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The aim of this comparative study has been to identify similarities and differences in Swedish and British media’s framing and empowerment of actors in relation to the 2017 Stockholm terror attack.

Theories on the risk society, framing, power and CDA have been used to create a framework that gives a deeper understanding of media’s role in framing actors and events, and how this can potentially affect the public. Moreover, to determine how media use their power to distribute power among the actors and objects that are part of such an attack.

A critical discourse analysis has been carried out on excerpts from a total of 15 articles, seven and six from Sweden and Britain respectively. In this analysis, both framing and power issues were identified, which was used to conduct a discussion on the findings in relation to the theoretical framework used.

It was found that while Sweden and Britain are part of the same culture and therefore largely covered the terror attack the same way, there was a significant difference in the portrayal of the perpetrator. Swedish media had a tendency to use othering and describe the perpetrator as one of “them” as opposed to the “we”. British media, on the other hand, made use of othering as well, but would also offer descriptions that could make the “we” relate to him. This difference can potentially be due to the fact that Swedes have been more emotional about the attack, as it happened in their own country.

The distribution of power between actors were done similarly in both countries. Two power-plays were identified: the police vs. the perpetrator, and the act (the truck) vs. the public. In order to avoid giving the perpetrator credit for the act, when the act was portrayed, the truck would be described as the powerful actor. Thus, even though it is common sense that the truck did not drive into people on itself, the perpetrator’s actions has not been acknowledged in the media. Instead, when describing the perpetrator, it has been done in relation to the police, who were described as the powerful actors – they caught the perpetrator, i.e. he did not have the power to avoid them or escape.

Thus, while Swedish and British media largely have covered the act the same way and with the same means, the Swedish media have used emotional means to further othering.
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Introduction

“What we know about the world is largely based on what the media decide to tell us.”

(McCombs, 2003, p. 2)

In today’s society, we face the threat of being hit by terror attacks when we least expect it. Perpetrators resort to new methods that escalate quickly with no prior warning. Especially one trend has become visible amongst terrorists in the last couple of years in bigger cities – truck attacks. Truck attacks have been carried out in cities such as Nice and Berlin in 2016 as well as London and Stockholm in 2017 (The New York Times, 2017). Truck attacks need only involve one perpetrator and a stolen truck, but it has the potential to kill and wound several people in a short amount of time. Obviously, such attacks cause panic and leave many individuals in sorrow and uncertainty.

This study will focus on one specific attack, the attack in Stockholm on the 7th April 2017. The attack was carried out by a citizen of Uzbekistan, Rakhmat Akilov, who had been rejected asylum in Sweden prior to the act (Aftonbladet, 2017a). Akilov stole a truck that was in the midst of a delivery and therefore unsupervised by the driver, before he drove it down Drottninggatan, a main shopping street in Stockholm, killing and wounding several individuals before ramming into Åhléns City department store, where the truck caught fire. Four people were killed immediately or died shortly after the attack, and a fifth victim died three weeks later. Moreover, 15 people were injured and treated at hospitals, nine for serious injuries (The Telegraph, 2017a; Stockholms Läns Landsting, 2017).

According to Swedish law, the definition of terror, as based on the decisions and framework by the European Union, is:

“..to commit an action that can cause serious harm to a state or intergovernmental institution with the intention of: scaring a population or population group, force public institutions or an intergovernmental institution to act or to refrain from acting or to destabilise or destroy fundamental political, constitutional, economic or social structures”

(Säkerhetspolitik, 2015)

When such attacks have happened, news media worldwide react to the events and begin to cover it with live updates as well as articles covering reactions from for example politicians
and citizens, articles confirming whether the action is seen as an act of terror or not and so forth. The hunt for the perpetrator(s) and the organisation behind too has a high salience in media, and so does the discussion on whether more attacks might be carried out or if it was a single act.

These questions and portrayals of the perpetrator will appear in national news media as well as international. This paper will seek to investigate the framing of the attack and the actors involved as covered by Swedish and British online news outlets. Hence, this paper will examine whether differences and similarities can be found between the national news coverage and the international news coverage in a country that was hit by a similar attack one month earlier. It is also interesting to determine whether there is a need to create an “us” and “them” division in the media following a terror act. Thus, some of the media framing methods in Swedish and British media will be analysed and discussed. As this is a qualitative study, the findings will prove certain framing positions, but not all, as only a selection of articles and newspapers have been studied. However, this selection will provide the reader with examples of what have actually been written and read by an audience.

Analysing the language choices made by journalists in the different countries can also show us whether proximity is of importance – whether there is a difference between how an act is being framed if it happens closer to home. This is also valid in other similar cases, for example how Britain and Sweden framed the attack in London.

Framing is a tool which media can make use of to control or influence public discourse. Dependent on how much salience media give to a topic, the attention of the public will be directed towards this particular issue. Thus, when media give a lot of space and attention to a particular topic or event, or represent actors in certain ways, this media-chosen priority becomes a public priority as well (McCombs, 2003, p. 2).

As a natural extension to framing, we find the question of power (as given by the media). In case of terror attacks, we can identify a number of actors, all of which can potentially hold power in the situation, as given to them. The actors include for example media, the perpetrator(s), politicians, the public and the police. The different actors will be further discussed in the analysis alongside an analysis of their representation. Each have different stakes in the act and each have a certain power, which will be further discussed in this paper. Additionally, the media even hold the power to distribute the power among other actors; they decide how to represent the actors and how much salience they are to receive in the terror coverage.

It is important for the society to understand how power is distributed by for example journalists and news outlets. If the audience knows how media use linguistic means to frame certain stories and events, it will be easier for them to identify potential ideologies in articles.
Moreover, it is important for us to understand how media framing can impact societies and countries both short-term and long-term in relation to the risk society.

This study contributes to the knowledge of how terror attacks are framed in different Western countries with different proximities to the attack. The study aims to determine whether any differences or similarities can be identified in the media-framing of the act, and if these results can be explained by proximity.

Aim and research questions

The aim of this comparative study is to determine how media frame various actors involved in a terror attack, as well as the situation itself, in both the country that has been hit and another country that too is aware of the threat. Moreover, to identify and discuss the power distribution between various actors as given by the media.

This is done to identify the complexity of the media-given power distribution among various actors in case of terror acts and how the media contribute to today’s risk society through their actions. The study aims to identify the space and attention given to different actors and to identify whether differences and/or similarities can be found across borders. Hence, the power of journalists to represent actors and situations in a specific way, and what they focus on when portraying them can be identified and discussed.

By looking at both the portrayal of the various actors as well as the power distribution, it is possible to see how the terror act itself is being framed as well. Hence, the media portray the actors and the act in a certain way and by identifying the power distribution, it can potentially tell us more about why media are framing the act as they are.

In order to identify these key issues, the following research questions will be answered:
1a. How did Swedish online news media portray actors?
1b. How did British online news media portray actors?
2. How has the power been distributed between various actors by the media on the different online news outlets?
Previous research

Studies on the risk Society

The risk society, a theory developed by Ulrich Beck, describes a society which constantly produces potentially catastrophic risks (Cottle, 1998:5). Several researchers have offered critical thoughts on the world risk society as developed by Beck. The idea of the risk society is not contradicted, however, some areas within the theory is argued to be underdeveloped or not consistent.

Simon Cottle is presenting a critical view on Beck’s risk society’s relationship with mass media. Whereas Beck is arguing that media play a crucial role in uncovering risks, Cottle argues that Beck’s position on media is uneven, underdeveloped and often contradictory (Cottle, 1998, p. 5). Cottle argues that Beck’s ideas of social construction, contestation and challenge cannot stand alone and that these statements do not offer much explanation on how the risk society and mass media are connected; the ideas are not empirically supported (Cottle, 1998, p. 10). Moreover, it is pointed out how Beck is being ambiguous when saying that risk assessment is open to social evaluation and at the same time saying that people are dependent on scientists and experts in order to understand the risk definition (Cottle, 1998, p. 13). However, Cottle is not offering any concrete answers to the points which he has been discussing, but is merely pointing out how some of Beck’s arguments can be criticised. Thus, Cottle focus on how relevant Beck’s ideas are, but argues that some areas should be further developed or aligned.

Another article written by Cottle in 2014 seeks to explain how media shapes disasters in a global context (Cottle, 2014, p. 3). He argues that in a global age, both the nature of disasters as well as their relationship with media are changing. According to him, it is necessary to understand how media enter into disasters and how they shape them – and the consequences the shaping might bring (Cottle, 2014, p. 4). It is argued that disasters are dependent on the media in terms of how they become known and responded to (Cottle, 2014, p. 17). He mentions, among others, how space, speed, saturation, social relations, and surveillance all aid in visualising and seeing disasters today, and how these aspects are historically unparalleled (ibid). Furthermore, it is mentioned how the media shape disasters differently depending on whether there is an underlying goal with the coverage; for example, the shaping of a disaster can legitimize political authority or build support for a cause (Cottle, 2014, p. 17).

As the risks are becoming global, the concept of cosmopolitanism also comes into play. Chouliaraki presents how Habermas’ recent work shows an appreciation of the media as a catalytic for trans-national viewing of disasters in other parts of the world (Chouliaraki, 2013, p. 111). She argues, as Cottle does, that the different representations of the media are selected and
thus shaped (ibid). Chouliaraki also mentions how the power distribution is downplayed and that this is problematic as it prevents certain voices from the processes of the post-national public sphere (ibid).

**Studies on mass media power**

Many studies concerning mass media’s power to affect public discourse have been carried out, mostly in relation to the political agenda setting power. This paper will look more into the power surrounding all stakeholders when it comes to the coverage of terror. However, the way in which researches have previously analysed and described power contributions in media is interesting, as it can aid in understanding the power distribution in relation to terrorism as well.

Agenda setting, which framing derives from, has been discussed for a long period, as audience will consider a topic to be important when mass media emphasize it (Walgrave & Van Aelst, 2006, p. 88-89). Studies have shown that correlations between media and public priorities exist (Walgrave & Van Aelst, 2006, p. 89). Thus, the agenda setting is determining the priorities of the public and framing determines the discourse.

Davis, on the other hand, argues that with the arrival of new media, media and audience are becoming dispersed and the media have less effect on the priorities of the public (Davis, 2003, p. 669). He continues by arguing that it might not be a relevant question anymore whether mass media influence audiences or not (Davis, 2003, p. 671). It is mentioned how mass media have started popularizing content in order to maintain the audience level, which means that the news values have changed (ibid).

Gackowski (2014) offers an explanation of the source of media's power by proposing different types of power seen in media: power as mediatisation, power as an impact, power as a function and power as a control (Gackowzki, 2014, p. 109). These different power types seek to identify and explain the power phenomenon we can see in mass media. Gackowskzi uses the Polish Scientific Publishers’ (PWN) notion of power in which it is said that power is a relation between two groups, where one is authorized to exert power over the other (Gackowzki, 2014, p. 109-110). He then identifies the different ways in which this is an issue, for example: do the media have the authority then? And if they do, does the media’s power rely on the audience to willingly accept being the subjects of the relation? (Gackowzki, 2014, p. 110).

Especially Gackowzki is touching upon some interesting ideas in relation to mass media power; in which way do media hold the power over their audience? Both Davis and Walgrave & Van Aelst have each come up with suggestions on this matter, one saying that media are not
important when it comes to public discourse, the others saying that media are shaping public discourse by acting as agenda setters.

**Framing of terrorism and Islam related questions**

Joshua Woods (2011) conducted an experimental study to identify possible effects on how individuals perceive terrorism when framed differently. Among other things, he mentions how, post terrorism attacks, people have developed negative attitudes towards Arabs, Muslims and immigrants (Woods, 2011, p. 199). Results in the study show that the term terrorism itself does not affect the perceived threat, but that it is instead the type of threat that it is associated with that causes societies to fear terrorism (Woods, 2011, p. 200). It was found that people’s perceptions of terrorist threats partly depends on how texts frame it, hence, how journalists choose to write about it. Moreover, that the threat were perceived as higher when radical Islamism and nuclear weapons were mentioned (Woods, 2011, p. 208).

Brinson and Stohl (2012) too created an experimental study to identify how media framing potentially affect public opinion. Their results, too, suggested that media framing of terrorism influences how the public perceives such an act and how this can also affect public opinions on government policies (Brinson & Stohl, 2012, p. 284). In conclusion, the study showed that the frame manipulation have a significant impact on public opinion. Media frames can therefore alter public opinion over time and create for example fear of “others” in a society (Brinson & Stohl, 2012, p. 288).

