ETHNIC BIASES AND RACIALIZATION IN SWEDISH JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

- A qualitative study regarding lay judges' narratives on Ethnic Discrimination and Racialization in judicial proceedings

Emma Flodin

Lund University
Sociology of Law Department

Master Thesis (SOLM02)
Spring 2021

Supervisor: Matthias Baier

Examiner: Rustamjon Urinboyev

Abstract

The purpose of this study has been to examine how lay judges serving in district courts and appellate courts talk about their experiences of racism and ethnic discrimination in legal proceedings and what strategies exist to counteract these contradictions. The focus is on the judges' presentation of their own stories about anticipating derogatory treatment of a defendants and what is done organizationally to counteract these biases. Furthermore, the study and analysis of the empirical material is based on Pierre Bourdieu's theoretical framework, where the central concepts of the study have been limited to *Social Field* and *Capital*, as well as Erving Goffmans *Dramaturgical Perspective*. This choice of theory's strives to leave room to see what significance language, education, ethnicity, external attributes, social performance and body language can affect both the defendant in the trial but also the judges' own attitude to the case. To find out this, qualitative semi-structured interviews with lay judges from the District Court and the Court of Appeal were conducted.

The study shows that the lay judges believe that the Swedish legal system is not a free zone from either racialization or ethnic discrimination, but that these biases in the judicial process are mainly shown "behind closed doors", as during the deliberation. Therefore, the analysis of the results has resulted in a strong connection to Erving Goffman's concepts of frontstage and backstage. The lay judges' *frontstage* is the courtroom, in which they need to put on a mask to displace uncomfortable and difficult thoughts, feelings, values and emotions. Their *backstage* is during the deliberations where they are allowed to take off their masks and be more outspoken, show emotions, ask questions and judge according to personal as well as political values and opinions.

Keywords: Ethnic Discrimination, Racialization, Biases, Capital, Frontstage, Backstage, Lay Judges, Legal Processes, Defendant.

Table of Contents

Preface:

I would like to preface a generous thank you to the people who have been involved in this master's thesis. First of all, I would like to direct my gratitude to the informants who participated and made this study possible. Above all, I would like to extend a big thank you to my supervisor Matthias Baier who showed great commitment by giving me guidance and support during the entire dissertation process. Furthermore, I also want to show gratitude to the classmates who opposed the thesis and gave me the right conditions to constantly develop and improve my work. It is also of great importance for me to thank my parents, my grandparents, my friends and my boyfriend for their ultimate support and patience during all the trials and tribulations of the process!

In this dissertational project, I have tried to embrace the value of my previous judicial and sociological experiences, following Max Weber's appeal that "*you should not only choose research topic with your heart, but nevertheless approach it as objectively and open-mindedly as you can*".

List of Abbreviations and Glossary

ADB - The agency of Antidiscrimination Stockholm

ARR - American Racial Reasoning

BRÅ - Crime Preventing Counsel in Sweden

CRT - Critical Race Theory

DL - Discrimination Act

Defendant - Prosecuted person

DO - Ombudsman against Ethical Discrimination

JO - Ombudsman

Judicial Process - Trial

Lay Judge - Adjudicates in cases where the lay judge's vote is as valuable as the legal judge's

RB - Code of Judicial Procedure (1942:740)

SOU - Official Reports of the Swedish Government

1. Introduction

> "The norm in" these circles "is further that a woman tells the family that she will be abused if she becomes so that the matter can be resolved within the family. The fact that the woman did not tell his relatives that he beat her, but instead reported it to the police, further reduces her credibility. The man's family seems to be a good family, unlike hers, which is also important for the assessment of the debt issue." (Sidenvall, 2018).

This quote comes from the article "Sharia in the Court" (Sidenvall, 2018). The background to this statement is that an Islamist lay judge and politician in 2018 tried to sneak in and apply sharia law in Swedish courts. This is unauthorized for the simple reason that Sharia advocates Islamic law, morality and fundamental rules for how to live your life as a Muslim. However, this debate will not be the focus of my thesis. Accordingly, I would like to highlight that judges in Swedish law are equal to the professional legal judge in court cases and deliberations as well as that their vote can sometimes be decisive for either a conviction or acquittal. In the famous case above, a man who abused his wife was acquitted since the Islamist judges appointed via the Center Party (Centerpartiet) agreed that the man should be acquitted because of he came from a finer/better family than the woman (here I also want to illuminate the importance of making a difference between Islamic and Muslim). The quote above is an excerpt from the reasons for the judgment. The central point is that the lay judges let their personal values from their religion influence the verdict, since the lay judges were numerous more than the legal judge, it did not matter if the judges were not united in the question. The man was acquitted, and the verdict has generated a lot of criticism in social media against the judges, the Center Party as well as the lay judge-system in general.

A central part of a democracy is that all people should be equal before the law and that courts should observe objectivity and impartiality. Thus, public power must be exercised in accordance with the principle of equal treatment and strive for respect for the equal value of all human beings and for the freedom and dignity of the individual (RF Chapter 1, Sections 2–9).

In a democratic society, regardless of skin color, ethnicity, language, gender, social status, education or anything else, the individual citizen must be treated with respect and the judiciary's greatest task is to give the individual citizen legal security (SOU, 2005: 56ff). The shortcomings in the system presented by SOU's report have led to a concern about whether justice is really fair and the societal problems that are created due to discrimination in the judiciary and how this in turn affects the societal climate in our country.

BRÅ's report "*Discrimination in the legal process*", (2008: 4) shows examples of how suspects and victims of crime with a foreign background can be disadvantaged in the legal process. Furthermore, Martens, Shannon and Törnqvist (2008) highlight that both Swedish and international research shows that people with a foreign background can be disadvantaged in the encounter with many different social institutions; the judiciary is no exception. Thus, it is stated that one has enough information and evidence to act purely politically, but there is a concern about whether one actually knows enough to answer *what* to do to avoid biases such as discrimination and racialization in the Swedish judiciary.

This thesis will focus only on the Swedish judicial system and the selection of the study have been limited to lay judges. The purpose is to investigate and try to understand the judges' experiences of discrimination and racialization in legal proceedings, as well as how they in their organization work to counteract these biases. The lay judge system has existed in Sweden since the 13th century. The system means that politically represented lay people without legal education are equated with the legally qualified judge in the court. The purpose of lay judges is that they should exist in order for society to have insight into the work of the courts, but also to influence the legal system with an outside view. It is therefore a matter of democracy of the utmost importance.

1.1 Aim and purpose of the study

This master's thesis is based on the matter of fact that there is no reason to believe that the Swedish judicial system would be a free zone from either ethnic discrimination or racialization, despite the fact that all humans should be equal before the law and despite the fact that courts should be characterized by neutrality. In addition, this dissertation is considered to be socio-legally relevant as it intends to study the lay judges' experiences of objectivity, neutrality and equal treatment in judicial processes, deemed to be a building block for a law obeying society. For this reason, the current study in the area of Sociology of Law will focus on concepts related to Goffmans *frontstage and backstage* as well as Bourdieu's concepts of *capital*. In addition, this will be processed and analyzed in the light of the academic discipline regarding racialization and Critical Race Theory, to see how these perspectives can be useful for understanding how ethnic biases and discrimination of defendants can occur in judicial processes. To this background, my purpose and my research questions are about investigating how lay judges who serve in district courts and courts of appeal talk about their experiences of racialization and ethnic discrimination in judicial proceedings and what strategies there are to counteract these biases.

1.2 Research Questions

- How can biases that appears in Swedish judicial processes be understood from a Lay Judge perspective?

- How can lay judges' experiences of racialization and ethnic discrimination of the defendant in judicial processes be understood?
- How does lay judges in their organization attempt to avoid biases as racialization and ethnic discrimination?

- In what ways can the lay judges' narratives derive to Bourdieu's theory of *social capital* as well as Goffmans concepts of *frontstage and backstage*?

The research questions are divided into one general question and three supporting sub-questions, for the reason of being able to acquire as concrete and reliable material as possible. To investigate these issues, qualitative interviews with lay judges will be conducted.

1.3 Limitations

In this master's thesis, I will not examine the lay judges' accounts of their actual participation in the judicial activity. This means that I will not investigate civic opinions and ideas about the judges through surveys nor similar. The character of this thesis is increasingly socio-legally theoretical and analytical.

Starting with making myself acquaint with the lay judge system and legislation on discrimination supplemented by a qualitative method for creating an understanding of the lay judges' narratives and experiences, I hope to achieve a wide-ranging analysis at the end of this thesis process.

In the account of the lay judge system in the background chapter of the essay, I will focus on lay judges' assignments in general courts and will not further account for their participation in administrative and appellate courts. This is because the study intends to center on lay judges in district courts and courts of appeal. Furthermore, I will only focus on the Swedish lay judge system and will not affect other forms of lay judges, such as jury systems. However, I will use previous research on an international level, to strengthen he theoretical starting point of the study.

Finally, I will not take a position on whether the lay judge system due to the conditions of racialization and discrimination in trials should remain or not. Therefore, this thesis will not focus on highlighting the advantages nor disadvantages of the lay judge system, since the aim of the study is nevertheless to understand the extent to how lay judges attempts to avoid racialization and ethnic discrimination of defendants in Swedish judicial processes. Thus, it is not

reasonable to create a debate on whether the system of lay judges should remain or not.

1.4 Definitions of Concepts

Below, key concepts for the study are addressed and explained generally.

1.4.1 Ethnicity

According to the Swedish DO, the term ethnicity refers to someone belonging to a group of people who have the same national or ethnic origin, skin color or other similar relationship (DO, 2020). For example, people who belong to an ethnic minority often identify themselves as inter alia Sami or Chileans and Swedes (DO, 2020).

1.4.2 Ethnic Discrimination

Ethnic discrimination is when someone is discriminated because of their ethnicity. It is often due to a person's background, culture, social and/or economic status. The term "other similar relationship" is also relevant in the issue of ethnic discrimination and refers, among other things, to derogatory perceptions of "immigrants" or people with a certain skin color that justify unfavorable actions or actions. Discrimination thus occurs in situations where people are generally judged and superficially categorized according to their possible ethnicity (DO, 2020).

1.4.3 Structural Discrimination

The report SOU 2005: 56 defines that the concept of structural discrimination on the grounds of ethnic or religious affiliation thus refers in these investigative directives to rules, norms, routines, accepted attitudes and behaviors in institutions and other societal structures that constitute an ethnic or religious barrier minority to achieve equal rights and opportunities as the majority of the population has.

Furthermore, it is stated that such discrimination can be visible or hidden and it can occur intentionally or unintentionally (SOU, 2005: 56, s 21).

1.4.4 Racialization

Racialization is an attempt to show how racist notions are created where they did not exist before, and how social differences are beginning to be perceived as cultural and inherited. Thus, racialization is a process that socially constructs racial notions based on differences that are attached to external markers, such as cultural and symbolical. According to this, the concept of race is not a natural or biological being, but instead something that is done through a racialization process (Molina, 2005). To this background, racialization of the defendant in a judicial process would mean that persons belonging to the imagined "races" who are far from the indigenous population are discriminated because of these racial representations. In the theoretical framework of this dissertation, the theory of Racialization will be explained more extensively.

1.4.5 Ethnic Bias

The Cambridge English Dictionary explains the concept of bias as "*the action of supporting or opposing a particular person or thing in an unfair way, because of allowing personal opinions to influence your judgment*" (Cambridge English Dictionary, 2021). Against the background of this description, the term bias will be used in the study with reference to the description of how lay judges' stereotypical notions and prejudices about ethnicity might affect the defendants in Swedish judicial processes.

2. Background and Previous Research

The following chapter intend to provide a background to the lay judge system and the concept of racialization and ethnic and structural discrimination, further how these are expressed within the Swedish judicial system. I will begin the following section by explaining what the Swedish judge system means in theory and how it works in practice. Henceforth, an overview of mainly national but also international research on discrimination and racialization in the judiciary will be presented comprehensively. Furthermore, the legislation that is relevant within the framework of the study will also be introduced.

2.1 The Lay Judge System

The purpose of the first part of the background is to describe the meaning and significance of the Swedish lay judge system and also how it operates.

2.1.1 The electoral system

Lay judges in district courts are appointed by election of the municipal council. Election of lay judges in the Court of Appeal, County administrative Court and Administrative Court of Appeal is performed by the County Council Assembly. The judges are elected from a circle of persons proposed by the political parties represented in the electoral assembly and are elected for four years, according to RB Chapter 4, Section 7.

There are two main categories of election systems used in the election of lay judges: the election method and the lottery method. *The election method* works in such a way that an elected parish elects lay judges from among the citizens entitled to vote. *The lottery method* works in such a way that an authority, outset of a list, makes random selections. Most European countries use the election method and Sweden has for long used the election method, with success (Diesen, 1996).

On one hand, Christan Diesen (1996) believes that a lottery system could, however, lead to a more demographic versatility on the board in general. On the other hand, he mentions two relevant disadvantages of the lottery system. Firstly, that randomly selected citizens from one electoral roll would not provide sufficient guarantees that the person elected is suitable for the job and secondly, that it is inappropriate to force citizens into such board positions because it is not considered appropriate that the board consists of unjustified or inappropriate lay judges due to that it should be versatile (Diesen 1996:130-140). The tribunal is considered to be an important link between the court and society and the tribunals constitute the public representation in the tribunal. Therefore, it is natural that it is a municipal election assembly that appoints the candidates for the committee member assignment (SOU, 2013).

