The Linguistic Recontextualization of
the Kosova and Serbia Negotiations in Global Media

Lindita Tahiri, *PhD Associate Professor*
Besa Luci, *MA Teaching Assistant*
Faculty of Philology, University of Prishtina, Kosova
lindita.tahiri@uni-pr.edu
besaluci@gmail.com

Abstract: This study compares the coverage of Serbia and Kosova[1] negotiations in the period from September 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013 by *The New York Times* and *Al Jazeera English*, from the perspective of quantitative and qualitative analysis. The content analyses highlight the profile of the texts in these two outlets, their sources and topics, grammatical features such as word frequency, predication, attribution, classifier role and word relations. The Critical Discourse Analysis uses the concept of recontextualization of social practices developed by van Leeuwen (2008) and analyzes the media recontextualization of the social practice of Kosova and Serbia negotiations from the perspective of three key elements: participants with their roles and identities, the kind of actions they undertake, and the construction of the discursive legitimation for these actions.

This paper raises questions about the linguistic choices of *The New York Times* and *Al Jazeera* in presenting the Kosova-Serbia negotiations, questions about knowledge and values these media transmit, and in particular questions about their ideological effects. The findings of this study reveal dominant linguistic elements in journalistic narratives of these two global media, hence revealing the strategic interaction of these media with the audience. Both quantitative and qualitative analysis results correspond and show that *The New York Times* and *Al Jazeera* apply dissimilar recontextualizing practices, generating ideologies which influence the social and political reasoning by shaping the way the audience understands the everyday world.

Keywords : Critical Discourse Analysis, Kosova, Serbia, participants, actions, legitimations

1.Background

Following Kosova's declaration of independence on February 17, 2008, the establishment of a long-term framework for normalizing relations between Kosova and

---

[1] "Kosova" is the Albanian name and "Kosovo" is the Serbian name for the country, which institutionally calls itself the Republic of Kosova. The government of Serbia, which does not recognize the state, calls it Kosovo. The use "Kosovo" by international speakers does not necessarily imply that they believe that Kosova is Serbian. The deliberate choice in this paper is the Albanian form of the lexeme.

Serbia was seen as a crucial process within the European Union integration agenda for the Western Balkans. Therefore, three years later in 2011, a EU-mediated dialogue was set up between the government of Kosova and Serbia and the process had two main aims. The first aim was to address and resolve technical and political barriers to Kosova's involvement and representation in a just political, economic and social context, (the majority of which were a result of Serbia's rejection of Kosova's statehood and consistent counter-independence lobbying), establish rule of law in the north of Kosova and secure the participation of Kosovar Serbs in Kosova's democratic life. The second aim was to place the platform for dialogue within the framework of future EU integration, which would provide greater incentives for both parties.

Between March 2011 and February 2012, nine rounds of the so-called "technical talks" were held in Brussels between representatives of the Government of Kosova and Government of Serbia. They were followed by the so-called "political dialogue", which took place in Brussels between the Prime Minister of Kosova Hashim Thaci and the Prime Minister of Serbia Ivica Dacic and was mediated by Catherine Ashton, the EU Foreign Policy Chief. By April 19, 2013, as part of the political dialogue, the two prime ministers agreed to the 15-point agreement, commonly referred to as the "Brussels agreement", which sought the commitment that neither side would seek to block the other's progress in the path toward EU integration, as well as establish a framework for the inclusion and participation of Kosova Serbs in the north in state processes.

Whereas the Kosova-Serbia dialogue was not devoid of criticism at home, within international political and media circles it was largely hailed as a "historical moment." By October 2013, the EC commended both sides for their efforts towards EU integration, resulting in a plan for Serbia to start membership negotiations with the EU by January 2014, and with Kosova's negotiations for a stabilization and association agreement to commence on October 2013. The Kosova-Serbia talks placed Kosova once again under international headlines and generated much coverage from global media.

2. Data and Methods

For the purposes of this study, two international media have been selected: *The New York Times* (NYT) and *Al Jazeera English* (AJ). NYT was selected as one of the leading global daily newspapers, with an average circulation of around 750,000.[1] AJ was selected as a global media that has built a great audience since its establishment in 2007, with around 8.5 million website visits a month.[2] The sampling period ran from

---

[1] http://www.poynter.org/latest-news/mediawire/211994/new-york-times-passes-usa-today-in-daily-circulation/ (accessed on August 7, 2014)

[2] http://www.trafficestimate.co.uk/ (accessed on August 7, 2014)

September 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013, when the technical talks had ended and the meetings between the two prime ministers were taking place. The results from the sampling period yielded articles pertaining to the implementation of the agreements from the technical talks, as well as to the developments with regard to the political talks between two prime ministers. The sampling period includes April 2013 when the "Brussels Agreement" was reached, which was a peek time for international coverage on Kosova.

For the NYT, research was conducted via the Lexis Nexis academic database. The keyword search of "Kosovo" resulted in 32 articles, and after excluding the irrelevant material, 16 articles were used for research. Meanwhile, the search for AJ was conducted through the medium's website, which resulted with a total of 38 articles. Upon closer examination 22 articles were included based on their relevance for the purposes of the study.