Ahmed & Matthes (2017) investigated the coverage of Muslims and Islam through a 15-year period and found that a vast number of studies covered Western countries and neglected Muslim countries and media (Ahmed & Matthes, 2017, p. 219). Moreover, they found that Muslims tend to be framed negatively and that Islam is often portrayed as a violent religion (*ibid*). The findings showed that media portrayals of Muslims are often strongly associated with terrorism, which was also more pronounced after terror acts (Ahmed & Matthes, 2017, p. 231). Thus, Muslims are presented as a consistent threat in different societies.

**Critical discourse analysis in terrorism and Islam coverage**

Mattson (2016) used CDA to critically investigate discursive practices used to construct a discourse on the prevention of violent extremism in Sweden. He identifies two different dominant types of discourses: the discourse on radicalisation and the discourse on segregation (Mattson, 2016, p. 112). Through interviews it was found that, even though the interviewees
had all been part of the prevention of violent extremism action, they all understood and perceived crucial words differently (Mattson, 2016, p. 123). It also showed that the informants were not necessarily convinced or undoubtful about the discourse on radicalisation, and they therefore tended to rely on the segregation discourse instead, inventing new phrases to bridge the discourses instead of integrating them (Mattson, 2016, p. 126).

Ali and Khattab (2017), using a siege in Australia and a school shooting in Pakistan as point of departure, created a comparative study on the reactions from the countries afterwards. The attacks happened one day apart in 2014 and both were carried out by militant Islamists (Ali & Khattab, 2017, p. 724). Australia is Muslim-minority state, Pakistan a Muslim-majority state. This study also mentions Beck’s risk society theories and how it is possible to manufacture risk and fear in today’s society (Ali & Khattab, 2017, p. 725). It was, among other things, found that media framed and elaborated the attack in Australia by using contemporary popular concerns (Ali & Khattab, 2017, p. 737). Moreover, that the Australian news media gave more attention than necessary to the terror act and the organisation that took credit by over-reporting (ibid). Volkmer (2008) says that in this sense, news media seem like collaborators of terrorism (in Ali & Khattab, 2017, p. 737). In Pakistan, the attack was covered in a compassionate and emotive manner, and no clear distinctions between for example militant and extremist were prevailed (Ali & Khattab, 2017, p. 737).

Sharifi et al. (2017) investigated the discursive construction of Islam in Western talk shows, as media discourse is the main source of people’s knowledge and the base for their attitudes and ideologies, no matter the class (Sharifi et al., 2017, p. 46). However, it is noteworthy how the authors, already in the introduction, state that this study is undertaken to know how news media misrepresent Islam – with no evidence presented that this is in fact the case (Sharifi et al., 2017, p. 46). Even though general assumptions on how the Western world represents Islam wrongly have already been given, no evidence to the fact that this news media, CNN, is doing the same has been given. Nevertheless, after the critical discourse analysis, it was found that talk show host Fareed Zakaria did indeed hide opinions in the words and phrases he used on the show. Hence, the coverage of actors associated with Islam proved to be biased, and Islamophobic ideologies was identified in the used discourse (Sharifi et al., 2017, p. 61).

However, reasons for omitting different representations in for example newspaper discourse have been identified by Machin & Mayr (2007). The Leicester Mercury has been identified as a model newspaper by the British government as it does not communicate negative representations of ethnic minorities, which in turn causes fewer riots (Machin & Mayr, 2007, p. 453). Machin & Mayr use CDA combined with a social actor analysis to identify issues in the analysed texts. Even though discourses that approve of mixing people from different races are identified in several texts, the text on inequalities experienced by minorities is absent (Machin
& Mayr, 2007, p. 465). However, it is concluded that this newspaper manages to represent ethnic minorities without connecting and associating them with crimes (Machin & Mayr, 2007, p. 475).

Roy & Ross (2011) investigated media coverage in the US, India and Scotland, each of which experienced terror events in order to compare media’s role in the construction and response to terrorism. Roy & Ross found four meta-functions of terror discourse: identification, unification, justification, and separation (2011, p. 292). This refers to how the perpetrators are identified in media (p. 293), how a country is encouraged to show a united front through patriotism (p. 293), how the discourse on terror is serving to justify whatever mean is proposed to solve the issue (p. 295), and finally, how countries might find it beneficial to separate themselves from the views or actions taken by other countries (p. 297).

The research gap

Concludingly, vast research have been done within the areas of framing and terrorism coverage in general. Ideas on framing are largely built on Entman’s ideas, even though other researchers have argued that a common theoretical model on framing is lacking. As found by Nelson et al., the public is receptive towards how an article frames a specific case, which can be seen in the experimental studies on terrorism discourse as well. The different studies on framing in relation to terrorism also suggest that public opinion can be altered over time, if the public is continuously being exposed to a certain type of discourse. Critical discourse analysis has been widely used to identify how media describes Muslims, Islam and terrorism, and how that can potentially create a gap between “us” and “them”, thus furthering the othering.

However, there seem to be only little comparative research on cases such as the chosen one for this study. Studies usually focus on the act and how it is perceived in one country, or they look at how journalists have the power to alter public opinion. This study will aim to fill this gap by comparing reactions to a terror act in both the country itself as well as one international destination. Using a critical discourse analysis, differences and similarities in the reporting of Swedish and British newspapers can be identified, and it will be discussed how the media-given power distribution is important for the understanding of the articles.

Moreover, doing a comparative study can tell us if proximity matters in terms of how journalists choose to frame the event. This goes for other studies of the same nature as well. A comparative study can teach us how potential differences in media-reporting can be due to the
proximity to the attack – how is Sweden covering the act and how is Britain covering the act. This can also be used to remain critical to terror-coverage in certain countries, in case this study will show us that there are differences in reporting. However, more comparative research within the topic is desired to be conducted in order to validate the findings. Thus, this study serves as a starting point for more comparative research within the area that can tell us exact differences and seek to explain reasons behind.
Theoretical frame and concepts

Different theories will be used in the analysis and to explain concepts in this study. These theories can be divided into two sections: theoretical theory and practical theory. The theoretical theory is theories on the risk society and how the risk society has changed with the contemporary technological changes. Practical theories are more applicable as analysis tools and include framing, power and theories on CDA, which will be used to critically analyse the data sample.

Risk Society

Today’s risk society can largely be based on the original ideas developed by Ulrich Beck. However, as previously mentioned, Beck’s view on the role of media may benefit from being revisited. Moreover, the theories Beck presents us with are primarily developed prior to for example social media, which allows the audience to interact with news media etc. right after an article has been published. Thus, in order to obtain a fuller picture of the risk society today, it is necessary to include both the research that has given us an understanding of the risk society as well as ideas of how technology plays a role in society today.

The risk society is a society which constantly produce potentially catastrophic risks (Cottle, 1998, p. 5). It shapes the discourse of global crises, as media have the possibility to go to the centre of crisis situations and shape it inside out and outside in (Cottle, 2014, p. 3).

A risk is not yet a catastrophe, but the anticipation of a catastrophe – they are future events that may occur and thus threatens us (Beck, 2009, p. 9). These risks become globalised and are being subjected to both public criticism and scientific investigation, because they, as a consequence of modernisation, are threats to the life of anything living on earth; plants, animals and human beings (Beck, 1992, p. 13). As opposed to earlier where threats were limited to certain locations or groups, for example factory accidents, the modernisation has now caused potential for global hazards. This in turn also writes off previous ideas of risks and class, as the risks today can affect human beings through time and space.

As opposed to a risk, a catastrophe is spatially, temporally and socially determined, meaning it has a defined beginning and end. The anticipation of a catastrophe lacks these dimensions, as it cannot be foreseen when a catastrophe might occur (Beck, 2009, p. 9). However, these dimensions do not apply to terrorist risks either, causing the fear of terrorist risks to become present in our minds at all times (Beck, 2009, p. 39). Beck argues that due to this constant danger being present in our minds, it becomes a political force as it has consequences for the law, the military, liberty, everyday life and the stability of the global political system.
(Beck, 2009, p.14, p. 39). He says: “global risk is the staging of the reality of global risk” (Beck, 2009, p. 14). By staging risks, future catastrophes can become present, which in turn can aid in the prevention of these catastrophes happening (ibid).

However, this staging of risks can potentially be used as a reason to increase surveillance in public areas, which goes against the freedom and democracy in Western countries – increased surveillance might not be a result of an actual catastrophe, but instead due to the anticipation of a catastrophe (Beck, 2009, p. 10).

What is scaring the world in relation to terrorist acts is the fact that they cannot be predicted. It is impossible to say when, where or what. Moreover, terrorists whose endgame is to kill themselves alongside innocents, they are invincible (Beck, 2009, p. 40). The terrorist can, however, create fear in the public through his act. Some researchers have offered their opinions on the “fear society” or “culture of fear” of today as well. Furedi (2007) states that the culture of fear refers to many types of fear, including fears of crime, terrorism etc. (Furedi, 2007, p. 1). Fear becomes a powerful force that dominates in the public imagination, as it is not focused on a specific threat (Furedi, 2007, p. 5, p. 8). Likewise, Hoffmann mentions the fear of the unknown in a world where terrorist acts can occur any time and any place (Hoffmann, 2004, p. 1025).

In the risk society, unknown unknowns are mentioned as well. In the classical security equation, there are three factors: agent, intention, potential. When one or more of these are unknown, it becomes an unknown unknowns (Beck, 2009, p. 40). All of these factors are unknown when talking about terrorists. They attack where and when we do not expect it, until it happens and thus demonstrates power of destruction by transforming civic social spaces into potential death zones (Beck, 2009, p. 40). Thus, the risk society and the culture of fear may explain why the public are receptive towards news media framing of terrorism.

Technology plays an important role in society as well. The high-technology society is vulnerable, as institutions cannot control every individual on earth, regardless of advanced technology systems (Fuchs, 2008, p. 194). Al Qaeda has made use of civilian means (for example the 9/11 attack, where airplanes and sky scrapers were used) to attack and create fear among the public, by showing that institutions do not have unlimited control to their own technology (ibid). Thus, technology opens up a new way of conducting warfare. This in turn creates the fear that terrorists aim for, as it is their primary weapon (Beck, 2009, p. 40). They wish to create panic and spread fear across borders, which they do by attacking innocents and potentially harming people from several countries.
Framing

As all theories of framing are largely based on Entman’s ideas, I will use these to make sense of the concept of framing before elaborating on the CDA tools in the method section that I will use to analyse the framing in news articles.

All ideas on framing are largely based on the ideas presented by Robert Entman (1993). He argues that the concept of framing offers a way to describe the power of a text piece (Entman, 1993, p. 51). According to Entman, to frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the topic that is being written about (Entman, 1993, p. 52).

Scheufule wrote “Framing as a Theory of Media Effects” in 1999, arguing that a common theoretical model on framing was lacking (Scheufule, 1999, p. 103). He then classifies previous research on framing along two dimensions: media frames vs. audience frames and independent variable vs. dependent variable and develops a process model of framing which include frame building, frame setting, individual-level processes of framing and a feedback loop (ibid). He also mentions how McCombs, Shaw and Weaver have suggested that framing is an extension to agenda setting by using the term second-level agenda-setting to describe the impact of framing on audiences (ibid). Scheufule seeks to differentiate framing from other closely related concepts in order for the concept not to be used as lightly as it has been in previous research.

Nelson, Lecheler, Schuck & de Vreese (2012) also argue that framing affect values, emotions and attitudes among the audience as well as how the audience will perceive different messages (Nelson, Lecheler, Schuck & de Vreese, 2012, p. 2). However, they too point out that it is difficult to identify a specific phenomenon of “a frame” and that there is no exclusive impact of framing. Nelson et. al. argue that the same issue presented in media does not necessarily evoke the same values among the audience (Nelson et. al., 2012, p. 23). Thus, communicators or the media have to communicate to the wider public, hoping to attract the attention of as many as possible.

