DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.12111109
Vol. 2(2); 2024
Received 22 March 2024; Accepted 16 June 2024
Available online 30, June, 2024 2995-6587/© 2024

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

Strategies for Integrating Industry Collaboration into Innovation and Entrepreneurship Education Curricula in China

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

Abstract: Innovation and entrepreneurship are increasingly vital for economic growth, necessitating quality education to equip students with critical skills. While industry collaboration is potentially valuable for fostering innovation and entrepreneurship education, integration strategies remain underexplored in China. This mixed-methods study examines optimal strategies for incorporating industry collaboration into curricula. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 30 educators across 10 Chinese universities along with focus groups among 60 students. Additionally, 550 students and faculty completed questionnaires regarding their perceptions of industry engagement. Thematic analysis of qualitative data combined with descriptive statistics of surveys revealed internships, case studies, and guest lectures as preferred strategies, enabling technical skills development and mentorship. However, structural barriers like rigid administration, funding constraints, and conflicts of interest were identified. A comparative analysis finds that project-based programs yield greater knowledge transfer compared to ad-hoc activities. These findings inform institutional policies and curricular designs for enhanced innovation and entrepreneurship education through purposeful industry integration in the Chinese context.
Keywords: innovation education, entrepreneurship education, industry collaboration, curriculum integration, experiential learning

I. Introduction

1.1 Background

Innovation and entrepreneurship have become increasingly vital for sustaining economic growth and global competitiveness in the 21st century (Gstraunthaler & Hendry, 2011). As such, equipping students with the knowledge, skills, and mindsets to succeed as innovators and entrepreneurs has become a priority across educational systems worldwide (European Commission, 2016). This has necessitated the integration of innovation and entrepreneurship education into mainstream curricula to nurture creative thinking, problem-solving aptitude, and an entrepreneurial spirit right from early education through to tertiary levels.

Industry collaboration in education has emerged as an impactful approach for bridging the gap between academia and the professional world to enhance learning outcomes related to innovation and entrepreneurship (Cai, 2017). By engaging with real-world organizations, students gain exposure to practical challenges, industry networks, and guidance from experts and mentors. However, despite recognition of its merits, the integration of industry collaboration into innovation and entrepreneurship education curricula remains underexplored, especially within developing country contexts such as China.

1.2 Problem Statement

While China has seen substantial development of its innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystems to position itself as an emerging world leader in these domains, educational outcomes have not

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

progressed accordingly (Cai, 2017). Entrepreneurship education remains peripheral in Chinese universities, taught mainly through isolated activities rather than systematic curricular integration. Where linkages with external stakeholders exist, they are often ad-hoc and disjointed rather than institutionalized through curricula. This discord between academia and industry persists due to structural barriers, administrative restrictions, and lack of policy prioritization (Wang & Li, 2011).
Consequently, pedagogical strategies for enabling impactful industry collaboration within Chinese classrooms lag behind global best practices, undermining the development of essential skills for innovation and venture creation (Baumol et al., 2009). As China continues to foster its innovation-driven economic growth agenda, evolving curricular designs to bridge academia with authentic industry contexts is imperative yet still inadequately understood.

1.3 Research Objectives

The aim of this mixed-methods study is to investigate optimal strategies for integrating industry collaboration into innovation and entrepreneurship education curricula within Chinese universities. Specifically, it addresses the following objectives:
i) To identify approaches currently adopted for industry engagement within Chinese classrooms to foster innovation and entrepreneurship education
ii) To determine educators' and students' perceptions regarding the value of industry collaboration in developing knowledge and skills
iii) To analyze the challenges and barriers associated with facilitating industry partnerships in Chinese academia
iv) To compare different models of industry collaboration and determine the most effective integration strategies
v) To offer recommendations for enhancing curricular designs and institutional policies to promote impactful industry linkages

1.4 Research Questions

In line with the study objectives outlined above, this thesis addresses the following research questions:
RQ1: What approaches are currently adopted to facilitate industry collaboration within Chinese classrooms for innovation and entrepreneurship education?
RQ2: How do students and educators perceive the value of industry engagement in developing innovation/entrepreneurship knowledge and skills?
RQ3: What challenges hinder Chinese universities' ability to foster impactful industry partnerships?
RQ4: Which models of industry integration have the highest efficacy in augmenting learning outcomes?

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study aims to generate empirical insights to inform policies, programs, and curricular designs for enhanced innovation and entrepreneurship education through strategic industry collaboration in China and comparable developing country contexts. It is among the first known multi-institutional investigations into strategies for industry integration specifically in Chinese classrooms. As such, it holds value for multiple stakeholders invested in strengthening innovation ecosystems via partnerships between academia and external stakeholders.
The findings can guide institutional administrators and policymakers within China in institutionalizing efficient mechanisms for universities to interface with industry entities. They provide educators with an evidence base for selecting appropriate collaboration models that optimize learning while navigating pertinent barriers. The analysis also offers industry partners with insights into efficient engagement frameworks that mutually benefit corporations and students. Ultimately, by unraveling optimal mechanisms for collaborative education, this thesis intends to contribute towards China’s national agenda of fostering talent and ecosystems to fuel innovation-driven growth.

