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I. Introduction

Non-governmental organisations and civil society is often perceived as pillars of modern democracy. Organising citizen interests, they allow for political organisation outside of the once a few years-election day, they provide policy makers with important input, and may possess crucial specific knowledge about specific issues. Traditionally the nation state has been the arena for influence for non-governmental organisations; locally, and nationally, the domestic political actors have been subject to citizens influence. Sweden has a vibrant civil society and although no longer as profound, it is known for the corporatist model allowing for NGO:s to actively participate and contribute to the political processes (Möller, 2009:1).

But the political arena is changing. The nation state is increasingly becoming one of many political arenas, rather than the only existing one. The EU and the solidification of international institutions provide arenas to influence beyond the national arena. For some organisations, such as those concerned with education or social welfare, the nation state may very well remain the most appropriate arena to influence; for others, the supranational arenas are increasingly controlling the policy outcome. This is especially true for environmental organisations. Climate and environment has of course always been a global issue, but in the last few decades the emergence of potent supranational arenas may create incentives to influence the global policy process as well. In other words, environmental organisations are inevitably confronted with need to operate in a context of multi-level governance.

For Swedish organisations the most immediate supranational arena is the European Union, a powerful and profiled actor within climate change issues and with extensive control to construct climate and environmental policies. Furthermore, international arenas with significant political control also increase, such as the annual meeting of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), where states come together to make decisions in regards to prevention of climate change.

But are the supranational arenas comparable to the traditional nation state? Many theorists note the difficulties that domestic organisations may face on the supranational arenas. The EU, for example, will favour certain kinds of organisations but prove inaccessible for others. The global actors may be incredibly resource demanding in terms of staff, time and finances of the
organisations, and the supranational arenas are consistently associated to the so called business bias; interest groups representing fossil, transport and industrial sectors, perceived as directly opposed to environmental organisations are given substantial influence in the policy process (Beyers, Eising and Maloney, 2008:1111; Poloni-Staudinger, 2008:551).

Furthermore, influencing is affected by a dilemma; to be able to influence the supranational arenas, organisations must seem credible and reliable. They must show an understanding of a perhaps slow process, as well as having knowledge about complex issues. But in order to get support and resources, organisations will have to get the attention of the public. To rouse and get the attention of the public, fast, simple and accessible strategies are needed, such as demonstrating or manifestations (Beyers, 2004:) - directly opposed to the need to profile credibility. This trade-off is too something all organisations must consider.

The question that emerges is if, how and why domestic environmental non-governmental organisations (ENGO:s) are adapting to the multi-level context in which the climate change issue is resolved. The domestic and supranational arenas shared control over the issue may provide several influence points to operate and promote for ENGO:s, but the arenas may also prove to be inaccessible - consequently undermining the democratic role that civil society may play in modern society. There is thus the need to understand the role of how organisations may operate in the logic of multi-level context.

1.2 Aim and purpose
The purpose of this study is to investigate the problem introduced above, and contribute to and expand the current research of multi-level interest representation. The qualitative design may contribute and expand current research dents, in a research field often characterized by quantitative studies. By exploring the Swedish ENGO:s activities and capabilities to influence, the study may also contribute to inspire further studies as well as providing important knowledge to the civil society itself.

The question that will guide the study is
Where, how and why do Swedish ENGO:s organisations operate in order to promote their goals?

This study intends to investigate how domestic environmental organisations are operating to promote their goals in a multi-level context, guided by the three dimensions of multi-level influence; where, how and why. Where are organisations active - the domestic or the supranational arena? How are they trying to influence these arenas - what strategies are they using, and are the strategies used suitable for the arenas targeted? And finally, why are they choosing to promote their goals on the arenas that they do - can ideological foundations of the organisation affect the choice of influencing arena? In other words, this study investigates the logic influence in a multi-level context in relation to domestic ENGO:s.

These questions are investigated in a qualitative case study of 6 Swedish ENGO:s, by conducting semi-structured interviews with representatives of the organisations, where the three dimensions of multi-level influence are explored. The qualitative design may contribute with more precisioned understanding of NGO:s strategic usage towards domestic or supranational actors, and further, expand the current relatively limited research field Swedish civil society from a multi level context approach.

1.3 Disposition

Following this section, an overview of previous literature is presented, followed by the theoretical framework of this study, showing and elaborating the several dilemmas of interest group influence on supranational arenas presented in the introduction. The next section covers on the methods, the cases included, and introduces the analytical framework of the study. Next, the results are presented and analysed. Finally, key findings and conclusions are discussed.

2. Previous literature and theoretical framework

In this section I present the theoretical foundation of the study, starting by presenting an overview of previous research on the subject. Next, I introduce the relevant theoretical
framework that will guide analysis, including several dilemmas organisations are confronted with that might affect the capabilities of multi-level influence.

2.1 Previous research of interest representation in the supranational context

Interest representation refers to the inclusion of non-state actors in the policy process carried out in different governance arenas. The research of multi-level interest representation is an increasingly studied area, which mainly focuses on the European Union as well as to some extent influencing towards UNFCCC (see for example de Moor, 2018).

Generally, it is differentiated between so called specific interest groups and so called diffuse interest groups. Specific or industrial groups refers to interest representation of companies, industries and other financial interests, while diffuse interests refers to groups representing broader public and citizen interests, ranging from social issues to food safety regulation, including environmental groups as well (Hix & Hoyland, 2012:183). As the EU explicitly encourages and welcomes interest representation, it is sometimes theorized that the vibrant civil society of the EU might remediate the democratic deficit of the union often mentioned (Beyers, Eising and Maloney, 2008:1111).

However, while encouraging interest representation and participation of NGO:s in the policy process, the EU is often described as biased towards specific kinds of groups and interest. Numerous theorists have for example often noted that the EU interest representation tends to be heavily biased toward economic interest groups (Beyers, Eising and Maloney, 2008:1111). Others note that the EU and other supranational arenas do try to include both economic and diffuse interests, but that certain kinds of organisations are favoured. The approach from the EU is generally to include orderly, institutionalized and representative participation, rather than radical or less formalized groups (Poloni-Staudinger, 2008:356). The implications are that resourceful, formalized and established groups of both diffuse and specific interests are those that are the most active beyond the nation state. (Hix & Hoyland, 2011:185).

Much of the research regarding multi level interest representation of domestic NGO:s is quantitative and comparative in nature, favouring large EU member states such as France, the
United Kingdom or Germany (Saurugger, 2013:338). Research of Swedish interest representation of NGO:s beyond the nation state is growing but still relatively limited. Recent studies show that many organisations only have a limited level of European influencing. Scaramuzzino and Wennerhags study *Vägen till Europa: Det svenska civilsamhället och EU* (2017:151-183) find that few Swedish civil society organisations are represented in the EU, nor do they actively try to influence the European institutions. In the cases representation do occurs, organisations with resources that perceive the EU as a relevant arena (Scaramuzzino & Wennerhag, 2017:183). However, this quantitative study is focused on social organisations, which, as will be noted below, may not be expected to act beyond the nation state.

### 2.2 Why engage on the Supranational Arena?

So what makes NGO:s reach beyond domestic institutions to target supranational arenas? As noted above, there is no question of the global nature of climate change and environmental issues. Thus, there seems to be a pull effect to influence European and supranational arenas.