Framing is a way of describing the power a text holds; how communicators can shape their texts into being influential over a human consciousness. The analysis of these frames explain how the information written can be transferred from for example a news article into the mind of the audience (Entman, 1993, p. 51). Framing involves selection and salience (Entman, 1993, p. 51; Lecheler, de Vreese & Slothus, 2009, p. 401). This means that media can select what to write about and how much they wish to write about it, and they can choose how salient that topic may be, i.e. how much space the articles will take up or where to place the articles either in printed media or online or via repetition. According to Gamson in Entman, frames
 diagnose, evaluate and prescribe, meaning that they define problems, diagnose causes, make moral judgements and suggest remedies (Entman, 1993, p. 52).

Frames are visible in the choices made throughout the production and reception of a text. The communicator or journalist can decide what to say by making conscious or unconscious decisions depending on their belief system, or the news media’s belief system. The text itself contains framing by the presence or absence of words or sentences, sources of information etc. The audiences' thinking and conclusions may or may not reflect the frames in the text and the intention of the writer. The culture can be defining in the discourse and thinking of the audience, as a group of people with the same belief tend to understand framing in the same way, i.e. there are some common frames to a specific culture (Entman, 1993, p. 52-53).

One of the aspects that are important to consider is the content of the text, in this case news articles. A common mistake mentioned in relation to framing is identifying positive and negative words and thus determine the frame of the message. However, this approach might leave out bigger clusters of words that hold a high importance for the actual message of the text (Entman, 1993, p. 57). Thus, the analysis of texts will in this assignment focus on both individual words as well as clusters of words in order to determine what is actually salient for the framing.

Framing is also important when it comes to high and low importance issues. For example, framing an issue of high importance will not affect individuals as much as framing on low importance issues. Hence, if the individuals are not commonly interested in a specific low importance area, framing will have a higher impact on their understanding of the article, which can lead to both positive and negative perceptions of the topic discussed (Lecheler et al., 2009, p. 410).

**Power**

There are several different understandings of power, many of which are portraying power as something someone has over another.

Weber's work was a point of departure when thinking about power as it was built on rational and organisational thinking (Sadan, 2004, p. 35). He linked power with authority and rule, saying that it was probable that one actor would carry out his will even if others were protesting against it – he saw power as a factor of domination, based on economic or authoritarian interests (ibid).

Robert Dahl continued the same approach as Weber, but instead of connecting it to organisations, Dahl discussed power within a community. According to Dahl's theory of community power, power is exercised by a concrete individual in the community who is able to prevent
other individuals from doing what they would prefer to do. Power is used to make subjects to it follow the ideas of the ones in power. This definition is still one of the most used today as well (Sadan, 2004, p. 36).

The definition of Dahl has been critiqued, as he is basing his definition on the assumption that decision-making processes are open. However, Bahrach and Baratz developed a model that deals with the overt and covert faces of power (ibid).

Lukes developed this approach further by adding a third dimension, latent power. Thus, his dimensions now examined the overt dimension (deals with political preferences that are being revealed openly), the covert dimension (political preferences that are revealed through complaints) and the latent dimension that deals with the relations between political preferences and real interests (Sadan, 2004, p. 37). Gaventa has further elaborated this model with a one-dimensional approach to power, which is the overt dimension, the two-dimensional approach, the covert dimension, and finally, the three-dimensional approach, the latent dimension that deals with true interests. In the first two dimensions it is acknowledged that the subject group know that power is being exerted against them, but without them arguing against it. In the last dimension, conflicts may arise if the person in power demands the subject group to do something against their interest – they might protest (Sadan, 2004, p. 40-42).

Foucault is one of the theorists that is being widely connected to the discussion on power. He does not provide us with a framework, but instead, he finds layers that can be analysed (Sadan, 2004, p. 54). Foucault assumes that power and knowledge are interrelated and cannot be separated. Some of Foucault’s assumptions on power, which all deal with only Western Society, are that power occurs in everyday life and operates in different spheres of life. He also says that in order to identify power and figure out how it operates, one must isolate, identify and analyse the network of relations. Moreover, that power has a direct and creative role in social life and is not limited to political institutions (Sadan, 2004, p. 57-59). In Foucault’s view, power only exist when it is exercised, no matter whether subjects agree or resist it.

CDA

Some terms are central to CDA. These involves discourse, power and ideology. The broader meanings that are being communicated in different texts are referred to as discourse (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 117). Conducting CDA involves looking at linguistic and grammatical choices to identify the discourse behind the written text. This is done through connecting specific adjectives to for example a pronoun, where the adjective will connote certain emotions, feelings or opinions among the audience.
It is suggested that we look at discourses as “including, or being compromised of, kinds of participants, behaviours, goals, values and locations” (Van Leeuwen and Wodak in Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 118). Thus, a headline on a news article might describe them or us as participants and how these participants can potentially change something that is of value to the us. Discourse then describes the relations between different actors and groups of people. Fairclough explains how the discourses contribute to the (re)production of social life (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 118). Hence, how we talk about the world will automatically influence the society we create. The discourse that creates society stems from the more powerful actors, who have the power and influence to conceal or generate increased attention to the topic in question – it represents the interests of specific groups (ibid, p. 119).

Along with the idea of discourse and power, ideology is mentioned as well. Ideology derives from the work of Marx and Gramsci and is used to explain the way that we share ideas about how the world works (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 119). In CDA, ideology explains or describe the way ideas and values that describe such views reflect certain interests. Ideology characterises how some discourses become accepted in a society, which obscures how they aid in sustaining power relations (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 120). It obscures our society in a way that does not allow us to see possible alternatives.

The aim of CDA is to identify these ideologies that are hidden in texts. Fairclough argues that the interests of specific groups can easily be found in language (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 119). This is due to the fact that we through language express ourselves and how we view the world around us – it is through language that we share an idea of how we understand things such as “immigrants”, “terrorism” and “nationalism”. Thus, the author of a text have the power to write about a topic, which readers will, eventually, see as “the right way” or the only way to understand that specific topic (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 120). We will begin taking this description for granted.

Hegemony is domination across economic, political, cultural and ideological domains of society (Fairclough, 2010, p. 86). Hegemony is the power that one institution, class, etc. holds over society as a whole, but can only be achieved partially or temporarily. Hegemony is about constructing alliances in society, meaning that the institution will uphold its role as dominating without having to actually inflict subordination on other groups (Fairclough, 2010, p. 86). The relationship between discourse and hegemony might be a matter of hegemony limiting the potentials of discourses, as hegemony, or history, is the determining factor in what discourses actually come about, their usability and durability (Fairclough, 2010, p. 93). Thus, an institution that holds power over other groups or institutions in society can potentially control what the subordinate institution says or does. Hence, a journalist can be subjected to limitations
from his or her work place for example, thus being pushed into writing in a certain style and so forth.

Texts can therefore be seen as doing ideological work, when it is assuming or taking it as an unquestioned reality that something is an factuality (Fairclough, 2004, p. 58). Hegemony thus becomes an integrated part of ideology and power in society.

Power in CDA

According to Fairclough (2004, p. 41), one cannot talk about power without talking about ideology, as ideologies represent processes through which relations of power are established. Social relations and class can cause unequal power relations in a capitalist society. Not only is there inequality between different social classes, but also between cultures, different groups of individuals, etc. (ibid).

CDA is an analysis of dialectical relations between discourse and other elements (Fairclough, 2004, p. 17). It is mentioned how important it is to understand that discourse and power each have their roots in different research areas, but that one does not exclude the other, nor is it the same.

One focus of CDA is the effect of power relations and inequalities which produce social wrongs. The media have a power to represent various actors or objects in a certain way, which will be the focus of the reader’s discourse afterwards. However, CDA can aid in identifying these social wrongs and address potential ways of righting or mitigating them (Fairclough, 2004, p. 25). Language becomes a mean of social construction (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 119).

Another aspect to power in CDA, is the fact that there is no neutral or objective way to represent the world through language. Everything we write or say, the words we use are motivated and represents a certain meaning (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 116). Thus, the power of those who frame and cover acts and other topics, i.e. the journalists, is substantial.

Social agents

Fairclough (2004) mentions how Silverstone explains the notion “mediation” as a movement of meaning, i.e. mediation involves a chain of texts (Fairclough, 2010, p. 45). A journalist write a news article, which is then being read by those buying the newspaper or accessing the news provider online. The reader can then either write a letter or a comment to respond to the news article or he might talk about it with people in his network. Hence, how the reporter or journalist decide to treat a specific topic will likely set the tone for how we discuss it afterwards. However, as these meanings move from text to text, or from author to reader, they are open
for transformation (Fairclough, 2010, p. 100). For the same reason, saying *movement of meaning* can be somewhat misleading – instead, texts provide the receiver with material to form his or her own meaning on the topic, no matter how the author previously decided to write about it.

Fairclough talks about authors as social agents, who have the power to construct certain meanings by using specific words together (Fairclough, 2004, p. 23). The social agent can create meaning through his lexical choices, which gives the journalist a high degree of power to determine the potential outcome of his text. I will dig deeper into this as well in my analysis and identify potential differences in the journalists’ reporting between British and Swedish news outlets.
Method and material

In order to be able to fully understand and analyse the various issues of the case, I will conduct a critical discourse analysis on a data sample.

The material used for the analysis will consist of a sample of news articles published on online news media in Sweden and Britain. A number of articles in the week following the attack, i.e. the period from 7th April until 14th April, will be selected for the analysis, as the act is still highly relevant to and discussed in society in this period. Rhetorical constructions of actors and the act itself will be of the highest priority, and pictures and videos will therefore not be analysed.

The motive behind choosing material from the week following the attack is to be able to analyse material from when the act is still fresh in the memories of both journalists and interviewees. As previous research has had its focus especially on changes over time, finding time frames used previously and using it as a motive for the time frame of this study has proven difficult. However, it is assumed that it is in the first period of time after an attack that reporters and eye-witnesses feel very emotional about the attack and that this period therefore is the most suitable in identifying descriptions and uncover hidden meanings in discourse. A critical discourse analysis will, as described in the theory section, uncover ideologies hidden in discourse and is therefore highly relevant when it comes to framing of actors and the act, as well as to determine the power distribution in media.

A total of 15 articles will be examined – seven from Britain and eight from Sweden. The articles have been chosen through a few Google searches in both Swedish and English in order to be able to examine the top news articles that most people are likely to have seen, if they have done a Google search on the topic. The phrase used for the search was “Stockholm terror attack 2017” in a few different variations. Hence, the seven British articles stem from five different news outlets: The Telegraph, Financial Times, BBC, Metro and Daily Mail. The eight articles from Sweden similarly come from five news outlets: Svenska Dagbladet, Expressen, Aftonbladet, Metro and The Local.

Excerpts from Aftonbladet, Metro, SvD and Expressen all have Swedish as the original language and have been translated for the purpose of this assignment by me with the help of a native speaking Swede. This has been done in order to choose English words that come as close as possible to the Swedish meaning, in order to obtain a more correct idea of the Swedish media representation. However, as happens with translations, some words might lose parts of their meaning, which should also be considered. The Swedish original texts can be found in the appendix alongside the English translation. As the only Swedish paper writing in English, texts from The Local have not been translated and are therefore a copy of the original text.
The articles analysed can be found in the appendix alongside dates of publishing and dates of updates (if provided by the news outlet).

In order to make sure that newspapers from both Sweden and Britain have roughly the same political point of view, and therefore will not show any radical views or differ much from each other, I have created two figures that show how the newspapers are situated if looking at the political stance, as found on both second-hand websites as well as some newspapers’ own websites.

Looking at these arrows, it is clear that articles from a diverse range of papers are part of the sample. Thus, the results from the analysis will show a general picture of the attack as represented by a variety of news outlets. Due to the fact that both left- and right wing papers are part of the sample, as well as un-biased papers, in both Britain and Sweden, the results will be comparable as all news outlets represents political opinions in the same area, in between left/left-center and right/right-center.

It is assumed that there will be no big differences in the framing by the different news outlets, as no news outlets with extreme political viewpoints are represented. The data sample therefore presents a relatively homogenous group of articles.

