, I., 2019. Factors Impacting Technology Business Incubator Performance. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, Volume 23(01), pp. 1–30
- Bøllingtoft, A., Ulhøi, J.P., 2005. The Networked Business Incubator—leveraging Entrepreneurial Agency? *Journal of Business Venturing*, Volume 20(2), pp. 265–290
- Campbell, C. Kendrick, R., Samuelson, D., 1985. Stalking the Latent Entrepreneur. *Economic Development Review*, Volume 3(2), pp. 43–48
- Campbell, C., 1989. Change Agents in the New Economy: Business Incubators and Economic Development. *Economic Development Review*, Volume 7(3), pp. 56–57
- Carayannis, E.G., Popescu, D., Sipp, C., Stewart, M., 2006. Technological Learning for Entrepreneurial Development (TL4ED) in the Knowledge Economy (KE): Case Studies and Lessons Learned. *Technovation*, Volume 26(4), pp. 419–443
- Chandra, A., Chao, C.A., 2011. Growth and Evolution of High-technology Business Incubation in China. *Human Systems Management*, Volume 30(1–2), pp. 55–69
- Colombo, M.G., Delmastro, M., 2002. How Effective Are Technology Incubators? Evidence from Italy. *Research Policy*, Volume 31(7), pp. 1103–1122
- Corsi, C., Di Bernardino, D., 2014. Assessing the Business Incubator' Performance Referring the Local Development in Italy. *European Scientific Journal (ESJ)*, Volume 1, pp. 323–334
- Costa-David, J., Malan, J., Lalkaka, R., 2002. Improving Business Incubator Performance through Benchmarking and Evaluation: Lessons Learned from Europe. *Materiaty*, Volume 16, pp. 28–04
- Chan, K.F., Lau, T., 2005. Assessing Technology Incubator Programs in the Science Park: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly. *Technovation*, Volume 25(10), pp. 1215–1228
- Drucker, P.F., 2006. *Classic Drucker: Essential Wisdom of Peter Drucker from the Pages of Harvard Business Review*. Harvard Business Press, Boston
- Dumas, M., La Rosa, M., Mendling, J., Reijers, H.A., 2013. *Fundamentals of Business Process Management*. Berlin: Springer
- Denscombe, M., 2007. *The Good Research Guides*. 3rd Edition, Berkshire. England: McGraw-Hill Education
- European Commission Enterprise Directorate General, 2002. Benchmarking of Business Incubators. Center for Strategy and Evaluation Services
- Eveleens, C.P., van Rijnsoever, F.J., Niesten, E.M., 2017. How Network-based Incubation Helps Start-up Performance: A Systematic Review Against the Background of Management Theories. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, Volume 42(3), pp. 676–713
- Gibson, L.J., 1988. *The Old and the New*. Economic Development Review, 1, 7
- Gozali, L., Masrom, M., Zagloel, T.Y.M., Haron, H.N., 2016. A Framework of Successful Business Incubators for Indonesian Public Universities. *International Journal of Technology*, Volume 7(6), pp. 1086–1096
- Gozali, L., Masrom, M., Zagloel, T.Y.M., Haron, H.N., Tjahjadi, E., 2018. A Framework Toward Successful Business Incubator for Indonesian Public Universities: A Pilot Review. In: Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management Volume 2018-March, 2018, pp 869–883
- Graff, J.C., 2016. *Mixed Methods Research: Evidence-Based Practice*, Volume 47
- Grapeggia, M., Ortigara, A.A., Bastos, R.C., Juliatto, D.L., Lezana, A.G.R., 2011. Analysis by Clustering Factor Performance Business Incubators, *RAI*, Volume 8(1), pp. 64–91

