

# Entrepreneurship education: a proposal for human development\*

## *Educación para el emprendimiento: una propuesta para el desarrollo humano*

**Arantxa AZQUETA, PhD.** Associate Professor. Universidad de Navarra ([aazqueta@unav.es](mailto:aazqueta@unav.es)).

**Concepción NAVAL, PhD.** Professor. Universidad de Navarra ([cnaval@unav.es](mailto:cnaval@unav.es)).

### **Abstract:**

Interest in entrepreneurship education has become an international trend with a major impact in the field of education. It is promoted in all educational stages from early years to higher education. This piece uses a theoretical research methodology that focusses on interpretation based on academic literature. Its aim is to reflect on and encourage improvements in educational practice. The proposal offers a critical perspective on the inclusion of entrepreneurship education in the curriculum. It aims to look more closely at the keys to strengthening the value of en-

trepreneurship education using a humanistic anthropological paradigm. Entrepreneurship education is defined as an educational focus that enhances entrepreneurial potential in students and contributes to their all-round growth. It is not just limited to socio-economic and professional growth but places a particular focus on the intellectual, social, and moral dimensions of their development. First of all, it helps to stimulate intelligence by developing creativity and innovation, both of which are intrinsic and unique to all human beings and to their freedom. Secondly, it promotes social development, encouraging relation-

---

\* This piece is part of the research output of the Education, Citizenship, and Character consolidated research group of the Universidad de Navarra (<https://www.unav.edu/web/facultad-de-educacion-y-psicologia/educacion-y-ciudadania>).

Revision accepted: 2018-11-22..

This is the English version of an article originally printed in Spanish in issue 274 of the **revista española de pedagogía**. For this reason, the abbreviation EV has been added to the page numbers. Please, cite this article as follows: Azqueta, A., & Naval, C. (2019). Educación para el emprendimiento: una propuesta para el desarrollo humano | *Entrepreneurship education: a proposal for human development*. *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, 77 (274), 517-533. doi: <https://doi.org/10.22550/REP77-3-2019-03>

<https://revistadepedagogia.org/>

ISSN: 0034-9461 (Print), 2174-0909 (Online)

Year 77, n. 274, September-December 2019, 517-533  
revista española de pedagogía



ships that transcend mere reciprocity and aim to find the common good and not just economic well-being. Finally, it stimulates moral development, which involves an awareness of freedom and entails autonomy and leadership. This proposal for entrepreneurship education is part of a line of work that underlines the intrinsic goal of education by focusing on the personal needs of the student and allows for entrepreneurial development to manifest the explicit relationship between the individual, education, and society.

**Keywords:** entrepreneurship education, educational anthropology, humanistic education, educational development.

### Resumen:

El interés por la educación emprendedora se presenta como una tendencia educativa internacional que ha calado con fuerza en la institución educativa. Se promueve su desarrollo en todas las etapas educativas, desde la educación temprana a la educación superior. Esta aportación analiza la inclusión de la educación para el emprendimiento en el currículo desde una perspectiva crítica, profundizando en la búsqueda de las claves que permitan fortalecer el valor educativo de la educación emprendedora, desde los planteamientos de la antropología humanista. Para ello, se emplea una metodología de investigación teórica con

un enfoque analítico e interpretativo, fundamentado en la literatura académica y se busca la reflexión que favorezca, con posterioridad, el desarrollo de líneas de mejora en la práctica educativa. La educación emprendedora se define como el enfoque educativo que posibilita el crecimiento del potencial emprendedor de los estudiantes y contribuye al crecimiento integral, principalmente de las dimensiones intelectual, societaria y moral de la persona, y no se limita al crecimiento socioeconómico y laboral. Favorece, en primer lugar, el crecimiento de la inteligencia a través del desarrollo de la creatividad y de la innovación, anclado en el carácter irreplicable del ser humano y de su libertad; en segundo lugar, el crecimiento social, que promueve la relacionalidad más allá de la reciprocidad, busca el bien común y no solo el bienestar económico, y favorece el desarrollo de virtudes sociales como la solidaridad y la cooperación; y para finalizar, el crecimiento moral, que supone el desarrollo de la libertad e implica el crecimiento de la autonomía y el liderazgo. Esta propuesta de educación para el emprendimiento se inscribe en una línea de trabajo que subraya la finalidad intrínseca de la educación, pone en primer lugar las necesidades personales del educando y posibilita que la educación emprendedora manifieste la relación explícita entre educación, persona y sociedad.

**Descriptor:** educación emprendedora, antropología educativa, educación humanística, educación y desarrollo.

## 1. Introduction

In recent years, interest in an entrepreneurial culture has become much stronger in our society. It is seen as a method that encourages the change of mindset European society needs to adapt to the requirements of the 21st century General Assembly of the United Nations, 2000, 2015; European Council, 2000; European Commission, 2012, 2014). This situation has increased attention to entrepreneurship education all over the world (Nabi, Liñán, Fayolle, Krueger, & Walmsley, 2017; Hornsby, Messersmith, Rutherford, & Simmons, 2018).

