Master thesis in Sociology, 30 higher education credits

Why are immigrants absent from environmental movements?

A qualitative report of educated immigrants' perspectives on climate change and environmental activism in Sweden

Ava Tolouei

Supervisor: Wahlström, Mattias

Spring term 2021

Abstract

Environmental crisis is one of the most important issues of the past decades therefore ecological movements tackling it are getting more and more attention. This report explores the reasons behind the lack of participation in climate change activism for educated immigrants. The research is based on the Swedish immigrant population using grounded theory on three focus groups and one individual negative case interview. Attitudes, feelings, and opinions on the subjects of climate change, environmental movement and activist participation were investigated to answer the research question. For theoretical basis, this paper employs the theory of *accounts* (Scott & Lyman, 1968), the framework of *emotions and social movements* (Jasper, 2011) and Klandermans and Oegema's (1987) theory about *steps towards participation in social movements*. This study's results argue that immigrants understand the climate crisis but often fail to see environmental movements as an efficient solution for it. To address this problem, organizations and politicians need to reach out to immigrants directly and adapt their messages and policies to account for the specificities of this population group. Doing so would increase political participation, contributing to the crisis' resolution and improving political engagement of foreign-born inhabitants.

Keywords: immigrants, environmental movements, climate change, political participation

Introduction

Since the mid-20th century, the impact of human activity on earth's climate has been increasing tremendously. As nations develop through industrialization, the negative consequences of this growth on the environment get more and more noticeable. Nowadays, after decades of research, science is almost unanimous on the cause-effect relationship between global industrialization and global warming. This becomes increasingly tangible as the effects themselves escalate in frequency and intensity. More and more environmental crisis happen all around the world with droughts and floods, crop failures, rising sea level, glacier's melting, and desertification. All these disproportionately affecting vulnerable populations and provoking migration of climate refugees (IPCC, 2018).

While political actions increased in recent years, many consider these decisions to be too limited, too late. The concern is that these actions will not suffice to prevent a catastrophic outcome for everybody on this planet. In reaction, environmental movements and activists push for immediate actions from politicians to provide concrete solutions for this issue. One recent example is Greta Thunberg who decided to do a school strike in 2018 in protest against the inactivity of politicians in the climate crisis. This spark ignited the creation of the global movement Fridays For Future (FFF). Later she addressed world leaders directly during the UN Climate Change Conference where she urged them to act. As similar groups develop, their effect on the political process become more and more prominent in part due to the attention they gather in the media, forcing politicians to take measures (Hadden, 2015).

However, despite an increase in mobilization for movements centered on climate and environmental issues, immigrants seem to be an underrepresented minority group as shown in a recent quantitative study on foreign-born demonstration participants in Sweden (Karlsson, 2019). While some research has already been done on their motives in other type of movements or in politics (Ribeiro et al., 2015), not much has been done on the motivation of immigrant participation for climate change movement. Therefore, the reasons why their level of involvement is lower than natives are currently still unclear and has not received much attention in the literature.

Aim and research questions

My report contributes to this growing field of research by exploring educated immigrants' non-participation in climate change movements. More specifically the aim of the research is to explain:

> *How are educated immigrants making sense of their lower participation numbers in climate activism in Sweden?*

This is achieved by gathering information on the three following points:

- *How is the climate crisis understood among educated immigrants in Sweden?*
- *How are environmental movements understood among educated immigrants in Sweden?*
- *What reasons educated immigrants give for not participating in climate activism?*

The motivation behind these questions is to get an overall vision of the subject. This is crucial for the report's ability to suggest what can make immigrants more or less likely to participate in movements focused on climate-change. In turn, the investigation gives some basis for reflection on why immigrants participation in Swedish environmental movements in particular, but also in Sweden's political society in general, is lower than average. By doing this, the hope is that politicians, governments, activists, sociologist, and any other interested party would understand better the views and problematics of immigrant minorities on issues of climate change. This can in turn facilitate better policymaking by politicians or governmental agencies (like the Swedish MUCF[1]), allowing them to adapt their messages contents and forms to touch an audience who is notably difficult to reach and thus often left out. Similarly, it can help climate movement groups and organization such as FFF, improve their recruitment processes to reach a more diverse and representative public. Finally, making immigrants increasingly aware of climate change and involved in environmental activism is crucial to develop quickly better propositions pushing for real changes against the climate crisis.

In order to answer my questions, I conduct a local examination of members of the immigrant population in Sweden with at least post-secondary education level. In addition, most of them are not considered "actively mobilized", in the sense that they are not part of a dedicated

---

[1] Swedish Agency for Youth and Civil Society (Myndigheten för Ungdoms- och Civilsamhällesfrågor, MUCF)

organization putting pressure on politicians, governments, and industries, but they might be contributing as individuals through recycling, buying second-hand, vegetarianism or other contributions. This makes them particularly interesting as potential critical cases. Indeed, when looking at their profiles some of them should be mobilized, but it is not the case. Finding out why they are not mobilized brings valuable elements into the light since, if the educated population does not participate, there is even less chance for the others to do so.

To perform the investigation, I study their attitudes, feelings, and opinions on the subject of climate change, environmental movement and activist participation. While previous work confirmed that immigrants' participation numbers were lower, no clear understanding of their perspectives was developed. This motivates the choice of a qualitative approach using grounded theory due to its exploratory nature. The collected data will help capture potential reasons behind the studied phenomenon. In particular, qualitative research lends itself well to sociology of talk and emotions which I am using in my theoretical framework alongside social movement theory.

To gather data, I interviewed a selection of participants using focus groups. This was done to help generate more meaningful results by encouraging participants to reflect and question each other on my research problem and its potential causes. In addition, a negative case of an immigrant who is actively participating in environmental movement was added. She provided a valuable reference point to help refine the hypotheses and ideas generated from the focus groups.

Previous research

For this section, I will present some of the previous research I found related to the subject of this paper. While immigrant's involvement in climate change movements has not been heavily covered before, parts of this question have been treated in various ways. By introducing these publications, I aim to give some context and framing to my own work.

1. Lower participation rates in climate movements for immigrants in Sweden

Working from the bachelor thesis of Karlsson (2019), we know that the rate of participation of immigrants in environmental movements in Sweden is lower when compared to natives. In her study, she used 1748 surveys from respondents who participated on May 1st and climate demonstrations in Sweden. Focusing on foreign-born participants, she found out they were less active in these movements than natives in proportion to the global population in Sweden. Contrary to previous work, she did not find that the intensity of the factors deciding immigrants and locals to participate were very different. Her last point was that foreign-born movement participants were not representative of the foreign-born groups in general population in terms of country of origin. Fewer participants came from countries like Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Somalia. Building up on this work, I will focus on what can be potential explanations for this lack of involvement/participation and how it can be alleviated.

2. Comparison of immigrant and non-immigrant civic and political participation

In their paper, (Ribeiro et al., 2015) talk about the meanings that younger generations in Portugal give to their civic and political participation (CPP). Particularly, how traditional forms of political participation has declined in recent years. They used focus groups for their work, mixing natives, first, second and third generation immigrants, with every participant sharing a common language and colonial background. In their results, potential differences based on the origin of the participants were highlighted. For instance, all participants mentioned a lack of interest in traditional CPP, but immigrants added lack of time and lack of identification with citizenship on top of this. Additionally, some participants conveyed the idea that they were more preoccupied with these questions in their country of origin as they felt it was a more pressing matter there. This paper is interesting for my work as it gives a point of view on immigrant participation on social issue, making it useful for comparing with the data I got from

my own focus groups and as an example on how to use focus group when conducting research involving immigrants.

In a related quantitative research article, De Rooij (2012) talks about political involvement among immigrants in Western European countries. I am using it as an illustration of how the pattern of non-participation among immigrants seems more obvious when it comes to environmental mobilization. She uses data from the European Social Survey for her research, taking into consideration the specificities of immigrant populations. She also differentiates various participation types in which non-native populations engage, which is a distinction previous studies had failed to consider. From this, she found that immigrants tend to have a more homogeneous type of participation than natives. She also noted differences between Western and non-Western immigrants' profiles. For the former, which is more similar to the local population, decisions to engage are affected less by costs or trust in government and more by the lower mobilization level (society doesn't try to reach them) and their sense of belonging. For the latter, while similar observations can be made, the influence of recruitment channels seems stronger. Additionally, reasons and motivations to participate differ significantly between the two groups.

3. Recruitment, participation, narrative views, and strategies in social movements

One of the central aspects in my research is how immigrants are often outside of the influence spheres of environmental movements, and what can be done to reach them. The topic of recruitment was researched by Jasper & Poulsen (1995) using surveys of animal rights and anti-nuclear protester. They investigated recruitment and participation mechanisms, focusing on outsiders not already part of the network. They built on two concepts from previous theories: "networks", where *"previous contact with someone in the movement is the most important factor explaining an individual's recruitment"* (Jasper & Poulsen, 1995, p. 494), and "frame alignment" where *"organizers try to forge agreement between their own diagnoses and goals and those of potential recruits"* (Jasper & Poulsen, 1995, p. 493). The authors then develop these two ideas, accounting for when organizers target outsiders to broaden the organization's appeal and enlarge their influence spheres. They also chose to consider not only the work of organizers but also the pre-existing beliefs of the future recruits as important facets of the recruitment process. In the end, they show how recruiters adapt their messages, using condensed

symbols and moral shocks, according to the cultural sensibilities of their audiences to reach them and have them join movements. Thus, by resonating with the beliefs and feelings of strangers, recruitment becomes facilitated. But this is only possible if and when the recruiter understands what these beliefs and feelings are in the first place.

4. Influence of emotions on climate change mobilization

For this last part, I used the publication of (Marlon et al., 2019) studying the effects of two major emotions, hope and doubt, on political support and mobilization against climate change. Their research applied mixed methods on two U.S. national surveys about what makes people hopeful or doubtful that humanity will address the problem. Through their work, they identified how constructive forms of these two emotions could promote engagement while false hope and fatalistic viewpoints have the opposite effect. The idea is that people can rationalize their disengagement, either thinking things will resolve themselves or that nothing can be done. On the contrary, constructive forms of hope and doubt pushes for: higher mobilization, acknowledging the reality of the issue, increasing the amount of and demand for concrete action and convincing people that they can change the outcome. Considering this, authors argue for better information on realistic solutions that should be implemented to generate constructive views. They also highlight how informing about climate actions efficacy can help limit more fatalistic views. Finally, they mention that presenting this information with an innovative or mobilization frame is preferable to using a conflicting one to garner support from people and how involving community leader can be used to encourage behavioral change. This research is a valuable reference when evaluating the answers of my participants for potential causes for the lack of immigrant participation in climate change activism.

