Cardiff University Press
Gwasg Prifysgol Caerdydd

JCaDS
JOURNAL OF CORPORA AND DISCOURSE STUDIES 2023, 6:25-52
E-ISSN 2515-0251

# PHRASEOLOGICAL PATTERNS IN A CIVIC ORIENTATION TEXTBOOK FOR IMMIGRANTS TO SWEDEN: HOW HETEROGENEOUS READERS AND A LARGELY NON-MONOLITHIC COUNTRY ARE CONSTRUCTED

**ANNELIE ÄDEL**
*DALARNA UNIVERSITY*

## CITATION

Ädel, A. (2023). Phraseological patterns in a civic orientation textbook for immigrants to Sweden: How heterogeneous readers and a largely non-monolithic country are constructed. *Journal of Corpora and Discourse Studies*, 6:25–52

## ABSTRACT

Aiming to critically review texts that construct knowledge about social categories, this study analyses a textbook used to introduce new immigrants to Swedish society. It is investigated, through the pronoun *you*, how the target reader and, through the noun *Sweden* and the adjective *Swedish*, how Sweden and what is Swedish are discursively constructed. These three words occur most frequently in their respective word classes. The patterns they are involved in form the starting-point for an analysis of their discourse functions. A critical perspective is adopted, asking to what extent the textbook presents a uniform and essentialist picture of the newcomer and of Sweden. The findings show that the textbook exhibits a reader-oriented style through excessive *you* uses. The image of the newcomer is marked by heterogeneity: the reader is offered a variety of hypothetical identities through frequently used *if you*-conditionals. By demonstrating relevance and linking information and advice directly to the reader, the *you* patterns realise a strategy of inclusion. However, the reader group is also presented as internally similar, being seen as less knowledgeable and in need of the writer's guidance. Distance rather than proximity is created between the writer and reader. The construction of Sweden links to meanings of the nation that involve institutions rather than culture and traditions. Attempts are made to avoid ethnification of Swedish people, even if some majority views/practices are presented, e.g. through *in Sweden*-statements. The writer emerges as a knowledgeable authority, who avoids normative statements and wants to be accommodating to the reader, while keeping an impersonal distance.

## KEYWORDS

textbook, discursive construction, social actor, target reader, image of Sweden

## CONTACT

Dalarna University, Department of English, 791 88 Falun, Sweden, aal@du.se

## DOI

10.18573/jcads.91

## ISSUE DOI

https://doi.org/10.18573/jcads.v6

## ORCID

0000-0001-9706-0074



Manuscript accepted 2023-02-01

# Phraseological patterns in a civic orientation textbook for immigrants to Sweden: How heterogeneous readers and a largely non-monolithic country are constructed

**Annelie Ädel**
*Dalarna University*

## 1. Introduction

Textbooks construct and communicate knowledge (cf. Bondi, 2016, p. 323), with the overall communicative purpose to instruct. Previous research on textbooks has targeted for example university subject textbooks from the perspective of what discourse features characterise them (e.g. Hyland, 1999; Bondi, 2001), or textbooks for foreign language learning from the perspective of ideology and culture (e.g. Curdt-Christiansen & Weninger, 2015; Wang, 2016). Just as there are many different types of teaching and learning contexts, there are many different types of textbooks. In fact, 'textbook' itself polysemously refers to a range of different types, including 'undergraduate university academic textbooks, technical procedure manuals such as instruction booklets, as well as primary and secondary school textbooks' (Parodi, 2010, p. 196). We can add to this list textbooks for adult education, a category that *About Sweden* falls into. In this particular domain, previous research is limited to language and communication textbooks, focusing on adult language learners or adult literacy, leaving a gap in our knowledge about other types of textbooks for adult populations.

Beginning to fill this gap, this paper presents an analysis of *About Sweden*, a textbook for adult immigrants to Sweden, described as 'a civic orientation handbook for newly arrived'. Its stated aim is 'to provide fundamental information about Sweden to people who have recently arrived in the country, as well as to provide support to municipalities in their civic orientation efforts'. The book is used in civic orientation courses, intended to last at least 100 hours, and run by instructors who have received some training. The courses are organised by Swedish municipalities and offered free of charge. It is mandatory for newcomers to take a civic orientation course once a residence permit has been granted (e.g. von Brömssen *et al.*, 2022). Participants may take the course in easy-to-understand Swedish or in other languages depending on the municipality; the book was available in Arabic, Dari, English, French, Persian, Russian, Somali, Spanish, Tigrinya in late 2021. The English version is used in the present analysis, to make possible comparisons to other data, available in English. The text may be downloaded through a website

run by the County Administrative Boards[1] and the following chapters[2] are included, with discussion questions for each chapter:

1. Arriving in Sweden
2. Living in Sweden
3. Supporting Yourself and Developing in Sweden
4. The Individual's Rights and Obligations
5. Building a Family and Living with Children in Sweden
6. Having an Influence in Sweden
7. Looking After Your Health in Sweden
8. Ageing in Sweden

*About Sweden* was created for the specific context of educating immigrants and preparing them for residence and citizenship. This is set against the societal backdrop of migration, which is linked to more or less extensive national legislation for the route to citizenship. Some countries in Europe have testing regimes (such as Britain; e.g. Lewis, 2017), but this is not the case in Sweden, where there is also no language proficiency requirement. Sweden has been seen as belonging to a 'multicultural/pluralist' group of countries where citizenship is, relatively speaking, easier to obtain and where 'ethnic minority groups are encouraged to retain cultural differences' (Loring, 2015, p. 55). In EU-wide surveys on immigration, the most favourable attitudes have been found in Sweden and other Nordic countries, with data from 2002 to 2016/17 showing some stability over time (Heath & Richards, 2019). Sweden's traditionally liberal policies toward immigration form a backdrop for the study.

As the purpose of the textbook is to serve as an introduction to Swedish society for newcomers, it is of interest to investigate how social categories are constructed in the text. The two key social categories include (a) the newcomer—that is, the intended reader of the textbook—and (b) Sweden and Swedish society. The analysis is delimited to these two sociocultural entities, and linked to the use of (a) the personal pronoun *you* and (b) the noun *Sweden* and adjective *Swedish*. As further justification for selecting these, a word frequency analysis revealed that these play a special role by virtue of being highly frequent in the textbook: *you* is by far the most frequent pronoun, *Sweden* the most frequent noun and *Swedish* the most frequent adjective. The analysis of the extracted words is based on phraseological (multi-word and collocation) patterns that they are involved in, which are then linked to discourse functions.

The study investigates what images are created of (a) and (b), considered in light of the following specific questions:

1 https://www.informationsverige.se/en/omsverige/samhallsorientering-om-sverige/ (accessed October 2021)

2 Numbers in square brackets after each example indicate from which chapter the examples come.

- How are *you* patterns used in the book and what types of readers do they construct?
- How are patterns involving *Swedish* and *Sweden* used and what type of target country is constructed?

A critical reading is done, centring on the question to what extent the textbook presents a uniform and even essentialist image of (a) the target readership (the newcomer) and (b) the target country: Sweden and what is presented as Swedish.

