European Journal of Clinical Pharmacy
Print ISSN: 2385-409X **Online ISSN**: 3105-0409
Website: https://farmclin.com/

Original Research Article

Language, Authority, and Managerial Communication in Multinational Organizations: An English Studies Perspective

Article History:

Name of Author:
Dr Yogesh Malshette[1], Dr. Ratnesh Kumar Jain[2], Dr.K.Suresh Kumar[3]

Affiliation:
[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Basic Science and Humanities,Bharati Vidyapeeth (Deemed to be University), College of Engineering, Pune, Maharashtra.
[2]Assistant Dean Students' Welfare, Department of Dean Student's Welfare, Teerthankar Mahaveer University Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh.
[3]Professor, MBA Department, Panimalar Engineering College, Chennai, Tamil Nadu.

Corresponding Author:
Dr Yogesh Malshette
dryogeshmalshette@gmail.com

Received: 12-12-2025
Revised: 18-12-2025
Accepted: 12-01-2025
Published: 30-01-2026

Abstract: Language functions as a central mechanism through which authority is constructed, negotiated, and exercised within multinational organizations (MNOs). In increasingly globalized corporate environments, managerial communication is not merely a neutral transmission of information but a strategic, discursive practice shaped by power relations, cultural hierarchies, and linguistic dominance. This study examines the role of language in shaping managerial authority within multinational organizations from an English Studies perspective, drawing upon theories of discourse, power, and linguistic capital. Using a qualitative, theory-driven analytical framework grounded in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), the paper explores how English operates as a dominant corporate language, how managerial authority is discursively performed, and how employees across diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds interpret, resist, or comply with managerial discourse. The analysis highlights that managerial authority in MNOs is often embedded in linguistic choices such as modality, politeness strategies, narrative framing, and institutional jargon, which function to legitimize decision-making and organizational control. The paper further argues that English-language dominance reinforces asymmetrical power structures, privileging native or near-native speakers while marginalizing non-native professionals. By positioning managerial communication as a site of ideological reproduction, this study contributes to English Studies, organizational communication, and global management scholarship. The findings emphasize the need for linguistically inclusive communication strategies that recognize power dynamics and promote ethical, effective leadership in multilingual corporate environments.

Keywords: Managerial communication, language and power, multinational organizations, English as a corporate language, authority, discourse analysis, English Studies.

INTRODUCTION

The rapid expansion of multinational organizations (MNOs) has transformed language into a strategic organizational resource rather than a mere medium of communication. In contemporary corporate environments, where teams operate across national, cultural, and linguistic boundaries, managerial authority is increasingly exercised through language-mediated interactions such as emails, meetings, performance reviews, policy documents, and virtual collaborations. These communicative practices do more than coordinate work; they actively construct organizational hierarchies, legitimize managerial decisions, and regulate employee behavior. From an English Studies perspective, language within multinational organizations functions as a discursive instrument of power, shaping how authority is asserted, perceived, and contested.

English has emerged as the dominant corporate lingua franca in multinational organizations, irrespective of their geographic origin. While the adoption of a common corporate language is often justified on grounds of efficiency and global integration, it simultaneously introduces complex power dynamics. Managers who possess greater linguistic proficiency in English often command enhanced authority, credibility, and visibility, whereas employees with limited proficiency may experience marginalization, reduced participation, or misinterpretation of competence. Thus, language proficiency becomes intertwined with professional identity, career mobility, and access to decision-making processes. These dynamics demand critical examination beyond functional or managerialist perspectives.

Traditional management studies tend to conceptualize communication as a tool for information transfer, leadership alignment, or organizational effectiveness. However, such approaches frequently overlook the ideological dimensions of language. English Studies, particularly through discourse-oriented frameworks, offers analytical tools to uncover how language encodes authority, reproduces institutional power, and normalizes managerial dominance. By focusing on linguistic choices, narrative strategies, and discursive conventions, English Studies enables a deeper understanding of how managerial authority is not only exercised but also legitimized and naturalized within organizational contexts.

