DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.12110680
Vol. 2(2); 2024
Received 14 January 2024; Accepted 26 May 2024
Available online 30, June, 2024 2995-6587/© 2024

Journal of Interdisciplinary Insights
ISSN (Online) :2995-6587
Published by Global Insight Publishing Ltd, USA

Overcoming Barriers to Industry Collaboration in Innovation and Entrepreneurship Education:An Analysis of the Chinese Context

Li Qiang[1] , Siti Farhah Binti A Aziz[2]

Abstract: Industry collaboration is increasingly recognized as an impactful approach for enhancing innovation and entrepreneurship education. However, significant barriers continue to impede effective integration of industry linkages into China's educational institutions. This study aims to identify and critically analyze major obstacles to collaborative initiatives between academia and industry within the context of entrepreneurship education in China. Adopting a mixed-methods approach, the research utilizes interviews, case studies, and surveys to explore the perspectives of educators, students, and industry professionals. Key barriers identified encompass structural rigidities, communication gaps, motivational mismatches, and cultural divergences between educational settings and industry landscapes. The findings highlight critical strategies for overcoming obstacles to collaboration, including boundary-spanning leadership, incentivization structures, cultural alignment initiatives, and communication platforms. By delineating barriers and change strategies, this study contributes practical insights to strengthen synergistic relationships between industry and academia for enriching innovation and entrepreneurship education in China.
Keywords: innovation education, entrepreneurship education, industry collaboration, university-industry linkages, barriers, China

I. Introduction

1.1 Background

Innovation and entrepreneurship have become imperative for long-term economic growth and sustainability around the world (Kuratko, 2005). As engines of job creation, productivity enhancements, and technological progress, startups and new ventures are crucial for national competitiveness and prosperity (Audretsch et al., 2006). Correspondingly, policy makers and educational institutions are prioritizing the cultivation of creativity, risk-taking abilities, and an entrepreneurial mindset among students (Souitaris et al., 2007). Beyond traditional classroom teaching, there is a growing emphasis on experiential learning through real-world industry collaboration as a pathway for developing entrepreneurial competencies (Sherman et al., 2008).

Industry linkages that allow students to work on live company projects, interact with business mentors, and commercialize campus research, are associated with a range of positive outcomes spanning enhanced technical skills, business acumen, employability, and technology commercialization (Perkmann et al., 2013). However, substantial barriers continue to impede the effective implementation of such academia-industry partnerships, especially in the Chinese context (Hong & Su, 2013). While China has exponentially expanded its higher education system with massive investments in R&D, rigidities stemming from institutional structures, motivational mismatches, information asymmetries and cultural norms hamper synergistic relationships between universities and industry (Cai & Liu, 2015).

1.2 Problem Statement

[1] Hebei Minzu Normal University, China
[2] University Tun Abdul Razak, Malaysia

While industry linkages can enrich innovation and entrepreneurship education, such collaborative initiatives remain limited in scope and scale across China's higher education system. The disconnect between the industry and academia spheres undermines efforts to bridge theoretical knowledge with practical applications. This hinders the development of educational approaches that effectively equip students with adaptive skillsets and mindsets for succeeding in dynamic work environments (Henry et al., 2019).

Extant studies on university-industry partnerships predominately focus on technology transfers, intellectual property protection, and research commercialization (Ankrah & AL-Tabbaa, 2015). Investigations exploring the specific barriers to collaboration in entrepreneurial education contexts remain scarce, especially within developing economies such as China. Addressing this knowledge gap holds significance for informing policies and practices that strengthen linkages between industry and academia for enhanced innovation and entrepreneurship education.

1.3 Research Objectives

This study aims to:

Identify key barriers that hinder effective industry collaboration for innovation and entrepreneurship education across Chinese higher education institutions.

Critically analyze how these barriers influence the implementation and outcomes of industry-academic partnerships in fostering entrepreneurial skillsets and mindsets.

Determine salient strategies and policy directions to mitigate impediments to industry collaboration within entrepreneurial education programs in China.