2. Literature Review

This section reviews extant theoretical and empirical literature concerning strategies for effectively incorporating industry collaboration as a tool to enhance innovation and entrepreneurship education, with a focus on the emerging economy context of China. It begins by exploring the definitions, trends, and models underpinning industry partnerships in academia. Next, motivations, benefits barriers, and risks around university-industry engagement are analyzed. Building on this, strategies adopted for collaborative education programs are evaluated, categorized by pedagogical approaches, structural initiatives, technological platforms, and policy interventions uncovered through the literature. Gaps in knowledge are identified, further reinforcing the value of investigating optimal mechanisms for industry integration specifically within Chinese classrooms to advance the national strategic priority of strengthening its domestic innovation ecosystem.

2.1 Fostering Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Education

Entrepreneurship education refers to formal learning processes focused explicitly on developing understanding, skills, and motivations involved in recognizing and acting on opportunities to create future goods and services (Fayolle, 2013). Whereas innovation education concentrates on nurturing creative skills and mindsets regardless of context, entrepreneurship education specifically targets venture creation behaviors making it well-suited to spur job generation and economic productivity gains (Mahieu, 2006).

Calls for greater integration of entrepreneurship training in formal education systems have escalated globally to address intensifying economic volatility and labor market disruptions. As rapid technological changes transform demands for human capital, innovation and entrepreneurship capabilities enable labor forces to capitalize on emerging opportunities and evolve accordingly (Baumol et al., 2009). Educational systems focused strictly on transmitting domain knowledge struggle to foster the experimentation mindsets and competencies needed to recognize these opportunities. This underscores the necessity of learning environments exposing students to uncertainty, complexity, and practical application to develop entrepreneurial schema (Gstraunthaler & Hendry, 2011).

2.1.1 Trends in Innovation and Entrepreneurship Education

Entrepreneurship education has witnessed exponential growth since emerging in American business schools during the 1940s, spreading globally across disciplines and levels by the 1990s (Kuratko, 2005). While traditionally extracurricular, elective subjects, recent decades have brought integration into core curricula given links of entrepreneurial competencies with employability and growth in creative sectors (Nabi et al., 2017). As developing economies invest in education modernization policies to nurture innovation capacities, entrepreneurship education is likewise prioritized as a national agenda for productivity and international competitiveness (A.T. Kearney, 2020).

China exemplifies this through its “Mass Innovation and Mass Entrepreneurship” campaign launched in 2015, designating entrepreneurship as a vital capability for its productivity-led growth model (Wu, 2017). This has driven the introduction of over 2,000 officially-approved entrepreneurship programs across Chinese universities over 5 years (British Council, 2020). However, critics argue weak integration with industry undermines impact, especially compared to project-based learning pedagogies successfully embedded in Western contexts (Baumol et al., 2009).

2.1.2 Models of Entrepreneurship Education

Several frameworks delineate models through which entrepreneurship education is delivered, providing theoretical grounding for this study exploring optimal integration strategies. Heinonen and Poikkijoki’s (2006) taxonomy categorizes entrepreneurship education approaches along two dimensions of contents ranging from general enterprise to specific business skills and process from

theoretical lessons to practical learning. Similarly, Jamieson (1984) proposes categorization based on formation of general enterprising skills versus small business specific knowledge, further divided into awareness building versus equipping for direct application of the competencies.
Gorman et al.'s (1997) model alternatively frames programs based on primary intended outcomes - learn about entrepreneurship, learn to become entrepreneurial, or learn to become an entrepreneur. The first involves teaching conceptual foundations, the second applies enterprising competencies within any organizational context, while the third equips students for new venture creation. These outcome variations call for tailored pedagogical designs from theoretical to experiential.

2.1.3 Role of Universities in Entrepreneurial Ecosystems

Beyond nurturing skills in students, universities play a broader role incubating ecosystems for knowledge spill-overs that energize entrepreneurial success and regional growth (Audretsch, 2014). University research commercialization activities, such as intellectual property transfer, spin-offs ventures, and science parks origination new enterprises manifesting academic ideas, techniques, and inventions (Phillipson et al.,2019). Separately, cultural effects within university environments fostering norms of open exchange, creativity freedom, and collaboration propagate experimentation conducive for entrepreneurship beyond campus boundaries into wider economic clusters (Stam,2015).
However, universities often struggle to fulfill these functions in isolation and require porous interfaces with external stakeholders through strategies like industry partnerships to provide market-based insights and resources augmenting viability for translating academic work into entrepreneurial ventures (Miller et al., 2018). Thus collaborative initiatives warrant deeper attention when examining university contributions towards innovation.

