



Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

Faculty of Natural Resources and
Agricultural Sciences

Communication about sustainability in the food value chain

– Communicative challenges and opportunities

Astrid Mäehans

Communication about sustainability in the food value chain
- communicative challenges and opportunities

Astrid Mäehans

Supervisor: Helena Nordström Källström, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Department of Urban and Rural development

Examiner: Sara Holmgren, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Department of Urban and Rural development

Credits: 30 HEC

Level: Second cycle (A2E)

Course title: Independent Project in Environmental Science - Master's thesis

Course code: EX0431

Programme/Education: Environmental Communication and Management – Master's Programme

Place of publication: Uppsala

Year of publication: 2017

Online publication: <http://stud.epsilon.slu.se>

Keywords: Communication, sustainability, food, challenges, opportunities, One Planet Food

Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

Faculty of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences
Department of Urban and Rural Development

Abstract

A change in diets is vital due to the high environmental impact of food. To enable this change communication about sustainable food plays an important role. Food and sustainability are both areas involving a high level of complexity, making the relationship between communication, sustainability and food a central area to study. The thesis is written in connection to One Planet Food, a food-initiative from World Wild Fund for Nature, which steered the focus of the study to communication within the food value chain. This thesis examines how actors working within the food value chain experience communicative challenges and opportunities in connection to sustainability. The Actors are interviewed through semi-standardized expert interviews to study their subjective understanding of communication in connection to sustainability. A theoretical framework is build based on Per Espen Stoknes' model of strategic communication, which is evaluated in connection to the actor's experiences of sustainability communication. The interviews showed patterns of both challenges and opportunities in connection to sustainability messages, and the patterns were also possible to link to parts of Stoknes' strategies. Communication about sustainability showed to be a complex area, however concluded in that both the interviewed actors and Stoknes argued for a communication strategy of positive, simple and consensus oriented communication. Communication about sustainability showed to be limited due to aspects as an individual focused message, profit being a competing factor with sustainability, communication noise and a lack of dialogue with the audience.

Keywords: communication, sustainability, food, challenges, opportunities, One Planet Food

Table of contents

1 Introduction	7
1.1 Research problem.....	8
1.2 Aim and research questions.....	9
2 Previous research	10
2.1 Communication as transmission	10
2.2 The classical communication model	10
2.3 Purpose of communication.....	10
2.4 Psychological barriers	11
2.5 Selling sustainability.....	11
2.6 Food and communication	12
3 Theoretical framework.....	13
3.1 Social	13
3.2 Supportive	13
3.3 Simple	14
3.4 Story-based.....	14
3.5 Signals	14
4 Method	16
4.1 Choice of method	16
4.2 Mapping and choice of interviewees	16
4.3 Data collection.....	17
4.4 Semi-standardized interviews	17
4.5 Expert interviews	18
4.6 Interview guide	18
4.7 Data analysis and coding	19
5 Result and analysis.....	20
5.1 Challenges	20
5.1.1 Is communication about sustainability different from general communication?	20
5.1.2 Complexity.....	21
5.1.3 Noise	21
5.1.4 Ominous message.....	22
5.1.5 Moral pointers.....	22
5.2 Opportunities.....	22
5.2.1 Simplicity	22
5.2.2 Positive communication	23
5.2.3 Health	23
5.3 Other findings.....	23
5.3.1 Meat.....	23
5.3.2 Trends	24
5.3.3 Purpose of communication	25
5.3.4 Target groups	25
5.3.5 Profit versus sustainability	26
5.4 Challenges and opportunities connected to Stoknes' theories	27
5.5 Other findings connected to Stoknes' theories.....	28
6 Discussion	30
6.1 Findings.....	30

6.2 Receiver and dialogue	30
6.3 One Planet Food	31
6.4 Further implications for sustainability communication.....	32
7 Conclusion.....	34
References	35
Appendix 1	38
Appendix 2	39

Table of figures

Figure 1. Info box over food service in Sweden, own figure	16
Figure 2. Graph over division of food service, own figure	16

1 Introduction

How we produce and consume food is a big part of today's climate issues. Numerous studies have shown that the impacts of our food system is closely connected to environmental issues as greenhouse gas emissions, biodiversity loss, water deficiency and pollution (Garnett, 2014, p 31, Scarborough, P., et al. 2014, p. 180, Westhoek, H., et al. 2014, p. 197). The numerous choices of food in supermarkets puts a pressure on the individual choice and makes it vital to have informed consumers. Even though the general awareness of foods climate impact has increased during the last decades, studies have shown that large uncertainties in connection to sustainability still remain amongst consumers (van Dooren, 2014, p. 36). To actively inform both consumers and companies selling food about sustainability is central, which makes it important to study communication on sustainable food (Röös & Schütt, 2017, p. 2).

Recognizing the urgency for a sustainable global food consumption, World Wildlife Fund for Nature Sweden (WWF) has created the project One Planet Food (OPF) with the aim to contribute to the issue. The project seeks to create a framework for sustainable food, "*food within the limit of one planet*", a framework meant to guide consumers and retailers along the value chain of food. The project is narrowed down to focus on meals and recipes (Richert, WWF, 29-08-16). Together with a group of researchers WWF has located two main areas of interest; to keep the global temperature increase below 1,5° Celsius and to preserve biodiversity. Calculations and assessments based on this framework will be the foundation for WWF's definition of sustainable food. As this thesis is written the final structure is still under development, however a couple of foundation pillars have been set. All meals will have set criteria regarding carbon emission, in order to reduce animal-based protein and increase locally produced food. Criteria on organic food will also be developed to favor biodiversity and a conscious production (Richert, WWF, 29-08-16). This is the definition for sustainable food which WWF use and will also be the definition which is referred to in discussions about sustainable food in this thesis.

By creating a framework for sustainable meals, WWF hope to spread the concept and get different actors to implement it. One Planet Food has two different targets; primarily: actors working with meals, for example meal suppliers, recipe banks, and restaurants, and secondary: those actor's customers and clients. (Richert, WWF, 29-08-16). At the time of writing this thesis, One Planet Food is still at an early stage and the description above is based on the project plan of OPF. The description may raise questions on how the project will be carried out, however, these details fall outside the frame of this thesis.

This thesis is written in connection to the project One Planet Food as WWF expressed a wish to gain insights in the communicative conditions for the project. The perspective is made broader and OPF will be used as a study-case in order to explore communication strategy. The collaboration stretches no further than the research topic and the selection of interviewees. One Planet Food will be brought up again in the concluding discussion, where a discussion will be held to investigate what the insights of the thesis can tell about the conditions for communication strategy in connection to One Planet Food.

1.1 Research problem

Sustainable development is today used in many different scholars and due to the broad definition the concept can mean different things in different situations (Oates, 2006, p. 247-248). The interpretation of sustainability is shown to be closely connected to personal norms and values as well as subjective understanding of cultural context and societal development. (Godemann & Michelsen, 2011 p. 5,6). One of the most frequently used definitions for sustainable development is the Bruntland report; *Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs* (WCED, 1987), which also will be the basis for sustainability in this thesis. However, usage of the concept always needs to be critically reviewed since the definition allows for subjective interpretation and as is not often possible to specify the exact meaning of sustainability (Aiking & de Boer, 2004, p. 360). Sustainability is on the verge of impossible to define, which make communication about sustainability highly complex. The area has developed into its own scientific field named environmental communication, emerging out of a diverse group of older scientific fields. (Cox, 2010, p. 12). Environmental communication aims at creating an understanding of the relationship between the environment and nature through communication and to shed light on the issues of this relation from the perspective of a social discourse. One of the most central notions of the field is that communication about sustainability demands more of the communication due to the pluralism which sustainability entail (Godemann & Michelsen, 2011, p. 6). This will be further explained below.

Food, which is in the scope for this thesis, have shown to share great similarities to the topic of sustainability. Previous research show that perceptions of sustainable food, as well as sustainability, in as an area of high complexity and subjective interpretations (Aiking & de Boer, 2004, p. 360). Attitudes, opinions and values play a great importance of how food choices are made. Individual needs and wants have been shown to contest scientific arguments in the shaping of food habits (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006, p. 170). Sustainable food also implies different meanings for different nations, food security may be the most prioritized issue in one country whereas a shift from animal-based protein to plant-based protein is the located as the most urgent subject in another country (Aiking & de Boer, 2004, p. 360). Even though it is possible to detect an interest for food in the research field of communication (Brummet, 2014, p. 2) few studies on the combination of sustainability and food are to be found within communication research. Bhaskaran et. Al (2006) argue for a lack of existing marketing programs for sustainably produced food. This will be developed under previous research.

To communicate within the complex areas of sustainable food demands well-functioning communicative strategy in order to create a sustainable food consumption (Röös & Shütt, 2017, p. 1, 16). Communication about sustainability and food are both complex areas, and this thesis depart from the notion that the combination of the two carry great challenges. There is also a lack of research on the are of communication strategy of sustainable food. Based on this, I argue for the great importance of studying the relation between communication strategy, sustainability and food.

In the thesis a variation between *communication about sustainability* and *sustainability communication* will be used to describe communication addressing sustainability.

1.2 Aim and research questions

This study seeks to explore the relation between communication strategy, sustainability and food. By using the communication model of Per Espen Stoknes as departure, the aim is to investigate experienced challenges and opportunities in communication by actors working in the food value chain. The thesis is written in collaboration with WWF's project One Planet Food. To get insights in the communicative conditions for a project which intend to spread a framework for sustainable food to companies and consumers, is therefore part of the aim of the study. The study will focus on the following questions:

- How do actors in the food sector choose to exemplify communicative challenges and opportunities in connection to sustainability?
- What similarities and differences exist between the actor's view of communication and Stoknes' model of communication strategy?
- What would be conceivable options for WWF when conducting a strategy for communication about sustainability?

2 Previous research

2.1 Communication as transmission

Looking back at the field of communication, I want to start off with one of the most classical and influential images of communication, Shannon & Weaver model of *communication as transmission*. The model is originally described as information being transmitted as a signal via a phone line, from a transmitter to a receiver. In the middle of the image “noise” is interfering the transmission. This theorizing seeks to locate and avoid noise, weakening the preconditions of the message being understood by the receiver (Craig & Muller, 2007, p. 261). The model is today critiqued due to the simplified view of one-way communication. The critique states that due to the lack of feedback mechanisms the model fails to include how the receiver response to the message, which means failing to embrace the agency of the receiver. However, the concepts of communication from a sender to a receiver is still present in todays work of communication (Craig & Muller, 2007, p. 162).

From the theory of communication as transmission, the scientific field of communication has developed and grown. A number of different disciplines have contributed to the discussion with new aspects of importance when communicating. These include audience, framing, message and messenger, how the message relates to the societal discourse, channels, and planned effect (Moser, 2010, p. 37). Even though the concepts generalize communication on a broad level, I have chosen to include them since they make out a comprehensive theoretical frame of communication today. Moser further argues, a more sufficient understanding of each component is needed, as well as emphasis on the *dialogue* between audience and messenger (2010, p. 37).

