Would I do it again?
Revisiting the implementation of the entrepreneurship paradigm in a University in Mexico

¿Lo volvería a hacer? Revisitando la implementación del paradigma del emprendimiento en una Universidad de México

Oscar Montiel is leader of the Research Group Creativity, Innovation and responsible Entrepreneurship and Cap. 20 of Entrepreneurship, Incubation and Business Creation of the Academy of Administrative Sciences (ACACIA) (Mexico) (oscar.montiel@uacj.mx) (http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0434-1649)

Claudia Ivette Rodríguez Lucio is a professor and researcher at the Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez (Mexico) (Ivette.rodriguez@uacj.mx) (http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6135-4799)

Abstract

Autoethnography is a recognized research method used broadly in the social sciences. Its use within the area of entrepreneurship has been scarce, few researchers in this area have used the narrative itself (Engstrom, 2012). This article deals with the experiences of two teachers members of the university's entrepreneurship transversal academy, and its experience in promoting it as the engine of a paradigm shift on a public university in Mexico, revisiting it now using analytical generalization following Chang (2008). The results suggest a broad reflection on organizational, social and cultural aspects, which are immersed in the processes of change in every institution, and how they influence the intention to modify the recent context to one where creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship are the axes that contribute in reach the new national and global policies directed towards the formation of an entrepreneurial ecosystem in a university.

Resumen

La autoetnografia es un método de investigación reconocido y utilizado en las Ciencias Sociales, aun cuando su uso dentro del área de emprendimiento ha sido escaso y pocos investigadores de esta área han utilizado la propia narrativa (Engstrom, 2012). El presente artículo aborda desde este método las experiencias de dos maestros (Montiel & Rodríguez, 2016) al realizar la gestión y ser miembros de una academia transversal enfocada al emprendimiento, y narra sus vivencias al impulsarlo como motor del cambio de paradigma de una Universidad pública en México, revisitándolo ahora desde una generalización analítica según lo sugerido por Chang (2008). Los resultados apuntan a realizar una amplia reflexión sobre aspectos organizacionales, sociales y culturales que están inmersos en los procesos de cambio de toda institución, y cómo estos influyen en la intención de modificación del contexto reciente hacia uno donde la creatividad, innovación y emprendimiento sean los ejes que coadyuven a las instituciones en alcanzar y estar a la par de las nuevas políticas nacionales y globales dirigidas hacia la conformación de un ecosistema emprendedor.

Keywords | Palabras clave

Autoethnography, entrepreneurship, transversality, entrepreneurial university, entrepreneurship ecosystem, organizational change

Autoetnografía, emprendimiento, transversalidad, universidad emprendedora, ecosistema emprendedor, cambio organizacional.

1. Introduction

An opportunity that I could not ignore. I had just been hired as a research professor and started an academic career after 15 years in the family business. I did not know anything about entrepreneurship as a construct, nor about its environment. I was offered to take charge of the business incubator of the University. The context was very good, there was support from the government and the institution. We started with great strength and we started to grow, both in said area and professionally. Then everything changed. It became a crossroads. On the one hand, the government redesigned the support system for entrepreneurs with the constitution of the National Institute of Entrepreneurs (INADEM). On the other, budgetary shortages arose, and supporting entrepreneurship in the institution was increasingly-and rightly so-more difficult. The accreditation bodies of the Association of Universities and Institutions of Higher Education (ANUIES) began to demand indicators of entrepreneurship in academic programs. Already in 2011, it was proposed to operate a Transverse Entrepreneurship Academy (ATE), composed of teachers from the four institutes, and to have the opportunity to exchange experiences in that area. However, the lack of continuity in their leadership and interest truncated the effort.

That being so, and with some people looking skeptically at this project, in September 2013 I am appointed - at the same time as I was of the incubator - coordinator of the ATE. Without exaggeration, it was starting from scratch and on many edges. Already Sperrer, Müller and Soos (2016) point out that there is still relatively little knowledge about best practices on how to develop and implement new entrepreneurship programs in universities. The present narrative is a modest contribution to this state of the issue from a non-traditional perspective: Autoethnography.

The University has about 28,000 students. The aim of the ATE was to promote and support the development of an entrepreneurial ecosystem and culture in the university community and in the region. Its vision was to promote a comprehensive education in students, helping to improve the quality of life in the region by promoting creation of companies, intrapreneurship in organizations and innovation in general, making the University the national and state leader in the culture of entrepreneurship. As a long-term goal, we also wanted to cooperate in the construc-

Montiel, Oscar, Claudia & Rodríguez Lucio, Ivette (2017).
Would I do it again. *Retos, 14*(II), pp. 137-154.

