

CURRENT TREND AND STUDIES IN **SOCIAL, HUMAN AND ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCES**



All Sciences Academy

*CURRENT TREND
AND STUDIES IN
SOCIAL, HUMAN
AND
ADMINISTRATIVE
SCIENCES*

Editor

Prof. Dr. Osman YILMAZ





Current Trend and Studies Social, Human and Administrative Sciences

Editor: Prof. Dr. Osman YILMAZ

Design: All Sciences Academy Design

Published Date: September 2026

Publisher's Certification Number: 72273

ISBN: 978-625-8839-97-5

© All Sciences Academy

www.allsciencesacademy.com

allsciencesacademy@gmail.com

CONTENT

1. Chapter	5
Why Should Journalism Survive? A Philosophical Inquiry into the Sustainability of the Profession <i>Önder DENİZ</i>	
2. Chapter	19
A Technical and Harmonic Analysis of The Piano Accompaniment in the Piece “Seni Seviyorum” <i>Zeynep EKİZ, Sercan ÖZKELEŞ</i>	
3. Chapter	31
What Knowing a Language Means Now: Competence, Context and Language Technologies <i>Vesna Prodanovska-Poposka</i>	
4. Chapter	46
From Toolbox to Architecture. Institutional Embedding in EU Cyber Diplomacy <i>Andreea Nicoleta Dragomir, Cătălin Nicolescu</i>	
5. Chapter	61
More Uxorio Cohabitation and Family Law: Property Relations, Legal Consequences and a Comparative Perspective <i>Greta Petriti</i>	

Why Should Journalism Survive? A Philosophical Inquiry into the Sustainability of the Profession

Önder DENİZ

Uşak Üniversitesi, İletişim Fakültesi, Gazetecilik Bölümü, Genel Gazetecilik Anabilim Dalı Adres:
Ankara İzmir Yolu 8. Km, Bir Eylül Kampüsü, Merkez/Uşak, Türkiye E-posta: onder.deniz@usak.edu.tr
| ORCID: 0000-0003-4583-0713

ABSTRACT

This chapter examines the sustainability of journalism as a profession in the context of technological transformation. It argues that journalism is not disappearing but is being reshaped by changes in internet technologies, social media, mobile communication, algorithms and artificial intelligence. Beginning with the historical development of journalism from early newspapers to its professionalisation in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the chapter discusses how Web 2.0, citizen journalism and mobile technologies have altered the production, distribution and consumption of news. Particular attention is given to the growing preference for watching and listening rather than reading, the increasing role of algorithmic visibility, and the pressure to generate clicks. The chapter also evaluates the continuing importance of news gathering, verification and professional ethics, identifying risks such as defamation, privacy violations, misinformation, plagiarism, the erosion of the presumption of innocence, covert advertising and the uncritical use of artificial intelligence. It further considers the opportunities provided by artificial intelligence for document classification, summarisation, multilingual source tracking and routine news production. The chapter concludes that the future value of journalism will depend less on speed than on verification, contextualisation, ethical judgement and protection of the public interest. Journalism can remain sustainable by using technology without allowing professional values to be determined by technology.

Keywords - journalism; sustainability; artificial intelligence; social media; mobile journalism; journalism ethics; public interest

INTRODUCTION

Although the emergence of newspapers on the stage of history is associated with Acta Diurna in 59 BC, the profession of journalism is not as old as newspapers. Since newspapers did not acquire their classical form as we know it today until the eighteenth century, journalism as a profession could not truly develop either. For a long period, newspapers did not go beyond functions such as reporting daily events, announcing the decisions of rulers to the public, or publishing literary texts. For this reason, journalism was long considered within a structure similar to the profession of writing (Conboy, 2008; Wright, 2016). The political, economic and social transformations brought about by the Industrial Revolution and the American and French Revolutions made an important contribution to the emergence of the profession of journalism as we understand it today. In

particular, the acceleration of urbanisation and the development of democracy were decisive in journalism becoming an independent profession. In the nineteenth century, the development of mass publishing and newspapers becoming part of everyday consumption accelerated the institutionalisation of the profession. Newspapers entering people's homes every day became an important means of satisfying society's seemingly endless need for news and information. As newspapers reached wider audiences and their sales increased, the profession of journalism also grew and developed. Thus, particularly in the large metropolises of the nineteenth century, journalism increasingly became a respected and institutionalised profession (Nord, 2015; Shattock, 2020).

In the twentieth century, the development of radio and television meant that journalism was no longer limited to newspapers and began to operate through different means of communication. These developments also led to the diversification of news types and increased specialisation within journalism (Briggs and Burke, 2009). This century was important not only for the development of the journalism profession but also for the institutionalisation of journalism education. The Missouri School of Journalism, founded by Walter Williams in 1908, became one of the important examples of the institutionalisation of journalism education at higher education level in the United States. Following this development, journalism became both an academic field of study and one of the important professions of everyday life in many countries around the world (University of Missouri, 2026). The continuation of journalistic activities through different media such as radio, television, newspapers and magazines led to the diversification of news types and the development of specialisation within the profession. Journalism, which became specialised in many areas ranging from art to sport and from economics to politics, achieved a strong professional and institutional structure in the second half of the twentieth century. During this period, journalists played an active role in almost every stage of the news production process, from researching and producing news to verifying and publishing it (Briggs and Burke, 2009).

In the first quarter of the twenty-first century, developments in internet technologies brought the profession of journalism into a profound process of transformation. Initially, Web 1.0 technology provided journalism with a new medium in which news could be published alongside

newspapers, radio and television. However, with the development of Web 2.0 technologies and particularly social media, the production, distribution and consumption of journalism changed considerably. Although this transformation has sometimes been regarded as journalism moving towards disappearance, it can essentially be considered a painful process of change in which the profession is attempting to adapt to new technological and social conditions (Hermida, 2010). The starting point of this study is the idea that this transformation does not represent the disappearance of journalism but rather a process in which the profession is being reshaped.

Web 2.0 and Social Media

Although internet technology first began with the ARPANET project in 1969, it did not have a significant effect on the wider social structure until the development of the World Wide Web (WWW) and its opening to public use in the 1990s (Berners-Lee and Fischetti, 1999; Leiner et al., 2009). Social media and Web 2.0 technology are among the most important developments through which the internet has affected many structures. This structure has removed many of the boundaries surrounding the dissemination of information over the internet and has largely eliminated the distinction between producer and consumer. The fact that information can be disseminated on the internet through programmes that do not require specialist knowledge has played a role in removing these boundaries (Benkler, 2006). Wikipedia is one of the most important factors in the removal of this boundary. Wikipedia is a free encyclopaedic programme available on the internet. The revolutionary nature of this programme does not merely lie in its being an online dictionary. The entries within the encyclopaedia are written by internet users. Traditional encyclopaedias, such as AnaBritannica, consist of information written by experts. Wikipedia, on the other hand, has made it possible for this information to be written by everyone. This has, of course, meant that being an expert on a subject is no longer a requirement for writing something about that subject (Benkler, 2006; Khamsi, 2005).

Wikipedia's structure, which transcended existing boundaries, and the ease with which all kinds of information could be written on the internet resulted in even ordinary information finding a place on websites. Facebook, founded in 2004, also created a revolutionary structure in the removal of

these boundaries. People's photographs and posts suddenly began circulating on the internet, and ordinary information about individuals became widespread online (boyd and Ellison, 2007; Karaman and Tuğluk, 2019). While personal posts were dominant at first, over time social media became a source of news and enabled ordinary people to produce news as well. This situation contributed to the emergence of citizen journalism. Institutions or individuals who were the subjects of news began to make direct posts through their own personal pages, causing some news stories prepared by traditional journalists to lose their currency. Thus, readers acquired the opportunity to obtain news without an intermediary (Hermida, 2010). A study of media use has also shown that the internet is used prominently for accessing information and that informing and providing news remain central expectations of media (Karaman, 2010).

Web 3.0 technology has taken Web 2.0 technology to a higher level and has enabled internet information related to an individual's interests to appear before them. Within this structure, referred to as the Semantic Web, information appearing according to an individual's interests and curiosity has begun to eliminate the cumbersome structure of traditional journalism (Berners-Lee et al., 2001). In traditional media, the press and broadcasting require particular processes, as well as time and money. Social media journalism, by contrast, is not dependent on these elements to the same extent; it requires fewer processes and is inexpensive or free. News can be produced or updated instantly. There is no situation of "it has been published and it is finished", as there is in traditional media. This has also encouraged readers to consume news through social media (Zamith, 2019).

Mobile Technologies

Another factor that has accelerated the habit of consuming news through social media rather than traditional media, while also increasing citizen and institutional journalism, is the development of mobile technologies. During the 1990s, the mobile phone became part of our lives. Mobile communication ceased to be a luxury or something used solely for business purposes and became part of everyday life through mobile phones. Apple's introduction of the iPhone in 2007 was another technological development that profoundly changed traditional news consumption and production. This technology facilitated the use of social media tools and the

production of content for those platforms. Developing technologies transformed the telephone into a portable computer and paved the way for the development of citizen journalism and access to news from anywhere (Westlund, 2013).

With access to a mobile phone, publishing news became something that anyone could do, while news began to be consumed through these smart devices that people carried with them at all times. Mobile phones, which initially possessed simple technologies, are today equipped with cameras capable of producing images superior to those of many cameras and have become powerful devices capable of carrying out almost all the news production processes formerly performed by traditional media equipment. Through these phones and high-speed internet, an individual can access news from anywhere, make it available to others, or disseminate any kind of information throughout the world (Okumuş & Karaman, 2025). The multiplication of previously limited news sources, particularly through mobile technologies, and people's exposure to news from a wider variety of sources have contributed to the decline in the use of traditional media (Newman et al., 2025; Westlund, 2013).

Watch and Listen Instead of Reading

It would not be wrong to say that social media platforms such as YouTube and Instagram have reduced the habit of reading news today. Since watching and listening to news is easier than reading texts in traditional media, news consumption is also evolving in this direction. Written news in traditional media occupies an increasingly smaller place among news consumption preferences. Even relatively older media systems that provide news using Web 1.0 technology have become less preferred because of the development of habits of listening to and watching news. In addition, people's tendency not to seek out news that does not automatically appear before them has also reduced the readership of newspapers providing news through Web 1.0 technology (Newman et al., 2025). These changes also increase the importance of media literacy, since internet access and the frequency of television, internet and newspaper/magazine use are associated with media literacy levels (Karaman and Karataş, 2009).

The increase in internet speed and the ability to transmit visual and video content rapidly have further reduced people's interest in textual news. In traditional journalism, news is gathered, photographed and written.

Today, however, news must also be supported by video and visual elements during this process. Otherwise, the news may remain outside the interests of the news consumer (Newman et al., 2025).

News Gathering and Ethics

Web 2.0 and social media, mobile technologies, the understanding of “Watch and Listen Instead of Reading”, and new forms of journalism are among the factors that negatively affect the profession of journalism. Nevertheless, these technological advances cannot change certain fundamental structures that journalism has developed throughout its historical development. News-gathering processes and ethical principles are foremost among these. These two elements have become even more important, particularly with the increasing use of artificial intelligence in journalism. This is because artificial intelligence is an important factor that further accelerates the production process of social media news that is rapidly consumed and disseminated. Artificial intelligence now occupies an important place in many stages of news production, from writing news to gathering information. Although it contributes to the speed of news production, it can significantly undermine ethical principles and information-gathering processes, particularly when news is produced according to trends (Jungherr and Schroeder, 2023; Zamith, 2019).

The most crucial point of traditional journalism has always been the news-gathering stage. This stage is essential to the formation of news and is one of the indispensable conditions of journalism serving the public. The stages involved in preparing a news story constitute the foundation on which accurate and reliable news is produced. In the new generation of journalism known as new media, the aim of producing as many news stories as possible and increasing click-through rates can reduce the quality of news. Although technologies have developed, news gathering remains a difficult and time-consuming process. Producing truly accurate and error-free news necessarily requires effort. Producing news while sitting at a computer is possible to a certain extent, particularly through data journalism. However, the originality of such news may not always be sufficient. Furthermore, a lack of originality also reduces the value of the news. It should not be forgotten that readers themselves can directly access the information circulating on the internet from which such news is produced. This can make it more difficult for news

to become original content serving the public interest (Kovach and Rosenstiel, 2021).

Whether the journalism of the new era is called citizen journalism, new media journalism or social media journalism, news is fundamentally produced within a system increasingly based on generating more clicks. Therefore, for those producing news to earn money from their work, click rates may become more important than the content of the news itself. In this situation, the process largely comes under the control of news algorithms. In other words, algorithms determine the value of news according to individual interests and preferences (Karaman and Yiğit, 2024). No matter how good a news story is, it may never appear before a sufficient number of readers because of algorithms (Zamith, 2019). In addition, advertising revenues, one of the most important elements of traditional media, have increasingly come under the control of social media platforms. As a result, the value and visibility of news increasingly come under the control of artificial-intelligence-supported algorithms (Bell and Owen, 2017). For these reasons, widely accepted ethical principles can be disregarded. Ethical principles may be violated in the following ways (Basın Konseyi, 2025):

- Demeaning and defamation: Content on social media that contains insults, uses accusatory headlines or targets individuals may result in the violation of this principle.
- Protection of private life: Sharing photographs, videos, messages or information relating to individuals' private lives without a public-interest justification may violate the privacy of private life.
- Verification of news: Publishing information without verification because of the pressure for speed in new media and failing to obtain the views of the parties concerned are among the important areas of ethical violation.
- Attribution and plagiarism: Using content produced by other news websites or social media accounts without identifying the source creates ethical problems.
- Presumption of innocence: Presenting individuals on social media as guilty when they are merely the subject of an allegation or investigation may violate the presumption of innocence.
- Protection of sources and recordings: Violating the confidentiality of a news source or making or publishing visual and audio recordings without permission may create ethical problems.

