

ЯЗЫКИ НАРОДОВ ЗАРУБЕЖНЫХ СТРАН (С УКАЗАНИЕМ КОНКРЕТНОГО ЯЗЫКА ИЛИ ГРУППЫ ЯЗЫКОВ) / LANGUAGES OF PEOPLES OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES (INDICATING A SPECIFIC LANGUAGE OR GROUP OF LANGUAGES)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.60797/RULB.2025.61.10>

ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH TERMINOLOGY IN THE FIELD OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Research article

Vinnikova T.A.^{1,*}, Churilova I.N.², Fedorova M.A.³

¹ORCID : 0000-0001-5865-1023;

²ORCID : 0000-0001-6063-8661;

³ORCID : 0000-0002-0899-6303;

^{1,2,3}Omsk State Technical University, Omsk, Russian Federation

* Corresponding author (tavinnikova[at]omgtu.ru)

Abstract

The article examines the terminology in the field of social entrepreneurship and its relationship with the emergence and development of the socio-economic discourse. The aim of the work is to study the content of the term "social entrepreneurship", define the basic terms of the social entrepreneurial discourse, analyze the discourse as a whole, and indicate the main perspectives for its study. The research was based on materials from presentations of Russian and foreign scientists, investors, social entrepreneurs at the annual forum "Innosib" (Omsk), collections and methodological manuals of the Omsk School of Social Entrepreneurship, English-language websites of social entrepreneurship projects, Internet resources dedicated to the history of social entrepreneurship development in European and African countries, content pages of social entrepreneurship projects on social networks. Within the framework of the research, linguistic-cultural analysis of the text, comprehensive selection of terms, statistical analysis of term through online tools, as well as cognitive-linguistic analysis of the history of the described terminology development were carried out. Special attention was paid to the interaction between social entrepreneurial discourse and the continuous development of terminology in this area. The basic dominant concept, "social entrepreneurship", is analyzed. The research results showed a close connection between the studied discourse, which is currently in the process of formation, and the continuous development of terminology in the field of social entrepreneurship. It was found that the terminology of this field combines terms from charity, healthcare, social work, rehabilitation, sports, education, leisure, and business. In conclusion, the importance of further studying this terminology for a deep understanding of its evolution and use in this area is emphasized. The tasks for future research include a more detailed study of the development and application of terms in this field.

Keywords: terminology, intertextual terminological system, key terms, English, discourse, social entrepreneurship.

АНАЛИЗ АНГЛИЙСКОЙ ТЕРМИНОЛОГИИ В СФЕРЕ СОЦИАЛЬНОГО ПРЕДПРИНИМАТЕЛЬСТВА

Научная статья

Винникова Т.А.^{1,*}, Чурилова И.Н.², Федорова М.А.³

¹ORCID : 0000-0001-5865-1023;

²ORCID : 0000-0001-6063-8661;

³ORCID : 0000-0002-0899-6303;

^{1,2,3}Омский государственный технический университет, Омск, Российская Федерация

* Корреспондирующий автор (tavinnikova[at]omgtu.ru)

Аннотация

В статье рассматривается терминология в сфере социального предпринимательства и ее взаимосвязь с появлением и развитием социально-экономического дискурса. Целью работы является изучение содержания термина «социальное предпринимательство», определение базовых терминов социально-предпринимательского дискурса, а также анализ самого дискурса в целом и указание на основные перспективы его изучения. Исследование проводилось на основе материалов выступлений российских и зарубежных ученых, инвесторов, социальных предпринимателей, представленных на ежегодном форуме «Инносиб» (Омск), сборников и методических пособий Омской школы социального предпринимательства, англоязычных сайтов социально-предпринимательских проектов, Интернет-ресурсов, посвященные истории развития социального предпринимательства в европейских и африканских странах, контент-страниц социально-предпринимательских проектов в социальных сетях. В рамках исследования проведены лингвокультурологический анализ текста, сплошная выборка терминов, статистический анализ встречаемости терминов посредством онлайн инструментария, а также лингвокогнитивный анализ истории становления описываемой терминологии. Особое внимание уделялось взаимодействию между социально-предпринимательским дискурсом и постоянным развитием терминологии в данной области. Анализируется базовая доминанта – понятие «социальное предпринимательство». Результаты исследования показали тесную связь между изучаемым дискурсом, который в настоящее время находится в стадии становления, и постоянным развитием терминологии в области социального предпринимательства. Было установлено, что терминология указанной сферы объединяет термины благотворительности, здравоохранения, социальной работы, реабилитации, спорта, образования, досуга, бизнеса. В заключении работы подчеркивается важность дальнейшего изучения данной терминологии для глубокого понимания

