

INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME 8, ISSUE 2

Dmitry S. Khramchenko, Editor-in-Chief

1. Overview

Welcome to Volume 8, Issue 2 of *Professional Discourse & Communication*. The articles assembled here examine how language functions as an instrument of authority, persuasion, resistance, and institutional reproduction in markedly different professional spheres. From the correction of grammatical errors in a Russian teacher's private messages to the rhetorical framework of presidential legitimacy in Nigeria, from the hyperbolic registers of automobile marketing to the cautious framing of artificial intelligence in German journalism, each contribution demonstrates that professional communication is never merely transactional. It remains strongly ideological and considerably consequential for how institutions operate and how individuals position themselves within them.

This issue brings together six studies that span political, educational, commercial, scientific, and cinematic discourses. What unifies them is a shared commitment to treating language as a professional practice in its own right – not as a transparent medium for conveying pre-existing meanings, but as a material force that constructs identities, legitimates power, manages public sentiment, and organizes economic exchange.

2. Geographical scope and scholarly dispersion

The geographical distribution of contributors to this issue reflects both the global reach of the journal and the local specificity of the phenomena under investigation, bringing together research from Nigeria, Indonesia, and Russia. This dispersion is not incidental. The study of professional discourse, when it remains confined to a single linguistic or national background, risks producing parochial theory. The articles published here resist that limitation by grounding their analyses in concrete communicative situations, whether in 1980s Lagos banking offices, contemporary Nigerian university tribunals, German newsrooms covering AI-generated art, Indonesian internship interviews, or Russian university messenger chats with international students – all drawing on conceptual theories that are immanent to these communicative environments. The result is a collection that speaks to the particular without sacrificing theoretical ambition.

3. The structure of this issue

The sequencing of articles in this issue follows a deliberate logic of scalar descent, moving from the broadest manifestations of professional discourse in public political and commercial spheres toward increasingly more granular and localized communicative situations. We begin with mass genres that influence national audiences and public perceptions (presidential commemorative rhetoric and promotional marketing discourse) before turning to journalistic framings of technological change, cinematic representations of institutional gender politics, corporate hiring practices, and finally the dyadic interactions that construct the foundation of professional socialization. Such progression mirrors the structure of how professional

discourse circulates: moving from the mass-broadcast registers establishing the ideological climate directly down to the localized, face-to-face and screen-to-screen encounters where professional competence is actually transmitted and evaluated.

4. About the articles

Reuben Kende opens the issue with his article “*‘We Rose from the Ashes of Despair’: A Pragma-Stylistic Analysis of Metaphor in President Tinubu’s 2024-2025 Democracy Day Speeches*”, examining metaphor as a professional instrument of state communication. Using the Metaphor Identification Procedure, the author identifies 22 active metaphors organized into six conceptual domains, with rebirth and struggle metaphors dominating the rhetoric. The article’s central finding concerns the multifunctionality of these metaphors in cognitive frameworks and stylistic dimensions simultaneously. Kende convincingly demonstrates that commemorative political discourse is a highly institutionalized professional genre where metaphor performs organizational work, reframing historical trauma as collective triumph, justifying present economic hardship, normalizing systemic repair, and elevating democratic governance to the status of sacred duty. As seen in the article, integrating Conceptual Metaphor Theory with combined pragma-stylistic frameworks offers a methodological model for analyzing professional political discourse that avoids reducing metaphor to either pure cognition or pure rhetoric.

Yulia Filyasova’s “*Linguistic Means of Intensification and Emphasis in English Promotional Discourse*” shifts the focus from political legitimation to commercial persuasion, yet maintaining the analytical gaze on mass-mediated professional discourse. Exploring speech segments in ten luxury and premium vehicle brochures, the author establishes a hierarchy of emphatic devices with dominating adjectives and adverbs, followed by pragmatic intensifiers, comparatives, and superlatives, alongside a minor presence of abstract nouns, verbs, idioms, and metaphors. The crucial finding here concerns the absence of complex figurative language. Metaphors and idioms constitute merely 2% of intensification means in the study’s corpus. Filyasova argues that global automotive conglomerates deliberately eradicate complex cultural idioms. They replace them with highly positive evaluative descriptors to guarantee cross-cultural persuasion. This corporate communication strategy relies on linguistic homogenization to maintain commercial dominance in international markets.

Natalia Shnyakina’s “*Strategemes for Representing the Creativity of Artificial Intelligence in German Popular Science Discourse*” introduces the concept of strategemes, i.e., abstract units realized through clusters of speech tactics within broader communicative strategies. The author identifies two dominant negative strategemes – rejection and doubt – which heavily overpower minor expressions of approval. The rejection strategeme, which uses vocabulary of theft, copying, danger, and degradation, proves most frequent. Shnyakina explains its domination through German linguocultural values – respect for legal norms, commitment to quality, emphasis on deliberate and accountable action, and orientation toward innovation tempered by risk awareness. The study exposes how science journalists mobilize specific strategemes to protect the borders of human copyright. Popular science journalism functions as a crucial institutional gatekeeper, and the media aggressively renegotiates the ethical boundaries of automated professional labor.

“*Challenging Gender-Hegemonic Narratives in Nollywood: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Kunle Afolayan’s Citation and Swallow*” by Aanu Jekayinoluwa Olowe examines how female characters deploy speech acts and deliberate discursive positioning to resist patriarchal

authority in academic and workplace interactions. Cinematic dialogue operates here as a direct simulation of institutional communication. The most theoretically significant finding concerns the manipulation of van Dijk's ideological square as female characters strategically emphasize positive in-group attributes (e.g., professional credentials, procedural knowledge) and simultaneously de-emphasize the positive attributes of patriarchal out-groups. In one striking exchange, analyzed in the article, a female professor lists her superior qualifications (two PhDs, a Rhodes Scholarship, a Doctor of Letters, and a Nobel Prize nomination) before delivering the decisive imperative "Sit down!" to lexically counter-dominate a male interlocutor who attempts to unfairly dismiss her. The article shows that cinematic dialogue can model discursive strategies of institutional resistance applicable beyond fiction.