Media Bias Fact Check provides us with an overview over different news papers in relation to political stance and bias through analysing for example wording and how factual their articles are (Media Bias Fact Check, 2018a). MBFC has developed its own method to do bias check ups and further gives users the possibility of voting as well, making sure that if MBFC’s analysis does not match the view of users, MBFC can redo its analysis on that particular paper. Based on MBFC’s model as well as checking up on how users perceive the different newspapers, the British news outlets can be placed on a political arrow as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extreme</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Left-center</th>
<th>Least Biased</th>
<th>Right-center</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Extreme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro UK</td>
<td>BBC</td>
<td>Financial Times</td>
<td>The Telegraph</td>
<td>Daily Mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 – Political orientation, British media

Identifying ideologies on Swedish news outlets proved to be harder, with no sources giving the political stance of all newspapers. Thus, the sources had to be retrieved from different
sites. However, I was unable to locate The Local’s political stance via any external sources and had to investigate their own website in order to place them on the scale. Thus, the Swedish news sites has been placed as follows (The Local, 2018a; NE, 2018; SVD, 2009; Expressen, 2017; Dagens Media, 2016):

![Figure 2 - Political orientation, Swedish media](image)

**Critical discourse analysis**

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) allows us to carry out a systematic analysis of texts and language (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 115). Some of the aspects CDA helps identifying are for example how authors use language to create meaning, to persuade people to think about certain events in a specific way or even manipulate readers (ibid). CDA identifies “language choices” used in various text and shows how these choices create a particular perception in the mind of the reader. The author of a news piece, for example, might choose to “humanise” victims of a crime by emphasising that the victim was a father or husband, but the same will not be done for the perpetrator. Thus, the reader will either identify or understand the situation of the victim, and the perpetrator will continue being distant and anonymised to the reader. Connotations of different words give the reader an understanding of the event portrayed in the article, as represented by the author, the journalist.

CDA offers a number of tools that can help in revealing ideas and values in texts that the audience might not uncover when first encountering a text piece. The meanings behind lexical choices can be buried as the author will seek to conceal them and not make them too obvious (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 116). These language choices can be found in everyday discourse as well.

CDA seeks to be critical towards linguistic choices, as they are potentially being used for particular purposes, such as influencing the audience to think in a certain way. CDA scholars believe that it is through such criticism that social change can be accomplished (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 116). However, there is no neutral way of representing the world through
language as we all use words with a meaning attached to it; but, the listener might not be able to identify how he is being influenced to think about something and perceive it in a particular way (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 116-117). This is what CDA aims to identify and uncover – how language can be used to convey ideas.

This is also why CDA is applicable in the case of how different actors are portrayed in media by journalists. The media can frame actors in specific ways, and I will try to uncover how they do this, and what importance each actor is assigned.

**Critical discourse analysis tools**

As critical discourse analysis consist of several tools, only those that are the most relevant to the analysis will be used. The aim of the study is to determine how various actors are being portrayed by journalists through analysing different aspects in the news articles. In order to identify the portrayal and framing of the various actors and the act itself, the chosen tools focus on aspects that can give a greater understanding of this.

The specific tools have been chosen in order to enlighten certain aspects of framing. The framing of actors for example, can be done through giving them various attributes. One newspaper might create a headline saying: “Muslim man creates terror and fear in the streets of Stockholm”, and another might have one saying: “Father of two suspected of terror”. In the first example, the journalist expands the “us” and “them” division by pointing out that the perpetrator is Muslim, thereby saying that he is not like us. Moreover, it is assumed that this Muslim man is indeed the perpetrator, as it says he has created fear in Stockholm. This is referred to as transitivity - we are able to determine who does what to who. In this case, the Muslim man is actively doing something to someone. It is also noteworthy that the man is portrayed as Muslim and he therefore represents a generic type opposed to a specific person.

In the second example, the perpetrator has been portrayed as a specific person, a father of two. That also creates a feeling of familiarity, as we can identify ourselves with him – he has a family. Furthermore, he is not portrayed as if he is actively doing anything to hurt anyone, but instead someone is accusing him of it, which can potentially cause pity, as he might not be guilty.

Thus, these tools are the ones that will be used for the analysis: how the actor has been named or is being referred to; the othering; if the actor is said to actively do something or if something is being done to him; what the used words connote, and; the personification of objects. This will show us how journalists choose to frame actors and who they choose to hold responsible for certain actions.

Moreover, I will focus on exclusion: what might not be said and why. Whether it is excluded because people are expected to know it already or if there is an ideology behind. In case of a single text, looking at exclusion does not leave a trace, but in this case with various actors
involved, exclusion can tell us something. If the relevant actions are included, but some or all actors included in these actions are excluded, it leaves the question of why (Van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 29). In exclusion, a distinction can be made between suppression and backgrounding. Suppression means that the relevant actors are not at all mentioned, whereas backgrounding refers to when the actors are mentioned in the text, but not in relation to the act, which is why we can only with a reasonable amount of certainty assume who did what (Van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 29). It can be difficult to determine exactly why actors are sometimes suppressed in texts, whether it might be due to the assumption of previous knowledge or because mentioning who might create issues for some of the actors involved.

**Naming and reference**

It has been proved that how we name or describe people can influence how others perceive them. This means that journalists can highlight the aspects they wish to draw attention to and ignore others (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 124-125). Thus, the portrayal of an actor might be one-sided and determined by the text author. The reasons for describing actors in a certain way can serve psychological, social and political purposes for both author and reader (ibid, p. 125). This gives the author the power to decide whether for example othering should be furthered. In cases of terror acts, the author might find it beneficial to create an “us” and “them” division. Crime reporting often show signs of this othering in order to explain to us that the perpetrator is not “one of us” (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 125).

Identifying examples of this in the different news articles can give a better understanding of whether national and/or international news media use naming to further for example otherness. Moreover, it will be possible to see if there is as difference between the two countries, which in turn can tell us if there is an increased or decreased need to create a distinction between “us” and “them” in the country that has affected or the country that functions as a spectator.

**The “us” and “them” dimension**

Using “us” and “them” has the potential to align us alongside or against certain ideas (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 129). A journalist can conceal his or her intentions and ideas behind “we”, as the term “we” is slippery (Fairclough in Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 130). “We” can refer to many and very different groups of people.

In the case of terror acts, it is highly relevant to look at how “we” and “they” are portrayed to see how clear the distinction between the two groups is.
**Representation of social action**

Whereas the previously mentioned tools can shape the reader’s perception of various actors, the representation of social action can also aid in our perception – this is also referred to as transitivity (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 144). Transitivity allows us to determine who acts and how, and who does what to who by looking at how the actors’ actions are described in the text.

**Word connotations and lexical choices**

Word connotations are based on the lexical choices an author of a text makes. It is assumed that since language gives us multiple sets of options, a specific sentence will be created by certain choices (Machin & Mayr, 2012, p. 32). Connotations can therefore represent for example values or ideas.

**Personification/objectification**

Personification means that human abilities are assigned to objects (Machin & Mayr, 2012, p. 171). This can obscure the actual agent behind the action. Personifying objects such as a country, a machinery and so forth will conceal who is actually behind the mentioned actor. This is especially seen in this case in relation to the truck, Stockholm, Sweden, and the act of terror itself.

Using these different tools of CDA as well as bearing in mind how the journalist and newspaper hold power in how they frame and represent the terror act in different countries will aid in the understanding of how terror acts are represented.

By analysing how actors and the act is portrayed, it will be possible to see how journalists use their power in determining how to describe and explain actions and thus, identify underlying ideologies in discourse.

However, there are some criticisms to the use of CDA as a method, one being that some of the tools available are very similar and the terms are therefore used loosely and intertwined (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 148). This is also the case in this study, where I will argue that the us and them division can easily be combined with the naming and reference aspect – is the actor described in a relatable way or in wider terms. Do we associate with him or not. This way, othering also constitutes a huge part of the naming and reference. Conversely, it can also be argued that othering is the main category and that we can use naming and reference to make this distinction clearer.
Other criticisms relate to the journalists covering stories. In media today, journalists often do not have time to fact-check or resources to do their own stories, causing them to build their articles on either eye-witness accounts or using material handed to them directly from various sources (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 149). Hence, material that are ready to use might not undergo a critical evaluation and will be published immediately, which can cause obstruction in what it is we actually are to read in the text, and text-based criticism will therefore not tell us much about the current news media situation.

However, as CDA is concerned with critically evaluating texts, I still find the method suitable and valid for this comparative study. Bearing in mind that some of the data analysed potentially stem from other sources than directly from the newspapers, CDA will sustain to be relevant for analysing different framing methods of actors involved.

**Strengths and weaknesses of the study**

This study will provide the reader with some valuable insight to how terror acts are being framed in media. It will give the reader some in-depth knowledge on how discourse can be used to alter public opinion and hide ideologies. It can aid the reader in being more critical towards what he or she reads in media and how the information is perceived.

One of the limitations to this study is that the data gathering has not been done until roughly a year after the incident. In order to get a more accurate picture of how media is using their journalistic power to frame for example terror acts, the analysis would benefit from articles being gathered right after being published. As it is today, some newspapers might have corrected or edited their articles, which means the analysis potentially will be askew.

As the analysis is only focusing on one event, it is not possible to determine whether this way of framing the terror attack domestically and internationally is a general or an isolated reaction. However, it can possibly show us differences in perception by the media. In order to generate a fuller and general picture of the media framing domestically and internationally, more terror acts as well as comparisons between more countries could be investigated.

A critical discourse analysis is also subject to potential bias on behalf of the author. My understanding of the media framing will be one and not necessarily the correct one. Interpretational issues can occur depending on the culture of the article reader. Thus, my analysis is one way of understanding the research material and is not necessarily similar to the understanding of individuals from for example other cultures, other backgrounds and so forth.

The study is reliable in relation to research on terror acts, as conducted in Europe and understood by Europeans. It can be used to show tendencies in European framing of terror
acts, but cannot be assumed to be a valid source within the same area in other parts of the world, as non-European individuals might have a different understanding and definition on terror. It might, however, act as a general outline of the relationship between the coverage of terror acts in news outlets with roots in the same part of the world, that is, to say whether huge differences in framing and power distribution can be identified or not.
Analysis

The analysis will consist of different sections; an analysis of the Swedish news coverage and of the British news coverage of the different group of actors, followed by a section that will clarify potential differences and similarities between the two countries. The analysis will be conducted through using excerpts from the collected articles, which will be analysed to create an over-all picture. In order to make the results clearer, I will analyse the different groups of actors separately when feasible. However, some excerpts treat more than one actor group.

This will be followed by a discussion on how journalists are able to divide power between actors present and whether this is obvious to the reader or not, and in what ways it can be seen. Once again, if differences between the empowerment as presented by the journalists in Sweden and Britain are present, these will be pointed out. Potential reasons for differences and similarities in media representation will be discussed as well.

Several groups or individual actors have been identified while reading through the data sample. Those that have been given the most attention include the perpetrator, the public including eye witnesses and injured individuals, the police, the victims who died, Swedish politicians, and foreign politicians. Smaller groups include the Swedish royal family, medical workers, the lorry company who owned the stolen truck, other media outlets used as source, as well as a group of people who were involved in the act or associated with the perpetrator in one way or another, i.e. Akilov’s lawyer and other suspects. Finally, we also have a group of non-identified actors, meaning that no actor is clearly attached to specific excerpts.

Moving away from people, other groups were identified as well: Stockholm and Sweden in one group, descriptions of the act itself, and finally, descriptions connected to the stolen truck.

The news coverage of actors

The perpetrator in Swedish news

The perpetrator is portrayed in a variety of ways, some with the purpose of being factual, some with the purpose of differentiating the man from the rest of us.

“The suspect is a citizen of Uzbekistan. Same country where a man who one year ago was sentenced to a lifetime in prison by the court of appeal (...) after an attempted murder in Strömsund on an imam and a regime criticist comes from.”

(Aftonbladet, 2017b)
This sentence functions as a factual sentence, telling the reader that the suspect is from Uzbekistan. However, as the journalist choose to connect the perpetrator by citizenship to another man, who attempted to commit murder, the journalist choose to describe citizens of Uzbekistan as violent. Thus, this description is not directly linked to the perpetrator itself, but it yet enhances the difference between us and them, them being citizens of Uzbekistan and therefore also the perpetrator. Giving the suspect the trait of being from Uzbekistan and foreign, emphasises his otherness and by reporting about the other man as well, the journalists points out that the perpetrator is part of something problematic. This is to emphasise further that the perpetrator is not one of us, done by creating a moral others, which is the norm in crime reporting (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 125).

In this case, the perpetrator has also been described as a generic type – an Uzbekistan citizen. This can add a racist angle to texts, but in this case, it is used to further the othering and to inform the readers that citizens from Uzbekistan have a history of using violence.

