



# Application

2016-04-14

2016-00657

Hallgren, Lars

Brg1603

## Information about applicant

**Name:** Lars Hallgren

**Doctorial degree:** 2003-05-14

**Birthdate:** 19711204

**Academic title:** Doktor

**Gender:** Male

**Employer:** Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet

**Administrating organisation:** Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet

**Project site:** Stad och land

## Information about application

**Call name:** Annual open call 2016

**Type of grant:** Project grant

**Focus:** Project grant

**Call for proposals subject area:** Formas

**Project title (english):** Beyond idealistic glorifications and categorical rejections – The co-construction of meaning in dialogue practices in natural resource management

**Project start:** 2017-01-01

**Project end:** 2019-12-31

**Review panel applied for:** Brg1603, Brg1607, Brg1602

**Classification code:** 50401. Sociology (excl. Social Work, Social Psychology, Social Anthropology), 50802. Communication Studies, 50403. Social Psychology

**Application subject area:** 5003. 21.1 Samhällsvetenskaplig miljöforskning

**Keywords:** Dialogue in natral resource management, Deliberative democracy, Environmental communication, Practice theory, Ethnomethodology

## Funds applied for

**Year:** 2017 2018 2019

**Amount:** 949,000 996,000 1,055,000

## Participants

**Name:** Lotten Westberg

**Doctorial degree:** 2005-09-29

**Birthdate:** 19570325

**Academic title:** Doktor

**Gender:** Female

**Employer:** Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet

**Country:**Sweden

**Name:** Hanna Bergeå

**Doctorial degree:** 2008-01-07

**Birthdate:** 19761010

**Academic title:** Doktor

**Gender:** Female

**Employer:** Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet

**Country:**Sweden

## Basic information

### Number of project years\*

3

### Calculated project time\*

2017-01-01 - 2019-12-31

---

### Project title (Swedish, max 200 characters)\*

Bortom idealistisk glorifiering och kategoriska förkastanden – Samkonstruktion av mening i dialogpraktiker inom naturresurshantering

### Project title (English, max 200 characters)\*

Beyond idealistic glorifications and categorical rejections – The co-construction of meaning in dialogue practices in natural resource management

---

### Popular scientific description (Swedish) (max 4500 characters)\*

Dialog har kommit att bli något av ett modeord inom naturresursförvaltning. Det pågår för närvarande en lång rad samråd där intressenter bjuds in för att genom dialog hantera olika typer av intressekonflikter kring naturresurser. De som anordnar och deltar i samråd ställer höga förväntningar på dem – de ska leda till färre konflikter, ökad förståelse, effektivare förvaltning, bättre policyimplementering och mera demokrati.

Vi har identifierat två olika forskningsansatser som undersöker samråd. Den ena utvärderar samråd för att se om de lever upp till de högt ställda förväntningarna. Den andra ansatsen beskriver förutsättningar som behöver finnas för att dialogen ska fungera som tänkt och föreslår modeller för bättre dialog i samråd. Forskningsfokus ligger alltså på förutsättningar, metoder och resultat av samråd, inte på den kommunikation som sker där, trots att huvudingrediensen i samråd är just kommunikation.

Utgångspunkten i det här projektet är att samråd har en given plats i modern naturresursförvaltning men att vi behöver förstå mera om hur kommunikationen i samråd går till för att kunna bedöma under vilka förutsättningar de verkligen kan bidra till förvaltningen på ett relevant sätt, samt hur samråd kan utformas för att uppfylla realistiska mål och samtidigt intressera både organisatörer och deltagare. Syftet med det här projektet är utveckla detta underlag.

För att kunna analysera och förstå hur kommunikationen i samråd går till deltar vi som observatörer vid fyra olika samrådsprocesser som pågår för närvarande:

- Samråd samebyar och länsstyrelserna i Jämtlands och Västerbottens län. Syftet med dessa är att utveckla en plan för att minska rennäringens ekonomiska förluster till rovdjur. Förlusterna ska minska från nuvarande ca 35% till 10% och det ska ske utan att hota rovdjursstammarnas bevarandestatus.
- Samråd mellan representanter för skogsbolag och samebyar. FSC märkta skogsbolag måste ha samråd med samebyar om de vill avverka skog i vinterbeteslandet. I samråden ska de komma överens om om och i så fall var och när detta kan ske.
- Samråd om älgförvaltning. Sveriges älgförvaltning är indelad i älgförvaltningsområden och i varje område ska jägare och markägare genom samråd utveckla en förvaltningsplan.
- Samråd om betesskador av fåglar. I de här samråden träffas representanter för länsstyrelser och lantbrukare med åkermark som angränsar till rastplatser för trana och gås. Syftet är att diskutera och komma fram till strategier för att skydda känsliga grödor.

Utöver observationer gör vi ljud- och ibland även bildinspelningar av mötena. Vi gör också intervjuer med deltagare och arrangörer, samt undersöker policydokument, lagar och beslut som rör de områden som avhandlas i samråden. Ur detta material analyserar vi kommunikationen på tre nivåer:

1. Samtalsnivå: Människor som samtalar förväntar sig att de ska förstå vad den andre säger och att de själva ska bli

förstådda. När de blir osäkra på om de förstår/blir förstådda så kommer de antingen att försöka rätta till den osäkerheten, t ex genom att fråga vad den andre menar eller fråga om den andre förstår, eller så uppstår det missförstånd, som allt eftersom samtalet fortlöper kan bli allt större. Vi analyserar bland annat samtalssekvenser där missförstånd uppstår, repareras eller permanentas, och hur det påverkar samtalet.