The idea that organisations will engage in arenas where their policy issue is decided is often an essential assumption of many theorists (Lowery, 2007:31). According to this view, we should hypothesize that environmental organisations should be organised at supranational arenas. In other words, the supranational arena’s control and power over the climate change issue creates a pull-effect for organisations. However, previous research also indicate that there seems to be several additional factors that might shape the activity on supranational arenas and even create push-effects from the organisations point of view.

Poloni-Staudinger (2008) notes that the pull-effect of the EU is not the only important part in explaining supranational activity. Instead, Poloni-Staudinger argues, the domestic opportunity structures play a great role in being push-effects as well. In his study of French, UK and German environmental groups, Poloni-Staudinger argues that if the groups already feel that they can reach representation at home the level of supranational action will decrease. Conversely, if the opportunity structure of the nation state is closed, the groups will try to bypass their national government and European action will increase (Poloni-Staudinger, 2008:551). Again, as the EU
will favour well-established and orderly organisations, the ones that will be able to by-pass national governments are those who are able to adapt and navigate these demands.

Further elaborating the supranational arenas demand of interest participation in an orderly fashion, Berny and Rootes (2016) notes that not only the preferences of the arenas may determine if organisations reach beyond the nation state. Instead, organisations ideological direction may also matter when deciding appropriate action. As the environmental issues become more and more emergent, and action fall short of the supranational legislation and efforts, environmental organisations are facing of the dilemma to either adapt to the demands of the supranational arenas or promote far the more radical action they might perceive needed (Berny & Rootes 2016:957f). In other words, not only mat the supranational arenas favour certain kinds of organisations, organisations may also favour arenas, depending on the ideological basis that guides the organisations work. If they wish to adapt and navigate to the demands of institutional and orderly participation, they might seek influence beyond domestic arenas. If they can not, however, due to for example radical ideologies or methods, they might instead perceive supranational arenas as irrelevant. Berny and Rootes thus notes that ENGO:s face the dilemma of compromise or to promote the action needed (2016:968f).

**2.3 How to reaching Influence on Supranational Arenas?**

There seems then to exist both incentives and hindrances to engage beyond the nation state. To reconnect to the multi-level nature of environmental policy, we can assume that organisations identify supranational arenas as relevant arenas to influence. What are organisations actually doing? What strategies are to their disposal when trying to influence a multi-level issue?

Interest groups can generally choose to either use inside or outside lobbying when trying to influence policy processes. Inside lobbying means that the group seeks to influence policy process from within, while outside strategies influence policy processes through the public. Furthermore, these approaches may be further defined as *access* and *voice*-strategies. These are separated from each other in the way that information from the interest groups are transmitted. *Access* is achieved by a group if they transmit information directly to the policy makers (Beyers 2004: 213) *Voice* is achieved if a group transmits information to policy makers through the
strategies used by organisations that aim to achieve either of these influence positions (Beyers 2004: 213f).

Access strategies takes place out of the public eye and influences several types of influencing with the common denominator that the direct contact is present between policy process and group. This may be functioning as consultants, seats in expert committees, being present in implementation processes, and so on. Voice strategies on the other hand are strategies that are directed to the policy process through the public, and means that the groups are trying to influence public opinion and activity. These are further separated into information politics and protest politics; the first referring to activities that make information about an issue available to the public, such as information campaigns, debate articles. Protest politics refers to the radical, distinct and direct strategies aimed to gain the direct attention of the media and the public through direct action and protest, demonstrations and manifestations. (Beyers, 2004: 213f).

2.3.1 The Dilemma of Voice and Access

Both these strategies may influence policy, but access and voice achievement does not refer to actual influence. Achievement does not mean that the policy process will go in the direction that the organisations wish. It simply means that the strategies are used successfully, gaining direct or indirect contact to policymakers. By using voice-strategies, the group can influence the public discourse and in length the political agenda and alert policy makers to the opinions of the electorate. Voice is also necessary for organisations to get support, members and perhaps finances, depending on how resources are accumulated. Access strategies on the other hand gives the opportunity to directly influence the policy processes. Both of these are this powerful tools of interest groups (Bindekrantz & Pedersen, 2016: 305).

However, access strategies are understood as being the most effective for creating greater influence possibilities. Access achievement obviously means that the organisations may directly change or influence actual legislation. This means that in order to reach a political goal the organisations should be more inclined to reach access. The possibility to actually influence the policy process will simply be greater if a group has access (Binderkrantz & Pedersen, 2016: 306). But - civil society organisations are not driven simply by influential goals. Instead they are
subject to a dilemma. In order to gain access, they need a voice. As environmental organisations are not financial groups nor have personal interests, they need to profile themselves as a relevant actor to the policy makers. They are thus also driven by a survival goal; they need to be alive and recognized by a diffuse and broad public or constituency to be relevant. Paradoxically, this survival goal may lead to the opposite perception by policy makers. Diffuse organisations will need to use voice strategies that necessarily include formulating a complex problem in such a way that a broad public will care. The problem needs to be easy to access and understand (Beyers, Eising & Maloney, 2009: 1115). As Beyers puts it, “demonstrators can shout only a few slogans” (Beyers 2004: 214). The following result may be that they become far too radical or are perceived as outsiders or too unreliable by policy makers - and their chances of gaining access (i.e. actual influence) is decreased. Thus, Beyers argues, not only do resources or the pull effects of the supranational arenas matter when NGOs seek influence; they must also navigate the dilemma of voice and access, as well as the giant task of gaining public support from a supranational constituency (Beyers 2004: 217).

2.4 Summary of theoretical framework

When taking into account the observations described above made by Poloni-Staudinger (2008), Berny and Rootes (2016) and Beyers (2004) and Beyers, Eising and Maloney (2008), there are then several implications of the logic of multi-level influencing that NGO:s must consider. To summarize, supranational arenas tend to favour orderly, established and formalized organisations. These organisations are also more likely to have public support and acknowledgement needed to profile themselves as credible and legitimate. Groups that do not gain access will instead use voice strategies in order to gain public support - which will undermine their ability to reach access. Furthermore, if organisations are too focused on access strategies, they might become unattractive for the public, leading them to become tangential as NGOs. Moreover, Berny and Rootes (2016) suggests that not only may the arenas push-or-pull factors; organisations themselves may in turn favour or avoid certain arenas depending on the ideological direction of the organisation. Radical or perifer organisations may not identify the supranational arenas as a plausible ally, thus avoiding certain arenas.
The study of interest representation in the multi-level system that the European and international political institutions provides is a growing research field. As non-governmental groups may struggle in this landscape to continue playing a relevant role in the policy processes there is no current agreement about what actually determines ENGO:s operating abilities. While similar case studies have been carried out by scholars in large EU member states, these have often had a quantitative approach, as well as rarely focusing on Swedish cases. This means that there is a lack of knowledge of how organisations actually form and perceive their influence and the strategies used. Scaramuzzino and Wennerhags study (2017) is focused on organisations that according to the research included in this study should not be expected to engage beyond the domestic arena. By using the theoretical framework introduced, building on and using the previous research, I aim to contribute to this growing research field with a qualitative approach, as well as perhaps find motivations or justifications not visible in the quantitative study approach that characterize this field.
3. Design and methods

In this section the cases included for the study are presented, followed by the methodological choices of the study. Then, the analytical framework that guides the analysis is presented, based on the theoretical framework where, how and why.