This study compares the presentation strategy of the Kosova and Serbia negotiations in NYT and Al Jazeera by applying quantitative content analysis and critical discourse analysis. As critical discourse analysis (CDA) has become a diverse field of research during the last decades, within a context of interdisciplinarity and internationality, this paper will refer to the work of scholars of Critical Linguistics such as Roger Fowler (1979, 1991,2003), Hodge, Kress and Trew (1979), as well as scholars who developed the exchange of ideas between linguistics and social sciences such as Fairclough (1995,1997,2003,2010), van Dijk (1988, 1998, 2008), van Leeuwen (2005, 2008), Wodak (2005, 2009). What makes these theoretical approaches correspond to each other is the attempt for a critical language awareness, which questions the role of discourse in the construction and transformation of the social representation of reality. The media discourse has been on focus of analysis as "CDA is specifically interested in the power and dominance of the symbolic elites, those who have special access to public discourse" (van Dijk, 2005, p. 88). Furthermore, taking into account the interdependence between the field of media and politics, Wodak (2009, p. 6) recalls the term "political linguistics" proposed by Burkhardt (1996), which would designate the linguistic sub-discipline committed to studying political language. As has been argued by Fairclough (2010, p. 30), the critical approach towards discourse aims the 'denaturalisation' of ideologies which it has the capacity to 'naturalise' and to present as one would normally expect them to be, therefore sustaining power relations and relations of domination within society.

One of the important references of this paper is Systemic Functional Linguistics, a theory particularly related to Michael Halliday (1973, 1978), which focuses on the relevance of formal language features that are significant depending on their particular effect or value related to the specific functions, which implicate three macro-functions. Halliday's threefold classification of ideational, interpersonal and textual functions has been influenced by Bühler's (1934) expressive, conative and referential functions, to which Jakobson (1960) added three other functions, the phatic, the metalingual, and

poetic function. Fundamental to these models is the belief that the uses of language shape the linguistic system. As Halliday says, "by their everyday acts of meaning, people act out the social structure, affirming their own statuses and roles, and establishing and transmitting the shared systems of value and knowledge" (1978, p. 2). The corpus of the media analyzed in this paper will be seen from the aspect of interpersonal function, which Halliday describes as both interactional and personal, as means whereby social groups are integrated and the individual is identified and reinforced. Respectively, this paper will raise questions about the linguistic choices of NYT and AJ in presenting the Kosova-Serbia negotiations, revealing the attitude and speech roles of the media producers associated with the kinds of content that they transmit.

Considering that the naturalized ideologies are not overtly manifest in the language production but may be characteristically opaque to participants, we considered it efficient for the 'denaturalization' to combine both methodologies, the quantitative method and the discourse analysis, aiming with this mutual approach to add to the complementariness of the study.

3. Results

3.1. Content Analysis

A total of 38 stories or 18,578 words in both media were analyzed (see Table 1). Within this corpus, 42% of articles belong to the NYT and 58% belong to AJ. The average words per story for NYT was 748,3 words; the average words per story for AJ was 328,6 words. With regard to story type, NYT had 2 commentaries/ editorials, and AJ had no commentaries/editorials within the selected corpus. NYT had 6 (37.5%) news reports, and AJ had 11 (50%). NYT had 7 articles (43.7%), and AJ 3 articles (13.6%). NYT had 1 brief (6.2%), and AJ had 4 briefs (18.2%). Meanwhile, AJ had 4 multimedia posts, which included brief text (included in the corpus), and associated with a video reportage (not included in the corpus). NYT had no multimedia since the newspaper format was used.

Table 1 Comparison of profiles of sampled stories in the NYT and AJ

	Word Count	Average words per story	Story type: editorial/ commentaries	News	Articles	Briefs	Multi media
NYT	11, 668 (42%)	748,3	2 (12.5%)	6 (37.5%)	7 (43.7%)	1 (6.2%)	N/A
AJ	6,910 (58%)	328,6	N/A	11 (50%)	3 (13.6%)	4 (18.2%)	4

Table 2 compares and contrasts the two media outlets in the use of source. Both outlets have relied on their own journalists reporting, with NYT having 14 stories (87.5%), and AJE 13 stories (59%). But AJ has a higher number of agency-retrieved stories at 12 (54.5%), while NYT has only one (6.2%). The outlets also differ in the number of Kosova and Serbian officials cited - NYT relied more on Kosova officials (13 or 81.5%) and less on Serbian officials (2 or 12.5%), and AJ cited 8 or 36.3% Kosova officials and 10 or 45.4% Serbian officials. The other main difference is in the use of other sources, which examined independent, non-official sources, such as civil society and NGO representatives, or analysts. NYT cited 9 or 56.25% other sources, while AJ cited only 1 or 4.5%. Meanwhile, both outlets included sources critiquing the Kosova-Serbia Brussels talks within the respective countries, where NYT had 2 (12.5%) and AJ had 1 (4.5 %).

Table 2 Comparison of the use of sources

	NYT	AJ
Media Reporters	14 (87.5%)	13 (59%)
Agencies	1 (6.2%)	12 (54.5%)
Kosova official	13 (81.2%)	8 (36.3%)
Serbian official	2 (12.5%)	10 (45.4%)
EU official	5 (31.2%)	10 (45.4%)
US official	5 (31.2%)	N/A
Kosova opposition	2 (12.5%)	3 (13.6%)
Other sources	9 (56.2%)	1 (4.5%)

As shown in Table 3, with regard to the Kosova-Serbia dialogue, NYT had 6 stories (37.5%) and AJ had 6 stories (27.2%). Both outlets covered war crime stories: NYT had 1 story (6.2%) and AJ had 3 stories (13.6%). Similarly for organ trafficking related stories, where NYT had 1 story (6,.2%) and AJ had 2 stories (9%). The main difference is in the other Kosova-related articles that the two outlets covered. The NYT covered the role of the US and the interested of US companies to invest in Kosovo (3 stories or 18.7%). And AJ covered discontent and opposition in Kosova with regard to the Kosova-Serbia talks (3 stories or 13.6%).

