

Promoting the Ecological Swede

- A Frame Analysis of Swedish Green Party Policy

Abstract

Recent developments within the environmental debate have focused on the individual's role in mitigating environmental degradation this, together with the advancement of feminist thought and globalization, has lead Andrew Dobson to call for a new conception of citizenship an 'ecological citizenship'. Although being scarce, practical application and empirical testing has affirmed the existence of such a citizen and the unsurprising link with political affiliation. Considering Sweden's affirmed role as an environmentally friendly nation, how and to what extent has Swedish Green Party policy taken up and adopted 'ecological citizenship'? Using the method of frame analysis in examining official party policy documents and membership publication articles, this paper found that the Swedish Green Party had taken up and adopted ecological citizenly characteristics. It was also found that the inclusion of the private sphere and policies aimed at individual behavior, mainly taxation, were both significant and indicative for such a conclusion, affirming 'ecological citizenships' normative value.

Key words: Ecological Citizenship, Swedish Green Party, Frame Analysis, Policy, Environment

Words: 5

Table of contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Scope	1
1.1.1	Research Question	2
1.1.2	Sweden and the Swedish Greens as Significant Cases?.....	2
1.2	Outline	3
1.2.1	Material	3
1.2.2	Limitations	4
2	Background	5
2.1	Citizenship and the Environment	5
3	Theory	7
3.1	Andrew Dobson’s ‘Ecological Citizenship’	7
3.1.1	The Non-Reciprocal Responsibilities of Ecological Citizenship	7
3.1.2	Ecological Citizenship and the Private Realm	8
3.1.3	The Non-Territoriality of Ecological Citizenship	9
3.2	Ecological Citizenship and Empiricism	9
4	Methodological Approach.....	11
4.1	Frame Analysis.....	11
5	Empirical Analysis.....	14
5.1	The Swedish Greens and ‘Ecological Citizenship’	14
5.1.1	Outlining Characteristics.....	15
5.2	The Evolving Years (1981-1998).....	16
5.3	A New Frame for A New Millennium	18
6	Discussion	23
7	Conclusion	25
	References.....	27

1 Introduction

“We are living as if we have an extra planet at our disposal. We are using 50 per cent more resources than the Earth can provide, and unless we change course that number will grow very fast – by 2030, even two planets will not be enough.” – WWF, Living Planet Report 2012

1.1 Scope

There are two rather evident observations that can be made from the aforementioned statement, the alarming rate at which environmental degradation is occurring. And the multiple use of the word *we*. The rather inevitable questions which follow such a statement is *how* do we solve or mitigate environmental degradation and what role do *we* play? It is such a fundamental recognition and question which led Andrew Dobson to formulate his normative green theory on ‘ecological citizenship’, and much like the quoted text insinuates, ‘ecological citizenship’ recognises the importance of individual responsibilities and actions across different spaces and time.

The debate of how to solve or mitigate environmental degradation has been continuous since it became a political issue in the 1960’s, as has the discourse regarding citizenship and the environment. Since then, not only have environmental problems become progressively more pressing but so has the need for plausible solutions. And although much of the debate has centred on liberal democracy’s assumed cause of and inability to reduce environmental degradation, with alternative democratic models being proposed (Dryzek 1992, Hayward 1998, Barry & Wissenberg 2001, Eckersley 2004), there has also been an increased focus on the individual.

In the documents emerging from the 1992 ‘Rio Summit’ the individual’s role and the ‘participation of the people’ was explicitly stressed. This closely tied to the recognition that the world’s most challenging environmental problems develop and need to be addressed independently of political or geographical borders. The current debate has as a result largely moved away from discussing political systems and instead focuses on the individual, addressing whether people are willing and have the incentive to make the sacrifices necessary to mitigate environmental degradation (Lafferty and Meadowcraft 1996, Micheletti 2003)

It is within such a context that Andrew Dobson formulated his theory on ‘ecological citizenship’, and with the inclusion of the private sphere being central, arguing that such a conception is not optional but rather a necessity if we are to address environmental problems of the aforementioned nature. And while

Dobson's theorizing has been criticised on certain accounts (Hayward 2006, Bell 2005, Seyfang 2005, Valdivielso 2005), as well as largely acclaimed for its normative value, there has been little practical application or empirical results regarding this normative concept. The few studies that have been done however (Seyfang 2006, Wolf et al. 2009, Jagers 2009), have all explored the existence of an ecological citizen and the display of ecological citizenly characteristics. The general conclusions of these studies have affirmed the existence of ecological citizenly characteristics and the close link between such values and, not surprisingly, political affiliation. This evidence leads one to inquire about the views and policy promoting such values. Especially in a country like Sweden which has been argued to be one of the most progressive with regards to change in environmental policy, governance and attitudes (Dryzek et al. 2003, Eckersley 2004, Lafferty & Meadowcraft 2000, Lundqvist 2004, Meadowcraft 2007).

Given that the 'participation of the people' has been deemed necessary, that 'ecological citizenship' as a normative value has been commended and observed, and that further action needs to be taken in order to mitigate environmental degradation, a closer understanding of how such values have been taken up and adopted is of great interest.

1.1.1 Research Question

The aim of this thesis is to investigate to what extent Swedish Green Party policy has taken up the concept of 'ecological citizenship'. Inherent, is the study of the move from just public to including also private responsibilities i.e. the private sphere, a distinguishable characteristic of 'ecological citizenship'.

With regards to the scope and aim of the thesis the principal research question for this analysis can be expressed as:

How and to what extent has ecological citizenship been taken up and adopted within the official party policy of the Swedish Greens?

Related to this issue is how the role of the citizen has been framed over time, moving from public to private. In a larger context the paper aims to make a small contribution to the environmental policy debate.

1.1.2 Sweden and the Swedish Greens as Significant Cases?

Environmental policy has undergone a considerable change in the last 20 years for most developed as well as developing countries. The general opinion seems to be that most change has been observed in developed countries, even more so in the Scandinavian countries, Netherlands and Germany (Dryzek et al 2003) (Eckersley 2004) (Lafferty & Meadowcraft 2000) (Meadowcraft 2007).

Sweden and Swedish environmental policy in particular is considered to have made some of the more significant institutional changes towards ecological sustainability after the 'Earth Summit'. Sweden is seen as a leading country in sustainability governance (Eckersley 2004) (Lafferty & Meadowcraft 2000) (Lundqvist 2004) and Swedes are also usually ranked in the top with regard to environmentally friendly attitudes (Eckersley 2004). Given such observations, Sweden is in strong favour to be regarded as a critical case for assessing the normative effects of 'ecological citizenship'.

In his 2009 article *In search of the ecological citizen* Sverker C. Jagers argued just that, looking at the existence of an ecological citizen, in one of the very few if not only, extensive studies realised. His findings were quite significant, as 25% of the respondents were seen as fitting into Jagers's definition of an ecological citizen. Further, and less surprising, was that these citizens mainly sympathised with the Swedish Greens (Jagers 2009).

Given the empirical evidence and the general picture of Sweden as a critical case, there is a strong argument for looking at how 'ecological citizenship' has been taken up and adopted by the Swedish Green Party, with hopes of gaining greater insight of their policy making.

1.2 Outline

Primarily, the debate surrounding citizenship and the environment will be presented. Secondly, the methodological approach will be addressed and finally, an analysis of Swedish Green Party policy will be performed.