2.2 The classical communication model

The *classical communication model* is another model of communication, with roots in Shannon and Weaver’s sender-receiver perspective. This model is widely spread in eg. marketing, where communication is used to target individuals in order to sell a product. The receiver is perceived as a member of a specific *target group*, based on their perceived behavior. Communication is used to instigate a demand, trough a message adjusted based on the target group (Nitsch, 2000, p. 200). In communication about sustainability, the message is more complex and there are more diverse opinions to be met. In contrast to the idea of something meeting a demand, a sustainability messages might be perceived as inconvenient, costly or to much of an effort. Because of this, communication about sustainability carries with it certain limitations when it comes to the practical usability of using concepts like selling ideas to specific target groups. Instead, the receivers must be viewed as an active part of the communicated message (Nitsch, 2000 p. 201-204).

2.3 Purpose of communication

Moser (2010) explains how the *purpose* of communication plays a significant role when communicating about sustainability. In contrast to classical communication, the purpose when communicating about sustainability is often something more than selling a product. Moser has distinguished anticipated goals and structured them in to three categories of purpose. First; *to inform and educate individuals about climate change*, second; *to achieve some type and level of social engagement and action*, and third; *to bring about changes in*

social norms and cultural values. (2010, p. 38) She draws attention to how the desired outcome affects the design of communication, whether the communication has a long time goal to change behavior, or a shorter goal to spread information.

Another important aspect of communicating common topics within sustainability communication, like climate change, is the relationship between scientists and the “lay public”, as Moser (2010) describes it. According to Moser scientist have for too long appointed themselves as solitary experts at interpreting climate change and spreading knowledge, and she argues for a move towards a more trans-disciplinary approach with emphasis on communication scholars. The issue as she describes it lies in that the scientific community needs to communicate complex and knowledge heavy issues to an audience with less knowledge. The communication needs to be done in a way which creating understanding and lead to engagement, otherwise our communication about sustainability fails (Moser, 2010, p. 37).

2.4 Psychological barriers

Contributing to the field of sustainability communication, Stoknes (2015) has explored how communication about sustainability previously has been conducted and analyzed *how to not to* communicate. He has located five psychological barriers to explain how sustainability messages gets blocked out: distance, doom, dissonance, denial and identity. The first barrier *Distance*, explain how climate change compared to other issues, are abstract making it hard for individuals to relate to the issue which creates a distance. Climate change being communicated as a disaster, without practical solutions trigger the second barrier *Doom*. *Dissonance* occurs when we cannot make sense of our habitual behavior, we know that driving is bad for the environment but at the same time, society keeps encouraging us to use cars. When we get criticized for our behavior, we protect our selves by *Denial*, which make out the fourth barrier. The last barrier is *Identity*, is triggered when challenging ideas threaten our cultural identity. Together they make up walls which hinder the environmental message from reaching the audience (Stoknes, 2015, p.81-87).

2.5 Selling sustainability

Alongside the scientific community, companies and businesses are today eager to contribute to the debate. An example of this is a guide for communication about sustainability published by the communication agency Futerra. They address the challenge of communicating sustainability arguing “*climate change is no longer a scientist’s problem - it’s now a salesman’s problem*” (2015, p. 2). Trying to turn up the emergency level does not work, instead there is a need for a new type of climate message. They argue that actors conducting communication about sustainability needs to know how to *sell* climate change. Futerra also argue that successful sustainability communication can be profitable, and for the importance of framing sustainability as an opportunity instead of a problem in order to potentially attract more companies in to working with it (2015, p. 4,6,14).

In this thesis I will focus on communication about sustainability taking place between an environmental non-governmental organization, businesses, and consumers. This aspect will define the prerequisite of the communicative frame in which I operate. One of the main aspects that this bring is that communication and sustainability studied in this thesis relates to goals like *profit* and *business competition*.

2.6 Food and communication

In the same spirit as companies locate sustainability as both a hinder and an opportunity, Bhaskaran et. Al's (2006) study of sustainable food argue for a similar conclusion. By looking at marketing and consumer's choices of sustainable food, they argue that the number of caring consumers are increasing slowly, however a majority still associate sustainable choices to an increased cost and fail to see any advantages. The consumers also expressed that the many different sustainability labels were confusing. The study also concluded that a number of companies found it expensive to adapt sustainability standards and to market them in a fruitful manner (Bhaskaran et. Al, 2006, p. 687).

One way to define and measure sustainable food is through sustainability labels. Even though research reports speak of an increased interest for organic food, the total percentage of food with the organic label KRAV in Sweden during 2016 was 6% of all sold food (KRAV, 2016, p. 3). The numbers are in line with Van Loo et. Al's (2014) report of sustainability labels on meat in Belgium, arguing for an increased interest amongst the consumers followed by an increased number of different labels. Although consumers are positive towards information about sustainability, the many different labels can lead to confusion and decreased credibility, which is a communicative issue for companies, governmental agencies and policy makers. The study also shows a variation in which sustainability issue consumers value most, for example animal welfare, health, carbon footprint. The authors argue that more research in this field is needed (Van Loo et. Al, 2014, p. 147,148).

Vermeir & Verbeke (2005) has done an in depth study of how the behavior of consumer in relation to sustainable food, which is of importance in connection to communication strategy.

They argue that the decision making process in sustainable consumptions are not only driven by personal needs and want, but also a level of social responsibility. They have also located a gap between attitude towards sustainable food and the actual purchase. A change in consumption behavior is competing with habits, price, norms and convenience. At the same time transparency and knowledge about the food value chain is often limited for the consumer, which also have shown to impact in the choices of the sustainable option.

The study concludes that the consumers chose sustainable to a larger extent when they feel involved and informed about the effect of their choice. The authors argue that communication play a significant role in this and to research the topic further (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2005, p. 169, 175, 188).

3 Theoretical framework

A large amount of the previous research on communication strategy end up criticizing the strategy to the point where it no longer feels logical to implement it. I found myself longing for research that, instead of focusing on the limitations, argued for the *possibilities* of communication. This led me to the social psychologist Per Espen Stoknes book *What we think about when we try not to think about global warming* (2015). In his book Stoknes explore the psychological effects of climate communication, and argues that solving climate crisis is simple. He presents a model of five different strategies for how to successfully conduct communication about sustainability, which build on the five different psychological barriers (presented in previous research) that comes from the same book. The strategies are argued to be suitable for policy makers to businesses, scientist to the average citizen. I found it intriguing how Stoknes argues that solving climate crisis is simple, and theoretical framework will therefore be build around these strategies. Due to the collaboration with One Planet Food, the thesis is angled towards communication in foodservice. The theoretical framework will be used comparatively to actor's experiences of communicative challenges and opportunities. This will be further explained in the method.

Following is a presentation of the five different strategies. Each strategy stands by itself, however are meant to be used together and may therefore seem similar.

3.1 Social

The first strategy focuses on making the communication social. Stoknes (2015) contradicts the ideas of global warming being solved through individual behavior-change and neat how-to-live-a-sustainable-life-guides. The movement needs to be social and inclusive, instead of arguments based on the individual's responsibility in the climate crisis. Humans are social beings, and when people do not know how to act, they tend to look at how their surrounding are acting. In these situations, Stoknes argues, people respond to consensus. If climate science is communicated to be perceived as consensus, the social affect results in that the message is experienced as normative. The climate message can therefore become a norm. In science of behavioral change, it has been shown that targeting social networks is more effective than targeting individuals. The social part of the message is therefore crucial, Stoknes argues. He brings up Earth Hour as an example where (apart from the critique of the insignificant effect on energy reduction) a great importance lies in the global, social narrative which it creates. A message should therefore be clear, consensus-oriented and socially situates in order to not trigger dissonance or denial. (Stoknes, 2015, p. 96-104)

3.2 Supportive

The most common reporting of climate change in media is done by using a vocabulary as doom, destruction, disaster, cost, sacrifice and loss. Solutions to climate change are often presented as losses to the individual; eating less meat, travel less et cetera. Stoknes (2015) illustrate that psychological reaction to this is distanciation or resentment. The strategy fails at engaging people, which is why Stoknes argues for supportive frames rather than catastrophic frames. Through supportive frames climate solutions can instead be communicated as an opportunity for innovation or connected to health-benefits and resilience. To frame climate change as connected to personal health has shown to be more effective than the abstract message of a two-degree rise in temperature. Stoknes argues that to be forced in to making sacrifices does not make up an effective message, instead innovation and opportunity should be used to shape a supportive message. Climate disruption means a shift in behavior, which Stoknes argues, will generate opportunities for jobs and

technological innovations. Instead of using a framing of increased expense or loss, attention should be directed towards the benefits of climate action (Stoknes, 2015, p. 111-123)

3.3 Simple

The third part of the strategies focus on keeping the message simple. It has been shown that sustainability rarely is the ruling factor determining how humans make choices in their everyday lives. Instead, choices are influenced by price, convenience or presentation of options. It is therefor, Stoknes (2015) argues, that green choices needs to be simpler. If the sustainable option is set as default, few individuals go though the process of actively changing the default option to a less sustainable choice. He raises an example where 99% of Austrian citizens are organ donors, simply due to a structure where you actively have to register to not be a donor. Nudging, as this technique also is called, can also be used by changing structures which nudge people into a more sustainable behavior. By being aware of the possibilities, nudging can be used as a tool in the toolbox of communication about sustainability, alongside with regulations and government initiations, Stoknes adds. (Stoknes, 2015, p. 124-130)

3.4 Story-based

With a similar stance as in the supportive strategy, Stoknes (2015) argues for the importance of storytelling when communicating about sustainability. The current majority of stories about our future climate describes an apocalypse, including everything from sea level rises, extinction of species to droughts and wildfire. This is not the only true story about climate change, and certainly not the most effective one. Instead, Stoknes argues for stories focusing on the opportunities our future holds, a plurality of stories which can engage and create meaning for a variety of contexts. What is enabled through stories, which alone standing scientific facts often fail to do, is to make climate change something relatable and personal. Stories about how we want to live are easier to embrace than stories of how to not live. These stories should spread through all different parts of society. Stoknes also argues for the importance of replacing the story of a society of fossil fuels, and instead introduce green growth. Green growth, based on the idea to create more value and less wasted resources, can reach out to business minded entrepreneurs, politicians and groups of people that otherwise might not relate or see any importance of engaging in sustainable solutions. (Stoknes, 2015, p.132-138)

3.5 Signals

Signals, and more specific signals of progress makes out the last part of Stoknes'(2015) strategies. Climate change is a so-called wicked problem, it is characterized by high complexity, without a clear solution, and without the possibility to know when it is "solved". Because of this, Stoknes argues, feedback is of great importance. Without signals that make our actions meaningful and tell us that we are moving in the right direction, people will lose their engagement. Hence progress should be measured and communicated. Stoknes argues for signals in order to create an sustainability communication which focus on the measure of progress, instead of presenting issues. (Stoknes, 2015, p.150-153)

In scientific reviews of Per Espen Stoknes' book, there is surprisingly little to no critique to be found, instead he is praised for his research on this paradoxical topic of climate change. Reviews are filled with tribute to his presented strategies for how to overcome the psychological barriers of climate inaction (www.publisherweekly.com, 30-05-2017) Might it be so, that Stoknes gives an answer to an issue that so many researchers have addressed but failed to solve and that the reviews of the book are an expression of relief, I ask. I would argue that some areas go un-critiqued. This will be reviewed more under the section *discussion*. Stoknes' strategies are also possible to bridge with the previous research on communication. The main difference, as I view it, is that Stoknes' strategies origins from the issue of communication, with the goal to overcome psychological rejection of climate messages. The models for communication brought up under previous research, all seek to explain communication and from that perspective locate weaknesses. The argumentation about sustainability as a complex area to communicate, is however possible to find in both previous research and Stoknes' theories.

