

Education for Entrepreneurship at the Crossroads of Neoliberal and Emancipatory Pedagogy

Daliborka Luketić

Department of Pedagogy, University of Zadar

Abstract

Entrepreneurship cultivation and education is an omnipresent and unavoidable educational concept in the educational systems of European countries. The formation, development and the rise of this concept are closely related to modern development trends of European educational policies. Education for entrepreneurship is determined by the social and educational values of entrepreneurship and its placement among the fundamental prerequisites for the achievement of lifelong learning. It has been noted that there is insufficient theoretical foundation of this concept in the science of pedagogy. One consequence of this situation is the evaluation of entrepreneurship education as pedagogically irrelevant. Entrepreneurship, in the educational context, is often referred to as an area of paradoxes because of the characteristics that are constantly balancing on a continuum from neo-liberal to emancipatory interpretations. The aim of this work is to segregate possible valuable and targeted controversies by way of conceptual-theoretical analysis of entrepreneurship education, and to consider its emancipatory and affirmative value in the process of education. The results of the analysis will contribute to the understanding of the complexity of what education for entrepreneurship is or what it could become if we do not approach education policy trends critically.

Key words: *education for entrepreneurship; emancipation; European educational policy; neoliberalism; theory of liberal education.*

Introduction

In the last 10 years of reform efforts, particularly those in the European context, there are more significant reflections on the value and importance of education for entrepreneurship. Within almost two-thirds of European systems of education there

is a recognition of forms and models of education for entrepreneurship at the level of compulsory education, primarily as a transversal key competence implemented in the form of interdisciplinary and cross-curricular topics and contents (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012). Promoting entrepreneurship as a value and key competence is established in the estimation of personal usefulness and social benefits, which deliver a full range of expected learning outcomes achieved on the basis of its competence components. The modernization and reform of the curriculum implemented through European educational systems has become one of the basic mechanisms of introducing entrepreneurship and the development of entrepreneurial competences in compulsory education.

The direction of this development, based on the recommendations and guidelines of the European education politics¹ and post-Lisbon² political discourse, along with the simultaneous national curriculum reform, represents a fundamental form of creation, development, (re)definition and implementation of education for entrepreneurship in educational practice. Nevertheless, viewed conceptually as well as practically, education for entrepreneurship is still an area whose central concept is often assessed with the label of questionable educational value. The fundamental reason for this situation is the concept of *entrepreneurship* and its understanding in the exclusive framework of the parent discipline. Namely, the economy as a discipline and a practice for the management of resources, the creation of goods and value added in modern interpretations, is directly associated with the neoliberal political and economic concept, and consequently, with neo-liberal and cultural practices. Viewed in the context of the development of culture, the formation of neo-liberal cultural practices is evaluated as disputable. The unacceptability of such a cultural pattern is based on the thesis of “the removal of the code of humanity”, because “the cultural meme of neoliberalism is free from morals and ethics” (Kulić, 2000, p. 874). Although extremely simplistic, the essential criticism is based on the premise that entrepreneurship is purely an economic concept and process, and the modern economy is full of neo-liberal ideology. On these and similar premises may rest the conclusion that entrepreneurship and education are not compatible processes. Their mutual incompatibility is based on different value foundations and essentially for a different purpose. Moreover, critics of entrepreneurial education in this concept, see the attempt of establishing neo-liberal principles in education (McCafferty, 2010) striving to indoctrinate children and youth

¹ European education policy⁴ is the name for the public, so to speak, common policy of European countries in the field of education. Although the management of the system of education is in the exclusive jurisdiction of member states, the European Union in this sector has a supportive role through the systems of recommendations, guidelines, policy instruments, monitoring and various other mechanisms for achieving voluntary common goals in the field of education.

² The phrase refers to the period of European politics after the signing of the Lisbon Treaty (2000) which was marked by the development of various sectoral policies directed towards achieving the objectives set out in the treaty itself. Post-Lisbon's discourse lasted intensively for about 10 years, when a new strategy of smart and sustainable development entitled Europe 2020 (2010) entered the political and economic strategic scene in Europe.

through neo-liberal values (Komulainen, 2006; Komulainen, Naskali, Korhonen, & Keskitalo-Foley, 2011) and another form of “speculative pedagogy³” (Dahlstedt & Tesfahuney, 2010). Legitimization of educational goals and values of education for entrepreneurship, which, according to some interpretations (McCafferty, 2010) are a direct product of neo-liberalism, are evaluated as contrary to the humanistic dimension and the value of education in the tradition of continental pedagogy.

The aim is to analyze and critically examine the concept of education for entrepreneurship, with emphasis on values and goals within the framework of discussions on the neo-liberal and emancipatory moment. Issues mentioned in the introduction, on education for entrepreneurship suggest the profound conceptual vagueness and the strengthening of polarization at the theoretical and practical level, thereby separating into neoliberal threats and the opportunities for the affirmation of man in contemporary society. In doing so, we are focused on discovering the origins of theoretical discussion of this concept through tradition, and the contemporaneity of theoretical thinking on education.

Education for Entrepreneurship: Underlying Values, Objectives Pursued

Valuable educational foundation in pedagogical science reached the levels of almost axiomatic meaning. The values incorporate concepts such as belief, civilizational standards, human well-being, social identity and integrity, and they are regarded as a kind of orientation mechanism (Halstead, 1996; Vican, 2006). Therefore, regardless of whether they possess socio-cultural and/or educational significance, initially it should be specified what values are proclaimed as education for entrepreneurship. Seemingly, we can connect entrepreneurship most closely with the idea of growth and development, success and efficiency, competition and competitiveness, originality and innovation, social and personal well-being (...). The mentioned characteristics, while not synonymous with entrepreneurship, can be associated in many ways with its understanding. Although these characteristics do not have meaningful value in the strict sense of the word, they are evaluated as having positive meaning for life and for the functioning of modern society. Meta-analysis of scientific papers on education for entrepreneurship (Luketić, 2013) indicates that in the area of education, the value and importance of entrepreneurship is recognized precisely through its direct and often associative characteristics, such as creativity, innovation, responsibility, diligence, perseverance and the like. Furthermore, the articulation of entrepreneurship as a key competence, which is expected to contribute to the immediate recognition of educational importance, however, is not fully realized, even though such vision is

³ Speculative pedagogy is a term that encompasses education guided by profit, and different philosophies, theories and practices in education that are based on valuation and capitalizing. It combines a number of educational ideas based on the creation of marketable value regardless of whether they are personal, economic, national, etc. (Dahlstedt & Tesfahuney, 2010).

closer to the idea of education, teaching, and curricular programming and design. In this sense, these two discursive (in)separable aspects are basic for questioning the (non)justification of criticism of neoliberal elements and (non)existent value of emancipation through education and training for entrepreneurship.

Value Dimension

Entrepreneurship is primarily characterized by a large number of meanings that stretch from economic, through social, to personal aspects. From the narrowest lexical meaning of entrepreneurship as a process of creating your own business enterprise, and the entrepreneur as owner of the company, attempts of scientific determination result in definitions with a very complex interpretative potential. Within the scope of economic theory, the first modern understandings of entrepreneurship are aimed at highlighting the creative destruction and innovation, and entrepreneurs as holders of these processes, which is especially evident in Schumpeter's theory of economic development (Shionoya, 2012). On the other hand, starting a business is an essential feature, but at the same time, it is insufficient for complete understanding of the phenomenology of entrepreneurship. It is the process of vision, change and creation, which requires personal investment of effort, and a priority in the design and realization of new ideas and of creative solutions (Kuratko & Hodgetts, 2004). For British authors Gibb and Cotton (1998), entrepreneurship is a pattern of behavior, of qualities and skills that enable individuals and groups to create changes and innovations, and cope with a higher level of uncertainty and complexity.

Entrepreneurship brings forth at the same time meanings of the process, phenomena, activities, actions, behaviors and social roles, as well as personality traits. When it comes to falling outside the scope of disciplinary origins, it is partly conditioned by the interest of other scientific disciplines for its understanding, and by abandoning the "undertaking of a business venture" as the only relevant definition content (Kuratko & Hodgetts, 2004; Schultz, 1980). Thus the meanings are further delaminated towards recognition in wider social environment (social entrepreneurship) and in activities directed towards personal development (personal enterprise). Entrepreneurship contains powerful valuable and positive elements of creating, beginning, changing the current situation, creative destruction, finding opportunities, proactive response to their own environment (...). Entrepreneurship, therefore, is considered a value *per se*, having both socio-cultural and educational significance. Based on the results of the analysis of European educational values, it was concluded that the enterprise, along with other associated value basis, such as initiative, innovation, responsibility, team spirit, creativity, flexibility, and other, "can at the same time be classified on the value level of goals and standards, and on the value level of personality traits and personal activities" (Vican, 2006, pp. 11-12). The testing of value dimensions of education for entrepreneurship shows the value affirmation of creativity, abilities of problem-solving, cooperative behavior, orientation towards the future, taking responsibility, learning

from mistakes, adapting to change, willingness to take risks, self-confidence, personal initiative and dedication to work “as a combination of those most desirable traits in educational practice” (Tiikkala et al., 2011).

The notion of a person – entrepreneur – is inevitably linked with entrepreneurship. The portrait of an entrepreneur implies an active and innovative person, a person with initiative, ready for unknown experiences in an uncertain environment, a decision-maker whose acts carry certain risks in order to achieve different objectives and tasks. The named properties indicate the value inherent in the mobilization of a number of positive personality qualities, behavior and actions, which at first glance are not in conflict with the wider educational ideals and goals. If the development of these personality characteristics is the goal of education for entrepreneurship, and these attributions are the expected outcome of these and other educational concepts and broader educational goals, the following question arises: what is the basis for criticism aimed towards the questionable educational values? We must look for the answer to this question in the present socio-cultural context, within which the pluralism of values allows for the existence of a large number of values and their numerous reinterpretations, according to which their meaning differs in space and time.

During the time of the Enlightenment, when the first relevant scientific articulation of entrepreneurship occurs, the entrepreneur is a certain kind of hero - a free and responsible man who by his own efforts creates something new that ultimately leads to economic progress (Hansen, 2001), while the enterprise was noted as a process that contributes to the personal and social well-being, with a powerful emancipatory moment. Fertile ground for the development of entrepreneurship, as an economic and personal process, marked the abandonment of the safe background of medieval crafts and, at the same time, strengthening of the economic and social uncertainties brought by the processes of industrialization and modernization. The essence of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial activity is comprised of boldness, courage, innovation and creativity. These qualities of human personality and behavior provide for an active relationship with the world, the dismissal and abandonment of subordinate positions and “taking matters into their own hands”. This way, all those qualities that an entrepreneur embodies do not come at odds with the modern idea of education. Although the idea of entrepreneurship development through learning and teaching is more recent, the confirmation of its importance is justified by the need to live in society, both the society of the Enlightenment, and the modern society. Numerous advocates, including Zhao (2012) estimate that in time of the new global economy and ever changing society, young people need to think wisely, flexibly, creatively and globally; in a word, their opinions must match the entrepreneurial way of thinking. Furthermore, through education, the development of such an opinion, of attitude, of abilities and skills can be encouraged by appropriate curricular design. Legitimization of education for entrepreneurship by arguments based on the principles of usefulness goes in the direction of emphasizing the importance and usefulness both

for the individual and for society as a whole. The interpretation by the arguments of why and where it is important, and the execution of the purpose based on usefulness, brings out overtones of extremely utilitarian goals of education for entrepreneurship.

Whether it is about scientific, political or everyday discourse on entrepreneurship, across the whole spectrum of attributed values, meanings and importance for society and the individual, it seems that we still stumble on the contextual observation and understanding of the value of entrepreneurship. The changing social dynamics lead to new interpretations and accordingly, all that once seemed as emancipatory potential slowly turns into an instrument of neoliberal cultural hegemony⁴. It is interesting to see how this happens, and the findings of the Finnish scientist Marttila (2013a; 2013b), in an effort to uncover the ways in which the entrepreneur becomes an omnipresent neoliberal model, can be used for this purpose. The concept and meaning of “being an entrepreneur” in recent years has changed its meaning from “the propagator of the economy, through an active social subject” to “a creative individual who learns” (Marttila, 2013a). It is precisely this last notion that allows the creation of the image of a learning subject by means of a very important feature of “readiness and ability to try something new”. In the opinion of Marttila (2013a, 2013b), the entrepreneur becomes “a general model of social subjectivity, without any spatial, sectoral and institutional constraints”. It seems that the initial meaning of the notion, which is still not completely devoid of economics and of the meaning of business enterprise, by permeating new “spaces” is interpreted as the development of the culture of entrepreneurship and enterprise. At the same time, the enterprise culture mobilizes the meaning of personal action of the individual, while the entrepreneurial culture has the connotation of ways of thinking and acting which is generally inherent to entrepreneurship as a process in the broadest sense. However, the development of both *cultures* is seen as an element of neoliberal cultural hegemony (McCafferty, 2010; Peters, 2001), which presents a distinct kind of social danger especially if the schools are designated to function as promoters and developers of such a culture, which leads to “the formation of a desirable entrepreneurial identity and a Taylorism of the mind” (Homgren & From, 2005). There is a large amount of caution in accepting entrepreneurship. Especially, by its legitimation in educational significance, there is “a shortage in social sense” (Marttila, 2013), thus ceding its place to processes of adaptations to market mechanisms. The evaluation of everything that makes social development, from relationship to identity, would designate the essence of this process, based on the principles and logic of an open market. Thus, in addition to its economical relevancy, the value of the free market would reflect, and would be the criteria for selecting the content of curriculum relevancy.