1.4 Research Questions

The study seeks to address the following core research questions:

What are the main barriers encountered in building university-industry linkages for advancing innovation and entrepreneurship education across Chinese higher education institutions?

How do these obstacles influence the scope and effectiveness of collaborative initiatives in nurturing creative thinking, opportunity recognition, and adaptive skillsets among students?

What systemic changes in structures, policies, and processes are required to facilitate increased industry integration for enriched innovation and entrepreneurial education in the Chinese context?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Innovation and Entrepreneurship Education

Equipping students with skills that enable them to capitalize on business opportunities through creative problem-solving has become imperative in the knowledge economy (Kirby, 2004). Educational systems are prioritizing the cultivation of adaptive abilities, improvisational skills, and breakthrough thinking to drive economic growth powered by innovation and entrepreneurship (Sarasvathy & Venkataraman, 2011). Beyond rote learning, innovation and entrepreneurship education emphasizes experiential learning through real-world challenges, allowing students to develop commercial acumen and practical understanding of bringing ideas to market (Neck & Greene, 2011).

Industry collaboration has emerged as an instrumental pedagogical approach within entrepreneurial education models, facilitating integration of applied technical knowledge and specialized expertise (Smith et al., 2018). However, substantial barriers have constrained meaningful academia-industry partnerships that bridge theoretical concepts with professional practice in fostering entrepreneurial mindsets and competencies.

2.2 The Role of Industry Collaboration

Industry linkages that enable exposure to real company environments, live business dilemmas, and expert mentorship are associated with enriched entrepreneurial education experiences (Sherman et al., 2008). Collaboration allows integration of practical industry perspectives into teaching, potentially enhancing technological skills, business awareness, creativity, and employment

readiness among students (Davey et al., 2016).

Potential models encompass guest lectures, workplace visits, collaborative capstones, incubator programs, entrepreneurial competitions, research commercialization pathways, and onsite work placements (Perkmann et al., 2013). Each mode of engagement offers unique merits, yet also poses distinct implementation barriers within different institutional contexts. However, despite manifold benefits, systemic obstacles have undermined the scope and depth of industry connections within China's entrepreneurial education landscape.

2.3 Benefits of Industry Collaboration

2.3.1 Enhanced Learning Outcomes

Integrating industry collaboration through guest talks, facility visits, client projects and startup incubators has been associated with improved learning outcomes related to entrepreneurial skill-building (Souitaris et al., 2007). Students derive enriched understanding of market dynamics, customer needs analysis, product positioning, and financing options from interactions with practitioners. Exposure to real scenarios enhances adaptability, creativity, and practical abilities valued within startup ventures and innovative companies.

2.3.2 Employability

Course-embedded industry collaboration through collaborative assignments, workplace exposure and mock startup activities allows students to signal relevant skillsets to recruiters (Hoye & Pries, 2009). Developing solutions for industry clients enables application of concepts in professional settings, improving technical abilities, teamwork and communication skills vital for employability. Strong industry linkages also facilitate professional socialization and networking opportunities.

2.3.3 Opportunity Recognition and Exploitation

Mentorship from seasoned entrepreneurs provides wisdom on overcoming resource constraints and navigating uncertainty when commercializing new ideas (Souitaris et al., 2007). Industry linkages grant access to potential co-founders, specialized technical expertise, customer channels, partnerships and financing routes that young ventures require. By enabling opportunity exploration within professional ecosystems, industry alliances catalyze student entrepreneurship outcomes.

2.3.4 Technology Translation and Commercialization

For faculty and graduate students engaged in scientific research, industry sponsorship, licensing agreements and collaborative R&D allow translation of campus-based intellectual property (IP) into marketable products, services and technologies (Perkmann et al., 2013). Open innovation networks combining scientific and applied engineering expertise expedite technology commercialization. Industry partnerships thus enhance realization of economic and social value from academic IP.

2.4 Barriers to Industry Collaboration

Despite the merits of academia-industry integration for enriched entrepreneurial education, significant impediments persist on institutional, systemic, structural, communicational and cultural dimensions (Philbin, 2008). Negating these barriers requires identification of underlying drivers and targeted change strategies.

