

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 434 251

CE 079 268

AUTHOR Erkkila, Kristiina  
TITLE Enterprise Education in the Case of Finland.  
PUB DATE 1996-07-00  
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the World Congress of Comparative Education Societies (9th, Sydney, Australia, July 1996).  
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*Education Work Relationship; Educational History; \*Educational Needs; \*Educational Policy; Educational Practices; Elementary Secondary Education; \*Entrepreneurship; Foreign Countries; Partnerships in Education; \*School Business Relationship; Vocational Education; \*Work Experience Programs  
IDENTIFIERS \*Finland

ABSTRACT

In Finland, industrial visits have been the most common method of enterprise (entrepreneurship) education. For example, in 1990, more than 40 percent of Finnish companies acted as hosts for students and teachers. There is a need to make these visits more meaningful and active. Other recent practices in Finland are to include work experience in lower secondary school and to include it in primary and upper secondary levels. The reasons for enterprise education are societal, vocational, behavioral, and educational. The development and implementation of educational policy supporting enterprise education started with seven projects started by the National Board of Education in 1993. The idea of partnering projects between schools and companies is a good one, but a national model might not be practical. Instead, a national focus on enterprise education and dedication to developing that concept throughout the country are needed. (Contains 22 references.) (KC)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND  
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS  
BEEN GRANTED BY

*K Erkkilä*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

## Enterprise Education in the case of Finland

**Kristiina Erkkilä**  
**Graduate Student**  
**Administration and Policy Studies in Education**  
**University of Pittsburgh**  
**5S01 Forbes Quadrangle**  
**Pittsburgh, PA 15260**  
**USA**  
**e-mail: erkrist+@pitt.edu**

Paper presented at 9<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Comparative Education Societies

July 1996, Sydney, Australia

## 1. BACKGROUND

Throughout the world there is currently a great deal of activity in what might be broadly termed the field of enterprise and entrepreneurship education in schools and colleges. In USA entrepreneurship education has been pursued extensively for several decades extending through a wide variety of different models. In the United Kingdom a substantial number of programs were developed in the 1980s with the support of both public and private organizations. There are now many activities at the local, regional and national level. Most of the governments in the European Community have also, in the 1980s, given substantial support to activities designed to stimulate entrepreneurship among young people. In recent years the interest and activities have grown also in Canada. In Asia there are now major experiments in several countries including India, Malaysia and the Philippines. (Gibb 1993, 11-12).

Enterprise education, as it applies to the case of Finland, originates from 1980s in Northeast England, where it emerged from the large-scale closure of traditional industries and the ensuing high unemployment in the UK. The similar changes in Finnish society and simultaneous changes in delivery of education have initiated Enterprise Education Pilot Projects in Finland, mainly following the models from the UK. In fall 1993 the National Board of Education launched enterprise education pilot projects in seven schools. These schools are spread in the country and represent different types of institutions. Enterprise education could be, from its share, helping the economic development of the country, it could provide young people with essential skills for tomorrow's, and even today's, world and the partnerships are important for education to keep up with the changes in the society. Even though I identify myself as advocate for enterprise education I am skeptical about some moral aspects related to it.

The regular education system in Finland is composed of nine years comprehensive school (compulsory), the senior secondary school, vocational and professional education institutions and universities. This paper will concentrate in enterprise education efforts in comprehensive and senior secondary education. The educational system in Finland is facing big changes with its decentralization. Schools will have more to say in their own curriculum and also in their own administration. Local authorities have the power of decision in drawing up educational plans. The National Board of Education only lays down the guidelines for educational planning and on this basis the schools can draw up their own plans. The decentralization of the curriculum means that subject matter will be more closely linked to local needs including those of industry and business.

## **2. RESEARCH PROBLEM**

The purpose of this paper is to address the problem of conceptualizing approaches to enterprise education in Finland.

### **Research questions:**

1. What is understood by Enterprise Education in Finland and internationally?
2. Why should education and industry work together in Finland?  
-Who is in favor and who is against?
3. What are the main stages of the implementation of the policy?
4. What kind of assessment can we draw from policy outcomes?