- Violence and hatred: Publishing content that encourages hatred, violence or bullying in order to generate engagement may result in violations of ethical principles.
- Separation of advertising from news: Presenting influencer content, sponsored news or covert advertising as news may eliminate the distinction between advertising and news.
- Right of reply and correction: Failing to correct an inaccurate story after it has been published online, or failing to give the person concerned an opportunity to respond, may result in the violation of this right.
- Protection of children: Sharing children's names, photographs, videos or information that could reveal their identities may violate ethical principles relating to the protection of children.
- Health news: Presenting health information in an exaggerated or sensational manner, or as though it provides certain results, for the purpose of attracting clicks may mislead audiences.
- Use of artificial intelligence: Failure to verify news produced or supported by artificial intelligence, or failure to disclose the use of artificial intelligence to the reader, may cause ethical problems.
- Social media: Professional principles of the press also remain applicable to news shared through social media.

These problems relating to the right to receive information, one of the fundamental elements of democracy, also remain relevant to news shared through social media.

These problems significantly undermine the right to receive information, which is one of the fundamental elements of democracy. Instead of receiving news, people may be exposed to manipulated, incomplete or directed information (Kovach and Rosenstiel, 2021).

The Dangers of Artificial Intelligence Journalism

People's intense exposure to online technologies in everyday life is accelerating news consumption. In this process, people increasingly use new media tools in order to access more news and more up-to-date news. While this situation increases the speed of news gathering and publication, it has also increased the use of artificial intelligence systems in journalistic methods. In particular, news generated by artificial intelligence according to online trends or with the aim of increasing click-through rates spreads very rapidly on the internet (Jungherr and Schroeder, 2023; Zamith, 2019).

Today, news websites using artificial intelligence produce large quantities of news, and individuals who consume news encounter such content intensively in their everyday lives. In fact, this system can also cause considerable harm to public-interest journalism. For this reason, the individual, interpretative and original character of news may be weakened by such content. At the same time, artificial intelligence journalism shaped entirely around increasing the number of clicks may, in some cases, produce partially or completely fabricated news stories. Within this structure, imaginary content independent of real people and events can be produced, allowing false news to be presented as though it were genuine news (Jungherr and Schroeder, 2023).

Future Perspective: The Transformation and Sustainability of Journalism

Throughout its historical development, journalism has entered a process of change with every new communication technology that has emerged. It has used paper, the printing press, the telegraph, radio, television and, finally, the internet, and has been shaped by them (Briggs and Burke, 2009). Today, with artificial intelligence and mobile technologies, the journalism profession has entered another process of transformation that is reshaping the profession rather than causing it to disappear. One of the most important positive aspects of new technologies for journalism is that they increase the opportunities available for news production. In addition, technologies have facilitated news broadcasting and removed the necessity for journalists to be tied to an institution. Particularly when mobile tools are used correctly, journalists are able to produce high-quality broadcasts from anywhere in the world without institutional editorial limitations. Artificial intelligence technology in particular provides considerable assistance to journalists in processes such as classifying documents, summarising long texts, following sources in different languages and preparing routine news stories (Zamith, 2019). Thus, journalists can devote a greater proportion of their time to fundamental professional activities such as research, news gathering, speaking with sources, verification and interpretation.

The fundamental factor that will make journalists valuable in the future will not be speed. The journalist's real strength lies in determining which information has news value, comparing different sources, verifying information, evaluating events within their social and historical contexts, and

protecting the public interest (Kovach and Rosenstiel, 2021). It should not be forgotten that “the journalist is the one who thinks the unthought”. Within this framework, the new era offers journalists many opportunities.

In the future, one of the fundamental values of journalism will be trust. The journalist of the future will not merely be a person who “provides news”, but also someone who verifies, explains, contextualises and makes sense of information. It is inevitable that this transformation will also affect journalism education. Classical journalism education is dead. It is certain that knowing only how to write news will no longer be sufficient for the journalist of the future. Journalists will need to know how to use artificial intelligence systems, understand social media platforms, analyse data, produce visual and video content, and use digital verification methods (Jungherr and Schroeder, 2023). The future of journalism will be based on a structure that can use technology without becoming a profession determined by technology. Those who choose journalism as a profession should never forget this. A form of journalism has emerged that can place accuracy against speed, editorial judgement against the algorithm, the public interest against clicks, and reliability against artificial content.

CONCLUSION

The profession of journalism has not disappeared in the face of technological developments. On the contrary, it is being reshaped by adapting to new conditions. For this reason, it would be very wrong to claim that the profession of journalism is dead. New technologies brought by the internet, social media, mobile technologies and artificial intelligence have significantly changed the ways in which news is produced and consumed. This change does not eliminate the fundamental functions of journalism. Accessing accurate information, verifying information, making sense of events, protecting the public interest and providing society with reliable news are currently among the most important and sought-after elements. The person who will perform these functions is the journalist.

In the future, the value of the journalist will derive not only from delivering news quickly, but from distinguishing accurate information from false information. Artificial intelligence and other technological tools have made the journalist’s work easier. Just as when the first personal computers

began to be used in journalism. This technology can only accelerate the news production process and enable news to reach wider audiences. In contrast, making ethical judgements, questioning sources, considering news within its context and protecting the public interest remain dependent on the journalism profession.

For this reason, the future of journalism will be shaped by the balance established between technology and professional values. A journalistic approach that uses technology correctly while refusing to abandon accuracy, reliability, ethics and the public interest is emerging. Technological transformation should be regarded not as the end of journalism, but as the beginning of a new understanding of journalism.

REFERENCES

- Basın Konseyi. (2025). Basın meslek ilkeleri. <https://basinkonseyi.org.tr/basin-meslek-ilkeleri/>
- Bell, E., and Owen, T. (2017). The platform press: How Silicon Valley reengineered journalism. Tow Center for Digital Journalism.
- Benkler, Y. (2006). The wealth of networks: How social production transforms markets and freedom. Yale University Press.
- Berners-Lee, T., and Fischetti, M. (1999). Weaving the Web: The original design and ultimate destiny of the World Wide Web by its inventor. HarperSanFrancisco.
- Berners-Lee, T., Hendler, J., and Lassila, O. (2001). The semantic web. Scientific American, 284(5), 34–43. <https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0501-34>
- boyd, d. m., and Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 13(1), 210–230. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00393.x>
- Briggs, A., and Burke, P. (2009). A social history of the media: From Gutenberg to the Internet (3rd ed.). Polity.
- Conboy, M. (2008). Newspaper, history of. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), The international encyclopedia of communication. Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405186407.wbiecn037>
- Hermida, A. (2010). Twittering the news: The emergence of ambient journalism. Journalism Practice, 4(3), 297–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17512781003640703>
- Jungherr, A., and Schroeder, R. (2023). Artificial intelligence and the public arena. Communication Theory, 33(2–3), 164–173. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/qtad006>
- Karaman, M. K. (2010). Öğretmen adaylarının TV ve internet teknolojilerini kullanma amaç ve beklentilerinin medya okuryazarlığı bağlamında değerlendirilmesi. Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 3(2), 51–62. <https://doi.org/10.12780/UUSBD71>
- Karaman, M. K., and Karataş, A. (2009). Öğretmen adaylarının medya okuryazarlık düzeyleri. İlköğretim Online, 8(3), 798–808.

- Karaman, M. K., and Tuğluk, S. (2019). İletişim fakültesi öğrencilerinin Instagram'ın gözetim aracı olarak kullanılmasına ilişkin algıları. *Atatürk İletişim Dergisi*, 17, 69–94.
- Karaman, M. K., and Yiğit, İ. (2024). Yeni medya bölümü öğrencilerinin algoritma okuryazarlıkları üzerine bir araştırma. *Erciyes İletişim Dergisi*, 11(1), 155–180. <https://doi.org/10.17680/erciyesiletisim.1338510>
- Khamisi, R. (2005). Reference revolution. *Nature*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/news050314-17>
- Kovach, B., and Rosenstiel, T. (2021). *The elements of journalism: What newspeople should know and the public should expect* (4th ed.). Crown.
- Leiner, B. M., Cerf, V. G., Clark, D. D., Kahn, R. E., Kleinrock, L., Lynch, D. C., Postel, J., Roberts, L. G., and Wolff, S. S. (2009). A brief history of the Internet. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, 39(5), 22–31. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1629607.1629613>
- Newman, N., Ross Arguedas, A., Robertson, C. T., Nielsen, R. K., and Fletcher, R. (2025). Digital news report 2025. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism. <https://doi.org/10.60625/risj-8qqf-jt36>
- Nord, D. P. (2015). The Victorian city and the urban newspaper. In R. R. John and J. Silberstein-Loeb (Eds.), *Making news: The political economy of journalism in Britain and America from the Glorious Revolution to the Internet* (pp. 73–106). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199676187.003.0004>
- Okumuş, M. H. & Karaman, M. K. (2025). İletişim fakültesi öğrencilerinin haber okuryazarlığı düzeyleri ile seçici maruz kalma durumları arasındaki ilişki. *Turkish Studies*, 20(4), 2565-2583. <https://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.87497>
- Shattock, J. (2020). Cultural agents and contexts: The professionalisation of journalism. In D. Finkelstein (Ed.), *The Edinburgh history of the British and Irish press, volume 2: Expansion and evolution, 1800–1900* (pp. 153–194). Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.3366/edinburgh/9781474424882.003.0008>
- University of Missouri. (2026). School of Journalism. <https://catalog.missouri.edu/schoolofjournalism/>
- Westlund, O. (2013). Mobile news: A review and model of journalism in an age of mobile media. *Digital Journalism*, 1(1), 6–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2012.740273>
- Wright, B. J. (2016). Ancient Rome's daily news publication with some likely implications for early Christian studies. *Tyndale Bulletin*, 67(1), 145–160. <https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.29414>
- Zamith, R. (2019). Algorithms and journalism. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.779>

A Technical and Harmonic Analysis of The Piano Accompaniment in the Piece “Seni Seviyorum”

Zeynep EKİZ¹
Sercan ÖZKELEŞ²

-
- 1- Bilim Uzm.; Ordu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müzik Bölümü
Zeynepekiz52@gmail.com ORCID No: 0009-0003-0197-5483
 - 2- Prof. Dr.; Ordu Üniversitesi Müzik ve Sahne Sanatları Fakültesi Müzikoloji Bölümü
sercanozkeles@odu.edu.tr ORCID No: 0000-0003-2845-5667
 - 3- This study was derived from the master's thesis entitled Instrumental Techniques and Harmonic Elements in Piano Accompaniments: The Example of the Album with Piano Accompaniments for Singing, conducted under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Sercan Özkeleş.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine the technical and harmonic elements employed in the piano accompaniment of the piece “*Seni Seviyorum*”, included in the album *Piano Accompaniment for Singing*. The study employed a survey model, and the data were analyzed and interpreted through document analysis. An examination of the technical and harmonic structure of the piece revealed that sixteenth-note patterns, slurs, double notes, and three-note chords were predominantly employed. In terms of dynamics, the markings *p*, *mf*, *f*, *crescendo*, and *decrescendo* were used. In addition to root-position and inverted chords, both plagal and authentic cadences were identified. Furthermore, delayed resolutions of V7/I and the use of inversions in conjunction with the secondary dominant (DD) were observed. The harmonic structure also included tonicizations toward the dominant (V) chord (D7) through the A7 chord and toward the sixth-degree chord (Em) through a rootless VII7 chord. The accompaniment concludes with a V–I authentic cadence in its final measures. Overall, the findings indicate that a variety of technical and harmonic elements are employed in the piano accompaniment of the piece.

Keywords: Piano, Accompaniment, Accompanist, Instrumental Technique, Harmonic Analysis

INTRODUCTION

The piano is an instrument that requires the simultaneous use of auditory, physical, and cognitive skills, with imagination and discipline playing a prominent role in its performance (Gasımova, 2011:105). Due to its polyphonic capabilities and distinctive structural characteristics, the piano occupies an important position as a fundamental instrument in various fields. Its lack of intonation problems, wide range capable of accommodating both female and male voices, and rich harmonic capacity make it particularly suitable for accompaniment. Furthermore, its ability to support aural and vocal training and to imitate the characteristics of different instruments contributes to its suitability as an accompaniment instrument (Say, 1997:325; Kurtuldu, 2016:324).

Accompaniment, which has an important place in piano performance, can be defined as a complementary musical structure with distinctive characteristics that supports and enriches a melody performed by a solo instrument or voice. The concept of accompaniment is also expressed through the term *Korrepetition* or *repetiteurship*. *Korrepetition* refers to the practice of accompanying a voice or another instrument with an instrument, most commonly the piano. The piano is widely used to accompany vocalists as

well as string and wind instruments. The ability to vary dynamic expression according to the force applied to the keyboard enables accompanists to convey their musical interpretations more effectively, thereby contributing to the widespread use of the piano in both solo performance and accompaniment settings.

Harmonic and stylistic developments across different historical periods have influenced the evolution of accompaniment practices. Piano accompaniment is also regarded as an essential tool in the learning process, particularly in supporting intonation and developing students' attention, coordination, and perception of polyphony (Demiray, 2023:42). From both educational and performance perspectives, piano accompaniment is not merely a technical skill. Beyond performance itself, accompaniment fulfills multiple musical functions during activities and rehearsals, supporting both the orchestra and the soloist while naturally revealing the harmonic and structural integrity of a musical work. During accompaniment, the accompanist may simultaneously undertake the roles of soloist, supporting soloist, music coach, and performance partner, depending on the requirements of the musical context (Kurtuldu, 2016:324).

The accompanist and vocalist should perform with mutual coordination. While singing, the vocalist should communicate the emotional content of the performance to the accompanist, while the accompanist should respond by progressing together with the vocalist in accordance with the structure and rhythmic characteristics of the work (Kaptanoğlu & Çanakçı, 2015:199).