3.1 Case selection and respondents

In order to investigate where, how and why Swedish ENGO:s are, the population of Swedish ENGO:s needs to be defined. The definition of the population is deliberately wide, as civil society organisations is very diverse, showcasing diversity in organisational structure, resources, membership status, profitability, connection to umbrella organisations, or ideology and policy goals. Allowing for maximal variation in possible cases is crucial for interview studies. (Esaiasson et al, 2015:269). The population definition excludes highly specialized organisations directed towards local or regional matters such as preservation of specific nature reserves or other clearly locally resolved issues. This does not mean that organisations in this study does not work with these matters, but rather, that they also explicitly work with climate change and broader environmental issues. Furthermore, the case definition excludes organisations on behalf of political parties or governmental bodies. Finally, the organisations have national boards or networks. By defining the population within the above borders, the selection allows for a wide variety of organisations to be included, thus aiming to reach maximal variation.

Based on the above definition, 13 organisations were contacted. In the end a convenience based selection approach was used, where 6 organisations responded and were able to participate. While in no way providing a complete picture of the ENGO:s in Sweden, the variation of the included cases still makes the case selection relevant to contribute to expanding the knowledge of the research field. Below follows a short overview of the included organisations:

Greenpeace Sweden is a national unit, part of Greenpeace Nordic, which in turn are fractions of Greenpeace International, a global organisation with units in 39 regions or countries. The relationship between the international and regional units is flexible and allows for independency. Common, long-term goals are decided that all units are expected to follow, while shorter term
strategies and campaigns are designed on regional or local levels (Respondent, Greenpeace Sweden, 2019-04-16). The respondent from Greenpeace Sweden is campaign leader, responsible to lead and formulate the campaigns carried out by Greenpeace Nordic.

*Friends of the Earth Sweden* (abbreviated as FoES) is a domestic unit, part of the international organisation Friends of the Earth (FoE) with national and regional units in 74 countries, including FoE Europe. Like Greenpeace general goals are jointly decided, while each regional or national unit in turn are free to formulate independent, specific goals and campaigns (Respondent, FoES, 2019-05-13). The respondent from FoES works with several things in the organisation, but is mainly responsible for international relationships with sister organisations.

*Klimataktion* is a Swedish organisation with several local groups, working with several campaigns regarding climate change (Respondent, Klimataktion, 2019-04-26). The respondent from Klimataktion is spokesperson for the organisation and a long-term active member.

*Fossil Free Sweden* (not to be confused with Fossilfritt Sverige, which is a government initiative) is an activist organisation, working do “divest” Loosely connected to the activist network 350, they work according to common goals, although with very high independency. The respondent is active in a local group active at a university and in the national mobilization unit.

*Fältbiologerna* is a youth organisation with members up to 26 years of age. The organisation also functions as a youth organisation to Naturskyddsföreningen, but is independent with own bylaws, members and activities (Respondent, Fältbiologerna, 2019-04-18). The organisation works with both broad climate change issues and biodiversity. The respondent is president of the organisation.

*Push Sweden* is a youth organisation with members up to 26 years of age with a decentralized structure (Respondent Push Sweden, 2019-05-14). The respondent is president of the organisation.

Essential for the purpose of this study is the centrality of the respondents, meaning the respondents relevance and knowledge about the matter (Esaiasson et al 2015:267). All respondents are active in the national boards and activities of the respective organisation, and can thus be expected to be highly knowledgeable of the issues the study intends to investigate.
3.2 The semi-structured interview method

The question guiding this study is *where, how and why do Swedish ENGO:s operate in order to promote their goals?* These questions calls for a case study approach, in which semi-structured interview method was deemed as the most appropriate to use. The interview method is useful when approaching material not previously researched, when looking for motivations and when aiming to find material relating to processes not visible to outsiders (Esaiasson et al, 2015:272). As these motivations to why and how strategies are formed, as well as access strategies that naturally are taking place out of the public eye, the interview method was decided as beneficial over textual analysis. Moreover, the interview method was most suitable in order to gain uniformity in the material. As the organisations are highly diverse, this also means that the available textual material is too. Some organisations are providing elaborate reports and statements that could be used for textual analysis, while others are less formalized and provide less textual material. The interview method thus makes it possible to include organisations that otherwise would be excluded.

The interview guide was structured and inspired by the theoretical framework of arenas and strategic usage presented in section 2. Used as guidance with open-ended questions as fundamental, the interview guide allows for flexibility and spontaneity, as well as openness towards findings not properly included in the theoretical framework. View Appendix A for interview guide. The interviews were conducted in Swedish and translated into English. For original quotes, view appendix B. The respondents chose where to meet. Two interviews were conducted at cafés, one at the organisation’s office, and two were held by phone due to unavailability of the respondents. All respondents agreed to be used by name, which was later changed to increase readability, and to be recorded for transcription.

When using the semi-structured interview method the interviewer will inevitably influence the respondents, whether through the questions asked or by attributes with the interviewer (Esaiasson et al, 2015:243). Although not investigating personal or sensitive subjects, reflexivity may still be important to comment on. The respondents may still have adapted or unconsciously answered in ways that I as a researcher influenced. Some problems encountered were respondents not understanding a certain question, and apologizing for giving what they thought
were dull or uninteresting answers. This may indicate an ambition to answer according to their perception of my intentions. However, generally all respondents felt confident in their answers, honest when they felt that they could not give an answer, and eager to correct and nuance misunderstandings or simplifications from my part.

3.3 Analytical framework

Moving on from the method, this section elaborates on the analytical framework was constructed. Based and inspired by the theoretical framework of this study, the analytical framework is based on the three dimensions of the research question; where, how, and why organisations operate in a multi-level context.

3.3.1 Operationalisation

*Where to influence* means that there are either the domestic arena or the supranational arena available influence. The domestic arena is understood as domestic actors, including domestic government, parliament, politicians, media and citizens, as well as additional domestically based actors. The supranational arena primarily includes European arena, understood as European institutions and actors, European politicians and the EU citizens. The supranational arena may also include global actors operating on a global scale, such as the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the COP. The supranational arenas of European and International arena are connected due to the few international actors that may be subject to influence; the European arena continues to be the most immediate and expected arena to be targeted.

*How to influence* is based on Beyers distinction of voice and access-strategies. *Access* is understood as the presence of direct contact between interest groups and a political arena (Bindekrantz and Pedersen, 2016:307), meaning, the direct transmission of information from interest group to decision makers (Beyers, 2004:214). *Access strategies* is thus choices of action aimed to reach direct contact with decision makers, but do not necessarily mean that access is present. *Voice* is understood as interest group choice of action that influence the policy process
indirectly by changing the opinion of the public on an issue (Beyers, 2004:214). *Voice strategies* thus include actions that gain the attention of the public in several ways. Voice strategies can be separated into information politics and protest politics. Information politics refers to public presentation of information, such as organisations holding a press conference or writing debate articles (Beyers, 2004:214), with protest strategies referring to “explicit staging of events in order to attract attention” (Beyers, 2004:214), such as demonstrations or protests.

The analytical framework thus intends to analyse the organisation's activities in four dimensions; domestic voice strategies, domestic access strategies, supranational voice strategies and supranational access strategies.