In the case of Spain, educating entrepreneurial skills has become an aim of the educational system in the last decade. Both Spain's Organic Education Law (LOE) (2/2006) and its Organic Law to Improve the Quality of Education (LOMCE) (8/2013) explicitly state in their preambles their strong commitment to the objectives and concerns raised by the United Nations and the European Union since the start of the 21st century. Furthermore, Law 14/2013, Supporting Entrepreneurs and their Globalisation mentions the need to strengthen entrepreneurial culture through education. It is also worth noting that the inscription of the *sense of initiative and entrepreneurial spirit* competence as a key element in compulsory education ensures that this competence will be lasting (Orden ECD 65/2015).

This situation has involved strengthening the connections between educational institutions and interest in entrepreneurialism. Finding a place in the

classroom for entrepreneurship education is presented as something desirable. This context provides incentives for researchers in education to provide a theoretical grounding, and this article aims to participate in this task. The main aim of this work is to encourage reflection and facilitate the development of lines for improving educational practice. We have used a theoretical research methodology with an analytical and interpretative study-focus based on academic literature. We chose this method because it is regarded as appropriate for a conceptual and theoretical piece that sets out to understand the phenomenon of entrepreneurship and provide information of interest for the field of education.

## 2. Including entrepreneurship training in education: a critical analysis

There is an extensive bibliography on entrepreneurship education. This reflects the interest in this discipline from a very wide variety of perspectives, although the focus that associates it with economic growth and the creation of companies is dominant (Jones, Maas, & Pittaway, 2017; Bernal Guerrero & Cárdenas, 2017; Nabi et al., 2017). We are in a period of deep changes in the economic sector, as a result of the technological revolution and globalisation, in which an economic model dominated by entrepreneurial values is developing.

In this model, knowledge — primarily technical and scientific — is the dominant factor of production. Creativity, the ability to communicate, and emotional

intelligence are important factors and innovation provides a competitive advantage. Being able to innovate and accept risks is a key element in the knowledge society (Bernal Guerrero, Granados, & González Donoso, 2014).

Medium- and long-term investment in education reactivates economies and balances industrial systems that lack qualified staff and require workers with specific skills that add value in the market. Successful innovation depends on human creativity — knowledge, skills, and talents — that is, to a great extent, developed through education. Accordingly, the European Education Area, with its competence-based training, links social and workplace demands to the requirements of the market (Michavila, Martínez, Martín-González, García-Peñalvo, & Cruz-Benito, 2016; Martínez Clares & González Morgia, 2018).

The efforts driven by current educational reforms have a fundamentally neo-liberal inspiration that shapes the educational policy the European Union promotes (Erkkilä, 2000; Rae, 2010; Komulainen, Naskali, Korhonen, & Keskitalo-Foley, 2011; Business, Innovation & Skills Department, 2015; Fougère, Segercrantz, & Seeck, 2017). The reasoning that supports the concept of education we wish to focus on is the theory of human capital, set out and established in the middle of the last century on the basis of sociological studies by Theodore Schultz (1961), Gary Becker (1964), and Jacob Mincer (1974). This theory is complemented by the perspective of functionalist sociological model of

reality, which is characterised by utilitarianism and places the greatest importance on innovation, technological creation, and interest in the economic capacity of individuals and society (Espejo, 2001). Likewise, entrepreneurship synthesises some of the characteristics of cognitive capitalism, which makes the role of entrepreneur a professional profile that adapts to the new practices of flexibility, initiative, creativity, and innovation that the market requires (Ruiz-Herrero, 2013).

The need to remove interest in entrepreneurship education from the political and economic debate should be underlined. Education is not just a way of achieving a goal, but instead is a project in itself. It defines itself as being for the benefit of the human being, and it contributes to his or her personal development, not just to increasing productivity and economic profitability. According to Ibáñez-Martín and Fuentes (2017), increased economic power does not result in improved human development, but instead other determining factors are necessary for these capacities to reach their greatest extent, develop, and benefit society. It is vital that entrepreneurship education has foundations that ensure that its impulse is not limited to developing the skills that improve productive capacity.

Those in charge of educational policies cite economic progress as an educational objective, and they trust in economic ideas and concepts to guide their work. Economic progress is measured through satisfaction of preferences, and its main aim is to improve well-being: the higher the level

of satisfaction, the greater the well-being. Accordingly, satisfying preferences becomes an object of debate for philosophers of education (Gilead, 2012).

This approach, which has utilitarian roots, can make people into means for achieving progress rather than ends to consider and for whom to make economic progress possible. This could be described as dehumanising, as it treats the individual as a what, not a who. The goal that shapes educational actions cannot just be subjective in nature, as then it would only resolve a transitory need, for example, increasing rates of self-employment, stimulating the growth of the business fabric, or alleviating a social problem. This perspective gives entrepreneurship education a short-termist functionality with an extrinsic motivation geared towards achieving the results society demands. Instead, interest in entrepreneurship education should contribute to the integral growth and development of the human individual.

It is important not to give legitimacy as subjects of educational interest to areas that only have an instrumental rationale or only contribute to the progress of science and technology (Bauman, 2013). A society and education focussed on efficiency and utility to excess, limiting what is reasonable to the technical and instrumental, may run the risk of becoming dehumanised or denaturalised. In the words of Barrio (2013), this happens “because the truly meaningful reality for people is only the one they build” (p. 17). In the early 20th century, the philosopher Dewey

noted how “the lack of understanding of human nature is the primary cause of disregard for it. Lack of insight always ends in despising or else unreasoned admiration” (Dewey, 2002, p. 3).

