Revista Românească pentru Educație Multidimensională
ISSN: 2066-7329 | e-ISSN: 2067-9270
Covered in: Web of Science (WOS); EBSCO; ERIH+; Google Scholar; Index Copernicus; Ideas RePeC; Econpapers; Socionet; CEEOL; Ulrich ProQuest; Cabell, Journalseek; Scipio; Philpapers; SHERPA/RoMEO repositories; KVK; WorldCat; CrossRef; CrossCheck

2023, Volume 15, Issue 1, pages: 422-440 | https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/15.1/704
Submitted: June 2nd, 2022 | *Accepted for publication:* October 12th, 2022

Social Entrepreneurship Education Promotion to the Socially Vulnerable Youth

Halyna KRAVCHENKOVA[1], Alina KALASHNIKOVA[2], Iryna SOLDATENKO[3]

[1] Associate Professor, The Department of Applied Sociology and Social Communications, V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5412-0735, kravchenkova@karazin.ua
[2] Senior Reseacher, The Department of Applied Sociology and Social Communications, V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3179-9030, kalashnikova@karazin.ua
[3] Associate Professor, The Department of Applied Sociology and Social Communications. V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4764-8632, irinasoldatenko@karazin.ua

Abstract: The purpose of the present paper is to develop the key messages for social entrepreneurship education promotion among socially vulnerable youth. The scope of the research includes the communicative specificities of the vulnerable students with a special focus on orphans. The data for the research was obtained by conducting 12 expert interviews with educators and NGO members (2021-22, qualitative methodology). The results of the research showed that orphan students tend to hide their status and appear "average" in communication, though are more closed than their peers. It is discussed that communication with vulnerable students at HEI has to avoid treating them as special and motivate them to participate by messages of the personal empowerment and knowledge necessity to be autonomous and successful social subject. In conclusion, we propose the guidelines for educators' communication with vulnerable youth and key messages for the inviting communication of the «Creative Spark. Making Good» social entrepreneurship educational project of the Anglia Ruskin University (Cambridge, UK) at V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University.

Keywords: *social entrepreneurship; students; social vulnerability; higher education; adaptation; communication.*

How to cite: Kravchenkova, H., Kalashnikova, A., & Soldatenko, I. (2023). Social Entrepreneurship Education Promotion to the Socially Vulnerable Youth. *Revista Românească pentru Educație Multidimensională, 15*(1), 422-440. https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/15.1/704

©2023 Published by LUMEN Publishing. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

Introduction

Contemporary higher education in Europe and neighboring countries faces multiple challenges concerning the students' preparation and motivation in a frame of their future role as fully functional society members.

Higher education institutions (further in this text appealed to as HEIs) are often commonly seen as responsible for professional socialization only. However, young people today tend to come to higher school in search if not for themselves, then for a strong basis for future activities, or even for the understanding of what these activities should be. People having the degree are expected to be future leaders and innovators, they are more active politically and more often take part in volunteering (Gross, 2019). That is why HEIs strive to provide students with extra leadership and business-building courses to enhance their startups and form the overall entrepreneur mindset (Charrón Vías & Rivera-Cruz, 2020). For instance, at V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University we partner with Anglia Ruskin University in holding masterclasses and courses on social entrepreneurship to make our students' projects also beneficial for society.

Social entrepreneurship is considered the leading paradigm to win clients in any business field, and simultaneously the reliable approach to establishing sustainable development worldwide. Social entrepreneurship creates the basis for re-engagement in local communities, bridging capitalism together with social altruism. That is why studying social entrepreneurship as a way to recreate social structures through pedagogical influence is valuable for places affected by negative events, such as political reforms, economic crises, and war. Social entrepreneurship learning also fulfills the task of students' empowerment and shapes their value system towards more social responsibility and participation.

The latter is especially important for socially vulnerable categories of student youth – those having higher risks of social inadaptation due to special educational needs, traumatic experiences, or torn family connections. For them, higher education is already a way to social adaptation, and participation in entrepreneurship educational projects could make an even deeper impact.

However, in developing countries, social entrepreneurship is still a new approach that needs time to become known as proven effective. For educators, this means students may not be motivated to participate in activities that are crucial for their and their community's well-being. Facilitating participation with promotion helps to gain the students' audience

for social entrepreneurship projects, but there is no scientifically-based approach to pedagogical communication and motivation of the socially vulnerable students, who are regarded as the primary target group for such activities. In fact, in many countries, governments provide inclusive environments in schools, set entrance quotes, and build systems of foster care, but these programs center around children and adolescents (Zablotskiy, 2020), and even those aiming for socially vulnerable youth do not regard the problem of socially vulnerable students' communicational specificities.

