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Abstract

Based on the argument of the importance of citizens’ political participation for democracy, this thesis investigates transnational political participation among Swedish citizens living abroad. Transnational political participation builds on the components of transborderism and simultaneity which makes political participation in Sweden and political participation in the host country a dynamic relationship. Four participation outcomes are stated: individuals who direct their participation toward Sweden; individuals who direct their participation toward the host country; individuals who participate in both Sweden and the host country; and finally individuals who are inactive and do not participate in politics neither in Sweden nor in the host country. Combining theories of migration and political participation, the thesis argues for different factors important in explaining the different participation outcomes. While assimilation variables are expected to influence the two first participation outcomes, resource factors are argued to affect the third and the fourth outcome. Using data from the SOM survey to expatriate Swedes, the thesis investigates transnational political participation among Swedish citizens in 103 countries. Empirical results from the logistic regression models find strong support for the assimilation hypotheses. Hypotheses of resource factors as determinants of the third and the fourth participation outcome are not confirmed.
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1 Introduction
For thousands of years, humans have migrated in search for a better life. Although migration is driven by many complex factors, a common strive among migrants is the hope for better life conditions; a more agreeable environment; and the wish to join family and friends abroad. The traditional focus in migration studies is the migration from lower income countries to wealthier ones (World Migration Report 2013: 21). However, in recent years, increasing attention has been drawn to research about migration from developed countries, since people living in those countries have proved to be as likely to migrate as people living in developing countries. This questions one of the main “push factors” of migration: lack of development (World Migration Report 2013: 58).

An increasing emigration is present also from Sweden, reflecting the trend of increasing emigration from developed and advanced industrialized countries. The wave of emigrants searching for happiness abroad, mainly in America, starting from the mid 1800 until the 1930's, are now matched with the same numbers of individuals moving from Sweden each year (Solevid 2016: 9). Citizens moving from Sweden, permanently or as part of a circular migration in several cycles, poses new questions, possibilities and challenges for the society. The labour market as well as trade and international relations are influenced by experiences and knowledge that citizens bring when moving from one country to another. Also democratic functions of political participation are restructured with an increasing part of citizens living abroad. Further, an increasing migration poses new questions about citizenship. Bauböck (2005) argues that “it is only in our age that the challenge of migration for democratic boundaries has thoroughly undermined traditional ideas of how citizenship, residence, and voting rights should be connected” (Bauböck 2005: 686).

Many scholars recognize that migrants, as they are incorporated in their host countries, also maintain ties of cultural; economic; social; and political nature to their country of origin (Levitt and Jaworsky 2007: 129). This thesis is situated the specific field of political participation among expatriates. It is based on the general argument of the importance of citizens’ political participation, as stated by Dalton (2008) a defining element of the democratic citizenship. Without citizens’ participation, democratic processes are meaningless (Dalton 2008: 78). Combining the research fields of political participation and migration, this thesis poses the overarching question of which factors that explain expatriate Swedes transnational political participation. What explains that some individuals direct their political participation toward either Sweden or the host country? And what explains that some individuals participate in both Sweden and the host country, while some do not participate in any of the two?
The transnational viewpoint constitutes the main theoretical perspective of the thesis. As developed by Tsuda (2012), transnational theory should include two components: transborderism and simultaneity (Tsuda 2012: 632), making migrants’ political participation in country of origin and host country a relationship of four scenarios. The political engagement of the migrant in country of origin and host country can be a zero-sum relationship; it can coexist simultaneously; or it can either be positively or negatively reinforcing (Tsuda 2012: 634-635). This thesis will investigate the zero sum relationship and the coexisting relationship by measuring four different participation outcomes – political participation only in Sweden or only in host country respectively; political participation in both Sweden and the host country; and no political participation in either Sweden or host country. The different participation outcomes are related to a theoretical framework of assimilation and resources as important factors for political participation among expatriate Swedes. Several variables representing both concepts are tested through logistic regression models.

Previous studies, both in the U.S. and Europe, about political engagement among diasporas are often based on migration from developing countries. By studying political participation of Swedish citizens living abroad, deepened knowledge is gained not only of the specific case of expatriates Swedes but also about migrants from advanced, industrialized countries as a group previously overlooked in research. Further, as will be discussed in the theory chapter, many scholars who study political transnationalism have focused more heavily on the transborder aspect of political participation, overlooking the component of a simultaneously existing political engagement in more than one setting. This thesis operationalizes a theoretical starting point rarely used in research. Additionally, the thesis contributes to both fields of political transnationalism and traditional research on political participation by combining the two into one coherent concept.

1.1 Objective
The aim of this thesis is to study the four different participation outcomes that are derived from theory of political transnationalism. These represents individuals that direct their political participation toward either Sweden or the host country as well as individuals that participates both in Sweden and host country. The last group are individuals that do not participate in politics neither in Sweden nor in host country. More specifically, using theories of assimilation and resources as important determinants of political participation, the purpose of thesis is to investigate which factors that affect the different participation outcomes among expatriate Swedes.

1.2 Disposition
This thesis proceeds as follows; first, theories of transnationalism and political participation are introduced independently, by discussing previous research and theories. These are also the main
theoretical tools of the thesis. The theory chapter closes with the theoretical framework of the thesis, which relates the different participation outcomes to assimilation and resource theories and stipulates four hypotheses. Second, a methodology chapter follows which presents the data, the variables and the method of the thesis. Third, I will present the results from the statistical analyzes, including regression tables and predicted probabilities for some of the variables. The last chapter discusses the results, concludes and discusses future research.
2 Theoretical Framework

This chapter will conceptualize and develop the theoretical framework of the thesis. The main theoretical concepts are transnationalism and political participation\(^1\), which will be presented independently as well as a coherent concept representing the basis of the thesis.

2.1 Transnationalism

Transnationalism is an increasingly important and debated research field, attracting scholars from a wide range of research areas such as sociology; geography; economics; law; and political science, as well as interdisciplinary fields of international relations and developments studies (Vertovec 2004: 641). One of the first formulations of transnationalism was developed by Basch, Glick Schiller and Szanton Blanc (1994) (Tsuda 2012: 632; Yeoh, Willis & Fakhri 2003: 208). Basch, Glick Schiller and Szanton Blanc conceptualized transnationalism as a process by which immigrants link together their societies of origin and settlement by forging and sustaining simultaneous multi-stranded social relations. By this practice, immigrants build social fields which cross geographic, cultural and political borders. Immigrants developing and maintaining multiple relationships - might they be of economic; social; organizational; familial; religious; or political nature – are called transmigrants. The multiplicity of involvement in both home and host societies is an essential component of transnationalism, and actions taken, decisions made and identities developed by transmigrants are embedded in networks simultaneously connecting them to two or more nation-states (Basch, Glick Schiller and Szanton Blanc 1994: 7). As reflected in Tsuda (2012), the original definition of transnationalism should be understood as constructed of two components: transborderism and simultaneity (Tsuda 2012: 632).

However, even though not labeled as transnationalism, cross-border engagement of immigrants is not a novel phenomenon. Immigrant historians have documented continuing bi-national socioeconomic and political involvements of nearly all American immigrant groups in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Joppke and Morawska 2003: 21). Joppke and Morawska (2003) state that new transnationalists’ claims that todays’ immigrants’ multinational connections is a new phenomenon is mistaken at least in three aspects. First, the view that twentieth-century international travels, also across the Atlantic, were singular journeys from one sedentary space to another, is incorrect. Second, earlier migrations did not divide the lives of the immigrants as past and present and temporary migrants as well as those settled abroad permanently maintained ties of economic, cultural and social nature with their countries of origin. Third, the perception of new, complex spheres of politics, as a response to new transnational spaces, is not correct. Also in the twentieth

\(^1\) Throughout this thesis, political “participation” and “engagement” will be used as synonyms. Other views might be present in other studies.
century, sending states in south and east Europe actively involved immigrant communities abroad (Joppke and Morawska 2003: 21). In other words, discussing transnationalism requires the perspective of a practice in many ways undertaken long before the term was invented.2

2.2 Political transnationalism

Migrants transnational involvements might refer to activities of social, political as well as economic nature (Martiniello and Lafleur 2008: 649). Using a rather wide definition, political transnationalism is migrants’ various forms of cross-border political participation in country of origin as well as indirect political participation via political institutions in host country (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003: 762). Further, such actions may be aimed at gaining political power or influence at both individual and collective level (Martiniello and Lafleur 2008: 653). Portes (2003) states that transnationalism, besides economic and political transactions, also includes religion; cultural movements; professional and scientific ties; arts; and sports (Portes 2003: 888). Political transnationalism is extensively discussed from the perspective of political theory by Bauböck (2003; 2005; 2006), arguing that what is specific about migrant transnationalism is the creation of overlapping memberships. Further, political transnationalism affects collective identities and conceptions of citizenship among native populations in sending as well as receiving countries (Bauböck 2003: 700). Bauböck argues that “migration highlights the political core and the boundaries of citizenship” (Bauböck 2006: 15). However, an overlapping membership can also be understood as a possibility and in this sense, this thesis will look at Swedish citizens’ actions aimed at influencing political outcomes in more than one nation state.

Transnational political engagement has been examined among scholars in a variety of ways. The distinctions between “broad” and “narrow” and between “core” and “expanded” has been adopted by researchers as a mapping exercise, necessary as a first step in stating where the field of inquiry begins (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003: 761). Referring to Itzigsohn et al. (1999), a narrow political practice concerns actual membership of parties and hometown associations, since narrow refers to a more institutionalized participation. Broad, on the other hand, is a more occasional participation in, for instance, meetings or events (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003: 761). A similar distinction is the one between core and expanded, where core political participation among migrants are activities

---

2 The field of transnationalism suffered for a period from critique, mainly due to an overenthusiastic application of the concept (Tsuda 2012: 632), with an incorporation across disciplinary boundaries making it running the risk of becoming an empty conceptual vessel (Guarnizo and Smith 1998: 4). For instance, scholars pointed at unclear conceptual distinctions between global, international and transnational, and a limited scope and importance of transnationalism since many claims were based on case studies (Lewitt and Jaworsky 2007: 131). Subsequent scholars have met the critique by focusing on clarifications of the social spaces and structures in which transnationalism occurs; its variations in dimension; and the relationship between transnationalism and other processes of incorporation (Lewitt and Jaworsky 2007: 131).
undertaken regularly and as an integral part of the individuals’ life, whereas expanded are those practices more occasionally undertaken (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003: 761-762). Using a more restricted definition would probably enhance the understanding of the group of migrants that are the most politically active. For the purpose of this thesis, however, the focus on any political participation will advocate for a broader and more expanded definition. The discussion of broad and expanded political participation further corresponds to the general discussion of non-institutional political participation, which will be apparent in the next section of this chapter. In general, it can be stated that the narrow or core political transnationalism is undertaken by a few migrants compared to those engaging in more sporadic political events (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003: 761-762). The small minority engaging in regularly transnational political actions tend to be socially bounded across national borders and reproducing preexisting power asymmetries (Guarnizo, Portes and Haller 2003: 1211).