With these publications, we saw elements of answers to my questions. Quantitative work about lower immigrant participation in social movements and other papers proposing explanations for it, albeit in political domains. Finally, research investigating recruitments and influence of emotions which could be used to remedy the problem. However, I identified a gap in the literature regarding reasons for the lack of immigrant participation in environmental movements. Therefore, I propose building up from my peers' work, highlighting possible blockers of recruitment and participation in environmental movements for the immigrants' population. In particular, looking at how their perception of these movements influence the attitude they have towards them and how, in turn, this knowledge could potentially be used by

climate activists and politicians to influence their own recruitment strategies to try and alleviate this lack of participation.

Theoretical framework

To conduct this research, three different theories are used to study the responses of the participants. Indeed, the material has a very large breadth and there are multiple valid reasons brough forward which together explain the lower participation numbers. No single theory can be used to gather all the aspects together. This is consistent with my methodology of grounded theory were: *"The theories developed are likely to be complex rather than oversimplified ways of accounting for a complex world, and this quality is likely to enhance their appeal and utility."* (Turner, 1981, p. 227)

The first theoretical tool I used when working with my data was *accounts* Scott and Lyman (1968). As a form of sociology of talk, it focuses on the study of *excuses* and *justifications* provided when peoples' acts and/or their consequences are put into question, explaining the differences between their actions and what was expected of them. When accounts get *honored* that discrepancy between act and expectations is resolved as the answer provided is deemed acceptable. Developing the idea further, it also touches on *"the underlying negotiation of identities within speech communities"* (Scott & Lyman, 1968, p. 46). Meaning that accounts given are not formed in a vacuum but come in different styles. They are built by the respondent in order to be honored by the questioner, relying on a myriad of sociological and cultural factors. Therefore, the acceptance of an account is situational, one explanation might work with friends or family at home but be unacceptable in a professional environment for instance.

Another element of the theory is the distinction between excuses and justifications. Although these words can sound negative, they do not address the validity of what is said, the legitimacy of accounts is not what this research is about. Rather, it is about understanding the rationale of the person using accounts. While excuses and justifications are both used to answer inquiries about untoward actions, the latter rejects the negative side of what is being questioned: *"to justify an act is to assert its positive value in the face of a claim to the contrary"* (Scott & Lyman, 1968, p. 51) while the former argues with the extent of the responsibility: *"Excuses are accounts in which one admits that the act in question is bad, wrong, or inappropriate but denies full responsibility"* (Scott & Lyman, 1968, p. 47). This difference is reflected in how the answer

gets formulated and is helpful to understand the mindset of respondents, opening a door on their views about the subject.

As this paper is based on focus groups and a negative case interview, paying attention to the participants' speech content and formulation is critical. Using sociology of talk is a relevant practice to draw a clearer picture of opinions and perceptions coming from an oral interaction. This is particularly true here as the aim is to understand why participation rate in environmental movements is lower for immigrants. Indeed, the respondents, immigrants themselves, had to give accounts for this difference in participation on a subject which, in Sweden, is considered as something that should not be ignored. For this reason, analyzing the way in which they gave their answers, and how they positioned themselves on the topic is an important part of this research.

Another aspect of the conversations was the importance of emotions. Interviewees showed a wide range of feelings to support and back their accounts on their actions for the environment. Studying these therefore provided valuable input for the research subject. To perform this investigation, I relied on theories from sociology of emotions on the domain of activism and protest movements (Jasper, 2011). It is an exploration of the interactions between people's emotions, and organizations promoting societal changes. Jasper offers a typology of emotions, before giving elements of reflections on how these can create, reinforce, or transform the political actions of individuals. As Jasper says: *"Emotions can be means, they can be ends, and sometimes they can fuse the two. They can help or hinder mobilization efforts, ongoing strategies, and the success of social movements."* (Jasper, 2011, p. 286). By breaking down emotions in different categories such as *feelings*, *reflex*, *moods* or *reflexive*, the analysis process gains in precision. Making for a clear frame of reference to better define the research material in an unambiguous manner, avoiding misunderstanding.

Now in addition to this, and in order to get a more detailed perspective on the emotions present with environmental movements, I relied on Kleres and Wettergren's (2017) work. They studied how emotions affect individuals' behaviors on the question of climate change. More specifically, how they get transformed, mediated and mobilized in order to push people to action and, what the key differences are between North and South hemisphere's prospects on the topic. They highlight how fear can be used to put attention on a problem but also paralyze people into inaction. Similarly, guilt is referred to as a mostly Northern concern, which could be detrimental

to the decision to participate. To mitigate this, social movements can generate hope which can push people to action. The major difference with Southern participants is that they combine all these with anger at the North, which for them is a contributing factor against staying passive on the subject of climate change.

Drawing from these two body of work, I get a theoretical framework to use for the analysis of my participants emotions. Jasper's typology helps avoid conceptual confusions, providing clear definitions to the type of emotions witnessed in the participants. Consequently, Wettergren's work is a robust comparison base when looking at the effects emotions have, specifically when talking on the subject of climate change and environmental activism. Combining the two, I was able to efficiently surface the differences and commonalities between the material I collected and previous research on the subject.

The outcome of these examinations can then be used to diagnose reasons for lower participation numbers. To help me with this, I relied on Klandermans and Oegema's (1987) division of people's participation or non-participation into four aspects: *"formation of mobilization potentials, formation and activation of recruitment networks, arousal of motivation to participate, and removal of barriers to participation"* (Klandermans & Oegema, 1987, p. 519). This covers the entire spectrum of what needs to happen for someone to decide to get involved in social movements. It is presented as a set of distinct problems which needs to be tackled sequentially for participants to become activists. It starts with agreeing there is an issue and that the movement goals are valid. Then follows the process of recruiting individuals with mobilization attempts, investigating how people get targeted and the importance of personal connection for successful recruitment. Building up the motivation to participate becomes the next step, which can be summarized as a *perceived* material or social cost/benefits analysis of the participation effort. Lastly, barriers such as conflicting hours or external obligations need to be removed to allow participation, however these are also affected by the motivation: *"the more people are motivated, the higher the barriers they can overcome"* (Klandermans & Oegema, 1987, p. 520).

As expected, these categories all become potential reasons behind non-participation and are important to consider when studying movement participation. Breaking down mobilization in this manner, allows for a more nuanced explanations of the reasons and behaviors behind activism than if a single all-encompassing system is used. Doing so offers more precise views

on what organizations potentially need to do to support each of these different aspects. Interestingly, the author himself later used this work in combination with Sociology of Emotions to investigate the impact feelings can have on participation (van Stekelenburg et al., 2011).

For my research, I used a similar approach. Combining the theories of accounts by Scott and Lyman and Jasper's theories of emotions in social movements against the analysis grid of movement (non)participation that Klandermans created. The latter will be particularly useful for the concluding discussions when giving proposals on what would be needed to improve participation. Using this theory, I will be able to pinpoint where the mobilization efforts are ineffective for our participants and how could this be remedied.

Methodology

Focus group, negative case and sampling

For my research I primarily used focus group interviews. While surveys give a better representation of prevalent behaviours for certain traits within a population (Ward et al., 1991), and individual interviews are better at idea generation (Fern, 1982), focus groups will provide *"insights into the sources of complex behaviours and motivations"* (Morgan, 1996, p. 139). Through their mutual exchange, participants encourage each other to explain and think more about their ideas as they build up or disagree with others. This makes the group discussion larger than the sum of its parts, i.e., if the respondents were interviewed individually. This mechanism is what is labelled *"the group effect"* (Carey & Smith, 1994). Vague assertions get clarified as people query each other and we get to observe the strength of how people react when they agree or disagree with other's opinions. This gives an idea of consensus and diversity of opinion that would not happen if asked alone.

A challenge with focus groups has been that: *"moderator's effort to guide the group discussion had the ironic consequences of disrupting the interaction that was the point of the group."* (Morgan, 1996, p. 140). This means that a focus group is not really a form of casual conversation between participants, but instead is closer to a meeting with a discussion leader. Thus, the researcher needs to be mindful of his moderation and questioning but that is the case for other types of interviews as well. Another potential problem which was raised by (Sussman et al., 1991) is how the discussions can change a participant's attitude. A limited *"polarization effect"* occurs where *"attitudes became more extreme after the group discussion".* (Morgan, 1996, p. 140). The last element to consider is that, due to their public nature, focus group should not be used for "sensitive topics" as participants might either refuse to join or alter their opinions to avoid negative views of their peers.

I will now explain how I formed the groups for my research, and what I paid attention to when constructing them. To find participants I used snowball sampling. The respondents therefore had a connection with me which made them more comfortable and the conversations more informal. On the other hand I had to pay attention to avoid biases based on prior knowledge. As an immigrant myself, this approach made it easier to find immigrant's participant in Sweden. The immigrants who accepted to join this research were not a fully accurate representation of

the immigration population of Sweden but that was not my aim in the first place anyway. For example, only one of my respondents was a refugee (my negative case) which fails to capture some of the nuances of cultural, educational, and economic deprivation existing in immigrant populations. However, we can potentially extrapolate from the point of view shared by the other participants and stay mindful of the missing perspectives during analysis and interpretations. The profiles I gathered are also more relevant for the research since the questions were all focused on educated immigrants participation. Having a comfortable situation and a certain education level makes them more likely to have an opinion and interest on the subject. Therefore, one can argue that analyzing their answers will give useful information that could apply to other immigrants.

I sampled three focus groups of four and one individual interview as a "negative case". They were split according to social-economical background, interpersonal knowledge of the participants, level of education, age, and level of participation in activism. Usually, recommendations for participation count are higher for focus group to guarantee full data saturation. However, I had to restrict the size of the groups because of the pandemic, and the number of groups because of time and subject availability. Nevertheless, given the circumstances I still managed to get a reasonable saturation level for my data thanks potentially to the extra care I took with selecting the participants and putting them together. Indeed, when applying grounded theory on the data of my last group, most of the findings were becoming redundant. Groups were mixed in the following characteristics: 33% male 67% female, countries of origin (Western, Middle East and Asian), occupation (studies and work). All of them shared a couple of characteristics: having a resident permit, living in Sweden for more than 2 years and none had children with the exception of my negative case.

