



Language Power in Political- Legal Discourses and Educational Policies: From Linguistic Responsibility, Correctness, and Precision to Strength, Authority, and Sovereignty of Language

Edlira Troplini (Abdurahmani)^{1*}, Mirela Metushaj², Luiza Lluri³, Bitila Shosha⁴

¹Faculty of Education, “Aleksandër Moisiu” University of Durrës, Albania

²Faculty of Political Sciences and Law, “Aleksandër Moisiu” University of Durrës, Albania

³Faculty of Professional Studies, “Aleksandër Moisiu” University of Durrës, Albania

⁴Faculty of Business, “Aleksandër Moisiu” University of Durrës, Albania

*edliraabdurahmani@uamd.edu.al

DOI: 10.26417/pns30w50

Abstract

This study examines linguistic usage within the political- legal sciences, emphasizing the importance of orthographic accuracy and mastery of the standard language. Particular attention is devoted to issues of linguistic correctness, precision, and the enrichment of terminology through internal development and periodic updating in line with contemporary usage. The analysis also considers diverse discourse types and registers relevant to political-legal communication. Central to the inquiry is the role of individual and professional responsibility in sustaining linguistic competence and applying it effectively in practice. The study further reflects critically on the status and prestige of language within this domain. Beyond these considerations, it evaluates educational policies in linguistics, highlighting their potential to support broader human endeavors and the political- legal sciences specifically. Such policies should cultivate awareness among students at all levels, recognizing language as a dynamic, evolving phenomenon responsive to future challenges and innovation.

Keywords: Linguistic education, Education policies, Linguistic development, Political sciences, Legal sciences, Normative accuracy, Skills, Linguistic competence.

Introduction

The core inquiry advanced by this research is: Why does the Albanian language fail to adequately fulfill its functional role across different domains of human activity? How and to what degree is the role of language acknowledged and valued in achieving the objectives of these activities?

Language continually generates itself in response to novelty, engaging with change and evolving in an ongoing, unending continuum. As a fundamental dimension of human existence, it manifests in multiple forms, developing and producing a wide array of linguistic variants across the diverse spheres of human activity. (Abdurahmani et al., 2025a)

This is a process that occurs in accordance with each era preferences and demands, shaped by shifting aims and ambitions (Abdurahmani et al., 2025b), and in response to the challenges posed by different domains, within varied contexts and situations (historical, social, political, and geopolitical) thereby constructing diverse linguistic landscapes: social, specialized or sectoral, formal or informal, all embedded within the internal dynamics of different linguistic communities.

Linguistic usage is a process that requires the appropriate degree of accuracy. It demands the highest precision in the quality of selecting the proper terminology, tailored to diverse linguistic contexts, in the quantity of linguistic material employed, in the clarity of expression, in the appropriate emotional coloring, in the tone adopted, in stylistic choices, and in the deployment of prosodic devices, and so forth (Abdurahmani–Troplini, E: 2025).

Since the central focus of this study is language usage within the domain of political-legal sciences, additional specific questions naturally emerge in continuation of the broader inquiries outlined above. These include: What measures should be undertaken to ensure that pedagogical strategies in higher education foster linguistic responsibility among students of law and political science? To what extent are accuracy and precision in language employed within the legal sciences? How is the potential of language utilized to convey legitimacy and to generate constructive impact in politics? In what ways does language contribute to the to the improvement and advancement of diplomatic relations? How does interdisciplinary linguistic interaction enhance achievements in the political-legal sphere? Finally, what analytical framework may be employed to evaluate the linguistic potential of this field?

The importance of developing linguistic competence in this domain is linked, first and foremost, to professional responsibility, and subsequently to the prestige and success that human language can convey. The strong terminology of power, its authority, legitimacy, and sovereignty necessitates a specialized, sectoral mode of expression that diverges from everyday discourse. Likewise, the language of relations, interaction, and negotiation must be equally specialized and a moderate language in

this domain.

On the other hand, in many societies, particularly those in the process of development, a noticeable gap emerges between the specialized language of this field and the real linguistic competence possessed by individuals. Linguistic discourse in the domain of political–legal sciences is highly specialized, marked by distinctive terminology and expertise, and remains largely unfamiliar to the wider public. Hence, it is situated at a considerable distance from common usage (“Dardano, as cited in Sobrero, A. A. (Ed). 1993) For this reason, greater attention must be devoted to strategies that enhance linguistic accessibility, ensuring that political discourse, and especially legal discourse, can be more readily understood by society at large. This concern is closely aligned with the objectives of the present study.

Consequently, this study also constitutes an open critique of the Albanian educational system (as well as other comparable systems), which has largely confined its focus to linguistic knowledge while neglecting its practical application. Mastery of linguistic competence cannot be deemed successful unless it is actualized in practice, that is, unless it results in effective performance. Educational institutions tend to emphasize theoretical knowledge of the native language, acquired naturally from early childhood, in a manner analogous to the acquisition of a foreign language. In the context of enhancing the capacity of the mother tongue, orthographic and grammatical rules should be given due attention, but not in the form of unnecessary overburdening. At the same time, however, efforts to enrich and develop the native language are neglected, and above all, little to no work is undertaken to raise students’ awareness of the social role and value of language, of its importance within specific fields and beyond...