To stop education becoming a transitory practice or interest, it is important that it has an anthropological foundation in line with the nature of the human being and that it is not guided solely by productive and economic needs. It has intrinsic value, combining excellence and ethics, and seeks a “good life” so that people can live full, ethical, and productive lives (Nucci, Krettenauer, & Narváez, 2014). Consequently, Lackeus (2017) states that entrepreneurship education that which is oriented towards others, that develops the pursuit of the benefit of others in students, mitigates the discipline’s neoliberal tendencies.

Neoliberalism in education sees the individual in economic terms, emphasises the importance of the autonomous individual, and regards freedom as the ability to choose (Lynch, 2006). This approach favours the development of human inventiveness and initiative, which are at the base of entrepreneurial initiative, but forgets that freedom serves the common good.

Educational policies should have an intrinsic and perfective objective, permitting the overall improvement of the capacities of people in themselves. The most important educational task is to help new generations find values that help them act and make decisions, that provide illumination

to answer the question of what type of life I want to live and what I should learn in order to live this life (Pring, 2016). In this regard, entrepreneurship education is a dual reality, not just covering economic principles but also involving the development of the personality and the exercise of freedom.

In addition, we must note that entrepreneurship education originates in the economic sphere and business education is at the origin of the entrepreneurial culture. These aspects contribute to it having a marked economic and entrepreneurial character and to the prevalence of the perspective that identifies it with the creation of businesses (Pepin, 2012; Peña, Cárdenas, Rodríguez Martín & Sánchez-Lissen, 2015). This confusion is to some extent logical given their conceptual affinity.

In many developed and developing countries, entrepreneurship education features in syllabuses from an early age (Mahieu, 2006; Volkman, Wilson, Mariotti, Rabuzzi, Vyakarnam, & Sepulveda, 2009; Mwasalwiba, 2010; Draycott & Rae, 2011; Rosendahl, Sloof, & Van Praag, 2014; Moberg, 2014; Jayawarna, Jones, & Macpherson, 2015; Eurydice, 2016). This paradigm is based on the premise that, in a mature economy, growth in the quantity and quality of business activity will be in proportion to the quality of business training. However, this paradigm is not universal. Numerous authors oppose it for a variety of reasons, raising doubts about its effectiveness (Matlay, 2006, 2007), questioning the educational value of learning

how to develop a business plan (Neck & Greene, 2011; Jones & Penaluna, 2013), or believing that it promotes the market ideology and neoliberalism, for which reason a significant proportion of teachers oppose it (Erkkilä, 2000; Lynch, 2006; Johannisson, 2010; Rae, 2010; Komulainen et al., 2011; Gill, 2014; Fougère et al., 2017; Lackeus, 2017). There are also authors who suggest that entrepreneurship training in primary education stages should support the development of students' entrepreneurial skills but with a non-commercial focus (Iredale, 1993; Lewis & Massey, 2003; Hitty, 2008). Similarly, there are some proposals that serve as incubators for the development of community projects and encourage entrepreneurship education with a marked cooperative element. They seek an impact beyond the economic, identifying problems in the environment and proposing creative solutions (Bel, Fernández-Guadaño, Lejarriaga, & Martín-López, 2016).

If entrepreneurship education sticks closely to the development of the business fabric, there is the risk that it will become a pedagogy of business culture (Bernal Guerrero, 2015). According to Barroso (2015), an early education in entrepreneurship that lacks educational meaning would raise questions about how advisable it is to support early education that specialises in other professional options or is associated with other ways of life.

These ideas suggest a need for an alternative model of entrepreneurship education that prioritises the individual and cooperates in the growth of all of its dimensions and is not limited to developing

business projects. From this perspective, the proposal set out below considers in greater depth — within the limits this space offers — the theoretical framework of entrepreneurship education. This is a prerequisite that helps to consolidate entrepreneurial competence, both as a cross-sectional competence developing an educational focus that favours the growth of the students' entrepreneurial potential and when it is proposed as an independent subject with its own identity in syllabuses.

### 3. Proposal for an anthropological basis for entrepreneurship education

We start from the hypothesis that entrepreneurship education requires a conceptual foundation rooted in anthropology that places the individual at the centre of pedagogical reflection, responds to a plan for the human being and society which is in accordance with human nature, and contributes to the harmonious growth of all dimensions of the individual. We have chosen the perspective of humanistic anthropology because it protects the individual, prevents transient interests from being treated as educational priorities, and prevents the individual from being guided by productive and economical needs. UNESCO has recently encouraged a humanistic conception of education and development that differs from utilitarianism and economism. It suggests that it would be desirable for education to integrate the many dimensions of human existence, based on solid ethical and moral founda-

tions, and for it to help forge the social, economic, and environmental dimensions of a new model for sustainable development (UNESCO, 2015).

The corresponding pedagogical perspective derives from the concept of the human individual. It is necessary to listen to the suggestions society makes, but the educator's reflection is concerned with protecting the aims and principles that govern the educational endeavour. This is an operative task that leads what is taught being selected in order to favour human education and contribute to personal fulfilment.

In this regard, the importance of considering the individual as a principle and not just as a result is apparent (Altarejos & Naval, 2011). The attribution of his or her actions is in play, and these are free and responsible and not just the result of social, economic, biological, and technical factors. Under this model we make a proposal with anthropological foundations, which starting from humanistic assumptions elaborates on entrepreneurship education's contribution to the growth of all dimensions of the individual. It directly and primarily contributes to the development of: 1) the intellectual dimension, 2) the social dimension, and 3) the moral dimension.

