



UWS Academic Portal

Entrepreneurship, marketing and the multicultural

Telford, Nicholas; Gustafsson, Veronika

Published in:
Handbook of Entrepreneurship and Marketing

Published: 31/07/2020

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication on the UWS Academic Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Telford, N., & Gustafsson, V. (2020). Entrepreneurship, marketing and the multicultural: the case of a European Union Erasmus+ Project. In I. Fillis, & N. Telford (Eds.), *Handbook of Entrepreneurship and Marketing* (pp. 292-305). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://www.e-elgar.com/shop/gbp/handbook-of-entrepreneurship-and-marketing-9781785364563.html>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the UWS Academic Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact pure@uws.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

This is a draft chapter. The final version is available in Handbook of Entrepreneurship and Marketing edited by I. Fillis and N. Telford, published in 2020, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd

<https://www.e-elgar.com/shop/gbp/handbook-of-entrepreneurship-and-marketing-9781785364563.html>

The material cannot be used for any other purpose without further permission of the publisher, and is for private use only.

<a>Entrepreneurship, Marketing and the Multicultural: The Case of a European Union Erasmus+ Project

<au> Nicholas Telford and Veronika Gustafsson

Keywords: Erasmus+; multiculturalism; entrepreneurial marketing education; university branding; exchange.

Introduction

In September 2016, the authors, based at a UK university, embarked upon a three-year EU Erasmus+ project with six other EU HEIs (in Finland, France, Germany, Belgium, Czech Republic and Poland) in order to develop both entrepreneurial capacity in students and their ability to work in multicultural teams. Alongside the many benefits of close and intensive multicultural work, the authors want to reflect upon and consider if the project could have been more effective in its planning, execution and outputs. This chapter describes the journey of the authors' experience, the student experience (including preliminary findings from feedback and research undertaken) and attempts to reflect upon the project's value. Methodologically, the authors follow the principles of analytic autoethnography (Anderson, 2006, p.373), namely, the authors are full members in the research setting, which is fully visible in the research texts, and they are committed to developing theoretical understanding emanating from social phenomena. In this case we attempt to tease out how the espoused theories (what the universities claim they strive to achieve) might run contrary to the theories in use (what the business school management requires from the project team) (cf. Argyris and Schon, 1974) affected university's image. Apart from the theoretical contribution we also try to provide normative advice to the wider academic community to avoid future pitfalls and make future international partnership working more effective and less fraught.

The project's commencement coincided with the UK's referendum to leave the European Union. Partners knew that while we were safe for the time being, the subject of Brexit cast a shadow over events. The overall aim was to exchange best practice in the form of various 'mobilities', i.e. students and faculty visiting each other within variety of events. The first was the kick-off meeting in the UK, the next was the first of three annual Intensive Programmes (IP) for students in Finland, then various other planning and 'multiplier' events and meetings or mini-conferences in each of the seven partner countries. This chapter is presented as a narrative of experience with the aim of promoting understanding of such an international European Union-funded project and what potentials and potential pitfalls is has for promoting university brand and the development of income generation through cultural and entrepreneurial education. It is framed by the notion that academic staff are both entrepreneurship educators but also in themselves attempting to be entrepreneurial and innovative by engaging in 'third stream' activities (Johnson et al., 2016) that aim to deliver extra value to university stakeholders and confer added brand value on their institutions and their own personal brands as academics (Shephard, 2005; Sturdy and Wright, 2008).

We present our experience in the form of vignettes of experiences – critical incidents and highlight the benefits and positives as well as detailing what we believe could have been done better. We present this chapter from the point of view of academics operating as

entrepreneurial marketers wishing to attract attention, engage in intercultural development of teaching and research on teaching in order that benefits may be obtained for students, the institutions and for our own professional development. This has – it turns out – been done in the face of adversity both at a personal-professional level, an institutional level and at an intra-institutional level across the seven partners that make up the project. We hope that this chapter will give readers an overview of what a multicultural entrepreneurship project consists of from the first-hand perspective of UK-based academics.

