

Framing Conflict in Society

NWO - Conflict programme line

Prof. M.L.J. Karskens (Chair)
Radboud University Nijmegen

Dr P.C. Ruigrok
University of Amsterdam

Prof. E. van Dijk
Leiden University

Dr H.J. van Houtum
Radboud University Nijmegen

Prof. G. Buelens
Utrecht University

Dr B.M. Oomen
Roosevelt Academy

Dr. M.M. Kommer
Ministry of Justice

Conflict and perception of conflict

Who actually started the fight in the sandpit? Was it adultery or a logical response to years of neglect? Are company clothing regulations practical measures or forms of outright discrimination? Is it constructive criticism or belittlement? Is Mladic a hero or a villain? Is the discussion about a holy shrine or merely a plot of fertile farming land? Is it aggression or a pre-emptive strike?

Conflict can be seen as a “situation perceived by the actors or the observer as a discord (dissensus, *différend*) between interacting agents or powers vis-à-vis an end situation of incompatibility”. The *perception of conflicts* thus forms an essential inroad to understanding both conflict dynamics and possible resolutions. After all, the essence of conflict, like beauty, often lies in the eye of the beholder. Conflicts arise among other things from differences in disputants’ perceptions about the issue at hand, what is important and what should be done. As Ross (1983) puts it, “conflicts are rooted both in interests and in participants’ observations of events and other actors.” How the conflict is understood by the different parties depends strongly on the way the conflict is perceived, constructed and narrated. In other words, understanding the *framing* of the conflict is a crucial step when we want to understand a conflict.

Framing conflicts: Defining the concept

Framing takes shape in cultural symbols such as speeches, news items, conversations and symbolic actions and ritual events, but also in public debates, government policies, legislation and court case. In addition, literature, film, music, poetry and art also play a role in framing conflict. The notion of framing has therefore surfaced in many fields, including psychology and sociology, management and organisation studies and media studies, but also in law and legal sociology, decision-making, negotiation, peace and conflict studies and environmental conflict management. A frame, as a noun, denotes the boundary within which one captures a whole picture, similar to a frame placed around a photo or painting, referring to a static situation. Framing as a verb indicates a process, referring to the creation or the transportation of frames.

Within a conflict context, scholars refer to frames as “cognitive structures held in memory and used to guide interpretation of new experience” (Minsky, 1975; Tannen, 1979). Furthermore, “parties rely on these mental structures to interpret or make sense of ongoing events” (Gray, 1997). People create and use frames to make sense of a situation in order to identify and interpret specific aspects that seem important in understanding the situation, and to communicate that interpretation to others. This is in line with Entman’s definition of the concept, although he goes a step further in saying that the frame can also include an evaluation of the situation and an assessment about what to do about the problem discussed. According to Entman (1993, p. 52) framing is “to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation.”

Within the context of conflict, framing may take many forms. It may for example refer to the valence of the conflict issues (positive vs. negative) or the nature of the conflict (e.g. resources vs. ideology; greed vs. grievance). In addition, parties may define the conflict differently depending on whether they take a short term or long term perspective. The form of framing is also determined by the level of analysis. At the lowest (micro) level, conflicts may be perceived as individual conflicts, and at the highest (macro) levels as conflicts involving nations, cultures or world ideologies. This level of analysis will most likely affect the spatial delineation of conflict, for example by influencing the perception of property rights (e.g. by defining property

in individual versus collective terms). Moreover, depending on the level of analysis, people may differ in how they define their own identities (e.g. as an individual, a woman, a religious believer, a citizen or an outsider; cf. social identity theory, Tajfel & Turner, 1987), and situational characteristics may affect this process of self definition. These situations are all characterised by the occurrence of (potential) diversity and identifying a certain frame suggests that other frames could have been used. A common denominator in studies into framing can be found in the notion that a problem can be understood, constructed or narrated in different ways. A frame can therefore be considered a sense making device (Weick, 1995), providing meaning to a previously ambiguous situation or domain.

Frames in action: how do frames arise, evolve and change?