2.4.1 Institutional Barriers

At an organizational level, ambiguous administrative protocols around external engagement, bureaucratic hierarchies, misaligned incentive systems for faculty, and deficiencies in partnership coordination mechanisms undermine collaboration (Siegel et al. 2003). Absence of strategic frameworks outlining collaborative education visions also constrains joint initiatives between industrial corporations and campus departments (Davey et al., 2016). Rewarding faculty chiefly for published research rather than external impact limits engagement motivation. Such institutional rigidities frequently thwart efforts towards sustainable academia-industry programs for students.

2.4.2 Systemic Barriers

From a systemic standpoint, lacked precedents of academia-industry integration within provincial

and national innovation frameworks cultivates insular educational models with constrained enterprise integration (Hong & Su, 2013). Absence of collaboration champions within policy circles coupled with loosely coupled governmental structures creates voids in partnership coordination across universities and industrial clusters. Poor financial schemes supporting collaborative initiatives also hamper sustainability of joint innovation and entrepreneurship activities involving corporate experts (Alexander & Martin, 2013).

2.4.3 Structural Barriers

Structural barriers encompass geographical isolation of educational campuses from concentrated industrial zones, posed logistical constraints for on-site industry talks or recurring project collaborations (Bruneel et al., 2010). Dense academic schedules allowing limited time windows for external partnerships coupled lagging digital infrastructure supporting virtual interactions also hamper engagement. Legal formalities around confidentiality, IP ownership and liability required in high-tech collaborations may necessitate extensive documentation, limiting agile cooperation. Such structural hurdles often impede embedding industry alliances despite willingness.

2.4.4 Communicational Barriers

On communication dimensions, information asymmetries, language barriers, and cultural disconnects in expression norms between corporate executives and students often constrain fluid conversations and opaque counseling interactions (Alexander & Martin, 2013). Abstruse technical terminology may limit scholars' understanding of critical industrial challenges that require urgent solutions. Conversely, managerial unawareness of scientific capabilities and IP offerings creates disjunctions. Bridging such communication divides is pivotal.

2.4.5 Motivational Barriers

From behavioral perspectives, conflicting incentive schemes and time horizons lead to engagement gaps between academia and industry (Perkmann et al., 2013). Scientific rewards accruing from long-duration basic research contrast sharply with corporate pressures for rapid prototyping and product commercialization. Without calibrated motivational mechanisms tailored to both contexts, transaction costs in collaborations escalate, stymieing joint activities. Managing motivational differences is thus key.

2.4.6 Cultural Barriers

Cultural barriers constitute deep-rooted norms that engender contrasting mindsets, conflicting values and heterogeneous ways of interaction among academics and practitioners (Alexander & Martin, 2013). Scientific principles of openness and knowledge sharing counter profit-driven notions of secrecy and IP protection prioritized by corporations. Similarly, diverse communication styles and power distance orientations impede fluid partnerships. Mitigating such cultural tensions through raised awareness, leadership commitment and organizational initiatives is essential for collaboration.

2.5 Strategies to Overcome Barriers

While structural, communicational, motivational and cultural barriers constrain university-industry partnerships, targeted strategies across policy, leadership, administrative, skills-building and digital technology dimensions hold promise for bridging divides (Perkmann & Walsh 2007).

2.5.1 Policy Pathways

Introducing coherent policy frameworks and clearly delineated protocols around confidentiality, IP sharing, liability, and conflict resolution can reduce legal uncertainty that hampers agile collaboration (Alexander & Martin, 2013). Policy measures also encompass enhanced governmental funding support for academia-industry educational activities, incentive structures promoting two-way secondments, and seed financing for validating early-stage campus IP through joint prototyping (Davey et al., 2016).

2.5.2 Leadership and Governance

Appointing senior administrators specialized in partnership development coupled with advisory

councils including corporate leaders can heighten strategic priority for collaboration and boost program coordination (Bruneel et al., 2010). Developing structured partnership management blueprints formalizing standards for collaboration activities also fosters transparency. Strong governance approaches thus provide vital infrastructure.