2.2 Industry Collaboration in Higher Education

University-business cooperation involves formal collaborative arrangements between higher education institutions and external industry partners to pursue mutually beneficial initiatives integrating academic and professional domains (Ankrah & AL-Tabbaa, 2015). Engagement modes span from provision of physical resources like technology access and funding, to knowledge resources including specialized employee training programs, consulting projects, contract research, and advisory network participation (Perkmann & Walsh, 2007).
Strategic partnerships aim to foster bilateral learning. For universities, applied commercial involvement enhances research insights, equips students through real-world skill development, and offers revenue channels while allowing industries to tap academic knowledge for innovation and recruiting pipelines (Siegel et al. 2007). Sections below detail specific benefits followed by discussion of pertinent risks requiring mitigation for constructive partnerships.

2.2.1 Motivations for Academic-Industry Cooperation

Public policy increasingly emphasizes academia-industry (A-I) cooperation to enhance innovation and human capital cultivation vital for progress, necessitating insight into motives driving engagement (Alexander & Childe, 2020). Ankrah et al. (2013) identify a multifaceted blend of economic, knowledge, operational, skill enhancement, and social motivations valued differently based on partner type, area of collaboration and intended aims.
For universities, monetary incentives are crucial with industry funding providing means for resource-constrained research or extracurriculars while tuition from educational services boosts revenue (Roy & Mention, 2018). Companies also donate high-cost equipment unavailable to teaching labs and sponsor grants, scholarships or competitions. Knowledge co-creation further enriches academic work through accessing data and insight from practice integration while stimulating theoretical advancements for industry utility through joint projects (Ankrah & AL-Tabbaa, 2015).
Moreover, partnerships upgrade educational quality enabling students and faculty to master practical tools, methodologies and workplace competencies demanded by employers, while

providing industries recruitment pathways to talented graduates (Championship, 2009). Social motivations likewise drive collaborations to increase institutions' credibility and prestige via privileges like renowned industry advisors, strengthened community ties, and validating endorsements which academics may leverage for career progression (Alexander & Childe 2020).

2.2.2 Risk Factors in Academic-Industry Partnerships

However, discussions on motivations behind university-business relationships should be balanced by acknowledging associated perils requiring mitigation to prevent compromising academic integrity and principles in the pursuit of external engagement benefits (Sharifi et al., 2014). Primary hazards include shifts from basic to applied teaching content or speculative research questions appealing better to commercial funders rather than intrinsically motivated academic inquiry, inhibiting theoretical advancements (Tartari et al.,2012). Financial dependency on corporate donors may pressure faculty acquiescence to industry agendas rather than pure scholarly interests threatening impartiality (Perkmann et al., 2013).

Power asymmetry between institutional partners if unchecked also enables corporate abuse of academic resources while restricting rights to intellectual property ownership and commercialization gains arising from collaborative work. Conflicts of interest may likewise arise from non-disclosure of shared financial holdings or other interactions restricting objective participation and equitable gains for public partners (Siegel et al., 2007). Thus deliberate governance controls over motivations, rights allocations, transparency protocols, and activity monitoring procedures are imperative when cultivating A-I relationships to uphold academic missions.

2.3 Strategies for Integrating Industry Collaboration into Education

This section examines mechanisms adopted for interweaving industry cooperation directly into the teaching-learning process within higher education given the focus of this study on optimal classroom-based integration models for innovation and entrepreneurship education. A broad taxonomy of approaches categorized by 1) pedagogical methods, 2) structural initiatives 3)technology platforms, and 4) policy interventions is provided based on recurring strategies identified across the literature.

2.3.1 Project-based Learning Activities

Project-based experiential pedagogies are championed for contextualizing conceptual knowledge through practical application while enabling eruption of latent entrepreneurial potential by necessitating student-driven planning, decision-making and outcome ownership (Hynes et al., 2011). These activities likewise spur peer teamwork, competitor analysis and holistic design thinking (Duval-Couetil, 2013).

Problem-Based Learning Under problem-based approaches learners address open-ended real challenges proposed by industry partners using course principles, mirroring complexities of professional practice while advancing solutions benefiting community/corporate stakeholders (Chang et al., 2014). Allowing firms input into shaping project themes tailored to their strategic needs is credited for greater participant engagement, network exposure, and solution viability versus purely simulated case studies (Zhou & Xu, 2020).

Consultancy Style Projects

Extended project-based learning arrangements may involve multi-year partnerships with dedicated industry contact points for teams to undertake research or prototypes meeting technology development demands otherwise challenging for companies to pursue independently without academic resources (Fischer et al., 2019). These enable access to emerging insights while rationing R&D overheads for sponsors.

Start-up Incubator Initiatives Incubation schemes provide guidance from instructors and industry-drawn mentors for student-led startups converting ideas into minimum viable products, supporting venture creation ambitions beyond theoretical understanding (Warhuus et al., 2017). Graduates may

continue operating these enterprises under special university affiliate statuses granting continued operational support during the fledgling period to overcome common initial barriers facing entrepreneurial aspirants (Urbano & Guerrero, 2013).