ее эволюции и использования в данной области. В задачи для последующих исследований входит более подробное изучение развития и применения терминов в данной сфере.

Ключевые слова: терминология, интертекстуальная терминосистема, ключевые термины, английский, дискурс, социальное предпринимательство.

Introduction

Studying the terminology and concepts of social entrepreneurship (SE) is of great importance in the modern world, where the role of social entrepreneurs and their impact on society is constantly growing. Understanding the terminology of social entrepreneurship enables various stakeholders – researchers, practitioners, investors, government bodies, and non-profit organizations – to communicate effectively, collaborate, and develop strategies to address social problems.

Studying the terms of social entrepreneurship also contributes to establishing a common understanding of the essence and goals of this form of activity. This helps to establish recognized standards and criteria for assessing the effectiveness of social entrepreneurial projects, which is important both for attracting investments and evaluating social outcomes.

Another important aspect of studying the terms of social entrepreneurship is the formation of public awareness and the dissemination of ideas about innovative approaches to solving social problems. The wider the understanding of the value of social entrepreneurship and its potential for public good, the greater the chances of creating sustainable and effective social change.

Therefore, studying the terms of social entrepreneurship plays a significant role in promoting the development of this field, increasing its importance, and recognizing its potential to improve society as a whole.

This study aims to investigate the processes involved in the formation of social entrepreneurship (SE) terminology, considering both external and internal linguistic factors. The research objectives include defining the content of the term "social entrepreneurship", identifying key terms in socio-entrepreneurial discourse, analyzing the discourse as a whole, and highlighting key issues in discourse analysis.

Main results

Thus far, the distinct terminology of social entrepreneurship has not been delineated as a standalone entity. The discourse surrounding social entrepreneurship evolves within the interconnected realms of economics, politics, sociology, and media. This interconnectedness highlights the intertextual and non-isolated nature of social entrepreneurship, underscoring how various discourses shape the terminology associated with it. From a linguistic perspective, the terminology of social entrepreneurship encompasses lexical units derived from both economic and social spheres, reflecting the multidimensional nature of this field.

In practice, we have not seen any philological studies on the features of the SE terms and socio-entrepreneurial discourse, although there are enough publications devoted to both the characteristics of economic discourse and the study of economic and social terminology. An in-depth analysis of economic discourse is presented in the works of T.A. Yevtushina and T.V. Solodovnikova [1], [2], [3]; the economic terminological system being characterized from the point of view of various aspects [4], [5], [6].

Social discourse is most often considered in the context of philosophy, sociology, and political science [7]. Several linguistic studies devoted to the analysis of social discourse should be noted: the characteristic of its pragmatilistic features is presented in the works of E.V. Lukhina [8], the structure of the discourse of social values are mentioned in the publications of M.V. Terskikh [9]. Linguists are often interested in the terminology of social work, the analysis of which are presented in the works of E.I. Bezryadina and E.P. Meteleva [10], [11].

Understanding the history and origins of social entrepreneurship provides valuable insights into how the concept has evolved in response to changing societal needs, economic landscapes, and cultural shifts. By tracing the trajectory of the term and unpacking its evolving meanings, researchers can gain a comprehensive understanding of the nuances and complexities inherent in the field of social entrepreneurship.