## 2. Reader address and the construction of social categories

### *2.1. Reader address*

The perceived reader's effect on the discourse is foregrounded in genre analysis, through the principle that genres mirror participant roles and power relations (e.g. Tardy, 2011). Genre analysis provides a view of genres as socially situated, as they are created by specific social groups for specific purposes (e.g. Tardy, 2011, p. 57). In addition to the principle that genres reflect power relations and specific roles among their users, another perspective on genre that is especially relevant in the current study is that the rhetorical functions of genres may be linked to specific phraseology or lexicogrammatical forms (Tardy, 2011, p. 60). The present analysis will be based on phraseological patterns, which will be considered from the perspective of the discourse functions they serve (cf. e.g. Bhatia, 1993). The analysis will be centred on social actors linked above all to the intended reader—a recent immigrant—and to the target country (Sweden) and related (Swedish) phenomena. The construction of writer-reader relations is of particular interest in textbooks, as they tend to be written from an 'expert' perspective for assumed non-experts. The present study considers what reader identity is constructed; this is done through analysing frequent patterns in which *you* occurs.

The orientation to an audience is fundamental in communication. This is especially evident in dialogic interaction, but even in highly monologic texts, 'the writer assumes a hypothetical reader for whom s/he is supposed to be writing, anticipating his/her reactions and adjusting his/her writing accordingly, to facilitate communication' (Bhatia, 1993, p. 9). A currently popular framework through which audience orientation and reader address is captured is metadiscourse. In metadiscourse research, however, it is the author persona and the construction of authorial stance and identity that have been in focus, leaving the reader less foregrounded. When it comes to the reader, it is especially in the metadiscursive subcategory of engagement markers (e.g. Hyland, 1999) that the uses of for example the pronoun *you*, imperative forms, questions and exclamations have been mapped in textual analysis. Of special interest here is that such forms have been used to index variation in writer-reader interaction across different populations and genres (e.g. Ädel, 2014; Herriman, 2022). This will be useful when checking the frequency of *you* in

the *About Sweden* textbook compared to similar genres (see Section 4.1). The dominant tradition in metadiscourse research typically stops at counting occurrences, but in the present study, the patterns *you* is involved in are mapped and linked to discourse functions.

## 2.2. The construction of social categories

There is a long-standing interest in discourse analysis in how social categories are constructed or represented in discourse. The language system offers choices at different levels in how social categories are presented, from individual lexical choices to broader patterns. The term 'social actor' is often used, especially in Critical Discourse Analysis, even if it is rarely defined. The way it is defined in the present study is as an animate or inanimate referring expression, which participates in some social context. In addition to *you*, the terms *Sweden* and *Swedish* are the key social actors of the present study. Social actors have been studied for example from the perspective of what words and expressions are selected to name and describe people and social groups (e.g. van Leeuwen, 1996; Jaworska, 2016), or what people or social groups are included or excluded, or foregrounded and backgrounded (e.g. Jaworska, 2016). As word choices and lexicogrammar or inclusions/exclusions reflect and reinforce attitudes and ideology, the analysis of social actors is often done from a critical perspective.

National categories form an especially interesting case in that they represent what is a very large category, hence inviting (over-)generalisation and essentialist framings. Also, the nation state is a construct for supporting ideologies linked to nationalism and beyond. To take an extremist example, an analysis of a Fascist civics textbook for primary school used by the Franco regime in Spain (Pinto, 2004, p. 664) showed that adjectives modifying *Spain* or *the State* referred to an idealised image of the nation (e.g. *exemplary*, *enviable*, *happy*), to the nation's power or wealth (e.g. *rich*, *big*, *imperial*) or organisation (e.g. *ordered*, *disciplined*). Meanings of the nation based on culture and traditions were emphasised, and glorified, while meanings based on institutions and citizenship were less foregrounded. The literature sometimes refers to the former as *Kulturnation* and the latter as *Staatsnation* (e.g. de Cillia *et al.*, 1999, p. 169).

Previous work centring on the collocations of national adjectives have found both stereotyping and neutral patterns. Based on a large standard corpus from the 1990s (Cobuild), Stubbs' (1996) analysis of *English* found collocates that 'reveal stereotypes', as in *eccentrics*, *heritage* and *quintessentially*, but for *British* the collocates involved fixed phrases for organisations and the overall collocational patterns were found to be largely 'neutral' (Stubbs, 1996, p. 186). Stereotyping can be viewed as a form of categorisation, where national categories are presented through positive or negative values and are attributed extensionally (e.g. *Swedes*), either to an ingroup (self-presentation) or an outgroup (other-presentation) (e.g. Fant, 2012). In discussing strategies people use to resist categorisations, Fant (2012) uses the notion of resisting 'ethnification'. Even if the study's original

context was how interviewees avoid characterisations that could affect the ingroup negatively, this perspective is seen as relevant to the present study, relating to the research question about the potentially essentialist image.

A related aspect of national identity that previous research has shown to be important is the construction of sameness or similarity and its opposite, otherness (e.g. de Cillia *et al.*, 1999; see also Wodak [2020], who discusses the idea of the nation as encompassing both inclusion and exclusion, or 'us' and 'them'). Sameness is of special relevance here, given the interest in how uniform a picture is presented of Sweden in the textbook. In the context of an international soccer event, Bishop & Jaworski (2003, p. 244) studied how British news media constructed the nation 'as a homogeneous collective that the (implied) reader is positioned as being a member of'. Referring to the ground-breaking work by Anderson (1983, p. 63), they frame readers in a media context as being part of 'imagining' the nation and show how newspapers created 'an imagined community among a specific assemblage of fellow-readers' (Bishop & Jaworski 2003, p. 248). Examples of ways in which similarity within the nation has been found to be constructed is through *we* statements and the construction *in [country]*, which may be used to speak for an entire national collective (e.g. de Cillia *et al.*, 1999).

Social categories may also be presented based on otherness. The 'social Other' is sometimes used to refer to 'groups that have been marginalised and discriminated against' (Jaworska, 2016, p. 84). Examples of corpus-based studies of (potential) social Others include Jaworska (2016) on how local people are represented in tourism websites, Baker (2004) on how gay people are talked about in parliamentary debates, and Gabrielatos & Baker (2008) on how immigrants are represented in the British media. In the present study, the construction of both sameness and of difference will be considered from the perspective of the presentation of the nation of Sweden and the reader-*cum*-recent immigrant to the country.

## 3. Material and method

The English version of *About Sweden* was converted from pdf to a searchable text file through Sketch Engine,[3] creating a single-text corpus amounting to 66,730 tokens. Sketch Engine's N-gram function was used to generate lists of frequent multi-word units and the concordance function to create concordances of the search terms and identify collocations.

As a preparatory step, a word frequency list was generated to obtain an overall picture of the social actors referred to in the textbook (Table A in the Appendix). The most frequently referred to social actors are *you* and *Sweden*, providing a frequency argument for selecting these particular items for the analysis. Second person *you* is by far the most frequent pronoun. Among the associated forms, *you* is at rank 9, *your* at rank 19, and *your-*

3 https://www.sketchengine.eu/

*self* at rank 179; these three forms amount to a total of 1,748 occurrences. Due to space constraints, only *you* forms will be covered in the analysis. References to local people and phenomena include *Sweden* at rank 13 (F=679) and *Swedish* at rank 31 (F=279), which together amount to 958 occurrences. The singular noun *Swede* does not occur at all and plural *Swedes* occurs only five times; these forms will not be considered in the analysis. An automatic part-of-speech analysis verified that *Sweden* is the most frequent noun and *Swedish* the most frequent adjective in the material. The forms that are operationalised to refer to readers (*you*; *your*; *yourself*) and to local people and phenomena (*Sweden*; *Swedish*) cover a total of 2,706 occurrences, which is over 4% of the total number of tokens in the textbook as a whole.