This approach fits in with an education "that can bring unity to all aspects of the life of an individual" (García Hoz, 1981, p. 24). In this way, entrepreneurship education is integrated into the syllabus, either independently or transversally but always

contributing to the growth of all dimensions of the individual.

### 3.1. Contribution to development of the intellectual dimension

Of the different dimensions of the person, the intellectual one stands out first, with a dual purpose: a theoretical purpose, providing knowledge of the world, and a practical one, helping interact with reality and discover new possibilities. Entrepreneurship education is integrated into the practical purpose as it contributes to the development of creativity, which is understood as improvement in the capacity to think differently, as well as of the capacity to solve problems and develop strategic thinking which enables the search for opportunities and a readiness to achieve.

There is currently great interest in creativity, boosted by the growing value given to innovation, which is regarded as a basic tool for sustainability and for the development of any project. In turn, innovation is of interest because it makes socio-economic improvement possible and opens up new business opportunities (European Commission, 2007; Wagner, 2014).

Creativity, as the ability to create ideas and find solutions for problems, reflects the distinctiveness of the person. The person's actions show its distinctive way of working, its original and creative character, given the novelty each person provides in his or her unrepeatability. Creativity therefore guides us to undertake a variety of actions such as thinking, seeking relationships, establishing and prioritising

objectives, responding to a changing environment, creating future strategies, and designing or solving life problems (García Hoz, 1981; Pérez Alonso-Geta, 2009).

Consequently, creativity is important for people and for society. Nevertheless, it is not solely associated with the creation of economic value, but rather is an element of personal development. Otherwise, it becomes dehumanised. This is how entrepreneurship education, anchored in the unrepeatability nature of human beings and their freedom, bears the mark of constructive intentionality directed at performing positive actions, both for society and for people.

Throughout the 20th century, alongside the concept of creativity, the concept of innovation developed, and has come to occupy a central place on the stages of world politics and economy. The links between creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship have been strengthened, as three interrelated processes in which the capacity for innovation creates value and new opportunities (Edwards-Schachter, García-Granero, Sánchez-Barrioluengo, Quesada-Pineda, & Amara, 2015).

The creativity-innovation-entrepreneurship trio is based on Schumpeter's *creative destruction* model (2010)<sup>1</sup>. This regards creativity as a precursor for innovative behaviour and a central feature of the potential and of the entrepreneurial effort of individuals. A type of behaviour is classed as entrepreneurial when it includes innovation. But this, in turn, must be accompanied by values that promote a better society (Ceberio, 2009).

### 3.2. Contribution to development of the social dimension

Secondly, entrepreneurship education contributes to the growth of the social dimension. In this work, we start from the focus of relational sociology (Donati, 2002, 2006). This approach is compatible with an education rooted in the individual as a being who coexists and grows as a giving being (Polo, 2006). Both of these perspectives, sociological and anthropological, complement each other and are vital in syllabuses that prioritise the formative dimension and at the same time consider the relationship with social reality.

The individual is fulfilled at an essential level by living in society, not just because of the need to relate to others but also because he or she is a relationship. This idea is linked to the systematic human character proposed by Polo (2006), in which *systemic* involves the interrelation of diverse elements, so that what affects one of them affects the others in some way.

From this perspective, entrepreneurship education simultaneously contributes to personal development and to changing and improving society. Its foundation is the fact that the individual does not just establish relationships but rather is a relational being who is realised through giving because human beings not only give, but are given when they hand over their gifts (Altarejos & Naval, 2011). This gives a new perspective on student-society relationships where any improvement in the individual is immediately an improvement in society.

Relational education is not limited to utility nor is it merely a vehicle for solving social problems. It sees the individual as the main subject of all social action, open to his or her setting and to others, and constantly committed to society and social improvement, beyond his or her material well-being. It seeks to educate active and committed citizens who can create relationships and goods for others in line with human nature and in which reciprocity, team work, and assistance are key elements (Sandoval & Garro, 2012). One challenge in entrepreneurship education is to contribute to the establishment of solid, meaningful, and ethical social relationships and give them meaning beyond utilitarian criteria. In this approach, the pillars supporting entrepreneurship education are social virtues like sociability, solidarity, and social cooperation, the service dimension, and the common good because they show the supportive potential and humanising character of relationships. Individuals are capable of identifying shared objectives and goals based on shared needs and so come to create a collective identity in which all of them recognise themselves, always respecting and welcoming the personal identity of each one (Sandoval & Garro, 2012). This way, relationships are humanised and the individualism that denies the relational character of the individual and closes it in on itself is avoided.

According to Donati (2006) and Zamagni (2012), this is possible if the individual is prioritised and relations of reciprocity (*homo reciprocans*) take precedence over exchange (*homo oeconomicus*). Zamagni

(2012) invokes a relationality that is not the type characterising exchange, but rather reciprocity. The first type is instrumental: even though the person enters into a relationship with somebody, this other person is just a means to an end. The principle of exchange states I will give you something on condition that you give me something of equivalent value in exchange. Reciprocity, however, cannot be understood in terms of self-interest: I give you something freely so that you, in turn, can give to others in accordance with your abilities.