The introduction of the term "social entrepreneurship" is credited to W. Drayton, the founder of the Ashoka Foundation, which stands as one of the pioneering organizations dedicated to promoting social entrepreneurship globally. Drayton's conceptualization of social entrepreneurship emerged during his visit to India in the early 1980s, a journey that would shape the course of his work and influence the development of the field. It was during this trip that Drayton encountered the transformative "Land Gift" movement led by Vinoba Bhave, a social initiative focused on alleviating poverty through sustainable land redistribution. Despite the relatively recent establishment of the Ashoka Foundation, which is just over 35 years old, the roots of social entrepreneurship can be traced back centuries. Throughout history, innovative individuals and visionary leaders have engaged in endeavors that blend entrepreneurial principles with a deep commitment to addressing pressing social issues.

The late 1960s and 1970s marked a significant period of growth and dynamism for civil society movements in Western Europe. During this time, there was a surge in grassroots initiatives and community-based organizations working towards the development of civil society and the promotion of social justice. These movements aimed to empower individuals and communities to address systemic social issues and advocate for positive change at local, national, and international levels.

The emergence of social entrepreneurship in Europe in the 1990s marked a significant shift in how organizations approached social issues and welfare. The concept, initially rooted in the non-profit third sector of the economy, which includes volunteering, charity work, and cooperative movements, gained prominence as a new approach to addressing social challenges.

The development of social cooperatives in Italy, following the passage of a specific law in 1991, exemplified this trend. Social cooperatives were designed to combine economic activity with a strong social mission, focusing on creating employment opportunities for marginalized groups and promoting community well-being. This legal framework provided a structured platform for social entrepreneurship to flourish in Italy.

Meanwhile, in the United States, the concept of social entrepreneurship also began to gain traction in the early 1990s. The launch of the "Social Initiative of Industrial Enterprises" project at Harvard Business School in 1993 further underscored the growing interest in exploring how businesses could contribute to social good while maintaining financial sustainability.

The rise of social entrepreneurship on both sides of the Atlantic reflected a broader shift towards innovative approaches to addressing societal challenges. By blending traditional business practices with a social mission, social entrepreneurs sought to create sustainable solutions that could drive positive impact and change in communities.

Overall, the emergence of social entrepreneurship in the 1990s paved the way for a new wave of organizations and initiatives that sought to combine profitability with social purpose, reshaping the landscape of social innovation and business practices.

Currently, many researchers are studying the field of social entrepreneurship. An analysis of the current situation in various countries is being conducted, and forecasts for the future are being made [12], [13], [14]. Conducting research on the terminology of social entrepreneurship contributes to a deeper understanding of this domain.

Discussion

The study draws on a variety of sources, including speeches by Russian and foreign scholars, investors, and social entrepreneurs at the Innosib Forum in Omsk, materials from the Omsk School of Social Entrepreneurship, English-language websites featuring socio-entrepreneurial projects, online resources detailing SE development in Europe and Africa, and content from socio-entrepreneurial projects on social media platforms. The research is predominantly conducted in English, reflecting the geographical and historical roots of social entrepreneurship in the United States and Europe.

The main research methods are linguistic and cultural analysis of the text, a continuous selection of terms, statistical analysis of the terms through online tools

Indeed, the concept of social entrepreneurship is still evolving globally, and this is particularly true in Russia where the discourse is still in the formative stages. While the precise definition may vary depending on the context, there are several key components that are often associated with social entrepreneurship:

1. *Participants of the discourse*: entrepreneurs, volunteers, investors, coaches.
2. *Fields of communication*: charity, business, investments, education, service industry, healthcare, leisure.
3. *Functional styles*: official, conversational, journalistic, and less often – scientific.
4. *Genres*: among the genre characteristics of socio-entrepreneurial discourse, we list the following: lecture, speaker paper, report, business plan, social media post, brochure, project presentation, genres of business correspondence, forum (conference) program, welcome letter, thank you letter, grant application,

5. *Terminology*: based on the above, it can be assumed that the terminology of the social entrepreneurship combines terms from such areas as charity, health, social work, rehabilitation, sports, education, leisure, business (entrepreneurship). Thus, terminology of SE is an intertextual one. It means that it is a system of interconnected and permeating texts and terms used in various fields of knowledge. This concept implies the presence of connections between texts and terms that interact with each other, creating a particular network of meanings and concepts. Possibilities of studying the terminology of social entrepreneurship will be examined in details below.

