



Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Department of Urban and Rural Development

Master thesis, 15hp
Environmental Communication

Communication internally in LRF

- How the question regarding GMO have been communicate with LRF members

Information

University:	Sveriges Lantbruksuniversitet, SLU Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Department:	Department of Urban and Rural Development
Program:	Environmental Communication and Management
Author:	Fredrik Vieru
Title:	Communication internally in LRF: <i>How the question regarding GMO have been communicate with LRF members.</i>
Titel in Swedish:	Kommunikation internt i LRF– Hur frågan angående GMO har kommunicerats med LRF medlemmar.
Key words:	<i>Federation of Swedish farmers (LRF), communication, communities of practice, genetically modified organism (GMO), GMO policy</i>
Mentor:	Lars Hallgren? SLU, Department of Urban and Rural Development
Examiner:	Hans Hansen, SLU, Department of Urban and Rural Development
Examiner:	Lotten Westberg, SLU, Department of Urban and Rural Development
Course:	Practice and Thesis Work in Environmental Communication and Management
Course code:	EX0409
Level:	Advanced, level D
Credits:	15 hp
City:	Uppsala
Year:	2009

Abstract

An investigation of the Federation of Swedish farmers (LRF) and how their agenda and communication have addressed growing genetically modified organism (GMO). LRF is an interest organization for the rural industries with almost 170 000 individual members. Currently, no commercial GMOs is grown in Sweden. LRF has decided to investigate the potential benefits of growing GM crops in Sweden from the perspective of science and the precautionary principles in their GMO policy. LRF are now gathering information to help them address the GMO issue. Utilizing interviews with Stockholm LRF employees and one member the thesis examine how LRF have communicated their GMO policy about GMO internally in the organization with the two target groups; employees and members. To get the perspective of the two target groups in LRF the thesis using the theoretical concept of communities of practice. Communities of practice are a theoretical concept that is based on community where members can share knowledge within the community. Through this knowledge the member's can develop the communities' interest by common action through interaction with other members, or outside the community.

The power structure in LRF is centralized with the general assembly and LRF board deciding the policies. However, the members of LRF and other farmers has the freedom to choose to follow the GMO policy or not, although LRF has to follow the policy. The discussion regarding the GMO question in LRF is about the patent rights that are mostly owned by big companies. These companies give them an oligopoly situation on the market of GM crops, which has been misused on the global arena. The media are creating a situation from this misuse of GMO issue. The question regarding GMO has been a communication problem for LRF where both members that are against and those that are pro of GMO criticise the LRF policy about GMO and how GMO should be used. Lack of knowledge about GMO has been one issue where LRF not has succeeded to cover. The ambition has not been only to teach the members benefits GMO can give the members, but to give a broad base for the farmers' decision to use or not to use GMOs.

Acknowledgments

This thesis has been very interesting to write and have given me a lot of experience how an organization works that have many different actors involved. I would therefore like to thank everyone who helped me with the thesis. In particular, I want to thank my contact on LRF, Jan Eksvärd for ideas and feedback. He has taken the time to meet and answer questions and helped with meeting and people to contact for interviews. I would also like to thank the interviewee for their help. I want to thank Melissa McEwen for her support and encouraged feedback on the paper. Finally, I want to thank all my classmates in the program **Environmental Communication and Management**. The classmates did a really good job and I learned a lot from them. However, we didn't have resources we wanted for this thesis with no feedback or presentation tasks. The ECM had not the resources we needed for the learning, reflection and the knowledge, but we helped each other out were the teachers couldn't or wanted.

Stockholm, June 2009

Fredrik Vieru, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

Contents

1.	Introduction.....	1
1.1.	Background – Communicative dilemma	1
1.2.	Aim.....	1
1.3.	LRF - The federation of Swedish farmers	2
1.3.1.	LRFs structure	3
1.3.2.	LRFs target groups.....	3
1.4.	GMO.....	4
1.4.1.	GMOs legislation.....	5
1.4.2.	LRFs GMO policy	5
2.	Method.....	6
2.1.	Research method.....	6
2.2.	Interview techniques	6
2.3.	Limitation	7
3.	Theoretical background.....	8
3.1.	Theory as a method.....	8
3.2.	Communities of Practice	9
3.2.1.	Critics to communities of practice	11
3.2.2.	Applying communities of practice to LRF.....	12
4.	Discussion.....	12
4.1.	The interviewees interpretation regarding GMOs in LRF.....	12
4.1.1.	The power over GMO.....	14
4.1.2.	Politic in European Union and Sweden	15
4.1.3.	Lack of knowledge to the gen technology	15
4.1.4.	Internal communication in LRF regarding GMO.....	16
4.2.	LRFs National Assembly, 26-27 th may, 2009.....	17
4.2.1.	Discussion in the National assembly about LRF GMO policy	18
5.	Interpretation.....	19
5.1.	Analysis LRF and communities of practice.....	20
5.2.	Proposal for LRF and further communication in GMOs.....	21
6.	Conclusion	22
7.	References.....	23
8.	End notes	25
8.1.	Background information about the interviewee	25
8.2.	Question in the Semi-structure-interview	26

1. Introduction

This part investigates the communicative dilemma. The aim will be explained, and LRF background is brief shortly with their structure and target groups. GMO is explained and how it's connected to LRF and the GMO policy and other legislation

1.1. Background – Communicative dilemma

In communication it's important to let all people know they have a voice to interact and discuss with other people. Having an opinion is the most important value in communication. It's that value that will create the social interaction and builds up a learning process for new reflection for people's perspective. This knowledge gives the communication different strategies for solutions. To get a successful outcome of a solution it's good to adapt the right solution where the issue is located, which make the higher chances for a successful output. By getting everyone understands each other and given the opportunity to understand other perspectives people have, it gives people the knowledge by using communication. You will never know what the situation is and we must be prepared for all the different scenarios that may come in communication. The communication in the thesis has been focus on an environment aspect where communication have been used; an environment communication. Environment communication can be described the human relationship to the nature. The communication can be divided into many different field of study depending what the environment knowledge is as well the human relationships to the nature¹.

The communication in this thesis has been wide and not only focuses on the environmental aspects. The main goal in this thesis has been to look at an example of an question that is part of the environment and how it have been discussed with different interest and competence to see how the communication have looked like and what the outcome have results in. Deepening on the outcome the thesis will give the answer why it was so and a proposal what can be done to achieve better communication.

1.2. Aim

In this thesis I chose to do a communication thesis for the Federation of Swedish farmers, LRF, in Stockholm. While working with LRF Stockholm my main contact was Jan Eksvärd. Eksvärd worked earlier with three questions for LRF since 1992, sludge issue, organic farming and genetic engineering. Today Eksvärd's main tasks are head of sustainable

¹ Cox, Robert (2006) "*Environmental Communication and the Public Sphere*", p 12, Thousand Oaks. Sage Publications

development and expert in climate change question. I met Eksvärd several times while writing the thesis. Eksvärd came up with the idea about GMO that would be interesting to write a thesis about. The GMO question is on the agenda for LRF since the upcoming National assembly which is a central meeting LRF and is once a year and it's where the next year's activities for the organization are discussed². I chose the topic to learn about how GMOs were communicated for LRF with their employee and the members. LRF is an important spokesman for the business of rural industries. Rural industries are mainly small scale business based on agriculture, forestry and the open landscape³. LRF motto, according to Eksvärd, is to "*bruka utan att förbruka*" - use without consume⁴.