Table 3 Comparison of topic and number of stories in the two outlets

	NYT	AJ
Kosova-Serbia dialogue related articles	6 (37.5%)	6 (27.2%)
War crimes	1 (6.2%)	3 (13.6%)
Role of the US in Kosovo	3 (18.7%)	N/A
Organ trafficking case	1 (6.2%)	2 (9%)
Reconciliation and minority issues	1 (6.2%)	2 (9%)
Culture	1 (6.2%)	1 (4.5%)
Kosova independence celebrations	N/A	2 (9%)
EU membership talks with Serbia	N/A	1 (4.5%)
Opposition to Kosova-Serbia talks	N/A	3 (13.6%)
Religious identity	N/A	1 (4.5%)
Sports	N/A	1 (4.5%)

Tables 4 have used the results of Phrase Net and Word Tree visualizations in the Many Eyes Program to identify the high frequency words and their relations between each other. Two lexemes "Kosovo" and" Serbia" were analyzed from the aspect of their predication, attribution as well as parts of coordinating and possessive constructions that they belong to. These grammatical features are analyzed in relation to the interpersonal function of language as stated by Halliday (1973, 1978), which in particular is expressed by modifiers, intensifiers and comments.

Table 4a "Kosovo" and "Serbia" word frequency, their predication, attribution, classifier role and their word relations in NYT

Grammatical category	Kosovo (total frequency 142)	Serbia (total frequency 65)
Matching verbs	declared independence won independence signed an agreement to resolve disputes is willing, was willing to grant hopes to accelerate would attain greater autonomy would spurt secessionist move would gain more powers	has refused, steadfastly refused does not recognize rejected the plan has not agreed considers Kosovo had/retained de facto control will be given, will get a start date had insisted that Kosovo had torpedoed the agreement would help enjoy

		would help buttress its standing
Matching modifiers	former province of Yugoslavia, of Serbia predominantly Muslim "another Bosnia" , poor	
'and' constructions	Kosovo, Macedonia and Montenegro Kosovo and Serbia	Serbia and Kosovo (14 occurrences) were sitting at the same table were edging toward a deal signed an agreement, are eager to join, reached agreement Serbia and its former province Serbs and Kosovars, Serbs and Muslims
Possessive's constructions	Kosovo's (37 occurrences): Independence(10) Majority, ethnic Serbs state, deputy, capital, membership, chance, security	Serbia's (7): ally Russia, bloody war aspiration, attempt, readiness favor
Attributive vs classifier role	Kosovo: parliament ethnic Albanian majority deal/agreement opposition movement liberation army identification cards Kosovar: deputy minister judge	Serbian (46 occurrences): orthodox Christian minority in the north, enclave appendage, homeland, province, majority area news media, broadcaster negotiating team, government, capital, officers, legislative, judicial, municipalities, high court, leader, institutions atrocities nationalist party recognition of Kosovo

Table 4b "Kosovo" and "Serbia" word frequency, their predication, attribution, classifier role and their word relations in AJ

Grammatical category	Kosovo (total frequency 145)	Serbia (total frequency 86)
Matching verbs	Waiting (international recognition), was kept waiting	Pledged, aimed
		Should accept
	Declared, celebrated	Has rejected, has refused, relinquished
	Has made it clear	Has taken, vowed, expressed
	Has been damaged	
	Has been under pressure (from Brussels)	Does not recognize
		Lost control
	Has fired, opened, met, reached	
	Has failed, rejected, warned	
	Had put forward	
	Is considered by nationalists to be cradle of Serbian state	
	Is the key Brussels set condition	
	Is one of Europe's majority Muslim countries	
	Will mark, will be absorbed	
Matching modifiers	Serbia's former province	A candidate to join EU
	Which was under UN	Which was bombed
	Which has ethnic Albanian majority	Backed by
'and' constructions	Kosovo, Turkey and Israel	Serbia and Kosovo (13)
	Kosovo and Albania	
	Kosovo and Macedonia	
	Kosovo and Serbia (2)	
Possessive's constructions	(19) independence, north, war, ethnic Albanian , self-	(10)Refusal, war crimes, refusal, integration, poorest

	proclaimed independence, sovereignty, statehood, unification, Serb minority	region, approval, progress, nationalist president
Attributive vs classifier role	Approval, deal, war Albanian interests Liberation Army Capital, Prime Minister Kosovar flag Kosovan state, roots, capital, Counterpart, leader	Police, European leaders, talks Serbian (41): government, officers, prime minister, president, police, federation, counterpart, capital, military, province, church, refusal, parliament, territory, politicians

The particular grammatical forms presented in the tables above will be considered from the perspective of functional grammar (Downing, Locke), which matches forms to functions and meaning in context. Table 4a shows that "Kosovo" is used mainly with factive verbs (Kreidler 1998: 230) except for one case of non-factive verb (hopes) and most of these verb phrases with Kosova as subject denote situations of activity, achievement and accomplishment (Griffiths, 2006, p. 66). "Kosovo" also takes the auxiliary "would" used with past time meaning but also with the dynamic modality of propensity (Huddleston, Pullum, 2002, p. 197) and they also denote situations of achievement (attain, gain). On the other hand, "Serbia" takes factive verbs of negation, mainly of cognitive and psychological states (refuse, reject). It also takes the passive forms (will be given, will get), which put it in the role of the affected and recipient and not the role of the agent. The auxiliary would is used with the meaning of past time as well as with the meaning of inclination.