This matter requires, it must be said that it requires greater institutional engagement to identify effective approaches, through carefully designed methods, techniques, and teaching strategies, so that both field specialists and the wider public can become acquainted with updated terminology and diverse linguistic models within the field.

Conceptual framework and Literature Review

Our research is guided by contemporary perspectives on language that highlight not merely its role as a linguistic competence, but its broader utility in practical contexts and its dynamic potential to act across all domains of human life, thereby contributing directly to the enhancement of human quality of life.

Human language constitutes an indispensable dimension of human existence and, as such, should function as an enabling and contributive instrument rather than a trivial or obstructive one. In the domain of legal sciences, precision, accuracy, and accountability are not secured through the mere acquisition of linguistic knowledge, but through its effective enactment. Likewise, the consolidation of authority, the manifestation of sovereignty, and the empowerment of relations within political science are realized through the strategic exploitation of the manifold benefits that

language affords.

These objectives, significant not only within the boundaries of this discipline but extending well beyond them, intersect with what Saussure (1916) designated as “*External linguistics*”, Chomsky (1965) as “*Performance*”, Lyons (1977) as “*Macrolinguistics*”, Harris (1981) as “*Integrational linguistics*”, Peng (1982) as “*Extended linguistics*”, Lass (1986) as “*Speaker-free linguistics*”, and Hopper (1988) as “*Emergent grammar*” (Hernández-Campoy, J. M., 2016). In order to achieve meaningful results in both personal and professional life, language must not function merely as a mediator or facilitator, but rather as a contributor, stimulator, and generator in response to new demands, ambitions, and challenges.

High-quality education in the Albanian language, at every stage and in every period, should cultivate in the individual a deep awareness of the inexhaustible value of human language. In this regard, teachers of Albanian (and of any language) must critically examine the aforementioned concepts so as to grasp their distinctions from the contrasting framework emphasized by the list following namely: *Internal linguistics*, *Competence*, *Micro linguistics*, *Autonomous linguistics*, *Restricted linguistics*, *Speaker-bound linguistics*, and *A priori grammatical behavior* (Hernández-Campoy, J. M., *ibid.*). Before teaching students rules, definitions, and theoretical knowledge concerning the variable and invariable parts of speech, teachers of Albanian (and of any language) should first explain how human language is constituted as a complex ensemble of variants, and how it manifests diversity and undergoes change across time, space, social strata, social class, social situations, and broader sociocultural contexts.

These are conclusions that emerge from the long-term consolidation of the discipline of sociolinguistics and from the sustained work of the most eminent figures in twentieth-century linguistics (particularly during the latter half of the century and beyond).

What contemporary linguists observed was the fact that types of discourse could be analyzed on the basis of different linguistic variations, such as: diachronic variation (in the temporal and historical dimension), diatopic variation (in the spatial dimension, related to the geographical distribution of speakers), diastratic variation (associated with different socio-cultural strata), diaphasic variation (linked to diverse situational contexts), and diamesic variation (concerning the medium of communication, whether written or oral).

This material (initially found in Berruto, 1974/1992; literature also recommended by Shkurta, 2009) provided us with the opportunity to explore this line of reasoning more deeply, and we observed that Coseriu (1969) had introduced two perspectives regarding this significant argument in sociolinguistics: *the comparative-longitudinal* perspective and *the descriptive-cross-sectional* perspective. The former, according to him, refers to variation in the historical and diachronic development of language, specifically: *diachronic* variation (temporal, historical), *diatopic* variation (spatial,

geographical), *diastratic* variation (social, class-based), and *diaphasic* variation (stylistic, situational). The latter refers to variation in the synchronic dimension, namely: *synchronic* variation (present temporal dimension), *syntopic* variation (spatial, geographical), *synstratic* variation (social, class-based), and *synphasic* variation (stylistic, situational).

Subsequently, Coseriu himself cites Flydal (1951), who had earlier classified linguistic variation according to the “architecture of language,” distinguishing four fundamental dimensions: *diachronic*, *diatopic*, *diastratic*, and *diaphasic*. This scheme later became the foundation for Coseriu’s theory of variation. At no point, however, should we overlook Saussure, who in his lectures around 1910–1911 (published by his students in 1916 as Course in General Linguistics), was the first to formulate the distinction between *synchrony* and *diachrony*.

This study is the outcome of a comprehensive deconstruction of the aforementioned concepts and has been developed with careful consideration of the perspectives previously cited. It follows the trajectory of recent aims and ambitions in the field of linguistics, which increasingly view language as a specialized endeavor (Hudson, 1996/2001) across diverse domains of human activity. The present work constitutes a direct contribution to the orientation of Albanian sociolinguistic thought toward a new perspective; one that emphasizes the social value of language and its powerful potential to enhance the quality of human life and to motivate individuals toward success.

