

# Literature List - Facilitation in Project and Conflict Management

**MX0148.** January 18 – March 23, 2021

**Note:** changes in the literature list may occur. The course does not have a course book that you need to buy in advance. All literature will be available in the course CANVAS page once the course starts. If you have any questions regarding the literature or other course related questions please contact [camilo.calderon@slu.se](mailto:camilo.calderon@slu.se)

## Types of readings

The literature list is structured with readings for the different course weeks (CW). The list is divided in Required Readings (RR) and Supplementary Readings (SR). Detailed reading instructions will be provided at the beginning of the course.

**RR - Required Readings** are texts that you have to read. They contain main concepts and theories presented during the course lectures. They will help you prepare for and further develop your knowledge on the lectures, workshops and assignments of the CW.

**SR - Supplementary Readings** are texts provided for expanding your understanding of a theory, concept or topic of a CW. These are mainly texts that use such concepts or theories in specific cases or situations. They are also texts that contain related concepts or theories to the ones presented in the course lectures. Supplementary Readings are optional but they are very valuable as a basis for assignments and your home exam as it will help you to strengthen your arguments. **It is recommended to skim through all of the SR and choose a few that can be useful for your assignments.**

## Literature list

### RR literature seminar - CW 1 (group reading following reading instructions for literature seminars)

Coleman, PT. (2006). Intractable conflict. In Deutsch, M., Coleman, PT., Marcus, EC. (Eds): The handbook of conflict resolution – theory and practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 533-559.

Hallgren, L. (2016). Reframing conflict in natural resource management: Mutuality, reciprocity, and pluralistic agonism as dynamics of community constructivity and destructivity. In Petersson et al.: Environmental Communication and Community: Constructive and Destructive Dynamics of Social Transformation. London: Routledge. 16-29.

Hallgren, L., Bergeå, H., & Westberg, L. (2018). Communication problems when participants disagree (or avoid disagreeing) in dialogues in Swedish natural resource management—challenges to agonism in practice. *Frontiers in Communication*, 3, 56.

### **Supplementary readings - CW 1**

Ångman, E., Hallgren, L., Nordström, E-M. (2011). Managing Impressions and Forests: The Importance of Role Confusion in Co-Creation of a Natural Resource Conflict, *Society & Natural Resources*, 24:12, 1335-1344.

Buijs, A., Lawrence, A., (2013). Emotional conflicts in rational forestry: towards a research agenda for understanding emotions in environmental conflicts. *Forest Policy and Economics*.33(1):104-111.

Coleman, PT., Deutsch M. (2006). Some guidelines for developing a creative approach to conflict. In Deutsch, M., Coleman, PT., Marcus, EC. (Eds): *The handbook of conflict resolution – theory and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 402-413.

Gillespie, A. (2008). The intersubjective dynamics of trust, distrust, and manipulation. In: *Trust and Distrust: Sociocultural Perspectives*. Information Age Publishing. 273-289.

Gomes de Matos, F. (2006). Language, peace and conflict resolution. In Deutsch, M., Coleman, PT., Marcus, EC. (Eds): *The handbook of conflict resolution – theory and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 158-175.

Krauss, R.M., Morsella, E. (2006). Communication and conflict. In Deutsch, M., Coleman, PT., Marcus, EC. (Eds): *The handbook of conflict resolution – theory and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 144-157.

Watson, R. (2009). Constitutive practices and Garfinkel's notion of trust: Revisited. *Journal of classical sociology*. Vol 9 Issue 4, 475-499.

### **RR literature seminar - CW 2 (group reading following reading instructions for literature seminars)**

Bäcklund, P. & Mäntysalo, R. (2010). Agonism and institutional ambiguity: Ideas on democracy and the role of participation in the development of planning theory and practice – the case of Finland. *Planning Theory* 9(4): 333-350.

Ganesh, S. & Zoller; H. M. (2013). Dialogue, Activism and Democratic Social Change. *Communication Theory* 22(1): 66-91.

Larsen, R., Raitio, K., Stinnerbom, M. & Wik-Karlsson, J. (2017) Sami-state collaboration in the governance of cumulative effects assessment: A critical action research approach. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 64: 67–76

### **Supplementary readings - CW 2**

*[For Camilo Calderon's 28/01]*

Calderon, C., & Westin, M. (2019). Understanding context and its influence on collaborative planning processes: A contribution to communicative planning theory. *International Planning Studies*.