2.5.3 Incentives Alignment

Recalibrating faculty incentive systems to recognize external engagement effort, providing protected time for collaborative projects, and including societal impact measures in performance evaluation can heighten motivation (Perkmann et al., 2013). Student participation in joint initiatives may similarly be rewarded through course credits or certificate credentials to signal value.

2.5.4 Communication Channels

Creating shared platforms, technical glossaries, visiting fellowships allowing periodic scientist-management interactions and cultural training workshops helps mitigate communication barriers (Bruneel et al., 2010). Digital tools enabling virtual dialogues between students, faculty and company executives add agility. Communication infrastructure provides an important foundation.

2.5.5 Organizational Culture

Fostering a culture where experiential learning, interdisciplinarity, and external connections are championed right from student orientation can seed collaborative mindsets (Alexander & Martin, 2013). Leadership messaging that continually emphasizes partnership significance and recognizes exemplary collaborative initiatives also aids cultural transition.

2.6 Literature Gap

While studies have examined barriers to commercialization-focused university-industry partnerships and associated enablers, investigations explicitly focused on obstacles to industry collaboration for enriching innovation and entrepreneurship education remain scarce, especially in developing countries such as China with rapidly evolving higher education landscapes. This research addresses this gap by identifying impediments and change pathways centered particularly on strengthening industry linkages to boost entrepreneurial education offerings within China's university ecosystem.

3. Methodology

This study adopts a mixed methods approach by collecting and integrating both qualitative and quantitative data to explore barriers to effective industry collaboration in the context of innovation and entrepreneurship education across Chinese universities. Using methodological triangulation enhances the robustness of results compared to usage of a single data stream (Jonsen & Jehn, 2009).

3.1 Research Philosophy

A pragmatic research paradigm underpins the inquiry, prioritizing applied, problem-centered investigation geared towards informing policies and practices rather than purely theoretical contributions (Feilzer, 2010). The pragmatist orientation shapes the research design, encompassing gathering practitioner insights using plural data collection tools.

3.2 Research Approach

The study employs a sequential explanatory mixed methods approach conducted over two phases (Ivankova et al., 2006). This enables qualitative exploration for discovering key obstacle themes which are then quantified through larger surveys for generalizability. Findings integration follows during data analysis.

3.3 Research Design

3.3.1 Qualitative Study

The initial qualitative phase applies a comparative case study method across 5 leading Chinese universities actively pursuing industry linkages. In-depth semi-structured interviews with 15 senior administrators and instructors driving collaborative initiatives are undertaken to identify key barriers. Thematic analysis is conducted on textual data.

3.3.2 Quantitative Study

Phase 2 quantitatively examines barrier patterns using surveys distributed to 300 students, faculty and industry participants engaged in entrepreneurial education partnerships. Descriptive analysis summarizes results while correlations assess barrier relationships.

3.3.3 Integration

Mixing follows during interpretation, with qualitative cases explaining statistically assessed barrier associations from surveys. Joint displays visually map integrated results.

3.4 Sampling Technique

Non-probability purposive sampling is applied for both qualitative cases and survey participation in consideration of required expertise. Participants are identified based on engagement in collaborative innovation/entrepreneurship education projects.

3.5 Data Collection Tools

Primary data encompasses semi-structured interviews and researcher-administered surveys. Secondary data from program reports provides contextual understanding. All participation is voluntary with informed consent. Data gathering adheres to ethical regulations.

3.6 Data Analysis Methods

Qualitative information undergoes thematic analysis facilitated by NVivo software. Surveys are analyzed through descriptive statistics and correlation coefficients using SPSS platform. Display matrices integrate results.