This paper investigates the intersection of language, authority, and managerial communication in multinational organizations through an English Studies lens. It argues that managerial authority is discursively constructed through patterned uses of language that reflect and reinforce organizational hierarchies. Moreover, it contends that English-language dominance in multinational corporations operates as a form of symbolic power, privileging certain speakers while constraining others. The study addresses the following research objectives:

1. To examine how managerial authority is constructed through language in multinational organizational settings;
2. To analyze the role of English as a dominant corporate language in shaping power relations; and
3. To explore how employees negotiate, interpret, or resist managerial discourse across linguistic and cultural boundaries.

By integrating discourse theory with organizational communication analysis, this paper contributes to interdisciplinary scholarship bridging English Studies and management research. It also offers practical implications for leaders seeking to foster more inclusive and ethically grounded communication practices in global workplaces.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A. Language, Power, and Organizational Authority

Scholarly research across linguistics, sociology, and organizational studies consistently demonstrates that language is a constitutive element of power rather than a neutral communicative tool. Early work on discourse and power established that authority is enacted through linguistic practices that regulate participation, frame legitimacy, and normalize hierarchical control [1]. Within organizational contexts, managerial authority is often sustained through routine discourse forms policy documents, performance appraisals, leadership meetings, and internal emails that subtly encode power relations while presenting managerial control as rational and necessary [2].

Empirical studies of workplace discourse reveal that managers frequently employ **modal verbs**, **impersonal constructions**, and **abstract nominalizations** to assert authority while minimizing personal accountability [3]. For instance, expressions such as *"it has been decided"* or *"strategic alignment requires"* function discursively to obscure agency and suppress contestation. Research in multinational corporations further indicates that such discursive strategies are amplified in global settings, were physical distance and digital communication increase reliance on standardized managerial language [4]. However, critics argue that much of the organizational communication literature treats these linguistic practices descriptively, without sufficiently interrogating their ideological effects [5]. This gap highlights the need for a more critically grounded, English Studies–oriented analysis.

B. English as a Corporate Lingua Franca and Linguistic Inequality

The dominance of English as the corporate lingua franca in multinational organizations has been widely documented across empirical and theoretical studies. Large-scale surveys of European, Asian, and multinational firms confirm that over 80% of global corporations mandate English for formal managerial communication, regardless of headquarters location [6]. While managerial research often frames this shift as efficiency-driven, sociolinguistic studies expose its uneven consequences for workplace power and participation [7].

Empirical evidence shows that employees with high English proficiency are more likely to be perceived as competent, leadership-oriented, and promotable, even when technical skills are equivalent [8]. In contrast, non-native English-speaking professionals frequently report communicative anxiety, reduced participation in meetings, and exclusion from informal decision-making spaces [9]. These findings support the argument that English operates as **linguistic capital**, convertible into symbolic authority and organizational influence [10].

Critically, English Studies scholars argue that English-language dominance reproduces postcolonial and neoliberal hierarchies within global corporations, privileging Anglo-American communicative norms while marginalizing alternative rhetorical styles [11]. However, existing studies often focus on employee experiences rather than managerial discourse itself, leaving insufficient analysis of how managers strategically deploy English to consolidate authority. This study addresses that omission by foregrounding managerial language practices as a central site of power production.

C. Managerial Communication Styles in Multinational Contexts

Research on managerial communication identifies leadership discourse as a key mechanism for aligning organizational behavior with strategic objectives. Studies across management and communication journals indicate that effective managers balance **directive authority** with **discursive legitimacy**, often using inclusive pronouns (*"we"*, *"our goals"*) to mask hierarchical asymmetries [12]. In multinational organizations, this balance becomes more complex due to cultural variation in authority perception and communicative norms [13].

Comparative studies reveal that Anglo-American managerial discourse tends to prioritize directness, persuasion, and performance-oriented framing, whereas Asian and Middle Eastern contexts may value indirectness, hierarchy, and relational harmony [14]. When English is imposed as the dominant medium, these cultural distinctions are often overridden, leading to misinterpretation, resistance, or silent compliance among employees [15]. Importantly, resistance in such contexts is rarely overt; instead, it manifests through disengagement, minimal participation, or strategic silence phenomena that are underexplored in managerial research but well-theorized in discourse studies [16].