Kosova only gets post-modifiers, concrete ones such as location and temporal attributives (former province of Yugoslavia, of Serbia) and evaluative concrete and abstract descriptors (predominantly Muslim, "another Bosnia", poor). It is interesting to notice the classifier figurative role of the proper name "Bosnia" whereby the category of specific countries is suggested where Kosova belongs. The table also shows the prevailing use of "Serbian" as classifier, limiting the entities to a subclass in relation to this adjective. The adjective "Serbian" in this position is not an epithet but refers to an affiliation, to a belonging of particular entities. This use of "Serbian" is associated with nouns referring to places and objects, both concrete and figurative (area, homeland), to political and media institutions, and to abstract and concrete actions (recognition, atrocities) whereas "Kosovar" is used only twice as a classifier, referring to individuals belonging to governmental bodies. On the other hand, "Kosovo" as a proper noun is used as an attributive modifier, denoting a set of entities

bearing relation with the bearer of the name. This is a syntactic role that makes the noun look like an adjective, when in fact grammatically it is not so (Huddleston, Pullum, 2002, p. 521).

The coordinating constructions were chosen for analysis because of their semantic effects: they suggest equivalence, parallelism, resemblance, unison, despite the similarity they might have in reality. In this case it is noticeable that most commonly "Serbia" rather than "Kosovo" is the first part of the coordinating construction, taking predicates denoting the process of negotiation. This suggests asymmetry in the coordinative link between Serbia and Kosova, which is furthermore strengthened with the substitution of Kosova with "its former province." Regarding the possessive constructions, they suggest a range of associations between two parts of the construction, such as ownership, domination, authorship, part-whole relation etc. The table shows that Kosova is possessor mainly of "independence," which is used in the concrete sense of getting the status of a state, and as a head noun it is mainly associated with concrete nouns, whereas Serbia is possessor of abstractions except for the "ally Russia" and the "war."

Table 4b shows that compared to NYT the lexeme "Serbia" in AJ has a slightly higher frequency, whereas the lexeme "Kosovo" has equal frequency to NYT. "Kosovo" takes passive forms (is considered, will be absorbed, was kept waiting), which put it in the role of the affected and recipient and not the role of the agent. It also takes factive verbs of negation, mainly of cognitive and psychological states (fail, reject) and most of these verb phrases with Kosova as subject denote states, with rare cases when they denote situations of activity, like " has fired," when the concrete action is aimed towards its own population during protests. "Kosovo" as subject takes the verb "be" with specifying rather than ascriptive use (Huddleston, Pullum, 2002, pp. 266-7) as in "is the key" where it is identified rather than described, for instance it is not described as a country with Muslim religion but is identified as one of majority Muslim countries in Europe. On the other hand, "Serbia" does not take passive forms, however most of the verbs that it takes as subject are not active and are expressed in negative form or meaning, belonging to verbal, psychological and cognitive states. Kosova and Serbia get post-modifiers, concrete ones such as location attributives (former province) and evaluative concrete and abstract descriptors.

The coordinating constructions with Kosova include not only neighboring countries like Albania and Macedonia, but also Turkey and Israel. Similarly as in NYT, it is noticeable that most commonly "Serbia" rather than "Kosovo" is the first part of the coordinating construction, implying inequity in the coordinative link between Serbia and Kosova which is furthermore strengthened with the substitution of Kosova with "its former province." Regarding the possessive constructions, the table shows that Kosova is less a possessor in AJ compared to NYT, mainly of "independence", which is interchanged also with "soverignity," but in few cases also evaluated as "self-proclaimed." Serbia is an owner of mainly abstract processes (refusal, approval, war

crimes, progress) or concrete nouns (nationalist president, poorest region) mainly with negative connotations. Similarly to NYT, in AJ there is a prevailing use of the adjective "Serbian" as classifier, associated with nouns referring mostly to concrete entities, such as governmental, political and religious institutions and officials. In difference from NYT, in AL also the adjective "Kosovan" is used as classifier of both concrete (state, capital) and abstract (counterpart, roots, leader) nouns, and once is used as adjective with "–ar "suffix (Kosovar). Both Kosova and Serbia are used as attributives, associated with concrete and abstract nouns.

3.2. Critical discourse analysis (CDA)

The critical discourse analysis of selected articles from NYT and AJ will be based on the concept of recontextualization of social practices developed by van Leeuwen (2008). The social practice of negotiations, which has nowadays prevailed the common sense wisdom of the usefulness of talking for solving problems, is even an academic and professional field of expertise, which is extensively part of formal education in reputational schools such as Harvard Law School under labels such as " Negotiation Skills," "Win-Win Negotiation," "Learn How to Negotiate," "Learn How to Learn to Negotiate." In the case of the Kosova and Serbia negotiations the linguistic recontextualization of this social practice will be linked to key elements of : participants, actions, and legitimations, which Leeuwen describes as "answers to the spoken and unspoken question 'Why should we do this?' or 'Why should we do this in this way?' " (2008, p.105).