Therefore, putting the principle of reciprocity into practice in education becomes the practical objective of entrepreneurship education, which takes shape as a means of social regeneration and of concern for the individual. This approach gives precedence to relationships based on reciprocity, abandons immanence, and pursues the common good, not just exchange of value and economic well-being. It aims to create the capacity to detect good and put it into practice, not just sporadically but as a stable habit.

### 3.3. Contribution to development of the moral dimension

Finally, thanks to its eminently practical character, entrepreneurship education is an opportunity and a medium for moral education. Educational quality is subordinated to the dignity, profundity, and scope of the values we can elicit (Díaz-Torres & Rodríguez-Gómez, 2008).

Moral education is inseparably associated with intellectual education. Although

they are conceptually different, they are not separated at an operational level. The anthropological perspective demands that, from the educational viewpoint, moral education focuses on the development of virtues (Peters, 1969; Altarejos & Naval, 2011; Nucci et al., 2014).

The crisis in Western societies is not restricted to productivity or to the economy. Instead, it is rooted in a deeper anthropological and moral crisis, one which is both individual and social, a crisis of convictions and foundations of society, that needs to strengthen its principles and provide the basis for the educational work of policies and supranational systems of education. Entrepreneurship education is as a link between society and individuals and is an opportunity to develop and improve society. What is taught, how it is taught, and why it is taught will have an influence on the form of democratic political systems and on the values of future generations (Medina, 2001).

Entrepreneurship education encourages the development of students' moral sensitivity "to build shared moral principles that aim to be universal without ceasing to foster conditions that help recognise the differences, values, traditions, and culture in general of each community" (Díaz-Torres & Rodríguez-Gómez, 2008, p. 163).

On the one hand, entrepreneurship education's links with autonomy are clear because it develops self-knowledge and the responsible exercise of freedom. Also with leadership, understood at a personal level, where leaders guide their own lives

in accordance with a set of principles and their competences are habits that define their personal identities.

The exercise of autonomy has a special importance in modern societies, which are undergoing a process of dissolution of responsibilities (Bauman, 2013). Arendt (1996) observes that autonomy avoids the tyranny of the majority and prepares people for the task of renovating a shared world. According to Altarejos and Naval (2011), the interest in autonomy is connected to the development of freedom, which defines human nature and involves an increase in the possibilities for action, which the individual collaborates with in the subjective realisation of the desired benefit. Personal development and individual self-realisation currently have a strong weight in the formative task. They involve developing responsibility, as well as exercising one's own opinion and decision making, critical spirit, assuming risks, and personal integrity. Exercising autonomy tightens relationships with responsibility. This is not just a case of an autonomy that leads people to perform actions, but that through these actions, they establish a commitment with the world and create an identity. We are — partly — the result of what we do and through our own actions the human condition becomes established.

In turn, entrepreneurship education has a close connection with leadership understood in its personal dimension. This is defined as “the capacity to guide one's own life following coherent principles with a true understanding of one's own world, so that a well-lived life is finally achieved, in

other words, a stable and profound inner happiness” (Cardona & García-Lombardía, 2005, p. 137). This task is possible if entrepreneurship education is given an anthropological basis that does not vary according to the cultural context and which makes this interest durable. The competences pertinent to leadership are habits that define the leader's identity, give meaning to one's own life, and unfold one's own personal mission in time. This sense of a mission guides and promotes leadership competences.

Through entrepreneurship education it is possible to contribute to the development of civic virtues, solidarity, and cooperation. At the same time, from the personal sphere these strengthen the development of personal responsibility and help people value broadness of vision and moral interests. In this way they come to form foundations, and contribute to moral maturity. Moral and civic judgment and character combine. This approach distances itself from proposals that regards entrepreneurial competence as the development of technical skills or the creation of economic and business value. It sees entrepreneurship education as an opportunity to enrich the personality and forge habits of responsibility and commitment.

The following table contains a summary of the correspondence between the dimensions of the individual and the most important indicators of entrepreneurial competence. Future works will enable us to consider in greater depth the methodological strategies its development entails, understood as an opportunity for growth in all dimensions of the individual.

TABLE 1. Dimensions of the individual and indicators of entrepreneurial competence.

Intellectual dimension	Social dimension	Moral dimension
Imagination	Communication	Autonomy
Creativity	Sociability	Responsibility
Innovation	Service	Self-knowledge
Problem solving	Team work	Decision making
Seeking opportunities	Solidarity	Critical ability
Initiative	Social cooperation	Ethical and sustainable thinking
Readiness to achieve		Leadership

Source: Own elaboration.

#### 4. In conclusion

Interest in entrepreneurship education appears to be an international educational trend that has become strongly established in education as an institution and has gradually been introduced into syllabuses. Its development is being fostered as a means of favouring the change in mindset society needs to adapt to the requirements of the 21st century, where lifelong adaptation to change and entrepreneurship have become necessary imperatives. The economic crisis and high levels of unemployment have incentivised its development.

Socially, entrepreneurialism is a recent phenomenon but its human dimension is old and universal. What makes it new is that it has started to be seen as an economical phenomenon (García del Dujo, 2015). From the pedagogical perspective, a lack of consensus about the conceptual foundations that should underpin the entrepreneurship model of education is apparent. The entrepreneurial spirit has its origin and natural environment in the business world (Peña et al., 2015). Its development runs in parallel to economic theory and it use has only subsequently become

common in other areas. It is, therefore, a phenomenon with economic roots. In turn, the practical application of this subject is heterogeneous; it is often restricted to the development of productive and economic capacity and is associated with improving business creation skills.