The text is organised around a review and discussion of relevant literature related to the history of the Erasmus scheme in its entirety, but with particular reference to the Erasmus+ initiatives – how they are formed, operate, what their outputs are intended to be. Such literature is surprisingly scant given that this is a European-wide initiative which is to be funded at £20 billion for the five years from 2020. Given the UK's national status as leaving the EU at the time of writing we have an extra dimension to consider – a great act of apparent disintegration at a time when integration is desirable and one of the main aims of the Erasmus+ programme among its young and more mature participants.

Background to Erasmus+

The European Union began the educational exchange programme known as Erasmus in 1987 either after the itinerant philosopher Erasmus of Rotterdam or the clever yet contrived acronym 'EuROpean Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students' (European Union, 2013). As Enders (1998) puts it, the rationale has been the 'fostering of communication and cooperation among institutions and academia aimed at the advancement of knowledge, the renewal of academic teaching, and European integration' (Ibid. p. 46). The project discussed in this chapter was funded to the value of c. €300,000 over three years for seven institutions drawn from Finland (lead partner); Germany, Belgium, Poland, Czech Republic France and the UK. Erasmus is well-known in the university sector but possibly more for the exchanges it allows for undergraduates to study for a term or more at an established partner university elsewhere in Europe. This Erasmus+ project is standalone and intended to develop specific capacities for academic staff and students, in this case, namely in entrepreneurship (containing key strands of marketing and other business functions) and working in multicultural teams. The project came about through links forged between our Erasmus coordinator and counterparts in other partner institutions.

Espoused Theories vs Theories-in-Use

Due to the ongoing decline of public funding and the neoliberal corporatisation of Universities as businesses first and public institutions second, UK universities have long been desirous of obtaining income through activities which provide full cost recovery on their considerable human and other resources. Various means are tried by the UK's entrepreneurial universities and acquiring links to business that also release public funding in the so-called third-stream activities but have been questioned and rejected by academics themselves (THES, 2004; 2016). In a younger University such as ours this entrepreneurial message is clearly sent from our senior leadership team. As we know, the "entrepreneurial" spirit's chief aim and locus has been the search for profit rather than of innovation (Hobsbawm, 1969 as cited by Baumol, 1990). Of course, according to the university's espoused theory, we strive for understanding the world around us and educating that world (yes, we educate the world from our corner of it). We also want image and reputation that

comes of the ongoing internationalisation of the higher education sector. The reality is that the money is never enough and the long-term image and reputation of the university, albeit explicitly promoted, may in effect be compromised in order to fulfil short-term KPIs. Participation in the Erasmus+ programme is deemed to also be a source of income but perhaps in the way which covers costs rather than provides for surpluses. It is also expected that institutions contribute by matching resources such as staff time to the funded projects.

<c>The Key ‘Mobilities’

Apart from the planning meetings, multiplier events, i.e. mini-conferences hosted in Poland and Belgium where partners brought in other colleagues and external parties known to the academic partners, the main mobility and focus of research was the Intensive Programmes (IPs). These were two-week residential bootcamp-type events where six students from each partner university participated in an intensive programme of lectures, seminars and coaching in order to refine and produce a working business idea and to pitch it in a safe yet competitive environment. Using these events the partners aimed to develop innovative entrepreneurship teaching practices and achieve intercultural communication.

<c>Stated Project Outputs and UWS Participation.

The project was supposed to achieve its aims through nine explicitly stated outputs; however, not all partners were expected to participate in each output or to participate in equal measure. Below we present an overview of the outputs through the lens of our university’s involvement:

Output 1: The development of a blended module for use among the partners and for sharing with the wider academic community. UWS played auxiliary role supporting the leading partner team, with some additional material, proof-reading and suggestions.