3.1. Structural analysis of the SE basic terms

Single-component terms: **business, stakeholder, entrepreneurship, entrepreneurs, sustainability.**

Two-component terms: **social innovation, social entrepreneurship, inclusive business, social impact, impact investing.**

Multi-component terms: **double bottom line.**

Abbreviation: **ESG** (Environmental, Social, Governance) is a set of criteria used by investors to assess the social and environmental responsibility of companies; **CSR** (Corporate Social Responsibility) is a business strategy based on voluntary actions taken by companies to improve societal conditions and protect the environment; **SDG** (Sustainable Development Goals) is a set of global goals approved by the United Nations to achieve sustainable development on the planet; **B-Corp** (B Corporation certification) is a designation for companies that combine commercial objectives with a social mission and high standards of social responsibility.

3.2. Statistical analysis of SE terms

The most frequent English terms in all the studied texts of social and entrepreneurial discourse are:

Nouns: **mission, entrepreneurs, inclusivity, impact, sustainability, innovation, ecosystem, enterprise, actors, microcredit, incubator, sector.**

Verbs: **support, mobilize, create, engage, improve, promote, invest.**

Adjectives: **entrepreneurial, sustainable, environmental, target, social, profit (non-profit).**

3.3. Lexical and grammatical analysis of the SE terms

Lexical groups of SE terms:

The following key terms of social entrepreneurship are highlighted:

1. **Innovations**: *creative solutions, innovative projects, progressive ideas, social changes.*
2. **Community**: *social interaction, public support, community participation, impact investing.*
3. **Economy**: *economic growth, financial inclusion, circular economy, corporate philanthropy, economic justice.*
4. **Law**: *legal responsibility, licensing of social projects, legal support for social initiatives, corporate social responsibility*
5. **Ethics**: *ethical investing, ethical leadership, ethical marketing behavior.*

Conclusion

By examining the history and formation of the social entrepreneurship discourse and delving into the central term of "social entrepreneurship", we analyzed the evolution and significance of this growing field. The general characteristics of

social entrepreneurship terminologies provide a framework for recognition of the sphere and contribute to the broader understanding of social entrepreneurship.

Studying the terminology of social entrepreneurship is an important and promising area of research in the modern world. Some of the main perspectives of studying this field include:

1. Development of theoretical basis: analyzing the terminology of social entrepreneurship contributes to a deeper understanding of the concepts and principles of this type of entrepreneurship.

2. Support for social entrepreneurship practice: meaningful application of terminology helps improve the practical skills of social entrepreneurs and enables them to more effectively implement their social projects.

3. Contribution to education: Studying the terminology of social entrepreneurship can serve as a training course for interpreters and translators in the field of social entrepreneurship.

4. Formation of professional communities: A shared language and understanding of social entrepreneurship terminology help in creating professional communities that encourage the exchange of experience and effective interaction in this field.

5. Facilitating discussions and research: the terminology of social entrepreneurship is the subject of active discussions and research, leading to in-depth analysis of the social and entrepreneurial aspects of this activity.

Overall, studying the terminology of social entrepreneurship not only contributes to the development of the field itself but also has the potential to have a significant impact on societal development by promoting innovation, sustainable development, and the resolution of social issues.

Конфликт интересов

Не указан.

Рецензия

Все статьи проходят рецензирование. Но рецензент или автор статьи предпочли не публиковать рецензию к этой статье в открытом доступе. Рецензия может быть предоставлена компетентным органам по запросу.

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

Review

All articles are peer-reviewed. But the reviewer or the author of the article chose not to publish a review of this article in the public domain. The review can be provided to the competent authorities upon request.