The *purpose* of the present research is to develop the key messages for social entrepreneurship education promotion among socially vulnerable youth. Considering this goal, we first analyzed the existing law and academic and practical literature on the vulnerable youth in Ukraine and abroad, focusing on orphans as an example. Second, we conducted interviews with V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University departments' deputy chiefs, educators, and Kharkiv experts on the topic. Third, we compiled their ideas with a secondary analysis of the quantitative research of students' communicative preferences. Finally, we created guidelines for communication with socially vulnerable student youth that can be used by educators and educational institutions' administration, local and state bodies. Abiding by these guidelines, we developed key messages for the social entrepreneurship education project «Creative Spark. Making Good» promotion among the socially vulnerable students of V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University.

Literature review

Socially vulnerable categories include groups of people who have limited resources to meet their needs and exercise their rights under normal circumstances and people who, under circumstances beyond their control, find themselves in particularly difficult social conditions. The Law of Ukraine on Social Services defines difficult life circumstances as "circumstances that negatively affect the life, health, and development of a person, the functioning of the family, which the person/family cannot overcome on their own" (Law of Ukraine of 17.01.2019 №2671-VIII). Thus, socially vulnerable categories of student youth are people under the age of 35 getting higher education who, due to circumstances beyond their control, have limited resources to meet their needs and overcome the consequences of these circumstances. Socially vulnerable categories are regarded as fewer active participants in social exchange, consumption of educational content, and social communication in general.

The concept of social vulnerability in a broader sense refers to the distorted relations of young people with such institutions of society as the family, school, labor market, health, and justice. Central to the concept is the gradual accumulation of negative experiences from interaction with such institutions, which ultimately leads to social incoherence (Haudenhuyse, 2012). This means that putting the wrong accents or topics in communication with the vulnerable student may deepen the vulnerability and alienate such student even further. Social vulnerability is a condition that can occur due to experiencing or realizing the ties severance or subject's alienation from the values through which a person largely identifies him/herself (May, 2017, quoted in McLennan, 2019). According to empirical research, the rupture of a close emotionally significant relationship, especially at a young age, does increase the probability of mental health disorders, such as low self-esteem, anxiety, and depression (Sahad et.al., 2017; Priyanka, 2018; Cameron, 2017), and behavioral disorders affecting academic success and adaptation (Berardi, 2017). Though such findings are primarily associated with orphanages, foster care children and adolescents also face issues related to the quality of parenting in the foster family and mutual adaptation (Chodura, 2021; Hassall et al., 2021). Accordingly, the communication specificity of students that were deprived of parental care in childhood, may take the form of redundancy or lack of participation, inclusion, content production, or other parameters of communication.

The second factor of vulnerability is the experience of being controlled by external forces (McLennan, 2019). Usually, to help children deprived of parental care adapt, the compensatory approach is used. The state and social services try to provide a substitute for the family and lost ability in both material and social terms. However, being exposed to such special, inevitable and necessary, kinds of services, focused on a selected group, may become an important factor in the orphans' differentiation from the "average" youth.

For young people, stigmatization, discrimination, sanctions, and the outer perception of incompetence due to low ambitions and lack of "success" are often associated with a higher degree of social vulnerability (Haudenhuyse et al., 2012). That is why the process of vulnerable students' adaptation and empowerment inside the HEI is crucial for their future life success and social functioning, and this is not limited to specific professional knowledge (Spivak et al., 2021). In this regard, HEI serves as the space of their beliefs and values challenging and comparing with those dominating the current world. Mastering the legitimate means of participation in profession and social life, students also gain from HEIs a certain vision of

the world and possible impact on its change. So, the target pedagogical influence here is to give vulnerable ones the knowledge needed to succeed.

Entrepreneurship relates to the features and practices that principally contrast those associated with vulnerability. An entrepreneur is usually the person or organization making production start, namely, clarifying the needed resources, accessing risks, and actively engaging labor, capital, and means of production to run the process (Ashta, 2019). The main focus of entrepreneurship, therefore, lies in communication with social entities, as "the entrepreneurial organization gains access and functional control over a network of resources that are not within its hierarchical control" (Baporicar, 2017).

Regarding the social vulnerability from N. Luhmann's perspective as the state of communicational dysfunction between the individual or group and the society, we can conclude that such individual or group has narrower access to resources needed to participate in various forms of entrepreneurship. An absence or lack of emotional connections with significant Others and material insecurity, born by trauma, lead to hesitation in life goals. It is accompanied by usual challenges – stresses from examinations and adaptation to the HEI itself, that students overbear only by self-resistance (Topuzov et al., 2020). Sometimes the vulnerability forms paternalism and a dependent psyche, which significantly reduces the motivation to continue education, and can later lead to life failure (Bailey & Phillips, 2016; Bevz et al., 2020; Tate, 2012). For example, while the overall statistics for a bachelor's degree in youth in the United States is about 30%, for young people who have left the system of foster care, this rate is only about 8% (Gross, 2019).