Finally, exceptions when a person may not be elected as a board member are regulated in Chapter 4, Section 6§ RB, in addition to these exceptions, anyone who has passed the aptitude test may be appointed as a board member in Sweden (Domstolsverket, 2021).

2.1.2 The Lay Judge-commission

Concerning Swedish judicial processes, lay judges vote as a judge and have individual voting rights when they vote, they also have the same responsibility for the court's decision as the legal judge. The judges thus vote on all issues that belong to the decision of the case and have the right to reserve themselves against a judgment or a decision. Just like the legal judge, they are obliged to follow the law in the judicial activity. Neither the professional legal judges nor lay judges can choose which cases to judge in. Instead, it is the court that draws lots of who will judge in the various cases.

Although the lay judge commission is not a political assignment, but a legal one, lay judges are elected to the municipal and regional councils by the political parties. To become a lay judge, you must therefore contact a political party and announce your interest (Domstolsverket, 2021).

All board members are appointed in accordance with RB chapter 4 section 5§ first paragraph, and how the elections are conducted is further regulated in Chapter 4, Sections 7-8§§ RB as previously described. Despite the fact that lay judges are nominated by political parties, the commission is highly apolitical. Thus, the judges must not be influenced by individual political opinions or personal values.

Politically discussed, lay judges have throughout the ages been seen as guarantors of trust and democratic support, and the lay judge system has received strong support from all political parties every time it has been investigated and discussed. Most in the judiciary also agree that the system works satisfactorily and that the lay judges are generally both wise and committed to their judicial duties. On the other hand, the jurisdiction and role of the judges has become more and more in focus in recent years, and the discussion about whether the system is legitimate or not has become increasingly relevant. Both media and the Bar Association's website, writes that the law has become too complex and difficult for lay judges and that the quality of judicial power is therefore at risk. The fact that new, more extreme, political party representatives are stepping into the courts also arouses strong feelings when it comes to everyone's equality before the law (Advokaten, 2011). In an interview with a magazine for the Swedish Bar Association, number 8 2011 Volume 77, the lawyer Bengt Ivarsson conveys that the distribution between judges is a problem. He points out that the majority of the suspects who are convicted are youths with an immigrant background. His conclusion is that lay judges who are native Swedes and who have lived in a secure existence most of their lives may have difficulty understanding the situation of the suspects (Ibid).

2.2 Legal framework

2.2.1 The Legal Process

Legal certainty means that there is a fair legal system, i.e., that all people are equal before the law and that the courts do not judge people on loose grounds. Therefore, it is important that there are clear guidelines for how a legal process should proceed. According to the Swedish Courts' website, criminal proceedings usually look the same. The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of what happens during a trial and in what order.

The first thing that happens after a crime has been committed is that it is reported to the police. After that, what is called a preliminary investigation/criminal investigation begins. After a suspected perpetrator has been arrested, the prosecutor takes over and becomes the head of the preliminary investigation, and it is thus the prosecutor who decides whether there is sufficient evidence against the suspect to bring charges. In a prosecution, the prosecutor submits a lawsuit against the suspected perpetrator to the district court. The district court is the lowest instance of courts in Sweden and this is also where all criminal proceedings begin. If the district court considers that the criteria for a lawsuit application are met, a lawsuit is also issued (Domstolsverket, 2021).

The central part of the trial is called the main hearing. It is the legal judge who leads the trial and is the chairman of the court. It is always the judge who gives the floor to the parties in the trial. The legal judge is assisted by three lay judges. As mentioned in the previous chapter, these are politically appointed by the parties represented in the municipal council in the municipality where the district court is located, however, they must be impartial and may never take a position based on their party affiliation. The role of the lay judges is to give the trial a popular and democratic basis, but also to give advice to the legal judge (Ibid). The trial itself begins with a call in which the legal judge calls all participating parties. After the judge has clarified that there are no obstacles to carrying out the trial, a description of the crime takes place. In this part, the prosecutor presents what happened, what the defendant is suspected of and whether there is any denial or acknowledgment of the act.

After that, the prosecutor makes a factual presentation where the preliminary investigation is presented. Here also comes the defense lawyer with his objections (Swedish Courts 2021). Furthermore, interrogations are an important part of the litigation process. First, the plaintiff is questioned by both the prosecutor and the defense counsel. Then the accused is interrogated and finally interrogation follows with any witnesses to the act. In his closing remarks, the prosecutor summarizes the indictment and submits a request for sanction. This means that the prosecutor submits a proposal to the court as to which sanction is appropriate (Crime Victim Compensation Authority 2021).

In summary, the above has mainly explained what a district court trial looks like, but a main hearing in the Court of Appeal is very similar to that in the district court. An important difference is that you watch recorded video interrogations from the district court so that the people who testified in the district court usually do not need to be heard again, and that those who judge in a civil case in the Court of Appeal are usually three legal judges instead of one. If the case in the district court has been decided by three judges, four judges will judge in the Court of Appeal. In cases involving family law, two judges sometimes participate in the sentencing. The task of the judges is, just as in the district court, to rule on the case together with the legal judges (Domstolsverket 2021).

After the closing speech, the judge and the judges gather for deliberation, this always takes place behind closed doors and no one else is allowed to attend. The legal judge presents his opinion here and the committee members are given the opportunity to make their voices heard by contributing their knowledge, giving their opinion and sharing their views on the case in question. In most cases, the judge and the judges agree on the sanction to be imposed. However, it may happen that you do not agree and then the punishment that is mildest for the defendant is imposed. An indictment can also be dismissed, which means that the accused is acquitted, for example in the absence of evidence (Domstolsverket 2021).

Finally, for the purpose of this study, it is important to point out that a board member has the same responsibility for the court's decision as the legal judge. The judges thus vote on all issues that belong to the decision of the case and have the right to reserve themselves against a judgment or a decision. Like the legal judge, the judges are obliged to follow the law in the judicial activity, and they must not be influenced by their political opinions. The committee member assignment is an apolitical assignment, even if the committee members are nominated by the political parties (Domstolsverket, 2021).

2.2.2 Instrument of Government: "Human Equity Before the Law"

Based on the Swedish Instrument of Government (RF), it is stated that courts in their authority must consider every humans equality before the law, as well as observe the duty of objectivity and impartiality. This thus affects every human's equality before the law, which concerns protection against discrimination which may be about courts and authorities not being governed by subjective factors such as that a defendant has a certain ethnicity or social position in society (RF, 1:9). The principle of equality before the law thus refers to the *application* of the law and not the *enactment* of the law and aims to be a protection against arbitrariness as well as discrimination (FN Art 7).

2.2.3 Discrimination Act (2008:567)

According to DO (2021), the Discrimination Act aims to "*counteract discrimination and promote equal rights and opportunities regardless of gender, transgender identity or expression, ethnicity, religion or other belief, disability, sexual orientation or age*" (my translation). According to Chapter 1, Section 4, direct discrimination implies that someone is disadvantaged by being treated worse than someone else is treated, has been treated or would have been treated in a comparable situation, if the disadvantage is related to gender, transgender identity or expression, ethnicity, religion or other belief, disability, sexual orientation or age.

Furthermore, this law is considered relevant to the present study since the purpose of the Discrimination Act is to counteract discrimination and in other ways promote equal rights and opportunities regardless of ethnicity, Chapter 1, Section 1§ DL.

2.2.4 Background on discrimination in Swedish legal proceedings

When discussing knowledge and measurements of structural discrimination in Sweden, SOU report "The blue-yellow glass house: structural discrimination in Sweden" (2005) is considered relevant. The task of this inquiry has been to report the knowledge that exists on structural discrimination due to ethnic or religious affiliation in Sweden, primarily in seven areas of society, including the Swedish judiciary. The report primarily deals with the definition of structural discrimination inherently, but also, in relation to the concept of racialization, and intends to examine relevant measures and knowledge for structural discrimination at an international level (SOU, 2005:56, s 21-23). Furthermore, the report describes that structural discrimination means that the principle of equal value for human beings is not upheld. Thus, this becomes a serious democratic problem for the whole of society and not just for the groups that are exposed (Ibid). It is obvious that the author has proceeded from sociological posteriori that implies that actions of individuals, both conscious and unconscious, are required to create and maintain structures and vice versa. Consequently, it is described that humans shape structures as well as structures shape humans. Thus, discrimination based on notions of ethnicity should simply be seen from a structural perspective and therefore, one conclusion is that individual acts cannot be excluded or kept apart from structural discrimination (Ibid:22).

There are several studies that declares an increase of individuals with other ethnicities or foreign backgrounds being judged more harshly than Swedish-born people. Other studies show, however, that there is neither a significant difference nor an increase regarding people with other ethnicities being sentenced to harsher prison sentences in a criminal case than a Swedish-born person would have received.

On the other hand, there is a discrepancy in Sweden as to whether persons with an ethnicity other than Swedish are judged more harshly in relation to Swedish-born persons (SOU 2006). Moreover, a conclusion made of Kardells studies is that foreign-born people with a non-European background have greater sub-risks of discrimination than foreign-born people with a European origin (SOU and Kardell 2006). Based on the results of Kardell's studies, it is therefore possible to see a recurring pattern of unfavorable outcomes for minority groups with a foreign background since this appears to have a clear support from researchers, not only Kardell himself, but also Christian Diesen (SOU, 2006).

As the results show that there are probably mechanisms in the Swedish legal system that generate recurring patterns of unfair outcomes for people with other ethnicities and backgrounds than Swedish-born ones. To this background, a conclusion is thus that there is discrimination within the Swedish judiciary and that there are signs of differential treatment and that the goal of everyone's equality before the law and the courts' neutrality (RF 1: 9) is not met (Kardell, 2011; Diesen, 2006). However, according to Kardell, it is important to point out that the effects of these unequal patterns are not so extensive in his study that they can explain the overrepresentation in registered crime in Sweden in general (Ibid, 2011).

2.3 Literature Review

For previous research I have collected a literature review of relevant articles and research related to the area of subject. The significance of doing this is to conduct enough research within the field of racialization as well as ethnic discrimination in legal systems generally, both national and international, to create ultimate material for a later analysis. In order to get as much relevant information as possible I have been focusing on peer reviewed articles from above all the databases of LUB-search, Google Scholar, ResearchGate and SAGE. However, since the study is orientated to the Swedish legal system, material from Swedish legal and socio-legal research is likewise of great relevance.

Since the research topic lies on a crossroad of several widely researched fields, which are: *ethnic* as well as *structural discrimination* and *racialization in Swedish judicial processes,* a wide range of literature should be considered. For the sake of structure, international research in the field of the subject of my thesis will be presented and then proceed into Swedish research on the same. Finally, based on this literature review, I will define the relevance for Sociology of Law as well as a research gap which my study proceeds from.

2.3.1 American Racial Reasoning

In the article ”Importing *American racial reasoning to social science research in Sweden”* Voyer and Lund describes that American Racial Reasoning is based on the US racial history. According to the authors, fundamental to the concept is that it allows a discursive space to consider racial issues that may otherwise be difficult to deal with (Voyer & Lund, 2020). They are further making a discussion on the basis of Professor Epstein’s (2016) research that focuses on the paradigms of American Racial History and multicultural approaches to difference that from the part of the debate on identity politics and democratic equality. He believes that rhetorical methods such as these allow a discursive space to take into account racial issues that are otherwise difficult to address internationally, while placing race as a meaningful basis for thinking through problems of social justice (Voyer & Lund, 2020; Epstein 2016). Furthermore, Wacquant (2005) argues that engaging difference and inequality through ARR links categorization processes to the pursuit of justice as those that arise in connection with the United States' failure to realize the lofty ideal of democratic equality. The author believes that looking at both race and racism through the ARR perspective means seeing race as an idea or notion, more concretely expressed; an articulate principle of social classification (Wacquant 2005). American racial reasoning is largely consistent and compatible with most formulations of post-colonial theory and critical race theory as these theories also tend to highlight categorization and division as key elements of racism, power, and empire (Ibid).

2.3.2 Critical Race Theory

Critical Race Theory is one of the main theories in this essay since it highlights race as socially constructed. In the book "*Critical Race Theory - an Introduction"*, Delgado (2010) criticizes the narrow definition of racism and believes that the concept is too complicated and therefore must be contextualized as well as narrowed down. According to the author, the narrow definition creates problems that lead to difficulties to deal with racism in society in general. The theoretical premise of the CRT advocates that racism is common but at the same time an undesirable part of all societies, thus it is difficult to combat through a color-blind view of equality as this liberal view could only combat the most visible and obvious cases of discrimination, meaning that other forms of discrimination would fall between the cracks (Ibid). Pursuant to Delgado, an example of this is that racist statements are clearly racist, but at the same time they can be considered more or less racist depending on the stereotypes and norms that prevail in that particular society.

Another argument that Delgado presents is that CRT addresses that people of the same origin can share certain collective characteristics, such as traits, language, skin color, and more, but that these external attributes or physical and social characteristics have nothing to do with their personalities, such as intelligence, morals and values. Therefore, he argues that race should only be significant insofar as the concept occurs in institutional structures and contexts and thus in the minds of those who discriminate (Delgado, 2010; Möschel, 2011). However, this is not the only argument Möschel puts forward, he also believes that there is a shortage of CRT in Europe. Since Europe is a multicultural and immigrant society and that minority groups are allowed to discriminate, he emphasizes the need for CRT in the European context but given that racism and race do not have the same meaning in Europe as in the US, focus should shift from the US, according to Möschel the version of the black-and-white problem and instead put on the European version where race includes all the racial affiliations that can lead to racism as well as processes of racialization (Möschel 2011).