Methodology

Research addressing linguistic interaction in relation to the specificities of particular fields are very neglected in Albania. In fact, such a topic has been almost entirely unexplored.

It is evident that the analysis of linguistic usage from this perspective necessarily entails a critical engagement with language policies in the Albanian educational system. As previously emphasized, this objective presupposes the formulation of advanced strategies and policies that should be initiated at the earliest stages of education and carried through to specialized profiling at the tertiary level, specifically within the disciplines of political and legal sciences, which form the central focus of the present study.

The methodological approach adopted is qualitative, combining a predominantly descriptive orientation with occasional analytical insights. The empirical foundation rests on data analysis, primarily official documents, collected online from a wide range of public and private institutions, including municipalities, courts, notaries, educational institutions at all levels, and various organizations such as businesses, hospitals, and health centers. A detailed examination of linguistic usage in political science and jurisprudence has been undertaken. The study identifies types and models of discourses and registers, highlighting both their common and distinctive

features.

In the context of political-legal discourse, beyond its emphasis on correctness, rigor, precision, seriousness, and the dimensions of power, authority, and sovereignty, the linguistic expression of this domain equally advances its prestige and linguistic potential.

In the context of global development, these objectives assume particular significance and should be positioned at the core of language curricula and beyond; they should be more inclusive in a broader sense. The study concludes with specific insights into this field, yet its contribution extends further, offering generalizable value for contexts and realities analogous to that of Albania.

While the scope of this study is admittedly broad, encompassing linguistic usage within political and legal sciences, together with their discursive subtypes, typologies, and categorizations, its significance is substantial. The work serves as a powerful wake-up call, not merely for this domain, but for the wider spectrum of non-linguistic fields as well.

As an initial attempt, the study opens new horizons, inviting future exploration and development by younger researchers

Analysis and Findings

The Importance and Care in Language within Normative, Judicial, and Contractual Legal Discourse

Legal discourse pertains to the field of law and constitutes a state-institutional and administrative mode of communication. For this reason, it is classified as a sectoral and specialized discourse. Legal discourse is characterized by the specialized terminology of the field and by a formal, procedural register tailored to the legal domain, whose function is the protection, realization, and enforcement of what is expressed. On the other hand, these features mark it as the prototypical language of a distinct sector, which is why it is classified as sectoral language.

As Shkurtaj (2013) underscores, legal discourse is subject to stringent requirements, wherein all expression is articulated in the name of the state, since the documents produced within this discourse embody the authority of the state itself. Consequently, it must demonstrate not only accuracy but also incorporate all necessary details and elements required for its concrete implementation. The texts of legal discourse employ a coded and unequivocal language. Punctuation is regarded as an indispensable semiotic system for state activity, as no space must be left for ambiguity. Such texts are characterized by stereotypical phrases and formulaic sentences.

The syntactic construction adheres to a system of paragraphing and hierarchical structuring through points, sub-points, branches, and related divisions, repeated as often as necessary. A single error, even in punctuation, renders the document invalid.

This underscores that writing necessarily requires mastery of the code of written communication: the alphabet, orthography, morphological and syntactic norms, punctuation rules, as well as the ability and knowledge to select the most appropriate words in alignment with contemporary Albanian usage and the development of the relevant field. It further entails the possession of professional competence in lexical and terminological norms specific to the discipline (Shkurtaç, Gj: 2013).

Upon reviewing Shkurtaç's analysis, with which we concur, it must be emphasized that, regarding matters of professional competence in lexical and terminological norms within the field, much remains to be accomplished in the Albanian context. As noted earlier, the language policies implemented in our schools devote particular attention to adherence to the rules of the standard, yet even this practice is currently revealing serious problems, owing to the decline in the quality of education over the past decades. Meanwhile, the updating of terminology, the refinement of specialized dictionaries across diverse domains, and the consideration of the role, function, and development of language in relation to the advancement of various spheres of human activity, politics, law, economics, medicine, the exact sciences, and the natural sciences, have continued to remain in the background.

At present, language education in Albania faces profoundly serious challenges (Abdurahmani- Troplini, E: 2018), with repercussions across all domains. In the legal domain specifically, the accurate use of the Albanian standard language constitutes an essential prerequisite. As Shkurtaç recounts, legal circles often cite the anecdote of an individual spared execution due to the shifting of a comma: "Pardon impossible, execute!" which, through the repositioning of the comma, transformed into: "Pardon, impossible to execute!". (Shkurtaç, Gj: 2013).

The normative, legislative, and contractual functions of the legal domain render this type of discourse integral to other spheres, including education, economics, medicine, engineering, and beyond. More specifically, every official administrative and governmental document produced within diverse areas of human activity becomes part of legal procedures. In the sphere of business, whether private or public, all matters pertaining to administration and governance acquire official status and thereby fall under the scope of legal processes. Illustratively, customs invoices, tax records, sales invoices, and income declarations, indeed, the entirety of economic, governmental, and administrative issues, are legally regulated and thus incorporated into juridical procedures.