Output 2: Curriculum development. UWS was very actively involved in this output and the results also feel most satisfying, partly due to students’ success (international exposure, company start-ups etc.) and partly due to professional development of the team members. Experience gained in preparation and participation in the IP was successfully used in teaching at home.

Output 3. Community of learning. UWS not involved.

Output 4. Peer learning model. UWS not involved.

Output 5. Publications. Minor supportive role.

Output 6. Student survey. Supportive role, as it proved quite difficult to persuade students to submit these essays. Upon reflection, certain perks (e.g. module marks etc.) could be motivational. Students could not obtain the digital badge (Output 9) if they did not submit an essay.

Output 7. Literature review. UWS was active in this output as main contributors (alongside with IUT team). Present results provide an introductory level overview of entrepreneurship research in the areas prioritised by the Project, namely entrepreneurship education, social entrepreneurship and failure management in entrepreneurship.

Output 8. Articles. UWS not involved.

Output 9. Digital badge. This was to authenticate participation for professional social media promotion to students in the project. UWS not involved.

<c>A Question of Commitment – Is there any material to research in this?

One thing we have all learned is that while European universities may differ in the details, we are all subject to the tripartite aims of managerialism, profit-seeking and public relations. In choosing opportunities to promote the university brand, student experience and staff development not to mention the possibility to generate income, our participation in this project – at least at the time of writing – could not support delivery of research outputs. We believe that we went in with genuine aims but have been disgruntled by instances of miscommunication. Incentives have gradually been removed; as a result, motivation has suffered and we are now working to complete our obligations as efficiently as possible. It is difficult to understand exactly what these are, however, and we remain open to suggestions at the conference on ways in which we might make the best of this project as well as offering a narrative of experience and our own recommendations.

A key aim of the project at its outset was to perform concurrent research on activities (predominantly the IPs) while we were doing them. The problem was that we could not achieve a consensus on the approach to this research and we had an ad hoc approach to gathering data after the first IP. For the second IP in Germany we did collect a number of personal essays from participants and these were shared. These can be collated, and we will provide some of the outputs from these at our presentation. From preliminary analysis these fairly short accounts are blandly positive. Previous interviews were similar, and the main findings were that students had had low- or no expectations but enjoyed interacting with other students from around Europe and had some minor disagreements and misunderstandings. We collected focus group recordings with our own students and one one-to-one interview because UWS students after the first IP were not always in agreement (there were mutual accusation either of constant partying or frequently engaging in noisy sexual activities in students' shared accommodation). It is notable that this detail was elided in the focus group and in the one-to-one interview. While this is all very interesting it does not speak to the way in which entrepreneurial marketing education is performed effectively in multicultural teams via a robust and meaningful research regime. But we may draw the conclusion that our first IP team certainly had a good time but not necessarily a good time altogether. We have a final opportunity to collect more data but we do not hold out much hope for the effectiveness of this approach across all project partners, given we still have not discussed never mind agreed a shared approach. However, we decided to interact with the various data collections and salvage something of value. This has already been done independently, to some extent, by one of our colleagues (Badzinska, 2017).

Personal Experience: NT Reflects...

Although I volunteered and was accepted early on in the project, I did not at that point fully understand the funding and reporting aspects. It was understood that the project was prestigious

and generated an external income stream and would contribute to my own professional development as well as to developing international and intercultural networks that offered various benefits to our students and to the development of both teaching and research capability. The line manager I had at the time was positive and promoted my participation and that of other in our team but again, did not perhaps fully understand the commitments of the project from an institutional and line management point of view or seek to promote the participation wider than the internal project team we formed. Later, when I deputised for the internal project, I tried harder to understand the ins and outs and made contact with both internal and external administrators of the scheme but it seemed that no one was really experienced with this particular scheme (e.g. internally, one project had been done previously but was very different in its setup and how it was conducted) Externally, our 'national agency' had little to offer in the way of in-project support of experience of university-level projects of this nature and while friendly and confident did not appear to be able to offer much in the way of advice or assistance. My feeling throughout the project was that there was much more to be done that I didn't quite understand and ultimately this was not accounted for by my personal line manager nor the institution as a whole. I found myself spending a lot of time negotiating a steep and often disappointing learning curve to administer the Intensive Programmes or to account for activity when much of it could not be easily accommodated in the pre-determined work packages. When this is already not adequately accounted for in work-load planning and I have a number of other work and personal commitments the end result was often demotivation and resentment.