*Domestic voice strategy* usage is indicated through descriptions of information or protest strategies directed to citizens, media as well as activities with the aim of gaining support and attention. These may include organising demonstrations, civil disobedience actions, writing debate articles or other activities directed towards the public.

*Domestic access strategy* usage is indicated through descriptions of activities aimed to achieve access, such as formal or informal contacts with policy makers. These may include directly contacting politicians, governmental bodies, parties or in other ways targeting actors within the policy process.

*Supranational voice strategy* is indicated through descriptions of information or protest strategies directed to European public, global public, international media as well as activities with the goal of gaining support and attention from the European and/or global public. These may include organising or participating in transnational demonstrations and campaigns, debate articles directed to the European policies, or additional activities directed to influence the European or global public.

*Supranational access strategy* usage is indicated through descriptions of activities such as informal or formal contacts with European or global policy makers, including European and/or global institutions, European institutions, members or the European parliament, European administration, or additional European or global policy makers.

To summarize the analytical framework guiding the analysis of the organisation's activities of where and how influence takes place, may be visualised as followed:
Finally, why do organisations operate on their chosen arenas? Based on the dilemma between adapting to reformism and radicalism suggested by Berny and Rootes (2016), this question is explorative, seeking to investigate if ideological grounds or perceptions occurs in the material that may influence choices to act on certain arenas. Indicators of why operating occurs include positive or negative attitudes linked to certain arenas, or ideological motivations to influence on either arenas.

### 3.4 Summary of analytical framework

To summarize, the analytical framework concerning where and how organisations are operating in multi-level context is heavily guided by Beyers distinction of voice and access, with the dimensions of domestic or supranational arenas is combined with the dimensions of voice and access. Additionally the analysis concerning why organisations are operating in a multi level context is included, although less extensive, allowing for an explorative approach to the material. The analytical framework was used extensively when categorizing and coding the transcripted interviews.
4. Results

In this section the results of 6 interviews conducted with representatives from the organisations is presented. The analysis is structured according to the analytical tool, presenting the domestic and supranational arenas separately, linking strategic usage to each arena. Corresponding quotes are added to clarify or exemplify. After this, additional strategies are presented, followed by ideological indications and perceptions present in the material. Lastly, key findings are summarized, followed by a discussion theoretical framework is included.

4.1 The importance of the domestic arena

There is no doubt that the domestic arena remains the main arena of influence for the organisations in this study. While all being aware of the global nature of climate change and its solutions, no organisation were exclusively active on supranational arenas. Below I present the strategies used to influence domestic actors.

4.1.2 How do they engage on the domestic arena - voice or access?

Domestic arenas are made up of numerous possible actors to influence. The actors named as important to influence varies from government, governmental bodies, members of parliament, parties to universities and to media and citizens. Companies are frequently targeted as well. All organisations in the study reported that voice strategies were elementary when seeking to influence. All organisations states that they want to affect and influence the public opinion. The voice strategy usage described includes both information and protest strategies; either meant to gain attention about an issue or spread information about an issue, both categorized as being directed towards the public. Organisations name a variety of activities and combinations of activities of both strategies, and often perceives them as having the same purpose - to inform and increase the public’s awareness of an issue. This is for example evident in the statement from
Fältbiologerna: “We arrange many demonstrations and manifestations. We want to make people aware and to understand”

One organisation that associates itself with extensive voice strategy usage is Fossil Free Sweden. Its activities are directed to the organisation's main actors of choice; the universities and the Nobel Foundations, in order to stop investments in fossil industries. Activities described include spreading posters and pamphlets, as well as more pronounced protest strategies such as demonstrating during doctoral award ceremonies, or symbolic protests such as placing blindfolds on a statue of Geijer along with signs informing about the Uppsala University investments in fossil sector. Another action the respondent mentions is a “Twitter storm”, directed towards Uppsala University, tweeting up to 4000 tweets during an hour.

The voice strategies are the main methods that Fossil Free Sweden uses to put pressure on the institutions they wish to influence. This is partly because they are not reaching access, but is also conveyed as an intentional strategy:

“We are not inside! We don’t help to do “how”. People might say like “oh so what should we invest in instead?” But we don’t want to be too helpful in issues like that. We can’t really advertise for companies like that.”

In other words, Fossil Free Sweden may be actively choosing to influence through voice strategies rather than voice. Later, the respondent phrases Fossil Free Sweden's influence ideology like this:

“The most important thing for Fossil Free campaigns is that they are supposed to be a grassroots movement, the inspirations are from social movements that has been before, like, too started in universities, and that is what it is about... [...] The main thing is about the social. That we say that we decide this ourselves. If we say it, it is about the social capital, we can say if it is okay or not.”

---

1 Respondent Fältbiologerna, Appendix B
2 Respondent Fossil Free Sweden, Appendix B
3 Ibid, Appendix B
All other organisations, Greenpeace Sweden, Fältbiologerna, FOE, Push! and Klimatak tion notes that voice strategies are important and fundamental for the organisation as well. While not as exclusively occupied with voice strategies as Fossil Free Sweden, participating and organising manifestations, spreading information and finding potential members in public spaces, organising debates and seminars, arranging petitions, and writing debate articles is mentioned by all organisations as important strategies, including Greenpeace Sweden, Push Sweden, Fältbiologerna, FoES, Klimatak tion. Spreading information about climate change and environmental issues is the main goal, using both protest and information strategies used interchangeably. Thus, all organisations are in some way or another engaged in voice-strategy usage.

Likewise, access-strategies are described as fundamental and used by all with the exception of Fossil Free Sweden. Notably, most organisations also perceive that they do achieve access to decision makers, including Greenpeace, FoES, Fältbiologerna, Klimatak tion, Push Sweden. This means that they already are in either formal and repeated or informally in contact with decision makers. The most common form of access is functioning as consultation bodies to various governmental bodies and authorities. FoES states that participating as consultation processes is in fact a large portion of their access activities. Further, Fältbiologerna, Klimatak tion, Greenpeace Sweden and Push Sweden notes being invited to meetings with environmental department, to have round-table talks with the environment minister or being be invited to meet with the finance department. Informal contacts are noted as important by Greenpeace, Push Sweden, FoES and Klimatak tion, such as exchange of information from organisation to politicians or officials, or in other ways to talk and discuss the issues with policy makers.

Klimatak tion notes that while they have been in contact with decision makers both formally and informally, for example by being in contact with political parties or members of political parties, the usage of access-strategies is resource demanding. For a small organisation with no full-time staff, the ability to upkeep a of constant or consistent access to decision makers is small:

“'We have not been some clear-cut lobby organisations, partly because we don’t have the time and resources, and then, I think that a small organisations like us, we can never be as streamed as
Greenpeace… We don’t have that weight because we are not that many yet. [...] Those who are most active [towards decision makers] gains the most influence, that’s how it is.”

Importantly, all organisations note that access and voice are both needed, seeing the advantages of both strategies as necessary to influence. The respondent from Greenpeace Sweden phrases usage of both strategies:

“We often say that we have no permanent friends or foes, we have no permanent friends or foes within Greenpeace and that is how we see our role a little, to be able to come with constructive suggestions to decision makers one day and the next day give constructive feedback through direct actions to the very same people so to speak.”