The first group had completed University education at master level and up, good salary office jobs, age 30-40, only individually participating for the environment through petitions and donating (no movement activism). The second group was working towards or had completed bachelor level education, had average salary with jobs in service industries (retail trade, care…), age 27-33, again no participation in environmental activism. The third group was composed of students mostly finishing their masters, some of them working part-time jobs, aged 20-27, with one being second generation and another raised here since her first birthday. A few of them participated in activism but either not related to environmental movements or their engagement was mostly connected to their work or studies.

By having the groups built in this manner, I tried to make sure that single participants would not take too much of a front role during conversation (because of age difference, higher education or more experiences) to encourage everyone to talk. I also wanted to make groups where people did not know each other but shared similar life experiences so that conversations happened more naturally thanks to these commonalities. This turned out quite beneficial since conversations were natural, everybody had the opportunity to talk, and I got useful debates and even disagreements. The subject was not considered as sensitive for the participants, so none felt uncomfortable talking in front of others. I had concerns that the common traits between participants of a similar group might make answers too similar, but I was proven wrong as there was a large spectrum of viewpoints in each group.

The interview guide that I prepared was meant to drive conversations on three major issues: knowledge and opinions about the environmental crisis and climate change; knowledge and opinions about climate change activism and movements; motivation and perceptions on individual's involvement in climate change activism and movements. These themes were selected based on Klandermans and Oegema (1987) model on steps towards participation in social movements. Using the same set of questions for all interviews also gave a standardized approach to all my focus group interviews thus simplifying comparisons across groups, later making the analysis phase easier.

Each interview session took between 2 and 2:30 hours. During the first group interview I lost around 30 minutes at the end because of technical issues. I was able to compensate this using my notes from the interview and mailing these participants a follow-up questionnaire by email. Their answers were integrated back in the process and provided additional interesting elements to the research (thanks to the difference in format) which will be talked about in the analysis.

Since the interviews happened during the Corona pandemic, I gave two options for meeting to my participants, virtually and physically and I made sure to have a safe area following social distancing guidelines. In the end, all chose to meet up physically after signing an ethical form prior to the meetings. This physical presence helped analyzing and understanding conversations and group dynamics compared to online interviews. After the focus group met, I had very strong personal memories of the conversations, peoples body languages and reactions.

Prior to the interviews, I prepared a small survey for general information like age, education, religion... It gave me general knowledge of the participants which I used when forming the groups. It also saved time during the interviews, allowing me to focus on the core subject and avoided participants sharing information they might not feel comfortable giving publicly.

Moving on from focus groups, I will now talk shortly about my negative case. Studying negative or deviating cases can contribute to more robust theories able to explain a broader range of cases. The idea is to confront with a single case datapoint that is somewhat anomalous, different or in opposition to the rest of what is available. Inspecting how these variations does or does not affect the expected outcome allows crafting more solid explanations. When including negative cases, the researcher gets data which *"makes it easier to distinguish between important and irrelevant events, processes, structures and patterns"* (Emigh, 1997, p. 658).

For my study, the negative case was a 65 year-old mother of three who could mostly only speak her mother-tongue and came to Sweden three years ago. Adding her was helpful to my research because of her different life situation and, more importantly, because she was an active immigrant in environmental movements. The fact she was so different from all the other respondent, while also being the most active, was an important addition and allowed me to challenge my assumptions and interpretations during the analysis.

The need for a negative case interview came to me after all focus groups were conducted and their analysis had started. It became clear that I needed to gather more data to guide my research and make it more meaningful while avoiding speculations. For that reason, having an immigrant with an insider perspective on how movements operate was highly valuable. She was able to confirm and clarify large parts of what the other participants mentioned but also gave different motivations for some of their points. Indeed, to understand better the existing challenges to become engaged, talking to someone who actually walked that path and asking them about their difficulties in doing so was invaluable. Ideally, an entire focus group for the negative case would have allowed a more straightforward comparison with my initial data set, focus group to focus group. However, finding her was quite difficult already and the language barrier during the conversations would have added even more constraints for finding additional participants to talk to.

Ethical considerations

For both interview types, participants were given an ethical form to fill at least a week prior the interview dates. It contained detailed information about my study goals, how it would unwind and what would be used from their participations in the idea of open communication and honesty. Quotes from the interviews have also been de-personalized using replacement names and removing potential identifying elements, guaranteeing respondents anonymity, and following the Vetenskapsrådet (ALLEA, 2017) obligation to safeguard the interests of research subjects. In addition, their precise nationalities have been masked to avoid potential stigmatisation of a country based on respondents' answers to guarantee fairness. Finally, with the research addressing Swedish immigrant's population, I wanted to reflect on the possible consequences of my work. While this report can improve socio-political mobilization for this under-represented group, I also did my best to avoid any hasty generalization which could be detrimental to perceptions of this population.

Grounded theory

To perform this research and formulate a theoretical proposition I relied on Glaser and Strauss' (1967) methodology of grounded theory to handle the qualitative data I had. The idea is to discover theory from the gathered data inductively, using the researcher's creativity. This method allows to stay very close to the source material and build ideas from the ground up.

Many advantages lie in this method, for instance, *"it promotes development of theoretical accounts and explanations conforming closely to the situations being observed."* (Turner, 1981, p. 226). This is due in great part because the researcher constantly goes back and forth between constructing the theory and the original source data. In turn, this allows the theory to be understandable and usable directly by study participants, allowing them to comment back on it and eventually correct it. Unfortunately, I did not have sufficient time to perform such a review. The ideas grounded theory generates are usually complex instead of oversimplified, accounting for a complex world. Lastly, by following the method, researcher goes straight *"to the creative core of the research process and facilitates the direct application of both the intellect and the imagination to the demanding process of interpreting research data"* (Turner, 1981, p. 227). Potential caveats should be kept in mind though, for instance, there is a risk to get unsuitable arguments coming from the data when used without care. Additionally, this method is best

applied to qualitative data coming from participant observation, interviews, case-study material, or documentary sources of small scale.

To execute the analysis, I used two practical guides on how to conduct such a research (Turner, 1981) and (Dierckx de Casterlé et al., 2012). Both authors warned against using their work in a rigid manner. Instead, they presented it more as guidelines which should be adapted by the researcher. Using multiple references gave me a broader set of examples and practices on which to base my analysis, a better understanding of what grounded theory was, and several viewpoints and ideas on how to extract meaning out of the data I gathered. Overall, the philosophy and sequences of steps from both articles are highly related making it simple to combine. Consequently, it helped me work in a way that I was comfortable with, using tools that I was already familiar with. This would not have been the case had I followed a single approach, forcing me to dedicate more of my reflection to understanding and executing a methodology rather than focusing on the material and my own research.

After running the three focus-group interviews and transcribing the data to text, I started the analysis process. Ideally, you would start doing analysis as soon as the first focus group is done to inform the following interviews and adapt them. Unfortunately, due to the very compressed timeline, all my interviews happened in a ten day period, preventing me from doing very deep analysis of the first interview as I had to first transcribe the conversations in between. I was still able to do this with my negative case however, as it came several weeks after I had already started the process on my previous data. This means the negative case gave a larger contribution to my research since I had already some initial interpretations before conducting the interview.

Grounded theory is an iterative process, where the researcher goes back and forth between his data and the ongoing process. After audio transcription, several layers of notes were generated, each one an abstraction of its predecessors. This was a conscious effort to extract the essence of the exchanges, focusing and grouping together elements that would help me answer my research questions. This also made for more manageable documents, and their creations made me more in tune with their contents allowing me to start making connections between what the various groups said.

While these generalization steps were mostly inspired by Dierckx de Casterlé et al's (2012) approach, I relied on Turner's (1981) work when starting the coding process. What I did was

create paper cards containing the major concepts previously generated. Doing this, they started getting grouped and linked together, fused, and split as the process unraveled. Working in this manner made my data manipulable which in turn made the analysis more concrete for me, forcing me to make my actions and decisions more conscious. As Turner said: *"With this [...] set of records, the researcher develops a gradually changing, abstract representation of the social world in a form which can be re-arranged to let new aspects of its properties become evident."* (Turner, 1981, p. 230).

When the deck of 81 cards was finished, each representing individual concepts at different abstraction levels, I grouped them under several categories (12 in total) which were related more directly to my research questions. With this representation, I had a visual map of my research data showing how different groups were interconnected. Working in this way felt better than trying to answer my questions directly from the raw data. It allowed me to search for features in my material and the 12 groups appeared naturally while working instead of me creating them artificially from the get go.

Once this process was over, I started a quick analysis of all categories and their concepts to get general ideas in place and find related theoretical framework for my research which I introduced previously. After that, I wrote the full analysis below, keeping the key categories as sub-headlines throughout the text. I asked myself questions on what the participants said, why they said it and how it related to other elements. These series of abstractions and development freed me from the source which generated it while guaranteeing fidelity to the original interviews, allowing me to focus on patterns, which I then used in my analysis, interpretations, and discussions.

Analysis

Perceptions of the climate crisis

To study immigrants and their views of climate change, I asked several questions on the subject. My aim was to understand their knowledge, perceptions, feelings, and their potential contributions to the fight against the ongoing crisis in relation to their status as immigrants. This would provide me with clues and hints about whether their understanding of the crisis affected decisions to participate or not.

Participants' awareness about climate change

Emerging from my application of grounded theory to their answers, one of the major themes was the awareness participants had about climate change. It meant talking about how they got their knowledge on the matter, what their understanding of the situation was, who the movements trying to solve the crisis were and what their own role in it was as both culprits and victims.

While all participants mentioned social media as a source for their information, the ones whose work or studies were related to environmental questions also brought up more scientific sources such as reports and publications (IPCC). For the few of them that were involved in forms of environmental activism[2] because of their occupations, they also talked about their peers. Additionally, there was a shared admission that a lot was learned in Sweden because of how much more active this country is compared to their home countries:

> *Shahrzad: When I moved here, I realized I missed a lot of things about the environment. And now with the knowledge I have from here, I can go back and educate people like my family. Not a lot, but the things that I know.*

This highlights one of the first major differences in the construction some respondents made of natives and immigrants' population. Knowledge about the environment was somewhat considered as innate for locals while it was more an acquired element for immigrants.

