

Entrepreneurial uberisation in Spanish education

Enrique Javier Díez Gutiérrez

University of León, León, Spain

Abstract

In this article, we analyse some of the mechanisms that neoliberal ideology is using to penetrate the educational system. The educational reforms being introduced throughout much of the world, following the guidelines of clearly neoliberal international economic organisations, are inserting this logic into current education systems. The latest Spanish educational reform, the LOMCE, is a good example of this. The present article analyses some of its key aspects. Now that conquest by force is a thing of the past, control is exercised by means of persuasion. Domination is more deep-rooted and lasting when the person dominated is unaware of it. This is why, in the long term, the challenge for every empire that desires to endure is to subjugate the people's will. The efficiency of the neoliberal system rests primarily on a process of collective internalisation of the system's logic, so that people "freely" abide by what they have been led to believe.

Keywords: *Entrepreneurship, Uber-education, neoliberal education, entrepreneurial neosubject, emotional capitalism*

Introduction

Entrepreneurial uberisation (Nurvala, 2015; Constantine, Gebauer, & Bartsch, 2019) is the inculcation of the neoliberal model of labor and vital precarization, promoted by multinationals and platforms such as Uber (Valenduc, 2019). Neoliberal ideology permeates the education system through the logic of

entrepreneurship that transforms self-interest into an essential, transcendental drive. Self-interest is raised as a standard in opposition to the public good.

As Howard Zinn (2004) has pointed out, civil disobedience is not the problem; the problem is civil obedience. The problem is that vast numbers of people throughout the world have obeyed the dictates of their governments' leaders and have waged wars in which millions have died because of that obedience. The problem is that throughout the world, people are obedient in the face of poverty, hunger, stupidity, war and cruelty. The problem is that people are obedient even though the prisons are full of petty thieves while arch-thieves govern the country. That is the problem.

Much of the efficiency of the neoliberal system resides in a process of collective internalisation of the system's logic, so that people "freely" abide by it. This new internalisation replaces the "surveillance society" described in Orwell's dystopia, *1984* (Han, 2014). "*Confession obtained by force has been replaced by voluntary disclosure*", contends this South Korean philosopher. "*Smartphones have been substituted for torture chambers*", the tools for our self-exploitation, he asserts.

What capitalism realised in the neoliberal era, Han argues (2014), is that it did not need to be tough, but seductive. The need to impose control and surveillance has ceased because we control and monitor ourselves and others. This has become our normality and everyday discipline. Apple, Facebook and Instagram were not imposed on us; we were persuaded to impose them on ourselves. "*Of our own free will, we put any and all conceivable information about ourselves on the internet.*" Han calls this *smartpolitics*. Instead of saying no, capitalism says yes: instead of denying us our dreams with commandments, discipline and shortages, it seems to allow us to buy what we want when we want, if we have

the resources to do so, to become what we want, if we have the power to do so, and to realise our dream of freedom, in the paradise of desiring our own subjugation. At least in the dystopia *1984*, nobody felt free. But as Han says, in 2018 we all feel free, and that is the problem.

Neoliberal governmentality techniques

Michel Foucault (1975) contended that present-day Western societies have abandoned the disciplinary model in favour of fostering the active participation of the governed as the main tool for exerting social control (Hardt & Negri, 2002). The neoliberal system teaches us to “freely choose” —and even desire— to form part of its apparatus. This new exploitation is beloved. The “opium of the masses” is the system itself.

Neoliberal ideology not only destroys social rights and achievements, but also creates a lifestyle, social relations, a “rationality” (Foucault, 2004; Ong, 2007) and a social imaginary; in sum, a given type of subjectivity, neoliberal subjectivity. The goal of this remodelling of subjectivity is to impose competition as a pivotal aspect of life, not only within economic relations, but also as a generalised form of personal and social behaviour. Entrepreneurship should guide all human relationships, in a universe of ubiquitous competition, which transforms all individuals, who are urged to conceive of and conduct themselves as a company, as entrepreneurs of their very selves, as “doers” (Laval & Dardot, 2013).

This neoliberal ideology has become the “instrumental rationale” of contemporary capitalism, a capitalism that governs without government. It is a “neoliberal governmentality” (Foucault, 2006) that “allows” the governed to “freely choose” this rationality. To paraphrase the Marxist theorist Antonio Gramsci (1981), when the dominated class adopts the ideology of the ruling

class, there is no need for “armies of occupation”, because its will has already been conquered: the ideology of a social class becomes hegemonic when its values and beliefs become part of the collective imaginary, with the result that its vision of the past and the solutions it proposes are considered common sense.