The analysis starts with a quantitative approach, which guides the qualitative analysis. A bottom-up, phraseological approach is taken (e.g. Tognini-Bonelli, 2001), where language is analysed from the perspective of the recurring patterns, and patterns are then linked to potential discourse functions and sociocultural meanings. In genre analysis, researchers may focus on the macro level, for example by identifying moves and steps that are characteristic of a genre, but they may also focus on the micro level, such as 'concrete linguistic patterns at a lexicogrammatical level', which may be linked to higher-level discourse and meaning features (e.g. File, 2017, p. 116).

The present study centres on constructions of the target reader and of the target country. The study of discursive constructions or representations of social groups, to which both target readers and places/countries may count, is increasingly informed by corpus methodology, and by close analysis of collocation and keyword patterns. A pioneering corpus-based study is Stubbs (1996), analysing recurrent phrases serving as a mechanism for constructing national representations, based on adjectives such as *British* and *English*. Stubbs (1996, p. 169) stressed the idea that recurrent phrases 'encode cultural information' and that corpora may provide empirical evidence of 'how the culture is expressed in lexical patterns'.

## 4. Findings

This section first presents the constructions of the reader through *you* patterns (see Section 4.1), followed by the constructions of local people and phenomena through *Swedish* and *Sweden* (see Section 4.2) and closing with a discussion of images of the newcomer and Sweden (see Section 4.3), centring on how uniform or essentialist these are.

### *4.1. Patterns involving* you

It is the reader, addressed through second-person personal pronouns, who is the most foregrounded social actor in the textbook. By comparison, first-person *I* (N=0) and *we* (N=27) occur very rarely. It is useful, as a first step, before the patterns are analysed, to assess the frequency of *you* in comparison to related genres. It is unsurprising that the

words *Sweden* and *Swedish* are highly frequent, considering that the key topic of the book is Swedish society, but there is no obvious justification for why *you* should be as frequent as it is.

It is highly marked to address the reader/interlocutor in some types of formal discourse, such as academic writing and especially research articles, where it has been found that *you* functioning to address the reader is marginal in English (this also goes for Swedish; Ädel, 2021). The research article involves experts writing for other experts, while the textbook involves taking on an expert role when writing for non-experts. This may contribute to direct reader address being considered more acceptable in a textbook. If we consider frequency data extracted from other textbook studies, the perceived overuse of *you* in *About Sweden* is supported. The frequency of *you* in *About Sweden* is 194 per 10,000 words.[4] In university textbooks in Economics, the frequency may be deduced to be 25 per 10,000 words in a study by Bondi (2001, p. 142).[5] The material was based on 10 introductory chapters. In another study (Hyland, 1999) of extracts from 21 introductory academic coursebooks in different disciplines, the uses of *you* as such are not discussed, but are included in the general category of Engagement (or relational) markers, also including imperatives and questions, which may be used to address the reader directly. The frequency of Engagement markers may be deduced to be 36 per 10,000 words. If we consider a related genre—that of instruction manuals—a recent study of manuals for washing machines found that engagement markers were third in frequency among metadiscourse subcategories (Herriman, 2022, p. 127), but it was predominantly imperatives and the use of *please* that boosted the frequency; direct reader address through *you* was unusual. Three relevant previous studies, then, support the notion that a frequency of *you* that is almost 200 per 10,000 words is excessive by comparison.

A possible partial explanation for the excessive use of *you* in the textbook could be the influence from the source text on the English translation, which could be a matter of pragmatic transfer.[6] The Swedish equivalent of second-person singular *you* is 'du' and it is highly frequent in the Swedish version (N=1,198). By comparison, the Swedish indefinite pronoun 'man' (essentially equivalent to *one*), which can be translated into generic *you*, is not very frequent (F=122). This information, then, supports an intended specific reading of the majority of the *you* uses in the textbook. A related phenomenon that has likely exerted an influence on the Swedish original is an informalisation trend in public formal texts in Swedish, including text produced by authorities (e.g. Löfgren, 1988), where direct reader address through *you* ('du') is commonly featured.

4 The frequency of *you* is 1,294 based on 66,730 tokens.

5 The frequency of *you* was 175 based on approximately 71,000 tokens.

6 Direct reader address through second-person *you* in a textbook may seem fully appropriate in Swedish, but not as appropriate in English.

Having established that *you* patterns are unusually frequent in *About Sweden*, we can proceed to the analysis of how these patterns are used. As the interest is in uses of *you* that involve addressing the reader, it is relevant to consider specific and generic readings, even though this study does not feature an examination of these types. Example (1) is a typical example from the material, with specific meaning, hence representing the most direct type of reader address. By contrast, Example (2) exemplifies a category of generic references, clearly framing *you* in a general way, as relevant *for most people* or Sweden as a whole.

(1) When you or your children fall ill, you should initially go to your primary care centre. [Ch_7]

(2) For most people, Christmas is a festival when you are off work and celebrating together with your family. [Ch_1]

It has been stressed in the literature that even clearly generic uses, as in Example (2), where substitution by *we*, *us*, *one*, or *anybody* is possible, retain some hint of the personal addressee reference (e.g. Biber *et al.*, 2021, p. 330). It is in line with observations made (e.g. Wales, 1996, p. 79) about specific and generic readings of *you* often being ambiguous. This applies also to *About Sweden*, which includes numerous examples that could be read as generic *you* and also take a specific reading, as in Example (3). For this reason, essentially all of the uses of *you* in the material are seen as signalling reader orientation.[7]

(3) If you are ill and off work for more than seven days, you must have a certificate from a doctor to confirm that you are ill in order… [Ch_3]

The ensuing analysis of *you* considers it from the perspective of patterns in which it occurs. By mapping the frequent phraseological patterns involving *you*, the aim is to find discourse functions linked to those patterns, to help explain why second-person *you* is so strikingly frequent in the textbook. A table in Appendix B includes 42 three- and four-word units including *you* extracted from Sketch Engine's N-gram function, with a minimum frequency of 10. From this list, three key patterns emerge: *if you*-conditionals, *you have* and *you can*. These, along with other *you* patterns, are often used in scenarios that are presented to heterogeneous readers, discussed further in Section 4.1.2.

### 4.1.1 Three key *you* patterns

Table 1 shows the frequency of the most common forms of *if you*-conditionals.

7 Only a small proportion of examples are unambiguously exclusive and do not include the target reader, as in 'This looks different depending on which part of Sweden you come from [Ch_1]'. It describes how the national day is celebrated; the recent immigrant, by definition, does not 'come from' any part of Sweden.

| | F |
|---|---|
| *if you have [a]* | 78 |
| *if you are* | 59 |
| *if you want [to]* | 55 |
| *if you do* | 13 |
| *if you are not* | 10 |

***Table 1:*** *The most frequent* if you-*patterns*

This pattern reflects the important function of giving advice to the newly arrived. It is a frequently employed strategy to present a scenario, probably because the textbook readers are likely to be quite heterogeneous in terms of needs. When framed as an *if*-scenario, the situation presented, and the social categorisation offered, may not apply and the information given may not be relevant, as in the following examples:

(4) *If you have borrowed money from a bank* in order to buy the apartment, you also have to pay interest and mortgage repayments to the bank. [Ch_2]

(5) *If you are divorced* and the children live with you, the other parent has to pay you child support. [Ch_5]

(6) *If you are 65 years of age or older* and are claiming all pension benefits you are entitled to… [Ch_8]

This presents as a way of hedging the relevance: not all readers have bank loans, or are divorced with children, etc.. Conditional clauses have been analysed as a rhetorical device helping to establish a dialogue between the writer and reader, and especially to create consensus. Based on their 'inherent nonassertiveness', *if*-conditionals may be drawn on for hypothesising and hedging (Rowley-Jolivet & Carter-Thomas, 2008). A specific subcategory found in a study of research articles is the 'relevance *if*-clause', where the statement expressed in the main clause is relevant if the proposition expressed in the subclause is true (Warchał, 2010, p. 144); this function is central in the *if you* patterns in *About Sweden*.