---

[2] As a reminder, here environmental activism is used to refer to active participation in forms of organized protest or movements putting pressure on political actors.

This knowledge about climate change as a global issue and ecological movements in general was more pronounced in focus groups were participants had higher education levels or for participants with more personal interests on the subject. Interestingly, this deeper understanding was specific to the issue of climate change and not extended to general environmental knowledge. Some respondents argued that this was because the ongoing crisis pushed them to learn more on the subject as it will affect them directly. Indeed, many of the participants did consider that climate change was the biggest threat to the world, and they saw themselves both as responsible for it but also threatened by it:

> *Farzin: Human being from the beginning started to interfere with environment. And we are at a point now, where nature is hitting back. Because people in history have been so selfish and never thought about the future and what's going to happen.*

What we see in this quote however is that the entire humanity is considered to be in danger. The question of e.g. climate-refugees or vulnerable population groups being more affected by the crisis was never brought up by any of the participants. In a similar way, we should keep in mind that the fact they all had a good awareness of the topic can be linked to the relatively high education among the respondents in my sample.

Main causes for climate change

Moving on from knowledge of the problem to perception of the cause behind the problem, conversations started diverging much more. When asked about the main reasons behind climate change, two main themes emerged. Population, as the sum of everyone living on the planet and capitalism as an institutionalized social order.

Indeed, when talking about capitalism the participants saw it as more than just an economic system. Several of them defined it as a root element that had influence on all levels in the modern world, for instance:

> *Bobby: Capitalism is a massive problem and that's probably THE problem behind a lot of others like climate change and resources. We see many countries set goals towards fighting climate change, but you see for decades now that they never reach them. The problem with this is that states, lose control because of pressure from companies. All caused by a growing demand around the world of iPhone and whatever you want. So*

businesses go for that demand, and ignore the issues we have around resources and climate change.

We can see here that capitalism is also seen as responsible for the lack of sincerity and accountability of governments and industries, while also driving consumerism in society. While this definition is quite large it is also only agreed on partially by the participants. One of them, for example, felt a political side to these statements and asked others about it: *"One question, if you are talking about capitalism… How would you replace capitalism? With socialism or what? "(Farzin)*

This shows that the opinions here are at least partially driven by political views of participants, which in turn poses the question about what kind of causes behind climate change we did not hear due to lack of more ideological diversity among participants. For example, this same Farzin was the only one bringing overpopulation as the main reason behind climate change. Another participant, who also was isolated in her reasons behind the crisis, was the negative case:

> *Mahin: The main problem is that people around the world always take the easy road. When we were young we had to take our own dish if we wanted to take away food. We didn't produce trash. Disposable dishes are now a very big problem. They don't decompose and enter the food chain. It is a global issue, no matter if a country is developed or not.*

With this statement, we can see that contrary to participants in the focus groups, who consider the climate crisis as a large-scale issue that single individuals have no power against, the negative-case sees it as the responsibility of individuals. The main cause being modern lifestyle/consumerism. This different conception of the problem is potentially one of the reasons why people in general can decide to act or not to act for the environment.

Emotions on climate change

All this leads up to the question of how feelings about the issue can affect likeliness of individuals to participate in solving it. With these feelings stemming from, among other things, their mental construction of climate change and its causes which we previously mentioned.

To analyze these feelings, I used the work of Jasper (2011) on emotions. During the interviews, participants brought up their sentiments on the difficult subject of the environmental crisis. These came at what Jasper calls a *reflexive* level, meaning that they are constant elements for the participants and testify of a certain continuity in their views on the subject. Therefore, they should not be simply ignored in the analysis as something irrational and fleeting, which sometimes happen in research when emotions are alluded to. I can say additionally that the words used by the participants to vocalize their feelings were very similar to what Kleres and Wettergren (2017) found in their work on emotions in climate activism.

For example, while some of them spoke directly about the guilt they felt regarding their impact on the environment: "*I try to take steps every day to decrease my impact. But still it is probably 100 times higher than someone in a developing country… There you go with the guilt again.*" *(Andrew).* Others only expressed it indirectly: *"I mean, I think to some extent you could question how much I care. Since I think I don't do enough." (Rojan).* In a similar way, one of the participants mentioned the notion of cognitive dissonance[3]:

> *Interviewer: What do you know about the climate change?*
> *Emma: I have cognitive dissonance with this because I don't want to know because I think it's too depressing.*

These multiple quotes illustrate elements that were brought up together multiple times by respondents in their emotional process. Cognitive dissonance, guilt and shame about climate change caused sadness, anger, or depression which they coped with by either willfully ignoring the subject or resigning themselves that nothing could be done. Another interesting point is how the different subjects formulated these ideas and where the guilt/shame was coming from or was directed to. As we saw, certain participants felt responsible which caused them guilt, while other participants were accusing groups they were not a part of (Thus blaming others):

> *Stella: The generation of our parents, they do not have the same point of view as younger generations and that is also the problem. Those people I would say partially caused the crisis because they did not take care, forcing us now to save the earth.*

---

3 While an interesting point, I am not exploring the theme of cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1962) in depth for the sake of coherence in my theoretical framework.

From this difference, I argue that the guilt and shame that some participants felt as a negative evaluation of themselves came from both a constructed image of the general society and directly from other real individuals, others which could very well be their relatives and peers. This blaming might be a way for respondents to negotiate these feelings by offloading their guilt and shame to someone else. I suspect also that part of the contradiction where they sometimes acknowledge the fault on themselves while also saying its governments not doing enough, appeared because participants were pushed to think about the subject in more detail and provide explanations. Having these conversations made them consciously realize how much contradictions some of them had. In particular, when comparing what they said was the most worrying things (which many of them responded was climate crisis) and the actions they were taking to solve the issue (not that much). Some participants even voicing out loud this discrepancy when they realized it. As the conversations continued, they rationalized this, blaming governments or industries, or claiming powerlessness.

One last example related to the subject of dealing with guilt was a participant bringing up pointless decisions taken in the name of the environment. He mentioned how some people would decide to throw away a diesel car to buy an electric one. This relates to the problems of consumerism as a source of climate change but also illustrates how you can potentially buy your guilt away if you have the financial mean to, which is not often possible for immigrants, particularly when compared to local population. Also, calling this pointless goes back to the idea of resignation and the fact that the issue is seen as too big for individuals.

Once more though, Mahin, who was active in the climate movement, was particularly enlightening since she did not share any of the emotions previously mentioned. Instead, she was on the other side of the spectrum and showed positivity and hope. Although she was not the only one with a better outlook on the situation, my negative case was the most brilliant example of it. When asked if she thought some things were pointless to do about the crisis, she answered: *"No, I have never seen anyone do something pointless, everyone that I see was always so passionate about it." (Mahin).* This was repeated later in our conversations where she said that: *"This is serious and if nobody fights against it, it will be a disaster in near future. But it can be fixed if we all act." (Mahin).*

This shows that the issue is personal and for her to fix, however she can. She never mentioned that it could only be fixed at a higher level, she acts as if the matter needs to be solved by

everybody and she is determined to do so (this was even her attitude in her home country). Taking into consideration her activist engagement, this is worth considering for the analysis. It seems her positive and determined attitude act as a positive feedback loop which pushes her to take matter into her own hands even more. This is quite the opposite to the more vicious circle we surfaced previously with other participants who considered that their actions were not sufficient to solve an issue that was too big for them anyway, causing them growing mental discomfort and guilt. These findings are in line with the ones from Marlon et al. (2019) who studied the effects of hope and doubt on support for climate change activism. Their responses had similar correlations between the will to act and emotions felt by participants when compared to mine.

Going back to Mahin, another element is that for her, *"everyone"* she sees is always passionate about it. In her context though, this word refers to other Swedish activists. This can be another positive feedback loop that is missing for the immigrants to feel like their actions can have an effect on the environment. If anyone comes from a milieu where protecting the environment is not something people do usually, it will be more difficult for individuals to act on it and consider it helpful (immigrants or not).

Finishing on the subject of feelings, the last type of emotional response we got was confusion on what was necessary in Sweden. One participant was quite active in her home country and had a very good understanding of the problems there. But in Sweden, it proved hard to figure out what could be done that would have a real effect and what would be a waste of time or even counterproductive.

Participation against climate change

This leads us to the next theme of self-perception of participation against climate change. This represents how participants see their own actions against the climate crisis. Mentioning recycling, being vegetarian, using less, but also talking about their studies or job or previous activism participation. As we see, the overall theme here is not only about what they are doing, but more importantly how they perceive their own acts against the climate crisis.

For instance, when asking what actions they did for climate change, several participants started thinking and picking acts they did which they knew were beneficial for climate change, but it was transparent that it was not the initial motive, or one of the core beliefs they held:

> *Interviewer: Do you do anything for the environment?*
>
> *Bobby: I don't have a car, once I will need a car, I will like something that doesn't consume much.*
>
> *Maral: I would like to be a vegetarian, but I love meat and I cannot.*
>
> *Emma: I Probably do not a lot for the environment. I recycle, but I avoid doing it. I will ask my partner to do the bins. I am reluctant to buy new clothes. Because it s so pointless when fashion is literally just recycling itself. With trends coming back again. But apart from that not really a lot.*

Here, we see the lack of car ownership is first and foremost because of a lack of need, and not the environment. There is also an aspiration for vegetarianism that is not realized yet and, in my last example, there is admission that not much is done for the environment in addition to some avoidance. It shows that although they have the knowledge to contribute against climate change, they are avoiding choices that would constrain their lives too much. This means that the problem is not a main concern that they wish to tackle with passion and conviction opposite to what we see with our negative case.

