



**University of South-Eastern Norway**

**Faculty of Humanities, Sports, and Educational  
Science**

**Master's Thesis**

**Study program: Nordic Master in Friluftsliv Studies**

**Spring 2023**

## **Friluftsliv and Immigrants in Norway**

A qualitative study on Greek immigrants' perceptions of Friluftsliv and the factors affecting their participation in it

**Author: Agni Tzimourta**

**Supervisor: Laufey Haraldsdóttir**

University of South-Eastern Norway  
Faculty of Humanities, Sports, and Educational Science  
Institute of Bø

PO Box 235

NO-3603 Kongsberg, Norway

<http://www.usn.no>

© 2023 < Agni Tzimourta >

This thesis is worth 30 study points.

# Abstract

Immigration and outdoor engagement have received a lot of attention in recent years. Participation in the outdoors, especially in Norway, is essential for all people. It improves their physical, mental, and to a greater extent, the health of the broader population- the public health. With this small-scale analysis, I tried to ascertain the factors affecting the participation of the Greek population outdoors in Norway. The findings showed that there are no clear associations among gender, socialization in Norway, and engagement in nature. While the family background, their childhood experiences with nature, and the type of their hometown- urban and non-urban, the weather, and the accessibility to the natural areas - appeared to influence participants' relationships with nature.

Keywords: immigrants, nature, engagement, participation, Norway, Friluftsliv



# Contents

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Contents</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>List of figures and tables</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Foreword</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Literature review</b>	<b>8</b>
The importance of nature	8
Friluftsliv- definition and history	9
The phenomenon of immigration and its history	10
<b>The connection of immigrants with nature</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Methods</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Results</b>	<b>26</b>
Background in terms of nature and their previous relationship with it	28
Connection to Norway and Norwegian Culture	29
Pictures and views of nature	30
Participants' preferences according to already picked pictures	30
Participants' personal pictures of nature	31
The optimum relationship with Nature	32
Participants' relationships with nature	33
Connection to Nature after Immigration	36
Greek Immigrants' Activities in Nature in Norway	36
Changes in human nature relationship after immigration	36
Factors affecting the human-nature relationship	38
Friluftsliv	39
Greek Immigrants' opinions on Friluftsliv	39
Friluftsliv and Greek culture	40
Friluftsliv and accessibility in Norway	41
Accessibility in the Outdoors in Greece	42
<b>Discussion and conclusion</b>	<b>44</b>

<b>References</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Annexes</b>	<b>50</b>
Annex 1: Interview guide	50

## List of figures and tables

<b>Table 1: People with high engagement in nature</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Table 2: People with standard/medium engagement in nature</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Table 3: People with low engagement in nature</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Figure 1: A park in Oslo</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Figure 2: A forest area with a path</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Figure 3: Wilderness</b>	<b>25</b>

# Foreword

When I began this Master's study a year ago, I first encountered this word and notion of Friluftsliv. In Greek, there is no word to describe it. However, during the course and living in Norway, I have learned what it is and how important it is for everyone. In classes, I mostly got the theories and the history behind it, but also living in its native country has given me many opportunities to experience it.

During the classes, we also discussed the relationship between minority groups and nature and further Friluftsliv. It was interesting how many different cultures and perspectives people have and how this can affect acclimatization to a new country. Moreover, I am highly interested in health concerning nature. That is why I have chosen to explore the accessibility of Friluftsliv and the different cultural perspectives, feeling that it is a significant issue that requires extensive discussion.

# Introduction

Nature's positive effects on humans have been well established. In Norway, nature and outdoor activities are embedded in their culture and life. Friluftsliv is an essential part of Norwegian culture. It literally means 'free-air - life', and it is a tradition that aims to bring people closer and more connected to the natural environment. However, there is a discussion about immigrants' participation in the outdoors. The aim of this paper is to find the factors affecting immigrants, specifically Greek immigrants, participation in Friluftsliv. So, the research question has been stated as follows: 'What factors affect the Greek immigrant population's participation in outdoor activities in Norway?'

This thesis is divided into five chapters. The first one is the *Literature review*, in which there is an extensive examination of prior studies about the importance of nature, Friluftsliv, and the phenomenon of immigration. The *Issue* is coming after, an in-depth analysis of different investigations about immigration and engagement in nature from different countries and Norway as well.

The third chapter is the *Methods*. In this chapter, I analyzed the methodology used to conduct this study. This is a qualitative study, including semi-structured interviews with ethnography. For the interviews, I used an interview guide that helped me approach the major areas of the study.

*Results* are the fourth part, and there are all the findings from interviewing the participants. In closing, the last chapter is the *Discussion and conclusion*, where I linked the findings to draw an answer to my research question.

## Literature review

### The importance of nature

Nature and ecosystems contribute to human well-being in several ways (Russell et al., 2013, p.474). The research literature on the topic is vast and growing. Except for the various resources nature



provides -food, shelter, etc.- it offers people advantages that are important for their psychological and cultural well-being (Russell et al., 2013, p. 474). It is well known that being in nature and participating in activities has numerous benefits for people's physical and mental health. An investigation has also shown that even watching nature through the window has helped people with their recovery after surgery in comparison with the wall view patients (Ulrich, 1984).

Today's fast-paced lifestyle, excessive social media use, and disconnect from nature, along with stress and other variables, have contributed to a number of mental and physical health problems. It has been scientifically proven that nature can be a valuable tool for reducing stress symptoms and enhancing mental recovery (Pálsdóttir et al., 2014, p. 7095). Different studies have also found that living in a green environment was positively related to well-being indicators such as stress level and physical activity (Godbey, 2009, p. 3). Research in Australia has found that long trips to green spaces were associated with decreased rates of depression and hypertension, while frequent visits were associated with higher levels of social cohesion (Shanahan et al., 2016). At the same time, outdoor recreation decreases the likelihood of overeating and suffering pollution-related health problems, and of course, while outdoors, people are less likely to be sedentary (Godbey, 2009, p. 3). And there are a ton more comparable research findings about the advantages of nature that help to explain the rise in interest in recent years in using the outdoors to promote and enhance health and well-being.

## Friluftsliv- definition and history

Fortuitously, outdoor recreation is deeply rooted in various countries' cultures. Norway is one of them, being the native country of Friluftsliv. Friluftsliv is a notion unknown to non-Scandinavian countries. This Norwegian word can not easily be translated into a foreign language (Faarlund, 2007, p. 394). It literally means 'free air life.' According to Humberstone and Pedersen (2001, p.26), Friluftsliv is 'traditionally connected with the practice of simplicity, 'sportsmanship', and traveling through the landscape without leaving traces. People had been using the word up to 1921 without having any definition. Then, Nansen - a Norwegian explorer, scientist, and diplomat, spoke about Friluftsliv as cooperation with nature's powers and the joy of being in nature (Gelter, 2000, p. 79). He believed that free nature was our true home and that being engaged in Friluftsliv was our way back home (Gelter, 2000, p. 79).

Friluftsliv, as a national symbol, emerged to represent and support the idea of healthy and active youth (Humberstone & Pedersen, 2001, p. 26). Skiing and skiers' role as Arctic explorers, along with other elements of Friluftsliv, were seen to reinforce this identity of Norwegian youth who were "capable of surviving on the edge of an icy waste" during the interwar years (1918–1940) (Humberstone & Pedersen, 2001, p. 26). Thus, the idea of the young, healthy, outdoorsman was embodied in

Norwegian national philosophy (Humberstone & Pedersen, 2001, p. 26; Bjerkli, Flemsæter, Lein, Rørtveit, Setten & Aasetre, 2017). The outdoor movement became a symbol and setting for boosting hegemonic masculinity and nationalism (Humberstone & Pedersen, 2001, p. 26). As the years passed, Friluftsliv changed according to the periods, keeping some branches of the older tradition. Today though, it has been overshadowed by strong commercialization and a never-ending flow of new consumption-lifestyle (Gelter, 2000, p. 80). That is why people define it simply as outdoor activities, with hiking getting paramount importance, whether it be by walking or cross-country skiing.

As a big part of Norwegian culture, the Norwegian population follows a lot of activities like hiking, skiing, and climbing. A lot of Norwegian people of all ages enjoy nature. Added to that, it is part of Norway's cultural legacy to travel and gather freely throughout the country (Humberstone & Pedersen, 2001, p. 27). This was protected by a powerful labor administration and codified in a law approved by parliament in 1957 (Humberstone & Pedersen, 2001, p. 27). The population is allowed to travel around without limitation, including on privately owned, uncultivated land in the summer and even cultivated land in the winter; to gather mushrooms, flowers, and berries; and to fish and hunt with only minimal restrictions (Humberstone & Pedersen, 2001, p. 27). Anywhere is acceptable for short periods of tent camping as long as environmental protection is taken into account (Humberstone & Pedersen, 2001, p. 27). But despite the right to travel freely, many studies have shown that a few people have the freedom to roam around. Even with the increasing number of immigrants in Norway, making up 15% of the country's total population (*Statistics Norway*, 2022), the number of immigrants being outside seems to be low (Ali & Czapka, 2016, p. 6). This raises the question of how much those individuals engage in outdoor activities and, if not, why, especially since these activities have numerous recognized benefits.

## The phenomenon of immigration and its history

Immigration is the process by which people move to another country to live permanently (*Immigration | Definition, History, & Facts | Britannica*, 2022). Therefore, immigrants are people who are foreign-born to a country. The history of immigration is lengthy and diverse, and it has frequently led to the emergence of multicultural communities (*Immigration | Definition, History, & Facts | Britannica*, 2022). Many countries are distinguished by a wide range of cultures and ethnicities that have come about as a result of earlier waves of immigration (*Immigration | Definition, History, & Facts | Britannica*, 2022). One of those countries is Norway, with the number of people coming from the European Union and the United Kingdom reaching the percentage of 6.6 out of 15.1% of the total number of immigrants in the country's population (*Statistics Norway*, 2022). Meaning that around 8 % of them are from other continents.