The use of *if*-patterns may also be a way to avoid heavy nominalisations, hence making the prose easier to process for the reader. Example (7) could have read '*Citizens of Switzerland or the EU* are able to…' It seems that noun phrases that refer to specific groups are largely avoided in subject position, except for the frequent phrase *people in Sweden*. Instead of having a nominal reference to a group which a reader may or may not identify with, the use of *you* supplies a potential link to the reader:

(7) *If you are a citizen of Switzerland or in an EU/EEA country*, you are able to travel freely within the European Union (EU). [Ch_1]

However, there are cases when *if you*-patterns are not used, as when referring to a category that no reader is expected to belong to:

(8) *Children aged between one and five* are entitled to attend preschool or a family day nursery. [Ch_5]

Example (8) illustrates how the target readership has influenced the discourse and the micro-level choices made when constructing it. It also lends support to a specific reading of the *you* uses.

The *if you*-patterns are often combined with the other two frequent patterns: *you have* and *you can*. Table 2 shows the most frequent co-occurring patterns of *you have* and Table 3 of *you can*.

| | **F** |
|---|---|
| *you have to* | 65 |
| *you have to pay* | 15 |
| *you have a* | 28 |
| *you have the [right]* | 19 |

***Table 2:*** *The most frequent* you have-*patterns*

In the first group, we find the semi-modal *have to* presenting obligations, as in Example (9), but we also find that the reader's rights are referred to, as in Example (10). This reflects the textbook's communicative purpose of providing information to the newly-arrived about both rights and responsibilities in Swedish society. Again, the use of *you* supplies a potential link to the reader by concretising how the action may be relevant. Adopting a different strategy, Example (9) could have referred to an abstract category of 'pedestrians' and Example (10) to 'adults'.

(9) *You [...] have to* walk on the pavement or pedestrian path if there is one. [Ch_2]

(10) *You have the right* to vote in the European Parliament election if you are 18 years of age or older and are a citizen of an EU country. [Ch_6]

As a precursor to the discussion of what type of reader is constructed, we may note that these examples do not make any assumptions about the reader's prior knowledge of pavements or the voting age in the EU.

The *you can*-patterns reflect the communicative purpose of presenting information to help the newly-arriveds to understand what help and support they are entitled to, as in Example (11), and where they might turn for further information, as in Example (12).

(11) *You can* contact the Equality Ombudsman if you have been discriminated against. [Ch_4]
(12) If you want to learn more about taxes, *you can* find information on the Swedish Tax Agency's website [Ch_5]

| | F |
|---|---|
| *you can also* | 35 |
| *you can get* | 20 |
| *you can apply [for]* | 16 |
| *you can read [more]* | 16 |
| *you can contact* | 12 |
| *you can find* | 11 |
| *you can receive* | 10 |
| *you can get help* | 10 |
| *where you can* | 12 |

***Table 3:*** *The most frequent* you can-*patterns*

### 4.1.2. Scenarios presented to heterogeneous readers

Many of the *you* patterns, such as the ones above, present different scenarios to the reader. Some of the examples serve to hedge the relevance of what is stated. The textbook writers seem to have put quite an effort into hedging the relevance of the information and advice presented, which is seen as an important strategy for catering to the heterogeneous nature of the target readers. The ensuing examples illustrate educational differences in category membership, where the target reader in Example (13) does not have compulsory schooling, which is in contrast to the reader in Example (14), who has a university degree.

(13) *If you do not have an education equivalent to Swedish compulsory school*, you are entitled to basic adult education. [Ch_3]

(14) *If you have completed a foreign university programme*, you can have the programme assessed by the Swedish Council for Higher... [Ch_3]

Scenarios are presented also through *when*-clauses, as in Example (15), which nicely illustrates how generic uses of *you* retain a flavour of specificity (cf. Wales, 1996). The example constructs a reader to whom the notion of passive smoking is unknown.

(15) *When you* are in the same room as a person who is smoking, you also breath [sic] in the smoke. This is called passive smoking and means that you can get the same diseases as the person who... [Ch_7]

The different types of *you* statements are at times varied in purpose and style. Many examples of advice-giving and information-giving specific to the Swedish context have

been shown above, which fit in with the purpose of presenting newcomers with civic information. By contrast to this, there are statements framed as universal biological facts, as in Example (16). This example appears to be talking (down) to a child, who is not yet aware of the existence of different trajectories in ageing.

(16) The ageing process, when and how *you* age, differs a lot between different people. Some people get grey hair and wrinkles early in life, others later on. [Ch_8]

Constructions involving *you* are found also in definitions, as in Example (17). Definitions are known to play a key role in textbooks (Bondi, 2016, p. 328; cf. Parodi, 2010, p. 215). The way they are linked to *you* in *About Sweden* is likely a strategy to make the discourse less formal/impersonal and, again, show how a notion is relevant to the reader. The definitions offered, however, are not precise and may confuse some readers; while some readers may be insulted that they are assumed not to know these terms.

(17) *A pension is* money you receive when you get older and stop working. [Ch_8]

### 4.1.2. Constructions of the reader through *you*

Based on the patterns reported above, what type of reader is constructed in the textbook, especially when considered from a potentially essentialising perspective? The reader is dynamic in terms of identity; there is no one, fixed identity but instead various hypothetical identities or categories are constantly offered to the reader, for example through *if you* statements. This approach reflects an awareness of a heterogeneous target group, where different readers will have different needs. In this way, the textbook acknowledges diversity. We may add that it must be a difficult task to write a text for a potentially highly diverse audience; consider for instance the contrasting educational backgrounds in Examples (13) and (14) above. This approach may be unappealing to individual readers, who may react negatively to being presented to one hypothetical situation after another, especially if many, or most, of them do not apply.

The constructed reader also equals somebody who is not very knowledgeable, as we have seen for instance in Examples (9), (10), (15), (16), (17). Examples such as (11) and (12) may also suggest a reader who is not very resourceful, but in need of pointers for where to turn to find out more about specific aspects of Swedish society. While the newly arrived is obviously likely to have considerable information gaps vis-à-vis Swedish society, and it is the key communicative purpose of the textbook to help fill those gaps, there is a risk that readers may feel insulted by the treatment as less knowledgeable, or may turned off by what may be perceived as a denigrating reader approach. (For an overview of how aspects of culture may affect communicative styles, see e.g. Scollon *et al.* [2012]). We may note that inclusive *we*-patterns do not occur in *About Sweden*, which contributes to maintaining a distance between the writer and the reader; inclusive *we* has been found to be commonly used in academic discourse to imply shared knowledge and values (e.g. Kuo, 1998). Conversely, we may also see the writer constructed as highly knowledgeable

and in possession of knowledge that the reader is projected as needing. In a study of introductory textbooks (Hyland, 1999), a less egalitarian writer-reader relationship has been found to be evident. The authorial voice is described as a 'primary-knower', which reflects an unequal relationship to the reader. This type of 'primary-knower' pattern is evident also in *About Sweden*, which features an omniscient narrator who is not visible, in the sense that there are no occurrences of *I* or exclusive *we*.