The doer: hero of the new working class

No-one is spontaneously “transformed” solely through the propaganda of the neoliberal model. It has been necessary to instate, via “a strategy without strategies”, mechanisms of education and control of work, rest and leisure based on a new ideal of the human being as someone who is simultaneously a calculating individual and a productive worker.

The initial step consisted in inventing the individualistic “human calculator” who seeks the maximum self-interest in a context pervaded by self-seeking and competitive relationships. Based on a discourse which argues that self-interest is the best strategy to serve society, self-seeking behaviour is almost considered a “social duty” and relations of market competition are normalised (Ginesta, 2013; Torres, 2017). The goal of humanity seems to be to fulfil oneself at the expense of others, viewed as a “natural, innate desire”.

In the general model presented as an example to follow, entrepreneurship and competition have been transformed into a new ethics. Thus, individuals are urged to conceive of themselves, and to behave in all aspects of their existence, as the bearers of a personal talent-capital that they must know how to capitalise on and exploit at all times to outstrip others in the identification of new opportunities for gain (Laval & Dardot, 2013).

The radical innovation of neoliberal ideology is that it links the way in which individuals are “governed” with the way in which they “govern” themselves. In

essence, this is the function of the mechanisms of learning and control. These teach people to “govern themselves” in response to competitive pressure, in accordance with the principles of calculating maximum self-interest. Thus, subjects are enjoined to constantly police and transform themselves in order to become more effective as regards achieving results and returns. Economic profitability is hailed as a personal discipline,

leading to the emergence of the “doer”, and being a “doer” becomes a goal to strive towards. “Doers” are people who fight for what they want and are willing to sacrifice themselves to untold lengths because they put their goals first. These are the new heroes and heroines of the “working class”, because they go without sleep and swill caffeine to work as if they were the owners of a company, while earning the wage of an intern or even paying to work in order to gain work experience. Exploitation and poverty are thus newly recast as ways to become an entrepreneur and surpass oneself (Cantó, 2017).

These techniques of governmentality and control are supported by the new “science” of “self-care”; from coaching to positive thinking, multiple disciplines related to trends or gurus help entrepreneurs, the “doers”, to better master their emotions and adapt to stress, insecure employment and dismissal.

Pseudo-psychological trends have become big business, generating authors, reference books, a special jargon for the initiated (Coelho, 2010) and methods that appear empirical and rational, and are now permeating education.

Emotional capitalism: The Hunger Games

We have entered what Byung Chul Han (2014) has called “emotional capitalism”. Neoliberal domination no longer solely exploits labour but also individuals themselves, their hopes and dreams, via the new “religion” of self-

improvement and the optimisation of personal productivity. Exploitation is assumed through the Facebook logic of “likes” (Beni, 2017).

“Neoliberal psychopolitics is dominated by “positivity”. Instead of using threats, it uses positive stimuli. It does not use “bitter medicine”, but “likes”. It flatters the soul instead of shaking and paralysing it with shocks. It seduces rather opposes the spirit. It takes the lead. It scrutinises and takes note of aspirations, needs and desires. With the help of forecasts, it anticipates actions and even acts before these occur instead of impeding them. Neoliberal politics is smartpolitics: it seeks to please, not repress” (Han, 2014, 57).

Hence, Foucauldian biopolitics, external all-seeing control (Foucault, 2006), is continued by neoliberal psychopolitics, in which control becomes internalised and is managed through emotion. The (post)modern panopticon is voluntary. Subjects bare themselves, revealing the entirety of their inner and outer lives, in a virtual agora populated essentially by spectators and consumers. In this transparent society (Han, 2013), the entire population forms the panopticon. This creates a society fragmented into an infinity of isolated and narcissistic units that exploit themselves but believe they are free, lack to the will to join in continued and global collective actions but are happy to be click activists at the touch of a mouse. Emotional management, positive psychology and coaching contain and channel collective protests and struggles.

