

Nominative Specificity of English Marketing Terminology

Irina B. Rubert¹, Tatiana S. Rosyanova², Svetlana V. Kiselieva¹✉

¹*Saint Petersburg State Economic University, St Petersburg, Russia*

²*Russian Christian Humanitarian Academy, St Petersburg, Russia*

✉svkiseljeva@bk.ru

Introduction. The paper deals with the concepts of a term and terminology as they considered both in classical general theory of terminology and cognitive linguistics. The field of English economic terminology provides extensive material for the terminologists to develop and clarify theoretical guidelines helping to understand the nature of scientific and professional nominations that constitute the aim of presented research. The processes of term formation viewed through the cognitive approach are considered in connection with conceptualization and categorization and help to reveal the creative nominative models of marketers as it is seen vital within an antropocentric focus of linguistic studies.

Methodology and sources. A general theory of terminology is based upon the approach in which the nature of concepts, conceptual relations, the relationships between terms and concepts and assigning terms to concepts are of prime importance. But in fact, terminology is closely linked to an activity carried out within the field of knowledge and thus it is inseparable from its social context and its obvious applications. Methods of cognitive analysis applied for the study of terminologies are supposed to overcome contradictions of the previous century of terminology studies. English marketing terms under consideration were extracted from the professional dictionaries and handbooks. The thematic group chosen as the illustrative example is consumer terminological group.

Results and discussion. Nominative originality of marketing terminology has been revealed within the idea of continually changing specific autonomous and self-sufficient consumer models reflected in micro-systems of terms nominating and verbalizing holistic concepts of the authors. Nomination of the typical individuals (customers) by the terms discussed in the presented paper reflects deep and various psychological characteristics of individuals. As it seems, all these parameters form the foundation of the professional domain of modern markets in accordance with the existing conceptual knowledge, verbalized by terms.

Conclusion. The study is relevant since the research of conceptualization and categorization in the professional fields of knowledge seems to be an understudied area. The more interdisciplinary is the area of professional knowledge, the more integrated are specific features of terminological nomination, and the more sophisticated is the term-formation used by the experts.

Key words: term, terminology, English economic terminology, cognitive linguistics, terminological nomination.

For citation: Rubert I. B., Rosyanova T. S., Kiselieva S. V. Nominative Specificity of English Marketing Terminology. DISCOURSE. 2020, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 121–130. DOI: 10.32603/2412-8562-2020-6-4-121-130

Conflict of interest. No conflicts of interest related to this publication were reported.

Received 15.06.2020; adopted after review 15.07.2020; published online 26.10.2020

© Rubert I. B., Rosyanova T. S., Kiselieva S. V., 2020



Контент доступен по лицензии Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Особенности терминологической номинации в английской терминологии маркетинга

И. Б. Руберт¹, Т. С. Росянова², С. В. Киселёва¹✉

¹Санкт-Петербургский государственный экономический университет, Санкт-Петербург, Россия

²Русская христианская гуманитарная академия, Санкт-Петербург, Россия

✉svkiseljeva@bk.ru

Введение. В статье рассматриваются теоретические вопросы термина и терминологий с точки зрения общей теории терминологии и когнитивного подхода. Область английской экономической терминологии предоставляет терминоведам обширный материал для исследований, чтобы углубить и уточнить теоретические постулаты, помогающие понять природу научных и профессиональных номинаций. Процесс образования терминов рассматривается с позиции когнитивного подхода в тесной связи с процессами концептуализации и категоризации, тем самым помогая выявить модели терминотворчества, используемые маркетологами, что является актуальным в связи с антропоцентрическим направлением в лингвистике.

Методология и источники. Классическое терминоведение основано на принципах, в которых природе концептов, концептуальных отношений в предметных областях, взаимоотношениям и взаимосвязям между терминами и концептами придается первостепенное значение. Кроме того, терминологии тесно связаны с профессиональной деятельностью, осуществляемой в конкретной области специальных знаний и, следовательно, неотделимы от социального контекста и практического применения. Методы когнитивного анализа, которые используются при изучении терминов, способны преодолеть логические противоречия, накопленные в предшествующее столетие изучения терминологии. Изучаемые английские термины маркетинга извлечены методом сплошной выборки из толковых терминологических словарей и оригинальной литературы.