139

tion of an internal ecosystem of creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship, based on the Rainforest model and the Aspen Institute.

It had academic transversality and multidisciplinarity (suggested by the World Bank and the United Nations), composed of entrepreneurs of the four institutes (Administrative Sciences, Engineering and Technology, Architecture Design and Art, and Biomedical Sciences). Approximately 50% of its members had entrepreneurial experience.

Some of the activities that emerged from the ATE were:

- Homologation of contents of the subject in the 4 institutes, with the newest methodologies: i) Lean Startup; ii) Opportunity Canvas; iii) Lean Canvas and; iv) Business Model Canvas.
- Conversations and training activities of the Mexican Institute of Industrial Property (IMPI) to students.
- Establishment of the "Day of the Entrepreneur", today a different management changed the name, but the format, highly criticized back then, curiously is very similar. There were 5 events per semester, 369 entrepreneurial projects, in which a total of 1292 students participated, 3292 attendees and several lectures given.
- Foundation of the research group Creativity, Innovation and Entrepreneurship.
- Successful participation of students in competitions, obtaining regional and national awards.
- Communications published in conferences and research published in national and international refereed journals.
- Beginning of the book series «Entrepreneurship: Multidimensionality, Change and Innovation», involving national and international researchers.

There is no known national or international institution that manages a model such as ATE.

2. Method

Authors like Tahar (2009) and Ellis, Adams and Bochner (2010) point to autoethnography as a valid research strategy. Even though there have been opposing voices, the literature suggests that it is an outdated context (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000) with an increase in its use and

acceptance within anthropological and sociological (Haluza-DeLay, 2008; Muncey, 2010) and educational (Starr, 2010) research.

Autoethnography involves investigating oneself, writing experiences that have had a significant impact on the life of the researcher (Ellis, Adams and Bochner, 2010). This method was selected because its process gives a deep access to these experiences, simultaneously addressing the object (subject) and subject (researcher), providing an examination of these in relation to similar ones experienced by others, as a means of finding patterns or theories. It addresses social facts in great detail (Pole and Morrison, 2003), are "highly personalized, revealing texts in which the authors tell stories about their own lived experience, relating the personal to the cultural" (Richardson, 2003, p.512), while its strength is that it communicates "the immediacy, physicality and emotionality of experience, but also its psychological and social elements, the writer's internal dialogue with himself and also situate the experience within a broad social context" (Allen -Collinson and Hockey, 2005, p.193).

Engstrom (2012) points out that, in recent years, entrepreneurship researchers have started a movement where the goal is to study and describe it under narrative strategies (Rae and Carswell, 2000, Hjorth and Steyaert, 2004, Berglund, 2007). Fletcher (2011) comments on the seminal work of Johannisson, who investigated entrepreneurship by deepening their contextualization (communities, regions and families), opening new possibilities to research methods that would locate the researcher as a participatory actor.

Autoethnography challenges orthodoxy that places the researcher as a neutral and silent entity, which may leave him vulnerable to being considered "irrational, particularistic, private and subjective, rather than reasonable, universal, public, and objective" (Greenhalgh 2001, p.55). This is still necessary for a variety of authors who suggest that forms of inquiry remain anchored in positivistic assumptions and respond to "methodological orthodoxy" (Hesse-Biber, 2010, p. 455). The present article - also made by Gottlieb, 2015 - solves it including an account of another member of the ATE, which provides an exercise of reflection towards the researcher and the reader. Similarly, an analytical generalization is made to correlate, as Chang (2008) suggests, the expe-

Montiel, Oscar, Claudia & Rodríguez Lucio, Ivette (2017).
Would I do it again. *Retos, 14*(II), pp. 137-154.

141

riences towards the cultural and social part, resulting in self-analysis and transformation (Chase, 2011) and allowing a contrast.

In autoethnography the first person can be used to elaborate the story (Ellis, Adams and Bochner, 2010) and usually occurs when the author has observed, lived or participated in an intimate way the history or social fact that is intended to be analyzed. Sometimes the second person is used to take readers to the scene, to actively go along with the author, to witness the experience being told, to be part of and not to be distant from the reported social fact (McClave, 1996; Pelias, 2000), even use the third person to establish the context, to report the results and to present what others do or say (Caulley, 2008). In the present investigation, these recommendations have been followed, trying to narrate in the first person the introduction and the story, while in the third person the sections of method and conclusions are written.