⁴ The expansion of the concept of market value in the form of neoliberal capitalism into different social spheres. Thereby, *neo-liberal* is seen as a totalitarian form of various activities aimed at reshuffling the balance of power between capital and labor at all levels of society in favor of capital.

Goal Orientation

In addition to different interpretations of value, entrepreneurship is formed within the process of education by different educational goals. Entrepreneurship, as one of the key competences for the realization of lifelong learning, represents the articulation of educational objectives and outcomes. The articulation of entrepreneurship as a key competence provides directly targeted educational goals designated by the curriculum with the purpose of adopting competence components, and enterprise development as personality distinctions. Consequently, commitment to lifelong learning and competence foundations also signifies commitment towards entrepreneurship as its integral part. Considering the meaning of basic competences and the possible polarization between economic neoliberalism and global views on social justice, it has been pointed out “that, a successful businessman needs the same set of meta-competences as a successful parent or a responsible citizen, although they may be different according to the activity, knowledge and skills they possess” (Deakin Crick, 2008, p. 317). It is obvious that entrepreneurship brings a certain value significance which identifies properties that, regardless of the context, have a positive meaning for teaching and learning in the 21st century. Furthermore, the competence approach in defining entrepreneurship starts from the most general formulation that it is “the persons’ ability to implement their ideas into action, including creativity, innovation, willingness to take risks, and the ability to plan and manage projects in order to achieve objectives” (European Commission, 2007, p. 11). The overall objective of education for entrepreneurship, in the context of compulsory education to which the key competences are related, means to empower student attitudes, knowledge and skills for entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial activity. Enterprise also includes “identifying opportunities for personal, professional and/or business activities, the ability to develop a broader perspective of man’s work and life planning skills, leadership, management, organization, as well as risk-taking, initiative, proactivity and personal, and professional innovation” (European Commission, 2007, p. 11).

Understanding entrepreneurship as a competence brings out a new dimension, and it has at least two significant consequences for education. First of all, what makes an entrepreneurial competence is basically very heterogeneously defined. The heterogeneity is reflected in a variety of contexts of possible applicability. Furthermore, from the perspective of the objectives of education, the observed heterogeneity allows the (re)definition of each of these elements of the proposed definition of entrepreneurship as a key competence in the form of exhibited educational objectives in each of the national educational systems. Because of that, we can expect that we can identify at least as many different value and goal orientations for entrepreneurship education, as there are educational systems. So, it is necessary to clarify to which extent the national commitment to entrepreneurship education is oriented towards the development of personality traits – towards enterprise, or towards some functional aspects of adopting entrepreneurship as a skill.

The analysis of the goals of entrepreneurship education, as well as the analysis of the learning outcome, (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012b) partially confirm the previously assumed heterogeneity. The former categorization of the models of education for entrepreneurship, education about entrepreneurship, and education through entrepreneurship (Hytti, 2002; Jamieson, 1984) can be compared with the expected learning outcomes at the level of compulsory education of European national education systems. From a recent analysis of education for entrepreneurship in schools in Europe (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012b, p. 21), for example, we notice that in the Finnish compulsory education, the goals and outcomes of education for entrepreneurship are mainly related to the cultivation of initiative and creativity, to critical thinking and problem solving, and learning about taking risks. In addition, elements of vocational guidance and learning about the world of work are partially detected. In states under the sovereignty of the United Kingdom – although each of them is unique – we can also observe a wide range of outcomes aimed at achieving self-esteem and self-awareness of students, development of teamwork skills, planning and achieving their own goals, and also fostering initiative and creativity, as is the case in Finland. In later levels, all of the above-mentioned outcomes are complemented with the need of adopting the content of financial literacy. On the other hand, there is an interesting example of the Austrian education system where education for entrepreneurship has a clearly defined goal, and it is directed toward the economic and financial literacy, and learning about the world of work through professional orientation. If we compare these national examples, and if we try to perceive them as a result of something much more significant than a mere implementation of educational policies or European intervention, we come to the initial story of values. Finland, as a model of social welfare state (Sahlberg, 2011), opts for social and individual aspects of entrepreneurship, with an emphasis on personal development and social competence as priority outcomes of teaching and learning that are not in contradiction with the broader goals of education. On the other hand, it is necessary to observe the Austrian example through the strong economic idea and tradition (author's comment: the Austrian school of economics) that perhaps best reflects the political and economic culture based on the work of an individual, within which these forms of education are entirely desirable and acceptable (Hytti, 2008). These examples demonstrate national commitment to those educational goals and learning outcomes that are inextricably linked to the wider socio-cultural and political-economic national habitus.

Furthermore, the image of an entrepreneur as “a creative individual who learns” (Marttila, 2013a; 2013b), but is also ready to act in uncertain situations, has a number of significant consequences for education. In particular, because it highlights the culture of learning, coping with new situations, innovative approach to problem solving, and a number of other elements of competence, which, quite logically, support the idea of lifelong learning. Promotion and advocacy, promotion and development of a learning model of creative entity, whether we call it entrepreneur or something

else, poses a challenge not only in the implementation, but also in the creation of joint curricula, and in synergy with other areas of educational activities. In this group of meanings, it is important to point out that the development of entrepreneurship is assessed equally important both for students and for teachers. The role of teachers is to promote the development of entrepreneurship in students, while at the same time the changes in education and the teaching profession expect teachers to show entrepreneurship through all their professional work. Thus, entrepreneurship becomes an objective and an educational tool, an approach and a method of teaching and learning, but also “an important cognitive tool that can bridge the dichotomy of traditional and progressive education” (Lackéus, Lundqvist, & Williams Middleton, 2013). More concisely, it becomes a desirable quality, but also a norm and a criterion of the quality of modern school.

Education for Entrepreneurship from the Perspective of the Holder of the Educational Process

Notwithstanding the ascribed meanings and importance, entrepreneurship is the operating mode of our schools (Vican, 2012), even though there are conflicting opinions on the extent to which this concept “fits” the very idea of teaching and learning. This is primarily because of the evolved perception of reliance on the environment, which is characterized by a high degree of certainty and predictability in today’s schools, but also due to the development of a culture of dependency. Programmed contents of teaching, rigorous subject-hour structure and numerous other factors identified in school organization and teaching methods leave little room for the expression of their own initiative within the professional autonomy of teachers or at levels of more desirable activity and initiative of students. However, the stated educational objectives, expected outcomes of teaching and learning related to the development of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial competence can be found within core and differential school curriculum. However, the question is to what extent these elements are recognized as components of the concept of education for entrepreneurship. The teachers’ perspective and position, as one of the pillars of the educational process, are important for understanding *what entrepreneurship really is*. Such a position allows the interpretation and understanding on what basis the enterprise is recognized in the educational practice, as opposed to political normativity present in strategic documents. Research conducted by Komulainen et al. (2011), examining teachers and students at teacher colleges, concludes that their perception of entrepreneurship is built around two basic meanings: “external” and “internal” entrepreneurship. Namely, the external aspect of entrepreneurship brings competitive, individualistic and commercial dimension, and as such, it presents a source of inequality, which is contradictory to the basic educational values and is *a priori* rejected as a possible general educational objective (Komulainen et al., 2011). Furthermore, the concept of internal entrepreneurship implies the development of an

entrepreneurial mentality along with the development of personal responsibility, hard work and independence from others, what is generally considered a logical educational aim. A similar conclusion was reached by Backström-Widjeskog (2010), in attempts to identify the content, and then the value of education for entrepreneurship. Based on the analysis of teacher and student attitudes, she concludes that “this concept is understood as a series of activities aimed at developing individuality and social skills, with the goal of developing strong character based on personal and social aspect of entrepreneurial competence, and not so much to the functional aspect which gravitates towards cognitive development of business focused entrepreneurial skills” (Backström-Widjeskog, 2010).

The results of previously mentioned studies (Backström-Widjeskog, 2010; Komulainen et al., 2011; Tiikkala et al., 2011) indicate that the conceptual education for entrepreneurship is not something that can be taken for granted, or that it is in different proportions constituted of lexical meanings of key concepts and the implicit theories as bearer of the educational process. The lexical element in detecting the meaning of entrepreneurship is not insignificant. Is the aim to encourage and educate future entrepreneurs (functional element) or to support the development of entrepreneurship as a set of positive attributions of individual education? It is a matter of understanding, which is evident in the way in which teachers reflect on entrepreneurship. In fact, in their responses to the question of “What is your understanding of enterprise?”, the attribution elements such as “student initiative” and “creativity” are in the forefront, and the functional element comes afterwards. Additionally, implicit reinterpretation as part of hidden curriculum is different from the proclaimed educational objectives of publicly revealed educational policy. In the case of education for entrepreneurship, the source of controversy is primarily based on the extent to which the proclaimed values and goals approach the neo-liberal values, and then how the interpretation evolves in accordance with the implicit theories of teachers. For example, although all that combines the internal entrepreneurship is the manifestation of neoliberal subjectivity (Komulainen et al., 2011; cf. Marttila 2013a; 2013b; Read, 2009), it becomes desirable in this interpretation because it fits the traditional liberal value of the spectrum, specifically in the case of the above research, the Finnish society and education. Therefore, values and value judgments presented in various studies are partly to be observed in the spectrum of contemporary liberal values and neoliberal interpretation versions. It is obvious that the notion of value and legitimization in educational practice is established in accordance with the concept of “educational person”, as well as with humanistic and liberal values as civilization legacies of modern society. General liberal values such as freedom, equality and rationality, and then their educational versions such as personal autonomy, critical openness, equality of opportunity, rational morality, diversity, avoiding indoctrination and others (Halstead, 1996, p. 21) have the emancipatory function and purpose, rather than an instrumental and utilitarian one. Only in recent decades, as pointed out by

Halstead (1996), comes the emphasis on the principle of usefulness in the argument for the goals of education, and thus the needs for preferential development of those skills and abilities that are associated with the world of work, easier employability and competitiveness. Thus, the instrumental role of all that is economically relevant through formal education is imposed upon education for entrepreneurship. The described value-target conflict with teachers generates the contrast that is expressed in the view that “the interests of the school and the child’s interests are no longer in harmony, and that they are trapped between the market values that the schools are forced to promote, and the values that as educators they wish to convey to their students” (Halstead, 1996, p. 26).

The Theory of Liberal Education and Education for Entrepreneurship: a Source of Scientific and Theoretical Legitimization

According to available data, one of the earliest scientific discussions with the aim of detecting the theoretical tradition of education for entrepreneurship was led by British researchers D. Bridges and C. Bailey. Both of them as representatives of liberal education⁵, the fruitful theoretical tradition that values learning as a function of having a cultural and advanced lifestyle saw the conceptual difficulties in the then predominantly political discourse on education for entrepreneurship. According to the classical interpretation of this theory, education is founded on the ideal of intellect, cognitive growth and cultivation of intellectual excellence. Generally, the purpose of a liberal education is the liberation or emancipation of man “from the present and from the individual” (Bailey, 1984).

Bridges (1992) supports the thesis according to which education for entrepreneurship conceptually very clearly fits within the theory of liberal (free) education. This endeavor is based on the recognition of the complementarity of the goal of education for entrepreneurship, “development of entrepreneurship as a personality trait and the trait of enterprising individuals” as the central element within the central feature of liberal education “to equip people to make their own free, autonomous choices about the life they will lead” (Bridges, 1992, p.92). Emancipating elements are found in at least three levels of what is, according to the understanding of Bridges, education for entrepreneurship. At the individual level, those are all attribution properties of enterprise and entrepreneurship, while at the collective level, those are enterprising institutions that are “ready to create and creatively respond to new requirements, and to maintain and support the initiative taking of its staff” (Bridges, 1992, p. 93). Finally, the important aspect of education for entrepreneurship emphasizes “the development of a broader comprehension and understanding of enterprise and entrepreneurship as an integral part of social and economic life”. It is evident from this thesis that

⁵ Without going into the historical and cultural debate about the theory of liberal education, we emphasize that this is a very dominant theory of education, particularly outside the continental (German) tradition of pedagogy.

Bridges promotes the idea of entrepreneurship as an integral part of free education. Entrepreneurship facilitates personal emancipation and a greater degree of social activism. The development of attributive components of entrepreneurship, such as creativity, initiative, responsibility, etc., becomes independent and somewhat devoid of contextual meaning, because they may simultaneously be targets of some other form or concept of education. On the other hand, to be entrepreneurial as part of the social and economic functioning, brings about a meaning of different contextual applicability; especially because the enterprise as a personal feature, besides the individual meaning, has a much broader meaning. Extending the scope of the meaning to the other socio-organizational entities means abandoning the culture of dependence and the development of entrepreneurial culture. So, not only is there a personal entrepreneurial culture: we can also talk about the culture of entrepreneurial school.