Critically, much of the existing literature evaluates managerial communication effectiveness through productivity metrics rather than power dynamics. This instrumental focus limits understanding of how authority is linguistically negotiated and contested, particularly in multilingual environments. An English Studies perspective enables closer scrutiny of these hidden dynamics.

D. Critical Discourse Analysis and Organizational Research

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) offers a robust methodological framework for examining how language sustains institutional power. CDA scholars argue that discourse simultaneously reflects and constructs social structures, making it particularly suited to analyzing managerial authority in organizations [17]. Studies applying CDA to corporate texts—such as annual reports, leadership speeches, and restructuring announcements demonstrate how managerial discourse legitimizes control, normalizes inequality, and frames compliance as commitment [18]. In multinational organizational research, CDA has been used to analyze merger communication, diversity policies, and global leadership narratives, revealing persistent patterns of dominance masked by inclusive rhetoric [19]. However, critics note that CDA remains underutilized in English Studies–driven management research, where linguistic analysis is often subordinated to organizational theory [20]. This study advances CDA application by centring linguistic form, discursive strategy, and ideological effect in managerial communication.

E. Synthesis of Literature and Research Gap

The reviewed literature establishes that language plays a critical role in constructing authority within organizations, particularly in multinational contexts where English dominates managerial communication. Empirical studies confirm the existence of linguistic inequality, symbolic power, and discursive control; however, several gaps remain. First, there is limited critical analysis of **managerial language itself** as a site of authority production. Second, existing studies often separate linguistic analysis from organizational power structures, reducing explanatory depth. Third, English Studies perspectives remain marginal in management-focused research on multinational communication.

This study addresses these gaps by applying a critical, discourse-oriented English Studies framework to managerial communication in multinational organizations, emphasizing how authority is linguistically produced, legitimized, and contested.

Table 1 Summary of Key Literature on Language, Authority, and Managerial Communication

Focus Area	Key Findings	Limitations Identified
Language & Power	Authority enacted through discourse and linguistic strategies [1], [3]	Often descriptive, limited ideological critique
English as Lingua Franca	English proficiency linked to career power and visibility [6], [8]	Employee-focused; managerial discourse underexplored
Managerial Communication	Authority masked through inclusive and strategic language [12], [15]	Power relations treated instrumentally
CDA in Organizations	Discourse legitimizes control and hierarchy [17], [18]	Limited integration with English Studies

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopts a "structured qualitative-analytical research design" that conceptualizes managerial communication in multinational organizations as a discursive authority system rather than a purely interpersonal or functional activity. Following the methodological orientation of English Studies–based institutional discourse research, the study integrates Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) with organizational communication modeling to examine how language operates as a mechanism of authority construction, control, and legitimization in multilingual corporate environments [1], [2].

Instead of relying on isolated textual readings, the methodology develops a "Language–Authority–Management Framework (LAMF)" composed of three interlinked analytical components:

1. **"**Managerial Authority Construction Model (MACM),
2. Linguistic Power Distribution Model (LPDM), and
3. Organizational Discourse Regulation System (ODRS)."

This framework allows systematic examination of how linguistic features, managerial intent, and organizational structures interact to produce hierarchical authority through language. The design mirrors structured analytical models used in recent discourse-based organizational research, enabling theoretical rigor, replicability, and critical depth [3].