4 Method

4.1 Choice of method

For this study qualitative approach was chosen, since communication is being studied from the actors' individual experiences through interviews. This type of qualitative research calls for a bottom up inductive analysis process, creating themes based on data interpretation allowing for an adaptable report (Creswell, 2013, p. 32, 234). Interviews were conducted with actors working within the food sector. It was necessary to collect primary data, since no research had been done on this specific setting.

4.2 Mapping and choice of interviewees

Since the thesis is written in connection to One Planet Food it affected the method and the selection of interviewees. As mentioned in the introduction, OPF has a primary and secondary audience, primarily; companies which WWF wish to spread OPF to and second; these company's customers. What this means from a communicative perspective, is that the primary audience will adapt OPF as a concept and communicate it to their customers. The content and narrative will be decided by WWF, which will be spread by and in the companies own channels. With the hope to explore how the companies today conduct communication about sustainability, this thesis is limited to focus on the communication happening between the the companies and their costumers.

OPF want to spread their concept of sustainable food to companies working with providing different meal solutions, this was therefore used as a frame when choosing the interviewees. Foodservice, is the general term for the service of selling composed meal solutions to private- or public sector. The concept of food value chain will also be used in the thesis as a way to include customers and suppliers. In order to understand the market of foodservice a mapping exercise was done. The mapping served the purpose of locating relevant companies, to understand what type of companies exist and how they relate to each other. Starting as a google search, the mapping lead to the discovery of the Delfi foodservice guide, a yearly report of statistics and business intelligence of the foodservice sector (Delfi, 2014). The Delfi guide, complemented with google searches, made it possible to get an overview and to structure the different actors in an excel chart. The companies were divided in five different categories, depending on the design of the company. The different divisions were; meal solutions in the public sector, grocery stores, recipe websites, grocery delivery services and restaurants. To explain these areas a graph and an info box has ben done (see below). A more detailed explanation of the categories is found in *appendix 1*.

Figure 1. Info box over food service in Sweden, own figure

Figure 2. Graph over division of food service, own figure

Division	Serve meals	Provide recipes	Sell groceries	Reviewed companies
Meal solutions in the public sector (Swe: Måltidsleverantör)	X			6
Grocery stores		X	X	4
Recipe websites		X		9
Grocery delivery services (Swe: Matkasse)		X	X	6
Restaurants	X			10

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Sweden, the market is divided with 59% private actors and 41% public actors. (Delfi, 2014)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The private sector consists of many small independent restaurants, while the public sector is dominated by a few larger companies. (Delfi, 2014)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meal solution companies and restaurants provide ready meals, which are served in private restaurants or public facilities as schools, hospitals and elderly care. Recipe websites provide recipes as a service. In a grocery delivery services, recipes plus groceries for x number of days are composed and delivered home to the customer. Grocery stores now provide the same service, and at the same time try to compete with the recipe websites.

After mapping the different companies, it was possible to choose relevant actors to interview. The mapping was done through purposive sampling, aiming at finding stakeholders providing specific knowledge due to their position (Flick, 2009, p. 122). The final selection of the companies was made in deliberation with WWF. Purposive sampling to find *relevant companies* therefore meant companies relevant from WWF's perspective, defined as companies which make out possible target groups for the project. This aspect affected the selection of interviewees.

In order to get a wide cover of the actors, ten companies divided over the five groups where chosen. The employee responsible for communication at each company was then contacted via phone or email. Some communicators however, also brought a person responsible for sustainability to the interview, referring to that the interview was about communication with a focus on sustainability. Both communication and sustainability experts were therefore interviewed and will henceforth be described as *actors*, instead of communicators. The actors and the companies are treated anonymously, which was a methodological choice in order to create a safe space during the interviews since some actors represent large companies. The anonymity showed to be highly important to some actors, since they felt that some questions partly touched their internal business strategy.

4.3 Data collection

The data collection resulted in seven interviews, with eleven people in total since some of the interviews were with two persons at the same time. Trying to book interviews with head of communication at large companies was met by few replies or busy schedules. Due to the limited amount of time, the data collection resulted in seven interviews. The idea was to conduct interviews face-to-face, however since I broke my leg in a skiing-accident in the middle of this process, one interview was conducted face-to-face and the other six were rescheduled and conducted via phone or skype, due to my limited mobility. The fact that some interviews were conducted via phone or skype can potentially affect the outcome of the data collection. All interviews were recorded and later fully transcribed, although leaving out verbal expressions and speech disfluencies. The interviews had a duration between 30 minutes and an hour.

4.4 Semi-standardized interviews

The interviews were conducted based on the method of semi-standardized interviews. The method departs from the field of psychology and is a type of semi structured interview. Being a combination of a theoretical viewpoint and method, the basic idea builds on a notion that interviewees have a subjective understanding of the field they operate in, which construct valuable knowledge (Flick, 2009, p. 156). In this study the field of interest was the interviewees knowledge of communication in foodservice. Elements of semi standardized interviews are hypothesis directed and theory driven questions in order to reconstruct the

participants subjective view of their field. The goal with these questions is to get the participants to express their implied understanding (Flick, 2009, p. 156, 157). How the questions were formulated in relation to the theory will be described further below. Hypothesis directed questions has been critiqued for its scientific validity in various method literature. Häger (2001) answer to this critique, arguing that hypothetical questions open up for possibilities and visions about what has not yet happened (2001, 74-75). Hypothesis directed question also make an important part of the semi standardized method as it makes *the interviewees implicit knowledge more implicit* (Flick, 2009, p. 167) when reacting to these kind of questions.

4.5 Expert interviews

The interview method will also be inspired by the notions of expert interviews, which bridge with semi standardized interviews (Flick, 2009, p. 168). An expert interview is described as when the interviewer and the interviewee share scientific background, which enable a dialogue on a higher scientific level. A mutual understanding of the fields relevance will encourage the experts to give elaborated answers (Bogner et. Al, 2009, p. 2-5). I will use this methodology as an inspiration and uppermost as a tool to enable a critical reflection of the validity of the interviews. As mentioned, the interviewees are people responsible for communication and or sustainability at the different companies. The selection of interviewees can therefore be argued to represent a part of the expertise of communication in foodservice in Sweden. When conducting expert interviews, there are some aspects that should be considered as how is “expert” defined, and how to handle if the expert change between an expert and a private role during the interview (Flick, 2009, p. 167). Since I am combining the methodology with semi standardizer interviews and in connection to the aim of my research, I do not see this as a hinder in this specific case, but instead as a way to closer investigate a subjective understanding of communication about sustainability.

4.6 Interview guide

An interview guide was created in order to get the interviewee to focus on certain parts of their communication in a specific order, and to create a cone structure from broad to more narrow questions. The interview guide was divided into two parts. The first part contained questions on the interviewees’ general view of communication and how they worked with it in practice. Same questions were then asked about sustainability. The second part of the guide focused on questions about communicative opportunities and hinders in connection to sustainability, and questions on communication strategy. These questions were based on the theoretical framework in order to investigate any possible similarities in the actor’s view of communication strategy and Stoknes’ five strategies. In Stocknes’ theory he defined both hinders and opportunities, and questions regarding these were created in order to explore the actors view. Example of questions were; *How do you experience communication where sustainability is framed as an issue?* or *What is your view of communication with a positive sustainability-framing?* in order to lead the interview in to the idea of Stocknes’ supportive-strategy. Although allowing for the possibility to rephrase the questions depending on the answers to the question in the first part of the interview guide.

Before the first interview was conducted, it was not possible to know how well Stoknes’ strategies would correspond with the strategies of the actors. However, after the first interview, which worked as a test interview, it became clear that Stoknes’ strategies corresponded well. The actors touched a lot of the Stoknes’ strategies in answers connected to other questions. A change in the approach was therefore made during the following interviews. The second part of the interview guide was instead used as a checklist, and as follow-up questions if a certain strategy not yet had been mentioned by the actor. During the

interviews the semi-structure aspect of the method was embraced. It allows the researcher to go back and forth between topics to create a seamless interview responding to the different topics an interviewee may bring up. The approach enables a flexibility towards new emerging paths of information during the interviews (Bryman, 2012, p. 415-416). The semi structured approach showed to be particularly useful in connection to the second part of the interview guide.

4.7 Data analysis and coding

The collected data was analyzed based on the principle of open coding. Flick (2009, p. 161) argues that coding is the most suitable way to interpret semi standardized interviews, since the method aims at investigate the complexity of subjective views and not create objective conclusions. Open coding was also chosen because it suited my angle of research and use of theoretical framework. Flick describes the process as “representing the operations by which data are broken down, conceptualized, and put back together in new ways” (2009, p. 307). The coding aims at locating generic concepts and networks, to structure how the different concepts relate to each other (2009, p. 307, 308). I will in my coding use the word pattern instead of networks. I began the coding process by reading through the transcribed interviews several times to get an overview of the material. The material was then organized by color marking passages of text and dividing them in to themes of communicative opportunities and communicative hinders. The themes were based on to the research question with the same formulation. This resulted in a color coding on challenges, opportunities, and third color for other interesting findings. The color coded text was then scanned again to locate generic concepts under each theme, which was collected and copied to a new document. Notes were also made in connection to each generic concept, to keep track of in how many interviews the concepts appeared. This resulted in data sorted under themes and the most frequently appearing concept under each theme. This material was then compared to Stocknes’ ideas of challenges and opportunities and analyzed based on similarities and differences in the actor’s answers. The most emergent concepts became the patterns used in the analysis.

5 Result and analysis

The interviews resulted in twelve different patterns, which will be presented below. It was possible to detect both communicative challenges and opportunities in the interviewees answers. Even though the companies which the actors represent varied in size, purpose and activity, a number of different patterns emerged. Due to the varying amount of relevant answers, the representation and use of material from each interview vary. Since the companies/interviewees are treated anonymous, the interviews will not be named in the analysis. Instead the findings will be focused around patterns and insights to avoid the risk of connecting answers to specific companies. All information presented in the analysis are taken from the interviews, if nothing else is stated. The interviews provided a large amount of transcribed material. To give an overview of the result each segment includes a number of quotes with the purpose to represent findings of each pattern. Since all interviews were done in Swedish the quotes are a translation of the original transcription. In wanting to avoid a subjective interpretation while translating the quotes, the colloquial language was preserved. All quotes are presented in its original language in appendix 2. The patterns were organized under three different themes; challenges, opportunities and other findings. At the end of the analysis, the findings of each theme are connected to Stoknes' strategies.

5.1 Challenges

The patterns concerning challenges will be explained below after a short introduction to the actors' relation to sustainability communication.