- Hackett, S.M., Dilts, D.M., 2004. A Real Options - Driven Theory of Business Incubation. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, Volume 29(1), pp. 41–54
- Haapasalo, H., Ekholm, T., 2004. A Profile of European Incubators: A Framework for Commercializing Innovations. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, Volume 4, pp. 248–270
- Hannon, P.D., 1995. Hey, I'm an Entrepreneur Too! The Dichotomous Role of Incubator Managers and their Impact on the Entrepreneurial Process. *In: Proceedings of the International Ent95 Conference*, Burbury
- Hughes, M., Ireland, R.D., Morgan, R.E., 2007. Stimulating Dynamic Value: Social Capital and Business Incubation as a Pathway to Competitive Success. *Long Range Planning*, Volume 40(2), pp. 154–177
- Hutabarat, Z., Pandin, M., 2014. Absorptive Capacity of Business Incubator for SME's Rural Community Located in Indonesia's Village. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Volume 115, 373–377
- Johnson, R.B., Onwuegbuzie, A.J., 2004. Mixed Methods Research: A Research Paradigm Whose Time has Come. *Educational Researcher*, Volume 33(7), pp. 14–26
- Kaplan, R.S., Norton, D.P., 2001. Transforming the balanced scorecard from performance measurement to strategic management: Part I. *Accounting horizons*, Volume 15(1), pp. 87–104
- Lalkaka, R., 2003. Business Incubators in Developing Countries: Characteristics and Performance. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, Volume 3(1–2), pp. 31–55
- Lee, J. J., Kim, J.S., Chun, H.K., 1999. A Study on the Management and Financial Independence of University Technology Business Incubators (UTBIs) in Information and Telecommunication Industry. *Korean Small Business Review*, Volume 21(2), pp. 185–206
- Löfsten, H., Lindelöf, P., 2002. Science Parks and the Growth of New Technology-based Firms–Academic–Industry Links, Innovation and Markets. *Research Policy*, Volume 31(6), pp. 859–876
- Marshall, M.N., 1996. Sampling for Qualitative Research. *Family Practice*, Volume 13(6), pp. 522–526
- Messeghem, K., Bakkali, C., Sammut, S., Swalhi, A., 2018. Measuring Nonprofit Incubator Performance: Toward an Adapted Balanced Scorecard Approach. *Journal of Small Business Management*, Volume 56(4), pp. 658–680
- Mian, S.A., 1997. Assessing and Managing the University Technology Business Incubator: An Integrative Framework. *Journal of Business Venturing*, Volume 12(4), pp. 251–285
- O'Neal, T., 2005. Evolving a Successful University-based Incubator: Lessons Learned from the UCF Technology Incubator. *Engineering Management Journal*, Volume 17(3), pp. 11–25
- Pena, I., 2004. Business Incubation Centers and New Firm Growth in the Basque Country. *Small Business Economics*, Volume 22(3–4), pp. 223–236
- Peters, L., Rice, M., Sundarajan, M., 2004. The Role of Incubators in the Entrepreneurial Process. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, Volume 29(1), pp. 83–91
- Ryan, L., 2014. *If You Can't Measure It, You Can't Manage It: Not True*. Forbes
- Shah, L., Etienne, A., Siadat, A., Vernadat, F., 2012. (Value, Risk)-based Performance Evaluation of Manufacturing Processes. *In: INCOM Proceedings of the 14th Symposium on Information Control Problems in Manufacturing*, 23–25 May 2012. Bucharest, Romania, pp 1586–1591