Another element which appeared was the idea of self-construction. A couple of participants when asked question about their actions for the environment referred directly to their profession or studies instead:

> *Sara: I work with environment, so I spend my time with that. So I kind of like contribute very much to this...*
>
> *Siavash: (**Jokingly**) you don't need to sort…*
>
> *Sara: No (**Laughs**). I sort my waste, I started when I moved to Sweden. Didn't do it back home. I try to be careful how I consume energy. With electricity. I started to buy second hand a lot, but not because of environmental concerns. It happened because I didn't have so much money, and second hand was good. But I continue because it felt so good, using these quality things that can still be in the cycle of use.*

We can see here that the other participants are commenting on the construction as it is happening. This shows that, potentially, the responses participants gave to some questions might have been affected to show a better image of oneself to the group, which is consistent with the theory of accounts. A comparable thing occurred when part of the audio recording of

one group got lost and participants were asked to send written responses to the missing questions as close as possible to what was said during the interview. When comparing these responses to my personal notes, I could clearly see that some participants developed their answers heavily to provide an image of someone more knowledgeable, that was surely more in line with their self-perception.

Interestingly, very few of the participants actually mentioned any kind of recent public protests when answering questions of what they were doing for the environment (with the notable exception of the negative case). This also shows that what someone considers an action against the climate crisis varies between different individuals, and in turn can influence their answers when interviewed. For instance, most participants did mention various acts to mitigate climate change when asked: things like recycling, or reducing their consumption habits. This is what is commonly referred in sociological science as lifestyle politics were: *"citizens reject a definite boundary between "politics" and other aspects of their lives."* (van Deth, 2014, p. 362).

By analyzing the relationships some immigrants had with the question of climate crisis in the previous pages, valuable information was gathered. We saw that participants had a good awareness of the problem at hand which rules out potential lack of knowledge as a reason behind this lower level of activism participation. While the root cause identified were quite similar, different responsibilities were given. It is seen either as a large-scale issue that should be tackled by government and industries or instead, as a shared duty coming from modern lifestyle that people should tackle at their individual level. Feelings also diverged along these lines with a positive and determined attitude or a more negative and resigned one. We then showed how environmental activism was not necessarily considered as a practice to fight climate change (based on how they construct their perspective of participation as immigrants).

Perceptions of environmental movements

Now that we investigated the topic of climate crisis, we will do the same thing with environmental movements, with the goal once more to find clues and hints allowing a better understanding of how immigrants representation of these organizations can affect their participation.

Point of view about environmental movements

When asked about climate activism, participants where less factual and more opinionated in their speech compared to conversations on climate change in general. The topic brought more interactions between the respondents. As it is often the case with political subjects, there are mostly polarized viewpoints on the subject. Among the participants interviewed, the ones that did not mention much personal guilt and negative emotion on the issue of climate change previously were the ones that were the most positive about movements and, on the opposite, the most critical ones where those who showed resignation and doubts when talking about their feelings of the climate crisis.

The biggest benefit respondents saw in these movements was how it raised awareness on the issue, and particularly on the young generation:

> *Siavash: They are the right movements in the right direction that has attracted attention towards a very important topic.*
> *Bobby: It is a great feeling to see that people, especially the young ones, care about the environment and how we can create a better future.*

On the opposite side, people questioned the sincerity and were wary of an overall lack of trust and effectiveness:

> *Rojan: It's based on individuals doing stuff that are not doing anything really. It's just a performance.*
> *Emma: Yes, a lot of environment initiatives are extremely performative, or a byproduct of something.*
> *Farzin: I don't have trust in these movements because I don't know how they are organized and funded.*
> *Andrew: I was a part of some of those marches as a journalist but… Yeah I didn't really feel that it was so meaningful.*
> *Saba: I cannot say that movements are positive. I feel like it has no effect, In Sweden in particular, I don't think it's useful to do that.*

We can see here how some see activists as engaging the problems directly and potentially putting pressure and attention on government and companies while others instead treat this the

same way as some individual environmental practice, labeling them as performative, lying or useless. Somehow, this can be seen as a continuation of the view these same participants had that no individual actions would have any effect. Potentially meaning that their lack of faith in movements is coming not from the movements themselves, but by their own feelings/perceptions of the problem.

Additionally, as we can see with this last quote from Saba, the idea of nationality, quickly followed by race and social class, starts to appear in the interviews as we start talking about movements. This specific point was brought up by some respondents as a critique against movements, particularly in Sweden. They identified these events as emotionally muted and destined primarily for privileged white rich people:

> *Asha: I took a meeting with Climate Collage members from a Swede and from a British lady. She was very open and I loved it, it felt like it was maybe because they have more diversity in England. Here people are used to work in a specific, very descriptive and non-personal way. The climate change topic is very big and stressful and emotional, but that was not facilitated in here. It was emotionally muted.*

This statement, which was acknowledge by the other participants in the group is interesting to put in relation with the work of Kleres and Wettergren (2017). In it, the researchers argue that emotions interact with each other to generate or paralyze activism. What is interesting here though, is that this non-native felt a general lack of emotion display from Swedes. Therefore, if one says emotions are necessary to push people to action, their complete absence will most likely push people away from joining. On a related note, some participants went even further, expressing how they viewed movements in general: "*I have conflicting feelings for these movements. They feel like really white privileged people thing." (Rojan).*

What is interesting in here is that for some immigrants, environmental activism seems to belong to a specific nationality, class and/or race, with behaviors that they don't necessarily share as immigrants in Sweden. Therefore, this can mean that movement participation for immigrants is seen as something external to them, potentially useless, performative or even deceitful and belonging to the native white-rich population of the country they live in.

Friday For Future (FFF) movement and Greta Thunberg

In this next section, we will start to see potential explanations behind previously mentioned perceptions, using the example of Greta's movements in particular. There are several important reasons why we focus on this specific mobilization and its leader. First, the respondents themselves debated Greta and her group a lot throughout all the interviews, even before being asked about it. Second, as a Swedish global symbol, analyzing what Swedish immigrants say about her and FFF can give us another perspective on their views on the subject in general but also locally in Sweden. Notably, we know that her general impact on people's mobilization has been important (de Moor et al., 2020), but we can get some pointers on whether this also was the case for part of the immigrants' population.

Indeed, when the topic came, people had very opposite views and they all wanted to be heard:

> *Saba: I hate this girl.*
> *Shahrzad: I've seen her speech in front of Trump. And she is very strong. If she can have follower like her, people will listen to her and join her activities. I don't want to join her movement because it's so unclear. If in the future, I see some changes because of her movement, then I can say that I like her. But she is a strong girl and she can do something about the environment.*

Here, positive opinion came from people who had a good outlook about FFF and were optimistic about the climate crisis getting resolved, while the negative ones came from people with a more fatalistic view. The reasons they gave behind these negative opinions were plural. Some questioned the ethical aspect for getting children involved in such a heavy subject, without blaming Greta per-se:

> *Rojan: I don't know if that is a good thing, should children think about these things? Maybe adults should realize… wow a child is talking about this, we really fucked up. We should fix this today and not put it on next generation.*

But others had issues with her directly because of her age and argued she was merely a pawn:

> *Stella: I see stuffs on social media, Greta Thunberg's speeches. But I am not interested in that character. When I see her talk she can't grab my attention. She is just a kid…*

> *Farzin: She is an uneducated person without scientific and ground knowledge about what she is talking about and represents. The left media, politician and organizations have been promoting her for their political and financial interest.*

Although the negative point of view about her age appears in every population, including Swedes, cultural differences between immigrants and natives should not be ignored here. Some of the participants have witnessed bold differences in the children status in Swedish society when compared to their home countries which they see with a negative eye. Therefore, when a Swedish child (which is how some of them saw Greta) makes aggressive demands from government officials, it takes on an additional meaning among some immigrant groups in Sweden, reminding them of the perceived excessive authority kids can have in Sweden. Broadening this idea, people mentioned that some actions felt excessive or forced and the general attitude of the movement was put in question:

> *Asha: She is such a fanatic. I think the whole movement is feeling fanaticism. Like oh god we are so doomed, we will die… There is no real hope shown in some of the movement as such.*

From all this, we now have a better idea of how participants consider environmental movements in general and what are the different problems and benefits they identify within. Comparing it to previous findings on how they perceive the climate crisis, there were quite a few continuities. Respondents impression on whether individuals were powerless to change the situation or not, tended to have similar views on how effective movements could be. However, new elements also appeared, with more disagreements as people debated how effectives movements were. Here, based on our theoretical framework, we can see the absence of several aspects required to have immigrants participate in movements (Klandermans & Oegema, 1987). They don't have much trust that climate activism can change things or even sympathy for the movements themselves or their members. But, perhaps more importantly, the questions of national, ethnic, and social identity were also brought forward directly when asked for reasons behind their views and opinions. This element will become even more prominent as we will see with the last question.

Conceptions of factors reducing one's will and capacity to participate in climate change activism

Accounts for lack of participation

The first element of answer will be the many reasons respondents gave throughout the conversations for not participating. To interpret these, I used the *account* theory by Scott and Lyman (1968). Justifications were given mainly by participants who did not believe in climate change activism as a way to resolve the climate crisis. On the other hand, excuses were more frequent for respondents who appreciated what movements were standing for and agreed with their goals and achievement. Interestingly, while the account types differed, most of the reasons backing them were similar as we will now see in the following paragraphs.

Several categorizations emerged from the data when applying our grounded theory process. One was the idea of having basic needs to deal with first, thus preventing participation. Things like pursuing a more stable life environment focusing on jobs, health, or better economy. Then there was a psychological aspect with concerns first towards families, home countries' problems, fear of Covid-19 and a lack of self-confidence regarding how meaningful their contribution would be if they were to participate. Lastly, there were mentions of a lack of interest and emotional connection to the subject making it less fulfilling than other topics. Coming from all this, the idea of a lack of time and having more prominent things than climate change to deal with became apparent, in combination with respondents bringing up once more powerlessness of individuals to change the situation. While these are all arguments which could apply to anyone, including native population in Sweden, some other elements specific to immigrants were added on top of them by respondents. Mentioning problems such as the language barrier, remoteness of loved ones, fear of deportation and the need to be entirely self-dependent.