Within the theory of free education, Bailey (1992) points out the relevance of the social and economic context of life, and in that sense the teaching about the functioning of the market and the economy is acceptable in terms of the context of education. However, education for entrepreneurship – in order to promote knowledge about the economy and the free market – offers an idealistic picture, while the negative consequences such as poverty, the role of social systems and so on are ignored. All of this can lead to the conclusion that unemployment, social deprivation, etc. are a result of insufficient individual initiative. According to Bailey (1992), instead of becoming a liberating (emancipating) form of education, by putting the blame on the individual, and at the same time not reflecting on the role of social systems, it becomes an indoctrinating and, in many ways, an instrumental form of education. Perhaps the most interesting element of Bailey's criticism of education for entrepreneurship refers to the fact that "the entrepreneurial spirit is not an absolute virtue" (Bailey, 1992, p. 101). In addition, everything that an entrepreneurial spirit encompasses within the attributed characteristics such as initiative, determination, creativity and innovation, and many others, by itself without content or context, does not mean much. "A number of properties and dispositions become desirable qualities, i.e. they lead to the moral act, if the context of action or of the will to effect a certain disposition is moral in itself" (Bailey, 1992, p. 101). Within the theory of liberal education the goals of education that led to the development of those dispositions that would encourage activity and action of persons in accordance with reason, broad and basic capabilities for understanding, irrespective of the context of action, have always been cherished. And Bailey himself (1992), on the trail of his ethics of virtue⁶, emphasizes that for every purposeful and rational action, as well as the very purpose of liberal education, there are dispositions such as "participation, focus, collaboration, time management, materials, thoughts and actions, judging, imagining possibilities, questioning and trying to understand" (Bailey,

⁶ Rejecting existence of absolute permanent traits and characteristics, and the emphasis of the context for understanding and evaluation of some capacity.

1984, p. 113). The advantage of these dispositions is that they are general and thus have no direct link with the creation of an entrepreneurial culture and society. Liberal education in its theoretical basis rejects the possibility of any kind of ideologization and instrumentalization of education. In the context of the enterprise, all attributed characteristics are important, but they are also dependent “on how we estimate the context of their realizations or a particular ideology which they fit into or which they strengthen” (Bailey, 1992, p. 101). The basic message of Bailey’s criticism of education for entrepreneurship essentially reduced to the question of (de)contextualization of initiative, i.e. the question of determining the content and context.

Furthermore, within the theory of liberal education, defining the content is not irrelevant, because it results in a collection of general and broad knowledge that reflects the strength of the intellect. The contemporary discourse on entrepreneurship as a competence places the discussion of skills and capabilities to the forefront, while trying to avoid a direct description of the position of knowledge (content) as to the values that determine entrepreneurship and enterprise. Precisely this example of decontextualization of knowledge with emphasis upon functional components applicable in any context complicates the recognition of entrepreneurship and enterprise in educational practice. We come to the position that the conceptual openness and inclusiveness at the same time mean a lot, and nothing – because they make this concept unrecognizable. This is conditioned in part by the fact of accepting the new curriculum paradigm that goes in the direction of movement from the contents to the outcomes. The need for dosage of the main economic content, including the simultaneous need for the elaboration of the various contents within the social, as well as the educational context, brings us to “the omnipresent forms of (neo)liberal subjectivity” that are then more susceptible to criticism, both 20 years ago (Bailey, 1984) and today (Komulainen, 2006). The premise of an incomplete interpretation of the content may imply the explanation that education for entrepreneurship may be pretentiously classified within the theory of liberal education. At the same time, it is necessary to understand that this same theory is upgraded with different interpretations within which the concept of an educated person changes. Mulcahy (2009) assesses that the concept of education, inside and outside the theory of liberal education, has to move away from the tradition of acquiring theoretical knowledge and mere cognitive growth towards the formation of the intellect, which includes the possession of the width and depth of knowledge, but also the development of skills and abilities that allow action in meaningful activities. “Cultivation of the intellect recognizes the importance of the acquisition of practical knowledge and education, of education for action, acceptance of the principles of educating the whole person which includes emotional, moral and spiritual formation, and adopts the pedagogical view according to which experience, skills and abilities, and interests of the individual are equally relevant” (Mulcahy, 2009, p. 484). In addition to the classical interpretation of liberal education of involving the cultivation of the mind, the transmission of cultural heritage, leading the good life, it also indicates the need for self-actualization, through the development

of competences and education of personality, and through strengthening of personal efficiency. Achieving self-realization, not only through the exclusive formation of personality, but also through adoption of different competences, is on the track of what education for entrepreneurship brings to the educational system.

Recognizing the theory of liberal education as a possible source of scientific-theoretical debate is important, but perhaps it is not enough for accepting its educational relevance, and also the necessity of education for entrepreneurship. In addition to a number of reasons, we single out the fact that this theoretical position, although originally developed in the tradition of European (ancient) philosophy⁷, is not sufficiently recognized in the tradition of continental pedagogy⁸. Therefore, we wonder how much common content or educational ideals do humanistic and liberal education share? Humanistic education is based on the ideal of humanism that places human welfare, freedom and dignity above political, ideological and economic ideals and interests. Humanistic education is embodied in the concepts *Paidea* and *Bildung*⁹, originally as a part of Europe's cultural and theoretical tradition, and something that is understandable only within that context and evaluated as an educational ideal (of knowledge and intellect). On the contrary, the theory of free education evolves in the framework of modernization and modernity of Western societies, and the philosophy and practice of pragmatism. The central theoretical concept or ideal is the formation of the intellect and intelligence through the exercise of personal growth. It should be noted that the interpretation of these two theories of education is based on the simultaneous existence and non-existence of differences. Namely, *Bildung* can also be understood as a way of achieving human development, which ultimately leads to self-determination, freedom, emancipation, autonomy, maturity, commitment and responsibility. Something that is so typical for humanistic education, and very nurtured in the pedagogic tradition, can find its equivalent in the ideal of personal growth and development. These central concepts are intertwined in the two hundred years old tradition of philosophical and pedagogical debate, but also in contemporary post-modernism and post-structuralism. With the acceptance of this theoretical tradition, and the recognition of relevant conceptual differences in ways that lead to the achievement of educational ideals within both theoretical perspectives, we are in no way trying to diminish the detected theoretical dualism; instead, we want to develop a discussion in the direction of recognizing and acknowledging those common elements that would determine similarities (common ground) of the liberal and humanistic education. It is obvious that we can find more space within the theory of liberal education for legitimizing competence development, than within humanistic education. Namely, there is an ingrained opinion in the humanistic tradition that one

⁷ Lat. *Artes liberales*

⁸ Within the idea of continental pedagogy, the reference is primarily to the strong tradition of German pedagogy.

⁹ The concept of *Bildung* is kept in its original language characters because of the inability of determining the appropriate term in the English language, which would encompass the whole original meaning of the term in German.

can be emancipated only through intellectual excellence. Education whose objective is the fulfillment of purpose or function that has certain utilitarian overtones, for example education for the acquisition of certain skills or crafts within the humanist tradition, can be considered as weaker, and also less valuable form of education that does not contribute, but instead delays the achievement of emancipation as the educational ideal. Aloni (1997) answers the question whether these two traditions can co-exist and if they have anything in common by way of his integrative model. The basic premise of this model is, on the one hand, the existence of different humanistic traditions, whose goal is to help people to live a good and fulfilling life, and on the other hand, the fact that liberalism and liberal education are based on humanism as the supreme ethical principle. According to Aloni (1997), the humanistic-liberal education is “free and complete cultivation and empowerment of human beings as individuals, in the intellectually moral and acceptable manner, with the goal of leading the best possible life in core domains, by achieving their potentials and tendencies; and as members of society through involvement and responsible citizenship, and as human beings, by continuous enrichment and training through collective achievements of human culture” (Aloni, 1997, p. 97). Anyway, the descriptive-normative position of this integrative model in many ways emphasizes the development of an autonomous personality, independent and critical thinking and the processes of acculturation as basic educational principles. Modern education is, at the same time, the process of cultivation of character and competence, but also a process of acculturation. Given the extremely wide range of possible outcomes of this concept, it is not easy, nor entirely justified, to insist on establishing a clear limit according to which emancipatory contents can be the subject of teaching and learning, while those identified as neo-liberal, cannot. According to the theory of free education, every content is worthy of knowledge and education if it enables the development of an authentic personality that can be achieved in various areas. No matter which way we interpret the components of education for entrepreneurship, both – the one from the position of liberal education, and the one from the integrative model of humanistic education – have their justification. Emancipation is not only a process of recognizing and resisting social enslavement, but also taking responsibility for the development of one’s potential and active social engagement. If we accept this definition, then this concept can greatly prepare young people for knowledge, information and competence for the way the modern world of work functions. Emancipatory effects of these educational concepts, such as the application of critical thinking, social and personal responsibility, can only be evaluated in the long run. The paradox of this concept is that, even if it strives to strengthen the non-liberal meme, the acquired knowledge and results can be used precisely for recognizing attempts of neo-liberal slavery and for acting in the direction of leaving such a position in society and fighting for a more just and humane social and working environment.

Conclusion

The objective of this work is, above all, to open a dialogue within the general criticism of education for entrepreneurship. Based on this analysis we conclude that the area which is subject to criticism within the conceptualization of education for entrepreneurship, may determine: perseverance in contextual independence, terminological ambiguity of entrepreneurship, especially within the body of pedagogical terminology, and development of entrepreneurial culture. Whether viewed individually or in an interrelationship, the non-systematic aspect of theoretical legitimization and domination of political and public argument with a touch of neo-liberal ideology are best reflected in singled out components.

Whether it is legitimate to ask if this concept promotes neo-liberal values or not, however, the fundamental difficulty in understanding education for entrepreneurship is reflected in insufficient scientific theoretical legitimation within pedagogy and/or the science of education. The omission of any need for theoretical scientific thinking contributes significantly to the conceptual development on the levels of public education policies, which creates the impression that some other levels of thought and argumentation on education for entrepreneurship, such as empirical and theoretical, are unlikely and unnecessary. The conducted conceptual-theoretical analysis shows that the theory of liberal education can be used in its understanding by the very fact, because it *a priori* does not negate this type of education. The direction towards the fundamental premises of this theoretical tradition shows possible educational value and empowering function. Namely, the cultivation of the mind and critical thinking, self-actualization of man as a result of the development and character and competence, acquisition of complex learning skills and practical activity, learning and understanding of the world in harmony with humanity as the supreme principle, are just some of the premises of liberal education congruent with education for entrepreneurship. The discussion included the model of integrative liberal and humanistic education (Aloni, 1997), which further advocates complementarity of liberal and humanistic goals towards humanism as the supreme value and principle. However, the issue that cannot be resolved, not even by establishing a solid theoretical base in the traditions of scientific and theoretical notions about education, is the fact that with the exclusion of enterprise from the scope of the main teaching, we significantly change its ontological characteristics. Since the concept of education and training for entrepreneurship has been for some time an integral part of school curricula, its conceptualization must go in the direction of determining the meaning and methods of implementation in educational practice with the aim to determine the factual-descriptive, not normative-prescribed, understanding and meaning for bearers of the educational process.

Education for entrepreneurship can be a positive example of pedagogy, and not anti-pedagogy, only if “the positive is not externally imposed on education in the form of universal virtues, but the participants in the educational process agree to

and determine values and develop those values and virtues they consider to be important for achieving what they want by their independent, free actions” (Bognar & Simel, 2013). The results of research show that teachers, as key agents of change in education, prefer and affirm the very characteristics and outcomes of education for entrepreneurship that have emancipatory character. The levels of acceptance of external and internal objectives of education for entrepreneurship, and accordingly, of related outcomes vary. In the framework of educational desirability, preference is given to the internal goals, while the external goals are interpreted through the neo-liberal prism. Attempts to understand entrepreneurship through mobilization of virtues of creativity, innovation, responsibility, etc., show that in the educational sense, subjectivization of entrepreneurship takes place in the opposite direction from the social one, identified in the work of Marttila (2013a, 2013b). The research results show that the interest of the schools, and also teacher articulation within the debate on the possible objectives of this concept, emphasize the features that can be brought under the common denominator of *the development of creative and innovative subject*, who has realistic expectations that after completing education, he/she will become *an active social subject (citizen)*. However, in the greater part of the research, teachers reject the part of the internal and external objectives that lead to the adoption of the functional elements of entrepreneurship as skills and competences, the strengthening of capacity for self-employment and creating preconditions for the development of future enterprise. It seems that the interest of schools that is articulated in the attitudes of teachers, and with it the assessment of the role of education and education, is not in cultivating a person as “a propagator of economy”. The modern student as the future propagator of economy, a person working within the same free market, is the least accepted and desirable outcome. The fear of the expansion of neoliberal memes in the area of education, through the conscious acceptance of education for entrepreneurship establishes a number of factors. First of all, it is clear from the analysis of the objectives, that in addition to the present social elements, the development of entrepreneurship as a business process and the adoption of certain functional aspects, such as skills and competences, raise the suspicion that the ultimate goal of this educational concept is the creation of entrepreneurs and designation of schools for the function of meeting the needs of the free market. Whereby, the free market as a superior mechanism of human achievement and *homo oeconomicus* as the educational ideal become a direct form of neoliberal or speculative pedagogy. Acknowledging the articulated values and positive traits expressed in the attitudes of teachers, which can be generated in this concept, we conclude that the entrepreneurship is a human virtue, a characteristic of personality and a reflection of the complex relationship of knowledge and skills that can be articulated as a goal and a result of modern education. It is necessary to carefully determine the meaning of entrepreneurship in goals and outcomes of learning and teaching. To leave it independent of context we run a risk of a concept without its true value, and so, lose not only its terminological potential, but also a key parameter in the evaluation of the development of character and personality.