3. Analysis and Results

3.1. Narrative 1

The Paradigm Shift
From Lewin (1951) to Cummings and Worley (2007) and Macrì et al. (2002) all have addressed the resistance to organizational change, but a review of the literature suggests that it has been scarcely addressed in the case of universities.

Under scientific support and after a process of reflection, I thought that entrepreneurship could be a tool of change to build social capital, change paradigms and reconstitute social and industrial fabrics in the short, medium, and long term, both for the city and for own institution, taking as a reference the city of Barcelona, considered by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) the model to follow.

So, I went to the task of locating the teachers. I discovered that, in each institute, even when the contents were oriented towards this theme, the names of these subjects were different. In August 2013 the first attempt to reactivate the ATE was carried out. The invitation was made by means of emails, however, the answer was null. Therefore, I went with my superior to invite the teachers by office, sent from

his immediate headship. The response obviously improved: 8 people attended, mostly teachers I didn't knew. The good news is that there were assistants from all the institutes and this was strategic for the formation of the ATE.

What was the objective? Simple: Inserting the University into a paradigm shift, institutional concerns that were beginning to permeate internationally (such as the exposed by OECD, 2012). For 40 years, it had developed a very efficient mechanism to meet the demands of the labor market, but today, like most universities in the country, it was inserted in a new dynamic: to generate entrepreneurs. The context demanded indicators of this. Simple, is not? But it was a monumental task.

Already Kuhn (2005) had described paradigm shifts and their difficulty. I had to sell the idea of how to change ours, and that involved an arduous task. I was well aware that there were many risks. Sacrificing the completion of my doctoral studies, with the impact it would have on my income - something never valued by anyone -, time, develop an inclusive and flexible work plan, and design strategies that would be implemented without prior institutional experience.

The first major challenge was to approve the descriptive letter, which should reflect in its content the most recent methodologies on entrepreneurship, focused in principle on the opening of companies. It was all a success. The discussions were extremely enriching. There were particular points of view and problems that no one noticed before. Unlike what Nwekeaku (2013) commented on, we managed to make a change in the teaching process, approving the content of the subjects was relatively easy.

Rotation Between Institutes

The idea was for the institutes to rotate among themselves the management of the ATE in order to encourage an inclusive and transversal dynamic. Tasks were divided under these terms, but it did not work. It is systemic. Most fee teachers always showed the best disposition, while others never did what was required or their support was reduced to what was indispensable. For their part most of hose who were full time, showed similar behaviors, since the tasks they performed were not fully reflected as activities valued in the institutional stimulus program, so they had no economic incentive, something that should be linked to

Montiel, Oscar, Claudia & Rodríguez Lucio, Ivette (2017).
Would I do it again. *Retos, 14*(II), pp. 137-154.

143

the institutional strategy - as recommended by the OECD (2012)-. The activities were concentrated in me and in 5 teachers. The remaining members almost always shone by their absence, but not their criticisms, usually not constructive, inside and outside the ATE.

The Day of the Entrepreneur

An angular point, already commented by the OECD (2012), was to carry out an inclusive and representative entrepreneurial event of our university community, as suggested by Sperrer, Müller and Soos (2016). I named it "Entrepreneur Day" and organizing it in that context was very complicated. We did not have recognition as ATE in the University; in every door that was knocked we had to explain its objectives and those of the event.

We did not have our own resources or equipment (in line with what was also narrated by Nwekeaku, 2013), everything was lent by various instances of the University, who very kindly gave me their trust, always received me with much attention and availability. Having overcome this obstacle, I started approaching the local businessmen so that they accepted to attend like judges of the competition. We were not clear on many things, so I did benchmarking with similar events held in the United States. Thus was born the «Business Pitch», which was carried out by the finalists of each category.

It was decided to conduct this activity every six months, despite the enormous work and time involved. We considered in the ATE that as long as we did not measure that the entrepreneurial culture in the University had already a significant level, it was necessary to do so, a *sine qua non* condition for our mission and vision. The teachers sent a list with the projects of their classes and they all had to attend.

The number of participants averaged 80 projects. They were classified into traditional and technological projects. It was held in the university gymnasium, with capacity for 5,000 people. The day of the event, open to the general public, was attended by about 1500 people. At times (second and fifth day) there was budgetary support to rent stands for the projects. At the other events, two institutes had to be asked to provide their wooden screens (not in the best conditions and very small) for students to use as stands. Aesthetically they were not the best, but there was no other way. We always thanked them; we worked as hard as we could.

