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Abstract. This article describes the organizational approaches to the formation of regional ecosystems of entrepreneurial education. The model of the organization of interaction between the actors of the regional ecosystem of entrepreneurial education is considered. The presence of a logically structured ecosystem in the region will allow to organize the process of continuous formation, development and practical implementation of entrepreneurial competencies, especially for young people, which will greatly contribute to the growth of entrepreneurial activity in the Russian Federation.

1. Introduction

The need to solve a variety of socio-economic and technological challenges facing the Russian state and society necessitates further accelerated development of entrepreneurship and private business initiative. At present, the Russian Federation is in a very high demand for a new generation of leaders-practitioners, entrepreneurs, who, among possessing other qualities, are able to independently and proactively develop and apply modern adaptive business approaches and business models in conditions of high uncertainty and instability of the business environment. As practice shows, the Russian economy experiences quite acute shortage of young and energetic people with initiative-and-risk based skills of running a business independently in order to obtain entrepreneurial income and commercialize entrepreneurial projects. This shortage adversely affects the pace of socio-economic development of Russia. According to the Global Entrepreneurship Monitoring (GEM) research project, in 2016, only 5.0% of the Russian population reported that they were planning to set up a business in the next 3 years. At the same time, among the respondents who have entrepreneurial intentions (i.e. are ready to get engaged in entrepreneurial activity), about half are already existing entrepreneurs planning to set up another business. Only 2.1% of Russians who are not yet entrepreneurs, consider for themselves an opportunity to start a new business. It is noteworthy that the figure fell by 4 percentage points compared to 2006. [Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, 2016]. In general, it should be recognized that entrepreneurship as a type of professional activity is becoming less and less attractive among Russian citizens. In the Russian society, the attitude to entrepreneurship as an activity aimed at trivial profit-making has become quite a widespread opinion shared by many young people. Moreover, most often these profit-making activities are carried out through mediation, which fails to contribute to the growth of the popularity of business activities.

Meanwhile, it would be quite appropriate to note that in the world practice, the understanding of entrepreneurship is different and more extended. It has long been known as an activity for creation and...
exploitation of market opportunities [Shane, Venkataraman, 2000]. In other words, entrepreneurship in a new modern interpretation is a model of proactive human behavior [Sarasvathy, 2001] allowing to identify the existing and potential market niches and to create value propositions on this basis.

All this testifies to the need of developing mechanisms of expanded reproduction of high-quality human capital in our country, those mechanisms that will meet the modern requirements of the market economy, the mechanisms which will be based on a quality system of business education. This postulate is confirmed by numerous studies that show that training in entrepreneurship has a positive impact on the overall entrepreneurial activity and contributes to the growth of economic efficiency as a result of the activities of new enterprises [Fayolle, Gailly, Lassas-Clerc, 2006; Cruz at al., 2009; Oosterbeek, van Praag M., Ijsselstein, 2010; Martin, McNally, Kay, 2013].

However, currently Russia lacks a holistic, intuitive, logically designed and structured system of entrepreneurial education. It is perceived as fragmentary, poorly structured and mainly based on institutions of secondary vocational and higher education alongside with a number of commercial and non-profit organizations. Each of them implements its own format of training, for both potential and current entrepreneurs. Unfortunately all these educational structures are mostly focused on an adult contingent of students. Young people of school age are not actually engaged in entrepreneurial education. Thus, until the moment they enter university or college, the younger generation remains outside the environment that forms their entrepreneurial competence. This produces a negative impact on the economic outlook of schoolchildren, given that unlike countries with a developed history of market economy, Russia lacks socio-cultural environment that encourages the younger generation to be aimed at achieving personal (including entrepreneurial) success. Thus, according to the above mentioned study, the GEM experts throughout the project period stressed that the Russian national culture fails to encourage entrepreneurial risk and does not support the idea of personal achievement. [Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, 2016].

In modern conditions the ability and professional skills of independent initiative-and-risk based economic activity (entrepreneurship) is one of the key factors for successful competitiveness of school, college and university graduates in the labor market. It is obvious that developed entrepreneurial skills will allow them to be more effectively implemented not only in the field of independent business activities, but also significantly increase their job and career opportunities in other areas due to the qualities that are becoming more and more appreciated by employers, such as initiative, creativity, innovation, ability to change, responsibility, efficiency, good learning abilities, etc. Thus, in today's fast-changing world, such personal qualities as entrepreneurship, initiative and independence become especially relevant.

In connection with this, the social order of the society sets a goal for teachers to create and test new forms and methods of educational activities. The urgent need today is training energetic enterprising workers with the qualities of a leader, ability to think creatively, to find innovative solutions, to be able to design their individual professional trajectory, to achieve success in life.

However, within the Russian educational system, the methodology of teaching social and economic subjects at school is focused on studying theoretical issues of micro- and macroeconomics. The forms and methods of training used do not allow to involve students in independent practical activities and do not contribute to the active adaptation of graduates into the social structure of a society with a developing market economy. The existing system is not oriented at developing the students’ creative potential, initiatives and other social skills that would allow more school graduates to predict their entrepreneurial activity in the future as the practical component of training is presented insufficiently.

In General, it can be concluded that the current system of upbringing and school education does not make it possible to launch a mechanism for the early development of entrepreneurial and innovative way of thinking and behavior in the younger generation. Often, under the influence of various factors of the external environment, children gradually acquire a fear of failure and negative social assessment of entrepreneurship.
2. Results and discussion
In General, experts emphasize the low level of primary and secondary education which does not pay attention to entrepreneurship and fails to provide the necessary training for setting up new businesses. [Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, 2016].