My aim in this thesis was to learn about the communication in LRF regarding GMOs. To study how LRF communicates, it's important to learn how LRF is organized. The purpose of this thesis was to interview employees in LRF about communication and communication objectives regarding GMOs. I have focused on the GMO question and LRF from a communication perspective. To study how LRF works, the theoretical concept of communities of practice will be used. I will try to answer two objective goals:

1. How does the internal communication work for LRF regarding GMOs?
2. Does LRF have communities of practice to reach the goal to share the knowledge with the members in LRF?

1.3. LRF - The federation of Swedish farmers

The federation of Swedish farmers, LRF, is an organization for rural industries. The organization is aimed mostly at landowners engaged in forestry and agricultural business⁵. LRF have 30 association businesses, mostly agricultural cooperatives. LRF has also almost 90 000 company members from 60 different industries. The rest are family members and other individual members in the business for rural industries⁶. Together, LRF has almost 170 000 members. This makes LRF the biggest organization in Sweden for rural industries where LRF's agenda is to create conditions good for business in the rural industries. LRF started a modernization at the same time Sweden joined the European Union. From 1995, Sweden went from nationally regulated market integration with the whole Europe

² Lrf.se (2007), "*Viktiga frågor för regionens bönder på riksförbundsstämma*", <<http://www.lrf.se/Regionalt/Malardalen/Pressmeddelanden/Viktiga-fragor-for-regionens-bonder-pa-riksforbundsstamma1/>>

³ Kryssaleif.nu (2004), "*Landsbygden behöver de gröna näringarna*" <<http://www.kryssaleif.nu/artikel.asp?artikelId=68&strukturId=4&arkiv=true>>

⁴ Eksvärd, Jan (2009), expert in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 29/4-2009

⁵ Lrf.se, "*About LRF*", <<http://www.lrf.se/In-English/>>

⁶ Eksvärd, Jan (2009), expert in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 29/4-2009

market. Since then, the global market has grown and the competition has increased in and between the countries. LRF is looking towards a modern countryside and be open-minded towards new ideas and technology. The adaption what is happening around the world and what LRF members ask are the other main tasks⁷. However, Sweden has changed much during the last ten years. The old Sweden had Swedish cooperative rural industries, owned by Swedish farmers. Today it's many countries that own businesses in Sweden⁸.

1.3.1. LRFs structure

To keep up what the members want and be able to know that happening, LRF is organized having 1,156 local clubs divided into 19 regions in Sweden⁹.

Each region has their *regional association* with delegates. The regional association is a regional board where delegates have been elected to represent the organization in their region¹⁰. The delegates of the regional association represent LRF in their *regional assembly*. The regional assembly is for LRF a regional meeting in the 19 regions where motions from the members are decided in the region. A motion, or a bill, is an official proposal to introduce a matter for consideration¹¹.

The motions that are accepted will later go to the *National assembly* for the organization which is once every year and is a central meeting for LRF. These 19 regions are electing 150 delegates for terms of 1 and 2 years to the *LRF board*¹². LRF board assignment is to decide and determine motions the members of the organization have proposed. The National assembly is the highest meeting in LRF for decision-making. It is where motions are handled, and were policy and guidelines are decided¹³.

1.3.2. LRFs target groups

What the organization did before was to influence the market. The influence was to use experts from LRF to communicate with consumers and policy makers. The problem was that the consumers were not open to the expert's beliefs because they don't want be taught how to live their life¹⁴. When LRF restructured they developed different communication strategies

⁷ Akeri.se, Svensk åkeritidning, (2008), "*LRF: Men bondförnuft som strategi*" - <<http://www.akeri.se/svensk-akeritidning/artiklar/lrf-med-bondfornuft-som-strategi>>

⁸ Kringstad Annichen (2009), chief of communication department LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 20/4-2009

⁹ Lrf.se, "*Lokalavdelningar och kommungrupper*", <<http://194.22.7.75/viarbetarmed/lokalavdelningar>>

¹⁰ Thefreedictionary, "*Regional association*", <<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/Steering+Committee>>

¹¹ Bookrags.com, "*Motion (democracy)*", <[http://www.bookrags.com/wiki/Motion_\(democracy\)](http://www.bookrags.com/wiki/Motion_(democracy))>

¹² Kringstad Annichen (2009), chief of communication department LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 20/4-2009

¹³ Eksvård, Jan (2009), expert in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 29/4-2009

¹⁴ Kringstad Annichen (2009), chief of communication department LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 20/4-2009

depending on the target group. The four target groups are the employees, members, policy makers, and the public:

- The employees are workers for LRF. LRF's task is to make them understand the purpose of LRF and engage them in their work. It is also important that the employees help LRF to reach others using targeting communication
- The members are the people that pay dues to LRF. LRF shares knowledge with members to help develop their companies and businesses.
- The policy makers are an external target group. LRF hopes to influence them to promote policies that open for rural industries to be supportive of sustainable development of society as a whole.
- The public target group is where the consumers are. LRF's communication strategy is to influence the public to choose Swedish products. This target group is diverse and has the three other target groups (the employees, members, and policy makers) which makes this group being external and internal in LRF.

There is now a greater focus to support the individual members than the big cooperation in LRF. It's a consequence of the modernization that has been in LRF when big cooperation members in LRF have received a reduced fee to LRF. It's from the individual membership fee LRF get most of the economic finance from¹⁵.

To follow up this greater focus LRF has on individual members, the thesis will focus on LRF's members regarding the question about GMO and how employees for LRF have been engaged in the GMO question to reach out with communication to their members.

1.4. GMO

GMOs, or genetically modified organisms are organisms whose genes have been artificially altered by humans by changing the metabolism. Metabolism is chemical reaction in all living organism to maintain their structure and other important elements for the organism to maintain life¹⁶. Using genetic engineering, or gene technology, the metabolism can be changed by inserting new sets of genes into the organism¹⁷. Genetic engineering can put in new genetic material from animals, plants, microorganisms or fungi into plants. This kind of genetic technology is used around the world to produce crops that have various benefits from pest

¹⁵ Kringstad Annichen (2009), chief of communication department LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 20/4-2009

¹⁶ Users.rcn.com (2003), "*Metabolism*",

<<http://users.rcn.com/jkimball.ma.ultranet/BiologyPages/M/Metabolism.html>>, footnote 20. Metabolism

¹⁷ Romerlabs.com, Romer Labs, "*Genetically Modified Organism*", <<http://www.romerlabs.com/gmo.html>>,

resistance to superior nutrition. Most of the commercial GMOs on the market today have been modified to be resistant against popular herbicides¹⁸.

1.4.1. GMOs legislation

In the European Union GMOs are governed by a common legislation which all the member states have to follow. The legislation allows member states to have their own regulations regarding GMOs. The purpose is to ensure a safe food protection is taken into account for the consumers. In Sweden the use of GMO requires authorization by the Swedish board of agriculture, which is an expert authority with the task to inform the Swedish Government about question regarding agriculture and food policy. The authority proposes regulation for the Government to decide. They also have the task to implement EU regulation in the Swedish national law¹⁹. The GMO is regulated mostly by the Environmental Code, which is a new section of the Swedish law system since 1999. The aim for the Environmental Code is to promote good and healthy environment and achieve sustainable development²⁰.