Migrants’ political engagement includes several domains of action: immigrant politics; homeland politics; emigrant politics; diaspora politics; and translocal politics (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003: 762). Levitt and Jaworsky (2007: 136) discuss three of those as main dimensions. The dimension of homeland politics refers to migrants’ political activities in their host country, concerning issues of their home country. Such participation includes expatriate voting, electoral campaigning and also running for political office (Levitt and Jaworsky 2007: 136), therefore reflecting ordinary political activities in which a citizen can participate, with the difference that those are performed in another country. The dimension of immigrant politics is migrants’ participation in activities in order to improve their social status in the host country: promoting recognition and rights of the group and fighting discrimination. Last, translocal politics are such political activities that migrant might engage in to support specific places or projects in their countries of origin. Such transnational, mainly economic, actions become political when the state intervenes to control or support them (Levitt and Jaworsky 2007: 136). Within this categorization of migrant political engagement, this thesis will mainly focus on the domains of homeland politics and immigrant politics. I do believe, however, that for the purpose of this thesis, the definition of immigrant politics is too strict. As should be reflected in my analysis, the political participation of expatriate Swedes does not necessarily concern issues related to the fact that they are immigrants. Their possible engagement in different actions might just as well be related to any part of the society or their own lives. Therefore, the classical division of homeland politics and immigrant politics needs to be slightly redefined in order to capture the political participation that takes place in home and host country but might reflect any issue that is important for the individual.
Most studies of migrant transnational political practices are performed in Western societies. However, Østergaard-Nielsen (2003) argues that on a very generalized level, there is a distinction between U.S- based and European-based studies. First, there is less research available on migrants’ transnational politics in Europe than in the U.S. Second, there is a difference in perspectives: European-based research is to a larger extent preoccupied with migrants’ immigrant political participation, that is the implications of transnational political practices on the receiving country. Transnational ties are not treated as a phenomenon in its own right as it is in U.S.-based research, where studies of transnational political practices tend to focus on sending countries as mobilizing factors (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003: 764). A number of studies confirm this perspective where different diaspora groups and their homeland ties are discussed in a variety of approaches (eg. Eckstein and Barberia 2002; Itzigsohn 2000; Waldinger, Soehl and Lim 2012). Since this thesis represents transnationalism as a dynamic relationship between home and host country, and explores political ties among expatriate Swedes in 103 countries, it reflects an intermix of the two research traditions. This approach is, as understood, rarely used in the research filed of transnationalism and the thesis will therefore contribute to a new perspective on migrants’ political transnationalism.

2.3 Simultaneity - an overlooked component of political transnationalism

As previously discussed, the two main components in the theory of transnationalism are transborderism and simultaneity. The second, the dimension of a simultaneously existing engagement in both country of origin and receiving country, characterizes the political realm of transnationalism through political membership; rights and responsibilities; and domains of actions (Levitt and Jaworsky 2007: 136). Instead of replacing one political membership with another, an increasing number of migrants keep feet in two worlds (Levitt 2003: 177). Since migrants’ incorporation into a new land and transnational connections to their homeland can occur simultaneously and reinforce one another, the field of transnationalism should benefit from further exploring the aspect of simultaneity (Levitt and Glick Shiller 2004: 1003). The commonly held view that processes of long-term transnational involvements and assimilation are incompatible is a false dichotomy, based on a poor understanding and conceptualization of transnational engagement (Levitt 2003: 178). However, subsequent scholars have partly overlooked the component of simultaneity in favor of the tranborderism aspect of transnationalism. Tsuda (2012) argues that even though recent definitions of transnationalism continue to include simultaneity, the simultaneous impact of transnationalism on sending and receiving country is studied only by a few researchers (Tsuda 2012: 633). Focusing on transborder engagement in economic, political and socio-cultural spheres should rather be labeled long-distance nationalism, since the dual engagement in two or more nation-states is what differentiates transnationalism from nationalism (Tsuda 2012: 633).

In order to theorize and examine the element of simultaneity in political transnationalism, Tsuda
(2012) states that immigrants’ incorporation in receiving country and their transborder engagement with their sending country must be explored as a dynamic relationship understood as one coherent transnational social process (Tsuda 2012: 634). This argument will be further developed after the second theoretical cornerstone of the thesis has been introduced – which is political participation.

2.4 Political participation - an overview
Studying political participation in the perspective of transnationalism certainly requires a deepened discussion of political participation as a subject of its own. Some of the most influential scholars on political participation, Verba et al. (1995) state that citizen participation is at the heart of democracy (Verba et al. 1995: 1). Public participation is a defining element of the democratic citizenship - without the participation of citizens, democratic processes are meaningless (Dalton 2008:78). Consequently, when studying contemporary representative democracy, political participation is one of the most central topics (Teorell, Torcal and Montero 2007: 334).

A classic definition of political participation is offered in the seminal work of Verba and Nie (1972) stating that “political participation refers to those activities by private citizens that are more or less directly aimed at influencing the selection of governmental personnel and/or the actions they take” (Verba and Nie 1972: 2). This definition widened the scope of activities among which democratic citizens could engage - an important step at the time. Up until this definition, electoral participation had been in the center of attention among scholars. With the widened scope, the action repertoire became multidimensional and included non-electoral aspects of influence as well (Teorell, Torcal and Montero 2007: 335). However, the definition of political participation offered by Verba and Nie (1972) was still too narrow, since it assumed all political outcomes to be determined by governmental personnel. Teorell, Torcal and Montero (2007) reflect upon Easton (1953) and the discussion of “allocation of values for society”, stating that what makes an act political is its relation to such values. The essence of modern, market based economies, argue Teorell, Torcal and Montero, is that the authoritative allocation of values is not the sole responsibility of the state. Instead, attempts to influence politics may just as well be directed towards corporate actors in the non-profit or private sector, including for instance citizens buying or boycotting certain products (Teorell, Torcal and Montero 2007: 336). Brady (1999: 737) developed the definition of political participation to include “actions by ordinary citizens directed toward influencing some political outcomes”. This definition entails four components. First, political participation involves actions. Second, individuals taking such actions are ordinary citizens, not elected officials or paid lobbyists. Third, there is an intention to influence, which excludes, for instance, discussing politics with friends or following politics in the media, from the definition of political participation. And fourth, the target is some political outcomes which reflects that the objective does not have to be neither
government personnel nor a state agent (Teorell, Torcal and Montero 2007: 336). This broadened, political participation repertoire is not restricted to political participation in one nation-state and might therefore reflect both sides of Østergaard-Nielsen’s division of homeland and immigrant politics. As previously stated, this thesis will treat political participation as a comprehensive concept and political participation does not necessarily have to concern issues closely related to emigration or immigration. Brady’s definition of political participation also touches upon the discussion of institutional and non-institutional political participation, which will be introduced in the next paragraph.

An early, influential classification of political participation was set out by Barnes et al. (1979), distinguishing between conventional and non-conventional types of participation. Conventional participation is more closely related to the representative element of democracy, including campaigning for a candidate or voting in elections, whereas activities outside this arena, such as protesting, are labeled non-conventional (Nygård and Jakobsson 2013: 68). Eventually, this distinction was replaced by the classification of institutionalized and non-institutionalized political participation. The former includes organized, formal forms of participation, for instance voting, whereas the latter refers to informal forms of participation outside the “institutionalized” political sphere, such as protesting or boycotting (Nygård and Jakonsson 2013: 68). The dividing line between institutional and non-institutional political participation further draws upon the distance to, or involvement in, the political system. Party membership; voting; contacting a politician; or attending a political meeting is an individual’s attempt to influence the political system directly, as he or she by such actions “becomes part of the political system”. Participants in non-institutional forms of political participation, on the other hand, can keep some distance from the political system by influencing it indirect, by political consumerism; participation in demonstrations; signing of petitions; or boycotting products (Hooghe, Marien and Quintelier 2010: 188). The “distance” from the political system is reflected in the definition of political participation employed in this thesis, which stated the influence over “some political outcomes”.

Several scholars report that institutional forms of participation, in particular voting, decreases in Western Societies3, while non-institutional political participation increases (eg. Dalton 2008). The transformation has been reported as a change in value structures; an erosion of trust in politics; and an overall change in political integration (Nygård and Jakobsson 2013:68). Another, related set of explanations, states that non-institutionalized participation is more compatible with the demands of new generations of citizens, who have been labeled “post-materialist”, “monitorial” and “critical” (Hooghe, Marien and Quintelier 2010: 188). The monitorial element refers to that citizens still are

---

3 Although not in Sweden.
interested in politics but refrain from participating in formal political institutions. Post-materialist citizens, as a related concept, prefer more individualized political engagement, avoiding enforced commitments and party politics. The critical aspect of new generations of citizens refers to support for democracy but a critical view on its functioning. Further, some authors have claimed that non-institutionalized political participation is less demanding referring to that they require less commitment and often are more sporadic (Hooghe, Marien and Quintelier 2010: 188). Non-institutional political participation is an important concept within this thesis since several non-institutionalized activities will be included in the host country participation dimension.