These new “sciences of happiness” are used to curb the frustration of large sectors of the population affected by the mass redundancies arising from company relocation and restructuring processes. Mediated by emotionality, their teachings mask the mechanisms of subjugation, which conceal relations of exploitation, enabling subjects to see themselves as free and proactive partners. The goal is to learn to change perceptions rather than attempting to change circumstances: *“It’s your own fault if you are poor and unhappy, and you need*

to change your attitude” (Galindo, 2017, 119). We are told to leave our comfort zones and learn to consider difficulties as an opportunity for personal fulfilment, as if self-improvement and striving to reprocess emotions could solve unemployment, illness or exclusion. The underlying problem, we are told, is our personal attitude to problems, because “if you believe it, you create it”. Such methods encourage voluntary servitude.

The motivational industry has burgeoned, spreading the mantra of our capacity for self-improvement and personal development, and teaching us to experience servitude as if it were a liberating activity. Our mission in life is to constantly prove that we are successful; nothing prevents us from realising our dreams; there are no excuses. Every day is our last chance to become a “doer”, with no time to eat, rest for a second, sleep or stop for a coffee, under constant pressure, living on the edge, always being busy. In a fragmented and competitive labour and social scenario always teetering on the edge of insecurity, the ideology of motivation and the consumption of psychiatric drugs (which has tripled since the economic crisis began) today serves the function of yesteryear’s foremen who policed factory workers, squeezing us dry with our own consent. Today it is desire itself, combined with the fear of lagging behind and being left alone in this eternal competition, which colonises the collective mind. “*The Hunger Games*”, sugar-coated with the language of coaching, have transformed us into shareholders of our own work. We are our own brands, which we must constantly promote and sell (Moruno, 2015).

We are witnessing a revolution in Foucault’s techniques of governmentality (2006). These days, power is no longer exerted solely over bodies, thoughts and behaviours, but also over individual desires, in such a way that each individual must actively engage and participate in what Han (2012) has termed “voluntary self-exploitation” to the point of exhaustion. Exploitation by others is thus

internalised. Self-exploitation is much more efficient than exploitation by others because it goes hand in hand with the idea of free choice, so that people exploit themselves while at the same time thinking that they are “free”.

Linked to the logic of self-interest and competition as the social ideal, this new cognitive framework functions as a means to control the ego (Foucault, 2004) through the subjective introjection of guilt. It transforms victims into the party responsible for their suffering and unemployment into problem of a personal failure. Those who fail, fail twice over because they have been led to believe that they themselves are to blame for their failure (Bolívar Botía, 2014; Hernández, 2017).

Worse still, social criticism has been turned on its head: whereas previously, capitalism was seen as the cause of unemployment or inequality, these are now being attributed to the welfare state. This was one of Ronald Reagan’s slogans: “The State is not the solution, it is the problem”. According to neoliberal ideology, public services are irresponsible and undermine the essential spur of individual competition, free education encourages indolence, policies aimed at the redistribution of wealth disincentivise effort and the welfare state discourages and extinguishes personal effort (Kumar, 2019). This deters poor people from attempting to improve their lot because it takes away their responsibility for themselves, thus dissuading them from seeking work, training, or looking after their children, and leading them to prefer leisure over work, resulting in the loss of dignity and self-esteem. There is only one solution: the suppression of the welfare state and in the last resort, for “impossible” cases, the resurrection of charity from the family and NGOs, thus forcing people to shoulder their responsibilities in order to avoid disgrace and regain their pride.

“The aid provided to people in need generates dependence on others and relieves them of their duty to meet their obligations. The welfare state represents an enormous moral danger for people, because it stops them from having to bear the consequences of their actions” (Moya, 2014, 67).

Entrepreneurial uberisation

This new ideology of entrepreneurship (Ararat Herrera, 2010) leads to countless, boundless practices of exploitation. The government of the city of Buenos Aires recently championed secondary education reform, proposing that in their last year of education, students should work unpaid in companies for half of their school time, arguing that this was “professional work experience”, and that the other 50% of the time should be devoted to developing an entrepreneurial spirit (Pike, 2017).

Following the example of platforms erroneously termed collaborative, such as *Uber*, *Cabify* and *Deliveroo*, we are steadily advancing towards the *uberisation* of the entrepreneurial model (Beni, 2017), in which capitalists no longer need to risk their capital and where workers flock to generate profits for these platforms, assuming all the risk and glad to no longer be “working class” but rather savvy entrepreneurs and genuine “doers”.

