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Abstract
In this study, we analyse reflective diary texts produced by twelve multilingual Swedish fifth-graders with immigrant background after the terrorist attack in Paris in 2015, where several employees of the magazine Charlie Hebdo were killed. Our overall aim was to study if allowing the students to discuss and reflect upon engaging events outside the school in writing educates the students in democratic values and in arguing for their opinions. Our specific aim was to analyse and discuss how the students expressed their emotions, opinions and moral values in the texts in terms of the discursive strategies of representation and legitimisation (Hart 2010), and how they actively construe the events accounted for in relation to themselves. Our results show that in the few lines of the texts, the students, with varied linguistic resources in Swedish, constructed social groups based on dichotomous ethical concepts of right and wrong and on emotional assessments legitimising their opinions and beliefs.

Introduction
The terrorist attack at the offices of the magazine Charlie Hebdo in Paris in January 7th 2015 gave echo in a Swedish multilingual grade 5 primary school classroom. The school, situated in a segregated residential area in a smallish city, has 98 percent students with immigrant background. After the attack, the students gave voice to anxiety and concern, which their teacher responded to by giving them an assignment after a discussion about the subject: write down what you think and how you feel about the events in Paris in your reflective diaries. This is an extract of what one of the students wrote:
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Example 1.

Mina tankar kring händelserna i paris (title)


My thoughts about the events in Paris (title)

I think that it is stupid that they draw (a picture of) the Prophet Muhammed. And that it is stupid too that Muslims kill other people. I feel that it is dangerous there that perhaps the one(s) who are dead also have families and have children and the mother is dead and the father is dead too. Hope this war will end because killing does not help. [Continues]

The student begins with a negative evaluative comment about the fact that the magazine had published a drawing of Prophet Mohammed – a provocative and offensive act for many Muslims, as the drawings published were caricatures, perceived by many as ridiculing their faith. However, she immediately complicates her description of the situation by adding a general statement condemning Muslims killing people. In this way, she introduces two opposite parties in to the scene, both behaving badly in her view. Her personal emotions of anxiety and danger are expressed in a sentence that connects the deceased to the family sphere: they also had families, they had children, and now perhaps both the mother and the father are dead. She, thus, gives a personalised or proximised account of her feelings of danger that surround the events. She concludes with a wish for the events to stop. Her wish is explicitly expressed in a general moral judgement of the meaninglessness of war.

In the few lines of this text, the student gives voice both to strong personal emotions (danger), opinions (it is wrong to publish caricatures of the Prophet, it is wrong to kill people), knowledge (people were killed) and moral values (war does not solve problems). In this paper, we analyse the texts

1 The examples are have been transliterated from the student’s reflective diaries and given here with their original wording. Any clarifying additions by the authors are in brackets. The English translations aim to reproduce the content of the Swedish example, with authors’ clarifications in brackets.
produced by the twelve multilingual fifth-graders with immigrant background who wrote the assignment. Our overall aim is to see how engaging events outside the school, which strongly affect the students emotionally, can be put into pedagogic use in the classroom. According to the Curriculum for the compulsory school, preschool class and school-age educare 2011 (Skolverket 2018, p.10):

The goals of the school are that each pupil

• an consciously determine and express ethical standpoints based on knowledge of human rights and basic democratic values, as well as personal experiences,
• respects the intrinsic value of other people,
• rejects the subjection of people to discrimination, oppression and victimisation, and becomes involved in helping other people,
• can empathise with and understand the situation other people are in and also develops the will to act with their best interests at heart, and
• shows respect and care for both the immediate environment, as well as the environment from a broader perspective.

We argue that in allowing the students to discuss and reflect upon these events in writing, the teacher not only develops the students' literacy, but also educates the students in democratic values and in arguing for their opinions. Our more specific aim is to analyse and discuss how these students express their emotions, opinions and moral values in the texts in terms of the discursive strategies of representation and legitimisation (Hart 2010) to better understand how they actively construe the events accounted for in relation to themselves.