2.3.3 Racialization and Racialized Groups

In the article "*Replacing Race: Constructionism about Racialized Groups*", Adam Hochman (2017) defends an anti-realism about race and a new theory of racialization. He claims that there are no races, only racialized groups. The article introduces an interactive constructionism about racialized groups which Hochman believes is a new position in societal debates about the nature and reality of races (Hochman, 2017).

In summary, interactive constructionism suggests that race does not exist, but that racialization is a real process that leads to the development of racialized groups, that are represented by the ongoing interaction between different factors, such as cultural, political, social, psychological, etcetera. Thus, a conclusion is that interactive in Hochman's sense means interaction, or mutual interaction between these different factors and the racialized groups. Therefore, the strength of a given interactive is context dependent (Ibid). Furthermore, Hochman believes that racialization does not only take place in one direction, but that it can appear in degrees. The explanation for this, he claims, is that both groups, individuals and society can be racialized. For example, dominated social groups can racialize minority groups, and individuals can be racialized differently at different points in their lives. Hochman's theory differs from Miles' (1989), whose theories shows how ideas about human races and ethnicities can be the cause of structural discrimination through collaboration with, for example, class affiliation. Hochman opposes a social constructivist explanation of racial formation theories that explains what race becomes, as this assumes the existence of races. Thus, interactive constructivism seeks to move the discussion away from the dualistic (social vs. biological) metaphysics that "*has crushed this debate and believes that racialized groups are the common products of a wide range of non-racial interacting factors*" (Hochman, 2017).

Continuing, Steve Garner (2009) writes in his book "*Racism an Introduction*" that there is an agreement that racialization is something harmful and destructive and that is done against others, as part of power relationships.

However, he argues that this is a universal validity for society's subordinate groups who are constantly in need of defending themselves collectively in order to add meaning to their own group (Garner, 2009). The authors also explain that there is a problem with individuals asserting themselves collectively to their own group as a "race" for the reason that this introduces the concept of positive attributes and opinions (Ibid). Therefore, Garner's reasoning will be relevant for this study to see how racialization not only takes place from the outside, but also from within groups, individuals and institutions such as the legal field. Moreover, Garner argues that racialization in his opinion indicates that racism is never just racism, but always exists in complicated confusions with, among other things, ethnicity and class. For this reason, both a dismantling of racism is required, as well as a strategy to reduce inequalities among classes, ethnicity, masculinity and other social characteristics where both racism and racialization occurs (Ibid).

2.3.4 Discrimination in Swedish Legal Processes

The report "*Discrimination in the legal process*" (2008) shows examples of how suspects and victims of crime with a foreign background can be disadvantaged in the legal process. Further, Martens, Shannon and Törnqvist (2008) explains that both Swedish and international research shows that people with a foreign background can be disadvantaged in the meeting with many different social institutions, furthermore that the judiciary is no exception. In summary, the authors describe that certain studies have been conducted in Sweden over the years, that show signs that people with a foreign background are disadvantaged due to both communication problems and stereotypical perceptions even during the court hearing. However, the authors also discuss that there has been published very limited research in Sweden on factors that can lead to people with a foreign background to be discriminated during court proceedings (Martens, Shannon and Törnqvist, 2008). This is of great interest to the present study since it clearly defines an existing gap-problem between issues of reality and scientific research, which I intend to study.

Diesen et al (2005) relates on a study in which he summarized and processed a number of unpublished research papers from the legal line, in the form of students' theses, all of which discuss different treatment of different dimensions of discrimination that occur in Swedish legal proceedings. The conclusion of Diesen's study of these research works shows that vulnerable groups such as women, the disabled and homosexuals are exposed to negative discrimination in the legal process (Diesen et Al, 2005). Furthermore, he suggests that the possibility of prosecution in certain cases is often about perceptions, stereotypes and attitudes, among other things he believes that the class dimension is one of the most important factors in terms of credibility that can affect whether a report should lead to a prosecution or not (Ibid). This means that the person's social status and behavior become fundamental to their credibility and can therefore also affect the process if, for example, there were no witnesses.

According to Diesen, the interpretive privilege one has the right to receive is thus affected depending on what qualities the person and the attitude that the person in question possesses (Ibid). It is important to highlight that he distinguishes between men and women in this discussion and believes that women's credibility is positively affected by factors such as high social status, sobriety, age, relationships, proper dress, and instead is negatively affected by low social status, sobriety or if she had worn challenging clothes at the time. Men's credibility, he claims, is positively affected by factors such as high social status, rising age, socially established and previously unpunished. The man would have been perceived as less credible if he had had lower social status, drug addicts, drunkards, immigrants or if he had been punished before (Diesen et al 2005).

Of the great importance for the literature review of this study are the research works in Diesen's study that completely focus on equality before the law with regard to ethnicity. The conclusion Diesen draws from the survey material is that it is not sufficient to claim that all immigrants are exposed to discrimination in all parts of the Swedish judiciary, but he believes on the other hand that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that people born outside Western Europe are subject to discrimination within the Swedish legal system.

Among other things, the results of Diesen's research show that the overrepresentation of immigrants found in Swedish registration statistics can not only be explained by higher crime per se and/or low social status, but at least in certain types of cases must be linked to the ethnicity of the person concerned (Diesen 2005; SOU 2006). Furthermore, what this ethnic discrimination looks like in detail does not appear and thus a conclusion can be drawn that significantly more research is required in this area. In some respects, Diesen's conclusions are in line with the results presented in SOU's report by Johan Kardell (SOU 2006: 13ff; Kardell 2011). This is especially true when people belonging to certain ethnic minorities and/or people with an immigrant background are convicted in the Swedish courts, as previously explained in the background chapter of this thesis.

2.4 Research Gap and Socio-Legal Relevance

Given this literature review, certain gaps in the literature are evident and illustrates the usefulness of this particular research. In Sweden, mostly quantitative research on discrimination within the Swedish judiciary has been done in different areas, mostly focusing on structural racism or similar of the entire Swedish judiciary. Based on the reading of previous research, study’s done on the lay judge system has generally been based on the argument regarding whether or not it should exist. Moreover, previous research also shows compilations and generalizations within gender and ethnicity, where the main aim is to investigate the probability that men and women are judged differently harshly. The fact that this study deviates from intersections of the defendants, such as gender and age, but instead focuses on the judges' experiences of discrimination of defendants and how this is handled organizationally, will further generate the study's originality. Taking the collocation of the presented articles and background all together, it is shown that there is an existing issue of discrimination and racialization in the Swedish judiciary.

However, when it comes to the lay judges' own narratives on how they experience this as well as how they in their organization work to counteract this, the material is non-existent, at least according to the research I have conducted for the purpose of this study. This provides an interesting research gap that this socio-legal thesis strives to fill, nevertheless.

Overall, this research topic can contribute to the growing body of literature on how judges in their organization work to counteract biases such as ethnic discrimination and racialization of the defendant in Swedish legal proceedings. This study is thus considered to be sociologically relevant because it strives to contribute knowledge about how politically elected judges in the Swedish judiciary resonates, act and judge based on norms and rules that originate from both society and the law. Through *Critical Race Theory* and Bourdieu's theory of the *social field and capital* as well as Goffmans concepts of *Frontstage and Backstage* current laws and practices will be understood from a socio-legal perspective, placing the lay judge system in a larger social whole.

3. Theoretical Framework

The aim of this research is to investigate how lay judges experience and talk about ethnic discrimination and racialization in Swedish juridical processes, and to create a deeper understanding of how lay judges in their organization work to actually counteract these biases. On the basis of this, I have chosen following three main theories based on their relevance in relation to the purpose of the study: *Critical Race Theory*, Goffmans *Dramaturgical Perspective focusing on Frontstage and Backstage* as well as Bourdieu's *Theory of the Social Field and Capital*.

3.1 Critical Race Theory

CRT is a jurisprudential and academic theory focusing on the intersections between law, power and racism. In addition, there is a will within the CRT to not only study the phenomena that lead to racial discrimination and racist hierarchies, but also to change these from the ground up. Moreover, this theory defines racism as a structure that permeates society as a whole and is sustained by everyday racism. Further, Critical Race Theory has its historical roots in the late 1970s, emerging as a new strategy for dealing with race according to civil rights structure in the United States, as the civil rights movement of the 1960s had not yielded the results and impact hoped for. In this historical context, CRT emerged as a framework that aims to undermine the liberal color-blind ideology through a deconstruction of its racist conditions (Harris, 2017. Carlson, 2011). Although the success of the movement meant that various discriminatory practices and laws were repealed, racism did not disappear in American society (Ibid.). Instead, it often took on a different, more elusive and discreet form. For that reason, a new way of looking at racism in society and the role that legislation and the application of law played in this was needed (Carlson, 2011). However, since CRT is an American legal theory from the beginning it might be somewhat difficult to apply in international contexts.

On the other hand, Angela P. Harris describes in the book Law and Social Theory (2017) that the fundamental insight of critical race theory is that contemporary societies both explicitly deplore racism and covertly uphold racial hierarchies, and that this is applicable far beyond the United States. Continually, Harris explains that the roots of race are to be found in European settler colonialism and imperialism; both global phenomena's (Harris, 2017) and therefore, the future of CRT lies in comparative and international studies.
For this reason, the present study will be focusing on CRT within the Swedish Legal context. Furthermore, the purpose of the theory is to apply a relevant approach and an explanatory model to the purpose of the essay on the judges' experiences of racism and ethnic discrimination in Swedish trials.

The reason for including Critical Race Theory (CRT) as a theoretical perspective and approach, is based on how this academic theory studies the extent to which various social organs with their exercise of power practice structural racism. The aim of this thesis is to study how judges in their organization work to counteract racialization and ethnic discrimination of the defendant in Swedish trials. Therefore, it is necessary to include a theory that can shed light on whether a social body such as the Swedish judiciary actually exercises this form of ethnic discrimination, racism and even structural racism. An analysis from a CRT perspective can show whether there is a perpetuation of racism. As previously explained, the theory originates from the United States and thus has an obvious and clear connection to American society. However, since CRT examines the constructions of society and specifically the legal structures from a racial perspective and the power relations between them, it is considered feasible to apply CRT and its approaches also in the Swedish legal context.

Furthermore, from the outset of my literature review I have come to the conclusion that many CRT researchers work to develop the reforms needed to be able to break racist power structures. Delgado and Stefancic are among the leading authors within CRT and advocate that CRT questions the liberal legal order, which includes theories of equality, neutral and objective principles in constitutional law and legal reasoning (Delgado and Stefancic, 2010 p3). study the relationship between race, racism and power. The main focus of this toeirn is on how legal structures and the legal culture affect the legal system and respond to racism, by understanding this, CRT believes that this will lead to an effective fight against racial structures in law (Ibid.). Moreover, racism within CRT is discussed on the basis of a definition of race as socially constructed.

This means that race and race-relations are a result of social relations, stereotypes, norms and ideas that people can be classified into races with emphasis on "better" and "worse" race groups (Delgado & Stefancic 2010). As a result, groups that do not really have the same ethnicity are lumped together by the dominant group in society as a race, which is called racialization which I will talk about in more detail in the later part of the theory.

Thus, according to this theory, race is both a categorization that is created in the social interaction between people and that these are not only created but also manipulated and questioned in social interaction. Within CRT, it is discussed that a common perception is that class plays a greater role than race in today's society and that racism therefore does not need to be problematized. But racism is still an obvious societal problem because even people with high social status, class or education are questioned and face discrimination and racism because of their skin color (Delgado & Stefancic 2010).

3.2 Dramaturgical Perspective: Frontstage and Backstage

In the book "*The Self and the Masks*" (Goffman, 2004)", Goffman describes the dramaturgical perspective which describes both how individuals present themselves and their activity to others, but also how they control the perception that others forms about them in the prominence they make. Goffman likens human behavior and the idea of life to a stage performance at a theater performance, where individuals appear in front and back regions: *frontstage* and *backstage*. He makes an important distinction between behaviors on the first stage, which are actions that are visible to the audience and are part of the performance; and backstage behavior, which are actions that people engage in when no audience is present (Goffman 2004).

In the role we act in our appearance, in other words, all the activity that an individual exhibits in front of a group of observers or actors, there is a facade that works in a generally defined way to influence observers' definition of the scenery. Thus, the role figure of society is considered identical with the actor's personality (Goffman 2004). With this as a fundamental idea, it becomes important for individuals to maintain a "self-presentation" that they themselves wish to be associated with, where the scene and the actor's activity becomes the decisive factor for what the “I actor” is attributed by the audience, and not the holders themselves as an organic thing (Ibid). In summary, Goffman links human behavior to a theater where individuals are part of a spectacle in different arenas and where they want to make specific impressions on their audience.

With the concept of *frontstage*, he refers to the place where the performance takes place, the action that we use when we stand in front of an audience, in other words, where we are public. *Backstage* is thus the place where we remain hidden, anonymous or as Goffman puts it: behind the scenes. Furthermore, Goffman believes that individuals apply different masks depending on the situation and environment, as said, he believes that individuals act differently depending on whether we are in a so-called front region (frontstage) or in a back region (backstage). In a legal case or process, for instance, the judges could step into their frontstage when they are in the courtroom. The judges are then right where the performance takes place and where the audience in the courtroom - the other actors - can directly see their actions, they are thus public in the courtroom arena. Through frontstage, the individual often tries to give the audience a certain impression. What then happens behind the scenes, backstage is important for what can eventually be shown frontstage, on stage (Goffman 2004). For the judges, backstage could thus be during the deliberations, as these take place behind closed doors and where confidentiality prevails.