Vladimir Botin and Irina Malyavkina narrow the analytical focus further to the most granular scale of professional communication – private digital correspondence between teachers and students – in "*Personal Internet Discourse of a Teacher of Russian as a Foreign Language: Linguodidactic Aspect*". Working with the message corpora sent by students from China, Turkmenistan, and Vietnam via VKontakte, Telegram, and WeChat, the authors identify typological models centered on information transmission and action-prompting persuasion. The study's most provocative finding is that error correction in student messages does not produce resistance but rather intersubjectivity, i.e., a pedagogical effect achieved through the specific discourse structure of social media, where informality coexists with institutional hierarchy. The authors reveal that personal Internet discourse possesses high pedagogical potential precisely because it combines personal orientation with institutional framing, a duality that traditional classroom communication cannot replicate.

Koen Hendrawan, Mardi, and Dewi Susita close the issue with "*Developing Work Readiness in Generation Z: The Role of Digital Skills, Communication, Experiential Learning, and Self-Efficacy*", a mixed-methods study that explores how students perceive the communicative demands of the labor market and specialized professional discourse communities they are about to enter. The authors deliver a finding that directly contradicts Western theoretical models: self-efficacy fails entirely as a mediator between professional competencies and work readiness. Instead, digital skills, communication skills, experiential learning, and demonstrable portfolio outputs drive work readiness directly. The qualitative phase reveals why. Indonesian Gen Z students prioritize tangible skill evidence (e.g., portfolios, certifications) over internal psychological confidence, and they perceive "Orang Dalem" (informal networks) as more decisive than individual self-belief. For readers concerned with teaching professional communication, this article challenges confidence-building interventions that lack authentic, output-oriented task design.

5. Themes of the issue

Four interconnected themes organize the conceptual territory covered by this issue.

The first theme concerns discourse as institutional reproduction and resistance. It encompasses the ways professional communication maintains or subverts organizational power structures. Olowe's analysis of cinematic tribunal discourse and Kende's examination of presidential commemorative rhetoric both demonstrate that institutional genres are sites of ideological contestation. Olowe shows female characters appropriating the formal registers of academic and workplace authority. Kende highlights the presidency appropriating deep biological schemata and sacred ritual metaphors to construct legitimacy. Both articles reveal that professional discourse is never neutral with respect to power. It either strengthens the existing

hierarchies of power or provides the verbal means for their transformation. This theme connects linguistic analysis to theories of institutional change, proving that discourse is beyond simple reflection of power relations, being a constitutive of them.

Digital transformation of professional communicative channels is the second important topic. Botin and Malyavkina's study of messenger-based pedagogy and Hendrawan et al.'s analysis of digital skills in employability both address how new technologies reconfigure the spatial and temporal boundaries of professional communication. Botin and Malyavkina find that the integration of personal and institutional discursive types in social media expands the teacher's professional jurisdiction beyond the classroom. Hendrawan et al. conclude that professionally relevant digital competence must materialize as verifiable output rather than internal capacity. Together, these articles suggest that digitalization does not simply add new channels to existing professional practices. It transforms the criteria by which professional competence is evaluated. This theme exposes the flaw in assuming that work-related communication and private interactions should stay separated.

The third theme is persuasion and the construction of value. Filyasova's analysis of promotional intensification and Shnyakina's examination of AI representation in science journalism both investigate how language constructs evaluative frameworks in specific professional fields. Filyasova demonstrates that the globalized economy demands a flattening of rhetorical complexity in favor of universally legible positive evaluators. At the same time, Shnyakina shows that emerging technologies are evaluated through culturally specific ethical filters, prioritizing legal caution over technical enthusiasm. The contrast is instructive. Commercial discourse minimizes cultural specificity to maximize market reach, whereas scientific journalism mobilizes cultural specificity to manage public risk perception. This theme connects linguistic analysis to theories of valuation and risk communication, showing that professional discourse is always engaged in the construction of what counts as desirable or dangerous.

The fourth and final theme of this issue is teaching practice and the formation of professional communicative competence. Botin and Malyavkina examine the micro-level of error correction and register acquisition in informal digital pedagogy. Hendrawan et al. analyze the macro-level of curriculum design and general employability of future specialists. Both research teams from Russia and Indonesia find that effective training in professional communication must bridge the gap between institutional regulation and existing real practice. Botin and Malyavkina discover that teachers should correct errors in contextually meaningful exchanges rather than through abstract drills. Meanwhile, Hendrawan et al.'s finding is that students require experiential learning, which would produce tangible evidence of competence. This last theme connects the studies, featured in this issue, to broader debates in language for specific purposes and pedagogy of professional communication, suggesting that the acquisition of competences related to professional discourse demands authentic participation in concrete professional communicative situations and not simulation or abstraction.

6. Conclusion

The articles in this issue collectively argue that professional discourse is not a peripheral concern for linguistics but a central object of study that sheds light on how institutions function, how power is exercised and resisted, how economic value is constructed, how technological change is managed, and how competence is transmitted to new generations. The authors

demonstrate that discourse analysis must be institutionally specific and attentive to the rigid generic conventions and ingrained cultural values that govern communication in particular professional fields, remaining theoretically ambitious in its claims about the constitutive role of language in social life.

We extend our gratitude to the authors for their patience and intellectual rigor throughout the revision process, and to the anonymous peer reviewers whose detailed critical engagement strengthened each contribution.