2.5 Explaining political participation
One of the most influential explanatory models of political participation is the Civic Voluntarism Model (CVM) developed by Verba, Schlozman and Brady (1995). Already in earlier work, Verba and Nie (1972) discussed socioeconomic resources (education or income) as explanatory factors of political participation, a theory eventually supported by Wolfinger and Rosenstone. The CVM is based on the same line of reasoning (Nygård and Jakobsson 2013: 70). CVM states that political participation derives from three groups of factors: resources; engagement; and recruitment. Even though all three components are important, the authors place greater emphasis on resources and engagement, than recruitment. (Verba, Schlozman and Brady 1995: 269-270). Resources include time; money; and civic skills. The origins of such resources are traced back to individuals’ involvements in major social institutions, including experiences in the family, at school and at the workplace. Further, voluntary affiliations in religious institutions and non-political associations have an impact on the individuals’ socially structured circumstances, which affects time, money and civic skills (Verba, Schlozman and Brady 1995: 271). The second dimension, engagement, refers to for instance interest in politics; the sense of political efficacy generating a belief in capacity to influence politics; the civic values that participation fulfills a duty; and the identification with a political party or commitment to specific policies (Verba, Schlozman and Brady 1995: 272). Recruitment, the last cornerstone in the CVM, states that requests from friends, relatives or acquaintances to participate in politics often works as a triggering factor. Scholars have demonstrated that various institutions can mobilize citizens: the workplace, the church or organizations (Verba, Schlozman and Brady 1995: 272-73).

2.6 Transnationalism and political participation – a theoretical framework of the analysis
As a cornerstone in the democratic society, political participation of citizens is under constant scrutiny by scholars. And within the increasing migration flows in the world, the political participation among migrants, both within sending and receiving countries, is of importance not
only for the studies of migration and assimilation, but also for the study of political engagement. Within this interdisciplinary field, this thesis develops and investigates political participation based on theories of transnationalism.

As previously stated, transnational political participation among migrants is considered a dynamic relationship of four scenarios, namely the zero sum relationship; the coexisting relationship; the positively reinforcing relationship; and the negatively reinforcing relationship (Tsuda 2012). For methodological considerations, this study will treat the reinforcing (positively and negatively) relationships as coexisting⁴. The forthcoming paragraphs will therefore present two transnational relationships: a zero sum relationship, that is a political participation in either country of origin or host country, and a coexisting relationship, which reflects political participation in both countries or none. The two relationships states two participation outcomes each, which is illustrated in Figure 1 below. The thesis will work with those four participation outcomes as dependent variables and the forthcoming paragraphs will develop a theoretical discussion establishing a framework of the thesis. Four hypotheses are stated, one for each participation outcome.

**Figure 1: The two dynamic transnational relationships and their participation outcomes.**

[Diagram showing the two dynamic transnational relationships and their participation outcomes]

---

⁴ Please see the methodology chapter for the argument behind incorporating two of the relationships into another.
It is important to keep in mind that most studies of political transnationalism concern migrants from developing countries, such as diasporas in the U.S. and Europe, including discussions of hometown associations as well as monetary remittances (see Guarnizo, Portes and Haller 2003). Croucher (2009) even states that the literature of transnationalism calls for minor refinements in order to account for scenarios where the sending state is privileged in relation to the receiving state (Croucher 2009: 463), reflecting the relative lack of such investigations. Since the case of expatriate Swedes is an example of migrants from a developed and industrialized country, this study belongs to the underrepresented dimension of transitional studies. Swedish citizens living abroad differs from migrants from developing countries in a variety of ways, for instance reasons for moving and political status and involvement in home country. Further, education and income levels among expatriate Swedes are in general high (Solevid 2016: 26). Therefore, the discussion of explanations that have confirmed to be important in previous studies might fail to explain certain outcomes in this study. The explanations discussed will represent both factors from the general theory of political participation and more specifically migration related factors.

In the first transnational relationship, political participation in sending and receiving country work as a zero sum relationship where the individual participates either in country of origin or host country. This relationship indicates a lower degree of simultaneity since the participation in one country counteracts the involvement in the other. In general, the more marginalized and less integrated the migrant is, the more he or she tends to strengthen the ties to the home country (Tsuda 2012: 635). However, several scholars points at the contrary: assimilation and transborder involvement are not necessarily opposites (Levitt 2003; Snel, Engbersen and Leerkes 2006). The assimilation argument should therefore be tested to confirm the idea of integration as an important factor for participation in the receiving country. In other words: the less integrated in host country, the more likely the migrant is to adapt the zero sum relationship in favor of political participation in the sending country. Within the analysis of this thesis - the more ties and connectedness to Sweden, the more the individual adjusts the relationship in favor of participation in Sweden at the expense of participation in the host country.

Boccagni, Lafleur and Levitt (2015: 17) states that migrants’ transnational political involvement should be looked at in the interaction between two sets of factors: the migrant’s social and economic position in the receiving country and the migrant’s orientation toward the homeland polity. The second is shaped by, for instance, interaction with significant others left behind. The argument of social networks is present also in Guarnizo, Portes and Haller (2003: 1218) stating that transnational involvement is conditioned by the maintenance of a strong web of social contacts. I argue that this line of reasoning is associated with the integration argument, suitable to investigate
in the zero-sum relationship since this relationship assumes political participation in only one of the settings. In other words, the maintenance of a strong web of social contacts and interaction with significant ones left behind represents an example of reverse assimilation that increases the probability of a political participation oriented toward the country of origin.

Safi (2010) reports two perspectives on immigrants’ assimilation present in research. The first one reflects objective indicators such as educational fulfilment; labour market achievement; and social mobility. The second perspective rather points at the social psychology of immigration, representing subjective patterns of the process and is associated with “cultural uprooting” and migrants “establishing themselves” in host country (Safi 2010: 160). Yet again, expatriate Swedes constitutes an underrepresented case in research. However, theoretical reasoning and variables included in the analysis can be stated to relate to both strands of assimilation theory. Objective indicators will be represented by variables of citizenship and language skills whereas the social psychology dimension of immigration will be reflected in, for instance, the individuals subjective feeling of home in Sweden and host country respectively. By using both dimensions, the analysis will capture an overall picture of assimilation to host country.

Researchers have reached different conclusions concerning how time spent in host society affects political participation (Guarnizo, Portes and Hall 2003: 1239; Itzigsohn and Saucedo 2002: 789). I will employ a variable of time of residence in order to control for this dimension of assimilation.

The reasoning of assimilation factors as important for the zero sum transnational relationship generates the following hypotheses:

**H1:** Less assimilation into host country will have a positive impact on the first participation outcome, that is participation in Sweden combined with no participation in host country.

**H2:** More assimilation into host country will have a positive impact on the second participation outcome, that is no participation in Sweden combined with participation in host country.

The second relationship states that the political participation in sending and receiving country can coexist without one of them having much influence over the other. This is certainly the opposite to the reinforcing relationships where the direction of participation in one country has an impact of participation in the other (Tsuda 2012: 635). However, as will we apparent in the discussion of the data, such a mechanism is impossible to determine. Instead, I will treat the reinforcing relationship as a coexisting one, arguing that it is the simultaneously existing (or not existing) participation that is of most interest, not the influence of one over the other. Since the reinforcing relationships therefore are incorporated into the coexisting, the theoretical discussion will be based on a
simultaneously coexisting relationship and which possible explanations that could generate the two connected participation outcomes.

Tsuda (2012) states that in a coexisting relationship of political participation, immigrants get simultaneously involved in politics in both countries, for different and unrelated reasons. In many cases, such participation is encouraged by both the sending and the receiving state: the first one in order to maintain loyalty and benefit from migrants’ transborder activities and their possibility to lobby host country’s government, the latter as realizing the importance of immigrants as constituents and voters (Tsuda 2012: 638-639). It is unlikely to believe that such motivations and encouragement should be of crucial importance for expatriate Swedes’ political participation. Their possible importance in any of the political realms are not yet recognized. It is, I argue, more probable that the argument of states’ encouragement more exclusively works in the participation of larger diasporas from less privileged countries.

Other arguments for a coexisting transnational political engagement is aspects of time of residence and socio economic positioning. Some scholars have found that a long-term settlement and a more socio-economically secure position tend to increase political participation in host country as well as country of origin (Tsuda 2012: 639). Socio economic positioning further touches upon the resource dimension of the CVM, where time; money; and civic skills are argued to have a positive impact on political participation. Since the coexisting relationships includes *all* political participation (Sweden and host country) or *none* political participation, it is argued to be more closely related to a resource dimension than assimilation aspects. In other words, for those individuals included in any of the two coexisting participation outcomes, resource variables of education and socio economic status will have impact, whereas assimilation variables will be important in explaining participation in the zero-sum relationship outcomes, where the individual have chosen to participate only in one setting. For the two coexisting outcomes of political participation, the following hypotheses are stipulated:

**H3:** More resource will have a positive impact on the third participation outcome, that is political participation in both Sweden and host country.

**H4:** Less resources will have a positive impact on the fourth participation outcome, that is no political participation neither in Sweden nor in host country.
3 Methodology
The methodology chapter will describe the data and give a brief overview of the group under study: Swedish citizens living abroad. Further, the chapter will present the variables included in the analysis. Last, the method of the thesis will be discussed, which is a logistic regression.

3.1 Data
The data used in the analysis is collected by the SOM Institute at the University of Gothenburg. The study, which was conducted autumn 2014, is a unique insight in the lives of expatriate Swedes – never before have a Swedish research institute conducted a survey directed to a random sample of Swedish citizens living abroad. Further, the study gives deepened understanding of emigration from Sweden in general (Solevid 2016: 9-10).

The data was collected through a web based survey. The population of the survey are Swedish citizens in the age of 18-75, living abroad, according to the national register of emigration at the Swedish Tax Authority. All regions are included except a few small island nations. The selection of citizens was made by a disproportional stratified random selection method based on six geographic areas: (1) The Nordic Countries; (2) Western Europe, North America, Australia and New Zealand; (3) Eastern Europe and former Soviet; (4) Africa and Middle East; (5) Asia; and (6) Latin-America (Vernersdotter 2016: 287). A disproportional stratified selection is a method where each stratum (region in this case) represent its population proportionally but where the total selection has a skewed distribution compared to reality. In other words, the respondents in each region are randomly selected and the probability of being “selected” is equal among citizens in the same region, but unequal comparing regions. The method is illustrated by, for instance, that the first region, the Nordic Countries, has 49 013 citizens in the age of 18-75, and among those, 2000 were randomly selected to participate in the survey. Within the region Latin-America, on the other hand, among the total number of 3028 citizens, 1000 were randomly selected. The argument behind this method is to ensure enough respondents from each region to make statistical inference (Vernersdotter 2016:290). In the analysis of this thesis, I will correct for this skewness, and also for the different response rate in different regions, by weighting the data. This process will be further described in the method discussion later in this chapter.

