



Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

Faculty of Natural Resources and
Agricultural Sciences

The Swedish Hunters Association

– A friend or a foe of the Swedish wolf?

Henrik Engbladh

The Swedish Hunters Association - A friend or a foe of the Swedish wolf?

Henrik Engbladh

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

Examiner: Erica von Essen, 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: 2016

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

Keywords: Wolves, Hunters, Critical Discourse Analysis, Swedish Hunters Association...

Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

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

Abstract

The Swedish Hunters Association (SHA) is an influential actor in Swedish wildlife management – it is both a powerful interest organization for hunters, and it has been given a major influence by the Swedish state, to be responsible for executing a considerable part of the wildlife management in the country. The association does however seem to have indeed disparate values and perspectives connected to different kinds of animals. The SHA does for example officially state that they want the population of wolves to be very strict, partly because of the wolves many times competing interests with hunters. Having the associations powerful position in mind and adding that previous research indicate a many times complex relationship between hunters and predators, this study was aiming to get a deeper insight into how the SHA perceives the wolf and the management of it and then discuss what these findings might have on a societal context. By engaging in Norman Faircloughs' critical discourse analysis, which main purpose is to discover unequal power balances, documents produced by the SHA concerning wolves in Sweden were analysed with a focus on the discourses that are underlying their argumentations and ideas. The findings showed that the authors of the articles consistently provided a negative image of both the wolf itself and all potential consequences of having a wolf population. Any kinds of positive features connected to wolves were absent in the texts and the discourses emerging were all functioning to support the agenda of the SHA and to dismiss any conflicting perspectives provided by opponents. It is however likely to believe that the SHA plays an important role in society, representing the perspectives of hunters and other people experiencing negative consequences of the wolf. Their aversion towards wolves does appear problematic though, given their powerful influence on Swedish wildlife management. Their strictly anthropocentric view on wildlife management, which seems to be based on a perception that animals should be managed based on their importance and relation towards hunters, could be a serious threat towards the Swedish wolf population and the goals of Swedish wildlife management.

Keywords: Wolves, Hunters, Critical Discourse Analysis, Swedish Hunters Association...

Table of contents

1. Introduction	5
2. Purpose.....	6
3. The Swedish Hunters Association and wildlife management in Sweden.....	6
3.1. The Swedish Hunters Association.....	6
3.2. Swedish wildlife management.....	7
4. Method and theory integrated.....	7
4.1. Discourse and Critical Discourse Analysis.....	8
4.2. Social constructionism.....	9
4.3. Human-animal studies and the relationship between hunters and predators in the literature.....	9
4.4. Environmental ethics.....	10
5. Research design.....	11
5.1. Choice of method.....	11
5.2. Selection, collection and delimitation of data.....	11
5.3. Data analysis.....	11
5.4. Analytical tools.....	12
6. Analysis and results.....	12
6.1. Step one – Textual analysis of the SHAs' wolf-related arguments.....	13
6.1.1. The discourses occurring in the arguments.....	18
6.1.2. The order of discourse and the discursive struggle.....	19
6.2. Step two – The degree of intertextuality (the discursive practice).....	20
6.3. Step three – The Social Practice.....	20
7. Discussion.....	21
7.1. Results discussion.....	21
7.2. Method discussion.....	22
8. Conclusions.....	23
9. Future research.....	24
10. List of references.....	25
11. Appendix 1 – Empirical data.....	27

1 Introduction

The wolf and wolf population in Sweden are controversial topics, engaging people from different parts of society, which are possessing various ideas and feelings about the animal. The population has over the last years grown in size, which has intensified the debate about the management of it. Although people as well as institutions and interest organisations have differing opinions about the existence of the wolves, it is decided upon by the Swedish state that they shall exist in the country in viable populations, strong enough to be able to survive in a long-term perspective (“Mål för viltstammarna,” n.d.).

One interest organisations, The Swedish Hunters Association (SHA), has lately been in the spotlights due to their role/interest in the Swedish wolf management. The SHA is not only the largest hunting organisation in Sweden; they have also by the Swedish state been given a substantial influence on the wildlife management in the country. The government has trusted the SHA to be involved in the Swedish wildlife management; which partly includes matters related to the management of predators. These two roles, the one of an interest organisation, lobbying for the sake of hunters towards politicians, as well as working to execute missions from the state – appears paradoxical. The exact objectives related to their governmental mission seem to differ from one year to another, and so does the extension of the involvement of the management connected to predators. But irrespective of the exact details concerning their influence, is the SHA a substantial stakeholder, being an organisation consisting of many members and of great financial power. That is why this study will discursively analyse documents produced by the association in order to try to understand how the SHA relate to and value the wolves in Sweden and what kind of implications this might have on a broader societal perspective.

2. Purpose

The purpose of this study is to critically review and analyse the way the SHA is arguing and debating about the management of wolves in general and about the wolf especially. By using a critical discursive analytic perspective as theory and method, the aim is to clarify how and why the SHA talks about wolves and the wolf management the way they do. I want to explore the link between the use of language and power structures within the SHA and the society and try to bring forth how arguments and beliefs are constructed as more “true” and natural than others are in the case of the Swedish wolf. The main objectives guiding the study are described below, which will be used in order to find an answer to the overall purpose, which is to investigate the relation the Swedish Hunters Association has towards the wolf population in Sweden

1. How is the wolf and the wolf management perceived by the SHA?
2. What do the main arguments about wolves consist of?
3. Which are the main discourses occurring in the documents and how are they relating to each other?
4. What kind of consequences may these findings have in a broader social perspective?

3. The Swedish Hunters Association and wildlife management in Sweden

In this section, information about the Swedish Hunters Association – who they are and what the influence they have on the Swedish wildlife management consists of is provided. It is also presented how the association ethically perceives animals as well as how the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency has decided that the management of animals should be carried out.

3.1. The Swedish Hunters Association

The Swedish Hunters Association (Svenska Jägareförbundet) was founded 1830 as a means to carry out a healthy wildlife management in the country. In 1938, new hunting laws were decided upon in Sweden and in connection to this; the SHA was given a so-called *general mission* by the government, to take the lead in parts of the wildlife management in Sweden. Its main directives are for the SHA to maintain a sustainable wildlife management, to provide information, knowledge and training directed to hunters. In practice, this means that the SHA engage in wildlife monitoring, wildlife and traffic safety and to provide professional hunting education. Another important function is to provide objective information about hunting and wildlife management to the public (Svenska Jägareförbundet, 2014). For 2016, the SHA were given 52 million SEK, intended for labour costs and for administration of the mission (Svenska Jägareförbundet, 2016). It is the government of Sweden who is in charge of the general mission and who decides what it should consist of. It is also the government that, yearly, decides how much money from the fund that will be given to the SHA (Naturvårdsverket, 2015). The SHA also functions as an interest organisation for Swedish hunters, which consists of around 200 000 members – a vast majority of the registered hunters in Sweden (Svenska Jägareförbundet, 2012). According to themselves, their purpose is to “represent the hunters, the wildlife, and the hunting” and they state that they serve to enable a sound and sustainable wildlife

management, which considers both the life value of animals and humans (Svenska Jägareförbundet, 2013).

According to the SHA, all wild animals deserves the same amount of respect, regardless of specie, which should be reflected in the way one not only treat and interact with the animal, but also in the way one speaks about it (Jägareförbundet, n.d.-a). They regard the wild animals as a resource, which are in need of being managed for the sake of their own long-term survival. Concerning predators specifically, they state that populations should be regulated by hunt based on adequate hunting ethics, biological ground and with regard to that the populations of prey (for the hunters) are viable and strong enough to be hunted. A major regard should be considered to damages created by the predators as well as to the impact the predators have on game populations (Jägareförbundet, n.d.-b). The SHA points out that the wolf is part of the Swedish fauna, but that it should be regulated by hunt so that its impact is acceptable regionally in the point of view of those who live in the regions affected, for the wildlife management and from the perspective of “the Nordic hunting tradition” (Jägareförbundet, n.d.-c). The associations’ estimations is that a population of a hundred wolves would be a viable number, but its limit is 150 individuals, since this is in accordance with the goals guiding the wildlife management they have committed to strive for (Jägareförbundet, n.d.-c). The SHA points out that they are not happy with how the politics and management connected to the wolf is being carried out in Sweden today, since it encourages a too big wolf population. Mostly, they believe that those who actually are affected by the consequences of the wolf in their everyday life have a way too little say about how many wolves that should be living in Sweden. They also strongly believe that the regional influence on wildlife management is way too small (Jägareförbundet, n.d.-c).