Now if we try to analyze what we just mentioned in general terms, we will quickly be reminded of Maslow's hierarchy of needs (Kenrick et al., 2010). There were mentions of basic life needs and the means to pursue them but also references to higher level of the pyramid, bringing up things like belonging, esteem and finally self-actualization. What is interesting here is that different participants mentioned different levels of the pyramid depending on their own life-situations:

> *Asha: A lot of people struggle to be independent by themselves as immigrants. This is a big thing for us, moving from parent's house. The environmental crisis is the least of the priorities, and it should be. Otherwise, how do you survive in Sweden?*
>
> *Andrew: I think that is a huge factor. An immigrant in general has much more on his/her mind.*
>
> *Emma: I care about the environment, but I care about other things a lot more. Because it's not in my day to day, and it's not noticeable in my environment that is around me.*

This illustrates the concerns previously mentioned but also shows how in this part of the interview, the participants again started reflecting on themselves as immigrants instead of individuals. As they started this process, their expressions started to change as well. Making sentences that use more often "we" and "immigrants". They used their personal experiences to construct themselves separately from the local population. Therefore, excuses and justifications here were not given solely from an individual perspective but also as a representant of a group. Thus, here is an effective indicator of elements which can be tied back specifically to immigrants and not the general population.

Another aspect to their lack of participation is related to the perception mentioned previously that some see this problem as a bigger issue that cannot be treated on the individual level (powerlessness). It should instead be tackled by governments and industries: *"I think we individually can do little and its mostly the big countries and people in power who must do something." (Shahrzad).*

The lack of self-efficacy was also visible through the interviews and is one of the contradictions we can identify in the research. Indeed, all participants had some form of understanding of what climate change was, and had opinions and knowledge about its causes, as we saw previously. However, when asked about reasons for why they avoid participating, several of them who previously talked about the issue accurately mentioned they did not feel they had anything to say on the subject compared to natives to justify their non-involvement:

> *Saba: We don't have anything to say. Because we did not know about the environment, we are just learning.*
>
> *Shahrzad: We are learning now, it's something almost new for us.*

Finally, a couple of participants also mentioned fear of repression from participating in a movement as an immigrant which could have consequences on their residence status. This was not a commonly held opinion, probably because environmental movements are not known for being violent or heavily repressed by Sweden. Interestingly it was also brought up by Western European immigrants which agreed themselves that they were the least likely to be affected by that. Potentially this could also be because of how, if someone comes from harsher governed nations, they do not imagine that heavy repression against them could happen in a place like Sweden for talking about something as generally agreed on as climate change.

Mahin, our negative case, did relate to some of the concerns that were brought up in the focus groups but her conclusions differed: *"People without a right to stay can be excluded due to their difficult life, although I personally accept no excuses in this context, but it is somehow understandable, they come here, no job, no money, nothing." (Mahin).* It seems that her views on the importance of each individual contributing in the fight against the climate crisis increases massively the necessity to tackle the question for everybody, including herself. Indeed, it is clear to see that her reasons to participate is first and foremost that she is incredibly motivated by the subject. She used to be active even in her home country, and she continued with this in Sweden, despite the language barrier and having to travel for more than 30 km each friday to participate in the movement. However, other elements that she brought up are worth mentioning. When speaking about her participation she talked a lot about the social aspects, which she enjoyed. She used this to meet new people and make connections (both in her country and in Sweden) although it was difficult for her to join the group:

> *Mahin: As an outsider, it took so long for me to prove myself. I did not have any documents or resume, but had worked for five years, nevertheless they were reluctant at first. Actually, back home we had similar precautions. When someone new came, leaders scrutinized them for a couple of weeks to make sure they were not there just for taking some Instagram photos or flirting. But here it is more intense, and they are right to do so. If immigrants really love the environment, they can persist and prove themselves. Trust is built through honest work. We should not prejudge, immigrants have so many problems to deal with. A native Swede is secure in every way, but an immigrant struggles twice as much to get there. My friends at home now say I am lucky to be where I like and do what I want, but they also say it is only possible outside our home country, in developed countries.*

We can see here that she acknowledges the barriers being harder for immigrants as mentioned by members of the focus group, but unlike them she doesn't see it as unfair treatment but rather a necessary precaution which she is able to draw parallel to in her own experience back home. This implies that perceptions differ based on previous experiences, but one could also argue that there is a certain aspect of gate keeping in action here. Where, having made it herself, she ends up justifying behaviors she was subjected to. Finding the detailed cause would require more careful investigations as there could be many reasons behind this. Last point she brought was that participation is not remunerated:

> *Mahin: Economical and financial issues are of high priority. Less and less people volunteer. We did it for free, but now I see most people won't do something without money involved. We had to even pay for our commute, which sounds ridiculous to people now, they say we get nothing let alone we must pay, forget it! Attitudes have changed.*

She sees it as a reason why participation diminishes, arguing that people are getting more and more selfish, thinking about their own interests first. The fact that this came from the one negative case we have shouldn't be ignored, as this trait she identifies as a potential cause of non-participation is quite "negative" so it's not a surprise that the other interviewees (who do not participate as much) did not bring it up (no one calls himself selfish easily).

Throughout this entire section, we clearly see the theory of accounts in action where people offer various valid excuses and justifications as reasons for not participating based on the individual's life situation and views. Indeed, depending on the opinions of the respondents, answers given are considered acceptable, or not. Our negative case, for example, willingly excuses the Swedes who are making it difficult for newcomers, while she is more ambivalent with some claims other participants put forward. These are all examples of accounts being situational, with different participants perspective providing different reasons for their actions while criticizing the justifications and excuses others give. Putting this in perspective with the idea of blockers in Klandermans and Oegema (1987), we see that accounts on barriers to join movements varies based on the motivation of who is giving it and their acceptance depends on who is receiving it. Meaning that for extremely motivated people, even highly legitimate reasons for not joining can be refused. This could alienate people from joining environmental movements, seeing them as too elitist or contemptuous towards entire group of individuals.

Acceptance of immigrants by society

As we saw, when asked what the reasons were to participate or not in climate change activism, respondents gave a complex set of answers which drew on many of the points we mentioned so far, with the additional perspective of life as an immigrant. This brings us to our next category where we look at how immigrants view their relations with the society they joined, how they see their integration in said society and what effect can this have on their attitude towards climate change activism. Here, themes of cultural differences, uneasiness in society, lack of integration and segregation, all interact with each other, painting the picture of the immigrant population within their new adoptive country.

To start with, the subject of cultural differences between immigrants and Swedes was recognized by some participants as an aggravating element for their acceptance in society: *"They are cold! People here don't know their neighbors. They hide from them. Swedes need to learn how to be human." (Asha)*. Ironically, this cultural difference vis-à-vis the Swedes brought them together despite potentially having their own cultural differences with each other, since they themselves came from very different parts of the world. What is also interesting is that they identified the same specificities within Swedish culture as an obstacle for getting accepted in their personal lives there.

Stemming from this, a couple participants went a step further and shared feelings of unease when they were in situations where they had to interact with natives:

> *Rojan: My whole life has been like that. When there were clubs in schools, they were all middle class, white girls. They can be… not necessarily mean, but uninviting, cold… You wonder what I am doing here, and you don't get in. They don't understand your perspective.*

We see here that even though this participant grew up in Sweden, she sees herself as a foreigner in her own country. This is caused by that perception of cultural difference we mentioned before, bringing it as a direct reason for not participating in group activities in general. However, this is only one opinion related to the effect cultural differences can have on the attitude towards participation. Another respondent had a different view for instance and saw it as a failure not on the Swedish side being too "cold" but on immigrants not making enough efforts to integrate themselves in the new society they arrived in. What we see here is two sides

of the same coin, which, in this study, seems to follow along the interviewee's political inclinations but are also justifications for theirs or others behaviors.

One thing however on which all participants agreed, without necessarily mentioning cultural differences as the reason behind it, was the difficulty to join local organizations:

> *Asha: I didn't feel welcome and accepted by these. It's very cold to start with. It's taken as if it's your responsibility to be a part of it. It was difficult to "jam up" with them. It's difficult with Swedes to do anyway. Why would they invite somebody else?*
> *Andrew: Yeah, I went for one of the marches as a journalist. It was just a march, everyone was walking it was nice but… Everyone was with their group, no eye contact even. The main thing is Swedish segregation really...*

We can see here that the label *"Swedish segregation"* is used. It shows how strong this barrier is perceived by the participants. This concept was a common thread throughout all the interview groups, from start to finish. Some felt that they could not blend in the society and they had to figure out everything themselves without any help. Lots of them mentioned a lack of interest of Swedish society for their own culture and perspective.

In addition, all of them talked about how difficult it was to join, even on a personal level. In one instance, when a group was asked about having Swedish friends who might be participating in environmental actions, I received the following answer: *"Swedish friends? What is that? (**Everybody starts laughing**)"* (Stella).

Interestingly, this idea is perhaps the largest common denominator between all study participants. It is an identifying element shared by all, independently of age, gender, socio-economic situation, first or second-generation immigrant and even whether they participate in environmental movement or not. Besides, I don't think that this shared point of view came from focus group methodology where, sometimes, participant are influenced by each other and say things they wouldn't otherwise. It came naturally in the conversation from participants in each groups and was a topic that all of them had stories to contribute to.

While our negative case, Mahin did acknowledge the viewpoint: *"Well the Swedes are not completely willing to communicate with immigrants. They are hard-working and honest, but I*

know we behave as second-class citizens and have caused them trouble". (Mahin). She holds a more apologetic view of the local population's behavior, when compared to other interviewees. While previously, we saw she was keener on seeing herself as an outsider trying to join a group than as an immigrant trying to join Swedes, when she does identify as such, she still never voices anything negative towards the natives. While it would be pointless to try and come up with an exact reason for this opinion, maybe the fact she labels herself and disadvantaged immigrants in general as second class gives us a glimpse of her views on the reasons for Swedish segregation, arguing that some foreigners from developing countries are not as educated and capable as natives.

Overall we see here a total agreement from every participant that acceptance is an issue they are all facing, even when they had diverging views on other topics. With that said, while this is one of the points where everyone agreed, different respondents had different causes and justifications behind the problem. Overall, when combining this with the perception that environmental movements is a Swedish thing, we do get elements of answers about the reasons why some of them, particularly the ones who blame the natives for the segregation, choose to abstain. This might be a different story provided they had natives' friends who would act as connection in these groups, helping them break that barrier. One can also see that as an illustration of the second aspect of recruitment in our theoretical framework. This aspect states that not having been the target of mobilization attempts is a cause for non-participation in collective actions (Klandermans & Oegema, 1987). I would add here that it is not just a lack of outreach from natives but even a perceived rejection from them which is being touched upon here by our respondents. The combination of those two would definitely have very detrimental effect to mobilization of newcomers.