2. Organisatorisk nivå: I samrådsprocesser skapar deltagarna genom att samtala normer som styr hur de talar och vad de talar om och inte. De skapar också roller som indikerar vem som får tala, vem som kan vad och vem som är överordnad och underordnad. De samtalande kan vara omedvetna om dessa normer. Vi analyserar och beskriver hur sådana normer skapas och vad det leder till när det gäller hur meningsfulla samråden, den kunskap som utvecklas och de beslut som fattas i dem, är för de inblandade.
3. Policy nivå: Samrådsprocesserna verkar i ett institutionellt sammanhang där formella lagar och regler inte är anpassade för samråd som förvaltningsmetod. Analysen på den här nivån ger oss möjlighet att beskriva hur det som sker i samråden samspekar med andra händelser i det större sammanhang som de ingår i.

Forskningsprojektet pågår från 2017-2020. Utöver vetenskapliga artiklar kommer vi i slutet av projektet hålla seminarier med berörda, berätta om våra resultat och diskutera hur samråd kan utformas för att uppfylla realistiska mål och samtidigt fylla viktiga funktioner för såväl organisatörer som deltagare.

---

### **Abstract (Swedish) (max 1500 characters)\***

Dialog har blivit ett modeord i naturresursförvaltningen (NRM), men trots att samråd med berörda aktörer har blivit en standardprocedur när frågorna är komplexa och konfliktfyllda så är fortfarande begreppet och den konkreta tillämpningen ambivalent. I naturresurshanteringslitteraturen behandlas ofta social interaktion som en svart låda mellan förutsättningar och utfall av dialog. Syftet med forskningsprojektet ”Dialogens praktik” är att föreslå och kritiskt diskutera vilken betydelse dialog och samråd kan få för NRM. Syftet uppnås genom att analysera social interaktion, meningsskapande och policy produktion som sociala praktiker som samkonstrueras av deltagarna. Fyra fallstudier kommer att genomföras: a) Rennäring – Stora rovdjur, b) Skogsskötsel – Rennäring, c) Betesskador från gäss och trana, Älgförvaltning – Skogsbeteskador. Analysen av fallstudierna kommer att synliggöra t ex:

- Hur kunskap hanteras
- Hur den gemensamma förmågan att kommunicera konstrueras och dekonstrueras
- Vilka underliggande betydelser som samråden ges
- Vilken kunskap som skapas och i vilken utsträckning den är relevant utanför den aktuella dialogpraktiken
- Hur dialogens mandat och instruktioner tolkas i den organisatoriska praktiken.
- Hur beslut som fattas i olika praktiker passar ihop

### **Abstract (English) (max 1500 characters)\***

Dialogue has become a buzzword in natural resource management (NRM), but although joint consultations with stakeholders has become a standard procedure in complex and conflictual issues, the concept and the concrete application are ambiguous. In NRM literature social interaction is often treated as a black box between preconditions and outcomes. The aim of the research project “The practice of dialogue” is to propose and critically discuss the role that dialogue and joint consultations (JC) can play within NRM. This is achieved by analyzing the social interaction, the meaning making and policy production in such processes as practices co-constructed by the involved participants. Four case studies will be performed a) Reindeer husbandry – Big carnivores, b) Forestry - Reindeer husbandry, c) Crop raiding by geese and cranes, and d) Moose management – Forest grazing damage.

These analysis will reveal e.g.:

- How knowledge is managed
- How joint capacity to communicate is constructed and deconstructed
- What underlying meanings the JC meetings are given
- What knowledge that is created and to what extent this knowledge is relevant also in contexts outside the JC processes
- How the meanings of mandates and instructions given to JC practitioners through policies are made sense of in the organizational practices
- How decisions made in different practices fit together.

## Research programme

### Specific aims and objectives of the proposed project and a background description containing an overview of the research area, including key references (max 7 000 characters)\*

#### Aim

The aim of the research project “The practice of dialogue” is to propose and critically discuss the role that dialogue and joint consultations (JC) can play within natural resource management (NRM). This is achieved by analyzing such processes as social practices co-constructed by the involved participants and by analyzing the normative and institutional conditions under which these processes operate. The project will improve the understanding of how these processes should be organized in order to reach the goals that motivate the NRM actors to initiate and participate in the JC processes. Based in social constructivist theory on communication the JC practice, its conditions and consequences will be investigated on three levels:

1. Interactional practice; Analyze how the social interaction between the participants in JC construct, deconstruct and use communicative capacity in order to investigate knowledge and value issues, responsibilities and space for action.
2. Organizational practice; Analyze how the participants in JC attribute meaning, how norms and identities are developed, and how the participants handle transitions between the practice of the JC and their other everyday practices i. e. forest management, reindeer husbandry, administration.
3. Policy practice; Analyze how the JC is given mandate within the institutional structure where they are set, and how the communication in JC in turn affects this institutional structure.

In this project we study when actors with potentially different perspectives and interests meet in a series of formal, regularly occurring, meetings. The Swedish term used for describing these processes is “samråd”, here translated to *joint consultations* (JC). The participants of these joint consultations also often talk about the processes as “dialogue”. In NRM literature “dialogue” is often used in a normative sense, addressing idealized communication situations. The planned research will however analyze dialogue in JC from a non-normative but analytical angle.