Modern societies are undergoing rapid demographic and societal change. People began leaving their countries in search of a brighter future, especially when economic crises and war broke out in those nations. Those movements of immigrants were usually quite big, creating the phenomenon of immigration waves. One huge immigration wave was in the later 20th century, after World War II. In Northwest Europe, three factors—colonial links between nations, economic growth driving a need for migrant labor, and asylum-seeking—have largely shaped post-war immigration patterns ( Kloek et al., 2012, p. 119). First, while colonies were on the verge of independence, migration from former colonies happened in France, the UK, the Netherlands, and Belgium ( Kloek et al., 2012, p. 119). The second occurrence, the recruitment of temporary employees, occurred in a number of Northwest European nations, including France, Germany, Sweden, Denmark, Belgium, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, and Austria ( Kloek et al., 2012, p. 120). Especially between the 1950s and the mid-1970s, there was a significant increase in labor migration, with the Mediterranean region providing the majority of these workers ( Kloek et al., 2012, p. 120). The third phenomenon, migration seeking asylum, significantly increased in many Northwest European nations starting in the 1980s ( Kloek et al., 2012, p. 120). This resulted in a diversification of the countries of origin of immigrants ( Kloek et al., 2012, p. 120).

The history of immigration in Norway can be divided into three areas according to the three types of immigrants coming. Those categories are:

1. professionals who are actively recruited to Norway,
2. immigrant workers who come on their own initiative
3. refugees (Gursli-Berg et al., 2023).

Immigration of professionals was crucial during the early stages of industrialization when Norway was totally reliant on outside expertise (Gursli-Berg et al., 2023). The Norwegian oil industry is an example, which has been entirely dependent on the arrival of knowledge and technology since the mid-1970s, especially through American oil professionals (Gursli-Berg et al., 2023).

Up until about 1920, there was a significant migration of workers from nearby nations. South-Eastern Europe, Yugoslavia, Turkey, and Pakistan also sent labor immigrants from the early 1960s until immigration was stopped in 1975 (Gursli-Berg et al., 2023). People from the new EU member states found it considerably simpler to move to Norway after the 2004 EU expansion, and since then, labor immigration from nations like Poland and Lithuania has been on the rise.

Last, the third category of immigrants—refugees and asylum seekers has increased significantly after the year 2000. Since at least the 18th century, Norway has welcomed exiles from politics and religion (Gursli-Berg et al., 2023)

## The connection of immigrants with nature

The relationship between immigrants and the outdoors is rarely highlighted. However, different studies around the world have been conducted about it. According to a past study in Florida, African Americans are less likely than other groups to engage in outdoor recreational activities. Precisely, it was ascertained that significant correlations existed between race, sex, and wildland ( Johnson et al., 1997, p. 105). Sex and wildland meaning had a positive relationship, while race had a negative relationship. Moreover, for both endogenous variables, age was also important and had the anticipated impact ( Johnson et al., 1997, p. 105).

Interesting results on the wildland meaning scale involved similar answers from women, older people, and African Americans ( Johnson et al., 1997, p. 106). This implies that each of these categories had something in common with the scale. Researchers believed that the scale touched on a general feeling of vulnerability in environments for outdoor recreation. Despite expectations, education did not significantly indicate wildland meaning ( Johnson et al., 1997, p. 105). Children's appearance also had no bearing on visitation ( Johnson et al., 1997, p. 105). Wildland meaning, as expected, was the most important factor in explaining visits, with its impacts mediating those of both race and sex (Johnson et al., 1997, p. 105). Lastly, those data demonstrated the perceptual differences in the wilderness between natives and immigrants, but also that other factors affected this relationship, like sex and age.

Research on how locals and immigrants view the wilderness in the United States revealed a range of findings. The researchers discovered that Blacks, Latinos, and Asian Americans were much less likely to report visiting a wilderness area than 'Whites' ( Johnson et al., 2004, p. 621). The value statement about the wilderness as a refuge for plant and animal species for human health and medicine received positive responses from 95% of the sample ( Johnson et al., 2004, p. 622). While women and immigrants who have assimilated well appeared to think that wilderness is crucial for air and water quality (Johnson et al., 2004, p. 622). At the same time, U.S.-born Asian women, urbanites, and more assimilated immigrants were more likely to support wilderness protection in order for wilderness to continue in its natural state ( Johnson et al., 2004, p. 623). Although people with postsecondary education, older respondents, and immigrants were less likely to assert this ( Johnson et al., 2004, p. 623).

The longer immigrants had lived in the country, the more likely they were to indicate they would like to make a future visit to the wilderness ( Johnson et al., 2004, p. 622). Additionally, individuals with tertiary education were more likely to say they would make a future visit than those with less education ( Johnson et al., 2004, p. 622). Along with that, women, Blacks, and Asians were less likely than Whites to say they would travel within the following year ( Johnson et al., 2004, p. 621). Older respondents had a lower likelihood of planning an excursion into the wilderness than younger respondents, and higher-educated respondents were more inclined to plan a trip to the outdoors (Johnson et al., 2004, p. 621).

Those results can not give the conclusion that locals and immigrants view or build wilderness in culturally distinct ways (Johnson et al., 2004, p. 624). All the answers differed in gender, age group, education level, and probably other factors that had not been included in the research. When the less visitation of Blacks in the wilderness was compared to Whites, it could be explained geographically and culturally. Concentrations of the Black population are distributed in areas with no easy access to the wilderness ( Johnson et al., 2004, p. 624).

Later research explored whether Dutch natives and immigrants from Islamic nations had distinct perceptions of nature and landscape preferences (Buijs et al., 2009). Researchers used the concept of images of nature to analyze the topic (Buijs et al., 2009, p. 114). According to them, images of nature are “enclosing frameworks that direct and structure the perception and appreciation of nature” (Buijs et al., 2009, p. 114). They believed cultural differences might be linked to how each group prefers to depict nature and the landscape (Buijs et al., 2009, p. 115). Actually, the majority of native Dutch people (51%), but only 25% of immigrants, backed the idea of the wilderness (Buijs et al., 2009, p. 118). Opposite to only 15% of native Dutch people and 44% of immigrants showed the greatest enthusiasm for it (Buijs et al., 2009, p. 118). Immigrants basically voiced a more anthropocentric perspective on the human-nature relationship, preferring a high level of management of nature and placing less value on the need for the autonomy of nature (Buijs et al., 2009, p. 118).

Interesting distinctions between first- and second-generation immigrants are revealed by a study of the two groups (Buijs et al., 2009, p. 119). In their support for different depictions of nature, second-generation immigrants appear to occupy a middle ground between first-generation immigrants and native Dutch. Compared to first-generation immigrants, they supported the wilderness idea more, but not as much as native Dutch people.

Between immigrants and native Dutch residents, significant differences were also found in how they value various landscape types. Immigrants generally had a lower appreciation for Dutch environments

than native Dutch people did (Buijs et al., 2009, p. 119). Native Dutch people valued typical Dutch landscapes like shallow marshes, heathland, and dunes much more than newcomers did. Immigrants demonstrated a relative affinity for forests and landscapes with more obvious agricultural interactions with nature (Buijs et al., 2009, p. 119). Native Dutch individuals, on the other hand, generally displayed rather low preferences for most man-made landscapes (Buijs et al., 2009, p. 119). Nevertheless, the preferences of the two groups did not substantially diverge on managed landscapes, with the second-generation immigrants in the middle of these groups.

M. Kloek, A. Buijs, and J. Boersema (2012) compared various studies from different countries on recreational behavior in nature. The findings revealed significant parallels. First of all, in all the nations studied, immigrants were more likely than non-immigrants to frequently visit urban green spaces, particularly those in their immediate neighborhoods (Kloek et al., 2012, p. 125). The utilization of non-urban green space seemed to be underrepresented among immigrants (Kloek et al., 2012, p. 125). Low income and low educational levels, less mobility due to fewer car owners, a greater physical distance to nature areas, a lack of knowledge about natural areas, and limited knowledge of the Dutch language were socioeconomic factors cited in the Netherlands to explain immigrants' underrepresentation in the recreational use of non-urban green space (Kloek et al., 2012, p. 125). At the same time, in Germany and Scandinavia, different issues, like time limitations, poor weather, a lack of company, and fear of attack, were highlighted (Kloek et al., 2012, p. 125). Furthermore, greenspace appeared to be seen as a place for social gatherings by immigrants frequently. Instead of solitary or small-group trips by indigenous, recreational outings were typically made in larger groups (Kloek et al., 2012, p. 125).

Taking gender into consideration, German and Dutch studies agreed that men went out alone or with friends, whereas women mostly went to green spaces with their families (Kloek et al., 2012, p. 126). However, most of this research was conducted on people with a Muslim heritage (Kloek et al., 2012, p. 126). So, Muslim women had fewer recreational alternatives in nature, in all likelihood, because of the Islamic laws governing the social and physical segregation of the sexes (Kloek et al., 2012, p. 126).

Studies on recreational behavior usually end with management and planning recommendations (Kloek et al., 2012, p. 126). Dutch studies suggested provisions largely concerning hygiene (providing water taps, toilets), control of phenomena perceived as morally wrong (restricting dogs from running free and topless sunbathing), facilities for group entertainment (providing games facilities, tea rooms), and rules on area use (removing bans on picking fruit, allowing walking off the pathways, for example) (Kloek et al., 2012, p. 126). Some of the same suggestions to accommodate immigrants, particularly those of Turkish heritage, were made in a German study as well (Kloek et al., 2012, p. 126).

Meanwhile, studies on social inclusion found that immigrants had different perceptions of obstructions to using green space for recreation ( Kloek et al., 2012, p. 126). Negative emotions like perceived prejudice or concern about standing out, safety concerns, cultural norms, a lack of information, structural restrictions (time, budget, transportation), bad weather, a lack of suitable facilities, and language are some of the barriers mentioned (Kloek et al., 2012, p. 126).

Images of nature have been thought to have an impact on recreational activity. According to M. Kloek, A. Buijs, and J. Boersema, images of nature are “enclosing frameworks that direct and structure the perception and appreciation of nature and environment.” ( Kloek et al., 2012, p. 127).