In the next chapter *Background*, (Ch. 2) the normative theorizing on citizenship and environment will be presented, In (Ch. 3) *Theory*, the focus will be Andrew Dobson's theory of 'ecological citizenship'. Further (Ch. 4), the *Methodological Approach* will be addressing frame analysis and its implementation. This method will guide and inform the *Empirical Analysis* examining Swedish Green Party policy (Ch. 5). Lastly, a *Discussion* and *Conclusion* will be presented. (Ch. 6 & 7). Following will be a complete *Reference list*.

Applying such an approach I argue that the aim and purpose of the thesis will not only be clearly presented but also sufficiently fulfilled.

1.2.1 Material

The scope and aim of this thesis calls for the applied material being twofold. Firstly, the theoretical material is based on the most prominent works regarding ecological citizenship and frame analysis. There is one particularly influential contribution to this material; Andrew Dobson's *Citizenship and the Environment* (2003), his normative theorizing on 'ecological citizenship' is as expected of major importance for my analysis. Also the works by (Seyfang 2006, Wolf et al

2007, Jagers 2009) have been of use. With regards to understanding the concept of frames, frame analysis and its application, the workings of (Rein & Schon 1993, Hajer 1995, Wagenaar 2011) have been particularly influential and aiding.

Secondly, the examination of Swedish Green Party policy is based on primary material e.g. official policy documents and membership articles. The material under scrutiny will be the only available official party programs, being those for 2005 and 2013, all available election manifestos from 1988 – 2010, as well as a selected sample of articles from the party member publication *Grönt*.

1.2.2 Limitations

One can observe three mentionable limitations to the applied method and material of this thesis.

The principal limitation lies with the methodological approach and its ‘frustratingly ambiguous’ nature (Wagenaar 2011). Despite much theorizing on the subject the epistemic nature of frames is still unclear. One cannot definitively argue whether frames are observed or constructed, discourse analysis would claim both. Frame analysis adopts a meaning realist position, implying that meanings are fixed entities noticeable or observable independent of its interpreter. However, the unavoidably subjective nature of frame analysis is contradictory of its realist claim. (Wagenaar 2011, p. 88-89) It can however be argued that this is counteracted with a structured and exposed approach. Also, frame analysis is appropriate and appreciative when answering *how* questions, but struggles to answer questions of *why* nature. This is a task which is suitable and left to be answered by further research.

Further, the scope of the thesis is limited and although an important step towards further analysis of the normative effect of ‘environmental citizenship’, and a continuing exploration of the usefulness of frame analysis, it can still only expect to provide a small contribution. Given this, the case studied and the material acquired also to some extent is restricted. As the Swedish Green Party can be seen as critical case in the study of the adoption of ‘ecological citizenship’ the analysis does carry importance, however, an analysis which carries a greater range either with regard to political parties or national policy making would be interesting. Further, since we are examining the policies of a political party which has and does not have many mandates, the study of proposals and legislation is limited, and also beyond this thesis. An effort has instead been made to compensate this by studying various forms of policy documents, directed at citizens or members and formulated collectively or independently. Finally, an aspect of change over time has been encompassed by examining documents over two decades as to add another dimension to the analysis.

2 Background

Citizenship most commonly refers to the status of individuals that arises from the membership of a polity which bestow upon its members a set of reciprocal rights and responsibilities. For the purposes of this article citizenship not only regards the legal status bestowed by a nation-state upon the members of its political community, but also as a social identity, as discussed in (Heater 2004). (see Riesenbergr (1994), Shafir (1998), Heater (1999) and Heater (2004) for an excellent overview on *citizenship*)

2.1 Citizenship and the Environment

Citizenship is most commonly divided into two broad types, *liberal* and *civic-republican*. The division is considered to be between the responsibilities of the first and the rights of the latter.

Building on the work of Turner (1990) Dobson regards this divide to be broad and simplistic, hindering the discussion of modern citizenship. Arguing a broader dimension of citizenship, Dobson articulates four inherent contrasts, *rights and obligations, non- and territorial, public and private sphere and non- and virtue* based conceptions of citizenship. He maintains there to be a shared ‘contractual’ nature bridging this divide and that there is a reciprocal nature between these two forms of citizenship and the state, paying taxes being a good example. More explicitly stated, the rights of an individual are nonetheless granted by the state when fulfilling ones citizenly obligations, or as referred to by Anthony Giddens ‘no rights without responsibilities’. This is said to be conditionally connected with citizenship, rooted in a social ontology which is based upon free individuals choosing to engage in relations of trade and exchange (Marshall 1950, Roche 1992, Ignatieff 1995, Giddens 2000, Dobson 2003).

Although having different conceptions of territoriality, both civic-republican and liberal citizenship are considered ‘territorial’, entailing that citizenship requires the membership of a defined political community. For liberal citizenship this assumes the rights that follow a membership of the relevant territory, while civic-republican citizenship carries with it the responsibilities to the community (Turner 1990, Dobson 2003). Also, there is little contention that both liberal and civic-republican citizenship is tied to and exercised only within the public sphere. (Dobson 2003)

Lastly, the virtues of these two forms of citizenship are today more indistinct. The historic division, once more being between rights and responsibilities, entails more explicit virtues for civic-republican than the rights based liberal citizenship

and is founded on the liberal views lack of a '*common good*'. The general opinion is that liberal citizenship, emphasising freedom, entails virtues such as '*tolerance, self-criticism, and mutual respect*'. While classical civic-republican virtues regard *obedience, courage, solidarity and sacrifice*, to this we can add modern ones such as, *reasonableness, plurality and democracy*. The general view being that the divide can be argued both bridged and less evident (Kymlicka & Norman 1994, van Gunsteren 1994, Heater 1999, Dobson 2003, Jagers 2009).

Given this, civic-republican and liberal theorists can also be observed divided regarding citizenship and the environment, specifically on how to address environmental degradation. The latter emphasising the rights of the individual and the resulting extension of human rights to include 'the right to a habitable environment' as an answer (Bell 2005, van Steenberger 1994). With the main critique being its capability to address global environmental problems, as citizen rights are dependent upon the nation state. Civic-republican theorists on the other hand see the environment as a collective good and thus impose citizenly responsibilities. This has however been assumed incompatible with the liberal ideals of today (Lundqvist 2004, Jagers 2007). Consequently, the reason for liberal citizens to minimize environmental degradation is the claim to some right or benefit in return, while civic-republican reap the reciprocal gain within the community. (Jagers 2009, p. 20) And this still only takes place within the public sphere.

At this point, we should mention *cosmopolitan* citizenship and the reason for its absence. As Dobson sees 'ecological citizenship' as a '*post-cosmopolitan*' one, they both carry distinctive similarities *as well as* differences and will instead be addressed in the subsequent section.

We can conclude by pronouncing that citizenship is a politically and historically evolving term, and recent developments as regards to feminism and globalization have challenged the traditional understanding of citizenship, with implications for environmentalism (Dobson 2003). Building upon the works of (Smith 1998, Dean 2001) Dobson calls for a new conception of democracy and citizenship, a '*post-cosmopolitan citizenship*'.

