

# JUST

JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE  
RIGHTS & MINORITIES

— — — —  
REVISTA DE DRETS  
LINGÜÍSTICS I MINORIES

---

## The right to an interpreter – A guarantee of legal certainty and equal access to public services in Sweden?

Kristina Gustafsson 

Eva Norström 

Linnéa Åberg 

### To cite this article:

Gustafsson, Kristina, Eva Norström & Linnéa Åberg. 2022. "The right to an interpreter – A guarantee of legal certainty and equal access to public services in Sweden?" In "Language Policies for Social Justice," edited by Christopher D. Mellinger & Esther Monzó-Nebot. Special issue, *Just. Journal of Language Rights & Minorities, Revista de Drets Lingüístics i Minories* 1 (1-2): 165-192.

<https://doi.org/10.7203/Just.1.24781>.



© 2022 JUST. JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE RIGHTS & MINORITIES, REVISTA DE DRETS LINGÜÍSTICS I MINORIES, VOL 1 (1-2), CÀTEDRA DE DRETS LINGÜÍSTICS - UNIVERSITAT DE VALÈNCIA.

## The right to an interpreter — A guarantee of legal certainty and equal access to public services in Sweden?

Kristina Gustafsson,\* Eva Norström\* & Linnéa Åberg\*\*

\*Linnaeus University, Sweden | \*\*University West, Sweden

### Abstract

In Sweden, the Administrative Procedure Act regulates authorities' obligation to use interpreters *if needed* in contact with persons who do not speak Swedish, with impaired hearing, sight, or speech. Hiring an interpreter is stated as a guarantee of transparency, participation, and legal certainty. The article aims to investigate these language duties and rights from the perspective of non-Swedish speaking clients. Guiding theoretical concepts are formal and substantive legal certainty as a primary condition protecting the client as a rights holder. Three main themes were found in an analysis of migrants' narratives about interpreting experiences: mistrust in interpreting services, self-regulated minimization of language rights, and absence of professional interpreting and translation services. These factors may be compounded and lead to situations in which clients decline the use of interpreting services. Based on the clause "if needed" in the law, it might be legitimate to acknowledge such wishes and skip interpreting services. Yet, this means that public services undermine the client's position as a rights holder, formal and legal certainty, as well as their own possibilities to fulfill their duties.

**Keywords:** formal legal certainty, language rights, public service interpreting, rights holder, substantive legal certainty

## 1. Introduction

Since the 1970s, the Public Administration Act in Sweden has regulated the public service obligation to use interpreters when in contact with persons who do not speak Swedish and persons with impaired hearing, sight, or speech (SSB 2017: 900 section 13). Hiring an interpreter is stated as a guarantee of transparency, participation, and legal certainty while handling individual cases and making decisions. Hence, employing interpreting services could be framed as a duty among Swedish authorities but also as a right for individual public service providers who are responsible for fairness and equal access to welfare in their contacts with non-Swedish speaking clients (Norström, Gustafsson & Fioretos 2011; Fioretos, Gustafsson & Nordström 2020).

Previous research in different disciplines, such as health and medical care, social work, asylum investigation, and interpreting and translation studies, shows that public service providers lack confidence in interpreting due to extensive experience of having to rely on dysfunctional services (Chand 2005; Kriz & Skivenes 2010; Hsieh 2014; Westlake & Jones 2017). These studies describe the perspective of public service providers and the problem of having a legal duty and right to use interpreters as well as having access to interpreting services but lacking trust in them (Edwards & Alexander 2005). Therefore, this mandated configuration might cause problems in their contact with clients since they might avoid using interpreters, or use other non-professional brokers, for example, the clients' relatives, friends, or children, thereby putting clients at risk and undermining their possibilities for equal access to public services (Prunč 2012; Weisskirch 2017; Gustafsson, Norström & Höglund 2019; Gustafsson 2021). Another reason that may explain why public service providers perceive interpreting services as dysfunctional is that they usually have no specific budget to fund interpreting services and, when they do, this budget is insufficient. As a consequence, the funding necessary is reallocated at the expense of other purposes. As Dominelli (2018, 93) describes of the British context: "High quality translation resources are integral to delivering appropriate services to families with limited knowledge in English. Demands for these services are rising, but funding for them is scarce."

Based on these problems pointed out by researchers in different public service areas, we seek to turn to the other party involved in interpreted encounters and investigate the issue of the right to interpreting services in Sweden from the client's perspective (Keselman 2009; Gustafsson, Fioretos & Norström 2012a; 2013). The point of departure for this research is the same – i.e., existing legislation acknowledges the right to interpreting, and there are interpreting services available – but we seek to understand what the clients' experiences regarding interpreting and translation in their contact with public services. Moreover, this study seeks to address how these experiences support or undermine their language rights. To investigate these questions, we scrutinize the principles of transparency, participation, and legal certainty as addressed in the aforementioned Swedish legal framework. The guiding theoretical concepts are formal and substantive legal certainty as a primary principle protecting the client as a rights holder.

The analysis is based on migrants' narrations of interpreted encounters in Swedish welfare institutions. The empirical data comprises observations of 50 lectures conducted by public service interpreters in dialogue with refugees and migrants who take Swedish language courses. In these dialogues, the interpreter describes the regulations and ethics of interpreting and their experiences of interpreting in various public service settings. The participants, that is, the refugees and migrants, react and comment on this information, sharing their experiences of interpreting services.

The article first introduces the legal framework and context for interpreting services in Sweden. Then, a brief explanation of the theoretical concepts used in the article is provided, focusing specifically on legal certainty and the position of clients as rights holders. In the next section, the methods and materials used to elicit narrative data are described, followed then by a discussion of the thematic analysis and the three main themes that emerge from the data. To conclude, we discuss these themes and the implications of the related experiences in a broader perspective to clarify the impact of public service interpreting on legal certainty.