The NYT sample consists of six articles: "Clinton urges Serbia to accept Kosovo borders," "For Serbia and Kosovo, talks are at least a start," "Serbia: Kosovo deal is rejected," "Serbia and Kosovo near deal, official says," "Serbia and Kosovo reach agreement on power sharing," and "In Kosovo, ethnic barriers linger as a new accord is taking effect," which capture not only the period of the formal signing of the agreement but also the phase before and after the signing.

Table 5a Social Practice Analysis of NYT sample

Participants	Actions	Legitimation
Hillary Rodham Clinton	urges Serbia	personal authority
	urged Kosovo to protect Serbian minority	
US and EU	press S and K to normalize relations	political authority
EU	mediated the talks	authority of power: made it clear to
K and S		
	presses countries to make difficult compromises	incentive for
membership		

Catherin Ashton   met Thaci,Dacic,produce reports,invite S,K   authority:EU foreign policy chef

NATO   drove out of Kosovo Serbia's forces   moral authority: stop persecutions

NATO bombs   pushed Milosevic out, ended brutal war   moral evaluation

Ninety nations   recognized independent Kosovo   role model authority

Russia   blocks Kosovo' recognition   it is staunch ally of Serbia

Two former sworn enemies   signed the agreement   moralized activity of improvement

S and K   reach agreement   moral values: power sharing, overcoming ethnic enmities

                 agreed in principle on a text   theoretical rationalization

K and S representatives   made an achievement   authority of custom: sat at the same table

Kosovo   erected Clinton's monument   moral authority: lead position

          should warm up ties with S   needs to strengthen economy, is corrupted, is Muslim

Kosovo government willing to grant autonomy to minority rationalization: central issue of talks

Thaci nationalist credentials   made deal possible   expert authority: analyst said

Kosovo Serbs   resists government authority   Serbia finances them

               left Kosovo   domination of Albanians, attack on churches

               block the bridge   mythopoesis: epic battles described in history texts

                        and folk songs ; evaluation: prejudices of Serbia

Selimi, deputy minister   opposes a state within a state   rationalization: effect oriented

Kosovo ethnic Mulsim Albanian majority   achieved self determination   moral authority

Kosovo opposition movement   plans protests   evaluation: another Bosnia

Serbia   refuses to recognize K   fear of ethnic Albanian government

               must accept Kosovo's borders   rationalization: no border change

               should accept EU deal   rationalization: will receive invitation to join EU

               considers Kosovo its heartland   mythopoesis: moral tale

Serbs   will get enormous social pressure   authority: EU political adviser

Serbian doctor	supports the deal	evaluation: to start leaving a normal life
Talks	mark a seminal moment	moralized activity
The accord omits	Serbian recognition of Kosovo	authority of conformity
The agreement	has strong symbolism of reconciliation	authority: leading Balkan expert
	could end isolation of the North	expert authority: EU officials say
Day to day life	threatens the accord	evaluation: Brussels's lofty ambitions
Elimination of parallel structures	help security	EU officials say

The AJ sample consists of 12 articles "Isolated voices," "School astride the Kosovo divide," "Serbia and Kosovo presidents hold rare talks," "Easing border controls," "Kosovo Albanians angered by Serbia talks," "EU hosts key talks between Kosovo and Serbia," "Serbia-Kosovo talks end without accord," "Serbia rejects EU-brokered deal," "Serbia and Kosovo agree on normalizing ties," "Tough tasks ahead," "Serbia-Kosovo deal faces opposition," and "Serbia deal with Kosovo stirs up old grudges," covering the period before, during and after the agreement.

Table 5b Social practice analysis of AJ sample

Participants	Actions	Legitimation
EU	wants Belgrade to loosen its grip on North	incentive for EU membership
	gives Serbia until Tuesday to respond	power of authority
Ashton	affirms EU perspective for S and K	personal authority: they assured me of
	calls Serbian government	their support and commitment
NATO	bombed Serbia	moral authority: to halt the killing and expulsion
Ninety countries	recognized independent Kosovo	role model authority
Germany foreign Minister	said a huge step forward	personal authority
Ban Ki-moon	said he congratulates both sides	personal authority
S and K	have been under pressure from Brussels	EU: power of authority
	agree on normalizing ties	EU negotiating talks

Presidents of S and K   try to mend strained ties   authority of power: EU is pressing them

S and K Prime Ministers try to ease long-running tension   authority of power: EU is hosting

                                fail to come to agreement   evaluation: deep gap between two sides

Kosovo government   remains committed to negotiations   solution to long-standing problems

                                disappointed with Serbian refusal

Kosovo opposition party   protesting against negotiations   moral evaluation: talks are bargain

Kosovo police   beats up activists, fires   power of authority

Kosovo deputy   calls the meeting shameful   rationalization: responsibility for

                                                    crimes has not been taken by Serbia

Kosovo prime minister   calls protesters 'isolated voice' power of authority

                    says Kosovo has proposed integration of Serbs

Kosovo president   expresses interest for good   rationalization: all Region benefits