Theoretical framework

As demonstrated in Example 1, even a short account of a student’s thoughts around the shocking events in Paris includes a number of evaluative expressions, which mirror the student’s opinions and beliefs, but also her personal emotions. Recent developments of Critical Discourse Analysis, especially in analysing political discourse (see e.g. Cap 2013, Chilton 2004, Hart 2010) have emphasised not only the social, but also the psychological and cognitive basis of discourse conducted using language. In short, the mental representations of the world evoked by interaction with the world and encoded in linguistic structure used in social interaction is explained in terms of evolutionarily adapted psychological strategies used by human beings when interacting with each other. For example, Hart (2010) conducts an analysis of immigration discourse in the British media in terms of the macro-strategy of coercion, defined as “an intention to affect the beliefs, emotions
and behaviours of others in such a way that suits one’s own interest” (Hart, 2010, p.63). He explains coercion with reference to psychological mechanisms evolved in the course of human history. The texts analysed here are not written with the intention to affect an audience in a coercive way. However, the representational strategies of reference, predication and proximisation (which fulfil the ideational function of language) and the legitimisation strategy (which fulfils the interpersonal and textual functions of language within Systemic Functional Linguistics [SFL, cf. Halliday 1985; Halliday & Matthiesen 1999]), are here argued to be well suited to analyse the emotions, attitudes and moral values expressed in the texts. They are, however, without the coercive intentions found in for example political discourse. Representational strategies and legitimisation strategies construct the coercive macro-strategy in Hart’s model. In this paper, however, we will focus on the use of evaluative language as legitimisation, as a means to elicit involvement and empathy from the reader (cf. Wiksten Folkeryd 2007, p. 59), and analyse how the students actively construe the social actors and the events accounted for in relation to themselves.

The ideational function of language is in Hart (2010, p. 92) analysed in terms of three kinds of discourse strategies: referential strategies, predication strategies and proximisation strategies. The way we talk about people and groups of people or rather, “the strategies by which one constructs social actors” (Reisigl & Wodak 2001, p.45) such as in-groups (‘us’) and out-groups (‘them’) are referential. In political discourse studies and social studies it has, for example, become commonplace to analyse nominal expressions as examples of different types of referential micro strategies such as dissimilation (e.g. aliens, outsiders), nationalisation (Swedes, Syrians), despatialisation (migrants, social tourists), collectivisation (we, they) etc. In this narrow sense, referential strategies create polarised or dichotomous categorisations. Predication strategies, in their turn, load the social actors constructed by using referential strategies, but also events, states of affairs and processes with qualities, quantities, action potentials, time, and space and so on. Reisigl & Wodak (2001, p.46) describe predication as “the very basic process of linguistically assigning qualities to persons” (also referred to in Hart 2010, p.65). In political discourse and social studies, predication often reflects prejudice, implicitly or explicitly. The out-group is often characterised as (i.e. predicated to be) unreliable, dangerous, dirty, exploiting the welfare system etc., whereas the in-group is by default the opposite.
The last of the representational strategies, proximisation, accounts for how time, space and values are reflected in the way people, objects, events etc. are situated or moving in relation to the writer/speaker. Cap (2006, 2010) proposes a cognitive-pragmatic model of coercive proximisation to account for how politicians and other leaders create crisis and threat constructions in order to reach their own aims. He builds upon Chilton’s (2004, 2005) theory and concept of discourse space. A discourse space is, according to Chilton, the creation of an egocentric, cognitive (representational) model of the world around the writer/speaker in terms of space, time and modality. The writer/speaker is situated inside the deictic center, the IDC, the here and now. The space outside the IDC is occupied by ‘the others’ there and then, and constructs the outside deictic center space, the ODC. In Cap’s model of proximisation, elements “crossing symbolic distances” (Cap 2015, p.1) in the discourse space, i.e. elements moving from the outside to the inside deictic center affect people, influence their feelings and opinions and make them feel personally endangered. Cap (2006, 2010) defines three types of proximisation: spatial, temporal and axiological. All three involve movement towards the IDC from the outside, thus threatening the in-group. Spatial and temporal proximisation move events and actors from there and then to here and now as a possible threat. Axiological proximisation concerns values or ideologies. The movement of these from the ODC to the IDC involves growing conflicts, as the movement can be perceived of as an intrusion. According to Cap (2013, p. 214) Proximisation Theory is universal enough to be investigated in more discourses and need further input. In this paper, we apply it on school texts instead of political texts and as a part of Hart’s (2010) socio-cognitive critical discourse analysis, more specifically as the representational strategy of proximisation that realises the ideational function of language together with referential strategies and predication.