## **3. WHAT IS UNDERSTOOD BY ENTERPRISE EDUCATION IN FINLAND AND INTERNATIONALLY?**

### **3.1. International Definitions**

Enterprise education is an increasingly accepted part of the school curriculum in such different countries as Malaysia, the United Kingdom, and the United States; either as a stand-alone subject or integrated with economics, mathematics, or liberal studies courses. International comparisons in the field are complicated not only by differences in objectives and in meanings of the words used to describe programs, but most of all because of the contextuality of existing programs. In Canada and the United States the term entrepreneurship education is commonly used, but it is rarely used in the UK and only occasionally in Europe. (Gibb 1993, 12.)

Much of what have been practiced in this field within the United Kingdom is labeled enterprise rather than entrepreneurship education and is focused upon the development of personal attributes. It does not necessarily embrace the context of the 'for profit' small business or indeed the entrepreneur although arguably it is substantially linked with the development of an enterprise culture within which the entrepreneur will flourish (Gibb, 1987). The major objective of enterprise education, however, is to help develop enterprising people and in particular, to inculcate an attitude of self-reliance through the process of learning (Cotton, 1991). Professor David Warwick from United Kingdom, who represents the organization Education for Enterprise, defines (1993) enterprising behavior including creativity, taking risks and turning ideas into practice. Traditional dictionary definitions of the "enterprising person"

include: pioneering, adventurous, daring, go ahead, progressive, opportunist and ambitious. The overriding aim of the enterprise education (or according to Gibb, more accurately, the enterprise approach to education) is to develop enterprising behaviors, skills and attributes and by this means also enhance students insight into, as well as knowledge of, any particular phenomenon studied. The distinctive ingredient that sets enterprise education apart from action or discovery learning is that it is delivered within the context of an independent, usually small business for profit, or not for profit project stimulation. (Gibb 1993, 15).

Durham University Business School in England has developed a model based on Caird's (1990) definition. Caird has suggested defining Enterprise Education as being divided into three separate categories:

- education for enterprise
- education about enterprise
- education through enterprise.

The materials based on this model have been purchased by over 75 percent of secondary schools in UK and training workshops have been conducted with more than 1000 teachers. This approach has been recently adopted for example in Hungarian schools.

In the United States entrepreneurship education is an umbrella term for School-To-Work programs, economic education and teaching entrepreneurship. It means providing students with real life working experience during their K-12 education and the knowledge and skills to become productive members of the work force, responsible citizens, knowledgeable consumers, prudent savers and investors, effective participants in a global economy and competent decision makers throughout their lives (Saunders & Gilliard 1995). In United States primary schools enterprise education consists of courses designed to raise pupils awareness of the market economy, and simple business simulation exercises. At the secondary level there are more experimental and practical courses in owning and operating a small business, or running school based businesses. (Hailey 1994, 1988)

In Malaysia the Life-long Entrepreneurship Education Model envisages entrepreneurship to be embedded at an early age in the national curriculum (Hailey 1994, 1988). The Asian and Pacific Programme of Educational Innovation for Development (APEID) has launched a Joint Innovative Project on Education for Promoting the Enterprise Competencies of Children and Youth, JIP-EDENTEP. The purpose of the project is to encourage a group of member countries to work together in a co-operative effort to examine

how primary school leavers and secondary school students, who increasingly face the prospect of becoming unemployed youths, can be prepared adequately in advance to enter the world of work, equipped with the necessary enterprising qualities either for the job market or to manage their own mini-businesses as “entrepreneurs”. Countries involved are China, Indonesia, Philippines, Sri Lanka and Thailand. (Unesco/APEID 1992, 1.)

### 3.2. Problems with Finnish Terminology

The difficulty in defining concepts for Finnish enterprise education lies in the lack of precise terminology. In Finland the educationists have turned to the business schools to look for concepts for enterprise education. They have started by analyzing what is entrepreneurship, and derived concepts and definitions for enterprise education from the business terminology.

The Finnish word *yrittäjyys*, which is part of the Finnish term for enterprise education i.e. *yrittäjyyskasvatus* could be translated both with word **enterprise** and **entrepreneurship**. The semantics of the word *yrittäjyys* opens up when we elaborate the English translations of it.

According to the American Heritage Dictionary (1982, 456-457)

- **e n t e r p r i s e** means an undertaking especially one of some scope, complication, and risk.  
Readiness to venture; initiative.
- **e n t r e p r e n e u r** is a person who organizes, operates, and assumes the risk for business venture.