#### Background and problem formulation

Dialogue has become a buzzword in NRM, and inviting stakeholders to meetings about NRM is standard procedure when addressing the complexity inherent in NRM (Mårald et al 2015, Muro & Jeffrey 2012, Renn 2006). In Sweden there are currently several initiatives where stakeholders in NRM meet in order to manage NR dilemmas. In the stakeholders’ own descriptions of these processes there are expectations that these processes will entail less conflicts, increased consensus, joint learning, more efficient management, increased policy implementation and improved democracy. (see Table in ‘society relevance’). The ideas on how this will take place are however vaguely expressed, if at all.

When discussing dialogue, it is important to recognize a distinction between theories about dialogue as an ideal form of communication and theories considering dialogue purely as meaning making social interaction (Linell 2009). The first category of literature is dominating the NRM literature and originates in an ideal represented by Habermas (1984), among others. According to Habermas’ theory of rational communication, the dialogue serves to jointly investigate coordination dilemmas through joint assessment of the arguments where the force of the better argument being the decisive factor for agreement and consensus. The value of this dialogue for NRM has been described in NRM literature (see e.g. Muro & Jeffrey 2012). Ganesh and Zoller (2012) identify another normative role for dialogue in the organization of societies, referring to Mouffe (2000) where dialogue articulates tensions, resistance and differences in society. We argue for that independently of which normative role dialogue is given, an investigation of the dialogue is needed from an analytical, non-normative perspective. Therefore the NRM research and policy will be strengthened by investigating the dialogue as social interaction and practice.

The literature about dialogue in NRM can be divided into two kinds of scholarly contributions: i) texts suggesting methods to create dialogue. e.g. Stoll-Kleemann & Welp (2006) and ii) texts analyzing whether dialogue is efficiently reaching the expectations e.g. Duit & Löf (2015), Mårald et al (2015) and Sandström et al (2013).

Communication is at the core of consultation and dialogue. Despite this, research about dialogue is remarkably inconsiderate of communication, treating it as a black box between prerequisites, methods and outcome. Research of dialogue is often based on interviews or questionnaires (e.g. Duit & Löf (2015), Stöhr et al (2014), Sandström et al (2013),) and leave out descriptions and analyses of the practice of dialogue. This makes the discussion of the function of dialogue in NRM and how to achieve it unprecise.

In the literature about dialogue in NRM there are a few phenomena which are repeatedly mentioned as important ( Muro & Jeffery 2012, Sandström et al 2013, Zachrisson & Lindahl 2013, Duit & Löf 2015), but which are rarely investigated further: Trust, learning, disagreement and coordination of knowledge.

These phenomena are interactional in their character, and are imbedded in the practice of dialogue. To understand the role they play in the practice of dialogue and how they are accomplished, demands observations, monitoring and analysis of interaction. These kinds of phenomena have been studied with practice oriented approaches, however carried out in contexts very different from NRM: Learning in primary school classrooms (Ingram & Elliott 2016), meta-communication in aircraft cockpit (Arminen & Auvinen 2013), trust and mistrust in emergency calls (Garcia & Parmer 1999).

In order to proceed the discussion about how to organize and facilitate dialogue in NRM we suggest observation and monitoring of the interaction in JC meetings, and in-depth, non-normative analysis of the social practices emerging in these situations, applying a social constructivist, interactionist, practice oriented theoretical approach.

## References

- Arminen, I & Auvinen, P. 2013. Environmentally coupled repairs and remedies in the airline cockpit: Repair practices of talk and action in interaction. *Discourse Studies* 15(1):19-41.
- Bachtin M. 1990. *Det dialogiska ordet*. Anthropos.
- Berger PL & Luckman T. 1966. *The social construction of reality. A treatise in sociology of knowledge*. Anchor books.
- Contu A. 2014. On boundaries and difference: Communities of practice and power relations in creative world. *Management Learning* 45 (3): 289-316.
- Duit A & Löf A. 2015. Dealing With a Wicked Problem? A Dark Tale of Carnivore Management in Sweden 2007-2011. *Administration & Society* 1-25.
- Ganesh S & Zoller HM. 2012. Dialogue, Activism, and Democratic Social Change. *Communication Theory* 22: 66-91.
- Garcia AC & Parmer PA. 1999. Misplaced Mistrust. The collaborative construction of doubt in 911 emergency calls. *Symbolic Interaction* 22 (4): 297-324.

---

## • Description of the project including a summary of the structure, theory, methods, performance and a plan for scientific deliverables (max 15 000 characters)\*

### Approach

The aim of the project is to propose and critically discuss what role dialogue and joint consultations (JC) can play within NRM. This is achieved by analyzing the processes as social practices co-constructed by the involved participants and by analyzing the normative and institutional conditions under which these processes operate. The project will improve the understanding of how these processes should be organized in order to reach the goals that motivate the NRM actors to initiate and participate in the JC. The study consists of several case studies of JC, where representatives from different organizations meet regularly and talk about coordination of activities which impact natural resources. The conversations will be recorded and transcribed for analysis, interviews will be performed and documents analyzed. Based in social constructivist theory on communication, the practice, conditions and consequences will be investigated on three levels: Interactional practice; organizational practice; and policy practice. After analysis of the respective practices, an analysis will be done of the relation between the three levels; how interactional and organizational practice are influencing and influenced by policy practice.

