

Mr. sc. Kemal Avdagić

CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF DISCOURSE FEATURES OF THE HIGH REPRESENTATIVES IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Abstract

The aim of the paper was to conduct Critical Discourse Analysis of political discourse of three High Representatives stationed in Bosnia and Herzegovina for the period 2006 – 2010. In order to carry out the envisaged analysis, the key tool for language description was Systemic Functional Grammar. The theory elaborates significance of language in everyday life and its role in the construction of meanings. The analytical framework for CDA consisted of three stages: description, interpretation and explanation. The paper shows that CDA approach to language analysis and SFG descriptive language tools provide a valuable platform for investigations of language in context. The findings highlight different communicative models which emerge as a result of lexico-grammatical choices that political actors make in specific contexts and under specific circumstances.

Key words: *Critical Discourse Analysis, Systemic Functional Grammar, experiential meaning, interpersonal meaning and textual meaning.*

Introduction

Political discourse comes to light in various ways and on different levels of realization. It has been the subject matter of investigation for ages. For some, such as Cicero, developing the power of speech was “the essence of the citizen’s duty”, whereas for others it was the means of promoting dishonesty and falsehood (Chilton, 2004: ix). Being aware of the power of language and its role in the process of communicating desired ideas, politicians use its power to promote, influence, and persuade people in order to support certain political standpoint. Van Dijk (1997: 14) argues that members of political groups are involved in political discourse “only when acting as political actors, and hence as participating in political actions, such as governing, ruling, legislating, protesting, dissenting and voting”. Theoretically, political discourse may take various forms, but considering its peculiarities it is assumed that political discourse is mainly about politics and covers “meanings related to political systems, ideologies, institutions, the political process, political actors, and political events” (van Dijk, 1997: 25). For linguists, “political discourse refers to the study of political language where the focus is on aspects of language structure as it constitutes and displays specific political functions” (Wilson, 2015: 776). Following the notion of political discourse introduced by van Dijk (1997), in this paper the term discourse will be used to refer to speeches of the High Representatives acting as political actors, in the context of the accession of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the European Union.

Aim of the paper and hypothesis

The aim of this paper is to conduct Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) of the official statements provided by the European Union Special Representatives in regard to the status of Bosnia and Herzegovina and its possibility to become a part of the European Union. The paper will also touch on the issue of ideology. The reason behind this rests in the

fact that language represents a fundamental source for identity construction (Fukada, 2014), and the notion of identity in the promotion of political ideologies is vital for politicians (Hamdaoui, 2015). In terms of CDA, the accepted definition of ideology is the one that corresponds to the meaning of worldview (Hart, 2014).

In this paper, the key tool used for language description will be Systemic Functional Grammar (henceforth SFG). It is a linguistic theory developed by Michael Halliday (Halliday, 1978, 1994; Halliday and Mathiessen, 2004). The theory elaborates significance of language in everyday life and its role in the construction of meaning where language “shapes and is shaped by, the context in which it is used” (Schleppergrell, 2012: 21). The theory facilitates investigation of meaning in contexts through grammar that enables researchers to identify linguistic choices within the language system and to explore their functional aspects in construing the desired meaning (Schleppergrell, 2012).

The working hypothesis of the paper:

- Political discourse of the European Union Special Representatives in the context of accession of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the European Union is context bound (political and historical) and as such affects lexico-grammatical choices speakers make in construing their official statements.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis is a type of discourse that takes critical approach towards language. It focuses on analysing different discourses with the aim of identifying ideologies and values interwoven in them (Koussouhon & Dossoumou, 2015). According to Wodak (2002: 6), CDA stems from classical Rhetoric, Text linguistics, Sociolinguistics, Applied Linguistics and Pragmatics. It is important to point out that CDA is not a coherent theory or a special method of doing discourse analysis. In all fields of study methodologies are different and they vary depending on the aims of the researcher (Wodak, 2002). There is an interplay between language and discourse in CDA in a sense that language reveals social construct but at the same time it strengthens it. Thus, discourse is not just a matter of language since it participates and takes an active role in creation of “the social systems, situations, institutions and ideologies in which it is embedded” (Hart, 2014: 3). The primal concern of CDA is the relationship between language and power (Wodak, 2002). The issue of power and social actors in CDA is approached from a neo-Marxist perspective in regard to privileged access to social resources, status and wealth as well as means for the dissemination of information (Hart 2014). Studies in CDA are manifold and originate from different theoretical backgrounds which are using different data and approaches (Wodak, 2002). Critical Discourse Analysis is significant for linguistic scholars since it investigates “real, and often extended, samples of spoken and written discourse” in its broadest sense Baxter (2010: 126). CDA approach is gaining on popularity among researchers investigating language use and more and more researchers are arguing that the study of language should be based on a sound socio-political intellectual basis allowing for better analysis of power in language and language use (Wodak, 2011).