The Swedish board of agriculture is supposed to weigh different risks and benefits before approval is granted. The use of the approved GMO will be monitored and any unexpected effects that may occur have to be reported to the Swedish board of agriculture. In Sweden today there is no commercial farming of GMOs. Many Swedish farmers and consumers worry about the consequences of GM crops spreading into nature, where it could affect biodiversity and harm native flora and fauna which mean the Swedish national environmental quality goals is affected. The national environmental quality goals are 16 different goals that describe what can be done for the environment to let it become sustainable in the long term. All of the goals expect to be achieved before 2020²¹. A possible use of some herbicide tolerant GMOs are already supposed to affect three goals: A rich farmland, rich plant and animal life, and non-toxic environment²².

1.4.2. LRFs GMO policy

LRF GMO policy that was created 1997 and later in 2006, have six different principles of ground rules:

1. Perseverance: GMO must bring value to the society and benefit to humans, the human health, animals and the environment

¹⁸ Eksvärd, Jan (2009), expert in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 29/4-2009

¹⁹ Sjv.se (2005), "Om Jordbruksverket", <<http://www.sjv.se/omjordbruksverket.4.7502f61001ea08a0c7fff122625.html>>

²⁰ SFS, "Miljöbalk (1998:808)", <<http://www.riksdagen.se/webbnav/index.aspx?nid=3911&bet=1998:808>>

²¹ Swedish environmental protection agency (2008), "Miljömålen i korthet", p 3. CM-gruppen

²² Sustainability in Swedish agriculture (2007), SCB, jordbruksverket, Naturvårdsverket och LRF, "Hållbarhet i svenskt jordbruk", 2007

2. Care and ethics: GMO must take consumers and producers' ethical values into concern
3. Competitiveness: GMO must contribute to the profitability, growth and attractiveness within the rural industries
4. Coexistence rules: GMO must give farmers freedom to choose the production type they want
5. Labeling and transparency: GMO must reveal information about genetic engineering and its use
6. Disclaimer: when GMOs is used the farmer have the responsibility for property damage, environmental damage or economic injury

With the LRF GMO policy LRF have formulating their background:

“LRF saying yes to the use of various genetic engineering, both for tracking and processing materials for the production of GMOs, provided that GMO contribute to environmentally and economically sustainable development and does not affect the quality of human life”.

With this GMO policy LRF don't want to close the doors for the gene technology and therefore having an open view how it can give benefits in the future for the members to develop their business²³. However, on the National assembly 2009 the GMO policy where approved with changes and is now under developing stage for further adjustment which will be discussed later in the thesis.

2. Method

This part explains how the research was done for the thesis and how the information was gathered

2.1. Research method

The communicative aspect in LRF was my main focus. My communication with LRF has been primarily through interviews with employees and one members of LRF. I have also observed a picture of LRF's operations through participation on seminar and the National assembly meeting. I visited LRF six times between 15th April and 4th June 2009. It wasn't an internship, but rather a short study on a job-related environment.

I used a qualitative research method. A qualitative research method means that the data was collected from primary and secondary sources²⁴. Interviews, phone calls, mail and meetings on LRF were the primary sources. The secondary sources were taken from literature, lectures and the internet.

2.2. Interview techniques

²³ Genteknikpolicy (2006), "LRFs stämma 2006 och LRFs styrelse juni 2006", LRF

²⁴ Hallgren, Lars (2009), "Research methodology", lecture 17/3-2009, SLU

The main goal for my interviews was to gather information and analyze it and not to get the perfect interview. Most of the interview that was done used an open-ended method. That means the interview was opened up with a subject and the interviewee could continue the interview following the flow without limits²⁵. The interview was not limited to the question of communication regarding GMOs in LRF. I also gave the interviewees the opportunity to explain their relation to LRF and their experiences with communication and their knowledge to GMO.

I also used a semi-structure method, which means two things. First the questions that going to be asked the interviewee was written down on a paper where I follow the questions in an order on the paper. The second is that the interview was flexible so the interviewee could speak without the need to strictly keep to the question. That meant follow-up questions were used in the need for collecting relevant information. The interview question weren't revealed in advance to the interviewee, although they knew the topic and therefore knew what to focus on²⁶.

Interviews with the employees on LRF were conducted between 20th and 29th April 2009. The interview with Annichen Kringstad, chief of communication department, was 20th April, took 50 minutes, and was open-ended. The interview with Johan Taubert, chief press officer, was the 22th April and was 20 minutes using an open-ended method. The two later interviews were more semi-structure. Lena Johansson, internal communicator was interviewed 29th April for 30 minutes, and Jan Eksvärd, expert in LRF was interviewed that same day for 50 minutes. All these interviews were at the LRF office in Stockholm, and they all were voice recorded. One of the interviews was over mail. The mail interview was with Anders Lunneryd. Lunneryd is a LRF member and had been a member of the board of LRF regional association between 2004 and 2007 in the region LRF Väst. Lunneryd was the only interviewee that wasn't an employee for LRF.

A draft of the thesis was sent to the interviewees to give them an opportunity to provide feedback and comments, which contributed greatly to removing misunderstandings and clarifying information. I believe it was an important part of the thesis to let the communication be in practice to get feedback and comments on the thesis.

2.3. Limitation

²⁵ Sandström, Emil (2009), "*PRA methods*", lecture 26-01-2009, SLU

²⁶ Krag Jacobsen Jan (1993), "*Intervju: Konsten att lyssna och fråga*", Studentlitteratur, Lund

The methods I used were limited and therefore the aim what could be done become limited. I wasn't able to give a picture how LRF as a whole organization believe about GMO, due it would need more information from the members and employees. By focusing on internal communication between employees and members of LRF, communications about GMO were examined in the context of communication. The limit is that only a sample of employees was interviewed and the external context was not examined. The thesis will therefore only investigate how the communication in LRF concerning GMOs has worked from the employees view in LRF that have been interviewed. Only one member for LRF where interview. That limits the knowledge and interpretation what the members think about LRF and their view of GMO. However, the question regarding GMOs was discussed in the National assembly, a central meeting for whole LRF, which was in May 2009 where delegates in the LRF board representing the members.

GM crops can be created using many different methods. However, in this thesis GMOs will be simplified as one single concept comprising all genetic engineering of agricultural plants and animals.

Knowledge of GMOs varied greatly among the interviewees, some being experts and others being laymen.

The first draft of the thesis that was sent out to the interviewees had the focus both on the internal and external communication in LRF, and all of the four target groups. In this final version I limited to the internal communication in LRF with the employees and the members, and how the communication has worked with the question regarding GMO from their perspective. However, using the GMO question as an example of how LRF communications in other areas might be developed with further discussions, dialogues, and meetings.

3. Theoretical background

The theoretical approach for the thesis is explain deeply, and how it can we applied on the investigated area

3.1. Theory as a method

Theories have different purpose. In this thesis an abductive method was used to test the theory in use. The abductive method is different from the inductive and deductive. In an inductive method observation are creating the theory to analyze the results and explain why something from the observation is like that. The deductive is to take a theory and test it on something to see if it works or not²⁷. The abductive method is a third way to relate theory and empirical

²⁷ Hassler, Björn (2006), "Internationell Environmental Institution", Seminar. 1/12-2006

data in a scientific work. The abductive method gives the opportunity and possibility to develop the empirical application area and adjust and improve the theory in the process.

For that reason, the thesis is based on participating, observation, and four interviews with LRF employees and one member of LRF. The arguments and discussion using an abductive method, it's important to have a theoretical basis²⁸. I have used the theoretical concept of communities of practice.