## 2. Background

Two laws are of particular interest for understanding the position of clients as language rights holders in public service environments in Sweden: the Language Act and the Administrative Procedure Act. The Language Act (2009:600) stipulates the following (translation by the Ministry of Culture 2009. Emphasis added):

### Section 1

This Act contains provisions on the Swedish language, the national minority languages and Swedish Sign Language. *The Act also contains provisions on the responsibility of the public sector to ensure that the individual is given access to language and on the use of language in the public sector and in international contexts.*

### Section 2

The purpose of the Act is to specify the position and usage of the Swedish language and other languages in Swedish society. The Act is also intended to protect the Swedish language *and language diversity in Sweden, and the individual's access to language.*

The Language Act establishes Swedish as the official language in Sweden. Furthermore, in line with the National Minorities and Minority Languages Act (2009:724), the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages Committee Directives (1995:84), and the Nordic Language Convention (1981), national minority languages and Swedish Sign Language are recognized as holding particular rights. Other languages used in Sweden due to global migration, which are of primary interest in this article, are also addressed in the first section of the Act by stating the responsibility of the public sector to provide access to public services. The second section defines Sweden as multilingual and recognizes access to language as an individual right. This legal right gives the individual protection against discrimination based on language. The category of migration languages is treated in line with Patten's (2009) definition of accommodation rights, one of the five different categories of language rights in his analysis. Patten notes that accommodation rights are designed for people who lack sufficient proficiency

in the dominant language and that they might imply the provision of interpreting and translation services. Thus, these rights are linked to other entitlements, such as social justice and fair trials (Alcalde 2015).

The need to recognize multilingualism and different language minorities in Sweden, old and new, is also addressed in the Administrative Procedure Act, which dates to the 1970s. In the latest version (2017:900; unofficial English translation from [www.government.se](http://www.government.se). Emphasis added):

#### Section 13

An authority shall use an interpreter and arrange to translate documents *if this is needed* to enable a private person to look after their rights when the authority is in contact with someone who does not have a command of Swedish.

In the same circumstances, an authority shall use an interpreter and make the content of documents accessible when it is in contact with someone who has a disability that severely limits their ability to see, hear or speak.

The first version of the Administrative Procedure Act (1971:290) used the words “can use an interpreter if needed,” the second version from (1986:233) used the words “should use an interpreter if needed,” which is reinforced in the present version by the imperative “shall.” The statement that it is the duty of the authority to secure the rights of the private person in their contacts with them, was added in the latest 2017 version. Overall, the act implies awareness of the need to employ an interpreter when public service providers do not share a language with the client or patient and this is stated as a guarantee of transparency, participation, and legal certainty. Rather than the individual’s right, the act underlines the duty of the authority and its responsibility for robust investigations and fair decisions. Thus, public employees must request interpreters also for their own sake when they do not share a language with the client.

As stated in the introduction, the two acts, the Language Act and the Administrative Procedure Act, lay the groundwork for the State’s responsibility to provide public services with adequate interpreting and translation services. How these acts have been practiced in Sweden has been described in our previous work (Norström, Gustafsson & Fioretos 2011; Gustafsson, Norström & Fioretos

2012b). For example, state-funded training programs in public service interpreting are available at two Swedish universities and several other adult education providers. There are authorization possibilities, provided by the state-governed Kammarkollegiet (the Legal Financial and Administrative Services Agency). Procurement practices of interpreting services following the Procurement Act (2016:1145) could also be defined as a guarantee for good quality in interpreting and translation services.

However, previous research shows several factors undermining the quality of interpreting services in Sweden (Fioretos, Gustafsson & Norström 2020; SOU 2018:83). Precarious working conditions for public service interpreters is one factor, the ambiguity embedded in the Administrative Procedure Act by the words “if needed” is another. The above-mentioned lack of trust in interpreting services as well as low competences among both interpreters and public service providers described in previous research is a third factor. Lack of adequate resources is a fourth. These problems have been addressed and investigated in for example, social work (Chand 2005; Kriz & Skivenes 2010; Dominelli 2018; Gustafsson, Norström & Höglund 2019; Gustafsson 2021), legal and court settings (Torstensson 2010; Elsrud 2014; Elsrud 2017; Elsrud, Lalander & Staaf 2017; Staaf & Elsrud 2018) health and medical care (Gerrish et al. 2004; Kale and Syed 2010; Hadziabdic 2011; Plejert et al. 2015; Silva et al. 2016; Åkerman et al. 2017; Haralambous et al. 2018; Granhagen et al. 2019), in the area of migration and asylum investigation (Herihly & Turner 2007; Kjelsvik 2014; Akin 2017; Puumala, Ylikomi & Ristimäki 2017), and in the field of interpreting and translation studies (Prunč 2012; Tipton 2016; Westlake & Jones 2017; Skaaden 2019).

A negative factor in the Swedish case is that only a third of all 5000–6000 active public service interpreters in Sweden have adequate training and/or authorization (SOU 2018:83), which is suggestive of uneven quality of interpreting services. Constantly changing demands due to changes in global migration combined with the above-mentioned lack of resources and the reluctance to link education to the qualification of interpreters in legislation undermines the quality and status of the profession (Norström, Gustafsson & Fioretos 2012; Prunč 2012; Tiselius 2022). The lack of trained professional interpreters becomes even more troublesome in combination with present Swedish integration policies

suggesting limiting access to public service interpreting to two years (Jakbo 2022). These suggestions are based primarily on discussions about costs and what is the most efficient use of Swedish tax money. Embedded is also the argument that access to public service interpreting would prevent people from learning Swedish (Fioretos, Gustafsson & Norström 2020; Elsrud, Gruber & Lundberg 2021). The same arguments have been critically discussed by researchers in other European countries (Schäffner 2009; Pokorn & Jaka 2018; Dominelli 2018).

Despite several limitations with public service interpreting as noted above, and based on the current legislation, individual clients who do not speak the majority language of Sweden nevertheless have solid arguments for claiming their right to public service interpretation to gain access to their human and social rights in meetings with public services.

### 3. Theories and concepts

The concept of legal certainty is used in this article in an empirical and explorative way as a tool to conceptualize the experiences of interpreting as described by this study's participants – i.e., migrants attending the SFI classes during the interpreters' lectures. In their narratives and questions they asked the interpreters, discrepancies emerged between the intention of public service interpreting as stipulated in law and how public service interpreting is perceived in practice. The most common comment among the participants about interpreting services was that it is "both good and bad." In order to understand the context of this ambivalent expression, four core concepts must first be introduced, namely *rights holders, formal legal certainty, substantive legal certainty, and language rights*.