Список литературы / References

- Евтушина Т.А. Экономический дискурс как объект лингвистического исследования / Т.А. Евтушина, Н.А. Ковальская // Вестник Челябинского государственного университета. — 2014. — № 6(335). — С. 42–46.
- Солодовникова Т.В. Специфика современного экономического дискурса как категории / Т.В. Солодовникова // Экономическая наука сегодня. — 2017. — № 5. — С. 80–86.
- Umida E. Characteristics of economic literature and it's translation / E. Umida // Science and Innovation. — 2023. — Vol. 2. — № 7. — P. 163–170.
- Брыкина С.В. Английские экономические термины: структура, семантика, перевод / С.В. Брыкина // Известия Пензенского государственного педагогического университета им. В.Г. Белинского. — 2012. — № 27. — С. 223–229.
- Пушкарева И.А. Экономическая терминосистема как метаязык описания мир-системы: на материале английского и русского языков : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.19 / И.А. Пушкарева. — Барнаул, 2006. — 198 с.
- Пиньковецкая Ю.С. Дефиниции "предприниматель" и "предпринимательство": обзор исследований зарубежных ученых / Ю.С. Пиньковецкая // Управление в современных системах. — 2020. — № 2(26). — С. 34–41.
- Богомягова Е.С. Социальные проблемы как дискурс: производство новых форм неравенства / Е.С. Богомягова // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. Сер. 12. Психология. Социология. Педагогика. — 2015. — № 4. — С. 112–117.
- Лухина Е.В. Социально-ориентированный дискурс в лингвопрагматическом освещении: на материале современного американского варианта английского языка : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.04 / Е.В. Лухина. — М., 2011. — 196 с.
- Терских М.В. Дискурс социальных ценностей: структура и базовые дискурсивные практики / М.В. Терских // Политическая лингвистика. — 2015. — № 4(54). — С. 144–149.
- Безрядина Е.И. Особенности смысловой и морфологической структуры терминов социальной работы и их отражение в интернациональной лексике / Е.И. Безрядина // Язык науки и техники в современном мире : материалы VI Международной научно-практической конференции, Омск, 20 апр. 2017 г. — Омск : Издательство ОмГТУ, 2017. — С. 11–16.
- Метелева Е.Р. Определение ключевых терминов в социальной сфере / Е.Р. Метелева // Известия Байкальского государственного университета. — 2016. — Т. 26. — № 1. — С. 90–98.
- Hota P.K. Mapping the Intellectual Structure of Social Entrepreneurship Research: A Citation/Co-citation Analysis / P.K. Hota, B. Subramanian, G. Narayanamurthy // Journal of Business Ethics. — 2020. — Vol. 166. — P. 89–114. DOI: 10.1007/s10551-019-04129-4.
- Shahid S.M. Social entrepreneurship education: A conceptual framework and review / S.M. Shahid, G. Alarifi // The International Journal of Management Education. — 2021. — Vol. 19. — № 3. — P. 100533. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijme.2021.100533.
- Gupta P. Social entrepreneurship research: A review and future research agenda / P. Gupta, S. Chauhan, Ju. Paul [et al.] // Journal of Business Research. — 2020. — Vol. 113. — P. 209–229. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.03.032.
- Text stemming online // SGen.RU. — URL: <https://gsngen.ru/tools/dlina-seo-text> (accessed: 23.09.2024).