In the domain of both public and private education, the situation is analogous: statutes, regulations, ethics' codes, decisions, memorandums, guidelines, official reports, and all related instruments are subsumed within legal procedures, insofar as they are founded upon law. Similarly, in medicine; patient records, medical reports, prescriptions, referral documents, and the administrative paperwork of hospitals and health centers are prepared in accordance with the legal framework governing these institutions. In engineering, depending on the specific branch, for example,

construction engineering; the drafting of projects, their implementation, the transmission of documentation to the competent authorities, and the content of such documentation (including engineering sketches, architectural plans, geodetic surveys, electrical, water supply, and seismic designs...etc.) are all legally mandated and thus integrated into juridical procedures.

In conclusion, it can be affirmed that all matters founded upon law necessarily enter into the sphere of legal procedures and, as such, must be governed by the conventions of written language, conventions demanding clarity, exactitude, decisiveness, and rigorous correctness.

The Importance and Care for the Language Used in Political and Diplomatic Discourse

Political discourse continues to be classified as sectoral and, in contrast to legal discourse, it is only partially specialized. Both political and diplomatic discourse fall within the domain of political science. Diplomatic discourse, as a sub-branch of political discourse, is situated within the discipline of international relations. Such discursive practices demand a high level of professional linguistic competence too.

Political discourse manifests in various forms, including speeches, declarations, official communiqués, and resolutions...etc. Diplomatic discourse encompasses agreements, diplomatic communiqués, notes, and declarations... etc. Normative, judicial, and contractual legal discourse is expressed through constitutions, laws, codes, legal acts, regulations, directives, court decisions, judicial acts, official report, protocol and so forth. Administrative politico-legal discourse takes shape in strategies, action plans, governmental programs, institutional reports, administrative decisions, announcements, official documents...etc. In addition, hybrid policy discourses that belong both to political and legal sciences include public policy discourse, human rights discourse, and discourse on European integration. All these practices require specific linguistic registers characterized by particular usages.

The registers most commonly employed in political discourse include rhetorical, diplomatic, and media registers, among others. Although the political discourse is intersected with legal discourse (since legal specialist terminology is also employed) it is nonetheless regarded as sectoral, insofar as it is oriented toward public communication or the pursuit of international relations. Consequently, these discourses periodically eschew the rigid, codified language of law, though they inevitably retain elements of legal terminology.

The bureaucratic written language of official documentation underpins the authority of the state, whereas the diplomatic language of protocols safeguards the nation's international sovereignty.

The stylistic profile of political discourse is inherently more subjective, with its overarching purpose being the transmission of messages. Politics is directed toward the populace, the public sphere, voters, the media, and political parties, while

diplomacy is addressed to states, embassies, and international organizations. Political discourse is saturated with ideological language, whereas diplomatic language strives to minimize ideological content, precisely because it must remain adaptable to the diverse ideological landscapes of states across the globe (each country possesses its own political language shaped by its cultural-ideological context). This constitutes a form of formalized official institutional discourse, wherein language functions are as a central instrument of diplomatic interaction. Such linguistic interactions are enacted within the framework of foreign policies, serving to structure and regulate inter-state relations.

Accordingly, diplomatic communication necessitates the standardized use of language, consistently aligned with the specific diplomatic register, which must be grounded in formal institutional discourse while remaining responsive to the evolving requirements of contemporary practice in this domain. Precision in diplomatic language constitutes an essential prerequisite, as it serves to preclude conflicts and other potential complications. Misinterpretations are impermissible in this field. Professionals in international relations are expected to command a thorough knowledge of the diplomatic language employed by different states, particularly their respective diplomatic visions. This presupposes intercultural, international, and even juridical competence, enabling the establishment of effective and sustainable relations. The role of language, its proper use may lead to important negotiations, whereas its misuse may yield adverse outcomes.

Language embodies equilibrium, functioning intrinsically as a principle of balance. Political and diplomatic discourse, in particular, constitute specialized institutional forms of communication that are highly formal yet deliberately moderated, designed to sustain balance and mitigate tensions. Through political state discourse, strategies of governance are articulated, defended, and legitimized, but equally subjected to analysis, critique, opposition, and strategies collapse also. Diplomatic language, by contrast, not only formulates and juridically interprets foreign policy but also constructs the international political image of the state.

State and Administrative Sectoral Discourse within the Political and Legal Sciences. Bureaucratic language

The written and administrative language of a state is closely linked to the historical of its formation. Indeed, administrative discourse has often served as a primary documentation of the respective languages, precisely because the state itself has played a central role in codifying them in written form. From this perspective, the less fortunate are those peoples and nations that established their state very late, such as the Albanian people who, although among the earliest peoples of the Balkans with Illyrian origins, formed their state relatively late. Consequently, the Albanian language, although an independent branch of the Indo-European family, very ancient in origin and marked by Illyrian continuity as clear evidence of the territorial existence of this people, was documented in written form at a late stage too.