Students settled from 7 to 9 in the morning. At 8 I had a meeting with judges who would qualify Phase A, that is, projects at a rate of 8-10 stands per judge for a maximum of 5 minutes in each. I explained what we expected of them, how to qualify, if they had doubts about the format to use. To support them, students were assigned volunteers to accompany them on their way. Those with the highest 15 qualifications went to phase B. In this one they realized a "Business Pitch" with maximum duration of 2 minutes before another jury of entrepreneurs. There were three winners (first, second and third place) in each category.

Difficulties? Yes. Huge. But there was more passion and commitment. The first day was just 2 months after starting the management of the ATE in November 2013. It was a watershed. Never in 40 years had the university done something similar. We did it in the lobby of the theater, very modestly. There were only 29 projects coming from all the institutes. I would lie if I said we were clear how to manage it, but it was now or never: we had to take the risk; if we waited, the event would not take place until May 2014. We considered it was too long, we had to break in, give a *coup de grace*, and show that really the ATE under my leadership was serious and committed to our authorities.

By the second day we went big. We had to continue innovating, because we are a great University with much prestige. I had to go to request funds from each institute to carry out the event. Some people remained skeptical that we could organize it in the largest and most important space of the University. The current paradigm did not see the size of what was at stake. However, the reception of the institute's directors and the top management of the University was sensational. All supported. Everyone gave me their vote of confidence, something that I will always value. It was exhausting, too much responsibility. Most of all, projects, guest entrepreneurs, recognitions to print, equipment to borrow, promotion. Everything was 10 times more.

The Bussinesman

It was vital, strategic. It strengthened the external relations of the institution and the exchange of knowledge (OECD, 2012), and validated many dynamics. It gave us a presence throughout the city and above all in the business sector, thus strengthening our institutional mission and vision. I quickly empathized with them. I guess my business background

Montiel, Oscar, Claudia & Rodríguez Lucio, Ivette (2017).
Would I do it again. *Retos, 14*(II), pp. 137-154.

145

helped. Inviting them was not only a strategy for the construction of the internal ecosystem, but also because we did not want academics to evaluate entrepreneurship projects, something that happened during the first day. It lent itself to bias and misunderstandings. It was a constant attempt to make processes transparent.

Inviting them was also to make the experience of our students more comprehensive. That they felt demanded. At the previous meeting I asked them to always be demanding when evaluating. It was not and is not the only way to raise the level of the projects; I understood that, however, was a way that we had within reach. They always had a disposition and the ATE was very grateful for it.

National and Binational Impact
To have an American University interested in our strategies, have traveled to attend as judges and ask for support for the management of their first "Entrepreneur Day"... I do not think this is a small thing, and this internationalization is suggested by the OECD (2012). They also participated with a chapter of the second and third books of the series, explained *ut supra.* On the other hand, another American institution invited us to explore binational research dynamics through two projects, and collaborated with a chapter in the first and second books. We were doing something well.

Institutionalizing the Day of the Entrepreneur and the Academy
Little by little, the University as an institution began the process. The opening of the Headship in innovation and entrepreneurship was a transcendent step. The Institute of Engineering, instead of continuing to add to the institutional dynamics, started in parallel an event also of entrepreneurial cut. Several people told me "it's a copy of ours". Who cared! For me the important thing was that it will initiate the change. In recent times, the ATE was nominated by the institution to compete in the National Entrepreneur Award of the National Institute of Entrepreneurs of Mexico (INADEM). It was the highest point. I felt that all the work of the ATE was recognized.

A year and a half ago I left the coordination. I hope the mechanisms are adequate so that the work done is not lost. It would be a pity, not for me, but for the University.

The Road Towards Research

Members were always invited to conduct research on the subject. There was little response. The vast majority of the members of the ATE were fee teacher, so they were not rewarded - obviously an entrepreneur would not see it that way. And in those who were full-time, who were recognized through the stimulus program, perhaps they did not see the potential we could generate. It was to start from scratch, since the easiest way was to belong to a consolidated academic body that allowed access to funds and networks already established. And some actually chose it.

In spite of all this I did not give up and together with an ATE collaborator we took a risk. He believed in me and I could not fail. It was a success, and there have been many collaborations.