That is why an effort to make pure business could be more traumatic for vulnerable youth and for the society they act in, as they lack connections balancing purely commercial motivation in entrepreneurship. The answer to this is social entrepreneurship education for the vulnerable youth, reconnecting the individual and the society. While entrepreneurship usually aims to create added value and income for everyone directly included in the business, social entrepreneurship specifies its goal of addressing social problems and creating value from which society can also benefit (Zhao & Mao, 2018).

However, making social entrepreneurship skills the optional part of the educational program means neither the people with vulnerabilities start automatically joining these activities, nor the pedagogical staff acts in the right way to attract vulnerable students to the courses on entrepreneurship.

This is why we researched the needs of vulnerable students to reform HEI's communication with this category towards more trust and efficiency.

Data & methodology

In this research, we focus on the students-orphans. In Ukraine, they are treated as a specific group of vulnerable youth, with an appeal to special educational and socialization needs. Orphans' upbringing for a long post-soviet period was and still is based on the principle of compensation for family deprivation, mainly in a form of residential care (Lialiuk et al., 2019; Popovych et al., 2020; Udovenko et al., 2020). As the new connections, membership, and exchange networks we are building are always being calibrated with patterns from existing structures, we can hypothesize that communicational specificity of students deprived of parental care may take the form of redundancy or lack of participation, and inclusion, content, or other parameters of communication.

To identify these features, the authors of the project proposed to interview students from children deprived of parental care and their "ordinary" colleagues, after which it was planned to compare these groups to determine whether there is a qualitative difference in their life and educational practices, first of all, in communication.

After conducting 3 trial interviews with orphan students of the V.N. Karazin University, it turned out, that the first and foremost specificity is the avoidance of emotional topics and accesses. For the stranger, it is almost impossible to obtain information this way, because when approaching the sensitive topic of close contact, living conditions, family circumstances, etc., students who have no emotional contact with the interviewer are communicatively closed. Given the ethics of sociological research, we decided to completely revise the design of the interview so as not to aggravate the trauma of students deprived of parental care in any way.

Accordingly, the authors of the study conducted expert phone interviews (2021-22, N=12) with representatives of education and social care, who have experience both with students from children deprived of parental care and "ordinary" students. In particular, the study included as experts the deputy chiefs for education or relevant administrators of 8 faculties of Karazin Kharkiv National University, as well as 4 representatives of public organizations and volunteers who also have relevant experience.

To obtain the communicational profile of orphans, we first asked the experts about the general features of the category in communication and then checked their perception of values, education activity, and participation in social projects. In the final part, we directly asked for experts' advice on

communication with socially vulnerable students and social entrepreneurship education promotion to them.

Key findings

According to the results of the interview, students from children deprived of parental care do have several communicative specifics, mainly stemming from their childhood experiences of being or not being an orphan.

In any case, it changes the person, and not in a good way. […] Maybe, when it happens at 16 or 17, it's not that bad, but if it happens before 14 – for me, it's the age when the person can understand the adult problems in full, – then it leaves the not good trace on the human's psychic. And we are talking about not having parents. If they are absent from the beginning, this is the one case, if they are parents abandoned from the parental rights – another… (Educational expert 5)

In general, the later they suffered the trauma and the more social ties with family members they continue to maintain after it, the less dramatically it will affect their communication. In contrast, for the grown-up person becoming an orphan, though emotionally traumatic, is, in a way, less traumatic socially. Such students are more sustainable in their professional and social development: *I had a graduate student, M., who graduated seven years ago. Her aunt was her caregiver. Around the time M. was in her fourth year, her aunt died. But nothing happened, M. has a normal life, now she works as a chemistry teacher at school, she is married and has a child. She has a normal life* (Education expert 2).

On the contrary, the broken connection with such the fundamental basis of personality as the basic family, continuing to higher school, redefines and inevitably changes for the subject the "sense of scale" in social coordinates. Lack of close relationships in the early years of life leads to an inability to determine the degree of closeness in communication with teachers and adequate content, especially when maintaining a long social distance in communication (this conclusion is intermediate and is better to be validated through quantitative psychological research). *If a "normal" child has basic trust in adults, then they [students from orphanages or boarding schools], due to the constant change of adults, have basic distrust. They perceive the discipline differently… they do not perceive that it is for their benefit* (NGO expert 1). Though this case is rather unusual, one of our experts told a story of the girl student orphan he helped; perceiving professional care as a personal attachment, she developed closer relationships with him and his wife, acting as if they were her family while she studied and even after she graduated.

The majority of our informants noted that vulnerable students do not seek to share all the details of their biographies, hiding them from most

people around: *the girl in the fifth year, A., has a caregiver, but we never touched this topic [in conversation]* (Education expert 4). They seek to not differ from their "average" colleagues in everyday superficial communication or table talk: *students communicate differently, some more, someone less, so I had two such girls as magister supervisor. Well, here I would say that I did not notice any difference from others, that is, they are normal, socialized* (Education expert 2)*[…] if I did not know that he is an orphan, I would not even think he is* (Education expert 1), *average students… No worse than everyone else. They do not make an impression of being dysfunctional* (Education expert 7).