A pianist working as an accompanist is expected to possess strong sight-reading, improvisation, and transposition skills. In addition to interpreting accompaniment parts, the accompanist should be able to follow composers' intentions, respond to the demands of a choir conductor, and understand fundamental stage practices and choreography in theater, dance, and ballet performances within the performing arts. The ability to provide accompaniment spontaneously and adapt to the requirements of a performance is also essential. An accompanist should continuously develop their knowledge of music and literature and should not be limited to performance-oriented skills. Rather, a multifaceted approach incorporating psychological, pedagogical, and artistic dimensions enables the accompanist to contribute both as an educator and as a guide.

For an effective accompaniment performance, it is important for the accompanist to possess knowledge of musical genres and styles from different historical periods and to understand the technical and timbral characteristics of various instruments. The accompanist should be familiar with the technical, harmonic, and musical characteristics of the piano part being performed and should be able to rapidly analyze its relationship with the solo part. In addition, an understanding of the relationship between voice and breathing, the ability to analyze vocal ranges, and sensitivity to vocal

qualities contribute to the realization of a highly effective performance (Demirova, 2010:256).

In this context, Gülşen Şimşek's book *Şan İçin Piyano Eşlikli Albüm (Album with Piano Accompaniments for Singing)* can be regarded as an important resource for developing the accompanist's musical expression and interpretive skills in both educational processes and stage applications. The piece "Seni Seviyorum" by L. V. Beethoven, included in *Şan İçin Piyano Eşlikli Albüm*, constitutes a valuable source for examining piano accompaniment from technical and harmonic perspectives. Accordingly, this study aims to examine the technical and harmonic structure of the piano accompaniment in "Seni Seviyorum" and to identify the musical elements employed in the work. Revealing the technical and harmonic characteristics of the piano accompaniment is expected to contribute to a better understanding of the musical structure of the work within the context of piano accompaniment for singing.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Technical and harmonic elements acquire meaning in relation to one another. Innate talent alone may not fully contribute to musical expression and interpretation unless it is integrated with a musical perspective. Technical skills are important not only for improving physical execution but also for developing musical understanding, aural skills, and theoretical knowledge. In this respect, technique encompasses much more than speed and practical proficiency; it is a comprehensive concept that includes rhythm, dynamics, articulation, and forms of artistic expression. Accordingly, the development of both technical competence and an understanding of harmonic structures can contribute to a more professional level of musical performance (Gasımova, 2011:100).

In this context, individuals should be able to perceive the works they study through inner hearing and perform them by understanding their structure, stylistic characteristics, character, tempo, and musical expressive elements. Determining the interpretive and expressive characteristics of a work in advance is one of the fundamental factors shaping the way technical practice is translated into musical expression. At the same time, pianists should establish clear goals and continuously develop their musical understanding. This approach, which forms the foundation of technical development, facilitates the resolution of technical challenges and contributes to the integration of musical thought with technical skills. Technical practice carried out without a specific purpose or musical understanding, however, may remain detached from artistic expression. Therefore, establishing the intended performance objectives in advance is of great importance for ensuring that technical practice is both effective and adequate.

Harmony is a field with both artistic and scientific dimensions that examines the combination of sounds according to various principles and explains the construction, functions, and applications of chords. Harmony is regarded as one of the fundamental elements of music and constitutes a basic structural component of polyphonic music. In addition to establishing the technical principles governing the combination of sounds, harmony is also considered a branch of music theory that addresses the functional dimensions of relationships among sounds (İlerici, 1974:22).

In the construction of piano accompaniment, it is important to consider harmonic structure and rhythmic organization as an integrated whole. The harmonic structure of an accompaniment can be enriched through the use of diatonic and chromatic passing tones, leading tones, tension tones, and arpeggios. Furthermore, utilizing the functional characteristics of chords and employing them in different inversions can provide greater richness and variety to the accompaniment. The use of major and minor scales as well as various modes can further contribute to the development of an accompaniment that is both technically effective and harmonically expressive.

METHOD

Research Model

In this study, a survey model was employed to examine the technical and harmonic elements used in the piano accompaniment of L. V. Beethoven's "*Seni Seviyorum*", included in the book *Şan İçin Piyano Eşlikli Albüm*. The survey model is a research approach that aims to objectively describe the current state of a phenomenon that exists either in the present or has existed in the past (Karasar, 2010).

Study Group

The study group consisted of L. V. Beethoven's "*Seni Seviyorum*", included in *Şan İçin Piyano Eşlikli Albüm*, which was written for soprano and tenor voice types.

Data Analysis

Document analysis was employed to analyze the data obtained in the study. "Document analysis involves the analysis of written materials containing information about the phenomenon or phenomena targeted for investigation" (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2021, p. 189).

The instrumental techniques and harmonic elements employed in the accompaniment of the piece were examined by categorizing them into relevant components. In the analysis of the technical elements used in the piano accompaniment, the frequency and functions of elements such as

arpeggios, chords, octaves, dynamics, and articulations were examined. In the harmonic analysis, elements including the tonal structure, chords and chord progressions, non-chord tones, modulations, and related harmonic features were analyzed and interpreted.

FINDINGS

Findings and Interpretations Regarding the Technical and Harmonic Analysis of the Piano Accompaniment in “Seni Seviyorum”

SENİ SEVİYORUM
(Ich Liebe Dich) L. van BEETHOVEN
(1770 – 1827)

Andante



mf Sev - dim se - ni se - nin gi - bi kö - tü ve i - yi gün - de pay - laş - tık ha - ya -

p

I	V 4/3	V 6/5	I	I 4/3	I+6
G	D7	D7	G	G	G+

From a technical perspective, the piano begins with the right hand in the first measure, marked *p* (piano), and predominantly provides accompaniment through the use of slurs within sixteenth-note patterns. A crescendo marking is used in measure 6.

In terms of harmonic structure, the left-hand part in the first six measures supports the melody through the use of the I–V–I scale degrees and octave notes in half-note values. In measure 6, D# is used as an auxiliary tone. Chord inversions and augmented fifth (+5) chords are also employed.

7

ti tek-rar bû - tün güç-lük - le - ri - le. *mf* İz - di - rap - la - rı -

7

mf *p*

IV DD → I6/4 V7 V7/I I V..... DD4/3 DD7V..... V6 V....
C A7 G D7 D7/G G D A7 D

From a technical perspective, the accompaniment continues in the right hand with slurs involving double notes. A *decrescendo* marking is observed in measure 8, an *mf* dynamic marking in measure 9, and a *p* dynamic marking in measure 11.

In terms of harmonic structure, a tonicization of the I degree (G) through an A7 chord on the II degree is observed in measure 7, while a delayed resolution of V7/I occurs in measure 9. In measure 11, inversions are used together with the secondary dominant (DD). The sixteenth-note double notes in this measure are also used as passing tones.

13

miz din-di do - ğan her ye - ni_ gün - de sen kal - bi - me ne - şe ver-din göz

13

DD4/3 DD7 V V V DD4/3 V IV6 I6/4 V7 I
A7 D D D A7 → D C G D7 G

18

yaş - la - rım din - dir - din ke - der - le - ri - mi ve_ *mf*
dolce

18

V6 I DD4/3 → V7 I V7
C G A A7 D7 G D7

I	V7	I
G	D7	G

From a technical perspective, beginning in measure 16, the continuous articulation of the sixteenth notes following the sixteenth-note rests at the beginning of each measure, connected through slurs, suggests the continuation of a different structural approach compared with the preceding figure. The *crescendo* marking in measure 20, the *f* dynamic marking and fermata in measure 21 are particularly noteworthy. The melody presented between measures 22 and 29 is reproduced identically to the melody introduced in measures 1–10 of the piece.

In terms of harmonic structure, repeated tonicizations toward the dominant (V) chord (D7) through the A7 chord are observed in measures 13, 15, and 19. The harmonic progression between measures 13 and 21 is structured around the IV–I and V–I degrees. Both root-position and inverted chords are employed. In measure 21, the use of block chords with a half cadence on the dominant is observed.

IV	DD	14/3	~~V~~ 7	VI	I7
C	A7	G	D7	→	Em
					G7

From a technical perspective, beginning in measure 27, double notes and three-note chords in the right hand, articulated through slurs, form an accompanying figure that supports the melody. In some measures, the soprano and accompaniment parts employ the same dynamic markings, including *f* and *p*. A *diminuendo* (Dim.) marking is used in measure 28, followed by a *crescendo* marking in measure 29.

In terms of harmonic structure, a tonicization of the VI degree (Em) through a rootless D7 (VII7) chord is observed in measure 28. In the left hand, harmonic movement is characterized by inversions of chord tones and octave notes, together with IV–DD–I and VII–VI–I degree progressions in the bass line.

IV	I7	IV	DD	I	V7	I	V7	I	V7
C	G7	C	A7	G	D7	G	D7	G	D7

I	V7	I	IV6/4	I6	V7	I	V7.....	I
G	D7	G	C	G	D7	G	D7	G

From a technical perspective, three-note chords are observed in both the right- and left-hand parts in measures 30–34. Beginning in measure 33, the sixteenth- and eighth-note patterns accompanied by double notes in the left hand and octave notes in the right hand contribute movement and rhythmic vitality to the accompaniment. D-major scale tones are used in the final measures of the accompaniment. The *crescendo* marking leads to the conclusion of the solo piano accompaniment in the final two measures.

In terms of harmonic structure, plagal and authentic cadences are observed through IV–I and V7–I progressions. The use of the secondary dominant (DD), as well as root-position and inverted chords, is also observed. In the final measures of the accompaniment, the piece concludes with a V–I authentic cadence within the D-major scale.

Considering the piece as a whole from technical and harmonic perspectives, the piano accompaniment is performed at an *Andante* tempo. The right hand predominantly continues with sixteenth-note patterns characteristic of Lied accompaniment, while the left hand features plagal and authentic cadences based on IV–I and V7–I progressions. The accompaniment also includes the use of block chords with a half cadence on the dominant, delayed resolution of V7/I, and inversions used in conjunction with the secondary dominant (DD). Tonicizations toward the dominant (V) chord (D7) through the A7 chord, toward the VI degree (Em) through a rootless VII7 chord, and toward the I degree (G) through the II-degree A7 chord are also noteworthy. Three-note chords in the right hand and Alberti-bass chord tones and inversions in the left hand contribute to an accompaniment texture that supports the melody. The melody concludes with a V–I authentic cadence in the final measures. From a dynamic perspective, *p*, *mf*, *f*, *crescendo*, and *decrescendo* markings are employed, along with *diminuendo* (Dim.) and fermata markings.

CONCLUSION

Based on the technical findings, it was determined that the use of different note values, particularly sixteenth-note patterns, contributes to a dynamic and flowing texture in the piano accompaniment. The slurs employed in the right hand were found to support the melodic continuity and flow of the vocal line. The *p* dynamic marking used in the piece creates a simple and balanced sound texture, allowing the vocal line to remain prominent, while the *crescendo* marking in measure 6 contributes to strengthening the musical expression. Furthermore, the piano solo accompaniment at the beginning of the piece serves to establish the musical context prior to the vocal entrance and contributes to the expressive development of the work.

Regarding the harmonic findings, the analysis revealed the use of harmonic structures such as the secondary dominant (DD) and rootless VII7, as well as

root-position and inverted chords. The auxiliary and passing tones used in the accompaniment were found to support the melodic structure, while the delayed resolution within the V7–I progression contributes to increased harmonic tension. The use of plagal and authentic cadences (IV–I and V–I) contributes to reinforcing the tonal center and maintaining harmonic coherence. In addition, the half cadence on the dominant, together with alterations and the use of augmented-fifth (+5) structures, contributes to the harmonic variety of the piece.

REFERENCES

- Demirova, G. (2010). Korrepetitörlük mesleğine genel bir bakış. Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 12(1), 255-267.
- Demiray, P. Ç. (2023). Overview of piano education in music teacher undergraduate programs. Journal of Contemporary Research in Education and Social Sciences (JOCRESS), 13(3), 10. <https://doi.org/10.26579/jocress.13.3.10>
- Gasıмова, T. (2011). Piyano öğrenme ve öğretme teknikleri. Atatürk Üniversitesi Güzel Sanatlar Enstitüsü Dergisi, (25), 99-106.
- İlerici, K. (1974). İş halinde üçlü sistem armoni. Millî Eğitim Basımevi.
- Karasar, N. (2010). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi (21. bs.). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kurtuldu, M. K. (2016). Piyano ile eşliğin önemi ve gerekliliğine yönelik ölçeğin geliştirilmesi. Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 19(35), 323-344.
- Say, A. (1997). Müzik tarihi. Müzik Ansiklopedisi Yayınları.
- Yıldırım, A., ve Şimşek, H. (2021). Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri. Seçkin Yayıncılık.

What Knowing a Language Means Now: Competence, Context and Language Technologies

Vesna Prodanovska-Poposka^{*}

¹Faculty of Biotechnical Sciences- University St. Kliment Ohridski-Bitola, N. Mcedonia
^{*}vesna.prodanovska@uklo.edu.mk

ABSTRACT

Language competence is often understood through what learners know about language, including vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation and the meanings associated with particular linguistic forms. In actual academic and professional communication, however, knowledge of linguistic forms does not necessarily guarantee that language users will be able to interpret, produce, adapt or apply those forms appropriately when situations change. This issue has become more complex as language use is increasingly mediated by technologies capable of processing, translating, recognising and generating language. The paper draws on three short practitioner columns by the author as starting points—one on Legal English terminology, one on ESP pronunciation, one on academic communication—and reads them through established work on communicative competence, the CEFR, and recent research on language technologies. The paper argues that language competence involves more than possession of linguistic knowledge. It also requires contextual interpretation, spoken production, pragmatic adaptation, mediation and, increasingly, the ability to work critically with technologies that process and generate language. Contemporary competence can therefore be understood as the ability to mobilise, evaluate and adapt linguistic resources in human and technologically mediated communicative situations.