3.2. Communities of Practice

Communities of practice have existed as long people have learned from each other. It can be at the home, school, work, in a country or just from sharing hobbies and interests. It can also be in a classroom, at the school, at a department for an organization, or for international development between countries that have same interests. We visit many communities of practice under a life time and you can be part of one without knowing it. Communities of practice have a lot of different definitions used by many different social scientists, but the concept was first used for theories about learning²⁹. The theory was founded 1978 by the work of Lev Vygotsky which was concerned by communities and how people learn inside them³⁰. In 1991 the work was brought up by Etienne Wenger to explore an alternative theory of learning. The introduction of Wenger's definition of what communities of practice is, communities started to be examined in many different areas. The concept of communities of practice doesn't see everything that is called community as a community of practice³¹. For instance is neighborhood a community, but not a community of practice. The reason is that because communities of practice have three crucial elements³²:

The first element is *the domain*. The domain means a community of practice doesn't need to be with only friends or family, or especially people within a group that may have some kind of connection. People within a group can never be sure which people belong to the group. But everyone in the domain in a community of practice shares an identity with the same interest. The members in the communities of practice know who the other members

²⁸ Hasseludden, Yasuragi (2008), "*Sinnenas betydelse för ett varumärke*", bachelor thesis, p.11

²⁹ Ewenger.com, Etienne Wenger, "*Communities of practice: a brief introduction*", <<http://www.ewenger.com/theory/>>

³⁰ James V. Wertch, Pablo Del Rio, Amelia Alvarez (1995), "*Sociocultural studies of mind*", p37, Cambridge university press

³¹ Ewenger.com, Etienne Wenger, "*Communities of practice: a brief introduction*", <<http://www.ewenger.com/theory/>>

³² Wenger E, McDermott R, & Snyder W (2002), "*Cultivating Communities of Practice*", Harvard Business School Press

are and can therefore interact with each other easily. This gives the members in the domain the value of the expertise from other members in the community of practice.

The second crucial element is *the community*. Here the member will need to have an interest in the domain and engage in community activities and discussions. However, the community doesn't need to be a place where the members have the same job, or visiting the same websites because that will not create a community of practice. In a community of practice it's important to help other members and share knowledge of the interest the community has. In that case relationship can more easily be built up between the members through interaction in the community and learn from each other. Members doesn't need to be around all the time but need to discuss the community interest which will give the knowledge and education to reflect and to develop further understanding of the community of practice

The third and last element is *the practice*. In a community of practice the members don't need to have an interest in everyone else in the community. The important thing is to keep the community on feet and help with development. Resources, tools, experience and problems are shared by the members. It takes always more than to just have interaction with the members in the community of practice. It's very important to be engaging with other members' observations of knowledge. It's from the members of the community that gives the strength where learning from each other becomes necessary to fulfill the community of practice³³.

The theory isn't always called communities of practice. In some organization it can be called for example "learning networks" or "practice learning"³⁴. Even if the community using the three elements that builds up the communities of practice, it doesn't mean they all look the same. Some community of practice has administrations group that having a responsibility to take care of the community and the members, or only the members that have the responsibility. Meeting for the community could be in the same room, or during an online meeting. They may be local or global and large or small. The community can be one organization or many together. It can be community that has support from the members with finance. It can also be completely independent from finance if the community doesn't have a budget.

³³ Ewenger.com, Etienne Wenger, "*Communities of practice: a brief introduction*", <<http://www.ewenger.com/theory/>>

³⁴ Practicelearning.org.uk, "*Welcome to the Social Work Development Website*", <<http://www.practicelearning.org.uk/>>

3.2.1. Critics to communities of practice

Many organizations have adopted this concept of theories of practice because knowledge is very critical for them, and that is what communities provide the organization with. The focus will be on the members and structure of the organization that enables the learning. This gives them knowledge and the members have a sense of collective responsibility to develop what is best for the organization. That gives the members the type of learning style to participate in the communities of practice. The knowledge can then be use to create and share knowledge with other members, or outside the organization³⁵.

However, some critical views say that focus on communities of practice is taking away from more important concerns in the organization. The concept masks other tensions within the common objectives the organization has with the community of practice. Community of practice should try to keep up with the common interests. If a member and an employee in an organization gains knowledge by learning, they will develop themselves and provide knowledge to their organization. However, they both have different interests, which may lead to competition that impedes them from helping each other³⁶.

The GMO question will stand as an example of how the knowledge from learning and development can lead to competition. Knowledge is critical in communities of practice and how knowledge will be received by different actors can become complicated. The knowledge about GMOs can be between an employee in an agriculture organization with expertise about GMO and a farmer which is a member for the organization that have an interest in GMOs, but no knowledge of their risks and benefits. Conflict can therefore arise regarding how GMO should be used in agriculture. If looking from a natural science perspective, the problem is that the GMO pollen can be spread very far, perhaps to farms that don't want it. Policy interventions can be done, such as having a required buffer distance for how far away the growing for GM crops should be grown from organic crops. The employee in the agriculture organization, that has the expertise about GMOs, needs to have better contact with the farmer that is a member and give the needed knowledge about GMOs. In communities of practice contacts between people is given and the knowledge becomes clearer to understand for all. However, this does not always work in practice. It could emerge

³⁵ Ewenger.com, Etienne Wenger, "*Communities of practice: a brief introduction*", <<http://www.ewenger.com/theory/>>

³⁶ Liedtka J (1999), "*Linking competitive advantage with Communities of Practice*", Newspaper Management Inquiry, page 7

separation between farmers against GMOs and farmers that see opportunities with GMOs which will lead to conflicts and a decreased communication³⁷.

3.2.2. Applying communities of practice to LRF

Wenger describe these three bounded elements together as when the group of members starts to share expertise and passion for their community. That can create strategy and generate new business. It can spread the best knowledge in the community and solve problems internally and externally³⁸. Using the theoretical concept of communities of practice to LRF, LRF would be the community sharing information between their members and employees.

For instance, a problem arise that need to be solved in the community about GMOs when different opinions about GMOs exist between members. To work out a communication strategy, the employees and the members would need to interact and share the knowledge and experience through the local clubs, region assembly and the National assembly. The question about GMO would be discussed from employees and members experience and expertise. It would work to access knowledge about GMO and things are available for the members and the employees³⁹. However, an organization as LRF with many members, it would be impossible to know all the members in the domain and it would be tough to find one single way to communicate and share practical knowledge about GMO to all members.

This was an example of GMO and the problematic with the question would look like in LRF from communities in practice view. To see how the LRF have communicate the question regarding GMO, the internal communication through interviews with employees, a member and summarizing from the National assembly meeting about LRF GMO policy will be analyzed.

4. Discussion

This part is where the gathered information is explained and the discourse about LRF and GMO

4.1. The interviewees interpretation regarding GMOs in LRF

³⁷ Oreszczyn and A.B. Lane (2006), “*Farmer Communities of Practice and High Tech Futures*”, <http://oro.open.ac.uk/5470/1/rural_futures_paper3.pdf>

³⁸ Wenger E (2000), “*Communities of Practice and Social Learning Systems*”. *Organization*, Vol7(2), p.225-246

³⁹ Ewenger.com, Etienne Wenger, “*Communities of practice: a brief introduction*”, <<http://www.ewenger.com/theory/>>

Lena Johansson, internal communicator on LRF, explained that the communication is very important for LRF in all different areas, mainly because it affects LRF's reputation with the consumers and members⁴⁰.