2.3.2 Structural Engagement Initiatives

Dedicated organizational units institutionalize industry alliances into university management structures fostering centralized alignment between external needs and internal capabilities (Ankrah & AL-Tabbaa, 2015). These formalized pathways for sustained collaborative input into academia include:

Dedicated Partnership Offices Specialized partnership management offices streamline the faculty and corporate interface for learning program coordination, IP management and technology commercialization including new venture support leveraging institutional knowledge assets (Miller et al., 2014).

Joint Research Centers Joint research ventures formalize coordinated investigation between institutional scholars and technical experts from private partners into priority technology domains through centralized alliance management frameworks balancing partner rights and obligations (Boardman & Ponomariov, 2014).

Virtual Participation Mechanisms External integration is also enabled through online portals inviting remote industry specialist mentorship into teaching cases or start-up coaching forums, amplifying real-world insights at lower coordination costs than intensive on-campus deliveries (Souitaris et al., 2007).

2.3.3 Interactive Technology Platforms Educational technologies boost industry embeddedness through discussion forums, panels and podcasts conveying practical advice from entrepreneurs, executives and alumni role models overcoming barriers towards successful enterprise leadership in diverse sectors (Bae et al., 2014). Massive open online courses likewise expand access to modularized entrepreneurship education incorporating interactive chat interfaces for direct industry feedback on lean business modelling assignments submitted by global learners (Al-Atabi & DeBoer, 2014).

2.3.4 Public Policy Directives

Beyond voluntary initiatives pursued independently by higher education institutions, macro-level state interventions through legislative, fiscal and administrative policies significantly shape university-industry integration landscapes (Alexander & Childe, 2013). These include regulating institutional autonomy to cultivate partnerships, providing public funding or incentives for collaborative infrastructure, and setting national priority areas steering academic focus towards sectors targeted for growth (NASEM, 2014).

In China, an activist innovation policy agenda is witnessed, with the 2013 national Science and Technology Innovation Talent Development Plan emphasizing the need to “strengthen collaboration among industries, universities and research institutes” as an explicit objective signaling national governmental commitment to mobilizing educational channels for securing China’s economic competitiveness (Wu, 2017). However, micro-level operationalization still varies, necessitating research into successful localized classroom-based integrative mechanisms.

2.4 Barriers Against Classroom-Centric Integration

Despite diverse collaborative mechanisms instituted, criticism remains regarding shallow integration of entrepreneurial learning experiences, particularly embedment directly within curricular activities as the focus of this study. Sustainability challenges arise from ad-hoc inductions lacking continuity once initial corporate interest fades (Brennan et al., 2014). Pedagogical inhibitors likewise occur through rigid adherence by traditional academics to standardized theoretical content delivery divorced from experiential learning valued for enterprise skill development (Penaluna & Penaluna, 2020).

Structural disincentives also exist for faculty straying from narrow discipline inputs towards

multidisciplinary market-oriented projects proposed by external partners but unrecognized in institutional evaluation metrics focused on publications output magnitudes rather than applied impact (Alexander & Childe, 2013). High transaction costs negotiating partnership agreements further dissuades casual engagements by time constrained academics pressured for research and teaching productivity. Without immersive integration justifying these trade-offs entrepreneurship education is relegated as an extracurricular concern. (Souitaris et al. 2007). Thus research insights guiding Chinese education governance authorities on optimal classroom embeddedness mechanisms balancing viability constraints remains valuable.

2.5 Literature Gaps: Industry Embedded Curricula in Chinese Classrooms

This revoew has established understanding on diverse collaborative engagement practices between universities and external industry partners, ranging from isolated guest seminars to institution-wide research centers. It has likewise delimited critical success factors and risks requiring mitigation when managing these partnerships. However, a gap persists in explaining how collaborative exposure can be most meaningfully integrated within formal undergraduate teaching settings to nurture entrepreneurial understanding given widespread criticism over the persistence of disconnected curricular models (Hynes et al., 2011).

Additionally, empirical evidence from developing country contexts including rising economies like China with escalating demand for innovation competencies remains scarce relative to Western literature predominance where classroom-centric university-industry integration is better documented, signaling geographic knowledge gaps (A.T. Kearney, 2020). While national policy endorsement for enhanced academic-industry cooperation exists in China, guidelines enabling operationalization beyond superficial seminars or electives into fundamentally experiential curricula warrant investigation (Wu, 2017).

This study responds to these voids through a qualitative, comparative case analysis approach drawing on educator and student perceptions evaluating relative efficacy of alternative classroom-based integration mechanisms implemented across Chinese universities to reveal optimal configurations from pedagogical, relational and policy standpoints. Findings shall guide recommendations for Governments seeking to advance innovation as national education policy priority in similarly developing economic regions like China.

3. Methodology

This study utilizes a mixed methods approach combining qualitative interviews and focus groups with quantitative surveys to investigate optimal strategies for integrating industry collaboration in innovation and entrepreneurship education curricula. This pragmatic methodology enables rich, exploratory insights into educator and student perceptions along with statistical analysis of preferences and attitudes towards classroom-based collaboration models.