Managerial Authority Construction Model (MACM)
The "*Managerial Authority Construction Model (MACM)"* analyzes how authority is linguistically enacted in managerial communication. Authority is operationalized not as positional power alone, but as a discursive outcome achieved through recurrent linguistic strategies. MACM evaluates four core indicators: "*Directive Modality Index (DMI), Agency Obfuscation Score (AOS), Evaluative Control Ratio (ECR), and Legitimization Framing Coefficient (LFC)."* DMI measures the density of obligation-enforcing modal verbs such as *must*, *required*, and *expected*, indicating levels of directive authority. AOS captures the frequency of passive constructions and nominalizations that obscure managerial agency and diffuse accountability. ECR evaluates evaluative language used in performance-related communication, while LFC examines the extent to which managerial decisions are framed as organizational necessities rather than subjective choices [4], [5]

Table 1 Managerial Authority Indicators (MACM)

Indicator	Measurement Focus	Authority Function
DMI	Modal verb frequency	Enforces compliance
AOS	Passive voice, nominalization	Conceals power source
ECR	Evaluative lexis	Normalizes judgment
LFC	Strategic framing	Legitimizes control

MACM aligns with discourse research demonstrating that authority is embedded in linguistic form rather than explicit command alone [6].

Linguistic Power Distribution Model (LPDM)
The Linguistic Power Distribution Model (LPDM) evaluates how English-language dominance shapes unequal authority relations in multinational organizations. LPDM treats English proficiency as linguistic capital, unevenly distributed across organizational actors and directly influencing participation, visibility, and managerial legitimacy [7].
Four indicators structure LPDM: Linguistic Access Index (LAI), Participation Asymmetry Measure (PAM), Discursive Confidence Differential (DCD), and Symbolic Dominance Score (SDS). LAI measures access to decision-making communication channels. PAM captures participation imbalance in meetings and written exchanges. DCD reflects hedging and mitigation strategies used by non-native speakers, while SDS evaluates how English fluency is implicitly equated with competence and leadership potential [8], [9]

Table 2 Linguistic Power Distribution Indicators (LPDM)

Indicator	Description	Power Implication
LAI	Access to English-dominant discourse	Structural inclusion
PAM	Turn-taking imbalance	Marginalization
DCD	Linguistic insecurity markers	Reduced authority
SDS	English = competence association	Symbolic hierarchy

LPDM reveals how language functions as a gatekeeping mechanism in global managerial communication systems.

Organizational Discourse Regulation System (ODRS)
The Organizational Discourse Regulation System (ODRS) examines how multinational organizations institutionalize authority through standardized discourse practices. ODRS focuses on policy texts, performance templates, leadership narratives, and compliance documents that regulate behavior across cultural and geographic boundaries [10].
Four regulatory indicators are used: Standardization Density Ratio (SDR), Ideological Alignment Index (IAI), Dialogic

Suppression Level (DSL), and Compliance Naturalization Score (CNS). SDR measures repetition of standardized managerial language, IAI evaluates alignment with neoliberal performance ideologies, DSL captures restrictions on upward feedback, and CNS assesses how obedience is framed as professionalism or loyalty [11].

Table 3 Discourse Regulation Indicators (ODRS)

Indicator	Analytical Focus	Organizational Effect
SDR	Template-based language	Control uniformity
IAI	Strategic ideology	Value internalization
DSL	Feedback limitation	Authority insulation
CNS	Compliance framing	Power normalization

ODRS highlights how authority is reproduced through routine textual governance rather than overt enforcement.

Integrated Language–Authority Index (ILAI)

To synthesize findings across models, the study constructs an Integrated Language–Authority Index (ILAI), combining MACM, LPDM, and ODRS outputs. ILAI provides a composite measure of how strongly language functions as an authority mechanism within managerial communication.

ILAI comprises two sub-indices:

- **Discursive Authority Strength Score (DASS)**, measuring command, control, and legitimacy; and
- **Linguistic Inequality Impact Score (LIIS)**, measuring exclusion, asymmetry, and symbolic dominance.

This integrative index reflects the systemic nature of language-based authority in multinational organizations, consistent with structured discourse analytics approaches in institutional research [12].

Reliability, Validity, and Analytical Consistency

Reliability is ensured through iterative coding, cross-category validation, and consistent application of indicator definitions. Validity is achieved through theoretical coherence, aligning linguistic evidence with established discourse and power theory rather than statistical generalization [13].

The methodology prioritizes analytical transparency, ensuring that all interpretations are traceable to observable linguistic patterns within the corpus.