Where do we draw the line between entrepreneurship as a desirable educational value and entrepreneurship as a neo-liberal value? To identify the neo-liberal discourse means to persist in scientific research and theoretical analysis, which must be a counterbalance to the arguments of public policy. The limitations of this analysis come from universal access, without entering into detailed specifics of different models of education for entrepreneurship. Future analysis, if they strive to determine more precise forms of the neoliberal discourse, must focus on individual models, on knowledge of specific socio-cultural conditions, as well as educational particularities. Furthermore, an important limitation in this study are the terms empowerment and emancipation that are used synonymously. However, a more precise answer to the question if education for entrepreneurship aspires more to the development of enterprise, and whether it is an opportunity for personal development and emancipation, or if it is the form of institutional adjustment to market forces in society, lies in abandoning the equivalence in terms of emancipation and empowerment. By establishing the proposed conceptual differences, we can get a powerful analytical tool. However, the undesirability of neoliberalism and the desirability of emancipation are simplified articulated poles of a much more complex image of contrasts of modernist and postmodernist interpretation of education, of theoretical “dichotomy” of liberal and humanistic education, and of eternal contrast of public-political and scientific-theoretical thinking. The border between liberal and neo-liberal interpretations, of course, is not made up of one prefix; it is the contrast of human values and the values of the free market. The comprehension of these limits lies in our professional responsibility and immanent reflexivity. Precisely by pointing out the moral dimension of pedagogy, Giroux (2004, p. 500) reminds us that “the responsibility of teachers and other academic elites is inseparable from the effects of the knowledge we produce, from the social relations we justify, and the ideologies and identities that we offer students”.

References

- Aloni, N. (1997). A Redefinition of Liberal and Humanistic Education. *International Review of Education*, 43(1), 88-107. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1002962614704>
- Bailey, C. (1992). Enterprise and Liberal Education - Some Reservations. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 26(1), 99-106. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9752.1992.tb00268.x>
- Bailey, C. (1984). *Beyond the Present and the Particular: A Theory of Liberal Education*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Backström-Widjeskog, B. (2010). Teacher's Thoughts on Entrepreneurship Education. In K. Skogen, & J. Sjøvoll (Eds.), *Creativity and Innovation-Preconditions for Entrepreneurship Education* (pp. 107-120). Trondheim: Tapir Academic Press.
- Bridges, D. (1992). Enterprise and Liberal Education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 26(1), 91-98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9752.1992.tb00267.x>

- Bognar, B., & Simel, S. (2013). Filozofska polazišta pozitivne pedagogije. *Metodički ogledi*, 20(1), 137-168.
- Dahlstedt, M., & Tesfahuney, M. (2010). Speculative Pedagogy: Education, Entrepreneurism and the Politics of Inclusion in Contemporary Sweden. *Journal of Critical Educational Studies*, 8(2), 249-274.
- Deakin Crick, R. (2008). Key Competencies for Education in European Context: Narratives of Accountability or Care. *European Educational Research Journal*, 7(3), 311-318. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/eeerj.2008.7.3.311>
- Gibb, A. A., & Cotton, J. (1998). *Entrepreneurship at Schools and College Education – Creating the Leading Edge*. Background paper to the conference to be held at the Department of Trade and Industry Conference Centre, December 8th 1998.
- Giroux, H. A. (2004). Public Pedagogy and the Politics of Neoliberalism: Making the Political More Pedagogical. *Policy Futures in Education*, 2(3-4), 494-503. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2004.2.3.5>
- Halstead, J. M. (1996). Liberal Values and Liberal Education. In J. M. Halstead, & M. J. Taylor (Eds.), *Values in Education and Education in Values* (pp. 15-30). London: The Falmer Press.
- Hansen, E. D. (2001). *European Economic History: From Mercantilism to Maastricht and Beyond*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press.
- Holmgren, C., & From, J. (2005). Taylorism of the Mind. Entrepreneurship Education from the Perspective of Educational Research. *European Educational Research Journal*, 4(4), 382-390. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/eeerj.2005.4.4.4>
- Hytti, U. (2008). Enterprise education in different cultural setting and at different school levels. In A. Fayolle, & P. Kyrö (Eds.), *Dynamics between Entrepreneurship, Environment and Education* (pp. 131-148). Cheltenham (UK): Edward Elgar Publishing Limited. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4337/9781848445017.00017>
- Jamieson, I. (1984). Schools and enterprise. In A. G. Watts, & P. Moran (Eds.), *Education for enterprise* (pp. 19-27). Cambridge, MA: CRAC.
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2012a). *Developing Key Competences at School in Europe: Challenges and Opportunities for Policy*. Eurydice Report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of European Union. doi: 10.2797/93204
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2012b). *Entrepreneurship Education at School in Europe: National Strategies, Curricula and Learning Outcomes*. Brussels: Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency. doi: 10.2797/80384
- Komulainen, K., Naskali, P., Korhonen, M., & Keskitalo-Foley, S. (2011). Internal Entrepreneurship - a Trojan Horse of the Neoliberal Governance of Education? Finnish Pre- and In-service Teachers' Implementation of and Resistance towards Entrepreneurship Education. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 9(1), 341-373.
- Komulainen, K. (2006). Neoliberal Educational Policy. A Case Study of Finnish Textbooks of Entrepreneurial Education. *Nordisk Pedagogik*, 26(3), 212-228.
- Kulić, S. (2000). Konceptcija neoliberalizma, edukacija i egzistencija. *Ekonomski pregled*, 51(9-10), 867-894.
- Kuratko, D. F., & Hodgetts, R. M. (2004). *Entrepreneurship: Theory, Process. Practice*. Mason, OH; South-Western Publishers.

- Lackéus, M., Lundqvist, M., & Williams Middleton, K. (2013). *How can Entrepreneurship Bridge between Traditional and Progressive Education?* ECSB Entrepreneurship Education Conference, Århus, Denmark /online/. Retrieved on 19th November 2014 from <http://publications.lib.chalmers.se/publication/175433>
- Luketić, D. (2013). *Razvoj poduzetničke kompetencije u okviru kurikulskih promjena odgoja i obrazovanja*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb). Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.
- Marttila, T. (2013a). *The Culture of Enterprise in Neoliberalism: Specters of Entrepreneurship*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Marttila, T. (2013b). Whither Governmentality Research? A Case Study of the Governmentalization of the Entrepreneur in the French Epistemological Tradition. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 14(3), Art. 10 /online/. Retrieved on 19th November 2014 from <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs1303106>.
- McCafferty, P. (2010). Forging a 'Neoliberal Pedagogy': The 'Enterprising Education' Agenda in Schools. *Critical Social Policy*, 30(4), 541–563. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0261018310376802>
- Mulcahy, D. G. (2009). What Should It Mean to Have Liberal Education in 21st Century? *Curriculum Inquiry*, 39(3), 465–486. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2009.00452.x>
- Read, J. (2009). A Genealogy of Homo Economicus: Neoliberalism and the Production of Subjectivity. *Faulcault Studies*, 6, 25–36.
- Sahlberg, P. (2011). *Finnish lessons. What can the world learn from educational change in Finland?* New York: Teachers College Press.
- Schultz, T. W. (1980). Investment in entrepreneurial ability. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 82(4), 437–448. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3439676>
- Shionoya, Y. (2012). Joseph Alois Schumpeter: The Economist of Rhetoric. In J. G. Backhaus (Ed.), *Handbook of the History of Economic Thought* (pp. 581–604). New York: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-8336-7_23
- Tiikkala, A., Ruostesaari, M-L., Seikkula-Leino, J., & Troberg, E. (2011). *Values of entrepreneurship education in EU-countries*. ESU Conference 2011 University of Seville, (pp. 12-17). September, Seville, Spain. ISBN 978-84-694-7290-3.
- Vican, D. (2012). Samoprocjena nastavnika o poduzetničkom porivu – doprinos stvaranju poduzetničke kulture u osnovnoj školi. *Acta Iadertina*, 9, 61–78.
- Vican, D. (2006). Odgoj i obrazovanje u Hrvatskoj u kontekstu europskih vrijednosti. *Pedagogijska istraživanja*, 1(1), 9–20.
- Zhao, Y. (2012). *World Class Learners: Educating Creative and Entrepreneurial Students*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Daliborka Luketić

Department of Pedagogy, University of Zadar
Obala kralja P. Krešimira IV/2, 23000 Zadar, Croatia
dluketic@unizd.hr

Odgoj i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo na razdjelnici neoliberalne i emancipacijske pedagogije

Sažetak

U obrazovnim sustavima europskih zemalja odgoj i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo sveprisutan je i nezaobilazan odgojno-obrazovni koncept. Nastanak, razvoj i uspon tog koncepta u tijesnoj su vezi sa suvremenim razvojnim trendovima europske obrazovne politike. Odgoj i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo određeno je društvenom i odgojnom vrijednosti poduzetništva, zatim svrstavanjem među temeljne preduvjete za ostvarivanje cjeloživotnog učenja. U pedagojskoj znanosti uočava se nedostatna teorijska utemeljenost tog koncepta. Jedna od posljedica takvog stanja je vrednovanje odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo kao pedagojski irelevantnoga. Poduzetništvo, u odgojno-obrazovnom kontekstu, često se naziva područjem paradoksa zbog obilježja koja neprestano balansiraju na kontinuumu od neoliberalnih do emancipacijskih interpretacija.

Cilj ovog rada je konceptualno-teorijskom analizom odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo, izdvojiti moguće vrijednosne i ciljne prijevode te razmotriti njegovu emancipacijsku i afirmativnu vrijednost u procesu odgoja i obrazovanja. Rezultati provedene analize doprinose razumijevanju kompleksnosti onoga što je odgoj i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo ili što bi mogao postati ako nekritički pristupamo trendovima obrazovne politike.

Ključne riječi: *emancipacija; europska obrazovna politika; neoliberalizam; odgoj i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo; teorija liberalnog obrazovanja.*

Uvod

U posljednjih desetak godina unutar reformskih nastojanja, posebno onih u europskom kontekstu, značajnije se promišlja vrijednost i važnost odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo. Unutar gotovo dvije trećine europskih odgojno-obrazovnih sustava prepoznaju se oblici i modeli odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo na razini obveznog obrazovanja, ponajprije kao transverzalne temeljne kompetencije implementirane u obliku interdisciplinarnih i međupredmetnih tema i sadržaja (European Commission/

EACEA/Eurydice, 2012a). Promicanje poduzetništva kao vrijednosti i temeljne kompetencije utemeljuje se u procjenama osobne korisnosti i socijalne dobrobiti koje donosi cijeli niz očekivanih ishoda učenja deriviranih na temelju njezinih kompetencijskih sastavnica. Modernizacija i reforma kurikula kroz koju prolaze europski obrazovni sustavi time postaje jedan od osnovnih mehanizama uvođenja poduzetništva i razvoja poduzetničke kompetencije u obveznom obrazovanju. Takav pravac razvoja utemeljen na preporukama i smjernicama europske obrazovne politike¹ i postlisabonskom² političkom diskursu, uz istodobne nacionalne kurikularne reforme, predstavlja temeljni obrazac nastanka, razvoja, (re)definiranja i implementacije odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo u odgojno-obrazovnu praksu. Unatoč tome, promatrano konceptijski, ali i praktično, odgoj i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo je još uvijek područje čiji se središnji koncept nerijetko vrednuje epitetom upitne odgojne vrijednosti. Temeljni razlog takvog stanje jest pojam *poduzetništvo* te njegovo razumijevanje u isključivim okvirima matične discipline. Naime, ekonomija kao disciplina i praksa upravljanja resursima, stvaranja dobara i dodatnih vrijednosti u suvremenim interpretacijama izravno se povezuje s neoliberalnim političko-ekonomskim konceptom, a kao njegova posljedica i s neoliberalnom kulturnom praksom. Promatrano u kontekstu razvoja kulture spornim se upravo ocjenjuje oblikovanje neoliberalne kulturne prakse. Neprihvatljivost takvog kulturnog obrasca počiva na tezi „odstranjenja koda ljudskosti” jer je „kulturni kod neoliberalizma oslobođen morala i etičnosti” (Kulić, 2000, str. 874). Iako krajnje pojednostavljeno, suštinska kritika zasniva se na premisama da je poduzetništvo isključivo ekonomski koncept i proces, a suvremena ekonomija prožeta je neoliberalnom ideologijom. Na takvim i sličnim premisama može se temeljiti zaključak kako poduzetništvo i odgoj i obrazovanje nisu kompatibilni procesi. Njihova međusobna nekompatibilnost zasniva se na različitim vrijednosnim temeljima i u osnovi različitoj svrhi. Štoviše, kritičari obrazovanja za poduzetništvo u toj koncepciji vide pokušaj etabliranja neoliberalnih principa u odgoju i obrazovanju (McCafferty, 2010), nastojanje prema indoktrinaciji djece i mladih putem neoliberalnih vrijednosti (Komulainen, 2006; Komulainen, Naskali, Korhonen i Keskitalo-Foley, 2011) i još jedan od oblika „spekulativne pedagogije”³ (Dahlstedt i Tesfahuney, 2010). Legitimiranje odgojnih ciljeva i vrijednosti

¹ „Europska obrazovna politika” je naziv za javnu, uvjetno rečeno, zajedničku politiku (eng. *policy*) europskih zemalja u području obrazovanja. Iako je upravljanje sustavom odgoja i obrazovanja u isključivoj nadležnosti država članica, Europska unija u tom sektoru ima podupiruću ulogu putem sustava preporuka, smjernica, *policy* instrumenata, praćenja i različitih drugih mehanizmima za ostvarivanje dobrovoljnih zajedničkih ciljeva u području obrazovanja.

² Sintagma označava razdoblje europske politike nakon potpisivanja Lisabonskog ugovora (2000) koje je obilježeno razvojem raznih sektorskih politika usmjerenih prema ostvarivanju ciljeva postavljenih samim Ugovorom. Postlisabonski diskurs intenzivno traje otprilike desetak godina kad na političko-gospodarsku strategijsku scenu Europe stupa nova strategija pametnog i održivog razvoja pod nazivom *Europa 2020* (2010).