                            neighborly relations

2000 ethnic Albanians   protesting against talks   afraid of North Mitrovica joining Serbia

in ethnically split town of Mitrovica

Kosovo Serbs   refuse Kosova government   want to join Serbia

                    protest against the agreement   moral evaluation: it is act of treason

Serbia   lost control of Kosovo   authority of power: NATO strikes

                                            moral authority: Serbia purged Kosovo of Albanians

                    must normalize relations with Kosovo   in order to join EU

                    hopes it will be enough to get green light for EU   rationalization

	rejects EU plan	it doesn't guarantee full security of Kosovo Serbs
	has taken very significant steps	moral evaluation
Belgrade	refuses to recognize Kosovo	power authority: will not accept agreement
President Nikolic	said he favored a wide autonomy	personal authority
Serbian Prime Minister	said they will inform EU by letter	personal authority
Serbian Orthodox Church	denies the deal	moralization: clear surrender of our territory
Top level meeting	marks a significant step	moralized activity
	comes 14 years after the conflict between Belgrade and Kosovo Albanian separatist guerillas	
Settling impasse	would help both countries	EU membership
The deal	sets the stage for Serbia to get EU membership	rationalization
The handshake between S and K	is symbolic, important	personal authority EU diplomat
The agreement	represents new era, will help heal wounds	moral evaluation

4. Discussion

4.1. Findings of Content Analysis

Although the final corpus included a larger number of stories from AJ (22) then NYT (16), a few factors are important to be considered. As the results presented in Table 1 show, the NYT articles had more words in total, as well as greater average words per article. This is due to the fact that the NYT corpus includes stories from the print edition of the outlet, while AJ was examined through the outlet's website. Being an online medium, AJ has greater opportunities for updates, follow-ups, briefs and agency reports. This resulted in AJ having a greater total number of articles, such as briefs, news and agency reports, whereas NYT has a greater word count due to the longer articles and commentaries/editorials.

With regard to use of sources, Table 2 shows differing results, particularly in the number of official Kosova and Serbia sources. Closer examination of the sources revealed that NYT uses a greater number of Kosova official source, which also includes direct contacts by NYT journalists. AJ uses more Serbian official sources, and whether with regard to Kosova or Serbian officials sources, they are predominantly

based on government statements released to the media. Both outlets include sources that were in opposition or critical to the negotiations. In other articles (those not pertaining to Kosova-Serbia talks), NYT and AJ significantly differ in the use of independent sources, where NYT allocates space to analysts and civil society representatives, and AJ quotes its journalists from the field.

The results in Table 3 also speak to the differences in overall topics covered during the sampling period. Although both media had the same number of articles for the Kosova-Serbia negotiations, NYT covered the talks more with 37.5% of its total articles, and AJ with 27.2% of its total articles. Being a US-based media, NYT also included stories on the role and influence of the US in Kosova, which was not present for AJ. The latter AJ coverage during the sampling period also stories on Kosova's independence celebrations, religious identity and sports.

The results presented in Table 4a show an image created for the reader by NYT with Kosova as an agent in the process of negotiation, creating concrete situations of achievement and accomplishment, whereas Serbia appears as a recipient who mainly creates situations of denial. The NYT also creates and image of a particular place (north of Kosova) is more connected to Serbia, and the inhabitants of this place are foregrounded by means of twofold classification of their religious group. On the other hand, the "Kosovar" classification is concrete and technical, referring to institutional representatives, and the same formal and conventional relation of the noun "Kosovo" is observed in cases when it is used attributively. The entailment of the cases when "Serbian" is used as classifier is that of definition, whereas the entailment of the "Kosovo" usage as attributive is that of description. In other words, the image created is that "north" is situated in Kosova, whereas it has Serbian properties. The same image is created with and-constructions, when typically "Serbia" is the first coordinate, and therefore the second coordinate "Kosova" is not only later expressed than the first one but it is also a consequence of it. Hence, when "Serbia and Kosovo were sitting at the same table", the implicature is that Serbia was sitting at the table and therefore Kosova was sitting there as well. On the other hand, the possessive constructions create an image of Kosova possessing the independence and Serbia is mainly an owner of abstract processes as well as of the concrete friend Russia.

The results presented in Table 4b show an image created for the audience of AJ with Kosova as recipient and affected, either as a beneficiary where in most of the cases EU is an agent or as the sufferer, where Serbia or EU are agents. On the contrary, Serbia appears as an active counterpart, but only formally, as it is an agent of verbs of denial, presenting mainly verbal processes and not material ones. AJ emphasizes Kosovar Muslim identity, identifying the country with religion rather than describing religion as one of traits of the country, and it also identifies Serbia through its religion. Similarly to NYT, Kosova in and-constructions is typically the second coordinate, as a consequence of the first coordinate "Serbia", presenting them as disproportionate partners in the process of negotiation, with "Kosovo" as the subordinate one. In difference from NYT,

Kosova is associated not only with Serbia but also with Turkey and Israel and a few times with Albania. Kosova is less a possessor of its independence compared to NYT, and the independence is qualified as self-proclaimed. On the other hand, the "Kosovan" classification which does not appear in NYT at all, is used a couple of times in AJ with the entailment of definition, which suggests Kosovan properties to both concrete and figurative entities associated with the adjective. Serbia becomes synonymous with negative connotations of nationalism, crime and poverty, as well as with the religious orthodox identity.