3 Theory

According to Andrew Dobson ‘*post-cosmopolitan*’ citizenship encompasses four defining characteristics; “[...] *the non-reciprocal nature of the obligations associated with it, the non-territorial yet material nature of its sense of political space, its recognition that this political space should include the private as well as the public realm, and, relatedly, its focus on virtue and its determination to countenance the possibility of ‘private’ virtues being virtues of citizenship.*”

(Dobson 2003, p. 82)

3.1 Andrew Dobson’s ‘Ecological Citizenship’

These characteristics of Dobson’s ‘*post-cosmopolitan*’ citizenship are essentially what broaden the concept in ways which cannot be claimed by neither liberal nor civic-republican rational. Further, what according to Dobson sets ‘*post-cosmopolitan*’ citizenship apart from cosmopolitan are virtues such as *care* and *compassion*, and the inclusion of the *private sphere*, which clearly distinguishes it from other understandings of citizenship. Also, and according to Dobson more importantly “*The principal difference between cosmopolitan and post-cosmopolitan citizenship, then, is that between the ‘thin’ community of common humanity and the ‘thick’ community of ‘historical obligation’.*” (Dobson 2003, p. 81) What Dobson means is that ‘*post-cosmopolitan*’ citizenship is rooted in identifiable relations of actual harm, while ‘*cosmopolitan*’ refers to a community including all humankind. Using climate change as an example, as climate change is argued not to be the result of ‘all humankind’ living unsustainably.

Dobson argues that this ‘*post-cosmopolitan*’ perspective on citizenship is virtually obligatory if a normative political theory is to address global and enduring environmental problems, such as climate change, successfully. (Dobson 2003, p. 67f) Also, as this ‘*post-cosmopolitan*’ citizenship is advanced in the light of environmental politics it is rearticulated as ‘*ecological citizenship*’, a normative green political theory. (Dobson 2003, p. 82) ‘*Ecological citizenship*’ will also be the designation used in this article from this point on.

3.1.1 The Non-Reciprocal Responsibilities of Ecological Citizenship

‘*Ecological citizenship*’ stresses responsibilities over rights and what clearly sets it apart, is that these responsibilities are considered non-reciprocal (Dobson

2003, p. 139). Citizenship which is non-reciprocal can be neither civic-republican nor liberalist. Dobson argues that the *fundamental responsibility* of the ecological citizen, is to ensure that *the pursuit of fulfilling individual needs does not affect the ability of others to pursue theirs*, applying not only to present but also future generations. It is the relationship between citizens that gives rise to these responsibilities.

The main virtues of ecological citizenship are *justice, care and compassion*, with the two latter being necessary to exercise the first (Dobson 2003, p. 132-134). According to Dobson it is however not the virtues themselves which are determinant “[...] *but the relationships that give rise to citizenship obligations.*” (Dobson 2003, p. 66) Consequently, Dobson brings in traditionally considered ‘feminine virtues’ with respect to the ‘masculine’ ones of liberal and civic-republican citizenship. Further, the emphasis of relationships includes the private sphere, another area often considered feminine (Dobson 2003, p. 62ff). (see Werbner (1999) and Hutchings (2002)) Thus it is the relationships and not the virtues themselves that yield citizenship responsibility. Ecological citizens care because they want to do justice, and the non-reciprocal nature of its responsibilities lies with minimizing the negative ecological impact on others (Dobson 2003, p. 122). (see Sagoff 1988 and Wackernagel & Rees 1996)

3.1.2 Ecological Citizenship and the Private Realm

The most discernible characteristic of ‘ecological citizenship’ is the inclusion the private sphere. The responsibility of the ecological citizen does not only regard the public, but also the private sphere for two reasons, “*private acts can have public implications in ways that can be related to the category of citizenship*” also with regards to virtues “[...] *care and compassion in particular, with their unconditional and non-reciprocal character -are characteristics of ideal –typical versions of private realm relationships.*” (Dobson 2003, p. 135) Dobson argues that the private realm, rather than being lesser than the public, might be a crucial cite of citizenship activity. Dobson clearly takes inspiration from the works of (Kymlicka & Norman 1994) who state that “*the state cannot protect the environment if citizens are unwilling to reduce, reuse and recycle in their own homes.*” (Kymlicka & Norman 1994, p. 360) Ecological citizenship can be seen as entailing a public concern for the consequences of individual acts. More specifically, acts of the private sphere can have public implications. A more than appropriate example is that of driving an automobile which emits greenhouse gases (GHG’s). The action lies within the private sphere but due to its consequences has public implications. Taken one step further, such an act is closely related to even larger issues of living standards and lifestyle. (Dobson 2003, 135ff) (Lafferty and Meadowcraft 1996, Micheletti 2003)

Thus what Dobson argues is that “[...] *the private realm is important to ecological citizenship because it is a site of citizenship activity, and because the kinds of obligations it generates, and the virtues necessary to meeting those*

obligations, are analogously and actually present in the types of relationships we normally designate as 'private'” (Dobson 2003, p. 138).

3.1.3 The Non-Territoriality of Ecological Citizenship

Much of Dobson’s non-territorial aspect is, according to himself, owed to the focus on responsibilities rather than rights (Dobson 2003, p. 117). The political space of ‘ecological citizenship’ and its responsibilities are not bound to a specific political territory. Rather it is the earlier mentioned responsibilities and actions within the private realm that in a globalized world induces this non-territoriality. Our actions and consumption of global goods and services, affects and has consequences for other citizens, implying that the footprint of our actions have global and social consequences that are not delimited by space or time (Dobson 2004, p. 97ff). This is the essence of Dobson’s theorizing on the ecological citizen, that the behaviour of citizens affects others, giving rise to responsibilities regarding public as well as private acts, which transcends both space and time. ‘Ecological citizenship’ is according to Dobson not optional but rather a necessity if we are to address environmental problems, especially issues of the nature such as climate change. For him it represents a particular interpretation of ‘post-cosmopolitan’ citizenship that supports the notion of ‘ecological footprints’ and thus includes the private sphere. (Dobson 2003, p. 139) (*see* Matti (2006) for an extensive overview)

Despite little disagreement among scholars as regards to the normative value of ‘ecological citizenship’ a number of criticisms have been ventilated, the principle being ‘ecological citizenship’s’ lack of polity. Also, the distinction between moral and citizenly responsibility has been questioned, together with the fact that there seems to be no clear indication of what ecological citizenship entails or the qualification required for its membership. Lastly, numerous scholars have questioned the impact and effectiveness of individual actions and what allows for ecological citizenly engagements (*see* Hayward 2006 Bell 2005, Sáiz 2005, Seyfang 2005, Valdivielso 2005).

3.2 Ecological Citizenship and Empiricism

There are few works addressing ecological citizenship which have extended beyond normative theorizing, although differing in approach they all provide valuable insight. In her 2006 article *Ecological citizenship and sustainable consumption* Gill Seyfang set out to investigate whether ecological citizenship could be seen as a driving force for ‘alternative’ sustainable consumption by expressions of consumer behaviour such as purchasing local organic food (Seyfang 2006). What Seyfang found was that organisation and consumers alike exhibited strong evidence of ecological citizenship values, and that the initiative further promoted such values and behaviour. Seyfang observed that a strong

environmental ethic was a major motivation for the partakers, with characteristics such as justice and fairness, ecological footprint rational, solidarity and non-territoriality being clearly expressed. Further, participants saw actions and values as being deeply political, and expressed them within the private realm (Seyfang 2006, p. 393-394). Ecological citizenship was found to be a valuable theoretical model, with further research being called for within the development, nurturing and promotion of ecological citizenship, as well as, how policy can aid its societal progression (Seyfang 2006 p. 395).

This is similar to the evidence observed by (Wolf et al. 2009) in a case study addressing individual responses to climate change, with subjects perceiving an individual responsibility for climate change. And although many of the previously mentioned criticisms were supported, justice, actions taken within the private realm and non-territoriality were again found to be of importance. Also, further research on how such behaviour is to be encouraged was called for (Wolf et al. 2009, p. 518-519).