Jan Eksvärd, expert on LRF, said that GMOs might be beneficial for business. Science, however, has not proven genetic engineering is without risks⁴¹. LRF has therefore developed policy with six precautionary principles is to be sure no damage will occur when activity that may harm the nature or the health of human is in use⁴². Eksvärd explained that in the middle of the nineties LRF had five seminars on GMO which was well attended because Eksvärd understood that the audience that visited the five seminars thought GMO was something new, exciting and frightening. LRF's policy about genetic engineering was later decided in 1997. Eksvärd continue to explain that the LRF board decided that a genetic engineering committee (GTK) would be created to follow the development. Due to comments throughout later on Sweden it was important clarify positions regarding GMOs; LRF's National assembly adjusted its policy in 2006. The GTK decided to develop information and educational material about GMOs to use to educate members of LRF. Eksvärd clarified that LRF didn't take own initiative to distribute this knowledge. But rather that adult educational association (Vuxenskolan) and the members would seek it out themselves⁴³.

Johan Tabuert, chief press officer on LRF, believe that today LRF has no direct communication strategies about how LRF should work with the GMO question⁴⁴. However, the question about GMO was discussed at LRF regional assembly in region Väst. In the autumn of 2008, region Väst arranged a seminar to discuss GMO because many LRF clubs sent motions regarding establishing GMO free zones⁴⁵. One such motion was approved by LRF Väst's region assembly and was forwarded to the National assembly. Under the circumstances the motion wanted stricter rules how GMO should be used, and that LRF have a strict GMO policy⁴⁶. The motion regarding the GMO free zone was brought up to LRF at the National assembly, but the motion was not passed through. Anders Lunneryd, a member of LRF and have struggle for GMO free zone, said it was because LRF didn't want a conflict

⁴⁰ Johansson, Lena (2009), internal communicator in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 29/4-2009

⁴¹ Eksvärd, Jan (2009), expert in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 29/4-2009

⁴² Genteknikpolicy (2006), "LRFs stämma 2006 och LRFs styrelse juni 2006", LRF

⁴³ Eksvärd, Jan (2009), expert in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 29/4-2009

⁴⁴ Taubert, Johan (2009), chief press officer in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 22/4-2009

⁴⁵ Motion: LRF mot GMO (2008), "För LRF mot GMO", Västra Tunhem – Vänersnäs LRF – avdelning

⁴⁶ Motion Nr: Väst 3 (2008), "LRF's Hållning i GMO-frågan", Västra Tunhem - Vänersnäs, Västerlanda, Stångenäset samt Spekeröd – Ucklum

with industries interested in GMOs⁴⁷. However, Eksvärd dismissed this accusation that LRF have no interest together with industries with GMO interests and no such boundary have never existed⁴⁸.

Johansson on LRF, pointed out that while Sweden may already grow enough food and thus not have a high need for GMOs, some have the opinion from a global point of view GMOs have the potential to solve many problems. Considering the potential to develop crops with improved characteristics that could improve yields in countries that need more food, Johansson believe from her own statement that LRF generally cannot say absolutely no to genetic engineering⁴⁹.

However, Eksvärd believe this question how genetic engineering should be used is too broad and complicated for people that don't have the expertise about GMO to believe why it's good or not. There is no benefit with GMO that can provide any sort of food security for the consumers or economic benefits for their members in Sweden. Eksvärd think that the majority of Swedish consumers are still against GMO⁵⁰. A reason for that, Johansson believe it's the power issue of who owns the patent rights and monopolies of GMOs, and the political issues relating to this⁵¹.

4.1.1. The power over GMO

About the power issue regarding GMO, Eksvärd describes the situation that there are large transnational companies with patents for GM crops. Over 90 percent of GM corn is owned by one single company, Monsanto's. Eksvärd therefore believes this situation has serious implications and is concerned with the power the company has over the food chain from farm to table. A monopoly allows individual companies to have significant power to determine prices and sale conditions for fertilizer, plant protection, and seed. Eksvärd is therefore worry that this is forcing individual farmers to become tractor drivers for large companies. This situation may disturb the dynamism, diversity, and development of the rural industries. Patents may also hamper innovation in genetic engineering itself. Eksvärd also thinks this makes a worry and uncertainty among consumers about GMOs: both their potential effects on humans and the environment and the affects of patent monopolies. It becomes mistrust in authorities handling GMOs. Eksvärd believes that gene technology and the power structure are grouped by the public into one single issue, which clouds the debate. But Eksvärd pointed

⁴⁷ Lunneryd, Anders (2009), members of LRF, Mail interview, 9/5-2009

⁴⁸ Eksvärd, Jan (2009), expert in LRF, Meeting LRF Stockholm, 2/6-2009

⁴⁹ Johansson, Lena (2009), internal communicator in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 29/4-2009

⁵⁰ Eksvärd, Jan (2009), expert in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 29/4-2009

⁵¹ Johansson, Lena (2009), internal communicator in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 29/4-2009

out that this is connected to the legislation about GMO and how European Union's legal framework for GMO works.

4.1.2. Politic in European Union and Sweden

Eksvärd confirm that the European Union's legal framework on GMOs has been a problem for LRF. When European Union makes decision to verify and approve GMOs, the framework should be based on scientific examination of environmental and health aspects. Consumers and producers should feel that they are secure and can choice what they want to buy and produce. Eksvärd however, said that this has not worked with European Union's legal framework because of the political process which European Union has within and between countries.

Eksvärd gave an example that if countries like France, where all regions in the country have decide to be free from GMOs, the Minister of Agriculture of France will therefore say no to GMO. Eksvärd verify that these assessments are only made for political rather than scientific reasons.

In Sweden the legal framework for GMO is followed by the Swedish board of agriculture. They have a responsibility to make scientific assessments of GMOs and how the regulations should look like. The Swedish board of agriculture has the task to identify and decide the cultivation distances for GM crops in order not risk to pollinating organic crops. However, this has become a problem because distances have been determined without any basic data and from Swedish circumstances and neither organic farmers or LRF satisfied. Eksvärd continues and pointed out that this has led to more disagreements on the arrangements for GMOs in Sweden.

Eksvärd ends saying this have currently perceived LRF being pro-GMO by consumers and members because they haven't said no to GMO⁵². It has also been a lack of knowledge regarding the genetic technology.

4.1.3. Lack of knowledge to the gen technology

Annichen Kringstad, chief of the communication department on LRF, said that LRF are trying to examine potential benefits of GMOs and not closing the doors. Kringstad state that LRF is a broad organization with many members from different rural industries. All the members come from different background, which makes it difficult to know what the target audience believes and wants. That's why Kringstad thinks that LRF cannot say everyone

⁵² Eksvärd, Jan (2009), expert in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 29/4-2009

should produce without GMOs, because LRF believes that the individual farmers and businesses should decide⁵³.

Eksvärd pointed out same thing and said the farmers should have a choice to grow GMOs or not, because as individual farmer you should be able to choose what to produce⁵⁴.

Johan Tabuert on LRF confirms that LRF are an open organization and open with information. LRF circulate in 17 events every day in media. Taubert verify that LRF appears around 6000 times in different media channels like newspaper, radio and TV spots⁵⁵.

However, Johansson on LRF said that GMO question haven't been treated properly by the Swedish media. She believes that the media has used scaremongering and portraying the GMO issue as being black and white, with GMOs all being bad⁵⁶. Eksvärd brings up an event when a documentary that was shown on Swedish television in September 2008, showed how a big transnational company, Monsanto's, exploits their patent rights to different GM crops. The opinion after the documentary in Sweden was that GMO was something bad for both agriculture and consumers and polarized the debate even more. After the documentary motions came in from LRFs regional assembly demanding stricter rules of GMO and GMO free zones. The GMO policy which LRF adjusted 2006 become questioned and made communication about GMO both more important and more complicated for LRF.