3.2 Swedish wildlife management

The Swedish Environmental Protection Agency is a state agency and the main responsible actor when it comes to wildlife management in Sweden. This is a complex task, as they state themselves:

“The view of wild game values and how it should best be administered varies according to people's different interests and values. Society needs to find ways to both take advantage of the resource that wildlife forms and manage the challenges and conflicts that it generates. Game is a shared resource that needs to be managed jointly, in dialogue and cooperation between different interests.” (Naturvårdsverket, 2015, p.3).

To be able to do this, to share knowledge and set up goals for the management, those who are affected by the wildlife management and its consequences should be part of the knowledge base and of what is decided regarding the management, the agency argues (Naturvårdsverket, 2015). If this is happening, differing interests can be met and evaluated and necessary compromises can be made. This is also why it is interesting to investigate how the SHA, being a major stakeholder, is relating to the wolf.

4. Method and theory integrated

In this chapter, the concepts discourse, discourse analysis and Norman Faircloughs’ Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) are explained, since they serve as method and theory for the study. Faircloughs’ CDA does however acquire a further theory of social character, which is meant to put the findings of the study in a social context. Due to the character of this study – how wolves are perceived by the SHA – the theoretical framework consist of theories related to the relationship between humans and animals. Since discourse analyses are building on a social constructionist perspective, this view will also be described. A literature review of the relationship between hunters and predators is provided at the end of this chapter.

4.1 Discourse and Critical Discourse analysis

There is not one main definition of what the concept *discourse* mean in the literature, but it is often summarised as a certain way of understanding and speaking about the world. This study relates to the concept as Michel Foucault (1984) explains it – as the general domain of all statements and as an individualizable group of statements; a regulated practice that accounts for a line of statements. Winther Jørgensen & Phillips (2000) further discusses the concept and thereby making it clear why it is a suitable way of investigating the focus of this study – how the SHA as a stakeholder relates to wolves and wolf management. They state that since discourse is a certain way of speaking and understanding the world, a discourse could be regarded as an imperative, forcing way of speaking, which is constructing certain ways of relating to the world possible, whilst at the same time excluding others. Inglis & Thorpe (2012) says about discourses that they are especially dangerous when they are the most invisible, since they can shape peoples perceptions on a unconscious level, whilst they appear as completely natural when people construct their thinking.

The discourse analysis, then, is concerned with addressing topics that are oftentimes related to social science, such as gender relations and social control. It seeks to investigate and bring clarity into the ways inequalities are constructed; by the way they are being carried out, sustained and justified in talk (Silverman, 2014). This “talk” can be found in various forms, such as in transcripts of interviews, media, documents from institutional settings etc. These characteristics are making it an indeed adequate method to apply when trying to find out how the SHA perceive wolves by looking at documents they have produced with their arguments about the wolf. Thus, one could say that the activity of analysing discourses and social constructions could be seen as finding out and considering what is being said and how it is said, as well as finding out who it is that is allowed to speak. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) consists of theories and methods for empirical studies of the relations between discourse and cultural and social processes (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2000). Norman Fairclough’s approach is both a theory and a method, consisting of a number of philosophical premises, theoretical methods, methodological guidelines as well as certain linguistic analysis techniques (Fairclough, 2003). All CDA approaches, including the one of Fairclough, share common ground in five aspects (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2000) .

1. The character of social and cultural processes and structures are partly linguistic-discursive
2. Discourse is both constitutive and constituted. Discourse is a kind of social practice that both constitutes the social world and is constituted by other social practices.
3. Language use should be empirically analysed within its social context.
4. Discourse functions ideologically. In CDA, it is assumed that discursive practices commit to both the creation and reproduction of unequal power balances amongst social groups. These consequences are within the CDA field called ideological effects. The CDA is called ‘critical’ due to its ambition to make visible how discursive practices contribute to these unequal power balances.
5. Critical Research. As was implied in the fourth point, CDA is not politically neutral, since it is intending to result in social change. All of the approaches within the CDA field take the side of those groups that are the oppressed ones in power relations (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2000) .

Due to these premises, the CDA appears adequate for the this study, since it want to clarify the relation of the SHA towards wolves, by using documents produced by the SHA about the animal as empirical data. The objectives of the study will be explored by discursively looking at, as mentioned above, if unequal power balances are constructed and reproduced in the way they are arguing about the wolves. The CDA’s main focus is to make visible the relation between how the language is being used and the social practice it is part of, each communicative act is analyzed as part of the discursive order. This is due to the premise that each parlance is either maintaining or questioning the discursive order (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2000).

The CDA of Fairclough is divided into three main steps explaining how to approach and analyse discourses. They are part of what he calls the *three-dimensional model*. The steps are – *A detailed textual analysis* – *An analysis of the discursive practice* – *An analysis of the social practice*. Fairclough argues that a mere textual analysis is insufficient to analyze discourse with, though it does not make visible the relation between the text and the social structures, processes and developments occurring in society. The model is made on the premise that texts alone cannot be understood, nor analyzed in isolation, but only in relation to webs of other texts and in relation to its social contexts (Fairclough, 2003). The first two dimensions of the model, the textual analysis and the discursive practice, are taking place inside the third one, the social practice. The actual discourses are supposed to be found in the textual analysis, the frames of the discourses are meant to be found in the discursive practice and not until then is it possible to engage in the final analysis, in which the discourses are put into a social context – where it should be discussed whether social change or ideological changes may take place. The model will be further explained in the research design and analyze section of the study.

4.2 Social Constructionism

The discourse analysis is building on a social constructionism approach, which main premises should be pointed out in order to understand some main assumptions the method is building on. Burr (1995) single out four main premises, which most social constructionist approaches agree upon and which are acknowledged in the CDA approach used in this study as well.

A critical approach to taken-for-granted knowledge. Information and knowledge about the world should not be regarded as objectively correct, as truths. Our reality is based on our own ways of categorising and making sense of the world. *Historical and cultural specificity.* Our knowledge about the world is a product of our history and how it has taken place. It could just as well have developed in an other way. Our identities and worldview does furthermore change over time. This is a reason why we should question our knowledge. As Burr (1995) points out, discourse is a kind of social action, which is part of producing the social world, and, by doing so; it is part of maintaining social patterns. *Link between knowledge and social processes.* The ways by which we understand the world are constructed and maintained by social processes. Knowledge comes from social interaction, where common truths are created and where ideas about what is true or false compete with each other. *Link between knowledge and social action.* In each of all worldviews in the world, certain lines of ideas, about truths, beliefs etc. are shared, or at least appear as natural, whilst other ideas are regarded as wrong or unrealistic. Since people with different worldviews have differing social understandings, their beliefs also lead to differing social actions. Due to this, social construction of knowledge and truth has social consequences (Burr, 1995).

4.3 Human-animal studies and the relationship between hunters and predators in the literature

The character of this study can be seen as taking place within the field of Human-animal studies (HAS), since it is trying to sort out the relationship an institution in society has with wolves in Sweden. Human-animal studies (HAS), is a multi- and interdisciplinary discipline, studying the interactions and relationships between human and nonhuman animals. HAS is not about understanding animal behaviour, but rather to understand them in the context of human culture and society. The focus is to look at animals wherever they exist in the human world. Although animals exist in the “wild”, they invariably have interactions with humans – e.g. during various human outdoors activities, when deer walk into gardens or in the context of *hunting*. The HAS are concerned with what the consequences of these wild encounters are in both human societies and wildlife. As Demello (2012) puts it

... HAS scholars try to understand how animals are socially constructed. On one level, animals surely exist in nature. However, once they are incorporated into human social worlds they are assigned to human categories, often based on their use to humans, and it is these categories (lab animal, pet, and

livestock) that shape not only how the animals are seen but also how they are used and treated... these classifications are not neutral – they are politically charged in that they serve to benefit some (humans, some animals) at the expense of others (other animals) (p.10).