³ Spekulativna pedagogija je pojam koji obuhvaća obrazovanje vođeno profitom, različite filozofije, teorije i prakse u obrazovanju koje su utemeljene na valoriziranju i kapitaliziranju. Ono objedinjuje niz ideja obrazovanja utemeljenih na stvaranju utrživih vrijednosti bez obzira na to radi li se o osobnim, gospodarskim, nacionalnim i sl. (Dahlstedt i Tesfahuney, 2010).

odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo koji su, prema dijelu interpretacija (McCafferty, 2010), izravni izdanak neoliberalizma, u tradiciji kontinentalne pedagogije ocjenjeni su protivnim humanističkoj dimenziji i vrijednosti odgoja i obrazovanja.

Cilj rada je analizirati i kritički razmotriti koncept odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo s naglaskom na vrijednosti i ciljeve u okvirima rasprave o neoliberalnom i emancipacijskom trenutku. Uvodno naznačena pitanja o odgoju i obrazovanju za poduzetništvo upućuju na produbljenu konceptualnu nejasnoću i jačanje polarizacije na teorijskoj i praktičnoj razini, dijeleći se na neoliberalne prijetnje i šanse za afirmacijom čovjeka u suvremenom društvu. Pritom smo usmjereni prema otkrivanju početaka teorijske rasprave o tom konceptu posredstvom tradicije, ali i suvremenog teorijskog mišljenja o odgoju i obrazovanju.

Odgoj i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo: vrijednosti na kojima počiva, ciljevi kojima teži

Vrijednosna utemeljenost odgoja i obrazovanja u pedagogijskoj znanosti dostiže razinu gotovo aksiomatskog značenja. Vrijednosti objedinjuju pojmove kao što su vjerovanja, civilizacijski standard, ljudska dobrobit, društveni identitet i integritet te ih se smatra svojevrsnim orijentacijskim mehanizmom (Halstead, 1996; Vican, 2006). Stoga, bez obzira na to posjeduju li društveno-kulturno i/ili odgojno-obrazovno značenje, početno valja utvrditi koje se vrijednosti proklamiraju odgojem i obrazovanjem za poduzetništvo? Naizgled, poduzetništvo najuže možemo povezati s idejom rasta i razvoja, uspjehom i uspješnošću, kompeticijom i kompetitivnošću, originalnošću i inovativnošću, društvenom dobiti i osobnom dobrobiti (...). Pobrojana obilježja iako nisu sinonim poduzetništva, u mnogočemu mogu biti asocijativna za njegovo razumijevanje. Iako navedena obilježja nemaju značenje vrijednosti u užem smislu riječi, ona su vrednovana kao nešto što ima pozitivno značenje za život i djelovanje suvremenog društva. Metaanaliza znanstvenih radova o odgoju i obrazovanju za poduzetništvo (Luketić, 2013) ukazuje na to da se u području odgoja i obrazovanja vrijednost i važnost poduzetništva prepoznaje upravo putem svojih posrednih i često asocijativnih obilježja, kao što su kreativnost, inovativnost, odgovornost, marljivost, ustrajnost i sl. Nadalje, artikulacija poduzetništva kao temeljne kompetencije, za koju postoje očekivanja da će doprinijeti neposrednom priznavanju odgojne važnosti, ipak se ne ostvaruje u potpunosti iako je taj vid bliži ideji odgoja i poučavanja, kao i kurikularnom programiranju i oblikovanju. U tom smislu ta dva diskurzivno (ne) odvojiva aspekta predstavljaju osnovu za propitivanje (ne)opravdanosti kritike o postojanju neoliberalnih elemenata i (ne)postojanju vrijednosti emancipacije putem odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo.

Vrijednosna dimenzija

Poduzetništvo ponajprije karakterizira velik broj značenja koja se protežu od ekonomskog preko društvenog do osobnog aspekta. Od najužeg leksičkog poimanja

poduzetništva kao procesa stvaranja vlastitog poslovnog poduhvata, a poduzetnika kao vlasnika poduzeća, pokušaji znanstvenog određenja donose definicije s vrlo kompleksnim interpretacijskim potencijalom. U okviru ekonomske teorije prva moderna shvaćanja poduzetništva idu u smjeru naglašavanja kreativne destrukcije i inovativnosti i poduzetnika kao nositelja tih procesa, što je posebno vidljivo u teoriji ekonomskog razvoja Schumpetera (Shionoya, 2012). S druge strane pokretanje poslovanja je bitno obilježje, ali i nedostatan za potpunije razumijevanje fenomenologije poduzetništva. Ono je proces vizije, promjene i stvaranja koji zahtijeva osobno ulaganje napora te prednost u kreiranju i oživotvorenju novih ideja i kreativnih rješenja (Kuratko i Hodgetts, 2004). Za britanske autore Gibb i Cotton (1998) poduzetništvo je sklop ponašanja, osobina i vještina koji pojedincima i grupama omogućuje stvaranje promjena i inovacija te nošenje s većom razinom neizvjesnosti i kompleksnosti.

Poduzetništvo istodobno donosi značenja procesa, fenomena, aktivnosti, djelatnosti, ponašanja, društvenih uloga i odlike osobnosti. Kada je riječ o izlasku iz okvira disciplinarnosti, onda je ono djelomično uvjetovano zanimanjem i drugih znanstvenih disciplina za njegovim razumijevanjem te napuštanjem *pokretanja poslovnog poduhvata* kao isključivo relevantnog sadržaja definicija (Kuratko i Hodgetts, 2004; Schultz, 1980). Time se značenja dodatno raslojavaju prema prepoznavanju u širem društvenom okruženju (socijalno poduzetništvo) te djelovanja u smjeru osobnog razvoja (osobna poduzetnost). Poduzetništvo sadrži snažne vrijednosne i pozitivne elemente stvaranja, pokretanja, promjene postojećeg stanja, kreativne destrukcije, uočavanja prilike, proaktivnog reagiranja na vlastito životno okruženje (...). Poduzetništvo stoga smatramo i vrijednošću *per se*, jer istodobno sadrži i društvenokulturno i odgojno-obrazovno značenje. Na temelju rezultata analize europskih odgojnih vrijednosti zaključeno je da se poduzetništvo i njemu pridružene druge vrijednosne osnove kao što su inicijativnost, inovativnost, odgovornost, suradnički duh, stvaralaštvo, fleksibilnost i druge „istodobno mogu svrstati i na razinu vrijednosti kao ciljeva i normi te na razinu vrijednosti kao obilježja osobnosti i djelovanja osobe” (Vican, 2006, str. 11-12). Ispitivanje vrijednosnih dimenzija odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo pokazuje vrijednosnu afirmaciju „kreativnosti, sposobnosti rješavanja problema, suradničkog ponašanja, orijentiranosti na budućnost, preuzimanja odgovornosti, učenja temeljem pogrešaka, prihvaćanje promjena, spremnosti na preuzimanje rizika, samopouzdanje, osobnu inicijativnost te predanost u radu” kao skup onih najpoželjnijih u odgojno-obrazovnoj praksi (Tiikkala i sur., 2011).

Uz poduzetništvo se neizostavno veže pojam osobe – poduzetnika. Portret poduzetnika podrazumijeva aktivnu, inicijativnu i inovativnu osobu, spremnu za nepoznata iskustva u uvjetima neizvjesnosti, donositelja odluka koje nose određene rizike sa svrhom ostvarivanja različitih ciljeva i zadaća. Pobrojena svojstva ukazuju na svojstvenu vrijednosnu mobilizaciju niza pozitivnih odlika osobnosti, ponašanja i djelovanja, koja na prvi pogled nisu u koliziji sa širim odgojnim i obrazovnim idealima i

ciljevima. Ako je razvoj tih odlika osobnosti cilj odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo, a navedene su atribucije očekivani ishod te i drugih obrazovnih koncepcija, kao i širih obrazovnih ciljeva, postavlja se pitanje na temelju kojih se osnova upućuju kritike o upitnoj odgojnoj vrijednosti. Odgovor na to pitanje moramo potražiti u sadašnjem društveno-kulturnom kontekstu unutar kojeg pluralizam vrijednosti dopušta egzistiranje velikog broja vrijednosti i njihove brojne reinterpetacije prema kojim se značenje koje poprimaju razlikuje u prostoru i vremenu.

U vrijeme prosvjetiteljstva, kad se javljaju prve relevantne znanstvene artikulacije poduzetništva, poduzetnik je svojevrсни heroj, slobodan i odgovoran čovjek koji vlastitim naporima stvara nešto novo što u konačnici dovodi do ekonomskog progresa (Hansen, 2001), a poduzetništvom se imenovao proces koji doprinosi osobnoj i socijalnoj dobrobiti sa snažnim emancipacijskim trenutkom. Plodno tlo za razvoj poduzetništva kao ekonomskog i osobnog procesa označilo je napuštanje sigurnog zaleđa srednjovjekovnog obrtništva i istodobno jačanje ekonomske i društvene neizvjesnosti koju donose procesi industrijalizacije i modernizacije. Esenciju poduzetničkog i poduzetnog djelovanja čine odvažnost, hrabrost, inovativnost i kreativnost. Upravo istaknute odlike ljudske osobnosti i ponašanja omogućuju aktivan odnos prema svijetu, oslobađanje i napuštanje podčinjenog položaja te „uzimanje stvari u svoje ruke”. Time se sve one osobine koje poduzetnik utjelovljuje ne razilaze sa suvremenom idejom odgoja i obrazovanja. Iako je zamisao o razvoju poduzetništva putem učenja i poučavanja novijeg datuma, potvrđivanje njegove važnosti je opravdano potrebom življenja u društvu, kako onom prosvjetiteljskom tako i ovom suvremenom. Brojni zagovornici, među kojim je i Zhao (2012), ocjenjuju da u vrijeme nove globalne ekonomije i trajno mijenjajućeg društva mladi ljudi moraju razmišljati snalažljivo, fleksibilno, kreativno i globalno, jednom riječju njihovo mišljenje mora odgovarati poduzetničkom načinu mišljenja. Nadalje, putem odgoja i obrazovanja razvoj takvog mišljenja, stava, sposobnosti i vještina može se potaknuti primjerenim kurikulskim oblikovanjem. Legitimiranje odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo argumentima zasnovanim na principima korisnosti ide u smjeru naglašavanja važnosti i korisnosti kako za pojedinca tako i za društvo u cijelosti. Interpretacija putem argumentacije zašto i kome je ono važno, te izvođenje svrhe na temelju principa korisnosti donosi prizvuk krajnje utilitarističkog cilja odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo.

Bilo da je riječ o znanstvenom, političkom ili svakodnevnom diskursu o poduzetništvu, u cijelom spektru pripisivanih vrijednosti, značenja i važnosti za društvo i pojedinca, čini se da se još uvijek spitičemo o kontekstualno promatranje i poimanje vrijednosti poduzetništva. Mijenjajuća društvena dinamika dovodi do novih interpretacija unutar kojih se sve ono što je jednom činilo emancipacijski potencijal polako pretvara u oruđe neoliberalne kulturne hegemonije.⁴ Zanimljivo je

⁴ Širenje koncepta vrijednosti tržišta u obliku neoliberalnog kapitalizma u različite društvene sfere. Pri tome se *neoliberalno* shvaća kao totalitarna forma različitih aktivnosti s ciljem preslagivanja odnosa snaga između kapitala i rada na svim društvenim razinama u korist kapitala.

vidjeti na koji način se to događa, a rezultati istraživanja finskog znanstvenika Marttile (2013a; 2013b) u pokušaju otkrivanja načina na koji poduzetnik postaje sveprisutan neoliberalni model, mogu poslužiti za tu svrhu. Pojam i značenje „biti poduzetnikom”⁵ u posljednjih godina mijenjalo je svoje značenje od „širitelja ekonomije, preko aktivnog društvenog subjekta” do razumijevanja kao „kreativnog subjekta koji uči” (Martilla, 2013a). Upravo taj posljednji pojam omogućuje stvaranje slike učećeg subjekta i to putem vrlo važne karakteristike „spremnosti i sposobnosti za iskušavanje nečega novoga”. Prema mišljenju Martille (2013a, 2013b) poduzetnik postaje „opći model socijalne subjektivnosti bez bilo kakvih spacijalnih, sektorskih i institucionalnih ograničenja”. Čini se se da inicijalno značenje pojma, koje još uvijek do kraja nije lišeno ekonomije i značenja poslovnog poduhvata, interpelirajući se u nove „prostore”, tumači kao razvoj kulture poduzetništva i poduzetnosti. Pri tome kultura poduzetnosti mobilizira značenje osobnog djelovanja pojedinca, a kultura poduzetništva ima prizvuk načina mišljenja i djelovanja općenito svojstvenog poduzetništvu kao procesu u najširem značenju. Međutim, razvoj jedne i druge *kulture* doživljava se kao element neoliberalne kulturne hegemonije (McCafferty, 2010; Peters, 2001) koji predstavlja svojevrstu društvenu opasnost, posebno ako se škole stave u funkciju promicanja i razvoja takve kulture koja dovodi do „stvaranja poželjnog poduzetničkog identiteta i tejlorizma uma” (Homgren i From, 2005). Postoji velika doza opreznosti u prihvaćanju poduzetništva. Posebno da njegovim legitimiranjem u odgojno-obrazovnom smislu dolazi do „štednje na socijalnom” (Martilla, 2013a) ustupajući tako mjesto procesima prilagodbe na tržišne mehanizme. Suštinu tog procesa označavalo bi vrednovanje svega onog što čini razvoj socijalnog, od odnosa do identiteta, na temelju principa i logike otvorenog tržišta. Time bi vrijednost slobodnog tržišta, osim što je ekonomski relevantna, odražavala i bila kriteriji za odabir sadržaja kurikulske relevantnosti.