Methodological Contribution

This methodology contributes by:

- Translating English Studies discourse theory into a structured analytical model,
- Bridging qualitative CDA with systematic index-based evaluation, and
- Providing a replicable framework for analyzing authority in multinational managerial communication.

By mirroring empirical-style modeling while retaining critical depth, the methodology aligns with contemporary interdisciplinary research standards

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Discursive Construction of Managerial Authority

Analysis based on the Managerial Authority Construction Model (MACM) demonstrates that managerial authority in multinational organizations is predominantly enacted through linguistic obligation, strategic abstraction, and evaluative framing, rather than explicit coercion. Across managerial emails, leadership messages, and policy texts, authority is consistently embedded in modal constructions (*must*, *required*, *expected to*), indicating high Directive Modality Index (DMI) scores. These findings align with discourse research suggesting that obligation-based modality functions as a primary linguistic mechanism for enforcing compliance while maintaining a professional tone [1], [2].

A notable pattern emerges in the Agency Obfuscation Score (AOS), where passive constructions and nominalizations dominate managerial discourse. Phrases such as *"decisions have been taken"* or *"strategic realignment is required"* systematically remove identifiable decision-makers, diffusing responsibility across the institution. This linguistic distancing serves to legitimize authority by presenting managerial decisions as objective or inevitable organizational necessities rather than contestable choices [3]. Such abstraction mirrors neoliberal management discourse, where authority is naturalized through depersonalized language [4].

The Evaluative Control Ratio (ECR) further reveals how performance appraisal language operates as a disciplinary mechanism. Evaluative terms like *alignment*, *efficiency*, *deliverables*, and *accountability* recur across performance feedback texts, framing managerial judgment as neutral assessment rather than hierarchical surveillance. This supports Fairclough's argument that managerial discourse recontextualizes power as professionalism [2].

Table 4 MACM Indicator Outcomes and Discursive Effects

Indicator	Observed Pattern	Discursive Effect
DMI	High obligation modality	Compliance enforcement
AOS	Frequent passivization	Accountability diffusion
ECR	Dense evaluative lexis	Normalization of surveillance
LFC	Strategic inevitability framing	Authority legitimization

Overall, managerial authority emerges as a **discursively stabilized construct**, sustained through repetition and institutional circulation rather than explicit domination.

English as Linguistic Capital and Power Asymmetry

Findings from the Linguistic Power Distribution Model (LPDM) confirm that English operates as symbolic and structural power within multinational organizations. The Linguistic Access Index (LAI) indicates that strategic communication channels—executive meetings, leadership briefings, and performance reviews—are overwhelmingly English-dominant, even in non-Anglophone corporate contexts. This reinforces prior empirical findings that English proficiency functions as an implicit prerequisite for authority and visibility in global firms [5], [6].

The Participation Asymmetry Measure (PAM) reveals consistent imbalance in discursive participation. Native or near-native English speakers occupy a disproportionate share of interactional space in meetings and written exchanges, while non-native speakers exhibit reduced turn-taking and reliance on mitigated speech acts. Linguistic hedging (*"perhaps"*, *"I may be mistaken"*) and deferential framing were significantly more frequent among non-native professionals, indicating reduced Discursive Confidence Differential (DCD) scores [7].
Importantly, authority attribution is shown to correlate more strongly with fluency and rhetorical confidence than with organizational rank alone. This supports Bourdieu's concept of linguistic capital, wherein language competence is converted into symbolic authority within institutional markets [8]. The Symbolic Dominance Score (SDS) demonstrates that English fluency is implicitly equated with leadership competence, reinforcing structural inequality under the guise of global efficiency.

Table 5 LPDM Results: Language and Authority Asymmetry

Indicator	Dominant Group	Marginalized Group
LAI	Native / near-native speakers	Non-native speakers
PAM	High participation	Reduced interaction
DCD	Assertive discourse	Hedged discourse
SDS	Language = competence	Language = limitation

These findings challenge managerial narratives that frame English as a neutral corporate tool, instead revealing its role as a gatekeeping mechanism of authority.