Against this backdrop, the starting point for the present article was to collaborate on the theoretical basis of entrepreneurship education to ensure that it contributes to improving educational practice and facilitates the work of teachers (Pittaway, Aissaoui, & Fox, 2017; Bernal Guerrero & Cárdenas, 2017; Lackéus, 2017).

We adopted the humanistic anthropological perspective for two main reasons. Firstly, because, as we have made clear, entrepreneurship education has a strong economic identity that it is necessary to counteract. This task requires us to locate the individual at the centre of pedagogical reflection, responding to a plan for the human being and society that is in accordance with human nature and contributes to the harmonious growth of all dimensions of the individual.

Secondly, because the task of enterprise cannot be limited to improving business skills but instead, given its origins, it is a task that is specific to the human being, which does not limit itself to covering its needs but instead freely chooses the means to achieve an aim and tries to ensure that its contribution improves its surroundings. Initiative, along with the capacity for cooperation, are the central mechanisms of this activity.

Finally, with this proposal for entrepreneurship education, we intend to respond to students' personal needs and contribute to their all-round development, and also develop the transformative intent and strengthen the habit of thinking and working to improve one's surroundings. With this dual outlook, students' all-round education is favoured, along with tightening the bonds between education, person, and society.

## Note

1 *Creative destruction* is a concept Joseph Schumpeter introduced in economics. It is a process that favours economic growth, which is regarded as essential in the market economy because it drives constant evolution, change, and productive reorganisation of the economy.

## References

- Altarejos F., & Naval, C. (2011). *Filosofía de la educación*. Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra.
- Arendt, H. (1996). *La crisis en la educación*. Barcelona: Península.
- Barrio, J. M. (2013). *La innovación educativa pendiente. Formar personas*. Barcelona: Erasmus.
- Barroso, C. (2015). Emprendedor: cuando el término es más que una palabra. In L. Núñez-Cubero (Coord.), *Cultura emprendedora y Educación* (pp. 133-142). Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla.
- Bauman, Z. (2013). *Sobre la educación en un mundo líquido*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human Capital*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bel, P., Fernández-Guadaño, J., Lejarriaga, G., & Martín-López, S. (2016). La iniciativa emprendedora como base para la creación de empresas de participación. Un instrumento para la innovación social. *Cooperativismo y Desarrollo*, 24 (108), 1-50.
- Bernal Guerrero, A. (2015). Sobre la relevancia del factor personal en la investigación en educación emprendedora. In L. Núñez Cubero (Coord.), *Cultura emprendedora y Educación* (pp. 127-132). Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla.
- Bernal Guerrero, A., Granados, P. D., & González, M. D. (2014). Economy of knowledge, Entrepreneurial Culture and Employability in the field of Education. An Approximation to the Spanish Case. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 139, 168-174.
- Bernal Guerrero, A., & Cárdenas, A. (2017). Evaluación del potencial emprendedor en escolares. Una investigación longitudinal. *Educación XXI*, 20 (2), 73-94.
- Business, Innovation, & Skills Department (2015). *Fulfilling our potential: Teaching excellence, social mobility and student choice*. Retrieved from <http://xurl.es/pjfpjm> (Consulted on 2019-05-28).
- Cardona, P., & García-Lombardía, P. (2005). *Cómo desarrollar las competencias de liderazgo*. Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra.
- Ceberio, I. (2009). Innovación y creatividad en las personas. In M.<sup>a</sup> J. Madariaga (Eds.), *Filosofía de la innovación* (pp. 169-177). Madrid: Plaza Janés.
- Dewey, J. (2002). *Human nature and conduct*. New York: Dover Publication.
- Díaz Torres, J. M., & Rodríguez Gómez, J. M. (2008). La educación en valores como estrategia de desarrollo y consolidación de la persona moral. *Estudios sobre Educación*, 15, pp. 159-169.
- Donati, P. (2002). *Introduzione alla sociologia relazionale*. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- Donati, P. (2006). *Repensar la sociedad. El enfoque relacional*. Madrid: Ediciones Internacionales Universitarias.