Various Dutch investigations on the depictions of Turkish and Moroccan immigrants in nature revealed that on a cognitive level, these immigrants differed from natives in that they frequently endorsed a broad notion of nature ( Kloek et al., 2012, p. 127). Yet, on a normative level, nature frequently had a practical value ( Kloek et al., 2012, p. 127). Further, more immigrants had a picture of function than natives who had an image of the wilderness, when research from several nations on the preferences for landscapes among immigrants from the Mediterranean region concluded that immigrants favored more built and regulated sites that allowed for public usage over wild landscapes (Kloek et al., 2012, p. 128).

Kloek, in a later study with fellow researchers, tried to analyze (under-)participation and outdoor recreational behavior among immigrants, specifically those of Turkish and Chinese origins, in the Netherlands compared to non-immigrants (Kloek et al., 2015, p. 48). According to them, different theories put forth by academics explain why immigrants and nonimmigrants behave differently when engaging in outdoor recreational activities. *The marginality and ethnicity hypotheses are the most well-known (Kloek et al., 2015, p. 48). According to the marginality theory, socioeconomic disparity, such as poor income or a lack of education, limits immigrants' access to outdoor recreation ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 48). According to the ethnicity hypothesis, different cultural norms and values have an impact on immigrants' leisure behavior ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 48). A third, more recent theory looks at perceived discrimination as a key element in revealing variations in recreational behavior ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 48). Each of the three theories is supported by the findings of American investigations ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 48).*

In the same research, it was discovered that depending on whether the focus is on participation rate or participation frequency, the level of immigrant engagement clearly varies by ethnic group and type of greenspace ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 51). They examined the behavior of immigrants with Turkish and Chinese backgrounds and non-immigrant Dutch people ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 49). Individuals of Turkish origin participated at a similar rate to non-immigrants in non-urban activities ( Kloek et al.,

2015, p. 51). Though, they did so half as frequently as non-immigrants, on average, as they visited nonurban greenspace ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 51). On the other side, respondents of Chinese descent participated in non-urban recreation at about half the rate and frequency of non-immigrant respondents ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 51). Chinese respondents had a lower involvement percentage than non-immigrant respondents in urban greenspace, whereas respondents of Turkish heritage had an even greater engagement rate ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 51). At last, both respondents of Turkish and Chinese ethnicity participated in urban recreation more frequently than respondents who were not immigrants ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 51).

Additionally, when used to describe immigrants' leisure activities, the word "under-participation" is simplistic, as shown by the rates of involvement in specific outdoor recreational activities ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 51). Almost all activities showed substantial ethnic differences, with impact sizes ranging from small to large ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 51). For each activity, the "under-participation" rate varied depending on the ethnic group ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 51). Non-immigrant respondents actually participated in more activities than immigrant respondents did in a few instances ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 51). However, respondents of Turkish descent participated in other activities, such as barbecues and picnics, about as frequently as respondents without a background in immigration ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 51).

It is also confirmed that each ethnic group has a different average group size ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 52). Respondents of Turkish descent frequented non-urban outdoor spaces in big groups significantly more frequently than respondents who were not immigrants. In contrast, respondents of Chinese descent went to nonurban green spaces alone or with partners more frequently than respondents who were not immigrants ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 52). Nonetheless, urban leisure typically included smaller group sizes and less obvious ethnic differences ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 52).

Contrary to what was anticipated, individuals with immigrant backgrounds in the same survey appeared to feel fewer restraints than non-immigrants ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 53). Fifty-five percent (55%) indicated up to three barriers to why they didn't participate in non-urban activities ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 54). Only 6% of respondents of Turkish origin and 28% of respondents of Chinese descent, respectively, indicated up to three restraints, in stark contrast to respondents with an immigrant background ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 54). Differences were even more pronounced among participants in nonurban recreation: just 16% of Turkish and 37% of Chinese individuals reported up to three limitations, compared to 80% of non-immigrant participants who reported up to three ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 54). Participants of Turkish and Chinese ancestry also expressed no limits more frequently ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 54).



Potential barriers to outdoor recreation are also explored. Less than two percent of respondents first mentioned a barrier that is usually believed to be specific to immigrants, such as poor information access, a lack of facilities, and safety concerns, while only a few respondents from immigrant backgrounds mentioned discrimination as a barrier to participating in outdoor sports ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 54). Turkish respondents were more likely to cite the weather, whereas Chinese and non-immigrant respondents were more likely to mention the time ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 54). Additionally, people of Turkish and Chinese heritage were less likely to participate simply because they had little interest in non-urban outdoor activities ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 54).

The same restrictions applied to urban outdoor activity, with accessibility being stated less frequently and time and no restrictions being mentioned more frequently than for non-urban recreation ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 54). The lack of noticeable differences in perceived limits between ethnic groups shows that disparities in outdoor recreational behavior between ethnic groups are not primarily explained by constraints ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 54).

Ethnicity was connected factually with various variations in outdoor recreational activity in addition to being subjectively thought of as a determining factor ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 54). But it was also demonstrated that identities other than ethnicity, particularly individual but also community identities, are subjectively linked to outdoor recreational behavior. This finding suggested ethnic group heterogeneity (Kloek et al., 2015, p. 54).

Recreational types of people had a strong association with ethnicity but with other demographics as well (Kloek et al., 2015, p. 55). They determined five recreational types: "Nature lovers", "Social animals", "Individual quiet seekers", "Group-based quiet seekers" and "Activity lovers." According to the researchers, compared to most other types, "nature lovers" are motivated by the natural world and partake in outdoor activities more regularly ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 55). "Social animals" are motivated by social factors when they go outside and like to have fun in groups ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 55). Everyone who visits a green area has a different reason for doing so, namely "Individual quiet seekers," "Group-based quiet seekers," and "Activity lovers." ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 55) The distinction between "activity lovers" and "(Individual and Group-based) quiet seekers" is that the former has by far the largest involvement rates ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 55).

The analysis, mentioned above, provided proof of ethnic group heterogeneity ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 56). People with a Turkish background were more likely to be classified as "Social animals" and less likely to be "Nature enthusiasts." ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 55). Meanwhile, more respondents of non-immigrant descent fall into the "Activity lovers" category compared to respondents of other ethnic backgrounds, more respondents of Chinese descent fall into the "Individual quiet seekers"

category, and more respondents of Turkish descent fall into the "Group-based quiet seekers" category ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 56). This was in line with the findings that respondents of Turkish origin took part in group activities more frequently than respondents of Chinese descent took part in individual activities ( Kloek et al., 2015, p. 56). However, the differences between ethnicities were narrow, including that all ethnicities were part of all recreational types.

In a follow-up investigation, Kloek, Biujs, Boersema, and Schouten attempted to quantify and further examine the similarities and differences between young adults from non-immigrant backgrounds and young adults from two different ethnic backgrounds in terms of how they perceive and value nature (Kloek et al., 2018, p. 819). Despite the fact that the immigrants included, spent (most of) their youth in the Netherlands, they demonstrated that people's perceptions of the environment varied by ethnic group (Kloek et al., 2018, p. 836). Indeed, immigrants, particularly Chinese immigrants, voiced a more expansive definition of nature than non-immigrants, who used the strictest criteria to classify green spaces as nature. In particular, natives stated that “ there is no ‘real nature’ left in Netherlands” , while a few of the immigrants viewed all the images used in the conversation as representing "real nature," even the ones of urban green spaces. ( Kloek et al., 2018, p. 829-830).

What is more, regarding the protection and conservation of nature, Chinese immigrants stood out for citing anthropocentric reasons the most frequently, while Turkish immigrants focused more on ecocentric and religious justifications for protecting the environment ( Kloek et al., 2018, p. 830). In fact, 94% of respondents of Turkish descent rated protecting the environment as essential, compared to 50% of respondents from Chinese and non-immigrant backgrounds ( Kloek et al., 2018, p. 830). These findings demonstrated that, with religion and location of residence being the most significant influencing factors, people's perceptions of the environment appeared to reflect some traditional cultural representations of it ( Kloek et al., 2018, p. 843).

An analysis conducted in Oslo among secondary-school students supported that there was a significant relationship between class, gender, and ethnic origin and the outdoor recreational exercise of hiking in the woods (Krange & Bjerke, 2011, p. 5). Specifically, hiking was more common among non-immigrant students (Krange & Bjerke, 2011, p. 7). Individuals who had one parent born in Norway consistently performed between the two other categories, while people who had two parents born outside of Norway went on hikes less frequently (Krange & Bjerke, 2011, p. 8). Only 38% of students in the majority and 2/3 of minority students say they "never or almost never" go for a stroll in the woods, respectively (Krange & Bjerke, 2011, p. 8). Furthermore, minority students reporting being inactive was almost twice as prevalent (Krange & Bjerke, 2011, p. 8). At the same time, boys were more likely to be inactive than females, and the non-active group was a little older than the active group (Krange & Bjerke, 2011, p. 9).

The overall impression was that class showed up in the economic and even more so in the cultural elements of simple activities like hiking in the woods (Krange & Bjerke, 2011, p. 9). They found a definite correlation with going on a hike in the woods. A nearly linear relationship was seen between the hiking variable and the parent's employment variable (Krange & Bjerke, 2011, p. 9). Nearly two-thirds of children whose fathers work manual labor said that they "never or almost never" go hiking, compared to a little over one-third of upper-middle-class students who were not active (Krange & Bjerke, 2011, p. 9).

Classes are shaped by social and economic factors. They tried to examine them through the number of books and cars, respectively (Krange & Bjerke, 2011, p. 9). It came out that only 30% of people who claimed to have more than 1000 books at home admitted to being inactive, compared to 72% of people who claimed to have fewer than 20 books (Krange & Bjerke, 2011, p. 9). Meanwhile, 62% of young people without cars claimed never to go hiking (Krange & Bjerke, 2011, p. 9). Less than 50% of people who owned one or two vehicles made the same statement (Krange & Bjerke, 2011, p. 9). The significant difference was between those who owned cars and those who did not. Therefore, even though hiking is cost-free and doesn't require many resources, there was a strong statistical correlation between the household-economy proxy and hiking in the forests (Krange & Bjerke, 2011, p. 9). However, the connection was not as powerful as it is with books (Krange & Bjerke, 2011, p. 9).