- Sherman, H., Chappell, D.S., 1998. Methodological Challenges in Evaluating Business Incubators Outcomes. *Economic Development Quarterly*, Volume 12(4), pp. 313–321
- Smilor, R.W., Gill Jr., M.D., 1986. *The New Business Incubator: Linking Talent, Technology, Capital, and Know How*. Lexington: Lexington Books
- Smilor, R.W., 1987. Managing the Incubator System: Critical Successful factors to Accelerate New Company Development. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management EM-34*, Volume (4), pp. 146–156
- Sutama, I.K., Pasek, I.K., Mudana, I.G., 2018. Business Incubators Support College Performance. *SOSHUM: Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora (Journal of Social Science and Humanities)*, Volume 8(1), pp. 33–42
- Stefanović, S., Stanković, M., 2014. Entrepreneurial Model of Franchising. *In: Proceedings of the International Symposium SymOrg, Faculty of Organizational Sciences*, pp. 560–567, Zlatibor
- Tashakkori, A., Creswell, J.W., 2007. Exploring the Nature of Research Questions in Mixed Methods Research. *Sagepub*, pp. 207–211
- Vanderstraeten, J., Matthyssens, P., Van Witteloostuijn, A., 2012. *Measuring The Performance of Business Incubators: A Critical Analysis of Effectiveness Approaches and Performance Measurement Systems*. Academia
- Van Looy, A., Shafagatova, A., 2016. Business Process Performance Measurement: A Structured Literature Review of Indicators, Measures and Metrics. *SpringerPlus*, Volume 5(1), pp. 1–24
- Van Rijnsoever, F.J., Van Weele, M.A., Eveleens, C.P., 2017. Network Brokers or Hit Makers? Analyzing the Influence of Incubation on Start-up Investments. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, Volume 13(2), pp. 605–629
- Verma, S., 2004. *Successful Factors for Business Incubators: An Empirical Study of Canadian Business Incubators*. Eric Sprott School of Business, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario
- Voisey, P., Gornall, L., Jones, P., Thomas, B., 2006. The Measurement of Success in a Business Incubation Project. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Volume 13(3), pp. 454–468
- Wilson, T., 2012. *Review of HE-Business Collaboration*. Department for Business, Innovation and Skills. London
- Wolf, G., 2017. Entrepreneurial university: A Case Study at Stony Brook University. *Journal of Management Development*, Volume 36(2), pp. 286–294
- Wonglimpiyarat, J., 2016. Government Policies Towards Israel's High-tech Powerhouse. *Technovation*, Volume 52, pp. 18–27
- Yin, R.K., 2003. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods, Applied Social Research Methods Series*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Xie, F., Wu, W. Q., Zhao, L.M., 2011. Co-integration Analysis between Performance of Business Incubator and Incubation Fund. *In: 2011 IEEE 18th International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management*, pp. 2028–2031
- Zibarzani, M., Rozan, M.Z.A., 2017. The Role of Knowledge Sharing in Business Incubators Performance. *In: International Conference of Reliable Information and Communication Technology*, pp. 719–727, Springer, Cham