On the one hand, this is in line with the strategy of stigma avoidance as the way to adapt and proceed in social life and education; on the other, it is likely the impact of insecurity in social relationships factor: *because of the traumatic experience, they perceive the world more suspiciously […] they are more closed. They can be pulled to talk, but then they are attached to you faster, if you start communicating with them more closely, help them. If this is not the first, not the second, or third meeting, then they are attached, and if they are already attached, then they are very strongly attached. That is, they already believe that you are… maybe, not owing to them, but that you will always respond, despite the fact that you are strangers* (Education expert 3), *is difficult to make friends with them, but if you make friends, it is difficult to explain that you still need to keep a certain social distance* (Education expert 2). This may be an attempt to supplement or compensate for the lack of strong structural ties, especially important for those who have the experience of living in an orphanage or boarding school, and/or of orphaning events in childhood.

Among the orphans' life values, success prevails, though for them it is understood sometimes in monetary terms. *Their main motivation for joining the higher school is that they will be paid money* (NGO expert 3). Experts also accented that money in this case stands for the opportunities to consume, take part in youth life and have autonomy. For orphans, the last is even more important than for students from average families – we can assume that gaining a stable source of money is part of their empowerment and becoming the social subjects fully included in society. For instance, experts noted the importance of fashionable and beautiful clothes for orphans, *because for them it is very important – to look no worse than «average»* (Education expert 8), it is a kind of symbol of ability, especially for those who came to HEI from boarding school.

The academic success of orphans is usually good, or at least not worse than that of average colleagues, though it also depends on whether they were part of a boarding school or not. *Speaking of cognitive functions, they do not differ, same kids [as the "usual" ones]. Possibly, there is a deficit of attention, and*

they may experience difficulties in adaptation because they felt no such support as those with parents. But in the educational process, there are no [special] difficulties. […] Ten years ago, there were such cases, when the persons just didn't study. […] He just didn't study, had no motivation, possibly, he hadn't had an understanding of what is higher education for, though the state had provided it to him. And now I observe there are no such problems, they are motivated, and they possess a relatively high level of academic success (Education expert 7). It can be due to the cultural capital's self-reproduction patterns because the more effort a person makes at the stage of general school, the more likely it is that (s)he will continue to try in higher school. For children deprived of parental care, this works in the same way, especially in the case of the university: *for them, Karazin is a dream. They will not sleep at night just to enter, because they still have such an understanding of healthy prestige* (NGO expert 1). There is also usually not used nowadays the «legislative immunity», which does not allow the expulsion of the student with the status of a child deprived of parental care: *earlier it could be said they made use of it, now – I don't think so* (Education expert 8). Due to personal secrecy, as well as the availability of financial support from the state, if unwilling to make extensive acquaintances, such students, according to experts, are less distracted from their studies: *they have, so to speak, nothing to spend time on* (Education expert 7). Therefore, sometimes they are even more successful than their «ordinary» colleagues. That is why, for those orphans who made it to the university, academic success is part of the overall success in socialization and rather can't be used solely as the core value to the key message to promote social entrepreneurship education.

In higher school, students from orphanages seek, first of all, the continuation of care and social protection. *They have a mad fear of leaving the boarding school for adult life,… of staying in the vast world alone* (NGO expert 3). Admission to the higher school provides an opportunity to extend the years of study and, in fact, adaptation, though for foster and relative care students this is less common. Students who have a caregiver from among relatives are generally more active and confident than those from a boarding school or orphanage. Indirectly, this indicates the imperfection of the boarding school system, as one of the experts noted, *a lot depends on the boarding school, and what people work there* (NGO expert 2).

Group relationships of students from children deprived of parental care are equal to those of the average student; there are no special conflicts between them. Some experts said these students were willing to find close friends at the university, but due to their suspiciousness towards the world, they have usually few such connections. Others accent the vulnerable students' overall will to be part of the group, despite even the visibility of the

trauma. Comparing the orphans to the students with disabilities, who often have no way to hide their trauma, one of the experts shared a case: *[orphans] sometimes have to learn even the everyday psychology of their peers… Because they have to cross this margin of speaking to another person, for example, to ask for the summary of a lecture, or to speak to the lecturer about repassing some credit. At the same time, I once had a boy with a disability, who wasn't able to speak. But he forced his parents to drive him by car to listen to the lecture. He also observed his peers, I'm sure, and I asked his mother, why they are coming, wouldn't it be easier for them to study at home? She answered that he wanted to listen to the lectures and to be among students* (Education expert 7). In general, experts stated orphan students neither treat, nor are treated by anyone differently, be it their peers or tutors: *personally, I don't even pay attention to who they are – students with privilege, orphans, whatever… There are just E & D-level students, C & B, and A-level students. Other tutors – well, though this information is at the dean's office, tutors do not use it* (Education expert 5). At the same time, except for mandatory interviews or documents needed specifically from people with orphan status, these students ask for help from the administration no more often than others. Some experts even noted that orphans more often have the habit of solving problems independently. This is especially true when approaching the organization of independent living in a dormitory: *ours will give a hundred points ahead in comparison to family ones, as they can do everything themselves* (NGO expert 2). On the other hand, there is *some slovenliness… Trifles, but something crumpled… As if a person is not trained* (Education expert 4), *constantly dirty shoes… They just do not pay attention to it* (Education expert 5).