Ciljna orijentacija

Osim različitog vrijednosnog tumačenja poduzetništvo unutar procesa odgoja i obrazovanja oblikuje se putem različitih ciljeva odgoja i obrazovanja. Poduzetništvo kao jedna od temeljnih kompetencija za ostvarivanje cjeloživotnog učenja čini model artikulacije odgojno-obrazovnog cilja i ishoda. Artikulacija poduzetništva kao temeljne kompetencija omogućuje neposredno ciljno usmjereno odgojno i obrazovno nastojanje oblikovano kroz kurikulum s ciljem usvajanja kompetencijskih sastavnica i razvoja poduzetnosti kao odlike osobnosti. Posljedica je opredjeljenje za cjeloživotno učenje i kompetencije, i opredjeljenje prema poduzetništvu kao njihovu sastavnom dijelu. U promišljanju značenja temeljnih kompetencija i mogućoj polarizaciji između ekonomskog neoliberalizma i globalnog pogleda na socijalnu pravdu ističe se „da uspješan poslovni čovjek treba isti skup metakompetencija kao i uspješan roditelj ili odgovoran građanin, iako se možda razlikuju prema područjima djelovanje,

⁵ eng. *Being of entrepreneur*

znanjima i vještinama koje posjeduju” (Deakin Crick, 2008, str. 317). Očigledno je da poduzetništvo donosi određeno vrijednosno značenje u kojem se prepoznaju svojstva koja, neovisno o kontekstu, imaju pozitivno značenje za učenje i poučavanje u 21. stoljeću. Nadalje, kompetencijski pristup u određenju poduzetništva polazi od najopćenitije formulacije da je ono „sposobnost osoba da svoje ideje realiziraju u djelo, a uključuje stvaralaštvo, inovativnost, spremnost na preuzimanje rizika te sposobnost planiranja i vođenja projekata radi ostvarivanja ciljeva” (European Commission, 2007, str. 11). Sveobuhvatni cilj odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo, u kontekstu obveznog obrazovanja na koje se temeljne kompetencije odnose, znači osposobiti učenike stavovima, znanjima i vještinama za poduzetničko i poduzetno djelovanje. Poduzetništvo tako obuhvaća „uočavanje prilike za osobne, profesionalne i/ili poslovne aktivnosti, sposobnost razvijanja šire perspektive čovjekovog rada i života, sposobnosti planiranja, vođenja, upravljanja, organiziranja, kao i preuzimanje rizika te inicijativnost, proaktivnost i osobnu i profesionalnu inovativnost” (European Commission, 2007, str. 11).

Razumijevanje poduzetništva kao kompetencije daje jednu novu dimenziju, te ima najmanje dvije važne posljedice za odgoj i obrazovanje. Ponajprije, ono što čini poduzetničku kompetenciju u svojoj je osnovi vrlo heterogeno određeno. Heterogenost se ogleda i u različitim kontekstima moguće primjenjivosti. Nadalje, iz perspektive ciljeva odgoja i obrazovanja, uočena heterogenost omogućuje (re) definiranje svakog od navedenih elementa predloženog određenja poduzetništva kao temeljne kompetencije u formi ekspliciranih odgojno-obrazovnih ciljeva u svakom pojedinačnom nacionalnom odgojno-obrazovnom sustavu. S obzirom na istaknuto možemo očekivati da je moguće identificirati najmanje onkoliko odgojno-obrazovnih sustava koliko ostoji vrijednosnih i ciljnih orijentacija u odgoju i obrazovanju za poduzetništvo. S time da je potrebno razjasniti u kojoj su mjeri nacionalna opredjeljenja za odgoj i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo usmjerena prema razvoju odlike osobnosti – poduzetnosti ili prema nekim funkcionalnim aspektima usvajanja poduzetništva kao vještine.

Analiza ciljeva odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo te ishoda učenja (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012b) djelomično potvrđuje prethodno pretpostavljenu heterogenost. Otprije poznata kategorizacija modela odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo, odgoja i obrazovanja o poduzetništvu, odgoja i obrazovanja kroz poduzetništvo (Hytti, 2002; Jamesion, 1984) može se usporediti s očekivanim ishodima učenja na razini obveznog obrazovanja europskih nacionalnih obrazovnih sustava. Iz recentne analize odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo u europskim školama (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012b, str. 21), npr. uočavamo da se u finskom obveznom obrazovanju ciljevi i ishodi odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo uglavnom odnose na njegovanje inicijativnosti i kreativnosti, kritičkog mišljenja i rješavanja problema kao i učenje o preuzimanju rizika. K tome

se djelomično prepoznaju i elementi profesionalne orijentacije te upoznavanja svijeta rada. Države pod suverenitetom Ujedinjenog Kraljevstva, iako gledajući zasebno imaju svoje posebnosti, unutar ove analize možemo također uočiti širok spektar ishoda usmjerenih prema ostvarivanju samopoštovanja i samosvjesnosti učenika, razvoja vještina timskog rada, planiranja i ostvarivanja vlastitih ciljeva, također njegovanje inicijativnosti i kreativnosti kao u slučaju Finske. Na kasnijim razinama svi navedeni ishodi dopunjavaju se potrebama usvajanja sadržaja financijske pismenosti. S druge strane zanimljiv je primjer austrijskog obrazovanog sustava u kojem odgoj i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo ima jednoznačno određen cilj, a on je usmjeren prema razvoju ekonomske i financijske pismenost te upoznavanje svijeta rada putem profesionalne orijentacije. Usporede li se ti nacionalni primjeri međusobno, te pokušaju li se razumjeti kao posljedica nečega puno važnijeg od puke implementacije odluka obrazovne politike ili europskog intervencionizma, dolazimo do početne priče o vrijednostima. Finska kao model socijalne države blagostanja (Sahlberg, 2011) opredjeljuje se prema socijalnom i individualnom aspektu poduzetništva, stavljajući naglasak na razvoj osobnosti i socijalnih kompetencija kao prioritetne ishode učenja i poučavanja koji nisu u oprečnosti prema širi ciljevima odgoja i obrazovanja. S druge strane, austrijski primjer nužno je promatrati kroz snažnu ekonomsku ideju i tradiciju (op. austrijska ekonomska škola) koju možda najbolje odražava političko-ekonomsku kulturu utemeljenu u djelovanju pojedinca, unutar koje su takvi oblici obrazovanja u potpunosti poželjni i prihvatljivi (Hytti, 2008). Primjeri pokazuju nacionalnu opredijeljenost prema onim odgojnim ciljevima ie očekivanim ishodima učenja koji su neraskidivo povezani sa širim društveno-kulturnim i političko-gospodarskim nacionalnim habitusom.

Nadalje, slika poduzetnika kao „kreativnog subjekta koji uči” (Marttila, 2013a; 2013b), ali i spremno djeluje u neizvjesnim situacijama, ima niz važnih posljedica za odgoj i obrazovanje. Posebno jer ističe kulturu učenja, snalaženja u novim situacijama, inovativni pristup rješavanju problema, kao i niz drugih kompetencijskih elemenata za koje je sasvim logično da podupiru ideju o cjeloživotnom učenju. Promicanje i zagovaranje, poticanje i razvoj modela kreativnog učećeg subjekta zvalo se on poduzetnik ili nekako drugačije predstavlja izazov ne samo u implementaciji već i kurikulskoj sukonstrukciji i sinergiji s drugim područjima odgojno-obrazovnog djelovanja. U toj skupini značenja važno je istaknuti da se razvoj poduzetništva ocjenjuje važnim jednako za učenika i za nastavnika. Uloga nastavnika je u poticanju razvoja poduzetnosti učenika dok istodobno promjene u obrazovanju i profesiji nastavnika od njega samoga zahtijevaju poduzetnost posredstvom cjelokupnog profesionalnog nastavnog rada. Poduzetništvo time postaje cilj i odgojno-obrazovno sredstvo, pristup i metoda učenja i poučavanja, ali i „važan kognitivni alat kojim se može premostiti dihotomija tradicionalnog i progresivnog obrazovanja” (Lackéus, Lundqvist i Williams Middleton, 2013). Jednom riječju postaje poželjna osobina, ali i normativni i kriterijski segment kvalitete suvremene škole.

Odgoj i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo iz perspektive nositelja odgojno-obrazovnog procesa

Neovisno o pripisivanim značenjima i važnosti poduzetništvo je dio načina rada naših škola (Vican, 2012). Iako postoje oprečna mišljenja o tome u kojoj mjeri se ta koncepcija „uklapa” u samu ideju poučavanja i učenja. Ponajprije zato jer se u školama današnjice razvija percepcija oslanjanja na životno okruženje koje karakterizira visok stupanj sigurnosti i predvidljivosti, ali i razvoj kulture ovisnosti. Programirani sadržaj poučavanja, stroga predmetno-satna struktura i brojni drugi identificirani čimbenici organizacije škole i načina provođenja nastave ostavljaju malo prostora za iskazivanje vlastite poduzetnosti u okviru profesionalne autonomije nastavnika ili pak na razinama toliko poželjnije aktivnosti i inicijativnosti učenika. Međutim, proklamirani odgojno-obrazovni ciljevi, očekivani ishodi učenja i poučavanja vezani za razvoj poduzetnosti i poduzetničke kompetencije mogu se pronaći i unutar jezgrovnog i diferencijalnog školskog kurikula. Međutim, postavlja se pitanje u kojoj se mjeri takvi elementi prepoznaju kao sastavnice koncepta odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo. Perspektiva i pozicija nastavnika kao jednog od nositelja odgojno-obrazovnog procesa važna je za razumijevanje toga *što je zapravo poduzetništvo*. Takva pozicija omogućuje interpretaciju i razumijevanje onog na temelju čega se poduzetništvo prepoznaje u odgojno-obrazovnoj praksi za razliku od političke normativnosti prisutne u strateškim dokumentima. Istraživanje koje je proveo Komulainen sa suradnicima (2011) ispitujući nastavnike i studente nastavničkih studija zaključuje da se njihova percepcija poduzetništva izgrađuje oko dva temeljna značenja: „vanjskog” i „unutarnjeg” poduzetništva. Naime, vanjski aspekt poduzetništva donosi natjecateljsku, individualističku i komercijalnu dimenziju te kao takav predstavlja izvor nejednakosti koji je proturječan temeljnim odgojnim vrijednostima zbog čega se *a priori* odbacuje kao uopće moguć odgojno-obrazovni cilj (Komulainen i sur., 2011). Nadalje, poimanje unutarnjeg poduzetništva podrazumijeva razvoj poduzetnog mentaliteta uz razvoj osobne odgovornosti, marljivosti i neovisnosti o drugima, što se smatra logičnim odgojno-obrazovnim ciljem uopće. Do sličnog zaključka dolazi Backström-Widjeskog (2010), u pokušajima identificiranja sadržaja, a potom i vrijednosti odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo. Na temelju analize stavova nastavnika i studenata zaključuje „da se ova koncepcija razumijeva kao niz aktivnosti usmjerenih prema razvoju osobnosti i socijalnih vještina, s ciljem razvoja snažne osobnosti utemeljene u osobnom i socijalnom aspektu poduzetničke kompetencije više nego onom funkcionalnom koji teži kognitivnom razvoju poslovno usmjerenih poduzetničkih vještina” (Backström-Widjeskog, 2010).

Rezultati prethodno navedenih istraživanja (Tiikkala i sur., 2011; Komulainen i sur., 2011; Backström-Widjeskog, 2010) ukazuju na to da konceptijski odgoj i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo nije nešto što je samo po sebi razumljivo, odnosno da ga u različitim omjerima čine leksička značenja ključnog pojma te implicitne teorije nositelja odgojno-obrazovnog procesa. Leksički element u otkivanju toga što je poduzetništvo nije neznačajan. Je li cilj poticati i obrazovati buduće poduzetnike (funkcionalni

element) ili je cilj potaknuti razvoj poduzetnosti kao skupa pozitivnih atribucija odgoja osobnosti. Riječ je o temelju razumijevanja, što je razvidno u načinu na koji o poduzetništvu promišljaju nastavnici. Naime, u odgovorima nastavnika na pitanje što je za vas poduzetništvo u prvi plan dolaze atribucijski elementi poput inicijativnosti i kreativnosti učenika, a tek se potom promišlja funkcionalni element pojma. Osim toga, implicitne reinterpretacije kao dio skrivenog kurikula razlikuju se od proklamiranih odgojno-obrazovnih ciljeva javno objavljene politike odgoja i obrazovanja. U slučaju odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo ishodište prijevora ponajprije se temelji na tome u kojoj se mjeri proklamirane vrijednosti i ciljevi približavaju neoliberalnim vrijednostima, a potom na koji se način razvija interpretacija u skladu s implicitnim teorijama nastavnika. Primjerice, iako je sve ono što objedinjuje unutarnje poduzetništvo manifestacija neoliberalne subjektivnosti (Komulainen i sur., 2011; usp. Marttila 2013a; 2013b; Read, 2009), u dijelu tih interpretacija postaje poželjnim jer se uklapa u tradicionalne liberalne vrijednosne spektre, konkretno u slučaju navedenih istraživanja finskog društva i obrazovanja. Stoga je vrijednosti i vrijednosne procjene iskazane u različitim istraživanjima dijelom potrebno promatrati u spektru suvremenih liberalnih vrijednosti, kao i neoliberalnih interpretacijskih inačica. Očigledno je da se vrijednosno poimanje i legitimiranje u odgojno-obrazovnoj praksi utemeljuje u skladu s pojmovima „obrazovne osobe” te humanističkim i liberalnim vrijednostima kao civilizacijskim stečevinama modernih društava. Opće liberalne vrijednosti poput slobode, jednakosti i racionalnosti, a potom i njihove odgojne inačice kao što su „osobna autonomija, kritička otvorenost, jednakost šansi, racionalna moralnost, raznolikost, izbjegavanje indoktrinacije i dr.” (Halstead, 1996, str. 21) imaju emancipacijsku funkciju i svrhu, a ne instrumentalnu i utilitarističku. Tek u posljednjim desetljećima, kako ističe Halsted (1996), dolazi do naglašavanja principa korisnosti u argumentaciji ciljeva odgoja i obrazovanja, pa time i do potreba prioritetnog razvoja onih vještina i sposobnosti koje se povezuju sa svijetom rada, lakšom zapošljivosti i kompetitivnosti. Odgoju i obrazovanju za poduzetništvo time se nameće instrumentalna uloga ostvarivanja svega onog što je ekonomski relevantno putem formalnog odgoja i obrazovanja. Opisani vrijednosno-ciljni sukob kod nastavnika generira oprečnost koja se iskazuje stavom „da interesi škole i interesi djeteta više nisu u suglasju te da su zarobljeni između tržišnih vrijednosti koje su škole primorane promicati i onih vrijednosti koje kao odgajatelji žele prenijeti svojim učenicima” (Halstead, 1996, str. 26).