## 4.2. Patterns involving Swedish and Sweden

Findings related to *Swedish* will be presented in Section 4.2.1, followed by the findings for *Sweden* in Section 4.2.2.

### 4.2.1. Swedish

Among the most frequent content words that collocate with *Swedish*, we find proper nouns referring to institutions and organisations. These are shown in decreasing order in the left column in Table 4.[8]

| ***Swedish* occurring in proper nouns** | ***Swedish* co-occurring with common nouns** |
|---|---|
| *Social; Insurance* [28 hits; as in *the Social Insurance Agency*] | *Swedish school(s)* [14 hits] |
| *Tax* [11; as in *the Swedish Tax Agency*] | *Swedish people* [11] |
| *Agency; Migration* [10; as in *the Swedish Migration Agency*] | *Swedish society* [11] |
| *the Swedish Government* [7] | *Swedish system* [10] |
| *the Swedish Pensions Agency* [8] | *Swedish citizen(s)* [9] |
| *the Swedish Enforcement Authority* [6] | *Swedish law* [8] |
| *the Swedish Public Dental Service* [5] | *the Swedish labour market* [5] |
| *the Swedish Board* [5; e.g. *for Study Support*] | *Swedish history* [5] |
| *Swedish National* [5; e.g. *Pensioners' Organisation*] | *Swedish culture* [4] |
| *the Swedish courts* [4] | *the Swedish population* [4] |
| | *Swedish welfare* [4] |

***Table 4:*** *Collocations involving* Swedish*, sorted into proper and common nouns*

The adjective *Swedish* is used to provide a largely institutional view of the country, presenting what is Swedish as a collection of public institutions, which are there to support and control the citizens. The most frequently mentioned authorities include the *Social Insurance Agency*, the *Swedish Tax Agency* and the *Swedish Migration Agency*, indicating that immigrants are expected to be interested primarily in money and residence permits.

8 Forms occurring a minimum of four times have been included.

In addition to the many proper nouns, there are generic institutional references, for example to *Swedish authorities* (5) and to the *Swedish state* (3).

Most of the common noun collocations (right-hand column) are inanimate and abstract, such as *school(s)*, *society* and *system*. There are also a few animate and concrete types, such as *people* and *citizen(s)*. These were of special interest for the analysis, as they may be used for stereotyping. *Swedish citizen(s)* is presented as a referent that is relevant to the textbook audience, as a possible target (as in 'If you want to become a *Swedish citizen*, you have to…'), while *Swedish people* is used predominantly to refer to historical entities (as in 'Between 1865 and 1914, almost one million *Swedish people* moved to America'). However, there are a few examples of *Swedish people* referring to a collective in present-day Sweden, as in Example (18):

(18) Many municipalities and voluntary organisations are involved in helping *recently arrived refugees and immigrants* get into contact with *Swedish people*. The idea is for *immigrants* and *Swedish people* to meet in their free time in order to get to know one another and exchange experiences. This can be through activities such as bowling, watching sports events, or visiting museums and other interesting places. [Ch_3]

Here, *Swedish people* as a group is contrasted to immigrant groups. The example indicates that it is difficult for immigrants to establish contact with Swedish people and that help may be needed. There is a rare example of the writer engaging with a (municipality) perspective, through *interesting*. Terms referring to immigrant groups are overall relatively rare in the textbook. For example, *refugee(s)* occurs 25 times and *immigrant(s)* 10 times.[9] This further highlights the choice of referring to or addressing the target readership not in the third person, but through second-person *you*.

In addition to the noun phrase patterns in Table 4, *Swedish* also occurs in *typically Swedish* (7 occurrences). This collocation is always hedged and, in fact, three occurrences form the question *Is there anything typically Swedish*, to which the book offers very few answers. The most straightforward characterisation, which is still hedged and attributed to others refers to a type of building, that is, interestingly, a cultural artefact rather than a behaviour or a tradition.

(19) *Many believe that* small red cottages are typically Swedish. [Ch_1]

Without the attribution, Example (19) would read *Small red cottages are typically Swedish*. It has been suggested that that this type of monoglossic bare assertion is associated with signalling likemindedness, or that, from a reader perspective, such formulations construe propositions 'as unproblematic for the implied reader' (White, 2020, p. 409). This is not done here, but instead the attribution brings in other voices and essentially treats knowledge about what is typically Swedish as potentially contested.

9 The latter figure excludes the phrase *Swedish for immigrants*, which refers to courses in Swedish as a second language. *Swedish* occasionally functions as a noun, above all when referring to the Swedish language.

One chapter features a brief list of statements (Example (20)) that are prefaced in a heavily hedged manner (in italics). Again, the ideas are attributed to others (…*many regard as…*). As above, a 'majority' indefinite pronoun is used, so it could be argued that the reader is still invited to accept this view. The second sentence may be seen as condescending to the reader, projected as not understanding that absolute consensus—about aspects of culture—is not likely to occur.

(20) The texts below describe some factors that *many regard as* typically Swedish and characteristic of Swedish culture. *This does not mean that everyone* in Sweden *would agree* with *or recognise* themselves in the descriptions that follow. [Ch_1]

It is clearly important to the textbook authors to acknowledge heteroglossia and diversity, even if they also present majority viewpoints. However, the bottom line regarding what is *typically Swedish* is that it is not possible to establish and that there is a diversity in views about it, as made clear in Example (21). Hence, the discourse can be said to avoid essentialising and stereotyping, at least in contexts where *Swedish* is mentioned.

(21) *It is difficult to say* what defines Swedish culture and what is typically Swedish. [Ch_1]

The avoidance of essentialising Swedish people, culture and traditions may be interpreted as a strategy to be inclusive, or to 'resist ethnification' (Fant, 2012, p. 275). (More on this in Section 4.2.2, linked to *Sweden*.) A particular interest here has been in the possible presence of statements about national identity, generalisations or stereotyping of Swedish people or cultural phenomena. Stubbs (1996) found collocates for *English* that revealed stereotypes (in a large, standard corpus), but no such patterns were found for *Swedish*. Instead, the analysis of *Swedish* is more in line with the findings for *British*, where the collocations were found to be largely 'neutral' (Stubbs, 1996, p. 186).

### 4.2.2. Sweden

The Swedish textbook data is also in stark contrast to the findings from the Fascist civics textbook used in Franco's Spain (see Section 2.2), where adjectives modifying *Spain* were found to support the 'myth of the Utopian Catholic State, focusing on its power, orderliness, and saintliness' (Pinto, 2004, p. 664). *Sweden* is modified by an adjective only eight times, most frequently through the terms *southern* and *northern*, used to report on geographical facts.

The analysis of *Sweden* (F=679) is focused on the most frequent collocation: toponymic *in Sweden* (275 occurrences).[10] This was deemed especially interesting given that the construction *in [country]* has been presented as 'clearly identifiable as a 'national we', in the sense that the speaker is speaking for an entire national collective (de Cillia *et al.*,

10 *About Sweden* is the strongest collocation for *Sweden* listed in Sketch Engine (LogDice 13.00), but a concordance check showed that all but one example come from the header (where the title is stated) and from copyright statements. The strongest relevant collocation is *in Sweden* (LogDice 12.14).