Eksvärd thinks therefore that LRF has not managed to distribute GMO education material for seminars and meetings developed following LRFs GMO policy 1997. He also believes that the media have interpreted different LRF's GMO policy as being too lax and the alleged errors about LRF statement. Eksvärd believe that this has led to consumers and their members to perceive that LRF doesn't care about how GMOs are handled or doesn't know about LRFs precautionary principles in the GMO policy⁵⁷.

4.1.4. Internal communication in LRF regarding GMO

Kringstad on LRF said that it's important that the messages LRF sends out from the organization are the same as those LRF are communicating inwards. In an interview with LRF Federal, Lars-Göran Pettersson, Pettersson explain that LRF having dialogues through meeting and talking with their members in engaging them to help LRF develop further in

⁵³ Kringstad Annichen (2009), chief of communication department LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 20/4-2009

⁵⁴ Eksvärd, Jan (2009), expert in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 29/4-2009

⁵⁵ Taubert, Johan (2009), chief press officer in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 22/4-2009

⁵⁶ Johansson, Lena (2009), internal communicator in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 29/4-2009

⁵⁷ Eksvärd, Jan (2009), expert in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 29/4-2009

local, regional and global areas. That's why LRF using a long term communication strategy with the messages to know what the members of LRF want from them⁵⁸.

But the challenge with the GMO question, Kringstad believe is that while some members have a negative opinion of them, some members want to explore the opportunities that GM crops. Other farmers worry that if these crops were grown, they could contaminate their non-GM crops.

Kringstad believe that LRF has struggled to communicate their GMO position, both internally and externally. However, the chief of LRF communication department post has been a high turnover position because the LRF board hasn't been happy with the results. Kringstad reply that LRF communication strategy has therefore been restructured many times to fit the ever-changing terms and markets for the rural industries. Because of globalization and consolidation, Kringstad describe it has become more complicated divide the constituency into four target groups. The most important communication channel for LRF, Kringstad said their journal "Land Lantbruk", a member magazine that comes out once a week. Reading this journal, the members examine what LRF is doing really closely, and it is also read in the national press. But Kringstad believe the interpretation from media and the target group members and consumers varies and the internally communication for LRF often substantially differ from what is communicational externally⁵⁹. Eksvärd confirm that it exist members in LRF that are against GMOs and others are not. But Eksvärd feels that LRF hasn't been successful in addressing the needs of either group⁶⁰.

Kringstad comment that LRF GMO policy going to be discussed at the LRF National assembly, between 26-27th may 2009.

4.2. LRFs National Assembly, 26-27th may, 2009

In LRFs National assembly 2009, it was 38 reports from 19 regions. The report where discussed by 145 delegates in the LRF board that decided to approve or reject approaches for the reports⁶¹.

Four of the 19 regions brought up proposals to push for GMO free regions. The regional association of Dalarna, Gävleborg, Värmland, and Väst demanded that the LRF board urgently adjust LRFs policy about GMOs⁶².

⁵⁸ Akeri.se, Svensk åkeritidning, (2008), "LRF: Men bondförnuft som strategi" - <<http://www.akeri.se/svensk-akeritidning/artiklar/lrf-med-bondfornuft-som-strategi>>

⁵⁹ Kringstad Annichen (2009), chief of communication department LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 20/4-2009

⁶⁰ Eksvärd, Jan (2009), expert in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 29/4-2009

⁶¹ LRF riksförbundsstämma 2009, Tryckeri E-print

The report 16 on the National assembly was about LRF GMO policy and motions how the policy should be change by approve or reject the five approaches that were decided to be discussed for LRFs GMO policy. The five approaches, which later in the meeting become a sixth, were to:

1. approve the demand that the LRF board going to look over their GMO policy, especially about beekeeping and the question about GMO free zones
2. approve the demand that the LRF board have the mission to work out a GMO neutral basis of knowledge for the members and the consumers
3. approve the demand that the LRF board working so Sweden adopt more clear buffer distance where GM crops is grown
4. approve the demand that the LRF board working for so patent and competitive business not limit the diversity in the Swedish agriculture in the future
5. reject the motion that Sweden should become a GMO free zone⁶³.

4.2.1. Discussion in the National assembly about LRF GMO policy

Paul Christenson, LRF Väst, said during the meeting that there were differences of opinion in his region. However, there was general agreement that patents and possible anti-competitive business practices in the GMO industry are problems. Other question was about GMO free zones. Christenson understood that many members are worried that their organic production might be contaminated by the spread of GMOs, but thinks that it is questionable to close the door on all future GMO production in the entire region.

Emil Petersson of LRF Sydost, agreed, and said that there is a risk of losing competitiveness on GMOs. The question is not whether GMO will come to Sweden, but when it will come. Petersson also thought that the idea that Monsanto was a dangerous monopoly was unreasonable. He believes that increased demand for GMOs will increase the investment of other companies. Petersson demand rejection for the first and the third approach.

John Enander, LRF Ungdom, said that they have a precautious positive attitude to GMOs. However, he said there is an uncertainty with GMOs and that's why LRF must take an active role to seek answers to the issues of GMOs. LRF Board is too passive in the GMO issue and Enander therefore called for a new approach; the sixth approach:

⁶² Styrelsens för region Väst yttrande (2009), "*Genteknikpolicy*", Motion nr Väst 1, Värmland 2, Dalarna 1, och Gävleborg 2

⁶³ LRF riksförbundsstämma 2009, p. 155, Tryckeri E-print, 2009

6. approve the demand that the LRF board working for more experimental GMO growth so more knowledge about GM crops under Swedish growing conditions, and take an active part of the experimental results

The new sixth approach was comment by Christenson, LRF Väst. Christenson said it was wrong using experimental growth with GMO when the rest of the world having it and mostly just causing more destruction than benefits. Christenson believe it's the markets task to give the knowledge and not LRFs. The new sixth approach was therefore rejected by Christenson.

However, Enander reply to this answer with the comment that it's important LRF sending out right message and takes a responsibility for the consequence GMO may give. Enander don't want to see LRF as a passive actor and only wait what GMO gives in the future, and that's why experimental GMO growth is important to seek knowledge

Bengt Olov Gunnarsson of Lantmännen said that Swedish regulations is unclear to the protection buffer distances for GMO crops, which makes it difficult to conduct trials of GMO crops safely.

Eva Karin Hempel, LRF board Director, thought that the rules that exist today in Sweden with 50 meters buffer distance for GM corn and 3 meter for GM potatoes, is too weak. Hempel describe that other country in Europe having a more far distance on 200 meter for GM corn. Hempel suggest that this is what Sweden also should have and when more knowledge about GMO is gathered, the buffer distance can be reduced if necessary.

Petersson, LRF Sydost disagree with the idea to rise the buffer distance because it will be complicated to change the distance later. Petersson therefore believe that approach number three about clearer buffer distance with GM crops should be rejected⁶⁴.

The discussion on the National assembly about LRFs GMO policy took approximately 30 minutes. All of the six approaches where approved by the LRF board⁶⁵. The approach one and three had a voting where the 145 delegates that were present in the meeting could approve, reject or refuse to vote, although they both where approved.