### Theory

The theoretical basis for our analysis are i) social constructivist theory on communication that views communication as a process of co-construction of meaning and ii) theories on practice that start out from *practice* as the organizing entity to understand social life and human activity. Human beings' interpretation of their situation is dependent on other actors' actions, and this dependency is mediated by language, objects, and the routines of the practice. These are themselves dialectically both a precondition for, and a product of repeated actions carried out within the practice (Mead 1934, Berger & Luckman 1967, Reckwitz 2002). The interpretations of what members of a social practice do and why are (re)created in the continuous process of interaction maintained by the members as they are organizing their activities to make sense of their practices in a consistent way (Nicolini 2012). Routines, knowledge, norms, identity and roles are situated in the practice in which they are produced, and thus not residing in the heads (or bodies) of individuals (Nicolini et al 2003), or in artefacts (books, tools, laws). The interpretations created in one practice cannot be "transferred" to another, as they are given different meanings when introduced in a different practice (Contu 2014, Westberg & Polk 2016). This implies that we cannot assume that insights and understandings developed in JC meetings can make sense in other contexts.

Any action, whether it is an utterance in a conversation or a decision in a policy production process, arises from its positioning with respect to an immediate before and after. Each action both displays an understanding of a prior action and projects relevant next action (Hindmarsh & Llewellyn 2010) which makes actors appear as coauthors of each other's contributions (Linell 2009). This dialectic view on the relation between actors and the overall structure within which they act, allows for an understanding of how practices unfolds as situated agent-structure interplay.

Communication is a process of both integration and differentiation between actors. It is dependent on at least a minimum of intersubjectivity, joint symbols and expectations (Grauman 2010, Bachtin 1990, Rommetviet 1990). They also pre-assume counterparts to relate to each other as 'other' (Linell 2009). When participants communicate, they trust each other to collaborate in making sense of the situation (Heritage 1984), also in competitive situations (Linell 2009). However occasionally social interaction sequences develop paradoxical or equivocal meanings (Garfinkel 1967) which generates reciprocal doubts on intersubjectivity (Garcia & Parmer 1999) and potentially destructive conflict (Hallgren 2003).

Even if a social practice is jointly constructed by its members, this interplay can hardly be seen as neutral or equal. Inequalities and asymmetries characterize relations between members of social practices and affect what actions, values, knowledge etc are regarded as meaningful, important and relevant (Contu 2014).

## Method

The analysis will be based on recordings and transcribed material collected through interviews and observations of four JC processes that have been selected for this project and that we have confirmed access to. The common ground for the selection is that the processes are currently running, include regular meetings and concern natural resource questions around which there are diverging perceptions and opinions that could potentially entail conflicts. For every case the following data will be generated:

- Observations (including field notes) and recordings of meetings. In total approx. recordings of 20 meetings.
- Semi-structured interviews with participants in meetings, and with non-participating members of organizations concerned about the issues discussed in JC meetings. In total approx. 40 interviews.
- Collecting documentation of decisions made about the JC, in the JC and concerning the issues under discussion in the JC.

The analysis of the empirical material will be performed through three different levels of analysis:

Interactional practice – This analysis is based on transcripts of the communication taking place in the studied JC meetings and is carried out as ethnomethodological conversation analysis (Hindmarsh & Llewellyn 2010) according to established method. The unit of analysis (that is, what is regarded as the practice under study at this level) is sequences of social interaction.

The selection of sequences is based on their relevance for the normative theory of dialogue, for example: sequences containing i) meta-communication (i.e. when the communication concerns the communication), ii) articulations of agreement - disagreement, iii) uncertainty about shared understanding, iv) uncertainty about the frames for the communication, v) uncertainty about legitimacy, sincerity and influence, vi) misunderstanding and repair and vii) closures of investigations of the validity of arguments.

This analysis will reveal how i) knowledge is managed, retained or dismissed in the communication taking place in JC meetings, ii) how the participants' joint capacity to investigate claims on validity is constructed and deconstructed, iii) how difficulties and possibilities in the dialogue are developed and handled through different forms of meta-communication.

Organisational practice – The practices under study at this level are the entire JC processes. The analysis is based on empirical material collected according to the list above. In the analysis, situations and utterances will be categorized based on: i) what the participants talk about and not, and which participants that talk about what in the JC meetings ii) what/who's experiences are acknowledged and regarded important respective neglected, iii) which perspectives are dominating and which are subordinated and how this dominance and sub-dominance are co-created, iv) critical incidents (“breakdowns” and “crisis”) where the participants deviate from the communication norms created, v) how the participants use knowledge and experiences created in the JC meeting in other contexts and vice versa.

This analysis will reveal: i) the underlying meanings of what the JC meetings are to achieve and the implicit identities, norms and procedures that are created in order to fulfill these achievements, ii) critical situations that allow the participants to notice and reflect upon these norms and identities, occasionally change them and thereby change the direction and ideas of what the JC are to achieve, iii) the knowledge (learning) that is created and if/how this knowledge is relevant also in contexts outside the JC processes.

Institutional practice – The practice under study here is the institutional and political NRM context in which the JC are set as the practice. The analysis is based on written documentation preparatory to the decisions behind establishing the JC respectively, minutes and other written documentation produced adjacent to and by the participants of the JC, and written documentation of decisions that have been taken.

This analysis will reveal: i) the interplay between the organizational practices and the institutional practice, ii) how the meanings of mandates and instructions given to JC practitioners through policies are made sense of in the organizational practices, iii) how well/bad decisions made within the different practices fit together.

The JC processes we intend to study are:

#### **Case A: JC meetings on Tolerance Level Plans (TL) for reindeer husbandry and predator management**

The parliament has assigned certain County Administrative Boards (CAB) to be responsible for establishing TLPs together with Sami villages in order to develop long and short term measures for reducing economical losses from large predators from the current level (around 35%) to 10%. In these meetings measures to decrease predation on reindeers without threatening viable predator population are discussed.