According to Huuskonen (1992, 194-195) **entrepreneurship** and **entrepreneurial** in the English language are often qualitative statements for people who take care of their firms in certain way. In contrast *yrittäjä* (entrepreneur) and *yrittäjyys* (entrepreneurship) in the Finnish language simply refer to being in business. These words have no clear connotations of being oriented towards growth, being successful, admirable or anything of the like. The Finnish *yrittäjä* is more clearly owner-manager of the firm than the entrepreneur. International comparisons are difficult, because the core term entrepreneurship is very culturally loaded. Huuskonen explains also that another way to define entrepreneurship is to look at *what* an entrepreneur does instead of concentrating on *how* he does it. Entrepreneurship is action which directs to establishing, developing and managing (one’s own) firm. In the English-language literature, writers often associate the entrepreneurial role with innovating, risk bearing, leading and managing, and supplying capital.

Huuskonen in his own study defines **entrepreneur** as one who concurrently

- is in total responsibility of the firm he takes care of
- is an investor of the risk capital in the firm
- is the ultimate source of authority in the firm.

**Entrepreneurship**, in turn, is the business-related activity of the entrepreneur defined above.

Peltonen (1985, 13) divides entrepreneurship into **internal** and **external entrepreneurship**. Internal entrepreneurship means the creative and entrepreneur-like way of working either when developing one's own business or when working for somebody else. External entrepreneurship means setting up and taking care of one's own business.

*Yrittäen kasvuun* (1993, 9), the support material for enterprise education in comprehensive school, introduces also internal and external entrepreneurship. It defines internal entrepreneurship as acting in the spirit of enterprise in one's own life, either in school, in free time activities or in work. External entrepreneurship means being in the profession of doing business.

### **3.3. Finnish definitions for Enterprise Education**

According to Peltonen's (1985) division (above), we in Finland understand, that in entrepreneurship education the emphasis is mainly on external entrepreneurship, where as enterprise education could include both external and internal aspects of it.

A recent Finnish book about enterprise education, translated also in English, (Ojala & Pihkala, 1994) defines first entrepreneurship and then derives entrepreneurship education from that. Ojala and Pihkala (1994, 13) use for enterprise education the term **entrepreneurship education**, which they define as

“referring to education and teaching given both in school and in the surrounding society. Entrepreneurship education as a concept means growing into entrepreneurship which in turn means both external and internal entrepreneurship”.

My definition for Enterprise Education follows that of English Caird's. I would call the Finnish approach enterprise education, because the intention is to encourage enterprising culture, not only entrepreneurship. I see two sides in Finnish enterprise education. In general education the emphasis should be in learning internal entrepreneurship. This point of view is parallel to the goals set by the National Board of Education (Peruskoulun opetussuunnitelman perusteet 1994, 36-37). According to these goals, enterprise education should provide a student the kind of knowledge, skills and attitudes, that

one needs during one's studies and later on in one's working life, regardless of if one works as an independent entrepreneur or for somebody else, because these skills are essential for everybody in today's changing labor market. But there is an option, that some schools may want to emphasize entrepreneurship in their curriculum which is the case in the pilot projects started in Finland. In these schools, in addition, external entrepreneurship and education through enterprise will be emphasized. In Caird's categories it would mean **education for enterprise**, which represents internal entrepreneurship, the spirit of enterprise (attitudes), **education about enterprise**, which is external entrepreneurship, teaching economics and facts about the business world (knowledge), **education through enterprise**, which can be understood as a method itself, creating a mini enterprise in school, or it can refer to partnerships in education (skills). I am suggesting that the education given in schools that want to specialize in learning more about entrepreneurship as a career alternative, could be called entrepreneurship education, but enterprise education is a broader concept and could be the title for the entrepreneurial section of all round education.

The ideas for the Finnish enterprise education initiatives are mainly adopted from United Kingdom, but also Canadian influence is recognized. The originating situation in Finland is very similar to that of UK in the beginning of the enterprise education era. Professor David Warwick from UK has played an important part in launching the idea of enterprise education to Finland. His book *The Wealth of A Nation* (1993a) has been the mostly cited 'theory book' on enterprise education in Finland. In addition, Finnish educational planners have turned to the Durham University Business School for implementation ideas.