All matters pertaining to the state-administrative functions of specific public and private institutions rely upon *bureaucratic language*. As previously noted, bureaucratic language permeates not only the documentation of governmental organizations, such as parliament, ministries, the armed forces, the judiciary, justice institutions, political parties, diplomacy, agencies, and subordinate organizations, but also that of non-governmental, non-public, non-profit institutions, as well as diverse private entities...etc. Bureaucratic language is distinguished by its formalized and highly codified style.

Political-legal discourses within the administrative domain are multifaceted, encompassing political and strategic documentation, governmental programs, party platforms, and institutional reports, as well as administrative decisions, notifications, acts, and a wide range of official administrative texts. These include publications of an explicitly state and official nature, such as constitution, legal codes, official journals, bulletins, and regulatory frameworks. More precisely, the linguistic register of this field comprises the language of legislative articles, penal codes, judicial rulings, and the broader corpus of official documentation: codes of ethics, job codes, statutes, contracts, agreements, notarial acts, official reports, official announcements, directives, administrative decisions, and accompanying records. Collectively, these textual forms embed bureaucratic language, which is therefore aptly designated as the “language of official documents.” Its distinctive formal style ensures the formulation of texts in accordance with institutional standards. Through this linguistic medium, institutional legitimacy is consolidated.

Texts belonging to this discourse are distinguished by their detailed and intricate elaboration, a hallmark of bureaucratic expression, hence the notion of “burolingua” as Shkurtaĵ observes. He further invokes Italo Calvino, who famously characterized Italian bureaucratic or official discourse as “antilingua” (anti-language). (Shkurtaĵ, Gĵ: 2013)

On the other hand, while bureaucratic language constitutes a unifying feature of administrative discourse, it nonetheless exhibits variation across diverse registers operative within the field. For instance, state and public administration predominantly employ the bureaucratic register, yet in relation to the legal or political domain, and the heterogeneous registers previously identified, the “burolingua” acquires distinct nuances. Specifically, when state and public administration intersect with the legal sphere, the specialized legal register (sectoral and technical, as employed in laws, rulings, decisions, decrees, contracts, and normative acts) is marked by a bureaucratic language that is juridically precise, rigid in tone, unambiguous, and lexically rich, characterized by standardized expressions and formulaic phrasing. Its primary function is to impose legal obligations and ensure the enforceability of written provisions (a function already noted above).

Meanwhile, even within the same domain, when administration intersects with the judiciary (courts of various levels and types, the prosecution, etc.), the specialized

register employed is distinguished by its argumentative nature, with legal statutes serving as its primary reference.

Its principal aim in diplomatic bureaucratic language is the preservation and advancement of amicable relations among nations; for this reason, it is euphemistic and imbued with the characteristic nuances of spoken discourse. When administration intersects with the political sphere, it assumes the traits of a sectoral linguistic register, gradually relinquishing some of its specialized features. Although bureaucratic-administrative language within the political domain retains its institutional character, it evolves toward greater simplicity and flexibility.

The public rhetorical register, while drawing upon all the aforementioned registers, nevertheless diverges from them, acquiring sectoral traits of a distinctive kind; simpler, sharper, at times conciliatory and at times caustic, alternately direct and oblique, implicit, frequently ambiguous, and thus exceptionally rich in the nuances of spoken discourse; often reinforced by the recurrent use of slogans and highly figurative expression.

To illustrate the linguistic distinctions of bureaucratic language within the political-legal domain, we present following examples:

The bureaucratic register of legal discourse.

Based on Law No., "On Higher Education and Scientific Research in Institutions of Higher Education in the Republic of Albania," regarding the establishment of the "Ad hoc" commission for the reorganization of higher education institutions, their principal units, and their basic units within higher education institutions, the competent Ministry of Higher Education hereby orders:

The establishment of the Ad hoc commission composed of the following members: 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.

The following instances are charged with the implementation of this order: 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

This order enters into force immediately.

Minister of Education / its signature.

The bureaucratic register of political discourse.

The Ministry of Higher Education, and specifically the ad hoc commission entrusted with the implementation of the decision, undertakes to ensure full transparency in the execution of legal procedures by providing direct access to the processes applied across all higher education institutions and their subordinate units (including the relevant directorates with administrative functions). This initiative represents a significant milestone in the advancement of higher education, as it is anchored in the Action Plan of the Digital Agenda for Education 2025–2030.

The bureaucratic register of diplomatic discourse.

The Ministry of Higher Education undertakes to reinforce collaborative relations between our universities and those of partner nations. We are convinced that advancing education in alignment with the Digital Agenda for Education 2025–2030 will constitute a foundational pillar for regional stability and sustainable development. Institutions of higher education will endorse all initiatives directed toward shared progress and collective prosperity.

The bureaucratic register of rhetorical discourse.

