

A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF THE MICROBIZ INCUBATION PROGRAM IN PANABO CITY

Sharlene Grace L. Duco¹

¹College of Development Management University of Southeastern Philippines, Mintal Campus, Davao City
Slduco00268@usep.edu.ph

DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.58257/IJPREMS38205>

ABSTRACT

The MicroBiz Incubation Program was implemented in Panabo City in 2011 to support and enhancing the capability of local entrepreneurs. This systematic review evaluates the program's ability to bring about a successful entrepreneurial journey and regional development. This study utilizes the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework, integrating literature and empirical evidence on mechanisms, challenges, and outcomes regarding MBIP. The findings bring out the relevance of critical success factors like mentorship, financial access, and conducive policies but simultaneously point to shortcomings in infrastructure as well as underutilized resources. Additionally, recommendations for this study formulate approaches toward local governance to spur entrepreneurial ecosystems sustainably.

Keywords: MicroBiz Incubation Program, Entrepreneurship, Entrepreneurial development, Systematic Review, PRISMA framework

1. INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship contributes to economic growth and social development, creating jobs and innovation (Gherghina et al., 2020). SMEs account for 90% of global businesses and provide more than 50% of employment (World Bank, 2019). In the Philippines, MSMEs are composed of 99.6% of companies (Huang et al., 2016), which is a crucial factor in the economy. Furthermore, the MicroBiz Incubation Program (MBIP) was established in Panabo in 2011. It helps entrepreneurs by providing them with resources, training, and mentorship to the micro-entrepreneurs of the informal sector and small-scale vendors. These challenges, such as the lack of funds, and the unawareness of existing resources, impede the program.

Objectives of the Study

This study seeks to:

1. Determine the support mechanisms provided by MBIP.
2. Identify challenges of entrepreneurs in Panabo City.
3. Determine the impact of local governance in the success of MBIP

Significance of the Study

The findings of this study will improve the framework of MBIP for policymakers, local government, and community stakeholders to support sustainable entrepreneurial growth and regional economic development.

2. METHODOLOGY

Study Design

This systematic review utilized the PRISMA framework to ensure a holistic synthesis of literature and empirical data relevant to the review. The methodology will focus on identifying, screening, and analyzing studies focusing on business incubation programs, micro-enterprise development, and local governance roles.

Data Sources

The primary sources include peer-reviewed journals, government reports, and gray literature. In addition, studies demonstrating effectiveness, implementation, and outcome regarding incubation programs in similar contexts were first sought.

Sampling Techniques

Purposive sampling was used to select studies on incubation programs and entrepreneurship development. Relevance towards the expected outcomes and objectives of MBIP was considered in the inclusion criteria.

Data Analysis

The analysis integrates quantitative and qualitative findings to assess MBIP's impact on entrepreneurial development and local governance. Metrics include business performance, resource access, and program sustainability.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Support Mechanisms in MBIP- The MBIP has provided training, mentorship, and financial support; these are important for developing micro-enterprises (Hackett & Dilts, 2004). Entrepreneurial confidence and capacity increased through resources and networking opportunities. However, there remain gaps in advanced skill training and market integration (Frederiksen & Brem, 2017).

Role of Local Governance- Local governance plays a significant role in the implementation of MBIP. The policies, NGOs, and the private sector partnership will enhance the program's success (Eijdenberg et al., 2019). However, inconsistency in the implementation of policies and poor stakeholder involvement undermine the desired results.

Entrepreneurial Outcomes- MBIP has contributed to the entrepreneur's revenue, employment, and sustainability increase. Other performance metrics include customer retention and profitability, which are consistent with international incubation strategies (Van Looy & Shafagatova, 2016).

Key Challenges Faced by Entrepreneurs

- Limited Access to Finance: Many entrepreneurs struggle to access finance and, hence, cannot expand their businesses (Beck & Maksimovic, 2002).
- Inadequate Infrastructure: Poor infrastructure makes it hard for entrepreneurs to reach markets and run their operations successfully (Porter, 2008).
- Awareness Gaps: Entrepreneurs are not usually aware of the resources available, hence lower program utilization (Shinozaki & Rao, 2021).

4. CONCLUSION

The MicroBiz Incubation Program in Panabo City demonstrates potential in fostering entrepreneurial growth and local economic development. While mentorship, financial access, and policy support are critical success factors, addressing challenges like resource gaps and infrastructure limitations is essential for long-term sustainability.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Enhanced Financial Support: Flexible loan schemes and increase in microfinance opportunities.
- Infrastructure Development: Both physical and digital infrastructures must be invested in for efficiency in operation.
- Awareness Campaigns: Increase outreach to entrepreneurs about the available resources through awareness campaigns.
- Policy Improvements: Policy improvement in the local governance framework to respond to the needs of entrepreneurs.
- Stakeholder Collaboration: Stakeholder collaboration with NGOs and private sectors to diversify the support mechanisms.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] Beck, T., & Maksimovic, V. (2002). Financing patterns around the world: The role of institutions. World Bank Publications.
- [2] Eijdenberg, E. L., Thompson, N. A., Verduijn, K., & Essers, C. (2019). Entrepreneurial activities in a developing country: an institutional theory perspective. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 25(3), 414-432.
- [3] Frederiksen, D. L., & Brem, A. (2017). How do entrepreneurs think they create value? A reflection on Eric Ries' Lean Startup approach. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 13, 169-189.
- [4] Gherghina, Ș. C., Botezatu, M. A., Hosszu, A., & Simionescu, L. N. (2020). SMEs as the engine of economic growth. *Sustainability*, 12(1), 347.
- [5] Hackett, S. M., & Dilts, D. M. (2004). A systematic review of business incubation research. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 29(1), 55-82.
- [6] Huang, M. A. C., et al. (2016). Factors Affecting Entrepreneurship Decision in Los Banos, Laguna, Philippines. *Journal of Economics, Management & Agricultural Development*, 2(1), 89-102.
- [7] Porter, M. E. (2008). *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*. Simon and Schuster.
- [8] Shinozaki, S., & Rao, L. N. (2021). COVID-19 impact on MSMEs in the Philippines: Evidence from a rapid survey.
- [9] Van Looy, A., & Shafagatova, A. (2016). Business process performance measurement: A structured literature review. *SpringerPlus*, 5(1), 1797.
- [10] World Bank (2019). *Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) Finance*
- [11] <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/smefinance>