### **3.4. How Does Enterprise Education Work in Finland?**

In this presentation I am not going into details about the didactics of enterprise education. It is anyhow significant to point out that activating students to learn by doing is essential in enterprise education. The knowledge and attitudes can be better adopted by doing.

The pedagogical implications of achieving the competencies to become enterprising persons are well known. They have to be established beyond the level of competence, and at the level of proficiency in real life. Such a development is unlikely to be *taught*, but *learned* by doing i.e., by direct action by the learners in real life. Transfer to real life from purely academic situations is, as expected, low. (Unesco/APEID 1992, 27.)

The other vital aspect is to support co-operative learning. Enterprise itself can be a method. Students can learn by creating their own enterprise for a small group, for a class or even for the whole school. It can be

simulating or it can be real. One of the goals in enterprise education is to get to know more about the surrounding society. Therefore it is important to get out of the classrooms. An essential part of enterprise education is the partnerships with schools and other institutions, organizations or businesses of the community. For successful partnership David Warwick (1993b) gives his recipe:

A long term, mutual beneficial relationship with a business or a non-profit agency, based on the needs of each partner through a wise use of each others resources.

In Finland industrial visits have been the most common way of enterprise education in the past. For example in 1990 more than 40% of all companies acted as hosts for students and teachers. There is need to make these visits more meaningful and change them to active study visits. The other practice in Finland has been that, previously only in lower secondary level, students get 3-5 days work experience. The more recent attempt is to include work experience also in primary and upper secondary levels. (Lähdeniemi 1993, 205-206.)

Teachers' retraining and work experience programs are introduced, but how to prepare future teachers, who didn't have experience of enterprise education in their school time, is missing. In Finland enterprise education is offered as an elective in some teacher education units in universities, and it has proven to be very popular. As former teacher educator, I see including this aspect in teacher education crucial in getting enterprise education more practiced and the contents of it more meaningful.

#### **4. WHY SHOULD EDUCATION AND INDUSTRY WORK TOGETHER IN FINLAND?**

Enterprise education has been seen as an answer to the changes in the labor market. Canadians McMullan and Long (1987, 261) state, that the real promise of entrepreneurship education will be realized when it is strategically organized for economic development and job creation. Gibson (1993) points out that there is very little doubt that increased economic development requires also greater individual enterprise.

Social change and the advancements in various fields of science have dictated the need for profound changes in education in Finland. Government, political and economical systems have changed so much that the need for change has also to be acknowledged in education. The reasons for enterprise education can be defined as **societal, vocational, behavioral and educational.**

#### **4.1. Societal reasons**

The surrounding society sets demands for schools today. However, schools should look even further, they should educate today's youth for the future society. Internationalization and mobility of population bring new challenges for cultural and value bases of education. The division for rich and poor needs more attention. There is a strong estimate that the population in welfare countries, and in Finland especially, is growing older. The ecological problems are becoming more and more urgent. Future society will no doubt be more affected by information technology; communication skills will be essential. The society will be more and more fast moving; in 15 years we will have double the knowledge in the world that we have today. In some fields it will happen even faster. The questions about welfare and its conditions have to be re-evaluated from the perspective of economical and ecological possibilities.

#### **4.2. Vocational reasons**

The development of today's political economy in Finland calls for teaching enterprise education; more job opportunities are needed. The quick changes in work and economy emphasize flexible attitudes towards lifelong education and readiness for efficient learning. Abilities to use new technology and to study independently, spirit of enterprise, taking responsibility for the design and development of one's own work. Teamwork will be increasingly important in the world where work assignments are constantly changing and responsibilities are shared in new ways. The biggest change in the labor market is the reduction in the public sector. The present recession has also taught the Finnish people that to change the structure of the economy in Finland needs to be changed from medium-sized and large-scaled companies towards small businesses; the economical flexibility of small businesses could have saved many jobs. Entrepreneurship has long been undervalued in Finland, not least within education. In developed countries, it is the small businesses that have risen to become maybe the most important sector of growth. Within the European Union, the percentage of businesses employing fewer than 10 people is as high as 92%. As new jobs are nowadays more often than before created in small businesses in Finland as well, the status and value of entrepreneurship has to be re-examined within education and schooling, too (Hirvi, 1994). More than 20.000 new small businesses are needed in Finland to meet the European average. Even for public organizations and large-scaled companies market orientation and inner entrepreneurship have become essential. The debate whether to join the European Union or not and the new membership in the Union (from the beginning of year 1995) have boosted international cooperation

and competition and also increased the interest for enterprise education. One of the most active vanguards in Finland has been the Finnish Employer's Confederation.