Orphan students demonstrate the same level of inclination to participate in social projects or volunteering as average students do. Sometimes they do not want to have any connection with any social vulnerability, even with that one they have successfully overcome. *I'd say the majority nowadays aren't keen [to volunteer]. They [vulnerable students] are just in general trend* (Education expert 7), *among them there also are those who return, help… And there are those who grew up, succeeded, have their own family, forgot about it all, and do not want to remember* (Education expert 5). The last is especially true for boarding school students.

We can conclude that students from children deprived of parental care are characterized by a communicative strategy of stigma avoidance. Receiving the necessary financial support and working hard to achieve financial autonomy, they seek to convey the image of an «average student» in communication, often hiding the specificity of their life experience.

When asked about the ways to communicate with vulnerable students, the experts told of the urgent necessity to avoid exclusive

communication, which may accent their vulnerability. *Forget that they are special because they've got no parents* (Education expert 8).

Experts have also proposed the wider overall representation in media to reach as many Karazin students as possible, having in mind vulnerable students tend to be part of the group, so they will be reached if the students' opinion leaders and hubs are reached. *Just informing the students will be enough, so that they [vulnerable] would also hear about it* (Education expert 6). This is related indirectly to the HEIs' inevitably conservative communication: they rarely collaborate with external opinion leaders and tend to use more stable and respectable media than informal channels in messenger or TikTok.

Speaking specifically of the «Creative Spark. Making Good» project promotion, experts commented on extra-curriculum projects in general, regarding students' low motivation to participate in something that they aren't sure is useful and that isn't necessary for getting a diploma.

All experts confirmed it is necessary to build communication starting from why the project would be useful in terms of future personal and financial autonomy; and the sooner this future is, the better. The social support orphans get in HEIs may secure them from worries while they study, but as it finishes after graduation, the ability to earn without parental help is important and this message can attract their attention. *Even for me, it is difficult to understand how they can monetize what they do,… so if you could explain it to them!* (Education expert 4), *show them they can gain money from it* (Educational expert 6). Other suggested ideas include social entrepreneurship education building into the "regular" entrepreneurship courses; not promoting it separately; the widening covered topics with personal growth, etc.

The interview has also shown that social entrepreneurship is still a vague matter even for some of our experts, so promotion has to be simplified through the appeal to non-expert terms and specific cases and skills, avoiding possible misunderstandings. For example, the word "social" itself has a different connotation in Ukraine, so it may be better not even call social entrepreneurship social while teaching it: *as soon we speak the word "social", we understand this is for the poor. Social medicine, social society… Better to add "innovative", and "technological"* (Education expert 7).

Discussion

Summarizing the results of empirical research, we can say that it is important to consider not only the vulnerability source but also whether it becomes a factor of communication and whether it influences the process of education – i.e., whether it is separated from the communicative traits of the

subject (appearance, gestures, behavior, etc.). For example, in comparison to people with severe health disabilities, orphans' vulnerability is much less obvious. If the person does not have behavioral features that would be noticeable in communication, the carriers of this type of vulnerability will be less likely to speak openly about it or in some other way bring it to their communication with peers and educators. Moreover, even for the disabled, treating them in higher school "as a separate group runs the risk of obscuring areas of commonality that exist among all students. Nevertheless, this is not to suggest that there are no differences between students with disabilities and non-disabled students, but that it is easy to assume a great divide and overlook the overlap between the concerns of students with disabilities and non-disabled students" (Mutanga, 2019; p.16). Thus, an adaptation of the vulnerable can be considered successful if the practices, forms, and features of communication, including in the media environment, are fully consistent with the options broadcasted by their "average" peers. The administration and educators must not accent the difference or create condescending conditions, so they could learn to collaborate and solve conflicts through collaboration to integrate successfully (Moldovan & Bocoș, 2021).

Here the pedagogical challenge appears. Orphans coming to higher school certainly possess a relatively high level of socialization, so they tend to hide their status, but from the inclusive education perspective, it is common to take into account the special needs of vulnerable students. However, the efforts to make orphans' life in higher education easier can potentially lead to their trauma deepening in case they are subjected to anything other than the routine their "average" colleagues experience.