Результаты и обсуждение. Оригинальность номинации в терминологии маркетинга заключается в применении идеи постоянно изменяющихся автономных и самодостаточных моделей потребителей, которые выражаются в микротерминотерминах терминов, вербализующих целостные авторские концепции. Номинация типичных индивидуумов терминами, которая обсуждается в настоящей статье, основана на глубоком знании различных психологических характеристик людей. Предполагается, что все психологические параметры, вербализованные терминами, образуют основу профессиональной области современного маркетинга в соответствии с существующими концептуальными знаниями.

Заключение. Актуальность работы обусловлена тем, что изучение процессов концептуализации и категоризации в профессиональных сферах знания представляет собой недостаточно изученную область. Исследование показывает, что при ярко выраженной междисциплинарности профессиональной области возрастает специфика терминологической номинации и усложняются терминообразовательные парадигмы, используемые профессионалами.

Ключевые слова: термин, терминология, английская экономическая терминология, когнитивная лингвистика, терминологическая номинация.

Для цитирования: Руберт И. Б., Росянова Т. С., Киселёва С. В. Особенности терминологической номинации в английской терминологии маркетинга // ДИСКУРС. 2020. Т. 6, № 4. С. 121–130. DOI: 10.32603/2412-8562-2020-6-4-121-130

Конфликт интересов. О конфликте интересов, связанном с данной статьей, не сообщалось.

Поступила 15.06.2020; принята после рецензирования 15.07.2020; опубликована онлайн 26.10.2020

Introduction. Motivation for the study of terminology is inspired by both theoretical and practical considerations. Terminology research started systematically from 30s is seen as the necessary tool for overcoming difficulties connected with spontaneous growth of knowledge in different spheres of professional activity. Industrial society brought about the need to establish standards in technology and terminology, to codify terms and develop the concept of standardized language for direct and efficient communication. Post-industrial civilization values created sophisticated informational culture with focus on different sorts of databases. Researchers of terminology reacted to this stage of evolutionary development with the involvement of new conceptual fields of updated linguistic theories.

Methods of cognitive analysis applied for the study of terminologies are supposed to overcome contradictions of the previous century of terminology studies. Classical theory of terminology can not be denied, thus the aspects of transfer of specialized knowledge are introduced into the regulat agenda of researchers. Thus, the books of M. T. Cabre (1999) and R. Temmerman (2000) established a new trend in European studies and criticism toward principles of traditional terminology.

The traditional schools, for example, believed in the need for standardisation in order to improve special language communication. If the belief in an objective world is replaced by the belief that the understanding of the world and of the words used to communicate about the world is based on human experience, and if this understanding is considered to be prototypically structured and embedded in a frame, the basic principles of the traditional Terminology schools will need re-evaluation [1, p. 2].

Terminology as a science and lexicology differ in the way they deal with their approach to the object of study, in the object of study itself, in their methodology, in the way terms are presented and in the conditions that must be taken into account when proposing new terms [2, p. 8].

A general theory of terminology is based upon the approach in which the nature of concepts, conceptual relations, the relationships between terms and concepts and assigning terms to concepts are of prime importance. This focus on moving from concepts to terms distinguishes the methods used in terminology from those used in lexicography [2, p. 7]. Refreshing the classical definition, “the term (from lat. terminus – boundary, limit) is a word or phrase denoting the concept of special domain or professional activity. The term is included in the lexical system of the language, but only through specific terminological system (terminology)” [3, p. 508]. In order to distinguish between the term and the word, classical terminology scholars selected and developed the concept of the term linguistic features. But in fact, terminology is closely linked to an activity carried out within the field of knowledge and thus it is inseparable from its social context and its obvious applications [2].

The processes of term formation viewed though the cognitive approach are considered in connection with the processes of conceptualization and categorization. Currently, cognitive research of terms is carried out by well-known Russian scientists as L. M. Alekseeva, V. M. Volodina, E. I. Golovanova, S. V. Grinev-Grinevich, V. F. Novodranova, E. A. Sorokina and others. Recent studies are directed toward the terminilogy of humanitarian and social sciences as providing more creative insights into nominative aspects of term-formation.