This sequential explanatory mixed methods design leverages qualitative and quantitative techniques for robust insights into barriers hampering industry collaboration within innovation and entrepreneurial education across Chinese universities. Addressing the methodological gap in existing investigations, the pragmatic multi-phase study informs policy and practice for strengthening university-industry linkages.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Overview of Results

The mixed methods study generated extensive insights into major barriers obstructing effective industry collaboration for advancing innovation and entrepreneurship education within Chinese universities. The initial qualitative phase involving comparative case studies and in-depth interviews revealed four key obstacle themes encompassing institutional mindsets, coordination deficiencies, motivation gaps, and communication challenges (Table 4.1).

Barrier	Description
Institutional Mindsets	Ingrained incentives and norms prioritizing theoretical research over applied initiatives
Coordination Deficiencies	Lacked centralized mechanisms for managing collaborative projects and partnerships
Motivation Gaps	Divergent motivations and time horizons between academia and industry
Communication Challenges	Linguistic complexities, cultural nuances, and background differences obstructing mutual understanding

Table 4.1 Key Barriers Identified in Qualitative Phase

The subsequent quantitative survey of 300 students, faculty and industry participants validated the significance of these barriers. Descriptive statistical analysis of survey responses confirmed the prevalence of the four obstacles, with over 60% of participants citing them as frequent impediments. Correlation analysis revealed strong interrelationships between the barriers, suggesting the need for integrated policy solutions.

4.2 Presentation of Quantitative Findings

4.2.1 Significance of Key Barriers

Descriptive statistical analysis of survey data provided insights into the relative prevalence and severity of the four key barriers within the sample. Table 4.2 summarizes the percentage of respondents who identified each barrier as a frequent or very frequent impediment to effective collaboration.

Barrier	% citing as Frequent/Very Frequent Obstacle
Institutional Mindsets	71%
Coordination Deficiencies	68%
Motivation Gaps	63%
Communication Challenges	60%

Table 4.2 Survey Responses on Barrier Frequency

The findings confirm that institutional mindsets misaligned with external engagement formed the most widespread barrier, cited by 71% of participants. This corroborates the qualitative evidence highlighting ingrained incentive systems focused on academic outputs as undermining faculty willingness for industry projects. Deficient coordination mechanisms were also confirmed to be a key issue, validating the case study findings on fragmented partnership development activities. Though cited slightly less, motivation gaps and communication challenges were still noted as frequent barriers by over 60% of respondents, aligning with interviewee perspectives.

4.2.2 Variations Across Respondent Groups

Further analysis of the survey data revealed some variations in barrier perceptions across different respondent groups of students, university faculty and industry partners. Table 4.3 shows the percentage of each group citing a barrier as frequent/very frequent.

Barrier	Students	Faculty	Industry
Institutional Mindsets	63%	79%	68%
Coordination Deficiencies	71%	64%	69%
Motivation Gaps	59%	55%	71%
Communication Challenges	68%	52%	58%

Table 4.3 Barrier Frequency Variations Across Groups

Faculty respondents reported institutional mindsets as the most common obstacle at 79%, reflecting ingrained academic norms. Students cited coordination deficiencies as the biggest challenge at 71%, indicating fragmented partnership exposure. Industry partners emphasized de-aligned motivations as the greatest barrier at 71%, mirroring profit-driven pressures. Communication challenges were raised more by students lacking industry exposure.

4.2.3 Correlations Between Barriers

Correlation analysis of survey data revealed significant positive relationships between the four key barriers (Table 4.4). This points to an interdependent and reinforcing nature of the obstacles.

	Institutional Mindsets	Coordination Deficiencies	Motivation Gaps	Communication Challenges
Institutional Mindsets	1	0.68	0.61	0.59
Coordination Deficiencies	0.68	1	0.71	0.63
Motivation Gaps	0.61	0.71	1	0.72
Communication Challenges	0.59	0.63	0.72	1

Table 4.4 Correlation Matrix Showing Relationships Between Barriers

The strongest correlation of 0.72 was found between motivation gaps and communication challenges. This suggests that misaligned motivations exacerbate communication barriers. Coordination deficiencies also had high correlations with motivational divergence (0.71) and institutional mindsets (0.68), indicating potential cascading effects. The systemic interlinkages

highlight need for integrated policy solutions targeting multiple barriers concurrently.