The Albanian government has undertaken a serious commitment to enhance and advance national education through long-term strategies, notably the Digital Agenda for Education 2025–2030. Allocations for higher education and scientific research have been significantly increased, exceeding Albanian students will be well-prepared to face the demands of the labor market, competing successfully both internally and internationally. Our universities are projected to be ranked alongside Europe's most prestigious institutions... etc.

(Note: These examples have been prepared for study purposes only. They do not rest upon genuine legal foundations, regardless of the material employed in their drafting.)

It should be underscored that the written language of official documents requires particular vigilance. This implies, first and foremost, that all state employees must possess a solid knowledge of Albanian orthographic rules, and subsequently, they should attain an adequate level of mastery of terminology and contemporary models within the field. Yet, officials across diverse state and non-state institutions manifest a marked linguistic deficit in this respect, attributable to the inadequacies of their educational formation. Accordingly, the competent ministry should adopt long-term strategies involving compulsory training for this category of employees, with the explicit purpose of remedying the problem.

The aforementioned academic, when reflecting on developments of the previous decade, underscores that bureaucratic discourse is characterized by distinctive features at both the lexical and morphosyntactic levels. He identifies, in particular:

A set of specialized verbs and expressions denoting actions or procedures intrinsic to bureaucratic practice, such as: *to transcribe or clarify a speech, typewriting, typing, to record in protocol, to notarize, notarization, to initial*, among others (*zbardh fjalimin, daktilografoj, daktilografim, protokolloj, noterizoj, noterizim, sigloj...*);

Recurrent prepositional phrases and locutions, including: *in the direction of..., in response to..., in implementation of..., taking into consideration that..., etc. (në drejtim të..., në përgjigje të..., në zbatim të..., duke marrë parasysh se... etj)*;

Verbal constructions (verb + noun) functioning as equivalents of single verbs, for example: *to make known* in place of *to notify, to communicate; to put into knowledge*

instead of *to notify*; *to make a request* instead of *to request*, etc. (*bëj me dije* instead of *njoftoj*, *komunikoj*; *vë në dijëni* instead of *njoftoj*; *bëj kërkesë* instead of *kërkoj...* etj);

Impersonal forms at the morphosyntactic level, such as implicit subordinate structures (the participle, the gerund) and complex syntactic periodization, designed to highlight the impersonal and indeterminate character of bureaucratic discourse. Illustrative examples include: *on the basis of the law...*, *supported by article...*, *continuing with...*, *referring to...*, *according to the provisions...*, *we ascertain that...*; *we draw attention to...*; *we consider that...*; *allow us to...*; *I reserve the right to...*; *with regard to...*; *in any case...*; *in the capacity of...*; *awaiting your reply...*; *the deadline is...*, etc. (*në bazë të ligjit...*, *mbështetur në nenin ...*, *duke vijuar me...*, *duke iu referuar...*, *sipas dispozitave...*, *konstatojmë se...*; *tërheqim vëmendjen lidhur me...*; *konsiderojmë që...*; *na lejoni që...*; *rezervoj të drejtën që...*; *për sa i takon...*; *për çdo rast...*; *në cilësinë e...*; *në pritje të përgjigjes suaj...*; *afati i fundit është etj.*)(Shkurta, Gj: 2013)

As the academic also observes, such linguistic strata evolve diverse changes over time. What once appeared as marked bureaucratic vocabulary, words, expressions, locutions, or particular bureaucratic morphosyntactic constructions, nowadays sound entirely normal.

To gain a clearer understanding of the bureaucratic language employed in official correspondence within Albanian institutions today, we outline here the structure of a contemporary university document. Such a document typically comprises the following components:

Heading, which includes the emblem of the Republic of Albania accompanied by its designation ("Republic of Albania"), the emblem of the university with its designation ("University X"), and the institutional authority issuing the document (academic senate, rectorate, rector, dean, or heads of basic units... etc);

Date, protocol number, and document designation (e.g., decision, request, transmission of information), together with the document number where applicable;

Subject line, concisely outlining the matter; described concisely in a sentence, phrase, or short paragraph (the substantive content of the official document);

The legal basis, consisting of the Law on Higher Education (with number and year), specific legislation pertinent to the matter (with number, date, and year), as well as statutes, regulations, senate decisions, rectorate decisions, special documents, or extraordinary meetings, all referenced with precise numbers, dates, and calendar years;

Main body, presenting the detailed content in the bureaucratic register characteristic of higher education institutions;

Specification of subordinate entities charged with implementing the requirements set forth;

Finally, the signature of the institutional head (already identified in the heading) together with the official seal.

This raises the question: What developments or innovations can be identified in Albania when comparing an official document from a decade ago with one produced today?

The incorporation of logos has become both indispensable and highly significant in official documentation, extending even to private correspondence. On the occasion of major national celebrations, such as the centenary of Albania's Declaration of Independence in 2012, special logos were formally approved for a designated period which must necessarily accompany official documents. Institutions themselves now frequently adopt commemorative logos, for example in connection with university anniversaries or the milestones of state and private enterprises.