The relationship between the hunter and its prey is a complex one and wildlife management is a delicate issue, which concerns and affects many stakeholders on many levels of society. Large carnivore and human conflicts have been especially common throughout history (Inskip & Zimmermann, 2009; Karanth & Chellam, 2009), making it a constantly infected socio-political topic. Common reasons leading to conflicts are related to food and space, and culturally shaped ideas based on horror, adoration and, not the least, superstition (Karanth & Chellam, 2009). In many countries and regions, this had lead to a substantial reduction and sometimes to eradication of certain species, and particularly large predators such as bear, wolf and lynx (Ceballos et al., & 2005; Karanth & Chellam, 2009). Today, the conservation of predators is possibly more dependent on a countries socio-political landscape rather than on its biological status (Treves & Karanth, 2003). At the same time, scientists stress the importance of the consequences large predators have on the function and complexity of diverse ecosystems (Ripple et al., 2014). There is research demonstrating that hunters respect and admire predators, by perceiving them as powerful symbols of wilderness (Kruuk, 2002); although other studies indicate that hunting communities oftentimes hold a strong aversion towards predators (Bisi et al, 2010; Skogen & Thrane, 2007). This aversion is often due to that wolves sometimes kill hunting dogs and because the hunters perceive the carnivores as competitors for the game.

There are studies indicating that hunters have a notably negative perception of big predators and of wolves especially. One of these, which took place in Sweden (Ericsson & Heberlein, 2003), showed that hunters possess more negative attitudes towards wolves than the general public does. The study also concluded that hunters in wolf-areas possesses the most correct knowledge about wolves, and that their attitudes towards them are the most negative ones compared to other hunters and the general public. The attitudes amongst hunters towards wolves have also been explored, due to the growing wolf population in Finland (Bisi et al., 2010). It indicated that the hunters consider the increasing wolf population in a negative way, mainly because they see the animal as a competitor of resources, of which the moose seems to be the most important one. There is other research indicating that hunters experience carnivore management authorities as interfering and threatening their way of life (Skogen & Thrane, 2007) and that wolves especially are “interfering” with the way the hunters want to use their land.

Due to these examples of complex relationships between hunters and wolves, where Swedish hunters for example have been studied and demonstrated negative attitudes towards wolves, it becomes interesting to further and more specifically explore how the SHA perceives the wolf and wolf management, due to their governmental mission.

4.4 Environmental ethics

To be able to further put this study into a Human Animal studies context, it will partly be analysed from an environmental ethics point of view. As a tool to understand and interpret the ways the Swedish Hunters Association construct the way they perceive and value wolves, the concept anthropocentrism will be used in the analysis of the empirical data as well as in the third step of the CDA, which regards the societal level of the analysis. The ways in which humans are interacting with the nonhuman, natural world are in the academic field of environmental ethics oftentimes divided into these two main fields – anthropocentrism and ecocentrism.

Anthropocentrism is an umbrella concept for approaches that have in common that they are all first and foremost human-centred. The standpoint of the majority of them, is that they consider that the nonhuman natural world should ethically considered and regarded in relation to its instrumental/contributory values for humans (Palmer, 2003) . Those instrumental values, which the human world may find valuable, can consist of differing things, such as spiritual, physical, aesthetic, etcetera. Exactly what they may consist of is not the point, but rather that they exist in order for the human world to use. An anthropocentric worldview does not, however, automatically support careless exploitation of the world’s natural resources. In that context, the worldview could

simultaneously argue that the human kind should take advantage of the natural world in a wise and sustainable manner, in order to make the most of it in a long-term perspective to be able to support future human generations (Palmer, 2003). The ecocentric worldview can be seen as opposite the anthropocentric one. It is focused on ecosystems and the importance of balance within them. This is what is supposed to be the main focus when considering matters related to the nonhuman natural world. Whilst the natural world has an *instrumental* value based on its relation to the human world, seen from the anthropocentric perspective; it has an *intrinsic* value from an ecocentric point of view (Palmer, 2003). This means it has a value in itself, without being judged for its potential value for mankind.

5. Research Design

In this section, the choice of method is elaborated on, as well as how the empirical data was chosen and analysed. The analytical tools which will be used for the textual analysis and the discursive practice (step 1 and 2) will furthermore be explained.

5.1 Choice of method

The focus of this study has been the arguments that are being stated about wolves and the Swedish wolf management. This study is based on a qualitative approach and the research has been guided by Faircloughs critical discourse analysis, both as theory and method, with a certain focus on social constructivism and human animal studies for the interpretation of the third step of the analysis. Seeing that the purpose of the study is to analyse how linguistic communication is related to greater social orders, a discourse analytic perspective came off as the most appropriate one and the Faircloughs critical discourse analysis was decided as specific method. By discursively analyse various documents produced by the SHA, I believe it is possible to get a key insight into the mind set of SHA and thereby be able to answer the questions guiding the study. Since, as Winther Jørgensen & Phillips (2000) argue, the CDA tries to make visible how our way of using language both reflects and maintains power relations in society, as well as recreates a fixed image of reality, I found it to be adequate method to use in order to look into the SHAs' perspectives about wolves and wolf management.

5.2 Selection, collection and delimitation of data

The data, upon which the study is based, is produced within the timeframe of 2014-01-01 until 2016-03-02. The time period was decided upon to make the study as current as possible and to make the amount of data manageable. The documents that are forming the empirical data are consisting of texts published on the SHA's homepage, in the journal Svensk Jakt (which is owned by the association), as well as debate articles published in larger Swedish newspapers. The documents have in common that they are mainly authored by people who possess a substantial influence in the organisation of the SHA or Svensk Jakt in terms of either position or amount of space in the journal. The data used for the final analysis consist of 17 articles, which for the most part have been found on the homepages of SHA and Svensk Jakt. They have been searched for and selected based on their date of publication and on their topic. All of them are discussing either the Swedish wolf population or/and the management of it. The articles found in the newspapers were found via the data base primo and keywords such as 'wolf', "wolf management" and 'Svenska jägareförbundet'. The basis for the analysis has been editorials, debate articles, chronicles, a press release and blog posts authored by employees of the SHA. By discursively looking at these particular documents, I believe I will be able to capture the main ideas and worldviews occurring within the association concerning the attitudes towards the wolf population and management in Sweden. A list of the articles will be found in the appendix.

5.3 Data analysis

The documents, which has formed the base of the empiricism, was at an initial step repeatedly read through with the questions and purpose of the study as a lens, in order to categorize what was being said in them into separate groups. The categorisation was guided by how the authors of the articles were arguing and discussing the topics and questions, which this study seeks to find answers to. After

having divided the arguments into groups, “typical” examples from each group were then translated from Swedish into English. Although the quotations have been carefully translated from Swedish into English, nuances might have got lost in the translation process, although hopefully they are as accurate as possible. These translated examples, presenting the main strands of opinions and arguments, were then discursively analysed, guided by Faircloughs’ three-dimensional model.

5.4 Analytical tools and concepts

In the textual and discursive practice part of the analysis, which mainly is occupied with vocabulary, grammar and the connection between different types of texts, I have, guided by Fairclough (2003) chosen the concepts listed and described below.

Modality is concerned with how strongly something is stated by the speaker or writer. Which the degree of affinity with- or affiliation to the statement concerned reveals. Winther Jørgensen & Phillips (2000) exemplifies by referring to how different statements about temperature to how different modalities are represented, showing how the writer or speaker commit to varying degrees with the statement: ‘it’s cold’, ‘I think it’s cold’ and ‘perhaps it’s a little cold’. The kind of modality taking place has substantial consequences for the discursive construction of social relations taking place in the context as well as for the knowledge and meaning systems occurring. *Truth* is one type of modality and it can also be expressed by intonation.

Transitivity When analysing transitivity in texts, the focus is how events and processes are related or unrelated with subjects and objects. What one is looking to find is the ideological consequences different forms can have. Winther Jørgensen & Phillips (2000) demonstrate how transitivity can take place with the sentence “50 nurses were sacked yesterday”. This sentence, where the agent is absent, shows how a passive form is used, where the adjournment of the nurses appears to have happened almost like a natural phenomenon. No agent taking responsibility of the action is present in the sentence. This structure makes it appear as if there is no one who should be held responsible for the action either. It just emphasises the effect, whilst it at the same time disinterest the action and process causing the event.

Floating Signifier is also a concept used in the textual analysis. It is referring to a notion that is open for different meanings and content. When discourses of different kind use the same notion, but with different meaning, it can be a sign of an on-going struggle between discourses, about who has the right to decide what a certain notion or phenomenon should mean.

Intertextuality alludes to the position whereby all communicative events tie to earlier events – it is not possible to not be using phrases and words, which others have been using before. The intertextuality can both be showing a discursive and social change, but also to cementation of previous orders, due to occurring power relations.