Thus, the populist myth of the entrepreneur becomes a nightmare of never-ending self-exploitation, providing the means and infrastructures for work, funding repairs when necessary, signing insecure service provision contracts and working all hours of the day without social security contributions, paid holidays, sick leave, promotions, insurance or a pension. This constitutes an informal economy in which no taxes or social security contributions are paid; the bosses are algorithms; the working class ceases to earn a salary and instead, with luck, issues its own invoices; breaks, holidays, a work-life balance and

protection against contingencies such as illness or disability are excluded; and each supposedly “self-employed” individual is responsible for providing all the resources, materials and means necessary to do his or her work. Even so, the company or platform (*Uber* for transport, *Deliveroo* for food delivery or *Airbnb* for tourist accommodation) still takes its cut. Hence, all risk is transferred to the working class. This is exploitation 3.0, using technology to render employment hyper-insecure, for example by providing a delivery service without having a single delivery person on the payroll. “*Earn a bit more, be your own boss and decide for yourself when you work*”, is how this new venture 3.0 is advertised. It is as if Isaac Rosa’s ironic and dramatic dystopia, *Make your dreams work for you!* (2017), has sprung to life. The fictional readers in his narrative are urged to use the thousands of hours they spend sleeping to earn extra money by working as “free collaborators” on a collaborative dream via the *Udream* application. *Udream*, the latest revolution in the collaborative economy, he writes sarcastically.

Such companies, cynically termed the “collaborative economy”, conceal greed and exploitation transformed into insecure employment and neoslavery. This last step of self-exploitation represents a kind of “*commodification of communism*” (Han, 2014). The collaborative economy’s initial idea of solidarity and altruism based on the barter of goods and services —time, knowledge, space, resources, etc.— between people living in close proximity has been transformed into an *entrepreneurial capitalism 3.0* that is no longer imposed but offered to us as a new, individual and voluntary route to freedom (Beni, 2017). This is the hidden essence of “entrepreneurship”.

The pressure is becoming unbearable: if you are not an entrepreneur, you are nobody. You are responsible for constructing your own future. In an environment of co-working, surrounded by positive and glamorous catchphrases

such as “if you fear failure, you fear success”, fulfilling your dreams means becoming an entrepreneur, the architect of your dreams and successes. The goal is no other than to shift all responsibility for one’s working future onto the individual. With the collapse of the model of stable employment and the emergence of systematic job insecurity, risk and responsibility have been shifted to individuals, who must now invest to increase their employability in an unstable and insecure labour market.

Thus, rather than attempting to change the model of insecure, temporary employment introduced by conservative and neoliberal government reforms in the service of the business sector and multinational corporations, individuals must become “investors and shareholders” of their work and act in consequence, adapting to constant industrial restructuring (Beck, 2000; Pérez Tapias, 2008; Moruno, 2015). A line in a song by the rapper Nega, *Loser, why aren’t you an entrepreneur?*, is perhaps an accurate reflection of the neoliberal society under construction.

An education in entrepreneurship

The educational reforms being introduced in much of the world are geared towards entrepreneurship, following the guidelines of clearly neoliberal international economic organisations (World Bank, IMF, WTO, OECD, etc.). The latest Spanish educational reform is a good example of this.

The preamble or opening statement of the current Spanish educational law, the LOMCE, implemented in 2015, provides a synthesis of the ideology underlying the law and establishes that education should above all serve the needs of the productive system, competitiveness and employability. This law thus presents education as subservient to and instrumental in strengthening economic processes, prioritising market needs.

Its objectives include “strengthening the entrepreneurial spirit to engage in business activities and initiatives”. Said “entrepreneurial spirit” is inculcated through a cross-curricular approach (taught in all subjects) and through specific courses: an *Introduction to Entrepreneurial and Business Activity* in compulsory secondary education and *Business Economics* in non-compulsory secondary education.

The curriculum established by the Spanish Ministry of Education reveals concerted effort to insert “an education in entrepreneurship” wherever possible, no matter how bizarre. For example, in the subject of philosophy in the first year of non-compulsory secondary education, assessment standards are proposed that appear to have been taken from an anthology of absurd Hispanic metaphysics:

“To learn how to pose fundamental questions using the Socratic method in metaphysics in order to design a business idea and/or a business plan, applying metaphysical and gnosiological approaches to understand the company as a unified whole, facilitating the processes involved in questioning and clearly defining fundamental questions and their responses, such as: Who are we? What are we doing? Why? What is the purpose of this company? What is our mission? What is its reason for existence? Or “To learn the techniques of philosophical dialogue and rhetoric and the philosophy of language and metaphysics for the resolution of negotiations and trade disputes”.