In its most simple form, being a rights holder refers to rights of individuals as they are agreed on in a particular community or society. Rights could refer to human, social, and legal rights and are primarily defined in conventions, by policy documents and other collective agreements. These rights are protected by the society that stands as a guarantee for the fulfillment of the rights of the rights holders (individuals). The rule of law is the main medium for protection and fulfillment and is also the cornerstone for trust and legal certainty (Ivaylova 2017).

The concept of legal certainty is often associated with the judiciary, although it applies to all authorities and public service institutions (Bendz 2010). When public services maintain legally secure procedures that are governed by generally applicable and predictable rules and practices, clients can anticipate the consequences of their actions and what they can expect from the state. Such predictability thus gives public service authorities legitimacy as long as they apply the law in a way that service users and the general public perceive as equal and impartial.

However, there are situations in which laws are established that go against fundamental values—in liberal democracies, the equal value of people and everyone’s right to equal treatment. An example is the proposal to limit access to interpreting services to a maximum of two years for refugees and migrants (Jakbo 2022). Even if such legislation has been enacted according to applicable rules and correctly applies the legislator’s intentions, it harms people. Therefore, formal legal certainty requires supplements that guarantee fair and ethically based decisions, namely, substantive legal certainty (Bendz 2010).

Substantive legal certainty contains an ethical component which means that the authority must consider overriding values such as human rights, equal value for all, and fair handling of cases and decision-making. The material component thus gives authorities certain freedom of action in connection with interpretation of the law. However, the decisions must still be perceived as predictable and fair to be given legitimacy by public service users. Bendz (2010) shows that the authorities’ freedom of action and other difficulties, that is, lack of trained interpreters, may still affect the possibility of fulfilling legal certainty. In summary, the core values in formal legal certainty are predictability and universality, while in substantive legal certainty, these are efficiency in relation to the particular case and the upholding of fundamental ethical values. Bendz (2010) shows how these two aspects of legal certainty are not always possible to combine.

Based on these concepts, we define the refugees and migrants participating in the lectures as rights holders. Due to their status as residents, asylum seekers, or as holders of temporary or permanent permits, they are covered

by the Swedish legal system and have *language rights*, that is, a legal right to public services as well as to interpreting and translation services. These services can be seen as tools for providing access to the prescriptions of the law. Here, we will focus on the right to interpreter and translation services as it is established in the Administrative Procedure Act (2017:900). To analyze the experiences of the rights holders, the non-majority language speaking client in our study, we use the concept formal legal certainty to support our analysis of correctness, universality, and predictability, for example how public services understand the word “shall” as used in Administrative Procedure Act when there is a need to provide interpreting. We will use the concept of substantive legal certainty to support our analysis of efficiency and ethical considerations when the provision of interpreting is negotiated by public service in relation to the particular case in line with the open demand of “if needed.”

#### 4. Methods and materials

Migrants’ narrations of interpreted encounters in Swedish welfare institutions form the basis of the analysis in this article. The empirical data were collected during an intervention and research study, “Cultural dialogue via interpreter.” The project was conducted as part of a collaboration between Linnaeus University and two interpreting agencies. Eleven specially trained public service interpreters gave lectures for two groups: (1) professionals in public services and (2) refugees and migrants who are students in the Swedish language classes. The purpose of this intervention was to discuss the role of interpreting and experiences of interpreted encounters on a meta-level. The goal of this intervention was four-fold: (1) to find ways to take care of the experiences and expertise of public service interpreters by giving lectures, (2) to increase awareness about the impact of language and communication skills for access to public services among public service professionals based on these lectures, (3) to facilitate interpreted encounters by problematizing issues of power asymmetries, discriminatory as well as fair practices, and (4) to find long-term ways to promote legally certain and just encounters from the perspective of non-Swedish speaking public clients.

The project developed a course to prepare and train interpreters to give lectures. Narrative methods such as storytelling were used to verbalize their experience-based knowledge, to find generalized themes that were recurring dilemmas in interpreted encounters, to de-identify examples, and to use didactic skills for lecturing (e.g., Napier 2010; Nicodemus, Cole & Swabey 2015). The course included training in rhetoric, didactics, and the pros and cons of using the complex concept of culture (e.g., Gustafsson, Norström & Åberg 2022). During the project, the eleven interpreters conducted a total of 216 lectures. In an extensive ethnographic study, we observed 71 lectures, 50 of which were in SFI (Swedish language classes for Immigrants). In addition, we conducted 34 interviews with 47 participants, both public service professionals and refugees and migrants at SFI.

Here we focus on the material collected during observations of lectures in Swedish language classes and the dialogues between the lecturing interpreters and participants. Most participants were part of the Swedish two-year resettlement program, in which Swedish language classes are the cornerstone element. Once the migrants have completed the program, which includes individual labor market measures and civic orientation, they are expected to speak Swedish and be self-sufficient. This expectation is a complex and politically normative ideal, and many migrants do not achieve this outcome within the two-year resettlement program. Those migrants need to continue their studies in Swedish, and their dependency on social assistance and benefits is extended. Consequently, participants we met during our fieldwork at SFI could have lived in Sweden longer than two years.

The general framework for the lectures was that the interpreters lectured in pairs. The lecture was either in plain Swedish or a particular target language – e.g., Arabic, Somali, Persian – depending on which interpreters were lecturing and on the background of the participants in the Swedish language class. Due to restrictions implemented as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, many lectures took place over digital platforms such as Zoom and Microsoft Teams. Participants were often present in the classroom and accompanied by one or two teachers while the interpreters attended on Zoom. Several teachers were active during the lectures and asked questions. The interpreters met with the classes for four

hours, divided into two sessions (2x2). In the first two hours, they introduced themselves and described their profession, public service interpreting in Sweden, and the rights of the service users/clients/patients to have an interpreter. They also explained the role and the ethical principles guiding interpretation, namely using the first person, being impartial, neutral, and respecting confidentiality. This presentation was supported by specific anonymized and generalized examples to illustrate how interpreting works in practice. An exchange of experiences often followed this part of the lecture. To initiate discussions, the interpreters could ask: According to your experiences, is it good or bad to use interpreting? Consequently, the most common and immediate answer was that all students had both good and bad experiences of using interpreters when interacting with public service providers.