5. Interpretation

⁶⁴ LRFs National assembly 2009, Sånga-Säby, 27/5-2009

⁶⁵ Lrf.se (2009), ”LRF-stämman 2009: GMO vållar debatt” <<http://www.lrf.se/regioner/varmland/nyheter1/lrf-stamman-2009-gmo-vallar-debatt/>>

This part is where the theory is used to analysis the discourses about GMO and LRF. The authors own interpretation and knowledge is used to explain the communicative phenomena

5.1. Analysis LRF and communities of practice

The first element in communities of practice is the domain. LRF's domain is the members and employees. The members and the employees belong to LRF directly and are the internal groups. The members pay the memberships fee and get benefits being members. The employees get paid being workers for LRF and do what LRF believes is right. LRFs employees also have the skill, expertise and interest to help LRFs members. This creates a huge domain where LRF is the central spot to spread out the knowledge to the members. According to Annichen Kringstad in LRF, the main channel for communication to the members is the journal "Land Lantbruk". I believe this could be the main domain for LRF to gather all the interests and identities the organization has. It was explained by Kringstad that this journal provides published information that everyone can use to share and discuss about the organization. I also believe it has to be a central spot where knowledge can be gathered.

However "Land Lantbruk" doesn't provide the intellectual knowledge to give the members opportunity to be more "expert" for instance in GMO because it's still a journal where everyone should be able to read about short general news what is happening in LRF and the rural industries. LRF would need something else to provide the knowledge for the members about GMOs in education methods.

The second element is the community. The members and employees have both an interest in the LRF. As the theoretical concept proposed, the community isn't a specific place where both these groups have same job, interests, or business. LRF members are spread out in Sweden. Employees are also spread in local clubs and regions in Sweden. LRF has a structure where the National assembly is the highest decision-making bodies. Its here delegates are elected from the regions to represent the interest for the members.

However, I believe the member's interest in the question regarding GMO hasn't been present in the National assembly until the latest National assembly meeting where stricter rules for GMO where approved. But even that, the members that are pro and against GMO haven't been able to communicate and this have increased the tension between LRF members regarding GMOs.

The report about LRF GMO policy under the National assembly 2009 I believe it was three topics that were discussed where it exist different opinions:

- whether the patents and monopolies for GM crops will be a issue in the future for GMO
- whether LRF should have experimental GMO growth to gather knowledge
- How the buffer distance for GMO should look like

The power of patents and monopolies on GM crops creates concern for the members, while LRF might have concerns about the power of monopolies in the GMO industries; LRF is not against GMOs themselves.

LRF believes that GMOs might represent a new opportunity to develop the rural industries further and gives business advantages for farmers. To say no to something that the members and consumers might get benefits from would only damage LRF and their view of LRF being an open and democratic organization. However, this hasn't worked for LRF when the members have proposed a stricter GMO policy in the organization, and members that are pro believe LRF should be more open for GMO and the benefits it can give in the future.

In the end LRF as an organization have get both these members groups against them when communication have become a lack of knowledge about GMO and what LRF wants with it.

The final element for communities of practice is the practice. By helping LRF members with benefits to develop their businesses, LRF also gains as an organization in reputation and expertise. Members can get the expertise from the employees of LRF to develop themselves and their businesses from. LRF get feedback and the practical knowledge how the members developing process are tailored to them. The issue with GMO is that GMO isn't in use in Sweden. No input from LRF is used to encourage and educate the members about GMO, and therefore no output with knowledge to LRF is received back. Once again a lack of knowledge about GMO potential and disadvantage is highlighted. With no communication about GMO, the media is the main source for the members, where the GMO is threatening simpler that creates a polarization in the question.

5.2. Proposal for LRF and further communication in GMOs

So far LRFs communication hasn't worked as it should regarding GMO, and the knowledge about GMO and LRFs attitude for GMO has been interpreted differently depending on the audience. LRF has not been so successful at developing this common relationship. LRF has a responsibility to use more resources to bring out knowledge and not just wait until GMO becomes a hot debate in the media before acting. To just communicate about GMO and having an open view haven't worked.

My proposal for LRF is to develop the knowledge what the members want with GMO, but also give members the expertise LRF has. LRF should have done what LRF's genetic engineering committee decided in 1997, but actually given the opportunity to publishing information, having meetings, seminars, or other kinds of discussion about GMOs. This would more likely clarify the issue and satisfy LRF and their members. If it would work turn the wheels back to find the problems members had about GMO and conduct a deep discussion about GMOs, today's division and lack of knowledge would look different. LRF should not only teach about GMOs and learn about attitudes towards it, but to find solutions that satisfy the members LRF are representing in the rural industries, and having dialogue between members with different views on GMO.

The sixth approach in the National assembly that was approved by the LRF board to work for more experimental GMO growth so more knowledge about GM crops in Swedish conditions can be evaluated, is what I think is really important. This will not only let the LRF be able to give the members the results, but also give LRF the knowledge they need to reflect and learn from. Hopefully in the future LRF can move forward with or without the use of GMOs and still be a democratic and open organization what it is today.

6. Conclusion

GMO question has been a challenge by LRF interviewed employees to communicate. Lack of knowledge to educate the members about GMO has been one reason. The question regarding GMO in LRF has been misinterpreted by the members. Overall, the members have the impression that LRF is pro-GMO and doesn't care about the impact GMO could have. This highlights a communication challenge for LRF. However, in the National assembly 2009 LRF GMO policy was discussed and all the six approaches to adjust the GMO policy were approved by the delegates. However, the rejection for Sweden being a GMO free zone means the doors for GMO are still open for LRF. Optimism to use better communication for LRF to the members that having different opinions about GMO so an exchange with knowledge what GMO is and develop further understanding about the genetic technology in LRF.

7. References

- Akeri.se, Svensk åkeritidning, (2008), "LRF: Men bondförnuft som strategi" - <<http://www.akeri.se/svensk-akeritidning/artiklar/lrf-med-bondfornuft-som-strategi>>
- Bookrags.com, "Motion (democracy)", <[http://www.bookrags.com/wiki/Motion_\(democracy\)](http://www.bookrags.com/wiki/Motion_(democracy))>
- Cox, Robert (2006) "Environmental Communication and the Public Sphere", p 12. Thousand Oaks. Sage Publications
- Eksvärd, Jan (2009), expert in LRF, Interview in LRF Stockholm, 29/4-2009
- Ewenger.com, Etienne Wenger, "Communities of practice: a brief introduction", <<http://www.ewenger.com/theory/>>
- Genteknikpolicy (2006), "LRFs stämma 2006 och LRFs styrelse juni 2006", LRF
- Hallgren, Lars (2009), "Research methodology", lecture 17/3-2009, SLU
- Hasseludden, Yasuragi (2008), "Sinnenas betydelse för ett varumärke", bachelor thesis, p.11
- Hassler, Björn (2006), "Internationell Environmental Institution", Seminar. 1/12-2006
- James V. Wertch, Pablo Del Rio, Amelia Alvarez (1995), "Sociocultural studies of mind", p37, Cambridge university press
- Johansson, Lena (2009), internal communicator in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 29/4-2009
- Oreszczyn and A.B. Lane (2006), "Farmer Communities of Practice and High Tech Futures", <http://oro.open.ac.uk/5470/1/rural_futures_paper3.pdf>
- Krag Jacobsen Jan (1993), "Intervju: Konsten att lyssna och fråga", Studentlitteratur, Lund
- Kringstad Annichen (2009), chief of communication department in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 20/4-2009
- Kryssaleif.nu (2004), "Landsbygden behöver de gröna näringarna", <<http://www.kryssaleif.nu/artikel.asp?artikelId=68&strukturId=4&arkiv=true>>
- Liedtka J (1999), "Linking competitive advantage with Communities of Practice", Newspaper Management Inquiry, page 7
- LRFs National assembly 2009, Sänga-Säby, 27/5-2009
- LRF riksförbundsstämma 2009, Tryckeri E-print, 2009
- Lrf.se, "Lokalavdelningar och kommungrupper", <<http://194.22.7.75/viarbetarmed/lokalavdelningar>> - were not available 10/6-2009