Similarly, Push Sweden also notes on the need to act and utilize the voice-strategies to reach access when having the public's attention:

“Both parts are important. We have had discussions about this, such as with the Greta-demonstrations… We need to talk with the policy makers, not just come from the outside”

While the climate issue might have gained media salience this must be used by the organisation, the respondent notes.

Thus the need to use both voice and access strategies is recurring among all organisations. No organisation, except to some extent Fossil Free Sweden, deliberately avoided one or the other strategy.

Important and recurring with all organisations were the combinational usage of voice and access; meaning, the targeting of both decision makers and public in one an the same activity. One significant activity is the voice strategy noted by the respondent from Klimatakktion, that would eventually lead to access:

---

4 Respondent Klimatakktion, Appendix B
5 Respondent Greenpeace Sweden, Appendix B
6 Respondent Push, Appendix B
“We were there when Anders Borg came with the budget, then we were standing kind of in his way in order to get in contact with him. I think we contacted the financial department and got in contact with it. The minister, that is how its been. We have also done surveys with politicians too.”

The demonstration and blocking of the then-finance ministers walk from the financial department to the riksdag with the budget proposition is an obvious voice strategy, as the walk is a well-known tradition with extensive media coverage. But as they also sought contact and access (and gained) directly to the minister as well as the financial department, the blocking of the walk is also possible to place within the definition of access. It is unlikely that the act of blocking per se led to the contact with the financial department, but it did make the policy makers aware of the organisation and might have led to the latter meetings - and thus the achievement of access.

The same combinatorial activities of addressing policy makers while also directing the activities to the public are noted by all organisations. Writing debate articles directed to a minister or politician, arranging debates between politicians, or performing manifestations during strategic points - such as Greenpeace writing on the walls of Rosenbad before an important parliament debate regarding climate change (Aftonbladet, 2019) - may be placed as both addressing policy makers and the public.

4.1.2 Summary of domestic activity

To summarize, the organisations in this study are highly active on the domestic arena. Voice strategies and access strategies are used interchangeably and are recognized for their respective advantages by all organisations. Fältbiologerna and especially Fossil Free Sweden notes being somewhat more concentrated on using voice strategies on the domestic arena. While agreeing to the need of using voice strategies, and also using them to a great extent, the other organisations of Push Sweden, Greenpeace Sweden, FoES and Klimatakton shows a high awareness aware of the influencing advantage of having direct contact with decision makers. Combinational usage in which both decision makers and the public is targeted within one activity is also significant.

---

7 Respondent Klimatakton, Appendix B
showing that strategies may be combined and may be both access and voice at the same time. Access strategies are too used and access is achieved in various ways. Informal and formal channels give the organisations access to various officials and decision makers.

4.2 The importance of the supranational arenas

While the domestic arena undoubtedly is important for all organisations in this study, the supranational arena is too. Only Fältbiologerna and partly Fossil Free Sweden states exclusively domestic activity, indicating that supranational activity is existent with the larger part of organisations. However, supranational activity differs from the domestic arena in several aspects. Significantly, direct action seems to be relatively limited and occasional, while network participation is a characteristic attribute of the supranational arena.

4.2.1 How do they engage on the supranational arenas - voice or access?

Supranational arenas is generally understood as the EU or UNFCCC. Generally, influencing on the supranational level seems more occasional and fragmented than on domestic levels, intensifying when election to the European parliament is approaching, as well as when COP are held in European cities. Strategic usage, when existing, includes access strategies directed members of the European Parliament, or MEP:s, that may be formally or informally contacted, noted by FoES, Greenpeace Sweden and Klimaktion. Other direct strategic usage is mentioned by Klimataktion and Push Sverige. While noting that current activity toward supranational arenas are limited, Klimataktion also states that some mobilization may occur during COP negotiations:

“But above all we have been active European when it was in Copenhagen when it was international contacts, it was very relevant at the time, EU was so relevant when Sweden was lead country and because Copenhagen was so relevant. [...] We also went down by bus to Poland to climate meetings demonstrations there with a bunch of other climate organisations, it was not super much networking down there, but it was like focus on international negotiations and that, yes, we have been involved in that.\(^8\)

\(^8\) Respondent Klimataktion, Appendix B
The strategy used here was voice in the form of demonstrations, trying to influence the negotiations from the outside.

Push Sweden states several activities directed towards the supranational arena. While not having direct activities directed to the EU, Push Sweden is focusing on the UNFCCC and international climate negotiations. These include being included in the official Swedish delegation to COP 25 in Chile, as well as participating in the campaign of People’s Climate Case.

While Klimataktion and Push Sweden do directly influence the supranational arenas, a characterizing trait of the other organisations supranational influence is the participation in global or European networks. Greenpeace International and FoE Europe are obvious such cases, which the domestic offices are connected to. While the domestic offices have great independence in formulating and acting on their own, they are not active on the European arena - instead they can be represented by other units of their umbrella organisations by proxy. Noting that the domestic unit is not independently targeting actors beyond the domestic arena, Greenpeace Sweden may still be represented by Greenpeace EU and involved in supranational activities if requested:

“We have an office in Brussels that work with and follow EU-matters and that are keeping an eye on all that. It is a unit within Greenpeace, the EU-unit that like us have our global goals and in some issues then the EU is an important actor. And Sweden is an important actor in the EU in many issues and from that logic we can influence Sweden that can influence EU that can influence globally. [...] We will try to influence how Sweden acts if there is a request or inquiry. We do not really push our own EU-agenda, like that. “

In other words, Greenpeace Sweden and other Greenpeace units can benefit from each other, and work together when deemed necessary. Influencing Swedish member state policy in the EU is thus an indirect influencing strategy, while not being placeable as voice or access. Strengthening both domestic and supranational activity, network participation can perhaps be understood as

9 Respondent Greenpeace Sweden, Appendix B
preparations for access or voice strategies. Likewise, FoES states that if supranational activity occurs it is in cooperation with other FoE units. This may include signing petitions or spreading information directed towards European institutions, and the respondent mentions for example participating in organising a petition to stop the formation of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP).

Although Fossil Free Sweden is principally active on domestic and local arenas, they are part of the global organisation of 350.org. While pressing the local strategies the organisation works, they use their network to a lesser extent than Greenpeace Sweden or FoES. Still, some utilization and representation from the global 350 may still occur, for example being inspired by other units of 350, or sharing videos on social media:

“350 is a global organisation and of course we look at each other, like, this is what they did in Mexico City, but it is not very common. [...] Maybe someone has edited a nice video about tornadoes, then we also might share that, that is kind of the practical. The campaigns and the activity is local, and that is kind of the point too.”

In contrast to Greenpeace Sweden and FoE, Fossil Free Sweden utilizes its network to a lesser extent. Supranational activity of the organisations participating in global networks, either voice or access-strategies, is thus a matter of cooperation and synchronization between units. The domestic units of Greenpeace and FoES are however not pursuing the EU independently.

**4.2.2 Summary of supranational activity**

To summarize, the supranational arenas are not ignored by the organisations in this study. However, activity seems more fragmented and diffuse than on domestic arenas. Greenpeace Sweden, FoES and Klimataktion mentions targeting and contacting Swedish MEP:s, and Klimataktion has also used voice strategies targeting COP in Copenhagen and Katowice. Push Sweden is through participation as part of the official delegation to COP25 using access strategies. Thus, there is indeed some level of supranational activity from the organisations.