The different frames parties use may reflect deliberate distortions of reality, e.g. when parties aim to present the conflict to their own advantage. The differing views may also, however, be less intentional and reflect a subjective and even nonconscious construction or reconstruction of reality. In general, we can state that the perception of a conflict situation is not a given, but a constructed reality. This construction of reality can evolve over time, as the social, cultural and economic environment changes, when new parties get involved or when mediators or media become engaged. A conflict is a dynamic process passing through a number of stages from an increased tension triggering a conflict to a post conflict situation in which the parties involved come to terms with the past. With conflicts changing over time, the real world changes over time and with that the construction of this reality - the framing of the conflict - will change too. This is a reciprocal and recurrent process since the framing of the conflict can have an impact on the development of the conflict as well: how parties perceive a conflict may strongly affect the actions people take, influencing the intensity and character of the conflict. The way the involved parties or outsiders frame a conflict can trigger a process of escalation or de-escalation, the continuation or termination of a conflict.

Framing, frames and the effects

As we saw above, the frames used during conflicts influence the course of events. However, the frame itself is a construction as well, undergoing influences during its construction phase, with the frame subsequently influencing the perception of the people confronted with this frame. The build up to the Iraqi war in 2003 is such an example. During this period the American media embraced the framework provided by the US and UK government, of Saddam Hussein possessing weapons of mass destruction ready to kill the rebellious people and attack the Western world. "Facing 'Common Enemy', Terrorism and Weapons of Mass Destruction" reads the headline of the New York Times of 1 February 2003. This newspaper later apologised for its one-sided news coverage. Ombudsman Daniel Okrent stated that the newspaper "fell for misinformation" and concluded that "the failure was not individual, but institutional."

It is often assumed that within the interpersonal context a conflict can come to an end if the parties come to perceive the conflict from the perspective of the adversary. Adopting the frame of the other party does not guarantee a smooth ending, however. What seems essential is whether a shared frame offers opportunities for mutual agreement. Drake and Donohue (1996) for example, in their study into marital dispute mediations present four types of frames (fact, interest, value and relational) and show that mediators who focus on frame convergence on any of these four frames reaches a greater number of agreements. Negotiation seems to be fruitful the moment mediators achieve the delineation of a frame within which an agreement can be reached.

An example of outsiders' influence on the framing of a conflict and the subsequent political actions undertaken can be found in the case of the Netherlands and the Bosnian war. The Dutch involvement in Bosnia is marked by the pictures of the emaciated men behind barbed wire in 'Omarska'. These pictures were framed as a new Holocaust with headlines captioning the photos with "Belsen '92". These images brought back memories of the concentration camps in Nazi Germany, with the Serbian forces in the role of Nazi's, and pricked a collective conscience, acting as a catalyst for the Dutch morally based crusade for military intervention in the conflict, with editorial boards writing "Intervention Necessary" (*NRC Handelsblad*, 5 August 1992) and "But doing nothing is no longer possible" (*de Volkskrant*, 8 August 1992). Research showed that the Dutch media purposely framed the Bosnian war in a stereotypical way. As Wieten concludes (2002, 83), "*Media and politics seem to have aided each other in creating a rather stereotypical, simplified picture of the conflict, and, as a consequence, also of what the international community, the Netherlands in particular, could do to bring it to an end and solve it.*"

Aim of the research programme

Framing occupies a central role in the occurrence, the development as well as the resolution of these conflicts. In the words of Kaplowitz (1990, p. 56): "If one's primary concern ... is to understand the *dynamics of conflict* and the strategies most likely to be effective in transforming destructive into constructive processes, then it is also crucial to focus upon the *differences in perceptions* of parties to conflict. Then one needs to analyse the differences with which parties perceive the same issues, events, policies, and peoples." Therefore, more knowledge about the framing of conflicts is needed. Not only can research lead to more knowledge about the character and the dynamics of the conflict, it can also help to prevent conflict, to de-escalate conflicts, and to form an aid in the phase of reconciliation after conflicts and thus lead to conflict *transformation* instead of their mere *resolution* (Lederach 1995, Reimann). This programme concerns framing as a phenomenon in itself as well as the consequences of the framing or reframing of conflicts.

The programme seeks to provide answers to the questions of how perceptions of conflict in different phases are constructed and how the specific framing affects the development of the conflict and its transformation. How does this process affect the actions that people take? How does it influence the dynamics and outcomes of the conflict? And how can framing processes be applied to prevent and resolve conflicts?

On a meta level and methodological level, the programme offers the possibility of both empirical and conceptual studies and reviews of literature on conflict framing, categorising and characterisation of the other.