Teorija liberalnog obrazovanja i odgoj i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo: izvorište znanstveno-teorijskog legitimiranja

Prema dostupnim podacima jednu od najranijih znanstvenih rasprava s ciljem otkivanja teorijske tradicije odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo vodili su britanski znanstvenici Bridges i Bailey. Obojica kao predstavnici liberalnog obrazovanja⁶,

⁶ Ne ulazeći u povijesno-kulturalnu debatu o podrijetlu teorije liberalnog obrazovanja, ističemo da je riječ o vrlo dominantnoj odgojno-obrazovnoj teoriji, posebno izvan tradicije kontinentalne (njemačke) pedagogije.

plodonosne teorijske tradicije koja vrednuje učenje u funkciji vođenja kulturnog i naprednog života, uvidjeli su konceptualne poteškoće u tadašnjem pretežno političkom diskursu o odgoju i obrazovanju za poduzetništvo. Prema klasičnoj interpretaciji te teorije obrazovanje se utemeljuje na idealu intelekta, kognitivnom rastu i kultiviranju intelektualne izvrsnosti. Uopće, svrha liberalnog obrazovanja je oslobođenje ili emancipacija čovjeka „od sadašnjeg i pojedinačnog” (Bailey, 1984).

Bridges (1992) zastupa tezu prema kojoj se odgoj i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo konceptijski vrlo jasno uklapa unutar teorije liberalnog (slobodnog) obrazovanja. To nastojanje počiva na prepoznavanju komplementarnosti cilja odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo „razvoj poduzetnosti kao odlike osobnosti i poduzetnih pojedinaca” kao oslobađajućeg elementa unutar središnje premise liberalnog obrazovanja „osposobljavanje osoba za donošenje slobodnih i autonomnih odluka o načinu na koji će voditi svoj život” (Bridges, 1992, str. 92). Emancipirajući elementi pronalaze se na najmanje tri razine onoga što je, prema razumijevanju Bridgesa, odgoj i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo. Na razini pojedinca to su sva ona atribucijska svojstva poduzetnosti i poduzetništva, a na razini kolektivnog to su poduzetne institucije koje su „spremne stvarati i kreativno reagirati na nove zahtjeve te održavati i podržavati inicijativnost svog osoblja” (Bridges, 1992, str. 93). Naposljetku, važnim aspektom odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo ističe se „razvijanje šireg shvaćanja i razumijevanja poduzetnosti i poduzetništva kao sastavnog dijela društvenog i ekonomskog života”. Iz tih teza vidljivo je kako Bridges zagovara ideju poduzetnosti kao sastavnog dijela slobodnog obrazovanja. Poduzetnost nam omogućuje osobnu emancipaciju i veći stupanj socijalnog aktivizma. Razvoj atribucijskih sastavnica poduzetnosti, poput kreativnosti, inicijativnosti, odgovornost i sl. time postaje neovisan i pomalo lišen kontekstualnog značenja jer oni istodobno mogu biti ciljevi neke druge forme ili koncepcije obrazovanja. S druge strane, biti poduzetan kao dio socijalnog i ekonomskog funkcioniranja donosi značenje različite kontekstualne primjenjivosti. Ponajprije jer poduzetnost kao osobno svojstvo osim individualnog ima i puno šire značenje. Proširivanje opsega značenja i na druge društveno-organizacijske entitete označava napuštanje kulture ovisnosti te razvoj kulture poduzetnosti. Pa tako u kontekstu razvoja ne samo osobne kulture poduzetnosti možemo govoriti i o kulturi poduzetne škole.

Unutar teorije slobodnog obrazovanja Bailey (1992) ističe kao je društveni ili ekonomski kontekst življenja izuzetno relevantan i na tragu toga je poučavanje o tržišnom funkcioniranju prihvatljivo u okvirima sadržaja obrazovanja. Međutim, slika koju odgoj i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo nudi, s ciljem promicanja znanja o ekonomiji i slobodnom tržištu, je idealistična te su zanemarene negativne posljedice poput siromaštva, uloge socijalnih sustava i sl. Sve to može voditi prema zaključku da nezaposlenost, socijalna depriviranost i drugo je posljedica nedovoljne poduzetnosti pojedinaca. Prema Baileyju (1992), umjesto da postane oslobađajući (emancipirajući) vid obrazovanja, svaljivanjem krivnje na pojedinca, a istodobno ne promišljajući ulogu

društvenih sustava, on postaje indoktrinirajući i u mnogo čemu instrumentalan oblik odgoja. Možda i najzanimljiviji element Baileyjeve kritike odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo odnosi se na činjenicu da „poduzetnost nije apsolutna vrlina” (Bailey, 1992, str. 101). Uz to, sve ono što poduzetnost obuhvaća u okviru pripisanih svojstava poput inicijativnosti, odlučnosti, kreativnosti i inovativnosti i brojnih drugih, sama za sebe bez sadržaja ili konteksta, ne znači puno. „Brojna svojstva i dispozicije postaju poželjne vrline, odnosno vode prema moralnom činu ako je kontekst djelovanja ili same volje za djelovanjem određene dispozicije za sebe moralan” (Bailey, 1992, str. 101). Unutar teorije liberalnog obrazovanja oduvijek su se njegovali oni ciljevi obrazovanja koji su vodili prema razvoju onih dispozicija koje će potaknuti aktivnost i djelovanje osoba u skladu s razumom, širokim i temeljnim sposobnostima razumijevanja i to neovisno o kontekstu djelovanja. I sam Bailey (1992), na tragu svoje etike vrlina,⁷ ističe da za svako svrhovito i racionalno djelovanje, kao i sam smisao liberalnog obrazovanja, postoje dispozicije kao što su „sudjelovanje, usredotočenost, suradnja, upravljanje vremenom, materijalima, mislima i postupcima, prosuđivanje, zamišljanje mogućnosti, ispitivanje te pokušati razumjeti” (Bailey, 1984, str. 113). Prednost navedenih dispozicija jest što su općenite te nemaju izravnu poveznicu sa stvaranjem poduzetne kulture i društva. Liberalno obrazovanje u svojoj teorijskoj osnovi odbacuje mogućnost bilo koje vrste ideologiziranja i instrumentaliziranja odgoja i obrazovanja. U kontekstu poduzetnosti sva su pripisivana svojstva značajna, ali utoliko su i ovisna „o načinu na koji procjenjujemo kontekst njihova događanja ili određenu ideologiju u koju se uklapaju ili koju učvršćuju” (Bailey, 1992, str. 101). Utemeljena poruka Baileyjeve kritike odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo suštinski se svodi na pitanje (de)kontekstualizacije poduzetnosti, odnosno na pitanje određivanja i sadržaja i konteksta.

Nadalje, unutar teorije liberalnog obrazovanja definiranje sadržaja nije nevažno jer ono rezultira korpusom općeg i širokog znanja koje odražava jačinu intelekta. Suvremeni diskurs o poduzetništvu kao kompetenciji u prvi plan smješta raspravu o vještinama i sposobnosti, dok se na pozicija znanja (sadržaja) nastoji izbjeći izravan opis vrijednih znanja koja određuju poduzetništvo i poduzetnost. Upravo taj primjer dekontekstualizacije znanja uz prenaplašavanje funkcionalnih komponenti primjenjivih u bilo kojem kontekstu otežava prepoznavanje poduzetništva i poduzetnosti u odgojno-obrazovnoj praksi. Dolazimo do toga da konceptualna otvorenost i sveobuhvatnost istodobno znači puno i ništa jer taj koncept čini neprepoznatljivim. Jednim je dijelom to uvjetovano činjenicom i prihvaćanja nove kurikulske paradigme koja ide u smjeru pomaka od sadržaja prema ishodima. Potreba za doziranjem onog matično ekonomskog sadržaja i istodobna potreba za elaboracijom različitih sadržaja unutar socijalnog konteksta, a i odgojno-obrazovnog, dovodi nas do „sveprisutnih formi (neo)liberalne subjektivnosti” koje su potom

⁷ Odbacivanje postojanja apsolutno trajnih karakternih osobina i svojstava, naglašavanje konteksta za razumijevanje i vrednovanje nekog svojstva.

podložnije kritici kako onoj od prije 20-ak godina (Bailey, 1984) tako i ovoj recentnoj (Komulainen, 2006). Premisa o nedorečenosti sadržaja može implicirati tumačenje kako se odgoj i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo možda pretenciozno svrstava unutar teorije liberalnog obrazovanja. Istodobno, potrebno je razumjeti da se ta ista teorija nadograđuje različitim interpretacijama unutar kojih se pojam obrazovanog čovjeka mijenja. Mulcahy (2009) ocjenjuje da se pojam obrazovanosti, unutar i izvan teorije liberalnog obrazovanja, mora odmaknuti od tradicije stjecanja teorijskog znanja i pukog kognitivnog rasta prema formaciji intelekta koja obuhvaća posjedovanje širine i dubine znanja, ali i razvoja vještina i sposobnosti koje omogućuju djelovanje u smislenim aktivnostima. „Kultiviranjem intelekta prepoznaje važnost stjecanja praktičnog znanja i odgoja i obrazovanje za djelovanje, prihvaćanje načela obrazovanja cjelovite osobe koje uključuje emocionalno, moralno i duhovno oblikovanje, te prisvaja pedagoško stajalište prema kojem su jednako relevantni iskustvo, sposobnosti i vještine te interesi pojedinca” (Mulchay, 2009, str. 484). Osim što prema klasičnoj interpretaciji liberalno obrazovanje podrazumijeva kultiviranje uma, prijenos kulturnog naslijeđa, vođenje dobrog života, ono označava i potrebu za samoaktualiziranjem osobe i to istodobno kroz razvoj kompetencija i odgoj osobnosti kao i jačanje osobne učinkovitosti. Dostizanje samoostvarenja čovjeka, ne samo kroz isključivi odgoj osobnosti već i usvajanje različitih kompetencija, na tragu je onog što odgoj i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo donosi u odgojno-obrazovni sustav.

Prepoznavanje teorije liberalnog obrazovanja kao mogućeg izvorišta znanstveno-teorijske rasprave je bitno, ali možda i nedovoljno u prihvaćanju obrazovne relevantnosti, ali i nužnosti odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo. Uz brojne razloge izdvajamo činjenicu kako ta teorijska pozicija, iako matično razvijena u tradiciji europske (antičke) filozofije,⁸ nije u dovoljnoj mjeri prihvaćena u tradiciji kontinentalne⁹ pedagogije. Stoga se pitamo koliko zajedničkog sadržaja ili odgojnog ideala dijele humanističko i liberalno obrazovanje? Humanistički odgoj i obrazovanje utemeljuje se na idealu humanizma koji ljudsku dobrobit, slobodu i dostojanstvo stavlja iznad političkih, ideoloških i ekonomskih ideala i interesa. Humanistički odgoj i obrazovanje utjelovljuju pojmovi *paidea* i *Bildung*¹⁰ matično kao dijelovi europske kulturne i teorijske tradicije i nešto što je samo unutar tog konteksta razumljivo i vrednovano kao odgojno-obrazovni ideal (znanja i intelekta). Suprotno tome teorija slobodnog obrazovanja razvija se u okviru modernizacije i moderniteta zapadnih društava, kao i filozofije i prakse pragmatizma. Središnji teorijski koncept ili ideal je oblikovanje intelekta i inteligencije putem ostvarivanja osobnog rasta. Valja istaknuti da je interpretacija tih dviju teorija odgoja i obrazovanja utemeljena

⁸ Lat. *Artes liberales*

⁹ U okviru pojma kontinentalne pedagogije prije svega se misli na snažnu tradiciju njemačke pedagogije.