5.1.1 *Is communication about sustainability different from general communication?*

The interviews confirmed that all actors work with sustainability in connection to communication. Some in a larger extent than others. As previously stated, all types of communication which include sustainability will be named as *sustainability communication* or *communication about sustainability*. However, research on sustainability messages argue for the notion that the concept of sustainability contains a high complexity and therefore needs to be communicated more reflectively than regular marketing or communication strategies in order to be effective. It was central to understand how the actors experienced it and if the notion could be confirmed. Do the actors work differently when communicating about sustainability compared to how they communicate in general? This question was posed in the interviews. No actor answered in a way that would confirm, or indicated an awareness of the notion. A number of actors chose to focus their answer on how sustainability is integrated with their general communication, an actor working with communication for grocery stores explained: *"Actually, there's no big difference, [--] I think that there might have been a big difference before, but that people are now trying to avoid the boring stuff, and instead increase the feelings of lust, simplicity and joy of food."* (appendix 2, 1.1). From my view, the actor answers the question from the premises that communication about sustainability previously was set aside and viewed as a dull communication, this is something the actors want to avoid today and therefore express how they integrate sustainability with other communication. In the quote it is also possible to detect a prejudice towards how sustainability is communicated, when the actor explain how they now *instead* focus on lust and inspiration. As said, many actors interpreted the question differently, and no actor expressed that communication on sustainability would be more complicated in any way, compared to their communication on other topics. However, later findings showed that all interviewees confirm a variation of different challenges specifically connected to

sustainability. Due to the semi structured design, and based on what the interviewee chose to bring up, these answers appeared in connection to various questions.

A possible limiting factor, which needs to be taken in consideration, is the presence of prestige in the actor's answers. They all work with communication and/or sustainability, and to confirm communicative challenges might be seen as threat to their professional identity. A discrepancy is therefore probable between what the actors do and what they say they do. For the legitimacy of the discussion the findings are not to be viewed as an objective truth, instead the analysis focus on the actors' subjective understanding.

5.1.2 Complexity

How to shape the message of sustainability was discussed a lot in the interviews. Many actors express how they approached sustainability in different ways, however ended up with a complicated message, trying to include too many aspects. A communicator for a grocery delivery servicer said: *“Maybe you can't be too technical in the way you communicate”* (appendix 2, 1.2.) As stated in the quote, the actor emphasize how he/she want to avoid a complicated communication. It is described how they want to communicate certain topics but are limited by information and knowledge, which from my interpretation, confirm that the actors' view sustainability as a complex topic. One actor says in connection to their grocery store customers that *“Well, there's a lot of areas that require a lot of knowledge to be able to communicate about or to give guidance [---] So, it's rather those specific questions that we have identified as unable to communicate because it's too complicated. Then everyone turns a blind eye and says we don't give a shit.”* while another actors sais *“It's not because we don't want to, but rather because [the market, my note] is not ready yet, it's sort of too complicated.”* (appendix 2, 1.3 & 1.4) What this means is that the challenge of reaching your audience with complicated messages is so substantial that it affects the choice of topics to be communicated. This becomes a limitation to the extent that actors avoid to communicate certain messages even when it is expressed that they wish to communicate about it. I would also argue that, how the actors' experience the challenge of complexity confirms the notion about differences between sustainability communication and other communication.

5.1.3 Noise

There are different reasons to why the actors perceive complexity in connection to communication. Noise in different communication channels are one main reason described. Two examples of this is when actor explain in connection to communication online that: *“Somehow there is so many messages. And we end up competing between all these good things.”* and *“We also talk about sustainable fish, certifications, etc. but it becomes somewhat subordinate because of all the white noise out there, it's complicated to communicate everything to the same extent.”* (appendix 2, 1.5, 1.6). Another actor working with grocery delivery services express that the many different sustainability labels are part of the issue, making it too complex for the customer to tell them apart. While another actor on the same note express that *“then again, organic bananas might not be the most important issue”* (appendix 2, 1.7) seeing a challenge in communicating the different scales in different sustainability issues. Based on the actor's answers it is possible to see how communicative noise take different shapes and occur at different levels, from too many actors communicating the same issue to too many different labels of sustainability. The noise adds complexity to the message and makes it hard for the actors to communicate a clear message. The noise also makes it harder for the consumer to receive the communication and to navigate through all the different messages and tell them apart.

5.1.4 Ominous message

A hinder expressed by the actors was to communicate ominous messages, referring to communication about dystopian consequences of climate change, temperature rising and scarce resources. An example is brought up by one interviewee in connection to their competitor company's communication of vegetables: *"I find it questionable, as [---] have been communicating, that non organic food is toxic. That is a good example of something we would not say, "That's toxic, don't eat it" (appendix 2, 1.8).* Other actors share the same view, and avoid messages of this kind. They experience that is hard to reach their consumers and that an ominous message is unwanted. Another actor explains: *"to try to reach out with information saying that you have to save the world and stop eating meat! there is greater profit in trying to take the positive approach."* (appendix 2, 1.9). Since no one wants to hear that climate change is their fault, the actor see a greater purpose of communicating trough other messages. This notion is closely connected to the next finding, to avoid moral pointers.

5.1.5 Moral pointers

To avoid moral pointers (swe: pekpinar) was something brought up in all of the interviews, often more than once. Referring to the phenomenon on telling someone what to do, and not do. For example: *"We work with positive a lot, integrated in all communication [---] never moral pointers, never ever, never ever."* (appendix 2, 1.10). Since it was so frequently occurring, it is possible to interpret it as a reaction or interpretation of a sustainability message as *being* a moral pointer. Which in turn, can be connection to the idea of sustainability being dull and boring, described in beginning of the analysis. The reasons behind it expressed by the interviewees are similar to the reason the actors avoid onerous messages, they want to avoid the risk of the customer feeling judged of being told what to do. Moral pointers are something, expressed by the actors, that threatens the personal image and be perceived as offending. However, some actors also see that moral pointers can play an important role when communication about sustainability depending on the sender: *"and really, no moral pointers. Or at least very few. I believe that we need to use some No No's, otherwise we loose credibility."* (appendix 2, 1.11) Few however see themselves playing that role and instead argue that researchers or environmental organizations can or should use it as a communication strategy since they obtain the agency and have a different purpose with their organization.

5.2 Opportunities

5.2.1 Simplicity

Opportunities are defined by themes and patterns which the actors find successful. One of the strongest patterns found on this was to communicate simple, *"Make it simple, make it convenient for people to make a difference."* says an actor working at a recipe website (appendix 2, 2.1) The simplicity includes both to make the choice of sustainability appear easy and to make the message of sustainability easy to understand, for example *"we want to make it easy for the customer to chose healthy and sustainable in the restaurant."* (appendix 2, 2.2) The actors describe how they actively use this as a strategy, and describe how they see it being possible to implement of different topics within sustainability. Actors experience that their costumers appreciate simplicity and that it is easy to reach their audience with this type of communication. No actor mentions any negative aspects of the strategy of simple communication.

5.2.2 Positive communication

To exclusively use positive communication was another strong pattern amongst the answers. Sustainability should always be communicated positive and push for the advantages of choosing sustainable. An actor argues in connection to introducing more vegetarian recipes: *“So that it becomes a positive experience instead of you removing something.”* (appendix 2, 2.3) In the same way as dystrophic communication was seen as a hinder, positive communication was seen as an opportunity. Frequently used language was inspiring, fun, exciting, and both good for the planet and you. To connect positive to the topic of food was also described as a fruitful way to communicate. One actor explained how they tried to include sustainability in the customers everyday life : *“Our vision, to make everyday life simple and to inspire our customers to simplicity and joy in cooking”* the actor continued: *“And hear you can include that sustainability questions have become more and more frequent in this area the last years.”* (appendix 2, 2.4). Positive communication showed to be a pattern not only detected by me, thus some actors described it as a general trend within food and sustainability communication. *““I guess that’s what we have seen in communication on a general level, is that if you start in something positive, while creating a positivism around it and make it into something exciting, fun, tasty, simple and healthy, then it’s a lot easier.”* (appendix 2, 2.5). No actor mentioned any hinders in connection to positive communication.

5.2.3 Health

When sustainability and food was connected to health another pattern appeared. Actors describes it as positive and natural to connect the topics from a communicative perspective. It was also expressed how health could be used as an entryway to talk about sustainability. *“Well it’s connected, eating more vegetables and less meat is good for your health and for the climate, so this becomes a really potent incentive”* (appendix 2, 2.6). Actors explain how they experience health to be a topic which plays on personal interest in a larger extent than sustainability: *““It’s usually the personal wellbeing that is being most valued, so if you use that as a motivator but also that, ah right! it’s also good for the climate and my wallet”* was said by an actor working with grocery delivery services (appendix 2, 2.7). These kinds of messages are described to be easier to reach their audience with, and therefore is seen as communicative opportunity. The idea of how health is used as a carrier of the sustainability message also correlates with the ideas of positive and simple communication. A healthier meal is positive and benefits the individual consumer without larger sacrifices.

5.3 Other findings

Except the patterns structured under challenges and opportunities, the interviews contributed to number of other relevant findings. Some of the findings relate to the challenges and opportunities described above, while other patterns relate to not yet discussed parts of the actors’ communication.

5.3.1 Meat

One topics which was not included in any interview question, although were brought up by all actors was the topic of meat. The topic, which has been on the agenda for quite some time, expressed by the actors, divided both actors and the actor’s audiences. An actor working with meal service in the public sector explained: *“The vegetarian question divides. There is a strong vegetarian, vegan trend, but I would almost say that it’s somewhat polarized because there is also a massive opposition.”* (appendix 2, 3.1) The issue is described as central and important due to the resource demanding production, and it is expressed that the actors want to communicate about the topic. At the same time, many actors describe a challenge of

communicating about meat and explain how it the communication can be seen as threatening to identity and a moral pointer. A strongly rooted tradition of eating meat in Sweden, is believed to be the reason for this. There are a lot of emotions connected to food in general and to meat in particular. Even though the topic is mentioned in all interviews it is possible to detect a division amongst the interviewees. One actor approaches the topic by saying: *“That this is something that actually has a huge impact on our climate [---] that a lot of people love meat and that, you know, this is something we need to reconsider.* (appendix 2, 3.2). While another actor argues that *“it is hard to get rid of the read meat [---] And it is not something that I am going to deny that we are a commercial company and first and foremost we want satisfied costumers.”* (appendix 2, 3.3). Both actors acknowledge the issue of meat consumption, however the first actor have a more progressive and forward approach, prioritizing sustainability over the customers love for meat. The second actor instead explain that due to their role as a company, satisfied customers need to be put first. From a communicative perspective, the actors’ approach to the subject determines if it is portrayed as a challenge or opportunity. One pattern that appeared is an increased demand for vegetarian options. Answers also show how actors experienced a change in norms and that customers now eat vegetarian options without defining their diet as vegetarian. However, the quotes also describe a perceived resistance towards vegetarian food, and how some groups, for example children, are harder to reach than other. From an actor working with meals in the public sector: *“If we are talking with the school board then they think it’s great that we’re working with vegetarian food. But if we approach the school kids and say “from now on there will be more vegetarian [---] then they won’t eat it. However, if we only say that this is a regular soup, they would be fine with it.”* (appendix 2, 3.4). What this means for the actors is that they have an audience with completely opposite wants. The division also make it possible to detect strategies which the actors’ view as successful and unsuccessful. For example, communication that mentions recused meat consumption is perceived as a challenge. To connected meat reduction and health it is described as an opportunity. The question of meat divides, and there is no shared opinion of how it best is communicated.