This programme has direct links with the other programmes within this research theme. Framing can shed light on conflicts within an organisational context or on conflicts related to gender, ethnicity, religion and natural resources: a labour dispute, for instance, might be framed in terms of socio-economic differences, but also as an instance of gender discrimination. However, we invite scholars from all scientific disciplines to come up with research proposals aiming to deepen our knowledge about the power of framing within the conflict dimensions, within and beyond the scope of the examples mentioned.

Within the dynamic process of conflicts, three important components play a crucial role. First of all, and directly related to the people involved, is the aspect of emotions. Most conflicts have a great impact on the people directly involved and go hand in hand with emotions. Here again, framing of the conflict can cause, escalate, or diminish emotions. On an individual level, the framing process of a conflict can easily trigger stress, fear, anxiety or even hate among the

parties involved. However, the same tendencies can be seen on a macro level of analysis. Collective emotions, such as fear, anxiety or hate can be triggered by the framing method, with all possible consequences. The examples above show how a simplified picture of bad guys and good guys presented by the media can cause collective indignation, resulting in involvement in a war. Moreover, with the current War on Terror, an increased feeling of fear rages through the world (Burkitt, 2005).

A second specific focus within the programme is related to the power differences in the relationship between the parties involved. Especially with respect to the issue of conflict, it should be acknowledged that conflicts arise in contexts characterised and shaped by power differences. Often, these power differences themselves are the subject of conflicts. Moreover, conflicts are frequently framed as political issues and fights for power (e.g. as war or conquest, revolution or liberation, repression or subjection). And finally, framing processes of course do not take place in a social or political vacuum. Within this context one could ask what role the distribution of political and social power plays in conflict framing.

The focus on framing in the conflict process opens up possibilities to prevent, manage and resolve conflicts. The interplay of perception, narration, representation, behaviour, social practices and outcomes during a conflict results in a dynamic and recurrent process of construction and reconstruction. Therefore, we assign a special role to the process of *Reframing* and *Deframing* conflicts. Reframing and/or Deframing a (potential) conflict situation in terms of for example valence, threat, opportunity and time perspective may first of all affect a notion of conflict among people. Moreover, in the course of conflict changes, reframing a conflict, by taking a new or unexpected perspective, might influence how people manage and resolve conflict, but also how a conflict is memorised.

Framing, conflict and emotion

Conflicts are often highly emotional, making it difficult for the parties involved to calmly assess the situation and determine how best to advance their personal and/or common interests. Since emotions lie at the core of many difficult conflicts, they must be addressed and cannot be simply suppressed, because that might even escalate the conflict yet further. The framing of conflict can trigger, evoke, deepen but also diminish these emotions. Mass media focusing on the violence aspect of small and large-scale conflicts may for example increase feelings of fear and insecurity among the audience. The Rwanda radio station Mille Collines, for example, began a hate campaign in July 1993 broadcasting and publishing material referring to the Tutsi as cockroaches that needed to be exterminated. Mass media may, however, also diminish feelings of fear and insecurity by providing insight and understanding for the arguments and perspectives of the parties involved (Kaufman, 2006).

With regard to the consequences of elicited emotions, a distinction can be made between intrapersonal and interpersonal effects. Intrapersonal effects refer to how our emotions affect our own cognitions, strategies, behaviours and practices. For example, anger may lead us to engage in destructive behaviours. Interpersonal effects refer to how our emotions affect others' cognitions, strategies and behaviours. For example, anger may evoke others to resort to destructive behaviours as well. When it comes to conflict, both effects may independently or jointly affect the conflict process.

To understand conflict, the analyses need to be broadened by also incorporating intergroup emotions (e.g. intergroup anger and fear). In a similar vein, collective emotions such as patriotism, collective guilt and compassion fatigue may influence conflict and perceptions of conflict, past or present. It seems worthwhile to investigate how the emotions subsequently turn

into behaviour. One possibility is that the way in which people construe the situation they face strongly determines what they consider to be appropriate behaviour (March, 1985). As such, the framing of conflict, and the emotions that go with it, will most likely determine a wide variety of conflict behaviours varying from resistance to yield in bargaining contexts, to derogation in intergroup contexts and violence in political contexts. In political science, for example, research shows that emotions such as anger and disgust can shape evaluations of presidential and government performance (Conover & Feldman 1986).