Another study tried to extend the increasing amount of evidence into the excuses people give for not spending more time in natural settings by using a sizable representative sample of England's adult population (Boyd et al., 2018, p. 104). It is not focused on immigrants, but the results were important not to get mentioned. Six of the top eight explanations that could be broadly classified are scheduling problems such as "too busy at work" and "too busy at home," contextual problems such as "poor health" and "poor weather," and preference problems such as "no particular reason" and "not interested." (Boyd et al., 2018, p. 104). Despite being in the top eight, "old age" and "a physical disability" were not examined in the current article, even if they were found to be by far the best predictors of these factors, according to preliminary analysis (Boyd et al., 2018, p. 104).

To begin with, it was impressive the result of the total number of participants who frequently visit nature in England (Boyd et al., 2018, p. 106). Three-quarters of adult English people reported exploring natural areas at least once per month. On an individual basis, women, older individuals, people from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, those who have chronic illnesses or disabilities, and vehicle owners are more likely to report being infrequent visitors (Boyd et al., 2018, p. 106). On the contrary, people of White British ethnicity (compared to all other groups), married or cohabiting

people, people with children in the house, and dog owners had a lower chance of reporting being an infrequent visitor (Boyd et al., 2018, p. 106).

There were numerous other variables that could account for how often people visited green spaces. One of them was the place of residence. Residents of less wealthy areas and those with fewer nearby green spaces were more likely to be classified as infrequent guests (Boyd et al., 2018, p. 108). On top of that, of course, were the individual-level predictors such as gender, age, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, employment, marital and health status (Boyd et al., 2018, p. 108). Practical factors like having children in the home, owning a vehicle, and having a dog were emerging alongside them (Boyd et al., 2018, p. 108). Also, they found that the lack of neighborhood nearby facilities and local green space are examples of spatial variables with little bearing on time-related problems (Boyd et al., 2018, p. 108). Instead, personal characteristics (such as employment position and family responsibilities) were more frequently linked to a sense of time pressure (Boyd et al., 2018, p. 108). One possible explanation for this, as given, is that being able to include trips to natural settings into daily life may be reduced by the busy/demanding lives of today, and the availability of in-home entertainment may be seen as a "necessity" rather than a choice (Boyd et al., 2018, p. 108).

One really intriguing factor of people visiting nature infrequently is the 'no interest' in it or 'no particular reason.' More than 20% of infrequent guests indicated they were either uninterested or unmotivated (Boyd et al., 2018, p. 110). As believed by the researchers, it's possible that spending time in nature was not a significant aspect of their cultural background, upbringing, daily routines, or current practices, or that it even "fell out" of earlier generations' lives for causes they were unaware of (Boyd et al., 2018, p. 110). A great and relevant example to explain this is when in the US state of Miami, some beaches were designated as "whites-only" or "blacks-only," those chosen for Afro-Caribbean Americans frequently being associated with greater risk (Boyd et al., 2018, p. 110). As a result, parents refrained from bringing their kids to these places, and family traditions involving seaside getaways faded (Boyd et al., 2018, p. 110).

In contrast to the majority of the earlier studies, a study conducted in Oslo showed no big differences in the preferences for outdoor recreation between immigrant women and the general population (Lorentzen & Viken, 2021, p. 10). This research specifically sought to investigate how immigrant women in Norway interacted with their natural surroundings (Lorentzen & Viken, 2021, p. 3). In detail, researchers interviewed fourteen women. All of them moved to Norway as adults and differed in the age of residence from 1 to 43 at the time of the conversation (Lorentzen & Viken, 2021, p. 3). The findings showed that most of these women enjoyed spending time in nature on weekends and during vacations, frequently with a small group of close friends or family members, and for a variety of activities and purposes (Lorentzen & Viken, 2021, p. 8). In this research, the results about the

women's enjoyment of and trips to local wooded areas are at odds with previous studies showing that non-Western women in Oslo prefer paths in developed green spaces in the neighborhood to those in nearby forests (Lorentzen & Viken, 2021, p. 8). Natural areas away from the women's neighborhood, such as mountains and fjords, were selected as locations for enjoyable outdoor recreation activities (Lorentzen & Viken, 2021, p. 9).

Similar to other studies, this one demonstrated that for social meetings, picnics, play, walks, and transportation, they utilized a variety of human-influenced sites (Lorentzen & Viken, 2021, p. 9). Nevertheless, the participants did also voice a special fascination and enthusiasm not only for managed environments such as their garden but also for more unspoiled natural areas, which more strongly represent a wilderness image of nature (Lorentzen & Viken, 2021, p. 10). Moreover, when visiting remote natural sites, they seemed to prefer passive leisure activities to active ones, and when visiting nearby natural areas, they seemed to appreciate both passive and active leisure activities equally, with walking being the favorite close to nature physical activity in their surrounding area (Lorentzen & Viken, 2021, p. 10).

The benefits of being in nature and engaging in activities for one's physical and mental well-being are numerous. Moreover, nature is free, and especially in Nordic countries, people have the right to roam freely in nature and the countryside. Though the studies above have demonstrated the diverse perspectives of immigrants and natives from various nations about nature. Though 'no one is an immigrant and an immigrant only,' as Kloek, Biujs, Boersema, and Schouten said (2015, p. 49). People have multiple identities and belong to a variety of social groups. All of them influence how they depict nature. Even the majority of the investigations have found that newcomers do not engage in outdoor activities that much they have not looked more closely into additional traits and variables that might affect how they interact with nature.

There is a definite need for additional research in the area. Despite the fact that there are many studies in some European and American nations, it is important to note that, despite the high number of immigrants, there is only a limited number of data in the Nordic countries and Norway in English. More studies are available in Norwegian in this field, but sadly not for non-Norwegian speakers. According to Abebe and Phil's research (Abebe & Phil, 2010), the immigrant populations were interrelated with poor health conditions and multiple risk factors related to pre-and post-migration experiences, socioeconomic conditions, and individual backgrounds. Due to these facts, I chose to conduct research on which factors are influencing immigrants' participation in outdoor activities and their views toward nature using research on the experiences of Greek immigrants to Norway. Therefore my research question can be expressed as: 'What factors affect the Greek immigrant population's participation in outdoor activities in Norway?'

# Methods

To address my research question, the method that has been used is a qualitative study, combining semi-structured interviews with ethnography. Qualitative methodology is ‘a subjective way to look at life as it is lived and an attempt to explain the studied behavior’ (Lowhorn, 2007, p. 3). The primary goal of ethnography is to develop a comprehensive understanding of a group's or community's culture (Humberstone & Prince, 2019, p. 103). My aim is to contribute new knowledge on immigrants' relationships to Norwegian nature and their participation in Friluftsliv. This is done by examining the experiences of immigrants in Oslo who have a Greek background.

The qualitative investigation has been done as I want to explain a current situation and the behavior observed and describe these for that group (Lowhorn, 2007, p. 3). In my case, the situation is the interactions of Greek immigrant people with the outdoors, and I tried to clarify and enumerate the factors affecting human-nature relationships.

Both primary and secondary data have been used. Secondary sources offer second-hand data and analysis of research from other scholars. Journal articles, book reviews, and scholarly texts are a few examples. Using secondary sources as a background theory to comprehend the topic better, I also collected primary empirical data to support and expand upon my topic.

Human beings are conversational creatures (Smith & Sparkes, 2016, p. 107). According to Smith and Sparkes (2016), conversations developed in interviews are an indispensable source of rich and new knowledge about social and personal aspects of our lives. Specifically, I did individual semi-structured interviews. This means that I used a preplanned interview guide to ask a participant relatively focused but open-ended questions about a specific topic (Smith & Sparkes, 2016, p. 104). I developed a structured interview guide with some different groups of questions around the theme (Smith & Sparkes, 2016, p. 110). This allowed me to get an insight into my interviewees' relationship with nature and what draws them to or repels them from being outdoors.

Observations are almost always included in the research (Smith & Sparkes, 2016, p. 147). I used participant observations, specifically recording human behavior in particular environments, to suggest interview questions based on them (Smith & Sparkes, 2016, p. 123). Participant observation could take the form of a rather inactive sideline watching, active participation in the field, or observation where my personal experiences and practices are at the center (Smith & Sparkes, 2016, p. 208).

To get the necessary data, I decided what I wanted to ask and learn, identified the study population, chose a sample, and got in touch with my respondents one time (Kumar, 2018, p. 251). This means that I conducted a cross-sectional study.

“Cross-sectional studies, also known as one-shot or status studies, are the most commonly used design in the social sciences. This design is best suited to studies aimed at finding out the prevalence of a phenomenon, situation, problem, attitude or issue, by taking a crosssection of the population. They are useful in obtaining an overall ‘picture’ as it stands at the time of the study. They are ‘designed to study some phenomenon by taking a cross-section of it at one time.” (Kumar, 2018, p. 249). According to Kumar(2018, p. 252), the disadvantage of this study is that I can not measure change, but this is not my purpose. Instead, I wanted to investigate a current situation problem and the factors affecting it.

I chose to interview Greek immigrants around Oslo because of the advantage of the Greek language being my mother tongue. The method used to select the sample was purposive sampling. As specified by Ilker Etikan and Kabiru Bala (2017, p. 2), this sampling design “is based on the judgement of the researcher as to who will provide the best information to succeed for the objective study. The person conducting the research needs to focus on those people with the same opinion to have the required information and be willing of sharing it.” Therefore, I got in touch with them through different groups on social media with Greek people around Oslo, and I asked people who were motivated to contribute to my research to send me a personal message. I started with a small sample of interested participants and continually selected individuals until I stepped to the saturation point. Reaching the saturation point means that “ you are not getting new information or it is negligible,” according to Kumar (2018, p. 422). So, when I felt that I had all the information I required, I ceased data collection.

The goal of the current research, as also mentioned above, was to explore the aspects of influencing the Greek immigrant community’s participation in Friluftsliv. To accomplish this, the interview guide included questions designed to touch on the five major areas of the study:

1. the interviewee's background in terms of nature,
2. his connection to Norway and Norwegian culture
3. his personal views on nature,
4. his connection to it at the present moment in Norway and
5. his perspectives about Friluftsliv and its accessibility.