On the other hand, to provide the most effective communication, educators can take into account the need of such students in the presence of "significant others" who are also sources of information and communication influences, as they have the right to forgive mistakes, which is quite necessary for the student's development (Kravchuk, 2021). Sometimes they tend to find such in the HEI and form strong social ties with them, decreasing the psychological distance. Through "a decrease in the psychological distance between tutors and students enhances learning achievement by increasing the quality of interactions and academic engagement" (Lee et al., 2016, p.4), it is dangerous for the vulnerable student's further well-being. That is why tutors and lecturers, becoming significant figures for students deprived of parental care, have to pay special attention to holding the personal distance and margins between professional and emotional inclusion.

There are also core values, which possibly resonate with the vulnerable students' experience and are to be used by educators in communication. Individual ability to change any status or overcome structural inequality, the clear explanation of the path between the knowledge gained and the ways to apply it to real-world problems, personal knowledge and skills growth as a way to personal financial security and social empowerment – all are strategic senses that must underline the communication by educators with the vulnerable students. They center around two main focuses: social subjectivity strengthening and this subject's empowerment with knowledge and skills. It's easy to see they reflect and restores the two factors of vulnerability by McLennan (distorted relations with society and external control). Educational practices for vulnerable students are to be explained as a way to the new social ties acquisition and individual control establishing.

To engage more students from the vulnerable categories in social entrepreneurship learning, the HEI must promote it with messages designed to meet this group's preferences in the form, style, and core messages.

As vulnerable students tend to share the communicational behavior patterns of their "average" colleagues, we can assume they are present on the same social media and use it in the pretty much same way. According to the results of the survey «The attitude of Karazin University students to the Sustainable Development Goals» (N=447, 2020, spontaneous target sample, by Google Forms service, with the participation of NGO "Ukrainian Expert League"), 98.9% of Karazin students use social networks. The most popular are Instagram (88.1%), YouTube (83.14%), and Facebook (35.3%). Text messengers are used by 99.6% of respondents; the most popular are Telegram (94.9%), Viber (50.1%), and WhatsApp (19.9%). The content students mostly consume consists of images (87.2%), videos (86.1%), and texts (82.1%). At the same time, only 65.5% are engaged in the creation of images (photos and pictures), 43% – of texts, and even less create video content. Commenting and reposting of images is made by 48.9% of students, texts by 39.5%, and videos by 33.6%. The involvement in higher education may support the intention to consume textual content, while the primacy of visual forms of media, in general, is a defining characteristic of social communication by media nowadays.

Conclusion

According to the insights on the vulnerable youth's risks of distorted communication, the most beneficial methods to work with vulnerable youth in the process of education are individual tasks with detailed positive

feedback, practical projects, and cross-specialization group tasks that facilitate communication. Here, of course, a teacher, tutor, or curator has a great influence and must be prepared for this role and take the position of the moderator of the discussion with the rules of acceptance, respect, and tolerance. But the major accent in educators' communication, whether it is the conversation in class or about an educational project, has to be shifted from the HEI's compensative support of vulnerable students to their ability and empowerment.

Thus, the most effective communication messages for vulnerable students at higher school are those that meet the following requirements:

1. Do not emphasize the status or somehow separate the vulnerable from the "average" students.

2. Do not accent on the support they get from the HEI or the state.

3. Promote theoretical and practical knowledge as means of gaining financial autonomy, security and success.

4. Center on the realization and strengthening of every student's subjectivity and free choice.

5. Center on participation as the way to choose and establish new social ties.

Taking this information into account, we propose to strengthen the media presence of the «Creative Spark. Making Good» project, using Instagram and Telegram as prime channels, focusing on the strong visuals with text added. The visuals have to meet the patterns of overall Instagram users' interest: to present the emotionally bright positive stories of achievement, including people, through the imagery precisely edited to the compositional and coloristic harmony (Kravchenkova et al., 2021). Posts have to include young people of various categories that Karazin students could associate themselves with (better to avoid stock images), in real interaction, with the focus on the leading person(s) faces and emotions, as students with high emotional intelligence are more inclined towards social entrepreneurial activities (Tiwari & Bhat, 2020). It is also highly recommended to include cute pets, use memes (cautiously, to avoid the too old ones), and hold the informal text style and sincere tone of voice.

Taking into account what our informants told about the vulnerable students' values specifics, the messages we use for the «Creative Spark. Making Good» project have to be told as stories and center on such key messages as:

1. Get the power to take care (of yourself).

2. Get the freedom to decide the future. Yours, your country's, your world's.

3. Knowledge secures (time, money, you).

4. Have you ever started from nothing and ended with the world knowing your name? We have, and we can teach you.

Given the specifics of the very concept of social entrepreneurship (non)understanding among Ukrainian educators, it would also make a huge difference if it would be also explained to the academics and student youth outside the project participators. It would allow creating the background literacy, therefore, the positive connotations for any project on social entrepreneurship, including the target one. A campaign like this would also widen the understanding of possible forms of entrepreneurship among academic staff of various departments.