---

10 Respondent Fossil Free Sweden, Appendix B
The general indication from the remaining organisations is that independent activity on supranational arenas is limited. Both Fossil Free Sweden and Fältbiologerna states that they focus mainly on the domestic arena, as well as Fossil Free Sweden. The international networks of Greenpeace and FoE, as well as to some extent 350, may provide resources and activities to the domestic units that strengthen domestic activity in the long run, but independent activities are more rare. Information exchange between domestic and EU-based units, participating in transnational campaigns as well as influencing member state policy in the EU is the main method through which supranational arenas are targeted by FoES and Greenpeace Sweden.

4.3 Additional strategies: Enabling

Some strategies occur in the material that are noted as extensively used by several organisations, including Greenpeace, FoES and Klimataktion. While all organisations in this study cooperate and work together with others in campaigns or actions, a specific strategy of enabling is also visible. This strategy means that organisations support other initiatives, but are actively choosing to not take credit for it.

This is a deliberate choice of strategy, as stated by Greenpeace Sweden:

“[A change is] to a higher extent that we strive for more cooperation with others, and try to enable other people and organisations from below, rather than the traditional image of Greenpeace like some kind of elitistic group of professional activists [...] More and more we have said that we do not want to run over others, because we realise that we are big but not that big, other people are needed, so we work a lot behind the scenes a lot in Sweden, especially lately in the climate issue, that we don’t necessarily go out with our name but help to boost others.”

Likewise, the same kind of enabling behind the scenes is mentioned by the respondent by Klimataktion, regarding the Fridays For Future demonstrations in which students strike each friday to bring attention to the climate crisis. The function of Klimataktion has been to help and

---

11 Respondent Greenpeace Sweden, Appendix B
support the initiative while not taking credit. The respondent notes that while the focus is the climate crisis, enabling others inevitably means that they might lose publicitly:

“And that is really like.. Klimatakktion has been there and supported them financially and with different things and stuff, but the taeanges don’t want to.. They want to be themselves, and that becomes a small dilemma for us - or, well, not that big of a dilemma, it’s all about the climate issue, but a little - what should our role be? What should we do with our own members if the things that grow happen somewhere where we don’t have much to say?”12

FoES also notes that they very rarely to independent activities, instead focusing on supporting and cooperating with others. Like Klimatakktion, the respondent from FoES notes that this behind-the-scenes enabling may be a reason to why the organisation is not as well-known as many others:

“I think that most people wouldn’t say that we are a well-known organisation. But on the other hand we have been existing for a long time, and because of that we have a lot of contacts, but we are not well known. [...] That we almost never do anything on our own, as we believe so much in networking, that is probably a reason to why we are not that well-known. That we don’t really lift our own name, but we want the issue to be in focus, to be the important thing.”13

In short, the enabling strategy means that the organisation deliberately take a step back, not fronting with their own name. Instead other organisations or movements are supported. While not being an access strategy as no policy makers are targeted, it cannot readily be defined as a voice action either; the organisation in question is not the one gaining voice, but the enabled initiative.

12 Respondent Klimatakktion, Appendix B
13 Respondent FoES, Appendix B
4.4 Possible reasons behind the choice to focus on either the domestic or the supranational level?

In this section, the question of why operating occurs is investigated. The intention is to investigate if ideological perceptions or attitudes may contribute to decide the arena to operate on. All organisations agree that the supranational arenas in the form of the EU and COP are essential actors when handling the climate crisis. As shown above, many organisations have been active at times on the supranational arenas, but the recurring theme is that organisations feel that they should be more so. “We want to do lots of things, but it is always a matter of resources”\(^{14}\), the respondent from Push Sweden notes. All organisations in this study named resources - financial, staff, time, etc - as crucial and fundamental for all kinds of activities, including both domestic and supranational activity. Thus resources, and lack thereof, is perceived as the most important factor determining where and how activities takes place.

With the importance of resources in mind, several attitudes of the supranational arenas emerge in the material that might contribute to the choice of arena. Three main perceptions other than lack of resources is mentioned that may influence supranational action; the complexitivity of the supranational arenas, the free trade ideology of the EU, and last, the after all progressive actors that may have more freedom than in the domestic arena.

4.4.1 The Supranational arenas as too slow or hard to grasp

One possible reason that would make the European or international arena unattractive is the slow and complicated process of climate change policy. As the climate change issue and the need to do something about it is increasingly perceived as acute, the potential progress of the COP meetings come far too late for some organisations. These views are recurring throughout the interviews. While these perceptions may be personal views, these kinds of views may influence organisations and their choice of arena. When asked what reasons the respondent could see to why there is so little supranational activity by organisations, the respondent from Klimataktion states:

\(^{14}\) Respondent Push Sweden, Appendix B
“Then I think that kind of a little of the frustration because it has been so extremely slow in the negotiations - the Paris agreement too that is so extremely hollow because there are no obligations or commitments like that. So increasingly with that I think that it will lead to that the climate movement at large begins to orient more maybe to influence the national policy, to build networks of civil disobedience [...] you try to find alternative roads, and maybe a little the focus on international climate policy decreases.”

Similarly, Fältbiologerna stated that its young members might find the EU too complicated or not have enough knowledge about the impact of the EU:

“We are a young organisation. I think many of our members think that the EU is too big and far away, hard to grasp. EU is of course important because many decisions are made on the EU level but. We focus more on local issues, things like that.”

Fossil Free Sweden also states that they indeed wish to focus on the local level, and that the goal of the organisation's strategic choices is to emulate a social, grassroots inspired movement. This is in turn directly opposed to the EU:s large and top-down approach:

“No, the whole point is somewhere that it should be local and then you don’t want to… [...] I think that that is kind of the point. Like that everything should be community led, community built, and local change and that is… [...] It is somewhere to show that the people have the power, we decide if fossil fuels are ok. And if you then turn to the EU, that it comes from above, that is a bit weird.”

In other words, some reasons for limited EU activity may be the complexity and distant element of the arena, that is opposed to the methods and strategies preferred by the organisations. Like Klimataktion notes, tiresome policy processes and slow progress may too incite frustration and resignation within organisations, leading to more focus on the perhaps more accessible domestic arena.

15 Respondent Klimataktion, Appendix B
16 Respondent Fältbiologerna, Appendix B
17 Respondent Fossil Free Sweden, Appendix B
4.4.2 Free trade bias of supranational institutions

A recurring theme in the interviews were frustration of the free market approach that characterizes political arenas and especially the EU. As the climate change issue is increasingly becoming more and more acute to solve, and the solutions suggested by the organisations of the study may include large and perhaps uncomfortable changes in consumption and the industrial sector, the EU:s focus on free trade and industry is seen as an obstacle to real progress.