Calderon, C., & Ledo, P. (n.d.). Participatory planning in the global South: the case of Sacaba, Bolivia

*[For the whole CW]*

Bond, S. (2011). Negotiating a 'democratic ethos': moving beyond the agonistic-communicative divide. *Planning Theory* 10(2): 161-186.

Connelly, S. & Richardson, T. (2004). Exclusion: The necessary difference between ideal and practical consensus. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 47(1): 3-17.

Gruber, HE. (2006). Creativity and conflict resolution – the role of point of view. In Deutsch, M., Coleman, PT., Marcus, EC. (Eds): *The handbook of conflict resolution – theory and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 391-401.

Forester, J. & Theckethil, R.K. (2009). Rethinking Risk Management Policies: From "Participation" to Processes of Dialogue, Debate, and Negotiation In U. Fra Paleo (Ed.) Building Safer Communities. Risk Governance, Spatial Planning, and Responses to Natural Hazards IOS Press, 2009.

Johnson, DW, Johnson, RT, Tjosvold, D. (2006). Constructive controversy – the value of intellectual opposition. In Deutsch, M., Coleman, PT., Marcus, EC. (Eds): The handbook of conflict resolution – theory and practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 69-91.

Kühn, M. (2020) 'Agonistic planning theory revisited: The planner's role in dealing with conflict', *Planning Theory*. doi: [10.1177/1473095220953201](https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095220953201).

Mattila, H. (2019). Habermas revisited: Resurrecting the contested roots of communicative planning theory. *Progress in Planning*, 100431.

Saarikoski, H. Raitio, K, Barry, J. (2012). Understanding 'successful' conflict resolution: Policy regime changes and new interactive arenas in the Great Bear Rainforest. *Land Use Policy* 32 (2013) 271–280.

### **RR during CW 1 and CW2 for Home Exam Part 1 (individual reading see instructions for Home Exam Part 1)**

Nonviolent Peaceforce (2011). Interstate Conflict in South Sudan: A Case Study in Unarmed Civilian Peacekeeping. Retrieved 2012-01-11 from: [https://www.nonviolentpeaceforce.org/images/news/Interstate\\_Conflict\\_South\\_Sudan\\_Case\\_Study\\_Unarmed\\_Civilian\\_Peacekeeping.pdf](https://www.nonviolentpeaceforce.org/images/news/Interstate_Conflict_South_Sudan_Case_Study_Unarmed_Civilian_Peacekeeping.pdf)

van Teijlingen, K. & Hogenboom, B. (2016). Debating Alternative Development at the Mining Frontier: Buen Vivir and the Conflict around El Mirador Mine in Ecuador. *Journal of Developing Societies* 32, 4 (2016): 382–420.

Kronenburg García, A. (2017). Exploring the 'layeredness' of recurring natural resource conflicts: The role of Loita Maasai leadership in the Naimina Enkiyo Forest conflicts in Kenya. *Land Use Policy*, 65, 66-77.

### **Required readings for project work - CW 3, 4, 5 and 6 (group reading in PW teams)**

**Note:** These are texts that can help you during the group project work. You are not expected to read all of these texts. You are expected to scan through all of them and identify the ones that are more relevant to your group work and the *real work case* that you will investigate. You are expected to use some of these texts as a reference to your investigation and in the report. You are also encouraged to use all RRs and SRs during your project work.

### **Texts useful for investigation of real world case**

Calderon, C. (2019). Unearthing the political: differences, conflicts and power in participatory urban design. *Journal of Urban Design*.

Daniels, E. and Walker GB. (2001). *Working through Environmental Conflicts. The collaborative learning approach*. Ch. 3 and 4. Understanding Conflict Situations. Praeger Publishers Westport.

Gray, B. (2003). *Framing of environmental disputes*. In: Making Sense of Intractable Environmental Conflicts. Concepts and Cases. Eds. Roy J. Lewicki, Barbara Gray & Michael Elliot. Island Press. Washington. 11–34.

Hallgren, L. and Westberg, L. (2015). Adaptive management? Observations of knowledge coordination in the communication practice of Swedish game management. In *Wildlife biology* issue 21, 165-174.

Marková, Ivana. (2012). Conflict and trust in dialogical perspective. In Markova, I. & Gillespie, A. (eds) *Trust and Conflict – representation, culture and dialogue*. New York: Routledge.