Among the 10 000 citizens in 136 countries contacted by regular mail and asked to participate in the Web-survey, 2668 did so (Vernersdotter 2016: 293-295). The survey consisted of 75 questions related to ten areas, among those politics and democracy; turnout; and interests and values5 (Vernersdotter 2016: 291-292).

5 For further details about the survey, please see Vernersdotter (2016).
The SOM data, beyond the obvious fact that it is the only survey to expatriate Swedes, has many advantages. It includes Swedish citizens living in 103 countries, enabling comparisons between individuals as well as contexts. Further, the survey includes a wide range of questions which is suitable when controlling for different explanations. For instance, political participation (in general) might be attributable to a variety of factors; ideology; values; trust; socio economic circumstances and more, and therefore, a broad diversity of questions is desirable.

The variety of questions might however reveal a drawback of the data: the relative lack of enhanced understanding of certain areas. For instance, questions that explicitly concerns political participation are quite few. However, conducting a survey is obviously a balance between the length of the survey and what it possibly can cover, and in line with previous argument, I believe a variety of questions is preferable. Further, additional questions of political participation would perhaps not enhance the understanding since they probably would just confirm a pattern of the respondent, in other words: individuals that answer in one way in one question would answer a certain way in another.

One disadvantage important to discuss, especially in the case of the analysis in this thesis, is the limitation of time comparisons of the same subjects (individuals). The survey is a snapshot of the respondent’s circumstances and values, and the development over time is impossible to follow. This further limits the possibilities of making causal inference: which mechanisms that has a causal impact over the other. Following the same individuals over time would be a solution to the time limitations. It is reasonable to believe that it would be more difficult to yield a sufficient response rate in such a study.

The limited time perspective has considerable implications for the purpose of this thesis: two of the transnational relationships are dependent upon development over time. Those are the positively and negatively reinforcement of participation in one country, on participation in the other. Since it is impossible, given the questions asked in the survey, to determine whether the engagement in one country has had any positive or negative impact on engagement in the other, those two transnational relationships will, as previously discussed, be merged with the coexisting relationship. This will naturally direct the analysis some steps away from the original theory of a four-fold relationship scheme. However, as Tsuda (2012: 639) argues, the mutually negative reinforcement is unlikely to occur, and therefore, the matrix has most probably three relationships and in this analysis, two of them will be represented together. It would also be difficult to determine the causality in the reinforce scenario, an additional argument for including it in the coexisting relationship.

Another possible shortcoming of the data is the relatively low response rate, which was at 27
percent (Vernersdotter 2016: 295). A low response rate certainly has implications for the possibility of drawing general conclusions. This is due to the fact that those who actually did participate in the survey might represent a certain group of expatriate Swedes. For instance, taking part of a survey is an engagement in itself, and it is therefore likely to believe that the respondents are individuals that in general are engaged and active in society. Concerning the demographic composition of the respondents and the actual demographic composition of expatriate Swedes, Vernersdotter (2016) concludes that regarding gender, the respondents mirror the reality in all regions except the Nordic Countries and Latin-America. In the Nordic Countries, women are slightly overrepresented, whereas the opposite holds for Latin-America. Regarding age, individuals younger than 30 years are in general underrepresented whereas individuals older than 60 are overrepresented. The age skewness obviously affects different regions differently: those regions that have an older population of expatriate Swedes are better represented in the survey (Vernersdotter 2016: 296). Recalling a slightly skewed response group and the argument of potential characteristics of the respondents, general conclusions about Swedes living abroad should be drawn with caution.

3.2 Expatriate Swedes – an overview

Swedish citizens living abroad differs in some important respects from Swedish citizens in general. Comparing the respondents in the national SOM-survey with respondents in the SOM-survey to expatriate Swedes, Solevid (2016) finds that education differs quite largely between the two groups. 56 percent in the group of expatriate Swedes are found in the highest education group, which means that they have graduated from university or conducted doctoral studies. For Swedish citizens in the national SOM-survey, 32 percent are found in this category. Also the socio economic status differs among the two groups: 47 percent among expatriate Swedes are placed in the highest socio economic group, whereas 37 percent of citizens living in Sweden are represented of the same group. Concerning age, a smaller proportion of expatriate Swedes are found in the lowest and highest age groups (18-29 years and 65-75 years respectively) and a greater proportion are in the age of 30-49 years (Solevid 2016: 15-16). The factors of education; socio economic status; and age, where individuals in the age of 30-49 to a larger extent automatically are working compared to a larger proportion of pensioners in the national SOM-survey, result in expatriate Swedes being a well-established group (Solevid 2016: 26). For the purpose of the analysis in this thesis, it is important to recall this general pattern of characteristics – some variable may due to a larger skewness in the answers not be as important as within other compositions. This is likely to be the case for the socio economic reasoning since very few expatriate Swedes have a low socio economic status. The effect between the other groups is however still of interest to compare.
3.3 Dependent variables

The political participation in Sweden and host country is, as previously described, considered a dynamic relationship with four outcomes. Please recall Figure 1 that illustrates each participation outcome. These four outcomes will function as dependent variables through the analysis. The construction of the four dependent variables is a several steps process described below and in detail in Appendix A. It is important to note that all respondents are represented in all participation outcomes, but each respondent can only be coded as (1) “Yes” in one participation outcomes, and is consequently coded as (0) “No” in the other three outcomes. In that sense, the forthcoming process resembles a dummy coding where all respondents that, for instance, report political participation in both Sweden and host country will have a (1) “Yes” coding in this outcome, and a (0) “No” coding in the other three outcomes.

**Figure 1: The two dynamic transnational relationships and their participation outcomes.**

**Political participation in Sweden**

The political participation in Sweden is the first side in each participation outcome. This measurement is based on the question of whether the respondent participated in the Swedish national election 2014, in which the respondent could answer *Yes; No;* and *Was not entitled to vote.* The respondents who were not entitled to vote will be excluded in the analysis, resulting in a new coding of (1) *Yes* and (0) *No.* Additional variables measuring political participation in Sweden
would have been desirable in order to represent other political actions than voting. On the other hand, voting is probably the most common political action concerning the Swedish dimension of the transnational political participation. Therefore, it is argued to sufficiently represent political participation in Sweden among expatriate Swedes.

**Political participation in host country**

The second side of each participation outcome is the one representing political participation in host country. Within political participation in host country, two original variables are combined. The first one refers to non-institutional political participation and in the survey, the question is stated as follows: *There is a variety of ways in which to engage in social and political issues. Have you performed any of the following in Sweden or somewhere else?* After the question followed six actions: *Signed a petition; contacted a politician; participated in a demonstration; contacted an official on local, regional or national level; contacted or participated in media; and donated or collected money for a political or social cause.* For each of the actions, the respondent could answer in three ways: *Yes, during the past 12 months; Yes, a longer time ago; and No.*

It is reasonable to believe that actions within the past 12 months in most cases refers to host country engagement, and therefore, only these answers will be used in the analysis. The respondents that stated that they had participated *a longer time ago* will be recoded into *No* and therefore, the variable will have to outcomes: *(1) Yes and (0) No.* This goes in line with the discussion of a social desirability bias in reporting political participation. Persson and Solevid (2014) find that using “face-saving response options” decreases the reported political participation concerning both institutionalized and noninstitutionalized political activities, concluding that such actions therefore most likely are overestimated in surveys with to clear “yes” and “no” response options (Persson and Solevid 2014: 104-105).

It should be noted that in the survey, this question is not explicitly stated as participation in host country. It will however be treated as this in the analysis. The most important argument for this claims that most likely, non-institutional actions are performed where the respondent lives. Since only participation performed in the last 12 months will be treated as *Yes*, I argue that those, in most cases, are performed within the host country.

The operationalization of host country political participation goes in line with previous discussion of a broad, expanded and non-institutional political participation (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003: 761; Hooghe, Marien and Quintelier 2010: 188). There are alternatives representing both close and more distant locations to the political system and as previously stated, they are treated as equally
important in the thesis. For instance, contacting a politician is arguably more closely related to the political process than signing a petition or donating money, but they will all be included in the definition of political participation: “actions by ordinary citizens directed toward influencing some political outcomes”.

The second original variable to be included in political participation in host country is voter turnout in host country. The SOM-data provides a question of whether the respondent has voted in a general election in the country where he or she lives. The question is stated as follows: *Have you voted in any general election in [Country]?

The answers *Yes* and *No* will be used in the regressions, whereas *Not entitled to vote* will be excluded, resulting in two possible alternatives used in the analysis: (1) *Yes* and (0) *No*.

This question might refer to an election at any level: mayoral election as well as election to the European parliament. A quick glance at the data states that 37 percent of the respondents were not entitled to vote, making this measurement not sufficiently representing political participation in host country. Further, depending on in which country the respondent lives, the probability of general elections differs.

After having recoded the two original variables of host country political participation, they are incorporated into one measurement. The six different non-institutional action forms and voter turnout in host country are therefore added together, where participation in any of the seven included actions yields a *Yes* (coded as 1) in the measurement. In other words, if the respondent has answered that he or she has performed any of the actions, the answer to the overall measurement of political participation in host country is *Yes*. Referring to previous discussion, combining the different actions into one variable make them all equally important as political actions.

The last step in constructing the four dependent variables is combining political participation in Sweden and political participation in host country into four possible participation outcomes. A respondent can only be coded a 1 in one participation outcome, and in the other three outcomes, that respondent is coded as 0. Therefore, each participation outcome has 1631 respondents. Remember that this procedure is a dummy coding, further illustrated in Table 1.
Table 1: Descriptive statistics of dependent variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Percent (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First participation outcome</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second participation outcome</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third participation outcome</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth participation outcome</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1394</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Independent variables
As discussed in the theoretical framework section, the independent variables will be categorized into two sets of variables: assimilation related independent variables and resource related independent variables.

Assimilation related independent variables
In line with previous research on assimilation and integration, as discussed in the theoretical framework, there are several aspects to measure assimilation. I will use a broad palette of indicators for assimilation, in order to rule out the importance of each one of them. The first variable in the analysis is *Years abroad* which is the respondents’ total time living abroad. This variable does not fully represent the time the respondent has spent in the country where he or she is currently living, but it is the best proxy within the survey when controlling for the time perspective of migration. Further, it can be seen as an indicator of de-integration from Sweden. Researchers argues that time of residence has implications for assimilation into the dominant society’s sociocultural and economic systems, and that longer time periods of residence will, as far as transnationalism concerns, lead to disengagement from country of origin (Guarnizo, Portes and Haller 2003: 1215).