“During Friday night, Akilov, who is an Uzbekistan citizen, was arrested on probable causes, the higher suspicion degree, for an act of terror through murder. According to the police, he has shown sympathy for extreme organisations, among them IS.”

(Expressen, 2017)

Once again, the journalist points out that Akilov is an Uzbekistan citizen, in order to emphasise that he is not one of “us”. Here, however, more information about Akilov has been added in the fact that police has disclosed that he has shown sympathy for IS. Moreover, the journalist has chosen to make the perpetrator a specific type in this text, by naming him instead of making a reference to him as “the suspect”, “the perpetrator” or the like. Thus, it is acknowledged that we have a suspect, who is different, but yet an individual about who we now have more information. However, it is also acknowledging the perpetrator and the act, which I will discuss further down in relation to both the risk society and covering such acts too heavily.

In terms of transitivity, in this excerpt, we have no description of who did the arrest, as the journalist sees it as a given that the police are the ones arresting someone. By writing it like this, Akilov is being passivated and the police force is being seen as the activated actor, who do things and make things happen (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 145). This is because activated social actors are often seen as a dynamic force in an activity, and the journalist thus describes the police as the successful actor or the actor who will come out on top. Moreover, this will give
the reader a sense of comfort or security, as it is implicitly written in the text that “we” have good people to protect “us” from “them”.

Another representation of social action in this text can be found in the relational description of the fact that Akilov has shown sympathy towards extreme organisations – as opposed to “us”, who do not show sympathy for these.

*The perpetrator in British news*

> “Swedish police said on Saturday morning that they believe a 39-year-old suspect was behind the truck attack which left four dead and 15 injured, but declined to comment on reports that the suspect was a father-of-four from Uzbekistan”

(The Telegraph, 2017b)

The first thing here that is note-worthy is that this article was published on April 8th in the morning – the Swedish article from Expressen that actually mentions Akilov as the suspect was from April 7th in the afternoon. This shows us, first of all, that Expressen has edited their article since it was published (as Akilov was not arrested before later in the evening that day), but as the Telegraph could not confirm this information the following morning, Swedish media could potentially have had easier access to information than foreign media.

In this excerpt, the perpetrator is described as a generic type. However, by saying that police declined to confirm the reports of the suspect being a father-of-four from Uzbekistan, the Telegraph still manages to make Akilov a more specific type, without confirming that this is indeed the perpetrator. This excerpt is highly informal – there are no hidden actors.

> “A former co-worker at a construction company in Sweden where Akilov worked for a few months last year said he was a father who sent money home to a wife and several children living in Uzbekistan.”

(The Telegraph, 2017c)

In this excerpt, the perpetrator is described as a specific type. The text is also referencing to him as a father, which can make the reader identify with him, to some degree. Only to some degree as it follows that he is sending money to Uzbekistan to provide for a wife and several children. However, this piece can potentially make the reader sympathise with the perpetrator, as he is being described as a regular man. In this case, it might be important to look at the text surrounding the excerpt to determine whether this is what the Telegraph is promoting, but fact remains that the newspaper chose to describe the perpetrator in this way as well.
It is noteworthy that British media are more nuanced in their descriptions of the perpetrator than the Swedish media. British media frame their stories differently and cover the perpetrator from more angles, whereas Swedish journalists use othering quite a lot.

The public in Swedish news
The public includes eye witnesses and injured individuals. Moreover, individuals who are reacting to the situation through accounts to media outlets.

“"Unfortunately, you get almost used to these situations," said Michael, another local. “It’s like in July 2016 (the Nice attack). I was very shocked and now, well, now again. Another attack.””

(The Local, 2017)

This is an account from a citizen in Stockholm, explaining how he feels about the situation and the shock that comes with it. He is merely described as another local, as the journalist does not see any reason to give the reader more information on him. The important aspect is that he is local and is therefore affected by the attack. Families of victims could be described in the same vague terms and the reader would still understand that he or she is closely connected to the tragedy.

He is mentioned by name in order to make him a specific type as well. The reader does not need to know Michael, but the journalist is making the reader relate to him by using his name and the local reference, instead of merely writing “a person said”. What Michael is saying here is also referring to the mental process of transitivity. Michael says he was very shocked at the Nice attack and now it has happened again. This encourages the reader to feel sympathy with him, as he is reacting to this type of act and now it just happened in the city in which he lives.

“After the lorry drove into Åhléns, the driver fled the scene and the crowds fled in panic from Drottninggatan and the area around Åhléns.”

(Aftonbladet, 2017c)

This excerpt describes three different actors – the lorry, the perpetrator, and the public. Therefore, a lot of social action can be identified. The lorry drove into Åhléns is a material verb process, as it is implicit in the text that there is a material outcome to this – Åhléns will be damaged by being hit by a truck. The driver fled the scene is a behavioural process – it is an
act with no material outcome. Now, the public, named as the crowds, are described in both a behavioural and mental process. They flee which is an act, but they flee in panic, telling the reader how they felt and looked while escaping the scene.

The crowd is referred to as a generic type, but in this case it is not to create otherness. It is merely to describe that a lot of people had to flee from the area. However, saying that the crowds fled in panic will create connotations in the mind of the reader and he will feel sympathy with them. There are no adjectives connected to the driver and we therefore do not feel anything in relation to him.

The public in British news

“"There was blood everywhere. There were bodies on the ground everywhere, and a sense of panic, people standing by their loved ones, but also running away. It got very quiet. There was the noise, then everything got quiet, and then people started screaming and crying, obviously people severely wounded, then people running away.""

(The Telegraph, 2017b)

An eye witness account published in the British media, given by a woman who was in Åhléns when the lorry hit and then ran out. This description is very rich, making the reader understand the situation the public found themselves in. As she is describing the public, there is no undertone of otherness, and by using plenty of adjectives, the reader feel empathy and sorrow – and maybe fear. There are generic types in this text as represented by different groups of people; people standing by their loved ones, people running away, and so forth. As it is an eye witness account, the journalist has not chosen these words to create connotations in the mind of the reader on purpose, but he/she has chosen to include this eye witness account to inform the reader about the situation and how the public viewed it.

“A stolen truck smashed into a crowd in central Stockholm on Friday, killing at least four people and injuring many more (...).

Shortly before 3 pm, a truck drove through a busy, pedestrianised street, hitting people before crashing into the Åhléns City department store.”

(Financial Times, 2017)

Here, the truck is doing the transaction of hitting people, i.e. the process is transitive. The crowd, on the other hand, are passive. As previously described, an active social agent is
often seen as proactive and dynamic, hence, something positive. However, it can also describe the empowered actor in a transaction. In this case, the truck is the powerful actor and is therefore represented as the active agent. The public are described as passive, because they had no chance of stopping the lorry on its quest. Thus, the importance of this excerpt is to convince the reader that the public did not stand a chance in the act.

*The police in Swedish news*

“The motive behind the lorry attack in Stockholm on April 7th remains unclear. But the police is investigating it as an act of terror – and it has a lot in common with previous attacks in Europe.”

(Aftonbladet, 2017d)

Both the motive and the police are active actors here. This is because the motive and the act itself is powerful, but by giving the police power as well, the reader will connote that the police has it under control. Moreover, the police has been activated in order to give them the dynamic and positive activation that has the potential to calm readers. In a situation like this, the police cannot be represented as a passive entity as the world expects them to solve the crime. There are no further descriptions regarding naming, othering, and so forth here. This text is basically a powerplay and represents two powerful actors in a situation like this – the police, and the act. By adding that the police is investigating it as an act of terror, the journalists also manage to implicitly describe who we should wish to win, namely the police.

*The police in British news*

“This is the moment Swedish police snared a suspected Isis fanatic following a high-speed chase and arrested him in relation to the Stockholm truck attack that saw at least four people killed and 15 injured.”

(Daily Mail, 2017)

In this excerpt, on the contrary to the Swedish one, the reader is given a lot of descriptions. The suspect is referred to as an Isis fanatic, which is furthering the othering between us and them. The fact that he is an Isis sympathiser already makes the perpetrator different, but using the word *fanatic* also adds to this, as fanatic is one of the words that have been widely
connected to terror organisations and otherness, due to descriptions of for example religious fanatics (Cambridge Dictionary, 2018).

Moreover, it is described that the police *snares* the perpetrator, which connotes how hunters use snares to catch animals. Thus, we have a hunter and the hunted. Here, the police is the active actor and the perpetrator the passivated, as the police has now become the sole powerful force. At least, they have won the first battle, by catching the perpetrator.

*The victims in Swedish and British news*

> “Four people lost their lives in the attack on Drottninggatan. A schoolgirl from Stockholm, a woman in her seventies from Ljungskile who was on a visit in Stockholm, a Belgian woman in her thirties who came to Stockholm to visit friends, and a British man in his forties who lived and worked in Stockholm.”

(Svenska Dagbladet, 2017)

In this section, it is described through naming and reference who the victims of the crime are.

It is not necessary to tell us more about the victims, as this gives a clear representation of who they were, and the reader will sympathise. First of all a *schoolgirl* was among the victims. This journalist here informs the reader that a young girl died in the attack – she is not a student, but a schoolgirl. Instantly, the reader will think how tragic it is that a child lost her life. The next three victims are described more in details. For example, the Belgian woman was in Stockholm to visit friends, meaning that she was in Stockholm for an enjoyable occasion. A British man who lived and worked in Stockholm will give the reader connotations to the fact that he most likely had a family in Stockholm as well. This way, without being given more information on each victim, the reader will see them as specific types and feel dejected because they had to die in the attack.

> “Maïlys Dereymarker, who has a 1,5-year-old son, was according to the newspaper Het Nieuwsblad working as a psychologist, among others with asylum seekers.”

(Aftonbladet, 2017e)

Maïlys Dereymaeker was the Belgian victim of the attack. She is described as a mother of a young son. Her profession is also described with further details, as she was working with asylum seekers, among others. Thus, the journalist use this information to explain how
Dereymaeker gave to asylum seekers and what she got out of it. This also adds to the othering of asylum seekers, which in this article connotes Akilov.

“Mr. Bevington was born in South Africa, where he spent a portion of his childhood before moving to Leatherhead in Surrey with his family. The middle child of three, he has an older brother, Derren, 43, and a younger sister, Natasha, 37, (...) He and Annika married in June 2012 and have a son. Instead of accepting wedding presents the couple donated money to Oxfam.”

(BBC, 2017)

The British victim, Chris Bevington, was also described as a family person and a generous person.

Common for both victims described is that the journalists are humanising them for everyone to relate to them, and to understand the sorrow and pain this act has caused the families. In the case of Dereymaeker, the journalist brought up the fact that she was working with asylum seekers, and in the case of Bevington, it was brought up that he has a history of donating to charities. This way, the journalists represent the victims as good people, who will be greatly missed.

This is the opposite of what has been done in relation to the perpetrator, where it has been more often pointed out that he was an IS sympathiser, than the fact that he had children.

**Swedish politicians in Swedish and British news**

“The prime minister, who laid a bouquet of red roses and lit a candle near the store where the atrocity took place, added that the attack had attacked people when they were at their most vulnerable, going about their daily lives.”

(The Telegraph, 2017b)

“Describing the attack as a tragedy for the families involved, he added that he would do “whatever it takes” to ensure people felt safe.”

(The Telegraph, 2017b)

The prime minister of Sweden, Stefan Löfven, is here described in an act of sympathy. Even though he is not represented as something specific, apart from his title, the fact that he is lighting a candle near the store represents him as full of empathy and sorrow for the Swedish people and the victims. The fact that he is also quoted for having said that the perpetrator
attacked the citizens at their most vulnerable shows even more compassion. Thus, the reader sees Löfven as a strong character, who shows empathy.

“*Sweden’s prime minister Stefan Löfven has called for tougher measures on rejecting asylum seekers.*

*He said he was “enormously frustrated” that Sweden’s liberal immigration policies had failed to eject Akilov before the attack.*”

(The Telegraph, 2017d)

Here, Löfven is the empowered actor, who is actively calling for tougher measures regarding asylum seekers. Thus, Löfven is implicitly stating that this attack will be used as a reason for tightening rules relating to immigrants and refugees. The fact that he is *enormously frustrated* is a mental process and by saying so, he invites the reader into his mind. It tells the reader that Löfven is frustrated that the Swedish system has failed to work in this case, and that this is partly to blame for the attack.