The interviews took place between March 2023 and April 2023 and were conducted in public libraries in Oslo. They were held in Greek and translated by myself into English. The participants in the

interviews were ten, consisting of six men and four women. Out of them, one was a pilot interview. This means that it was a trial interview with a familiar person to get feedback on my questions and find possible mistakes. I found the answers of the interviewee very interesting, and as he was a Greek resident of Oslo, I decided to use the interview in my research.

Throughout the interviews, I just requested the sex and age of the interviewees and decided not to ask for any other socio-demographic information. There are several analyses studying the socio-demographic characteristics like level of education and social class. However, I chose to focus on how they were attached to their places and their general views about nature. Participants ranged in age from 22 to 35, and they had emigrated as adults and been in Norway for six months up to six years.

Social groups' preferences for wild versus more controlled landscapes might vary greatly. To get their preferences in landscapes, I decided to use the concept of images of nature. According to Bjuss, Elands, and Langers (2009, p. 114), the image of nature is “enclosing frameworks that direct and structure the perception and appreciation of nature.” I selected photos of three different places in and around Oslo and measured their preferences according to their choice. During the interviews, I gave them the task of selecting the most preferable landscape to go for a walk among the three full-color, printed images that I had shown them (see Figure 1, 2, and 3).



Figure 1: A park in Oslo





Figure 2: A forest area with a path



Figure 3: Wilderness

The dialogues from the interviews were recorded by my computer and kept in a private file. After every interview, I transcribed them in Greek (the interview language ) and then translated them into English. For the study’s purpose, thematic analysis was applied because it “ identifies patterns of meaning across a qualitative dataset” (Smith & Sparkes, 2016, p. 191). Moreover, I used inductive coding to look for the obvious interpretations that were expressed in the data, and the data themselves guided the development of the analysis. Five major themes appeared, as the interview guide designed -the interviewee's background in terms of nature, his connection to Norway and Norwegian culture, his personal views about nature, his connection to it at the present moment in Norway, and his perspectives about Friluftsliv and its accessibility.

## Results

The analysis provided a general impression regarding the manner in which interviewees interacted with nature and the outdoors. In general, according to their responses to the questions about their time spent in nature and what they would like to change, the participants were separated into three groups. six out of ten participants had a good connection and relationship with nature and were constantly seeking it, two were in the middle position, and the other two had poor connection.

**Table1: People with high engagement in nature**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Time being in nature per week</b>	<b>What she/he would like to change in her/hie relationship with nature</b>
female	26	4-20 hours, depending on the season	“I would like to have more time to spend there...”
male	26	2-14 hours, depending on the season	“ I would like to spend more time in nature...”
female	27	2-14 hours, depending on the season	“If possible, I would like to be there all the time...”
male	32	10-20 hours, depending on the season	“The more, the merrier!”
male	33	5 - 15 hours,	“ I would like to spend

		depending on the season	more time in nature...”
male	35	6-15 hours, depending on the season	“...I would like, though, to have more time...”

**Table2: People with standard/ medium engagement in nature**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Time being in nature per week</b>	<b>What she/he would like to change in her/his relationship with nature</b>
male	22	3-7 hours, depending on the weather and his free time	“ I would like to spend more time... I also would like to learn snowboarding...”
male	25	0-12 hours, depending on the weather	“... I would like to spend more time... I want to experience waterfalls more and more..”

**Table3: People with low engagement in nature**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Time being in nature per week</b>	<b>What she/he would like to change in her/his relationship with nature</b>
female	26	only during vacations	“ I would not change something...”
female	31	0-3	“ I would definitely spend more time....”

As previously mentioned, they were also asked about their background with regard to the landscape and nature, their connection to Norway and Norwegian culture, their personal views of nature, their

connection to it at the present moment in Norway, and their point of view about Friluftsliv and its accessibility.

## Background in terms of nature and their previous relationship with it

First, the interviewees described their hometowns. Five of them were raised in big Greek cities, while the remaining five were raised in less urban settings (village and town settings), with one of them living on an island. Only one of the residents of small towns held a neutral view on exposure to and interaction with the natural environment.

On the other hand, both interviewees that expressed themselves as individuals with poor connection to nature were residents of big cities. They had also been asked about the outdoor activities they enjoyed taking part in as children. Both individuals that had the poorest engagement with nature had not much time in nature as kids, either.

“I did not do so many activities outdoors, only at the playgrounds as a child and maybe some parks. I played with friends in our houses a lot.

I think it is an easily controlled place for our parents.

That is why we were not spending that much time out.

Later, I started swimming, but it does not count as an outdoor activity.

It was in a pool.”

(Interviewee No7, 26 years old)

“Yes, I remember traveling a lot outside the city with my parents.

During the summer, we spent most of our time on the beach, lying on the sand and swimming. However, in my daily life, I only used to spend some hours of the day in the schoolyard playing after school.

But there were not many natural aspects there.”

(Interviewee No10, 31 years old)

Furthermore, the relationship that participants' families and inner circles have with nature was questioned. Each one of the participants who said their families had good relationships with nature, also showed high levels of engagement with nature.

“My family has a good relationship with nature. My dad and grandpa liked walking in nature, and they used to explain to me different things about plants.

At the same time, my mum loves her flowers and gardening.

Also, we used to spend a lot of time together in our yard or picnicking in other places.”

(Interviewee No2, 26 years old)

“My parent's relationship with nature was nice.  
At every chance we had, we made excursions to nature.  
Also, my grandpa had a small farm with sheep and goats, and my dad used to  
help him a lot with farming. Now my dad manages this farm, and I help  
him sometimes when I am there.”

(Interviewee No6, 32 years old)

One of the participants, a woman with low engagement with nature, also said:

“My family did not have a good relationship with nature.  
They were working a lot, so we did not go to nature in our daily life.  
Maybe that is why I am not connected to it, as well.”

(Interviewee No7, 26 years old)

## Connection to Norway and Norwegian Culture

Interviewees mostly had been back and forth between Greece and Norway. Only the people who had been in Norway for six to twenty months had been in Norway the whole time. Regarding the socialization with Norwegian people, five out of ten people had pleasant relations with Norwegians (for example, friends and romantic relationships).

“Yes, I do socialize with Norwegian people. My girlfriend is Norwegian,  
and I have Norwegian colleagues. Half of my friends here are Norwegians.”

(Interviewee No3, 35 years old)

“Yes, I do socialize with Norwegian people.  
I have colleagues and friends who are Norwegians.”

(Interviewee No6, 32 years old)

The other people also had interactions with them in their daily life but no close relationships.

“Yes, I socialize with Norwegian people. I like tango,  
and I have met a lot of people through dancing.  
We meet each other once a week for practice,  
but we have no further relations.”

(Interviewee No4, 27 years old)

“I mostly socialize with non-Norwegian people,  
but not on purpose. My colleagues are also immigrants here  
in Norway, and I mostly socialize with them until now.”

(Interviewee No5, 25 years old)

“I do not socialize with Norwegians that much. I mean,  
I have some Norwegian colleagues, but I mostly  
socialize with other immigrants in Norway.”

(Interviewee No8, 22 years old)

Moreover, four of ten spoke the Norwegian language, and of them, three belong to the group of people socializing with Norwegians.

## Pictures and views of nature

### Participants' preferences according to already picked pictures

After seeing the three images (see Figure 1, 2, and 3 ) with three different natural areas - park, forest area with a path and wilderness, participants were asked which one they preferred most and why. The two people- two women- who picked the park had weak relationships with the natural environment. They both mentioned how much they adore parks and enjoy spending time there with friends. One of them specifically stated:

“I would choose the first picture because it is a beautiful park which makes me feel calmer and more concentrated. The rest of the pictures depict a more wild scenery, and that would possibly require more time to organize a potential trip which is not my forte.”

(Interviewee No10, 31 years old)

The second image with the path was the one that was most favored. The majority of people stated that they felt safer there.

“I would like to walk in the forest with the paths. I would like to get away from city noises, which is why I did not choose the first one, and at the same time, I want to feel safe, and the paths help I do not get lost.”

(Interviewee No2, 26 years old)

“It depends greatly on my time, the weather, and who I am with. In this period that the weather is getting warmer and warmer, I would choose hiking at the landscape of the second one. It seems there is a path to follow, and I prefer to choose organized routes with tracks and signs so it is easier and you can enjoy the most out of it.”

(Interviewee No3, 35 years old)

Three people, two of whom have a strong connection to nature and one who belonged to the middle category, opt for the more untamed area. Of them, one was a woman.

“I would like to be at the third one because it looks more interesting and difficult with all the wilderness. I am easily bored, and I like climbing a tree, hopping around, and walking up on a fallen log.”

(Interviewee No5, 25 years old)

## Participants' personal pictures of nature

Very interesting were the answers when asked about their own pictures of nature. They were questioned about the first pictures that came to them when thinking of nature. Only two people (one man and one woman) mentioned landscapes they had never been to but would like to (like tropical areas, dessert, and the North Pole), whereas the majority of the answers focused on actual images they had in mind. The word 'hometown' was stated many times. Actually, seven out of ten respondents mentioned a landscape near their hometown or close to it. Six of those responses were their first thought when answering the question. Three of the six were men, and three were women. Worth mentioning was also that five people were centered around summer and beaches. Four of those mentioned that as their second picture of nature that came to them, while the first ones were about their home environment. In this case, there were two men and two women. Also, three individuals placed themselves in the pictures of nature they described.

“When thinking of nature, the first thing coming to mind is a green field with many flowers on a sunny day and me enjoying the view and the sun.

The second one is a beach with yellow sand and clear blue water, on a nice summer day, maybe with a small cool breeze....

The first one reminds me of my hometown.

There are many fields around, and during the blossom period, they are amazing.

While the second one is a summer picture that recalls memories from almost every summer.”

(Interviewee No2, 26 years old)

“When thinking of nature, the first thing coming to my mind is the lake in my hometown. It is there and makes beautiful the whole city. We have been there fishing there sometimes and canoeing. Also, I belong to a team that did organize many activities in the city, and we tried a lot with the help of the community and different organizations to clean the lake. Once we cleaned, we had a big party swimming there. I remember myself swimming really happily....