*News consumption* is the next independent variable among the assimilation independent variables. First, the respondent was asked to state to what extent he or she consumes news through media in host country. Second, the questions concerned news through Swedish media. Each set of questions provided the respondent with five categories of news providers, disregarding of whether they were used online or through original medium: *local daily newspaper*; *national daily newspaper*; *free daily newspaper*; *television*; and *radio*. For each news provider, the respondent could answer according to six choices. The original alternatives were then recoded in the opposite direction, representing: (1) *Never* (combining original alternatives “more occasionally” and “never”); (2) *1-2 days per week*; (3) *3-4 days per week*; (4) *5-6 days per week*; and (5) *On a daily basis*. After the redirection of the alternatives, the news consumption of host country media and Swedish media respectively, were combined into indexes (see Wadbring and Andersson 2016 for a similar approach). The rationale behind the news consumption variables states that first, it is likely that the
Swedish media, for instance, is provided in Swedish, representing a language perspective of assimilation. Second, host country media and Swedish media arguably reports different news and which one the respondent consumes could represent an integration argument: which news are the most important for the individual.

The next two indicators of assimilation are the respondents subjective feeling of home in Sweden and feeling of home in host country. Bauböck (2006) argues that migrants can develop a sense of belonging to several societies as well as to imagined communities located in a distant past or future (Bauböck 2006: 19). In this sense, the variables of feeling of home covers an important dimension of assimilation, not included in any of the objective measurements of years abroad or citizenship. Two questions from the survey are used for this, asking the respondent to what extent he or she feels like home in Sweden and host country, respectively. The respondent could answer between (1) Do not feel like home at all up to (7) Feels entirely like home. I argue that this subjective assessment of “home” captures a most important aspect of integration since it includes both cultural; social; familial and all other dimensions of the individuals’ life.

Language skills composes the next assimilation related independent variable. The respondent was asked to state whether he or she could read a short text written in the language that is spoken in the host country. The original alternatives were recoded in the opposite direction, representing (1) No; (2) Yes, with much difficulty; (3) Yes, with some difficulties; and (4) Yes, without any difficulties.

Citizenship in host country represents yet another assimilation variable and is arguably very important for political rights as well as subjective feeling of integration and belonging. Bauböck (2003) states that dual nationality is an “enabling device” for transnational practices (Bauböck 2003: 715). Even though many of the political actions within this analysis might be performed regardless of citizenship, it is reasonable to believe that it would increase the likelihood of participation in host country. However, whether citizenship in host country actually decreases political participation in Sweden is yet to be explored. Citizenship was coded as (1) Yes and (0) No.

The last two assimilation independent variables represent Interest in Swedish politics and Interest in host country politics. The question was asked in the survey: In general, how interested are you in politics concerning Sweden and [Country]? The respondent answered to each of the settings. The original scale was recoded to represent an increasing interest instead of a decreasing one. The alternatives used in the analysis are: (1) Not at all interested; (2) Not particularly interested; (3) Rather interested; and (4) Very interested.

Since the questions were asked about interest in politics in Sweden and host country respectively,
they are argued to be more closely related to assimilation than interest in politics in general. It is further likely to believe that a greater interest in politics in one of the settings leads to more engagement in that setting, and therefore, these variables are more closely linked to the zero sum relationships, which was the purpose of the assimilation related independent variables in the analysis.

**Resource related independent variables**

*Education* is the first variable representing the resource dimension of the analysis. Education is well established as an important factor for political participation (Verba, Schlozman and Brady 1995). The analysis will use a fourfold education variable as dummy categories, with the lowest education as a reference category. The groups represent *Low education*, *Middle low education*, *Middle high education* and *High education*. Appendix A provides detailed information about the coding.

*Socioeconomic status* is the second resource oriented variable. The respondent was asked whether *the household can cope on present income*. After recoding the alternatives in the opposite direction, now representing an increasing socioeconomic status, the analysis contains the following alternatives: (1) *Very bad*; (2) *Rather bad*; (3) *Neither good nor bad*; (4) *Rather well*; and (5) *Very well*. The alternatives will be used as dummies with the lowest group as a reference category.

Another important aspect in the resource dimension is *Age*. Scholars report that older people are more likely to vote, whereas younger citizens to a larger extent engage in other forms of participation, such as demonstrations and petitions. The relationship between age and political participation is further reported as frequently nonlinear (Melo and Stockemer 2014: 33). Age is used as a dummy variable in the analysis of this thesis. The first age group (18-29 years) will work as a reference category for the second and third category, which includes respondent in ages 30-49 years and 50-75 years respectively.

*Gender* was also coded as a dummy variable, where men serve as the reference category. Research reports gender differences in political participation, due to a lower desire to participate among women. A second explanation refers to the strongly related concept of political engagement, stating that women reveal lower levels of interests in politics; have lower levels of political efficacy; and are less knowledgeable about politics (Beauregard 2014: 617). The gender gap is, however, remarkably small in Sweden. Adman (2009) states that Swedish women, to a larger extent than men, adhere to norms of the importance of being politically active. Further, the collective mobilization based on interests specific to women, spurs political participation among women in Sweden (Adman 2009: 315).
The hypotheses predict the assimilation variables to have impact merely in the zero sum relationship models, and the second set of resource oriented variables to affect the coexisting participation outcomes. Both sets of independent variables, assimilation related variables and resource related variables, will be tested in all four participation outcomes. The rationale behind this is that including the variables that are predicted to have no impact, can evaluate whether this is actually the case. Further, as long as there is an improvement in the model, including the variables is appropriate.

3.5 Statistical method
When exploring and controlling different explanations for the four participation outcomes of transnational political participation, logistic regression models are performed. This is a common method employed when the dependent variable only has to values, as so called dichotomous variable (Aneshensel 2013: 363). Binary logistic regression is used when the aim is to predict membership of only two categorical outcomes, as in this case, whereas multinomial logistic regression is employed when predicting membership of more than two categories (Field 2013: 761). Logistic regression can be compared to an ordinary linear regression, in which observed data should have a linear relationship. This assumption is violated when the outcome variables is categorical (Field 2013: 762). We can overcome this problem by transforming the data using the logarithmic transformation. Therefore, instead of predicting the value of the outcome variable from an independent variable, logistic regression predicts the probability of the outcome variable occurring at certain values of the independent variable (Field 2013: 762). The odds ratio (OR) is easier to understand than the $b$ coefficient in a logistic regression output, since it does not require a logarithmic transformation. The OR is the exponential of $B$ and indicates the change in odds that results from a unit change in the predictor. When the value of the OR is greater than 1, it indicates that when the predictor increases, the odds of the outcome occurring increase. When the value of the OR is less than 1, it manifests the opposite: when the predictor increases, the odds of the outcome occurring decrease (Field 2013: 767).

In this analysis, each participation outcome represents a dependent variable and is, as previously described, a unique combination of participation is Sweden and host country. Therefore, the dichotomy of each variable is that the individual belongs to this specific outcome or not. In other words, the analysis should be understood as the impact of tested variables on a specific participation outcome.

For each participation outcome, three regression models are performed. The first includes only

---

6 See Fields (2013) for a detailed description of the calculation of OR.
assimilation independent variables, the second includes only resource independent variables and the last one, the final model, combines all variables. In line with codebook instructions, the data is weighted to account for the disproportional stratified selection of the data. Further, a filter is set before the regressions are performed. The filter ensures that only observations (individuals) with valid information on all variables are included in the analysis.

The models are tested for multicollinearity; the details are found in Appendix C. Multicollinearity was present only in the dummy variables of education and socio economic status, displaying Tolerance values below 0.1 for several groups (Fields 2013: 795). However, dummy variables with three or more categories are likely to suffer from multicollinearity if the reference category contains few observations, which is the case for this model. Since the multicollinearity found in the model is related to the few observations in the reference category, I argue that it is not of great concern, and no variables will be excluded from the model.

4 Results
This chapter will present the empirical findings on the relationship between assimilation related variables and resource related variables and transnational political participation, which is represented by four different combinations of political participation in Sweden and host country. Each participation outcome will be presented independently, based on results from the logistic regressions and predicted probabilities. Since the models contain many variables, I will focus on the variables with significant impact. Some variables that display large influence on the participation outcome will further be emphasized as illustrated with graphs of predicted probabilities.