Analytical framework for Critical Discourse Analysis

In the beginning, it is important to clarify two terms that define CDA, i.e. critical and discourse. In the context of CDA critical usually means investigation and understanding of

issues of domination and disparity and ways in which these two are reproduced in language (O'Halloran, 2011). Discourse, on the other hand, is understood twofold. The first one relates to language in use and the second one relates to the methods and ways of talking about the world. O'Halloran (2011) states that the most common analytical framework within CDA is the one developed by Fairclough (1995) which consists of three stages: description, interpretation and explanation. In the first stage the text is comprehensively described with the help of descriptive tools that SFG provides. The second stage focuses on conjecturing and understanding of analysts and ways they approach the text. The significance of this stage rests in understanding of how wider social and cultural context shape our understanding and interpretation. And finally, in the third stage CDA strives to provide critical explanation of relations between the text and discourse implications in wider context (O'Halloran, 2011).

Systemic Functional Grammar

Systemic Functional Grammar is a theory of language that focuses on purpose and choice (Halliday, 1994). It is concerned with what speakers do and why they choose particular modes of communication in specific communicative settings (Hart, 2014). In the words of Fowler (1991), SFG is specifically equipped and designed to relate language structure to its communicative function since it provides required descriptive tools. The conceptual framework of SFG is functional in “three distinct although closely related senses: in its interpretation (1) of texts, (2) of the system, and (3) of the elements of linguistic structures” (Halliday, 1994: F39). The general purpose of these functions is to understand the environment (ideational), to act on others in it (interpersonal) and to enable interaction between the two since meaning is actualized through the textual function. The three functions are integral part of language and any statement expresses all three functions (Hart, 2014). The aim of the approach is to provide a grammar models for the purpose of sensible and meaningful analysis of any text.

The focal element of analysis in SFG is the clause. Fontaine (2013) explains the role of the clause within different functions and explicates that the clause, within experiential function is seen as representation, within interpersonal function it is seen as exchange, and within textual function the clause is perceived as message. The main challenge in analysing grammar in SFG is understanding the relationship between function and structure since language is understood as a system that relates meaning to form (Fontaine, 2013).

Literature review

The last half of the twentieth century witnessed developments in the field of linguistics. Linguists who were interested in the public uses of language revealed a tremendous desire to link language, politics and culture. The most prominent was the Frankfurt school, but the trend was present in England as well (Chilton, 2004). According to Fukada (2014) language represents a fundamental source for identity construction. The notion of identity in the promotion of political ideologies is vital for politicians and their parties since it enables them to associate with their audience and promote all ideas that represent them positively in contrast to their opponents (Hamdaoui, 2015). Such notions are always wrapped up in ideology which somehow remains hidden and in the shadows since “these processes cannot operate successfully if their ideological foundation is exposed” (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 380). There

is semantic and ideological polarization present in political discourse since “descriptions and references to politicians, public figures, and organizations” represent “politically and ideologically based opinions and attitudes” (van Dijk 1997: 28). Researches have devoted a lot of attention in analysing political speeches with the aim of revealing hidden messages within the political discourse. Blommaert and Verschuere (1998) investigated the role of language in development of the European national ideologies. The focus of their interest were articles about ethnic conflicts and separatist movements. In regard to CDA, O’Regan and Betzel (2016) have used the dialectical-relational model in order to investigate the question of extremism in the context of islamism, white supremecism, and multiculturalism. Sadeghi et al. (2014) have investigated discursive strategies of legitimation used in VOA and Fars News reports in the context of Egyptian protests against Hosni Mubarak’s regime. Wodak (2018) uses CDA approaches to talk about European integration and the problem of politicization of the refugee crisis in Austria. Aydin-Düzegit (2014) introduces the potential of CDA in the study of the European Union foreign policy. Carta (2015) in her work investigates implications of the institutional reforms in development of European institutional actors. The article examines patterns of pronominal selection in expressing the sense of belonging and inter-institutional cooperation and conflict. In the context of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Majstorović (2007) discusses the question of power and political discourse of the international community in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Katnić-Bakaršić (2012) provides a significant contribution in understanding approaches to CDA in her book about basic methodological and theoretical methods in CDA, as well as in her other writings (2009, 2010). Osmankadić (2016) talks the role and function of linguistic negation in political discourse of the High Representatives in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Methodology

The intention of the paper is to carry out Critical Discourse Analysis of three press releases in which three High Representatives and the European Union Special Representatives talk about Bosnia and Herzegovina’s path to the European Union. In the first press release entitled *Constitutional Reform Critical to Future of Bosnia and Herzegovina* (available at <http://europa.ba/?p=13417>), the High Representative and Special Representative, Christian Schwarz-Schilling talks about the future of Bosnia and Herzegovina at an international conference in Berlin in 2006. In the second press release entitled *BiH must demonstrate its commitment to the EU* (available at <http://europa.ba/?p=13823>), the High Representative and EU Special Representative, Miroslav Lajčák talks about Bosnia and Herzegovina at a conference on BiH’s European perspective in Vienna in 2008. And, in the third press release entitled *Path to Europe Still Open – But Political Focus Must Change* (available at <http://europa.ba/?p=14437>), the High Representative and EU Special Representative, Valentin Inzko talks about BiH at an international conference in Austria in 2010.

The reason behind the choice of three different political actors and three different time frames rests in the intention to explore the differences in language and context. It is possible to carry out this kind of analysis since SFG “offers powerful tools for comprehensively exploring meaning in language [...] for accounting for differences between speakers, differences over time, or differences in context” (Schleppegrell, 2012: 29).