4.2. Findings of CDA

As Table 5a of the NYT shows, participants in the social practice of negotiation have different roles and identities: some of the social actors are represented as the active forces in the process and some others are submitting themselves to the process. The dynamic forces of the process are personalized through nomination of their representatives (Clinton, Ashton) who are functionalized as high status social actors. This powerful social actors are sometimes impersonalized by objectivation (Leeuwen 2008, p. 47), and represented by means of reference to their countries (US, EU). On the other hand, the two social actors who have to make the negotiations, Kosova and Serbia, have less activated social roles, and are represented mainly by objectivation, except for cases when Kosova which is represented by personalization through categorization (deputy minister of foreign affairs), through functionalization (government), and when it is classified by ethnicity and religion (ethnic Muslim Albanian majority). When the negotiators are represented by personalization (Thaci, Dacic) they are either beneficiaries of meetings or talks with high US or EU officials, and in other cases they are impersonalized by evaluation (two sworn enemies). The negotiators are only once associated with active role when they sit physically around the same table, and even then this concrete action becomes symbolical, and the participants of this process make a transition from individualization to fictionalization.

The social process of negotiation is represented through objectivation, as if it was an entity rather than a dynamic process, and in only two cases when the verb "agree" is used, implying the activity and reciprocity in the process. The objectivation of the process of negotiation through the "agreement," and in some cases "deal," "accord," "talks," represents it statically, as if it was ready made and not caused by human agency, or with van Leeuwen's terminology it is deagentialized (2008, p.66). The traces of human action are removed and the objectivated action of the agreement becomes subject of semiotic actions (end isolation, help security, bring normal life, symbolizes recognition). Whereas abstract nouns receive semiotic agency, on the other hand the concrete agency is removed from "Serbia" not agreeing to recognize Kosova, with the objectivation of the process in "the accord omits Serbian recognition of Kosova" hence backgrounding and deprioritizing the Serbian disagreement and

displacing the action from its real doer to an abstract noun "accord". Kosova and Serbia are involved mainly in semiotic actions, except when impersonalized by evaluation (two sworn enemies signed) when the most important final act of signing displaces the concrete individuals who performed this act with psychological moralization.

The discursive construction of legitimation for the social process of negotiations is produced by the social roles allocated to powerful social actors, US, EU, that take verbs denoting material and behavioral processes (press Serbia and Kosovo, urge, meet, invite) whereas the passivated social actors, Kosova and Serbia, get verbs denoting verbal and mental processes (say, will, refuse, consider), and are subjected to the modality of obligation (must, should). The rare cases of Kosova acquiring verbs of action is with negative evaluation (attack churches) and with symbolic representation (erected Clinton's monument). In cases of high officials, they have the legitimate personal authority, and besides the authority of power, legitimacy is also provided by authority of expertise, which is stated either explicitly, with a well known name in a given context (leading Balkan expert) or if it is not concretely stated than a general agreement of expertise is implied.

From the perspective of Serbia, the legitimation of their actions against recognition of Kosova is achieved through mythopoesis (Van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 117) when social actors restore social practices through story telling (epic battles described in history texts and folk songs). In fact, the Serbian perspective of legitimation is presented as multimodal, as mythopoesis is transferred into rationalization, with the fusion of folk songs and concrete institutional history books. This kind of legitimation is contrasted with the perspective of Kosova, which is achieved through an effect-oriented rationalization (opposes a state within a state), which represents the refusal of Kosova to grant full autonomy as a rational rejection. The strongest legitimation is achieved through the rationale of incentive for membership in EU, in fact presenting as legitimate not only for the behavior of two main participants in the negotiations but justifying the desire of EU to exercise power (At a time when the European Union is mired by crisis in the euro zone, it would also mark a vindication of the bloc's soft power).

In Table 5b of the AJ sample, participants in the social practice of negotiation have almost formal and dubious agency as they are mainly involved in verbalizing activities, except for Kosova in cases when it expresses resistence to the negotiations. EU and its representative Ashton take the active role of the sayer in verbal processes and in relational processes (calls, gives, affirms), whereas Kosova and Serbia are passivated in relation to EU, submitting themselves to the process (have been under pressure, agree). Functionalized high status actors in the process are personalized through nomination (Ashton, German Minister, Ban Ki-moon, Brussels) or impersonalized by referring to their institution (NATO, EU). Two main actors involved in the negotiations are represented differently: Kosova is mostly represented by personalization through

categorization (prime minister, deputy, president), through functionalization (government, party) and it is classified by ethnicity and religion. On the other hand, Serbia is represented both by objectivation, as a country, as well as through personalization, through categorization (prime minister, president), and in cases when associated with religious institutions.

As regarding the actions in the social process, similarly to NYT, negotiation is represented through concrete or figurative objectivation (agreement, deal, handshake) and it is presented as subject of figurative actions (sets the stage, represent new era, marks a significant step). Kosova gets concrete agency when it acts towards its own population (beats up activists), and in particularly when it opposes negotiations (Kosova Albanians protest, Kosova Serbs protest, opposition party protests). Otherwise, Kosova and Serbia acquire passive roles, with Kosova getting verbs of verbal and mental processes, with non-factive and negative connotations (try, fail, remain committed, are disappointed, say, call, express) and Serbia undergoing the modality of obligation (must) and taking verbs of negative meaning (refuse, lost control, reject, deny).