Keywords – language competence; communicative competence; specialised language; pronunciation; pragmatic competence; mediation; natural language processing; generative artificial intelligence

INTRODUCTION

What does it mean to know a language? The question appears relatively simple when language learning is considered through familiar categories such as vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation or comprehension, yet it becomes less straightforward when learners are required to use what they know in situations that differ from those in which the language was learned. A student may be able to define a specialised term but hesitate when required to apply it to an unfamiliar situation; another may recognise a technical word immediately in written form but experience difficulty when asked to pronounce it during a presentation; an experienced academic may have extensive knowledge of English while still having to make careful linguistic decisions when writing a short institutional email, interpreting bureaucratic language or communicating across languages. These situations differ in content and purpose, but they share an important characteristic: linguistic knowledge is present, while effective language use requires something more.

The distinction between knowledge of language and the ability to use language appropriately has a long history in language education.

Communicative approaches challenged a narrow understanding of language learning by drawing attention to the knowledge and abilities required for meaningful communication rather than restricting competence to grammatical accuracy. Canale and Swain [1] conceptualised communicative competence through grammatical, sociolinguistic and strategic dimensions, while subsequent work developed the importance of discourse and pragmatic knowledge. Celce-Murcia [2] similarly argues for a broader conception in which linguistic knowledge is connected to discourse, sociocultural knowledge, formulaic language and interactional strategies. The action-oriented approach of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) extends this perspective: the 2020 Companion Volume treats language users as social agents and describes communicative competence through linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic resources, while also expanding the framework to include online interaction, mediation and a more detailed treatment of phonology [3].

This broader understanding is particularly relevant in English for Specific Purposes (ESP), where language learning is connected to the purposes, contexts and communicative needs of particular groups of learners [4]. Specialised language consequently cannot be separated easily from the professional or academic situations in which it is used.

At the same time, the conditions under which language is used have changed considerably since many established models of communicative competence were developed. Contemporary users increasingly work with natural language processing (NLP), machine translation, automatic speech recognition, writing assistants, conversational agents and generative artificial intelligence. These technologies can process, analyse, transform and generate language rather than simply provide access to it. A 2025 systematic review of 144 empirical studies published during 2023 and 2024 shows the rapid expansion of generative AI research in language learning and teaching, particularly in higher education and EFL contexts, with applications involving language skills, writing and feedback, interaction, learning strategies and implementation [5].

The development of these technologies raises a further question for language education. If a learner can ask a language model to explain a technical term, generate an email, translate a sentence, provide pronunciation support or reformulate a paragraph, what does it mean to say that the learner knows the language? The answer cannot simply be that technology has made linguistic knowledge less important. Rather, as language users increasingly rely on technologies capable of producing language, their ability to evaluate meaning, context, accuracy, appropriateness and communicative intention becomes more visible. Recent systematic reviews identify both pedagogical possibilities and limitations of generative AI, including support for feedback, interaction and personalised learning alongside concerns about overreliance, content quality, pedagogical limitations and academic integrity [5], [6].

The research draws on three short practitioner columns by the author—on Legal English terminology, ESP pronunciation, and academic communication—as starting points for a conceptual argument about what language competence involves when language is used in academic and professional settings.

The paper addresses three questions: what dimensions of language competence become visible when language knowledge is examined through actual academic and professional situations; what the distinction between knowing linguistic forms and using them reveals about language learning and teaching; and how technologically mediated language use, including NLP, automatic speech recognition and generative AI, adds to contemporary understandings of language competence. The contribution is conceptual: language competence in technologically mediated environments is best understood as overlapping capacities rather than a single measurable quantity.

FROM KNOWING LANGUAGE TO USING LANGUAGE

The idea that language competence involves more than knowledge of isolated linguistic forms is well established, although the ways in which this broader competence has been conceptualised have changed over time. Communicative approaches shifted attention from abstract knowledge of grammatical structures towards the ability to use language for meaningful communication, while later models emphasised the relationship among linguistic resources, social context, discourse and pragmatic meaning [1], [2].

The CEFR Companion Volume offers a particularly useful contemporary formulation because it distinguishes among linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic competences while placing these resources within communicative activities involving reception, production, interaction and mediation. Its expanded descriptor system also includes online interaction and a more detailed treatment of phonology [3]. Such an approach places knowledge within activity: competence becomes visible not only in what a person knows, but in what that person can accomplish with available linguistic resources.

Mediation is particularly relevant to this matter. The Council of Europe conceptualises mediation not simply as conventional translation or interpreting but as a range of activities through which language users make meaning accessible to others, including the mediation of texts, concepts and communication. Successful language use may therefore involve helping another person understand information rather than merely producing an original message [3]. This is particularly relevant in ESP, where language use is closely tied to disciplinary purposes and activities; in specialised academic and professional environments, users regularly explain disciplinary concepts, simplify institutional information, reformulate technical language for different audiences and communicate across linguistic and cultural boundaries.

Language technologies add a new layer to this connotation. A learner may now mediate information through a technological system as well as directly between people. For example, a student may formulate a question to an AI system, receive an explanation of a technical concept, compare that explanation with a disciplinary source, identify an inaccurate or contextually inappropriate statement, revise the information and finally explain the concept to another person. The communicative activity remains humanly meaningful even though part of the linguistic processing has been technologically mediated.

The contemporary question is consequently not simply whether learners can produce language without technological assistance. Language users increasingly need to determine when technology is appropriate, how to instruct it, how to evaluate its output, when to reject a suggestion and how to retain responsibility for the final meaning.

APPROACH AND SOURCE MATERIALS

The paper draws on three practitioner columns by the author as starting points for reflection.

The Legal English column, *When Knowing the Legal Term Is Not Enough*, describes a classroom activity involving first-year law students who had worked with common-law defences including necessity, consent, self-defence, duress and public duty. The original discussion interpreted the students' responses not simply as evidence of missing vocabulary knowledge, but as an indication that students were attempting to connect concepts they knew with facts in a new situation without consistently identifying which facts were legally decisive. [10]

The second column, *Making Room for Pronunciation in ESP*, reports a short questionnaire with ESP students concerning their difficulties with the pronunciation of specialised vocabulary. The students identified problems involving unfamiliar sounds, vowel length, consonant clusters, word stress and the pronunciation of longer technical words. They also pointed to classroom practices such as repetition, syllable division, stress practice, self-recording and the use of pronunciation tools as potentially useful forms of support. [11]

The reflective column on academic communication, *Things My Academic CV Does Not Mention*, is a reflective account rather than a classroom study. It describes forms of linguistic work that remain largely invisible in formal professional profiles, including interpreting institutional English, managing the tone of professional emails, adapting language for different audiences and dealing with multilingual communication. [12]

The three texts have different evidential status. The Legal English text contains a small classroom observation; the pronunciation text contains a

small questionnaire; and the academic communication text is reflective rather than empirical.

Those texts were analysed thematically, with attention to what learners or professionals need to do with language once basic linguistic knowledge is available. As for this purpose, four dimensions are discussed: contextual-conceptual competence, phonological and productive competence, pragmatic-interactional competence, and mediation.

FOUR DIMENSIONS OF COMPETENCE

A. Contextual-conceptual competence

The clearest illustration of the distinction between knowledge and use comes from the Legal English classroom. Before students were asked to apply the terminology, they had demonstrated that they could explain relevant concepts and identify definitions. On the surface, this suggested successful learning. When the terminology was embedded in a new case involving an unconscious patient who required urgent medical treatment, however, the distribution of responses changed: although 91% could identify the definition of public duty, only 60% selected it when applying the concept to the situation. These figures come from a single classroom activity.

The difference is pedagogically important because the incorrect answers were not random. Students selecting necessity were responding to the urgency of the medical situation, while those selecting consent were responding to the absence of consent from the patient. They were therefore attempting to connect learned concepts with features of the case, even though they did not consistently identify which facts were legally decisive. The difficulty can consequently be understood as a movement from semantic recognition to contextual interpretation rather than simply as a vocabulary deficit.

This distinction is particularly important in ESP because specialised terms operate within disciplinary systems rather than as isolated vocabulary items. Hutchinson and Waters [4] place learner needs and communicative purposes at the centre of ESP course design, meaning that specialised language needs to be considered in relation to the tasks and contexts in which learners will use it. The CEFR's action-oriented approach offers a related perspective by understanding proficiency through what language users can do with their resources in particular situations [3].

Definitions therefore remain an important foundation of specialised learning, but they need not constitute its endpoint. Once students know what a term means, they need opportunities to encounter it in situations where contextual information determines whether and how it should be used. Contextual-conceptual competence can thus be understood as the ability to connect specialised linguistic knowledge with the disciplinary situation in which that knowledge becomes meaningful.

The issue becomes even more relevant when language is mediated by technology. An AI system may provide a definition that is linguistically clear but too broad for a particular legal or scientific context. The learner who can evaluate the definition against disciplinary knowledge is doing something qualitatively different from the learner who simply accepts it because it sounds plausible. Contextual understanding therefore remains necessary even when technological systems make access to explanations almost immediate.

B. Phonological and productive competence

In the practitioner reflection on ESP pronunciation, students reported difficulties involving unfamiliar sounds, vowel length, consonant clusters, word stress and longer technical vocabulary, while some also experienced difficulty understanding native-speaker pronunciation.

The important point is that specialised vocabulary is not encountered only on a page. Technical terminology may need to be pronounced during a presentation, discussion, practical session or professional interaction, and a learner who recognises a term in writing may still need considerable support before being able to use it comfortably in speech. The CEFR Companion Volume's treatment of phonology is useful here because phonological competence is situated within broader communicative competences rather than treated as an isolated technical ability [3].

Contemporary technology creates additional opportunities for this development. Automatic speech recognition systems can allow learners to practise speaking, receive feedback and monitor their own production. A synthesis of 50 ASR studies in computer-assisted language learning found recurring evidence concerning the use of speech recognition for L2 pronunciation assessment and development, while also emphasising variation among studies and the need to examine the strength of individual claims. A 2024 meta-analysis likewise found ASR beneficial for supporting L2 pronunciation development [9].

The usefulness of such tools does not mean that their feedback should be treated as an unquestionable judgement. Jeon et al. [8] raise concerns about bias in speech-recognition chatbots, particularly where systems may be more closely attuned to native-speaker pronunciation. This matters for multilingual learners whose speech may be intelligible to human listeners while being less readily recognised by a particular system. Technological recognition is therefore not identical to human communicative intelligibility.

The connection with the practitioner reflection is clear because several strategies suggested by the students—recording themselves, using pronunciation tools, listening and repeating—can now be supported by widely available digital applications. The pedagogical task is not to replace pronunciation teaching with technology but to use technological feedback as one source of information while retaining human judgement about intelligibility and communicative success.

C. Pragmatic and interactional competence

The third text introduces a different dimension because it moves from classroom performance into the everyday professional communication of an academic. Experiences involving institutional English, professional emails and multilingual communication demonstrate that linguistic competence remains active even in apparently routine situations.

A short email, for example, can require decisions concerning formality, directness, politeness, professional distance and the relationship between writer and recipient. Institutional language may be grammatically transparent while remaining difficult to interpret because its meaning depends partly on organisational conventions and shared professional knowledge. These decisions correspond closely to pragmatic competence, which the CEFR identifies alongside linguistic and sociolinguistic competence [3].

The multilingual dimension adds another layer. A message that is grammatically correct in one language may acquire an unintended meaning when transferred too directly into another linguistic or institutional environment. This does not necessarily indicate insufficient general proficiency. Rather, it illustrates the continuing need to interpret relationships, conventions and communicative purposes.

Generative AI makes these pragmatic decisions more visible. An academic may now ask a system to draft an email, translate a message, alter its degree of formality or make it sound more diplomatic. The output may be grammatically fluent, yet the human user still needs to decide whether it accurately represents the intended relationship and communicative purpose. Recent reviews of generative AI in language education identify useful functions such as feedback, tutoring, interaction and conversation practice, but also concerns involving content quality, overreliance and pedagogical limitations [5].

D. Mediation and making meaning accessible

The reflective academic text also corresponds closely with the expanded CEFR concept of mediation. Much professional language activity consists neither of producing an entirely original text nor of translating one language word-for-word into another. Academics and professionals regularly explain institutional information, simplify complex instructions, reformulate disciplinary concepts for non-specialists, summarise information for colleagues and adapt messages for different audiences.

The CEFR Companion Volume explicitly expands mediation beyond conventional translation and interpreting and includes mediating texts, concepts and communication [3]. This perspective is particularly useful for understanding the less visible language work described in the reflective text because much of that work consists of making information accessible rather than simply producing language.

Contemporary AI systems can participate in some of these activities by summarising, translating, simplifying or reformulating texts. Yet the presence of technological mediation does not eliminate the need for a human mediator. If a language model simplifies a technical text, the user needs to establish whether an important qualification has been lost. If a translation system converts a disciplinary concept into another language, the user must determine whether the terminology remains accurate. If an AI system summarises an institutional document, the user needs to establish whether the summary preserves information that matters for the intended audience.

Digital mediation therefore creates situations in which human and technological mediation operate together. The central competence remains the ability to judge whether meaning has been preserved, adapted appropriately and made accessible to the intended audience.

DISCUSSION

A. Language competence in a technologically mediated environment

Li et al. [5] reviewed 144 empirical studies of generative AI in language learning and teaching, finding that higher education accounted for 86.7% of research contexts and EFL for 86.1%. The review illustrates the rapid expansion of research on AI-mediated language learning.

A contemporary language user may now need to evaluate language that has been produced or transformed by a technological system. A student who does not know a legal term can ask a large language model to explain it, but the task does not end with receiving a fluent explanation. The student still needs to determine whether the explanation corresponds to the disciplinary meaning required, whether the concept has been applied to the correct circumstances and whether an important distinction has been omitted.