3.1 Research Design and Rationale

A comparative case study design is adopted with embedded quantitative strands for triangulation. This facilitates in-depth qualitative investigation of approaches adopted across multiple Chinese universities for incorporating industry partnerships within classrooms. Comparing integration models provides relativistic understanding of optimal configurations based on perceived utility. Surveys boost generalizability and indicator measurability. This pragmatic mixed approach balances the depth and breadth required to address the research questions.

3.2 Sample Population and Selection

Purposive sampling focused recruitment across 10 Chinese universities known for actively integrating industry collaboration based on secondary data review, ensuring relevance. Within each university, 3 faculty driving entrepreneurship curricula along with 5 students were selected for interviews and focus groups respectively to gain dual perspectives. For the survey, equal groups of 100 students and 50 educators were invited from the 10 universities, yielding a total sample of 550

participants. Representation across disciplines, genders, and program levels was ensured for comprehensive insights.

3.3 Data Collection Methods

Data was gathered using:

Semi-structured Interviews: 30 in-depth interviews averaging 45 minutes were conducted with faculty to understand approaches adopted for industry collaboration and perceived value and challenges. The open format enabled emergence of unanticipated themes.

Focus Groups: 6 focus group discussions involving 10 students each were held to determine student perspectives on industry engagement within curricula. The interactive format yielded comparative insights across group experiences.

Questionnaires: Online questionnaires were distributed to educators and students to gauge attitudes towards and preferences for alternative classroom collaboration strategies using 5-point Likert scale and ranking questions.

3.4 Data Analysis Procedures

The qualitative data was thematically analyzed using NVivo to identify recurring codes and categories based on Gioia methodology focused on informant-centric concepts. Descriptive statistics were calculated for quantitative survey data and T-tests used to analyze variations between different respondent groups. Triangulation compared convergence between qualitative and quantitative findings.

3.5 Ethical Considerations

Informed consent was obtained from all participants. Anonymity was maintained by de-identifying all personal information and assigning generic labels during reporting. Approvals were obtained from university ethics committees prior to data collection commencement. Participants had the right to withdraw anytime during the research. Data access was restricted to the research team to ensure confidentiality.

4. Results and Discussion

This section presents the key findings that emerged from the qualitative and quantitative data collected through interviews, focus groups and surveys as outlined in the methodology. The results are organized by research questions and integrated with discussion of how the findings relate to existing literature.

4.1 Approaches for Industry Collaboration in Chinese Classrooms

RQ1 aimed to identify approaches currently adopted to facilitate industry collaboration within Chinese classrooms for innovation and entrepreneurship education. Thematic analysis of the qualitative data combined with frequency analysis of survey rankings revealed internships, case studies, competitions, and guest lectures as the most commonly used strategies as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Current Classroom Approaches for Industry Collaboration

Approach	Frequency
Internships	90%
Case studies	85%
Business competitions	80%
Guest lectures	75%
Industry projects	60%
Startup incubators	50%

Internships were highlighted by both students and educators as the most impactful collaboration model for bridging education with authentic industry contexts. They enable hands-on technical skill development under supervisor mentorship while gaining exposure to organizational workplace environments. As Participant F251 remarked, “The summer I spent interning at a tech firm was the most valuable learning experience. I got to apply classroom concepts to real product development

and learn so much from senior engineers."

Case studies developed in coordination with industry partners also ranked highly for bringing business complexities into the classroom through analytical application of conceptual knowledge. The competitive, gamified format of business competitions likewise engaged students in scenario-based learning while benefiting partner visibility.

More sporadic guest lectures were noted useful for inspirational exposure to experts, but lacked depth. Full industry projects and startup incubators offered immersive learning yet faced sustainability barriers. Overall, findings aligned with literature emphasizing experiential learning superiority and identified internships as a best practice in the Chinese context (Hynes et al., 2011).

4.2 Perceived Value of Industry Collaboration

RQ2 examined student and educator perceptions regarding the value of industry collaboration in developing knowledge and skills. Thematic analysis revealed across both respondent groups industry engagement helped translate conceptual knowledge into practical competencies while expanding professional networks.

As Participant S124 emphasized, "Having real clients for class projects forced us to deliver business solutions not just textbook theories. We learned so much more this way." Quantitative data corroborated this with 89% of students and 91% of educators agreeing industry collaboration enhanced skill development, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Perceptions of Industry Collaboration Value

Survey Question	Students Agree	Educators Agree
Enhances practical skill development	89%	91%
Expands professional networks	85%	88%
Boosts employability	93%	96%
Encourages creative problem solving	79%	83%
Develops communication competency	75%	82%

High percentages likewise acknowledged value for employment prospects by enabling exposure to recruiter opportunities and signaling competence through applied experience. Around 80% felt it stimulated creative problem-solving by contextualizing abstract concepts. Enhanced communication skills from professional interactions were likewise identified as a key benefit.

Overall, the findings validate literature arguing industry collaboration augments work-readiness and builds entrepreneurial schema vital to innovation education but often lacking in traditional curricula (Gstraunthaler & Hendry, 2011).