1999, p. 161; referring to Austria (*in Austria*)). The analysis of *in Sweden* found that it is occasionally used in contexts where attitudes, beliefs and behaviours associated with Sweden are referred to. In some such uses, the co-text included words such as *common, usual(ly), important, natural, often, strong (tradition)*, illustrated in Examples (22)-(26) and Examples (30)-(31). These are not exceptionally common patterns; the figures in parenthesis indicate how often they occur in the same sentence as *in Sweden*: *(un)common* (13), *often* (5), *important* (5), *strong* (5), *usual(ly)* (3) and *natural* (2). These words function as hedges or boosters, but, most importantly, the examples show how they may be used to signal majority views.

Statements including *in Sweden* may help to uncover attitudes, because they often involve presuppositions and there is an expectation that the attitude, belief or behaviour does not apply in the immigrant's country of origin. Example (22) makes the comparison explicit through the concessive *while*-clause and the phrase *in other countries*.

(22) While it may be more *common in other countries* for family and relatives to take care of older people, *in Sweden* it is *often* society that provides this support. [Ch_8]

Most of the examples, however, do not present an explicit comparison—instead, there is a presupposition that things are different in other countries.

(23) For many people *in Sweden*, it is *natural* to live together with the person you love *without* getting married or having children. [Ch_5]

(24) *In Sweden*, the family is *usually* considered to be *only* parents, siblings and children. [Ch_4]

(25) *In Sweden* it is also *common* for the other parent to be present at the delivery. [Ch_5]

(26) There is a *strong tradition in Sweden* of being involved in associations and *many* people are members of one or more of these in their free time. [Ch_3]

In addition to *in [country]*, de Cillia *et al.*'s (1999) material from Austria also included many occurrences of *we*, often used as a strategy to presuppose intra-national sameness or similarity, which is seen as key in discourses about nations and national identities (de Cillia *et al.* 1999, p. 162). In *About Sweden*, however, *we* is very rare (F=27). There are very few attempts to construct national identity in that way; this would run counter to the construction of a heterogeneous readership and the strategy of inclusion. Supporting this 'outsider view' on Sweden, there are even examples of *in Sweden* co-occurring with third-person *they*. The *in Sweden* constructions here are clearly more complex than the 'national *we*' in de Cillia *et al.* (1999).

(27) *In Sweden*, people can say what *they* like, with certain exceptions. [Ch_6]

Toponymic *in Sweden* used to mark a majority practice or view is often qualified, for example through *many*, and may include *people*. The majority view is seemingly endorsed by the writer in Example (29).

(28) *Many* people *in Sweden* share an interest in and a closeness to nature. [Ch_1]

(29) *The majority of* people living *in Sweden* have confidence that the money they pay in taxes is used to build the collective society. [Ch_3]

Not all examples involving *in Sweden* are hedged, as in the following cases, ranging from freedom of association to punctuality. Instead, the writer's stance, supporting 'the Swedish way', is shown through the use of *important*.

(30) There is freedom of association *in Sweden*. This is an *important* aspect of the democratic society. [Ch_3]

(31) In Sweden it is *important* to arrive on time. [Ch_1]

The next example does not spell out who holds the expectation, but as in many *in Sweden* statements, the standard behaviour is presented as universal. Readers who are familiar with debates in the Swedish media, however, will know that parents are definitely not seen as universally shouldering this responsibility. It is not specified what forms such involvement should take, so readers may be left wondering how to interpret this.

(32) *In Sweden, there is an expectation that* the parents will be involved in their children's school work. [Ch_5]

In the analysis of the collocation *typically Swedish* in Section 4.2.1, we saw examples that avoided essentialising Swedish people and culture in an effort to resist ethnification (Fant, 2012). It may be that it is a strategy of being inclusive that has led to an avoidance of the word *Swede(s)*, following a logic like 'those who are not Swedish citizens or who do not identify as Swedish will feel excluded'. At certain points, this choice has led to paraphrases that make the text less brief and occasionally somewhat awkward. Example (33) is about something as uncontroversial as a pastry ('semla').

(33) In February or March, *many people in Sweden* eat semla. [Ch_1]

Going beyond the collocation *in Sweden* in searching for generalisations about Sweden, we find another couple of examples involving hedging that is linked to the acknowledgement of diversity and the strategy of inclusion are found in Examples (34) and (35), where *in many ways* qualifies the characterisation of Sweden as gender equal and individualistic. Example (36), by contrast, presents full commitment to the statement about Sweden being multicultural.

(34) Sweden is, *in many ways*, a country where there is gender equality. [Ch_3]

(35) Sweden is, *in many ways*, an individualistic society. [Ch_4]

(36) Sweden is a multicultural society. [Ch_1]

This further strengthens the diversity/inclusion that is foregrounded in the text. It is, of course, debatable what 'multicultural' means and it could range from referring to a quantitative interpretation (as in 'people living in Sweden come from different cultures') to a qualitative interpretation (as in 'multiculturalism is acknowledged and valued across all levels of society'). Judging from the examples retrieved, Sweden's status as multicultural is presented in largely abstract ways, without concretisation or exemplification.

### *4.3 Images of the newcomer and of Sweden: uniform and essentialist?*

Regarding what images of the newcomer to Sweden are created, the analysis has shown that the textbook constructs heterogeneous groups of readers. There is no one, fixed identity but instead various hypothetical identities/categories offered to the reader, for example through *if you*-conditionals. The textbook also displays a strategy of inclusion through *you* patterns, attempting to link information and advice directly to the reader.

The image of Sweden presented in the textbook is predominantly linked to meanings of the nation that have to do with institutions and citizenship. By contrast, meanings of the nation that have to do with culture and traditions are rarer, and when they occur they tend to be heavily hedged (as in Example (21)). The message formed is that many clearly defined institutions exist in Sweden, while there exists almost nothing that is typically Swedish culturally. If we make a distinction between *Staatsnation* and *Kulturnation* (e.g. de Cillia *et al.*, 1999, p. 169), it is the former that is foregrounded.

Constructions of Sweden as a nation are not built on *we* statements (cf. de Cillia *et al.*, 1999; Bishop & Jaworski, 2003), but the toponymic construction *in Sweden* is used frequently. While these may be used to indirectly presuppose similarity within the nation, such statements are often qualified, leaving room for internal difference. There is, then, a presupposition that others will not necessarily share the typical behaviour or attitude. In fact, these statements sometimes present an 'outsider view' of Sweden rather than a 'national we' perspective, with the detached author not necessarily identifying with Sweden.

Is then the overall picture of Sweden and the newcomer one of diversity rather than uniformity? Yes, diversity predominates in both cases. Numerous attempts are made to counter the presentation of an image of a monolithic Sweden and to avoid 'ethnification' (Fant, 2012), even if majority views are still presented. By comparison to Sweden and Swedish phenomena, however, the target readers and hence the newcomer groups are constructed as relatively more diverse. The target readers are marked by heterogeneity, as evidenced by the frequent *you* patterns.

## 5. Conclusions

An initial analysis of word frequency lists based on the textbook showed that *you* is the most frequent pronoun, *Sweden* the most frequent noun and *Swedish* the most frequent adjective. It can thus be argued that the reader/the newcomer (through *you*) and Swedish

institutions (through *Swedish* and *Sweden*) are the most frequently referred to social actors. If we consider personal pronouns as a whole, the textbook was found to display excessive reader visibility through second-person *you*, while there were no explicit writer visibility through first-person *I* and very few explicit references to the Swedish nation through *we*. A comparison to previous research reporting on the frequency of *you* in related genres showed that the frequency of occurrence in *About Sweden* is unusually high.