However, in order to be able to analyse what kind of evaluative language use the students’ texts instantiate, we first apply the Appraisal framework proposed within Systemic Functional Linguistics to account for the way social phenomena are evaluated through language use. More specifically, we apply the categories developed by Wiksten Folkeryd (2007) in her study of how Swedish school-children at grades 5, 8 and 11 express attitude by using evaluative language in their writing of narrative texts, recounts (e.g. of a school excursion) and observations (e.g. of a meeting), when analysing expressions loaded with evaluation used in these student texts (cf. also Martin & White 2005, White 2015). We argue that analysing appraisal not only stands for an analysis of legitimisation, but also offers a helpful tool to capture the evaluative language used in predication and to capture the
moving categories in proximisation. We, thus, propose an analysis of appraisal as a prerequisite for the analysis of predication and proximisation.

**Data and methods of analysis**

The data analysed here consists of twelve reflective diary texts written by twelve eleven to twelve year old multilingual students in grade 5, written in the frame of a research project focusing on their multilingualism (see Lindgren, Svensson & Zetterholm 2015). The data analysed here was, thus, collected as part of this larger project. As the students are minors, their parents were informed about the project and they have signed a consent form approving of both recordings and the use of their children’s texts for research purposes. The students were also informed about the project and have shared their texts for research purposes. The teacher also signed an informed consent form. The diary is a regularly appearing element in the classroom. In it, the students write down their thoughts and reflections on topics such as “My languages”, “If I were principal for this school for a day” and “My first school memories”, usually after an introduction and a discussion in the class by the teacher. The teacher is the audience of the texts; she reads and comments the content, but never the form (e.g. correctness) of the texts briefly in the diaries. The teacher’s explicitly expressed intention with the diaries is to train the students to reflect critically on phenomena in the world and to formulate their reflections. As the form of reflections is not in focus, the teacher encourages the students to write in any language, i.e. the teacher explicitly encourages the use of all the students linguistic resources in order to develop their biliteracy (cf. Hornberger 2004, Hornberger & Link 2012).

The twelve texts analysed here are written the day after the attack in Paris, i.e. January 8th 2015, after a discussion in the class, some with additional comments from the diary written a couple of days later, when the class had watched the Swedish public television children’s news (“Lilla Aktuellt”) that reported on the events. By this time the students had used the diaries for a term and were familiar with writing reflective texts. The total data without titles consist of 754 words. An example of a page in one of the diaries is displayed in Figure 1.
The analysis was conducted in several steps. First, the texts were transliterated by the authors. After that, they were analysed in several ways. In this paper, we will focus on four analyses:

1. an analysis of the evaluative language instantiated in the texts in terms of the appraisal framework (i.e. an analysis of the interpersonal function of a legitimisation strategy),
2. an analysis of the referential strategies instantiated in the texts,
3. an analysis of predication strategies instantiated in the texts and,
4. an analysis of the proximisation strategies used.

We will present each of these analyses as we report our results below.

The data analysed here is sensitive in nature, as the terrorists can be supposed to have religious motives for their act, and some, but not nearly all, the students writing the texts share their religion. However, we do not have data on the students’ religious affiliation or ethnicity. For ethical reasons, we have also deliberately chosen our examples to represent students with different countries of origin and different mother tongues spoken (which are known to us). For these reasons, our results cannot be interpreted in terms of religious, ethnic or linguistic categories. The only categorisation possible here is that they are Swedish students, in this case multilingual, multicultural adolescents representing different religious and ethnic backgrounds attending a Swedish school with 98 percent students with immigrant background, in a small Swedish city.
Analysis and results

In this section, we first briefly introduce the appraisal framework and present our analyses and results, as these function as the data analysed in the predication and the proximisation strategy analyses. After that, we analyse the texts and present our results regarding representational strategies. We start with the social actors constructed in the texts, i.e. the referential strategies used by the students. After that, we concentrate on the way these social actors and the events accounted for are loaded with qualities, i.e. we present our analyses in terms of predication strategies. Finally, we display our analyses and results of the proximisation strategies used by the students. As will be apparent from our analyses, the categories analysed interact with each other; they are not independent.