When observing monolingual lectures, we had an interpreter who knew the target language as a co-listener and observer. In these cases, we focused more on the interaction. On one occasion, for example, the participants were present in the classroom, and the lecturing interpreters were on Zoom (due to pandemic-specific restrictions). After the initial presentation and the first part of the lecture about the role and ethics of interpreters, the lecturing interpreter opened the floor for questions. Each participant, one at a time, went forward to the camera in the classroom. They presented their experiences and asked their questions. Each stayed in front of the camera until the dialogue with the interpreter was finished. Each participant was given the opportunity to present and discuss their dilemmas.

All of these encounters were later translated and explained to the researchers by our co-observing interpreter. Participants described problematic situations when interpreting had failed in their interactions with public service providers as well as when interpreting services were not used at all. Their examples covered a wide range of situations in various public service settings. One woman had been silenced by the interpreter when she was consulting a doctor. Another indicated that an interpreter approached her after a meeting with social services in the parking lot. The participant recounted that the interpreter was angry, and that the interpreter told her not to ask stupid questions next time. A third participant had a complicated case. She explained that the teachers had suddenly informed

her that her son had an appointment at the child and youth psychiatry due to suicidal tendencies. She was shocked that no one had ever mentioned this before. In the dialogue, it emerged that the school had tried to inform her to discuss the situation with the son, but interpreting services had not been used.

All observed lectures were documented in field notes, by hand, and later written as word documents (Davies 2008). We discussed the possibility of video and/or audio recording but decided that it would be too much interference in the classroom, especially since several participants were in vulnerable situations due to their legal status as asylum seekers or with temporary residence permits. It is also a matter of confidentiality and handling sensitive personal data (GDPR 2018). Yet we have followed good research practice with informed consent and the research is ethically vetted and approved by the Swedish Ethical Review Agency (Dnr 2020-04713).

As observers, we impacted the situation although we were not actively participating in the lectures (Davies 2008; O'Reilly 2012; Mellinger 2020). Our position as outsiders, listening instead of interacting, is essential to indicate in order to understand the quality of the material. The participants talk to a representative for the service that they evaluate by sharing narratives and posing questions. It is difficult to generalize how this affects them. Still, it was striking how respectful the conversation between participants and interpreters was and how frank both parties were, sharing a willingness to be constructive and improve interpreting services. The participants were also expecting advice and solutions from the interpreters, which would not have been the case if they had talked to us in semi-structured interviews.

Two questions guided the analysis of the written documentation from 50 lectures: What experiences of interpreting services do non-Swedish speaking service users express? What impact do these experiences have on how they perceive their legal right to interpreting? Statements, exchanges of experiences in dialogues, and individual narratives that addressed how the participants responded when the interpreters informed about the clients' legal rights to be assisted by professional interpreting in their contact with public service authorities to access social rights, such as healthcare, school, and social care were consequently coded in several stages until we had identified and labeled

three dominating themes (Ripley 2011). In the next section these are presented as results and further discussed by employing the above-described theories on legal certainty as a primary condition that protects the service user as a rights holder.

## 5. Analysis and results

In what follows, we reproduce situations from selected lectures that illustrate the three main themes that emerged in the thematic analysis and that have an impact on the migrants' position as rights holders and both formal and substantive legal certainty. These themes are labeled: *mistrust in interpreting services*, *self-regulated minimization of language rights*, and *absence of professional interpreting and translation services*.

### *Theme 1. Mistrust in interpreting services*

An interpreter in Swedish/Somali starts his lecture by discussing the ethical rules interpreters are bound to follow. While talking, he writes on the whiteboard: "Impartiality – Neutrality – Confidentiality." He explains that if interpreters do not follow the ethical rules, they are sanctioned and that they may lose their authorization, their assignments, or even be fined. He then asks the participants: Have you spoken through an interpreter in meetings with public services? What are your experiences?

One of the participants immediately raises her hand and describes a locally based interpreter who told stories about a woman who used to live in the neighborhood but had moved elsewhere. The interpreter had told her that the woman was very ill and that he had interpreted for her at the hospital. However, this was not true, as the participant later found out. The interpreter had lied about the woman's condition and talked about her to people who had no business knowing about the woman's situation. The lecturing interpreter validates the participant by saying that this is an example of an interpreter who does not follow the ethical rules. He goes on to tell the participants that they should tell the service providers if they end up in similar situations and that they have a right always to demand a better interpreter.

Another participant introduces himself as coming from Eritrea. He starts talking about the situations for Eritreans and says that many Eritreans do not trust the

interpreters as they might be spies for the regime. He continues by giving a personal example of how he is anxious about this and how this affects him. He tells about his asylum case at the Migration agency, and that it is pending. He has a feeling he cannot get rid of, that something may have gone wrong in his case because he has got an interpreter that works for the government in Eritrea. He says that he has been waiting and waiting for a long time, he wonders if the interpreter had said something that was not correct about his situation. He says that he does not know whether it is the Migration Agency or the interpreter who might have misunderstood his case.

A third participant continues and talks about the time when she did not understand Swedish. She says that now she understands Swedish, and she has realized that an interpreter does not interpret everything, and that is the reason why she prefers to communicate without an interpreter (Fieldnotes Lecture, 24 November 2021).

The examples reveal a widespread problem, namely when clients do not trust interpreters. Several participants speak of situations when interpreters have questioned their statements or when the interpreter has silenced them by whispering “you are lying,” or “you cannot say this!” in their language. Sometimes the interpreter has refrained from interpreting what is said. As shown in the example above, other clients are afraid of their compatriots.

It often happens that clients perceive that the interpreter is affected by political or religious views or shows anger, a perception which becomes a hindrance for the participant to speak about personal matters. One participant stated that “I do not want an interpreter – I prefer to speak in English.” Another says that she prefers to talk for herself in poor Swedish and to interpret for her mother. The lecturing interpreter gives advice– “you must tell the authorities,” “you can request a specific interpreter if there is someone you trust,” and “ask for distance interpreting over the telephone if you do not trust the interpreter at hand.” The participants respond by asking how they can complain if they do not speak the language. A common comment is that they do not want to ruin the situation for the interpreter who might lose their job.

Based on these situations, we can conclude that the mistrust in interpreting services, which was described in the introduction as prominent from the perspective of public service providers, is also prominent among clients (Chand

2005; Kriz & Skivenes 2010; Westlake & Jones 2017; Gustafsson, Norström & Åberg 2019; Skaaden 2019). Whether these experiences are authentic or not is not an issue. Regardless, the mistrust expressed towards interpreting and interpreters constitutes an obstacle to delivering public service to service users (Gustafsson 2021; Prunč 2012). It also leads to many situations where service users prefer to continue contacting authorities and public service providers without interpreting, using plain language, English, or a relative or child as a language broker.