Adding to the body of evidence with a first-time extensive study, Sverker C. Jagers investigated the existence of the ecological citizen and its underlying factors in his 2009 article *In search of the ecological citizen*. Using a random sample of 3000 Swedes aged 15-85 Jagers found that as much as 25% showed inclination of ecological citizenship, with age, perceived threat, environmental interest and ideology being influential. This regarded the willingness to pay taxes and give up economic growth for the benefit of environment and poor.

Worthy of note is the general focus on and indications regarding individual behaviour and private sphere.

Finally, there also seems to be a general consensus that further research is warranted, especially within the policy field and with regards to the inclusion of the private sphere, thus supporting the aim of this thesis. With consideration to prior and suggested areas of research, the utility of frame analysis is discernible. Consequently, frame analysis and its applicability will be addressed in greater detail.

4 Methodological Approach

As we are investigating *how* a concept has been taken up and adopted, we are inherently talking about in what way assumptions, beliefs and objectives have effected how different issues are presented and viewed, one would talk about how a certain issue is ‘framed’. With such an understanding we are inherently claiming a social-constructivist approach.

4.1 Frame Analysis

Frame analysis derives from discourse theory and is based upon a social-constructivist epistemology. What this entails is that it is based upon the notion that there are no universal truths. Knowledge, proof and most importantly objectivity are viewed with a critical eye (Fletcher 2009, p. 800). The notion of frames stems from concerns regarding real-world policy making and social science ability to guide or inform public decision making (Wagenaar 2011, p. 82). “[...] *frame analysis exposes the role of political language and worldviews in the construction of plausible, meaningful and socially relevant pathways that can enrol a majority of stakeholders and citizens in collective action.*” (Fletcher 2009, p 801) Purposes and values are absolutely crucial in our understanding, investigation and analysis of facts about our reality. There are no brute facts, everyday reality is made sense of by the profoundly interrelated mix of purpose, theory, value and facts. (Wagenaar 2011, p. 83-84) For the purposes of this thesis the concept of framing aids us in understanding the advancement of the focus on the individual’s role within policymaking and how the concept of ‘ecological citizenship’, with its distinctive characteristics has been taken up and adopted by Swedish Green Party policy.

According to both Hajer (1995) and Rein & Schon (1993) frames act as a vital precursor to further action by setting boundaries around issues. Wagenaar underlines the utility of frame analysis eloquently, stating that;

“The frame concept is useful in understanding the role of social science in the fundamentally contested world of policy making [...] a sophisticated theory about the relationship between social science research and public policy making [...] frame analysis shows how the perspectivism that is inherent to both policy making and research shapes and limits their reciprocal relationship.”

(Wagenaar 2011, p. 88)

Policy problems are seen to be viewed, discussed and resolved through different frames, and framing is as elaborated by Rein & Schon “[...] a way of selecting, organising, interpreting and making sense of a complex reality to provide guideposts for knowing analysing, persuading and acting. Further, a frame is considered to be “[...] a perspective from which an amorphous, ill-defined, problematic situation can be made sense of and acted on. “ (Rein & Schon 1993, p. 146) Framing is particularly appreciative within policy making that deals with complex and interdisciplinary issues, which require action across different areas, something that is exemplified by most environmental problems, such as for example climate change. (Hajer 1995)

Rein & Schon recognize four differing approaches to frames, these are not of competing nature, but rather distinct and mutually compatible images. A frame can be seen as a *scaffolding*, *boundary*, *cognitive/appreciative schema of interpretation* or a *generic diagnostic/prescriptive story*. What is important to acknowledge is that although capturing different important features and functions of frames, they all rest on the same perception. Namely, that “*there is a less visible foundation--an "assumptional basis"--that lies beneath the more visible surface of language or behavior, determining its boundaries and giving it coherence.*” (Rein & Schon 1996, p. 88) However, as also pointed out by Rein & Schon, frames can be very difficult to assess, as they are part of our taken for granted world, where we are often unaware of their influence. (Rein & Schon 1993, p. 151) Frame analysis is a rather interpretive and guiding form of approach, as revealed by its differentiated practical application (see Ascui & Lovell 2011, Fletcher 2009 and Lovell 2004).

As a method of interpretation nonetheless, there are a number of reasons why frame analysis is both important and interesting. It allows for the critical analysis of assumptions, beliefs and intervening aspirations with regards to policy proposals (Wagenaar 2011, p. 82). The said features of frames and the argued areas of application put forward is clearly in-line with the aim of this thesis. Further, the approach taken is especially rewarding as, although not dealing with a specific issue per-se, we have clearly pronounced characteristics to aid us in our analysis.

According to Fletcher, the encompassing feature that holds for all discourse theory, from which frame analysis stems, is the focus on how language builds, rather than reflects, social reality. Frame analysis provides us with a method for a systematic analysis of the interplay between actors, language and policy. Put differently, it enables the understanding of the features of metaphors, storylines and language that can advance normatively important and effective public policies (Fletcher 2009, p 802-803). Again, this speaks very well to the purpose, aim and subject of this thesis. Rein & Schon outline the process at hand in a rather simple and straight forward manner. The initial task lies with identifying the issue terrain, observing the competing frames, as well as the forums for the discourse. Following this is formulating the question related to our issue terrain. According to Rein & Schon, one of the most important questions is how reframing occurs, reframing being seen as a distancing and reflection period where the actors stop and question current presupposed understandings in order to adopt new

approaches, a 'reflection-in-action' (Wagenaar 2011, p. 225). Thus, entailing that the researcher observes how a framing changes over time, again, of particular interest for this thesis, with the inclusion of the private sphere being definitive. (Rein & Schon 1996, p. 96)

In conclusion, the analysis of frames sheds light on the assumptions and the context which, with regards to policy, is taken for granted (Rein 1983).

5 Empirical Analysis

In this chapter the analysis of Swedish Green Party policy is presented. One of the major focal points of this thesis has been to provide a clear and transparent line of reasoning. With the hope and belief that this has been achieved thus far, the following outline and approach used in examining the empirical material should be coherent.

5.1 The Swedish Greens and ‘Ecological Citizenship’

As demonstrated, there has been an increased focus on individual behaviour and the role of citizenship within the environmental debate. Globalization and feminism has challenged traditional conceptions of citizenship, inducing new conceptualizations such as ‘ecological citizenship’. Leading researchers such as Seyfang and Jagers to examine the existence of an ecological citizen, with their findings further research has been called for, especially within the policy field, and with regards to individual behaviour. Given this, and the scope and aim of this thesis, a study of Swedish Green Party policy documents is warranted. These are topics and questions which frame analysis has proven adept in answering.

As frame analysis is a rather interpretive approach, it requires much transparency from its employer. Thus, there are some initial notes to be made.

This analysis does not study a specific problem, such as for example climate change, much due to the fact that citizenship is an encompassing concept. Although not being addressed solely, the issue of climate change will be scrutinized more closely, as both frame analysis and ‘ecological citizenship’ uses it as a representative applicability example. One might argue that the article should have further narrowed the focus to just this issue, but the broad scope of citizenship and exploratory nature of this research suggests otherwise. Further, other issues will be exemplified in a consistent manner, however these will have to be identified throughout. Lastly, as already mentioned, the thesis will not address any specific action or document of such nature, as is also often referred to within frame analysis.