This is expressed by Greenpeace Sweden, when asked if the EU was perceived as a plausible ally:

“[…]Our organisation is building on changing the system on a more fundamental ground, then it won’t be enough to change just on the margin but you need to be ready but earlier and you need to change the EU on a fundamental level, and that is of course pretty hard.”\textsuperscript{18}

The respondent from Klimataktion also expresses this perception of the EU. While noting that the EU indeed can achieve more than individual states, the EU is also perceived as unlikely to do the radical changes needed:

“By accepting the rules of the game, where the four freedoms are put on a pedestal and prioritized you may have the tendency… There is a risk that the EU-project instead enforces a system that is unsustainable.[…] You can do very large changes in GHG emission mitigation, but the fundamental story is the same, that we need to maintain a system of growth and free trade and all that.”\textsuperscript{19}

The same views are expressed by the respondent from FoES, that too notes that the EU may be directly opposed to their political ambitions, ignoring efforts from environmental organisations:

\textsuperscript{18} Respondent Greenpeace Sweden, Appendix B
\textsuperscript{19} Respondent Klimataktion, Appendix B
“They job is to facilitate free trade and increased consumption, which is what we want to decrease [...] We [Friends of the Earth] organised a petition when there were talk about TTIP a few years ago and got a lot of, enough names but that was completely ignored.”

Further, a critique of the EU favouring certain interest groups is also expressed by the respondent from Push Sweden:

“A big discussion that has been happening right now is place for lobbyists. Partly in the EU and that parliament branch, but also in COP and climate negotiations, the big organisations with a lot of money and resources, the fossil industry, are let in to a much higher extent. And that is a big discussion, to limit their access.”

The specific function of the EU as a trading union as well as their tendency to favour financial interests or well-established organisations is thus seen as an obstacle of reaching influencing on the European arena, as well as the inclusion of large specific groups. The EU ideology or logic is directly opposed to the organisations solutions or political ambitions. However, as noted by the respondents, this is also true on national levels. The business bias of the EU is obviously not a deal breaker as the organisations expressing the concern are already either by proxy or independently active on the supranational arena, but at the same time, may still incite frustration.

4.4.3 Advantages of the EU to the domestic arena

The supranational arenas are not only perceived as resistant to the ENGO:s efforts. Some respondents also express positive views of the EU and organisations abilities to influence politics compared to the domestic arena. The EU and COP are clearly understood as powerful actors in handling climate change, having the ability to control and shape many important policies which can influence climate change on a global scale. Additionally, the slow progress of the EU is perceived as an advantage against the often quick or surprising actions of domestic actors, expressed by the respondent from Greenpeace Sweden:

20 Respondent FoES, Appendix B
21 Respondent Push Sweden, Appendix B
“Because the EU is such a sluggish mass in a way and a big bureaucratic colossus kind of, then the EU in that sense is not very quick on its feet. In Sweden they can write a press release and then ‘oh that was news’ for most involved, without us knowing it. [...] Then there is that advantage that the EU is a big organisation, many people, there are several ways to get in, like that.”22

In other words, the EU provides access points in the policy process in which organisations may influence proactively. Domestic actors, on the other hand, may be faster and thus creates a more reactive civil society.

The EU is also perceived as being more flexible for progressive actors. Domestic actors may need to consider party coalitions, cooperation and consequences of the electorate on a greater level than the members of parliament. This perception is expressed by the respondent from Klimataktion:

“My impression at least is that those that actually have a progressive agenda in the EU [...] they have a greater freedom than on national level as there are not the same kinds of government cooperation that you need to consider on that level.”23

4.4 Summary of perceptions - may perceptions of the supranational arenas affect the organisations choices to influence these arenas?

While resources are named as the sole most important factor deciding any kind of activity whether domestic or supranational, three main perceptions that may influence targeting the supranational arenas emerge in the material. Most organisations perceive both the EU and international arenas as one and the same. First, Fältbiologerna and Fossil Free Sweden perceive the EU as a top-down, distant institution that either is not relevant for young members, or not suitable for the preferred methods of influence of the organisation. Klimataktion further notes

22 Respondent Greenpeace Sweden, Appendix B
23 Respondent Klimataktion, Appendix B
that the slow progress of international negotiations and the shy progress of environmental policy in the EU risks to incite frustration, leading to organisations looking for alternative ways.

Furthermore, the financial bias and allowance of lobbyists of the EU and to some extent the COP is clearly felt by organisations. Push Sweden, Klimatakktion, Greenpeace Sweden and FoES all agree when noting the financial bias as a hindrance of reaching influence. Although the organisations mentioning this perception are either through network or directly active the supranational arenas, the financial bias may still produce an unattractive arena for more radical organisations. Finally, the supranational arenas do have advantages to the domestic arena. Especially the EU, with its many institutions and access points, can make reaching access easier, as noted by Greenpeace Sweden. And as Klimatakktion notes the politics of the EU may be more fluid and less restraining than domestic; thus making more progressive policy possible.

5. Key findings
The purpose of this study was to investigate which arenas in a multi-level context Swedish ENGO:s are targeting when reaching influence, which strategies the organisations use, and if ideological direction or other perceptions of the organisations may affect the choice of influence arena. The research question was where, how and why are organisations operating in the multi-level context. Below, I discuss the findings in relation to the theoretical framework.

Where are they operating? The findings indicate that Swedish ENGO:s main target to influence remains the domestic arena. All organisations - Fältbiologerna, Fossil Free Sweden, Greenpeace Sweden, Push Sweden, FoES and Klimatakktion - noted that they concentrate the domestic arena and focus their activities here. The supranational arena is not unused, but supranational influencing is fragmented and occasional. Fältbiologerna and Fossil Free Sweden states no supranational activity, while other organisations often state that they are not doing enough. Both Greenpeace Sweden and FoES cooperate within its international organisation, often supporting sister organisations or working together with other FoE or Greenpeace units. Klimatakktion notes some occasional targeting of supranational arenas, such as participating in
demonstrations targeting the UNFCCC when COPs are held in European cities. Push Sweden also mentions participating in transnational campaigns on European level, as well as participating in the Swedish delegation to the next COP25.

**How are they operating?** On the domestic arena the characterizing trait of the strategic usage may be phrased as the respondent from Greenpeace Sweden: “having no friends or foes”\(^{24}\). With the exception of Fossil Free Sweden all organisations actively use both voice and access strategies on the domestic arena, and apart from Fossil Free Sweden all organisations note reaching access to policy makers - functioning as consultants in governance policy processes, informal or formal contacts with politicians, arranging debates or panel discussions with politicians, as well as meetings with environmental or financial department. The voice strategic usage is diverse, ranging from twitter storms, demonstrations, protests, debate articles and information campaigns. Another important finding is the *enabling* as a strategy, meaning not directing either to policy makers or to the public, but to support other initiatives behind the scenes.

On the supranational arena strategic usage is more diffuse. As mentioned above, direct strategic is performed by Push Sweden and Klimataktion. Push Sweden is through participation in the Swedish delegation as official observers of the COP using access strategies, while Klimataktion by participating in demonstrations surrounding European-held COP, used voice strategies, seeking to influence the European and international public. However, the most characterizing trait of operating in the supranational arenas brought up by the ENGO:s of the study is participation in global networks. Greenpeace and FoE are obvious examples, that may use and strengthen the activities of their respective international or European units. This is not necessarily either voice or access, but may prepare or support usage of these strategies.