A threefold analysis of the clause with respect to each main metafunction will be conducted. In the analysis of the experiential meaning the focus will be on processes and participating entities. For the interpersonal meaning Subject and Finite elements are of particular importance and they will be the focus of investigation. And, in regard to textual meaning the focus of analysis will be on Theme since it signals “the maintenance or progression of what the text is about” (Thompson, 2014: 165).

The first text contains ten sentences divided into 24 clauses. The second text contains ten sentences divided into 32 clauses and the last text contains 13 sentences divided into 35 clauses. The entire corpus encompasses 91 clause. All identified clauses are finite clauses since they make possible for the analysis of different strands of meaning. The analysis has two parts. In the first part, each text is analysed using the SFG descriptive language tools, and in the second part the data is put through an analytical CDA framework.

Systemic Functional Grammar analysis

Within SFG analytical framework data is examined in order to gain insight into three types of meanings that could be derived on the clause level: experiential, interpersonal, and textual.

Experiential meaning

Experiential meaning represents the speaker’s experience. Here, analysts are dealing with processes, participating entities and circumstance (Fontaine, 2013). This strand of meaning indicates that available choices are organized into system which is called the Transitivity system. According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), the Transitivity system organises our experience into a set of process types. It is important to point out that each of these process types provide “its own model or schema for construing a particular domain of experience” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 170).

Table 1. Summary of Halliday’s process types and participant roles (adapted from Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 260)

Process	Category meaning	Participants
Material	doing, happening	Actor, Goal, Beneficiary, Scope
Behavioural	behaving	Behaver
Mental	sensing, seeing, thinking, wanting, feeling	Senser, Phenomenon
Verbal	saying	Sayer, Receiver, Verbiage
Relational	being, attributing, identifying	Carrier, Attribute, Identified, Identifier
Existential	existing	Existent

Analysis of transitivity in Text 1

Transitivity in SFG terms “refers to a system for describing the whole clause, rather than just the verb and its object” (Thompson, 2014: 94). The transitivity system is the grammar system of processes that relates participating entities in the clause (Fontaine, 2013).

Table 2. Comparison of the Transitivity systems

	Material processes	Behavioural processes	Mental processes	Verbal process	Relational processes	Existential processes
Text 1	6	-	1	8	9	-
	25%	-	4%	33%	38%	-
Text 2	21	1	4	3	2	1
	66%	3%	13%	9%	6%	3%
Text 3	20	-	2	7	6	-
	57%	-	6%	20%	17%	-
Σ	47	1	7	18	17	1
	51%	1%	8%	20%	19%	1%

The data from Table 1 shows that in the analysed texts the dominant Transitivity structure is Actor + material process (51%), followed by Sayer + verbal process (20%), and Carrier/Attribute + relational process or Identified/Identifier + relational process (19%).

However, there is a significant difference between texts in terms of the Transitivity system. In Text 1, relational processes dominate with 38%, followed by verbal 33% and material 25%.

In Text 2, preferable mode of communication is realised through material processes 66%, followed by mental 13%, and verbal processes 9%. In Text 3 the speaker opted for material processes 57%, followed by verbal 20%, and relational 17%.

Material processes

In SFG, activity-based processes are called material process and they express activities of doing, happening, changing and creating. The participating entities in material processes are: Actor (the one doing the activity), Goal (the one impacted upon or affected by the activity), Beneficiary (a participating entity that benefits from the process), and Scope (a participating entity which refers to the entity over which the process takes place) (Fontaine, 2013).

Table 3. Participating entities in the Transitivity system: process material

	Actor	Goal	Scope	Beneficiary
Text 1	3	2	4	1
	8%	2%	10%	3%
Text 2	9	5	16	2
	22%	12%	40%	5%
Text 3	12	12	7	1
	23%	23%	13%	2%
Σ	24	19	27	4
	18%	14%	21%	3%

Data from Table 3 indicates that dominant choice of participating entities in the Transitivity system is Actor + process material + Scope (21%) and Actor + process material + Goal (14%).

There is a variation between analysed texts in terms of the participating entities within the Transitivity system. In Text 1, the speaker chooses Actor + process material + Scope (10%) over Goal (2%). In Text 2, there is a similar structure Actor + process material + Scope (40%)

/Goal (12%), while in Text 3 the structure is Actor + process material + Goal (23%) /Scope (13%).

Verbal processes

Verbal processes are the process type which involves representation of saying. Participating entities in this process type are Sayer (the one who produces the message), Receiver (the one who receives the message), and Verbiage (what was said) (Fontaine, 2013).

Table 4. Participating entities in the Transitivity system: process verbal

	Sayer	Receiver
Text 1	8	2
	21%	5%
Text 2	3	1
	7%	2%
Text 3	7	2
	13%	4%
Σ	18	5
	14%	4%

In the Transitivity system for verbal processes 14% falls off to Sayer + process verbal. There is a variation of percentage with different speakers. Thus, in Text 1, 21% of the Transitivity system falls off to Sayer, in Text 2, 7% and in Text 3, 13%. The provided data indicates that there is a significant difference between speakers in terms of their language choices.