5.1.1 Outlining Characteristics

Dobson has in his publication provided a clear and distinctive characterisation between *liberal*, *civic-republican* and '*ecological citizenship*', as shown in the table below. (*Note*: although labelled *virtue free* we have outlined some for liberal citizenship) For the purposes of this analysis the same general criteria will be used, with specific focus aimed at the private sphere as this has been proven central.

	Liberal	Civic-republican	Ecological
Rights/Responsibilities Contractual/Non-Contractual	Rights Contractual	Responsibilities Contractual	Responsibilities Non-Contractual
Private/Public Sphere	Public	Public	Public & Private
Virtues	Virtue Free	'Masculine' Virtues	'Feminine' Virtues
Territory	Territorial	Territorial	Non-Territorial

(Dobson 2003, p 39)

Studying the empirical material with such clear characteristics in-mind, and other defining features inherent within these differing frames are expected to be clearly identified. Frames of liberal and civic-republican nature are expected to be detected, and certain aspects are predicted to be rather entangled. However, as observed '*ecological citizenship*' encompasses certain features which are clearly distinctive from those of *liberal* or *civic-republican*, especially with regards to the inclusion of the private sphere.

The intention behind the selected material is to achieve some form of triangulation which sufficiently serves the aim and scope of the thesis, further strengthening the conclusions drawn from the analysis. Thus, it is with such discernment that we now turn our attention to the empirical material.

5.2 The Evolving Years (1981-1998)

Solidarity, has been the phrase continuously used and representative of Swedish Green policy. Being a civic-republican virtue, solidarity strongly resonates with the public sphere and the ‘common good’. But as we shall observe, the meaning of this phrase has change significantly over the years.

Following the disappointment regarding the Swedish referendum on nuclear power in 1980, *Per Gahrton*, one of the founding figures of the Swedish Green Party, wrote an article in *Dagens Nyheter* calling for a new political party. A party that put quality of life before material and economic growth, claiming that a society based on growth has its own demise inherent. One year later, in 1981, the Swedish Green Party was officially founded (www.mp.se).

Although being the dominant frame from the outset, traditional civic-republican virtues were not solely present, certain phrases and views actually resonated with ‘ecological citizenship’. The presence of both traditional and more radical values is however no surprise. The party initially emphasised its divergence from ‘traditional’ ideology, in a sense contradictory of its civic-republican character, but stereotypical of a newly established political party. The Swedish Greens sought to exempt themselves from the existing political climate, by claiming to take a different road than the ‘*hundred year old*’ ideologies of the existing parties. (Election Manifesto, 1988) This was accomplished by using the civic-republican virtue of solidarity as the pathway for issue resolution and policy implementation (ibid) (Fletcher 2009). Attempting to differentiate themselves further by arguing views such as ‘*believing in man rather than capital or state*’ also using feminine virtues by combining ‘*conscience and solidarity*’ (ibid). They likewise introduced the ‘*future*’ as an important motivating factor for its environmental approach to politics, again stressing civic-republican responsibilities.

After two unsuccessful elections, the Swedish Greens were voted into parliament in 1988, coinciding with the rise of environment as a political issue. Framing the current situation as both urgent and non-forcible, the party urged for solidarity and sacrifice for the ‘common good’ not only nationally but globally, inclining towards non-territoriality, but clearly not including the private sphere.

A policy regarding the taxation on food does however show tendencies towards attempting to influence individual behaviour with heavier taxation for environmentally degrading produce. Economic sacrifice is called for, improving the care of elderly being exemplary. They oppose the European Union but say yes to open borders, again displaying views of non-territoriality. Also, an inclination with regards to Dobson’s ‘thick community’ is expressed as ‘*our prosperity cannot contribute to the poverty and need of others*’ (ibid).

Although demonstrating feminine and non-territorial influences, there is no question that these are bounded by civic-republican responsibilities towards the ‘common good’, clearly not going beyond the public sphere. With the concluding description being, ‘*We dream of a society where no one runs from their responsibility and where everyone has a say*’ (ibid).

Three years on Swedish Green policy became more conflicted, with the assumed desire to gain political influence, increased international recognition of environmental degradation and existing political climate, we can observe the introduction of liberal virtues and a competing 'liberal framing'.

The 1991 Election Manifesto affirmed the civic-republican frame but liberal virtues and views clearly challenged it. The dominant frame arguing the responsibilities of citizenship and 'common good' was still characteristic, it was now not only influenced by feminine virtues however, but also challenged by emerging liberal ones, *freedom* being the most distinctive. The Swedish Greens chose to emphasize that the important questions regarded *life, love, emotions* and *future generations* indicating the advancement of feminism and ecology, but also that virtues of the private sphere were progressively embraced. Although not altering the earlier mentioned policies, freedom of choice was now explicitly called for. This liberal embrace is best exemplified under the heading '*Distributional Solidarity!*' stating '*that societal solidarity has to be defended and the increased freedom we want to give people shall be able to reach everybody*' (Swedish Green Election Manifesto 1991).

Regarding the position on the European Union, the definite opposition to the union is still strong, however we again come across liberal and civic-republican virtues with statements such as '*We say yes to peoples freedom all over the world and with solidarity with the poor world*'. As mentioned however, certain aspects with regards to civic- republican and liberal citizenship, especially rights and responsibilities, are bridged due to their reciprocal nature.

The absolutely most noteworthy is the distinct introduction of the private sphere. This is a strongly significant inclination towards the advancement of an entirely new frame. The private sphere is, as mentioned, not included within civic-republican nor liberal citizenship. Stating that '*we have to reduce consumption*', calling upon the responsibility of the citizen also within the private sphere, while the control for consumption inducing publicity is necessitated. This marks an important introduction of individual behaviour and a more clearly defined new frame which we can associate to 'ecological citizenship'.

The dominating frame is still that of a civic-republican citizenship, based on the reciprocal responsibilities of solidarity. The important note lies with the occurring 'frame divergence' in this period, with the introduction of liberal virtues such as freedom and more importantly the inclusion of the private sphere, which is not linked with either civic-republican or liberal citizenship. (ibid)

The Swedish Green Party was excluded from parliament after the 1991 election, and the following 1994 Election Manifesto does not contribute much to our analysis. Observed is the continued challenging presence of the aforementioned frames. The party's rhetoric softened significantly, with most positions and policies remaining steadfast, but the text being much more technical rather than ideologically oriented, being exemplary of 'reflection-in-action' or the manifestation of reframing. There are however some things worthy of note, an increased inclination towards Sweden and its citizens as having a privileged position in the world, and the responsibilities that follows such a position, again inclining towards Dobson's conception of 'thick community'. Further, we observe

the constant which is the civic-republican virtue of solidarity, as well as the inclination towards non-territoriality. The inclusion of the private sphere however shines with its absence (Swedish Green Election Manifesto 1994)

With a return to parliament in 1994, the manifesto produced for the 1998 election marked a significant shift in policy. From liberal citizenly virtues and ideals being taken up and challenging the dominant civic-republican frame, to an ambiguous and technical policy approach four years on, there is now a reversion towards the party's original influences. With this we observe the emergence of a new frame that encompasses much more distinctive features of 'ecological citizenship'. Although the more specific policies proposed are rather unchanged, which to a certain extent impedes the argument for a complete reframing, the bounding certainly advances features distinctive of 'ecological citizenship'. Its emergence and conception has advanced as an influential and challenging frame. This is only additionally highlighted by the articulated critique of other parties and their politics, much as when the party first was elected into parliament. One only needs to exemplify this emerging frame by reproducing the first sentences of the manifesto, mentioning 'ecological footprints', a new concept that also ties to private sphere, as well as emphasising particular virtues.