Finally, *why are they operating?* This question aimed to explore if ideological attitudes may contribute as to why organisations are more or less active at some arenas, as suggested by Berny and Rootes (2016). The findings show that organisations indeed perceive both the EU and UNFCCC as too slow and insufficient, and often directly opposed to the organisations solutions to the climate crisis. Especially the EU:s focus on free trade is perceived as an obstacle to

---

\(^{24}\) Respondent Greenpeace Sweden
change. The EU might also be perceived as having advantages in the form of several access points and a slow process allowing NGO:s to react proactively, such as mentioned by Greenpeace Sweden, or being more progressive due to the less restraining politics compared to the domestic arena, as expressed by Klimataktion. Most importantly, however, the attitudes present in the material do not seem to influence the choice of arena; all organisations expressing different ideological directions have been or are active on the European arena.

5.1 Discussion

The key findings support and contradict some portions of the theoretical and analytical framework suggested by this study. Poloni-Staudinger (2008) suggested that if the domestic opportunity structure is open, and the organisations feel that they may reach representation, supranational activity will decrease. This is supported by the findings of this study. All organisations except Fossil Free Sweden states that they use both voice and access strategies on the domestic arena, and notes a range of variations of achieved access. Including functioning as consultants, being invited to meetings with departments and other officials, formal and informal contacts with politicians, it is clear that the ENGO:s in this study are involved in the policy process in many ways. In other words, the domestic opportunity structure might be perceived as open, contributing to the concentration on domestic arenas. While the occasional usage of the supranational arena indicates that the organisations indeed acknowledge the “pull effect” of the multi-level context, it also seems like the perception of access on the domestic arena is not providing enough of a “push”.

An interesting finding is that, when direct supranational action occurs in the cases of Klimataktion and Push Sweden, it seems like the global actor UNFCCC is more targeted than the EU. Perhaps NGOs are perceiving the EU as a closed opportunity structure and thus seek to bypass EU government, as Poloni-Staudinger suggests at a domestic level. Further studies are needed to confirm or investigate this question.

Beyers (2004) description of voice and access strategies is evident in the findings. All organisations are aware of the need to use both access and voice to reach influence, pressing the need to both have public support and contact with the policy process. Relevant to the discussion
of the theoretical distinction between voice and access strategies are also the additional strategies found in the material. Both combinational usage, where both policy makers and the public is targeted within one activity, and enabling, meaning supporting other initiatives behind the scenes, indicate that the theoretical distinction might be to simplified. Organisations do not seem to use just voice or access strategies to influence the policy process.

This study also attempted to explore alternative motivations with the organisations that might affect the choice of arena, as suggested by Berny and Rootes (2016). The respondents from Greenpeace, FoES, Push Sweden and Klimataktion all identified and elaborated on the problems of the EU, including the financial bias, the slow progress, and the favoring of lobbyists. However, all of these organisations are also active on the supranational arenas (either directly or through networks), indicating that these perceptions are obviously not obstacles for supranational activity. The two exclusively domestic organisations of Fältbiologerna and Fossil Free Sweden stated, respectively, that the EU either is felt to distant, or is not a relevant target for the organisations methods of influence. Generally, resources are mentioned as the most immediate factor determining action on either domestic or supranational arenas.

5.2 Conclusions

The aim of this study was to investigate where, how and why do organisations operate in order to promote their goals, with the purpose to contribute to and expand the current research of multi-level interest representation. Investigated through six interviews with respondents from six organisations, the following conclusions should be drawn.

Overall, the conclusions are that organisations focus on the domestic arena when promoting their goals. Both voice and access strategies are used. On the supranational arena, influencing is more diffuse and often indirect through network participation. While indeed showcasing frustration and perceived ideological differences with the supranational arenas in general and the EU specifically, these do not seem to guide whether or not organisations will engage beyond the domestic arena. Instead the perception of the EU as too distant or hard to grasp seem to indicate
less supranational activity. Further studies should be conducted to support the findings of this qualitative case study.

As this study was conducted from a qualitative approach, generalisation from these results should be done with circumspection. Still, the variety and weight of the organisations participating in the study indicate that multi-level operating from the Swedish ENGO:s is limited. While occurring on occasion, the domestic arena remains the most targeted when organisations are promoting their goals. In other words, domestic organisations influence in the multi-level context of climate policy is indeed domestic.
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**Appendix A Interview guide**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Vad arbetar organisationen med just nu?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aktuell verksamhet?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specifika kampanjer/frågor som ni ska/har jobbat med?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vilka aktörer brukar ni tycka är viktiga att försöka påverka? Regering, partier? Vilka partier, varför dessa, varför inte?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I tidigare forskning menar vissa att det finns inside och outside-strategier. Inside menar att man fokuserar mer på att ha direktkontakt med beslutsfattare, medan outside betyder att man tycker att det är mer viktigt att väcka opinion och debatt. Känner du igen detta/finns det en medvetenhet om detta?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vad är er funktion när ni har direkt kontakt med politiker eller myndigheter? Informellt lobbying, eller formellt i form av t ex remissinstans, beredning? Vilka aktörer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upplever du att ni arbetar mer med den ena eller den andra?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38
När man pratar om nivå menar man ofta att man kan välja lokal nivå, nationell nivå, EU-nivå och globalt samarbete. Vissa organisationer väljer att agera på enbart nationell nivå, andra är aktiva på andra nivåer. Om vi tittar utanför Sverige, är ni aktiva internationellt? (Om med i nätverk, självständighet från nätverk?)

5. Finns det verksamhet kopplad till EU eller andra transnationella aktörer?
   - *Hur ser den ut? Vilka aktörer försöker ni påverka då?*
   - *Agerar ni självständigt? I nätverk?*
   - *Känner du igen att det förekommer mer inside/outside-lobbying på den här nivån? Varför/Varför inte?*
   - *Är EU en arena som är viktig? Annan internationell verksamhet?*

6. Ibland upplevs EU (ev globala aktörer) som svårt att påverka och som en komplex organisation. Andra menar att EU är nödvändiga och fruktbara att organisera sig i. Dvs är det fruktbart att försöka påverka transnationellt?
   - *Varför/Varför inte? Ibland talar man om att det finns två motsatta sidor i EU - business och företag, som företräder ekonomiska intressen, var intressen ofta är motsatta sociala och miljöorganisationers. Är det något organisationen är håller med om/känner av?*
   - *Vilka hinder finns det?*
   - *Fördelar?*

Avslut

Återgå till tidigare frågor. Sammanfatta. Återkom till oklarheter.

9. Finns det något som du känner att jag missat? (Om du skrev detta?)
10. Finns det något som du känner att du skulle vilja veta mer om när det gäller organisering?
**Appendix B Original quotes**


5. Respondent Greenpeace, Stockholm 2019-04-16: “Vi brukar säga att vi har inga permanent friends or foes, vi har inga permanenta vänner eller fiender inom GP och det är så som vi ser lite på vår roll att kunna både komma med konstruktiva förslag till makthavare ena dagen och nästa dag komma med konstruktiv kritik genom aktioner gentemot samma personer så att säga.”


8. Respondent Klimataktion, Stockholm 2019-04-26: “Men framför allt har vi varit europeisk aktiva när det var i Köpenhamn då det var internationella kontakter, det var så aktuellt, EU var så aktuellt när Sverige var ordförandeland och eftersom Köpenhamn var så aktuellt. Så det var ju ännu mer då. Men Klimataktion, vi åkte också ned med buss till Polen till klimatmötet där med massa andra klimatorganisationer, det kanske inte var som att det var jättetorst nätverkande där nere, men det var liksom fokus på internationella förhandlingar och det har vi ju varit involverade i.”