The role of emotions is not restricted to the heating up of conflicts, however. Emotions (e.g. positive emotions such as pride) may have a positive effect on the development of conflict as well. On a global level, emotional images of conflict can trigger compassion and consequently international attention to a local conflict, and thereby instigate subsequent actions (Moeller, 1999). Moreover, emotions (guilt, regret, remorse, forgiveness and commemoration) can play an important role in the process of reconciliation after the conflict.

The analysis provided above highlights the interrelatedness and dynamics of the framing of conflict and emotions. On the one hand, the presentation and interpretation of conflict will determine what emotions will be evoked. On the other hand, the emotions that people experience determine how the conflict will be perceived. The leading question of this part of the programme will therefore be: *What is the interrelation between emotions and framing of conflict?*

Framing, conflict and power

Construal and framing processes do not take place in a social or political vacuum. They arise in socio-political contexts that are already shaped by institutionalised power differences and ongoing political fights for power. Ordinary social life is imbued with political symbols, ideas and narratives on national and international conflicts past and present. Often, power differences themselves are the source and subject of conflicts: resistance against authorities, liberation or emancipation movements and (civil) disobedience are widespread conflicts in social life. Moreover, other conflicts, such as labour disputes or family quarrels, are frequently framed as political issues, resistance against authorities or fights for power. And finally, many conflicts are framed in legal terms, as infractions of rights and obligations, and taken to court.

Power can be generally defined as the ability of an actor to make other actors to do what they would otherwise not want to do. As such it directly affects how people behave in situations of conflict. How does power work on the level of conflict framing? How does it already affect and interact with identification and self-definition processes (e.g. Wenzel & Jobling (2006) and Paasi (1996) on geo-political self definition)? How does (self) perception of power positions influence differences in perceptions and thus different framing of the conflict?

In this context it will be important to pay attention to the way in which already existing power differences influence conflict framing by privileging powerful actors or fora in their construction of the conflict-narrative. Stage setting, selective highlighting of certain issues ('integration of foreigners'), denegation of the other (e.g. Said, 1978; Van Houtum & Van Naerssen, 2002, on bordering and exclusion), political newspeak ('terrorism', 'illegals') and legal reframing are well known power strategies in the definition and narration of a conflict.

Therefore, the leading question of this part of the programme will be: *What is the impact of power differences on construal and conflict processes?*

Framing, conflict and reframing

A focus on conflict frames also offers insight into the potential role that can be played by both *reframing* and *deframing* the causes, objectives and ways of resolving the conflict at hand. Both are purposive activities, and cannot only help parties make sense of and resolve a conflict, but also play a role in whether parties experience conflict at all (Suurmond, 2005). Reframing, in this context, refers to the purposive management of frames, and the replacement of a certain set of perceptions by one or more alternatives. Deframing refers to the explicit deconstruction of conflict narratives, without offering an alternative version, thus leaving room for a wider variety of understandings of the conflict than was previously the case. The literature on negotiation theory, restorative justice and conflict transformation, but also on the narration of conflicts in the media, indicates how reframing of a conflict cannot only lead to its short-term resolution, but also to more successful, long-term conflict transformation and thus prevention of re-escalation (Lederac, 1995). This becomes increasingly important now that many contemporary conflicts are protracted and cyclical, crossing repeatedly into and out of conflict (Miall, 2001). Finally, reframing decides how a specific conflict is remembered or goes down in history. Often this leads to new conflicts over the legitimacy of these stories. A conflict that is officially 'over' is thus continued with different means (historiography, propaganda, art).

The processes involved in reframing may partly mimic the processes that underlie framing and narration. Like framing and narration, the concept of reframing concentrates on which stories people tell and how these stories are presented and construed. "Reframing is changing the way the public sees the world. It is changing what counts as common sense. Because language activates frames, new language is required for new frames. Thinking differently requires speaking differently" (Lakoff, 2004, p. 15). The process of reframing can be highly instrumental for the development and possible resolving of conflict situations because reframing may be used to affect how the parties involved view themselves, how they view their opponent, and how they view the conflict situation they face. At all levels, this kind of reframing can "guide us toward developing alternative understandings of ourselves experiencing the conflict; how we view the other person with whom we are in conflict; and the conflict or situation itself" (Fisher-Yoshida, 2005, p. 1).