Recent research on critical thinking supports the need for evaluation. Liu et al. [6], in a systematic review of 15 studies examining GenAI and LLMs in EFL education, identified both positive and negative effects on critical thinking, reporting potential benefits involving reasoning, evaluation and problem-solving alongside risks associated with overreliance and passive use.

Natural language processing also changes the pedagogical question. Some language processing can now be delegated to technology, so teachers increasingly need to consider which forms of processing should remain learner responsibilities and which forms of assistance can support them. When learners formulate precise prompts, evaluate generated language, identify inappropriate terminology, revise machine-produced text or compare AI output with disciplinary sources, they are engaging in linguistic and metalinguistic activities. Digital competence is therefore not detached from language competence; in many situations it is intertwined with it.

Automatic speech recognition provides a particularly clear example. ASR can provide additional opportunities to practise speaking, receive feedback

and monitor production, but its performance depends on the recognition model, training data, accents and linguistic varieties. Jeon et al. [8] raise concerns about systems that may be more closely attuned to native-speaker pronunciation. If a student records a technical term and an application fails to recognise it, the result should be understood as feedback from a particular system rather than an unquestionable judgement about communicative ability. Technological recognition is not identical to human communicative intelligibility.

Generative AI presents a similar issue. A system can produce an email, summarise an article, explain a scientific concept or generate a presentation script. The result may be grammatically polished and rhetorically convincing, yet fluency should not be confused with accuracy, contextual appropriateness or disciplinary validity. This is particularly important in specialised fields, where a technically incorrect statement can remain linguistically fluent. The learner can use technology while remaining responsible for deciding what the language means, whether it is appropriate, whether it is accurate and whether it should be communicated to another person.

B. Assistance and delegation

A useful distinction for language education is between assistance and delegation. A digital tool may assist a learner by retrieving a word, demonstrating a pronunciation, offering alternative formulations or providing feedback. In each case, the learner remains the agent who evaluates the output and decides whether to use it. Delegation occurs when the learner hands over the production of meaning to the system and accepts the result without the capacity to assess it. Assistance supports competence; delegation substitutes for it.

The same technology can serve either function. A student who asks an AI system for three possible ways to phrase a formal request, compares them, and chooses the one that best fits the relationship and purpose is using the tool as assistance. A student who asks the same system to write the request, sends it unread, and could not explain why the wording is appropriate has delegated. The tool is identical; the competence being exercised is not.

This distinction clarifies what language teaching should aim for in AI-mediated environments. The goal is not to prevent learners from using generative tools, nor to treat them as inherently corrupting. It is to design tasks in which the learner remains responsible for evaluation, revision and the final communicative choice. Recent reviews show that generative AI can support learning while also creating risks of overreliance and reduced analytical engagement [5], [6]. The assistance/delegation distinction gives teachers a way to think about which side of that line a given task falls on. Assistance depends on the learner's evaluative competence; delegation bypasses it.

C. Towards a multidimensional understanding of language competence

The comparison of the three practitioner texts, together with contemporary developments in language technologies, suggests that language competence is better understood as an interconnected set of capacities than as a single measurable quantity. The dimensions identified here should not be treated as five independent skills. They overlap continuously and become visible according to the activity being performed.

Contextual-conceptual competence concerns the ability to connect specialised linguistic knowledge with the facts and circumstances of a particular situation. Phonological and productive competence becomes visible when written recognition has to become spoken use. Pragmatic and interactional competence concerns the adaptation of language to audience, relationship, purpose and institutional context. Mediation involves making meaning accessible by explaining, reformulating, simplifying or adapting information for another person or group; the CEFR Companion Volume places it alongside reception, production and interaction and gives it a central place in contemporary communication [3].

Unlike the first four dimensions, this one is not visible in the three columns; it is a response to the technological environment in which contemporary language use occurs. Digital-evaluative competence overlaps with existing constructs such as critical digital literacy and AI literacy, but it foregrounds a specific responsibility: the user's accountability for meaning when language has been produced or transformed by a system. It is not simply technical knowledge of how to operate a tool. A learner who can use an AI system but cannot recognise a misleading explanation has technological access without sufficient evaluative competence; a learner who can question, compare and revise the output is engaging in a more complex form of language use.

BRINGING THIS INTO THE CLASSROOM

Specialised vocabulary instruction remains essential, particularly in ESP, but recognition and definition need not be treated as the final stage of learning. The Legal English case suggests returning to specialised terms through situations in which students interpret information, compare alternatives, make decisions and explain their reasoning, so that vocabulary becomes connected to contextual use.

Pronunciation likewise benefits from being connected to specialised language rather than treated as an unrelated component. Learners need opportunities to hear, repeat, practise and use technical terms orally, while digital tools can expand these opportunities through ASR and speech-enabled applications, provided that learners are taught to interpret automated feedback critically rather than equating technological recognition with communicative success.

Professional communication should receive explicit attention through activities in which students write emails, ask for clarification, participate in discussions, present technical information, explain procedures and reformulate information for different audiences. Such activities correspond closely to the CEFR emphasis on production, interaction and mediation and reveal forms of competence that may remain invisible in traditional language exercises.

AI-supported language work can be incorporated through tasks that require evaluation rather than simple production. For example, students might examine an AI-generated explanation of a legal case and identify where concepts have been confused, thereby preserving the importance of disciplinary knowledge while developing the evaluative abilities required in technologically mediated communication.

Across these activities, assistance and delegation should remain distinct. A digital tool may assist a learner in retrieving a word, hearing a pronunciation, generating alternative formulations or receiving feedback, but the learner should remain capable of understanding and evaluating what the tool produces.

The goal is not to keep technology outside the language classroom, but to ensure that technological assistance contributes to the development of language competence rather than replacing the cognitive and communicative processes that make such competence meaningful.

CONCLUSION

The three columns discussed in this paper began as separate pieces of professional reflection, each responding to a particular experience: students applying legal terminology to an unfamiliar situation, ESP learners discussing pronunciation difficulties, and an academic reflecting on forms of linguistic work that remain invisible on a conventional CV. Considered together, they make visible a lack that conceptual work on communicative competence has long described: linguistic knowledge remains necessary, but it cannot by itself account for what users do with language in academic and professional situations.

Knowing a specialised term does not necessarily mean knowing when it applies; recognising a technical word does not necessarily mean being able to pronounce it intelligibly; knowing English does not remove the need for pragmatic and multilingual decisions; and understanding information does not necessarily mean being able to make it accessible to another person.

The technological environment adds additional level here. Learners and professionals increasingly interact with systems that translate, transcribe,

summarise, generate and evaluate language. These developments do not make linguistic competence less important. They make the ability to evaluate language more important, because users increasingly encounter language that has been generated or transformed by another system. A technically plausible answer still needs to be judged against its context; an automated pronunciation result still needs to be interpreted in relation to human intelligibility; a translation still needs to be checked for disciplinary meaning; an AI-generated professional message still needs to represent the writer's intended relationship and purpose.

The question for contemporary language teaching may consequently no longer be only, "Do my students know this?" It may also be: What can they do with what they know, what can they recognise when the context changes, and how critically can they work with the technologies that increasingly mediate language use? This broader question does not diminish the value of linguistic knowledge. It places that knowledge within the communicative, professional and technological environments in which language users now have to act.

REFERENCES

- [1] Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
- [2] Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. In E. Alcón Soler & M. P. Safont Jordà (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 41–57). Springer.
- [3] Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment—Companion volume*. Council of Europe. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages>
- [4] Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning-centred approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- [5] Li, B., Tan, Y. L., Wang, C., & Lowell, V. (2025). Two years of innovation: A systematic review of empirical generative AI research in language learning and teaching. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 9, 100445. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100445>
- [6] Liu, J., Sihes, A. J. B., & Lu, Y. (2025). How do generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools and large language models (LLMs) influence language learners' critical thinking in EFL education? A systematic review. *Smart Learning Environments*, 12, 48. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-025-00406-0>
- [7] Lo, C. K., Yu, P. L. H., Xu, S., Ng, D. T. K., & Jong, M. S. Y. (2024). Exploring the application of ChatGPT in ESL/EFL education and related research issues: A systematic review of empirical studies. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11, 50. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00342-5>

- [8] Jeon, J., Lee, S., & Coronel-Molina, S. M. (2024). Rethinking AI: Bias in speech-recognition chatbots for ELT. *ELT Journal*, 78(4), 435–445. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccae035>
- [9] Ngo, T. T.-N., Chen, H. H.-J., & Lai, K. K.-W. (2024). The effectiveness of automatic speech recognition in ESL/EFL pronunciation: A meta-analysis. *ReCALL*, 36(1), 4–21. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344023000113>
- [10] Prodanovska-Poposka, V. (2026a). When knowing the legal term is not enough. *ELT Digest*. <https://eltdigest.org/when-knowing-the-legal-term-is-not-enough/>
- [11] Prodanovska-Poposka, V. (2026b). Making room for pronunciation in ESP. *EFL Magazine*. <https://eflmagazine.com/making-room-for-pronunciation-in-esp/>
- [12] Prodanovska-Poposka, V. (2026c). Things my academic CV does not mention. Medium. <https://medium.com/@vesna.prodanovska/things-my-academic-cv-does-not-mention-02842bf2c983>

From Toolbox to Architecture. Institutional Embedding in EU Cyber Diplomacy

**Andreea Nicoleta Dragomir^{*1}
Cătălin Nicolescu²**

¹Faculty of Law, Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, Romania

²Faculty of Law, Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, Romania

^{*}(andreea.dragomir@ulbsibiu.ro) Email of the corresponding author

ABSTRACT

This article examines the institutional evolution of European Union cyber diplomacy through the development of the Cyber Diplomacy Toolbox and its progressive integration into the wider architecture of EU external action. Using qualitative legal-institutional analysis and structured documentary analysis, the study traces institutional developments from the 2015 Council Conclusions on Cyber Diplomacy through EU legal and policy developments adopted in 2026. The analysis focuses on four dimensions: the formalisation of coordinated procedures, the range of EU actors formally assigned roles within those procedures, formal links between the Toolbox and adjacent external-action and crisis-management instruments, and the location and applicable decision rule of final political authority. The findings show that EU cyber diplomacy has become increasingly embedded in a broader configuration of CFSP instruments, cybersecurity bodies, hybrid-threat mechanisms, digital diplomacy and restrictive measures. However, this development has not produced a corresponding centralisation of politically sensitive authority, particularly on attribution and foreign-policy decision-making. The article therefore conceptualises the evolution of EU cyber diplomacy as institutional embedding without centralisation. This formulation identifies how the institutional framework for coordination can become denser while the applicable CFSP decision rules and national attribution determinations remain unchanged. The study concludes that the current architecture is functionally interconnected but legally plural, while whether denser coordination produces more coherent action in practice remains an empirical question beyond the documentary corpus.

Keywords – EU cyber diplomacy; Cyber Diplomacy Toolbox; institutional embedding; CFSP; cybersecurity governance; administrative coordination; cyber sanctions; EU external action

INTRODUCTION

Cyber diplomacy has become an increasingly significant component of the European Union's external and security action. Yet its institutional development cannot be adequately described as a simple expansion of the Union's capacity to sanction malicious cyber activity. When the Council established the Framework for a Joint EU Diplomatic Response to Malicious Cyber Activities in 2017, commonly referred to as the Cyber Diplomacy Toolbox, its objectives were already broader than punitive response. The framework was intended to contribute to conflict prevention, mitigate cybersecurity threats, and promote greater stability in international relations, while allowing the Union and its Member States to draw on measures available under the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), including

restrictive measures where necessary [1]. The Toolbox was therefore conceived from the outset as a framework combining diplomatic coordination, prevention, signalling and response rather than as a sanctions mechanism alone.

This distinction matters because the subsequent evolution of EU cyber diplomacy is better understood as a change in institutional depth and connectivity. The shift from an incident-based to a more strategic approach, expressly articulated in the 2023 Revised Implementing Guidelines [5], is one expression of that change rather than an alternative explanation of it. The academic literature has documented the gradual broadening of EU cybersecurity beyond its earlier sectoral settings [2], [3]. Carrapico and Farrand describe cybersecurity as a genuinely transversal EU policy and, particularly in the regulatory domain, identify a movement towards increased oversight and more hierarchical EU governance [4]. This paper asks whether the institutional deepening of cyber diplomacy has produced a comparable centralisation of final decision-making authority.

The 2023 Revised Implementing Guidelines of the Cyber Diplomacy Toolbox make this institutional development particularly visible. Rather than replacing the original framework, they expressly complement its incident-based approach with sustained, tailored, coherent and coordinated strategies towards persistent cyber threat actors [5]. They also connect cyber-diplomatic action to shared situational awareness, strategic communication, cooperation with international partners, other EU toolboxes and crisis-management mechanisms. Administratively, the Guidelines set out an agreed procedural framework for decision-making involving Member States, the European External Action Service, Commission services, Council bodies and relevant Union agencies and networks. The Horizontal Working Party on Cyber Issues plays a central role in evaluating the situational awareness provided for a possible joint EU diplomatic response, while assessments may involve SIAC, the Commission, ENISA, CERT-EU, Europol and, where appropriate, EU-CyCLONe [5]. The resulting architecture is therefore not merely an accumulation of instruments. It increasingly connects diplomatic decision-making with information-sharing, risk assessment, crisis management and broader external-policy coordination.

This development nevertheless stops short of institutional centralisation. Under the CFSP, politically sensitive decisions relevant to the Toolbox remain subject to the applicable Treaty decision rules, which as a rule require unanimity in the Council (Articles 24(1) and 31(1) TEU), while political attribution remains a sovereign determination of each Member State. Decision (CFSP) 2019/797 expressly states that targeted restrictive measures do not amount to attribution of responsibility for cyber-attacks to a third State [9]. At the same time, the 2023 Guidelines provide that coordinated political attribution at EU level may be pursued on the basis of shared situational awareness [5]. EU-level coordination of attribution can therefore coexist with

national determination. The legal literature identifies continuing tensions concerning attribution, State responsibility, and the Union's legal position in responding to cyber operations [6], while recent research continues to identify fragmented governance and limits on political coordination [7].