The two tables (Table 2 and Table 3) present the result from three models for each participation outcome. Model A displays the first set of independent variables: assimilation variables. Model B contains the next set of independent variables, resource variables, and Model C includes the full set of independent variables. When presenting the results, I will focus on the last model. However, it should be noted from the two tables that almost all independent variables from first two models holds for the control of the full set of variables.
Table 2: Logistic regression: the effects of assimilation related and resource related variables on the first and second participation outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years abroad</td>
<td>-0.15** (.005)</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>-0.18***(.006)</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News consumption Swedish media</td>
<td>0.191* (.094)</td>
<td>1.211</td>
<td>-0.325** (.124)</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>-0.363** (.126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News consumption host country media</td>
<td>-0.330**(.085)</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>0.109 (.087)</td>
<td>1.115</td>
<td>0.124 (.089)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of home: Sweden</td>
<td>0.017***(.005)</td>
<td>1.017</td>
<td>0.045 (.052)</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td>0.051 (.053)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of home: host country</td>
<td>-0.032 (.047)</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>-0.048 (.049)</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>-0.101 (.064)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language skills</td>
<td>-0.334***(.081)</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>-0.299***(.084)</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>-0.299 (.154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship in host country</td>
<td>-1.809***(.286)</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>-1.150***(.155)</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>-1.205***(.161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Swedish politics</td>
<td>0.597***(.108)</td>
<td>1.817</td>
<td>-0.877***(.118)</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>-0.867***(.120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in host country politics</td>
<td>-0.440***(.107)</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>-0.441***(.110)</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>-0.284** (.123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High education</td>
<td>1.054 (.603)</td>
<td>2.868</td>
<td>1.191 (.671)</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>-0.406 (.448)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle high education</td>
<td>.863 (.611)</td>
<td>2.370</td>
<td>.894 (.679)</td>
<td>2.445</td>
<td>-0.174 (.458)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle low education</td>
<td>.663 (.620)</td>
<td>1.941</td>
<td>.921 (.690)</td>
<td>2.511</td>
<td>-0.179 (.468)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio ec. status: Very well</td>
<td>1.206 (.849)</td>
<td>3.340</td>
<td>1.264 (.901)</td>
<td>3.538</td>
<td>-1.354** (.509)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio ec. Status: Rather well</td>
<td>1.031 (.850)</td>
<td>2.803</td>
<td>1.251 (.902)</td>
<td>3.495</td>
<td>-1.208** (.509)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio ec. Status: Neither good nor bad</td>
<td>.703 (.864)</td>
<td>2.021</td>
<td>.803 (.917)</td>
<td>2.233</td>
<td>-0.880 (.525)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio ec. Status: Rather bad</td>
<td>.240 (.922)</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>.270 (.977)</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td>-0.717 (.574)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 50-75</td>
<td>-0.668***(.184)</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>0.058 (.233)</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>0.109***(.256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 30-49</td>
<td>-0.617***(.173)</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>-0.396 (.233)</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td>-0.757***(.251)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (woman)</td>
<td>-0.401***(.114)</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>0.270* (.128)</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>0.167 (.129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.244* (.102)</td>
<td>0.146 (.123)</td>
<td>-2.008** (.710)</td>
<td>-0.815 (.687)</td>
<td>-1.166 (.1023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke R²</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood</td>
<td>1606.315</td>
<td>1848.771</td>
<td>1566.938</td>
<td>1345.615</td>
<td>1560.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>1570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance levels: * p ≤ 0.05, ** p ≤ 0.01, *** p ≤ 0.001. Values express B-coefficients and odds ratios (OR). Standard errors in parentheses. Comment: See Appendix A for coding of variables. Source: SOM-undersökningen till utlandssvenskar 2014. Version 1.0, Svensk Nationell Datatjänst. Weighted data.
4.1 First participation outcome: Political participation in Sweden and no political participation in host country
The first political participation outcome is the zero sum relationship adopted to Sweden. This means that the individual participates in Sweden but not in host country. As was shown in the descriptive statistics of the dependent variables, among the 1631 respondents 440 respondents were coded as 1 in this participation outcome.

Model 1C in Table 2 includes the full set of independent variables. In sum, all assimilation variables, except for News consumption Swedish media and the two Feeling of home variables have a significant impact on the participation outcome. Additionally, most resource related variables display no significant impact on the outcome, except middle aged versus the youngest and women compared to men, which both display negative impact on the participation outcome.

Predicted probabilities facilitates interpretation of the effects of the independent variables on the participation outcome. News consumption of host country media has a quite strong dampening effect on the participation outcome: the predicted probability of the outcome, holding other variables constant, drops from 29.6 percent to 10.1 percent between an individual that never consumes host country media and an individual that does so on a daily basis. Language skills also has a negative impact on the outcome. The predicted probability of the first participation outcome drops from 37.9 percent to 19.9 percent when comparing an individual with the least and the most language skills. This implies that the better the individual understands the language spoken in host country, the less likely it is that he or she displays a participation outcome as the first one: participation in Sweden but not in host country.

Citizenship in host country is also a strong predictor of the participation outcome: for an individual that do not hold citizenship in the host country, the predicted probability of adopting the political participation only to Sweden is 27.3 percent, whereas for an individual holding citizenship in host country, the predicted probability of the outcome is only 5.9 percent.

Concerning the variables of interest in politics, they both have a strong, and as expected opposite, effect on the outcome. The predicted probability of the first participation outcome increases from 7.8 percent to 31 percent for a movement from “not at all interested” to “very interested” in Swedish politics. For the interest in host country politics, the predicted probability of the first participation outcome is instead 39.9 percent for an individual not at all interested, and 15 percent for an individual that is very interested. The two variables reflecting interest in politics are

---

7 Predicted probabilities are the likelihood of a certain outcome (the dependent variable) at a certain value of the independent variable.
presented in the Graph 1 and Graph 2.

**Graph 1: Predicted probability of participation outcome 1 at different levels of Interest in Swedish politics.**

Comment: Interest is Swedish politics displays (1) Not at all interested; (2) Not particularly interested; (3) Rather interested; and (4) Very interested.

**Graph 2: Predicted probability of participation outcome 1 at different levels of Interest in host country politics.**

Comment: Interest in host country politics displays (1) Not at all interested; (2) Not particularly interested; (3) Rather interested; and (4) Very interested.
The effect of gender, that in this case is the effect of being a female, has a negative and quite weak, even though significant, effect on the dependent variable. The predicted probability of the participation outcome is 23.6 percent for males and 19 percent for females.

Summarizing the first participation outcome, the first hypothesis stated that less assimilation into host country would have a positive impact on the first participation outcome. In other words, the less integrated the individual is into the host country, the more likely it is that he or she adapt the zero sum relationship in favor of political participation in Sweden. Overall, this hypothesis is confirmed. In the first participation outcome, the empirical results confirm the stipulated impact of all nine assimilation variables except three. Language skills; citizenship in host country; news consumption host country media; and interest in host country politics all have negative and strong effect on the outcome. Interest in Swedish politics shows as expected a positive impact on the participation outcome.

4.2 Second participation outcome: No political participation in Sweden and political participation in host country
The second participation outcome is the zero sum relationship where the individual does not participate in Sweden but participates in host country. The regression output is reflected in Model 2C in Table 2. All assimilation variables except News consumption host country media; the two Feeling of home variables; and Language skills show significant effects on the outcome participating in the host country but not in Sweden. Years abroad; Citizenship in host country; and Interest in host country politics have as expected a positive impact on the participation outcome, whereas News consumption Swedish media and Interest in Swedish politics have a negative effect on the outcome. Concerning the resource related variables, the two highest socio economic groups showed a significant and negative effect on the participation outcome. The two age groups 50-75 years and 30-49 years have positive effects on the participation outcome, compared to the reference category of respondents in the age 18-29 years.

The effect of how long the individual has spent abroad; Years abroad, shows an almost mirrored impact from the other zero sum relationship. The impact is significant though very weak. For instance, if the individual reports five years abroad, the predicted probability of the second participation outcome, as always holding all other variables constant, is 11.9 percent. For 15 years abroad, the predicted probability has increased to 13.5 percent and for 30 years, it is 16.1.

News consumption of Swedish media has a negative impact on the participation outcome. Comparing an individual who does not consume any Swedish media with an individual who does on a daily basis, the predicted probability of the participation outcome drops from 16.9 percent to
4.5 percent. The difference is displayed in Graph 3.

**Graph 3: Predicted probability of participation outcome 2 at different levels of News consumption of Swedish media.**

Comment: News consumption of Swedish media displays (1) Never; (2) 1-2 days per week; (3) 3-4 days per week; (4) 5-6 days per week and (5) On a daily basis.

Citizenship in host country has a strong effect also in this participation outcome. The predicted probability of the outcome is 11.5 percent for an individual who does not hold citizenship in the host country, increasing to 30.2 percent for an individual who does.

Further, also in the second outcome of political participation, interest in politics has a strong and significant impact. Concerning interest in host country politics, the effect of an increasing political interest generates a greater likelihood of the participation outcome. From the least to the most interested, the predicted probability of the outcome increases from 8.3 percent to 17.5 percent. When it comes to interest in Swedish politics, between the two extremes, “Not at all interested” and “Very interested”, the predicted probability for the participation outcome decreases from 49.5 percent to 6.8 percent. This development is shown in Graph 4.
Concerning the socio economic status, which represents whether the household can cope on present income, the two highest groups display a negative and significant impact on the participation outcome, compared to the reference category. Expressed in predicted probabilities, the group “Rather well” shows a predicted probability of the outcome of 13.7 percent whereas the group “Very well”, shows a predicted probability of 12.8 percent. Therefore, even though the coefficients in Table 2 seem rather high, there is not a large effect.

In summary, also the second hypothesis is confirmed. This hypothesis stated that more assimilation into host country would have a positive impact on the second participation outcome, which is the case for several of the assimilation variables in the analysis. However, fewer variables show significant effect compared to the first participation outcome. Holding citizenship is found to strongly influence the participation outcome. Also interest in host country politics have a positive effect on the participation outcome, whereas interest in Swedish politics and news consumption of Swedish media have a negative impact on the outcome, as stipulated by the hypothesis.
### Table 3: Logistic regression: the effects of assimilation related and resource related variables on the third and fourth participation outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years abroad</td>
<td>-0.003(.004)</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>0.001(.005)</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>-0.001(.006)</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News consumption Swedish media</td>
<td>.136(.083)</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>.159(.085)</td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td>-0.341(*.138)</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News consumption host country media</td>
<td>.152(.068)</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>.178(.069)</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>0.022(.096)</td>
<td>1.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of home: Sweden</td>
<td>-0.043(.041)</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>-0.061(.042)</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td>-0.059(.053)</td>
<td>0.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of home: host country</td>
<td>-0.070(.044)</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>-0.052(.045)</td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td>-0.091(.061)</td>
<td>1.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language skills</td>
<td>.460***(.097)</td>
<td>1.584</td>
<td>0.397***(.100)</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td>-0.149(.100)</td>
<td>0.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship in host country</td>
<td>.462***(.141)</td>
<td>1.588</td>
<td>.433***(.145)</td>
<td>1.542</td>
<td>-1.700***(.308)</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Swedish politics</td>
<td>.507***(.092)</td>
<td>1.660</td>
<td>.553***(.094)</td>
<td>1.739</td>
<td>-0.682***(.121)</td>
<td>0.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in host country politics</td>
<td>.199*(.093)</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>.203*(.095)</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>-0.092(.123)</td>
<td>0.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High education</td>
<td>1.334*(.544)</td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td>1.364*(.563)</td>
<td>3.913</td>
<td>-1.933***(.413)</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle high education</td>
<td>1.223*(.550)</td>
<td>3.397</td>
<td>1.278*(.570)</td>
<td>3.590</td>
<td>-1.695***(.427)</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle low education</td>
<td>.978(.557)</td>
<td>2.660</td>
<td>1.125(.578)</td>
<td>3.079</td>
<td>-1.083*(.429)</td>
<td>0.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low education (ref. category)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio. ec. status: Very well</td>
<td>-0.041(.521)</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>-0.066(.547)</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>1.122(.957)</td>
<td>3.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio. ec. Status: Rather well</td>
<td>.007(.521)</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>-0.009(.548)</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>1.149(.957)</td>
<td>3.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio. ec. Status: Neither good nor bad</td>
<td>-0.034(.535)</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>-0.027(.563)</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>1.230(.970)</td>
<td>3.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio. ec. Status: Rather bad</td>
<td>-0.266(.578)</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>-0.361(.608)</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>1.806(.997)</td>
<td>6.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio.ec status: Very bad (ref. category)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 50-75</td>
<td>-0.131(.173)</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>-0.291(.208)</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>.142(.262)</td>
<td>1.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 30-49</td>
<td>-0.118(.164)</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>-0.082(.177)</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>.500**(.246)</td>
<td>1.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 18-29 (ref.category)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (woman)</td>
<td>.383***(.104)</td>
<td>1.467</td>
<td>.498***(.111)</td>
<td>1.645</td>
<td>-0.325*(.144)</td>
<td>0.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.365***(.518)</td>
<td>-1.752*(.748)</td>
<td>-5.815***(.939)</td>
<td>1.527**(.592)</td>
<td>-1.421(1.025)</td>
<td>2.383(1.224)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke R²</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood</td>
<td>2030.403</td>
<td>2156.407</td>
<td>1996.374</td>
<td>1216.673</td>
<td>1303.411</td>
<td>1173.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>1570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance levels: * p ≤ 0.05, ** p ≤ 0.01, *** p ≤ 0.001. Values express B-coefficients and odds ratios (OR). Standard errors in parentheses. Comment: See Appendix A for coding of variables. Source: SOM-undersökningen till utlandssvenskar 2014. Version 1.0, Svensk Nationell Datajäst. Weighted data.
4.3 Third participation outcome: Political participation in Sweden and political participation in host country