#### **4.3. Behavioral reasons**

The new world requires behavioral changes in an individual: new skills and manners. One requirement is cross-cultural understanding, which is needed in all human relations. In the time when we have more possibilities for international relationships it is good to know also other cultures and other ways of living. Interrelational communication skills will be essential. An individual needs the capability of cooperation and feeling of solidarity. One has to also know how to act as a member of a community. From the entrepreneur's point of view important communications include knowledge about marketing products. It is however useful for every consumer to know the basic laws of advertising. But for most, the new situation requires an individual to be more enterprising.

#### **4.4. Educational reasons**

Education and schooling have to change to be more relevant to the surrounding society and also to the future society. The future is more than ever unpredictable in all human fields. School now has the possibility to be the eye opener and pioneer in the alteration of course. The school system now needs to be flexible. The learning organization should be reflecting the surrounding world, it should be responding to the current challenges of time and reshaping according to the society. The time has passed for an organization to operate as a static system. The time has passed also for the top-down model both in industry and educational practice.

### **5. WHAT ARE THE MAIN STAGES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICY?**

#### **5.1. The Projects**

In fall 1993 the National Board of Education started seven enterprise education projects. This was a joint effort with cooperating partners such as the Economic Information Bureau, Finnish Junior Chambers of Commerce, the Center for School Clubs, the Finnish Jobs and Society, with its network of enterprise agencies, and the Confederation of Finnish Industry and Employers. Comprehensive schools, secondary schools and vocational schools from Tammisaari, Seinäjoki, Loviisa, Turku, Kolari, Imatra and Vaasa were involved in the project. The scope of the project was widest in the City of Vaasa, where it spanned the whole education system including higher education institutes. The first phase of the project

produced different models for curricula and teaching methodology. The projects concluded in the spring of 1995 and the final reports were due in November 1995. (National Board of Education, 1996a)

These cases were supposed to give some bases for exchanging ideas, reporting experiences, and expanding the projects. The general goals for participating students were to develop their internal entrepreneurship and enterprising spirit and increase the knowledge and positive attitudes towards entrepreneurship.

## **5.2. Outcomes of the Projects**

The contact teachers wrote a one-year report in spring 1994. A feedback seminar was also organized. In spring 1995 the principals and the contact teachers from the participating schools answered a survey questionnaire about their experiences. The questionnaire focused assessing how the goals on changing student attitudes towards more enterprising and developing partnerships between schools and businesses or organizations were achieved. The Questionnaire included questions about the resources for enterprise education. (National Board of Education, 1996a.)

The participants seemed to be quite content with the outcomes of the projects in all locations. The current high unemployment of the country was stated to be clearly the main motivation for enterprise education. The contents and methods had been implemented successfully in career counseling, arts, different language classes, technical work, textile work, civics, information technology and commercial subjects. The participating schools had invented numerous different ways to tie enterprise education in to the curriculum. It had strengthened students' sense of responsibility and self-esteem. This was seen particularly in teamwork, project work and setting up own enterprises. Other forms of popular activities included visiting speakers in school, theme days and special events. The contact teachers were clearly identified as key persons for the projects. Also the principals supportive attitude was seen as an important factor. Representation from different interest groups, such as municipal leaders, entrepreneurs and the centers for new enterprises were significant in the planning process. Teachers' attitudes changed during the project; the threshold against enterprise education had generally diminished and many of the teachers had become more co-operative and not putting priority to their own subject. Parents' role was perceived encouraging, but not very active. An important finding from the student perspective was that enterprise education provides a challenge both to more theoretically gifted and practically oriented students.

Particularly, the self-esteem of the latter group grew stronger when they had a change to participate in project work. (ibid.)