Appraisal

The appraisal framework is a model or representation of the world with regard to how stance, or point of view, is created and how information is exchanged when using evaluative language. It represents, thus, the interpersonal function (or interpersonal meaning, cf. Wiksten Folkeryd 2007 and references therein) of language. Building on previous works on evaluative language within SFL, Wiksten Folkeryd (2007) proposes an extended appraisal framework suited to analyse student texts. In her interpretation of the model, appraisal is construed through ‘dialogistic and intertextual positioning’ (engagement), ‘attitudinal positioning’ (attitude) and ‘intertextual positioning’ (graduation), and “is used to encompass all evaluative uses of language, both those by which speakers/writers adopt value positions and those by which they negotiate these positions with respondents” (Wiksten Folkeryd 2007, p.46). The attitude component accounts for the linguistic resources used for constructing emotions (affect), judging behaviour in ethical terms (judgement) and valuing objects or events ‘aesthetically’ (appreciation). We have applied the categories of affect, judgement and appreciation in our analysis of the student texts with the sub-groups/categories proposed in the extended appraisal framework (ibid.). We have also analysed the texts with respect to polarity (positive, negative or neutral assessment). The student texts, as already exemplified, are loaded with emotion and judgement. Table 1 displays the proportions of the different types of attitude instantiated in the texts in terms of polarity.
Table 1. Polarity and type of attitude. Number of instantiations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Appreciation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are totally 56 instantiations of attitude in the short texts analysed; all the texts instantiate this type of appraisal. The texts give voice mainly to negative evaluations of the events and emotions connected with them. We will now exemplify the different instantiations in some more detail.

*Attitude: Affect*

The emotions the students express are in half of the cases their own. They feel sad, anxious, afraid and angry, but in a low key; the only emotional instantiation of graduation, in this case intensification, is illustrated in Example 2:

Example 2.

_Jag är jätte orolig, rädd o ledsen för de som bor i paris._

*I am very anxious, afraid and sad for those who live in Paris.*

Most of the instantiations are explicit. There are, however, also implicitly expressed emotions, as in Example 3, where the student implicitly expresses his anxiety by reference to an aching body part that is the homestead of anxiety in our culture:

Example 3:

_Jag fick ont i magen._

*I got a stomach ache.*

The students also ascribe these (mainly) negative emotions to the protagonists in their texts, or make generic and/or impersonal statements of people in general having emotions as a consequence of the events in Paris. This is illustrated in the examples in Table 2, which also quantifies the instantiations of different sub-groups of affect in the data, to be discussed in connection to our analyses of the different representational strategies.
Table 2. Number of instantiations and examples of different sub-groups of affect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Man kan bli ledsen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>You can become sad.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displeasure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dem muslimer blev arga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Muslims became angry.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis/inclination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hoppas den hära krigen ska sluta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>I hope these wars will end.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disquiet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jag blev orolig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>I became anxious.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>skulle jag sänna [känna] mig räd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>I would feel afraid.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calmness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jag är inte orolig längre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>I am no longer anxious.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitude: Judgement