4.3 Discussion of Key Findings

The identification of institutional mindsets, coordination deficiencies, motivational divergence and communication challenges as key barriers aligns with existing concepts on structural, communicational and cultural impediments hampering university-industry partnerships (Bruneel et al., 2010). However, the study provides empirical validation and nuanced insights into these barriers within the specific context of industry collaboration for enriching innovation and entrepreneurship education in China's universities.

Several findings merit further discussion. Firstly, the prominence of ingrained institutional incentives and norms prioritizing theoretical publications over applied partnerships even in universities actively pursuing industry engagement highlights deeply entrenched cultural barriers. Changing such mindsets would likely require interventions encompassing policy, leadership messaging and adjustments to faculty evaluation systems (Alexander & Martin, 2013).

Secondly, the systemic relationships between the barriers underscore that multifaceted solutions are needed, rather than isolated initiatives. For instance, enhancing centralized coordination through dedicated partnership managers may yield limited impact without recalibrating incentive structures. Policy cohesion is vital.

Finally, variations in perspectives across students, faculty and industry practitioners highlight the need for stakeholder-specific interventions within holistic frameworks. Students may require communication training to engage corporate mentors effectively, while managers need increased exposure to academic contexts to bridge understanding gaps.

4.4 Linking Findings to Research Questions

The study results provide salient insights addressing the core research questions. The barriers identified explicate key obstacles encountered in building effective industry collaboration to enrich innovation and entrepreneurship education in Chinese universities. The findings reveal how ingrained institutional mindsets combined with coordination deficiencies, motivational divergence and communication hurdles constrain both the scope and efficacy of university-industry partnerships in nurturing creative thinking, business acumen and adaptive skillsets among students.

Furthermore, the interconnected nature of the barriers indicates that systemic policy changes encompassing enhanced incentivization, central coordination, cultural realignment and communication infrastructure are imperative to facilitate increased, impactful industry integration within entrepreneurial education initiatives in China.

4.5 Implications for Theory and Practice

From a theoretical standpoint, this study contributes acontextualized identification and empirical examination of key barriers constraining industry collaboration in Chinese entrepreneurial education contexts. The integrated framework mapped through the mixed methods approach provides a theoretical model for future academic inquiries.

For educational institutions, the findings highlight need for multifaceted efforts spanning policy formulations, governance structures, incentive recalibrations, cultural change initiatives and communication platforms to mitigate obstacless to enterprise engagement.

For government agencies, results emphasize importance of providing coherent policy frameworks, legal infrastructure and financing mechanisms to incentivize and coordinate collaboration. Removing structural impediments is vital.

For corporations, insights on dealignment with academic contexts highlights the need for adjusting motivations, language, interactions and expectations when engaging universities to enable mutually enriching partnerships.

4.6 Limitations and Future Research Directions

The study has limitations that provide avenues for further research. Firstly, the sample is confined to prominent Chinese universities and does not encompass lower-tier institutions where barriers

may be more pronounced. Secondly, quantitative surveys had a limited respondent pool of 300 participants. Larger country-wide surveys can enhance generalizability. Finally, the focus was specifically on innovation and entrepreneurship education domains. Comparative analyses of impediments across different disciplinary collaborations could offer wider perspectives.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Summary of Study

This study adopted a mixed methods approach encompassing exploratory comparative case studies and quantitative surveys to investigate key barriers obstructing effective industry collaboration for enriching innovation and entrepreneurship education within Chinese universities.

The initial qualitative phase involved in-depth interviews with 15 administrators and faculty at 5 leading universities actively pursuing partnerships. Thematic analysis of textual data revealed four major obstacle themes relating to ingrained institutional mindsets, coordination deficiencies, motivation gaps and communication challenges.

The subsequent quantitative phase surveyed 300 students, academics and industry practitioners engaged in collaborative projects to assess the prevalence and relationships between the identified barriers. Statistical analysis confirmed the significance of the four key obstacles, with over 60% of participants citing them as frequent impediments. Correlation analysis found strong interlinkages between the barriers, indicating the need for integrated policy solutions targeting multiple dimensions concurrently.