¹⁰ Pojam *Bildung* zadržavamo u izvornom obliku jezičnog znaka zbog nemogućnosti određivanja primjerenog pojma u hrvatskom jeziku koji bi objedinjavao cjelokupno značenje izvornog pojma na njemačkom jeziku.

na činjenici istodobnog postojanja i nepostojanja razlika. Naime, *Bildung* se može također razumjeti kao put ostvarivanja čovjekovog razvoja koji u konačnici dovodi do vlastitog samoodređenja, slobode, emancipacije, autonomije, zrelosti, odlučnosti i odgovornosti. Nešto što je toliko tipično za humanistički odgoj i obrazovanje i toliko njegovano u pedagoškoj tradiciji, svoje ekvivalente može pronaći i u idealu osobnog rasta i razvoja. Ti središnji pojmovi isprepleću se u dvjestotinjak godina dugoj tradiciji filozofsko-pedagoških rasprava, ali i suvremenosti postmoderne i poststrukturalizma. Uz uvažavanje te teorijske tradicije i priznavanje postojanja relevantnih konceptijskih razlike u načinu na koji se dolazi do ostvarenja odgojnog ideala unutar jedne i druge teorijske perspektive uočeni teorijski dualizam nikako ne pokušavamo umanjiti, već raspravu razviti u smjeru prepoznavanja i priznavanja onih zajedničkih elemenata kojim bismo utvrdili sličnosti (zajedničku osnovu) liberalnog i humanističkog obrazovanja. Očigledno je da unutar teorije liberalnog obrazovanja pronalazimo više prostora za legitimiranje razvoja kompetencija nego što je to slučaj unutar humanističkog obrazovanja. Naime, u humanističkoj tradiciji postoji uvriježeno mišljenje da jedino intelektualna izvrsnost emancipira. Odgoj i obrazovanje s ciljem ostvarivanja svrhe ili funkcije koja ima određene utilitarističke prizvuke, npr. obrazovanje za stjecanje određenih umijeća ili vještina, u okviru humanističke tradicije može se smatrati nižim, ali i manje vrijednim oblikom odgoja koji ne pridonosi već udaljava od ostvarenja emancipacije kao odgojnog ideala. Na pitanje mogu li te dvije tradicije koegzistirati te imaju li išta zajedničko, Aloni (1997) odgovara putem svog integrativnog model. Temeljna premisa tog modela je, s jedne strane, egzistiranje različitih humanističkih tradicija kojima je ipak zajedničko da pomažu ljudima kako bi živjeli dobar i ispunjen život, a s druge ustanovljena činjenica da liberalizam i liberalno obrazovanje počivaju na humanizmu kao vrhovnom etičkom načelu. Prema Aloniju (1997) humanističko-liberalno obrazovanje je „slobodno i cjelovito kultiviranje i osnaživanje ljudskih bića na intelektualno moralan i prihvatljiv način s ciljem vođenja najboljeg mogućeg života, u temeljnim domenama kao pojedinci kroz aktualiziranje vlastitih potencijala i sklonosti; kao članovi društva kroz uključivanje i odgovorno građanstvo te kao ljudska bića putem neprestanog obogaćivanja i usavršavanja putem kolektivnih postignuća ljudske kulture” (Aloni, 1997, str. 97). Iako je po mnogočemu pozicija tog integrativnog modela deskriptivno-normativna, ona u prvi plan stavlja razvoj autonomne osobnosti, samostalnog i kritičkog mišljenja i procese akulturacije kao temeljne obrazovne principe. Suvremeno obrazovanje jest proces kultiviranja istodobno i karaktera i kompetencija, ali i proces akulturacije. S obzirom na iznimno širok raspon mogućih ishoda te koncepcije, nije jednostavno, a ni posve opravdano inzistirati na uspostavljanju jasne granice prema kojoj emancipacijski sadržaji mogu biti predmetom učenja i poučavanja, a oni koji se iščitavaju kao neoliberalni ne mogu. Prema teoriji slobodnog obrazovanja, svaki je sadržaj vrijedan znanja i obrazovanja ako omogućuje razvoj autentične osobnosti koja se može ostvariti na različitim područjima. Bez obzira na koji način iščitavamo sastavnice odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo,

ono iz pozicije liberalnog obrazovanja, ali i integrativnog modela humanističkog obrazovanja, ima svoje opravdanje. Emancipacija nije samo proces prepoznavanja i odupiranja društvenom porobljavanju već i preuzimanje odgovornosti za razvoj svojih potencijala i aktivni društveni angažman. Ako prihvatimo tu definiciju, onda ta koncepcija uvelike može mlade ljude pripremiti za znanja, informacije i kompetencije u skladu s načinom funkcioniranja suvremenog svijeta rada. Emancipacijski učinci te odgojno-obrazovne koncepcije, poput primjene kritičkog mišljenja, društvene i osobne odgovornosti, mogu biti tek dugoročno vrednovani. Paradoksalnost te koncepcije jest u tome da ako ona i stremlje k učvršćivanju neliberalnog mema, stečena znanja i ishodi mogu biti iskorišteni upravo za spoznavanje pokušaja neoliberalnog porobljavanja, djelovanje u smjeru napuštanja takvog položaja u društvu i borbu za pravednije i humanije društveno i radno okruženje.

Zaključak

Svrha ovog rada je ponajprije u otvaranju dijaloga unutar sveopće kritike odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo. Na temelju provedene analize ocjenjujemo da se prostorom podložnom kritici unutar konceptualizacije odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo mogu odrediti: ustrajavanje na kontekstualnoj neovisnosti, terminološka neodređenost poduzetništva, posebno unutar pedagoškog terminološkog korpusa i razvoj kulture poduzetnosti. Gledano pojedinačno ili u međudodnosu, na izdvojenim komponentama najbolje se ogleda nesustavnost teorijskog legitimiranja i dominacija političko-javne argumentacije s primjesama neoliberalne ideologije.

Koliko god bilo opravdano pitati se promiče li ova koncepcija neoliberalne vrijednosti ili ne promiče, ipak temeljna poteškoća u razumijevanju odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo ogleda se u nedostatnom znanstveno-teorijskom legitimiranju unutar pedagogije i/ili znanosti o obrazovanju. Izostavljanju potrebe za teorijsko-znanstvenim promišljanjima znatno pridonosi konceptualni razvoj na razinama javnih obrazovnih politika, koji stvara dojam da su neke druge razine mišljenja i argumentacije o odgoju i obrazovanju za poduzetništvo, kao što je empirijsko i teorijsko, malo vjerojatne i nužne. Provedena konceptualno-teorijska analiza ukazuje na to da se teorija liberalnog obrazovanja može upotrijebiti u njegovu razumijevanju već samom činjenicom jer *a priori* ne negira takav oblik odgoja i obrazovanja. Usmjeravanje prema temeljnim premisama navedene teorijske tradicije prokazuje moguću odgojnu vrijednost i osnažujuću funkciju. Naime, kultiviranje uma i kritičkog mišljenja, samoakualizacija čovjeka kao rezultat razvoja i karaktera i kompetencija, stjecanje složenih vještina učenja i praktičnog djelovanja, spoznavanje i razumijevanje svijeta u skladu s humanosti kao vrhovnim načelom samo su neke od premisa liberalnog obrazovanja podudarne s odgojem i obrazovanjem za poduzetništvo. U raspravu je unesen model integrativnog liberalnog i humanističkog obrazovanja (Aloni, 1997) kojim se dodatno argumentira komplementarnost liberalnih i humanističkih ciljeva prema humanizmu kao vrhovnoj vrijednosti i načelu. Međutim, ono što ne može biti razriješeno ni

uspоставljanjem solidne teorijske baze u tradicijama znanstveno-teorijske misli o odgoju i obrazovanju jest činjenica da izuzimajući poduzetništvo iz okvira matične disciplinarnosti značajnije mijenjamo njegove ontološke karakteristike. S obzirom na to da je koncepcija odgoja i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo već neko vrijeme sastavni dio školskih kurikula, njegova konceptualizacija mora ići u smjeru utvrđivanja značenja i načina provođenja u odgojnoj praksi s ciljem utvrđivanja opisno-činjeničnog, a ne normativno-propisanog, razumijevanja i značenja za nositelje odgojno-obrazovnog procesa.

Odgoj i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo može biti primjer pozitivne pedagogije, a ne antipedagogije jedino ako „to pozitivno nije odgoju izvana nametnuto u obliku univerzalnih vrlina, već sudionici odgojnog procesa dogovaraju i određuju vrijednosti i razvijaju one vrline koje smatraju važnima za ono što žele svojim, samostalnim, slobodnim djelovanjem postići“ (Bognar i Simel, 2013). Iz rezultata istraživanja vidljivo je kako nastavnici, kao ključni nositelji promjena u odgoju i obrazovanju, preferiraju i afirmiraju upravo one odlike i ishode odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo koji imaju emancipacijski karakter. Razine prihvaćanja vanjskih i unutarnjih ciljeva odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo i u skladu s tim pripadajućih ishoda variraju, a prednost u okvirima odgojne poželjnosti daje se unutrašnjim ciljevima dok se vanjski ciljevi iščitavaju kroz neoliberalnu prizmu. Pokušaji razumijevanja poduzetništva putem mobilizacije vrlina kreativnosti, inovativnosti, odgovornosti i sl. pokazuju da se u odgojno-obrazovnom smislu subjektivizacija poduzetništva odvija u suprotnom smjeru od one društvene identificirane u radovima Marttile (2013 a, b). Rezultati istraživanja pokazuju kako je interes škola, ali i artikulacija nastavnika u okviru rasprave o mogućim ciljevima te koncepcije na prvom mjestu stavlja odlika koje možemo svesti pod nazivnik *razvoj kreativnog i inovativnog subjekta* koji uči i za kojeg postoje realna očekivanja da će završetkom školovanja postati *aktivan društveni subjekt* (građanin). Međutim, dio unutarnjih i vanjskih ciljeva koji vodi prema usvajanju funkcionalnih elemenata poduzetništva kao vještine i kompetencije, jačanju kapaciteta za vlastito zapošljavanje i stvaranje preduvjeta za razvoj budućeg poduzetništva, u većem dijelu provedenih istraživanja, nastavnici odbacuju. Čini se da interes škole koji se artikulira u stavovima nastavnika, pa time i procjena uloga odgoja i obrazovanja, nije u kultiviranju osobe kao „širitelja ekonomije“. Suvremeni učenik kao budući širitelj ekonomije, osoba koja djeluje unutar tog istog slobodnog tržišta, jest najmanje prihvaćen i poželjan ishod. Stah od proširenja neoliberalnog mema na područje odgoja i obrazovanja, kroz svjesno prihvaćanje odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo utemeljuje nekoliko čimbenika. Prije svega, osim prisutnog socijalnog elementa, iz analize ciljeva vidljivo je da razvoj poduzetništva kao poslovnog procesa i usvajanje određenih funkcionalnih aspekata, poput vještina i kompetencija, pobuđuje sumnju kako je krajnji cilj te odgojno-obrazovne koncepcije u stvaranju poduzetnika i stavljanju škola u funkciju zadovoljenja potreba slobodnog tržišta. Pri čemu slobodno tržište kao superiorni mehanizam čovjekova ostvarenja i *homo oeconomicus* kao odgojni ideal

postaju izravni oblik neoliberalne ili spekulativne pedagogije. Uvažavajući artikulirane vrijednosti i pozitivne osobine izražene u stavovima nastavnika, a kojima može rezultirati poučavanje u toj koncepciji, zaključujemo da je poduzetnost ljudska vrлина, odlika osobnosti, odraz složenog odnosa znanja i vještina koji se može artikulirati kao cilj i ishod suvremenog odgoja. Značenje poduzetnosti potrebno je u ciljevima i ishodima učenja i poučavanja pomno odrediti. Ostavljajući je neovisnom o kontekstu, riskiramo učiniti ga pojmom bez svoje prave težine te izgubiti ne samo terminološki potencijal već i ključni parametar vrednovanja u razvoju karaktera i osobnosti.

Gdje je granica poduzetništva kao poželjne odgojno-obrazovne vrijednosti i poduzetništva kao neoliberalne vrijednosti? Identificirati neoliberalni diskurs znači i dalje ustrajavati na znanstvenim istraživanjima i teorijskim analizama koji moraju biti protuteža argumentima javnih politika. Ograničenja ove analize proizlaze iz općeg pristupa, bez detaljnijeg ulaznje u specifičnosti pojedinih modela odgoja i obrazovanja za poduzetništvo. Buduće analize, ako budu težile utvrđivanju preciznijih formi neoliberalnog diskursa, moraju se usmjeriti prema pojedinačnim modelima, poznavanju specifičnih društveno-kulturnih uvjeta, ali i odgojno-obrazovnih posebnosti. Nadalje, bitno ograničenje u ovom radu čine pojmovi osnaživanje i emancipacija koji su korišteni u formi istoznačnica. Međutim, preciznije odgovoriti na pitanje je teži li odgoj i obrazovanje za poduzetništvo razvoju poduzetnosti te je li ono prilika za osobni razvoj i emancipaciju ili oblik institucionalne prilagodbe tržišnim mehanizmima u društvu, leži u napuštanju istoznačnosti u pojmovima emancipacija i osnaživanje. Uspostavljanjem predložene konceptualne razlike možemo dobiti snažan analitički alat. Ipak, nepoželjnost neoliberalizma i poželjnost emancipacije pojednostavljeno su artikulirani polovi puno kompleksnije slike oprečnosti modernističke i postmodernističke interpretacije obrazovanja, teorijske „dihotomije” liberalnog i humanističkog odgoja i obrazovanja, te vječite oprečnosti javno-političkog i znanstveno-teorijskog mišljenja. Granicu liberalnih i neoliberalnih interpretacija dakako ne čini jedan prefiks, već oprečnost humanističkih vrijednosti i vrijednosti slobodnog tržišta. Spoznavanje te granice leži u našoj profesionalnoj odgovornosti i imanentnoj refleksivnosti. Upravo ukazivanjem na moralnu dimenziju pedagogije Giroux (2004, str. 500) nas podsjeća na to da je „odgovornost nastavnika i drugih akademskih elita neraskidiva od posljedica koje imaju znanja koja proizvodimo, socijalnih odnosa koje opravdavamo te ideologija i identiteta koje nudimo učenicima”.