Human behaviour, but also human beings assessed in ethical terms, as right or wrong, good or bad, is in the appraisal framework of attitude accounted for in terms of judgement. The nature of the events reflected upon may have an impact on that there is a large amount of judgemental opinions in the student texts. The students condemn the behaviour of both the (people working in the) magazine and the terrorists, as exemplified in Table 3.
Table 3. Number of instantiations and examples of different sub-groups of judgement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Propriety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindness/malice</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jag tyckte att det va <strong>dumt</strong> att döda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>I thought that it was stupid to kill (people).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jg (jag) tycker att det var <strong>elakt</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>I think it was malicious.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morality/immorality</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>man behöver inte döda människor och att gisa hur muhammed ser ut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>You need not kill people. And guess what Mohammed looks like.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>man ska inte dödda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>You should not kill</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All examples of judgement in these data are based on ethical evaluation of the event or the persons involved and fall within the category of Social sanction – Propriety (or ethics, cf. Martin & White 2005, p. 53). The moral judgements are often phrased in impersonal or generic terms, whereas the judgement of specific human behaviour is often personalised and gives voice to the writers’ opinion about human conduct or the emotional disposition of the human actors.

**Attitude: Appreciation**

The evaluation of objects, artifacts, events and processes rather than human conduct is accounted for within the sub-group of appreciation. We have, however, even counted evaluations of a persons’ importance as appreciation rather than judgement. An example is given in Table 4.
Table 4. Number of instantiations and examples of different sub-groups of appreciation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>det är faligt där</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>it is dangerous there</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jg tycker att det var elakt föratt man kan bli ledsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kan de inte rita sig hella (själva?) de kan bli de kända mäniskor i världen, och sen dem ska rita sig helva (själva) då komer vi se är det roligt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>I think it was malicious because you can become sad</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>can’t they draw themselves they can become famous in the world, and then they can draw themselves then we will see if it is funny</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>man får rita vad man vill men inte en viktig person inte som profeten Muhammed i islam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>you can draw whatever you want but not an important person not like Prophet Mohammed of Islam</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>det var bra att polisen dödade dom onda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>it was good that the police killed the bad ones</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The appraisal framework within SFL analyses the interpersonal function of language. In Harts’ (2010) model of critical discourse analysis, the interpersonal function in language signifies legitimisation. Hence, the analysis of evaluative language through the analysis of attitude conducted here is a partial analysis of the legitimisation strategies used by the students in reflecting upon the events in Paris.

**Representational strategies**

In the following sections we present our analysis and results in terms of the representational strategies of reference, predication and proximisation.

**Referential strategies**

The main social actors constructed in the texts are 1) the writer, the ego, 2) the employees at the magazine Charlie Hebdo, 3) the Prophet Muhamad, 4) the Muslims/brothers committing the terrorist act (henceforth the terrorists), 5) the people offended by the publishing of the caricatures and, 6) the people living in Paris. In the texts analysed, they are constructed by several different means. In Example 4, the employees at the magazine (2) are
constructed by reference to their occupation. The ones committing the attack, the terrorists, are constructed with reference to their role in the events, but also as brothers - which the terrorists were (4).

**Example 4.**

*Dom som jobbar i tiddnings jobbet gjord en avbild av muslimer(s) profet och många tyckte att det inte var bra så att två bröder dödade dom.*

*Those who work in the magazine made a picture of the Prophet of the Muslims and many (people) thought that it was not good so two brothers killed them.*

In this example, two more actors are constructed, The Prophet of the Muslims (3) and many (people)(5). The many people referred to by a quantifier are obviously against the drawing of the prophet, as the actions of the two brothers are connected to the many by a consecutive conjunction.

Yet another way the students construct the actors is by reference to the location of the referents as in Example 3, or, directly by personal pronouns, implicitly present in the situation as the ones doing the drawing, as in Examples 5 and 6, or present as the author of the text (*I*). In these examples the students construct a dichotomy between ‘us’ and ‘them’, an in-group including themselves and an out-group excluding themselves.