Relational processes

Relational processes relate participating entities in an abstract way. The prototypical verb for this process type is the verb be. There are two types of relational processes: Attributive and Identifying. In attributive processes participating entities are called Carrier (carries the attribute or quality) and Attribute (participating entity that expresses the attribute).

Identifying processes are very similar to the Attributive. There are two participating entities here as well, called Identified (the one being identified) and Identifier (the one which is identified) (Fontaine, 2013).

Table 5. Participating entities in the Transitivity system: process relational

	Carrier	Attribute	Identified	Identifier
Text 1	9	9	-	-
	24%	24%		
Text 2	1	1	1	1
	3%	3%	3%	3%
Text 3	5	5	1	1
	9%	9%	2%	2%
Σ	15	15	2	2
	11%	11%	2%	2%

A significant percentage in the Transitivity system falls of to relational processes with the structure Carrier/Attribute + process relational (11%). The data on the Transitivity system

suggests that speakers have opted for different options in the process of meaning realization. In Text 1, 24% falls off to relational process, in Text 2, 3%, and in Text 3, 9%.

Interpersonal meaning

This strand of meaning gives an insight into the meanings created by speakers or writers and how they use language to interact with others. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) argue that in the interpersonal component the principal grammatical system is that of mood. In SFG, Subject plays a main role in determining the mood of the clause (Fontaine, 2013). In explaining its function, Thompson (2014) states that the Subject is used in order to make claim about something and the addressee can then either accept, reject, question or qualify the weight of what was said.

Table 6. Distribution of subjects, finite elements, modality and tense

	Subject		Finite element		Modality			Tense					
	simple	nominalized	auxiliary	verb	probability	obligation	inclination	present	pr. passive	past	past passive	future	fut. passive
Text 1	19	5	10	14	3	2	2	9	1	10	1	2	1
Text 2	21	11	20	12	3	13	-	12	13	5	1	1	-
Text 3	31	4	15	20	6	-	3	13	2	16	2	2	-
Σ	71	20	45	46	12	15	5	34	16	31	4	5	1

The data from Table 6 shows that the mood system was realised in the declarative mood with the structure Subject + Finite/Predicator (Subject + Auxiliary + Predicator 49% and Subject + Finite verbal element 51%). In 71 clause (77%), the Subject is realised as simple or a heavy nominal group, while nominalizations as Subjects are realised in 20 clauses (23%).

Besides expressing the Finite element, modal auxiliaries express speaker's modality, too. Thus, probability is expressed in 12 clauses, obligation in 15, and inclination in five. Dominant verb tenses are present 37%, present passive 18%, and past 34%.

Table 7. Comparison of the most frequent participating entities in the Subject position.

	Subject			
	The High Representative and EU Special Representative	Bosnia and Herzegovina	The European Union	Other
Text 1	7	2	3	13
	28%	8%	12%	52%
Text 2	2	5	2	25
	6%	15%	6%	73%
Text 3	8	7	3	14
	25%	22%	9%	44%
Σ	17	14	8	52
	19%	15%	9%	57%

The data shows that the most common participating entity in the Subject position is the High Representative and EU Special Representative (19%), followed by entity Bosnia and Herzegovina (15%), and the European Union (9%). Distribution of Subjects varies from text to text. In Text 1, the most represented entity in Subject position is The High Representative and EU Special Representative with 28%, in Text 2, it is represented with 6%, and in Text 3 with 25%.

Textual meaning

Unlike experiential and interpersonal function, the meaning of textual function extends across clause boundaries and is vital in the creation of text (Fontaine, 2013). Within the textual meaning, the clause takes on two main functional elements: Theme and Rheme. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 64) define the Theme as “the point of departure of the message; it is that which locates and orients the clause within its context”. The reminder of the message is called the Rheme. Simply said, a clause begins with a Theme (Bloor & Bloor, 2004). The Theme element is usually conflated with the Subject and when this happens the Theme is said to be unmarked. On the other hand, when the Theme is expressed by something other than Subject it is said to be marked (Fontaine, 2013). The Theme is realised through three strands of meanings: experiential, interpersonal and textual. Experiential Theme usually corresponds to the first participant in the clause. Interpersonal Theme is realised by the elements occurring before the experiential Theme. And, textual Theme refers to elements that only express textual meaning such as conjunction (but, and, or) or continuatives (well, so) (Fontaine, 2013).

Table 8. Distribution of unmarked Themes

	Textual Theme	Experiential Theme		Reference	
		Unmarked	Marked	anaphoric	cataphoric
Text 1	9	13	2	4	1
Text 2	7	21	3	3	-
Text 3	10	21	3	13	-

The data suggests that in Text 1 there are 13 message departure points preceded by nine entities contributing to the cohesiveness of the message realised as conjunctions / coordinators / subordinators. Four Themes have anaphoric reference and one cataphoric. In Text 2, there is 21 unmarked Theme preceded by seven textual Themes with three anaphoric references. In Text 3, there is 21 unmarked Theme with 13 anaphoric references.