### *Theme 2. Self-regulated minimization of language rights*

An interpreter in Swedish/Arabic gives a lecture, introduces a topic about an interpreter's work, and asks the participants in the room: "Do you have any experiences with interpreters?" "Do you use interpreters?" The questions position the participants as users of interpreting services. The following conversation shows how the participants perceive themselves as clients and translatable subjects.

Several people in the room become engaged in the conversation. One woman who speaks quite good Swedish (according to the teacher) starts by expressing that she has chosen not to have an interpreter because she does not see herself as worthy of one due to the time she has spent in Sweden and the fact that she is an adult. She explains: "I came from Bosnia and moved here two years ago. I have had the chance to learn Swedish for two years, but I haven't made it all the way. They asked me if I needed an interpreter. I said I don't need an interpreter; I'm old, I'm 50 years old, and I shouldn't have an interpreter. I need to work in Sweden to take care of my children." Another woman joins in. She says interpreters cost a lot of money for the State and are not good to use. Several in the room agree. There seems to be a consensus among the participants that interpreters should be used as little as possible. They discuss and conclude that they should only use an interpreter when they are with the doctor because there are so many difficult words, and it is essential to understand precisely what the doctor is saying (Fieldnotes Lecture, 16 November 2021).

The participants in this dialogue assume the responsibility of whether or not to use an interpreter. In their narratives, the participants expressed several arguments about why they are not eligible for provision of interpreting services. Most obvious is the normative standpoint that learning Swedish is the only way

for accessing social and medical assets, and the idea that they as refugees and migrants should not burden society and tax money. This echoes the political debate in Sweden and elsewhere in Europe, described above. Yet, established political parties suggest limitations in access to interpreting and translation services and demand more repressive actions for those who do not learn Swedish (Fioretos, Gustafsson & Norström 2020; Elsrud, Gruber & Lundberg 2021). Note that the woman in the example states that she has lived in Sweden for two years and should not need an interpreter, in line with the two-year window suggested by some politicians as a limit for when one should not be allowed to use an interpreter (Jakbo 2022/06).

From a theoretical perspective these standpoints reflect how integration policies reproduce oppressive assimilatory ideas in which one part integrates the other. It is the refugee and migrant who are the passive part that need to change, often rhetorically explained by their perceived lack of skills and competences. In other words, the dominant discourse is that lack of access to their rights, to just meetings, to the labor market, to the housing market can be fixed if the migrant learns Swedish (Pripp 2005). This might seem reasonable, but research has shown that language learning alone is not enough for integration. People learn Swedish, but they remain unemployed and with statistically verified worse living conditions and health situations than the majority population (ibid.). By internalizing these normative discourses, the participants self-regulate and minimize their position as rights holders and thus their language rights as they are formulated in the Language Act (2009:600) and Administrative Procedure Act (2017:900).

### *Theme 3. Absence of professional interpreting and translation services*

In this section, we present additional narrative excerpts and questions raised by the participants during different lectures related to the absence of professional interpreting and translation services. The absence of interpreting and translation was a common topic in Swedish language classes and related to the self-regulating minimization of language rights and the normative discourse of learning Swedish. The absence of interpreting and translation was

also conspicuous in the focus on learning Swedish as an emancipatory force that the participants were aiming for.

The migrants regularly described occurrences in which public service interpreting and translation services were not provided. For example, most of their interactions with authorities and public service providers took place in their homes on the computer. During the lecture, there was often a moment during which the lecturing interpreter showed the participant different websites, such as, the websites of the Swedish Tax Agency, the Public Employment Agency, and the Social Insurance Agency. They showed where to find English versions or translations of these websites in other languages. One participant indicated that this demonstration was the most useful information he had gotten since he came to Sweden. Until then, he had relied on his teenage son as a translator or interpreter, and he had also offered the son's services to fellow countrymen.

Another difficulty that several participants indicated was the inability to contact public service providers or make or change appointments since they do not speak Swedish. The lecturing interpreter then advised how to learn Swedish and provide concrete instructions about how the participants can reach public service providers by wading through the digital options offered by a machine voice and finally reach a receptionist.

Another commonly-recounted situation that falls within the scope of the theme of an absence of interpreting services is related to a mismatch between the language spoken by the interpreter and the client. In some cases, the language was entirely distinct from the needed language for interpreting; in others, the interpreter did speak the requested language but did not speak the same dialect. This is a sensitive situation to address, since participants feel they jeopardize future assignments for the interpreter if they complain about the service being provided. Another argument for not mentioning the mistake was that if "you complain about the interpreter speaking the wrong dialect and the meeting is canceled, you might have to wait for two-three months until you get a new appointment."

Finally, the teachers raised questions such as "Can you choose not to have an interpreter?" or made related comments including "It is so important to learn Swedish," and "Interpreting is not necessary – we can get so far by using gestures

and body language.” This type of question ultimately reveals a pervading view that confirms or legitimates the absence of translation and interpreting services, particularly since it suggests that these services are unnecessary if Swedish is learned sufficiently.

## 6. Discussion and conclusion

In this article we have focused on the experiences of the non-majority language speaking clients and the analysis has shown three main areas that might lead to situations where both formal and substantial legal certainty is undermined, as well as the position as a rights holder. To summarize the results, in the dialogues with the interpreters the participants gave examples of *mistrust in interpreting* along with different solutions to this issue. One solution was to submit but remain silent; another to decline the use of interpreting or speak for themselves in broken Swedish or English; a third to bring a friend or relative with them for language brokering. The advice from the lecturing interpreter, that they had to tell the authorities about their mistrust, was met with skepticism. Firstly, it seemed complicated when they did not speak Swedish. Secondly, to complain about the interpreter would be rude and perhaps devastating for the interpreter’s career (they did not want to ruin their work). Thirdly, if the meeting was cancelled due to the complaint, it might take two to three months before a new appointment was set up.