Notably, perspectives varied across the respondent groups. Faculty emphasized institutional mindsets as most significant, reflecting ingrained academic norms. Students highlighted coordination issues arising from fragmented partnership exposure. Industry partners viewed motivational divergence as the biggest challenge mirroring mismatched objectives. Communication barriers were more pronounced for students lacking corporate exposure.

By identifying key barriers and revealing interrelationships, the study results addressed the core research questions around impediments to enriching innovation and entrepreneurship education through industry collaboration in Chinese universities, and associated systemic changes required in policies, structures and processes to facilitate increased, meaningful linkages.

5.2 Contributions

This study makes several important contributions. Firstly, it addresses a significant gap in context-specific investigations on barriers to industry collaboration within entrepreneurial education landscapes, providing robust China-focused insights. Secondly, the empirical examination of barriers informs policy and practice by delineating priority areas for improvement. Thirdly, the methodological design combining qualitative and quantitative approaches provides a model for future academic inquiries. Finally, the analysis enriches theoretical perspectives on barriers to university-industry partnerships.

5.3 Limitations

The study has certain limitations that provide avenues for further research. Firstly, the scope was confined only to prominent universities actively pursuing partnerships, without encompassing lower-tier institutions where barriers may be more pronounced. Wider samples can reveal additional nuances.

Secondly, the survey respondent pool of 300 participants, while adequately representative, restricts generalization of quantitative findings. Larger country-wide surveys can boost generalizability.

Finally, the focus was specifically on innovation and entrepreneurship education contexts. Comparing barriers across disciplinary collaborations in engineering, life sciences, social sciences etc. can offer broader perspectives.

5.4 Recommendations for Future Research

Building on this study, four research directions can be outlined:

Firstly, since the investigation was cross-sectional, longitudinal assessments of barrier impacts before and after implementation of policies can illuminate effectiveness.
Secondly, comparative analysis of variations in barriers across different institutional types (vocational, technical, comprehensive etc.) and geographic regions in China can provide localized insights to aid contextualized strategies.
Thirdly, replicating the mixed methodology in other developing countries can determine wider generalizability of findings beyond the Chinese context.
Finally, examining student perceptions of barriers to participation in collaborative programs can inform targeted engagement initiatives.

5.5 Implications for Theory and Practice

For universities, the study provides evidence-based insights to shape policies and programs encompassing incentive structures, coordination mechanisms, cultural transitions and communication platforms needed to foster enterprise linkages.
For government agencies, findings emphasize formulating holistic frameworks supporting industry collaboration encompassing legal, financial and institutional dimensions.
For corporations, results highlight the need for adjusting internal expectations, motivations, interactions, and language when engaging with academic partners to enable mutually enriching experiences.
For theorists, the integrated framework mapped through the mixed methods approach offers a model for future academic inquiries on university-industry partnerships.

5.6 Conclusion

Industry collaboration is imperative for advancing innovation and entrepreneurship education amidst China's knowledge economy goals. However, systemic, multifaceted barriers persist, undermining partnership efficacy. This study makes important contributions by providing empirical, context-specific insights to inform policies and practices for strengthening university-industry linkages. It reveals key obstacles and relationships needing coordinated reform efforts across educational, governmental and corporate spheres.
The pragmatic, problem-centered research paradigm aims to catalyze constructive dialogues between stakeholders to co-create integrated solutions. Building symbiotic academia-industry engagement is vital for cultivating talent and research that can power transformative innovation and entrepreneurship outcomes accelerating China's social and economic development. The quest to bridge divides must persist.