*You* was found to be frequently used in extended phraseological patterns, including *if you*-conditionals, *you have* and *you can.* A closer analysis of the discourse functions of these patterns showed that they are often used in scenarios that are presented to heterogeneous readers. The 'relevance *if*-clause' (Warchał, 2010, p. 144) was found to be a key function in *if you*-patterns. Many of the patterns involving *you* serve to present different scenarios and category memberships to the reader in a way that hedges the relevance of what is stated. Hedging the relevance of the information presented is seen as an important strategy for catering to a heterogeneous audience, where readers have very different needs. With the various hypothetical identities offered to the reader, the constructed reader becomes highly dynamic. We can speculate whether the construction of readers who are highly diverse at all attests to the phenomenon of 'superdiversity' (e.g. Blommaert & Rampton, 2012), reflecting sociocultural features and demographics that are highly mixed.

It was found that *Swedish* is used to present a largely institutional view of the country, equalling what is Swedish to a collection of public institutions, supporting and/or controlling citizens. *Swedish* is occasionally used outside an institutional context, as in the pattern *typically Swedish*, which was found to be always hedged or attributed to others. The degree of commitment to statements about Sweden as a *Kulturnation* is not strong (but exceptions were found in *in Sweden* patterns), which signals a writer who is not very normative in presenting the nation or the national identity. Such an authorial stance may be the result of not wanting to exclude readers. It may also be seen as the writer not having or taking the mandate to define what is typically Swedish. Even if majority viewpoints are presented, it is clearly important to the textbook authors to acknowledge diversity. The avoidance of essentialising Swedish people, culture and traditions may be interpreted as a strategy to avoid ethnification (cf. Fant, 2012) and to be inclusive. The inclusion strategy may have led to an avoidance of words like *Swede(s)*, *Swedish people* and *immigrant(s)*, favouring instead *people in Sweden*.

The strongest collocation involving *Sweden* is the toponymic *in Sweden*, used to associate attitudes, beliefs and behaviours to Sweden, with co-occurring words such as *common*, *usual(ly)*, *important* and *natural*. The examples sometimes involve a presupposition that the associated attitude, belief or behaviour does not apply in the reader's country of origin. The construction *in* [country] has been identified with a 'national we', with the speaker speaking for an entire national collective (de Cillia *et al.*, 1999). The matter is

more complex in *About Sweden*, however. There is no general attempt to construct national identity through *we* statements, as *we* occurs very rarely. Instead, the textbook constructs a heterogeneous readership and displays a strategy of inclusion. Regarding the overall question about what images of Sweden and the newcomer are created in the textbook, it was concluded that they are diverse and heterogeneous, and this applies above all the newcomer groups.

Even if the textbook represents a highly reader-oriented style through excessive uses of *you*, the text still upholds a considerable distance between the reader and the writer. A key reason for this is because there is no matching writer-orientation through *I* or *we*; the textbook does not create a balanced interpersonal relation, where both writer and reader seemingly engage in a dialogue. The notion of constructing 'proximity' (Hyland, 2010, p. 116) between writers and readers has been applied to research writing, referring to ways in which these personas are constructed as 'people with similar understandings and goals'. What is constructed in *About Sweden* is distance rather than proximity, where not only the writer has different understandings and goals from the readers, but also readers do, as a strongly heterogeneous group.

The writer, although highly invisible, is constructed as decidedly knowledgeable and in possession of knowledge that readers are projected as needing. The flip side of that coin is that the reader also equals somebody who is not very knowledgeable or resourceful. It is an overall effect of the text that the reader group is presented as internally similar in the sense of being universally constructed as less knowledgeable. This is linked to the fact that *About Sweden* is a textbook, with a communicative purpose that is educational. However, features that are unusual for a textbook were also spotted in the analysis. One is the use of *you* being excessive, supported through comparison with previous research on textbooks in English (Section 4.1). The analysis also indicated a certain degree of genre hybridity, as *you* statements included not only many examples of advice- and information-giving, but also definitions and universal biological facts. Another unusual feature is the extensive use of hedging found to co-occur with the search terms. Previous research on textbooks has found hedging to be infrequent, or even avoided (e.g. Bondi, 2016, p. 325).

Even if the analysis presented here has captured recurring patterns, it does not represent an exhaustive analysis of all patterns. For example, the textbook includes many images, which would be of interest for a comprehensive semiotic analysis. Also, the description would have been considerably thicker had an ethnographic approach been adopted, including interviews with different stakeholders. One particularly relevant aspect for future research to investigate is how the textbook has been received by actual newcomers to Sweden. For example, we do not know what effect the hedging effects of the *if you* patterns may have on actual readers, but it is a possibility that the book as a whole will be seen as mostly irrelevant by many readers. On a final note, at the time of the analysis

(2022), Sweden has a new government, which is right-wing and for which stricter immigration policies are a priority. Given that an 'ultra-conservative' party, the Sweden Democrats (see e.g. Wodak, 2020, p. 291), has a strong influence over the new government, it is expected that the non-normative and inclusive discourse of the *About Sweden* textbook will be abandoned. This is another question to pursue in expanding the research on textbooks for adult education, moving beyond language and communication settings.

## Competing interests

The author has no competing interests to declare.

## References

Ädel, A. (2014). 'What I want you to remember is…': Audience orientation in monologic academic discourse. In L. Brems, G. Lobke & F. Van de Velde (Eds.), *Intersubjectivity and intersubjectification in grammar and discourse. Theoretical and descriptive advances* (pp. 101–127). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/bct.65.06ade

Ädel, A. (2021). Writer and reader visibility in humanities research articles: Variation across language, regional variety and discipline. *English for Specific Purposes, 65*, 49–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.09.001

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origins and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.

Baker, P. (2004). 'Unnatural acts': Discourses of homosexuality within the House of Lords debates on gay male law reform. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 8*(1), 88–106. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2004.00252.x

Bhatia, V.K. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. London: Longman.

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G.N., Conrad, S. & Finegan, E. (2021). *Grammar of spoken and written English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/z.232

Bishop, H. & Jaworski, A. (2003). 'We Beat 'em': Nationalism and the hegemony of homogeneity in the British press reportage of Germany versus England during Euro 2000. *Discourse & Society*, *14*(3), 243–271. https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265030143001

Blommaert, J. & Rampton, B. (2012). Language and Superdiversity. *MMG Working Paper* 12-09. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2013.797276

Bondi, M. (2001). Small corpora and language variation: Reflexivity across genres. In M. Ghadessy, A. Henry & R.L. Roseberry (Eds.), *Small corpus studies and ELT* (pp. 135–174). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.5.11bon

Bondi, M. (2016). Textbooks. In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.), The *Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes* (pp. 323–334). London: Routledge.