The standardized format of official documents is now consistently observed, accompanied by a growing awareness of the need for linguistic accuracy (even if full mastery remains a challenge).

As previously observed, contemporary usage frequently incorporates terms such as, *logo, legal basis, subject matter, entries*, and similar expressions. In practice, the subject line of an official document now typically opens with formulations such as: *Criteria for approval of...; Completion of documentation for...; Amendment to decision no....*, and so forth. The legal foundation is introduced with references such as *based on law no....; the statute; the regulation; decision no....; meeting dated....* The main body of the document often begins with declarative statements such as *Criteria are established; Supplementary documentation is attached; The amendment is approved*. This is followed by provisions such as, *For the implementation of this decision, the following entities are charged: 1., 2., 3., 4., 5.* The document concludes with the formulaic closure, *This decision enters into force immediately*. (Sample Decision Document for the Approval of the Academic Calendar 2025–2026: Consult the bibliography)

This represents, in broad terms, the panorama of bureaucratic language typically used in in Albanian official correspondence.

It must be acknowledged that official documents possess the distinctive function of fostering the expansion, refinement, and enrichment of personal lexicons in accordance with their respective domains. Such processes represent internal linguistic evolutions that unfold within the boundaries of diverse fields of activity. Economic, cultural, political, and social transformations have simultaneously fostered the advancement of various domains, and vice versa.

As Shkurtaç aptly remarks, *every change constitutes a knock at the doors of language*. In this way, all spheres of human activity cultivate their own growth through the enrichment of their internal lexicon, adapting to emerging needs.

However, these developments must be examined, corrected, filtered, and periodically improved by language specialists.

Discussion

The Impact of Educational Policies on the Improvement of Linguistic Accuracy and Usage

As has been consistently demonstrated throughout this study, one of the fundamental characteristics unifying all forms of discourse within the legal domain is linguistic accuracy and precision. In this regard, adherence to the orthographic conventions of the standard language plays a crucial role; yet, the enrichment and internal development of terminology within the standard language, tailored to the specific requirements of diverse discursive practices and adapted to temporal, contextual, and situational factors, constitutes a pressing and urgent issue. Informal discourses within the political-legal sphere are likewise subject to the necessity of respecting the standard norm; however, such texts tend to be grammatically simplified, being more conversational, emotional, metaphorical, and stylistically elaborate, depending on the type and function of the discourse. All these considerations must be taken into account in the formulation and implementation of language policies.

In relation to Albanian language education policies, it must be acknowledged that sustained attention has traditionally been directed toward compliance with orthographic norms and the enrichment of vocabulary within schools (an effort that reflects the committed work of Albanian language teachers). On the other hand, what has been lacking, and remains so, is a broader awareness of the necessity of applying linguistic standards across diverse domains of human activity; of adapting rules and specialized lexicons to the specificities of different activities; and of aligning them to particular contexts, discursive forms, functions, objectives, and registers of use. For example, precision and correctness are non-negotiable within jurisprudence, whereas they are not required with equal rigor in the political sphere. Extending further, in the domain of business language, certain departures from normative usage are often tolerated in ways similar to those in artistic literature, since in this field the weight of language is perceived differently (business language is simultaneously the language of revenue). Within professional studies, moreover, professional communication assumes a pivotal role, as it fosters a positive perception of professional competence and preparedness.

In conclusion, this analysis makes it evident that the role of language extends far beyond the limited conception often held by students (and even more so by the general public). The examination of linguistic differences across diverse discursive practices within the legal-political domain underscores, with urgency, the necessity of expanding curricula in Albanian educational institutions. Current challenges are particularly evident in pre-university curricula, where the Albanian language instruction is almost absent and most critically in the curricula of political and legal studies, where language courses are almost entirely absent. A detailed analysis of

political and diplomatic discourses, together with the role of the language employed and the precedents that may emerge from linguistic deficiencies, highlights once again the crucial importance of integrating language-related subjects specifically tailored to the respective academic fields."

In relation to this matter, state policies on linguistic education must assume an even greater degree of stringency. While this study has devoted considerable attention to the language of law, it must be underscored that the law itself ought to stand as the foremost guardian of a language.

The language should aspire highest levels of standards, serving not merely as a ready-made formula for every occasion (politicians, diplomats, and jurists..etc.), but as a vehicle for shaping and enhancing their professional and personal image. Language elevates and refines the individual day by day, since language is not only a tool of communication and representation, but also a powerful instrument of advancement and success.

Conclusions

Language represents a mission that transcends itself, forming an integral part of human communicative behavior in daily life. Linguistic realization, achieved through advanced proficiency and a high level of linguistic competence, ought to serve as a means of enhancing the overall quality of human life.

The exploitation every beneficial aspect of language in the pursuit of ambitious objectives serves as an alarm bell across diverse domains of human activity. The combination of linguistic units in both written and spoken forms, facilitated by interdisciplinary interaction, can significantly advance this purpose.