'The Swedish Greens are a young party. We carry with us thoughts, ideas and values for a new era. We think global, act local and do not want the ecological footprints we leave behind us to impede future generations to live a good life. We are convinced that it is possible to build an ecological and socially sustainable society intended for people that want to live, love, grow and dare'

(Swedish Green Election Manifesto 1998)

5.3 A New Frame for A New Millennium

As observed in the previous section, the new millennium looked to bring with it a reframing of the Swedish Greens policy and their view on citizenship. Although lacking certain definitive characteristics in order to firmly establish that a complete reframing had occurred, the development looked to favour the concept of 'ecological citizenship'.

The manifesto of the 2002 national elections, in much sustained the boundaries of the document formulated four years prior. Solidarity was again used as the principle virtue, this time however it was articulated in a different interpretation, '*Solidarity with animals, nature and the ecological system, Solidarity with future generations, Solidarity with the people of the world, Solidarity with the people in our own country.*' Also stated was that the Swedish Greens offer a path '*away from stress, ill-health, overconsumption and environmental degradation*'. (Swedish Greens Election Manifesto 2002) Evident is a more distinct resonance with 'ecological citizenly' characteristics, that of non-territoriality, relationships and most importantly the private sphere. Although, there is influence of other ideals, for example '*The green politics bridge the left-*

right division. It combines the dream of great individual freedom with extensive solidarity in resource division'. The general sensation is that there is a strengthening of a new frame. The use of words like *'care and love'* strongly resonates with the responsibilities of relationships, again bringing in the private sphere.

It is the first time we see a direct reference to *climate change*, interesting is that the approach to mitigate emissions of GHG's and other environmental degradation are within public *and* private sphere. Emissions are supposed to be mitigated with the development of infrastructure but also by altering individual behaviour through for example congestion taxation, also clearly voiced by leader *Maria Wetterstrand* in an article for the member publication *Grönt*, not only supporting such taxation as the *'most effective behavioural alteration method'* but also linking it to *historical debt, relationships and responsibilities* as *'we cannot drive the gas consuming cars we do, when Chines and Indian also want to live and drive like us'* (Wetterstrand 2004) Also most produce, food in particular, shall be exempted from high taxes as to induce environmentally friendly consumption. There is a continued opposition of the European Union, but support for closer communities, cooperation and open borders, again resonating with non-territoriality. (Swedish Greens Election Manifesto 2002)

With the first party program, we can in more detail observe the policies of the Swedish Greens. The 2005 programme builds upon a new and more distinctive frame. It further embraces certain concepts while incorporating and consolidating older ones. We observe not only how liberal and civic-republican virtues like *freedom, equality* and *solidarity* endure and reveal their normative impact, but how responsibility is increasingly associated with virtues such as *justice, care* and *compassion*. Also, *non-territoriality* is gaining increased importance, together with the incorporation of the *private sphere* and individual behaviour. Thus, exhibiting several characteristics of *'ecological citizenship'* (Swedish Greens Policy Programme 2005).

In order to demonstrate this *'reframing'* we do not have to go beyond the first page of the program. The objectives are described as *'a long-term sustainable democratic society, where people take responsibility, locally and globally'*, the following phrases being even further exemplary *'Man's freedom to decide over oneself should only be limited with regard to other peoples freedom and security, regard to future generations right to a habitable environment and regard to other feeling creatures'* (ibid). In fact, this particular sentence is strikingly similar to Dobson's own articulation on responsibilities. Further, the reoccurring slogan used by the Swedish Greens with regard to solidarity now also has a priori elaborating statement, *'The value of solidarity lies with our conviction that man is adept to see oneself in others, thereby feeling compassion and taking responsibility for all living'* (ibid). These are all statements and views which are tied to private sphere virtues and the responsibilities of relationships, with a historical obligation and global perspective. There is still a clear opposition to the European Union, due mainly to its ruling structure however, not international cooperation.

The general solution to environmental degradation and sustainability is according to The Swedish Greens an altering of the system and the responsibility taken by the individual for his or her lifestyle, furthering views with regards to individual behaviour, and the responsibility of the citizen. The Swedish Greens argue a direct democracy, as it enables and feeds responsibility and commitment with every citizen. The individual is in focus, *'responsibility lies with the individual and his or her interaction with others, only such which the individual cannot handle should be addressed by institutions, and if so the ones closest to the individual'* (ibid). Also, a *'resource conscious lifestyle'* is called for, with every decision and action having to display responsibility for future generations, again framing the issue as one regarding individual responsibilities and actions, bringing in the private sphere. The focus on environmental taxation as a critical solution, and as a motivating and behaviour altering factor, was highlighted as a party success with increase in sales of 'Green Vehicles' by leader *Peter Eriksson* (Eriksson 2005), and as a contrasting example when criticising the governments lack of climate change policy by *Wetterstrand* (Wetterstrand 2007).

Care and compassion are virtues clearly displayed, as in the concluding statement of the party programme expressing that *'the road to the future is through the heart of people'*, only further emphasising the Green party's embrace of virtues associated with 'ecological citizenship' (ibid).

The 2006 election manifesto did, for the purposes of this analysis, not contain any significant information nor did it add to the views observed in the 2005 policy programme.

In 2008, *Wetterstrand* with her debate article displayed open enthusiasm over the general trend, that 'green' was 'hot', clearly focusing on the individual choices and behaviour (Wetterstrand 2008). This was further celebrated by *Eriksson* proclaiming *The New Green Deal* as green parties advanced and collaborated in European Union elections (Eriksson 2009). Further in 2009, with regards to the upcoming climate change negotiations *Wetterstrand* displayed optimism, but also emphasised that we all have to do our part, intending that such issues are dealt with in the public *as well as* private sphere. (Wetterstrand 2009)

Following this enthusiasm the 2010 election manifesto displayed an even greater commitment to the inclusion of the private sphere, individual behaviour and responsibilities. A rather simplistic example is the statement that *'We want to make it easier for people to make sustainable choices in their everyday lives.'* showing a clearer will and readiness to advance such views as important for electoral success. With regards to the private sphere and individual behaviour, we now also observe the topic of *consumption* as a distinct issue.

Another point in the manifesto is the distinctive communication that Sweden has to take its global responsibility to reduce GHG's to recommended levels. As well as the responsibility to aid developing countries with regards to climate change action. Furthermore within this topic, there are other areas which are addressed in a similar manner, for public transport, energy, service industry and agricultural industry much of the proposed actions are aimed at reducing the cost for individuals to make environmentally friendly choices. What we can observe is

a much clearer and larger emphasis on actions within the private sphere and the way to influence consumption patterns.

Lastly, there is an important alteration with regards to the view on the European Union, namely that a distinct no to the union is no longer expressed, it is now rather the EMU and the way that the EU is governed which is criticised. (Swedish Greens Election Manifesto 2010) Already, in 2008 Wetterstrand had shifted position regarding the European Union as she argued that the advantages with regards to environment and open borders now outweighed the reasons for membership opposition (Wetterstrand 2008).

With the 2010 elections the Swedish Greens became the 3rd largest party in Sweden, accompanying was also a scheduled change in leadership. The new leadership continued along the same line, further including the private sphere by formulating a reoccurring description that *'everybody wants to join in'* people are talking *'in basements, laundry rooms, on coffee brakes'* and emphasising that *'the change you and I can achieve in the grocery store, union or own business can go far, but together we can go farther'* Being a perfect example of the continued focus on the public *and* private (Fridolin 2011).