Limitations

As the present study is built upon interviewing a small sample of experts (N=12) by the qualitative methodology, its results do not bear any quantitative representativity. Therefore, they cannot be used to describe with statistical significance the orphan students as a category, the processes in Ukrainian higher school, or even the orphans in higher education institutions in the Kharkiv region. Our choice to scale the results of the orphans' study to the full category of vulnerable students and youth is due to this category specificity and for practical purposes, but we do not recommend doing so without further research. To get statistically significant scaleable results on the topic, it is needed to conduct further representative quantitative research on the youth with various vulnerabilities.

As we talked to Ukrainian educators and NGO representatives, primarily from Kharkiv, the results of the study can be used by social and pedagogical scientists in other regions and even countries only concerning the specific conditions and contexts of the research. To name a few, they are the recent foster care system emergence in Ukraine, Ukrainian higher school being post-soviet, Kharkiv region being unique, the majority of experts being part of V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, the difference in programs, teaching, and management styles with other universities in the region. The research has taken Karazin Kharkiv National University as the base, and though we hypothesize this organization faces pretty much the same difficulties and opportunities as the rest of Ukrainian higher schools, they are not the same. All of this reduces the comparability of the research results even inside Ukraine.

From the point of view of international significance, the present research can only attract attention to the topic and encourage analogous, further, or broader research in other countries.

It has also to be mentioned that the empirical research was conducted as part of the project on the vulnerable categories of student youth adaptation to the mediated society. That is why we focus on communication features, and our perspective could be distorted by the tendency to regard orphan students as part of the broader category of vulnerable students, so we could miss some details that weren't relevant to our key concepts.

Though we accented on the most universal communicational aspects, if the recommendations are to be used to communicate with vulnerable youth in other regions, spheres, or states, as proposed by the present paper, they have to be carefully evaluated by the local experts before implementation.

Acknowledgments

This research was conducted as part of the project «Socially vulnerable categories of student youth adaptation in the context of Ukrainian society mediatization», state registration number 0119U101762, financed by the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine. This research analysis and publication were conducted under the «Creative Spark. Making Good» project of the Anglia Ruskin University (Cambridge, UK). We are also grateful to colleagues from the «Creative Spark. Making Good» project for an opportunity to use data from the research «The attitude of Karazin University students to the Sustainable Development Goals» for the secondary analysis. A great thank you goes to our colleagues from higher school and NGOs of Kharkiv oblast, who were taking part in the research as experts.

References

Ashta, A. (2019). *A realistic theory of social entrepreneurship: A life cycle analysis of micro-finance*. Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-32142-0

Bailey, T. H., & Phillips, L. J. (2016). The influence of motivation and adaptation on students' subjective well-being, meaning in life and academic performance. *Higher education research & development*, *35*(2), 201-216. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2015.1087474

Baporikar, N. (2017). Boundaries and challenges for social entrepreneurship. In *Entrepreneurship: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 379-399). IGI Global. http://dx.doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-1923-2.ch017

Berardi, A., & Morton, B. M. (2017). Maximizing academic success for foster care students: a trauma-informed approach. *Journal of At-Risk Issues*, *20*(1), 10-

16. https://dropoutprevention.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/JARI_201.pdf

Bevz, G., Melnychuk, T., Melnychuk, Y., Kondratyuk, N., & Udovenko, Y. (2021). Ukraine. In I. Earner, A. Telitsyna (Eds.), *The development of child protection systems in the post-soviet states* (pp. 167-181). Springer, Cham. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-59588-3

Cameron, S. (2017). Child Psychology beyond the school gates: Empowering foster and adoptive parents of young people in public care, who have been rejected, neglected and abused. *Educational and Child Psychology*, *34*(3), 74-95. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319270527_Child_psychology_beyond_the_school_gates_Empowering_foster_and_adoptive_parents_of_young_people_in_public_care_who_have_been_rejected_neglected_and_abused

Charrón Vías, M., & Rivera-Cruz, B. (2020). Fostering innovation and entrepreneurial culture at the business school: A competency-based education framework. *Industry and Higher Education*, *34*(3), 160-176. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0950422219895209

Chodura, S., Lohaus, A., Symanzik, T., Heinrichs, N., & Konrad, K. (2021). Foster Parents' parenting and the social-emotional development and adaptive functioning of children in foster care: A Prisma-guided literature review and meta-analysis. *Clinical child and family psychology review*, *24*(2), 326-347. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-020-00336-y

Gross, J. P. with contributions by Geiger, J. and Stolzenberg, E. B. (2019) *Former foster youth in postsecondary education: reaching higher*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-99459-8

Hassall, A.; Elmie Janse van Rensburg; Sebastian Trew; David J. Hawes; Dave S. Pasalich; (2021). Does kinship vs. foster care better promote connectedness? a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 24, 813-832. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-021-00352-6

Haudenhuyse R. (2012). *The Potential of Sport for Socially Vulnerable Youth*. VUBpress.