Table 9. Distribution of participating entities in unmarked Themes

	Participating entities in unmarked Theme
Text 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Constitutional reform - The High Representative and EU Special representative - Mr Schwarz-Schilling - Bosnia and Herzegovina’s future - Europe - The question

Text 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bosnia and Herzegovina - The High Representative and EU Special representative - The signing of a Stabilization and Association Agreement - Lajčák - The High Representative and EU Special Representative - Appointment of state property - Resolution of defence property - Completion of the Brčko Final Award - Fiscal sustainability - SAA signature - Continuing negative rhetoric by politicians - The key challenge - The EU - The citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina
Text 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High Representative and EU Special Representative Valentin Inzko, - The HR/EUSR, - A new political configuration, - Bosnia and Herzegovina, - The road.

Table 9 shows different participating entities occupying unmarked Theme positions.

Analysis of texts using CDA approach

In order to provide a critical assessment of the data provided by SFG descriptive tools, we will refer to the approach proposed by Fairclough (1995) which consists of three stages: description, interpretation, and explanation. In the first stage the analysed texts will be described in as much details as possible in terms of the main participating entities and the roles that they were assigned. In the second stage of interpretation, the focus will be on conjecturing and understanding of the text. The significance of this stage rests in understanding of how wider social and cultural context shape our understanding and interpretation. And finally, in the third stage CDA strives to provide critical explanation of relations between the text and discourse implications in wider context (O'Halloran, 2011). The analysis will encompass all three strands of meaning: experiential, interpersonal and textual.

Description

Experiential meaning

The dominant Transitivity model of communication in the analysed corpus is Actor + material processes, followed by Sayer + verbal processes, and Carrier/Attribute + relational process.

However, it can be seen that in Text 1, the focus is on relational processes (38%), followed by verbal process (33%). The focus on material processes is only 25%. The main participating entity in the dominant mode of communication is Carrier + process: relational + Attribute.

The following participants are identified: constitutional reform, the package of constitutional reforms, the review by PIC, and the question (the question of accession to the EU). In only one instance, the speaker made reference to Bosnia and Herzegovina referring to its future.

The following in line is Sayer + process: verbal. There are eight references to Sayer and all of them go back to the High Representative who either *says*, *points out*, *explains*, or *makes something clear*. Not one reference is made to entities referring to Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In material process the Transitivity model is twofold: Actor + process: material + Goal (2%) and Actor + process: material + Scope (10%). Actor position was occupied by entities referring back to either Europe and the European Union or the High Representative.

In Text 2 the dominant Transitivity model is: Actor + process: material (66%), followed by Sayer + process: mental (13%) and Sayer + process: verbal (9%).

In the model Actor + process: material + Goal, Actor position is occupied by entities referring to the EU and one entity refereeing to politicians from BiH but with negative polarity. Actor position is followed by verbs like: *will move forward*, *remains*, *fosters*, and *must remain*. Majority of Actor and Goal entities is expressed by nominalised forms (Continuing negative rhetoric, the signing of SAA, an impediment to further progress, and a permissive environment of mutual provocation).

In the model, Actor + process: material + Scope, Bosnia and Herzegovina occupies two Actor positions but in each case followed by modal auxiliary must (*meet + prove*). Other Actors are: policing laws, OHR, the Peace Implementation Council. Scope position is occupied by entities referring to the EU conditionality, the EU, EU integration and similar.

In the Transitivity model Sayer + process: mental + Phenomenon, two Sayer positions are occupied by the High Representative, one by Bosnia and Herzegovina and one that refers to the people of BiH. Two entities BiH and its people are followed by verbs want and deserve. In the Transitivity model Sayer + process: verbal, all Sayer positions refer to the High Representative.

In Text 3, the prevailing Transitivity model is Actor + process: material (57%), followed by Sayer + process: verbal (20%) and Carrier + process: relational + Attribute (17%). In material processes, Actor + process: material + Goal is more represented than Actor + process: material + Scope.

The Actor position in the system Actor + process: material + Goal is occupied by entities refereeing to Bosnia and Herzegovina and politics in six instances. Bosnia and Herzegovina in Actor position is followed by auxiliary modal with negative polarity. A new political configuration as a participating entity, after being introduced is put in a negative contexts and marked as being responsible for crisis. The European Union in Actor position is followed by modal auxiliary which expresses probability.

In the system Actor + process: material + Scope, the BiH leadership occupies one Actor position. Other Actor positions belong to the High Representative while Scope positions occupy entities referring to economic processes. In the system Sayer + process: verbal, all Sayer positions but one refer to the High Representative where he *tells*, *says*, *emphasises* and *warns*. BiH politicians occupy one Sayer position in which they *dishonestly* mislead voters.

The system Carrier + process: relational + Attribute emphasises processes related to the path to the European Union. Participating entity Bosnia and Herzegovina is being referred to once in Identified position. Carrier positions are mainly occupied by the pronoun *it* which refers to process of stabilization and integration.

Interpersonal meaning

The data shows that all examined clauses are realised in indicative mood. Subject positions are realised in two forms simple and nominalised. Modality is realised through obligation, probability and inclination, while preferred verb tenses are the present, past and the present passive. In regard to the participating entities of our concern that occupy subject positions, the High Representative occupies 19% of all subject positions, Bosnia and Herzegovina 15%, and the European Union 9%, while on other subjects falls off 57% of Subject positions.