Appendix A

The content of the Questionnaire

1. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to provide PHYSICAL OR LOGISTICAL FACILITIES: Office Space, Workshop Space, Laboratory, Computers, Conference Room, Meeting Room, Furniture and Equipment Rental, Telephone Equipment, Canteen, Shipping and Receiving, Logistic.
2. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to provide SHARED BUSINESS SERVICES AND EQUIPMENT: Audio Visual Equipment, Mail Service, Photocopy, Electricity, Water, Filling, Clerical Service, Receptionist, Office Hours Answering, Air Conditioner, Cleaning, Maintenance, Custodial Services.
3. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to provide FINANCIAL AND ACCOUNTING CONSULTATIONS: Business Taxes, Risk and Management Units, Government Grants and Loans, Government Procurement Process, Government Contract Preparation, Equity and Debt Financial Agreement, Export Development Assistance, Writing Financial Report.
4. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to provide MARKETING ASSISTANCE. Market Research, Advertising and Media Promotion, Customer Service Training, Pricing Strategy, Product and Image Development, Selling and Distribution Strategy, Business Events, Conferences and Exhibitions, Network to other business support, agencies, and potential clients.
5. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to provide PROFESSIONAL BUSINESS SERVICES AND BUSINESS ETIQUETTE: Pre-Incubation Services, Legal Counseling, Legal Representation, Patent Assistance, Accounting, Computing and Information Services, Book Keeping, Introduction to Seed and Venture Capitalist, Business Angel Network.
6. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to provide MANAGEMENT AND HUMAN RESOURCE ASSISTANCE: Business Planning Skill, Budgeting Skill, Employee or Human Relations Skill, Controlling Skill, Renumeration Packages, Career Path Planning, Public Speaking and Presentation Skill, Training Package for Human Development.
7. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to provide INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND E-COMMERCE ASSISTANCE: E Business or E commerce, E business or E Commerce, Computer & Software Skill, Network Provider, Web Admin, Accessibility.
8. The following criteria relate to the INCUBATOR GOVERNANCE: An Experienced Incubator Manager, A Key Board of Directors, A Noted Advisory Council, Concise Program Milestones with Clear Policies and Procedures, Dynamic and Efficient Business Operation, Good System Operation Procedure of Business Incubator, Vision, Mission, Value and Culture of Business Incubator.
9. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to screen tenants for admission to the incubator (ENTRY CRITERIA). Ability to Create Jobs, Ability to Present a Written Business Plan, Have a Unique Opportunity, Ability to The Firm to be Owned Locally, Advanced Technology Related Firm, Ability of Firm to Present Its Space Needs, Complementary to Existing Firms, New Start Up Firm, Age of Firm, Affiliated with University, Be Able to Pay Operating Expenses, Business Must Have an Innovative Project, Business Must Demonstrate The High Growth Potential, Social Impact.
10. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to decide when tenants should leave the incubator (EXIT CRITERIA): Time Limit of Tenancy, Space Requirements, Achieved Business Target and Objectives, Fail to Achieved Business target and Objectives, Need More Support that Incubator Cannot Offer.
11. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to provide MENTORING AND NETWORKING: Entrepreneurial Network, Entrepreneurial Education, Tie to a University, Community Support, Affiliation with Key Institutions, Finding the Strategy and Expertise Partner.
12. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to obtain GOVERNMENT SUPPORT AND PROTECTION: Grant or Funding, Good Regulation, Tax Holiday or Protection, Special Stock Market for Startup Company.
13. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to obtain FUNDING AND SUPPORT: Financing Arrangement, Organizational Arrangement, Good Supporting Data, Intellectual Property Protection, Help with Regulatory Compliance
14. The following criteria relate to the ability of the business incubator to obtain UNIVERSITY REGULATION: Good University Regulation for Entrepreneurship, Good Entrepreneurship Programs, appointed a Good Business Incubator Manager, Give Credit and Rewards for Business Incubator, Manager, Mentor and Counselor, Evaluation System for Business Incubator Services and social impacts
15. The following criteria relate to the ability of the incubator to provide SYSTEM INFRASTRUCTURE. Integrate Clients in the Largest, Technology Development System, Good Service Provider, High Speed Broadband Internet, Technology Support
16. The management use the following criteria to monitor the PERFORMANCE OF THE BUSINESS INCUBATOR itself. Incubator Occupancy Rates, Number of Companies Graduating from Incubator, Job Created by Tenant/Graduate Companies, Turnover of Tenant/Graduate Companies, Financial Performance of Incubator Itself, Business Incubator Contribution to Society or Local Development



Source details

International Journal of Technology

Open Access ⓘ

Scopus coverage years: from 2010 to Present

Publisher: Faculty of Engineering Universitas Indonesia

ISSN: 2086-9614

Subject area: Engineering: General Engineering Business, Management and Accounting: Strategy and Management
Business, Management and Accounting: Management of Technology and Innovation

CiteScore 2018

1.06 ⓘ

SJR 2018

0.345 ⓘ

SNIP 2018

1.395 ⓘ

[View all documents >](#)

[Set document alert](#)

[Save to source list](#) [Journal Homepage](#)

[CiteScore](#) [CiteScore rank & trend](#) [CiteScore presets](#) [Scopus content coverage](#)

CiteScore 2018 ▾

Calculated using data from 30 April, 2019

CiteScore rank ⓘ

$$1.06 = \frac{\text{Citation Count 2018}}{\text{Documents 2015 - 2017*}} = \frac{493 \text{ Citations >}}{465 \text{ Documents >}}$$

*CiteScore includes all available document types

[View CiteScore methodology >](#) [CiteScore FAQ >](#)

Category	Rank	Percentile
Engineering		
General Engineering	#110/275	60th
Business, Management and Accounting		
Strategy and Management	#211/396	46th

CiteScoreTracker 2019 ⓘ

Last updated on 09 April, 2020
Updated monthly

$$1.18 = \frac{\text{Citation Count 2019}}{\text{Documents 2016 - 2018}} = \frac{592 \text{ Citations to date >}}{501 \text{ Documents to date >}}$$

[View CiteScore trends >](#)

[Add CiteScore to your site](#) 🔗

Metrics displaying this icon are compiled according to Snowball Metrics ↗, a collaboration between industry and academia.