Discursive order refers to a concept, which is concerned with how discourses that are appearing in the same context are relating to each other. The concept both refers to the number of discourses taking place in the same area, where they may be conflicting each other, and the space where the discursive struggle takes place. The *discursive struggle* is the fight between the different discourses worldviews, in which they seek to achieve *hegemony* – the dominating perspective (Fairclough, 2003; Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2000)

6. Analysis and results

In this chapter, both the result and analyse of the material is presented, since the actual result in the critical discourse analysis is consisting of the textual analysis. The different steps in Faircloughs’ three-dimensional model will be presented separately, guided by the analytical tools explained above and by relating to the theory of the study. The emphasis of the study is concentrated to Faircloughs’ first step, the textual analysis, whilst the second step has been focused on to a minor extent. This is due to the questions and purpose of the study, which are most linked to the findings that can be made in the first step and last step of the model. The first and second step can however together demonstrate interesting findings, which will be discussed in the third step, – the social practice.

6.1. Step one – textual analyse of the SHAs' wolf-related arguments.

Here, the different arguments in the documents have been categorised by their themes and analysed. The quotes chosen are typical for the section they represent. The different discourses have then been singled out, after which the discursive order and struggle are discussed.

How is the wolf presented in the articles?

In this section, statements about the wolf have been analysed. The purpose was to try to find out what traits and values the SHA ascribe to the wolf, by looking into how they talk about it.

To really be able to understand the questions inherent explosiveness, you probably have to yourself have experienced killed and torn apart but still alive sheep in their pastures. Having experienced ones own child's fear of going to the school bus, talked to preschool teacher who is afraid to go out with the kids in the forest, seen ones own dogs being killed in the woods or in your garden. Only then, I think you really see that we are heading in the wrong direction and that powerlessness is spreading.
(Bo Sköld, Secretary General, SHA)

This quote captures how the view of the wolf is typically presented and captured throughout the documents analysed. The wolf is made synonymous with something causing negative consequences. Horrible things that the wolf is guilty of doing or might be responsible of are listed, making it appear as something dangerous, alluding to old myths about the wolf as an evil, bloodthirsty creature. The quote is saying that one *probably* has to have experienced these things in order to be able to really understand how serious the problems caused by the wolves are. The writer expresses different types of modality in the quote, by saying he “thinks” one has to have experienced these things to be able to understand, he expresses some affiliation with his statement, maybe to be able to hint that it is only those affected who can understand the problems. On the other hand, a high degree of affinity is expressed when saying that *we are* heading in the wrong direction and that a feeling of powerlessness is spreading, making it sound like it is an unquestionable truth. The identity is constructed as something that is harmful for humans and for human belongings. By focusing on the transitivity in the text, one can see that there is no actual agent in the text that is held responsible for the actions that leads to the terrible consequences described. It is rather implied that the wolf is capable, or that it usually is doing actions like these, but by not pointing out the wolf explicitly, it is probably easier to ascribe it with more negative connotations than perhaps are reasonable.

... A surprisingly calm, methodical and protracted wolf attack on a female dog, which is out in the woods doing what she was conceived to do and what she loves. To hunt. And hunting with unleashed dogs is fundamental in Swedish hunting practice. (Olle Olsson, reporter at Svensk Jakt)

The way the wolf is acting and behaving is here described as wrong and cruel towards its prey. The way the wolf is interfering with the dog is described as a well thought through, cold-blooded act. The wolf is *attacking* the dog. The dog is portrayed as a helpless victim, which is doing what she is “supposed” to do, the thing she loves doing – because she was bred to do it, to *hunt*. Interestingly, the writer does not see a conflict occurring. The wolf is “attacking” the dog (and its reasons for doing so are not discussed), whilst the domesticated dog (which is being under attack), is constructed by humans to “love” hunting. The purpose of the dog, then, is to hunt other animals, but it is not acceptable that the dog is attacked itself. It clearly demonstrates how the human perspective is justifying the act of the dog, whilst condemning the way the wolf is acting. Lastly, the writer points out that hunting with a loose running dog is fundamental in Swedish hunting, and that this is a crucial matter to regard, which is making the behaviour of the wolf unacceptable.

Arguments why the wolf management should be stricter and reasons why wolves actually should be allowed in the country

In this part of the textual analysis, the purpose has been to capture what the main motives of *how* and *why* the SHA wants the management of wolves in Sweden to be executed the way they do.

The wolf population has now grown and problems in rural areas are constantly increasing and we are heading for a disaster. We will never manage the situation with less than a proper population-limiting hunt. (Persson & Jakobsson, Svensk Jakt).

The transitivity in the first sentence is noteworthy. There is no actual agent pointed out, which could be held responsible for the “disaster” mentioned. Rather, it is implied that the increase of wolves is the reason for the problems – whichever problems it might be. The second part of the sentence states that the only way of avoiding a disaster is by regulating the population with severe hunting. In these two propositions, the writer’s degree of affinity with the statement is indeed high, completely committing to the statements. It is the modality form “truth”, which presents a very strong knowledge claim, although it is not explained how the propositions are connected.

Chaos is threatening – the protection classification of the wolf needs to be changed. (Persson & Jakobsson, Svensk Jakt).

This sentence captures and symbolises the reoccurring approach towards the wolf population found in the texts. – There are only negative consequences of having wolves and chaos is threatening around the corner. The affinity in those statements seems to always be high, expressing truth – something that will happen. The protection grade of the wolf *needs* to be changed, so that wolf hunt would be legal. The statement is using a strong intonation, making clear that this is the only alternative to be able to avoid chaos. The transitivity is neither completely logic: chaos is threatening and the solution is to change the classification of wolves, but it is not explained how these two events are connected.

The members have, from my point of view, chosen the best way forward on the issue - a healthy wolf population with as few individuals as possible, but with a maximum of 150. The population shall also be spread over large areas and there shall be opportunities to hunt wolves, so that the consequences of the predator get as small as possible. (Magnus Rydholm, Head of Communications, SHA)

This citation summarizes and brings forth how the wolf management should be executed according to the SHA. It is written in propos of how the association decided to take official stand towards the wolf population. “The best way forward” is a healthy population with as few individuals possible, but 150 at most. The reason for the main aim, as few wolves as possible, is so that the *consequences* of the *predator* will be as few as possible. This makes it clear that, according to the official standpoint of the association, there are no positive consequences that come with the wolf whatsoever. It seems to be taken for granted that the wolf could not have any positive consequences legitimizing its existence. In the context, the choice of the word *predator* appears to be made to make the animal appear as dangerous and it is hard to see why the word *animal* could not have been used instead.

To ignore the world outside and all conventions and stubbornly say not to wolf. This path would have made it impossible to retain the status and seriousness that surrounds the association. Our approach would have disqualified us from several decision-making forums, and we would have lost insight in research questions and other hunting issues, whilst we at the same time would end up further away from a good wolf management. (Magnus Rydholm, chief communicator, SHA)

This quote implies that zero wolves would be the ideal state, since it is arguing why the association should accept *at least* a few individuals. What is at stake, why the official approach should be to reluctantly accept some wolves, is that the writer is afraid that the association otherwise would

lose its prominent position and influence on the wildlife management in Sweden, as well as at the same time lose influence on the wolf management. Meaning, to allow wolves is just to not forfeit the position the SHA have today and to avoid a scenario in which Sweden would have even more wolves than today. The state of Sweden as a country with no wolves, appears to be a utopia in the eyes of the SHA, and the reason to accept some wolves seems to solely be a matter of compromising.

Why it is important to have as few wolves in the country as possible?

On the basis on what is found above, that the association wants to have as few wolves as possible, this and the following section is exploring what and more specifically, according to the SHA, the consequences of the current population are. Ideas of what an even bigger population would lead to are also expressed.

Where the wolf population is most dense, it affects both businesses and hunting. If for example a farmer goes out of business, it will have irreparable consequences on encroachment and loss of biodiversity. At the same time will the moose hunt cease in several areas. (Torbjörn Lövbom, chairman of the SHA's predator council).