- Draycott, M., & Rae, D. (2011). Enterprise education in schools and the role of competency frameworks. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 17 (2), 127-145.
- Edwards-Schachter, M., García-Granero, A., Sánchez-Barrioluengo, M., Quesada-Pineda, H., Amara, N. (2015). Disentangling competences: Interrelationships on creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship. *Thinking skills and creativity*, 16, 27-39.
- Erkkilä, K. (2000). *Entrepreneurial Education. Mapping the debates in the United States, the United Kingdom and Finland*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Espejo, B. (2001). *Políticas educativas para el nuevo siglo*. Salamanca: Hespérides.
- European Commission (2007). *Entrepreneurship education in Europe: fostering Entrepreneurial mindsets through education and learning. The Oslo Agenda for Entrepreneurship Education in Europe*. Retrieved from <http://xurl.es/7784t> (Consulted on 28-05-2019).
- European Commission (2012). COM (2012) 669/final 2, 12 February 2013. *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of Regions. A new concept of education: investing in competences to achieve better socioeconomic results*. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2x0bJFS> (Consulted on 28-05-2019).
- European Commission (2014). COM (2014) 130 final, 5 March 2014. *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Review of the Europe 2020 strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth*. Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/1/2014/ES/1-2014-130-ES-F1-1.Pdf> (Consulted on 2019-05-28).
- European Council (2000). *Conclusions of the Presidency. European Council of Lisbon 23 and 24 March 2000*. Retrieved from <http://xurl.es/gunbm> (Consulted on 2019-05-28).
- Eurydice (2016). *La educación para el Emprendimiento en los centros educativos en Europa. Informe de Eurydice*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Fougère, M., Segercrantz, B., & Seeck, H. (2017). A critical reading of the European Union's social innovation policy discourse: (Re)legitimizing neoliberalism. *Organization*, 24 (6), 819-843.
- García del Dujo, A. (2015). De la utilidad de las virtudes clásicas (para resguardar al sujeto de las inclemencias del tiempo). In L. Núñez Cubero (Coord.), *Cultura emprendedora y Educación* (pp. 61-68). Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla.
- García Hoz, V. (1981). *Educación personalizada*. Madrid: Rialp.
- General Assembly of the United Nations (18 Sep 2000). *Resolution 55/2. United Nations Millennium Declaration*. Retrieved from <http://xurl.es/40q1w> (Consulted on 2019-05-28).
- General Assembly of the United Nations (21 Oct 2015). *Resolution 70/1. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. Retrieved from <http://xurl.es/nevkr> (Consulted on 2019-05-28).
- Gilead, T. (2012). Education and the Logic of Economic Progress. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 46 (1), 113-131.
- Gill, R. (2014). If you're struggling to survive day-to-day: class optimism and contradiction in entrepreneurial discourse. *Organization*, 21 (1), 50-67.
- Hitty, U. (2008). Enterprise education in different cultural settings and at different school levels. In A. Fayolle, & P. Kyrö (Eds.), *The dynamics between entrepreneurship, environment and education* (pp. 131-148). Cheltenham-Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Hornsby, J. S., Messersmith, J., Rutherford, M., & Simmons, S. (2018). Entrepreneurship everywhere: across campus, across communities and across borders. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 56 (1), 4-10.
- Ibáñez-Martín, J. A., & Fuentes, J. L. (Eds.) (2017). *Educación y capacidades. Hacia un nuevo enfoque del desarrollo humano*. Madrid: Dykinson.
- Iredale, N. (1993). Enterprise education in primary schools: a survey in two northern LEAs'. *Education + Training*, 35 (4), 22-30.
- Jayawarna, D. Jones, O., & Macpherson, A. (2015). Becoming an entrepreneur: the unexplored role of childhood and adolescent human capital. In D. Rae, & C. L. Wang (Eds.), *Entrepreneurial Learning: New Perspectives in Research, Education and Practice* (pp. 45-72). London: Routledge.

- Johannisson, B. (2010). The agony of the Swedish school when confronted by entrepreneurship (pp 91-106). In K. Kogen, & J. Sjøvoll (Eds.), *Creativity and Innovation. Preconditions for entrepreneurial education*. Trondheim: Tapir Academic Press.
- Jones, C., & Penaluna, A. (2013). Moving beyond the business plan in enterprise education. *Education + Training*, 5 (8/9), 804-814.
- Jones, P., Maas, G., & Pittaway, L. (2017). New perspectives on entrepreneurship education. In *Entrepreneurship Education: New Perspectives on Entrepreneurship Education* (pp. 1-13). Bingley: Emerald Publishing.
- 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), 341-374.
- Lackéus, M. (2017). Does entrepreneurial education trigger more or less neoliberalism in education? *Education + Training*, 59 (6), 635-650.
- Organic Law 2/2006, of 3 May (Ley orgánica de educación, LOE). *Spanish Official Gazette*, 106, 4 May 2006, pp. 17158-17207. Retrieved from <https://www.boe.es/eli/es/lo/2006/05/03/2> (Consulted on 2019-07-04).
- Organic Law 8/2013, of 9 December (Ley orgánica para la mejora de la calidad educativa, LOMCE). *Spanish Official Gazette*, 295, 10 December 2013, pp. 97858 a 97921. Retrieved from <https://www.boe.es/buscar/doc.php?id=BOE-A-2013-12886> (Consulted on 2019-07-04).
- Organic Law 14/2013, of 27 September (Ley orgánica de apoyo a los emprendedores y su internacionalización). *Spanish Official Gazette*, 233, 28 September 2013, pp. 78787-78882. Retrieved from [https://www.boe.es/diario\\_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2013-10074](https://www.boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2013-10074) (Consulted on 2019-07-04).
- Lewis, K., & Massey, C. (2003). Delivering enterprise education in New Zealand, *Education + Training*, 45 (4), 197-206.
- Lynch, K. (2006). Neo-liberalism and marketization: the implications for higher education. *European Educational Research Journal*, 5 (1), 1-17.
- Mahieu, R. (2006). *Agents of change and policies of scale: a policy study of entrepreneurship and enterprise in education* (Doctoral thesis). Umeå Universitet, Umeå, Sweden .
- Martínez Clares, P., & González Morga, N. (2018). Las competencias transversales en la universidad: propiedades psicométricas de un cuestionario. *Educación XX1*, 21 (1), 231-262.
- Matlay, H. (2006). Entrepreneurship education: more questions than answers? *Education + Training*, 48 (5), 293-295.
- Matlay, H. (2007). Pertinent questions in entrepreneurship education: why, what, when, and how? *Education + Training*, 49 (8/9), 279-302.
- Medina, J. R. (2001). *Sistemas contemporáneos de educación moral*. Madrid: Ariel.
- Michavila, F., Martínez, J. M., Martín-González, M., García-Peñalvo, F. J., & Cruz-Benito, J. (2016). *Barómetro de empleabilidad y empleo de los universitarios en España, 2015*. Madrid: Observatorio de Empleabilidad y Empleo Universitario.
- Mincer, J. (1974). *Schooling, Experience and Earnings*. Cambridge, MA: The National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Moberg, K. (2014). Two approaches to entrepreneurship education: The different effects of education for and through entrepreneurship at the lower secondary level. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 12 (3), 512-528.
- Mwasalwiba, S. (2010). Entrepreneurship education: a review of its objectives, teaching methods, and impact indicators. *Education + Training*, 52 (1), 20-47.
- Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Fayolle, A., Krueger, N., & Walmsley, A. (2017). The impact of entrepreneurship education in higher education: A systematic review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 16 (2), 277-299.
- Neck, H. M., & Greene, P. G. (2011). Entrepreneurship Education: Known Worlds and New Frontiers. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49 (1), 55-70.
- Nucci, L., Krettenauer, T., & Narváez, D. (Eds.) (2014). *Handbook of moral and character education*. New York: Routledge.