3.3 Social Field

Bourdieu's studies are based on three basic sociological categories, *social action, social structure* and *social relationships.* These categories recur when he seeks knowledge about how and why social, structural and cultural differences are formed in society. A central idea in Bourdieu’s theory is that the actions of the individual are always social in nature. In summary, Bourdieu's theories address social relations, including collective social fields of competition, which are systems of autonomous social positions that compete with each other. In order for the individual to be able to advance in a competitive field and reach higher positions, he must acquire various assets and volumes of the field's dominant forms of capital (Bourdieu 1987; Broady 1998). Furthermore, Broady (1998) declares a general definition of field as from the quote down below:

> A field is a world in itself. In short, the participants are more dependent on each other than on the outside world. A compressed definition is suggested: a field is a system of relations between positions occupied by people and institutions that fight for something common to them (Broady, 1998, my translation).

By social field (also called "battlefield" or "competition field") Bourdieu refers to a changing area of society where people and institutions are fighting over something they have in common. Each autonomous field has its own specific type of capital, and the field concept is, in other words, a tool for the study of the distribution of capital, whether it concerns cultural, economic, social or symbolic capital (Broady, 1998). Moreover, Pierre Bourdieu defines the social field as "a system of relations between positions occupied by specialized agents and institutions that fight for something in common" (Engdahl & Larsson 2011; Bourdieu 1987).

In relation to the present study, the lay judges are the specialized agents, and the juridical system is the institution, they are thus located together in a social field where the “playing field” is seen as both social, political and juridical. At the same time, this is what Engdahl and Larsson (2011) describe as the fundamental for the social field: that participation in the social field requires that the actors have resources that are viable and recognized in the field in question, in other words capital, but also that the field can be likened to a game plan with the rules that shape the framework for the social game, regardless of whether it concerns economics, politics or law (Engdahl & Larsson 2011). To this background, the juridical field is part of the social field, where an acceptance of different laws, legal rules and practices is required, regardless of party status. According to Bourdieu, this also means that the juridical field, as one of the social fields, is characterized by norms, values and the legal culture (Bourdieu 1987).

The resources in the various fields are, as mentioned above, what Bourdieu calls capital. Briefly explained, capital is simply symbolic and material assets, for example that a person shows his or hers belonging or affiliation through external attributes such as clothes, style, interests, body language and more. Bourdieu distinguishes between different types of capital: *cultural capital* (developed language use and familiarity with the so-called fine culture), *social capital* (kinship, friendship, union spirit) and *economic capital* (materialistic assets and knowledge of how economy works).

For this reason, I see the relevance of both social field and social capital for this study, since social capital is the value of the contacts a person has both in private life and in professional life. The capital value consists of how these contacts can be useful in different ways to create benefits for the individual in different ways. According to Bourdieu (2006), the unfair distribution of social capital has a profound effect on the individual as it contributes greatly to the treatment one receives in society both on a social level and the treatment in society's various institutions (Bourdieu, 2006:241). In other words, which doors are open and what reception you expect to receive. Bourdieu's concept of social capital emphasizes conflicts and social relations that increase an actor's ability to advance his interests. Social positions and the distribution of cultural and social resources in general are legitimized with the help of symbolic capital (Ibid).

3.4 Theoretical Reflection

Critical Race Theory is relevant to this thesis because of the fact that racism and discrimination due to race within CRT is not considered an unusual deviation in society, which most people assume, but on the contrary something that is constantly present. This means that the formal equal treatment rules that are most often found in the legislation (such as the Discrimination Act) are not able to counteract all expressions of racism, but only the clearest and most obvious. Secondly, according to CRT, there are no major incentives for the majority society to actually change the racist structures that still exist because a large part of the population benefits from them (Delgado & Stefancic).

Thus, it becomes of great interest to use this theory in the light of the analysis of how judges in their organization work to counter biases such as ethnic discrimination and racialization in juridical processes.

Using Goffman's theories about Frontstage and Backstage, a clear illustration is made of how the judges' actions and behavior change depending on whether they are frontstage - in the courtroom, or backstage - during deliberations. Nevertheless, it provides an opportunity to see what field the judges are in and what capital they hold and how they adapt their assets to what the situation requires. The decision to include the theory of the social field is based on the assumption that the norms that appear in a social context, that are communicated in a social community, and that have social behaviors, social ties, and social effects are highly socio-legally interesting. Continuing, the Bourdian concept of capital, it can be argued that lay judges hold valuable capital that is effective when judging in a specific case. By examining how lay judges experience biases in judicial proceedings and how these are handled organizationally, it is possible to determine whether the capital they have has any significance for either the defendant, but also the lay judges themselves.

4. Methodology

Following chapter presents the methodological approach of the study. I explain the proceedings of all empirical data, delimitation and selection, reliability and validity, pre-understanding, hermeneutics as a research approach and the ethical aspects that I have taken into account during the work on the thesis. Finally, a methodological discussion is presented where I reflect on the selection of the method.

I have chosen to use qualitative interviews as a method as the purpose is to create more in-depth information from the informants I interviewed and to create an understanding of the lay judges' experiences and thoughts about the research problem (Mason, 2002). I chose this approach since the purpose of my essay and my research questions are about investigating how lay judges who serve in district courts and courts of appeal talk about their experiences of racialization and ethnic discrimination in legal proceedings and what strategies there are to counteract these contradictions. In order to gain a more in-depth understanding of the lay judges' personal narratives and experiences, I saw qualitative interviews as the most adaptable approach.

4.1 Research Design: Hermeneutics

Science is mainly about interpreting and understanding and through science it is possible to create an understanding and knowledge of the reality we live in. In order to be able to investigate, explain and understand reality, assumptions must be made about what reality looks like (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2014). The assumptions made then result in different approaches. Today, according to Patel and Davidson's (2011), there are two main scientific orientations: positivism and hermeneutics. The authors' presentation of theory of science is important in that their reasoning about methodological approach is relevant; that the main directions in the theory of science are separate but still not excluded from each other (Patel & Davidson, 2011).

However, this study will only focus on hermeneutics, since this scientific approach is most compatible with qualitative methods (Ibid). In hermeneutic studies, a holistic understanding, i.e., an insight, is sought. It is about achieving a holistic understanding through partial understanding. The word hermeneutics itself can be translated as "interpretive theory", which means that hermeneutic method thus means that a person, e.g., the researcher, understands another person's actions. Unlike positivism, which has an objective approach, hermeneutics has a subjective approach (Thurén, 2019). In hermeneutics, one's own understanding and one's own experiences are used to interpret other people's understanding and experiences. Thus, it is our own interpretation of reality that governs how we act Ibid).

4.2 Knowledge theory

An ontological position was central to the thesis since it deals with the attitude to how one looks at the outside world and one's fellow human beings and how one considers reality to be shaped. In the book "Qualitative Researching", Jennifer Mason (2002) writes about the *ontological position* as something fundamental and "as the very nature and essence of things in the social world" (Mason 2002:14). The ontological position of this essay has been shown through qualitative interviews as data collection method, since it was meaningful to me to generate material that would reflect the lay judges' narratives, interpretations and experiences in order to be able to understand their social reality (Ibid:63). By understanding how lay judges experience the problem of racialization and discrimination in judicial processes, I wanted to get a deeper knowledge of how the lay judges experiences of the problem of ethnic discrimination and racialization in judicial processes can be understood. Furthermore, *epistemology* concerns questions of how to generate knowledge, what knowledge is for oneself and how this knowledge should be generated.

As qualitative interviews form the basis of the data collection method, by talking to the lay judges, asking questions and follow-up questions and listening to them to gain access to their thoughts is of greatest epistemological interest (Ibid:63-65). As Mason advocates, I agree with the notion that man is unique and thus deeper knowledge and understandings can be reached only through qualitative interviews with those concerned, as each individual perceives the problem differently. Thus, ontology and epistemology together play a major role in how I analyzed the data.

4.3 Qualitative Research and Semi Structured interviews

In order to be able to answer my question in the best possible way, I made an active choice to limit the study's population to lay judges within the Swedish lay judge system. I used a convenience sample which, according to Skärvad and Lundahl (2016), means that the choice of informants is made through accessibility and their willingness to participate in the study. The lay judges who were asked for the interviews were represented by different political parties, at various ages and of different genders, however, I chose not to observe the distribution of this as it was not relevant to the results of the study.

Patrik Aspers (2011) describes that qualitative methods and approaches are highly relevant in social science research. This is because when constantly ongoing societal changes are to be studied, it is important to have an understanding of how different factors interact, for example when analyzing empirical data through theory and method (Aspers 2011). In this essay, I have started from a qualitative methodology with hermeneutics as a research approach, since according to Aspers (2011), hermeneutics contributes to the development of qualitative methods. The data collected will be based on previous research, theories and qualitative interviews with the intention of creating an understanding of the informants' descriptions and experiences. According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2014), qualitative interviews are used to more easily obtain the interviewees' subjective experiences by asking the questions in a way where the answers can reflect their personal picture of reality.

For that reason, I chose to use qualitative interviews as this was considered most appropriate to obtain the lay judges own experiences of racialization and discrimination of the defendant in judicial processes, but also to understand whether ethnic discrimination appears in those processes and in what ways.

Furthermore, a qualitative interview also enables the exchange of everyday opinions by the researcher being able to ask questions thoughtfully and by actively listening to acquiring valuable knowledge on the subject. An interview may resemble an everyday interaction, but the difference is that it has a structure as well as a purpose for gathering knowledge (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2014).
For that reason, I believe that the qualitative approach is applicable to this study, as it can be used to take part in the lay judge's narratives and also to be able to interpret the meaning of their experiences.

Moreover, when qualitative methods are used, it is relevant to again, however in a different environment, discuss *bias*. Bias in the purpose of the method part means that the researcher, through his or her presence and the actions during the interview, influences the answers that are receives from the informant (Aspers, 2011). Interpretive and meaning-creating research is based on the relationship-creating interaction with the interviewee where the researcher interprets what the interviewee says and vice versa, for that reason, Bias is inevitable (Ibid). Nevertheless, Aspers believes that what you can do as a researcher before an interview is to be yourself, be prepared and do your best (ibid.), which I have considered in my study. Furthermore, I designed an interview guide (See Appendix 1) in relation to the purpose of the study in order to be able to answer the questions. This was written in Swedish since the study is limited to lay judges in Swedish judicial processes. The interview guide was helpful as it aimed to create a clear structure and to be a support during the conduct of the interviews. Moreover, it consisted of 23 elementary questions that were divided into three main themes that I chose to name: *Organization and structur*e, *Neutrality and impartiality* as well as *Cultural and symbolic Capital.*

In addition to these, I also chose to have an introductory and a concluding theme for the reason that Skärvad and Lundahl (2016) believe that it is beneficial to start the interview with neutral background questions in order to make the interviewees feel more relaxed. In conclusion, I chose to apply a semi-structured interview guide that includes the same predetermined questions to all the informants and at the same time provides the opportunity to ask follow-up questions. The follow-up questions in turn gave me the opportunity to create a more personal interview based on the respondents' answers and partly to build trust between myself and the informants. Finally, I recorded all interviews via audio with the consent of the informants in order to be able to transcribe the material and in that way create a valid and reliable compilation of the results (Skärvad and Lundahl, 2016).

4.4 Implementation and Qualitative approach

Before I completed my interview guide, I started by contacting acquaintances in my area who have assignments or knew someone who had assignments as a board member in district court or court of appeal to ask them for help to get in touch with relevant interviewees for my study. A colleague of mine showed interest in participating in the study and in turn contacted committee members who also wanted to participate. In addition to this, I also sent out an email with the letter of mission to the lay judge's national association, whereupon the chairman helped me get in touch with more lay judges. When I collected contact information from the respondents, I sent out a mission letter with information about the purpose of the essay, the grounds for their participation, information about anonymity, voluntary participation and suggestions for the weeks I was available for interview. I also informed the respondents that they would be happy to contact me if they knew of any more colleagues who were interested in participating in the study. As I came in contact with relevant judges for the study, I booked the time, date and digital forum for an interview.

All interviews took place, due to the corona pandemic, thru the digital Teams platform on the respondents' wishes, except for one interview that was conducted by telephone. All interviews were booked and conducted over a two-week period. Each interview began with the respondents being reminded once again of the purpose of the study and their own rights where anonymity prevails. They were also informed that the interview would be recorded and that this would only be processed by us and not for any other purpose. Everyone agreed to this. The time scope of the interviews varied between about 50–60 minutes, which was due to the respondents' varying ways of expressing their knowledge and starting a discussion.

As I mentioned earlier, all of the interviews were recorded with the respondents' approval and consent. These recordings were made using my mobile phone through the app "voice memo" and the recording function on my computer where the recordings were saved directly to reduce the risk of the material disappearing, but also to facilitate the upcoming transcription. According to Kvale & Brinkmann (2014), a well-done transcription can constitute the central empirical core of the study. Aspers (2011) also describes that transcription is central to the coding and analysis of the working material and that it is a time-consuming part of the work, which I can relate to as the transcripts took longer than the actual conduct of the interviews.

4.4 Method of Analysis

To be able to analyze the collected data of the study, *thematization* and *interpretation* of meaning have been used as an analytical method in order to be able to best interpret and understand the empirical material. According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2014), thematization means that research questions and theory are defined and formulated in a way where the theme of the study is clarified. Further, the authors describe that meaning interpretation as a method of analysis can contribute to creating an overall picture and a broader perception of the text material, as structures can be discovered in the material that do not appear at first glance.