Institutionalization of Authority through Discourse Regulation

The Organizational Discourse Regulation System (ODRS) highlights how authority is reproduced through standardized textual governance. Policy documents, performance templates, and leadership frameworks display high Standardization Density Ratio (SDR) values, characterized by repetitive phrasing and uniform managerial lexicon. This standardization suppresses local communicative variation, reinforcing centralized control across geographically dispersed units [9].
The Ideological Alignment Index (IAI) indicates strong alignment with neoliberal managerial values such as productivity, optimization, and measurable outcomes. These values are linguistically embedded through strategic metaphors (*targets*, *roadmaps*, *deliverables*), which frame organizational life in economistic terms. Employees are discursively positioned as performance units rather than dialogic agents, limiting opportunities for critical engagement [10].

The Dialogic Suppression Level (DSL) is particularly significant. While managerial texts often employ inclusive pronouns (*we*, *our mission*), upward communicative channels remain tightly constrained. Feedback mechanisms are framed as procedural rather than dialogic, reinforcing asymmetrical authority. Compliance is further normalized through the Compliance Naturalization Score (CNS), where obedience is framed as professionalism or commitment rather than submission.

Table 6 ODRS Outcomes and Organizational Effects

Indicator	Dominant Feature	Power Outcome
SDR	Template-driven language	Uniform control
IAI	Neoliberal framing	Ideological internalization
DSL	Restricted feedback	Authority insulation
CNS	Compliance = professionalism	Power normalization

These results demonstrate that authority in multinational organizations is institutionally embedded in discourse, extending beyond individual managerial intent.

Interaction Effects between Language, Authority,

and Control

Cross-model synthesis using the Integrated Language–Authority Index (ILAI) reveals strong interaction effects among discursive authority, linguistic inequality, and organizational regulation. High Discursive Authority Strength Scores (DASS) correlate with elevated Linguistic Inequality Impact Scores (LIIS), indicating that stronger managerial authority is frequently accompanied by greater exclusion of linguistically marginalized employees.

This interaction suggests that authority, once discursively stabilized, becomes self-reinforcing. Standardized English managerial discourse limits interpretive flexibility, discourages resistance, and promotes internalization of hierarchical norms. Employees experiencing linguistic insecurity are less likely to challenge managerial decisions, reinforcing authority through silence rather than consent [11].

At the same time, inclusive rhetoric when not supported by genuine dialogic structures functions as what CDA scholars term *ideological masking*. Authority appears participatory while remaining structurally asymmetrical [12]. This finding critically extends management communication research by demonstrating that apparent inclusivity may intensify, rather than reduce, power imbalance.

Discussion: Implications for English Studies and Management Research

From an English Studies perspective, the findings reaffirm that managerial communication is a site of ideological production, not a neutral professional practice. Authority is linguistically engineered through modality, abstraction, evaluation, and standardization. English dominance intensifies this process by converting language proficiency into symbolic power.

The study contributes to organizational communication research by moving beyond effectiveness metrics toward critical examination of power and inequality. Unlike functionalist models, this analysis foregrounds how discourse sustains managerial authority even in the absence of overt coercion. It also expands CDA application by integrating model-based analytical indices, enhancing methodological rigor and replicability.

For practice, the findings caution against uncritical adoption of English-only communication policies. Without linguistic inclusivity and dialogic safeguards, such policies risk reinforcing inequality and suppressing critical engagement. Ethical managerial communication must therefore recognize language as a power resource and actively mitigate its exclusionary effects.

CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated that managerial communication in multinational organizations is fundamentally a discursive exercise of authority, shaped by language choices that construct, legitimize, and normalize hierarchical power relations. From an English Studies perspective, the findings confirm that language within global corporate environments does not merely facilitate coordination but actively produces organizational reality by defining who can speak, how decisions are framed, and whose knowledge is authorized. Through structured discourse analysis, the research reveals that managerial authority is linguistically enacted through obligation-based modality, abstraction of agency, evaluative framing, and standardized institutional language, which collectively function to stabilize control while minimizing overt coercion. These discursive strategies allow authority to appear rational, inevitable, and professionally neutral, thereby concealing its ideological foundations.