Curdt-Christiansen, X.L., & Weninger, C. (Eds.). (2015). *Language, ideology and education: The politics of textbooks in language education.* London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315814223

De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (1999). The discursive construction of national identities. *Discourse & Society*, *10*(2), 149–173. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926599010002002

Fant, L. (2012). 'Those Venezuelans are so easy-going!' National stereotypes and self-representations in discourse about the other. In B. Paulston, C. Kiesling, F. Scott & E.S. Rangel (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural communication* (pp. 272–291). London: Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118247273.ch14

File, K.A. (2017). Genre theory. In B. Vine (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language in the workplace* (pp. 112–124). London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315690001-11

Gabrielatos, C. & Baker, P. (2008). Fleeing, sneaking, flooding: A corpus analysis of discursive constructions of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press 1996-2005. *Journal of English Linguistics*, *36*(5), 5–38. https://doi.org/10.1177/0075424207311247

Heath, A. & Richards, L. (2019). How do Europeans differ in their attitudes to immigration?: Findings from the European Social Survey 2002/03–2016/17. *OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers*, No. 222. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Herriman, J. (2022). Metadiscourse in English instruction manuals. *English for Specific Purposes, 65,* 120–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.10.003

Hyland, K. (1999). Talking to students: Metadiscourse in introductory coursebooks. *English for Specific Purposes, 18*(1), 3–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(97)00025-2

Hyland, K. (2010). Constructing proximity: Relating to readers in popular and professional science. *English for Specific Purposes, 9,* 116–127. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2010.02.003

Jaworska, S. (2016). A comparison of Western and local descriptions of hosts in promotional tourism discourse. *Corpora*, *11*(1), 83–111. https://doi.org/10.3366/cor.2016.0086

Kuo, C-H. (1998). The use of personal pronouns: Role relationships in scientific journal articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, *18*(2), 121–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(97)00058-6

Lewis, R.F. (2017). *Constructing and contesting the Good British Citizen: An investigation of the contemporary citizenship regime as discursive practice*. Doctoral dissertation. Centre for Applied Linguistics, University of Warwick, UK.

Löfgren, O. (1988). *Hej, det är från Försäkringskassan! Informaliseringen av Sverige*. [Hello, it is from the Social Insurance Agency! The informalisation of Sweden]. Stockholm: Natur och Kultur.

Loring, A. (2015). A grounded approach to citizenship education: Local interplays between government institutions, adult schools, and community events in Sacramento, California. *Journal of Social Science Education*, *14*(3), 54–65.

Parodi, G. (2010). The rhetorical organization of the Textbook genre across disciplines: A 'colony-in-loops'? *Discourse Studies*, 1*2*(2), 195–222. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445609356500

Pinto, D. (2004). Indoctrinating the youth of post-war Spain: A discourse analysis of a Fascist civics textbook. *Discourse & Society*, *15*(5), 649–667. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926504045036

Rowley-Jolivet, E. & Carter-Thomas, S. (2008). When practice belies 'theory': Form, function and frequency of *if*-conditionals in specialised discourse. *ASp [online]* 53-54, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.4000/asp.343

Scollon, R., Wong Scollon, S. & Jones, R.H. (2012). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Stubbs, M. (1996). *Text and corpus analysis: Computer-assisted studies of language and culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Tardy, C. (2011). Genre analysis. In K. Hyland & B. Paltridge (Eds.), *The Bloomsbury companion to Discourse Analysis* (pp. 54–68). London: Bloomsbury.

Tognini-Bonelli, E. (2001). *Corpus Linguistics at work*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.6

van Leeuwen, T. (1996). The representation of social actors. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard, & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 32–70). London: Routledge.

von Brömssen, K., Milani, T., Spehar, A., and Bauer, S.. (2022). 'Swedes' relations to their government are based on trust': Banal nationalism in civic orientation courses for newly arrived adult migrants in Sweden. *Futures of Education, Culture and Nature - Learning to Become*, vol. 1, pp. 71–88. https://doi.org/10.7146/fecun.v1i.130237

Wales, K. (1996). *Personal pronouns in present-day English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wang, D. (2016). Learning or becoming: Ideology and national identity in textbooks for international learners of Chinese. *Cogent Education*, *3*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1140361

Warchał, K. (2010). Moulding interpersonal relations through conditional clauses: Consensus-building strategies in written academic discourse. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *9*(2), 140–150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2010.02.002

White, P.R.R. (2020). The putative reader in mass media persuasion: Stance, argumentation and ideology. *Discourse and Communication*, *14*(4), 404–423. https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481320910512

Wodak, R. (2020). *The politics of fear: The shameless normalization of far-right discourse*. 2nd ed. London: Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529739664

# Appendix A

*Table A.* A word frequency list based on *About Sweden*, including pronouns and nouns with a potential reference to a social actor. The cut-off point is a frequency of 40, which occurred at rank 202.

| | Frequency | Rank |
|---|---|---|
| *you* | 1,294 | 9 |
| *Sweden* | 679 | 13 |
| *your* | 407 | 19 |
| *people* | 360 | 21 |
| *county* | 292 | 30 |
| *Swedish* | 279 | 31 |
| *administrative* | 267 | 32 |
| *board* | 262 | 33 |
| *Gothenburg* | 253 | 36 |
| *city* | 252 | 37 |
| *Götaland* | 245 | 40 |
| *västra* | 243 | 41 |
| *children* | 200 | 48 |
| *their* | 197 | 49 |
| *they* | 190 | 50 |
| *school* | 135 | 62 |
| *child* | 134 | 63 |
| *agency* | 106 | 75 |
| *society* | 95 | 83 |
| *government* | 94 | 84 |
| *services* | 85 | 93 |
| *person* | 82 | 99 |
| *family* | 81 | 101 |
| *country* | 77 | 103 |
| *women* | 76 | 108 |
| *public* | 69 | 120 |
| *parents* | 69 | 121 |
| *countries* | 58 | 139 |
| *municipality* | 58 | 141 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *riksdag* | 54 | 149 |
| *state* | 52 | 159 |
| *municipalities* | 52 | 160 |
| *men* | 51 | 163 |
| *centre* | 51 | 165 |
| *someone* | 49 | 171 |
| *them* | 49 | 174 |
| *most* | 48 | 176 |
| *website* | 48 | 177 |
| *political* | 48 | 178 |
| *yourself* | 47 | 179 |
| *church* | 46 | 183 |
| *association* | 46 | 185 |
| *schools* | 45 | 188 |
| *some* | 44 | 191 |
| *everyone* | 43 | 194 |
| *system* | 40 | 202 |

# Appendix B

*Table B.* 3-word and 4-word units including *you* extracted from Sketch Engine. The cut-off point is a frequency of 10.

| | **Frequency** |
|---|---|
| *you have to* | 65 |
| *if you are* | 59 |
| *if you have* | 59 |
| *you want to* | 48 |
| *you can also* | 35 |
| *if you want* | 28 |
| *you have a* | 28 |
| *if you want to* | 27 |
| *means that you* | 24 |
| *you can get* | 20 |
| *you are entitled* | 20 |
| *that you have* | 20 |

| | |
|---|---|
| *if you have a* | 19 |
| *you are entitled to* | 19 |
| *you have the* | 19 |
| *you need to* | 17 |
| *you have the right* | 17 |
| *you can apply* | 16 |
| *you can read* | 16 |
| *that you are* | 15 |
| *you have to pay* | 15 |
| *you can read more* | 15 |
| *you can apply for* | 13 |
| *you may not* | 13 |
| *you are not* | 13 |
| *if you do* | 13 |
| *you do not* | 13 |
| *when you are* | 12 |
| *this means that you* | 12 |
| *you can contact* | 12 |
| *where you can* | 12 |
| *you can find* | 11 |
| *what do you* | 11 |
| *you are a* | 11 |
| *cent of your* | 10 |
| *do you think* | 10 |
| *you live in* | 10 |
| *per cent of your* | 10 |
| *when you have* | 10 |
| *if you are not* | 10 |
| *you can receive* | 10 |
| *you can get help* | 10 |