Similar problems appeared within the theme of the *self-regulated minimization of language rights*. Here the participants stressed their own responsibilities which shows a self-discipline where one has internalized ideas of not being worthy of interpretation. They did not want an interpreter due to the societal costs and their own failure in learning Swedish and getting employed. They did not want to burden the state. The more fragmented theme of *absence of professional interpreting and translation services* included the same kind of understanding that either they were responsible but lacked competence in Swedish language and therefore could not read official websites or call the public service provider to make an appointment, or that the interpreting services were responsible, but were perceived as

not good enough. Furthermore, the narratives and questions raised by the participants do not only reflect individual experiences or perceptions. They were often repeated in different lectures in similar ways, and they also reflect contemporary normative discourses about language and integration. One thing that struck us was that the participants did not seem to think of their negative experiences as the responsibility of the authorities, but as their own problems to solve, or the responsibility of bad interpreting services. As described above, such standpoints were supported and legitimated by the teachers who said things like: "It is not the authority that is problematic, it is the fact that they are provided with bad interpreting services and that they do not speak Swedish—that is the problem. Never the authority."

Here, we return to the question of what these findings might mean for the authorities and public service providers, as they are the ones who use interpreting and translations services if needed according to the Administrative Procedure Act (2017:900). Returning to the division between formal and substantive legal certainty, it can be argued that the formal legal certainty is fulfilled in a general and predictable way every time an interpreter is employed, following the strong imperative of "shall use" in the Act. The normal procedure is that the public service provider notes the use of interpreters in their official documentation, acts, and journals. However, the fulfillment of formal legal security does not necessarily mean that the substantive legal certainty is fulfilled (Fioretos, Gustafsson & Norström 2020; Bendz 2010). As noted above one problem might be that the authority cannot find a trained and/or authorized interpreter or an interpreter in a specific language at all. If they employ a non-professional interpreter, that is, someone with no adequate training or authorization, they fulfill the "shall" and "if needed" and secure formal legal certainty in line with the legislation. Simultaneously, the employment of inadequate interpreting services might undermine the quality of the service and thus the substantive legal certainty (ibid).

Another problem for the fulfillment of legal certainty is embedded in the ambiguous formulation, "if needed," leaving it open up to the authorities exercise of discretion. According to the law the authority is responsible

to decide whether interpreting and translation services are needed. Yet, previous research has been corroborated by this article's findings that clients often are defined as the ones in need of interpreting services rather than the authority (Skaaden 2019; Fioretos, Gustafsson & Norström 2020). This implicit assumption might lead to situations when clients, as was told in the lectures, decline the use of interpreting based on mistrust, self-regulated minimization of language rights, or absence of interpreting services. Due to the professional discretion of the authority, it might seem as an ethically legitimate decision to acknowledge the wishes of the client (Gustafsson, Norström & Höglund 2019; Gustafsson 2021). A short but important conclusion, though, is that they are then responsible for undermining the position of the client as a rights holder who will not enjoy equal access to their human and social rights if interpreting and translations services are not employed.

Nevertheless, to go against the client's request to employ interpreting could undermine trust and ruin a case, complicating an already complex situation. Therefore, we need to instead focus on the legitimacy of the authority, as the one in need of interpreting and translation in order to make robust investigations and take fair decisions. Not using an interpreter impinges on public service workers' rights and possibilities to fulfill their duties, and as primary interpreter users, this situation is not negotiable.

As a final conclusion, we provide a brief methodological reflection. By listening to the dialogues between interpreters and participants and their interactions during lectures, we have gained knowledge about experiences of interpreting among non-majority language-speaking clients. In the analysis, we have focused on the negative and problematic experiences, yet we note the ambivalence of their comments in some cases, insofar as the provision of services is recognized as positive. Our point of departure is that by analyzing in what ways legal certainty, both formal and substantive, risks failing and how the position as a rights holder might be limited, we can learn more about how to improve these areas. In doing so, these insights provide opportunities to incorporate feedback into interpreters' lectures and to invite critical discussion among authorities about the relation between their legitimacy and the use of interpreting services.

## References

- Alcalde, Javier.** 2015. *Linguistic justice: An interdisciplinary overview of the literature*. Amsterdam working articles in Multilingualism. Working article 3: 27–96. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2630104>.
- Åkerman, Eva, Birgitta Essen, Ragnar Westerling & Elin Larsson.** 2017. "Healthcare-seeking behaviour in relation to sexual and reproductive health among Thai-born women in Sweden: A qualitative study." *Culture Health & Sexuality* 19 (2): 194–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2016.1214746>.
- Akin, Deniz.** 2017. "Queer asylum seekers: Translating sexuality in Norway." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 43 (3): 458–474. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2016.1243050>.
- Bendz, Anna.** 2010. "Rättssäkerhet som välfärdspolitiskt ideal: Reformen av Socialförsäkringens Administration från 1995 till 2008" [Legal certainty as a welfare policy ideal: Reforms of the Social Security Administration from 1995 to 2008]. *CEFOS Working Article*. <http://hdl.handle.net/2077/26164>.
- Chand, Ashok.** 2005. "Do you speak English? Language barriers in child protection social work with minority ethnic families." *British Journal of Social Work* 35: 807–821. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bch205>.
- Davies, Charlotte Aull.** 2008. *Reflexive ethnography: A guide to researching selves and others*. London: Routledge.
- Dominelli, Lena.** 2018. *Antiracist social work*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-53420-0>.
- Edwards, Rosalind, Bogusia Temple & Claire Alexander.** 2005. "Users' experiences of interpreters: The critical role of trust." *Interpreting* 7 (1): 77–95. <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.7.1.05edw>.
- Elsrud, Torun.** 2014. "Othering the "other". Threats to self-presentation during interpreter-assisted hearings." *International Journal of Law, Language & Discourse* 4 (1): 27–68.
- Elsrud, Torun.** 2017. "Constructing otherness in Swedish district courts: Concurrent distance-making performances during courtroom interaction." In *Concurrent imaginaries, postcolonial worlds*, edited by Diana Brydon, Gunlög Fur & Peter Forsgren, 187–207. Amsterdam: Rodopi. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004347601\\_010](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004347601_010).