The current situation necessitates a certain transformation of the parameters of the Russian system of education in favor of the development of practice-oriented and project-based training, in the framework of which the most important place should be occupied by entrepreneurial education.

From our point of view, the effectiveness of entrepreneurial education contributing to the growth of the number of people who are willing and capable of active entrepreneurial activity can be provided only on condition that Russia will form its own national holistic ecosystem of entrepreneurial education coordinating the activities of various interested educational, public and business structures - schools, colleges, universities, authorities, non-profit organizations. In addition, it seems appropriate to focus on the design and development of regional ecosystems of entrepreneurial education which should become an integral part of regional business ecosystems [Moore,1993]. Thus, in the regional ecosystem of entrepreneurial education, the process of formation of innovative thinking and initial entrepreneurial competencies should be continuous, beginning at school age and involving as many students as possible. At the initial stage of formation of the system of continuous business education it may be advisable to include a compulsory subject "Fundamentals of entrepreneurship and innovation" in the secondary school curricula. This course will allow to reveal school-aged children who are prone to entrepreneurship and purposefully work with them developing and practically implementing entrepreneurial skills in the process of further training at college, university or in the direct transition to entrepreneurship.

Hence, the model of organization of interaction between the actors of the regional ecosystem of entrepreneurial education to be formed in the region is seen as follows (Fig.1).
Figure 1. The Scheme of Interaction of Educational Organizations in the Regional Educational Ecosystem of Entrepreneurial Education

Within the framework of the conception of continuous entrepreneurial education, children who are inclined to entrepreneurial activity may have different trajectories of obtaining and developing their entrepreneurial education and starting independent business projects, such as E1→E2→E4→E6, E1→E2→E5→E6, or else E1→E2→E6.

However, based on rich foreign and domestic experience, it can be assumed that the most effective way to obtain entrepreneurial education can be reached within the trajectory E1→E2→E3→E6, that is, by getting higher education.

The focus on university as the core of the potential educational ecosystem of the region is quite reasonable in the light of the development of new concepts regarding the functions of university in the modern market and technological conditions, such as the "Triple Helix" [Etzkowitz, Leydesdorff, 2000; Ranga, Etzkowitz, 2013] or "Entrepreneurial University» [Etzkowitz,1983 ; Clark, 1998, Foss, Gibson,2015 ]. In the Russian Federation, the concept of "University 3.0" has been given considerable impetus to. The concept is aimed at active integration of universities in the regional socio-economic system on the basis of balanced development of three areas of activity: educational, scientific and innovative (entrepreneurship).

From the point of view of the proposed conception of continuous entrepreneurial education, the concept of "Entrepreneurial University" seems to be of particular interest. Entrepreneurial university is
an institution striving for innovation, taking risks in the development of new practices, the final outcome of which is not yet known [Clark, 1998]. The basic idea of this concept is that entrepreneurship should be the main principle of organization of university activities [Unger, Polt 2017]. Based on the logic presented, we emphasize that the model of implementation of the concept of continuous entrepreneurial education can be effective if at least one University will develop in each region of Russia on the basis of one of the modern world concepts of development of universities - the concept of “Entrepreneurial University”. With the mandatory support of regional authorities, such a university or a network of universities, should ensure and coordinate the processes of entrepreneurial education in the regions. Thus, these leading regional universities should become not only "locomotives" of innovative development of the regions [Петросянц, 2013], but a real core of the regional ecosystem of entrepreneurship.

This logically structured ecosystem in the region will allow to organize the process of continuous formation, development and practical implementation of entrepreneurial competencies, especially for young people, which will greatly contribute to the growth of entrepreneurial activity in the Russian Federation.

All this accounts for the necessity to establish closer constructive cooperation and use joint efforts of the regional authorities, secondary, secondary vocational, higher professional and additional vocational education in the field of business development, which will contribute to the training of better business personnel and thus stimulate the economic development of the territory.

This will require transformation of both the national education system and its regional educational subsystems.

3. Conclusions

At the regional level, a large number of tasks need to be addressed, among which the following ones should be marked out:

1. Evaluation of prospects followed by development of practical mechanisms for the implementation of university management systems in Russian regions based on the concept of "University 3.0 "(education-science-innovation (entrepreneurship));
2. Evaluation of prospects followed by development of practical mechanisms of mass inclusion of project-oriented and entrepreneurial education in the curricula of all universities in the region;
3. Implementation of the regional eco-system of continuous entrepreneurial education and education with feedback (school → college → university → real sector of the economy) and active involvement of young people in the entrepreneurial movement;
4. Development of a set of measures aimed at improving the quality of university-based business education;
5. Development of a pilot model of cooperation "School-University-Industry-Regional authorities", its testing and implementation in practical work;
6. Development of a methodology for comprehensive monitoring of the quality of interaction among regional authorities, schools, universities and business entities in terms of effectiveness of joint efforts aimed at increasing the number and quality of business entities and improving their competitiveness in the interregional and global markets.

The solution of these tasks will allow to form a stable ecosystem in the country and its regions, providing expanded reproduction of young and energetic people with the skills of independent economic management on the base of initiative and risk in order to obtain entrepreneurial income and commercialization of projects (professional entrepreneurs), which in its turn will have a positive impact on the pace of socio-economic development of Russia.
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