Lack of resources was mentioned as the most important problem. Companies, that were the potential partners with education, do not have the personnel or the economic resources for the co-operation. The lack of economic resources can be compensated by reciprocal activities: students can carry out jointly agreed tasks for the company and it can in its turn make somebody available for the cooperation with school. Businesses that function for profit may be too busy to co-operate with schools. It is especially difficult to release somebody to work with schools from small enterprises, where everybody is working with the production. (ibid.)

## **6. WHAT KIND OF ASSESSMENT CAN WE DRAW FROM POLICY OUTCOMES?**

### **6.1. Assessment drawn from the policy outcomes**

At this point of time the survey conducted among the principals and the contact teachers of the participating schools is the only available evaluation material of the seven pilot projects, at least there hasn't been anything published yet. Also the filled questionnaires have not yet been carried to a study. There are only some conclusions drawn from the answers by the officials in the National Board of Education. It can be said according to the answers to the questionnaires, that the overall results of all the projects in all locations were positive. Of course this represents only the view of the dedicated school personnel. There is a need to interview also other stakeholders like the entrepreneurs, the personnel of the participating companies, students, parents and community groups. Entrepreneurs tend to see the partnerships with schools as a philanthropic activity. They don't see immediate benefits for the company and they cannot often afford to think that the rewards may come only on the longer run. The same phenomenon has occurred in England, where the school people have noticed that the companies are putting their 'reserves' to work with the schools where as schools are always using their 'first team'. There is an obvious lack of commitment from the business management. However, the business community in Finland has welcomed enterprise education initiatives with open arms. There might be personal aspects involved, like business people not being ready to speak in front of a class or not knowing sufficiently the development level of the students. Therefore co-operation plans have often remained on theoretical level.

As it is so typical for Finnish public policy, there hasn't been that many public attacks against enterprise education, unlike in other countries. Some concerned parents or educators might have written a letter to

the editor of a local newspaper. Generally, education is very appreciated in Finland and the general public relies to the system and the highly trained educators. Now, when the society is changing to more participatory model of public policy, particularly in education with the decentralization, people are not really capable or willing to participate. On the other hand the recession hit the country so bad that mostly all ideas to reduce the unemployment and provide future generations better prepared for the flexible labor markets are welcomed.

## **6.2. General Concerns**

Both businesses and schools have been driven into partnership largely by economic considerations. The assertion of a link between economic failure and weaknesses in education has been a powerful stimulant for both schools and businesses to get involved. If partnerships are stimulated by economic crisis, do they disappear when the crisis recedes? That question may be addressed at two levels: in terms of macro-economic or cyclical variations, and terms of micro-economic or structural change.

Partnerships that respond to rising youth unemployment tend to focus on the transition from school to work. The severe recession that hit many countries in the first half of the 1980s encouraged such 'Band-Aid' measures to mitigate the damage to school-leavers' prospects. Macro-economic recovery in the second half of the 1980s did not mean an end to such partnerships, but a change of direction. Employers now wanted to hire young people, but often found that they lacked the necessary skills. Schools and businesses started to consider the structural changes that had taken place over the previous decade, and realized that the content of schooling may have to change. This shifted the emphasis away from the transition to work, and engaged partnerships in the content of schooling, both general and vocational. The mission of partnerships thus became longer-term, addressing problems in the economic and education system that will not disappear overnight. Even as education begins to produce more of what employers need, the partnership mission will not complete. Many partnerships are likely to become permanent features — like the German dual system — rather than simply measures to promote reform. But in practice, macro-economic cycles could affect partnerships in another way. In recession, the long-term need to improve education does not disappear, but short-term means are reduced. When business is bad, companies are inclined to reduce spending on any item that does not contribute directly to bottom line results. (OECD/CERI, 1992, 45-46.)

### **6.3. Ethical concerns about Enterprise Education**

If enterprise education brings to schools values of free enterprise going for profit there might be mixed messages. It is not quite sure how business culture and education culture and/or values differ from each other, but going for profit is the overall goal in business, whereas education is trying to promote other values as important, not necessary as profitable. The fear of whose values will be thought has come up in Finland with the new ideas of decentralization presented, but somehow the discussion is even more concerned with bringing enterprise education, representing business, into schools.