The first of the coexisting relationship outcomes is the one where the individual participates in politics in both Sweden and host country. The theoretical framework argued that the coexisting relationships should be better explained by resource oriented factors than assimilation. The results from the regressions is presented in Table 3. Several of the assimilation variables turns out to have a significant impact also in this participation outcome. *News consumption of host country media* has a positive effect on the outcome; and so does also *Language skills; Citizenship in host country; Interest in Swedish politics; and Interest in host country politics*. However, *Years abroad; News consumption of Swedish media; and the two variables of Feeling of home* have no significant effect. Concerning the resource related variables, the two highest groups of *Education* have a positive and significant impact on the participation outcome, as well as *Gender* where being a female have a positive impact.

Language skills has a positive effect on the participation outcome. From the lowest to the highest score, the predicted probability of participating in both Sweden and host country increases from 17 percent to 40.3 percent. Graph 5 offers an illustration of the development.

**Graph 5: Predicted probability of participation outcome 3 at different levels of Language skills.**

*Comment:* Language skills ("reading a short text") displays (1) No; (2) Yes, with much difficulty; (3) Yes, with some difficulties; and (4) Yes, without any difficulties.
Citizenship in host country shows a positive and significant impact also for the participation outcome of participation in both Sweden and host country, however the effect is much weaker than in previous outcomes. Holding citizenship in host country yields a predicted probability of the outcome of 46.4 percent whereas not holding citizenship yields a predicted probability of 36 percent. Also interest in politics, for both settings respectively, has a positive effect, yet somewhat weaker than in the zero sum relationship outcomes. An individual with the lowest interest in Swedish politics has a predicted probability of participating in both Sweden and host country of 16.3 percent, and an individual with the highest interest in Swedish politics displays a predicted probability of the outcome of 50.5 percent. For interest in host country politics, the predicted probabilities of the participation outcome are 28.7 percent and 42.5 respectively.

The two groups representing the highest education show a positive and significant impact on the outcome, compared to the reference category of low education. An individual with middle high education has a predicted probability of the participation outcome of 37.4 percent. For the next group, high education, the predicted probability of the outcome is 39.5 percent.

Being a female increases the predicted probability of the participation outcome. For males, the predicted probability of the outcome is 32 percent, and for females it is 43.5 percent.

Returning to the hypothesis for the third participation outcome, it stated that more resources would have a positive impact on the third participation outcome. In other words, individuals displaying higher values on the resource variables would be more likely to participate in politics in both and host country. The result from the regression model is not as straightforward as in the first and the second outcomes where the hypotheses more easily could be confirmed. In the third participation outcome, the two highest education categories display significant and positive impact. Further, gender had a strong effect. Women are more likely to participate in politics in both Sweden and host country. Socio economic status and age fail to explain any differences in the outcome. Instead, several of the assimilation variables show considerable influence on the participation outcome. In summary, the third hypothesis is rejected due to the many assimilation variables that display significant impact on the outcome of participation both in Sweden and host country.
4.4 Fourth participation outcome: No political participation in Sweden and no political participation in host country

The fourth and last participation outcome is the one reflecting the inactive individuals that do not participate neither in Sweden nor in host country. As displayed in Model 4c in Table 3, several of the assimilation variables show no significant impact on this outcome. *News consumption of Swedish media; Citizenship in host country;* as well as *Interest in Swedish politics* display however quite strong negative impact on the outcome. *Gender* have a negative relationship to the participation outcome. All three *Education* groups, compared to the reference category, also display negative impact on the outcome. The four higher *Socio economic status* categories, in comparison with the reference category, fail to influence the outcome. Also the two higher *Age* groups display no significant impact as they were compared to the youngest group of citizens.

Concerning news consumption of Swedish media, the predicted probability of the dependent variable of an individual that does not consume Swedish media is 12.7 percent. An individual that consumes Swedish media on a daily basis has a predicted probability of the participation outcome of 3.3 percent.

Citizenship in host country has a strong impact on the participation outcome. All else equal, holding citizenship reduces the predicted probability of the outcome from 14.2 percent to 2.7 percent. In other words, there is a very small likelihood of an individual that holds citizenship in host country not be inactive in politics.

The variable reflecting interest in Swedish politics further has a negative impact on the participation outcome. Comparing an individual who is not at all interested in Swedish politics with an individual that is very interested in Swedish politics, the predicted probability for the outcome drops from 34.3 percent to 5.7 percent. Graph 6 illustrates the differences.
Concerning the resource related variables, higher education has as expected negative effect on the no-participation outcome. In other words, it is much less likely that an individual with higher education does not participate in politics at all. An individual in the middle low education category has a predicted probability of the participation outcome of 16.4 percent whereas the middle high education group and the high education group have predicted probabilities of 11.3 percent and 9.1 percent respectively.

The effect of gender on the participation outcome is quite strong. A male has a predicted probability of being inactive in politics of 13.7 percent whereas the predicted probability for a female is 8.5 percent.

The fourth participation outcome display the inactive individuals that do not participate in politics neither in Sweden nor in host country. The hypothesis stated that less resources would have a positive impact on this participation outcome. This is true for the all three education groups that do have a negative influence of the outcome, compared to the reference category. Gender further display the proposed effect where women are less likely to be inactive than men. Fewer of the assimilation variables have significant impact in this outcome. Language skills has no significant effect on the participation outcome, interpreted as that the choice not to participate in politics has nothing to do with lack of language skills. Instead, citizenship in host country displays a strong and
negative effect on the outcome, as well as news consumption of Swedish media.

Overall, also the fourth hypothesis is rejected. Even though education and gender display significant impact on the participation outcome, the other variables fail to explain the lack of participation. However, it should be noted that only three of the assimilation variables have significant impact, implying that assimilation in fact plays a less important role in this outcome, as stipulated by the theoretical framework.

5 Discussion and concluding remarks
Political participation is a defining element of democracy. With an increasing part of the population living abroad, a new dimension is added to the questions of who participates in politics. Even more important, which factors explain this participation? And which factors explain lack of participation? This thesis adopted a transnational perspective when investigating explanations for political participation among expatriate Swedes. Transnational theory, composed of transborderism and simultaneity, states that political participation among migrants is a dynamic relationship of four scenarios. By adopting two of the transnational relationships, namely the zero sum relationship and the coexisting relationship, four different participation outcomes were stated. The first participation outcome reflected individuals that participate in politics in Sweden but not in the host country. The second outcome contained the opposite scenario: no participation in Sweden but participation in the host country. The last two participation outcomes reflected the individuals that participate both in Sweden and the host country, and those who do not participate at all.

In the theoretical framework, the thesis argued for different factors explaining the two transnational participation relationships. Assimilation factors, including objective measurements of citizenship, as well as the individual’s subjective assessments of “feeling of home” were stated to effect the two zero sum relationships in opposite direction. Assimilation into the host country was argued to steer the political participation toward host country and therefore have a positive impact on the second participation outcome, whereas less assimilation would result in the first participation outcome. Concerning the two other participation outcomes, reflecting political participation in both settings or none, resource related variables were stipulated to play an important role.

The hypotheses for the two first participation outcomes were confirmed through the analysis. Several assimilation variables proved significant impact in the direction proposed: less assimilation leads to increased likelihood of participation only in Sweden, and contrary, more assimilation leads the individual to direct the political participation toward the host country.
Three assimilation variables displayed large influence on the first and second participation outcome: citizenship in host country; interest in Swedish politics; and interest in host country politics. When looking at the effect of citizenship, it cannot be determined whether it is the symbolic value in citizenship or the actual right to participate in institutionalized political activities that positively affects the second participation outcome. It is however clear that holding citizenship in host country makes a great difference in political participation. Also the interest in politics affects participation to a high degree. Since the effects of interest in politics has the opposite effects for the two settings, it simultaneously confirms traditional political participation theory and emphasizes the importance of assimilation factors.

Concerning both of the zero sum participation outcomes, some of the resource related variables proved significant impact as well. This is probably most reasonable - we cannot overlook commonly held determinants of political participation such as age and gender, even though they are argued to be less important when political participation is present in only one of the settings. The two highest socio economic status categories displayed significantly negative impact in the second participation outcome, but when transforming the coefficients to predicted probabilities, the effect is rather small.