#### **Case B: JC meetings on forest management and reindeer herding**

Forest companies performing forestry on winter grazing land of Sami villages are obliged by FSC to have joint consultations with the Sami villages before forestry measures are taken. In the meetings the timing and location for these measures are discussed.

#### **Case C: JC meeting on crop raiding from grazing birds**

CABs and farmers cultivating the land adjacent to halting places for geese and cranes meet regularly to discuss strategies for distracting grazing birds from vulnerable crops.

### Case D: JC meetings in moose management groups

Swedish moose management is organized in moose management areas. For every area there is a moose management group consisting of 3 representatives for hunting organizations and 3 representatives for the landowners. The group is assigned to through dialogue establish an annual management plan.

### Project implementation

Three senior researchers will be engaged in the project on 25% of full time each all three years: Hallgren (main applicant and project leader), Bergeå and Westberg. All three will contribute to collection of data and the responsibility for the case studies is distributed between them. Concerning the analysis of data, Hallgren and Bergeå work with the analysis of interaction practice, Westberg and Bergeå focus on organizational practice and Westberg and Hallgren on policy practice. The major part of the data collection will be accomplished during 2017 and 2018, and analysis and publishing is emphasized during 2019. In the last year of the project a workshop will be organized with participants from the field work.

The project is planned to generate 5 peer reviewed journal articles, published in: Journal of environmental communication, Discourse studies, Society and natural resources, Ecology and Society, Organization, which are RoMEO green journal or Open access. A monography is also planned, contact with Routledge is initiated.

### References (continued)

Garfinkel H. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs.

Grauman C. 2010. Commonality, mutuality, reciprocity, a conceptual introduction. In: Markova et al. *Mutualities in dialogue*. Cambridge university press, pp 1-24.

Habermas J. 1984. *The Theory of Communicative Action. Vol. 1. Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Beacon Press.

Hallgren L. 2003. *I djupet av ett vattendrag. Om konflikt och samverkan vid naturresurshantering*. Swedish university of agricultural sciences.

Heritage J. 1984 *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Polity press.

Hindmarsh J & Llewellyn N. 2010. Finding organization in detail: methodological orientations. In: Llewellyn N & Hindmarsh J. *Organisation, Interaction and Practice. Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, pp 24-45.

Ingram J & Elliott V. 2016. A critical analysis of the role of wait time in classroom interactions and the effects on student and teacher interactional behaviours. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 46:1, 37-53.

Linell P. 2009. *Rethinking language, mind and world dialogically – interactional and contextual theories of human sense-making*. Charlotte: IAP.

Mead GH. 1934. *Mind, self, and society from the standpoint of a social behaviourist*. The University of Chicago Press.

Mouffe C. 2000. *Deliberative democracy or agonistic pluralism*. Institute for Advanced Studies.



- Muro M & Jeffrey P. 2012. Time to talk? How the structure of dialog processes shapes stakeholder learning in participatory water resources management. *Ecology and Society* 17(1): 3.
- Mårald E, Sandström C, Rist L, Rosvall O, Samuelsson L & Idenfors A. 2015. Exploring the use of a dialogue process to tackle a complex and controversial issue in forest management. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research* 30:8, 749-756.
- Nicolini D. 2012. *Practice Theory, Work, & Organization, an introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Nicolini D, Gheradi S & Yanow D. 2003. Knowing in organisations, a practice-based approach. M. E. Sharpe.
- Reckwitz A. 2002. Toward a Theory of Social Practices. A Development in Culturalist Theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory* 5 (2): 243-263.
- Renn O. 2006. Participatory Processes for Natural Resource Management. In: Stoll-Kleemann S & Welp M. *Stakeholder Dialogues in Natural Resources Management. Theory and Practice*. Springer. pp 3-15.
- Rommetveit, R. 1990. On axiomatic features of a dialogical approach to language and mind. In Markova, I. & Foppa, K. *The dynamics of dialogue*. Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Sandström C, Wennberg DiGasper S & Öhman K. 2013. Conflict resolution through ecosystem-based management: the case of Swedish moose management. *International Journal of the Commons* 7(2): 549-570.
- Stoll-Kleemann S & Welp M. 2006. *Stakeholder Dialogues in Natural Resources Management. Theory and Practice*. Springer.
- Stöhr C, Lundholm C, Crona B & Chabay I. 2014. Stakeholder participation and sustainable fisheries: an integrative framework for assessing adaptive comanagement processes. *Ecology and Society* 19(3): 14.
- Westberg, L & Polk, M 2016. The role of learning in transdisciplinary research: moving from a normative concept to an analytical tool through a practice-based approach. *Sustainability Science* 11(3): 385-397.
- Zachrisson A & Beland Lindahl K. 2013. Conflict resolution through collaboration: Preconditions and limitations in forest and nature conservation controversies. *Forest Policy and Economics* 33: 39-46.