Even though I identify myself as advocate for enterprise education and partnerships between business and education, I am skeptical about some moral aspects related to it. I recognize myself and my culture being among those Europeans mentioned above, who are wondering whether allowing businesses into classrooms will be free of ethical issues. Businesses are profit making organizations with bottom lines and shareholders, while education is a social activity whose results are assessed according to a range of non-financial criteria. There are signs, however, that the 1990s might see a narrowing of this aspect of cultural difference. Companies are increasingly pursuing objectives that do not directly relate to financial results, if only because social responsibility is becoming more important to their customers (for example environmental issues). At the same time, education is becoming more inclined to define some bottom line of results (pressure from its customers), and also relate those results to the economy and employment. (OECD/CERI 1992, 22.)

There are many people in Finland who see a danger in bringing enterprise education into schools. Until now, all the books studied in schools have been approved by the National Board of Education. With decentralization, the power of deciding how to organize education and what material to use, is given to local level, the national level giving only broad guidelines. It is up to the local communities and schools to decide the contents and methods of education. There is fear that companies involving in (especially those only sponsoring education) schools might have too much to say in school practice, that has trusted to be the monopoly of the state (there is no namely private school system in Finland). On macro level there is fear, that market forces might take the power to direct education towards their needs. There have even been suggestions that schools should be run more like businesses. Some stakeholders are afraid that the civilization level of the education might fall. With all the action or discovery learning, there is not enough time to learn important knowledge and the culturally important things might be replaced with something more profitable. In other words people are concerned of loosing control of educational process and more afraid of loosing it to business powers, that might turn schools to marketplaces. The radical

functionalist forces, Marxists and others, and even the socialists, would be afraid that this is a threat from the new right capitalists.

One of the concerns is the question: who is this enterprise education good for and whom does it harm? Would it separate students to winners and losers from the beginning? Is it only for the winners or is the goal to make winners of everybody and can that be accomplished?

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

The current recession and the changes in working life woke the Finnish up from the nostalgia of rebuilding the country after the World War II and the economic boom of the eighties. It was about time. The welfare system in Finland is a ticking time bomb. It is already too expensive for Finnish taxpayers and the government and will be more and more so in the future, especially when the baby boom of 1946-1950 reach the age of retiring. But this wakening was timely also in light of the rapid changes that are happening in the world. The changes in the world are unpredictable. Therefore it is important to provide the youth with the attitude, knowledge and skills to cope with the uncertainty of the future. Enterprise education tries to be a tool for that.

My opinion is that education can't anymore be isolated from the rest of the world. It has to open up to the surrounding society and co-operate. Planning, negotiation and evaluation are the key for success. There has to be long term planning, terms for education should be openly negotiated in the community involved and evaluation should be conducted constantly at different levels. Research should be involved in both planning and evaluation. Teachers and school administrators have to be prepared for these new requirements.

I think that the **idea** of enterprise education is transferable to different environments where it can be implemented locally, but I would be careful of making **models** and then transferring them nationwide. I am in favor of linking education with a partner from the community. However the effects of the phenomenon for different stakeholders have to be studied more carefully .

A clear consensus of what is meant by enterprise education in Finland is missing. What is it? What is the foundation where it created? Who are the ideas behind it and what are the motives? What is not being

said? No academic work that explores enterprise education in Finnish context has been published yet. These issues and concerns need to be openly discussed and assessed.

In 1995 Finland started **The Enterprise Decade Project**. The Ministry of Trade and Industry, Ministry of Labor, Ministry of Education, National Board of Education and the Confederation of Finnish Industry and Employers initiated it. Altogether more than 20 most influential labor organizations and the Finnish society by large take part in the project. It is the largest project ever to promote enterprising culture and entrepreneurship in the Finnish history. The project is aimed to all Finns, but the main target group is the youth. One of the three main themes, *Enterprise within society*, deals with education and development in the society. The Enterprise Decade Project is an attempt to get the whole nation committed to change for more enterprising culture in the country. (National Board of Education 1996b.)