About Scopus

- [What is Scopus](#)
- [Content coverage](#)
- [Scopus blog](#)
- [Scopus API](#)
- [Privacy matters](#)

Language

- [日本語に切り替える](#)
- [切换到简体中文](#)
- [切换到繁體中文](#)
- [Русский язык](#)

Customer Service

- [Help](#)
- [Contact us](#)





SJR

Scimago Journal & Country Rank

Enter Journal Title, ISSN or Publisher Name









[Home](#)[Journal Rankings](#)[Country Rankings](#)[Viz Tools](#)[Help](#)[About Us](#)



International Journal of Technology

Country	Indonesia -  SJR Ranking of Indonesia	<h1>9</h1> <hr/> H Index
Subject Area and Category	Business, Management and Accounting Management of Technology and Innovation Strategy and Management Engineering Engineering (miscellaneous)	
Publisher	Faculty of Engineering Universitas Indonesia	
Publication type	Journals	
ISSN	20869614	
Coverage	2010-ongoing	
Scope	International Journal of Technology aims to provide cutting-edge research and practices in the management and design of technology, a forum for debate and reflection as well as an anchor point for many technology practitioners and academics programs. Submission are invited concerning any theoretical or practical treatment of technology design, development and application (from various field of study such as: architecture, chemical, civil, electrical, industrial, material, and mechanical engineering). The subject of papers contributed may cover, but is not limited to: Discussion and exploration of new theory and knowledge of technology, innovation and sustainable development. Industrial and service management, product and process design, and performance improvement. Proficiency in the understanding technology design, development and application derived from experimental data analysis. Case studies reporting insights and best practices regarding technology design and development drawn from practices. Technology tools, techniques and other structured approaches to understand, measure, or provide value. Empirical observations resulting in original and significant conclusions or application papers in the above areas are also welcome.	
	Homepage	
	How to publish in this journal	

Contact

 Join the conversation about this journal





International Journal of Technology

Q2 Engineering (miscellaneous)

best quartile

SJR 2018

0.35

powered by scimagojr.com

← Show this widget in your own website

Just copy the code below and paste within your html code:

```
<a href="https://www.scimagojr.com" style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 2px 5px; display: inline-block;">https://www.scimagojr.com
```

A **ASMAT** 10 hours ago

This journal totally disappointed me. I submitted my article in march 2019 in that time there were no APC charge, and entire 2019 year, the editor board did not reply regarding reviewing status. This journal has taking APC from jan 2020, and they send me email in feb 2020 for APC charge agreement.

I am poor student, how can I pay APC like 550 USD and my college was also not agreed to do this. This journal wasted total 1 year of my article.

reply



Melanie Ortiz 8 months ago

SCImago Team

Dear user,

thank you for contacting us.

Sorry to tell you that SCImago Journal & Country Rank is not a journal. SJR is a portal with scientometric indicators of journals indexed in Elsevier/Scopus.

Unfortunately, we cannot help you with your request, we suggest you to go to the journal's homepage or contact the journal's editorial staff , so they could inform you more deeply.