- Elsrud, Torun, Philip Lalander & Annika Staaf.** 2017. "Noise, voice and silencing during immigrant court case performances in Swedish district courts." *Ethnicities* 17 (5): 667–687. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796815588620>.
- Elsrud, Torun, Gruber, Sabine & Lundberg Anna,** eds. 2021. *Rättssäkerheten och solidariteten – Vad hände? En Antologi om mottagande av människor på flykt* [Legal certainty and solidarity – What happened? An anthology on the reception of people on the run]. Linköping: Linköpings universitet. <https://doi.org/10.3384/book-175736>.
- Fioretos Ingrid, Kristina Gustafsson & Eva Norström.** 2020. *Tolkade möten: Tolkningens betydelse för rättssäkerhet och integration* [Interpreted meetings: The importance of interpretation for legal certainty and integration]. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Gerrish, Kate, Ruby Chau, Abi Sobowale & Elizabeth Birks.** 2004. "Bridging the language barrier: The use of interpreters in primary care nursing." *Health and Social Care in the Community* 12 (5): 407–413. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0284186X.2019.1594362>.
- Granhagen Jungner, Johanna, Elisabet Tiselius, Klas Blomgren, Kim Lützén & Pernilla Pergert.** 2019. "Language barriers and the use of professional interpreters: A national multisite cross-sectional survey in pediatric oncology care." *Journal Acta Oncologica* 58 (7): 1015–1020. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0284186X.2019.1594362>.
- Gustafsson, Kristina.** 2021. "Child language brokering in Swedish welfare institutions. A matter of structural complicity?" In *Translating asymmetry – Rewriting power*, edited by Ovidi Carbonell i Cortés & Esther Monzó-Nebot. 125–144. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.157.06gus>.
- Gustafsson, Kristina, Norström, Eva & Fioretos, Ingrid.** 2012a. "Between empowerment and powerlessness: Separated minors in Sweden." *New Directions in Child and Adolescence Development* 3 (1): 65–77. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cad.20011>.
- Gustafsson, Kristina, Eva Norström & Ingrid Fioretos.** 2012b. "Community interpreter training in spoken languages in Sweden." *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 4 (2): 24–38. <https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/ijie/vol4/iss2/4>.

- Gustafsson, Kristina, Ingrid Fioretos & Eva Norström.** 2013. "Att få vara den man är" [To be who you are]. In *Barndom och migration*, edited by Maren Bak & Kerstin von Brömssen Kerstin. 277–302. Umeå: Borea förlag.
- Gustafsson, Kristina, Eva Norström & Petra Höglund.** 2019. "Language Interpreting and brokering in Swedish public service institutions: The use of children for multilingual communication." In "Legal translation and interpreting in public services," edited by Melissa Wallace & Esther Monzó-Nebot. Special issue, *Revista de Llengua i Dret, Journal of Language and Law* (71): 13–26.  
<https://doi.org/10.2436/rld.i71.2019.3260>.
- Gustafsson, Kristina & Jesper Johansson.** 2021. "Bortom vardagsrasismen: Kritisk reflektion om vardagsrasism som metod för ett antirasistiskt socialt arbetet i flyktingmottagandet" [Beyond everyday racism: Critical reflection on everyday racism as a method for anti-racist social work in refugee reception]. In *Rasism, Antirasism och Socialt Arbete i Spåren av Migration*, edited by Jesper Johansson, Åsa Söderqvist Forkby & Ulrika Wernesjö, 153–183. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Gustafsson, Kristina, Eva Norström & Linnea Åberg.** 2022. "Towards critical intercultural training for public service interpreters." In *Interculturality in higher education: Putting critical approaches into practice*, edited by Melodine Sommier, Anssi Roiha & Malgorzata Lahti. London: Routledge.
- Hadziabdic, Emina.** 2011. *The use of interpreter in healthcare: Perspectives of individuals, healthcare staff and families*. Växjö: Linneaus University Press.
- Haralambous, Betty, Jean Tinney, Dina Lo Giudice, Sook Meng Lee & Xiaoping Lin.** 2018. "Interpreted-mediated cognitive assessment: Who wins and who loses?" *Clinical Gerontologist* 41 (3): 227–236.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07317115.2017.1398798>.
- Herlihy, Jane & Stuart Turner.** 2007. "Memory and seeking asylum." *European Journal of Psychotherapy and Counseling* 9 (3): 267–276.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13642530701496872>.
- Hsieh, Elaine.** 2014. "Not just "getting by": Factors influencing providers' choice of interpreters." *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 30 (1): 75–82.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-014-3066-8>.

- Ivaylova, Cherneva Boyka.** 2017. "Legal security as a principle in lawmaking." *Globalization, the State and the Individual* 2 (14): 23–29.  
<http://www.gsijournal.bg/gsijournal/images/dok/GSI14/ivaylova.pdf>.
- Jakbo, Rickard.** 2022. "M i Stockholm vill ta betalt för tolkstöd inom vården" [The moderates in Stockholm want to charge for interpreting support in healthcare]. *Läkartidningen*.  
<https://lakartidningen.se/aktuellt/nyheter/2022/06/m-i-stockholm-vill-ta-betalt-for-tolkstod-inom-varden/>.
- Kale, Emine & Hammad Raza Syed.** 2010. "Interpreters in health care language barriers and the use of interpreters in the public health services. A questionnaire-based survey." *Patient Education and Counseling* 81: 187–191.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2010.05.002>.
- Keselman, Olga.** 2009. *Restricting participation: Unaccompanied children in interpreter-mediated asylum hearings in Sweden*. Linköping: Institutionen för beteendevetenskap och lärande, Linköpings universitet. <http://liu.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A285469&dswid=-8659>.
- Kjeslvik, Björghild.** 2014. "Winning a battle, but losing the war: Contested identities, narratives, and interaction in asylum interviews." *Text & Talk* 34 (1): 89–115.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2013-0039>.
- Kriz, Katrin & Marit Skivenes.** 2010. "Lost in translation: How child welfare workers in Norway and England experience language difficulties when working with minority ethnic families." *British Journal of Social Work* 40 (5): 1353–1367.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcp036>.
- Mellinger, Christopher D.** 2020. "Positionality in public service interpreting research." *FITISPOS International Journal* 7 (1): 92–109.  
<https://doi.org/10.37536/FITISPos-IJ.2020.7.1.250>.
- Napier, Jemina.** 2010. "A case study of the use of storytelling as a pedagogical tool for interpreting students." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 4 (1): 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2010.10798795>.
- Nicodemus, Brenda, Janis Cole & Laurie Swabey.** 2015. "Storied classrooms: Narrative pedagogy in American Sign Language–English interpreter education." *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 17 (2): 55–62.  
<https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/ijie/vol7/iss2/6>.