All the consequences are here pointed out with a "truth" modality, consisting of a high degree of affinity with the statements. The hunting and businesses in the areas concerned *will* be affected. The moose population *will* completely disappear in some areas and *if* a farmer will be forced to shut down his business, it will have irreparable consequences on the biodiversity. This is stated without discussing how likely it would actually be, or how common it is that it happens. The transitivity here, which purpose is to investigate ideological consequences, is that, even though the link is not brought out or made clear, the effect the sentence gives is ascribing the wolf with negative credits, just by implying that it would be the wolves fault if a farmer would have to shut down his business. The consequences mentioned, the results of the wolves, are all of negative character. It is interesting though, that the wolf is pointed out as a threat to biodiversity, whilst the wolves eventual positive effects never are discussed.

For these fanatics, it's all about that each wolf shot is one too many. Regardless of how severe troubles the wolves cause the sheep owner, how many hunting dogs that are killed or that the moose hunt gets devastated in area after area in central Sweden, it still has no significance. (Jan Henricson, Debate article. Svensk Jakt).

This quote consists of many layers of what is prevailing within the SHA's relation with wolves and the wolf management in Sweden. It reflects how they oftentimes perceive their opponents and their arguments. It also demonstrates the feelings of hopelessness the SHA experience. But in this case, the focus is on the concerns, which the existence of wolves brings forth. Which in literally every document are of negative character. The consequences are usually focused on, as the quote above represent, the loss of loose running hunting dogs, which is threatening the Swedish hunting tradition and on those who gets effected when wolves kill life stock. All consequences are seen from a negative anthropocentric perspective, where all animals seem to exist for the purpose of the hunters and those who are negatively affected by the wolves.

How do people get affected by the wolves and by how the present wolf management is carried out?

This section is building on the previous one, although it is focusing more on how and in what way the current wolf management is having consequences on people. It is explored how the SHA perceive the interaction between humans and wolves.

From the frustration and powerlessness that comes with not being able to influence ones everyday life and solve ones problems, desperation is created. It is a dangerous force, which is reflected in actions nobody wants. That is why the SHA is working hard to find a solution to the wolf problems and instill hope in the people who are affected by the wolves. (Bo Sköld & Björn Sprängare, chairman and general secretary, SHA. Dagens Nyheter)

A common element in the documents analysed is how the SHA takes on the role as protectors of those affected by the wolves. Those who get their life stock or pets killed by wolves and for those who feel unsafe having wolves living nearby their homes. The first sentence is pointing out that, when people are not able to affect their everyday life, it will lead to desperation. This desperation, the writer points out, is very dangerous and manifests itself in ways no one wants. The clause is interesting, since it appears to consist of a silent threat building on the assumption that *if* people cannot affect their everyday life – it *will* lead to desperation (high modality). It seems to be assumed that this is what is actually happening amongst all those affected by wolves. Regardless whether the statement is true or not, the solution to the problem is the SHA and their quest to find a solution to “the wolf problems”, is to reduce the wolf population as much as possible. By implying that desperation is occurring, leading to potential devastating risks, the writer is legitimising the agenda of SHA. When looking at the transitivity in the text, the process in which the desperation is born, is not linked to any concrete events, but it seems to be linked to an assumed threat caused by wolves.

But I can understand the demand to say no to wolves. It illustrates the enormous frustration that is a result of the absurd handling of the affected people. (Magnus Rydholm, chief communicator, SHA)

This quote is capturing some prominent elements occurring in the documents. – The projection of the ideas and feelings of people in general, which has been affected by wolves. But, more interestingly, the continual way the word ‘affected’ is charged. People always seem to be *affected* by wolves and the word is constantly charged with a negative character. In each context where humans are situated in relation to wolves in the texts, it is in a negative way, where the human suffers from negative consequences due to the wolf. There are never encounters or relations between humans and wolf described as positive or where neither the traits of, nor the existence of, the wolf is talked about in positive terms. It is always, as described above, an element interfering with humans and the human world.

It is obvious that people lose faith in the democratic system when not even three parliamentary decisions are sufficient to fulfill the intentions of the elected parliament. And for the individual adversely affected by wolves, there is nothing to hope for, nothing to look forward to. There are no possibilities for them to influence their everyday lives. (Bo Sköld & Björn Sprängare, chairman and general secretary, SHA)

In the parts of the texts which are discussing political matters, it is usually in a way that refers to feelings of hopelessness and frustration caused by how politicians and, specifically, the EU is standing in the way of a more active wolf management. In this quote, the purpose of a democratic political system is questioned. The writer is referring to previous decisions made by the parliament concerning a more active wolf management, which, however, have been cancelled. This is considered to be a sign of a dysfunctional democratic system, or, perhaps rather, that the democratic system is not adequate in this specific question. The reasoning in the second part of the quote is not completely logic, as it states that those negatively affected by the wolves have no hope for change or to hope that they will have something to look forward to, or that their everyday life is likely to change into a better situation. Looking at the transitivity in the quote, the jump from the political concerns to those affected by the wolf and their state of hopelessness is not completely clear, especially when the writer says there are no possibilities for them to influence their everyday life. The statement is further more expressed with a high affinity modality, making it sound as if this is an indubitable truth.

It is unreasonable that a small part of Sweden has to carry an entire wolf population, it is unreasonable that a species that has a favourable conservation status is not being managed, it is unreasonable that Sweden does not take greater account of the people affected. (Bo Scold, Secretary General, SHA. Svensk Jakt).

Here, the democratic dimension of the consequences of the wolf population is touched upon again, although in a more subtle way. The argument is that, even though it is a democratic decision to have wolves in Sweden, it is only a small part of the citizens that has to deal with the consequences of the decision, which has to “carry” the wolf population. The feeling of

hopelessness is, as it is above, expressed here as well, and those affected are portrayed as victims, which are not shown any fair consideration.

How are the opponents of the association being perceived and presented in the documents?

There are a lot of heated opinions regarding how the wolf management should be executed. Due to this, this section is engaged with exploring how the SHA perceive and talk about other organisations and institutions with conflicting ideas about the wolf management.

They have only one single goal. More wolves, no matter what the cost will be. Because they are not the ones who have to pay anyway...

The rhetoric's of the environmental movement and their unwillingness to recognize the problems of individuals and interest groups is likely to kill more wolves than regulated license hunts ever will. (Gunnar Glöersen, SHA Homepage).

This quote (referring to the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation especially and environmental movements generally) consists of statements with a high degree of modality. The affinity with what is being said, the way the opponent is constructed, is put forward as a kind of truth. Additionally, the transitivity in how the assumptions are made between – the stated rhetoric's of the environmental movement and its unwillingness to acknowledge the problems of individuals and interest organisations – and that – this lack of acknowledgment is likely to kill more wolves than licence hunts will ever do –, is not clear or explained. The first three sentences are also demonstrating an example of how the authors of the documents many times seem to perceive what the aim of their opponents is – to argue for as many wolves as possible, no matter what. And the reason for this, as the third sentence demonstrates, is because they do not need to take any consequences for such potential growth of the wolf population (as those affected would).

It would probably not be enough with 1,000 wolves, or 2000 for that part, to satisfy the wolf huggers of the Nature Conservation Society, WWF, The Predators association, Association Nordulv and all whatever names they have. (Jan Henricson, Debate article. Svensk Jakt).

This quote does, as the previous one, demonstrate the many times occurring opinion/feeling that the opponents of the SHA wants an as big wolf population as possible. By saying that 1000 wolves, or probably not even 2000 would be enough, the author of the article creates the impression that the opinions of the opponents are not well thought through or anchored in reality. In this sentence, however, the writer is using a kind of “hedge” in the construction of the sentence, by saying “probably”. This demonstrates an affiliation towards the statement, showing that what is being said might not be true. Those with many times differing opinions about the size of the wolf population, are listed in a way as if they consist of an endless amount of organisations, expressing the massive opposition the SHA is facing. The opponents mentioned are all bundled together as “wolf huggers”, adding to the idea that they are not serious actors and perhaps lacking knowledge about the topic.

What is SHAs' relation with researchers?

A considerable part of the wolf discussion is concerned with what an adequate size of the wolf population would be. Just as there are many dissidents in general to the SHA when it comes to their ideas and perspectives about the wolves, the research community is another group that is commonly occurring in the documents. In this segment, utterances about researchers and the opinions of researchers are singled out and analysed. The aim is to explore whether there are certain strands of opinions towards researchers in the documents.

What is needed now is a wolf management, i.e. hunting, which also researchers underline as very important in their reports... (Forborn Lövbom, chairman of the SHA's predator council).