Furthermore, it is described in the methodological literature that the textual interpretations of the hermeneutic interpretation of meaning focuses on individuals' own experiences (Ibid). For the reason that I have taken as my starting point a hermeneutic research approach, interpretation of meaning became relevant for the analysis of the material. According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2014), it is important to be careful in the formulation of the questions posed to the text. Moreover, the authors advocate a perspectivist subjectivity that includes taking different perspectives and asking different questions that should lead to subjective interpretations of the meaning (Ibid.). For that reason, I chose to start from a perspectivist subjectivity instead of selectively interpreting and presenting the material in a way that only strengthens one's own conclusions.

4.5 Ethical considerations and potential risks

Ethical aspects can occur during each process in the thesis process and are therefore important to take into account in each step (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2014). Therefore, I have chosen to take into account the ethical aspects of the study from beginning to end, for example by ensuring from the outset that the interview questions were designed in a way that they would not be perceived as offensive or discriminatory. The ethical guidelines that have been fundamental to this study are above all the *informal con*sent and the *confidentiality requirement*. According to Kvale & Brinkmann (2014), information includes that the identification of the informants through the collected material will not be revealed and that their participation is voluntary and that they can thus withdraw at any time during the course of the study. The information I chose to give to the informants before the interview was summarized in a thesis mission/letter of information (See Appendix 2) which contained the purpose of the study, their rights as participants in the study and some general information about myself and my education.

Furthermore, Kvale & Brinkmann (2014) describes that the informants must be allowed to remain anonymous throughout the investigation when using the confidentiality requirement so that their identity cannot be seen or revealed by anyone else. I have also emanated from the Swedish Research Council (2017) guidelines for research ethics, which emphasize the need to protect individuals participating in research from harm. In order to protect the respondents' identities, I have chosen to name them with fictitious names in the results of the study. The respondents got to choose their own names and are thereby presented as Grace, Louise, Peter, Vanessa and Carl to further ensure anonymity, they have neither been referenced according to the numbering of the interviews. Because of the study's limitations, I have chosen to highlight the most relevant quotes where most of the judges have raised the same problem and discussion, but also results that shows where they are not fully united in question.

4.6 Reliability and Validity

Reliability and *Validity* are two central concepts for researchers who have to determine the quality of their research (Bryman 2011: 350ff). In this chapter of the thesis, I will on the one hand describe in what ways reliability and validity differ and on the other hand discuss the concepts in connection with this study.

According to Bryman, *reliability* concerns whether the results of a study can be repeated if this would be implemented all over again, or if it would be affected by random factors (Bryman 2011). Since this study is based on the interaction between me as a researcher and the interviewees, each interview becomes a unique interplay, which can be difficult to achieve in an attempt to reproduce the same inquiry in the future. Whereas my study is based on human interaction with the lay judges also includes the fact that emotions, opinions, thoughts, experiences and nevertheless laws, regulations and directives can change over time.

Moreover, Kvale and Brinkmann (2014) advocates that reliability cannot be considered fully good whereas the respondents' answers to the questions at the time of the interview may be affected by certain external factors, such as events during the day, time of the interview or individual mood, which in turn may have affected the answers given during the interviews (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2014; Bryman 2011). Due to the fact that the informants in the present study are guaranteed anonymity as well as the fact that I do not impose importance to either gender, age or party-political affiliation, the sample would probably differ as another researcher would not be able to interview specifically the same group of lay judges I included in this study.

In the light of the above, it cannot be guaranteed that the results of the study would be the same if the inquiry were conducted again. Furthermore, the *validity* of a survey is about assessing whether the results are relevant in the specific context and whether you investigated what you intended to investigate (Bryman 2011). It is thus partly about seeing how well the research can be generalized to other situations and social environments, but also, the notion that there must be a connection between the observations that the researcher makes and the theoretical perspectives that are developed in the study (Bryman 2011, Kvale and Brinkmann 2014). The former can be difficult since this study bases its results on a relatively small sample of informants.

To ensure the validity of this study, I have been careful with the choice and design of the questions asked to the informants. It has therefore been of utmost importance to have a clear interview guide and a clear connection between the aim and the issues of the research. In consultation with my supervisor, the interview questions were worked on and revised repetitive to ensure that the study could measure what it intended to measure, i.e., the validity of the research (Bryman 2011). Finally, the process of transcribing the interviews has also been of great importance in order to generate as reliable results and empirical material as possible.

4.7 Significance of Reflexivity

Reflexivity in Bryman's (2011) opinion largely means that researchers must carry out critical reflections on the research process but also on their own role as researchers (Bryman 2011). Therefore, it is of the utmost importance to reflect on the informants' own agenda and how this may affect the interview. What wants to be counteracted is that the study's informants are chosen by me as a researcher based on categories, such as according to the judges' political agenda, instead of as individuals. This could have generated a conscious result where the informants' political agendas regarding ethnic discrimination in the judiciary permeate the result and the objectivity of the study would then have suffered. Furthermore, Bryman (2011) believes that the researcher's personal experiences and emotions are with him during the course of the study and that it is impossible for researchers in today's society to remain value-free.

Further, he believes that personal values and feelings of the researcher can emerge at any time during the process and that this is especially common in qualitative research work. Researchers are also human beings with emotions, opinions, different backgrounds and values, which may mean that the compilation and analysis of the interview material is influenced or discussed through a biased approach. According to Bryman, the greatest opportunity to be able to carry out a scientific study with high validity and reliability is, as a researcher, to be self-reflective and critical in his approach to empiricism. In this essay, I have tried to show reflexivity by preparing an interview guide in a neutral way and thinking about how I should present myself during the interview.

Moreover, with my lack of experience in conducting research with judges and judges in general, however, conducting these interviews online under a strict lockdown, this should possibly be recognized as a risk factor. Therefore, through the essay process, in my attempts to meet Bryman's (2011) requirements for reflexivity, I have ventilated and discussed with my supervisor when it comes to formulating interview questions because these should not seem offensive, pressing or ignorant.

For the reason that judges and judges have a duty of confidentiality regarding what is said during the deliberations, I have, as far as possible, take this into account when I write the interview questions. In addition, I am knowledgeable about the function of the Swedish legal system and have done sociological work in the field before, even though these have not been research. In terms of research design, there will be space between the interviews - with one to two interviews per day - to reduce the emotional and personal impact that could arise through the analysis of that interview material.

During the process, I tried to gain strength in training, walks, communication with colleagues and friends or supervisors if I am affected by the material collected in a way where it is difficult to be critical and self-reflective. Thus, the goal is to, through communication and exercise, pursue resilience from being personally influenced and minimize the risk of conducting a biased or neutral neutrality and at the same time demonstrate the level of self-reflection and reflexivity that Bryman advocates.

4.8 Methodological discussion

The study has been characterized by a qualitative approach, which I considered appropriate as it gave me access to the informants' personal experiences, experiences and perspectives. In contrast to qualitative methods, Birkler (2012) describes that the quantitative method is based on the scientific and positivist research tradition and explains this way of examining causes and connections as rule governed. I did not consider that this would give me the opportunity to gain access to the judges' personal experiences of the reorganization. Birkler (2012) argues that subjective experiences cannot be quantified, for that reason we chose to exclude the quantitative approach in my study.

There are both advantages and disadvantages to a qualitative approach with semi-structured interviews. Skärvad & Lundahl (2016) describe that a disadvantage of qualitative interviews may be that the material is affected by the researcher's values and ideas. As it can be difficult to be objective in an interview, it is important as a researcher to be aware of your influence.

I was clear in confirming the informants' anonymity in order to bring in as truthful material for the study as possible. Despite this, it was still noticed that a few informants were somewhat sparing with the information and with how they expressed themselves, which may have been due to the fact that it was perceived as sensitive information to answer about the organization and especially because what is said during deliberation with them is confidential.

I noticed that from the informants' perspective, it would have been desirable to read the interview guide even before the interview, so that they could prepare for the questions and answer as extensively as possible, but also to be able to fall back on the questions in the meantime. However, it was desirable for me to get quick thinking and instead ask myself follow-up questions that would lead to discussion during the interview. Looking back on the planning and conduct of the interviews, I realize some aspects that could have been done differently. An example of this is that we used the same interview guide during all interviews, which meant that there were questions that the judges from the district court did not have as great an opportunity to answer to the same extent as the judges in the Court of Appeal.

5. Empirical Findings

In the following chapter, the collected empirical data will be presented. I have chosen to categorize the results based on three different themes. These themes are consequently presented as*: Frontstage, Backstage* and *Education, strategies and action plans*. Judging from the interviews, the results have shown a high validity for Goffman's concepts Frontstage and Backstage and that this applies to all trials, due to the fact that the judges need to suppress and allow their different capital in different parts of the legal process. Already at the compilation of the interview material, I could see a connection to these concepts and analyze the answers that showed that the Swedish legal system is structured in a way where the judges need to push away their own capital in the courtroom but are allowed to show it behind the frontstage, during the deliberations. Hence, it has been inevitable to

deviate from the concepts of frontstage and backstage as this permeates all trials and thus also my study.

Since my purpose and my questions are about investigating how judges who serve in district courts and courts of appeal talk about their experiences of racialization and ethnic discrimination in legal proceedings and what strategies there are to counteract these biases, I present below excerpts from the interviewees. I have chosen to present the interview answers that best correspond to the purpose and questions and will later analyze the interviewees' answers and see if it can be traced to the chosen socio-legal theories. I have deliberately chosen not to present background information about the interviewees since I am interested in patterns and phenomena. Trost (2014) advocates the importance of not associating the answers with quantities. How many interviewees give an answer and who says what is directly inappropriate when it comes to studies with a strict qualitative focus. Trost writes that it is the phenomena that are of interest and not how many states a position or opinion. Qualitative studies that quantify are directly inappropriate (Ibid). With this in mind, I have chosen to focus on what the interviewees have said and not how many that said what.

Lastly, since the interviews were conducted in Swedish, it is worth pointing out that the English translation of following quotes are my own. The purpose of the respondents' fictitious names is simply to make the material as interesting and understandable as possible for you as a reader of this thesis.

5.1 Section I: Frontstage

The results show that Frontstage is a central part, maybe even the fundamental concept in court proceedings, as the lay judges describe that what applies during the trial itself is that you need to be able to push away your own feelings, emotions, blankets and impulses in order to be so neutral and objective as possible. However, many of the interviewees think that this is difficult, since the judges and lawyers are also their own individuals with their own values, feelings, thoughts and background. This emerged especially when during the interviews I asked the question of how a defendant's cultural, social and symbolic capital or external attributes can affect how he or she is treated in the trial. All of the respondents agreed that external attributes such as skin color, clothes, tattoos and piercings as well as how defendants express themself socially can affect the lay judge's attitude to the case, more than what directly affects the defendant. Some of the respondents explains that this in turn can affect both the discussions during the deliberations and also how they judge in that case. On the other hand, the judges underline that this is not something that affects the defendant in the courtroom and the reason why it does not is that as a lay judge you have to oppress your own feelings.

There is a comprehensive number of things that you need to consider while being in the courtroom: "*[…] be impartial, you should be correct and clear, everything is very formal, dress code is important, you should be neutral and not show emotion […] during trial in court, just listen and do not talk*". Furthermore, the interviews show that the judges' strategies for being impartial and neutral are highly individual since there are no specific guidelines for this. However, the informants agree that there are certain qualities that are not only important, but even necessary for a judge to possess precisely when it comes to controlling his or her feelings, opinions and behaviors in the courtroom:

> Having knowledge of society in general and important and being able to take on a poker face is necessary and consideration for people is the most important thing […] That you do not show your feelings during the trial and that you have an understanding of the defendant's background but also the other committee members' backgrounds in the discussions that take place later in the process.
>
> […] Ideally, you should not do anything at all. I also come from healthcare and when you listen you have a confirming tone. You nod, smile and follow up on what is being said and you may not have to do it in the same way in the trial either as a judge or a judge […] You are allowed to listen and put on a band.
>
> It is super important that you should be correct, almost a bit so that if I look at the accused, I must also look at the plaintiff and if I smile to the right, I also need to smile to the left, you must be correct […] there is also a call to must be correct.
>
> It's formal. Dress code too. You should be professional; you should always say hello and say goodbye but not much more than that. Very square [...] It's a different matter when we are alone with the lawyers. Then we can discuss different things more broadly and of course laugh and joke in a different way, but certainly not for everyone in the courtroom.
>
> […] During the ongoing trial, as a lay judge, you make sure not to send signals that are incorrect […], for example that you sit and take notes during the time during the trial, but then you make sure not only to note 7 pages when the lawyer submits his part and then you do not move the pen when the defender presents something. It will be a very strange signal. It should look like you are interested. One should stay neutral […] it can be difficult. Then it is also a habit as a board member […] it is a process to be comfortable in the formal process that occurs there, it takes a while for most people.

According to the respondents, this is still easier said than done and another lay judge describes that:

Some defendants have had certain types of symbols that evoke emotions in me and may have had some kind of language or word choice or layout that I'm pretty sure I have a hard time completely sorting out, actually […] So there are lots of things like affects what you listen to. I'm convinced of that.

[…] You have to choose your words. People are free with their language. I personally do not want to listen to swear words. Things like "that bastard" or "that whore" play a role in how I will perceive that person in the trial. I can then get a different attitude to the case, but at the same time I know that I have to judge by the evidence that is available. The second is not allowed to play a role because you cannot kill someone because of language use.