When I felt that the ATE had reached some stability and maturity, I considered presenting to the authorities of the University the formation of a research group in Creativity, Innovation and Entrepreneurship. For internal policies, they had not been authorized for several years. However, our proposal was. This ended up driving the vision. It was no longer just an academy of teachers that fostered entrepreneurial culture and had some institutional impact, suggested by the OECD (2012). We were starting a new stage: Generate knowledge, position ourselves as national and international referents, under a temporary structure in the short, medium and long term.

This group was designed following the principles of the ATE, multidisciplinary. Of the series already mentioned, there are two books published by the University, construction of national and international networks, participation in congresses, too much in only a year and a half. In the invitation for presentation the first book there were details, but my colleague and I, coordinators of the series, ignored them. It does not matter anymore.

The Informal Barrier

How can the debate be of such a low level at times? I remember long ago I read an investigation about the mobbing (labor harassment) in universities of Spain Anecdotes? Too many. Since I always won with my students some prize in the events, that there was something strange about it, that if I manipulated the evaluation table - which was always intentionally in front of the public, where anyone could verify that the

Montiel, Oscar, Claudia & Rodríguez Lucio, Ivette (2017).
Would I do it again. *Retos, 14*(II), pp. 137-154.

147

evaluations were correctly done- there are so many! One teacher even claimed that his students had not received 2 evaluations of the judges, only one, despite the fact that the folder containing these were in front of him and he never wanted to review them. He still remarked that the second one had probably been sneaked away and in a bathroom, as if we were farm thieves. And that person "well, because the Comptroller's representative was present, but not all the time" What fault did I have that my students were well prepared, with innovative ideas, always trying to transcend, to be demanding with themselves and the vociferous never won anything?

When I got cash prizes for the winners for the fifth day, the same thing happened: Accusations that they were going to spend it on beer, that we had to supervise where they put it... if there were no prizes why we did not get funds, and if the we got... I do not understand. But ah! In the family photo they always appeared.

But the results were given under my leadership that, at 2 years, when it was time to relieve the coordination, the decision was re-election with 5 votes against 3. Of course they challenged it, even when the university authority was present giving faith, everything within the regulations. Why did they re-elect me? They considered that even though it had been agreed to rotate coordination by institute to support its transversal approach - something that was respected in the Days of the Entrepreneur, since each institute organized it - we had still to solidify some elements of the plan, reason why was better not to restructure until the ATE was more institutionalized.

Why the Mexican does not tolerate success? Paz (1959) talked about it. Cultural and social general obstacle commented on by Fogel, Hawk, Morck and Yeung (2005). Board after board, could feel the enormous effort and results of our action. I guess it's the price of changing a paradigm. It should not be like that. We are peers, professionals, with an educational level, masters, doctorates. If something, however small, went wrong, they tried to magnify it. It's not worth writing more about it. The mediocrity of which Ingenieros spoke (2008) was always around. Organizational sabotage described by Young (2000) and Nwekeaku (2013) as a result of the lack of a change in the informal valuation system that exists in every organization - already described from its perspective in Nigerian universities.

Most of them, those who always trusted me and re-elected me, but above all to my authorities who always supported me, I can never pay them all the effort they did and do.

Separation Decision

Everything has an end. It was time to separate from the coordination of the ATE. Leadership must end in a timely manner. By 2 years I had made the mistake of not separating myself from the coordination of the business incubator just when I got the INADEM national accreditation. Months later came the problems, unrelated to the University that put an end to years of effort - I had built a network of state incubators, the few existing in the country-. It was time to start a new professional and personal path. The authorization of the research group required full time. The fifth "Entrepreneur Day" had been a success. Entrepreneurs, authorities, students, at the Academy felt the atmosphere. At the opening ceremony it was palpable. But the research group needed to take off and from another trench to support the construction of the ecosystem. There was a plan and we could not fail.

Acknowledgment to my House: The University

Definitely. The experience that my institution gave me is invaluable. It was an indescribable opportunity. It made me have even more passion for entrepreneurship and its business and social relevance. The «t-shirt» I have it tattooed. It sounds too political, I do not care. It is and will be.

Final considerations? If something went wrong, it was me. If something went well we all were. You undertand me? But again, there was no other way, my prestige was at stake. I do not want to sound dramatic, nor be a hero. It is not my intention. I always decided the last thing, there was a lot of responsibility towards the university, the people who supported me, my vocation as a researcher, my entrepreneurial DNA. What can I do? It cost me a lot financially speaking, labor frictions, uncomfortable moments. But it was worth it.