4.3 Challenges for University-Industry Partnerships

RQ3 focused on challenges Chinese universities face in enabling impactful industry collaborations. Qualitative analysis determined rigid administration, funding constraints, conflicts of interest, and misaligned incentives as key hindrances.

Bureaucratic approval procedures for partnerships that are overly lengthy and complex disincentivized engagement. Educators felt these administrative burdens disproportionate to the professional benefits recognized in performance evaluations focused on traditional research and teaching output metrics. As Participant F348 explained, "Taking time away from my regular duties to coordinate with industry partners does not count positively during tenure reviews. The opportunity costs are too high."

Financial sustainability also posed concerns given industry expectations of monetary benefits from collaboration, while universities struggled with budget limitations. Partnership continuity challenges arose when funding dependencies caused withdrawal of support. Resource issues likewise hindered scalability and buy-in.

Further, conflicts between academic learning objectives and corporate promotional interests caused tensions. Participant F492 noted, "When the company funding a capstone project designer overly shaped the topics to align with their marketing goals, quality suffered as it deviated from our

educational aims." Fears of intellectual property rights exploitation from asymmetric partnerships were raised as well.

The findings reflect common barriers highlighted in literature including conflicts of interest from asymmetric power or hidden agendas that require transparency policies to avoid compromising academic integrity and goals (Sharifi et al., 2014).

4.4 Comparative Analysis of Industry Collaboration Models

RQ4 aimed to determine which models of industry integration had the highest efficacy in improving learning outcomes. A comparative analysis of approaches based on the study's qualitative and quantitative data found longer-term project-based collaborations create greater knowledge transfer and skill development relative to episodic activities.

Immersive programs like internships, dedicated consulting projects and incubators where students undertake continuous applications for external clients over a semester or year-long engagements were associated with higher perceived gains as shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Perceived Learning Value Across Collaboration Models

Approach	Knowledge Gains	Skill Gains	Overall Impact
Internships	4.7	4.8	4.9
Industry projects	4.5	4.6	4.7
Startup incubators	4.3	4.4	4.5
Case studies	4.1	4.0	4.2
Guest lectures	3.2	3.0	3.4
Business competitions	3.5	3.4	3.7

Note: Based on 5-point Likert scale responses (1=lowest, 5=highest)

In contrast, occasional activities like guest lectures and competitions generated lower gains. The interactive group problem-solving nature of case studies positioned them in the middle. The qualitative findings reinforced this:

"One week summer camps are too short to take away much. Sustained engagement over months creates immersion leading to real competence development" (Participant F124).

This aligns with arguments in literature that project-based pedagogies enable deeper learning-by-doing while episodic collaborations risk superficiality, despite requiring greater coordination costs (Duval-Couetil, 2013).

4.5 Integration of Findings with Existing Literature

The identified prevalence of internships, case studies and competitions corresponds to trends observed in the innovation education sphere beyond just China, suggesting certain collaboration formats have universal appeal and impact (Nabi et al., 2017). However, the lower ratings for guest lectures and incubators contrasts more positive perceptions noted in Western contexts, implying integration models warrant adaptation to local environments (Souitaris et al., 2007).

The perceived value dimensions mirror motivational factors like skill development, networks and signaling effects documented across wider industry-academia partnership literature, further validating these as universal gains from collaboration (Ankrah & AL-Tabbaa, 2015).

Likewise, overcoming deterrents around legal formalities, resource constraints and conflicts of interest replicate recurrent barriers cited for university-business relationships, though their magnitude within Chinese education carries specificity (Alexander & Childe, 2013).

The superiority of intensive project-based models also supports arguments around experiential pedagogy's immersive learning for entrepreneurship, though relatively fewer incubators in China versus the West was highlighted as a localization nuance (Hynes et al., 2011).

Overall, integrating findings with established theory and context-specific insights enabled well-rounded discussion.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

This mixed methods study revealed internships, case studies and competitions as the most prevalently adopted approaches for incorporating industry collaboration into Chinese classrooms to foster innovation and entrepreneurship education. Sustained project-based engagements like internships and dedicated consulting projects were found to enable greater learning transfer compared to episodic activities based on perceived gains in skill development, professional exposure, creative problem-solving and employability. However, bureaucratic obstacles, resource limitations and misaligned incentives posed adoption barriers requiring further policy interventions.

5.1 Summary of Key Outcomes

Analysis of qualitative insights from educator interviews and student focus groups combined with quantitative survey data highlighted hands-on internships as the most impactful collaboration model. The immersive integration of conceptual knowledge and technical skill application under real-world mentorship provided unparalleled experiential learning. As Participant S124 explained, "My internship at a tech start-up allowed me to understand product development in a way lectures never could. Working on a real platform design and getting feedback from engineers was invaluable."

Case studies and business competitions ranked second for their interactive problem-based learning formats enabling application of business concepts through competitive scenario analysis, although perceived gains were lower than intensive internships. Educators viewed case studies as a balanced model for providing authenticity without the logistical complexities of placements. Guest lectures from industry experts offered inspirational exposure but lacked depth. Resource-intensive industry projects and startup incubators were limited in adoption due to coordination costs despite recognized value for venture creation.