**Example 5.**

*I Paris gjorde dom en avbild av profeten mohammed.*

*In Paris they made a picture of Prophet Mohammed.*

**Example 6.**

*Jag tycker inte att det är rätt att göra så att rita muhammed när dem har inte sett honom.*

*I think it is not right to do so to draw Mohammed when they have not seen him.*

In the examples so far, the journalists at the magazine Charlie Hebdo are collectivised as the out-group, ‘them’. However, most students also collectivise the shooters, thus distancing themselves from both parties and constructing yet another category of ‘them’. In what follows, we will argue that even other cues point towards the construction of the categories of ‘us’ and the two categories of ‘them’.
**Predication strategies**

Predications strategies are processes by which people, objects, events, actions and social phenomena are linguistically assigned qualities, quantities, time, space and so forth, explicitly or implicitly. The appraisal analysis can help us focus on different areas of predication, if we add one more dimension of analysis: the discursive roles of the appraiser and that of the appraised, i.e. who does the appraising and who or what does the appraising yield (cf. Martin & White 2005, p.71–81). All the social actors appearing in the texts take on the role of appraiser. However, there is a difference between the actors as to the type of appraisal instantiated.

The affect dimension, emotions (cf. Table 2 above), are in these data instantiated with the writer (1), the terrorists (4), people offended by the publishing of the caricatures (5) and, people living in Paris (6) as the appraiser. Whereas the terrorists (4) are only appraised to be angry, the people offended (5) are appraised to be sad and, but only once, angry, and, the people in Paris (6) and the writer (1) are appraised to be both sad, anxious and afraid. The affect dimension, thus, ascribes partly different emotions to the actors, bringing the people of Paris and the offended people emotionally close to the writer, and distancing them from the terrorists, thus enhancing the categorisation of the terrorists as a distinct out-group.

The judgement dimension of appraisal (cf. Table 3 above) constructs the terrorists (4) even more apparently as an out-group: all instantiations in the sub-groups of and propriety—kindness/malice ascribe negative behaviours to this group, with the writers as the appraisers. The appraiser in the instantiations of propriety—morality/immorality is either the writer (1) or a generic, impersonal actor, which we take to echo the moral standpoint of the writer. However, in these instantiations, both the behaviour of the terrorist (4), i.e. killing, and the behaviour of the employees (2), i.e. the publication of the drawings, are clearly stated as morally unacceptable. Hence, the judgement dimension of appraisal helps us to nuance the categorisation in terms of in-group and out-group – the terrorists are clearly the others, but even the employees at the magazine are, according to the student texts, not without blame, they are construed as a second out-group. In what follows, we will call the terrorist the core out-group and the employees the secondary out-group.

The appreciation dimension of appraisal evaluate in the texts studied mainly events (cf. Table 4 above), some of which we will shortly discuss in connection to proximisation. There are, however, some evaluations that are
of importance when discussing what kind of characterisations the different social actors are given in the texts. Several of the students refer to ‘freedom of speech’, and connect this either explicitly or implicitly to the magazine and its’ employees. This concept might be something the teacher has taught the students during the discussion preceding the individual writing, but as there are no notes about this, nor a recording of this particular class, we can not be sure. We have analysed these examples as instantiations of valuation-importance. An example is given in Example 7:

Example 7.
De som har ritad om propheten Mohamed. De har äcka yttrande frihet.

_Those who draw Prophet Mohammed. They also have freedom of speech._

Reisigl & Wodak (2001, p. 55) mention how so called ‘flag words’ ”contain at least an implicit predication, as they connotatively convey a positive or a negative deontic-evaluative meaning”. _Freedom_ is one of the words mentioned as flag words. We, thus, argue that _freedom of speech_ conveys a positive evaluation of a social structure/order, analysed here as appreciation. The secondary out-group is, on one hand, construed as morally dubious in that they draw pictures (or rather, published them) that potentially offend people, on the other hand, many of the students nuance their picture of the group by assessing a positive value, the freedom of speech, as a right the group has. This duality is explicit in some of the texts. In Example 8, the student ascribes the secondary out-group a positive right, but criticises the specific act of publishing a caricature of the Prophet implicitly. It is not religion that is the problem, the attack was the deed of just some misguided individuals. The group of confessional Muslims is, thus, not accountable for the terrorist attack.
Example 8.

*The satire magazine had freedom of speech so they can write or draw whatever they want. But they need not blame Islam. It is just about some (people) who think wrong.*

This duality with respect to the secondary out-group is also visible in Example 9, where one of the four predications of a persons’ qualities or attributes in the data is given. In this example, the student ascribes Prophet Mohammed the positive evaluation of being an important person.