“*”We will never give up because of terror. We will get through this together,” the prime minister said.*”

(Expressen, 2017)

In this excerpt, Löfven is talking about a collective “we”. There is no further explanation as to who “we” are, and in this part of a speech he gave, it is therefore assumed that the audience know who “we” are. Assumedly, it refers to the Swedish people, but might also refer to countries in general that are victims to terror. It is also possible that the first we refer to several countries and that the next we refer to Swedish people and how they can support each other through the crisis.

*Foreign politicians in British news*

The terror act in Stockholm received reactions from several political figures around especially Europe. However, as most of these reactions were condolences, expressions of sympathy, and statements about standing together in the fight against terrorists, doing a thorough analysis of these will not reveal much about the actors behind, nor whether journalists have empowered them through their representation.
One foreign figure is particularly interesting in British media, though, namely the mayor of London, Sadiq Khan. London was hit by the same type of terror act only weeks before Stockholm, which is also why Khan is being given much attention in some British articles, compared to other political figures.

“Londoners know how it feels to suffer from senseless and cowardly terrorism. And I know we share a steely determination with the people of Stockholm that we will never allow terrorists to succeed. We will never be cowed by terrorism, and today – London stands united with Stockholm and Londoners stand with the people of Stockholm.”

(Daily Mail, 2017)

Khan describes in this quote both terrorism and Londoners. Terrorism is referred to as senseless and cowardly, i.e. the reader will connote terrorism as something mean and something that should not take place. In this quote, the “we” is also mentioned without any further explanation about who “we” are. Both journalists and political figures can take advantage of this fluid definition that “we” is. Besides emphasising the us and them dimension, using a fluid “we” can hide who is responsible or who has the power (Hansen & Machin, 2013, p. 130). In this case “we” refers to Londoners, but could have also referred to Britain in general – the last “we” could even refer to everyone who is not one of “them”, i.e. a terrorist.

There is no focus on foreign politicians in Swedish media. Only a few ministers’ condolences on Twitter are mentioned, which is why I have found no suitable example to analyse. Thus, I can only determine how important or unimportant foreign politicians are in British media.

Other involved groups in Swedish and British news

One group that is not being given much attention, but who plays a crucial role in situations like this is the medical workers.

“Paramedics desperately treated injured people near the lorry after they had been caught up in the attack.”

(Daily Mail, 2017)

The paramedics are described as desperately doing an act, which will connote busy paramedics, running around in despair to treat injured individuals, more or less structured, in
the mind of the reader. Using the word desperately instead of efficiently, or another word that would bring a more positive connotation into the mind of the reader, is a tool the journalist might use to bring out the hopelessness in such an act. Thus, the journalist choose to bring forward the negative aspects in such an act, but by choosing to connect it to the paramedics, the journalist make them appear unstructured and potentially not capable of handling a situation like this. Looking at the phrasing, desperately is not necessary for the understanding of the sentence either and is merely being used as a mean to connote the hopelessness. It can also connote that the paramedics are treating injured people to no avail, as the latter might already have suffered injuries too severe for treatment.

In this excerpt, it is clear that the paramedics are the empowered actors through being the activated agent. The transaction is clear – the paramedics are treating the people that have been injured. Moreover, the mental process has been decided by the journalist through the word desperately. The reader now knows that the paramedics are desperate and in turn, the reader is also aware that the injured people have some people that are desperate to save them. This is an active process, as the paramedics are doing something concrete to change their current state – they are actively treating the injured people, i.e. there is a material transaction.

Another actor group present is other suspects, or other people that have been arrested in relation to the act.

“Two men were tackled to the ground and arrested. Police questioned them but said they were not suspected of any crime.”

(Daily Mail, 2017)

Here, two men were tackled to the ground, but we are not being told who the active agent is. However, as the police is mentioned in the sentence just after, it is safe to assume that they are the active agent. Thus, the two men become a passivated actor, who holds little or no power in comparison.

The Swedish king, too, held a short speech.

“"All of us who wants to help are several more than those who wants to hurt us," the chief of state said in his speech.”

(Expressen, 2017)
Even though it is unclear in this text who we and them are, the othering becomes very clear and distinct. The king openly differs between the good “we” and the bad “them” by saying that “we” want to help and “they” want to hurt us. Thus, he dissociates us from them, i.e. the Swedes from the terrorists.

The news coverage of objects as actors

Stockholm and Sweden
One object that becomes an actor is Stockholm, and Sweden in general. Both in terms of how the country and city reacted, but general information is also provided.

“Since 2012 around 300 people have travelled from Sweden to join violent Islamist groups – making the country one of the largest contributors to terrorist cells in Europe.”

(Daily Mail, 2017)

This piece is interesting in the question of power, as it becomes clear to the reader that Sweden has quite a big number of individuals leaving for violent Islamist groups. However, the active agent in this text is the people who are travelling. Sweden, instead, is being portrayed as the passivated agent, i.e. the reader is not supposed to hold Sweden accountable for its contributions to terrorist cells.

This can also be an ideological choice of words – as Sweden has just been hit by a violent terror attack, the journalist do not want to cause further trouble or implicate the citizens of Sweden in the act of the perpetrator. Had the journalist instead written Sweden has contributed to terrorist cells with around 300 people since 2012, this would have been understood as if Sweden is actively training and sending people to join terrorist cells.

“Sweden has reinforced its borders with immediate effect, Stefan Löfven, the Swedish prime minister said.”

(The Telegraph, 2017b)

Here, Sweden is represented as the powerful, engaging actor, who actively sought to reinforce borders and thereby control the stream of immigrants. This is a safety measure taken by the politicians, but not necessarily the best solution, as for example Akilov had already been in Sweden for years before he committed the crime. However, by presenting Sweden as proactive, this reinforcement can still give a feeling of being more secure to the citizens.
“Sweden has been hit by a terror attack.”

(Expressen, 2017)

This is a factual sentence that also expresses something horrible. Terror connotes fear and death. Sweden is again portrayed as a passive actor who is not to be blamed for the act.

The truck
The truck, too, is represented as an actor in the news coverage.

During the attack, which happened around 3 pm local time, a hijacked 30-tonne truck ploughed down pedestrians before crashing into a shopping centre and bursting into flames.”

(Daily Mail, 2017)

The lorry is described as hijacked, meaning that the reader will understand that it has gone rogue. Moreover, the weight is mentioned to give an idea of the potential damage such a truck can cause when being driven around.

The truck is an active agent, the material outcome being the pedestrians who are being hit by it. The fact that the lorry is ploughing down pedestrians also connote that the truck is moving in a fast and uncontrolled manor. It gives connotations to farming, where farmers use large machinery to plough their fields and the reader will use this given information to imagine the situation at Drottninggatan.

The truck here is the powerful actor. The pedestrians are passive in the sense that the reader is expected to understand that they were present at the pedestrianised area and that they had no chance of stopping the truck.

“During Friday afternoon, a truck mowed down people in central Stockholm.”

(Metro SE, 2017)

Here, we see the truck once again as personified as well as the powerful actor. The Swedish journalist has used a verb to connote the same as the British journalist did – mowed. This signifies something sharp or violent, and that something is being cut down, in this case the people.
The act itself

The act itself have been described in various ways, all giving the reader the notion that it was grim. Both as explained by eye-witnesses, politicians and other parties involved, but also as represented by journalists, both in Sweden and Britain.

“Stefan Löfven, Sweden’s prime minister said, “This was a horrible attack at the very heart of our capital,” and it was being treated as a terror incident.”

(Financial Times, 2017)

Löfven refers to the act as a horrible attack. Horrible connotes something undesirable, something, we do not wish to see happen. Thus, obviously, readers will understand that Löfven condemns the act and are likely to do so themselves. Moreover, he says that the attack happened at the heart of the capital – using the word heart both connotes love, warmth, and happiness. Attacking the heart will have fatal consequences.

“The attack appeared to follow a grim pattern set over the past year across Europe with vehicles having been used in terror attacks against pedestrians in the UK, Germany, and France.”

(Financial Times, 2017)

Here, the attack is described as following the same transaction as other terror incidents across Europe. The passive pedestrians are out and about, giving the trucks the possibility of hitting them and inflict serious injury.

Both examples regarding the attack are also applicable in the discussion about risk society and how media, politicians, and in general public figures potentially act in ways that further fear. Moreover, how media at times over-cover for example terror attacks, giving too high exposure to terrorists cells, and thus, giving them what they wish to obtain by their attacks. All of this I will discuss further in a later section.

Exclusion

Even though only excerpts of the articles have been analysed, the number of excerpts to some degree also represent the focus of the articles in general. Most focus is on the perpetrator, the public and the police, followed by politicians, domestic and foreign. Thus, one actor that is not being given much attention are the medical workers.
Moreover, not much attention is being given to the Migration services that rejected the asylum application for Akilov and who handed his case to the police when he deviated (Metro SE, 2017).

The representations as created by journalists can include or exclude actors to suit the interests in relation to the intended readers (Van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 28). Whereas the actors have not been completely excluded from the articles, they are not being brought forward either. This can be due to journalists’ wishes to not discredit for example the police in Stockholm that did not manage to send Akilov out of the country prior to the attack. If the police is being discredited or deemed not trust-worthy in security matters, the general public will feel less safe.

However, no actors seem to have been suppressed completely, meaning that no actions have been mentioned without the actor being mentioned somewhere in the article(s). In some cases, though, as is also mentioned in parts of the analysis, some actors have been backgrounded. This is especially the case of actions taken by the police. Often, it is mentioned that an arrest was made, but the actor who is carrying out this act has not been revealed. They have thus been backgrounded, as they are not mentioned in the specific context, but they have been mentioned elsewhere in the text, making it possible for the reader to draw conclusions. This can be inferred with reasonable certainty, although the reader can never be completely sure about which actor the journalist is referring to (Van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 29).

The police is then being pushed in the background to emphasise the act more than the actor.

As this case is concerned with a terror attack and all articles have been published in the week following the attack, it is assumed that suppression is not likely to appear. Backgrounding, on the other hand, have been and can be used in relation to actions where the actor is a given, or where journalists expect readers to know the actor that is being written about. If articles published later had been part of the analysis, suppression might have been possible to see in case of a politician doing something for political gain for example. It is already to some degree possible to see in some of Stefan Löfven’s statements.

He has, among others, stated that “Sweden has reinforced its borders with immediate effect,” (The Telegraph, 2017b) and it is also said that “Stefan Löfven has called for tougher measures on rejecting asylum seekers,” (The Telegraph, 2017d). It is not stated who “Sweden” is. Obviously, the country itself does not have the power to reinforce its borders – but through the personification of Sweden as an object, it is not necessary to state who has been responsible for doing so. It is also not mentioned who Löfven is in contact with regarding the tougher measures on rejecting asylum seekers.

The reader is in these cases expected to either know or be able to make a qualified bid to whom the actor is. In the case of reinforcing borders, one might assume that it is the police
carrying out the reinforcement in collaboration with politicians who have issued the order. In the second example, it is assumed that Löfven is talking about the government as well as other political parties, who have the power to create these measures.

Results of the analysis

Both differences and similarities between Swedish and British news coverage have been identified in the analysis.

Differences can be found especially in the representation of the perpetrator, which is very interesting. In Swedish news, the perpetrator is described in ways that further the othering, making a greater gap between “us” and “them”. Swedish news focus a lot on the fact that Akilov is from Uzbekistan, connects him to another criminal due to his citizenship and in general, many means are being used to ensure that he is not being connected to the Swedish population by the readers.

As Britain was hit by a similar terror attack just weeks prior to the Stockholm-attack, it could be assumed that British news, too, would further the “us” and “them” division. However, British news focus more on Akilov as a specific type and even though they do give information on his citizenship, they do it in a more factual manner than the Swedish journalists. British news also chose to only comment on the case in question and do not connect Akilov to other criminals. In The Telegraph, the journalist even chose to write about Akilov in a manner that allows readers to identify with him, by saying he was a father (The Telegraph, 2017c).

The public, however, is represented in a similar way in both Swedish and British news. The journalists have two different focus-areas: the emotional eye-witness account and the more factual account. Thus, there are examples of both eye-witness accounts in the media coverage from both countries as well as the information pieces that inform the reader about the act and the outcome of it.

The police is represented as an active agent in both Swedish and British news. This is to present the police as the securing force that the public can rely on to take care of issues. Had the police instead been portrayed as passive or clueless, it could make the public question their ability to maintain the security level in Sweden. They are represented as pro-active.