Asymmetric partnerships, conflicts of interest around IP ownership distribution, and incentive misalignments posed barriers requiring governance mechanisms to uphold academic integrity. As Participant F261 described, "When the corporate partner overly dictated the research direction to align with their commercial interests rather than learning value, it compromised the educational merits of collaboration." Resource constraints also challenged sustainability when investments expected by industry could not be provided by universities over the long-term. The comparative assessment clearly demonstrated sustained project-based engagements enable greater learning transfer versus ad-hoc episodic activities.

5.2 Implications for Theory and Practice

This study's validation of hands-on learning principles substantiates claims in pedagogical literature that authentic experiential education amplifies entrepreneurial competencies. The findings reveal localization nuances around preferred collaboration formats in the Chinese context that hold practical value for educators in fostering impactful industry integration. They provide Chinese education policymakers an evidence base to reform curricular designs, faculty incentive structures, and industry partnership policies.

Theoretically, the research endorses calls to evolve curricular models beyond rigid classroom confines towards market-oriented collaborations for nurturing skills demanded by technology-driven economies. For practice, it offers educators guidance on appropriate formats suited for Chinese environments based on comparative efficacy insights. For policymakers, the findings identify specific areas for reform including bureaucratic procedures, resources allocation and transparency mechanisms to enable productive university-industry alignments focused on enriching innovation education.

5.3 Limitations of the Study

As a qualitative case analysis of recognized exemplar universities, the findings may not represent perspectives from nascent institutions lacking mature collaboration mechanisms. The perceptual data reliance also warrants caution against over-generalization. Follow-up behavioral research

tracking quantifiable entrepreneurial competency development could enrich conclusions. Cultural biases during interviews and focus groups likewise cannot be ruled out. The focus on technical entrepreneurship education further limits generalizability to non-technical domains.

5.4 Recommendations

For Educators:

- Prioritize project-based models for deeper industry engagement over ad-hoc activities - internships, consulting projects and incubators maximize learning.
- Develop structured partnerships under dedicated liaison support for continuity rather than sporadic engagements.
- Incorporate interactive case studies co-designed strategically with partners to balance authenticity and scalability.

For Policymakers:

- Streamline bureaucratic procedures for approving industry partnerships and adjust faculty incentives and career progression criteria to recognize collaboration efforts.
- Provide public funding and infrastructure support to seed and scale-up collaborative initiatives between universities and private partners.
- Institute IP protection protocols and conflict of interest policies to prevent compromising of academic missions.

5.5 Future Research Directions

This exploratory study focused on eliciting educator and student perceptions around integration approaches. Further longitudinal research tracking quantifiable skills development and post-graduation entrepreneurial performance could enrich conclusions. Comparative analysis across developing countries could reveal localization nuances beyond China. Given the dominance of technical entrepreneurship education, exploring industry collaboration mechanisms in non-technical domains like humanities and social sciences merits investigation. As online delivery increases, effectiveness of virtual collaboration models also warrants examination.

References

1.Alexander, A.T. and Childe, S.J., 2013. Innovation: a factor of production or by-product? The case of UK managerial innovation adoption and process innovation output. Production Planning & Control, 24(4-5), pp.354-367.

2.Al-Atabi, M. and DeBoer, J., 2014. Teaching entrepreneurship using massive open online course (MOOC). Technovation, 34(4), pp.261-264.

3.Ankrah, S. and AL-Tabbaa, O., 2015. Universities–industry collaboration: A systematic review. Scandinavian Journal of Management, 31(3), pp.387-408.

4.Ankrah, S., Burgess, T.F., Grimshaw, P. and Shaw, N.E., 2013. Asking both university and industry actors about their engagement in knowledge transfer: What single-group studies of motives omit. Technovation, 33(2-3), pp.50-65.

5.AT Kearney, 2020. Educating the Next Generation of Innovators. [online] AT Kearney. Available [Accessed 16 January 2024].

6.Audretsch, D.B., 2014. From the entrepreneurial university to the university for the entrepreneurial society. The Journal of Technology Transfer, 39(3), pp.313-321.

7.Bae, T.J., Qian, S., Miao, C. and Fiet, J.O., 2014. The relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions: A meta-analytic review. Entrepreneurship theory and practice, 38(2), pp.217-254.

8.Baumol, W.J., Litan, R.E. and Schramm, C.J., 2009. Good capitalism, bad capitalism, and the economics of growth and prosperity. Yale University Press.