Despite the difficulties and the guilt for travelling away from a young family regularly I also valued the experiences I had to travel to places I wouldn't ordinarily have travelled to in a professional context which is very different from leisure travel. I was able to gain cultural understanding from across the partner institutions and often most interestingly from colleagues who were non-natives in their place of residence and work.

My final almost nostalgic look back is that while I glad to have a rest from the admin and the travelling and the various misunderstandings, disagreements and suchlike, it was a very positive learning experience but one that can not be easily explained or qualified. The biggest regret might be the not knowing how to operate the project to best effect which is perhaps also the biggest learning point. I learned more through my perception of relative failure and what might be done better than by the various benefits that were clearly achieved but not fully realised (i.e. research data and potential for outputs). To be sure, the enjoyment of cultural learning was a high point and seeing the development and cultural – or just human – exchange of the students involved was extremely gratifying.

Joint Reflections

We took the following observations from a structure discussion.

Pedagogically we weren't doing anything particularly novel. Instead the IPs were more hubs or pivot points - same too with multiplier events. This is not to underplay the value of bringing students and faculty together under different social and cultural conditions and perhaps our expectations were higher than they were required to be.

All other aspects were ad hoc. Some partner teams harked back to previous experiences and tried to emulate them. Clearly this experience is valuable but there was a sense of nostalgia – it was better before, the way we did it with the established partners. By implication, new

partners such as ourselves were alien, inexperienced, probably, apprehensive and this is perhaps why opinions, ideas, suggestions were not always welcomed.

Ad hoc arrangements led to attendance issues. Not everyone could attend everything for scheduling/ other commitments and often the failure of technology. The result was miscommunication. While one barrier was that of language there was another of work and social culture in communication and joint working. I found as a native speaker, and I was not the only one despite being only one of two within our national team which was the only one of seven where English was the first language, it took much reciprocated effort to communicate at an appropriate level. One of the highlights for me was trying to work on my French language informally, but more on cultural knowledge. I think there was an assumption that as a native speaker I had an advantage. I am not sure that it the case. Partners would revert to their national languages in public forums which may be easier and necessary was an alienation even though we could pick up some fragments in the European languages more familiar to us.

Differing agendas – we thought we were signing up to a discrete and predefined project whereas as it was evidence through experience and behaviour of other teams that they had various aims and agendas going on beyond the project at hand. This may have been an established and explicit/ tacit expectation of doing an Erasmus+ project that economies of scale or ‘skunk working’ was a way to leverage other intersectionalities of experience. In other words, our partners were recognising and exploiting opportunities to combine trips to create other networks, have meetings, collect data and to otherwise get greater value out of their time and the budgets set for the ECMT+ project alone. On reflection we view this as creative, entrepreneurial and best value. We believe however, that it allowed mission creep and it should have been made explicit at the outset so we all knew what to expect.

We could have organised our teams better for work packages.

Given the lack of entrepreneurship academics and academics who were research trained and active or aspirational we could have done more from the outset to set up a better way of organising ourselves as a whole group. VG was unable to make more of the first official meeting (although was instrumental in earlier setting up of the project) and NT was more of host and tour guide while the Project Coordinator rightfully led the first team meeting in November 2016. Deep cultural, ideo-methodological and institutional differences came to light as the project participants attempted to successfully examine and report on knowledge, especially concerning publications in those outlets which are expected by our national and international networks.