Teachers are struggling to find “formulas” that meet the education authorities’ demand that they insert entrepreneurship into their daily teaching practice. Even at the earliest ages of pre-school education, teachers are required to go beyond the development of psychomotor skills using clay or play dough to seek strategies that endow all activities with an “entrepreneurial” nature. Thus, pre-school pupils are encouraged to create a sales cycle using plasticine figures as

an “educational” introduction to the “free market” and business competition. Children are transformed into sellers going from relative to relative until the product runs out or there are no more family members left and they must start selling to neighbours, as with the products of yesteryear sold door-to-door. Even toys have been revamped: in 2014, the company Mattel launched its *Barbie Entrepreneur*. Her entrepreneurial nature is embodied in her “sophisticated pink suit and the tablet and smartphone she carries” (Sturm, 2014). Furthermore, the programme “*Emprender*” (entrepreneur) on Spanish public television has created a neologism for the new proposed model of teacher-entrepreneur (in Spanish, *profesor-empresario*): *profesario* (Carbonell, 2018).

What is most disturbing is that while resources for basic needs in public education are being slashed, the vast resources being allocated instead to “entrepreneurial metaphysics” are yielding results. A macro-study of a sample of more than 12,000 young Spanish people (Llaneras & Pérez Colomé, 2017) found that the image of social success presented a predominant focus on the “entrepreneur”, the new magic word. The study looked at how the participants envisaged their future career. A typical comment was: “*When I grow up, I want to be like Amancio Ortega*”, the entrepreneur and owner of Inditex and the Zara brand who has become a national role model for entrepreneurs but has also been accused of fraud, tax evasion and of making his fortune by exploiting child slave labour in companies located in countries in the South.

Equality, peace and intercultural awareness have ceased to be cross-curricular subjects in education. Instead, hundreds of thousands of euros are being allocated to programmes aimed at incorporating entrepreneurship and financial expertise into the education system, especially in Autonomous Regions in Spain governed by conservatives.

“Fourteen-year-old Wisal Bachiri has been told that there is a world crisis but that it can be solved with patience and determination, and that there are children of her age throughout the world who are doing amazing things such as becoming an astronaut and going to Mars, starting up technology companies or winning a million dollars on the internet (“and their parents let them?” she wonders)”.

After class, the children are taken on an excursion to the Business Institute — one of the most important business schools in the world— to hear an intern give a talk entitled “*You’re a crack*”, in which they are told that “*the salvation of the world is to be an entrepreneur*” (Plaza, 2014).

The education authorities appear to believe that the solution to all problems is to become an entrepreneur, and promote this through a discourse that surrounds the category of “entrepreneur” with an aura of magic. In this ideological representation, entrepreneurs are endowed with extraordinary qualities, being depicted as creative, innovative and visionary leaders, as “self-made” people who underpin the social change necessary in present-day societies. Business populism is thus reformulated as entrepreneurial individualism (Ararat Herrera, 2010; Maestre, 2016).

Educational reforms aimed at churning out workers who are competitive in the local and global market not only reflect a blinkered vision of education, but also constitute a complete reversal of the principles and values underpinning the entire education system: training for future employment is necessary, but should be subordinate to the fundamental priority of any education system, which is to produce educated citizens capable of critical analysis in order to move forwards in the construction of a wiser, fairer and more cohesive society.

The entrepreneurial neosubject under construction

This entrepreneurial ideology in education involves a blind and unequivocal commitment to individual triumph (Ginesta, 2013, 67). Education thus becomes an individual investment that must provide a return and private interests become the pivotal element of the new educational model, constructing a citizenry “freed” of any moral obligation to engage in collective solidarity.

Under the pretext of “free choice”, a fundamental theme in the new forms of behaviour of the neoliberal subject, the system tends to generate calculation and self-interest. No longer is the goal to improve society as a whole through joint efforts seeking the well-being of the community and the common good, but rather for individuals to deploy their capacity and “talents” to unerringly select their best opportunity for success. A neo-Darwinist approach is being imposed on society in this competition to which we are all constantly exposed, where the “winner takes all”.