Human language constitutes the singular possession of our species; accordingly, sustained efforts must be pursued through well-designed linguistic policies so as to bring to light and harness every latent value inherent in human language.

Within the domain of political-legal sciences, language enjoys a status that necessitates accuracy, precision, meticulous attention, potency, and prestige. Consequently, it is imperative that specialists in this field cultivate an acute awareness of the value and significance of language in relation to their discipline.

Experts within the domain of political-legal sciences should cultivate familiarity with linguistic diversity, variation, and the distinctions among different forms of formal and informal discourse, together with the wide array of registers that this field encompasses.

The strengthening of individual and professional responsibility regarding issues related to linguistic usage within political and legal studies should be the primary objective of Albanian language courses.

The strategy of higher education and educational policies should be revised within

the framework of teaching the Albanian language, its linguistic interaction with other scientific disciplines, and the formulation of specialized interdisciplinary policies designed to serve diverse spheres of social and intellectual life.

All curricula ought to be reconsidered across the various cycles of study, and in particular the curricula of higher education in political-legal studies, with the aim of implementing courses that would pay special attention to the accurate and advanced use of the Albanian language.

Funding

This publication was undertaken within the framework of a project granted by the University "Aleksandër Moisiu" of Durrës and financially supported by the institution.

Literature

- [1] Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control, and identity: Theory, research, critique*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- [2] Berruto, G. (1974/1994). *La sociolinguistica*. Bologna: Zanichelli.
- [3] Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [4] Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- [5] Coseriu, E. (1969). *Teoría del lenguaje y lingüística general: cinco estudios*. Madrid: Gredos.
- [6] Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [7] Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theory and practice of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- [8] Flydal, L. (1951). *Les langues de l'Europe et leur classification*. *Word*, 7(2), 155–171.
- [9] Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- [10] Harris, R. (1981). *The language myth*. London: Duckworth. (Introduces integrational linguistics)
- [11] Hernández-Campoy, J. M. (2016). *Sociolinguistic styles*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [12] Hudson, R. A. (2002). *Sociolinguistika* (Sociolinguistics: M. Omeri, Trans. 1996, 2nd ed.). Tirana, Albania: Dituria.
- [13] Lass, R. (1986). *The history of linguistics and linguistic theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [14] Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [15] Peng, F. C. C. (1982). *Language in the brain: Extended linguistics*. New York: Longman.
- [16] Robins, R. H. (1997). *A short history of linguistics* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.
- [17] Saussure, F. de. (1916/1959). *Course in general linguistics* (C. Bally & A. Sechehaye, Eds.; W. Baskin, Trans.). Philosophical Library.
- [18] Shkurtaj, Gj. (2009). *Sociolinguistike e shqipës: nga dialektologjia te*

- etnografia e te folurit* (2nd ed.). Tirana, Albania: Dituria.
- [19] Shkurtaç, G. (2013). *Si të shkruajmë shqip: Baza të shkrimit akademik* (Botimi i 3-të). Tiranë: Botimet Toena.
- [20] Sobrero, A. (1993). *Introduzione all'italiano contemporaneo*. Bari: Laterza.
- [21] Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [22] Troplini (Abdurahmani), E. (2018). *Problems of Language Education in Pre-School Children*. European Journal of Education, Vol. 1 No. 1 (2018): *EJED January April 2018*, doi: <https://doi.org/10.26417/ejed.v1i1.p7-16>. (available online: Problems of Language Education in Pre-School Children | European Journal of Education)
- [23] Troplini (Abdurahmani), E. (2025) *The Connection between Language and Sciences: New Perspectives for Albanian Linguistic Field*, Interdisciplinary Journal of Research and Development (IJRD) ISSN 2410-3411 (online) / ISSN 2313-058X (print), Vol 12 No 1 / March 2025, <https://doi.org/10.56345/ijrdv12n103>
- [24] Troplini (Abdurahmani), E., Shosha, B., Metushaj, M., Lluri, L. (2025a). *The Linguistic Dimension of Restaurant Menus: Reflections on Language Education, Culture, and Social Mentalities*. European Journal of Social Science Education and Research (EJSER): Vol. 12 No. 4 (2025): December. (Principal Author). <https://doi.org/10.26417/e0n5nm79>
- [25] Troplini (Abdurahmani), E., Shosha, B., Metushaj, M., Lluri, L. (2025b). *Writing Techniques of Business Ergonyms in Commercial Context Exploring the Linguistic Landscape of Business Naming Practices in Durrës City*. Interdisciplinary Journal of Research and Development (IJRD) ISSN: 2410-3411 E-ISSN:2313-058X, Vol. 12 No. 3 (2025): November 2025, (Principal Author). <https://doi.org/10.56345/ijrdv12n317>
- [26] Universiteti "Aleksandër Moisiu". (2025). Academic Calendar 2025–2026. Kalendar Akademik - Universiteti "Aleksandër Moisiu"