Semantic and grammatical features of the languages of entrepreneurship practices

Abstract. Social phenomena in the first stages of their comprehension are investigated using general scientific methods, which are methods of the natural sciences. This leads to a multiplicity of concepts’ definitions, which manifests a crisis of their semantic interpretation. The result is numerous “pragmatic turns” in various humanities. This study aims to identify the structure of the language of entrepreneurship practices. Methods employed are morphological and semantic analyses of English terms practitioner entrepreneurs and researchers of entrepreneurship practices use. Data are obtained from Google and OpenAlex. Academics’ studies of entrepreneurship-as-practice were analyzed using PolyAnalyst. The results are: (1) the language of practitioners uses terms to denote ad hoc technical aspects of business practices; (2) concepts were discovered that express the syncretism of the actor and their practice; (3) preferential users of dictionaries of practices were identified; (4) the most commonly used interpretative terms of academics’ studies of entrepreneurship-as-practice were mapped.

1 Introduction

1.1 The pragmatic nature of social concepts

"intangible" component of the cognition process, which includes the concepts a science which is responsible for fixing the external “objective” content of signs; and pragmatics [1].
2 Materials and methods

The research employs the results of search queries on English entrepreneurship-related vocabulary in Google and specifically Google Scholar. A continuous sampling method and contextual analysis were used to collect words denoting practices of entrepreneurship. Morphological and semantic analyses were further applied to verify the selected data. The research material was also a dataset (“entrepreneurship as practice” search query; 1990–

3 Results and discussion

3.1 The concept of entrepreneurship: from hidden to explicit pragmatics

Specific actors attribute specific – relevant for them – meanings to any concept they use in their activities. Thus, entrepreneurship, which, as Joseph Schumpeter writes, can mean for some “the will to conquer: the impulse to fight, to prove oneself superior to others, to succeed for the sake, not of the fruits of success, but of success itself” and “the joy of creating, of getting things done, or simply of exercising one’s energy and ingenuity” [2. P. 93].

Different meanings of the same concept indicate different attitudes towards it from different people who practice the activity it expresses differently. Actually, in such differences in meaning lies the pragmatics (from the Greek prâgma – deed, act) of this concept, or its specific practical sense, associated with the values and intentions various actors invest in it thus making it – like all social concepts – a concept as value, or a projective concept (as opposed to semantics’ descriptive concepts). Accordingly, for the sociology of concepts, the operationalization of the pragmatics of a particular social concept is the representation of the distribution of its meanings, specific to a certain place and time, in the field of discourse of its relevant actors.

This removes the question of a single definition of the analyzed concept, which all people operating with it for work or out of scientific interest would accept, and raises another one. The latter is the question of the existing distribution of meanings in relation to conditions that actors – participants in the social construction of the corresponding object of social reality, which is entrepreneurship, – set.
Meanwhile, the purely semantic desire for the clearest expression of the “objective”

were not considered as “co-authors” of the developed theories, their voices were simply

result, pragmatics just “broke through”

from the background of other economic subjects, were “socially underconstructed”

“forms of modern life”. In other words, entrepreneurship has outgrown the status of a

Wittgenstein) “language games” and “forms of life” in their materiality, relationality

difference between subjects and objects, “human” and “non-human” actants.

3.2 Modalities of the language of practices

interests of the discourse “owner” [10]. The transformation of entrepreneurship from a

be insufficiently defined in terms of modality: whether they come from “direct actors”, i.e.,

tried to solve a similar problem, distinguishing between the “rationality of the observer”
... and the “rationality in the observed” [13]. However, his formulation is attached to the stem, which is a verbalization of a noun denoting an actor. In this fact that actors of any occupation are more prone to improvisation in the “technological” world, at least in business schools, engineering is known to be attributed to the specific language of practices for they serve as tools for constructing the “foundational terminology for the field of entrepreneurship that will make sense to both academics and practitioner entrepreneurs” [15. P. 16]. This approach puts academics in a position where they “have been known to ‘talk down to’ (or more accurately, ‘at’) practitioners rather than engaging in an equal exchange” [16. P. 1196].