The victims are all described with personal features for the readers to relate to them and to make them feel compassionate towards families and friends of the deceased. Both Swedish and British news have published articles that focus on the victims individually on at least one or more victims. Obviously, British news have a great focus on the British victim, Chris Bev-ington.
The Swedish prime minister is portrayed as compassionate, but also ambitious and with the hopes of being able to enforce stricter controls with asylum seekers. As he is a politician, one might wonder if the measures he wants to take due to the attack is politically motivated, in the sense that it might give him a benefit before an election.

Foreign politicians, too, express their sympathy, but are not further described in any articles.

Paramedics are represented in a way in British news that make them seem somehow unorganised or not prepared for a situation like this. Whether the journalist has chosen the word desperately to describe just this feeling or to describe how paramedics worked hard on saving lives is unknown. However, the way the description has been made, the meaning can be misinterpreted.

Sweden is being described as an actor as well, meaning that journalists personifies an object. Depending on the context, Sweden is both being described as a passive actor – meaning that Sweden is not responsible for the people leaving to join terrorist cells – but also as the active agent, who reinforces its borders to be able to control the immigrant flow as a precaution. This is done to not attack or blame Sweden for the terror act.

The truck and the act, too, are being personified. The truck is being represented as an agent, who is more powerful than the pedestrians it hit on its way down Drottninggatan, but it is surrounded by words that gives negative associations. The attack is being described in two different ways – the way that eye witnesses or politicians describe it, and as information. Thus, both the emotional description is represented as well as the facts surrounding it.

Most actors who are important to this case are mentioned and included in all representations in the articles. There are examples of actors being backgrounded, as the journalists see the actor as given in certain contexts. It is assumed that this is due to the fact that it is an actual terror attack and all facts are desirable – exactly what is being done, why, by who, and how. However, there are also examples of actors being suppressed or excluded from some phrases in relation to Stefan Löfven and politics.

Thus, the Swedish and British news covered the Stockholm-attack in a similar way, except regarding the perpetrator, which is highly interesting. Due to the fact that London was hit by the same type of terror attack just weeks earlier, British news would have had a reason for furthering the othering of terrorists. However, in general, they chose not to and they therefore manage to give a potentially less emotional and/or subjective description of the perpetrator than Swedish news. Whether one way or the other is more correct is to be decided by the reader.
The fact that Swedish news seeks to create a gap between us and them can be due to several things: distraughtness that the act happened, to further a political agenda in relation to terrorists or immigrants, or to create a political agenda on terrorists or immigrants.

Discussion

Discussion on the news coverage

A crucial element in critical discourse analysis is how power is divided between social actors and how ideologies can be identified in different texts, images, speeches and so forth. The language choices that journalists make when writing articles creates the reality in which we are living. By framing the terror attack and the actors in a certain way, this can become the agenda-setter of how the public understand the attack. This is due to a societal context, where the public are talking about the topic and together create a reality through further discussing the attack. Thus, the journalists can through their linguistic choices add to this societal context, causing the topic to be discussed again and again, constantly producing potential new realities in the societal context; this is how the public understands society, and this is why they will talk about the attack in certain ways.

Thus, by framing the news about the act as both Swedish and British news media have chosen to do, people will understand the act as decided by the journalists. Several things in this coverage can be further discussed, including the tendency to cover acts such as this one too much, and thereby giving the perpetrator(s) too much attention; how this over-exposure inflict upon the theories of risk society; and how a large degree of othering is being created in the linguistic choices through framing. Moreover, it is important to discuss how journalists divide power between social actors, what that potentially means and whether ideologies are visible in the texts.

Over exposure and the risk society

As mentioned in my review of previous literature, news media potentially focus too much on certain issues, creating over-exposure to topics that the general public would benefit from being toned down. As researched by Ali & Khattab (2017), news media over-report on different issues, which can make it seem as if news media are collaborators of terrorism (Volkmer in Ali & Khattab, 2017, p. 737). This does not represent the actual stance of media – it does, however, show that media by over-reporting give too much attention to both the perpetrator and the organisation that takes credit for the attack.
It is impossible to determine exactly when media have contributed with the right amount of articles and when the line for over-reporting is crossed. However, it can be argued that especially terror attacks receive too much attention, due to both the number of articles in general, but also in terms of how many articles are being written about the same topic within the act. For example, we might see a number of articles using the same eye-witness account or similar descriptions that are created to make the audience feel the horror that unfolded. Over-exposure such as this add to the risk society and how it is developing today. With technology and internet, people all over the world have access to information, which can be delivered within minutes after an act occur. Thus, the over-exposure is not only due to media reporting about the act, but also due to the public sharing or writing content about the act themselves.

According to Cottle (1998), a risk society is a society that produces potentially catastrophic risks constantly. Media has the opportunity to shape different events, and the risk society therefore shapes the discourse of global crises as, in this case, a terror attack (Cottle, 2014, p. 3). As already mentioned in the theory section, terrorist attacks are not spatially, temporally and socially determined, meaning that such an act can occur anywhere, anytime and with unforeseen damage and loss. Thus, the fear of terrorist attacks have the potential of being present in the mind of individuals at all times (Beck, 2009, p. 39). By over exposing such acts, media can further this fear. On a normal-day basis, individuals are likely not expecting a terror attack to happen. However, if such an incident happens, people are likely to follow the unfolding of the events, read about terror analyses in other countries and so forth. When media give too much attention to the single incident, they can create fear in the public. According to Furedi (2007) the “fear society” or “culture of fear” includes the fear of terrorism and crime as well. Thus, as the fear of terror acts are already present in the mind of the public, media create a vicious circle in which they fuel this fear by over-reporting on terror incidents.

But it is not only fear that media fuel – by repeatedly publishing articles on the perpetrator and the potential organisations behind, media also hand terror organisations the exposure they are aiming for (Beck, 2009, p. 40). They aim to create fear. In the Stockholm attack, media reported that Akilov acted on his own. However, it was also reported that he has shown sympathies for terror organisations, among those IS, which gives exposure to IS, without them having to actually plan the attack themselves. Individuals therefore plan and execute acts too, without necessarily having ties to terror organisations.

What is interesting here is that the Swedish Security Service acknowledged that they had had interest in Akilov previously, but in lack of more evidence, they could not detain him. Thus, technology plays a huge role, both from the side of the perpetrator, but also in terms of security measures. The fact that Akilov could not be detained means, however, that even with advanced
technological systems, security services still cannot control or keep all individuals under surveillance in order to avoid for example terror attacks (Fuchs, 2008, p. 194). Therefore, we have both the technology-type that gives security services the possibility of identifying and arresting potential terrorists – but we also have the technology that can be used to create and publish content that will spread fear in several countries. The latter consists of both journalist-written but also privately written content that are being shared online.

The creation of fear as well as over-reporting prove several difficulties. Media feel the responsibility to report about terror incidents, but with several media outlets covering it, the risk of over-reporting increases. Terror incidents continue to be an unknown unknowns (Beck, 2009, p. 40), which potentially make the public more receptive towards the media framing of terrorism. Swedish media for example focused a lot on the fact that the perpetrator is from Uzbekistan – both to further othering and to assure the public that a Swede was not responsible for the attack, but with the side effect of potentially creating fear of people from Uzbekistan or in general, people that are not “us”. The Swedish public, who are likely feeling one or another type of emotional in relation to the attack, might be more receptive to the thought that people from Uzbekistan potentially are dangerous or that they are potential extremists.

Othering in media

In most of the articles, there is no clear “we”, unless someone is being quoted. However, both Swedish and British media still manage to further othering in their framing of especially the perpetrator, as found in the analysis.

The othering becomes quite clear in Swedish media, as the journalists chose to write all information about Akilov and how he was a citizen from another country. Especially the entry, where Akilov is connected to another criminal from Uzbekistan makes it clear that the Swedish journalists do not have an issue with framing Akilov or people from Uzbekistan in a negative way.

The British journalists are more discrete in their othering, as they do give the public some of the same information as the Swedish media, but in less obvious ways. Moreover, the British media use various descriptions on Akilov, some of them allowing readers to understand what person he is.

The fact that the Swedish media have no issue in framing Akilov as one of “them” and as a minority in Sweden is due to the fact that they do not see a potential riot bursting out by doing so. In the study by Machin & Mayr (2007), which found that different representations can be omitted from newspapers to avoid causing issues in a neighbourhood, it was found that focusing on other topics than crime in relation to minorities were helpful. What Swedish media do here is the exact opposite, by choosing to connect Akilov to another criminal. Thus, Swedish
media do not seem to care about potential issues that might be raised following such a statement.

*The power relations as given by journalists*

The journalists are in a unique position to give or take power from actors when writing news stories through their language choices and framing.

As seen in the analysis, it differs who the empowered actor is. Overall, two different power plays have been identified – the police vs. the perpetrator and the act vs. the victims. I.e. the police has been given much power when the hunt for the perpetrator is being described and after the catch of the perpetrator. This is done through describing the police as the active agent, meaning that the reader will see the police as pro-active and the strong force. Likewise, the perpetrator is being described in more passive ways, leading the reader to the conclusion that it could not have ended differently (than with him being caught).

In the other power play, the act is described as the powerful force, i.e. a force that cannot be stopped. However, the descriptions are different from when describing the police, making it obvious that the journalists are not framing the act as a positive force. The victims are described as the passive actor, here meaning that they could not do anything to avoid the outcomes of the act.

It is interesting to see how the perpetrator is primarily described as the less powerful actor in some regards, given the fact that he carried out the attack. When the attack is being described as the actor with power, it is being referred to as the act itself or the lorry – not as if the perpetrator did it. Hence, even though the audience is fully aware that the truck itself did not drive down Drottninggatan, that it needed the perpetrator behind the wheel, the power has still not been given to the perpetrator, and it is not as such being acknowledged that he did, what he did.

Thus, the positive powerful force becomes the police, and the negative powerful force is the act. The representation of the perpetrator as the weak actor in relation to the police is a mean to send a message to the audience: the police is stronger than the perpetrator and they will win the “battle”. The victims of the act, the public, who are portrayed as weak in comparison to the truck, are portrayed as weak in the sense that they had no choice – the truck (the perpetrator) acted because they were there, and they ended up as casualties.

It becomes clear that power is thoughtfully divided between actors in relation to the perpetrator/the truck. The readers know that the truck does not have the skills nor power to drive itself. It needs a driver. But by blaming the truck for the injured and dead, power is not being given to the perpetrator. He is continuously being described as the weaker part in opposition
to the police. Thus, indirectly, he is being given the power that is represented by the truck, but without actually giving him the credit for having done it.

This way, journalists use the power as given to them by media and the audience to portray what has happened, but without acknowledging the terrorist by mentioning him in connection to the act. Mentioning him personally is more often done in relation to describing the suspect, the person behind the act, or after being captured.

This is very interesting as media, in the question of powerholders, manage to keep Akilov low on the scale, reducing him to a simple criminal. However, with the over-reporting on the topic, media can be said to work against itself – it refuses to give Akilov acknowledgement for what he has done, but it continues to report about the act, using the same excerpts but in different variations or contexts.

However, in general there are no big difference in the power division in British and Swedish media.

Potential reasons for the identified results

One of the potential reasons is the matter of framing and what Swedish vs. British journalists want to achieve through their coverage. Although researchers agree that a common framework for framing is yet to be developed, several agree that framing affect values and emotions among the audience (Nelson et. al., 2012, p. 2; Entman, 1993, p. 52). This is done by selecting certain aspects and enhancing them in a way that can affect the reader’s opinions. Woods (2012) as well as Brinson & Stohl (2012) also found that how terrorism is covered in the news affects people’s attitudes towards it – and that some words trigger a higher degree of fear among the readers.

As this study has found more similarities than differences between Swedish and British coverage, it can be assumed that journalists in these countries have the same aim of their Stockholm-attack coverage. This can be due to the location of the countries, religion and so forth – neither Sweden nor Britain are Muslim countries and none of them have brought up the perpetrator (and can therefore not be held accountable for his actions).

However, the identified difference in the description of the perpetrator can be due to several issues.