Rather than demanding that everyone has guaranteed access to the best schools, the goal now is to select the best one for “my children”, the one that best equips them to compete with others and obtain the best benefits. According to neoliberal logic, the role of the State is to strengthen competition between existing schools and create competitors where these do not exist, helping, supporting and funding private choices to thus expand consumers’ opportunities to exercise “free choice”. The educational world thus constructed mimics the model of a “global shopping centre”, supported and funded by the State (Díez Gutiérrez, 2007),

This model views people and their families as “customers” and “consumers” who seek to leverage and maximise their opportunities, and generates competition between educational institutions by applying goal-based

management models and performance-based pay in order to ensure that they strive to reach a high position in the rankings. Competition is internalised in school dynamics, and disciplinary pressure is brought to bear through “productivity” and “accountability”, sidelining all forms of collective solidarity.

This disciplinary strategy is simultaneously accompanied by the expansion of an entire “assessment technology” in education, understood as a measure of performance and efficiency. The more demand there is for “free choice” in the market, the more need there is to determine the “quality” of the products in order to select correctly and compete with a greater chance of success. Hence, assessment based on measurable outcomes —accountability— has emerged as the principal means to achieve this.

Neoliberal ideology is thus creating a new type of society and person, educated in the logic of calculation and competition (Ball, 2016). “*We are the champions*” is the anthem of the new entrepreneurial subject, set to the tune of positive psychology. But a word of warning: there is no room for losers in this new world. Conformity becomes suspicious, because entrepreneurial neosubjects are required to “surpass themselves”, become genuine “doers” and generate symbolic capital to create their own personal “brand”. Success has become the supreme value, and the desire to succeed, the meaning of life.

Having entered this logic, all protest is silenced and social conflict delegitimised, because no-one else can be held responsible for self-imposed demands, there are no other authors or identifiable external sources. This is unquestionably at the root of some of the new forms of mental suffering. This idolisation of neoliberal entrepreneurship and performance has led most people to feel useless and inadequate, giving rise to widespread symptoms of depression. The diagnosis of depression has multiplied seven times over in

recent decades (Sáez Rueda, 2017). Depression is in fact the reverse side of the model of performance (Han, 2012).

This explains why it is that in times of crisis, unions are not inundated with workers coming together to fight for their rights, but psychiatrists' consulting rooms overflow with patients suffering from depression, anxiety, dissatisfaction and feelings of personal failure due to job insecurity and unemployment (Rendueles, 1998). Prozac has stepped into the breach, substituting the welfare state, with its debilitated public institutions and censured social solidarity. The most widespread remedy is to administer psychiatric drugs, allowing us to sleep in exchange for ignoring the true state of affairs (Fuentes, 2018).

The hidden agenda behind this discourse of “self-realisation” and “success in life” is the stigmatisation of those who have “failed”, of unhappy people, of people who have been unable to achieve the new social norm of prosperity. Social failure is considered a disease. Brutal competitiveness necessarily engenders failure, shame and loss of self-esteem, and corrodes human nature (Sennett, 2000). The ideology of success, of individuals “who owe nothing to anyone”, erodes social ties and generates mistrust and even resentment or hate towards the poor, who are branded “lazy”, the old, refugees, seen as “unproductive and burdensome” (Han, 2018), and immigrants, who it is claimed “steal our jobs”. However, there has also been something of a boomerang effect, since everyone is aware that they too may one day become ineffective and useless.

Neoliberal restructuring has radically transformed the very definition of the political subject (Sefa Dei, 2019). The working class no longer needs rights because its members are now all entrepreneurs. All “responsible” and “realistic” discourse participates in this rationality and is based on prior acceptance of the

market economy, the virtues of competition and the benefits of the globalisation of markets. This neoliberal dogma denies that it is an ideology, instead presenting itself as non-partisan pragmatism. “Modernity” and “efficiency” belong neither to the right nor left, according to the platitudes of those who “are not engaged in politics”. The great ideological victory of neoliberalism has been to erase ideology from the policies carried out, to the point that these are no longer even the subject of debate but are accepted as the “new world order” (Laval & Dardot, 2013).