Список литературы на английском языке / References in English

1. Yevtushina T.A. Ekonomicheskiy diskurs kak ob'ekt lingvisticheskogo issledovaniya [Economic discourse as an object of linguistic research] / T.A. Yevtushina, N.A. Kovalskaya // Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta [Bulletin of Chelyabinsk State University]. — 2014. — № 6(335). — P. 42–46. [in Russian]
2. Solodovnikova T.V. Spetsifika sovremennogo ekonomicheskogo diskursa kak kategorii [Peculiarities of the modern economic discourse as a category] / T.V. Solodovnikova // Ekonomicheskaya nauka segodnya [Economic Science Today]. — 2017. — № 5. — P. 80–86. [in Russian]
3. Umida E. Characteristics of economic literature and it's translation / E. Umida // Science and Innovation. — 2023. — Vol. 2. — № 7. — P. 163–170.
4. Brykina S.V. Angliyskie ekonomicheskie terminy: struktura, semantika, perevod [English economic terms: structure, semantics, translation] / S.V. Brykina // Izvestiya Penzenskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta im. V.G. Belinskogo [News of Penza State Pedagogical University named after V.G. Belinsky]. — 2012. — № 27. — P. 223–229. [in Russian]
5. Pushkareva I.A. Ekonomicheskaya terminossistema kak metazyk opisaniya mir-sistemy: Na materiale angliyskogo i russkogo yazykov [Economic terminological system as a metalanguage of world-system description: Based on the material of English and Russian languages] : dis. ... of PhD in Philology : 10.02.19 / I.A. Pushkareva. — Barnaul, 2006. — 198 p. [in Russian]
6. Pinkovetskaya Yu.S. Definitсии "predprinimatel'" i "predprinimatel'stvo": obzor issledovaniy zarubezhnykh uchenykh [Definitions of "entrepreneur" and "entrepreneurship": review of foreign scholars' research] / Yu.S. Pinkovetskaya // Upravlenie v sovremennykh sistemakh [Management in Modern Systems]. — 2020. — № 2(26). — P. 34–41. [in Russian]
7. Bogomyakova E.S. Sotsial'nye problemy kak diskurs: proizvodstvo novykh form neravenstva [Social issues as discourse: production of new forms of inequality] / E.S. Bogomyakova // Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta. Ser. 12. Psikhologiya. Sotsiologiya. Pedagogika [Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Ser. 12. Psychology. Sociology. Pedagogy]. — 2015. — № 4. — P. 112–117. [in Russian]
8. Lukhina E.V. Sotsial'no-orientirovannyi diskurs v lingvopragmaticheskom osveshchenii: na materiale sovremennogo amerikanskogo varianta angliyskogo yazyka [Socially oriented discourse in a linguo-pragmatic perspective: based on the material of contemporary American English] : dis. ... of PhD in Philology : 10.02.04 / E.V. Lukhina. — M., 2011. — 196 p. [in Russian]
9. Terskikh M.V. Diskurs sotsial'nykh tsennostey: struktura i bazovye diskursivnye praktiki [Discourse of social values: structure and basic discursive practices] / M.V. Terskikh // Politicheskaya lingvistika [Political Linguistics]. — 2015. — № 4(54). — P. 144–149. [in Russian]
10. Bezryadina E.I. Osobennosti smyslovoy i morfologicheskoy struktury terminov sotsial'noy raboty i ikh otrazhenie v internatsional'noy leksike [Peculiarities of the semantic and morphological structure of social work terms and their reflection in international vocabulary] / E.I. Bezryadina // Yazyk nauki i tekhniki v sovremennom mire [Language of Science and Technology in the Modern World] : Proceedings of the VI International Scientific and Practical Conference, Omsk, April 20, 2017. — Omsk : Publishing House of OmSTU, 2017. — P. 11–16. [in Russian]
11. Meteleva E.R. Opredelenie klyuchevykh terminov v sotsial'noy sfere [Definition of key terms in the social sphere] / E.R. Meteleva // Izvestiya Baykalskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta [News of Baikal State University]. — 2016. — Vol. 26. — № 1. — P. 90–98. [in Russian]
12. Hota P.K. Mapping the Intellectual Structure of Social Entrepreneurship Research: A Citation/Co-citation Analysis / P.K. Hota, B. Subramanian, G. Narayanamurthy // Journal of Business Ethics. — 2020. — Vol. 166. — P. 89–114. DOI: 10.1007/s10551-019-04129-4.
13. Shahid S.M. Social entrepreneurship education: A conceptual framework and review / S.M. Shahid, G. Alarifi // The International Journal of Management Education. — 2021. — Vol. 19. — № 3. — P. 100533. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijme.2021.100533.
14. Gupta P. Social entrepreneurship research: A review and future research agenda / P. Gupta, S. Chauhan, Ju. Paul [et al.] // Journal of Business Research. — 2020. — Vol. 113. — P. 209–229. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.03.032.
15. Text stemming online // SGen.RU. — URL: <https://gsgen.ru/tools/dlina-seo-text> (accessed: 23.09.2024).