---

**Description of the potential societal value of the research and a plan for communication with stakeholders/end users (max 8 000 characters)\***

The proposed research project is in tangible ways engaged in challenges of democracy, equity and sustainability. Natural resource management (NRM) is central in society, and as well important for those stakeholders which are affected by the outcome of management of specific resources. Sustainable, equal and democratic NRM pre-assumes decisions which are based in true and legitimate assessments, which corresponds with societal norms about justice and rationality. However, natural resources are complex and characterized by uncertainty and disagreement about what is true and right and which societal interests should be of higher priority. Conflicts between different parts of society about NRM risk to paralyze coordination and decision making and result in unsustainable resource use and welfare losses. One example of locked decision processes in NRM is management of big carnivores, where stakeholders and sub-communities express experiences of exclusion, authorities have low legitimacy and the decisions made by sector authorities are appealed to higher levels. But conflict is also an important signal to society that there is a dilemma that demand investigation, development and management. With these dilemmas as a background, dialogue and joint consultation meetings have become included in the repertoire of NRM. The hopes expressed are that dialogue should manage and reduce uncertainty, complexity and conflict in a constructive way. This expectation is mirrored in how Swedish authorities write about dialogue:

Skogstyrelsen om dialog mellan skogsbolag och renskötsel	<i>"Dialog och samverkan behövs för att underlätta så att skogsbruk och rennäring ska kunna samsas på de marker där bägge näringarna bedrivs."</i>
Länsstyrelsen i Sörmland, Betesskador av tranor, gäss och sångsvan	<i>"Det är mycket viktigt att vidmakthålla en dialog mellan markägare, arrendatorer, andra brukare, myndigheter, ideella föreningar och allmänheten om gäsförekomsten vid Sörfjärden."</i>
Naturvårdsverket älgförvaltningen	<i>"[Vi] har utformat förslaget till föreskrifter så att gemensamt ansvar och dialog ska präglade den nya älgförvaltningen."</i>
Vattenmyndigheten	<i>"Deltagande och dialog: Svensk vattenförvaltning kan bara utvecklas i samverkan med dem som berörs. Att sprida information och att involvera berörda organisationer och allmänheten i arbetet är därför en viktig uppgift för alla som arbetar med uppdrag inom vattenförvaltningen."</i>

The expectations that dialogue will generate better decisions, increased democracy, reduce conflict are obviously high. Simultaneously it is quite unclear under which conditions these expectations will be realized, and what is taking place in the practice of dialogue. In some cases, however, what has been labeled as a democratic dialogue is resulting in participants experiencing lack of mandate and influence. This can further excavate the legitimacy of as well other actors as of the deliberative democratic system. Currently, the black box treatment of communication and dialogical practices, is hiding the real potential of dialogue in NRM. When the idealized expectations of dialogue are not matched by experience, there is a risk that this disappointment will hide the value of what dialogue actually can accomplish in NRM, and that actors' motivation to organize and participate in dialogue will decline. The proposed project will demonstrate how dialogue is accomplished by participants in dialogue and through that contribute with realistic expectations and development of the democratic tools. If NRM dialogue should match expectations, the actors of NRM need to understand the dynamic of dialogue, and to be able to meta-communicate about dialogue. The knowledge about the practice of dialogue which is developed in the proposed research project will be immediately useful as a frame for reflection and action for actors, individuals and organizations, who are initiating and participating in dialogue of NRM, and support them when designing dialogue processes and planning for their own participation and contribution.

### **Communication plan**

The proposed research project (RP) will develop knowledge about the practice of dialogue, how participants in NRM dialogue accomplish dialogue together. The aim of the communication conducted by the RP is that actors involved in NRM, who are organizing and participating in dialogue will understand the practice they are contributing to and receive and develop tools for reflection on how they influence and are influenced by the dialogue and the communicative preconditions in the dialogue, and how they can act in order to make the dialogue as constructive as possible. The goal of the communication of the RP is that organizations and individuals involved in dialogue in NRM will use concepts and models from the RP when talking with each other about the dialogue.

The target group of the communication of the RP is actors participating in and/or organizing dialogue about NRM e.g. collaboration officers and executives in forest companies, county administration, environmental protection agency, forest agency, Sami communities, farmer unions, hunter organizations, nature conservation associations. These actors have already made experiences of participating and initiating dialogue about NRM and have expressed hopes about what will be accomplished in dialogue, but often also expressed disappointment of dialogues which has not matched the expectations. They need to know more about the dynamic of dialogue, and about the dynamic between dialogue and other parts of decision making system, and how their contributions affect and are affected by the practice of dialogue. They also need concepts and models to use when talking about dialogue with colleagues inside and outside the practice of dialogue, since these meta-communicative conversations can increase the constructive potential of dialogue. Our experience is that participants in dialogue often have questions about the preconditions for and dynamic of communication and about how they will be affected by dialogue and how they themselves can improve the dialogue.

The three researchers involved in the RP "The practice of dialogue" are all experienced in communication about conflict and dialogue, and have been involved in conducting workshops and training in conflict management and dialogue for staff and actors in NRM. They have been teaching further education courses for more than 500 public officers from County Administration Board, SEPA and water authorities, for local development organizations, forest companies and game management delegations (Viltförvaltningsdelegationer).

The RP includes to facilitate a 2 day workshop with invited participants from the NRM organizations and authorities, including actors who have been involved in the dialogues which have been monitored and analysed. Further, the representatives of organizations which regularly call for joint consultations will be invited. During this workshop findings from the project in terms of theories on dialogue and its practice will be presented and the participants of the workshop will together use the concepts and models developed in the RP for reflecting on their own experiences of dialogue. The workshop will be designed and facilitated to increase opportunities for joint learning and search for how to detect and negotiate obstacles for improving practice in order to reach the goals that motivate the NRM actors to initiate and participate in JC.