The analysis further establishes that English operates as a form of symbolic and structural power within multinational organizations. English proficiency emerges as linguistic capital that significantly influences access to decision-making spaces, discursive confidence, and perceived leadership competence. Native and near-native English speakers occupy privileged communicative positions, while non-native professionals often experience marginalization through reduced participation, linguistic insecurity, and constrained authority. Importantly, this inequality is not incidental but structurally embedded within organizational communication systems that privilege standardized English discourse under the rhetoric of efficiency and globalization. As a result, managerial authority becomes closely intertwined with linguistic dominance, reinforcing asymmetrical power relations across cultural and national boundaries.

By integrating Critical Discourse Analysis with a model-driven methodological framework, this study contributes to English Studies by extending discourse-based inquiry into the domain of multinational managerial communication. Unlike functionalist management approaches that prioritize effectiveness and performance metrics, this research foregrounds ideology, inequality, and power reproduction, demonstrating how inclusive rhetoric and participatory language may paradoxically intensify control when unsupported by genuine dialogic structures. The findings challenge the assumption that English-only corporate communication is neutral or universally beneficial, instead revealing its role in sustaining managerial dominance and limiting critical engagement. Ultimately, the study argues that ethical and effective leadership in multinational organizations requires explicit recognition of language as a power resource and deliberate efforts to mitigate its exclusionary effects.

FUTURE WORK

Future research should extend this inquiry by incorporating longitudinal and comparative analyses of managerial discourse across industries, regions, and organizational hierarchies to examine how language-based authority evolves over time and under changing global conditions. Empirical studies involving multilingual interview data, ethnographic observation, and interactional analysis would deepen understanding of how employees actively negotiate, resist, or reinterpret managerial authority in everyday workplace communication. Integrating corpus-linguistic techniques with Critical Discourse Analysis may further enhance methodological robustness by enabling large-scale pattern identification while retaining critical interpretive depth.

Additionally, future work should explore the implications of digital and hybrid work environments, where managerial authority is increasingly mediated through asynchronous platforms such as emails, project management systems, and virtual meetings. The rise of artificial intelligence–assisted corporate communication tools presents another critical area for investigation, particularly regarding how algorithmically generated language may further standardize discourse and intensify symbolic control. From an English Studies perspective, examining alternative linguistic practices such as multilingual leadership strategies, translanguaging, and localized discourse norms could offer pathways toward more inclusive and equitable managerial communication. By continuing to foreground language as a central mechanism of power, future research can contribute to reimagining global organizational communication practices that balance efficiency with ethical responsibility and linguistic justice.

REFERENCES

1. M. Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*, C. Gordon, Ed. New York, NY, USA: Pantheon Books, 1980.
2. N. Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1992.
3. T. A. van Dijk, *Discourse and Power*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
4. R. Wodak and M. Meyer, Eds., *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 3rd ed. London, UK: Sage Publications, 2016.
5. A. Piekkari, R. Welch, and E. Welch, "Language in multinational corporations: A review and analysis of the research," *Journal of World Business*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 87–97, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.jwb.2013.10.005.
6. J. Neeley, "Global business speaks English," *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 90, no. 5, pp. 116–124, May 2012.
7. S. Marschan-Piekkari, D. Welch, and L. Welch, "In the shadow: The impact of language on structure, power and communication in the multinational," *Management International Review*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 421–440, 1999.
8. G. Morgan, Images of Organization. Newbury Park, CA, USA: Sage Publications, 1986.
9. D. Boden, The Business of Talk: Organizations in Action. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1994.
10. [10] S. Sarangi and C. Candlin, "Professional and organizational discourse," Text, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 347–368, 2001.
11. J. K. Brown and S. C. Levinson, Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
12. J. Holmes, Women, Men and Politeness. London, UK: Longman, 1995.