To change things for the better, deframing and reframing will often be needed. The interpretative schema that parties have used to organise and understand their current and prior conflicts may obstruct future cooperation. Redefinitions of the conflict may be induced when the situation and parties are viewed in a new context (e.g. Kriesberg 1991). Processes of negotiation, reconciliation or joint problem solving critically rely on deframing to come to solutions that otherwise would have been unattainable (Aggestam, 1999; Krog, 1999; Pinkley & Northcraft, 1994).

An example of reframing takes place within the often-quoted "juridification" of societal relations and of politics, be it in international conflicts or domestic disputes (Glendon, 1991; Ignatieff, 2003; Merry, 1990). Simultaneously, there is a widespread trend towards the reformulation of the aims of dispute resolution processes. While the classic, retributive approach to justice departs from the individual and depicts conflicts as adversarial, restorative justice emphasises communal interests and has restoration of relationships as its core aim (cf. Darley & Pitman, 2003). One example here is the rise of mediation, as an alternative approach to the resolution of civil, but also criminal disputes, and the increased involvement of victims in court procedures. Another lies in the "reconciliation or retribution" debate held under the banner of "transitional justice" in societies like Cambodia, South Africa and Guatemala. In spite of the bulk of theoretical literature on these issues, there is relatively little empirical evidence on what

judicial mechanism best contributes to sustainable peace (Roht-Arriaza & Mariezcurrena, 2006; Stover & Weinstein, 2006).

Finally, both reframing and deframing can play an important role in the aftermath of a conflict: the way in which parents retell a conflict to their children, how it is taught in schools (or left out of the curriculum), who and what gets commemorated in memorials, monuments, paintings, poems, literature and “lieux de mémoire”, what is remembered and what is forgotten. How to deconstruct certain renditions of what happened and introduce counter narratives? What role can these processes play in “breaking the cycles of hatred”? Picasso’s *Guernica*, typically, reframed the Spanish Civil War in a way that was both comforting for the victims and revealing as far as the perpetrators were concerned, just as Multatuli’s *Max Havelaar* would set the stage for the understanding of exploitation under colonisation for the years to come.

The leading question of this part of the programme will be: *How does reframing work as a general approach in the dynamics and outcome of conflict management, resolution and transformation?*

References

- Aggestam, K. (1999). *Reframing and Resolving Conflict: Israeli-Palestinian Negotiations 1988- 1998*. Lund: Lund University Press.
- Bolter, J. & Grusin, R. A. (1999). *Remediation: Understanding New Media*, MIT Press.
- Branscombe, N.R. & Doosje, B. (2004). *Collective guilt: International perspectives*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cobb, R. W. & Elder, C. D. (1983). *Participation in American politics: The dynamics of agenda building* (2nd ed.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Collier, P & Hoeffler, A. 2000. *Greed and Grievance in Civil War*, World Bank, Washington.
- Conover, P. J. & Feldman, S. (1986). Emotional Reactions to the Economy. *American Journal of Political Science*, 30, 50-78.
- Darley, J. M. & Pittman, T. S. (2003). The psychology of compensatory and retributive justice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7, 324-336.
- De Dreu, C.K.W., Carnevale, P.J.D., Emans, B.J.M. & Van de Vliert, E. (1994). Effects of gain loss frames in negotiation. Loss aversion, mismatching, and frame adoption. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 60, 90-107.
- De Dreu, Carnevale De Dreu, C. K. W., Harinck, F. & Vianen, A. E. M. (1999). Conflict and performance in groups and organizations. In C. Cooper & I. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 369-414). Chichester: Wiley.
- Entmann, R. (1993). Framing: Towards clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43, 51-85.
- Entman, R. (2003). Cascading activation: Contesting the White House's frame after 9/11. *Political Communication*, 20, 415-432.
- Fisher-Yoshida, B. (2005). Reframing conflict: Intercultural conflict as potential transformation. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 8, 1-16.
- Gamson, W. A. & Wolfsfeld, G. (1993). Movements and media as interacting systems. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 526, 114-27.
- Glendon, M. A. (1991). *Rights Talk: The Impoverishment of Political Discourse*. New York: The Free Press.
- Gray, B. (1997). Framing and reframing of intractable environmental disputes. In R. Lewicki, B. Sheppard & R. Bies (Eds.), *Research in negotiation in organizations* (Vol. 6, pp. 163-188). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Gray, V. & Lowery, D. (2000). Where do policy ideas come from? A study of Minnesota legislators and staffers. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10, 573-597.
- Herman, E. & N. Chomsky (1988). *Manufacturing Consent*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Ignatieff, M. (2003). *Human Rights as Politics and Idolatry*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kahneman, D. & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47, 263-292.
- Kaplowitz, N. (1990). National Self-Images, Perception of Enemies, and Conflict Strategies: Psychopolitical Dimensions of International Relations. *Political Psychology*, 11, 39-81.
- Karskens, M. (1995) 'Wat is een geschil?' in *Advocatenblad*. 75e jaargang, no 15, 18 Aug. 1995, pp.677-680. The quotation (given in the Introduction (p. 1) is from page 678, 1st column.
- Kaufman, S. J. (2006). Escaping the symbolic politics trap: Reconciliation initiatives and conflict resolution in ethnic wars. *Journal of Peace Research*, 43, 201-218.
- Krog, A. (1999). *Country of My Skull: Guilt, Sorrow, and the Limits of Forgiveness in the New South Africa*, Parklands: Random House.
- Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant! Know your values and frame the debate*, White River Junction: Chelsea Green Publishing.