5.3.2 Trends

Some of the interviewees expressed a presence of trends in sustainability which shaped another pattern, mostly perceived as a challenge. One actor within grocery stores express that: *“well, certain topics feel old, things you’ve talked about before, like legumes, beans and lentils”* (appendix 2, 3.5) describing that legumes no longer make an attractive message, since it has been done before. Why this was perceived as a challenge could be connected to two main reasons, trends as a *pressure* and trends as *limitation*. The reasons why a company chose to apply sustainability measurements are many, but one main reason should be to reduce once environmental footprint. It was made clear in the interviews that this however might not always be the case in sustainability communication. These trends, expressed by the actors, might not be what does the most impact from an environmental perspective, however still necessary to relate to in order to seem conscious. Said in connection to online recipes: *“what’s perceived as healthy and what’s trendy can vary a lot”* (appendix 2, 3.6) explaining how health trends also affect sustainability. Another actor also brings up the communicative challenge of untangling trends of healthy food that are mistaken as sustainable food.

The other hinder with trends is that they determine the agenda. One actor explained an example where they made a substantial effort to remove palm oil from their range of food and tried to communicate about the negative affects of palm oil early in the debate. They were hoping for standing ovations, instead it became a communicative challenge. The actor experienced an uninformed and uninterested audience, resulting in their communication getting little to no attention at that point. The actor concluded the example by saying: *“when we put down thousands or hours of work in to something it would be fun to se it having at least some outcome in media, but it is not the most important part”* (appendix 2, 3.7). Being in front of, or to set the agenda can be resource demanding from a communicative

perspective, and because of this, the actor argued for the importance of being in line with the general agenda in order to get successful media spread. It was however also possible to detect some positive answers in connection to trends. In the same way as trends could silence a topic, trends could also work as an amplifier for the trending sustainability-topics, making it easier for the customer to communicate about it.

5.3.3 Purpose of communication

Purpose of communication showed to have a great influence on the actor's communication about sustainability. As mentioned in previous research, the purpose behind ones' communication about sustainability shape the message. A purpose can vary between spreading norms to wanting to change norms (Moser, 2010, p. 38). The same phenomenon was possible to find the different answers. One actor described the company he/she worked for by saying: *"I think that it's connected with our history and our trademark to want to be greener and a force for good."* (appendix 2, 3.8) while another actor describes their goal as: *"What we market most frequently is to make it simpler for the costumers and to inspire [---] We don't market it as sustainability."* (appendix 2, 3.9). The first actor in this example also argue: *"I think it's a bit annoying because we're so far away from what we should, or what we eventually will have to change."* (appendix 2, 3.10) here referring to his/her own belief of the future in connection to sustainability. The second actor speak of use for sustainability by saying: *"To include it in a weekly menu, or if there's a specific occasion that we're celebrating, world nature yada yada, those kind of days."* (appendix 2, 3.11). I would argue based on these quotes, that it is possible to detect both a difference in purpose and a difference in how the actor personally view the issue of sustainability. The first actor uses words as changing norms, while the second actor speak of some "nature yada yada". Based on the language and on what scale the actors speak of sustainability, I would argue that the actors have different views of the urgency of climate change. What these quotes also show are the difference in purpose of their communication. In this comparison, it is important to add that the example I chose to raise was between one of the more conscious actors and one of the least conscious actors of all the interviewees. The quotes also indicate a shift between the "company's view" of sustainability and their personal opinion. Despite this, I would still argue that the comparison serves the purpose of showing the width of different purposes. It is possible to detect different definitions of sustainability and different views of necessary measurements amongst the actors.

A pattern in opposition to the actors' targets also appeared. The findings show that there is a misalignment between how often the actors want to communicate about sustainability and how they experience the customer's receptiveness. One actor describe how they are framing their meals: *"avoiding the headline "eat more environmentally friendly" because that would intimidate people. Instead you start with a normal approach to later on include the environmental aspect. You have to be a bit sneaky."* (appendix 2, 3.12) implying how the actor are trying to reach the customer with a message they do not want to hear. Instead of communicating about what they might see as important they describe how they hide the message in other topics, which becomes a communicative challenge.

5.3.4 Target groups

The companies' purposes showed to be closely connected to whom they viewed as their target group. Some actors were more transparent with this than others. One actor for example explained how they through surveys studied their target group's interests to plan their communication. Since sustainability was not in the top three topics, their positioning towards sustainability mirrored their result. A common discussion was also the variation of knowledge and interest within their target groups. A span of customers with a lot of knowledge and interest for sustainability, customers with lower knowledge, to customers with no interest at all. Some actors experienced certain groups to be more apparent then others, for example: *"Our customers are conscious, a bit more educated than the average,*

have higher wages [---] So it's pretty easy to reach out to them with this kind of product." said by an actor in grocery delivery services (appendix 2, 3.13). When actors spoke about how they interpreted their customer's knowledge in relation to their actions, they referred to general *hygiene level* (swe: *hygiennivå*). Which is possible to interpret as a norm or level of progressiveness of sustainability, specific for companies operating within the food sector. During the interviews actors benchmark their work against this, however without ever defining what the hygiene levels or norms implied.

The different target groups and the presence of a hygiene level, results in a challenge of reaching various groups with the same communication and to chose where on this scale of sustainability they want to place themselves. It became clear in the interviews that how progressive the companies aim to be, reflected back on how dynamic they chose to be towards their target group. For example: *"We can create a proposal with a radically changed menu with a lot of environmental benefits, but the guest might not at all be so positive about such a rapid behaviour change."* said by public sector restaurants (appendix 2, 3.14). Companies with a more progressive and green positioning described how they wanted their communication to be ahead of the general agenda. Same actors also argued for the importance of relating to scientific development of sustainability rather than consumer opinions regarding sustainability. Some actors also described themselves taking on an educating roll. One actor, in quote 3.31 above, express how they did not see a need to communicate about sustainability, but only to offer products which the customers wanted. In this case they experienced a demand for organic food, and therefore had it in their selection. They however did not experience any need to communicate aspects of sustainability which would not be in the customer's interest.

5.3.5 Profit versus sustainability

The goal of each company is to have an increased profit, it is determined by the system they act within. To study how the aspect of profit affected the sustainability message was therefore a central pattern. Profit was modestly brought up in some of the interviews which made it possible to analyze, however not many actors seemed to willingly associate profit with sustainability. One actor describes a conflict of interest on this topic by explaining: *"it might not always be the most profitable option for us to completely change the behaviour, and that's probably the most challenging part, to change something that it profitable for us but maybe not that good for the climate."* (appendix 2, 3.15). The actor describe how sustainability and profit can be a state of opposition, which leaves the actor at a moral crossroads. An actor from a grocery store argues that: *"if we only worked with the sustainability agenda we would be further ahead"* while another actor explains in connection to their restaurant: *"And at that occasion we said, that ok, if bacon means so incredibly much for the guest [---] then we might have started off at the wrong place."* (appendix 2, 3.16, 3.17). This can also be interpreted to indirect affect the actor's communication, since they have to choose whether to focus on sustainability or profit-driven communication. Another phenomenon which appeared in connection to purpose, was the consciousness to not appear "too green". One actor says that in their sustainability messages they: *"we focus on the positive, we are absolutely not rabid"* (appendix 2, 3.18). How the actor connects *sustainability* and *rabid*, implies that too focus much on sustainability can become a disadvantage, something they do not want to be associated with, in my interpretation.

However, actors also describe positive experiences were profit and sustainability strengthen each other. One actor for example connect sustainability and profit to image, saying: *"that's why our hope is that we as a brand will be connected to certain values"* (appendix 2, 3.19), referring to values of sustainability. My interpretation is that the actors at times describe sustainability as goodwill and a business opportunity to strengthen their own image. Organic food is another example which is brought up as an area which it easy to combine with profit. Communication on organic was described to be well received by customers, easy to create positive communication around and strengthens the image of the

company. Organic as a concept is well spread and actors experienced that many customers now know about all the advantages with organic food. In connection to this, actors also referred to an increased demand for organic food in Sweden the last few years, which becomes another obvious opportunity. Because of this, organic food therefore naturally became central in many actor's communication about sustainability.

5.4 Challenges and opportunities connected to Stoknes' theories

During the interviews and after the complete coding it became clear that many of the perceived challenges and opportunities align with the strategies presented by Stoknes. As described in the method, the interview guide was changed after the first interview since all actors to some extent mentioned each strategy. It was also possible to detect that the underlying reasons why they used certain strategies were almost always in order to avoid challenges. When the actors discuss challenges and opportunities the two are often discussed together. If a challenge is described, it is often followed by discussion of successful strategies to avoid that challenge. The same structure can be found in Stoknes' strategies.

In the interviews, the actors describe how they avoid complex messages because they strongly experience them as challenging in terms of reaching their consumers. Complexity is listed as one of the main barriers in Stoknes' theory, arguing that it triggers the psychological effects of dissonance or denial. In the Social strategy (2015, p. 96, 99), he instead argues for the importance of a clear and consensus oriented messages to avoid the perception of complexity in the receiver. In my view, it is possible to connect the experienced challenges of complexity with parts of Stoknes' *Social strategy*. Stoknes' idea of a social movement, found in the same strategy, is however not mentioned by any actor. Instead the actors repeatedly use a language focusing on the individual consumer without mentioning it as a hinder. However, when complexity was experienced as a challenge, simplicity was experienced as an opportunity, which makes it possible to connect the two patterns. The idea of simplicity, both in the message and choice of sustainability, showed to be a widespread strategy amongst the interviewed actors. The idea is fully in line with the *Simple strategy*, where Stoknes argue for the need of making green choices more simple (2015, p. 125). Stoknes as well as the actors' mentions nudging as a tool to successfully steer people into making better, more informed choices. The pattern of simplicity also confirms the idea of a consensus oriented message, as part of the Social strategy. In conclusion, I would argue that the actors' idea of simple communication implies no differences from Stoknes' Simple strategy.

The pattern of avoiding ominous messages share many similarities to Stoknes' reasoning behind the Supportive strategy. He argues that catastrophic framings trigger psychological effects of resentfulness that leads to decreased engagement (2015, p. 111). The interviewed actors explain how their consumer turns a *blind eye*, which Stoknes argue is a reaction to the feeling of loss by these messages. The Supportive strategy also overlap with the pattern of avoiding moral pointers, where the outcome of the communication is perceived in the same negative way as when communicating ominous messages. The pattern of positive communication appeared as a solution to ominous messages, based on the idea to focus on the positive aspects of sustainable choices. Similarities are to be found in the Supportive strategy, where it is argued that we should not communicate sustainability as a loss but instead focus on the benefits. The message should be based on supportive frames about opportunities and insurance of a better future (2015, p. 123), which is also mentioned in the interviews. Even if the actors do not use a language of supportive communication it is possible to connect supportive strategies to their argumentation for positive, inspiring and attractive communication. The pattern is also possible to connect to the Story-based strategy, where Stoknes argues for new stories about our possible future (2015, p. 132-133), since it is a type of storytelling the actors conduct in connection to their positive sustainability messages.