- Norström, Eva, Kristina Gustafsson & Ingrid Fioretos.** 2011. "Interpreters in Sweden – A tool for equal rights." In "Challenging boundaries in interpreting studies: Interdisciplinary approaches," edited by Fotini Apostolou & Ebru Diriker. Special issue, *GRAMMA Journal of Theory and Criticism* 19: 59–75.  
<https://doi.org/10.26262/gramma.v19i0.6326>.
- Norström, Eva, Ingrid Fioretos & Kristina Gustafsson.** 2012. "Working conditions of community interpreters in Sweden: Opportunities and shortcomings." *Interpreting* 14 (2): 242–260. <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.14.2.06nor>.
- O'Reilly, Karen.** 2012. *Ethnographic methods*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Patten, Alan.** 2009. "Survey article: The justification of minority language rights." *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 17 (1): 102–128.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9760.2008.00321.x>.
- Plejert, Charlotta, Eleonor Antelius, Maziar Yazdanpanah & T. Nielsen Rune.** 2015. "'There's a letter called ef' on challenges and repair in interpreter-mediated tests of cognitive functioning in dementia evaluations: A case study." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology* 30: 163–187.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10823-015-9262-0>.
- Pokorn, Nike K. & Jaka Cibej.** 2018. "Interpreting and linguistic inclusion – Friends or foes? Results from a field study." *The Translator* 24 (2): 111–127.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2017.1396406>.
- Pripp, Oscar.** 2005. "Den segregerande välviljan – kultur som makt" [The segregating benevolence – culture as power]. In *Bruket av kultur. hur kultur används och görs socialt verksamt*, edited by Magnus Öhlander, 73–90, Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Prunč, Erich.** 2012. "Rights, realities and responsibilities in community interpreting." *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 17: 1–12. <http://hdl.handle.net/10077/8539>.
- Puumala, Eeva, Riitta Ylikomi & Hanna-Leena Ristimäki.** 2017. "Giving an account of persecution: The dynamic formation of asylum narratives." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 31 (2): 197–215. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fex024>.
- Ripley, Tim.** 2011. "Some pragmatics of qualitative data analysis." In *Qualitative research*, edited by David Silverman, 273–290. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Schäffner, Christina.** 2009. "Does translation hinder integration?" *Forum* 7 (1): 99–122. <https://doi.org/10.1075/forum.7.1.05sch>.

- Silva Milagros D., Margaux Genoff, Alexandra Zaballa, Sarah Jewell, Stacy Staber, Francesca M. Gany & Lisa C. Diamond.** 2016. "Interpreting at the end of life: A systematic review of the impact of interpreters on the delivery of palliative care services to cancer patients with limited English proficiency." *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management* 51: 569–580.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2015.10.011>.
- Skaaden, Hanne.** 2019. "Invisible or invincible? Professional integrity, ethics, and voice in public service interpreting." *Perspectives* 27 (5): 704–717.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676x.2018.1536725>.
- Staaf, Annika & Elsrud, Torun.** 2018. "Competent interpreters and enabling working conditions in court – Crucial prerequisites for a fair trial." *Retfaerd (Nordisk tidskrift)* 3–4: 61–75.
- Sweden. Utrikesdepartementet.** 1981. *Nordiska språkkonventionen* [The Nordic Language Convention]. Adopted 17 June 1981. <https://www.regeringen.se/rattsliga-dokument/sveriges-internationella-overenskommelser/1981/06/so-198293/>.
- Sweden. Regeringssammanträde.** 1995. *Europarådets konvention om regionala språk och minoritetsspråk. Kommitteédirektiv 1995:84* [The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages Committee Directives]. Adopted 18 May 1995. <https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/kommittedirektiv/europaradets-konvention-om-regionala-sprak-och-GJB184>.
- Sweden. Kulturdepartementet.** 2009. *Språklagen 2009:600* [Language Act]. Adopted 28 May 2009. [https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/spraklag-2009600\\_sfs-2009-600](https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/spraklag-2009600_sfs-2009-600).
- Sweden.** 2009. *Lagen (2009:724) om nationella minoriteter och minoritetsspråk* [National Minorities and Minority Languages Act (2009:724)]. Adopted 11 June 2009. <https://filedn.com/ljdBas5OJsrLJOq6KhtBYC4/forarbeten/sfs/2009/sfs-2009-724.pdf>.
- Sweden. Finansdepartementet.** 2016. *Lag (2016:1145) om offentlig upphandling* [The Procurement Act]. Adopted 1 December 2016. [https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/lag-20161145-om-offentlig-upphandling\\_sfs-2016-1145](https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/lag-20161145-om-offentlig-upphandling_sfs-2016-1145).

- Sweden. Justitiedepartementet.** 2017. *Förvaltningslag (2017:900)* [The Administrative Procedure Act]. Adopted 28 September 2017. [https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/forvaltningslag-2017900\\_sfs-2017-900](https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/forvaltningslag-2017900_sfs-2017-900).
- Sweden. Utbildningsdepartementet.** 2018. *SOU 2018:83. Att förstå och att bli förstådd: Ett reformerat regelverk för tolkar i talade språk* [To understand and to be understood: Reformed rules for interpreting in spoken languages]. Adopted 19 February 2019. Stockholm: Fritze. <https://www.regeringen.se/remisser/2019/02/remiss-sou-201883-att-forsta-och-bli-forstadd---ett-reformerat-regelverk-for-tolkar-i-talade-sprak/>.
- Tiselius, Elisabet.** 2022. "Swedish interpreter professions. How legislation and public institutions contribute to creation and disruption of work, remuneration and education." *The Translator*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2022.2104664>.
- Tipton, Rebecca.** 2016. "Perceptions of the 'occupational other': Interpreters, social workers and intercultural." *British Journal of Social Work* 46 (2): 463–479. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcu136>.
- Torstensson, Niklas.** 2010. *Judging the immigrant: Accents and attitudes*. Umeå: Institutionen för språkstudier, Umeå universitet.
- Westlake, David & Rebecca K. Jones.** 2018. "Breaking down language barriers: A practice-near study of social work using interpreters." *The British Journal of Social Work* 48 (5): 1388–1408. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcx073>.