Collecting Student Feedback

For each of the three IPs, we attempted to feedback in the form, initially, of focus groups and one-to-one interviews. From the second IP onwards the preferred data collection technique was the use of student individual reflective essays. Our purpose for this feedback for was to i) inform future iterations of the IPs, ii) to report to the funders and ultimately to iii) produce published research of our work to contribute to the limited body of knowledge on the subject. However, the main issue we faced was disagreement upon the most appropriate approach to collecting the data and the subject of ethics and the requirement for students to participate.

The main disagreement over approach was over the choice of quantitative of qualitative approaches. Unless specific experimental methods were used, none of the project team appeared to have experience of, we felt that quantitative approach would not work with surveys

since the numbers of participants per IP was well under 100 at around 42 with total project student participants under 130. While we favoured qualitative approaches the problem of researcher bias and participant bias was never fully acknowledged or examined among the partners. While we expect bias in qualitative work, some partners did not accept that this was a matter for concern and presented findings as absolute but being uncritical of either the project or their own research methodology. The problem with faculty conducting the any form of data collection with students and students being the focus of the research given the small number meant that research data would inevitably suffer research bias and that for any of the three purposes noted above the quality and meaning of the outputs would be difficult to ascertain. Even in the reflective essays which were adopted as a way to minimise the negative effects of research bias at the participant level, we have an examples where a participant submitted then re-submitted their response having toned it down not wishing to offend or appear too negative or critical of the project as they saw it.

The matter of ethics was also a difficult one. Cultural and professional experience differences between individuals among the project partners meant that some did not have an understanding of the need that research participation should be voluntary. Some felt that in participation in the project meant automatic participation in the research aspects related to it or if participants did not submit a reflective essay they would not receive an official electronic badge for participation. Of course, it could be that the latter does not mean that the data would necessarily be used for anything other than project reporting but this in itself is a form of publication and therefore research which is subject to the requirements of research ethics. What makes the whole-project research data difficult for us and our institution/ expectations of our national Academy is that we cannot be sure that informed consent was obtained in the same way that we obtained it and followed our institution's ethical framework and therefore the expectations of our academic system.

Despite these muscular provisos we can give selected quotes from our student participants who, even if we take into account for bias, still had a very good experience from the ECMT+ programme. Participants were asked how it had changed them as a person. One of our participants said:

The IP course has thought me how much of the world is still to experience. I have been looking at overseas internships almost every day since being back! Hearing the plans of the other participants and what they hope to do in the next few years has been very interesting and really opened chances of opportunity that I had not even considered before.

Another participant was explicit:

The IP course has taught me to have confidence and to take steps believing that I am going to be successful. The IP has taught me to take action wisely in the right path. The IP did not change me as a person, but definitely it has made me wiser. And as a student it has given me the opportunity to strengthen my CV. The IP has also provided me with the opportunity to experience the required perception and decision-making process of a potential entrepreneur. I have learned that a potential entrepreneur must act quickly to change not only in the market, but within the strategy of the team and the company as well.

One students was pleasantly surprised:

My experience was better than I had ever expected. I thought it would just be a simple entrepreneurship programme and that I would attend and not really get too much from it rather than the basics of entrepreneurship. However, after finishing my two weeks I can firmly say that it was much much more than just a simple programme. I came away from

the project with a whole new selection of knowledge, multicultural points of view, increased motivation and confidence and a group of international friends and memories to cherish.

Another concludes:

[...] taking part in the ECMT+ programme has been highly beneficial for me. This is because I have been able to develop key skills, knowledge and confidence as a professional. I now have the confidence to leave my comfort zone and try new things (like move to a new country), and that is all thanks to this experience.

On the more (possibly) critical side:

It was my first experience working in this kind of event. What made it interesting was the chaos and confusion from beginning to the end of the event.

Two takeaways from these quotes are that they were done with the informed consent of the participants and that those participants recognised their own development and the benefits of that development, sometimes to their surprise. Of the major benefits from the programme student experience was certainly the key positive outcome in our opinion.