[…] It is necessary to have a poker face. Calm on the outside even if it pulsates on the inside. I have sat in some such trials such as crimes in child pornography […] can absolutely not sit completely untouched and neutral then. But what is visible on the surface, you still need to try to master.

5.2 Section II: Backstage

The results show that the lay judges in the present study believe that the Swedish legal system is not a free zone from either racialization or ethnic discrimination, as this occurs during different parts of certain legal processes. Above all, it is visible how the problem takes shape outside the courtroom, during deliberations, breaks or after the court hearing where the judges are given space to be more outspoken. As the result above showed that the courtroom is the lay judges Frontstage, the deliberation is thus their Backstage.

The informants agree that this is a problem based on the fact that the lay judge system is politically apolitical, which they believe leads to it being difficult for some to keep their political views to themselves. Certainly, the informants believe that this is not the point either, because they are politically represented and the system is based on them contributing their subjective experiences and values, Grace describes: "*political values and experiences and this is what you should also judge"*. Furthermore, when I asked the question whether it is common for political opinions to appear in legal proceedings despite the fact that the assignment should be apolitical, Grace answers:

> "Yes. It is so. Unfortunately. We know that political views should not be visible, but that is not the case. I have heard that there are harsher speeches and politically influenced opinions. We also have some politically represented people who sit as committee members and you notice that the discussion that goes on during breaks, deliberations and lunch breaks, especially about people who have a different ethnic background than Swedish. Much more must be said among the Sweden Democrats and the Moderates. They have often left opinions between judges that they absolutely should not mention in front of everyone".

At the same time, Vanessa discusses that just because you are a committee member and are represented by a specific political party, this does not have to mean that you are politically active within that particular parity. Louise confirms this and highlights that:

“[…] You do not have to be politically involved to be a board member. Just need to be represented by the party”. On the other hand, several of the informants highlight that they have rarely met another committee member who does not value a certain specific party policy, and even though this is the purpose of the Swedish lay judge system that we have today, the informants agree that it can also create certain problems. and discussions may see that some judges let their political values influence the discussion. Grace confirms this and says that *"[…] It is an apolitical mission […] but it can still be very difficult to deviate from the political position you have".* From the interviews it has been shown that several of the lay judge’s experience that it is impossible to disregard party politics altogether, even though it should not really exist within the legal field. Louise says:

> I would say it's not possible. I think that my opinions are completely ordinary and normal, but everyone thinks so regardless of which party you belong to. That's how it is. [...] but I mean that then maybe you cannot include such political arguments if a discussion arises in deliberations, even if that also actually occurs today.

Carl does not agree with this, but believes that the judges, including himself, are objective and that during the deliberations, no distinction is made between judges and legal judges, but that the case is discussed on the basis of the available evidence. His experience is thus not that political opinions are seen during deliberations and says: "*Had I never before sat as a lay judge colleague with a person or met a person before, I would never have been able to figure out what political affiliation that person has".* However, he adds that there may be arguments based on party politics, but that this is most evident among committee members who have just begun their assignment.

Consequently, I wanted to find out whether, according to the judges' own experiences, it happens that judges in a trial or during deliberation with them have expressed themselves in a prejudiced manner about the accused. From Grace's perspective, this is common, but at the same time she is quick to emphasize the professionalism of legal judges:

> Based on my experience, and the judge perspective yes. But not when it comes to lawyers. I have always thought about how professional they are. Only turns to the law and does not invent, as judges sometimes do […] Have never experienced that a lawyer has been discriminatory, racist or unethical in a case, this, however, occurs among lay judges.
>
> […] Not in the legal process but much more prevalent during lunch breaks and the deliberation of how judges express their views on persons or groups. For example, another group of people as Muslims, but there is not that discussion in front of the lawyers in the courtroom. But of course, when the judges then feel a little freer, my opinion is that they leave opinions that are not good.
>
> […] Also, when a father comes into the courtroom who has abused his child and he come with lots and lots of tattoos and his defense lawyer has to talk about how good he is, etc., then there is a different perception. We know that. People comment on how he can come in here like that, with that style of outfit, it is also discussed what the tattoos really implies and so on. […] Sometimes it is even discussed in a way that is discriminatory ethnically, like of course he did this, he is an immigrant or typical `them' and likewise.

Louise and Peter also believe that it occurs and say:

> Not very often in my opinion, but it has happened under deliberation that some judges have expressed themselves condescendingly and so, I myself may have a fairly high degree of sensitivity to that as well, but […] it happens that there are expressions that are extremely inappropriate which can be linked to stereotypical images of a discriminatory nature of the accused, racist as well, however, on a few occasions it has also happened that a judge during the break has hatched things. […] In the room with the legal judge, the box usually lasts reasonably, but it does occur, especially during breaks or so".

> […] When it comes to ethnic background, I feel that the professionals in the court there do not really hear any difference between the legal judgments but depending on the judges discussing the matter can change depending on party affiliation, unfortunately.

According to Louise, the fact that there may be derogatory treatment and derogatory expressions about the defendant between the lay judges during deliberations or breaks is not only due to the judges personal, and emphasizes that it is not a matter of the lay judges being bad people, but that:

> […] Probably depends not only on the judges and that you as a lay judge are legally uneducated but I think it depends on the legal professional judge also […] because we are all individuals, and we are all people that are different. The law is not always sharpened in the boundaries, but there is room for interpretation, subjectivity and room for maneuver.

Furthermore, the compilation of the interviews has resulted in the judges' own background, class affiliation, education, ethnicity and age can affect how they judge in a case. Peter describes that something that can affect both how judges judge and how this in turn can affect the treatment of the accused in the legal process is socio-economic background:

> "[…] I also unfortunately think that socio-economic background affects […] becomes more difficult for some who are in the middle of their careers with certain types of jobs and backgrounds are difficult to get away from, so that mix is probably not very good. But that the mix should be there […] because I think everyone agrees because it absolutely affects. Especially in the Court of Appeal also where it is about practice and so on. The breadth of judges and their background and involvement is important".

On the other hand, Carl believes that this should not matter, but that differences between lay judges can still be seen during deliberations.

5.3 Education, strategies and action plans

So far, the results of the interviews have shown that the problem of ethnic biases and racialization of the accused in Swedish legal proceedings, and that this becomes apparent in certain rooms; as during the deliberation, hence the question was also asked about *how the judges in their organization work to try to counteract this*? Judging from the interviews, there are currently no clear strategies for counteracting racialization and ethnic discrimination within the lay judge organization. Several of the respondents have expressed that they to some extent discussed grounds for discrimination from the outset of the discrimination act during their introduction, but that no further education or strategies in the area exist on their behalf. How to talk about discrimination and racialization within the organization and how to handle situations where this occurs is instead up to the judges themselves. The informants also believe that a major responsibility for avoiding discussions that, for example, are influenced by derogatory expressions, racist expressions or discrimination of the accused, lies primarily with the legal judge's responsibility. One informant state that *"[...] In the Court of Appeal [...], one can comment on various things and it can emerge that people judge based on political opinions. But the lawyers are always professional and put their foot down in cases where there are comments that you are not allowed to express* ". Furthermore, some of the judges discuss:

> […] With the judges, this is very individual. However, I think that there should be much more work with discrimination because, as I mentioned earlier, there are people who represent parties who express themselves in a way that is very condescending towards people who have a different ethnic background. But I do not know […] there is nothing that can help us ensure that one does not judge because of your political views. […] You are a person who has your own opinions, values and experiences and this is what you also judge.

Regarding the board members' training, several of the informants agree that more training should be provided while they are active in their assignment. Since none of the study's informants have any prior legal knowledge, all formal education they have is based on a full-day introduction given before they began their assignment. However, Carl believes that there are mandatory meetings once a year and in addition there are smaller trainings or lectures available, but that these are voluntary for the board members. Vanessa expresses that she had appreciated more active lectures or smaller trainings where you get updated and can ask questions. Louise also believes that during the introduction there is talk of different grounds for discrimination, but that more education is needed about discrimination and derogatory treatment in the legal process and how to deal with this as lay judges. At present, the greatest responsibility lies on the legal professional judge, Louise says regarding the introductory training:

> That's the only thing I've been to, and of course they talked about these things, such as the grounds for discrimination and so on, but then there is nothing that is maintained in a discussion. […] Lawyers and legal judges control the discussions and teach and guide the conversation if it takes a turn in the wrong direction, for example. I think they must take a great deal of responsibility to ensure that this is maintained.

In summary, the judges I have interviewed state the lack of strategies and action plans that are used today to counteract derogatory treatment and contradictions and promote neutrality and objectivity in the legal process. It is primarily the legal judge who must ensure that countervailing treatment of a defendant is countered, but the judges themselves bear a great responsibility in how they choose to express themselves. The interviews have shown that this can be a problem due to the fact that the legal judge as well as themselves are people with their own baggage and different opinions and values. From this, several of the informants believe that it would be advantageous to have more in-depth training on how you as a judge yourself can handle any conflicts, also how to deal with other judges directly in the situation if discrimination of a defendant would occur.

Peter also discusses how the high represented age of the judges can cause generational differences in discussions during deliberations and says that:

> Now it is also unfortunately the case among the judges that the age distribution […] is far from perfect and there are a little too many in old age who represent […] and the age distribution is far from diversified […] many representatives are pensioners and students. I think this can affect how one judges […] indirectly then the outcome of the verdict for the defendant.
>
> […] Careless expression, the higher the conspiracy of the higher age, the more conservative one could say. […] Not in the general political sense but experiences of norms, stereotypes […] linked to how you look at people, in this case addressed, in the form of dress, word choice, expression, skin color, I think if you go down in age it becomes not the same impact and not as many misinterpretations as can occur. This is where it is important to have an age distribution.

Regarding the age distribution, Carl believes that this is how the system looks because there is no other solution today. "*If you are younger and studying or working full time, you rarely have time to sit as a board member twice a week*", he claims. However, he also believes that the contradictions that may exist regarding the board members' background mainly depend on how far they have come in their assignment and the education they have accessed.

6. Socio-Legal Analysis

In the following chapter, the results of the collected empirical data will be analyzed in relation to the selected theories and scientific articles of previous research. Furthermore, I have chosen to divide the chapter into three main parts where the empirical data will be analyzed in relation to the purpose and issues of the essay.

6.1 Field, Capital and the roles of the lay judges

Two central theories for this thesis have been Bourdieu's *field and capital* as well as *Goffman's dramaturgical perspective, focusing on the concepts of frontstage and backstage*. I will now analyze the interview material from these theoretical perspectives.

During the interviews with the lay judges, it became clear to some extent the importance of being able to identify with a defendant and then in the form of capital. Capital confers value if it is recognized as valuable and the answers and quotations are also permeated by clothes, language and attitude as circumstances that can make a difference, in a positive sense for a defendant. Attire (as outfit) and language can also be considered as a form of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 305). In addition to a defendant's selection of clothes and manner of expression, attention is also paid to a defendant's behavior and/or manner of body language during the trial; and that, taken as a whole, is a circumstance which attracts attention during the trial. The answers crystallize, albeit somewhat vaguely, about how behavior during the legal process is something that is discussed before the judgment is presented. As stated earlier, according to Bourdieu's theory, one can emphasize clothing, behavior and language as something that is noticed and, in some sense, attracts attention. It is difficult to say in which direction a defendant's treatment will take place, but it cannot be ruled out that a defendant who behaves in a manner that deviates from or otherwise deviates from the lay judges' notions of "how to behave" during the trial might be treated differently, or even disadvantaged during the legal process.

Vanessa said during her interview that: *"[...] it affects how they present themselves in the courtroom. Their body language, hoodies, a lot of tattoos, attitude, looking down, arms crossed [...] all of this can affect one's own attitude towards the defendant in the case".*

Furthermore, Delgado and Stefancic (2010) discuss that a defendant belonging to a minority group may be most qualified in a certain capital, but if his capital in another area has been assessed to be worse due to, for example, the person's ethnic origin, derogatory treatment of the defendant may occur (Delgado and Stefancic, 2010). The judges confirm this but emphasize that this is not directly visible in the courtroom or in front of the accused or the other actors, but that it occurs behind the scenes, during the deliberations. My interpretation is based on this that it is not only the defendant's capital as such that plays a role in how he or she is treated, but also that the defendant's way of presenting themselves in the courtroom can certainly influence the judges' attitude to the case, and thus lay the foundation for how the latter will reason about the verdict during the deliberations.

The social field, according to Bourdieu's conceptual framework, is a system of relations between different factions. The existence of the social field arises when an agent, actor, a group or when different institutions compete and contend for common values (Broady, 1989). According to Bourdieu, it is this model that stipulates the structure for interaction between actors and the actions that the actors assimilate in the pursuit of legitimacy in the prevailing field (Ibid.). In my case, it is the judges' workplace, the district court and the court of appeal, which act in both the social and legal fields. The judges are, in the social field, distributed in a socially and legally hierarchical and geographical space - district court or court of appeal - where they fight for common values and goals, that is: everyone's equality before the law and an undefiled truth.

Therefore, I believe that the judges' equity is also important to consider when it comes to judging objectively according to the law, but at the same time being in an assignment that is very much characterized by subjective experiences and experiences. The judges do not receive any legal capital and are

not, as previously described, intended to contribute anything other than good judgment and life experience. At the same time, the lay judges assignment is a politically non-political assignment and the board members in the study believe that elements from the political field may risk coloring, opinion formation and party-political agenda in the legal field. This risk, according to the interviewees, arises in discussions behind closed doors during deliberations because the judges are usually active actors in the political field. Furthermore, what the risk is due to is explained as a lack of education and thus a lack of legal capital and knowledge in the legal field. The judges explain that the only education they have received is an introductory education regarding the assignment, they have not received any further legal education or education in the grounds of discrimination. They believe that if they have questions or feel uncertain about something, it is the legal judge they can turn to, thus a great responsibility rests on the legal judge in the specific case.