Supportive frame also connects to the pattern of health, and Stoknes specifically brings up health as an example for how to create a supportive message. He argues that to communicate the need to drastically reduce to consumption of meat as climate solution will for a lot of people be perceived as a loss, something that does not make for successful communication. To avoid this, he instead argues to communicate the same solution from the *positive health aspects* of eating less meat (2015, p. 111-114). It is possible to find similarities in the arguments presented by the interviewed actors, and their experiences of connecting sustainability to health. How health plays on personal benefits is also an idea included in the Supportive strategy (2015, p. 111). In the same way as positive communication connects to storytelling, health builds a story together with sustainability and food. It is not just food, it is something more, to eat this food means investing in a more prosperous future for both body and nature. Health, from my interpretation, is therefore fully tangent to both the Supportive and Story-based strategy.

The two strategies that were not mentioned by any of the interviewed actors were *Social* and *Signals*. The main idea of the Social strategy is to focus on the collective rather than the individual (2015, p. 96-99). However, no actor mentioned any opportunity in connection to this, but instead used individual targeted communication. The strategies did not manage to create a discussion about social/individual communication during the interviews, instead the actors seemed convinced that communication should target individuals. Actors also mentioned how they experienced an increased interest for sustainability and for example witnessed an increase demand for organic food, however no actor related this to a communicative opportunity. In the same way, actors discussed the action of giving feedback to their consumers, although did not see any direct purpose by it.

5.5 Other findings connected to Stoknes' theories

The patterns under *Other findings* were raised based on their relevance and complexity, since the same pattern could be viewed as both a challenge and an opportunity. I would argue that the findings represent a complexity within the actor's sustainability communication and show the range of interpretations and experiences. It is possible to find similarities to Stoknes' strategies, however the findings also show areas which are not included by the strategies.

It is possible to see how the hindrances in connection to meat correlates with many of the general challenges described in part one. For example, being perceived as moral pointers, ominous message and context. It is therefore possible to connect to the same part of the strategies, Supportive, Simple and Social to communication about meat. In a similar way, the opportunities of meat show to be comparable to many of the opportunities described, for example health, simplicity and positive communication, docking on to the strategies of Simple and Supportive. Communication on organic food share many of the same patterns as meat. Organic is described as easy to create positive messages around, the doom-framing is easily avoided and the communication focus advantages of organic food rather than a loss of something else, which all is included in the Supportive strategy. It is also possible for the actors to use story telling around organic food and meat free food as a way to enhance the positive message, in the same way as the strategy of Story-based communication. In conclusion, it is possible to connect all opportunities around organic food and meat to either one or more of Stoknes' strategies.

Trends is another topic which is described as both a challenge and an opportunity. Since it is resource demanding to go against the agenda, the interviewed actors describe how they find themselves obligated to relate their communication to trends. None of Stoknes' strategies mention any phenomenon close to trends or what it involves. I would argue that the same phenomenon that is perceived as challenge in trends, also is partly behind the challenge of having target groups with different opinions and different level of knowledge. The actors describe how they want to communicate certain topics or at a certain level, and need to choose

how to meet these external factors. This is not something described as hinder, nor any strategies of how to turn this into a communicative opportunity, in Stoknes' strategies. Other findings who fell outside the scope of Stoknes' strategies are purpose of communication. How the companies want to appear is shown to have a big impact on their communication, however is not given any attention in the strategies. The economic aspect of sustainability is partly mentioned under Signals, where Stoknes argues for the necessity of green innovation. Even if the intention is similar, to make sustainability appealing, is do not solve the fact that actors avoid to communicate certain topics because it would compete with their goal to make profit. From my interpretation, Stoknes' argumentation depart from an idea that everything can be made sustainable or replaced by a sustainable option, and at the same time made profitable. This will be studied further in the next section *discussion*.

6 Discussion

6.1 Findings

The findings showed a variation of examples on both challenges and opportunities. It was possible to connect the examples and experiences with Stoknes' model which was used as a theoretical framework. To apply the theoretical framework on food oriented communication showed to be of no hinder, instead I would argue that it enabled a deeper analysis. Before the interviews were conducted I did not know if the ideas behind Stoknes' strategies would be possible to compare to how the actors use and view communication. The answers however, showed that both strategies used by the actors and the view of communication correlated with big parts of Stoknes' theories. The type of communication that actors described as most successful can be concludes by; a supportive message, focusing on the positive and attractive aspect of sustainability which at the same time favor the customer. The analysis also sowed that some topics of sustainability were easier to communicate than others, for example organic food. A correlation between specific topics and the successful strategies were possible to detect. Organic food, as an example, could effortlessly be communicated through a supportive, positive, attractive and beneficial message. It could also be communicated without an ominous framing, and were not perceived as provoking or as a loss by the customers. Meat on the other hand, could not as easily be fit in to the different strategies, which also correlated with how actors experienced it as more difficult to communicate.

As stated in the analysis, the actors did not experience a specific difference between sustainability messages and other messages. However, many of the challenges described in connection to sustainability confirmed the notion of the area as complex. I would argue for a lack of awareness amongst the actors towards the implication of communication about sustainability. It is hard to know the direct affects of this, however if the actors would have more insights on this their sustainability communication might have been conducted in a different, and more fruitful way. The actors were chosen based on their representation of different companies within food service. The analysis showed that patterns occurrences were spread amongst the different actors, and none of the major patterns were specific for a certain type of company.

The analysis also showed patterns which fall outside the scope of Stoknes' theories. The patterns do not contradict Stoknes' theories, although they add a level of complexity which can be argued to affect the validity of the theory. This will be further discussed below.

6.2 Receiver and dialogue

The analysis showed how three of the five strategies was used in much larger extent. The two least occurring strategies where Social and Signals. What these two strategies have in common is a focus on the social aspect of the communication. The main idea behind the Social strategy is an emphasis on the collective environmental movement and to show other positive examples. The second strategy, Signals, argue for the importance of positive feedback in dialogue with the receiver. Strategies like this were not mentioned by the actors' as something they we've done, and were overall given very little attention in the interview answers. The actors reasoned that the strategies seemed hard to implement, that they were far from their ordinary way of communicating and that they did not see any clear communicative opportunities by using them.

Not surprisingly, the interviewed actors reasoned very much inline of the models brought up under previous research. The view of *communication as transmission* between sender and became apparent due to how the actors talked about the relation between themselves and their

customers. *Sending and receiving* a message was a common language used to describe communication. Noise, which was one of the analysis pattern, was also detected to be a communicative challenge in a similar way to how it is described in Shannon and Weaver model of communication (Craig & Muller, 2007, p. 161). Target groups was another strong pattern which influenced communication. How the actors viewed target groups showed to be similar to *classical communication* described by Nitsch (2000 p. 201), viewing communication as a tool to sell a product by marketing it to a specific target group. I want to stress that I do not seek to criticize the use of these concepts, they are well spread and used to explain communication. However, as brought up in the critique in both Craig & Muller and Nitsch, it is important to be reflective of how they are used, since they lean towards a one-way communication, which in itself is problematic due to the simplified view of the receiver.

One thing that is possible to conclude based on the argumentation in these two passages is that the view of the relation between communication and receiver is similar to the view of both communication models. The communication is viewed as a one-way communication where individuals can to some extent be divided into different target groups. The strategies in which Stoknes argue for a more collaborative communication moving away from the individual perspective, the actors responded to it is far from how they communicate. It was clear that these strategies were not viewed as a possible way to develop their communication, or something the actors showed interest for. The main critique brought up by both Craig and Muller, and Nitch can be concluded as critique towards the view of the receiver. The simplified view of the receiver becomes the main weakness in both of the strategies. I would argue that this notion can be used to gain valuable insights in the actors' communication. One of the main issues behind the challenges of complexity, ominous message and moral pointers can all be connected to the receiver. From a communicative perspective, the receiver becomes an element beyond the senders control, sine the message's reception is affected by the individual's knowledge, opinions and worldviews. A possible interpretation of this it that the current strategies used by the actors becomes limited by the challenge to "find" a message that suits each individuals interest. Since they are not in a dialogue with their audience, the actors chose to avoid messages that can be rejected, instead of trying to communicate them trough other methods. Co-creation of meaning is an area within environmental communication, which so far in this thesis, have not been explored. Co-creation of meaning is a theory to jointly produce meaning between sender and receiver trough dialogue. The dialogue is argued to enable a joint learning process, with active and involved individuals, and with a more equal power balance (Bendapudi, N., & Leone, R. P., 2003, p. 23-25 & Payene et al, 2008, p. 84-85). Since the audience became a common denominator in many of the challenges, a strategy leaning more towards co-creation of meaning would be a possible approach, in my opinion.

6.3 One Planet Food

The result of this study is not a general truth, but different actors' subjective experiences. However, since this thesis is a collaboration with the project One Planet Food and the actors where chosen due to their position as a possible target groups for the project, is it possible to say something about the conditions for communicating the project? The interviewees answers' cannot be argued to fully represent the 'companies' view of communication about sustainability, however, they do give an indication of general perceptions since they speak on the company's behalf and due to the different answers showing a great deal of consistency. Based on the result of this study I would therefore argue for some aspects which should be included in WWF communication strategy for the project One Planet Food.

To begin with, since the project stretches over a primary and secondary target group the communication needs to take a number of levels into consideration. OPF has its own targets however are still a part of WWF as an organization. This means that the purpose and values of WWF needs to be in line with the standpoints of OPF. At the same time, a big part of the communication of OPF will occur between other companies and their customers, which mean that the main message cannot go against the goal and purpose of the companies. Sustainability is in the core of WWF's organization, however as the study shows the companies have another structure. Their purpose is to sell and make profit, and sustainability becomes a goal amongst many others. This means that even though profit is not written as a target in the project of OPF, the strategy still needs to be coherent with profit being a central part of the companies' structure. The structure which the projects acts within obligate sustainability to be restricted by the terms of profit. In the interviews it was expressed that being "too green" was seen as a potential danger to some actors, although some actors also expressed the necessity in having trustworthy organizations taking on the role as a heavy stakeholder for sustainability. This can be interpreted as positive for WWF, since it gives them room to be more progressive with their sustainability message even though the result of this study show that it can mean being far from the hygiene level of the companies they want to collaborate with. My conclusion of this it that WWF should chose a more progressive cores to maintain their credibility and since it can be argued for to fill a requested position, however it might result in some companies experiencing it as being to farm the the image they wish to uphold.

The analysis also resulted in some potential guidelines for how to conduct communication about sustainability, which I would argue, also should be implemented in a communication strategy for OPF. Based on this, I argue that the message should be positive, simple and consensus oriented. To take health and trends in sustainability could also strengthen the message. A more sustainable diet, as WWF defines it, will however mean a reduction in meat, which showed to be a triggering topic. Sustainability, from the actor's point of view and as argued in previous research on sustainability, contain a number of topics which are harder to communicate, this is inevitable. The analysis showed that a conceivable way to approach this is to focus on the benefits of sustainability and wrap the "unwanted" messages into this communication. Based on the analysis I also argue that the communication of OPF should avoid ominous messages and moral pointers. And even though the project contains a large amount of scientific data and complex information, the project should find a way to translate this into an easy and digestible communication with a clear message.