Lessons to Learn and Recommendations for Future Work

The main issues that we have identified in our own practice or internally to our institution is drawn from a lack of experience in the type of project completed. We underestimated the pressures of both our own institution who have adopted a full economic cost attitude to our work plan allowance. This means that any contribution expected from our institution is not really available to us and we have had to triage aspects of the project such as the recruitment and administration of the intensive programme at the expense of recording, reporting and research elements. We have a lack of – ironically – managerial support both in the form of administrative and finance support who have little or no experience of a project of this type thus leaving this as an extra burden on our team. During the last year we have had the double problem of illness within our team and the partial retirement of a team member.

In the case of our partners, we think they would share some of the same issues at home as we have experience. Some have considerable experience of such projects and we think this gives them an advantage of knowing how to best run the projects effectively for their own institutions' objectives. Some run more than one project concurrently and involve many staff. This may be excellent for exposing staff from those institutions to various different experience and we have enjoyed the sociality and experience of a wider number of colleagues to engage which but it also makes communication more difficult and time consuming. It also decentralises team responsibility and therefore ownership of tasks and outputs. Other partners have small or even single member teams which has the opposite effect and places extreme responsibility on to few people who have insufficient time in their work schedule to do all they need to do.

The project is probably too big in terms of participants and underfunded in terms of the vague but grand aims of the application that was funded. The administrative and accounting burden for the project is high. Time and expenses have to be forensically accounted for and there are various rules for the inclusion of time and activities that are allowed or not allowed.

In recent times our partners have dictated unilaterally in the name of agreement to reduce our funding share yet further even though their contribution is not clear – at least to us. The official language is English but some members' grasp is limited and with the lack of honesty and nuance in addition to the issues noted above it has been difficult to really understand effectively what everyone is really thinking. That said, the power of non-verbal communication is breaking through and we feel 'la battre froid' or 'cold blast' [roughly cold shoulder] from our partners in the project.

If any readers of this chapter are wondering whether we would do it again then the gut response is not an immediate 'no' but a highly qualified 'possibly'. If we were able to have more hand in the design of not only the chosen project but the dimensions of the programme as a whole plus adequate institutional backing and we could implement the raft of recommendations for improvement here then it could be a very attractive proposition for us as a project. For us, we were hoping to have the obvious benefits of academic mobility, curriculum development and student experience with the added opportunity to collect meaningful data in order to publish our experience. As it turns out this is unlikely and we can only really give our findings based on the limited experiential reporting we currently. However, we hope that this paper, such as it is, will share our experience and help us develop it in order to refine the way in which academics through the desire for income generation and PR can most effectively achieve these aims under the restrictions elaborated above. If in our work of the near future we can provide a methodology for research and a framework for implementation for future similar projects then we feel we will have produced outputs of value.

The Devil in the Details_or What could be Done Differently

Ensure that institutional buy-in and knowledge of managing time, resources and outputs is made clear at the beginning of the project. We had a steep learning curve and little in the way of institutional knowledge on managing budgets and allocating internal resources. National organisations were not much help as they were unused to supporting university-level projects. Too much responsibility/ pressure lay with the lead partner to inform partners of the systems that were in place.

Start student selection and complete pre-IP earlier; if possible, bring in students with different background/ majors, but see to it that all have at least initial exposure to entrepreneurship. We were prevented from involving other faculties by Senior Management since this was viewed as a School-only project. Involving other faculties at the outset could have enlarged the appeal, profile and impact of the project. As it is, we have recently merged with another complementary faculty – that of Cultural Industries which could provide much needed disciplinary diversity in future projects.

Much greater time allowance is required for the administration of the project. As it was much time and effort need to be expended but could not be always attributed to an output.