In this extract, the hunting of wolves is legitimised by the fact that “the researchers” stresses that this is very important in “their” reports. This is expressed with a high degree of affinity. It does

not, however, refer to any specific researcher or report, providing an impression that researchers are having this opinion, regardless of the focus of the research. It is an example of intertextuality however (which will be examined further in next session) and serves to provide legitimacy and authority to the statement. “Researchers” and “research” are concepts oftentimes occurring in the documents. Interestingly, they are ascribed with different meaning depending on the context they appear in. This is an example of a floating signifier; a concept connected with differing meanings depending on the context it appears in. In the extract above, researchers are perceived as something important, which one probably should rely and listen to. In the quote below, researchers are ascribed with less importance and their role in relation to the wolf management is questioned.

The scientific research should only be used for scientific assessments. Since the animals affect rural livelihoods, the hunting practice and not the least many people's quality of life negatively, this is a social issue.. (Torbjörn Lövbom, chairman of the SHA's predator council, Svensk Jakt).

In this quote another locution about researchers is expressed, which is reoccurring in the documents. Here, the ‘researchers’ are more specified, researchers concerned with natural science are addressed. Researchers are supposed to stand for scientific assessments only. The modality in the statement is of a demanding character, expressing a high degree of affinity. The reasons for this are the same as those that expressed why Sweden should have as few wolves as possible; the occupations and quality of life of those living in the country side as well as because the wolves are standing in the way for the Swedish hunting tradition. As pointed out previously, all of the reasons are stemming from a perspective that the wolves should not interfere with the human way of life.

6.1.1. The discourses occurring in the arguments

In this section, the different discourses that have emerged through the textual analysis are categorised based on their ideas and traits.

The vicious wolf discourse

There are only few occasions in the documents where the wolf is addressed based on its inherent characteristics as an animal. In these occasions, however, it is associated with something being dangerous and likely to commit terrible actions. It is occasionally implied that not only domestic animals are threatened, but also human beings. The identity of the wolf is based on the consequences it has on human beings and their occupations. Never is the wolf described in terms of its potential beauty, its ability to survive and to hunt. Utterances of admiration for the animal are absent. It appears as if the construction of the wolf is building on an aversion for the animal. Even if the wolf is not directly addressed in very many occasions based on its traits, it is in every context it is occurring in associated with nothing but negative consequences.

The anthropocentric discourse

The anthropocentric discourse is building on an anthropocentric perspective, consisting of the idea that nature and the animals living in it exist to serve the needs of human beings. However. An anthropocentric perspective can manifest itself in various ways, resulting in different views of how animals and nature should be regarded. The one emerging in the analysed documents is based on the view that animals should not cause humans any problem and that their existence should be based on the way they interfere with humans. Interestingly, the interferences between wolf and humans are always of negative character. Other potential perspectives, which could value the existence of the wolf in positive terms, are absent in the documents. The anthropocentric discourse clearly emerges when the management of wolves is being discussed. The main reasons are, as seen above, the way the wolf damages the hunting communities possibilities to hunt and threatens the traditional Swedish hunting practice; the wolf is competing with the hunters about the prey and it is sometimes killing the loose running hunting dogs. Other reoccurring arguments are that wolves kill a lot of life stock and threaten businesses on the countryside.

The affected people discourse

The affected people discourse is building on the uninterrupted assumption that encounters, regardless of context, between wolf and human beings are always of a negative character. Literally never are positive consequences of the wolf described. Apart from talking specifically about those who have had their dogs and life stock killed, the documents are many times referring to “affected” people and how badly treated they have been. This discourse allows no space for any positive interactions between humans and wolf, providing the image that this is not something that can take place. A taken for granted consequence of the people that gets affected is that people soon will take the law in their own hands. This assumption is oftentimes latently underlying a lot of the descriptions of the affected people and in the debate articles it sometimes comes off as a hidden threat about what will happen if nothing changes and as an injunction/incitement to hunters to act upon.

The Ignorant opponents’ discourse

The opponents’ discourse builds on the idea that the SHA is working in constant headwind. It is consisting of an image of the SHA as an organisation fairly alone standing, which constantly has to fight everyone else, for the sake of the hunters and “the people affected”. The discourse emerges when perspectives of opponents and the political system are discussed and referred to. The key component in it is that the perspectives and ideas of them are generally rejected, although in different ways. – The political system and the outcomes related to the wolf management is described in terms of hopelessness, since things “never” goes the hunters way. The image that is created of their opponents, such as conservation institutions and the environmental protection agency, is one in which they are with emphasis rejected as ignorant, uninformed and impossible to cooperate with, sometimes addressed with what appears to be degrading names. Their perspectives, which can be seen as ecocentric, or at least anthropocentric in a very different way than the one of the SHA, are not acknowledges or discussed. The research community however, is referred to as a group that should not interfere with the wolf discussion too much, since it is mostly a societal/social matter, which researchers (such as biologists) cannot grasp. In some occasions, though, is researchers referred to in order to substantiate the claims the SHA are making about what a reasonable size of the population would be, but in these occasions, no specific sources are addressed.

6.1.2. The order of discourse and the discursive struggle

By exploring the order and struggle between the discourses found, it makes it possible to get an insight into how different ideas and worldviews relate to each other, making it possible to further investigate the purpose of the study.

Four main discourses have emerged after having analysed the data of the study. These discourses are the ones that constitute the discursive order prevailing within the discussion/the arguments that forms the foundation of the discussion. Since all of the documents in this study are produced by the same stakeholder/perspective, the discursive order and struggle is probably not as obvious as if documents from several conflicting stakeholders would have been analysed. However, the analysis has provided insight into how the perspectives of opponents of the SHA emerges in the discourse and affects the outcome and the agenda of the SHA. Or rather, the different discourses occurring have provided insight into why the SHA reason the way they do by mapping out how the discursive order and struggle is taking place. As mentioned above, the discursive order are the discourses occurring in the same institution or field, in which they are fighting and/or supporting each other – struggling to establish their respective worldview.

The discourses taking place within this, one could call, institution all appears to be supporting rather than fighting each other, which is likely due to the reason just mentioned. They all seem to try to legitimize and support the main goal that is, to more or less obvious extent, constantly underlying the documents – to have fewer wolves in Sweden. The vicious wolf –, the anthropocentric- and the affected people discourse are all functioning to justify why it is not a good idea to have wild wolves in the country. These three discourses are struggling to demonstrate why: since the wolf is dangerous and mean, since it is standing in the way for human occupations

and traditions and because it does not provide any positive outcomes, but rather threatens to make people commit illegal actions. The fourth discourse, the opponents' discourse, seems to disturb the hegemony – the dominating perspective that the three other discourses together construct. It is an element consisting of conflicting perspectives, which are threatening the hegemony prevailing. These perspectives are provided by opponents of the SHA – institutions and people with differing perspectives than them and systems that are interfering with the agenda of the SHA.

A struggle emerges between the opponents' discourse and the three other discourses. This is clearly demonstrated in the quotes discussing the size of the wolf population. Though the vast majority of the discourses all seem to support the view that it would be adequate to have no wolves at all, it becomes clear how the opponents' discourse interferes with these discourses and, in order to find hegemony, the outcome of the agenda is affected. It is argued in the documents that (pretty much) the only reason that the SHA is not saying no to wolves is because they do not want to be regarded as an unserious actor and, due to that, risk to lose their present influence on the wildlife management, and furthermore so that the current wolf management will not get any worse than it currently is. This has been visible and can be explained by the discursive struggle that is taking place, which results in the SHA to officially have an agenda that is accepting a wolf population.

The opponents' discourse is the one that is the least accepted and the authors of the articles do not accept the arguments and worldviews it is consisting of, which is demonstrated in the reduced and dejected way it is talked about. The worldviews occurring within it are not respected, since they are challenging the main discourses occurring in the field, but the existence of the opponents' discourse is acknowledged and in order to establish hegemony, a limited number of wolves are accepted.

6.2 Step two – The degree of intertextuality (The discursive practice)

The second step of Fairclough's three-dimensional model is concerned with how the analysed texts draw on and relate to previous and other texts than the ones analysed, in order to investigate whether social change is likely to take place.