Before we begin to distinguish the contributions of practitioner entrepreneurs and their role as a whole, it is important to note the inseparability of the workings, or accomplishments, produced in them, and the very identity of the practitioners rather than engaging in an equal exchange” [16. P. 1196].

A completely natural consequence of the noted difference in rationalities is the normal approach grounded on the ability to make the result of entrepreneurial activities completely predictable and, accordingly, the process itself teachable [14] based on the development of a “foundational terminology for the field of entrepreneurship that will make sense to both academics and practitioner entrepreneurs” [15. P. 16]. This approach puts academics in a position where they “have been known to ‘talk down to’ (or more accurately, ‘at’) practitioners rather than engaging in an equal exchange” [16. P. 1196].

The usual slang of immediate actors, as a rule, does not strive to express this purpose (or their elements are introduced into the contexts of a person’s life world, life activities, including entrepreneurship. However, for social practices, there are a number of concepts directly related to practices of entrepreneurship. A “foundational terminology for the field of entrepreneurship that will make sense to both academics and practitioner entrepreneurs” [15. P. 16]. This approach puts academics in a position where they “have been known to ‘talk down to’ (or more accurately, ‘at’) practitioners rather than engaging in an equal exchange” [16. P. 1196].

These are terms such as practitionering, farming, teaching, etc., and their elements are introduced into the contexts of a person’s life world, life activities, including entrepreneurship. A “foundational terminology for the field of entrepreneurship that will make sense to both academics and practitioner entrepreneurs” [15. P. 16]. This approach puts academics in a position where they “have been known to ‘talk down to’ (or more accurately, ‘at’) practitioners rather than engaging in an equal exchange” [16. P. 1196].
above-mentioned concepts associated with business techniques, they can be defined in accordance with Latin authors’ tradition as concepts of *arts of life*.[22]

Among them, “entrepreneuring” has a special status, which is associated with the theoretical conceptualization of “entrepreneurship as practice” [23–25] pragmatic turn in the theory of entrepreneurship. In other words, “entrepreneuring” have their own name or are designated descriptively, e.g., the conditional “practice of entrepreneurship in data analytics”.

The “entrepreneuring” concept is very generative in itself, providing a practicist view “entrepreneurship” as arts of life, regardless of whether they currently have their own name or are designated descriptively, e.g., the conditional “practice of entrepreneurship in data analytics”.

The “entrepreneuring” concept is very generative in itself, providing a practicist view “entrepreneurship” as arts of life, regardless of whether they currently have their own name or are designated descriptively, e.g., the conditional “practice of entrepreneurship in data analytics”.

Table 1. Use of terms from the “entrepreneuring” family in electronic media.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ecopreneuring</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ecopreneurist.com/2008/08/06/the-simplicity-of-ecopreneuring/">www.ecopreneurist.com/2008/08/06/the-simplicity-of-ecopreneuring/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technopreneuring</td>
<td>technopreneuring.com/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mompreneuring</td>
<td><a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NgmOFXWNJU">www.youtube.com/watch?v=NgmOFXWNJU</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gamepreneuring</td>
<td>campinlabs.com/gamepreneuring- academy/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dancepreneuring</td>
<td>podcasts.apple.com/us/podcast/the-dancepreneuring-studio/id963505402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interactivity and performativity of these terms in online media is ensured by both their easy conversion into a slogan (for example, “mompreneuring it”) and their appeal to people’s lifestyles: live by ecopreneuring/technopreneuring.

Some of them (biopreneuring[26], ecopreneuring[27]) enter scientific discourse, acting as a collaborative product of “equal exchange” between academics and equally intellectual real practitioner entrepreneurs, literally “sitting at the same table” with the former [16. P. 1996].