We need to have an agreed (and fair) process for recruiting and developing students for any future IP-based programmes. We didn't know what to expect or how to prepare them. Getting the 'level' right both of information/ experience and of the students was difficult to achieve and we found it difficult to interest and retain students on the project that would make good ambassadors for our institution to represent both our corporate brand as well as our personal brand as faculty. Much greater understanding of the resource commitments needs to be made clear to project team members and university administrators. Anecdotally, Erasmus+ is known for some prestige but the funding of projects is not enough in today's cash-strapped university sector. We think this is true across the partners, but most definitely in the UK.

There is also the need to set clear expectations with students (as far as it goes). Explain that the IP is as much a process of creation of an international project team, as an entrepreneurship boot-camp. Aside from the usual interpersonal difficulties that occurred within national groups most students were very pleased to be involved in the project and to make new friends and contacts across the partner universities and beyond. It is difficult to capture how effectively this happened. Post-IP interview and focus group data appears blandly positive or accusatory at the faculty other members of the student teams (the others should behave better) when not reflecting critically or equally on their own contribution.

The relatively small numbers of students involved coupled with disagreement on research approaches among project teams at the beginning and throughout made it difficult to adequately collect research data. If a project has research aspirations, it requires commitment to quality and rigour including agreeing in advance on a research design.

While multiplier events were interesting on a professional, personal and cultural level, frequent changing and adding members to core teams in other partners put pressure on the whole team to re-integrate and bring new additions up to speed. Invariably different ideas and directions became the result.

Benefits Drawn From ECMT+ Project

To be positive, the project has thus far been successful inasmuch as both academic and students have been mobile and engaged in deep and extensive cultural exchange. The most satisfying thing is the immediate and delayed feedback we have had from student participants that beyond telling us as faculty what they think they should say seem to have genuinely enjoyed and benefited socially from the experience. We can say anecdotally that this has been a good and positive thing but it has come at the cost of our professional and family time that may have been otherwise spent more profitably elsewhere. Nonetheless, the project yielded clear benefits which are detailed below:

Benefits for organisation: Most obvious benefits at the University level is the legitimacy and prestige of participation in a large European project. Also learning derived from this participation is invaluable; i.e. in order to successfully participate in a project of this magnitude and benefit from it, organisational support at all levels and functioning administrative infrastructure is paramount.

Benefits for teachers: increased international exposure; individual learning and experience in organising and coordinating of a large international project. Also ECMT+ helped Business School to achieve its KPI in terms of staff international exposure.

Benefits for students: The main benefit for the university was the possibility for its students to engage in short-term international exchange and thus to increase students' international exposure and meet the University's KPIs on student/staff mobility. Our university's hallmark is inclusivity (i.e. accepting students from underprivileged backgrounds); these students often have difficult family circumstances and/or have to work to support their studies. As such, it can be challenging for them to participate in longer Erasmus exchange, but the IP framework was perfect for them.

Also in terms of learning, curriculum development/entrepreneurship education and working in intercultural teams, for many of our students participation in the IPs was truly a life-changing experience. Some examples:

IP1 (Finland): having participated in the IP, a student of Accounting Bachelor completely changed his view of entrepreneurship and started an own company; another student (business major) from an underprivileged background was able to travel overseas and participate in an international programme (which he wouldn't be able to do otherwise); for him it was a life-changing experience.

IP2 (Germany): a part-time student who could not have committed to a longer Erasmus experience benefited from the international exchange experience in the short intensive format. A number of international students from outside the EU were able to participate which thus enlarged the cultural scope of the project through its participants.

IP3 (France): one of the students was experienced entrepreneur and he was able to team up with his fellow student who had long experience of working with autistic children. Together they were able to identify an opportunity, prove its feasibility and begin working on a start-up in Scotland.

As a conclusion, it is safe to admit that students indeed benefited most of all university stakeholders and their gains were very significant for professional as well as personal development.

All partners prioritised IPs, either as hosts or as participants. Despite somewhat exaggerated expectations, majority of students benefited from the events professionally and enjoyed it personally.

Members of the project team underwent significant professional and personal development.

The Project shifted from being result-oriented to becoming process-oriented; e.g. even if the Mentorship model has not been realised as initially conceived, the project team developed an ad-hoc process of knowledge sharing and individual learning.