The degree of intertextuality in the documents is markedly low and when it is occurring it is indeed vague. When it comes to the citations and quotes selected, there are no references made to specific texts, books, speeches etcetera, neither to any other quotes or specific people. Rather, when statements are made about ideas and motives of opponents and conservation organisations, or about what the consequences of the wolves are and why the wolf management should be carried out the way the SHA wants it to – they are not backed up with concrete or specific sources or evidence. It is rather by vague references, as “internationally” it is this way or according to “researchers” this is what is best and “all hunters think this way”. Instead of specific sources, the strong modality demonstrated seems to act as an instrument to provide a feeling of authority to the utterances and statements. This is happening in such statements as “this will lead to chaos” and “we need to limit the population”. Examples of intertextuality concerning references to other groups than those who are benefitting the purposes of the SHA, are always of the character that they are consisting of unreliable and weird opinions, which is a sign of that the discourses prevailing are generally closed and not open for change.

This lack of intertextuality can, according to Fairclough (2003; Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2000) be an indication that there is a lack of potential change within the field explored. When texts to a limited degree draw on text from other discourses or fields, but rather reproduce old one, it is probably not likely that change will occur within the field, since no elements do not seem to be accepted. This is concretely seen in the texts of the SHA, where arguments and perspectives from their opponents rather are rejected than acknowledged. Due to this, it does not appear as likely that there are processes going on, which will change the way the SHA perceives the wolf.

6.3 Step three – The social practice

In this third and final step, the findings in the two previous steps will be discussed from the perspectives of the theories provided in the study – human-animal studies and animal ethics theories.

The study has so far managed to demonstrate that there are a number of prominent discourses prevailing in the discussion the SHA engage in concerning the wolf and the wolf management in Sweden. By categorising and analysing the way people within the organisation are arguing about the topic, it has been possible to capture the main discourses that are influencing their perspectives. When discussing the findings of the study and its potential consequences on a societal level, the perspectives of Human-animal studies come in handy. As the literature review of this study demonstrated, there are many examples of countries in which wolves have been eradicated due to conflicting interests between human and wolves. Neither was it long ago since the wolf was extinct in Sweden as well. There are also examples in the literature pointing out that it is not unusual that hunters are holding feelings of aversion towards wolves. Signs of this aversion have clearly been identified in this study as well. This should be considered when discussing the SHAs' potential impact. Seen from a human-animal studies perspective, the SHA seems to consider that animals should exist for the benefit of hunters and that they should be managed in a way that serves humans in the most convenient way. In the world of the SHA, the animals are constructed based on their value in the eyes of the hunter. The wolf appears to be a losing species in the way the SHA perceive how nature, and the animals in it, should be managed. Their perspective could be argued to be a rather extreme form of anthropocentrism, which seem to be striving to construct the size and spreading of species in a way convenient for hunters and other "affected" people. The anthropocentric approach occurring within the SHA does not encourage a worldview in which all animals are treated equally, but rather one where some kinds of animals should be sacrificed for the sake of others (i.e. the moose).

These findings should be regarded when the implications of SHA as a powerful stakeholder in Swedish wildlife management is discussed. The way they are consequently dismissing arguments of their opponents and of those researchers who are not supporting their cause, and how they are expressing everything they say about the wolves (always negative) as not doubtable truths, makes it likely to believe that their perspective is very one sided when it comes to the wolf. The way influence and arguments from other parts of society are excluded also makes it likely to believe that the association are not keen at all to change perspectives. The only times perspectives from other parts of society are accepted, is when it serves their own purpose, i.e. from life stock owners, pet owners etc.

It is however likely to believe that the SHA plays an important role in a democratic society like Sweden, by being the voice of the hunters and other stakeholders that are suffering from negative consequences of the wolf. However, knowing how they are valuing the wolf and possibly other predators, their direct influence on the Swedish wildlife management should be scrutinized and very controlled, since they, due to the mission they have been given by the Swedish state, possesses great influence on wildlife related matters. The crucial question is whether they are able to handle it in a professional way, without letting their own interest take overhand. If they do, it is likely to be a major threat towards the Swedish wolf population.

7. Discussion

7.1 Results discussion

It was never a question whether this study would show that the Swedish Hunters Association has a restrictive approach towards wolves, nor that they would not treat them in favour over other animals, since they do officially states that they are advocators for a stricter wolf management. The literature review did furthermore point out matters related to hunters and their relation to wolves,

such as the competitiveness about game and space, horror-related issues, that it is common that hunting communities holds feelings of aversion towards wolves. These and other various socio-political problems were described as reoccurring elements of the interactions between the hunters and the wolves – problems and perceptions that were all identified in this study as well. This is why the CDA was an indeed suitable method to use, since the purpose of it is to take the part of those suppressed, which the wolf could be argued to be in this context. It was however interesting to discover how deeply rooted they are in the discussions and how much they are influencing the way the argumentations were articulated. The CDA served as a tool to be able to explore what the construction of these values and perceptions consist of and how the different discourses strongly are supporting each other; leading up to the strong feelings the hunters have towards the wolves.

There were a number of notable elements occurring both in the analysis itself, but more so when comparing the findings in the literature review. All aspects of “negative” character pointed out in the literature review, did clearly emerge in the study as well. Interesting though, was that this study could not find any support for any positive perceptions or feelings towards the wolves in the articles analysed. Though previous research has found feelings of affection and respect for the animal due to its traits and their important function as part of biodiversity and ecosystems, nothing in this study came across any utterances of such character. Things that could motivate a wolf population in Sweden was not pointed out as something positive in the documents produced by the SHA. On the contrary, the wolf is pointed out as not only a threat to other animals (the moose, above all), but also to biodiversity, due to its potential impact on grazing animals as well as on the population of wild animals.

Perspectives supporting differing opinions about the wolf than the SHA, are in the documents categorically dismissed. Opponents providing other angles of incidence are downgraded either by calling them names or, more often, by just stating that they do not know what they are talking about. Specific arguments are rarely treated objectively, which became clear when looking at the discursive order and how interfering discourses effectively were excluded and that the strong modality both strongly were functioning to support the sake of the SHA and dismissing other perspectives. This was also exemplified by the way ‘researchers’ were used as floating signifiers to promote the cause of the SHA – when it was fitting with the argumentation, ‘researchers’ were referred to as a group supporting the argument, but when researchers were mentioned in context where they had differing opinions than the ones of the SHA, they were rejected as not being adequately informed about the complete picture of the problems.

When looking at the intertextuality occurring in the documents as contrast to the literature review, all the negative aspects of a wolf populations are reproduced and in the few occasions references are being made, they are usually vague and always used in order to support the opinions of the SHA. When references are made in relation to the opponents of the SHA, they are even more vague and always functioning in their opponents’ disadvantage. This is likely to be interpreted as indicators of a lack of change of perspectives and ideas within the organisation. It does not appear as if there are possibilities of change, due to the fact that conflicting ideas and ideas from opponents appears to be expelled. One could say there are few incitements for new ideas/opinions to take place, due to the lack of intertextuality occurring in the arguments and discussion. The types of modalities taking place in the debate seem to be functioning the same way as the intertextuality, though they are continuously functioning and expressed as “truths”, regardless if it is in contexts where the extension of the negative aspects of the wolf are expressed or a statement about the ignorance of an opponent.

7.2. Method discussion

There are some points concerning the method and assumptions made in this study that are important to discuss. The general approach of the study is one of them. Seeing that the purpose of qualitative research is not to generalise, but rather to interpret and investigate the character of something in order to try to reach some sort of deeper understanding. Neither is the purpose of the CDA to study what reality actually looks like, or what people intrinsically mean by the utterances they make, but rather to investigate and make visible how some ideas and statements are perceived/produced as more true than others are. In trying to do so, however, a challenge is to stay neutral towards the data being studied and towards the purpose of the study. There are though

other traits of the CDA, which are making it challenging to stay objective in the research. As mentioned in the theoretical chapter, one of the main purposes of the CDA is to reveal/investigate how discourses reproduce and also creates unequal power balances. Therefore, it is not politically neutral, since it takes the side of those who are oppressed in power relations. Due to this, there are obviously already some preconceived ideas about what the outcomes of the study might consist of when the author of the study chooses what to study. As a researcher one is also part of constructing the discourses studied, by being the one who is choosing the research design and the selection of data. I decided to explore the topic of this study after having understood that the SHA is both involved in the Swedish wildlife management based on a mission given by the Swedish state, whilst at the same time being an interest organisation for the majority of the hunters in the Sweden. I thought that this might be a disadvantage for the wolf population, since I had a bias idea of hunters as people who does not like wolves, but also because the SHA officially states that they have a restrictive wolf policy. Due to this, the CDA came in very handy as method and theory. These are though aspects that might threaten the credibility of the study. A person with an other background, having differing preconceived ideas and choosing other data to analyse than I, would perhaps jump to other conclusions than the ones in this study. However. By being transparent with my preconceived ideas and by being as clear as possible when presenting the research design and the analytical process, so that the reader of the study shall be able to understand how the empirical data has been interpreted and then presented in the conclusions of the study.