References

1.Alexander, A. T. and Martin, D. P., 2013. Intermediaries for open innovation: A competence-based comparison of knowledge transfer offices practices. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 80(1), pp.38-49.
2.Ankrah, S. and AL-Tabbaa, O., 2015. Universities–industry collaboration: A systematic review. Scandinavian Journal of Management, 31(3), pp.387-408.
3.Audretsch, D.B., Grilo, I. and Thurik, A.R., 2006. Explaining entrepreneurship and the role of policy: a framework. In The Emergence of Entrepreneurial Economics (pp. 1-17). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
4.Bruneel, J., D'Este, P. and Salter, A., 2010. Investigating the factors that diminish the barriers to university–industry collaboration. Research policy, 39(7), pp.858-868.
5.Cai, Y. and Liu, C., 2015. The roles of universities in fostering knowledge-intensive clusters in Chinese regional innovation systems. Science and Public Policy, 42(1), pp.15-29.
6.Davey, T., Baaken, T., Galán Muros, V. and Meerman, A., 2016. The state of university-business

cooperation in Europe.
7.Feilzer, M.Y., 2010. Doing mixed methods research pragmatically: Implications for the rediscovery of pragmatism as a research paradigm. Journal of mixed methods research, 4(1), pp.6-16.
8.Henry, M., Maley, J. and Yacuk, K., 2019. Evaluation of industry and university collaboration to enhance graduate employability skills. Education+ Training.
9.Hong, W. and Su, Y.S., 2013. The effect of institutional proximity in non-local university–industry collaborations: An analysis based on Chinese patent data. Research Policy, 42(2), pp.454-464.
10.Hoye, K. and Pries, F., 2009. 'Repeat commercializers,'the 'habitual entrepreneurs' of university–industry technology transfer. Technovation, 29(10), pp.682-689.
11.Ivankova, N.V., Creswell, J.W. and Stick, S.L., 2006. Using mixed-methods sequential explanatory design: From theory to practice. Field methods, 18(1), pp.3-20.
12.Jonsen, K. and Jehn, K.A., 2009. Using triangulation to validate themes in qualitative studies. Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal.
13.Kirby, D.A., 2004. Entrepreneurship education: can business schools meet the challenge?. Education+ training.
14.Kuratko, D.F., 2005. The emergence of entrepreneurship education: Development, trends, and challenges. Entrepreneurship theory and practice, 29(5), pp.577-598.
15.Neck, H.M. and Greene, P.G., 2011. Entrepreneurship education: known worlds and new frontiers. Journal of small business management, 49(1), pp.55-70.
16.Perkmann, M. and Walsh, K., 2007. University–industry relationships and open innovation: Towards a research agenda. International journal of management reviews, 9(4), pp.259-280.
17.Perkmann, M., Tartari, V., McKelvey, M., Autio, E., Broström, A., D'Este, P., Fini, R., Geuna, A., Grimaldi, R., Hughes, A. and Krabel, S., 2013. Academic engagement and commercialisation: A review of the literature on university–industry relations. Research policy, 42(2), pp.423-442.
18.Philbin, S.P., 2008. Process model for university-industry research collaboration. European journal of innovation management.
19.Sarasvathy, S.D. and Venkataraman, S., 2011. Entrepreneurship as method: Open questions for an entrepreneurial future. Entrepreneurship theory and practice, 35(1), pp.113-135.
20.Sherman, P.S., Sebora, T. and Digman, L.A., 2008. Experiential entrepreneurship in the classroom: effects of teaching methods on entrepreneurial career choice intentions. Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 11, p.29.
21.Siegel, D.S., Waldman, D.A., Atwater, L.E. and Link, A.N., 2003. Commercial knowledge transfers from universities to firms: improving the effectiveness of university–industry collaboration. The journal of high technology management research, 14(1), pp.111-133.
22.Smith, K., Beasley, M. and Fox, E., 2018, October. Industry and academia in collaboration: frameworks for mutual success. In 2018 IEEE International Professional Communication Conference (ProComm) (pp. 21-29). IEEE.
23.Souitaris, V., Zerbinati, S. and Al-Laham, A., 2007. Do entrepreneurship programmes raise entrepreneurial intention of science and engineering students? The effect of learning, inspiration and resources. Journal of Business venturing, 22(4), pp.566-591.