(Interviewee No6, 32 years old)

Last but not least, two men and one woman addressed Norwegian beauty and places, talking about places they had been in Norway. Of those three, two of them were in continuous contact with nature.



## The optimum relationship with Nature

The content of the answers about how human-nature relationships should be varied, but each one mentioned nature conservation. Apart from conservation, four people- two men and two women- underlined the need for people to adopt eco-friendly habits. Additionally, seven respondents listed closeness and spending more time outdoors as the ideal ties objectives. There were three women and four men among the seven.

“People have to protect nature. We are a part of it, and without it, we would perish.

We need to make an effort to pollute the environment as little as possible.

For instance, using public transit rather than your own vehicle.

Alternately, use non-disposable containers rather than purchasing plastic bags.

The same applies to a number of other items as well, such as plates and glasses.

The more recycling is done, the better, but reducing consumption is also beneficial.”

(Interviewee No8, 22 years old)

“We, as residents of this planet, should regularly work to have a better relationship with nature. But, unfortunately, nowadays, this seems more and more difficult because of the fast rhythms of life. Together with the overconsumption of goods, we are getting further and further away. Therefore, we do not only need to spend more time in nature and connect with it, but we also need to connect indirectly, helping protect nature maybe by volunteering in some environmental organizations and being responsible for ourselves, thinking of our impact on nature.”

(Interviewee No2, 26 years old)

Three people- two women and one man- have cited the advantages and goodness that nature provides as an excellent reason for us to respect and be closer to it. Last, those who are really engaged with nature tend to give more in-depth and longer answers to this question.

## Participants' relationships with nature

As was previously said, according to their answers, there were three groups of people: those with high engagement, those with medium involvement, and lastly, those with low engagement. Six individuals can be classified into the group of high engagement, two into the medium, and two into the last one. In the group of high engagement, there were two women and three men. In the medium, there were

two men, and in the group of low engagement, there were two women. Answers from those who are genuinely attuned to nature generally included more detail and were longer. They were initially questioned regarding their engagement with nature as adults in Greece and following their current engagement in Norway.

The answers to those two questions are totally intriguing. Five respondents said that they used to hike as adults in Greece. Also, five individuals referred to outdoor summer activities, but not during the whole year, in Greece.

“In Greece, my relationship with nature was really good.

Almost every Sunday, we were going hiking up in the mountains or at the canyons.

While in the summer, we chose to spend our days on remote and isolated beaches, so there were just us and the sea. We spent - my friends and I- all day there, swimming, sunbathing, eating, and exploring the area around us. The last summer, we also chose rivers for those things as well.”

(Interviewee No4, 27 years old)

Agricultural work and gardening were also mentioned by three individuals. All of them were men.

“As an adult in Greece, I spent a lot of time on the beach,  
sunbathing and swimming.

And only a couple of times per year hiking.

However, I used to help my parents and my uncle  
a lot with agricultural work and farming.”

(Interviewee No. 1, 33 years old)

“I used to help my dad with gardening, planting, and picking up olives.  
Although I didn't chase nature much generally, I always went there when I  
had the opportunity. Most of the time for hiking. I always had a great time.”

(Interviewee No. 5, 25 years old)

There were only two who mentioned parks- one man and one woman - and both of them appeared to have medium and low interaction with nature. Meanwhile, one man also discussed his volunteer efforts in nature-related activities.

“My relationship with nature was good. I went hiking a lot with my friends. Sometimes camping as well. Later I had started downhill biking, and I was practicing many hours per week with friends but also by myself. During winter, I go snowboarding at our nearby ski center. We were a group of friends -we still are, and when I am there, I always help them- trying to bring people closer to nature and nature activities. We organized many events about it, and people loved it.”

(Interviewee No. 6, 32 years old)

Their responses regarding interacting with nature in Norway varied less compared to engaging in nature in Greece. Five persons, including three women and two men, highlighted their ecological habits regarding their relationship with nature.

“In general, I am trying in everyday life to create a better nature-me relationship. I recycle and try not to consume products I do not need and one-use products. I also try to buy ecological products...”

(Interviewee No. 2, 26 years old)

“My relationship with nature is good. I am trying to make ecological choices. I recycle as well. Here in Norway, it is so organized recycling—something missing from Greece. I go to as many times as possible in nature for different activities with my friends. I am not active in the community. It is much easier in Greece, and I probably feel comfortable there. But I believe there are enough people taking care of it here in Oslo.”

(Interviewee No. 6, 32 years old)

Additionally, two male and one female participant cited the weather as a factor in their lack of exposure to nature in Norway.

“I came to Norway when the winter started, and until now, the weather is not good. Since I do not enjoy winter sports, I have not explored nature here. I am waiting for the weather to get better so I can start hiking and walking in woodland and the forests.”

(Interviewee No. 4, 27 years old)

At the same time, skiing and other winter sports were more frequently mentioned as answers to this question.

“I climb outside when the weather allows me to. I have done cross-country skiing this winter, and I loved it. Till now, I am going almost one time per week. Soon hiking season starts, and I often combine it with a picnic.”

(Interviewee No. 3, 35 years old)

Moreover, four participants (two women and two men) were going hiking and walking in nature- the same number of people also mentioned going on a hike in Greece as well. Simultaneously, parks seem to have resonated with Greek people in Oslo, as they had been voiced four times by two women and two men.

Last, seven out of ten people stated they wanted to spend more time in nature. Two of them- both of them women- expressed an interest in concentrating more on ecological behaviors, and only a man declared that he would not change a thing.

## Connection to Nature after Immigration

### Greek Immigrants' Activities in Nature in Norway

As mentioned before, four participants indicated that hiking was one of their most preferred activities to do in Norway, and four more mentioned skiing or snowboarding. Furthermore, picnicking was listed in two of the answers, while walking in the city's natural surroundings was cited three times. Biking, climbing, kayaking, and sunbathing were other activities that were only mentioned a single time by the participants.

The fact that only two people claimed to have engaged in new outdoor activities in Norway is noteworthy. Both of them were men. One of them experimented with cross-country skiing but was not fond of it, while the other was more inclined to get keen on snowboarding. They both fall into the category of people who engage with nature on a regular basis.

## Changes in human nature relationship after immigration

People were questioned regarding how their relationships with nature had changed after immigration. There was a wide range of responses. Two of the individuals - a woman and a man - stated that their connections with nature have improved since moving to Norway. They were both pretty active regarding nature both in Greece and Norway. Additionally, they both emphasized how well-organized transportation to locations beyond the city and paths were in Oslo.

“Yes, it changed. It is much easier to do hiking and snowboarding here in Oslo.

You can use public transportation to reach many places around the city.

Moreover, the paths for hiking are all well-preserved and organized.

In Greece, there are so many organized paths.”

(Interviewee No. 2, 26 years old)

“In Oslo, it is so easy to go both hiking and skiing. You only take the metro, and you will be there. In Greece, you need your car to drive there if it is not a famous touristic destination.

So you need to spend a lot of money and time. Moreover, here there are many options, and they are so organized, while in Greece, there are few organized paths for hiking.”

(Interviewee No. 1, 33 years old)

In the meanwhile, three other individuals claimed that they had changed, but in a negative way. The lack of an important bond as previously to nature was attributed to weather circumstances by two of them-a woman and a man. The other man indicated he didn't have as much time as he had earlier in Greece.

In addition, four out of the participants, representing the majority, claimed that not much had changed. Three of them were deeply involved in the outdoors, whereas one was only moderately interested. Two individuals, in particular, stated that their relationships and interests in nature stayed the same despite some changes in activities and routines.

Only one person, a woman, claimed that her relationship with nature had not changed at all. In detail, she specified that she did not do outdoor activities because she was not athletic and fond of them. So

she had not tried new activities in Norway, and as long as her relationship with nature was mostly based on ecological habits and her respect for it, there were no changes.

## Factors affecting the human-nature relationship

The participants stated that a variety of factors could influence the human-nature relationship. They claimed that accessibility was the primary factor affecting people's participation in and contact with nature. There were two men and two women among those participants. At the same time, company and friends to motivate participating in nature activities were cited four times by two men and two women. After, the organization regarding nature by the municipality and the competent authorities (well-preserved paths and signs) and the conservation of natural areas are coming, being mentioned three times by two women and a man.

The weather was an important influence, according to two women and a man, as all of them specified that when the weather is cold and rainy, they preferred staying inside. Additionally, both a man and a woman highlighted the importance of health as an impact on human-nature relationships, while when people are sick, they prefer staying inside. Last, the financial situation, the lack of knowledge, equipment, and free time and the feeling of unsafety were stated once.

“The weather and the climate are factors that affect the time being outdoors.

Also, another factor is the company you have. In Greece, I have friends who love nature and motivate me to do different activities in nature. How much easy to have access there is also important. That is also a reason why I like Oslo. I know the nature here is really close, and you have access to a forest area with a metro. Last, health is also a factor. From personal experience, when I was sick, and I could not go outside, the only thing I was thinking about was when I would get better so I could go out.”

(Interviewee No. 4, 27 years old)

“Definitely, the company affects your relationship with nature. People do like different activities and have different habits. It is nice when you have friends with similar interests. Accessibility is also a factor... Moreover, equipment is also a factor and furthermore money. It depends on the activity you choose. Sometimes if you do not have the equipment needed, you can not follow some activities. Sometimes you do not have people to motivate you and maybe teach you the activity....”

(Interviewee No. 5, 25 years old)

“The factor is that I still do not know the area well. The knowledge and the relation with the area affect it. Also, I do not have so many friends engaging with nature that much. Mostly because they do not have that much time, and when we do something together, we choose to travel to other cities or villages or have dinner at a restaurant or barbeque.”

(Interviewee No. 9, 26 years old)

## Friluftsliv

### Greek Immigrants' opinions on Friluftsliv

As has been discussed, Friluftsliv's literal meaning is "free air life," and it is traditionally associated with moving across the landscape without leaving a trace, interacting with the powers of nature, and enjoying being outside. Six interviewees, as immigrants to Norway, did not know the meaning of it. Among the four interviewees, who knew or had heard of it, two spoke Norwegian, and the other two were deeply socialized with Norwegian culture. All of them belong to the category of high engagement in nature and outdoors.