Economy as a specialized professional reality reflected in economic terminology is very attractive for the reason of fast changes, ever-developing infrastructures and globalized approach to humankind. The field of English economic terminology provides extensive material for the terminologists to develop and clarify theoretical guidelines helping to understand the nature of scientific and professional nominations.

Goal task and material. Terminological nomination in the domain of marketing is analysed and discussed from the cognitive point of view.

Sampling of terms was conducted by a reputable English-English and English-Russian explanatory terminological dictionaries, glossaries and electronic sources. The material for the illustrating examples is taken from professional publications and marketing authentic monographs.

Methodology and sources. “Cognitive linguistics allows to reveal the specificity of the formation of human knowledge about the surrounding reality through the analysis of language units semantics and to identify hierarchical relationships among concepts through the language structuration” [4, p. 3].

The term can be understood as informational cognitive structure with the function of accumulating and transferring specialized knowledge from different periods of time. E. I. Golovanova focuses on the cognitive functions of terms, especially on the orientative one, term dynamics in the professional activities, interaction between cognition and communication in the semiotic domain of study, formats of knowledge accumulation [5, p. 14–15]. The difference between a word and a term is of objective nature due to the fact that terms reflect the effects of different levels of mental activity

The creative aspect of conceptualising and categorising the world in science and professions has presented considerable challenges for scholars. “The emergence of a new scientific cognitive approach represents an additional opportunity to reinvent the processes of conceptualization and categorization of the world, the formation of different structures of knowledge and ways of their representation in language, interaction of linguistic and non-linguistic content of consciousness in the process of mental activity” [6, p. 182].

According to H. Felber, every cognition is the result of a psychic process, which leads to knowledge. This process is no state but an activity of a person. Cognition is in the same way as knowledge, something psychic, attached to individual. There is no objective, detached cognition possible [7]. A concept can be considered as an element of thought, a mental construct that represents a class of objects. Concepts consist of a series of characteristics that are shared by a class of individual objects. These characteristics, which are also concepts, allow us to structure thought and to communicate. Language does not reflect the real world exactly, but rather interprets it. This explains why a single segment of the real world (a special subject field) can generate different structures simultaneously (different scientific theories) or successively (scientific changes) [2, p. 42]. Competing scientific theories provide vivid material for terminology researchers and as it can be seen later result in variety of conceptualised and categorised levels of terms.

From the point of view of terminology the lexicon of a language consists of the many separate subsystems representing the knowledge structure of each subject field or discipline. Each knowledge structure consists of variously interlinked concepts [2]. Professionals in the

same field share specialized vocabulary which they acquire naturally as their knowledge of a certain field advances. Terms, then, are not semantically isolated units, nor is the knowledge of the specialized world produced by means of isolated terms. As speakers become more familiar with a special segment of the real world, they turn their knowledge into conceptual structures in which each concept occupies a specific place and acquires a functional value. Terminology thus is the basis for the structure of thematically specialized knowledge [2, p. 43]. As it can be seen from the above citations, by means of cognitive approach in the erminology study the structure of specialized world can be revealed.

Results and discussion. English marketing terminology is the result of creative efforts within the last hundred years and as a fast moving dynamic system is characterized by nominative innovations in formal and semantic aspects. According to the definition of American Marketing Association (AMA) “*Marketing* is the activity, set of institutions, and processes for creating, communicating, delivering, and exchanging offerings that have value for customers, clients, partners, and society at large” [8, p. 5].

The processes of conceptualization and categorization seen as the basic cognitive processes are closely interrelated. Linguistic knowledge is supported by all knowledge and experience of the person leading to deeper understanding of conceptualization and categorization in different spheres of science and technology. As N. N. Boldyrev noted, anthropocentric factor plays a major role due to a man as an observer, “conceptualizer” and “categorizer”.

The perception of the professional field by experts, the choice of their vision formed by the professional activity focuses their attention on specific facts providing the foundation for the particular nominative trends. Our focus of study is the processes of conceptualization and categorization in English marketing terminology related to the thematic group “consumer”. That means also attempts to clarify the role of these terms in modern market place architecture.