In Text 1, the High Representative occupies seven subject positions, Bosnia and Herzegovina two, and the European Union 3. While the High Representative as Subject is followed by finites that help him to *say, tell, conclude, explain, make clear and point out*, Bosnia and Herzegovina in Subject position agrees with *modal* and relational verbs the same as the European Union.

In the second text, the picture is slightly different. The High Representative occupies two Subject positions, Bosnia and Herzegovina five and the European Union two. Again, the High Representative in the subject position agrees with finite predicators while Bosnia and Herzegovina is followed by auxiliary modals as well as the Europe, providing modal meaning to the clause.

The third texts provides the following portrait of the interpersonal meaning. The High Representative occupies eight Subject positions, Bosnia and Herzegovina seven and the European Union three. The High Representative from his Subject position *tells, says, and emphasises*. Bosnia and Herzegovina from its Subject position mostly agrees with modal auxiliaries, just like the European Union participating entity.

Textual meaning

This strand of meaning helps in understanding the overall message of the text since it provides information about the departure points of the message.

In the first texts departing points are almost all realised as definite/indefinite lexical expressions except for five clauses that begin with the pronoun element having an anaphoric reference in four cases and cataphoric reference in one case. The High Representative appears in seven unmarked Theme positions, Bosnia and Herzegovina appears once in the Theme the same as Europe.

In the second text only three pronouns occupy positions of unmarked Themes and all of them have anaphoric reference. The High Representative appears in four positions, Bosnia and Herzegovina once and the EU once as well.

In the third text 13 unmarked Theme positions are occupied by pronoun elements (all having anaphoric reference but one) and only seven definite/indefinite lexical expressions appear as unmarked Theme. The High Representative occupies three positions and Bosnia and Herzegovina two.

Interpretation

It would be suitable to begin interpretation from the Transitivity perspective. The dominant Transitivity model is Actor + process: material followed by Sayer + process: verbal, and finally Carrier + process: relational + Attribute. This type of Transitivity makes perfect

sense provided we know that all analysed texts are about speeches delivered by High Representatives at conferences. The logic behind their speeches is that they begin with introducing participating entities or Actors who/that/which are involved in different process types or activities. After that, they transition to the system Sayer + process: verbal. This makes possible for them to express their views and to inform the audience at conferences about what they did. And finally, using the system Carrier + process: relational + Attribute they present results of their work in terms of relationships between different participating entities

In the context of the communicative model of the High Representative, Christian Schwarz-Schilling, following inferences can be derived. His communicative model focuses on relational process (38%) and then he shifts to verbal process (33%), and the least attention gives to material process (25%). In his speech he makes general assumptions and compares between different processes. His participants are introduced as nominalised lexical expressions. The question of integrating Bosnia and Herzegovina into the European Union is one of his concerns but it is not the question of integration but of stability. He infers that the future of Bosnia and Herzegovina is in the EU, but there are many critical points still, and as such it may bring instability to the European Union. He was very determined in the presentation of his views since his Sayer position is expressed by finite predicators such as: *told, pointed out, explained, said and made clear*. He never gave any active role to Bosnia and Herzegovina in any of the processes and none of the political partners were made reference to. It is understood that Bosnia and Herzegovina has to go through many processes before it becomes a partner in the process of negotiations. The key question is a constitutional reform. The High Representative's role is the one of the supervisor (*He would seek to play a key role...*) and the responsibility of Bosnia and Herzegovina is to confirm to his supervision.

The dominant communicative model of the High Representative, Miroslav Lajčák is: Actor + process: material (66%), Sayer + process: mental (13%), and Sayer + process: verbal (9%). It can be inferred that the focus of the High Representative is on processes that are going on in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In the Goal position he talks about certain objectives that still need to be accomplished and also talks about obstacles to the process of accession of BiH to the EU. The source of the problem of progress is identified as a continuing negative rhetoric by politicians. Again, most of Actor positions are occupied by nominalised lexical expressions which shows that the High Representative does not have a real partner in the process of negotiations. In regard to Bosnia and Herzegovina, in the Scope position Lajčák puts the EU conditionality and five more important issues that await the country on its road to the EU. The focus of his attention are five issues that Bosnia and Herzegovina need to address if it wants to become a part of the European Union. In his transition to the system Sayer + process: material + Phenomenon, Lajčák concludes that Bosnia and Herzegovina wants to become a part of the EU, and that the people of Bosnia deserve it in order to secure their country. But, it is all in the domain of mental processes and abstract entities.

The High Representative, Valentin Inzko, uses the following communicative model: Actor + process material (57%), followed by Sayer + process: verbal (20%), and Carrier + process: relational + Attribute (17%). In his mode of communication, The High Representative focuses on material processes emphasising what is going on in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In the beginning of his speech he mentions that BiH has failed to become a part of the European Union, but gives hope that there is still a chance.

Actor positions are occupied by entities referring to BiH politicians. He uses nominalized lexical expression to refer to them, which is a clear indication that the EU still has not identified real partners in the process of negotiation for the accession of BiH to the EU. He identifies problems in Goal position and they refer to issues caused by “inability or unwillingness by BiH leaders”. But the real problem lies in “new political configurations”, an entity that occupies the Theme position through the speech. In his role of Sayer, he is very direct and uses finite predicators such as *say, tell, emphasise and warn*. Finally, he makes clear in the relational processes that there is still possibility for a credible candidate status but current political establishment is a major obstacle to it.