This is also confirmed by Diesen (2006) in his research as he discusses that when laws, practices and motives are clear, the lay judges must give in to the legal judge's expertise (Diesen, 2006). He also argues that a professional lawyer makes fewer mistakes than a lay judge in the evaluation of evidence and that this may be due to two different explanations. It can be the legal knowledge, but also a greater experience of the judicial activity. It is probably a combination of these, however, Diesen believes that it is the former, which means that the judges will never reach the level of the legal judge. The lay judges are thus dependent on the lawyer's expertise in all assessment situations. However, it is possible that the tribunals bring to the court experience that makes the joint assessment safer (Diesen, 2006). This is consistent with the results of the interviews with the judges, all of whom highlight the legal judge's responsibility. On the other hand, there is talk of a desire and need among the judges to get more solid education and expertise, as they believe that this would reduce the risk of party-political discussions and influences and strengthen their self-confidence as they know in more detail what is right and not. According to Bourdieu, there is a structure in the legal field of professional prestige and power. The professionals in

the legal field are in constant struggle with those who are outside the field to gain acceptance and legitimacy for their interpretation of the law in relation to society at large but also within the internal organization (Bourdieu, 1987).

My interpretation is that the lack of legal competence can create problems for the uniformity of law enforcement and also uncertainty in legal certainty. However, I would also like to emphasize that it is the lay judges' lack of legal knowledge, or legal capital, that is their greatest asset and the main purpose of the assignment as they are to contribute with "common sense" and an expanded frame of reference in the social-legal field. Their social knowledge, life experience and common sense must also contribute to the public's transparency in law. Therefore, it is also considered democratic to allow elected representatives to be involved and decide in the legal process, otherwise the judiciary can become too elitist if only legally educated people are allowed to judge (Swedish Courts, 2021).

The interviews also showed that many lay judges come from a different background than most judges, which they believe may mean that they see a situation from a different perspective. However, one of the interviewees thinks that it is too risky that the judges do not know the legal text and that they are politically represented, Louise says regarding this: *"[…] This with the lay judge system is a good system but I actually do not think it should be a majority of lay judges in the district court. I think the risk of it being wrong is greater than the possibility of democratic legal certainty and transparency in the legal process […] We can only react to what we see and hear, and it can be quite individual, strong, different and also spontaneous reactions where you can also sometimes see quite clearly who thinks what, depending on which party you represent*". This also shows that the legal capital of the lay judges is limited. They are politically and generally represented and not educated within the law; therefore, it is in a Bourdieusian sence impossible for them to have expert knowledge of laws, practices and legislation and other information that exists in the legal field.

6.2 Frontstage/Backstage and the roles of the lay judges

Based on the results of the lay judges' experiences, it is clear that they act and express themselves differently depending on whether they are in their front stage - in the courtroom, or in their backstage - during deliberations. The judges believe that during the actual trial in the courtroom they should not make any noise and they are then in a room where everything is very formal and where many rules and codes apply. Just as Goffman (2004) believes that an actor in frontstage wants or needs to show himself in a specific way to the audience, I interpret the lay judges' narratives as meaning that they need to do their best not to show impressions, feelings, body language, etcetera. This would not only mean that they are in the front stage but also that they are not allowed to show their assets of certain capital.

The treatment, the interaction and the lay judges' own attitude to a court case, as discussed above, can in many ways be linked to Goffman's dramaturgical perspective (Goffman, 2004). Individuals step into different roles for how each individual should or should not behave. Therefore, the roles may consist of how the individual should behave, but also general expectations or guidelines for how individuals should handle a specific situation. In this study, the similarity between a trial and Goffman's theory can be made visible, in the light of how lay judges' step in and out of front stage and backstage in the same way as they step in and out of the courtroom.

In the courtroom, the atmosphere can show a certain intensity and mood compared to during deliberations, or outside the courtroom in general. This intensity and mood set a foundation for the treatment, interaction and attitudes between individuals. According to the judges, it seems that a lighter and more relaxed atmosphere is obtained outside the hall, away from the other actors, during deliberations where the parties find it easier to express themselves more freely. This is thus the same definition of "behind the scenes" that Goffman (2004) means when he defines the backstage concept.

According to the judges, it is extremely important to be professional, show a formal impression, think about your body language, what you do and how to dress to give the best possible impression in the courtroom. Thus, it is as important for them, if not more important, to think about how they present themselves socially, as it is for the defendant to do the same. For example, Louise says: *"[...] It is necessary to have a poker face. Calm on the outside even if it pulsates on the inside. I have sat in some such trials as crimes in child pornography [...] can absolutely not sit completely untouched and neutral then. But what is visible on the surface, you must still try to master ".* This quote shows both how important and how difficult it can be to control their intentions to show a special impression in the situation, it also shows that the judges need to hold back part of their capital when they are in the front stage - to show a as professional an impression as possible.

Furthermore, Peter believes that there may be condescending, "extremely inappropriate" expressions linked to stereotypes and of a discriminatory nature of the accused, but that the legal judge is usually quick to intervene if it should "go out of control". An interpretation of this could thus be that the lay judges release their capital during the deliberations. They let go of their poker face (Goffman, 2004) and become more outspoken in the room behind closed doors where secrecy prevails. That the respondents describe that it is mainly among deliberations that discriminatory expression and condescending treatment of a defendant can occur, and at the same time that this has never been seen as a problem with the professional legal judge, I interpret as the lay judges and legal judges are in the same field - the juridical field - but they do not share the same resources. The resources in the various fields are, as previously mentioned, what Bourdieu calls capital. These exist in various forms and accumulate through exchanges with other active actors (Bourdieu 1987).

Lay judges seek knowledge, education and help from the legal judges when their juridical knowledge is lacking, but there are still significant differences in capital between the lay judges and the professional legal judges, given that the lay judges' resources based on Bourdieu's theories can be interpreted as political capital and the professional judges as legal capital.

6.3 Discrimination and racialization in the legal process

It has been shown that biases occur as derogatory treatment of the accused that may be associated with ethnic discrimination and racialization. What all of the jury members were quick to state, however, is that this does not occur in the courtroom, but is only visible during deliberations or breaks. The implication of this is that the judges need to withhold their capital in order to be professionals in the courtroom, in order to then be able to release the mask and allow their equity to be seen again in the backstage, during the deliberations. Bourdieu believes that it is in the backstage that the actor can relax and ventilate what has happened in the frontstage - on stage - as well as plan and train before appearing again. Behind the scenes, the actor can be himself and talk and behave as he wishes and then enter a role again when he “goes out on stage” (Giddens 2007; Bourdieu 1987; Engdahl & Larsson 2011). Furthermore, I interpret this as meaning that the frontstage - the courtroom is understood as the formal and the backstage - the deliberations as the informal.

My interpretation is that the racialization process that is going on in Swedish legal proceedings can be reflected in the definition of the theory where Adam Hochman (2017) describes how people are seen as stereotypes based on prejudices about their background or origin. The judges experience that comments and allegations of a racist and derogatory nature of a defendant occur in the backstage during deliberations, and that this has a connection to which party and the political capital one possesses as a judge. It emerged during the interviews that there have been times where the conversation about a defendant has had influences such as "he is an immigrant, no wonder he is involved in this" or "this is so typically 'them'",

but also, that culture clashes so which language barriers can affect if the defendant is unable to express himself correctly, formally or in a polite manner. This demonstrates a clear ratification process where the defendant's achievements and merits can be valued differently based on their affiliation with a particular race or ethnicity. The reason for this is that an objective truth in both racism theory but above all in critical race theory, is not considered to exist (Delgado & Stefancic 2010). Discrimination according to CRT is instead assessed for the most part objectively, by taking a position on how other people have been treated in the same situation and whether there is any difference in how the people have been treated. The treatment must also be objectively less favorable or involve a disadvantage (Ibid). Thus, I have used CRT in this study to emphasize and show the process of racialization that arises when derogatory treatment of a defendant in Swedish legal proceedings is based on the person's ethnicity or background, and where other people with, for example, a Swedish background would not be disadvantaged in the same way. The lay judges in the study believe that the problem with these contradictions may be due to the lack of education. For example, in her interview, Vanessa stated that she would like the organization to provide more education on discrimination and the consequences of it: *"[...] However, I think that one should work much more with discrimination because, as I mentioned earlier, there are people who represent parties who express themselves in a way that is very condescending towards people who have a different ethnic background."*.

My interpretation of the interview material is further that the racist structures often take shape through racist, discriminatory expressions and derogatory treatment, for example through generalizations about the accused's ethnicity, capital or unfavourability as "we and them" comments. They exist mainly in more informal parts of the legal process, behind the scenes, where judges are given space to be more outspoken and where political views may be expressed.

The problem with the judges believing that neither discrimination nor racialization is going on in the courtroom, but that it takes place during other parts of the legal process, I see as this in itself creates an ethnic and structural conflict within the system.

The judges also find it problematic not to have any clear guidelines or concrete action plans for how they should work to counteract these prejudices, the common attitude of the judges is that "everyone is just people" and that the greatest responsibility currently lies with the legal judge, but that they see a need and a desire for more in-depth education, as one of the lay judges puts it: "*As a board member, you are only your own individual with your own background and your own baggage. It is difficult to have a strategy to ensure neutrality and impartiality from a jury perspective because their decisions are individual and based on personal experiences, experiences and opinions. There, one might need training purely organizationally*".

Finally, the report "Discrimination in the legal process" (2008: 4) shows examples of how suspects and victims of crime with a foreign background can be disadvantaged in the legal process and Martens, Shannon and Törnqvist (2008) explain that both Swedish and international research shows that people with a foreign background can be disadvantaged in the meeting with many different social institutions. Looking at the lay judges' narratives in this present study, the Swedish judiciary does not seem to be an exception.

7. Final remarks and proposal for further research

In this final chapter of the thesis, I strive to reconnect to the research questions and to draw conclusions that have emerged through previous results and analysis of the material.

• How can contradictions that occur in Swedish legal processes be understood from a jury perspective?

From the perspective of the lay judges, these biases can primarily be understood as ethnic discrimination and the racialization process that arises as a result of lay judges' different perceptions and attitude towards a defendant and how their personal opinions are presented behind closed doors, in their backstage.

- How can the laymen's experiences of racism and ethnic discrimination of the defendant in legal proceedings be understood?

The lay judges believe that this occurs, but that it is important to emphasize that it does not occur directly in the courtroom. Thus, this is exclusively visible during deliberations or during breaks when judges feel freer to express their personal opinions are racist expressions and values of a discriminatory nature. The respondents also believe to some extent that this has a connection to which party one belongs to as a lay judge, and that one can to a greater extent see a connection to discriminatory treatment of a defendant from certain party-political influences.

- How do lay judges in their organization try to avoid prejudices such as racism and ethnic discrimination?

The judges in the study believe that there are no action plans or strategies to counteract these contradictions and that this can be a problem. Several of the board members express that they want more training to grow in their role as a lay judge and to increase their legal assets. Today, the only education they receive is an introductory education, further on the greatest responsibility relies on the professional legal judge to ensure that the discussions are conducted according to the legal framework.

- In what ways can the stories of the playwrights derive from Bourdieu's theory of social capital as well as Goffman's concept of frontstage and backstage?

Goffman's concept of frontstage and backstage has been a large part of the thesis' focus, as it is inevitable that the judges are in different arenas, depending on whether they are in the courtroom or under deliberation. At the same time, it has been discussed that the judges are in the same social field, also the legal field, without actually having access to any specific legal capital. In combination with the judges describing that a defendant's capital, as well as the judges' equity, affects not only their attitude to the case but thus also how they may judge in the specific case, makes the capital concept highly relevant for a socio-legal analysis.

In conclusion, the lay judges' *frontstage* is the courtroom, in which they need to put on a mask to displace uncomfortable and difficult thoughts, feelings, values and emotions. Their *backstage* is during the deliberations where they are allowed to take off their masks and be more outspoken, show emotions, ask questions and judge according to personal as well as political values and opinions.

Finally, one conclusion I can draw from this study is that the orientation of racialization theory that discrimination processes take place both at the structural level, as within state institutions but also at the interpersonal level in everyday life has been confirmed. The lay judges' perceptions of ethnicities and their political attitude can thus be the cause of ethnic as well as structural discrimination within the Swedish legal system. Above all, the racialized process here explains that these notions create "us and them" feelings and where the defendant's capital can form the basis for how he or she is treated, and that this to a high degree governs the judges' attitude to the case in question. Thus, both my previous research and the results of the study show that people of other ethnic backgrounds can be treated differently in the legal process (Diesen, 2006).

I find it problematic that several of the judges describe and confirm that there is ethnic discrimination and racism of the accused, while the interviews have shown that there are no strategies or action plans to counteract this.