## REFERENCES

- Caird, S. (1991) *Enterprise Education: The need for Differentiation*. British Journal of Education and Work 4 (1), 47-57.
- Cotton, J. (1991) *The Enterprise Education Experience*. Education and Training. 33 (4), 6-13.
- Gibb, A. (1987) *Designing Effective Programmes for Encouraging the Small Business Start-up Process*. Journal of Education and Industrial Training. Vol 4, 1987, 24-32.
- Gibb, A. (1993) *The Enterprise Culture and Education*. International Small Business Journal. 11 (3), 11-34.
- Gibson, A. (1994) *Freirean versus Enterprise Education: The Difference is in the Business*. Convergence 27 (1), 46-56.
- Hailey, J. (1994) *Enterprise Education :Small Business Training*. In Husen,T. & Postlethwaite, T.N. The International Encyclopedia of Education. (2nd ed.) Oxford, England; New York: Pergamon; New York : Elsevier Science.
- Hirvi, V. (1994) Preface in Ojala, A. & Pihkala, J. (Eds.) *First Steps Towards Entrepreneurship in schools*. Helsinki: Pikapaino.
- Huuskonen, V. (1992) *Yrittäjäksi ryhtyminen. Teoreettinen viitekehys ja sen koettelu*. The Process of Becoming an Entrepreneur û A Theoretical Framework with Empirical Experiments. Turku School of Economics and Business Administration. Series A-2.
- Lähdeniemi, T. (1993) *Finland: Alternative approaches*. In Warwick, D. The Wealth of A Nation. London:Brealey Publishing.
- McMullan, W. Ed & Long, W. A. (1987) *Entrepreneurship Education in the Nineties*. Journal of Business Venturing. 2 (3), 261-275.
- National Board of Education (1996a) *The Enterprise Education Project of the National Board of Education*. Finland. Unpublished working paper.
- National Board of Education (1996b) *The Enterprise Decade Project of the National Board of Education*. Finland. Unpublished working paper.
- OECD/CERI (1992) *Schools and Business: a new partnership*. Paris.
- Ojala, A. & Pihkala, J.(Eds.) (1994) *First Steps Towards Entrepreneurship in schools*. Helsinki: Pikapaino.
- Peruskoulun opetussuunnitelman perusteet* (1994). Principles of the New Curriculum. Opetushallitus. Helsinki: Valtion Painatuskeskus.

- Peltonen, M. (1986). *Yrittäjyys*. Entrepreneurship. Keuruu: Otava.
- Saunders, P. & Gilliard, J. (Eds.) 1995. *A Framework for Teaching Basic Economic Concepts*. New York: Economics America, National Council on Economic Education.
- The American Heritage Dictionary* (1982) Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Unesco/APEID (1992) *Education for Nurturing Enterprising Abilities*. Report of a Finalization Meeting on the APEID Joint Innovative Project on Education for Promoting the Enterprise Competencies of Children and Youth. Bangkok: Unesco
- Warwick, D. (Ed.) (1993a) *The Wealth of a Nation: Practical Partnership between Industry and Education*. London: Brealey Publishing.
- Warwick, D. (1993b) Unpublished material in a seminar for teachers in a pilot high school in Turku, Finland. February 1993.
- Yrittäen kasvuun* (1993). Support material for Enterprise Education in Comprehensive School. Taloudellinen Tiedotustoimisto ja Koulun Kerhokeskus. Helsinki: Esan Kirjapaino.



U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)  
National Library of Education (NLE)  
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



# REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

## I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <i>ENTERPRISE EDUCATION IN THE CASE OF FINLAND</i>	
Author(s): <i>KRISTINA ERKKILA</i>	
Corporate Source: <i>UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH</i>	Publication Date: <i>JULY, 1996</i>

## II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: <i>Kristina Erkkila</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>Kristina Erkkila, Grad. stud.</i>	
Organization/Address: <i>ADMIN &amp; POLICY STUDIES UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH 5501 FORBES QUADRANGLE PITTSBURGH, PA 15260</i>	Telephone: <i>412-648-7428</i>	FAX: <i>412-648-1784</i>
	E-Mail Address: <i>erkrst+@pitt.edu</i>	Date: <i>28.6.1999</i>

### III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

### IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

### V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:  <p style="text-align: right;">ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management 1787 Agate Street 5207 University of Oregon Eugene, OR 97403-5207</p>
---

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

**ERIC Processing and Reference Facility**

1100 West Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080

Toll Free: 800-799-3742

FAX: 301-953-0263

e-mail: [ericfac@inet.ed.gov](mailto:ericfac@inet.ed.gov)

WWW: <http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com>