An important difference between terms from the language of studies on entrepreneurship practices and similar words of practitioners is their embeddedness in the context of the theory of practices through their interpretation in the concepts of their own language (routine, everydayness, rule-following, language game, form of life, lifestyle, etc.) [22].

3.3 Mapping the scientific discourse of entrepreneurship as practice

To talk about entrepreneurship as practice, academics, unlike practitioner entrepreneurs, use their “language of practices”, their interpretative schemes – Wittgenstein’s “language game”, phenomenology’s “lived experience”, Foucault’s and Laclau’s “discursive struggle” representing a critical turn, etc. This language constitutes another language of practices, which is the language of the theory of practices (of entrepreneurship) that comprehends and explains these practices.

Figure 1 shows a network of terms that characterize the contexts of the entrepreneurship-as-practice concept fixed in scientific discourse, i.e., contexts within which academics investigate entrepreneurship practices. The network was automatically generated by the PolyAnalyst program.
Entrepreneurship practices represent a variety of culturally and socially embedded entrepreneurial activities, i.e., they are understood by academics as a cultural phenomenon with its values, which is given a phenomenological interpretation. People practice entrepreneuring by masterfully improvising its execution, thereby producing a variety of social changes, social transformations, or adapting to them.

Fig. 1. Mapping meaningful contexts of the entrepreneurship as practice concept

Entrepreneurship practices are determined by personal ways of thinking and doing, which are embodied in personal narratives and further in ways of acting (styles). Narratives are created by different authors (e.g., male entrepreneur) and supported by different situations (e.g., managerial control). Some nodes are associated with actors seeking to break out of the mainstream of hegemonic practices and narratives and defend their own “modi vivendi and operandi”: active resistance, discursive struggle, alternative modalities, alternative organizational styles. Practices marked by these nodes are opposed to the nodes representing “hegemony” (dominant discourse and neoliberal times) as signifiers of the general context of neoliberalism.

Neoliberalism implies entrepreneurship’s exit from the economic sphere and its expansion into the social sphere, which was previously considered incompatible with entrepreneurship. In the map, the social entrepreneurship node quite competes in size with the key node of entrepreneurship as practice. In addition, an organic part of the pragmatic turn in entrepreneurship studies is the female/women’s entrepreneurship narrative.

A new look at entrepreneurship as practice focuses on the processes of constructing idiosyncratic identities and the ways of thinking and doing of various actors by themselves through their rhetoric and sensemaking, which makes some types of entrepreneurship that are rapidly growing in popularity (female entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship, digital entrepreneurship) privileged platforms for experimenting with various methods of investigating practices (narrative and discourse analysis, phenomenology, social anthropology, ethnomethodology, etc.).

In the scientific discourse of entrepreneurship as practice, we observe the general message of the theory of practices – to understand the meaning of an action in its everydayness and its meaning for the actor and their life world. The map clearly demonstrates this research approach by closely linking the nodes of ethical practice, reflective judgment, and understanding entrepreneurship into a special “hermeneutic” cluster.

4 Conclusion

dictionaries of “techniques” and “arts” of entrepreneurship, understandable equally to
language of the “art” of entrepreneurship as a language of social practices itself is associated more with the efforts of the media and professional researchers of forms of life rather than with the linguistic routine of practitioner entrepreneurs. It is preferable for the latter to lead in the creation and approval of dictionaries of business techniques. An important component of the language of practices is the language of theories of practices, to which, first of all, the forms of life of people in entrepreneurship, their art of entrepreneuring, receive their interpretation.

An important part of the linguistic turn as a turn to practices is the formation of special grammars of various layers of language practices. Thus, in the course of the study, we revealed the use of special gerundial constructions for talking about practices as arts. In contrast to the concepts of practices as techniques, the latter add the suffix -ing to the stem denoting the agent (and ending in the corresponding suffix: -er, -or, -eur, -eer, etc.).
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