Another question is whether the empirical data of this research, 16 articles, are providing enough generalizability as for this organization consisting of hundreds of thousands members. It is likely to believe that all members of the organization are not sharing the arguments and ideas that are expressed in the documents. But the documents are on the other hand authored by people in leading positions of the organisation and people who are given a lot of room to express themselves in the SHAs' different channels. None of the documents are, compared to the other ones, expressing any different ideas and wouldn't the vast majority of the members agree with what the association officially expresses, there would most likely be other people in these positions having different opinions.

8. Conclusions

By critically analyse and single out the discourses occurring in the argumentation the Swedish Hunters Association use when discussing the wolf population in Sweden, this study has investigated the perspectives of this powerful organisation. Although the SHA claims that they treat all animals with the same amount of respect, do they at the same time, which they themselves state, see the wolf as a competitor of land use and game, as well as a threat to the Swedish hunting tradition with loose running dogs. Due to this, their wish is to have a very restrictive wolf management. It does however seem as if the authors of the documents analysed, holds a rather distinct aversion towards the wolf, which research about hunters previously has pointed out oftentimes is the case. The way the SHA perceives animals appears to build on a strictly anthropocentric worldview, in which animals should be managed in a way that are the most satisfactory for hunters. This approach is indeed disadvantageous for the wolf, since it, due to the reasons above, threatens the way the hunters want to execute their hunt. Ecocentric approaches and arguments such as the importance of biodiversity, which would be likely to favour a vivid wolf population, are either absent or consequently dismissed in the documents. This is demonstrated by how the SHA are excluding their opponents by reducing and dismissing their arguments and by making their own arguments appearing as the only reasonable way forward. The critical discourse analysis is invented by Fairclough to make unequal power balances emerge, and in this study it is demonstrated how the SHA with their arguments are letting their ideological ideas about the wildlife management are using discourses, which are making all potential positive aspects of a vivid wolf population, or of the wolf as an animal, absent. This is demonstrated by not accepting differing views of the wolf and by creating only negative images of the animal.

However. It has also become clear that the SHA is an organisation experiencing a substantial resistance from the society, which does not seem to acknowledge the frustration and hopelessness that hunters and other people negatively affected by the wolf are experiencing. Due to this does

the SHA seem to perceive themselves as the voice of those who are affected by the wolf, an important voice, since those who do not live close to the wolf may not know what it means to do so. In a democratic society, such voice is probably of great importance – the most basic democratic principle should be that everyone is able to make his or her opinion heard. This principle, which the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency at least officially seems to follow, should reasonably also be guiding the decisions that are taken/will be taken concerning the way the Swedish wolf population should be executed. This matter is hopefully concerned when the SHAs' influence on the same is decided upon by the Swedish state,

9. Future research

Adequate future research building on this study could focus on other animals than the wolf, such as ungulates and how those are being perceived by the SHA, interesting differences concerning perspectives might be found. Another direction would be to compare the SHA's perspectives about the wolf with those of other organisations, such as of various conservation organisations.

10. List of references

- Bisi, J., Liukkonen, T., Mykrä, S., Pohja-Mykrä, M., & Kurki, S. (2010). The good bad wolf—wolf evaluation reveals the roots of the Finnish wolf conflict. *European Journal of Wildlife Research*, 56(5), 771–779. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10344-010-0374-0>
- Burr, V. (1995). *An introduction to social constructionism*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Ceballos, G., Ehrlich, P. R., Soberón, J., Salazar, I., & Fay, J. P. (2005). Global Mammal Conservation: What Must We Manage? *Science*, 309(5734), 603–607. <http://doi.org/10.1126/science.1114015>
- DeMello, M. (2012). *Animals and Society: An Introduction to Human-Animal Studies*. Columbia University Press.
- Ericsson, G., & Heberlein, T. A. (2003). Attitudes of hunters, locals, and the general public in Sweden now that the wolves are back. *Biological Conservation*, 111(2), 149–159. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207\(02\)00258-6](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207(02)00258-6)
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social research*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1984). “The order of discourse” in M.Shapiro (ed) *The Language of Politics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Inglis, D., & Thorpe, C. (2012). *An invitation to social theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Inskip, C., & Zimmermann, A. (2009). Human-felid conflict: a review of patterns and priorities worldwide. *Oryx*, 43(01), 18–34. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S003060530899030X>
- Jägareförbundet, S. (n.d.-a). Den goda jaktetiken. Retrieved March 7, 2016, from <http://jagareforbundet.se/jakten/etik/den-goda-jaktetiken/>
- Jägareförbundet, S. (n.d.-b). Svenska Jägareförbundets rovdjurspolicy. Retrieved March 7, 2016, from <http://jagareforbundet.se/jakten/stora-rovdjur/svenska-jagareforbundets-rovdjurspolicy/>
- Jägareförbundet, S. (n.d.-c). Vargen - så här tycker vi. Retrieved March 7, 2016, from <http://jagareforbundet.se/om/var-verksamhet/vad-tycker-vi/vargen-sa-har-tycker-jagareforbundet/>
- Karanth, K. U., & Chellam, R. (2009). Carnivore conservation at the crossroads. *Oryx*, 43(01), 1–2. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S003060530843106X>
- Kruuk, H. (2002). *Hunter and Hunted: Relationships Between Carnivores and People*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mål för viltstammarna. (n.d.). [text]. Retrieved February 24, 2016, from <http://www.naturvardsverket.se/Miljoarbete-i-samhallet/Miljoarbete-i-Sverige/Viltforvaltning/Mal-for-viltstammarna/>
- Palmer, C. (2003). *Environmental ethics: an anthology*. (A. Light, Ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.
- Ripple, W. J., Estes, J. A., Beschta, R. L., Wilmers, C. C., Ritchie, E. G., Hebblewhite, M., ... Wirsing, A. J. (2014). Status and Ecological Effects of the World’s Largest Carnivores. *Science*, 343(6167), 1241484. <http://doi.org/10.1126/science.1241484>
- Silverman, D. (2014). *Interpreting qualitative data /: David Silverman* (Fifth edition). London: SAGE.

Skogen, K., & Thrane, C. (2007). Wolves in Context: Using Survey Data to Situate Attitudes Within a Wider Cultural Framework. *Society & Natural Resources*, 21(1), 17–33.

<http://doi.org/10.1080/08941920701460408>

Treves, A., & Karanth, K. U. (2003). Human-Carnivore Conflict and Perspectives on Carnivore Management Worldwide. *Conservation Biology*, 17(6), 1491–1499. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2003.00059.x>

Winther Jørgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2000). *Diskursanalys som teori och metod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

11. Appendix 1 – Empirical data

2014-01-19 Dagens Nyheter	Risk för illegal vargjakt
2014-09-26 Svensk jakt	Vi är mycket tydliga i vargfrågan
2014-12-09 SHA homepage	Varför säger förbundet inte noll vargar?
2015-02-08 Svenska Dagbladet	MP:s syn på vargar är verklighetsfrånvärd
2015-07-26 SHA homepage	En örfil i vargens spår
2015-08-20 SHA homepage	Lågt, förbannat lågt SNF!
2015-10-06 Svensk Jakt	Jägareförbundet: ”Utredningar stödjer fortsatt vargjakt”
2015-10-07 SHA homepage	I motvind och uppförsbacke...
2015-11-03 Svensk Jakt	Slugiltigt kvitto på galenskap
2015-11-30 Svensk Jakt	Något har gått riktigt snett i samhället
2016-01-01 Svensk Jakt	Ovärdigt spel för gallerierna
2016-01-04 Svensk Jakt	Naturskyddsföreningen fortsätter förvilla
2016-02-08 Svensk Jakt	Förbundet vill förlänga jakten
2016-02-14 SHA homepage	Det kokar i jägarleden
2016-02-29 svensk Jakt	Nu får det vara nog
2016-03-02 Svensk Jakt	Kaos hotar – vargens skyddsklass måste ändras
2016-03-17 Svensk Jakt	Varg eller människa – vem är störst miljöbov?