Haudenhuyse R., Marc Theeboom and Zeno Nols (2012) Sports-based interventions for socially vulnerable youth: Towards well-defined interventions with easy-to-follow outcomes? *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, *48*(4):471-484. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1012690212448002

Kravchenkova, H., Kalashnikova, A., & Shkrebets, S. (2021). Students' preferences in visual consumption on Instagram as the basis for the university PR-strategy. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, *21*(1), 414-430. https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v21i1.3701

Kravchuk, S. (2021). Willingness to forgive oneself and others as a way of personal growth of university students. *Revista Romaneasca Pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, *13*(3), 262-279. https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/13.3/451

Lee, Hye-Jung; Hong, Youngil; Choi, Hyoseon (2016). Perceptions of tutoring roles and psychological distance among instructors, tutors and students at a Korean university. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *36* (1), 143–157. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1177811

Lialiuk, G., Aleksieieva, M., Popovych, A., Bondarenko, V., Kovtun, O., & Tsiuniak, O. (2019). Sociocultural metrics of the personal paradigm of orphans' upbringing in pedagogical theory and practice of Ukraine. *Revista Inclusiones*, 343-356. http://dspace.lvduvs.edu.ua/handle/1234567890/3336

McLennan, M. R. (2019). *Philosophy and Vulnerability: Catherine Breillat, Joan Didion, and Audre Lorde*. Bloomsbury Publishing. https://www.bloomsbury.com/us/philosophy-and-vulnerability-9781350004139/

Moldovan, D., & Bocoş, M.-D. (2021). Resolving interpersonal conflicts through collaboration – an alternative way to facilitate the social integration of students in primary school. *Revista Romaneasca Pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, *13*(1), 01-18. https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/13.1Sup1/382

Mutanga, O. (2019). *Students with disabilities and the transition to work: a capabilities approach*. Routledge. http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780429465208

Popovych, I., Lialiuk, H. M., Aleksieieva, M., Popovych, A., Bondarenko, V. A., Kovtun, O., & Tsiuniak, O. (2020). Sociocultural metrics of the personal paradigm of orphans' upbringing in pedagogical theory and practice of Ukraine. *Revista Inclusiones*, *7*(3), 343-356. https://revistainclusiones.org/index.php/inclu/article/view/1638

Priyanka, A. P., & Dewangan, R. L. (2018). A comparative study of self-esteem and level of depression in adolescents living in orphanage home and those living with parents. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Research*, *4*(2), 51-53. https://bettercarenetwork.org/sites/default/files/4-2-24-195.pdf

Sahad, S. M., Mohamad, Z., Shukri, M. M. (2017). Differences of mental health among orphan and non-orphan adolescents. *International Journal of Academic Research in Psychology*, *4*(1), 20-29. http://dx.doi.org/10.46886/IJARP/v4-i1/3492

Spivak, L., Melnyk, Z., & Spivak, D. (2021). Factors of social work students' professional identity significance during professional training. *Revista Romaneasca Pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, *13*(3), 333-349. https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/13.3/455

Tate, E. (2012). Social vulnerability indices: a comparative assessment using uncertainty and sensitivity analysis. *Natural Hazards*, *63*(2), 325-347. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-012-0152-2

The Law of Ukraine on Social Services of 17.01.2019 № 2671- VIII. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2671-19#Text

Tiwari, P., & Bhat, A. K. (2020). The effect of emotional intelligence, empathy and perceived social pressure on predicting social entrepreneurial intention: A field research. In Satyajit Majumdar, Edakkandi Meethal Reji (Eds.), *Methodological Issues in Social Entrepreneurship Knowledge and Practice* (pp. 137-158). Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-9769-1

Topuzov, O. M., Shamne, A. V., Malykhin, O. V., Aristova, N. O., & Opaliuk, T. L. (2020). Adaptation peculiarities of the first-year students to university life: study on stress resistance. *Revista Romaneasca Pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, *12*(2), 48-59. https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/12.2/265

Udovenko, I., Melnychuk, T., & Gorbaniuk, J. (2020). Mentoring as an individual form of preparing orphans for independent living in Ukraine. *Current Problems of Psychiatry*, *21*(3), 167-173. https://doi.org/10.2478/cpp-2020-0016

Zablotskiy, A. R. (2020). Characteristics of alternative forms of state care for orphan children and children deprived of parental care. *Journal of Education, Health and Sport*, *10*(11), 373-381. https://doi.org/10.12775/JEHS.2020.10.11.037

Zhao, M., & Mao, J. (2018). *Social entrepreneurship: An innovative solution to social problems*. China Renmin University Press and Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-9881-4