Thematic group “consumer” is interesting in connection with the practical constructivization of the market economy in general. Marketers are constantly trying to analyze purchasing decision-making of individuals and make business projects for various models of consumer behavior influenced by demographics, life-styles and cultural values. According to academic studies, business managers realize that they must gain an understanding of consumers if their marketing strategies are to be successful.

Human psychology, motives and actions are studied in details, human reactions are scrupulously calculated and human weaknesses are transformed into market opportunities. That is why the basis of terminological nomination of consumers lies within the interpretation of incredibly numerous factors. We'll provide a brief glance of three popular models invented by the creative minds of marketers.

Model 1 (*buying roles*).

Recognition of the importance of consumer behaviour has led marketing managers to more closely analyze the factors influencing consumer choice. Now managers are concerned with benefits to consumers, changing their attitudes and perceptions [9, p. 2]. Decision-making process leading to a purchase is forming the ideas differentiating the roles of buyers (*buying roles*). Experts of the 70-ies and 80-ies created classifications, including five (initiator, influencer, decider, buyer, user), six (plus approver) and seven (plus gatekeeper) consumer roles [10, p. 176].

For example:

Gatekeeper – Information gatherer who may control the flow of information from the mass media to the group. Introduces ideas and information to the group but does not necessarily disseminate them [9, p. 715].

Thus, micro-system of terms with the generic term ‘buying roles’ include five to seven terms representing corresponding categorization. The generic term nominates a holistic concept, and hyponymic level is a specified categorization of the target consumer groups made by different experts.

Regarding to the structural and systemic- characteristics, terms, included in micro-system of terms, have uniform term-forming suffixes-ER/-OR. Therefore, it confirms the uniformity of the essential characteristics that formed the basis of terminological nomination.

Model 2 (adopter categories).

Further, marketing considers classification of customers according to their willingness to buy new products (adopter categories). A classification of adopters by time was developed by Rogers with five categories of customers: *innovators*, *early adopters*, *early majority*, *late majority*, *laggards* [11, p. 11], [9, p. 501].

Thus, micro-systems of terms with the generic term ‘adopter categories’ (conceptualization) includes five specific hyponymic terms, representing the lower level of terminological hierarchy (categorization).

For example:

Innovators represent on average the first 2.5 % of all those who adopt. They are eager to try new ideas and products almost as an obsession. They have higher incomes, are better educated, are more cosmopolitan, and are more active outside of their community than non-innovators. In addition they are less reliant on group norms, more self-confident, and more likely to obtain their information from scientific sources and experts [9, p. 501].

As an opposite style of consumer behaviour to *innovators* in case of diffusion of new products, we can find *laggards* who are reluctant to any changes, not relying on the norms of the group and tend to be suspicious of new products.

Roger’s classification deals with adopter categories, but does not take into account so-called *non-adopters*, that is consumers who simply reject innovations [9, p. 504]. Thus, in marketing studies there is also a transparent three-part classification: *early adopters*, *later adopters* and *nonadopters*, that reveals social character of people and their acceptance of new products.

Model 3 (values and lifestyles, VALS).

The marketer of a new product should determine consumer reactions to the product in a situational context and identify the segment of the market that is most likely to adopt a new product when it is first introduced. The idea of market segmentation according to the principle of life values and lifestyles of potential buyers (model psychographic segmentation – values and lifestyles, VALS) proved to be fruitful for marketing [11, p. 570].

Innovativeness was defined as the predisposition to buy a new product early. A number of personality characteristics have been related to innovativeness. Thus, innovators were found to be *inner-directed*, less dogmatic than noninnovators, more willing to accept risks and accept change and more socially active. In addition, innovators are more likely to be opinion leaders [9, p. 513, 521].

Life-style characteristics, in contrast to demographics, must be defined by the marketer’s objectives. Such life-style profiles help marketers target products to specific consumer groups. The

Value and Life Style program (VALS) was developed in 1978 by the Stanford Research Institute [9, p. 308]. In early surveys customers were identified as *actualizers*, *strivers* and *struggles*.