Best Regards, SCImago Team

reply

EDITORIAL TEAM

Editor in Chief

1. Dr. Mohammed Ali Berawi, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia

Managing Editor

1. Dr. Nyoman Suwartha, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia

Members

1. Dr. Agus Sunjarianto Pamitran, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
2. Dr. Anwar Usman, Universiti Brunei Darussalam, Brunei Darussalam
3. Dr. Cecilia Vale, University of Porto, Portugal
4. Dr. Eko Adhi Setiawan, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
5. Dr. Eng. Muhammad Arif Budiyanoto, S.T., M.T., Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
6. Dr. Eny Kusriani, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
7. Dr. Giuseppe Lo Papa, Teagasc Rural Economy Research Centre, Ireland
8. Dr. Hendri Dwi Saptioratri, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
9. Dr. Hng Huey Hoon, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore , Singapore
10. Dr. Johannes Widodo, National University of Singapore, Singapore
11. Dr. Lee Wilson, University of Saskatchewan, Canada
12. Dr. Muhamad Asvial, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
13. Dr. Muhammad Suryanegara, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
14. Dr. Nofrijon Sofyan, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
15. Dr. Reza Kia, Islamic Azad University, Iran (Islamic Republic of)
16. Dr. Roy Woodhead, Digital Innovation, Sheffield Business School, Sheffield Hallam University, United Kingdom
17. Dr. Ruki Harwahyu, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
18. Dr. Sam P. Sinha, Scientific Research & Development, United States
19. Dr. Sri Harjanto, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
20. Dr. Yudan Whulanza, S.T., M.Sc., Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
21. Dr. Yung-Jung Hsu, National Chiao Tung University, Taiwan
22. Prof. Dr. Akhmad Herman Yuwono , Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
23. Prof. Dr. Bambang Sugiarto, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
24. Prof. Dr. Dedi Priadi, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
25. Prof. Dr. Esah Hamzah, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia
26. Prof. Dr. Hamzah Abdul Rahman, Universiti Malaya, Malaysia
27. Prof. Dr. Hideaki Ohgaki, Kyoto University, Japan
28. Prof. Dr. Isti Surjandari, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
29. Prof. Dr. Jong-Taek Oh, Chonnam National University, Korea, Republic of
30. Prof. Dr. Muhammad Idris Saleh, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia
31. Prof. Dr. Nandy Putra, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
32. Prof. Dr. Raimundo Delgado, University of Porto, Portugal
33. Prof. Dr. Simon P. Ringer, University of Sydney, Australia
34. Prof. Dr. Sutrasno Kartohardjono, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
35. Prof. Dr. T. Yuri M. Zagloel, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
36. Prof. Dr. Toshio Shudo, Tokyo Metropolitan University, Japan
37. Prof. Dr. Yandi Andri Yatmo, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia

38. Prof. Dr. Yung- Hui Lee, National Taiwan University, Taiwan
39. Prof. Paramita Atmodiwiryo, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
40. Prof. Rui Calcada, University of Porto, Portugal

About the Journal

- Editorial Board (<https://ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id/people>)
- Focus and Scope (<https://ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id/about/5/focus-and-scope>)
- Online Submissions (<https://ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id/about/3/online-submission>)
- Publication Policy (<https://ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id/about/11/publication-policy>)
- Publication Ethics and Policy (<https://ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id/about/10/policy>)
- Author Guidelines (<https://ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id/about/4/author-guidelines>)
- List of Reviewers (<https://ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id/about/12>)

-
- Most downloaded papers (<https://ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id/home/mostdownloadedpapers>)
 - Most cited papers (<https://ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id/about/14>)

Login

Username

Password

Not as user?

Register (<https://ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id/register>)

LOGIN

IJTech

p-ISSN : 2086-9614

e-ISSN : 2087-2100

Journal Metrics

Metrics by SCOPUS 2018

CiteScore 2018: **1.06**

SCImago Journal Rank (SJR): **0.345**

Source Normalized Impact per Paper
(SNIP): **1.395**

Acceptance rate: **27.69 %**

Average time to publish: **149 days.**

📈 IJTech is indexed in:



(<http://www.scopus.com>)



(<http://www.ebsco.com/index.asp>)



(<http://www.doaj.org>)



(<http://www.scimagojr.com>)



(<http://www.indexcopernicus.com>)




(<http://www.crossref.org>)



([http://ip-science.thomsonreuters.com/cgi-](http://ip-science.thomsonreuters.com/cgi-bin/jrnlst/jlresults.cgi?PC=EX&Full=international%20journal%20of%20technology)

[bin/jrnlst/jlresults.cgi?PC=EX&Full=international%20journal%20of%20technology](http://ip-science.thomsonreuters.com/cgi-bin/jrnlst/jlresults.cgi?PC=EX&Full=international%20journal%20of%20technology))



(<http://info.flagcounter.com/AoS7>)