Example 9.
Jag tycker att man får rita vad man vill men inte en *viktig person* inte som profeten Mohammed i islam.

*I think that you can draw anything you want to but not an *important person* not like Prophet Mohammed in Islam.*

Another example also indirectly points out the Prophet as a “celebrity”, a widely known person, and yet one points out the terrorists as *the bad ones*. The lexical noun phrases denoting the actors are otherwise devoid of appreciative or judgemental evaluation even when relational (‘the prophet of the Muslims’).

In this section we have shown how the students ascribe different emotions, behaviours and properties to the social actors and the events recounted in the texts. The predication strategies used clearly differentiate the in-group from the secondary and the core out-groups. The writers, the in-group, stand out as emotionally negatively affected of the events and as morally righteous in that they condemn the killings and deem war as no solution to any problems. The terrorists, the one’s carrying out the condemned actions (the core out-group) are emotionally affecting the in-group. However, our analysis also reveals the existence of a secondary out-group, the employees at the magazine, a group ascribed both positive rights and negative actions. We will now turn to an analysis of how these groups interact and influence each other.
Proximisation strategies

Proximisation presupposes referential and predication strategies which construct both the in-group and the out-group(s), which are normally considered antagonistic and threatening. Proximisation than accounts for how time, space and values can be reflected in the way people, objects, events etc. are situated or moving in relation to the writer/speaker, threatening to intrude into the physical and mental “home territory”, the inside deictic center (IDC, Cap 2006, p.11), i.e. the in-group territory.

All but one of the student texts instantiate proximisation strategies. As already mentioned above, it is the actions of the core out-group (ODC), the terrorists, which are often explicitly, sometimes implicitly, the reason for a change of the students’ emotional state. In the normal state of the in-group, you feel happy and safe, but hearing about the events in Paris intrudes into the home territory and affects the students negatively. This is clearly illustrated in Example 10, where the change of emotional state is temporally marked as the cause for this:

Example 10.

När jag fick höra om händelsen blev jag orolig [...] Jag fick ont i magen
When I heard about the event I became anxious [...] I got a stomach ache.

The student not only describes her feelings of anxiousness when hearing about the events, but also the intrusion of her physical body. In example 11, we have a direct spatial placement of the source of fear in Paris, far away from the students. Implicitly, this student tells us that s/he is not afraid – the home territory is safe.

Example 11.

Om jag var i Paris skulle jag säna [känna] mig rädd
If I were in Paris I would feel scared

As we have already seen in numerous examples, many of the students feel anxious, uneasy and scared despite the fact that they are not in Paris but in far away Sweden. Hence, the mere image of a terrorist attack that could happen even in Sweden arouses an emotional response in these students, but none of the students state this possibility explicitly. However, some of them
express that this spatio-temporal threat no longer exists, implicitly stating that there was a threat, as displayed in Example 12.

Example 11.
Jag är inte orolig längre för att de har slutat.

*I am not anxious anymore because they have stopped.*

The examples so far clearly show how the behaviour of the core out-group threatens the students’ home base and gives rise to negative emotional responses. The moral judgements the students give voice to do not normally in these texts give rise to axiological proximisation between the in-group and the core out-group; i.e. the implicit ideology of the core out-group (to kill people in response to an offensive act is justified) does not threaten the ideologies of the in-group. When the student in Example 1 writes *To kill makes more war and stops nothing,* she makes an ideological anti-terrorism judgement but she does not express, neither explicitly nor implicitly, that it’s opposite is a threat that might cross the borders of her in-group.

However, one of the students does offer an alternative scenario where she does proximise an ideological stance held by, not the core out-group, but the secondary out-group. In this example, she explicitly condemns the drawing of Prophet Mohammed as malicious, and then brings the making of caricatures into the in-group and asks: how would you feel if it was you that somebody made fun of? This example was already displayed in Table 4, but is replicated here as Example 13.