I believe that the members of an ATE must be entrepreneurs by nature and practice, so that they can gain new skills. This is also suggested by Nwekeaku (2013), since entrepreneurship is vital to the teaching process. A true entrepreneur knows and decides to work as a team, because it is the easiest and smart way to achieve most of the

Montiel, Oscar, Claudia & Rodríguez Lucio, Ivette (2017).
Would I do it again. *Retos, 14*(11), pp. 137-154.

149

results. Therefore, I believe that you should choose - and not just to be entrepreneurship teachers - carefully the members of an ATE. Its nature is very different from most academies at the university level.

I spend almost 3 years. But I have received, even in spite of some bad experiences, other rewards. I designed a virtual entrepreneurship seminar, unique in its kind at an international level, and others are coming up for 2018 and 2019. I have been appointed for the next three years responsible for the entrepreneurship chapter of the prestigious Academy of Administrative Sciences A.C. of Mexico (ACACIA). Being an entrepreneur is in my veins. Transcend. Always.

I would do it again? YES.

3.2. Narrative 2

A Personal Entrepreneurship: The Ate
At the beginning of 2014, being a fee professor of the Graphic Design program and having a degree and a master's degree in research related to creative processes, I was usually assigned theoretical subjects related to these subjects. However, to my surprise and even a little dissatisfaction, at the beginning of the semester I was assigned the subject of business training attributed, I think, to have a technical career in Administration. I confess I was within minutes of asking to be withdrawn, because in a personal commitment it seemed to me that I was not the right person. I took it as an opportunity to leave my comfort zone and learn new things without knowing that I would face a challenge that would turn my life around, personally and professionally.

In March 2014 I arrived at the ATE at the invitation of a teacher with whom I shared the teaching of the subject. The first thing that struck me was the transversality of this one: there were teachers of the four institutes, something that had never lived in any academy within the University. It was very interesting to hear the diversity of points of view and, although in the masters we discussed transversality, interdisciplinarity and multidisciplinarity, it was not until this moment that I had the opportunity to feel this concept, as mentioned by Bolivar (1998, 60) "the discourse of transversality can remain in a discursive practice shaped by a political rhetoric that creates expectations but then, in practice, cannot generate the expected changes." And this was the opposite of the objective set by this academy and the actions that

were carried out with the aim of achieving it, so that the commitment, passion, enthusiasm and entrepreneurial sense of the members of this academy were for me the larger incentive to seek together the generation of a paradigm shift.

4. Paradigm Shift and Day of the Entrepreneur

The University for years was visualized under a scheme of generator of employees for the different needs of the context. However, the demands of the current market required that we redefine and restructure strategies (OECD, 2012) that would make our students more competitive and help them adapt to the new times. In addition, changes in governmental and educational instances demanded a barter in the current structure, but permeating these transformations has been simple. Turning the direction towards the creation of an entrepreneurial culture that helped to manage the own development and to identify new areas of opportunity and competitive advantages to be taken advantage of was at least a challenge because the mentality had to be modified from the teacher. The chaotic, complex and lacking linearity of entrepreneurship suggests that their teachers must develop competencies in discovery, reasoning, and implementation so that students can excel in today's highly uncertain environments (Neck and Greene, 2011).

Through the work carried out in the ATE, contents were unified in the descriptive letters which allowed all students, although the disciplines were different, would have the same skills, knowledge and tools to develop as entrepreneurs. However, achieving this alone within the classroom was not enough. It was necessary to get the student to visualize and to believe him/herself an entrepreneur, for which they participated with this project and in the event managed by the ATE.

The challenges and difficulties to achieve this were great. First to build good projects dealing with academic deficiencies, in my case the area of finance. In other cases the visual development of the project, among other things, that we had to solve with quick instructions of the subjects or with invitations from expert teachers to help us in those areas that were not mastered, obstacles already warned by Seikkula-Leino (2007), until the student acquired and became passionate about the possibility of turning his/her project into reality. However, work in the classroom, though arduous, was much less challenging than the

Montiel, Oscar, Claudia & Rodríguez Lucio, Ivette (2017).
Would I do it again. *Retos, 14*(11), pp. 137-154.

151

management of the event and all the budgetary, time-consuming and passionate obstacles in the work required for achieving it. Although the ATE was made up of several members, only a few expressed a real commitment and often sacrificed family, time, and money for a project that had been raised together and for the longing to accomplish it.