#### Developed publication plan

Working Title	Journal
The practice of dialogue – beyond efficiency and idealism	Journal of environmental communication
Articulating disagreement and doubts in environmental dialogues	Discourse studies
The meaning of dialogue - The co-construction of identity and norms in dialogue	Society and natural resources
A tin opener for the black box in sustainable development – Rethinking dialogue	Ecology and Society
Situated knowledge and norms in inter-organizational collaborations in NRM	Organization

## Budget

### Salaries including social fees

Role in the project	Name	Percent of salary
1 Applicant	Lars Hallgren	25
2 Participating researcher	Hanna Bergeå	25
3 Participating researcher	Lotten Westberg	25
Total		

  

	2017	2018	2019	Total
1	211,700	211,700	211,700	635,100
2	190,800	190,800	190,800	572,400
3	175,000	175,000	175,000	525,000
Total	577,500	577,500	577,500	1,732,500

### Dedicated time for this project

Role in the project	Name	Percent of full time
1 Applicant	Lars Hallgren	25
2 Participating researcher	Hanna Bergeå	25
3 Participating researcher	Lotten Westberg	25
4 Participating researcher	Lotten Westberg	
5 Participating researcher	Hanna Bergeå	

## Running Costs

Running Cost	Description	2017	2018	2019	Total
1 Fältresor	35 mötesobservationer inom Sverige	74,000	98,000	74,000	246,000
2 Slutseminarie	40 deltagare inkl viss resebidrag			34,000	34,000
3 Internationella konferenser	2 konferenser under projektperioden			37,000	37,000
4 Publicering	Open Access och språkgranskning		23,000	23,000	46,000
5 Bokprojekt	Språkgranskning			12,000	12,000
6 Licenser	Nvivo	3,000	3,000	3,000	9,000
Total		77,000	124,000	183,000	384,000

(1) - Materiel etc. refers to equipment and other research materiel not classified as fixed assets, e.g. chemicals, literature, and software.

## Equipment depreciation costs

Depreciation cost	Description	2017	2018	2019
-------------------	-------------	------	------	------

## Premises

Type of premises	2017	2018	2019	Total
1 Kontorslokaler påslag 11,69% på lönebas	67,500	67,500	67,500	202,500
Total	67,500	67,500	67,500	202,500

## Total Budget

Specified costs	2017	2018	2019	Total, applied	Other costs	Total cost
1 Salaries including social fees	577,500	577,500	577,500	1,732,500		1,732,500
2 Running costs	77,000	124,000	183,000	384,000		384,000
3 Depreciation costs				0		0
4 Premises	67,500	67,500	67,500	202,500		202,500
5 Subtotal	722,000	769,000	828,000	2,319,000	0	2,319,000
6 Indirect costs	227,000	227,000	227,000	681,000		681,000
7 Total project cost	949,000	996,000	1,055,000	3,000,000	0	3,000,000

### **Budget specification (max 7000 characters)\***

I det planerade forskningsprojektet arbetar 3 seniora forskare under de tre år som projektet löper. Eftersom våra kompetenser kompletterar varandra och utgör viktiga pusselbitar för projektets helhet har vi valt att fördela tiden lika oss emellan till i snitt 25% per person. Inklusivt universitetspåslag utgör detta den i särklass största kostnaden i projektet. I påslagen ingår lokalhyra på SLU campus.

En annan betydande kostnad rör resor och boende i samband med datagenerering inom Sverige. Syftet är att dokumentera interaktion vid samråd i de 4 fallstudier som ingår i projektet, samt intervjuer med mötesdeltagare och andra aktörer. Som framgår av projektbeskrivningens genomförandedel är 20 observationer i fallstudie 1 och 2 redan genomförda. Återstående datagenerering blir för respektive fall:

Fall 1: 4 möten

Fall 2: 4 möten

Fall 3: 10 möten

Fall 4: 8 möten

Totalt planeras ca 35 resor där någon (1 st) av forskarna deltar. Kostnader för tågresa, hyrbil (vid behov), övernattnings (vid behov) och traktamente (vid behov) beräknas till 157 000 sek. Ljudupptagningar från dialogmöten och intervjuer kommer att transkriberas, vi beräknar en kostnad för köpt tjänst om 87500 sek, sammanlagt kostnad för datagenerering 245 000 sek

Sista året under projekttiden kommer ett slutseminarium/workshop genomföras. Här förväntas ca 40 inbjudna deltagare vara med. Konferensen kommer att hållas på SLU. Deltagarna medverkar gratis, men bjuds på mat och logi och deltagare som inte är tjänstepersoner vid myndighet eller större företag erbjuds bidrag för att täcka resekostnader. Kostnaderna som söks för seminariet uppgår till 34 tkr.

Forskningsresultaten kommer att presenteras vid två internationella konferenser. Kostnad: 37 tkr.

Publiceringskostnader inkl språkgranskning uppgår till 58 tkr.

Licenser för programvaran NVivo kommer att köpas för transkribering och kategorisering av data

Kvalificerad inspelningsutrustning finns redan i forskargruppen.

En betydande del av det material som kommer att analyseras är sedan tidigare insamlad av forskarna genom ett tidigare projekt (gäller fall 1 och 2), vilket gör att det planerade forskningsprojektet kommer att kunna starta omedelbart.

## **Ethics**

**Animal testing**

**Human testing**

**Classifications****Subject area (min/max 1 subject area)\***

50. PROGRAMOMRÅDE MILJÖ &gt; 5003. 21.1 Samhällsvetenskaplig miljöforskning

**SCB-codes (min 1, max 3 SCB-codes)\***

50401. Sociology (excl. Social Work, Social Psychology, Social Anthropology)

50802. Communication Studies

50403. Social Psychology

**Keyword 1\***

Dialogue in natural resource management

**Keyword 2**

Deliberative democracy

**Keyword 3**

Environmental communication

**Keyword 4**

Practice theory

**Keyword 5**

Ethnomethodology



## Appendices

---

Appendix J. Illustrations. If figures, tables or images are needed to describe the project, an appendix may be uploaded here. The total size of the attachments can be maximum 4 MB in the formats jpg, png or gif

### Appendix J

---

Appendix K. Climate and environmental data (The [form for the publication of data](#) that is available from the ECDS (Environment Climate Data Sweden) must be used.)