Opinions of immigrants about Sweden

As we just saw, respondents do feel a certain segregation in Sweden, but that is not the only element in their perception of that nation which influences their decisions for participation. Throughout the conversations, we saw that views on the country they live in had a strong impact on the reasons people gave regarding involvement in environmental activism. Many different aspects were brought forward during the conversations. Going from social and racial struggle, perceived attitudes between natives/non-natives and geopolitical opinions. For some participants these merged into an attitude of us versus them.

Starting with the analysis, class issues, came from a couple of respondents. When talking they would give description of the immigrant population and put it in opposition with Swedes, pointing out that in the all-encompassing term of "immigrants" many sub-populations existed who suffered from different levels of discrimination: *"I will have to differentiate between upper and lower-class. Person of color immigrant versus white expat. Big difference, especially in Sweden." (Rojan).* It is noteworthy that this was not brought forward by everyone. The two second generation participants were the ones who mentioned it the most. This could potentially mean that racism might be more imperceptible and subtle for outsiders who might miss its cues or could be simply too isolated from the general population to be affected by it.

Following this, a combination of negative emotions and attitudes were also brought up by some participants. However, it was seen as happening both ways: Immigrants felt a lack of trust and empathy combined with fear and in return would not trust or feel very sympathetic towards natives. It should be said though that these were seen partially as a factor of living in a modern society and not necessarily as racism from Swedes. These perceived traits then get somewhat mirrored to environmental movements by participants who associate them with Swedishness, diminishing their desire to join.

After that, a more "macro" level can be identified in the exchanges. Constructing the country itself, what it represents, how it acts and what it concerns itself with:

> *Saba: The other day they talked about CO2 emission, thinking it is necessary to reduce in Sweden, but why? You are already doing something with this, other countries are much worse.*
> *Andrew: Maybe also movements should focus more on Sweden repaying its climate debt to developing countries.*

Here Sweden is viewed as somewhat self-obsessed with the climate problem, potentially ignoring other issues or focusing too much on its domestic aspects. However, it can also be seen like the account participants give is not necessarily personal, but instead comes from a standard repertoire of excuses and justifications immigrants have when criticizing the country they moved to. Another related point was that some participants mentioned they wanted to do something elsewhere than in Sweden. Actions were not very beneficial here but might be more useful if done in their home countries for example. And indeed, for two of the participants they

had engaged in activism before, but in their native country. While this is not directed towards Sweden per se, it relates to the immigrants' opinion of how good things are here, making it potentially useless to do more, while other parts are much worse. Finishing with the macro theme, the question of dishonesty was brought forwards by participants who were studying or working with environment: *"For example bananas we get bananas here from different countries but the emission to produce them are not accounted here. It makes Sweden the good guy meeting its goals in the Paris agreement." (Asha)*.

All this culminates in some respondents rejecting the idea of local participation while their own countries have worst problem to deal with: *"Why would I work for Sweden when my country has more shit" (Asha)*. Sometimes, as we saw, justifying this rejection by arguing that Sweden is being dishonest or indifferent. Sometimes simply stating that they would prefer to act somewhere else. Also, I would add that these positions of unwillingness to help "locally" is related to the segregation previously mentioned. By feeling isolated from the locals, they do not see themselves as part of society, and therefore don't feel the need to be involved in it. If you feel rejected, you might not want to put extra efforts, and in turn you can start rejecting back: *"As long as these movements have only one concern (climate change) and ignore other serious challenges all over the world such as war, poverty, overpopulation, I have no interest in participating." (Farzin)*.

To close this theme, while the tone was overtly critical, it is crucial to keep in mind that it came from the responses they gave regarding their (and immigrants in general) reasons for lack of participation in climate change activism and is therefore not a full picture of opinions about their host country. This represents instead more an excuse not to participate actively in movements related to the climate crisis here, because the issue is not that critical and help would be more valuable elsewhere.

Suggestions to increase immigrants' participation in environmental movements

As we get to the end of the analysis, we will now be talking about what participants answered when asked about what could be done to get them more involved in defense of the environment, covering both how to change their opinions and get them more involved. Two themes emerged, one self-reflecting, talking about where they could improve or what was hindering them personally. The other, external, with immigrants needing to witness actions and changes from

society which would make them change their opinions and feel more concerned and integrated within it.

Engaging themselves more politically was something that only the two second generation immigrants brought up when asked what they could do for climate change. This means that despite the issues they have with Sweden, they see a stronger connection and responsibility to act on it when compared to others who only arrived recently. Another possible cause might be that they have a stronger sense of security here, making political involvement the next logical step to take to slow down climate change. This is different for newcomers who still have to build their entire lives and for which political action is not even imaginable yet while struggling with things like language, or residence permit.

In terms of self-analysis, the idea of taking more conscious decisions to limit climate effect came from several participants. The areas they thought about applying this idea to were very diverse, and the more well-off the respondents were, the broader the scope. Starting from things like ecological and local grocery shopping, buying sustainable and ethical second-hand clothes and product but even going as far as considering their entire profession and future employers impact in their decisions to accept a new role for instance. Similar to what we could expect from natives, the respondents who went furthest with this idea were the ones that had the privilege of choice and higher incomes. The wealthier participants were also the ones who brought ideas of online petitions and donations as a way to contribute against climate change. This is a solution for them to contribute without dedicating a large amount of time which they do not have or do not feel like using in that way. Using instead other resources at their disposal in order to, potentially, relieve them of guilt. Indeed, none of the participants who raised the idea of donations and petitions also spoke about feelings of culpability.

Interviewees also identified external factors that were affecting their individual propensity to participate in environmental activism. As we identified before, things like lack of time, conflicting priorities and too much pressure were part of their responses. The more a person suffered from them, the higher the need for a change before they could join. In this domain, one type of answer was particularly interesting about the need to see positive results from movements first: *"I don't need someone to convince me to join. Instead, I need the knowledge that if I join, it will change something" (Saba).* What is noteworthy here is how the responsibility is not put on the shoulder of others but rather on the immigrants getting

knowledge and assurance about the outcome of involvement in environmental movements. This can mean that, if movements were to try and reach immigrant population when talking about their actions and the results they have achieved, they could probably get more of them to participate. This reflects pretty well the findings of Klandermans and Oegema (1987) where they say that even if a movement's mobilization potential is extremely large with a strong consensus it can only go so far without proper recruitment networks targeting and reaching out to new recruits.

At the frontier between external and internal factor that would increase likeliness to join environmental movement was society investing more in the education of people and younger generations in particular. Previously we saw how respondents mentioned a difference in knowledge when compared with natives due to Swedes being exposed to the importance of the environment from a young age. They also associated this with their lower level of involvement as foreigners. Therefore, it was natural to suggest that better teaching of the subject would be a way to close the gap that they feel between the two population groups. Developing education about the climate crisis was actually the only suggestion our negative case provided, showing the current situation for her was only happening due to lack of information. She even went one step further and proposed this knowledge to be made mandatory to receive for foreigners. While she shared this viewpoint when asked about how to increase immigrant's participation in Sweden, we can assume that it is at least partially informed by her past experiences in her own country as well where she saw a general lack of interest and understanding on environmental subject. Therefore, it is not necessarily a matter of improving education on the topic here, but rather of making it more available for everyone, everywhere in the world.

Moving to suggestions about societal changes, the proposals were to make a more mixed society, but different people had different ways to go about it. Immigrants from a Western European background mentioned it as the need to get local friends who might be involved themselves. Then, this could in turn encourage them to join movements as a form of social activity they would share together. For non-European, this goes deeper and brings the idea of increasing representation in society in general, and these environmental organizations in particular, as something that would change the mentality of non-natives. This really shows that the barrier to participation that needs to be breached to join is higher the further the immigrant is geographically and culturally from the native population.

To finish this section and my analysis, I would highlight that reasons for reduced will and capacity to participate in climate change activism were not related to the environment or even movements in general. Although some questions were raised about usefulness of mobilization, these were more directed towards their local incarnations in Sweden. Additionally, the climate crisis was a fact that was both understood and accepted by every participant.

Instead, we saw, as one could expect, that the extra layers of hardship that immigrants must face in everyday life was an account often given for lack of participation. This is especially true if, unlike our negative case, you do not have very strong emotions towards fighting the crisis in the first place. The issue can also feel too overwhelming for individuals and fall more on the shoulders of governments and companies. However, one aspect that is completely specific to this population, and on which they all agreed, was how perception of the society and their place within it can influence immigrants' opinions and actions. Being subjected to segregation, they in turn somewhat reject it by deciding to avoid participating. This is exemplified often when speaking about doing or having done things for the environment, back "home". By this simple way of expressing it, they point out that Sweden is not their home and therefore they do not feel a responsibility to participate, particularly when they themselves feel ignored.

Concluding discussions

To start the discussion, I will talk about the qualitative aspect of my work. When doing this type of research, the main goal is to uncover new uninvestigated fields of interest. Results are meant to give a general idea of the subject and not a full final answer. For this reason, the study does not capture all imaginable profiles of immigrants in Sweden but rather, focuses on a significant slice of this population and uses it as a base to develop a sensible answer to the research questions. This is possible since, as we saw, results found were consistent between participants and the aim was restricted to immigrants identified as more likely to participate in activism in the first place. It was deemed preferable to concentrate on this group since the report aims to provide concrete ideas on how to improve participation. Therefore, targeting first individuals with more chances to join was the more logical thing to do.

Nevertheless, follow-up work should be conducted to further the research and elaborate the results, using different methodologies and broadening the sample. For instance, opinions that were shared were voiced on the spot and might not be complete, fully matured reflections of the beliefs held by participants. Therefore, it would be fruitful to present the results back to participants to get their feedback and develop the theory, as is often suggested in grounded theory approach. One could also contrast the results with analyses of the local native population and a larger spectrum of the immigrants' population, building on the findings from my negative case. All these would increase the robustness of the work and address plausible blind-spots such as people lacking any opinion about the issue or immigrants coming from different backgrounds and life-situations.