6.4 Further implications for sustainability communication.

In this discussion, I want to stress that I study the possibilities of conducting communication about sustainability from the scientific field's perspective, which implies to place sustainability first. This bias, could be argued to affect the legitimacy of the study, however I want to argue that the specific angle is what provides the strength of the study. The actors state that they would be further ahead if sustainability was their only purpose. Although it is possible to see how their purpose is bound to profit, customers and, to a large extent, the system of neoliberalism. Their work with sustainability is highly limited to an anthropological perspective. Because of this that I argue for the importance of studying communication form the angle of sustainability. As mentioned in previous research, those who conduct sustainability communication are speaking on behalf of nature in a human-environment relationship, and to speak on natures behalf implies that the aim should be to improve for nature, to increase *sustainability*.

What became evident in the analysis was that the interviewed actors' communication differed depending on if the focus was on food or on sustainability. Food-communication often targeted the individual, through aspects as personal- health, taste and experience.

Communication about sustainability instead focused on global issues as carbon emissions and use of natural resources, speaking of a joint responsibility. Another thing possible to detect in the answers, was that food oriented communication targeting individual was experienced as more successful than communication focusing on global questions. A correlation can be made between the topics where food communication demands a change of individual behavior, while sustainability communication demands a change of a system. The answers also indicate that food and individual behavior are perceived as easier areas to communicate about.

A correlation could also be detected between this notion and my theoretical framework. Looking at the analysis of the answers, messages that could fit into Stoknes' strategies was perceived as easier to communicate. But what does that imply for all the topics that fall outside the scope to easily be communicated positively? What happens to melting glaciers and drowning polar bears when they fail to be fun, attractive, and conducive to healthy bodies? I would argue that this is a weakness and limitation in Stoknes' view of sustainability communication. It does not communicate on nature's behalf, it is adapted to communicate in relation to environmental boundaries on behalf of the economic system. I would argue that a strategy dependent on sustainability as profitable is an issue. The communication strategy fails to take on nature's perspective and is instead limited by the anthropological worldview.

This argumentation ends up in the conclusion that sustainability within food service will continue to compete with profit, the receptivity of the audience, and even trends, since it is conducted by humans, for humans. In my opinion, this is problematic from a sustainability perspective. The current system keeps consuming our carbon budget, I argue for the urgency for a climate disruption. Stoknes has chosen to approach the issue from within the system with a strategy that can be argued to provide a number of important merits. Climate change still needs to be approached from other, more disruptive angles. However, this study also reaffirms the merit of Stoknes' theories. They are in a way proven to be useful by people with extensive communicative experience. Maybe it is time to take a step beyond academia's focus on criticisms, that might sometimes hinder us from taking action, and take ideas as Stoknes' more seriously?

7 Conclusion

Communication about sustainability and food are complex areas that have been prone to avoid easy answers and fixed solutions – this study confirms this notion. The interviewed actors identified a number of communicative topics that they perceived as opportunities. Amongst these were simplicity, positive messages and health. In their answers also emerged a number of reoccurring communicative challenges, eg complexity, noise, ominous messages and moral pointers. Both the identified opportunities and challenges show great resemblance with the theoretical framework built on Stoknes' strategies. Patterns in the analysis revealed how some sustainability messages were experienced as easier to communicate, for example organic and health. A correlation between the patterns of opportunity and the main argumentation in Stoknes' *Social, Supportive and Story-based* strategies was possible to detect. The patterns of challenges showed to be in line with some of Stoknes' psychological barriers, and could also partly be explained by the critique brought up against the communication models presented in previous research. The critique centered around a simplified view of the receiver and a one-way communication, failing to take the receivers' behavior, values and subjective understanding into account. Purpose of communication, and purpose of the different companies also showed to have a strong effect on the communication strategy. In the discussion it became evident that the interviewed actors' have different views on both communication and sustainability, and viewed communication differently from how it is presented in the scientific field. To educate actors working with communication and sustainability could therefore be argued as a central future project. However, the analysis also showed that the actors within the food sector hold valuable knowledge on how to practically communicate about the do's and the don'ts, and an open minded exploration on possible collaborative efforts between sectors within the industry and academia could hold great potential for development of communication strategy for sustainability.

The argumentation behind the *Social strategy* and the *Signals strategy* was not present among any of the actors. An aspect that made these two strategies stand out from the rest where an emphasis on *dialogue* and *collective movement*. The reason why none of the interviewed actors perceived these strategies as tangible or promising was not transparent in the interview answers and a broadened understanding of this would make out a relevant area for further research. However, the strong focus on individual targeted communication, that became evident during the discussion, gives a hint of possible reasons. Even though the actors did not view the individual focus as an issue, obstacles like a simplified shallow view of the receiver, one-way communication, a lack of dialogue and collective movement could all be related to this. This created a gap in the actors' communication strategies, a gap that I argue could be mended with an implementation of the communication strategy of co-creation of meaning. How the implementation of a co-creation of meaning-approach would affect the outcome of sustainability communication in food service would be another interesting area for further research. The analysis also showed how the actors unknowingly communicate sustainability on a structural and collective level, even when arguing that individually oriented communication is easier. This notion is important to research further, in my opinion, since it is crucial to find ways to communicate the global and collective challenges. Regarding the WWF project One Planet Food, and other projects like it, the scientific knowledge is already there, it is the communicative formats that is lacking. It is therefore crucial that communication about sustainability is continuously and innovatively researched in order to successfully spread pluralism of engagements towards a more sustainable future.

References

Printed

- Aiking, H. & de Boer, J. (2004) Food sustainability Diverging interpretations. *British Food Journal*, Vol. 106 No. 5
- Bhaskaran, S., Polonsky, M., Cary, J., Fernandez, S. (2006) Environmentally sustainable food production and marketing Opportunity or hype? *British Food Journal*, Vol. 108 No. 8,
- Bendapudi, N., & Leone, R. P. (2003). Psychological implications of customer participation in co-production. *Journal of Marketing*, 67, 14–28
- Bogner, A. Littig, B. Menz, W. (2009) *Interviewing experts*. Palgrave Macmillan UK
- Brummett, B. (2014) Food and Communication: An Overview. *First Amendment Studies*, Vol. 48, No. 1
- Bryman, A. (2012) Social research methods. *Oxford University Press*, 4th ed pp. 44- 78.
- Cox, R. (2010) The study of Environmental Communication (Ch. 1). In *Environmental Communication and the Public Sphere*. SAGE publications.
- Craig, Robert T. and Hedi L. Muller (2007). *Theorizing Communication: Readings Across Traditions*. SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (Fourth (International Student Edition)). London: SAGE Publications.
- Delfi (2014) *Delfi foodservice guide*. Delfi MarknadsPartner AB
- Flick, U. (2009) *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. SAGE Publications Ltd; 4 edition
- Futerra (2015) *Sizzle, the new climate message*. Report. Futerra sustainability communications
- Garnett, T. (2014) What is a sustainable healthy diet? A discussion paper. Oxford, *Food Climate Research Network* (FCRN).
- Godemann, J. & Michelsen, G. (2011) *Sustainability Communication – An Introduction*. Springer.
- Häger, B. (2001) *Intervjuteknik*. Liber

- Moser, S. (2010) Communicating climate change: history, challenges, process and future directions. *Wires*. Vol 1 31-53
- Nitsch, U. (2000) *The Art of Environmental Communication*. In Lars J.Lundgren (ed)
- Oates (2006) *The RFF Reader in Environmental and Resource Policy*. Second edition
- Payne, Storbacka, Frow (2008) Managing the co-creation of value. *Academy of Marketing Science*. Springer. 36, 83–96
- Richert, A. (29-08-16) *Projektplan, One Planet Food*. Project plan. WWF.
- Röös E, Schütt E (2017) Evaluating Consumer Understanding of the Swedish Meat Guide - A Multi-layered Environmental Information Tool Communicating Trade-offs When Choosing Food. *Environmental communication journal*. 1-17
- Scarborough, P., et al. (2014) Dietary greenhouse gas emissions of meat-eaters, fish-eaters, vegetarians and vegans in the UK. *Climatic Change* 125, 179-192.
- Stoknes, P., E. (2015) *What We Think About When We Try Not To Think About Global Warming: Toward a New Psychology of Climate Action*. Chelsea Green Publishing
- van Dooren, C., et al. (2014) Exploring dietary guidelines based on ecological and nutritional values: A comparison of six dietary patterns. *Food Policy* 44, 36-46.
- van Loo, E. J, Caputo, V, Nayga, M. F, Verbeke. W. (2014) Consumers' valuation of sustainability labels on meat. *Food Policy* 49, 137–150
- Vermeir, I. & Verbeke, W. (2006) Sustainable food consumption: Exploring the consumer “attitude–behavioral intention” gap. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental ethics*. Springer 19, 169–194
- WCED (1987) Our common future. Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development. *G. H. Brundtland*, (Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Westhoek, H., et al. (2014) Food choices, health and environment: Effects of cutting Europe's meat and dairy intake. *Global Environmental Change* 26, 196-205.

Internet

KRAV (2016) *Marknadsrapport 2016*. (Translation: Market report)

Link: http://www.krav.se/sites/default/files/krav_marknadsrapport_2016_webb.pdf

Publisher weekly (30-05-2017) Article; *What We Think About When We Try Not to Think About Global Warming: Toward a New Psychology of Climate Action*.

Link: <https://www.publishersweekly.com/978-1-60358-583-5>

Appendix 1

Meal services in the public sector (Swe: Måltidsleverantörer)

Companies that provide meal solutions in the public sector makes out the first group of the mapping exercise. In Sweden the group consists of a few big companies, that compete with each other in procurements. The companies provide similar services and provide meals solutions to the Swedish healthcare and welfare including schools and hospitals. They have own restaurant within these facilities, where they put together menus and offer a variety of food. These companies also provide restaurants for businesses and industries.

Food wholesaler

Much like actors in meal solution a few but big companies make up the food wholesalers. Their role in the foodservice sector consist of delivering commodities to companies which cooks them. They deliver to meal solution companies and directly to restaurant. What was made clear in during the mapping was that these companies do not compose recipes or handle food solutions, but only deliver commodities based on other actor's requests.

Recipe websites

An important cornerstone of foodservice are the recipes, a blueprint of the ingredients of our meals. Recipes are a reflection of our time and are affected by trends, they can therefore be used to steers what individual consumers chose to cook. (*Recipe websites, open banks with recipes, funded by advertiser banners.*) Some websites focus on recipes, other include online grocery shopping. They are all built in similar ways, where the consumer can filter recipes based on a variation of dietary wishes.

Grocery delivery services (Swe: Matkasse)

Grocery delivery service was introduced in Sweden 2007, and is a concept were you subscribe to the service of getting groceries delivered to your home, with put together recipes and appurtenant ingredients. This is a service that has grown the last few years and around ten companies now offer this service I Sweden. (www.alltommatkassar.se, 070317) In difference to the recipe websites, the recipes are viewed as a part of the business idea and can only be accessed by buying the service.