Example 13.
Jag tycker att det var elakt för att man kan bli ledsen kan de inte rita sig hella (själv) de kan bli de kända människor i världen och sen dem ska rita sig helva (själva) då kommer vi se är det roligt.

*I think it was malicious because you can become sad can’t they draw themselves they can become famous in the world, and then they can draw themselves then we will see if it is funny.*

As already noted, many of the students question the appropriateness of the specific act of drawing (or rather, publishing) the caricature: “*They did wrong to draw a picture of Prophet Mohammed.*” or "*The magazine did also wrong.*” This student uses proximisation as a means to evoke sympathy for the opinion that in her opinion, it is not socially acceptable to draw a
caricature of famous people, in this case Prophet Mohammed. Hence, she uses proximisation both as a boundary marker (in our in-group, we do not accept this behaviour), but displays also sensitivity to the freedom of speech argument discussed above simultaneously as she argues emotionally for why the argument does not apply in this case.

**Summary of results**

Our specific aim was to analyse how the multicultural and multilingual students’ express their emotions, opinions and moral values in the texts studied. In summary, both legitimisation strategies (in terms of the attitude component of appraisal) and representational strategies are generally common in our data. The students’ texts are loaded with emotions, opinions and moral judgements of the terrorist attack in Paris, but also about the publishing of the caricatures of Prophet Mohammed. In our analysis we argue that the students create not only one but two out-groups, which they position themselves against in different ways.

**Discussion**

Chilton (2004, p. 199), referring to Aristotle, declares that humans are unique in having perception of good or evil, just or unjust, right or wrong. Humans, thus, operate with ethical concepts that stand out as dichotomies. The sharing of a common view of these concepts is an intrinsic constituent in forming social groups, an ‘us’ and a ‘them’, in-groups and out-groups.

Throughout our analysis, we have shown examples of how the students, in the few lines, with their varied linguistic resources in Swedish, constructed social groups based on dichotomous ethical concepts of right and wrong and on emotional assessments. We have argued that they have constructed two out-groups: the group of the terrorist (core out-group) and the group of the employees at the magazine Charlie Hebdo (secondary out-group). The core out-group is described as consisting of two angry Muslim brothers and the negative moral judgement that killing people is wrong. The secondary out-group is ascribed the role of victims holding the positive right of freedom of speech but simultaneously described as doing wrong in publishing the caricature. The in-group is implicitly constructed as the opposite of the other groups, but the moral values and ideologies of the in-group are also further justified by reference to other people also holding the values that killing is wrong, freedom of speech is a positive right – and that making fun or even ridiculing people’s religious beliefs is also wrong.
We hope to have demonstrated how even a partial analysis of legitimising strategies in terms of the interpersonal function of language strengthens the discursive analysis by systematically giving concrete examples of evaluative language based on linguistic analyses. However, we also believe that we have demonstrated throughout the analysis how the different categories used in analysing our data interact with each other and highlight different parts of the data. In doing this, they offer different perspectives from which the data can be approached. The analysis of the legitimising strategies focuses on the evaluative language used, highlighting emotional reactions to and moral values held by the students in relation to the events in Paris. The analysis of the representational strategies focuses on construction of and interaction between social groups, highlighting how the students in their reflective texts position themselves with respect to the events in Paris. Hence, the coercive strategies used to analyse political discourse can, in our opinion be adapted to analyse reflective student texts.

Finally, we hope to have demonstrated that our analyses give us insights into the fulfillment of the goals of the Swedish educational system. Our overall aim in undertaking this study was to see how the students’ anxiety was reflected in their texts, and whether or not this kind of activity (discussion followed by written reflection) initiated by the teacher, would correspond to some of the general goals in the Swedish National Curriculum (Skolverket 2018), as well as develop their writing skills. In allowing the students to discuss and reflect upon engaging events outside the school in writing, we argue, the teacher explicitly works with fulfilling the general norms-and-values-goals of the compulsory school, educating the students in democratic values and in arguing for their opinions. Our results strongly indicate that the teacher is successful: all the students, irrespective of their writing skills in Swedish, their second language, succeed in giving voice to their emotions as well as their ethical standpoints.
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