In terms of results, I will first speak of immigrants' views of the climate crisis. While interviewees all agreed and understood the effects of the climate crisis, the mentioned causes and responsibilities were less unanimous. There was a split between those who identified it as a large-scale unsolvable governmental and industrial issue and those who saw it as a shared responsibility stemming from modern lifestyle which could and should be dealt with by individuals. The latter group highlighted putting pressure on leaders and individual contributions as ways to improve the situation. They also did not mention any personal guilt and had a more hopeful outlook on the issue getting resolved. On the other hand, the former group did not see how their contributions could really change anything. The most prevalent shared negative emotions were guilt and despair. Overall, emotions acted as feedback loops

reinforcing beliefs and views of participants. Respondents showing hope that the climate crisis could be resolved were positively inclined to movements and talked about how their actions made them believe even more in a better future. Oppositely, when guilt and despair were prevalent, movements were seen as almost useless and the problem as unsolvable which reinforced these feelings further.

With all this we can say that the issue is understood, and responses do not hint at anything specific to their status as immigrants. One could expect likeminded attitudes and viewpoints in the native population, with similar effects on movement participation. Perhaps though, the ratio of who holds these opinions and who does not differ between local and foreign-born individuals, a hypothesis worth checking in the future using a quantitative research approach.

Moving on to the respondents' perspective on movements and activism, emotions also played an important role there. Doubts and resignation were seen in people who did not think movements helped much, while participants showing no signs of personal guilt were more positively disposed towards climate protestors. Some respondents also felt a disconnection between an emotionally loaded subject and the responses they saw in Swedish members of climate organizations. Lastly, some symbols to generate mobilization do not resonate in the same way for all non-natives as we saw with the example of Greta Thunberg. All this hints at the existence of an immigrant-specific problem regarding the formation of a mobilization potential. Although immigrants agree on the issue of climate change, there is a lack of motivation to participate because movements are not seen as an efficient way to respond to the crisis.

These perceptions on the climate crisis and environmental movements can be used as a starting point for an analysis of what is reducing immigrants' will and capacity to participate in climate change activism. The first motif mentioned by every participant was their personal situations. The respondents expressed a need to cover their basic needs first, getting a physically and psychologically stable situation. Sometimes this combined with insufficient interest or emotional connection with the subject which culminated into a perceived lack of time to allocate to address the problem personally. While these elements are also relatable for natives, their significance is arguably scaled up for foreigners and accumulate with other obstacles like language, remoteness of close ones and sometimes, concerns about expulsion. However, our

negative case helped identify that, just like for locals, occasionally individuals who are highly motivated by climate change, can overcome these barriers and participate.

Another aspect that should not be ignored when questioning participation numbers is the hardship of integrating in a new culture and population as an immigrant. All respondents talked about it as a problem encountered both in the country in general and movements in particular. In addition, a perceived lack of interest from the native's side in their own identity as immigrants discouraged them from putting extra efforts in surpassing these obstacles. The source behind these points can be segregation and racism, but also, cultural differences. Drawing from my personal experiences living here, I feel that Swedes tend to avoid singling out others by putting them on the spotlight and avoid sensitive topics in general, all of which can be felt as deliberately ignoring people that are different. I argue that these difficulties, independently of where they came from, have a real negative impact on the will of immigrants to get involved. In some case, it can even snowball into complete rejection of the idea of participating politically in Sweden, transforming it into an us versus them situation.

In this final section, I propose several ideas and changes based on the responses of the study participants, integrating their experiences to improve participation rates of immigrants in environmental activism in Sweden. Using them, civil society organization might be able to diversify their base and bolster their numbers, forming a more accurate picture of the country's population. Thus, giving more weights to their demands by representing a larger group of people. From a governmental and political perspective, some of these suggestions can improve immigrants' integration in the local population by becoming active members of community life through movement participation. Increasing climate movement participation more specifically would help achieve national goals set in terms of environmental footprint by making more inhabitants active towards them. All these would also concurrently increase overall political engagement in the population, allowing better policy making for a more diverse and larger group of people.

First of all, mobilization potentials should be addressed. Diffusing in the immigrant population the knowledge on what benefits and achievements were obtained via environmental activism. Possibly highlighting gains which can relate to their specificities as immigrants or their home countries, contradicting the impression that movements are not working for them. Propagating this information in locations (virtual or physical) that are associated with non-native groups.

This ties into the need to create and activate recruitment networks for this population which currently seem almost inexistent. For that, the first step would be to achieve better awareness of the nuances between the local culture and various immigrants. Bridging this gap is necessary to make participants more comfortable and increase mutual understanding. One way to do so is by making or using personal connections with potential recruits in the immigrant population who are already concerned by the ongoing crisis. Relying on their pre-existing sensibilities on environmental questions as an ice breaker. It could also happen by connecting to specific immigrants' organizations, getting familiar with their struggles, searching for aligned concerns. An even stronger sign would be to have role-model representation with members in leadership position coming from an immigration background alongside symbols resonating with a wider range of people.

Lastly, long-term efforts should be made in order to both improve motivation to participate in activism and remove barriers encountered as these two usually affect each other. For these matters, concrete solutions are more complex to put in place as they require political will and power. Anything that would facilitate life of the immigrant population, alleviating the pressure felt for basic sustenance could have a positive effect. Emphasis on education about environment in programs targeting immigrants would also help develop motivation to participate in climate activism (developing further existing elements in Swedish For Immigrants language class as an example).

Acknowledgements

References

All European Academies. (2017). *The European code of conduct for research integrity.* Berlin: ALLEA - All European Academies. Retrieved from https://www.allea.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/ALLEA-European-Code-of-Conduct-for-Research-Integrity-2017.pdf

Carey, M., & Smith, M. W. (1994). Capturing the Group Effect in Focus Groups: A Special Concern in Analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 4*(1), 123-127. doi:10.1177/104973239400400108

de Moor, J., Uba, K., Wahlström, M., Wennerhag, M., & de Vydt, M. (2020). *Protest for a future II: Composition, mobilization and motives of the participants in Fridays For Future climate protests on 20-27 September, 2019, in 19 cities around the world.* doi:10.17605/OSF.IO/ASRUW

De Rooij, E. A. (2012). Patterns of Immigrant Political Participation: Explaining Differences in Types of Political Participation between Immigrants and the Majority Population in Western Europe. *European Sociological Review, 28*(4), 455-481.

Dierckx de Casterlé, B., Gastmans, C., Bryon, E., & Denier, Y. (2012). QUAGOL: a guide for qualitative data analysis. *International journal of nursing studies, 49*(3), 360-371. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2011.09.012

Emigh, R. J. (1997). The Power of Negative Thinking: The Use of Negative Case Methodology in the Development of Sociological Theory. *Theory and Society, 26*(5), 649-684.

Fern, E. F. (1982). The Use of Focus Groups for Idae Generation: The Effects of Group Size, Acquaintanceship, and Moderator on Response Quantity and Quality. *Journal of Marketing Research, 19*(1), 1-13. doi:10.2307/3151525

Festinger, L. (1962). Cognitive dissonance. *Scientific American, 207*(4), 93-107. doi:10.1038/scientificamerican1062-93

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research.* New Brunswick and London: Routledge.

Hadden, J. (2015). *Networks in Contention: The Divisive Politics of Climate Change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781316105542

IPCC. (2018). *Global warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels.* Press. Retrieved from https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/

Jasper, J. M. (2011). Emotions and Social Movements: Twenty Years of Theory and Research. *Annual Review of Sociology, 37*, 285-303.

Jasper, J. M., & Poulsen, J. D. (1995). Recruiting Strangers and Friends: Moral Shocks and Social Networks in Animal Rights and Anti-Nuclear Protests. *Social Problems, 42*(4), 493-512. doi:10.2307/3097043

Karlsson, M. (2019). Protestens röster: En kvantitativ studie av utrikesfödda demonstrationsdeltagare i Sverige. *Södertörns högskola, Institutionen för samhällsvetenskaper, Sociologi.* Retrieved from sh.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A1391800

Kenrick, D. T., Griskevicius, V., Neuberg, S. L., & Schaller, M. (2010). Renovating the Pyramid of Needs: Contemporary Extensions Built Upon Ancient Foundations. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*(3), 292-314. doi:10.1177/1745691610369469

Klandermans, B., & Oegema, D. (1987). Potentials, Networks, Motivations, and Barriers: Steps Towards Participation in Social Movements. *American Sociological Review, 52*(4), 519-531. doi:10.2307/2095297

Kleres, J., & Wettergren, Å. (2017). Fear, hope, anger, and guilt in climate activism. *Social Movement Studies, 16*(5), 507-519. doi:10.1080/14742837.2017.1344546

Marlon, J. R., Bloodhart, B., Ballew, M., Rolfe-Redding, J., Roser-Renouf, C., Leiserowitz, A., & Maibach, E. (2019). How Hope and Doubt Affect Climate Change Mobilization. *Frontiers in Communication, 4*, 20. doi:10.3389/fcomm.2019.00020

Morgan, D. L. (1996). Focus Groups. *Annual Review of Sociology, 22*, 129-152.

Ribeiro, N., Malafaia, C., Neves, T., Ferreira, P. D., & Menezes, I. (2015). Constraints and opportunities for civic and political participation: perceptions of young people from immigrant and non-immigrant background in Portugal. *Journal of Youth Studies, 18*(6), 685-705. doi:10.1080/13676261.2014.992307

Scott, M. B., & Lyman, S. M. (1968). Accounts. *American Sociological Review, 33*(1), 46-62. doi:10.2307/2092239

Sussman, S., Burten, D., Dent, C., Stacy, A., & Flay, B. (1991). Use of Focus Groups In Developing an Adolescent Tobacco Use Cessation Program: Collective Norm Effects. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21*, 1772-1782. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1991.tb00503.x

Turner, B. A. (1981). Some practical aspects of qualitative data analysis: One way of organising the cognitive processes associated with the generation of grounded theory. *Quality and Quantity, 15*(3), 225-247. doi:10.1007/BF00164639

van Deth, J. W. (2014). A conceptual map of political participation. *Acta Politica, 49*(3), 349-367. doi:10.1057/ap.2014.6

van Stekelenburg, J., Klandermans, B., & van Dijk, W. W. (2011). Combining motivations and emotion: The motivational dynamics of protest participation. *International Journal of Social Psychology, 26*(1), 91-104. doi:10.1174/021347411794078426

Ward, V. M., Bertrand, J. T., & Brown, L. F. (1991). The Comparability of Focus Group and Survey Reults: Three Case Studies. *Evaluation Review, 15*(2), 266-283. doi:10.1177/0193841X9101500207