Explanation

In order to grasp full understanding of the Transitivity models and lexico-grammatical choices that High Representatives made, a wider context should be considered. It would be useful to point out that after general elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina in September 1996, a tripartite national presidency was established. The main responsibility of the government was to maintain foreign affairs, while the internationally appointed office of the High Representative oversaw the implementation of the peace agreement and acted as the final authority (Lampe et al. 2019). The year 2000 was significant for the countries of the Western Balkans because the EU took an active role in promoting the stabilization in the region and it offered the possibility for the Western Balkans countries to become full members of the EU under certain conditions. Bosnia and Herzegovina had recognised a chance as well and since then certain attempts have been made in order to gain a candidate status for negotiations in the process of accession of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the European Union. The aim of the paper was to track changes in communicative practices of the European Union representatives and their perception of development of Bosnia and Herzegovina on its way to the Union.

The first speech was produced in 2006. There were many open questions at that time and Mr Schwarz-Schilling identified two major issues: constitutional reform and the issue of stability. Bosnia and Herzegovina has a turbulent past and at that point it was suitable to emphasize security issues in the form of constitutional reforms. That is the reason for the preferred Transitivity model with the focus on relational processes more than on other process types. In his speech he uses adjectives like *critical* and *essential* in his relational processes in regard to constitutional reform, while as Sayer he makes clear that the European Union will remain a major Actor in the process. He does not see Bosnia and Herzegovina as a partner, but rather as someone who needs help in order to stabilize the country. In contrast to Schwarz-Schilling, Miroslav Lajčák is more focused on doing things than making relations. He delivered his speech in 2008, and it can be seen that his Transitivity model is completely different. Like his predecessor, he talks about Bosnia and Herzegovina from the position of power. He never mentions any political figures from Bosnia and Herzegovina but sees politicians as being the major obstacle to the integration process. Two years later, the focus of what is required from Bosnia and Herzegovina has expanded. Now, besides constitutional reforms five more issues are identified as being crucial to the integration process. The High Representative is fully aware that people of Bosnia and Herzegovina would like to become a part of the EU, but there are no legitimate political entities who would partner up with the EU. In 2010, Valentin Inzko gave his speech at a conference and his focus is also on processes. He talks from the position of

power and clearly blames politicians for their inability to make it possible for BiH to become a part of the EU. However, still in 2010, the EU does not have any real political partners in the process of negotiation. When talking about politicians in BiH, Mr Inzko, just like his predecessors, does not make any reference to legitimacy of any of political actors in BiH. They all emphasise the importance of the path to the European Union but neither one of them sees Bosnia and Herzegovina in the European Union yet. The main feature of their political ideology manifests in promotion of the idea of Europe as a political actor (Wodak, 2018; Rasmussen, 2009), and the (de)legitimization of political leadership in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The EU High Representatives in their speeches promote the EU as “a zone of peace” since it stands for peace and offers stability to member states (Sandrin & Hoffmann, 2018: 5).

Conclusion

The intention of this paper was to provide critical discourse analysis of political speeches delivered by three High Representatives in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Lexico-grammatical analysis was carried out by the means of descriptive language tools provided by Systemic Functional Grammar. To evaluate the obtained data a three-dimensional analytical framework for analysis, developed by Fairclough (1995) was used.

The results of analysis in this paper help in identification of the dominant communicative model of the High Representatives and at the same time show that there is a significant difference in the Transitivity system between them. It also makes possible for tracking changes in discourse that happen over time and between actors. Evaluation of the thematic structures has shown that there is a remarkable difference between speakers in terms of topics that were focus of their communication. Context, as well, affects choices that speakers make. The data obtained through experiential and interpersonal analysis has shown that linguistic choices were influenced by context and circumstances.

Along with lexico-grammatical features of the text, the analysis has given some insight into the ideology of the European Union representatives in Bosnia and Herzegovina. According to Fairclough (1995), ideology reflects change in communicative event and its structure and shows power imbalance between participating entities. The paper shows that political discourse of the High Representatives in BiH represents a fertile ground for such an endeavour.

References

1. Aydın-Düzgit, S. (2014). Critical discourse analysis in analysing European Union foreign policy: Prospects and challenges. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 49(3): 354-367.
2. Baxter, J. (2010). Discourse-Analytic Approaches to Text and Talk. In Litosseliti, L. (Ed.). *Research methods in linguistics*. Continuum International Publishing Group. New York.
3. Blommaert, J. & Verschueren, J. (1998). The Role of Language in Nationalist Ideologies. *Pragmatics* 2(3): 355-375.
4. Bloor, T., Bloor, M. (2004). *The Functional Analysis of English: A Hallidayan Approach*. Second Edition. Oxford University Press Inc., New York
5. Bucholtz, M., Hall, K. (2004). Language and Identity. In Duranti, A. *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

6. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
7. Carta, C. (2015). Framing the European Union international discourse: The swinging „we“. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 14(1): 65-86.
8. Chilton, P. (2004). *Analaysing Political Discourse: theory and practice*. Routledge: London.
9. Fontaine, L. (2013). *Analysing English Grammar: A systemic functional introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
10. Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge.
11. Fukada, C. (2014). Identities and linguistic varieties in Japanese: an analysis of language ideologies as participants' accomplishments. *Pragmatics*, 24(1), 35-62.
12. Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar (2nd ed.)*. Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press. Edward Arnold Publishers Limited.
13. Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar (3rd ed.)*. London: Edward Arnold.
14. Hamdaoui, M. (2015). The Persuasive Power of Person Deixis in Political Discourse: The Pronoun 'We' in Obama's Speeches About the 2007-2009 Financial Crisis as an Example. In *European Conference on Arts and Humanities, Official Conference Proceedings*.
15. Hart, C. (2014). *Discourse, Grammar and Ideology: Functional and Cognitive Perspectives*. Bloomsbury, London.
16. Katnić-Bakaršić, M. (2009). Jezik, politika i moć u tipovima diskursa. In Granić, Jagoda (ur.). *Jezična politika i jezična stvarnost*. Reality. Zagreb: HDPL. 333-338.
17. Katnić-Bakaršić, M. (2010). Discourse of Globalization between Rhetoric and Reality. 42. *Međunarodno srećanje pisateljev*, Bled: Slovenski centar PEN, 19-21.
18. Katnić-Bakaršić, M. (2012). *Između diskursa moći i moći diskursa*. Naklada Zoro. Zagreb.
19. Koussouhon, L. A., Dossoumou, A. M. (2015). Political and Ideological Commitments: A Systemic Functional Linguistic and Critical Discourse Analysis of President Buhari's Inaugural Speech. *International Journal of Linguistics and Communication*, 3(2): 24-34.
20. Majstorović, D. (2007). *Diskurs, moć i međunarodna zajednica*. Banja Luka: Filozofski fakultet u Banjaluci.
21. O'Halloran, K. (2011). Critical discourse analysis. In James Simpson (ed.). *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Routledge, London & New York.
22. O'Regan, J. P., Betzel, A. (2016). Critical discourse analysis: a sample study of extremism. In Zhu Hua (ed.) *Research Methods in Intercultural Communication*. Blackwell Guides to Research Methods in Applied Linguistics. London: Blackwell.
23. Osmankadić, M. (2016). Funkcije lingvističke negacije u političkom diskursu: analiza diskursa međunarodne zajednice u Bosni i Hercegovini. Filozofski fakultet u Sarajevu. Sarajevo.
24. Rasmussen, S. B. (2009). *Discourse analysis of EU public diplomacy: messages and practices*. Netherlands Institute of International Relations.

25. Sadeghi, B., Hassani, M. T., Jalali, V. (2014). Towards (De-)legitimation Discursive Strategies in News Coverage of Egyptian Protest: VOA & Fars News in Focus. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98: 1580 – 1589.
26. Sandrin, P. O., & Hoffmann, A. R. (2018). Silences and hierarchies in European Union Public Diplomacy. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, 61(1).
27. Schleppegrell, M. J. (2012). Systemic functional linguistics. In Gee, P. J. & Handford, M. (Eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Routledge, London & New York.
28. Thompson, G. (2014). *Introducing Functional Grammar*. 3rd ed. Routledge: New York.
29. Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis. *Belgian journal of linguistics*, 11(1), 11-52.
30. Wilson, J. (2015). Political Discourse. In Tannen, D., Hamilton, H. E., Schiffrin, D. (Eds.). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Second Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
31. Wodak, R. (2002). Aspects of critical discourse analysis. *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Linguistik*, 36(10), 5-31.
32. Wodak, R. (2011). Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis. In Zienkowski, J., Östman, Jan-Ola, Verschueren, J. (Eds.). *Discursive Pragmatics: Handbook of Pragmatic Highlights Vol. 8* John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia.
33. Wodak, R. (2018). Discourse and European Integration. Anders Hellström, ed. *MIM Working Papers Series*, 18:1. Malmö Institute for Studies of Migration, Diversity and Welfare (MIM), Sweden.

KRITIČKA ANALIZA GOVORNIH ODLIKA VISOKIH PREDSTAVNIKA ZA BOSNU I HERCEGOVINU

Sažetak

Cilj ovog rada je analiza političkog diskursa trojice visokih predstavnika za Bosnu i Hercegovinu u periodu od 2006. do 2010. godine. Sistemska funkcionalna gramatika predstavlja osnovni jezički deskriptivni alat za provđenje kritičke analize diskursa u ovom radu. Teorija ukazuje na značaj jezika u svakodnevnom životu i njegovu ulogu u kreiranju različitih značenja. Analitički radni okvir kritičke analize diskursa se sastoji od tri etape: deskripcija, interpretacija i obrazloženje. Rad ukazuje na činjenicu da KAD i SFG predstavljaju kvalitetnu platformu u cilju istraživanja jezika u kontekstu. Rezultati rada ukazuju na različite komunikativne modele koji nastaju kao rezultat leksičko-gramatičke selekcije koju politički akteri prave u datom kontekstu, a pod posebnim okolnostima.

Ključne riječi: kritička analiza diskursa, sistemska funkcionalna gramatika, ideacijsko, interpersonalno i tekstualno značenje