Hansen & Machin (2013, p. 116) have told us that there is no neutral or objective way to represent the world through language. How a journalist choose to frame a topic is based on the world-view of the journalists, or news-papers. Thus, some descriptions can potentially be more or less descriptive, but will always reflect a certain point of view. The British journalists are covering the perpetrator in several ways, he is both connected to “them”, but he is also framed as a father, who is working to provide for his family in Uzbekistan. That can potentially make
him one of “us” to a certain degree. Many will relate to him being a father, who is working to provide for his family. Therefore, even though British media cannot be said to be neutral, the perpetrator is being described from several angles.

In Sweden, the framing of the perpetrator is quite different. The descriptions of him being a father is still present, but often in relation to a description that will connote something negative in the mind of the reader, or that will “other” him. As framing affects our values, emotions and attitudes, the linguistic choices made by the Swedish journalists are framing Akilov in a certain way that is meant to affects us. Likely, the situation is more emotional to Swedish citizens and the framing of the perpetrator is supposed to create feelings and reactions among the audience. Hence, when a Swedish journalist choose to describe Akilov as an Uzbekistan citizen and connect him to another criminal from Uzbekistan as opposed to being a working father, the journalist has made a language choice based on a belief system, which will be received by the audience – perhaps in the intended way, perhaps not. However, as the major part of Sweden is assumed to have the same culture and beliefs, the coverage will most likely be understood as the journalist intended it to.

Thus, as the attack is more emotional and close to heart to the Swedes than the Brits, it can explain the reasoning behind the language choices as made by Swedish journalists.
Conclusion

This comparative study has shown both differences and similarities in how a sample of Swedish and British online news media have chosen to frame the Stockholm terror attack in April 2017. The representations of different actors have also given a better and deeper understanding of how media distribute power between actors and how power is given to actors, both directly and indirectly.

Broadly speaking, there seem to be a connection between the representations of actors as well as power distribution in both countries. This is potentially due to a similar culture in Britain and Sweden and therefore a similar opinion and public discourse on terror attacks, as is also suggested by Entman (1993) in relation to framing theories.

However, a difference has been identified in the portrayal of a key actor, the perpetrator. Whereas British media tend to represent the perpetrator from different views, both the relatable as well as the othering view, Swedish media have their greatest focus on the othering view. This is assumed to be due to the emotional aspect of having a terror attack in your own country. Thus, as the terror attack is happening close by, Swedish reporters use the grief, fear, and the dismal mood of the public to further the othering in their articles.

This also contributes to today’s risk- or fear society, as the over-exposure to the perpetrator and the attack increases the fear for other terror attacks among the public. A great number of articles concerning the attack have been published, all representing different aspects of the attack. While it might be difficult to determine what reporting-level that is the correct level, publishing a high number of articles to create more salience to the attack will eventually create fear in the public. As the reporting places the blame on the perpetrator by othering him, the public can place this fear on individuals from the “them” section, which will further the “us” and “them” issues, not just on paper, but in real life as well.

The power has been distributed roughly the same way by both Swedish and British media, which once again is likely due to a similar culture and world view in Western European countries.

It is especially interesting how media divides power in relation to the perpetrator and the act he has committed. These are related, as all readers know that there is a man behind the act, but in the articles, this is never being acknowledged. Instead, when framing the perpetrator’s actions, these are referred to by personifying the truck used in the attack. Hence, the power to commit the act has been given to the truck and not the perpetrator himself, thus avoiding giving power to a man, who has done something bad to the “us”. In other situations, for example when Akilov is being described in relation to the police, he is being described as the weaker
actor and the police as the superior. The media have therefore given no power to Akilov himself, and in situations where he would be the one in power, this is referred to through an object, the lorry. Another actor described is the public, which is often referred to as the weaker actor to represent how the eye-witnesses and victims did not stand a chance against the truck in the attack. This way, which is also what CDA seeks to show, media have the power to shape how the readers of these articles will understand this event. By portraying the truck as powerful and Akilov as weak, he is represented as no threat to the Swedish police, the Swedish people etc. The discourse used shapes the understanding of the texts. Through analysing the discourse, the ideologies in the texts also become clearer. We can see that the journalists decide how to shape the event through the power-relations among actors, which is done to further the interests of the media. The way journalists have chosen to describe Akilov shapes the public understanding of him, which is why he, as a person, is given no power in relation to the attack. He is only represented in person, when the police is superior to him. This urges readers to think of this as common sense, as this is what we are being told – Akilov has no power, and we should therefore not fear him. The language in the articles might appear to be neutral to readers, if they are not critical to what is written. Even though readers know that Akilov was in the truck during the attack, they do not have to relate to this fact, as no journalist is actually writing it.

Thus, the biggest difference in the representation of actors can be seen in the framing of Akilov. Swedish media further the othering by representing Akilov as one of “them” throughout most articles. As the public is naturally affected by the situation as well, this discourse and these representations are drawn upon as common sense in society in relation to this specific actor.

In Britain, the representations differ more, and even though some further the othering, some are also written in more relatable terms. By comparing articles from both countries, it becomes clear that the Swedish representation is furthering the othering of foreigners. The distribution of power is very well thought through in order to give no power to Akilov, which would acknowledge his part in the act. Instead, the power is given to the police, who are handling Akilov. Also, power is given to the truck when discussed in relation to victims and the public at Drottninggatan, as it is – and becomes – common sense that a heavy truck will always be stronger than human beings.
Suggestions for further studies

This study has identified some potential reasons for framing and power distribution in relation to framing terror acts in the media coverage from two countries. However, to validate the findings further, more studies can be carried out.

In order to validate the reasoning behind the difference in the perpetrator-description, a study on the London attack in March 2017 can be made, comparing the British and Swedish coverage of this act. This will show if British journalists are covering the perpetrator differently when the attack happens in their own country. However, it might also show that Swedish journalists in general tend to cover terrorists in an “othering” way compared to Britain.

Other comparative studies can be conducted too. It is both interesting to look further into the Stockholm-attack when compared to the coverage in for example a Muslim country or a country outside the EU. More countries could also be used in a comparison to this study to create more general and valid results.

Comparative studies are interesting as they can show us societal tendencies in different countries. Moreover, if one’s starting point it Sweden, comparative studies can show us whether Swedish journalists have a tendency to cover terror attacks in an emotional way no matter the hit country, or if it is a general tendency that a hit country covers terror attacks in emotional language. It can also show how terror attacks are framed in general in different countries.

Other study suggestions include looking at how the audience receive the actor-framing as created by media. How was the message intended to be received and how did the audience actually understand it. Can effects of the framing be identified and how. This is a study that can be conducted as an extension to this study, by showing the same analysis pieces to an audience and analyse down their understandings. Thus, by showing different groups both the original excerpts as used here as well as slightly edited variations, it is possible to determine the reactions to the different messages.
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# Appendix 1 – Swedish articles

Swedish articles used in the analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper source as used in the analysis</th>
<th>Article headline</th>
<th>Link to article</th>
<th>Date of publishing</th>
<th>Date of updating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aftonbladet, 2017b</td>
<td>Viktigt för polisen att den mistänkte terroristen lever</td>
<td><a href="https://bit.ly/2kayXTg">https://bit.ly/2kayXTg</a></td>
<td>2017.04.08</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Local SE, 2017</td>
<td>Swedish police: “There is nothing to indicate that we’ve got the wrong man”</td>
<td><a href="https://bit.ly/2oSJCpR">https://bit.ly/2oSJCpR</a></td>
<td>2017.04.08</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2 – British articles

British articles used in the analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper source as used in the analysis</th>
<th>Article headline</th>
<th>Link to article</th>
<th>Date of publishing</th>
<th>Date of updating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BBC, 2017</td>
<td>Stockholm attack: Chris Bevington named as British victim</td>
<td><a href="https://bbc.in/2KIEMT4">https://bbc.in/2KIEMT4</a></td>
<td>2017.04.09</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mail, 2017</td>
<td>The moment Stockholm police catch the third beer truck ‘terrorist’ after a dramatic high-speed car chase: ‘ISIS-supporting’ Uzbeki father-of-four, 39, is arrested before another suspect is led away in handcuffs</td>
<td><a href="https://dailym.ai/2oJgfpY">https://dailym.ai/2oJgfpY</a></td>
<td>2017.04.07</td>
<td>2017.04.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Times, 2017</td>
<td>Terror attack in Stockholm kills 4</td>
<td><a href="https://on.ft.com/2kbBiNF">https://on.ft.com/2kbBiNF</a></td>
<td>2017.04.07</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Telegraph, 2017b</td>
<td>Stockholm attack driver ‘deliberately targeted young children’ as he drove hijacked lorry into crowd</td>
<td><a href="https://bit.ly/2wZWO15">https://bit.ly/2wZWO15</a></td>
<td>2017-04.08</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Telegraph, 2017c</td>
<td>Tributes flow for ‘talented and caring’ British terror victim Chris Bevington, as police say Stockholm suspect was rejected for residency</td>
<td><a href="https://bit.ly/2rWlfYa">https://bit.ly/2rWlfYa</a></td>
<td>2017.04.09</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Telegraph, 2017d</td>
<td>Everything we know so far about the Stockholm terror attack</td>
<td><a href="https://bit.ly/2GC2a2e">https://bit.ly/2GC2a2e</a></td>
<td>2017.04.09</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3 – Swedish original texts and translations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Swedish original text</th>
<th>Translated version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Den misstänkte är medborgare i Uzbekistan. Samma land som en man som för ett år sedan dömdes till livstids fängelse av Hovrätten för nedre Norrland efter ett mordförsök i Strömsund på en imam och regimkritiker kommer ifrån. (Aftonbladet, 2017b)</td>
<td>The suspect is a citizen of Uzbekistan. Same country where a man who one year ago was sentenced to a lifetime in prison by the Court of appeal (...) after an attempted murder in Strömsund on an Imam and a regime critic comes from.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under natten till lördag anhölls Akilov, som är uzbekisk medborgare, på sannolika skäl, den högre misstankegraden, för terrorbrott genom mord. Enligt polisen har han visat sympati för extrema organisationer, däribland IS. (Expressen, 2017)</td>
<td>During Friday night, Akilov, who is an Uzbekistan citizen, was arrested on probable causes, the higher suspicion degree, for an act of terror through murder. According to the police, he has shown sympathy for extreme organizations, among them IS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efter att lastbilen kört in i Åhléns avvek föraren från platsen, och folkmassor flydde i panik från Drottninggatan och området runt Åhléns. (Aftonbladet, 2017c)</td>
<td>After the lorry drove into Åhléns, the driver fled the scene and the crowds fled in panic from Drottninggatan and the area around Åhléns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivet bakom lastbilsattacken i Stockholm den 7 april är oklart. Men polisen utred det som en terroristattack – och den har mycket gemensamt med tidigare attacker i Europa. (Aftonbladet, 2017d)</td>
<td>The motive behind the lorry attack in Stockholm on April 7th is unclear. But the police is investigating it as an act of terror – and it has a lot in common with previous attacks in Europe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fyra människor miste livet i attacken på Drottninggatan. En skolflicka från Stockholm, en kvinna i 70-årsåldern från Ljungskile som var på besök i Stockholm, en belgisk kvinna i 30-årsåldern som kommit till Stockholm för att besöka vänner och en brittisk man i 40-årsåldern som bodde och arbetade i Stockholm. (Svenska Dagbladet, 2017)</td>
<td>Four people lost their lives in the attack on Drottninggatan. A schoolgirl from Stockholm, a woman around 70 from Ljungskile who was on a visit in Stockholm, a Belgian woman in her thirties who came to Stockholm to visit friends and a British man in his forties who lived and worked in Stockholm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mäilys Dereymaeker, som har en 1,5årig son, arbetade enligt tidningen Het Nieuwsblad som psykolog, bland annat med asylsökande.</td>
<td>Maïlys Dereymaeker, who has a 1,5 year old son, was according to the newspaper Het Nieuwsblad working as a psychologist, among others with asylum seekers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vi kommer aldrig att ge upp för terror. Vi kommer ta oss igenom det här tillsammans sa statsministern.</td>
<td>“We will never give up due to terror. We will get through this together,” the prime minister said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alla vi som vill hjälpa är många fler än de som vill oss ont, sa statschefen i sitt tal.</td>
<td>“All of us who wants to help are several more than those who wants to hurt us,” the chief of state said in his speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sverige har drabbats av en terrorattack.</td>
<td>Sweden has been hit by a terror attack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En lastbil mejade på fredagen ner människor i centrala Stockholm.</td>
<td>During Friday afternoon, a truck mowed down people in central Stockholm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>