The problem is that it is easier to escape from a physical prison than to break free from a rationality, since this latter implies liberating oneself from a system of rules instilled by multiple mechanisms of internalisation. Thus, the collective unconscious of present and future generations is being impregnated by a supposedly neutral neoliberal logic. As Chan (2016) has indicated, an entrepreneurial education entails much more than learning particular techniques and knowledge; it means assimilating the rules of capitalism in order to succeed in this game (Darder, 2019).

References

- ARARAT HERRERA, J.A. (2010). La ideología del emprendimiento. Una mirada desde el análisis crítico del discurso. *AD-MINISTER*, 17, 5-33.
- BALL, S. J. (2016). Gobernanza neoliberal y democracia patológica. In J. Collet & A. Tort. (Coord.). *La Gobernanza Escolar* (23-40). Madrid: Morata.
- BECK, U. (2000). *Un nuevo mundo feliz. La precariedad del trabajo en la era de la globalización*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- BENI, E. (2017). Protégeme de lo que quiero. *El Diario.es* [Retrieved December 21, 2017, from <https://goo.gl/SiioJ2>]
- BOLÍVAR BOTÍA, B. (2014). El emprendimiento como ideología. *Blog Canal de Educación* [Retrieved August 17, 2014, from <https://goo.gl/Eb9YQQ>]
- CANTÓ, P. (2017). Cinco nuevas palabras en inglés que nos quieren colar para que vivamos peor. *El Confidencial*. [Retrieved July 25, 2017, from <https://goo.gl/BfrDqZ>]
- CARBONELL, J. (2018). Escuela y empresa: cada vez más cerca. *Eldiariodelaeducacion.com* [Retrieved August 14, 2018, from <https://goo.gl/uqft1Y>]
- CHAN, A. (2016). *Educación financiera. Para padres e hijos*. Barcelona: Plataforma editorial.
- COELHO, P. (2010). *El Alquimista*. Barcelona: Planeta.
- CONSTANTINE, B., GEBAUER, T., & BARTSCH, B. (2019). Uberisierung. In Dahm, Markus H. & Thode, Stefan (Hrsg.) *Strategie und Transformation im digitalen Zeitalter* (259-289). Springer Gabler: Wiesbaden.
- DARDER, A. (2019). Educational Reform and Exclusion in the Age of Neoliberalism. In Chitpin, S. & Portelli, J.P. (Eds.). *Confronting Educational Policy in Neoliberal Times: International Perspectives* (61-74). New York: Routledge.
- DÍEZ GUTIÉRREZ, E.J. (2007). *La globalización neoliberal y sus repercusiones en la educación*. Barcelona: El Roure.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1975). *Vigilar y Castigar*. México: Ediciones Siglo XXI.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2004). *Naissance de la biopolitique. Cours au Collège de France (1978-1979)*. Paris: Seuil/Gallimard.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2006). *Seguridad, territorio y población. Curso en el Collège de France 1977- 1978*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- FUENTES, J. (2018). La antimoral y sus coartadas. *El Salto*. [Retrieved August 2, 2018, from <https://goo.gl/cYTxpz>]
- GALINDO, E. (2017). Emociones capitalistas: La escuela de la ignorancia y la servidumbre voluntaria. *Nuestra Bandera*, 236, 116-123.
- GINESTA, V. (2013). Apología del emprendedor: análisis crítico del discurso sobre el interés propio. *Oxímora. Revista Internacional de Ética y Política*, 3, 56-74.
- GRAMSCI, A. (1981). *Cuadernos de la cárcel* (vol. 2). México: Era.
- HAN, B. (2012). *La sociedad del cansancio*. Barcelona: Herder.
- HAN, B. (2013). *La sociedad de la transparencia*. Barcelona: Herder.
- HAN, B. (2014). *Psicopolítica*. Barcelona: Herder.
- HAN, B. (2018). La expulsión de la diferencia y el valor de la hospitalidad. *Conferencia en Centro de Cultura Contemporánea de Barcelona*, February 6, 2018.
- HARDT, M. & NEGRI, A. (2002). *El Imperio*. Barcelona: Paidós.