9.Boardman, P.C. and Ponomariov, B.L., 2014. Management knowledge and the organization of team science in university research centers. The Journal of Technology Transfer, 39(1), pp.75-

92.
10.Brennan, L., Voros, J. and Brady, E., 2011. Paradigms at play and implications for validity in social marketing research. Journal of Social Marketing.
11.British Council, 2020. Developing China's Innovation and Entrepreneurship Capabilities. [online] British Council. Available [Accessed 16 January 2024].
12.Cai, Y., 2017. What constrains Chinese universities from achieving world-class status: A study in the context of entrepreneurial universities?. Higher Education, 74(2), pp.257-276.
13.Chang, Y.C., Yang, P.Y. and Chen, M.H., 2009. The determinants of academic research commercial performance: Towards an organizational ambidexterity perspective. Research Policy, 38(6), pp.936-946.
14.Duval-Couetil, N., 2013. Assessing the impact of entrepreneurship education programs: Challenges and approaches. Journal of Small Business Management, 51(3), pp.394-409.
15.European Commission, 2016. Entrepreneurship Education at School in Europe. Eurydice Report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
16.Fayolle, A., 2013. Personal views on the future of entrepreneurship education. Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 25(7-8), pp.692-701.
17.Fischer, B.B., Schaeffer, P.R., Vonortas, N.S. and Queiroz, S., 2018. Quality comes first: university-industry collaboration as a source of academic entrepreneurship in a developing country. The Journal of Technology Transfer, 43(2), pp.263-284.
18.Gorman, G., Hanlon, D. and King, W., 1997. Some research perspectives on entrepreneurship education, enterprise education and education for small business management: a ten-year literature review. International small business journal, 15(3), pp.56-77.
19.Gstraunthaler, T. and Hendry, S., 2011. Innovative pedagogy and didactics for accounting education: Utilising educational research to enhance course design and delivery.
20.Heinonen, J. and Poikkijoki, S.A., 2006. An entrepreneurial-directed approach to entrepreneurship education: mission impossible? Journal of management development.
21.Hynes, B., Costin, Y. and Birdthistle, N., 2011. Practice-based learning in entrepreneurship education: A means of connecting knowledge producers and users. Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning, 1(1), pp.16-28.
22.Jamieson, I., 1984. Schools and enterprise. Education for enterprise, 1, pp.19-27.
23.Kuratko, D.F., 2005. The emergence of entrepreneurship education: Development, trends, and challenges. Entrepreneurship theory and practice, 29(5), pp.577-598.
24.Mahieu, R., 2006, April. Agents of change and policies of scale: a policy study of entrepreneurship and enterprise in education. Doctoral dissertation, Umeå University.
25.Miller, K., McAdam, M. and McAdam, R., 2014. The changing university business model: a stakeholder perspective. R&D Management, 44(3), pp.265-287.
26.Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Fayolle, A., Krueger, N. and Walmsley, A., 2017. The impact of entrepreneurship education in higher education: A systematic review and research agenda. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 16(2), pp.277-299.
27.NASEM, 2014. Furthering America's Research Enterprise. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
28.Penaluna, A. and Penaluna, K., 2020. The flaws in entrepreneurial education: Addressing the disconnect between graduate entrepreneurial intent and graduate entrepreneurial behavior. Journal of Small Business Management, 58, pp.503-529.
29.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.
30.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.
31.Phillipson, J., Lowe, P., Proctor, A. and Ruto, E., 2019. Stakeholder engagement and knowledge exchange in environmental research. Journal of Environmental Management, 232, pp.110-120.
32.Roy, R. and Mention, A.L., 2018. Academia-industry R&D collaboration in Canada: the role of federal policy instruments. The Journal of Technology Transfer, 43(4), pp.785-806.
33.Sharifi, H., Liu, W. and Ismail, H.S., 2014. Higher education system and the labour market: A case study. Higher Education Studies, 4(2), pp.1-10.
34.Siegel, D.S., Waldman, D.A., Atwater, L.E. and Link, A.N., 2004. Toward a model of the effective transfer of scientific knowledge from academicians to practitioners: qualitative evidence from the commercialization of university technologies. Journal of Engineering and technology management, 21(1-2), pp.115-142.
35.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.
36.Stam, E., 2015. Entrepreneurial ecosystems and regional policy: a sympathetic critique. European Planning Studies, 23(9), pp.1759-1769.
37.Tartari, V., Perkmann, M. and Salter, A., 2014. In good company: The influence of peers on industry engagement by academic scientists. Research Policy, 43(7), pp.1189-1203.
38.Urbano, D. and Guerrero, M., 2013. Entrepreneurial universities: Socioeconomic impacts of academic entrepreneurship in a European region. Economic Development Quarterly, 27(1), pp.40-55.
39.Wang, Y. and Li, J., 2011. Entrepreneurship education and employment performance: large sample evidence from China. The Journal of Technology Transfer, 36(5), pp.543-559.
40.Warhuus, J.P. and Basaiawmoit, R.V., 2014. Entrepreneurship education at Nordic technical higher education institutions: Comparing and contrasting program designs and content. The International Journal of Management Education, 12(3), pp.317-332.
41.Wu, A., 2017. The signal effect of top university attendance: Evidence from China. Economics of Education Review, 60, pp.39-51.
42.Zhou, W. and Xu, Z., 2020. Structure and determinants of university technology transfer: evidence from China. The Journal of Technology Transfer, 45(3), pp.662-685.