

INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME 8, ISSUE 1

Dmitry S. Khramchenko, Editor-in-Chief

Language in professional and institutional spheres rarely serves as a neutral conduit for information. Instead, it functions as an instrument of control, a mechanism for identity construction, a marker of exclusion, and a tool for legitimizing certain structures of power. With the first publication in 2026, we begin Volume 8 of *Professional Discourse & Communication*. The opening issue sets a rigorous tone for the year ahead, dismantling the assumption that professional communication is merely about efficiency. The contributions collected here demonstrate that professional discourse is fundamentally about the negotiation of status and the maintenance of hierarchy.

Volume 8, Issue 1 establishes a cross-continental dialogue that bridges the Global South and the Global North, featuring original research from institutions in Russia, Ghana, Nigeria, France, and the United States. Such geographical spread ensures that our examination of professional linguistics is not confined to a single cultural tradition. It encompasses the post-colonial administrative struggles in West Africa and the digital media strategies of Anglophone academia, alongside the diplomatic rhetoric of the Cold War era and the meta-discursive reflections of European translation studies.

The arrangement of articles in this issue follows a specific trajectory, as it moves from the macro-level discourse of the state to the micro-level discourse of specific professional tasks. We start with the most codified form of institutional speech (the national anthem) and move through the high-stakes areas of international diplomacy, industrial conflict, and higher education management. From there, we move focus to the digital marketing of academic knowledge and the technical practices of scientific translation. This progression allows us to observe how ideology permeates every stratum of professional communication, extending from the constitution of a nation down to the translation of a single scientific term.

The issue opens with a comparative critical discourse analysis by Moses Olusanya Ayoola, Olubunmi Funmi Oyebanji, and Hannah Oluwatobi Odulaja. In “*A Comparative Critical Discourse Analysis of Ideology in the ‘Old’ and ‘New’ Nigerian National Anthems*,” the authors scrutinize the reinstatement of Nigeria’s 1960 anthem. They identify a profound change in mood and transitivity, considering that, although the discarded anthem used imperative verbs to demand service, the reinstated anthem resorts to declarative structures to assert an optimistic, yet perhaps idealized, pragmatic effect of unity. The analysis in the article underscores how state actors manipulate linguistic codes to legitimize governance and manage transitions.

Following the examination of state ideology, Evgeny Nasilnikov and Olga Maksimenko take us into the UN Security Council in “*Emotive Aspects of Quotation in Diplomatic Discourse: A Study of US and UK Speeches in the UN Security Council (1964–1965)*.” Analyzing speeches from a very important historical period, they reveal a stark functional-pragmatic divergence between American and British representatives. The authors demonstrate that British diplomats integrated indirect citations to weave arguments, whereas their American

counterparts used the so-called “scare quotes” as a weapon of distancing, doubt, irony, and disagreement. This study brings our attention to how citation functions not merely as a reference tool, but as a strategic emotive marker in high-stakes negotiation.

The focus then moves to the combustible intersection of labor relations and media performance. Oluwatosin Grace Abidoye, Richard Damilare Akano, and Johnson Adewale Akano present “‘*University Lecturers Are Not Casual Labourers*’: Stance and Discursive Framing of the 2022 ASUU-FGN Industrial Conflict in TV Interviews.” The researchers argue that television interviews during the strike were used for public legitimization rather than for conflict resolution. They expose how social actors weaponized concepts of “welfarism” and legality to entrench their positions, prioritizing blame-allocation over diplomatic engagement.

Moving from external conflict to internal operations, Sulemana Iddrisu, Abdul-Kadir Salifu, and Kadir Fuseini explore “*Communication Practices among Administrators in Colleges of Education in Ghana*.” The article exposes the friction between current policy-related discourse and extralinguistic specificities of real life. Administrators in higher education rely heavily on formal channels like memos, yet the authors find that bureaucratic bottlenecks, heavy workloads, resistance to change, and insufficient ICT infrastructure severely hamper decision-making. The research illustrates how resource constraints force a dependence on informal networks to bypass structural inefficiencies.

In the digital sphere, Irina Khoutyz analyzes the “*Syntactic Features of English-Language Academic Podcast Episode Descriptions*.” This article moves beyond content analysis to examine the grammatical mechanisms of persuasion. The author identifies that enumeration and contrast are more than just stylistic flourishes. They are essential marketing tools used to simulate expertise and comprehensiveness. The findings reveal how syntax acts as connective tissue between the informality of the podcast medium and the authority of academic knowledge.

Concluding the issue is a meta-analytical study by Denis Zolotukhin “*Metadiscursive Acts in the Translation of Scholarly Linguistic Texts*.” By analyzing French and Russian commentaries, the author reframes the translator from a passive converter of text to an active terminologist dealing with the “aporetic” nature of linguistic scientific discourse. The results show how translators use metadiscourse to justify their interventions when facing conceptual asymmetry between scientific traditions.

Three dominant themes emerge from this issue’s collection, offering a theoretical framework for understanding the linguistics of professional institutions.

The first is the codification of authority. Whether through the “sovereign” vocabulary of a national anthem, the “scare quotes” of a diplomat, or the “legitimization frames” of a striking union leader, the articles help us come to the conclusion that professional discourse is primarily concerned with establishing who has the right to speak. The authors demonstrate that authority is not inherent in the position of the speaker. It is constructed moment-by-moment through specific linguistic strategies like polarization, extensive enumeration, citation, and high-modality declarations. Professional status is indeed linguistically manufactured.

The second theme is operational friction. Several articles draw our attention to the gap between the idealized function of professional communication and its messy reality. Iddrisu et al. show this in the clash between Ghana’s administrative protocols and its infrastructure inefficiencies; Zolotukhin describes it in the struggle to translate non-equivalent linguistic

concepts; Abidoye et al. expose it in the failure of dialogue during industrial disputes. Professional communication is not portrayed as a seamless flow of information. On the contrary, it is a constant struggle to overcome existing structural, technological, cultural, and ideological barriers.

The third theme is the performativity of expertise. In all the issue's articles, we see that professional communication often serves a performative function rather than a purely informational one. Khoutyz's analysis of podcast descriptions shows how syntax is used to convey academic depth to attract listeners. Nasilnikov and Maksimenko show how diplomats perform skepticism to align with national interests. Ayoola et al. show how a nation performs unity through the lyrics of an anthem. The discourse types analyzed here (i.e., political, diplomatic, administrative, digital-promotional, and meta-linguistic) affirm that the linguistics of professional communication must account for both the rigid constraints of the genre and the creative agency of the practitioner.

We extend our gratitude to the authors for their rigorous contributions and to the anonymous peer reviewers whose critical feedback ensured the quality of the scholarship.