Against this background, this article asks: how has the EU Cyber Diplomacy Toolbox evolved from a framework for joint diplomatic response into an increasingly embedded component of the Union's broader external cyber action? Institutional embedding is used here to describe the progressive formalisation of coordinated procedures, the widening range of EU actors assigned roles within those procedures, the creation of formal links with adjacent external-action, security and crisis-management mechanisms, and the relationship between these developments and the location and applicable rules of final decision-making authority. This does not imply the emergence of a centralised EU cyber foreign policy. The distinction between embedding and centralisation provides the study's analytical lens.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

A. Research Design and Analytical Framework

This study employs a qualitative legal-institutional analysis combined with structured documentary analysis. Its unit of analysis is not the individual cyber incident or restrictive measure, but the **institutional position of the Cyber Diplomacy Toolbox within the wider architecture of EU external action**. This choice reflects the study's purpose: to determine whether EU cyber diplomacy can be identified in changes to institutional arrangements, coordination procedures, and decision-making structures rather than inferred only from an increasing number of instruments or responses.

The analysis distinguishes carefully between legal and policy sources. Council decisions adopted under the CFSP, Council Regulation (EU) 2019/796 adopted under Article 215 TFEU, and implementing regulations amending its annex are examined as binding Union acts within their respective Treaty frameworks. Council conclusions, implementing guidelines and strategic documents are treated instead as evidence of policy orientation, institutional design and agreed procedures; they are not attributed the legal effects of binding Union acts. This distinction is particularly important in cyber diplomacy, where operational coordination has developed substantially through Council and CFSP structures without a corresponding transfer of all relevant political authority from the Member States to the Union.

For the purposes of this study, institutional embedding is operationalised through four indicators: (1) the formalisation of procedures for coordinated cyber-diplomatic action; (2) the range of EU actors formally assigned a role in those procedures; (3) formal connections between the Cyber Diplomacy Toolbox and adjacent instruments or mechanisms of EU external, security and crisis action; and (4) the location and applicable decision rule of final political

authority. Centralisation, conversely, is defined as a reallocation of final decision-making authority away from unanimity-based CFSP decision-making or national attribution determination, for example through qualified-majority decision-making, delegated final authority to another Union body, or a binding Union-level attribution determination. Embedding without centralisation is therefore observed where indicators (1)–(3) deepen while indicator (4) remains substantially unchanged. Since indicators (1)–(3) are evidenced primarily through Council policy instruments and procedural guidelines, they are treated as evidence of agreed institutional design rather than proof of implementation in practice.

B. Documentary Corpus and Selection Criteria

The primary-source corpus covers the period from the Council Conclusions on Cyber Diplomacy of February 2015 to September 2026. The starting point is appropriate because the 2015 Conclusions articulated a common and comprehensive EU approach to cyber diplomacy and linked diplomatic and legal instruments to conflict prevention, cybersecurity-threat mitigation and international stability [8].

The corpus includes the 2017 Framework for a Joint EU Diplomatic Response to Malicious Cyber Activities [1]; the 2017 Implementing Guidelines of the Cyber Diplomacy Toolbox [27]; the 2019 legal framework for cyber restrictive measures established by Council Decision (CFSP) 2019/797 and Council Regulation (EU) 2019/796 [9], [10]; the 2022 Council Conclusions on the EU Cyber Posture [11]; the 2022 frameworks on digital diplomacy and coordinated responses to hybrid campaigns [12], [13]; the 2023 Revised Implementing Guidelines of the Cyber Diplomacy Toolbox [5]; and the listing acts and alignment statements adopted under the cyber-sanctions regime through September 2026 [17]–[19], [24]–[26]. The 2019 instruments are treated separately from the wider Toolbox because they establish the binding legal framework through which targeted restrictive measures may be imposed. The 2022 documents are included because they expressly connect cyber response with resilience, crisis management, partnerships and other components of EU external action.

Documents were selected purposively where they performed at least one of four functions: defining the objectives of EU cyber diplomacy; establishing or revising a response mechanism; allocating institutional or coordinating responsibilities; or connecting cyber diplomacy to other EU external-action, security or crisis-management instruments. The primary corpus is complemented by peer-reviewed legal, international-relations and EU-governance scholarship addressing cyber diplomacy, attribution, sanctions, institutional coordination and policy coherence. The corpus is purposive rather than exhaustive and is therefore designed to identify institutional connections, not to estimate their prevalence across the entirety of EU external action. The scholarship reviewed diverges on whether expanding EU cyber

governance is producing more hierarchical Union governance [4] or incremental adaptation that continues to coexist with fragmented governance and limited political leadership [7].

C. Analytical Procedure

The documents are examined chronologically and grouped for presentation into three analytical clusters: 2015–2017, 2019–2022 and 2023–2026. These groupings organise the selected milestones and do not imply the absence of relevant developments between them. At each stage, the four indicators are applied to procedures, participating actors, inter-instrumental linkages and final decision authority.

The method does not measure the operational effectiveness or deterrent effect of EU cyber diplomacy. It identifies formal institutional design and documented change, not the implementation of those arrangements in individual incidents. Because the corpus is purposively selected, it is more sensitive to evidence of institutional connectivity than to its absence. The analysis is also limited to the publicly accessible text of the 2023 Guidelines and does not include non-public annexes.

RESULTS

A. Initial Formalisation: 2015–2017

The documentary record shows that, from 2015, the Council addressed cyber diplomacy through dedicated conclusions as part of EU external action. The 2015 Council Conclusions recognised cybersecurity, international law, norms of responsible State behaviour, Internet governance, cyber capacity-building and strategic cyber relations as matters affecting EU external policies, including the Common Foreign and Security Policy. They also called for a coherent international cyberspace policy involving cooperation with international partners, organisations, civil society and the private sector [8].

The 2017 Framework for a Joint EU Diplomatic Response to Malicious Cyber Activities translated this policy orientation into a common response structure. The framework identified measures available within the CFSP, including restrictive measures where necessary, as suitable components of a joint EU diplomatic response and connected that response to conflict prevention, threat mitigation, international cooperation and longer-term influence on malicious actors [1]. The 2017 Implementing Guidelines further placed malicious cyber activities within the wider contexts of hybrid threats and resilience [27].

At this stage, procedures for shared situational awareness and joint response had been formalised; the actor configuration remained centred on Member States, Council preparatory bodies, the EEAS and selected EU bodies; links with hybrid-threat and crisis arrangements were emerging; and final decision authority continued to follow existing CFSP procedures and national attribution determinations.

B. Legal and Strategic Consolidation: 2019–2022

A second phase is visible between 2019 and 2022. In May 2019, Council Decision (CFSP) 2019/797 and Council Regulation (EU) 2019/796 established a legal framework for targeted restrictive measures against cyber-attacks threatening the Union or its Member States [9], [10]. These instruments added a legally structured sanctions component to the wider diplomatic framework. The first listings under the regime were adopted in July 2020 [24].

EU cyber diplomacy also became linked to a broader set of strategic objectives. The 2022 Council Conclusions on the EU Cyber Posture organised EU action around resilience, solidarity and crisis management, international cooperation, capacity-building and the ability to prevent, discourage, deter and respond to malicious cyber activity [11]. In the same year, the Council adopted conclusions on EU Digital Diplomacy and on a coordinated EU response to hybrid campaigns [12], [13]. These instruments placed cybersecurity within wider frameworks of digital external policy and hybrid-threat response.

The documentary record therefore shows an increase in both the legal density and the functional connections surrounding the Cyber Diplomacy Toolbox. By 2022, cyber diplomacy was no longer documented solely through instruments addressing malicious cyber activities, but also through instruments addressing resilience, digital diplomacy, defence, and hybrid threats. By 2022, formalisation had increased through the addition of a binding restrictive-measures regime and wider strategic frameworks, while the applicable CFSP decision rules and national determination of attribution remained unchanged.

C. Broader Institutional Embedding: 2023–2026

The most substantial procedural development appears in the 2023 Revised Implementing Guidelines. The revised framework expressly complements the incident-based approach with “sustained, tailored, coherent and coordinated strategies” towards persistent cyber threat actors [5]. It provides for strategic response notes based on risk assessments and links them to relevant geographical strategies and Council working parties.

The Guidelines also expand the administrative architecture supporting decision-making. The Horizontal Working Party on Cyber Issues is given, as a matter of agreed procedure, a central role in evaluating the situational awareness provided for a possible joint EU diplomatic response. Information and assessments may additionally involve SIAC, the Commission, ENISA, CERT-EU, Europol and, where appropriate, EU-CyCLONe [5]. The same document expressly links the Toolbox to EU Digital Diplomacy, the Cyber Posture, cyber-defence policy, other EU toolboxes and crisis-management mechanisms, while preserving the applicable Member State prerogatives [5].

This broader connectivity continued after 2023. The 2025 International Digital Strategy placed digital and technological issues more explicitly within

EU external action and identified cybersecurity, secure infrastructure, partnerships and global digital governance as areas for international cooperation [14]. The Council subsequently endorsed closer alignment between digital policies and foreign and security objectives and called for stronger cooperation between the Commission, the High Representative and the Member States [15].

Inter-toolbox connectivity was already explicit in 2022, when the Council stated that the Cyber Diplomacy Toolbox could contribute to a coordinated EU response to hybrid campaigns and called for cooperation and synergies between the relevant instruments [13]. The 2026 conclusions reaffirmed this approach, calling for full use of the Cyber Diplomacy Toolbox against malicious cyber activities and identifying both the cyber-sanctions regime and the restrictive-measures framework concerning Russia's destabilising activities as tools available for responding to hybrid threats [16].

The sanctions regime remained operational within this wider architecture. In March 2026, Council Decision (CFSP) 2026/588 and Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2026/589 introduced new listings under the cyber-sanctions regime [17], [25]. In July 2026, Council Decision (CFSP) 2026/1713 and Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2026/1714 further amended the respective CFSP and Union-law lists [18], [26]. On the same day, a declaration by the High Representative on behalf of the EU publicly denounced Russia's malicious cyber ecosystem and identified the 16th Centre of the Russian Federal Security Service as controlling cyber threat groups including TURLA [28]. Eight European partner countries subsequently aligned themselves with Decision (CFSP) 2026/1713 [19].

Across the period examined, the documentary corpus therefore records three observable developments: increasing procedural formalisation, a growing number of institutional connections between cyber diplomacy and adjacent EU policy mechanisms, and continued reliance on Member State participation in politically sensitive decisions.

DISCUSSION

A. Institutional Embedding without Centralisation

The findings indicate substantial institutional development in EU cyber diplomacy, but not a corresponding transfer of final political authority. The Cyber Diplomacy Toolbox has become increasingly integrated into a wider configuration of actors, procedures and policy mechanisms, while politically sensitive CFSP decisions remain subject to the applicable Council decision rules and political attribution continues to rest on national determination.

Carrapico and Farrand trace the expansion of EU cybersecurity beyond its earlier internal-market and justice-and-home-affairs settings into the CFSP and identify, particularly in the regulatory domain, increased oversight and more hierarchical EU governance [4]. The present findings qualify the

applicability of that tendency to cyber diplomacy: institutional connectivity has deepened, but the CFSP decision rule and national control over attribution have not undergone a comparable hierarchical shift.

Barrinha's concept of diplomatisation provides a useful wider frame for understanding this development. He describes the emergence of cyber diplomacy through processes of institutionalisation and positioning that gradually bring cyber issues within established diplomatic practices [20]. The concept of institutional embedding used here addresses a narrower question. Rather than explaining how cyber diplomacy emerged as a diplomatic field, it identifies how, within the EU, cyber-diplomatic action has become incorporated into an increasingly interconnected administrative and foreign-policy architecture. Institutional embedding is narrower than Barrinha's diplomatisation, which explains the emergence of cyber diplomacy through institutionalisation and positioning [20], and different from Pawlak's crisis-driven learning, which explains adaptation over time [7]. It also bears a family resemblance to the new intergovernmentalism's account of "integration without supranationalism" [29]. The concept is not advanced here as a new general theory of European integration. Its narrower purpose is to operationalise the procedural interconnection of legally distinct instruments, actors and decision routes within EU cyber diplomacy through observable indicators.

Attribution illustrates the distinction particularly clearly. Decision (CFSP) 2019/797 separates restrictive measures from attribution of responsibility to a third State [9], while the 2023 Guidelines permit coordinated political attribution at EU level without displacing national determinations [5]. Collective political attribution also occurs through declarations of the High Representative on behalf of the EU, as demonstrated in July 2026 [28]. Such declarations coordinate a common political position but do not establish a binding Union attribution determination. Poli and Sommario address the related legal separation between cyber sanctions and the attribution of international responsibility, arguing that the Union is poorly placed to invoke third-State responsibility directly [6].

The resulting configuration is neither a collection of autonomous national cyber policies nor a centralised EU cyber foreign policy. It is a layered system in which common procedures increasingly structure the exercise of authority without eliminating its differentiated legal and political location. This distinction between integrating governance structures and centralising final decision-making authority is central to understanding the current stage of EU cyber diplomacy.

B. Coordination as a Governance Function

The findings further suggest that coordination should not be regarded merely as a preliminary stage preceding substantive cyber-diplomatic action. Within

the institutional architecture that has developed around the Toolbox, coordination has itself become a governance function.

Shared situational awareness, risk assessments, strategic response notes, inter-service exchanges and interaction between Council structures and specialised EU bodies do more than describe channels of communication. As designed in the 2023 Guidelines, these arrangements are intended to shape the informational and procedural environment in which political choices are prepared; whether they do so in practice cannot be established from the documentary corpus. Under the Guidelines, what is recognised as a common threat, what information enters collective assessment, and which response options are considered are to be prepared through organised administrative interaction. Coordination does not replace political decision-making; it structures the formal conditions under which such decision-making is prepared.