As emerged from the literature review, Martens, Shannon and Törnqvist (2008) explain that a number of studies have been conducted in Sweden over the years, which show signs that people with a foreign background are disadvantaged due to both communication problems and stereotypical perceptions even during court proceedings. The authors also believe that the research that has been published in Sweden is very limited and that more research would be needed on factors that could lead to people with a foreign background being discriminated against during court proceedings (Martens, Shannon and Törnqvist 2008). I now hope that my study somewhat has contributed to this, despite the fact that the material is too small to be able to make any generalizations. With this, I also hope that my study highlights important factors about discrimination and racialization in Swedish legal processes from a lay judge perspective. The choice to limit the study to only lay judges and thus not include legal judges was intended to contribute to a unique discussion and a result that has been relatively unfiltered in order to highlight different perspectives of the lay judges' narratives.

In the future, it would be interesting to see studies that examine how the media and public debates can influence the judges' decisions and attitudes to specific cases. The interest emerged through the interview with Peter, who ended his interview by stating:

> […] One thing I was a little surprised that you did not directly ask about is the influence from the media and so, external influence. In the district court this is not common, but in the Court of Appeal it is not at all uncommon to be in a case that there has been a lot of fuss about since the district court's outcome […] And you know that there is an ongoing public debate and it is discussed in the media and you sit and wait for the outcome of the Court of Appeal […] and there I do not think that legal judges are affected so much, but I am completely convinced that judges do.

Bibliography

Advokaten, 2011. https://www.advokaten.se/Tidningsnummer/2011/Nr-8-2011-Argang-77/Lekmannadomarna-allt-mer-omdiskuterade/

Angela P. Harris (2017) . *Law and Social Theory*.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1993), Kultursociologiska texter i urval av Donald Broady och Mikael Palme. Stockholm: Brutus Östlings Bokförlag Symposium AB Broady,

Broady, Donald (1989), Kapital, hapitus, fält. Några nyckelbegrepp i Pierre Bourdieus sociologi. Stockholm: UHÄ

Broady, Donald (1998) Kapitalbegreppet som utbildningssociologiskt verktyg. https://uu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:328806/FULLTEXT01.pdf

Broady, Donald (1998). ”Inledning: en verktygslåda för studier av fält” http://www.skeptron.uu.se/broady/sec/p-98-kulturens-falt-inledn-o-frontmatter.pdf

Brottsoffermyndigheten, 2021. https://www.brottsoffermyndigheten.se/utsatt-for-brott/hur-gar-en-rattegang-till

Bryman, Alan (2011). *Samhällsvetenskapliga metoder*. 2., [rev.] uppl. Malmö: Liber

Carlson, Laura. ”*Critical Race Theory in a Swedish Context*”. 2011. http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:578121/FULLTEXT01.pdf

Carter, Bob; Green, Marci Ruth and Halpern, Rick. 1996. *Immigration policy and the racialization of migrant labour: The construction of national identities in the USA and Britain.* https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254273491_Immigration_policy_and_the_racialization_of_migrant_labour_The_construction_of_national_identities_in_the_USA_and_Britain

Criminal Code (SFS 1962:700) https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/brottsbalk-1962700_sfs-1962-700

Delgado, Richard & Stefancic, Jean: Critical race theory: an introduction, upplaga 2, New York University Press (New York), 2012.

Diesen, C, Lekmän som domare, Norstedts Juridik AB, Stockholm 1996

Discrimination Act 2008:567 https://lagen.nu/2008:567

Domstolsverket, 2021. https://www.domstol.se/

Epstein, Beth. *Redemptive politics: Racial reasoning in contemporary France.* 2016. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0031322X.2016.1164434

Eriksson-Zetterquist, Ulla & Styhre, Alexander. *Organisering och intersektionalitet.* 2011).

Garner (2010) "*Racisms An Introduction*". https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/lund/reader.action?docID=743653

Goffman, Erving (2004). *Jaget och maskerna: en studie i vardagslivets dramatik*. 4. uppl. Stockholm: Norstedts akademiska förlag

FN, Article 7. https://fn.se/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Allmanforklaringomdemanskligarattigheterna.pdf

Frändelid, Adam. Dagens Samhälle, 2015. https://www.dagenssamhalle.se/debatt/rasism-i-domstolarna-skadar-raettssystemet-15489
Accessed: 2021-01-26, 12.40

Haluza-DeLay, Randolph (2010). Racialization, social capital, and leisure services
https://www-tandfonline-com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/doi/pdf/10.1080/14927713.2006.9651351
Accessed: 2021.03.18

Hochman, Adam (2017). Replacing Race: Interactive Constructionism about Racialized Groups https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/ergo/12405314.0004.003/--replacing-race-interactive-constructionism-about-racialized?rgn=main;view=fulltext

Kvale, Steinar & Brinkmann, Svend (2014). *Den kvalitativa forskningsintervjun*. Tredje [reviderade] upplagan Lund: Studentlitteratur
ISBN: 9789144101675

Law of Discrimination (SFS 2008:567)
https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/diskrimineringslag-2008567_sfs-2008-567

Legal Glossary, Domstolsverket 2021.
https://www.domstol.se/globalassets/filer/gemensamt-innehall/for-professionella-aktorer/svensk-engelsk_ordlista_2019.pdf
Mason, Jennifer (2002). *Qualitative researching*. 2. ed. London: Sage
ISBN: 076197427X

Martens Peter, Shannon David and Törnqvist Nina. *Discrimination in the legal process*. 2008:4.

Mattsson, Tina. Intersektionalitet i socialt arbete: teori, reflektion och praxis. 2015.

Molina, 2005
https://www.regeringen.se/49bb01/contentassets/10ca6c4d2daf4916a6fcf7e91bdee5b8/bortom-vi-och-dom---teoretiska-reflektioner-om-makt-integration-och-strukturell-diskriminering-del-1

Möschel, Mathias (2011). *Race in Mainland European Legal Analysis: Towards a European Critical Race Theory.*
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233242769_Race_in_Mainland_European_Legal_Analysis_Towards_a_European_Critical_Race_Theory

Ombudsman of Ethnic Discrimination, 2019.
https://www.do.se/om-diskriminering/skyddade-diskrimineringsgrunder/etnisk-tillhorighet-som-diskrimineringsgrund/etnisk-profilering/

Accessed: 2021-01-14

Patel, Runa & Davidson, Bo (2011). *Forskningsmetodikens grunder att planera, genomföra och rapportera en undersökning*. Johanneshov: TPB

ISBN:

SOU, 2005:41, "*Bortom vi och dom*"
https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/B6C9AE6D-65E3-4F7D-BAC8-8D3DC84B684F

SOU, 2005:56. *The Blue-Yellow Glass House: Structural discrimination in Sweden*.
https://www.regeringen.se/49bb01/contentassets/0cf1e0d4944d469bb237b6b0945d08fe/det-blagula-glashuset---strukturell-diskriminering-i-sverige-del-1---missiv-t.o.m.-kapitel-4

SOU, "Diskriminering i rättsprocessen". Rappirt. 2008:4.
https://www.bra.se/download/18.cba82f7130f475a2f180007887/1371914724514/2008_4_diskriminering_i_rattsprocessen.pdf

SOU, 2013:46. "Nämndemannauppdraget – *breddad rekrytering och kvalificerad medverkan*"
https://www.regeringen.se/49bb86/contentassets/93949dc2aff640ea9e94e45228c4b350/namndemannauppdraget---breddad-rekrytering-och-kvalificerad-medverkan-sou-201349

SOU, "Är rättvisan rättvis". 2006.
https://www.regeringen.se/contentassets/106cc584ae1a489db46fde9bbbc090ab/ar-rattvisan-rattvis-tio-perspektiv-pa-diskriminering-av-etniska-och-religiosa-minoriteter-inom-rattssystemet-sou-200630

Thurén, Torsten (2019). *Vetenskapsteori för nybörjare*. Upplaga 3 Stockholm: Liber
ISBN:

Trost Trost, Jan (2014). *Att skriva uppsats med akribi*. 4., [rev.] uppl. Lund: Studentlitteratur
ISBN: 9789144101170

Vetenskapsrådet (2017). https://www.vr.se/download/18.2412c5311624176023d25b05/1555332112063/God-forskningssed_VR_2017.pdf

Voyer, Andrea and Lund, Anna. "*Importing American racial reasoning to social science research in Sweden".* 2020. https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1512057/FULLTEXT01.pdf Accessed: 2021-02-10.

Waquant, Loic. *Race as a Civil Felony.* 2005. http://ceas.iscte.pt/ethnografeast/loicwacquant/RACEASCIVICFELONY.pdf

Zack, Naomi (2004). Black, white, and gray: words, words, words. I Ifekwunigwe, Jayne O.(red). I Mixed race studies: A reader. London. Routledge https://1lib.sk/book/996716/21597f?regionChanged=&redirect=228439019

Appendix I Interview Guide

Introduktion

Tacka för deltagande. Informera om samtycke, inspelning, konfidentialitet och anonymitet.

Inledande frågor

- Hur länge har du suttit som nämndeman?
- Vad var det som fick dig att vilja söka till uppdraget som nämndeman?
- Har du någon utbildning eller juridiska förkunskaper? Ska en nämndeman vara lagkunnig?

Nämndemannasystemets organisering/struktur

- Som nämndeman under en rättegång, vad behöver du tänka på?
- Finns det några speciella förväntningar på dig som nämndeman? Berätta gärna i så fall vad det skulle kunna vara…
- Vilka egenskaper är bra, eller till och med nödvändiga, för en nämndeman att ha anser du?
- Hur brukar det gå till vid en överläggning? Beskriv!
- Är diskussionerna som uppstår mellan er nämndemän under övervägning till dom hemliga? Förekommer det att man då pratar mer öppet där än i rättssalen?
- Ser du något problem med kritiken som handlar om att nämndemannasystemet inte är tillräckligt diversifierat?

Tematiska frågor: Neutralitet och opartiskhet

- Får du ta del av bakgrundsmaterial eller förundersökningar innan en rättegång?

Följdfråga: Får man ställa frågor till domaren innan? (Om så är fallet) på vilket sätt skulle detta kunna påverka neutraliteten i rättegångsprocessen enligt dig?

- Hur gör du som nämndeman för att vara neutral och opartisk till fallet när ni överväger till dom?
- Regeringsformen, liksom er domared, ska säkerställa allas likhet inför lagen, hur väl efterlevs detta enligt dig i rättegångar?
- På vilket sätt skulle fördomar och sociala normer kunna ha betydelse för att fatta beslut i en rättegång?
- Utan att nämna ett specifikt fall, förekommer det att nämndemän i en rättegång eller under övervägning till dom har uttryckt sig på ett fördomsfullt sätt om den tilltalade? Har du själv någon erfarenhet av detta?

  Följdfråga: Om så är fallet, hur skulle detta kunna påverka den tilltalade?

Tematiska frågor: Kulturellt och symboliskt kapital

- Förekommer det att tilltalade bemöts olika i rättegången beroende på deras bakgrund?

  Följdfråga: På vilket sätt?
- Tror du att ”yttre attribut” såsom hudfärg, tatueringar eller liknande kan påverka bemötandet av den tilltalade under rättegången? På vilket sätt?
- Tror du att den tilltalades sätt att uttrycka sig, prata eller framställa sig socialt kan påverka hur denne bemöts under rättegången? På vilket sätt?
- Tror du att faktorer så som kön, ålder, politisk ståndpunkt, klasstillhörighet, religion, utbildning etc. hos nämndemännen kan påverka deras beslut?

Avslutande frågor

- Anser du att det förekommer några andra aspekter eller egenskaper som vi inte diskuterat nu som kan påverka den tilltalades bemötande i rättegången?
  - Spontana tankar?
- Jag är medveten att du är bunden av tystnadsplikt att inte diskutera det som sägs under överläggningarna. Har detta påverkat dina svar?
- Har du något du vill tillägga som du känner att jag missat fråga?
- Vill du ta del av det fullständiga materialet?

Slutreplik:

Återigen vill jag tacka för att du har tagit dig tid att vara delaktig i denna studie. Om du önskar att ta del av det fullständiga materialet så kommer jag skicka den slutgiltiga uppsatsen så fort jag har möjlighet till detta!

Appendix II Letter of Mission

Swedish version:

Hej!

Jag heter Emma Flodin och är student på mastersprogrammet rättssociologi vid Lunds universitet. Jag läser nu sista terminen och skriver min masteruppsats om hur nämndemän i sin organisation arbetar för att motverka olika- samt nedsättande behandling av de tilltalade i svenska rättegångar. Studien är begränsad till det svenska nämndemannasystemet. Tidigare forskning och rättssociologisk litteratur är av hög relevans för undersökningen och har valts ut I samråd med min handledare. Jag strävar efter att åstadkomma berättelser, erfarenheter och insikter du som nämndeman besitter I det nämnde ämnet. Därför vill jag nu intervjua dig som besitter kunskap, expertis och erfarenheter som kan vara värdefulla för mig I min studie. Intervjun kommer bestå av cirka 20-25 frågor där du som informant kommer ges möjligheten att skapa en givande diskussion kring frågorna som stalls och på ett sätt som är helt utifrån dig själv I rollen som nämndeman och dina individuella upplevelser. Fortsättningsvis kommer intervjuerna ta mellan 40–60 minuter, beroende på diskussionerna. Intervjun kommer att spelas in men självklart kommer du som respondent självklart att vara anonym, du kommer även få möjligheten att välja ditt eget kodnamn. Observera att ditt deltagande är frivilligt, du har rätt att ställa frågor och avbryta intervjun när som helst. Slutligen kommer resultatet endast att användas I forskningsändamål och behandlas konfidentiellt, då jag är färdig med transkriberingarna kommer dessa förstöras.

Har du vidare frågor eller funderingar är du välkommen att kontakta mig på:

emma.flodin@me.com

Med vänliga hälsningar,

Emma Flodin