In the 2013 policy programme, together with asserting the change occurring in the world and amongst humanity towards more environmentally friendly actions, the Swedish Greens make statements which resonate distinctly with those of Andrew Dobson. *'Man is a creative and empathetic creature who is willing and able to take responsibility.'*, also writing that *'Peoples practice of freedom is limited, in part by the boundaries of nature and partly because of other peoples practice of freedom. All people therefore have the responsibility not to limit or restrict others freedoms.'* Such statements are clearly in-line with 'ecological citizenship' (Swedish Greens Policy Programme 2013).

The general feeling is that the newly formed policy programme is a re-articulation and strengthening of the 2005 version.

Looking at the most critical topic, environment, we are now expecting there to be distinct views and policies expressed which resonate with 'ecological citizenship', providing us with a final indication whether a reframing has been adopted. The views expressed clearly take on a frame which is indicative of 'ecological citizenship', stating that, *'We in the richer countries must adapt our consumption so that our ecological footprints per capita as soon as possible reach a globally sustainable level'*. Nationally, similar views are expressed pronouncing that *'Sweden has to take responsibility for the effect that our production and consumption has on the ecological system, here and in other countries'*. Further, our historical debt as a developed nation is emphasized.

On a more explicit policy level we see a much greater focus on the individual and consumption, within all areas. Individual consumption must decrease, becoming less environmentally degrading and resource exhausting. This is intended to be achieved by three broader policies, lowering cost of services, education regarding environment and branding of goods, and incentives for environmentally friendly and lesser consumption, much of which will be induced by taxation. These are policies which have trailed Swedish Green policy since its establishment in one way or another. It is rather the articulation and a much

greater focus on the individual and consumption which is to be underlined. Exemplified by the following statement *'By travelling more environmentally friendly, buying local produce, eating increasingly vegetarian, making homes more energy efficient and consuming less goods we increase the chances of living a good life within the boundaries set by the environment'*. Revealing the clear reframing of marginally altered policies, especially with regards to taxation, it is rather the inclusion of private sphere and focus on individual behaviour which has reframed Swedish Green policy and affirmed the adoption of 'ecological citizenship'.

6 Discussion

After studying the empirical material it can be rather confidently argued that we have observed a reframing of Swedish Green Party policy. The Swedish Greens have taken up and adopted ‘ecological citizenship’, the inclusion of the private sphere and policies regarding individual behaviour being particularly supporting of this assessment.

Briefly readdressing the material, it was not surprising that views and issues where initially expressed within the boundaries of a civic-republican frame, nor was it surprising to find evidence of emerging feminist and ecological thought. It was in definite line with the overall developments of the period. There is no question however that the call for *responsibility* and *solidarity* towards the ‘*common good*’ depicts a civic-republican frame in line with the conceptualization of (Rein & Schon 1993) and (Fletcher 2009, p 801). Neither was there any evidence of policy that addressed private sphere and individual behaviour, characteristics specific of ‘ecological citizenship’.

The introduction of liberal virtues and the strengthening of already existing feminine ones, definitely challenged the dominant civic-republican frame. The years when the party was excluded from parliament clearly showed that the prior rather clear line was subject to ‘frame divergence’ and later ‘reflection-in-action’. Again this is not surprising as it coincides with the political climate and the party’s loss of parliamentary mandates. From this however, emerged clearer, stronger and more prominent views and policies which strongly resonated with ‘ecological citizenship’

It can be argued however that the theorizing which inspired Dobson’s conception of ‘ecological citizenship’ had already significantly influenced the characteristics of Swedish Green policy and its civic-republican frame. The early extension of solidarity and ‘common good’ beyond the borders of the nation-state and the adoption of feminist virtues rather suggests this. Indicating not only that the argued reframing was dependent on the inclusion of the private sphere, but also confirming our prior articulation of both the applicability and limitations of frame analysis itself. However, with the belief that a structured and exposed approach has counteracted any limitations of frame analysis and the observation of articulations such as ‘*Man’s freedom to decide over oneself should only be limited with regard to other peoples freedom and security, regard to future generations right to a habitable environment and regard to other feeling creatures*’, together with the evident adoption of the private sphere within party policy, should be seen as sufficient confirmation. Also, the material, although being limited and with a greater amount welcomed, was certainly adequate.

Not all characteristics are easily discernible, the non-reciprocal nature of responsibilities can only be observed and expressed as values related to private

sphere virtues, however not making them any less inherent in Swedish Green policy. Non-territoriality is clearly expressed, but such a conception is clearly an implicit social identity rather than legal status. Lastly, there is little question that an actual reframing was observed, and that the most prominent feature of this and of 'ecological citizenship', was the inclusion of the private sphere and policies regarding individual behaviour.

7 Conclusion

This study set out with the intention of studying how Andrew Dobson's normative green theory of '*ecological citizenship*' has been taken up by the Swedish Green Party. The general conclusion is that the Swedish Green Party has evidently taken up and adopted the essential characteristics of '*ecological citizenship*', the most significant indication being the inclusion of the *private sphere* and policies which address individual behaviour. However, with the strengthening of virtues such as *justice*, *care* and *compassion*, subsequent change of *responsibilities*, becoming increasingly *non-reciprocal*, and with *non-territoriality* being observable already in the party's forming years this was, at least according to Dobson, only a warranted progression.

Again, the *virtues* and *non-territorial* aspect of citizenship together with the emphasis of human *relationships* and '*thick community*' has been observable throughout Swedish Green Party policy. Given the emphasis of relationships, one could also argue the existence of a *non-reciprocal* nature. But it is the latter shift and inclusion of individual behaviour and actions which definitively argues that the Swedish Greens have taken up and adopted '*ecological citizenship*'.

With regards to policy application, one can say that *virtues* and *relationships* are used as means of appealing to the sense of '*right and wrong*', holding true for all areas.

Non-territoriality has been a clear position, closely linked with *relationships* and the support for *direct democracy*. The position on the European Union has changed somewhat, much due to the general 'green' success within the union.

It is however again the inclusion of the *private sphere* also in policy which gives a definitive framing, the focus being taxation as a means of mitigating environmental degradation, more importantly, with the new millennium *including* the private sphere addressing individual behaviour within all areas, food, employment and transportation, with the goal of altering environmentally degrading behaviour. Further, *consumption* has risen has a distinctive issue and with it the appeal to the individual. The general picture presented is that it is within the private sphere that problems and solutions pertain, being significant to issues like climate change among others.

An important point to make is that this further supports the conclusions drawn by previous research, especially that of Jagers (2009) who focused on citizen's willingness to pay taxes for environmental purposes and the fact that the Swedish Greens have so clearly emphasise this position, might explain their recent electoral success. We can most definitely see clear linkages with his and other research, supporting the chosen aim and scope, as well as our findings. (Seyfang 2006, Wolf et al 2009) However, much of the observed criticism, especially with

regards to membership and polity, cannot be discarded by this paper as the use of frame analysis is not intended for such reasoning.

The aim and scope of this thesis is one which frame analysis has proved very well-equipped in addressing. With a structured and exposed approach it was very adequate for the purposes of this thesis. It is also evident that its strength lies with answering *how* and not *why* questions, generating several questions for further research as well as suggesting additional studies of this nature. The more significant being the effects of such policies and the adoption within a national or governmental context.