Raitio, K. (2016). *Seized and missed opportunities in responding to conflicts*. Constructivity and destructivity in forest conflict management in Finland and British Columbia, Canada. In Peterson et al: *Environmental Communication and Community: Constructive and Destructive Dynamics of Social Transformation*. London: Routledge.

Raitio, K. (2013). Discursive institutionalist approach to conflict management analysis: The case of old-growth forest conflicts on Finnish state-owned land. *Forest Policy and Economics*.

Rosenberg, MB. (2004). *We Can Work It Out: Resolving Conflicts Peacefully and Powerfully*. Puddle dancer press. (pp. 12).

Simmel, G. 1955 (1908). Conflict. In Simmel, G. *Conflict and The web of Group-Affiliations*. p. 13 – 35 [until “Legal conflict”] New York: The free press.

von Essen, E. (2017). "Environmental disobedience and the dialogic dimensions of dissent." *Democratization* 24(2): 305-324.

### **Texts useful for reflection of team work**

Cilliers, F., Koortzen, P. (2000). The Psychodynamics view of organizational behaviour. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*. 38. 59-67.

Long, S. (2004). Building an institution for experiential learning. (p 101 – 138). In Gould, Stapley and Stein (eds): *Experiential learning in organisations*. Karnac. (pp. 37).

Marsick, VJ., Sauquet, A., Yorks, L. (2006). Learning through reflection. In Deutsch, M., Coleman, PT., Marcus, EC. (Eds): *The handbook of conflict resolution – theory and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Prins, S. (2006). The psychodynamic perspective in organizational research: Making sense of the dynamics of direction setting in emergent collaborative processes *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*.

### **Required readings during CW 7 for lectures and workshops in CW 8 (individual reading)**

Bryson, J. M., Quick, K. S., Slotterback, C. S., & Crosby, B. C. (2013). Designing public participation processes. *Public administration review*, 73(1), 23-34.

Gaventa, J. (2006) Finding the Spaces for Change: A Power Analysis. *IDS Bulletin* 37(6): 23–33.

Westin, M., Calderon, C., & Hellquist, A. (2014). The Inquiry Based Approach IBA: a facilitator's handbook. Visby: SWEDES - Swedish International Centre of Education for Sustainable Development. *Part I*

Westin, M. (2019). Rethinking power in participatory planning: Towards reflective practice. (PhD), SLU, Uppsala. Prologue, *Chapter 4 and Section 8.4.*

**Supplementary readings - during CW 7 for lectures and workshops in CW 8**

Allwood, J. (2014). Trust as communicative and epistemic simplifier and facilitator. In Markova. Dialogical approaches to trust in communication. London: Information age publishing. 189-211.

Bush, RAB and Folger JP. (1994). The promise of mediation. Responding to conflict through empowerment and recognition. Ch. 5. Capturing opportunities for empowerment and recognition. Jossey-Bass publ. San Francisco. 113-138.

Hay, C. (2002). Political analysis. Basingstoke: Palgrave. Chapter 5: Divided by a common language? Conceptualising power.

Forester, John. Profiles of practitioners. Practice stories from the field. On-line material available at: [http://courses2.cit.cornell.edu/fit117/COLL\\_Planners.htm](http://courses2.cit.cornell.edu/fit117/COLL_Planners.htm)

Flyvbjerg, B. (2002). Bringing power to planning research: One researcher's praxis story. Journal of Planning Education and Research, 21(4), 352-366.

Luyet, V., Schlaepfer, R., Parlange, M. B., & Buttler, A. (2012). A framework to implement Stakeholder participation in environmental projects. Journal of Environmental Management, 111(0), 213-219.

Mouffe, C. (2007). Artistic activism and agonistic spaces. Art and research - A journal of ideas, contexts and methods. Vol 1, No 2.

Sidaway, R. (2005). Resolving Environmental Disputes. Ch. 9. Organizations, Power and Conflict. (39 p.) From Conflict to Consensus. Cromwell Press Ltd. Trowbridge.

Susskind, L. & Thomas-Larmer, J. (1999). Conducting a conflict assessment. In: Susskind, L. & McKearnan, S. & Thomas, Larmer, J. 1999. The consensus building handbook. A comprehensive guide to reaching agreement. The consensus building institute, Sage publications. (38 p.).

Westin, M. (2019). Rethinking power in participatory planning: Towards reflective practice. (PhD), SLU, Uppsala. Chapter 2.