For example:

Actualizers – have high level of self-esteem, are open to change and buy the finer things in life [9, p. 308].

The futurist Arnold Mitchell was trying to measure both cultural and life-style values. The earlier, VALS 1 programme identified three consumer segments: *need-driven*, *outer-directed*, *inner-directed* [11, p. 570: 9, p. 324]. Such a three-level model of psychographic segmentation – values and lifestyles, VALS – had a great explanatory power.

For example:

The outer-directed consumer – buys with an eye to appearances and to what other people think [9, p. 324].

In 1988 the Stanford Research Institute introduced a new revised measure of values called VALS 2 because segments in VALS 1 were found to be too general and driven by a focus on baby boomers. Updated model included new categories within existing three groups: need-directed (survivors, sustainers), outer-directed (belongers, emulators, achievers), inner-directed (experientials, societally conscious, I-am-me), and a new group ‘combined outer and inner directed’ (integrateds) (1989) [10, p. 161]. In Table there are presented terms for eight groups as defined by the VALS 2 system (four groups with higher resources and four groups with lower resources) with their definitions, according to Ph. Kotler [8, p. 227]. It is worth mentioning the fact that VALS system is adaptive.

Table. Terms of psychographic segmentation

№	Term	Definition
1	<i>Innovators</i>	Successful, sophisticated, active, “take-charge” people with high self-esteem. Purchases often reflect cultivated tastes for relatively upscale, niche-oriented products and services
2	<i>Thinkers</i>	Mature, satisfied, and reflective people motivated by ideals and who value order, knowledge, and responsibility. They seek durability, functionality, and value in products
3	<i>Achievers</i>	Successful, goal-oriented people who focus on career and family. They favor premium products that demonstrate success to their peers
4	<i>Experiencers</i>	Young, enthusiastic, impulsive people who seek variety and excitement They spend a comparatively high proportion of income on fashion, entertainment, and socializing
5	<i>Believers</i>	Conservative, conventional, and traditional people with concrete beliefs. They prefer familiar, U.S.-made products and are loyal to established brands
6	<i>Strivers</i>	Trendy and fun-loving people who are resource-constrained. They favor stylish products that emulate the purchases of those with greater material wealth
7	<i>Makers</i>	Practical, down-to-earth, self-sufficient people who like to work with their hands. They seek U.S.-made products with a practical or functional purpose
8	<i>Survivors</i>	Elderly, passive people concerned about change and loyal to their favorite brands

Thus, looking at the development of a psychographic segmentation the following three hierarchical levels of terminology as the result of deepening thought of specialists can be traced:

1. The first highest level includes the concept of market segmentation itself (abbreviation VALS) (conceptualization).

2. The next level is represented by three (or four) specific terms: need-directed, outer-directed, inner-directed (plus ‘combined outer and inner directed’) (categorization of the first level).

3. Then a deeper level of clarifying specific terms follows: *survivors, sustainers, belongs, emulators, achievers, experientials, societally conscious, I-am-me, integrateds* (categorisation of the second level).

Regarding to structural characteristics, terms included in micro-system VALS, have two kinds of term-formation consistency. The first level categorization is achieved through the use of term-formation suffix-ED, and the categorization of the second level uses different term-formation suffixes, with a predominance of the suffixes-ER/-OR (50 %). Term-formation consistency is created with the suffixes-ER/-OR, reflecting the uniformity of the essential characteristics that formed the basis of terminological nomination [12].

Semantic potential of the primary conceptualising term *VALS* allows to conduct a two-level categorization by creating relevant specific terms.

Conclusion. In is evident that the majority of terms that characterize *consumers* in accordance with the three basic concepts - consumer roles (*buying roles*), willingness to buy new products (*adopter categories*), life values and lifestyles (*values and lifestyles, VALS*) – are formed with term-forming systemic suffixes ER/-OR. Most of the terms are, with rare exception, a single component ones.

Nominative originality of marketing terminology thus can be revealed within the idea of continually changing specific autonomous and self-sufficient consumer models reflected in micro-systems of terms nominating and verbalizing holistic concepts of the authors.