Lrf.se (2007), ”Viktiga frågor för regionens bönder på riksförbundsstämma”,
<<http://www.lrf.se/Regionalt/Malardalen/Pressmeddelanden/Viktiga-fragor-for-regionens-bonder-pa-riksforbundsstamma1/>> - were not available 10/6-2009

Lrf.se (2009), ”LRF-stämman 2009: GMO vållar debatt”
<<http://www.lrf.se/regioner/varmland/nyheter1/lrf-stamman-2009-gmo-vallar-debatt/>>

Lunneryd, Anders (2009), members of LRF, Mail interview, 9/5-2009

Motion Nr: Väst 3 (2008), ”LRF’s Hållning i GMO-frågan”, Västra Tunhem - Vänersnäs, Västerlanda, Stängenäset samt Spekeröd – Ucklum

Motion: LRF mot GMO (2008), ”För LRF mot GMO”, Västra Tunhem – Vänersnäs LRF – avdelning

Practicelearning.org.uk, ”Welcome to the Social Work Development Website”,
<<http://www.practicelearning.org.uk/>>

Romerlabs.com, Romer Labs, ”Genetically Modified Organism”,
<<http://www.romerlabs.com/gmo.html>>

Sandström, Emil (2009), ”PRA methods”, lecture 26-01-2009, SLU

SFS, ”Miljöbalk (1998:808)”,
<<http://www.riksdagen.se/webbnav/index.aspx?nid=3911&bet=1998:808>>

Sjv.se (2005), ”Om Jordbruksverket”,
<<http://www.sjv.se/omjordbruksverket.4.7502f61001ea08a0c7fff122625.html>>

Styrelsens för region Väst yttrande (2009), ”Genteknikpolicy”, Motion nr Väst 1, Värmland 2, Dalarna 1, och Gävleborg 2

Sustainability in Swedish agriculture (2007), SCB, jordbruksverket, Naturvårdsverket och LRF, ”Hållbarhet i svenskt jordbruk”, 2007

Swedish environmental protection agency (2008), ”Miljömålen i korthet”, p 3. CM-gruppen

Taubert, Johan (2009), chief press officer in LRF, Interview LRF Stockholm, 22/4-2009

Thefreedictionary, ”Regional association”,
<<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/Steering+Committee>>

Users.rcn.com (2003), ”Metabolism”,
<<http://users.rcn.com/jkimball.ma.ultranet/BiologyPages/M/Metabolism.html>>

Wenger E (2000), ”Communities of Practice and Social Learning Systems”. Organization, Vol7(2), p.225-246

Wenger E, McDermott R, & Snyder W (2002), ”Cultivating Communities of Practice”,

All internet addresses, except lrf.se (due new updated homepage) were available 10/6-2009

8. End notes

This section will give some background about the interviewee. The reason is to let the reader have the opportunity to know who was interviewed to get a better picture what the primary information was gathered from. The interview question that was used in the semi-structure interview will be uncovered.

8.1. Background information about the interviewee

Annichen Kringstad, chief of communication department, LRF, interview 20th April 2009

Annichen Kringstad has worked as communications manager on LRF for one year. Kringstad background is marketing and she has worked in business marketing 20 years. In these 20 years, she has had many different roles. Six years back she started on LRF's subsidiary organization LRF Konsult and later become communication manager on LRF in Stockholm.

Johan Taubert, chief press officer, LRF, interview 22th April 2009

Johan Taubert functions as chief press officer to manage and put together LRFs positions and arguments on different issues. What LRF is publishing should not be misunderstood and that is one important task Taubert has: to package and deliver LRF viewpoints.

Lena Johansson, Lena Johansson, internally communicator, LRF, interview 29th April 2009

Lena Johansson started in LRF subsidiary organization LRF Media and worked there 11 years. Johansson was transferred to LRF internal communications department and has been there 9 years. All together Johansson has worked for LRF for 20 years regarding internal communication. Johansson says much has changed, but much is the same also because everything is built with the same principles and type of members. However, members businesses have change a lot. Johansson also says that LRF has changed direction, from being an organization that comes to the society to require

services; LRF is coming now to offer services. Johansson is members of the international federation of agriculture journalism (IFAJ) that is an association for journalism that focuses on forest and agriculture.

Jan Eksvärd, expert in LRF, LRF, interview 29th April 2009

Jan Eksvärd was previously an environmental manager for the economic association and cooperation Lantmännen since 1979. Eksvärd was the head of the chemical department on Lantmännen with an environmental focus. In 1987 Lantmännen reorganized their structure and Eksvärd decide he wanted to work with environmental issues. Later Eksvärd worked full-time with environment issues, and in 1992 Lantmännen decide to re organize again because of financial reasons and that environmental concerns weren't prioritized. With the three questions Eksvärd worked with; sludge issue, organic farming and genetic engineering, Eksvärd was able to work with LRF and Lantmännen both. Eksvärd was interested in genetic engineering and how LRF would act in the question about genetic technology. In 1996, after five years working with LRF, LRF wanted Eksvärd to become a full-time employee and head of sustainable development and expert in climate change question.

Anders Lunneryd, members of LRF and crop producer, mail interview, 9th May 2009

Anders Lunneryd worked four years in the regional association in the LRF region Väst, between 2004 and 2007. From 2007 Lunneryd wasn't engaged in the question about GMOs, but had the feeling that GMOs should not be released in the nature. Lunneryd also had the feeling that LRF had the same perspective about GMO, but later realized it wasn't the case. After discussion with delegates in LRF board Lunneryd learned that LRF believed that Sweden should have a dominate role in developing GMOs. That's why Lunneryd believes Sweden has the weakest rule of law in Europe regarding GMO Lunneryd says that the day he doesn't have the strength to push for GMO freedom and LRF is approaching another direction in the question, Lunneryd will not be a member for LRF any longer.

8.2. Question in the Semi-structure-interview

The semi-structure interview had some question to ask the interviewee. The interviews with Lena Johansson and Jan Eksvärd were semi-structure. Some question was focus on Lena

Johansson which wasn't asked Jan Eksvärd. The question had sub question, but will not be covered here.

Questions to Lena Johansson:

1. Do you have any opinion how other department taking care of the other target groups?
2. Do the members get any benefits being members for LRF?
3. If someone wants to get information from LRF, can LRF give that information?
4. Is the question about GMO something that has been discussed inside or outside LRF?

Questions to Jan Eksvärd:

1. How is LRF structured and organized?
2. Who is deciding in LRF, the members or other?
3. Is there any interest about GMO in Sweden?
4. Does GMO give any sort of benefits today?
5. Would people in general change the opinion about GMO today or in future?

Questions to both Lena Johansson and Jan Eksvärd:

1. Is the communication in LRF an exposed area?
2. Is there any different on the internally and the externally communication LRF has?
3. Have the question about GMO polarized members having different opinion (members dislike each other)
4. Any plans to change the communication strategy to communicate GMO question, today or in the future?