- Lederach, J. P. (1995). *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures*. New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Mackie, D. M., Devos, T. & Smith, E. R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 602-616.
- March, J. G. (1995). *A primer on decision making*. New York: Free Press.
- Messick, D. M. (1999). Alternative logics for decision making in social settings. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 39, 11-28.
- Merry, S. E. (1990). *Getting Justice and Getting Even: Legal Consciousness among Working-Class Americans*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Miall, H. 2001. *Conflict Transformation: A Multi-Dimensional Task*, Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.
- Minsky, M. A. (1975). Framework for representing knowledge. In P. H. Winston (Ed.), *The psychology of computer vision* (pp. 211-277). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Moeller, S. (1999). *Compassion fatigue: How the media sell disease, famine, war and death*. London: Routledge.
- Morris, M. W. & Keltner, D. (2000). How emotions work: An analysis of the social functions of emotions in negotiations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 22, 1-50.
- Oomen B. (2005). *Chiefs in South Africa: Law, Power and Culture in the Post-Apartheid Era*. Oxford; Pietermaritzburg & New York: James Currey; University of KwaZulu-Natal Press & Palgrave.
- Parlevliet M. (in press). Icebergs and the Impossible: Human Rights and Conflict Resolution in Post-Settlement Peacebuilding. In E. Babbitt & E. Lutz (Eds.), *Human Rights and Conflict Resolution in Context* (pp. xx-xx). New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Pinkley, R. L. & Northcraft, G. B. (1994). Conflict Frames of Reference: Implications for Dispute Processes and Outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 193-205.
- Reimann, C. (2004). *Assessing the State-of-the-Art in Conflict Transformation*. Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.
- Roht-Arriaza, N. & Mariezcurrena, J. (2006). *Transitional Justice in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ross, M. H. (1983). *The management of conflict: Interpretations and interests in comparative perspective*. Yale, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ryan, M. (2004). Framing the war against terrorism: US Newspaper editorials and military action in Afghanistan. *Gazette*, 66, 363-382.
- Schelling T. (1960). *The Strategy of Conflict*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stover E. & Weinstein, H.M. (Eds.) 2004. *My Neighbor, My Enemy: Justice and Community in the Aftermath of Mass Atrocity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Suurmond, J. M. (2005). *Our Walk and Talk: Discourse Analysis in Conflict Studies*.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.) *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7 - 24). Chicago, IL: Nelson Hall. Tannen (1979).
- Trope, Y. & Liberman, N. (2001). Temporal construal. *Psychological Review*, 110, 403-421.
- Van Heusden, B. & Korthals-Altes, L. (2004). *Aesthetic Autonomy: Problems and Perspectives*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Van Houtum, H. & Van Naerssen, T. (2002), Bordering, ordering and othering, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 93, 125-136.
- Virilio, P. (1989). *War and Cinema: The Logistics of Perception*. London: Verso. Wanta, W., Golan, G. & Lee, C. (2004). Agenda setting and international news: media influence on public perceptions of foreign nations, *J&MC Quarterly*, 81 (2).
- Weick, K. (1995) *Sensemaking in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.