This finding develops Pawlak's account of EU cyber diplomacy as a process of learning and adaptation generated by successive crises [7]. Pawlak identifies incremental institutional, policy and operational change while also noting continuing fragmentation and limited political leadership. One institutional expression of that adaptive process is proceduralisation: repeated exposure to cyber threats has produced more stable interfaces between actors and more explicit procedures for gathering information, coordinating assessments and preparing collective responses.

The 2025 special forum frames the Russia–Ukraine war as a catalyst for a more comprehensive and action-oriented EU cyber diplomacy [21]. Within that forum, Fasola, Lucarelli and Moro show that the EU response relied substantially on activating and connecting pre-existing instruments and accelerating existing strategic and legislative developments [22]. This finding is consistent with the interpretation advanced here that institutional development has occurred primarily through greater connectivity and procedural integration rather than institutional replacement.

This inter-toolbox logic predates 2026. The 2022 hybrid-response framework expressly envisaged the Cyber Diplomacy Toolbox as part of the response to hybrid campaigns [13], while the 2026 conclusions reaffirmed and further operationalised the need for coherence across the relevant instruments [16]. Contemporary cyber diplomacy therefore increasingly operates within an interconnected set of response mechanisms rather than through a self-contained Toolbox.

This development, however, generates its own administrative problem. Institutional density should not be equated with institutional coherence. Additional interfaces can improve the capacity to combine expertise and mobilise different instruments, but they can also produce overlapping responsibilities, additional coordination costs and uncertainty over which mechanism should organise a particular response. The architecture therefore

contains a structural tension: the same institutional plurality that provides flexibility may also complicate collective action.

The distinction matters analytically. A system may become more deeply coordinated without becoming simpler, more centralised or automatically more effective. The development of EU cyber diplomacy should therefore be assessed not by the number of mechanisms connected to the Toolbox, but by whether those mechanisms enable dispersed actors to convert shared assessment into timely and politically sustainable action.

C. The Legal and Administrative Significance of the Emerging Architecture

Institutional embedding is consistent with an apparent paradox in EU cyber diplomacy: the institutional framework for coordination can deepen even where the underlying distribution and rules of final legal authority change comparatively little.

From an administrative perspective, governance capacity does not depend solely on holding final decision-making authority. The ability to aggregate information, generate shared assessments, coordinate specialised bodies, connect crisis-management mechanisms and prepare diplomatic responses can materially shape collective action even where the final political decision remains with the Member States or within intergovernmental CFSP structures. The evolution of the Cyber Diplomacy Toolbox is therefore consistent with, but cannot on its own establish, a broader pattern in which coordination arrangements expand faster than formal political authority.

Renard argues that EU cyber partnerships pursue not only bilateral objectives but also reflexive and structural purposes, including developing the Union's own cyber-diplomatic agency [23]. The present corpus, however, provides only limited evidence on this external dimension, principally through third-country alignment with listing decisions [19], and does not establish a systematic connection between cyber partnerships and the Union's internal coordination architecture.

From a legal perspective, this architecture remains differentiated. Only CFSP decisions and Regulation (EU) 2019/796, together with the implementing regulations amending its annex, are binding acts adopted on Treaty legal bases; Council conclusions and implementing guidelines are political instruments without binding legal effect, while crisis-management arrangements rest on other instruments. Their interaction therefore does not constitute a single unified legal regime.

Administrative integration does not alter the Treaty rules governing this architecture. CFSP decisions in this regime are adopted by the Council under Article 29 TEU, subject to the unanimity rule in Article 31(1) TEU; measures under Article 215 TFEU depend on a prior CFSP decision; and the Court of Justice may review individual restrictive-measures listings despite its otherwise limited CFSP jurisdiction under Articles 24(1) TEU and 275 TFEU.

The principal contribution of this analysis is therefore to identify institutional embedding without centralisation as a specific configuration of EU cyber diplomacy: an incremental densification of procedures, actor interfaces and inter-instrumental links without a corresponding change in the CFSP decision rule or in national determination of attribution. The concept accounts for a more structured cyber-diplomatic framework without treating institutional density as evidence of either legal unification or operational effectiveness.

CONCLUSION

This article has examined the institutional evolution of EU cyber diplomacy through the development of the Cyber Diplomacy Toolbox and its progressive connection to the wider architecture of EU external action. The analysis indicates that the move from incident-based to more strategic response announced in 2023 is part of a broader shift in institutional connectivity, but it has not taken the form of centralisation.

Across the period examined, procedures became more formalised, the range of actors assigned institutional roles widened, and connections with crisis-management, digital-diplomacy, hybrid-threat and restrictive-measures instruments became more explicit. At the same time, relevant CFSP decisions remain governed by the applicable Council decision rules and each Member State retains its own determination on political attribution.

From an administrative perspective, the findings indicate that the institutional framework for coordination can expand without a corresponding transfer of final political authority. From a legal perspective, the architecture remains plural: binding CFSP and Article 215 TFEU acts coexist with non-binding Council conclusions, procedural guidelines and distinct crisis-management arrangements. Institutional embedding therefore describes integration of procedures and interfaces, not legal unification.

Further research should test how these formally agreed arrangements operate in concrete cyber incidents and whether greater institutional connectivity produces more timely, coherent and sustainable external action.

REFERENCES

- [1] Council of the European Union, *Council Conclusions on a Framework for a Joint EU Diplomatic Response to Malicious Cyber Activities* (“Cyber Diplomacy Toolbox”), Council document 10474/17, 19 June 2017.
- [2] A. Kasper, A.-M. Osula and A. Molnár, “EU cybersecurity and cyber diplomacy,” *IDP. Revista de Internet, Derecho y Política*, no. 34, pp. 1–15, 2021, doi: 10.7238/idp.v0i34.387469.
- [3] J. J. Piernas López, “La Unión Europea como actor internacional en materia de ciberseguridad,” *Cuadernos de Derecho Transnacional*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 712–736, 2022, doi: 10.20318/CDT.2022.7202.

- [4] H. Carrapico and B. Farrand, “Cybersecurity Trends in the European Union: Regulatory Mercantilism and the Digitalisation of Geopolitics,” *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 62, no. S1, pp. 147–158, 2024, doi: 10.1111/jcms.13654.
- [5] Council of the European Union, *Revised Implementing Guidelines of the Cyber Diplomacy Toolbox*, Council document 10289/23, 8 June 2023.
- [6] S. Poli and E. Sommario, “The Rationale and the Perils of Failing to Invoke State Responsibility for Cyber-Attacks: The Case of the EU Cyber Sanctions,” *German Law Journal*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 522–536, 2023, doi: 10.1017/glj.2023.25.
- [7] P. Pawlak, “Forged in Crises: Learning and Adaptation in the European Union’s Cyber Diplomacy,” *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 765–780, 2025, doi: 10.1163/1871191X-bja10227
- [8] Council of the European Union, *Council Conclusions on Cyber Diplomacy*, Council document 6122/15, 11 February 2015.
- [9] Council Decision (CFSP) 2019/797 of 17 May 2019 concerning restrictive measures against cyber-attacks threatening the Union or its Member States, OJ L 129I, 17.5.2019, pp. 13–19.
- [10] Council Regulation (EU) 2019/796 of 17 May 2019 concerning restrictive measures against cyber-attacks threatening the Union or its Member States, OJ L 129I, 17.5.2019, pp. 1–12.
- [11] Council of the European Union, Council Conclusions on the Development of the European Union’s Cyber Posture, Council document 9364/22, 23 May 2022.
- [12] Council of the European Union, EU Digital Diplomacy: Council Conclusions, Council document 11406/22, 18 July 2022.
- [13] Council of the European Union, *Council Conclusions on a Framework for a Coordinated EU Response to Hybrid Campaigns*, Council document 10016/22, 21 June 2022.
- [14] European Commission and High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, *An International Digital Strategy for the European Union*, JOIN(2025) 140 final, 5 June 2025.
- [15] Council of the European Union, *Council Conclusions on Advancing the International Digital Strategy for the European Union*, Council document 15315/1/25 REV 1, 20 November 2025.
- [16] Council of the European Union, *Council Conclusions on Advancing the European Union’s Capacity to Counter Hybrid Threats*, Council document 7349/26, 16 March 2026.
- [17] Council Decision (CFSP) 2026/588 of 16 March 2026 amending Decision (CFSP) 2019/797 concerning restrictive measures against cyber-attacks threatening the Union or its Member States, OJ L, 2026/588, 16.3.2026.
- [18] Council Decision (CFSP) 2026/1713 of 13 July 2026 amending Decision (CFSP) 2019/797 concerning restrictive measures against cyber-attacks threatening the Union or its Member States, OJ L, 2026/1713, 13.7.2026.
- [19] High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, “Statement by the High Representative on behalf of the EU on the alignment of certain countries concerning restrictive measures against cyber-attacks threatening the Union or its Member States,” concerning Council Decision (CFSP) 2026/1713, 29 July 2026.

- [20] A. Barrinha, “Cyber-diplomacy: The Emergence of a Transient Field,” *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 439–466, 2024, doi: 10.1163/1871191X-bja10183.
- [21] J. A. Kooops, W. Vosse, J. Burton and G. Christou, “The European Union's Approaches to Cyber Diplomacy: Introduction to the Special Forum,” *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 743–747, 2025, doi: 10.1163/1871191X-bja10230.
- [22] N. Fasola, S. Lucarelli and F. N. Moro, “Cyber Diplomacy and the Russia–Ukraine War: The European Union's Response,” *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 749–764, 2025, doi: 10.1163/1871191X-bja10224.
- [23] T. Renard, “EU cyber partnerships: assessing the EU strategic partnerships with third countries in the cyber domain,” *European Politics and Society*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 321–337, 2018, doi: 10.1080/23745118.2018.1430720.
- [24] Council Decision (CFSP) 2020/1127 of 30 July 2020 amending Decision (CFSP) 2019/797 concerning restrictive measures against cyber-attacks threatening the Union or its Member States, OJ L 246, 30.7.2020, pp. 12–17.
- [25] Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2026/589 of 16 March 2026 implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/796 concerning restrictive measures against cyber-attacks threatening the Union or its Member States, OJ L, 2026/589, 16.3.2026.
- [26] Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2026/1714 of 13 July 2026 implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/796 concerning restrictive measures against cyber-attacks threatening the Union or its Member States, OJ L, 2026/1714, 13.7.2026.
- [27] Council of the European Union, Draft implementing guidelines for the Framework on a Joint EU Diplomatic Response to Malicious Cyber Activities – approval of the final text, Council document 13007/17, 9 October 2017.
- [28] High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Cyber / Russia: Statement by the High Representative on behalf of the European Union denouncing Russia’s malicious cyber ecosystem targeting the EU, its Member States and international partners, 13 July 2026.
- [29] C. J. Bickerton, D. Hodson and U. Puetter, “The New Intergovernmentalism: European Integration in the Post-Maastricht Era,” *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 703–722, 2015, doi: 10.1111/jcms.12212.

More Uxorio Cohabitation and Family Law: Property Relations, Legal Consequences and a Comparative Perspective

Greta Petriti¹

¹ Assistant Lecturer, “Aleksandër Moisiu” University, Albania

ABSTRACT

The increasing prevalence of stable cohabitation raises important questions concerning the legal consequences of family relationships established outside formal marriage. This article examines more uxorio cohabitation from a family-law perspective, focusing on property relations and the legal consequences arising from the termination of the relationship. The analysis begins with the Albanian legal framework, particularly the Family Code provisions concerning cohabitation, and examines their interaction with general civil-law rules on ownership and co-ownership. A comparative approach is then employed to examine selected models from Catalonia, Austria, Greece and the Dominican Republic, together with relevant Italian constitutional jurisprudence. The comparison demonstrates that legal systems adopt different approaches to balancing contractual autonomy, the distinction between marriage and cohabitation, legal certainty and the protection of economic interests generated during a stable common life. The Albanian framework recognizes cohabitation as a legally relevant factual union but leaves significant property questions dependent on private agreement and general civil-law rules. The article therefore considers possible directions for strengthening legal certainty and protecting legitimate economic interests without necessarily equating cohabitation with marriage.

Keywords: more uxorio cohabitation, family law, property relations, co-ownership, cohabitation agreement, comparative law, Albania.

1. INTRODUCTION

Family relationships are increasingly established through forms of living together that do not necessarily follow the traditional model of formal marriage. One of the most significant examples is stable cohabitation, commonly referred to in legal literature as *more uxorio* cohabitation. Although cohabitation does not establish the same legal status as marriage, it may generate a durable common life involving economic cooperation, shared expenditure, acquisition of property, childcare and mutual support.

The development of such relationships raises a fundamental legal question: what legal consequences should arise when a stable cohabiting relationship terminates, particularly where the parties have accumulated property or other economic interests during their common life?

The question is particularly significant where the parties have not entered into an agreement regulating their respective rights and obligations. Marriage generally operates within a statutory framework that establishes rules concerning property relations between spouses. Cohabitation, by contrast,

may occupy a less clearly defined legal position, with the parties relying to a considerable extent on contractual arrangements and, in the absence of such arrangements, on general civil-law principles.

The purpose of this article is to examine the legal regulation of *more uxorio* cohabitation, focusing specifically on property relations and the consequences arising upon the termination of the relationship. The analysis begins with Albanian family law and subsequently considers selected comparative models in order to identify different legislative approaches to stable cohabitation.

The comparative perspective is particularly relevant because jurisdictions have adopted substantially different solutions. Some systems preserve a strong distinction between marriage and cohabitation and rely primarily on general private-law rules. Others provide specific contractual mechanisms, while certain jurisdictions recognize stable cohabitation as a distinct legal status accompanied by broader property and family-law consequences.