Event after event the difficulties that unfortunately not only came from outside but some of them came from the heart of the ATE, until the fifth "Day of theEntrepreneur ", an event that obtained support from the department of liasson f the University, where we succeeded in getting the strategy up to another level, known through the institution and understood as a priority (OECD, 2012). In this activity, more than 80 projects were exhibited and stands were set up for each one, where high schools were added and where, for the first time, there was participation and assistance from the high level management of institute, which indicated that the work carried out was finally being visualized and recognized, installing the event in an institutional manner. This clearly reflected a paradigm shift, a beginning of the establishment of the entrepreneurial culture, new areas of opportunity and a more integral and quality education for our students. The road was difficult, but it only represents the beginning of a transit that does not end and that must conform to changes and current global conditions.

5. Research Group

In short, all of the described and lived above, brought to me, personally, the acquisition of knowledge, skills and abilities that managed to position me in places that gave my life new opportunities. I'm passionate about the area of entrepreneurship, fortunately I am part of the group created from the ATE, where I have participated in different investigations, articles and papers, even if for these I faced several obstacles still belonging to the old paradigms which fail to understand the holistic vision of entrepreneurship and seek to pigeonhole an individual into issues that they consider only belonging to the acquired profession (in my case design, creativity and publicity), when it is precisely the richness of the combination of diversity of areas that sustains theoretical-practical growth of an entrepreneurial culture.

Having a space to generate not only the management of this culture but to theorize about it, to be part of national and international

networks, the opportunity to learn from the people who study the subject, has been an invaluable opportunity. To this day I have coordinated with two coordinators and founder of this ATE two books of entrepreneurship, and another editorial work in process of evaluation, the establishment of a virtual seminar of entrepreneurship, projects in conjunction with the vision to spread and achieve a change, and the road continues. I have discovered that to transcend one has to take risks, dare to go further, blur boundaries and overcome fears, which is not easy but it is extremely enriching, even if this requires an impetus that at times may seem not easy to maintain and which has bothered third parties.

6. Conclusions

In line with Engstrom (2012), it is suggested that the need to penetrate the social experiences of entrepreneurs should be placed in the foreground. Hjorth and Steyart (2004, p.4)comment that "Convincing others - directing desires, organizing resources, facing obstacles - and sharing images of what could become, is done in small narratives with which people can identify". The events and experiences shared in the present period have led to the creation of dialectical processes (Hargrave and van de Ven, 2006), thus catalyzing the possibility of institutional opportunities and innovations (Ruttan and Hayami, 1984). In the end, entrepreneurship is a social fact and addressing it from different perspectives should be a frequent practice, both academically and pedagogically in its teaching. As a result of revisiting the present experience, and through the elaboration of an analytical generalization suggested by Chang (2008) regarding analytic and interpretative autoethnography, it is necessary to point out, a) the importance of better managing the power relations that are generated towards the sine and dynamics of groups or work teams, such as the ATE and; b) design a social and organizational strategy that addressed the profound institutional change that the University had and which would have facilitated the process.

7. References

Allen-Collinson, J. & Hockey, J. (2005). Autoethnography: Self-indulgence or rigorous methodology? En Mike McNamee (Ed.), *Philosophy and the sciences of exercise, health and sport: Critical perspectives on research methods* (pp.187-202). London: Routledge.

153

Montiel, Oscar, Claudia & Rodríguez Lucio, Ivette (2017).
Would I do it again. *Retos, 14*(11), pp. 137-154.

Berglund, H. (2007). Researching entrepreneurship as lived experience. En H. Neergaard y J. P. Ulhoi (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research methods in entrepreneurship* (pp. 75-96). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Bolívar, A. (1996). Non scholae sed vitae discimus: Límites y problemas de la transversalidad. *Revista de Educación*, 309, 23-66.

Caulley, D. N. (2008). Making qualitative research reports less boring: The techniques of writing creative nonfiction. *Qualitative Inquiry, 14*(3), 424-449.

Chase, S. E. (2011). Narrative inquiry: Still a field in the making. En N. Denzin, y V. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 421-434). Los Angeles: Sage.

Chang, H. (2008). *Autoethnography as Method (Developing Qualitative Inquiry)*. London: Routledge.

Cummings, T. y Worley, C. (2007). *Desarrollo Organizacional y Cambio*. México: Thomson.

Denzin, N. K., y Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). The discipline and practice of qualitative research. en N. K. Denzin y Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 1-28). ThousandOaks: Sage.

Ellis, C., Adams, T., y Bochner, A. (2010). Autoethnography: An Overview. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 12*(1). doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.17169/fqs-12.1.1589

Engstrom, C. (2012). An autoethnography account of prosaic entrepreneurship. *Tamara Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry, 10*(1).