Conceptual content is ensured by the general ideas of *buying roles, adopter categories, values and lifestyles*. As for a categorization, it is reflected in terms describing the detailed vision of professional marketers, and can be subjected to changes due to different factors.

Nomination of the typical individuals (customers) by the terms discussed in the above pages reflects deep and various psychological characteristics of individuals. As it seems, all these parameters form the foundation of the professional domain of modern markets in accordance with the existing conceptual knowledge, verbalized by terms.

Terms of semantic subgroups *consumer* represent elaborated complex of knowledge needed by professional marketers. Specific classification corresponding to each conceptual model of consumer behaviour presents a large variety of terms, connected with psychological, demographic and cultural characteristics.

Conceptualization represent the cognitive side of terminology. The general concept of *values and lifestyles (VALS)* remains permanent and at the same time terms of particular categories are subjected to changes in diachrony.

The use of standardized terminology helps to make communication between specialists more efficient and transparent, as it can be seen from the terminology of technical and natural sciences. At the time, terms of human sciences are much more flexible and reflect more subtle topics connected with interpretation of human life in general. In order not to simplify the complexity of individuals, terminologists must be ready to revise some principles of their science where it is necessary and appropriate.

The research of conceptualization and categorization in the professional fields of knowledge seems to be an understudied area. The fact is connected with the difficulties for linguists to penetrate into the professional domains that is actually a challenge, usually time-consuming and takes a lot of efforts. At the same time, studying the constantly changing world

of marketing reveals the principles of flexible approach to the formation of professional categories, their adaptation with the changing level of knowledge and economic situation. Summing up the results presented paper it is possible to make a conclusion about the complex nature of knowledge in modern marketing, comprising psychology, sociology, demography and cultural aspects of humanity. And it is of paramount importance to underline that the more interdisciplinary is the area of professional knowledge, the more integrated are specific features of terminological nomination, and the more sophisticated is the term-formation used by the experts.

REFERENCES

1. Temmerman, R. (2000), *Towards new ways of terminology description*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, USA.
2. Cabre, M.T. (1999), *Terminology, theory, methods and applications*, John Benjamins, Philadelphia, USA.
3. *Lingvisticheskii entsiklopedicheskii slovar' (LES)* (1990), Sovetskaya entsiklopediya, Moscow, USSR.
4. Cycarkina, N.N. (2012), "Objectification of the conceptual sphere of social relations in modern English", Abstract of Dr. Sci. (Philol.) dissertation, SPbGUEF, SPb., RUS.
5. Golovanova, E.I. (2013), "Cognitive terminology: problems, tools, directions and prospects of development", *Bulletin of Chelyabinsk state Univ.* no. 24 (315), iss. 82, *Philology, Art History*, pp. 13–18.
6. Kiseleva, S.V. (2009), *Sushchnost' mnogoznachnogo slova v angliiskom yazyke* [The essence of the polysemantic word in English], SPb., Asterion, RUS.
7. Felber, H. (1985), *Terminology Manual*, Unesco, Infoterm, Paris, FRA.
8. Kotler, Ph. and Keller, K.L. (2012), *Marketing management*, 14th ed., Prentice Hall, N.J., USA.
9. Assael, H. (1992), *Consumer behaviour and marketing action*, 4th ed., PWC-KENT, Boston, USA.
10. Kotler, F. (2005), *A Framework for Marketing Management*, Transl. by S. G. Bozhuk (ed.), Piter, SPb, RUS.
11. Imber, Ja. and Toffler, B-A. (2000), *Dictionary of Marketing Terms*, Barron's, Hauppauge, N.Y., USA.
12. Rosyanova, T.S. (2004), "Paradigmatic series of terms with suffixes – ER/OR (based on English economic terminology)", *Problemy lingvistiki i lingvodidaktiki v vysshei shkoly* [Problems of linguistics and linguodidactics in higher education], All-Russian scientific and methodological conference, in Gronskeya, O.N. (ed.), SPb., RUS, 16 June 2004, iss. 5, pp. 25–37.

Information about the authors.