As shown, the formation, rise and evolvement of the Swedish Green Party as one of the more important actors in Swedish politics, coincides well with the observed developments within the environmental debate in general and role of citizenship in particular, not only supporting the aim of this thesis but also making it timely. All the inherent characteristics of ‘ecological citizenship’ are observed, affirming the normative value of Dobson’s theory. The theory does however only support the argument made by Dobson himself, that recent developments has called for such a re-articulation, as it, except for private sphere inclusion, builds upon other theorizing on citizenship.

At the outset of this thesis we established that environmental degradation is occurring at an alarming rate, and asked *how* do we solve or mitigate these problems and what role do *we* play? The Swedish Green party’s answer to that is;

‘Compassionate and engaged people change the world. Every progression starts with individual commitment and engagement. You make a difference!’
(Swedish Greens Policy Programme 2013)

References

- Ascuí, F., & Lovell, H. (2011). As frames collide: making sense of carbon accounting. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 24(8), 978-999.
- Barry, J., & Wissenburg, M. (2001). Sustaining Liberal Democracy.
- Bell, D. R. (2005). Liberal environmental citizenship. *Environmental politics*, 14(2), 179-194.
- Dobson, A. (2003). *Citizenship and the Environment*. Oxford University Press.
- Dryzek, J. S. (1992). Ecology and discursive democracy: Beyond liberal capitalism and the administrative state*. *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 3(2), 18-42.
- Dryzek, J. S., Downes, D., Hunold, C., Schlosberg, D., & Hernes, H. K. (2003). *Green States and Social Movements: Environmentalism in the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, and Norway: Environmentalism in the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, and Norway*. Oxford University Press.
- Eckersley, R. (2004). *The green state: Rethinking democracy and sovereignty*. The MIT Press.
- Fletcher, A. L. (2009). Clearing the air: the contribution of frame analysis to understanding climate policy in the United States. *Environmental Politics*, 18(5), 800-816.
- Giddens, A. (2000). *The third way and its critics*. Polity Press.
- Hajer, M. A. (1995). *The politics of environmental discourse: ecological modernization and the policy process* (pp. 55-56). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hayward, T. (1998). *Political theory and ecological values*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hayward, T. (2006). Ecological citizenship: justice, rights and the virtue of resourcefulness. *Environmental politics*, 15(03), 435-446.
- Jagers, S. C. (2009). In search of the ecological citizen. *Environmental Politics*, 18(1), 18-36.
- Heater, D. (1999). *What is citizenship?*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Heater, D. (2004). *Citizenship: The civic ideal in world history, politics and education*. Manchester University Press.
- Hutchings, K. (2002). *Feminism and global citizenship* (pp. 53-62). Edinburgh University Press.
- Ignatieff, M. (1995). The myth of citizenship 'in Beiner, R.(ed), *Theorizing Citizenship*.
- Jagers, S. C. (2007). Prospects for green liberal democracy.
- Jagers, S. C. (2009). In search of the ecological citizen. *Environmental Politics*, 18(1), 18-36.
- Kymlicka, W., & Norman, W. (1994). Return of the citizen: A survey of recent work on citizenship theory. *Ethics*, 104(2), 352-381.

- Lafferty, W. M., & Meadowcroft, J. (Eds.). (1996). *Democracy and the environment: problems and prospects*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Lafferty, W. M., & Meadowcroft, J. (Eds.). (2000). *Implementing sustainable development: Strategies and initiatives in high consumption societies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lovell, H. (2004). Framing sustainable housing as a solution to climate change. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 6(1), 35-55.
- Lundqvist, L. (2004). *Sweden and ecological governance [electronic resource]: straddling the fence*. Manchester University Press.
- Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class: And other essays*. University Press.
- Matti, S. (2006). The imagined environmental citizen: exploring the state-individual relationship in Swedish environmental policy.
- Meadowcroft, J. (2007). National sustainable development strategies: features, challenges and reflexivity. *European Environment*, 17(3), 152-163.
- Micheletti, M. (2003). Political Virtue and Shopping: Individuals, Consumerism, and Collective Action.
- Rein, M. (1983). Value-critical policy analysis. In *Ethics, the social sciences, and policy analysis* (pp. 83-111). Springer US.
- Rein, M., & Schon, D. (1993). Reframing policy discourse.
- Rein, M., & Schon, D. (1996). Frame-critical policy analysis and frame-reflective policy practice. *Knowledge and policy*, 9(1), 85-104.
- Riesenberg, P. (1994). *Citizenship in the Western tradition: Plato to Rousseau*. UNC Press.
- Roche, M. (1992). *Rethinking citizenship: welfare, ideology and change in modern society* (Vol. 59). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Sagoff, M. (1988). *The economy of the earth: Philosophy, law and the environment*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sáiz Valencia, Á. (2005). Globalisation, cosmopolitanism and ecological citizenship. *Environmental Politics*, 14(2), 163-178.
- Seyfang, G. (2005). Shopping for sustainability: can sustainable consumption promote ecological citizenship?. *Environmental politics*, 14(2), 290-306.
- Seyfang, G. (2006). Ecological citizenship and sustainable consumption: Examining local organic food networks. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 22(4), 383-395.
- Shafir, G. (1998). *The Citizenship Debates: A Reader*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Smith, M. J. (1998). *Ecologism: towards ecological citizenship*. U of Minnesota Press.
- Turner, B. S. (1990). Outline of a Theory of Citizenship. *Sociology*, 24(2), 189-217.
- Valdivielso, J. (2005). Social citizenship and the environment. *Environmental Politics*, 14(2), 239-254.
- Van Gunsteren, H. (1994). Four conceptions of citizenship. *The condition of citizenship*, 36-48.

- Van Steenberg, B. (1994). Towards a global ecological citizen. *The condition of citizenship*, 141-152.
- Wagenaar, H. (2011). *Meaning in action*. ME Sharpe.
- Wackernagel, M. and Rees, W. (1996). *Our ecological footprint: reducing human impact on the earth* (Vol. 9). New Society Publishers.
- Werbner, P. (1999). Political motherhood and the feminisation of citizenship: women's activism and the transformation of the public sphere. *Women, citizenship and difference*, 221-245.
- Wolf, J., Brown, K., & Conway, D. (2009). Ecological citizenship and climate change: perceptions and practice. *Environmental Politics*, 18(4), 503-521.

Articles

- Eriksson, P. (2005). Nu kommer miljöbilarna!. *Grönt Nr 3*.
- Eriksson, P. (2005). A Green New Deal. *Grönt Nr 2*.
- Fridolin, G. (2011). Tack för förtroendet – nu kör vi vidare, *Grönt Nr 3*.
- Wetterstrand, M. (2004). Vi utmanar den passive bekvämlighetens politik. *Grönt Nr 4*.
- Wetterstrand, M. (2007). Regeringen rejält på minus i klimatpolitiken. *Grönt Nr 5*.
- Wetterstrand, M. (2008). Skälen för medlemskap överväger. *Grönt Nr 1*.
- Wetterstrand, M. (2009). Processen fortsätter efter Köpenhamn. *Grönt Nr 5*.

Collected from: <http://medlem.mp.se/organisera-dig/gront>, 2013-11-28

Official publications

Swedish Greens Election Manifesto 1988 – 2010

Collected from: <http://snd.gu.se/sv/vivill/party/mp>, 2013-12-03

Swedish Greens Party Program, 2005, 2013

Collected from: <http://medlem.mp.se/organisera-dig/partiprogrammet>, 2013-12-04

Other

<http://www.mp.se/om/historia>, 2013-12-10

<http://www.val.se/val/val2010/slutresultat/R/rike/index.html>, 2013-12-11