- HERNÁNDEZ, F. (2017). La innovación educativa y la formación del sujeto neoliberal. *El Diario de la Educación.es*. [Retrieved February 21, 2017, from <https://goo.gl/1Jbe4X>]
- KUMAR, A. (2019). *Curriculum in International Contexts. Understanding Colonial, Ideological, and Neoliberal Influences*. Cham (Switzerland): Palgrave Macmillan.
- LAVAL, CH. y DARDOT, P. (2013). *La nueva razón del mundo. Ensayo sobre la sociedad neoliberal*. Barcelona: Gedisa.
- LLANERAS, K. & PÉREZ COLOMÉ, J. (2017). “Yo de mayor quiero parecerme a Amancio Ortega”. *El País*. 29 de julio. [Retrieved December 21, 2017, from <https://goo.gl/en6QRb>]
- MAESTRE, A. (2016). El populismo empresarial y la cultura del esfuerzo. *El Diario.es*. [Retrieved August 21, 2016, from <https://goo.gl/JZyRrQ>]
- MORUNO, J. (2015). *La fábrica del emprendedor. Trabajo y política en la empresa-mundo*. Madrid: Akal.
- MOYA OTERO, J. (2014). *La ideología del esfuerzo*. Madrid: Catarata.
- NURVALA, J. P. (2015). ‘Uberisation’ is the future of the digitalised labour market. *European View*, 14(2), 231-239.
- ONG, A. (2007). Neoliberalism as a mobile technology. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 32(1), 3–8.
- PÉREZ TAPIAS, J.L. (2008). La ideología de la “calidad” en las propuestas educativas neoliberales. In J.I. Aróstegui Plaza & J.B. Martínez Rodríguez. (Coords.). *Globalización, posmodernidad y educación: la calidad como coartada neoliberal* (47-90). Madrid: Akal.
- PIKE, D. (2017). Argentina: Nueva Reforma del Secundario: Estudiantes a trabajar gratis a las empresas. *Resumen Latinoamericano*. [Retrieved September 9, 2017, from <https://goo.gl/9FA2qW>]
- PLAZA, A. (2014). ¿La salvación del mundo es ser emprendedor?” Lo que piensan los niños cuando les enseñan a emprender. *El Diario.es*. [Retrieved August 28, 2017, from <https://goo.gl/xpFSh4>]
- RENDUELES, G. (1998). La psiquiatría como mano invisible del desorden neoliberal. In ÁLVAREZ-URÍA, F.; GARCÍA SANTESMASES, A.; MUGUERZA, J.; PASTOR, J.; RENDUELES, G. & VARELA, J. (Compils.). (1998). *Neoliberalismo vs. Democracia* (197-217). Madrid: La Piqueta.
- ROSA, I. (2017). ¡Pon a trabajar tus horas de sueño! *El Diario.es* [Retrieved January 21, 2018, from <https://goo.gl/UxHcCr>]
- SÁEZ RUEDA, L. (Ed.). (2017). *El malestar de Occidente. Perspectivas filosóficas sobre una civilización enferma*. Hamburgo (Al.): Anchor Academic Publishing.
- SEFA DEI, G.J. (2019). Neoliberalism as a new form of colonialism in education. In Chitpin, S. & Portelli, J.P. (Eds.). *Confronting Educational Policy in Neoliberal Times: International Perspectives* (40-58). New York: Routledge.
- SENNETT, R. (2000). *La corrosión del carácter*. Barcelona: Anagrama.
- STURM, C. (2014). Mattel lanza la Barbie emprendedora. *Fayerwayer*. [Retrieved January 12, 2018, from <https://goo.gl/HtrrQG>]
- TORRES, J. (2017). *Políticas educativas y construcción de personalidades neoliberales y neocolonialistas*. Madrid: Morata.

- VALENDUC, G. (2019). New forms of work and employment in the digital economy. In Serrano-Pascual, A. & Jepsen, M. (Eds.) *The Deconstruction of Employment as a Political Question* (63-80). Palgrave Macmillan: Cham.
- ZINN, H. (2004). La historia popular de Estados Unidos. Un poder que nadie puede reprimir. *Le Monde Diplomatique*, 99, January, 11.

Author and Correspondence Details

Dr. Enrique Javier Díez Gutiérrez. Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Education, Public University of León (Spain). Specialising in educational organisation, Dr. Enrique Javier Díez Gutiérrez undertakes teaching and research in the field of intercultural education, gender and educational policy. His most recently published book is *Neoliberalismo educativo* (Octaedro, 2018).

Web: <http://educar.unileon.es>

Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/enriquejdiez>

Twitter: @EnriqueJDiez Contact: ejdieg@unileon.es