Irina B. Rubert – Dr. Sci. (Philology) (1996), Professor at the Department of the Theory of Language and Translation, Saint Petersburg State Economic University, 21 Sadovaya str., St Petersburg 191023, Russia. The author of more than 120 scientific publications. Area of expertise: text linguistics, cognitive linguistics, history of language, stylistics, theoretical grammar. E-mail: irleru@mail.ru

Svetlana V. Kiseleva – Dr. Sci. (Philology) (2007), Professor at the Department of the Theory of Language and Translation, Saint Petersburg State Economic University, 21 Sadovaya str., St Petersburg 191023, Russia. The author of 150 scientific publications. Area of expertise: terminology, semantics, stylistics, theoretical grammar. E-mail: svkiseljeva@bk.ru

Tatiana S. Rosyanova – Can. Sci. (Philology) (2012), Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Philology and Lingvodidactics, Russian Christian Humanitarian Academy, 15 Fontanka emb., St Petersburg 191011, Russia. The author of 70 scientific publications. Area of expertise: terminology studies, cognitive linguistics, general linguistics, sociolinguistics, communication, Business English. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8307-5694>. E-mail: rosyanova@mail.ru

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

1. Temmerman R. Toward new ways of terminology description. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2000.
2. Cabre M. T. Terminology, theory, methods and applications. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1999.
3. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь (ЛЭС) / гл. ред. В. Н. Ярцева. М.: Сов. энцикл., 1990.
4. Цыцаркина Н. Н. Объективация концептосферы социальных отношений в современном английском языке: автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук / СПбГУЭФ. СПб., 2012.
5. Голованова Е. И. Когнитивное терминоведение: проблематика, инструментарий, направления и перспективы развития // Вестн. Челябинского гос. ун-та. 2013. № 24 (315), вып. 82: Филология, искусствоведение. С. 13–18.
6. Киселева С. В. Сущность многозначного слова в английском языке. СПб.: Астерион, 2009.
7. Felber H. Terminology Manual. Paris: Unesco, Infoterm, 1985.
8. Kotler Ph., Keller K.L. Marketing management, 14th ed., N.J.: Prentice Hall, 2012.
9. Assael H. Consumer behaviour and marketing action, 4th ed., Boston: PWC-KENT. 1992.
10. Котлер Ф. Маркетинг. Менеджмент. Экспресс-курс. 2-е изд. / пер. с англ.; под ред. С. Г. Божук. СПб.: Питер, 2005.
11. Imber Ja., Toffler B-A. Dictionary of Marketing Terms. Hauppauge; N.Y.: Barron's, 2000.
12. Росянова Т. С. Парадигматические ряды терминов с суффиксами – ER/OR (на материале английской экономической терминологии) // Проблемы лингвистики и лингводидактики в высшей школы: мат. всерос. науч.-метод. конф., 16 июня 2004 г. Вып. 5 / под ред. О. Н. Гронской. СПб.: ВМедА, 2004. С. 25–37.

Информация об авторах.

Руберт Ирина Борисовна – доктор филологических наук (1996), профессор кафедры теории языка и переводоведения Санкт-Петербургского государственного экономического университета, ул. Садовая, д. 21, Санкт-Петербург, 191023, Россия. Автор более 120 научных публикаций. Сфера научных интересов: лингвистика текста, диахроническая текстотипология, история языка, когнитивная лингвистика. E-mail: irleru@mail.ru

Киселёва Светлана Владимировна – доктор филологических наук (2007), профессор кафедры теории языка и переводоведения Санкт-Петербургского государственного экономического университета, ул. Садовая, д. 21, Санкт-Петербург, 191023, Россия. Автор 150 научных публикаций. Сфера научных интересов: терминология, семантика, стилистика, теоретическая грамматика. E-mail: svkiseljeva@bk.ru

Росянова Татьяна Сергеевна – кандидат филологических наук (2012), доцент кафедры зарубежной филологии и лингводидактики Русской христианской гуманитарной академии, наб. реки Фонтанки, д. 15, Санкт-Петербург, 191011, Россия. Автор 70 научных публикаций. Сфера научных интересов: терминоведение, когнитивная лингвистика, теория языка, социолингвистика, коммуникация, деловой английский язык. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8307-5694>. E-mail: rosyanova@mail.ru