Accordingly, this article addresses four principal questions. First, how is *more uxorio* cohabitation conceptualized under Albanian law? Second, how are property relations regulated where the parties have not concluded a cohabitation agreement? Third, what approaches have selected jurisdictions adopted concerning the economic consequences of stable cohabitation? Finally, what elements of comparative experience may be relevant to the further development of Albanian family law?

2. THE LEGAL CONCEPT OF MORE UXORIO COHABITATION IN ALBANIA

2.1. Definition and Main Characteristics

The Albanian Family Code expressly recognizes cohabitation as a legally relevant factual relationship. Article 163 defines cohabitation as a factual union between a man and a woman living as a couple and characterized by a common life presenting stability and continuity.

The definition contains several elements that are relevant from a legal perspective. First, cohabitation is based on a factual union rather than on the formal establishment of marital status. Second, the parties must live together as a couple. Third, the relationship must demonstrate stability and continuity.

The concept of *more uxorio* derives from Latin terminology referring to living in the manner of spouses. In legal usage, it describes a relationship in which

two persons establish a common life resembling family life, while remaining outside the formal institution of marriage.

The distinction between marriage and cohabitation is therefore important. Marriage is established through a legally prescribed formal procedure and generates a comprehensive set of statutory rights and obligations. Cohabitation, on the other hand, arises from the factual reality of a stable common life and does not automatically confer the full legal status of spouses.

Nevertheless, the absence of marital status does not mean that the relationship is legally irrelevant. A stable cohabiting relationship may generate economic interests, obligations towards children, contractual arrangements and disputes concerning property accumulated during the relationship.

The central legal difficulty is therefore not simply whether cohabitation should be treated in the same manner as marriage. Rather, it concerns the extent to which the law should recognize and protect the legitimate consequences produced by a stable common life.

3. PROPERTY RELATIONS BETWEEN COHABITANTS UNDER ALBANIAN LAW

3.1. Contractual Regulation

The Albanian Family Code provides cohabitants with the possibility of regulating the consequences of their relationship through an agreement. This contractual mechanism is particularly important because it allows the parties to determine in advance how their economic relationship will operate.

A cohabitation agreement may provide greater legal certainty concerning the ownership of property, the division of assets, financial contributions and the consequences of termination. In this respect, contractual autonomy provides cohabitants with an opportunity to adapt their economic relationship to their particular circumstances.

However, the practical significance of such agreements depends upon the parties being adequately informed of the legal consequences of their choices. The role of the notary is consequently relevant in ensuring that the parties understand the nature and effects of the agreement they conclude.

The contractual approach also raises the question of the limits of party autonomy. The possibility of regulating property relations by agreement should not be understood as an unrestricted ability to eliminate all forms of

legal protection. Principles of equality, legality and protection against abusive arrangements remain relevant to the validity and interpretation of such agreements.

3.2. The Absence of an Agreement

A more difficult situation arises where cohabitants have not concluded an agreement.

In such circumstances, the property consequences of the relationship cannot automatically be determined according to the statutory property regime applicable to spouses. Instead, the parties may need to rely on general civil-law rules concerning ownership, co-ownership and other relevant property claims.

This distinction has important evidentiary consequences.

Where an asset has been acquired during cohabitation, the mere existence of the relationship does not necessarily establish that the asset belongs jointly to both parties. The party claiming an ownership interest may be required to demonstrate the legal basis of that claim and, depending upon the circumstances, the contribution made toward the acquisition of the property.

Consequently, the ownership of property acquired during cohabitation may depend upon factors such as the title under which the property was acquired, the source of the funds, the contributions of each party and the available evidence.

This situation differs considerably from the legal framework applicable to spouses, where statutory property regimes may create presumptions concerning property acquired during marriage.

The issue becomes particularly complex when contributions are not exclusively financial. A cohabitant may contribute through childcare, household responsibilities, assistance in the professional activity of the other partner or other forms of support that indirectly facilitate the acquisition of property.

A purely formal assessment based exclusively on title or direct monetary contribution may therefore fail to reflect the complete economic reality of a long-term common life.

4. COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES ON MORE UXORIO COHABITATION

The legal treatment of stable cohabitation differs considerably among jurisdictions. The following examples demonstrate several regulatory models.

4.1. Catalonia

Catalonia represents one of the more developed examples of statutory recognition of stable cohabitation.

The legal framework evolved from Law 10/1998 on stable couples and was subsequently incorporated into Book Two of the Catalan Civil Code through Law 25/2010 concerning persons and family. Later legislative developments also established mechanisms for the registration of stable couples.

Under the Catalan framework, a couple may qualify as a stable couple where statutory conditions are satisfied, including a qualifying period of cohabitation, the existence of a common child or formalization through a public act.

The significance of the Catalan model lies in the fact that the law does not merely acknowledge the existence of cohabitation. It establishes a specific legal status and attaches defined legal consequences to that status.

These consequences may extend to property relations, compensation, maintenance, inheritance and other areas of family law.

The Catalan approach therefore demonstrates how legal certainty can be increased by establishing objective criteria for identifying a legally relevant stable relationship.

At the same time, Catalonia also illustrates the limits of complete equivalence between marriage and cohabitation, particularly because certain rights remain dependent upon additional conditions under state legislation.

4.2. Austria

Austria adopts a considerably more restrained approach.

Non-marital cohabitation does not generally generate a comprehensive statutory regime equivalent to marriage. Each cohabitant remains the owner of his or her property, while disputes arising following separation may be

addressed through general property, restitution, enrichment or compensation rules.

The Austrian approach emphasizes the legal distinction between marriage and cohabitation and places substantial importance on individual ownership and general private-law principles.

From a comparative perspective, this model demonstrates the consequences of leaving economic disputes between cohabitants primarily to ordinary civil-law mechanisms.

4.3. Greece

Greece has developed a specific contractual framework through Law 4356/2015 concerning the cohabitation agreement.

The law enables cohabiting partners to establish a formal agreement regulating important consequences of their relationship, including property matters.

An important characteristic of the Greek approach is the combination of contractual autonomy with statutory safeguards. The parties may organize their economic relationship while remaining subject to principles concerning equality and mutual assistance.

Where the agreement does not regulate particular property consequences, statutory rules may provide a supplementary basis for claims between the parties.

The Greek model is therefore particularly relevant to the Albanian context because it demonstrates how contractual freedom may be complemented by more detailed statutory provisions designed to provide greater legal predictability.

4.4. Dominican Republic

The Dominican Republic provides a different model concerning the property consequences of *more uxorio* cohabitation.

Under the relevant provisions of its Civil Code, community-property consequences may apply to certain forms of publicly established cohabitation. Once the relationship satisfies the relevant legal requirements, property acquired during the relationship may be subject to rules resembling those governing community property within marriage.

This model gives considerable importance to the economic community created through stable cohabitation.

Its comparative significance lies in demonstrating that a legal system may attach substantial statutory property consequences to a de facto family relationship without necessarily requiring the parties to formalize their relationship through marriage.

5. JUDICIAL APPROACHES: THE ITALIAN CONSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Italian constitutional jurisprudence provides an important perspective on the distinction between marriage and *more uxorio* cohabitation.

The Italian Constitutional Court has considered on several occasions whether the exclusion of cohabiting partners from certain rights or benefits available to married spouses is compatible with constitutional principles, particularly those concerning equality and protection of individual rights.

5.1. Decision No. 310/1989

Decision No. 310/1989 concerned the compatibility of provisions concerning inheritance with constitutional principles.

The Constitutional Court maintained the distinction between the legal position of spouses and that of cohabiting partners. The Court emphasized that cohabitation and marriage constitute legally different situations and that the existence of a factual relationship does not automatically generate the same inheritance rights as marriage.

The reasoning is relevant to the present analysis because it demonstrates that different treatment does not necessarily result from an assumption that cohabitation has no social or legal relevance. Rather, the distinction may derive from the different legal structures and consequences associated with marriage and voluntary cohabitation.

5.2. Decision No. 169/2000

In Decision No. 169/2000, the Constitutional Court addressed issues concerning economic benefits connected to the death of a partner.

The Court again emphasized the structural difference between marriage and *more uxorio* cohabitation. Cohabitation is characterized by its factual and voluntary nature and does not necessarily create the same legal obligations as marriage.

The decision therefore reinforces an important comparative principle: legal recognition of cohabitation does not necessarily require complete assimilation to marriage.

At the same time, the existence of a legal distinction does not prevent the legislature from granting specific protections to cohabitants where policy considerations and the economic reality of stable family life justify such protection.

6. COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE ALBANIAN FRAMEWORK

The jurisdictions examined reveal several broad approaches to the regulation of cohabitation.

The first approach, represented by Austria, maintains a strong distinction between marriage and cohabitation and relies primarily on general private-law mechanisms.

The second approach, illustrated by Greece, emphasizes contractual autonomy while providing a specific legal framework through which cohabitants may organize their relationship.

The third approach, represented particularly by Catalonia, establishes a distinct legal status for stable couples and attaches a wider range of family and property consequences to that status.

The Dominican model provides an additional example of a system in which stable cohabitation may generate significant statutory property consequences.

Albanian law currently contains elements of the first and second approaches. It recognizes cohabitation and permits the parties to regulate its consequences through agreement. However, where an agreement is absent, significant property questions are addressed through general civil-law mechanisms rather than through a comprehensive statutory property regime specifically designed for cohabitants.

This structure provides contractual freedom but may also generate uncertainty.

A long-term cohabiting relationship can involve substantial economic interdependence. Property may be acquired through combined financial resources, one partner may assume greater responsibility for childcare, and one person's unpaid work may facilitate the professional or economic activity of the other.

The legal challenge is therefore to determine whether and how these contributions should be reflected when the relationship ends.

7. POSSIBLE DIRECTIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ALBANIAN FAMILY LAW

The comparative analysis suggests several issues that could be considered in the further development of Albanian family law.

First, greater clarity could be introduced concerning the legal criteria for identifying stable cohabitation. Clearer criteria could increase legal certainty while preventing the automatic extension of cohabitation rights to every informal relationship.

Second, the legislature could consider establishing more detailed default rules concerning property acquired during stable cohabitation. Such rules would not necessarily have to reproduce the statutory property regime applicable to spouses.

Third, the evidentiary treatment of different forms of contribution deserves particular attention. Financial contributions are relatively easy to identify, while household work, childcare and other forms of non-monetary contribution may be more difficult to quantify.

Fourth, the law could consider mechanisms of compensation where one partner has made a substantial contribution to the common economic life without obtaining formal ownership of the resulting property.

Fifth, contractual autonomy should remain an important element of the regulatory framework. Cohabitants should retain the ability to determine their economic relationship according to their individual circumstances. However, contractual freedom should operate within appropriate safeguards concerning equality, informed consent and legality.

The objective of such developments would not necessarily be to eliminate the legal distinction between marriage and cohabitation. Rather, it would be to

create a more predictable framework for the economic consequences of stable family relationships that exist outside marriage.

8. CONCLUSIONS

More uxorio cohabitation occupies a distinctive position within contemporary family law. It differs from marriage in its method of formation and legal status, yet it may generate a stable common life with significant personal and economic consequences.

The Albanian Family Code recognizes cohabitation and provides the possibility of regulating its consequences through agreement. Nevertheless, in the absence of such an agreement, property disputes may depend substantially on general civil-law rules and on the evidence available to establish ownership or contribution.

The comparative analysis demonstrates that different jurisdictions have responded to this issue through different legislative techniques. Austria relies predominantly on general private-law rules, Greece combines contractual autonomy with statutory regulation, Catalonia provides a more developed legal status for stable couples, while the Dominican Republic illustrates a model involving broader community-property consequences.

The Italian constitutional jurisprudence further demonstrates that maintaining a legal distinction between marriage and cohabitation does not necessarily exclude the possibility of providing specific legal protections to cohabitants.

For Albania, the principal issue is therefore not whether cohabitation should be completely equated with marriage. Rather, it is whether the existing framework provides an adequate degree of legal certainty concerning the economic interests created during stable cohabitation.

A more detailed statutory framework could clarify the criteria for recognizing stable cohabitation, the treatment of property acquired during the relationship, the relevance of financial and non-financial contributions, and the availability of compensation where appropriate.

Until such developments occur, a carefully drafted cohabitation agreement remains an important instrument for reducing uncertainty and protecting the legitimate interests of both parties.

The future development of Albanian family law in this area may consequently seek to balance three elements: respect for the distinctive legal status of

marriage, recognition of the factual reality of stable cohabitation, and protection of legitimate economic interests generated through a common family life.

REFERENCES

- Black's Law Dictionary. (2014). *Black's Law Dictionary* (10th ed.). Thomson Reuters.
- Felmeth, A. X., & Horwitz, M. (2003). *Guide to Latin in international law*. Oxford University Press.
- González Beilfuss, C., & Navarro-Michel, M. (2015). *National Report: Spain*.
- Italian Constitutional Court. (1989). *Decision No. 310/1989*.
- Italian Constitutional Court. (2000). *Decision No. 169/2000*.
- Law No. 9062/2003. *Family Code of the Republic of Albania*, as amended.
- Law No. 10/1998 of 15 July on stable couples of the Autonomous Community of Catalonia.
- Law No. 25/2010 of 29 July, Book Two of the Civil Code of Catalonia, relating to persons and family.
- Decree-Law No. 3/2015 of 6 October, amending Law No. 25/2010 of 29 July.
- Order JUS/44/2017 of 28 March, approving the Regulation of the Register of Stable Couples of Catalonia.
- Law No. 4356/2015. *Cohabitation Agreement*. Greece.
- Civil Code of the Dominican Republic*, relevant provisions concerning community property.
- Family Law: Jurisdictional Comparisons*. Sweet & Maxwell.
- Unioni civili e convivenze. Guida commentata*.