After introducing Friluftsliv to people who were unfamiliar with it, people discussed their opinions of it. The overwhelming majority of them had a positive view of it. They all remarked about the advantages of outdoor activities and being in nature.

“It is nice. Except for nature and the sun, sports are beneficial to people's health. Many individuals in Oslo can be seen traveling with the metro with their skis on to get to their destination. There are individuals of all ages, and older people can benefit greatly from exercise and sports as well.”

(Interviewee No. 7, 26 years old)

“It sounds nice. It is nice when people are in nature and doing sports. Besides enjoyment, people also cultivate their bodies. Training is an important factor in people's health, especially nowadays when people spend more and more time sitting in front of a computer. It is also nice that also older people participate in those. Movement in these ages is essential for their independence and their quality of life.”

(Interviewee No. 8, 22 years old)

“It is definitely good. I see many people with skis. That is true. Nature combined with exercise is medicine. It is nice that people of all ages are engaging as well. In Greece, older people do not do that kind of activities. For example, I can not imagine, for example, my parents skiing. It would definitely be nice to have those habits instead of sitting in front of computers or mobile phones. Also, for younger people and children who are at a sensitive age.”

(Interviewee No. 9, 26 years old)

## Friluftsliv and Greek culture

Many participants acknowledged the connections between Greek culture and Friluftsliv. Only two of the interviewees claimed that Greek culture did not resemble the practice of Friluftsliv.

“I do not believe that Greek people are that connected with nature. We have been alienated from nature. Though we love it, and every time we are there, we appreciate it. Many people forget that it is necessary to be there. Maybe they do not know it, or they have not been educated about how important nature is... The most common habit of Greek people, I think, is going to the beach and swimming. But I think with the commercialization of the beaches and all the beach bar and restaurants packed with people is getting worse and worse.”

(Interviewee No. 4, woman)

“Fishing and hunting are the first two things coming to my mind. I do not know if they are helping people connect with nature. Everyone has a different perception of it. Also, many Greek people pick up different herbs, weeds, mushrooms, and berries. Also, the beach and swimming are a part of Greek summer life. But I think the connection with nature has been sold, and people going there do not think that much about it. You must be in a quiet location, away from cafeterias, bars, and other common disturbances, in order to connect with nature. Of course, if you choose a remote beach, you can enjoy and appreciate



the landscape there. But nowadays, it is getting harder and harder.  
So, I can state that there is not a thing in Friluftsliv that makes me think of Greek culture.”

(Interviewee No. 5, 25 years old)

Most of them concurred that people cherished nature regardless of any ideology similar to Friluftsliv that might have existed in Greece. At last, the majority of participants claimed that Greeks enjoyed visiting the beach and sunbathing.

“There is no similar word in Greek, but generally, Greek people love nature. We connect it with different social events and food. So it is in our daily life. However, we do it in another way than Norwegians. We love the sea and the sun and spend as much time there as possible during summer. Also, on sunny days we choose to picnic, barbeque or eat in our yards surrounded by nature.”

(Interviewee No. 2, 26 years old)

## Friluftsliv and accessibility in Norway

As have already been mentioned, people are free to move around as they like, including on privately owned, uncultivated territory in the summer and even on the cultivated ground in the winter. They are also free to harvest fungi, flowers, and berries and to fish and hunt with just the barest of limitations. As long as environmental preservation is considered, tent camping for brief periods is permissible wherever. While having the freedom to roam, a greater number of those surveyed for the purpose of this research claimed that Friluftsliv, and especially hiking in the area of Oslo, is accessible due to the efficient transit system and well-maintained trails.

“Hiking is accessible. I know that nature is accessible to everyone in Norway, and you can pass through it even if it is private. So it is very easy, and I also know that you are allowed to go camping as well. Unlike other activities, hiking does not require a lot of gear or expertise. I am aware that outdoor gear is expensive to purchase, but if someone wishes to spend more time in nature, he can go hiking and walking.”

(Interviewee No. 4, 27 years old)

“Yes, it probably is. If you want to go for a walk in nature, there are many places inside the city of Oslo and outside as well. Cross-country skiing is another popular activity, and there are many paths available so you can go readily. You might need to travel by car

for other types of activities. I'm not sure. But as long as there are so many elderly individuals in nature, I think it is generally accessible.”

(Interviewee No. 7, 26 years old)

Four of the participants also brought up the price of the activities as a barrier and agreed that some parts of Friluftsliv were difficult to access. At the same time, it was also commonly mentioned that Friluftsliv was inaccessible since not everyone had the necessary knowledge and skills, and as a result, good education.

“It is accessible regarding the place. You can easily go out of the city, and find nature in the city as well. Public transportation is so convenient and easy to use to go all around the area.

Regarding the cost, some activities are expensive. Some people can not afford it.

Furthermore, a lack of knowledge and skills is also a barrier.”

(Interviewee No. 8, 22 years old)

One of them, a young man, was the only one to claim that Friluftsliv was inaccessible but only regarding the cost.

“I would say it is accessible regarding transportation. I was used to the Greek reality that there is no good transportation, and I was amazed when I came here. It is easy to go all around Oslo and ski or hike. You can also go to the ski center by metro. Though it might be pretty expensive. The equipment for sports is only affordable for some people. Some people buy second-hand equipment, and this is good and cheaper to begin with.

But still, they need preservation and monthly access, for example, at the ski center.

So, no, it is not accessible to everyone.”

(Interviewee No. 3, 35 years old)

## Accessibility in the Outdoors in Greece

Several individuals spoke without being asked about the accessibility of the outdoors. They contrasted Norway's and Greece's outdoor accessibility. Six of them cited Greece's poor public transportation as the cause of the outdoors' inaccessibility.

“... I was used to the Greek reality that there is no good transportation, and I was amazed when I came here. It is easy to go all around Oslo and ski or hike..”

(Interviewee No. 3, 35 years old)

However, two of them mentioned transportation specifically to the forest area.

“It is definitely not accessible regarding transportation to the forest area. However, it is accessible to different beaches. Especially during summer, there are more and more buses going to places like these.”

(Interviewee No. 8, 22 years old)

“Regarding transportation, there is a problem in most of the cities in Greece. You definitely need a car to find a forest area. Fortunately, there are many organizations or groups of people that organize trips and hiking, so people can choose this. About the other activities, it is the same situation as Norway, with the financial barrier being more common in Greece.”

(Interviewee No. 6, 32 years old)

Furthermore, a woman, who was highly engaged in nature and spoke Norwegian, addressed the regulations governing walking and camping in Greece. In detail, she said:

“In Greece, there is no law, like the Norwegian one, about the passage through a private outdoor area, but no one complains if you will pass through it. However, there is a law in which you are not allowed to set up a tent in public areas. For example, you are not allowed to set up a tent at the beach, and many people complain about this.

Most of the time, camping at those places does not help their businesses.

So, it is not that accessible.”

(Interviewee No. 4, 27 years old)

After all, a woman and a man who corresponded into the middle and low engagement groups said that everyone could access Friluftsliv if they so choose. Characteristically, both of them stated that people could get close to nature even in the city.

“Yes, I think nature is pretty accessible to everyone who really wants to be active, and there are many activities that do not require to have any special equipment, which means zero cost...”

(Interviewee No. 10, 31 years old)

“If your goal is to connect with nature, you can easily go walking and hiking in both Greece and Norway. Everyone can participate in an activity to connect with nature and select a route based on his or her abilities, budget, and preference of landscape. If there are no restrictions due to health issues, of course...”

(Interviewee No. 5, 25 years old)

## Discussion and conclusion

The current study depicts how the Greek immigrant population interacts with the natural environment in the city of Oslo. Norway is widely known as the “mecca” of the outdoors. Friluftsliv has been a national symbol since the early 20th century, and it still remains a daily habit for many people in Norway. However, it has been widely discussed regarding the participation of non-Norwegian people.

Differences among genders are common in research. Johnson and his fellow researchers (Johnson et al., 2004; Johnson et al., 1997), underlined the positive correlation between sex and interaction with the wildland. However, in this study, the two individuals who had the least interactions outdoors were women, while the two individuals having the standard interactions were men. While, there are no significant differences in preferences, choice of activities, or perceptions. So, even with the small differences between the groups, it seems that gender does not affect the relationship with nature.

Moreover, participants had also been questioned about the outdoor activities they were taking part in as youngsters. The two people, who linked with nature the least, barely spent time outside as children either. The participants' families' and social circles' interactions with nature were also questioned. Each participant who commented positively on the interactions in their families showed a high level of interest in the outdoors. Without question, experiences, and interactions with the natural world at people's tender ages, together with family experiences, are essential for their later relationship with nature.

In addition, the connection with Norway and Norwegian culture, together with their socialization in the new country, appear to be an unimportant element of their involvement in the natural world in Norway. Opposed to these results, another study found important the length of residence in a country -and, therefore, connection to the country- having a positive correlation with the likelihood of being in nature (Johnson et al., 2004, p. 622).

At the same time, only two out of four Norwegian-speaking individuals said that they were significantly involved and active in the outdoor world, while the other two were in the lowest category. Apparently, engagement in nature and knowledge of the native language, do not relate to each other. Similar are the findings about socialization with Norwegian people. However, an investigation, conducted in the Netherlands, identified that participants with limited knowledge of the Dutch language had low participation in nature-related recreational activities ( Kloek et al., 2012, p. 125).

Findings also demonstrate that Greek immigrants are strongly connected with their hometowns and landscapes in their surrounding areas. All of the participants had been back and forth between Greece and Norway. At the same time, when they were asked to describe pictures of nature, the majority of them talked about places from their native areas. The results above support the theory of place attachment, while they have no correlation to the frequency of engagement in nature.

Place attachment has been defined as “a positive affective bond between an individual and a specific place, the main characteristic of which is the tendency of the individual to maintain closeness to such a place”(Korpela, 2012, p. 149). According to Leila Scannel and Robert Gifford ( 2014, p. 275), attachment to a place can also be seen in specific behaviors. For example, people frequently visit a place, they are attached to, even the possibly high costs. In the present case, most of the interviewees visit their home country at least two times per year.