Grocery stores

The concepts of grocery delivery service and recipe banks are something that grocery stores now also are starting to approach. The biggest grocery store chains in Sweden all provide some sort of grocery delivery services and a variety of free recipes on their websites, competing with the sheer actors providing these services.

Restaurants

A big part of the foodservice sector, are the many restaurants. The mapping however showed that the majority of the actors are on a small scale compared to the companies targeting the public sector. There are a few restaurant chains in Sweden, however most of them are fast food chains rather than restaurants.

Appendix 2

Quotes

1. Challenges

Is sustainability communication different from general communication?

1.1 *“Actually, there’s no big difference, [---] I think that there might have been a big difference before, but that people are now trying to avoid the boring stuff, and instead increase the feelings of lust, simplicity and joy of food”*

Inte så mycket faktiskt, [---] Sen tror jag kanske att man kan säga att det har varit en stor skillnad tidigare, men att man nu försöker få bort det torra så att säga, och istället få det mer lustfyllt, enkelt, matglädje

Complexity

1.2 *“Maybe you can’t be too technical in the way you communicate”*

man kanske inte får vara för teknisk i hur man kommunicerar.

1.3 *“Well, there’s a lot of areas that require a lot of knowledge to be able to communicate about them or to give guidance [---] So, it’s rather those specific questions that we have identified as unable to communicate because it’s too complicated. Then everyone turns a blind eye and says we don’t give a shit.”*

Alltså det finns nog många områden som kräver för mycket kunskap för att kunna kommunicera om det eller för att ge någon vägledning [---] Så det är snarare de frågor som vi ser att det här går inte att prata om för det är för komplicerat. Då blundar alla och säger att när vi skiter i det.

1.4 *“It’s not because we don’t want to, but rather because [the market, my note] is not ready yet, it’s sort of too complicated.”*

Det är ju inte för att vi inte vill, utan det är för att det inte riktigt är moget ännu, det är liksom för komplicerat.

Noise

1.5 *“And somehow there is so many messages. And we end up competing between all these good things.”*

Det blir så mycket budskap på något sätt. Och det blir som att man konkurrerar mellan alla de här goda tingen

1.6 *“We also talk about sustainable fish, certifications, etc. but it becomes somewhat subordinate because of all the white noise out there, it’s complicated to communicate everything to the same extent.”*

Sen pratar vi ju också hållbar fisk, märkningar, osv men det blir lite underordnat för det är brusigt där ute, det är svårt att kommunicera allting lika mycket.

1.7 *“then again, organic bananas might not be the most important issue”*

Det kanske inte är den viktigaste frågan med ekologiska bananer heller

Ominous message

1.8 *“I find it questionable, as [---] have been communicating, that non organic food is toxic. That is a good example of something we would not say, “That’s toxic, don’t eat it”.*

Men sen tycker jag att det är tveksamt med det här som/.../ har kört på, att oekologisk mat är giftig. Det är en typisk sån grej som vi inte skulle säga, ”Det är giftigt, ät inte det”.

1.9 *“to try to reach out with information saying that you have to save the world and stop eating meat! there is greater profit in trying to take the positive approach.”*

att försöka gå ut med information om att man måste rädda världen och sluta äta kött? Då finns det en större vinning i att ta det positiva varvet runt.

Moral pointers

1.10 *“We work with positive a lot, integrated in all communication [---] never moral pointers, never ever, never ever.”*

vi jobbar jättemycket positivt genomsyrat i all kommunikation [---] att aldrig pekpinna, aldrig någonsin aldrig någonsin

1.11 *“And really, no moral pointers. Or at least very few. I believe that we need to use some No No, otherwise we loose credibility.”*

Och verkligen inga pekpinna. Eller få pekpinna. Jag tror att man måste ha med sig lite no no’s annars blir det ju inte heller trovärdigt.

2. Opportunities

Simplicity

2.1 *“Make it simple, make it convenient for people to make a difference.”*

Göra det enkelt, göra det smidigt för folk att göra en skillnad.

2.2 *“So we want to make it easy for the customer to chose healthy and sustainable in the restaurant.”*

då vill vi göra det enkelt för konsumenten att göra det hälsosamt och hållbart i restaurangen.

Positive

2.3 *“So that it becomes a positive experience instead of you removing something.”*

Så att det blir en positiv upplevelse istället för att man bara tar bort någonting.

2.4 *“Our vision, to make everyday life simple and to inspire our customers to simplicity and joy in cooking [---] And hear you can include that, sustainability questions have become more and more frequent in this area the last years.”*

Vårans vision, att göra vardagen enklare och inspirera våra kunder till enkelhet och en glädje i maten. [---] Och där kan man kopplar på att, det senaste året har hållbarhetsfrågorna blir ju allt mer frekventa förekommande i de frågorna.

2.5 *“I guess that’s what we have seen in communication on a general level, that if you start in something positive, while creating a positivism around it and make it into something exciting, fun, tasty, simple and healthy, then it’s a lot easier.”*

det är väl det vi har sett i kommunikationen generellt att, om man utgår ifrån en positiv alltså skapar en positivism runt det och gör det till något, spännande, roligt, gott, enkelt, nyttigt, då är det mycket lättare

Health

2.6 *“Well it’s connected, eating more vegetables and less meat is good for your health and for the climate, so this becomes a really potent incentive”*

Det hänger ju ihop, att äta mer grönsaker och mindre kött är både bra för hälsan och klimatet så det blir en väldigt stark drivkraft.

2.7 *“It’s usually the personal wellbeing that is being most valued, so if you use that as a motivator but also that, ah right! it’s also good for the climate and my wallet”*

Det är ofta den egna hälsan man värderar högst, så om man har den som en motivator men sen också det att, juste det! är bra för klimatet och min plånbok.

3. Other findings

Meat

3.1 *“The vegetarian question divides. There is a strong vegetarian, vegan trend, but I would almost say that it’s somewhat polarized because there is also a massive opposition.”*

Vegetariska frågan splittrar. Det finns en stark trend för vegetariskt, veganskt men det är nästan så att jag skulle säga att det är lite polariserat för det finns också ett jättestark motstånd

3.2 *“That this is something that actually has a huge impact on our climate [---] that a lot of people love meat and that, you know, this is something we need to reconsider.”*

att här är någonting som faktiskt har en väldigt stor påverkan på vårt klimat. [---] att många faktiskt älskar kött och att näe, där måste vi ändå tänka till.

3.3 *“It is hard to get rid of the red meat [---] And it is not something that I am going to deny that we are a commercial company and first and foremost we want satisfied costumers.”*

Där är det svårt att få bort det röda köttet [---] Och det är ju inget jag sticker under stolen med att vi är ju ett kommersiellt företag och det är ju den här avvägningen att vi ska ha nöjda kunder

3.4 *“If we are talking with the school board then they would think it’s great that we’re working with vegetarian food. But if we approach the school kids and say “from now on there will be more vegetarian [---] then they won’t eat it. However, if we only say that this is a regular soup, they would be fine with it.”*

Talar vi om skolledningen så tycker de att det är jättebra att vi jobbar med vegetarisk kost. Men går vi ut och säger det till skolbarnen att nu har vi mer vegetariskt [---] då kommer de inte äta den. Däremot om vi bara säger att det är en vanlig soppa då kommer de äta den.

Trends

3.5 *“Well, certain topics feel old, things you’ve talked about before, like legumes, beans and lentils”*

Ja, vissa saker känns ju som gamla, som att man har pratar om tidigare, mycket om baljväxter, bönor och linser.

3.6 *“What’s perceived as healthy and what’s trendy can vary a lot”.*

vad som är hälsa och vad som är trendigt kan ju variera väldigt mycket

3.7 *“And when we spend thousands of working hours on something like that, it would be nice if would get some sort of media coverage, but it’s not what’s most important.”*

Och utifrån det att vi lägger tusentals arbetstimmar på något sånt så vore det ju kul om det gav ett medialt utfall, men det är inte det viktigaste.

Purpose of communication

3.8 *“I think that it’s connected with our history and our trademark to want to be greener and a force for good.”*

jag tycker det hänger ihop med vår historia och vårt varumärke att vilja vara grönare och godare.

3.9 *“What we market most frequently is to make it simpler for the costumers and to inspire [---] We don’t market it as sustainability.”*

Det vi marknadsför mest är ju att förenkla för kunderna och ge inspiration. [---] Vi marknadsför inte det som miljö

3.10 *“I think it’s a bit annoying because we’re so far away from what we should, or what we eventually will have to change.”*

tycker jag är lite irriterande för att jag tänker att vi ligger så långt ifrån vad vi borde, eller vad vi eventuellt kommer bli tvungna att förändra.

3.11 *“To include it in a weekly menu, or if there’s a specific occasion that we’re celebrating, world nature yada yada, those kind of days.”*

att man bakar in det i en veckomeny, eller om det är någon speciell dag som man firar världsaturblabla, såna typer av dagar.

3.12 *“avoiding the headline “eat more environmentally friendly” because that would intimidate people. Instead you start with a normal approach to later on include the environmental aspect. You have to be a bit sneaky.”*

inte ha rubriken ”ät mer miljövänligt” för då kan man skrämman bort folk. Utan man börjar med ett vanligt tilltal och sen kommer man in på miljöbiten. Man får vara lite trixig.

Target groups

3. 13 *“Our customers are conscious, a bit more educated than the average, have higher wages [---] So it’s pretty easy to reach out to them with this kind of product.”*

Våra besökare är medvetna. Lite mer utbildade än snittet, har lite högre lön, [---] Så det är ganska lätt att nå ut till dem med en sån typ av produkt.

3.14 *“We can create a proposal with a radically changed menu with a lot of environmental benefits, but the guest might not at all be so positive about such a rapid behaviour change.”*

Vi kan ta fram ett förslag med kraftigt förändrad meny för att nå miljöfördelar men det kanske inte alls gästerna tycker är så spännande att förändra sitt beteende så snabbt.

Profit vs sustainability

3.15 *“it might not always be the most profitable option for us to completely change the behaviour, and that’s probably the most challenging part, to change something that it profitable for us but maybe not that good for the climate.”*

det kanske inte alltid är det mest lönsamma för oss att förändra beteende helt och hållet, det är väl den svåra biten att förändra något som vi kanske ser är sämre för klimatet men ger en bra vinst för oss

3.16 *“If we only worked with the sustainability agenda we would be further ahead.”*

Skulle vi bara driva hållbarhetsfrågan skulle vi ju ligga längre fram.

3.17 *“And at that occasion we said, that ok, if bacon means so incredibly much for the guest [---] then we might have started off at the wrong place.”*

Och där vi sa att okej är det så att baconet betyder så otroligt mycket för gästen [---] då kände vi att nu har vi börjat lite i fel ände.

3.18 *“We focus a lot on the positive and are never ever rabid.”*

Vi fokuserar mycket på det positiva och vi är inte rabiata någonstans.

3.19 *“That’s why our hope is that we as a brand will be connected to certain values*

Därför är ju vår förhoppning att vi som varumärke ska vara kopplat till vissa värderingar