- Order ECD/65/2015, 21 January, which describes the relationship between the competences, content and evaluation criteria of primary education, secondary education and non-compulsory post-secondary education. *Spanish Official Gazette*, 25, 29 January 2015, pp. 6986-7003. Retrieved from <https://www.boe.es/buscar/doc.php?id=BOE-A-2015-738> (Consulted on 2019-07-05).
- Peña, J. V., Cárdenas, A., Rodríguez Martín, A., & Sánchez-Lissen, E. (2015). La cultura emprendedora como objetivo educativo: marco general y estado de la cuestión. In L. Núñez Cubero (Coord.), *Cultura emprendedora y Educación* (pp. 19-60). Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla.
- Pepin, M. (2012). Enterprise education: a Deweyan perspective. *Education + Training*, 54 (8/9), 801-812.
- Pérez Alonso-Geta, P. M. (2009). Creatividad e innovación: una destreza adquirible. *Teoría de la Educación*, 21 (1), 179-198.
- Peters, R. S. (1969). *El concepto de educación*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Pittaway, L., Aissaoui, R., & Fox, J. (2017). Social Constructionism and Entrepreneurial Opportunity. In M. Karatas-Ozkan, A. Fayolle, S. Ramoglou, & K. Nicolopoulou (Eds.), *Philosophical Reflexivity in Entrepreneurship* (pp. 1-32). New York: Routledge.
- Polo, L. (2006). *Ayudar a crecer. Cuestiones filosóficas de la educación*. Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra.
- Pring, R. (2016). *Una filosofía de la educación políticamente incómoda*. Madrid: Narcea.
- Rae, D. (2010). Universities and enterprise education: responding to the challenges of the new era. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 1 (4), 591-606.
- Ruiz-Herrero, J. A. (July 2013). Nuevos espacios productivos en el capitalismo cognitivo: el ejemplo del emprendimiento. *XI Congreso Español de Sociología*. Symposium conducted at the meeting of Federación Española de Sociología, Madrid.
- Rosendahl, L., Sloof, R. y van Praag, M. (2014). The Effect of Early Entrepreneurship Education: Evidence from a Randomized Field Experiment. *European Economic Review*, 72, 76-97.
- Sandoval, L. Y., & Garro, N. (2012). La sociología relacional: una propuesta de fundamentación sociológica para la institución educativa. *Educación y Educadores*, 15 (2), 247-262.
- Schultz, T. (1961). Investment in Human Capital. *The American Economic Review*, 51 (1), 1-17.
- Schumpeter, J. (2010). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. Abingdon: Routledge Classics.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2015). *Rethinking education: towards a global common good?* Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved from: <http://xurl.es/78ugi> (Consulted on 2019-05-28).
- Volkman, C., Wilson, K. E., Mariotti, S., Rabuzzi, D., Vyakarnam, S., & Sepulveda, A. (2009). *Educating the next wave of entrepreneurs-unlocking entrepreneurial capabilities to meet the global challenges of the 21st Century. A Report of the Global Education Initiative*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.
- Wagner, T. (2014). *Creando innovadores. La formación de los jóvenes que cambiarán el mundo*. Madrid: Kolima.
- Zamagni, S. (2012). *Por una economía del bien común*. Madrid: Ciudad Nueva.

## Authors' biographies

**Arantxa Azqueta** holds a PhD. in Educational Sciences from the Universidad de Navarra, with a thesis on education for qualified entrepreneurship with outstanding and mention *cum laude*. Currently, she is an Associate Professor at the Universidad de Navarra and in the Department of Theory and History of Education, Faculty of Education of the Universidad Internacional de La Rioja (UNIR).

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2514-5989>

**Concepción Naval** is a Professor and Dean in the Faculty of Education and Psychology of the Universidad de Navarra. She has been Oliver Smithies Lecturer at Oxford University; Visiting Professor at

the Teachers College of Columbia University; Visiting Scholar Research at Harvard University, at University of Notre Dame (USA); International Office of Education (UNESCO), at St. Edmund's College of Cambridge University and at Boston University.

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5927-9398>