The discursive construction of legitimation for the negotiation is achieved through the social roles of powerful social actors within EU, who mostly demonstrate personal authority (Serbia and Kosovo assured me of their commitment). From the perspective of Serbia, legitimation of their acceptance of negotiation is achieved through rationalization: it is presented as the way to get EU membership. The legitimation of their rejection is evaluation: it does not guarantee full security of Kosovo Serbs. The perspective of Kosova is expressed through the theoretical rationalization of stabilizing the Region and normalizing neighboring relations, whereas it is articulated as concrete rationalization and moral evaluation when actions are directed against negotiation: talks could lead towards loosing the territory and sovereignty. The same legitimation of rationalization and moral evaluation when disputing the negotiations is presented for both Kosova Albanians and Kosova Serbs although from opposing stands. Regarding the EU perspective, both concrete and figurative legitimations are constructed (EU membership incentive, new era).

5. Conclusions

The findings of both quantitative and qualitative analyses are congruent and suggest that NYT and AJ deliver rather different pictures to readers, reproducing ideologies in tune with the strategic objectives of the political discourse of the respective media.

The analysis shows that NYT articles give greater space per story, which includes background to why the negotiations were initiated, summaries of what the political agreement entails, the political stances of both countries, lines of agreement and disagreement, their political and economic environments, perceived benefits from the

talks as well the stakes for the EU. AJ's coverage offers more number of stories, which are updates as the negotiations continue. It also offers background to the aim of the talks, the agreements stemming out of it, as well as the stance's presented by Kosova, Serbia and the EU. They differ in use of sources, with NYT using greater number of Kosova official sources and direct contacts by NYT journalists whereas AJ uses more Serbian official sources. In addition, they have differences in topics coverage, as AJ gives more prominence to religious identity of both countries and to the Kosova protests of opposition against negotiations.

The comparative analysis demonstrates that both NYT and AJ during the covered period present Kosova as the subordinate partner in the negotiation compared to Serbia, as the partner who follows the actions of the other one. Another similarity is the tendency to objectivate the social process of negotiation which is represented through objectivation, highlighting the quality of the process rather than the process itself. NYT displaces the concrete individuals who performed negotiations with psychological moralization, hence legitimizing the action not because of the political value or because of the partner's need and capability but because of the moral achievement. Both media present Serbia as a recipient who mainly creates situations of denial.

In difference from AJ, NYT presents the Serbian perspective of legitimation of their actions against recognition of Kosova through myths and fiction, which have become part of the Serbian institutional thinking. NYT contrasts the perspective of Kosova with the Serbian one by presenting it as an effect-oriented rationalization and thus this medium achieves a more professional level of realism and impartiality. On the other hand, AJ has an overall tendency towards representing both Kosova and Serbia as classified and labeled by their religious identity, thus implying a moral legitimation of the process of negotiations based on the religious stereotypes. Also, in difference from NYT, which presents Kosova as an agent in the process of negotiation, AJ presents Kosova as activated only when its actions are directed against the negotiations, hence creating a legitimation for the refusal of the process of talks. Both media present the powerful global social actors, with AL focusing on EU only and NYT on both US and EU. The strongest legitimation for the process of negotiation that both media construct is the rationale of incentive for getting EU membership.

The critical approach towards discourse aims the 'denaturalisation' of ideologies (Fairclough, 2010, p. 30), hence the press itself, through linguistic recontextualization of social processes can become an important space for public discourse and critical thinking. The results of this study illustrate how *The New York Times* aims to denaturalize the Serbian mythical legitimization of Kosova as its heartland, whereas *Al Jazeera English* aims to naturalize the stereotype of clashing religions contributing to. To end with, both media interpret the social action of negotiations as semiotic rather than material, or as van Leeuwen puts it (2008, p. 59), this action has least material purpose or effect, and it is an action in "meaning" rather than in "doing".

References

Chilton, P., Wodak, R. (Eds.) (2005). *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Downing, A., & Locke, Ph. (2006). *English Grammar*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Pearson Education Limited.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing Discourse*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. Pearson Education Limited.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.

Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (1979) *Language and Control*. Routledge Kegan Paul**.**

Fowler, R. (2003). *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in Press.* London: Routledge.

Griffiths, P. (2006). *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburg University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic*. *The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning.* London: Edward Arnold

Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G.K. (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language.* Cambridge University Press.

Kreidler, Ch. (1998). *Introducing English Semantics*. London:Routledge.

Lakoff , G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More than Cool Reason.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind.* Chicago: University of ChicagoPress.

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge University Press.

van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach.* Cambridge Universty Press.

van Dijk, T.A. (2005). Contextual Knowledge Management in Discourse Production. In P. Chilton and R. Wodak, Ruth (Eds.),   *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Opinions and Ideologies in the Press. In B. Bell and P. Garrett (Eds.), *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

van Dijk, T.A. (1988). *News as Discourse*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

van Dijk, T.A. (1988) *News Analysis. Case studies of International and National News in the Press*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

van Dijk, T.A. (1993). *Elite Discourse and Racism*. Newbury Park, London: Sage.

van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and Practice*. Oxford University Press.

van Leeuwen, T. (2005). *Introducing Social Semiotics*. London: Routledge.

Wodak, R. (2011). *The Discourse of Politics in Action: Politics as Usual*. Palgrave Macmillian.