The subjective measurement of “feeling of home” failed to show significant impact in all participation outcomes. This was unexpected since the measurement was argued to capture an important dimension of migration. It is, however, apparent from the frequencies of the two variables that many respondents highly “feel like home”, and that there are very few in any of the settings that “do not feel like home at all”. A larger spread in the variables would perhaps yield significant impact of the variables. Further, it is likely to believe that under control for citizenship in host country, the effect of “feeling of home” is reduced. In other words, a lot of the variation is already captured in the variable of citizenship.

Concerning the hypotheses for the third and the fourth participation outcomes, the results were less straightforward. Among the individuals that participate in politics both in Sweden and in the host country, the two highest education categories displayed a positive and significant impact. Among the inactive citizens in the fourth participation outcome, all three higher education categories had a negative influence on the outcome, compared to the reference category. Gender was also a significant determinant in both participation outcomes, where women were more likely to participate in both settings and less likely to be inactive. Socio economic status and age failed to explain any differences in the outcomes. Instead, several of the assimilation related variables showed considerable influence of the participation outcomes. For instance, citizenship and interest
in politics displayed large impact. Holding citizenship had a strong positive effect on the third participation outcome, understood as that an additional citizenship does not necessarily reduce political participation in Sweden but increases the likelihood of participation in host country. The effect of holding citizenship in host country was however much weaker in the third participation outcome than in the other three. It is further notable that for both third and fourth participation outcome, the time spent abroad has no influence. The variable showed a small yet significant effect in the two first participation outcomes.

In summary, the third and the fourth hypothesis are rejected due to lack of influence of several resource variables. However, especially for the fourth participation outcome, only a few assimilation variables affected the outcome. This implies that the theoretical discussion of different explanations for the different participation outcomes however is correct in some sense.

Possible shortcomings that might explain the non-significant impact of socio economic status is the relative skewness of the data. Very few respondents are found in the lowest socio economic groups and the effect between the other groups seems to be small. It is though more surprising that age does not display any effect. However, theory predicts younger citizens to be more active in non-institutionalized activities of politics whereas older citizens to a larger extent vote, and since the host country variable includes both, this might equalize the effect of age.

5.1 Future research
This study constituted a first look at transnational political participation among Swedish citizens living abroad. By treating political participation in Sweden and the host country as a dynamic relationship of four participation outcomes, I found support for hypotheses of assimilation related factors by including a migration perspective. In some cases, evidence was also found confirming a traditional view on resources as important for political participation.

This particular study has several shortcomings important to discuss and address in future research. For instance, it is a traditional case study only exploring one group of migrants, namely Swedes. It cannot draw any conclusions regarding other groups of migrants. However, it can relate to an extensive literature on political participation of migrants from developing countries. Since research on migration from developed countries is relatively rarely found compared to the actual migration flows, this thesis calls for a research perspective recognizing this overlooked field.

It should be further noted, as far as this thesis concerns, that a deeper understanding of the mechanisms behind each determinant can be of great interest. For instance, it is beyond the scope of this study to explore what aspect of citizenship that generates such a large influence on political
participation. The same goes for news consumption and language skills, largely influential in several participation outcomes.
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Appendix A. Coding of variables.

Dependent variables – all combinations built on the same variables

Voter turnout in Sweden. F26: “Did you vote in the Swedish national election? (1) “Yes”; (2) “No”; (3) “Was not entitled to vote”. The original coding was replaced by (1) “Yes” and (0) “No”. Responses that were not entitled to vote were excluded. The variable represents political participation in Sweden.

Non institutional political participation. F16A-F16F: “There is a variety of ways in which to engage in social and political issues. Have you performed any of the following in Sweden or somewhere else? Signed a petition; contacted a politician; participated in a demonstration; contacted an official on local, regional or national level; contacted or participated in media; and donated or collected money for a political or social cause”. Alternatives: (1) “Yes, during the past 12 months”; (2) “Yes, a longer time ago”; and (3) “No”. Original coding was replaced so that (1) “Yes” included original “Yes, during the past 12 months” and (0) “No” included original “Yes, a longer time ago” and “No”.

Voter turnout in host country. F30: “Have you voted in any general election in [Country]?”. Alternatives: (1) “Yes”; (2) “No”; and (3) “Was not entitled to vote”. The original coding was replaced by (1) “Yes” and (0) “No”. Responses that were not entitled to vote were excluded.

In a next step, Non institutional political participation and Voter turnout in host country was combined into an index with the alternatives (1) “Yes” and (0) “No”. Participation in any of the seven included actions yields a “Yes”. The index represents political participation in host country. Last step in constructing the four dependent variables was to combine political participation in Sweden and political participation in host country into four possible combinations:

- First participation outcome: Political participation in Sweden + No political participation in host country
- Second participation outcome: No political participation in Sweden + Political participation in host country
- Third participation outcome: Political participation in Sweden + Political participation in host country
- Fourth participation outcome: No political participation in Sweden + No political participation in host country

Independent variables

Years abroad. Sarutomlands: built variable representing aggregate time abroad.

News consumption of Swedish media. F10A-F10E: “To what extent do you consume news in [Country] through Swedish media?”. Stated for each of the following: local daily newspaper; national daily newspaper; free daily newspaper; television; and radio. Alternatives: (1) “On a daily basis”; (2) “5-6 days per week”; (3) “3-4 days per week”; (4) “1-2 days per week”; (5) “More occasionally”; and (6) “Never”. The original coding was replaced so that: (1) “Never” included original “More occasionally” and “Never”, and the other variables was (2) “1-2 days per week”: (3) “3-4 days per week”; (4) “5-6 days per week”; and (5) “On a daily basis”. The five different news providers were combined into an index.

News consumption of host country media. F9A-F9E: “To what extent do you consume news in [Country] through host country media?”. Stated for each of the following: local daily newspaper; national daily newspaper; free daily newspaper; television; and radio. Alternatives: (1) “On a daily basis”; (2) “5-6 days per week”; (3) “3-4 days per week”; (4) “1-2 days per week”; (5) “More occasionally”; and (6) “Never”. The original coding was replaced so that: (1) “Never” included original “More occasionally” and “Never”, and the other variables was (2) “1-2 days per week”: (3) “3-4 days per week”; (4) “5-6 days per week”; and (5) “On a daily basis”. The five different news providers were combined into an index.

Feeling of home in Sweden. F51D: “To what extent do you feel home in the following geographical
Feeling of home in host country. F51C: “To what extent do you feel home in the following geographical location [Country]?”. Alternatives: (1) “Do not feel like home at all”; (2); (3); (4); (5); (6); and (7) “Feels entirely like home”.

Language skills. F69: “Can you read a short text, for instance a newspaper article, written in the language mainly spoken [Country]?”. Alternatives: (1) “Yes, without any difficulties; (2) “Yes, with some difficulties; (3) “Yes, with much difficulty; and (4) “No”. The original coding was replaced by (1) “No”; (2) “Yes, with much difficulty; (3) “Yes, with some difficulties”; and (4) “Yes, without any difficulties”.

Citizenship. F63B: Do you hold citizenship in [Country]?”. (0) “No” and (1) “Yes”.

Interest in Swedish politics. F15A: “How interested are you in general of politics concerning [Sweden]?”. Alternatives: (1) “Very interested”; (2) “Rather interested”; (3) “Not particularly interested; and (4) “Not at all interested”. The original coding was replaced by (1) “Not at all interested”; (2) “Not particularly interested”; 83) “Rather interested”; and (4) “Very interested”.

Interest in host country politics. F15B: “How interested are you in general of politics concerning [Country]?”. Alternatives: (1) “Very interested”; (2) “Rather interested”; (3) “Not particularly interested; and (4) “Not at all interested”. The original coding was replaced by (1) “Not at all interested”; (2) “Not particularly interested”; 83) “Rather interested”; and (4) “Very interested”.

Education. Utb: built variable representing four categories of education (1) “Low”; (2) “Middle low”; (3) “Middle high”; and (4) “High”. The different categories are built upon the variable F74: Education level. The categories represent Low =Not completed elementary school (or equivalent compulsory school) + Elementary school (or equivalent compulsory school); Middle low = Studies at upper secondary school, college (or equivalent) + graduated from upper secondary school, college (or equivalent); Middle high = postsecondary education (not university) + studies at university; High = graduated from university + studies/graduated from doctoral studies. The four categories were coded as dummies with (0) “No” and (1) “Yes” and the category “Low” was used as the reference category.

Socio economic status. F66: “Can your household cope on present income?”. Alternatives: (1) “Very well; (2) “Rather well”; (3) Neither good nor bad; (4) “Rather bad; and (5) “Very bad”. The five categories were coded as dummies with (0) “No” and (1) “Yes” and the category “Very bad” was used as the reference category.

Age. Alder3: built categories of age groups (1) “18-29 years”; (2) “30-49 years; and (3) “50-75 years”. The three groups were coded as dummies with (0) “No” and (1) “Yes”.

Gender. Sex: original coding (1) “Female”; (2) “Male”; and (3) “Other”. Original coding replaced by (0) “Male” and (1) “Female” and other responses excluded from the data.
Appendix B. Descriptive statistics.

Descriptive statistics reporting distributions for dependent and independent variables after weighting and filtering of the data.

### Dependent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First participation outcome</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Percent (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second participation outcome</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third participation outcome</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth participation outcome</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1394</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Independent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years abroad</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News consumption Swedish media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News consumption host country media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of home: Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of home: host country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship in host country</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Swedish politics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in host country politics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle high education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle low education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio ec. status: Very well</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio ec. Status: Rather well</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio ec. Status: Neither good nor bad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio ec. Status: Rather bad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio.ec status: Very bad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 50-75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 30-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 18-29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C. Multicollinearity diagnostics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Antal år utomlands - svarsdata (byggd variabel baserad på f2 &amp; f3ba-bh exkl Sver</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Newsconsumption_sweden</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>1.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newsconsumption_hostcountry</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>1.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling home in Sweden</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>1.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling home in host country</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>1.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Låsa en kortare text på språket som talas i boendelandet</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>1.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizenship in host country</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>1.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intresse för svensk politik</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>1.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intresse politik boendelandet</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>1.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy_högutb</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>1.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy_medelhögutb</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>14.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy_medelågutb</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>11.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy_socioec_mycketbra</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>8.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy_socioec_ganskabra</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>25.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy_socioec_varkeneller</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>22.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy_socioec_ganskadåligt</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>10.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy_åldersgrupp3</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>4.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy_åldersgrupp2</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>3.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>1.056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: zero_se