In all likelihood, Greek immigrants valued Greek landscapes more than Norwegian land. Similar results emerged in a different study that demonstrated that the appraisal of Dutch settings by immigrants was lower than that of native Dutch people.(Buijs et al., 2009, p. 119)

Additionally, people’s involvement in nature and image preferences are related to one another. Both individuals with the lowest involvement chose the park as a place to walk, while the rest of the people chose the signed area for hiking and the wilderness.

What is more, Kloek et al. ( 2012) and Boyd et al. ( 2018), established the weather as a barrier to visitation in nature for the immigrant population. Indeed, the weather was frequently mentioned by the

interviewees. While only three participants referred to the weather as a factor influencing their participation, the majority of them agreed that during the summer and the spring, they spent more time in nature.

When participants were asked about the optimum relationship between people and nature, most of them referred to the demand of spending more time there and coming closer to it. So, it is clear that there is no correlation with any of the possible factors mentioned in this research (for example, gender, hometown, socialization, etc.). In the meantime, when they were asked about their relationship with nature at that period of their life, highly engaged people talked a lot about their activities, and the others tended to talk more about ecology and the protection of nature regardless of gender.

Furthermore, the answers to the question of accessibility outdoors were diverse. However, there is no obvious factor affecting the replies of the participants. Most of them affirmed that there are organized areas for outdoors and convenient transportation in Oslo, contrary to the lack of organization and the poor public transportation in Greece. At the same time, Kloek, Buijs, and Boersema (2012) indicated that more car owners were present outdoors than non-owners of cars, highlighting that the easier access to nature, the more people engage with it. Though, in Oslo, there is no need to use a private vehicle to visit the wilderness, as many interviewees said. Apparently, the results about the accessibility of the present paper apply only to the area of Oslo.

To the greatest extent, it appears that there is a low immigrant population interacting with nature (Johnson et al., 2004; Johnson et al., 1997), and it is a problem that needs to be solved. Expect easier integration into a new society, most crucially, it will enhance their physical, mental, and to a higher level, public health. However, race is not the only factor affecting people's relationship with the outdoors. Income, age, gender, and other personal characteristics also appear to have an influence on it (C. Y. Johnson et al., 2004; M. Kloek et al., 2012; Krange & Bjerke, 2011). In this research, the findings revealed that the majority of Greek immigrants participate in nature activities, with the most crucial factors being their childhood experiences, the landscape of their hometown, their families' relationship with nature, the weather, and the accessibility of the outdoor areas. Finally, this is a small-scale analysis, which I hope will trigger an additional investigation and the potential creation of new immigration and Friluftsliv legislation, making nature a place for everyone to be.

# References

- Abebe, D. S., & Phil, M. (n.d.). *Public Health Challenges of Immigrants in Norway: A Research Review*. 80.
- Ali, W., & Czapka, E. A. (2016). *Friluftsliv og innvandrere. En undersøkelse av holdninger og erfaringer blant innvandrersfamilier i Oslo*.
- Bjerkli, C.L., Flemsæter, F., Lein, H., Rortveit, H.N., Seten, G. & Aasetre, J. (2017). Integrering gjennom friluftsliv? *Plan*, 49(1), 36-39. <https://doi.org/10.18261/ISSN1504-3045-2017-01-09>
- Boyd, F., White, M. P., Bell, S. L., & Burt, J. (2018). Who doesn't visit natural environments for recreation and why: A population representative analysis of spatial, individual and temporal factors among adults in England. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 175, 102–113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2018.03.016>
- Buijs, A. E., Elands, B. H. M., & Langers, F. (2009). No wilderness for immigrants: Cultural differences in images of nature and landscape preferences. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 91(3), 113–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2008.12.003>
- Etikan, I. (2017). Sampling and Sampling Methods. *Biometrics & Biostatistics International Journal*, 5(6). <https://doi.org/10.15406/bbij.2017.05.00149>
- Faarlund, N. (2007). *Science and stewardship to protect and sustain wilderness values: Eighth World Wilderness Congress symposium*. 4.
- Gelter, H. (2000). Friluftsliv: The Scandinavian Philosophy of Outdoor Life. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education (CJEE)*, 5(1), Article 1.
- Godbey, G. (2009). *Outdoor Recreation, Health, and Wellness: Understanding and Enhancing the Relationship* (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. 1408694). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1408694>
- Gursli-Berg, G., Myhre, J. E., & Tønnessen, M. (2023). Norsk innvandringshistorie. In *Store norske leksikon*. [https://snl.no/Norsk\\_innvandringshistorie](https://snl.no/Norsk_innvandringshistorie)
- Humberstone, B., & Pedersen, K. (2001). Gender, Class and Outdoor Traditions in the UK and Norway. *Sport, Education and Society*, 23–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713696039>
- Humberstone, B., & Prince, H. (2019). *Research Methods in Outdoor Studies*. Routledge.
- Immigrants and Norwegian-born to immigrant parents*. (n.d.). SSB. Retrieved 5 October 2022, from <https://www.ssb.no/en/befolkning/innvandrere/statistikk/innvandrere-og-norskfodte-med-innvandrerforeldre>
- Immigration | Definition, History, & Facts | Britannica*. (2022, December 9). <https://www.britannica.com/topic/immigration>
- Johnson, C. Y., Bowker, J. M., Bergstrom, J. C., & Ken Cordell, H. (2004). Wilderness Values in

- America: Does Immigrant Status or Ethnicity Matter? *Society & Natural Resources*, 17(7), 611–628. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920490466585>
- Johnson, R., Horan, P. M., & Pepper, W. (1997). Race, rural residence, and wildland visitation: Examining the influence of sociocultural meaning. *Rural Sociology*, 89–110.
- Kloek, M., Buijs, A., Boersema, J., & Schouten, M. (2012). Crossing Borders: Review of Concepts and Approaches in Research on Greenspace, Immigration and Society in Northwest European Countries. *Landscape Research - LANDSC RES*, 38, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01426397.2012.690861>
- Kloek, M. E., Buijs, A. E., Boersema, J. J., & Schouten, M. G. C. (2015). ‘Nature lovers’, ‘Social animals’, ‘Quiet seekers’ and ‘Activity lovers’: Participation of young adult immigrants and non-immigrants in outdoor recreation in the Netherlands. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, 12, 47–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2015.11.006>
- Kloek, M. E., Buijs, A. E., Boersema, J. J., & Schouten, M. G. C. (2018). Cultural echoes in Dutch immigrants’ and non-immigrants’ understandings and values of nature. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 61(5–6), 818–840. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2017.1319803>
- Korpela, K. M. (2012). Place attachment. In *The Oxford handbook of environmental and conservation psychology* (pp. 148–163). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199733026.013.0009>
- Krange, O., & Bjerke, T. (2011). A walk in the woods: The effects of ethnicity, social class, and gender among urban Norwegian adolescents. *Nordic Journal of Social Research*, 2, 2–18. <https://doi.org/10.15845/njsr.v2i0.101>
- Kumar, R. (2018). *Research Methodology: A Step-by-Step Guide for Beginners*. SAGE.
- Lorentzen, C. A. N., & Viken, B. (2021). A qualitative exploration of interactions with natural environments among immigrant women in Norway. *International Journal of Health Promotion and Education*, 0(0), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14635240.2021.1921609>
- Lowhorn, G. L. (2007). *Qualitative and Quantitative Research: How to Choose the Best Design* (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. 2235986). <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2235986>
- Pálsdóttir, A. M., Persson, D., Persson, B., & Grahn, P. (2014). The Journey of Recovery and Empowerment Embraced by Nature—Clients’ Perspectives on Nature-Based Rehabilitation in Relation to the Role of the Natural Environment. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 11(7), Article 7. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph110707094>
- Russell, R., Guerry, A. D., Balvanera, P., Gould, R. K., Basurto, X., Chan, K. M. A., Klain, S., Levine, J., & Tam, J. (2013). Humans and Nature: How Knowing and Experiencing Nature Affect Well-Being. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 38(1), 473–502. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-012312-110838>
- Scannell, L., & Gifford, R. (2014). *The psychology of place attachment*.



- Shanahan, D. F., Bush, R., Gaston, K. J., Lin, B. B., Dean, J., Barber, E., & Fuller, R. A. (2016). Health Benefits from Nature Experiences Depend on Dose. *Scientific Reports*, 6(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep28551>
- Smith, B., & Sparkes, A. C. (2016). *Routledge handbook of qualitative research in sport and exercise / edited by Brett Smith and Andrew C. Sparkes*. Routledge, Routledge, an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group.
- Statistics Norway  
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.6143402>
- Ulrich, R. S. (1984). View through a window may influence recovery from surgery. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 224(4647), 420–421. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.6143402>

# Annexes

## Annex 1: Interview guide

Tell me a little bit about yourself.

1. Where did you use to live in Greece? Describe a little about the area regarding nature.
2. Did you use to do activities outdoors as a child?
3. How was your family's and innermost circle's relationship with nature?
4. What was your relationship with nature and the outdoors later in Greece?
  
5. How long have you been in Norway?
6. Have you been to Norway all the time or back and forth?
7. Do you speak Norwegian?
8. Do you socialize with Norwegian people in your daily life?
  
9. If you had to choose between those three places to go and have a walk, what would you choose and why?





10. What images do you have in mind when you think of nature? Describe with a few words two of them.
11. How do you think the relationship between nature and people should be?
12. How would you describe your relationship with nature now?
13. How much time approximately do you usually spend in nature per week?
  
14. Which outdoor activities do you usually engage in?  
( Have you ever been skiing, hiking, or doing other activities in Norway?)
15. How has your relationship with nature changed since you have been here?
16. If your relationship with nature has changed, what factors do you think have affected it?
17. If you could change something about your relationship with nature, what would it be ?

18. Have you heard about the concept of Friluftsliv?
19. What do you think about Friluftsliv - Norwegian culture about nature and outdoor activities?
20. Does it remind you of any part of Greek culture?
21. Do you think Friluftsliv is accessible to everyone in Norway? Why?
22. What do you think of accessibility to outdoor activities and nature in Greece?