Adaptability and wiliness to accommodate individual circumstances and systemic deficiencies of respective institutions; due to this the common project goal was achieved.

We think we have learned a great deal from this experience, not all of it positive, but useful in a negative and arduous kind of a way. Have we developed *Sitzfleisch* – the German concept of sitting flesh or meat which may be interpreted as either tenacity to complete tasks or the operation of waiting out the rest of the actors in the field until something else happens to resolve whatever it was that was supposed to have been done. We think both interpretations are valid in our example.

The benefits of writing this chapter is that it allows us to present the lived experience of academics trying to be both entrepreneurial and projecting a positive image to leverage both the brand of our respective institutions and our role in the European network in which we exist. For readers it should act as both a celebration of the possibilities as well as a cautionary tale of what can be challenging. As the German poet Henry Schiller, as quoted by Sigmund Freud says, 'Nothing is so hard to bear as a succession of fine days'. We have attempted to locate our experience in literature and ideas relevant and useful to promulgating both entrepreneurial learning and multicultural experience. We must celebrate the many successes of the project and the experiences that we and our students had. It was hard but it was worth it. Could we have done it better? Certainly. This chapter offers some insight from experience. We think that all parties benefited from the experience but it difficult to prove this in a concrete and robust epistemological way. We offer some suggestions for in future multi-team multinational groups

that attempt to achieve ground-breaking change but do so with relatively few resources in terms of people and institutional buy in.

References

- Argyris, C., & D.A. Schon, (1974), *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*, Oxford, UK: Jossey-Bass.
- Anderson, L. (2006), 'Analytic Autoethnography', *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, **35** (4), 373-395.
- Badzinska, Ewa, (2017), 'Empirical Study on Intercultural Collaboration in Project Teams: Preliminary Research Findings' *Journal of Intercultural Management* **9** (3), 29-44.
- Baumol, William J., (1990), 'Entrepreneurship: Productive, Unproductive, and Destructive', *The Journal of Political Economy*, **98** (5), 893-921.
- European Union, (2013), *History of the Erasmus Programme*, available online, accessed 19 January 2019, https://web.archive.org/web/20130404063516/http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus/history_en.htm
- Enders, Jurgen (1998), 'Academic Staff Mobility in the European Community: The ERASMUS Experience', *Comparative Education Review*, **42** (1), 46-60.
- Hobsbawm, Eric (1969), *Industry and Empire from 1750 to the Present Day*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Johnson, M, E.W. Monsen and N.G. MacKenzie (2016), 'Follow the Leader of the Pack? Regulatory Focus and Academic Entrepreneurial Intentions', *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, **34** (2), 181-200.
- Khan, M. S., R. J. Breitenacker, V. Gustafsson and E. J. Schwarz, (2015), 'Innovative entrepreneurial teams: The give and take of trust and conflict', *Creativity and Innovation Management*, **24** (4), 558-573.
- Kolveried, L., and Ø. Moen (1997), 'Entrepreneurship among business graduates', *Journal of European Industrial Training*, **21** (4), 154-160.
- Shepherd, I.D., (2005), 'From Cattle and Coke to Charlie: Meeting the Challenge of Self Marketing and Personal Branding', *Journal of Marketing Management*, **21** (5-6), 589-606.
- Sturdy, A., and C. Wright (2008), 'A consulting diaspora? Enterprising selves as agents of enterprise', *Organization*, **15** (), 427-444.
- THES (Times Higher Educational Supplement) (2004), *Third stream is not third class*, 10 December, available online, accessed 14 October 2019, <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/comment/leader/leader-third-stream-is-not-third-class/192957.article>.
- THES (Times Higher Educational Supplement) (2016), *Academics Shun Engagement With Business*, 16 January, available online, accessed 14 October 2019,

[https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/academics-shun-engagement-with-business.](https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/academics-shun-engagement-with-business)