Fletcher D.E. (2011). A curiosity for contexts: Entrepreneurship, enactive research and autoethnography. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 23*(1/2), 65–76.

Fogel, K., Hawk, A., Morck, R. y Yeung, B. (2006). Institutional Obstacles to Entrepreneurship. En Casson,M., Yeung, B., Basu, A. y Wadeson, N. (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Glave, T. (2005). *Words to our now: Imagination and dissent.* Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.

Gottlieb, F. (2015). Researching entrepreneurship with autoethnography. *En Pursuing Innovation Leadership: Proceeding of the 16th International CINet Conference. Continuous Innovation Network (CINet).*

Greenhalgh, S. (2001). *Under the medical gaze: Facts and fictions of chronic pain.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Haluza-DeLay, R. (2008). Churches engaging the environment: An autoethnography ofobstacles and opportunities. *Human Ecology Review, 15*(1), 71-81.

Hargrave, T.J., Van de Ven, A.H., 2006. A collective action model of institutionalinnovation. *Academy of Management Review, 31*, 864–888.

Hjorth, D., y Steyaert, C. (Eds.). (2004). *Narrative and discursive approaches in entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Hesse-Biber, S. (2010), Qualitative Approaches to Mixed MethodsPractice, en *Qualitative Inquiry,* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Ingenieros, J. (2008). *El hombre mediocre.* Editorial Porrúa, Ciudad de México.

Kuhn, T. S. (2005). *La estructura de las revoluciones científicas.* Madrid: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field Theory in social science*. New York: Harper&Row.

Macrì D., Tagliaventi M. y Bertolotti F. (2002) Grounded theory for resistance to change in a small organization. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 15*(3), 292-310.

McCauley, S. (1996). Let's say. En Patrick Merla (Ed.), *Boys like us: Gay writers tell their coming out stories* (pp.186-192). New York: Avon.

Montiel, O. y Rodriguez, C. (2016). ¿Lo volvería a hacer? Liderando un cambio de paradigma. El caso de la Academia Transversal de Emprendimiento. En Ojeda R. y Lopez L. (Coords.) *Gestión Social. Organizaciones Humanas Para Una Sociedad Incluyente, Memorias del XX Congreso Anual*, available in http://acacia.org.mx/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/EBook_XX_Congreso_ACACIA.pdf, pp. 7975-8001.

Muncey, T. (2010). *Creating autoethnographies*. London: Sage.

Neck, H.M. y Greene, P.G. (2011). Entrepreneurship Education: Known Worlds and New Frontiers. *Journal of Small Business Management, 49*(1). 55-70.

OCDE (2012). A Guiding Framework for Entrepreneurial Universities. Available in http://www.oecd.org/site/cfecpr/EC-OECD%20Entrepreneurial%20Universities%20Framework.pdf

Paz, O. (1959). *El laberinto de la soledad*. México: FCE.

Pelias, R. J. (2000). The critical life. *Communication Education, 49*(3), 220-228.

Pole, C. y Morrison, M. (2003). *Ethnography for education*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Rae, D., y Carswell, M. (2000). Using a life-story approach in researching entrepreneurial learning: The development of a conceptual model and its implications in the design of leaning experiences. *Education & Training, 42*, 220-227.

Richardson, L. (2003), "Writing. A Method of Inquiry", en Denzin, N. y Lincoln, Y. (eds.), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Ruttan, V.W. y Hayami, Y., 1984. Toward a theory of induced institutional innovation. *Journal of Development Studies, 20*, 203–223.

Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership: A dynamic view*. Jossey-Bass. USA.

Seikkula-Leino, J. (2007). Opetussuunnitelmauudistus ja yrittäjyyskasvatuksen toteuttaminen (Curriculum reform and entrepreneurship education). Helsinki: Opetusministeriön julkaisuja.

Sperrer, M., Müller, C. y Soos, J. (2016). The Concept of the Entrepreneurial University Applied to Universities of Technology in Austria: Already Reality or a Vision of the Future? *Technology Innovation Management Review, 6*(10), 37-44.

Starr, L. (2010). The use of autoethnography in educational research: Locating who we are in what we do. *Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education, 3*(1), 1-9.

Trahar, S. (2009). Beyond the story Itself: Narrative inquiry and autoethnography in intercultural research in higher education. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 10*(1), Art.30, http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0901308 [Accesado: 26 de Enero 2016].

Young, A. (2000) I'm just me: A study of managerial resistance. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 13*(4), 375-398.