### Appendix K

No file has been attached

---

# CV

## CV - Lars Hallgren

**Name:** Lars Hallgren  
**Birthdate:** 19711204  
**Gender:** Male  
**Country:**Sweden

**Doctorial degree:** 2003-05-14  
**Academic title:** Doktor  
**Employer:** Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet

## Educational history

### Research education

Examination	Organisation	Dissertation title (en)
Doctors degree, 50999. Other Social Sciences not elsewhere specified, 2003-05-14	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Stad och land	In the depth of a water course - On conflict and collaboration in natural resources management

### Basic education

Year	Examination
1997	1. Natural Sciences, Degree of Master of Science in Agriculture, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

## Professional history

### Employments

Period	Position	Part of research in employment	Employer
mars 2005 - Present	Senior lecturer, Permanent employment	80	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Stad och land
september 2003 - april 2005	Researcher, Permanent employment	50	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Stad och land

## Merits and awards

### Supervised persons

Year	Supervised persons	Role	Number
2012	PhD student, Elin Ångman	Secondary supervisor	
2009	PhD student, Johan Ahnström	Secondary supervisor	
2007	Licentiate, Antoinette Wärnbäck	Secondary supervisor	
	Student	Main supervisor	20

### Research grants awarded in competition

Period	Funder	Project leader	Your role	Sub amount (SEK)	Total amount (SEK)
2015 - 2017	Formas	Kaisa Ratio	Co-applicant	1800000	5163000
2014 - 2016	Riksantikvarieämbetet	Lars Hallgren	Applicant	0	5650000
2013 - 2016	Naturvårdsverket	Lotten Westberg	Co-applicant	1125000	4500000
2007 - 2009	Naturvårdsverket	Lars Hallgren	Applicant	0	2600000
2005 - 2007	Stiftelsen lantbruksforskning	Lars Hallgren	Applicant	0	250000

## Other merits

Period	Type of merit	Description
2014 - 2018	Board member advisory committee Viltskadecenter	Board member advisory committee Viltskadecenter Representing Fakulteten för Naturresurser och Jordbruk, SLU, Delegation from Dean
2008 - 2013	Co-responsible for education program "Dialog i naturvården" (Dialogue in nature conservation)	During 2008 – 2011 SEPA launched an education program for educating Swedish nature conservation officers in Dialogue and conflict management. Lars Hallgren, Lotten Westberg, Agneta Setterwall and Hanna Bergeå at Division of Environmental Communication were consulted to i) Design the education program, consisting of a number of 2 – 4 day workshops, and ii) to carry out the pedagogical activities. Lars Hallgren and Agneta Setterwall had previously been engaged by SEPA and county administrative board to run 4 courses in conflict management. During 2012 – 2013 Lars Hallgren and Lotten Westberg were appointed to educate game management delegation (Viltförvaltningsdelegationen) in dialogue and conflict management. These experiences are of relevance for the proposed research project since included in the project plan is a workshop for practitioners in Natural resource management. We have a long and deep experience of facilitating reflection on communication, conflict, participation and dialogue.
2008 - 2012	Board member advisory committee Center for nature interpretation	Board member advisory committee Center for nature interpretation Representing SLU, Fakulteten för naturresurser och jordbruk, Delegation from Dean

## CV - Lotten Westberg

<b>Name:</b> Lotten Westberg	<b>Doctorial degree:</b> 2005-09-29
<b>Birthdate:</b> 19570325	<b>Academic title:</b> Doktor
<b>Gender:</b> Female	<b>Employer:</b> Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet
<b>Country:</b> Sweden	

## Educational history

Research education		
Examination	Organisation	Dissertation title (en)
Doctors degree, 50802. Communication Studies, 2005-09-29	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Stad och land	Learning and power in collaborative processes within agro-food systems).

Basic education	
Year	Examination
1987	50802. Communication Studies, Degree of Master of Science in Agriculture, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

## Professional history

Employments				
Period	Position	Part of research in employment	Employer	Other information
juli 2012 - augusti 2016	Assistant professor, Permanent employment	60	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Stad och land	Efter augusti 2016 kommer jag att gå tillbaka till min anställning som forskare
augusti 2012 - juli 2016 (Present)	Assistant professor, Permanent employment	60	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Stad och land	När fo-ass anställningen upphör kommer jag att gå tillbaka till min anställning som forskare vid SLU/Stad och land

## Interruptions in research

Period	Description
2008-01-15 - 2010-09-15	Jag arbetade under denna tid på heltid med undervisning, dels inom SLU/Stad och Land mastersutbildning i milökommunikation, dels med uppdragsutbildningar för Naturvårdsverket

## Merits and awards

### Supervised persons

Year	Supervised person	Role
2012	PhD student, Antionette Wärnbäck	Secondary supervisor

### Research grants awarded in competition

Period	Funder	Project leader	Your role	Total amount (SEK)
2012 - 2016	Naturvårdsverket	Lotten Westberg	Applicant	4500000
2010 - 2011	Naturvårdsverket	Lotten Westberg	Applicant	450000

## CV - Hanna Bergeå

<b>Name:</b> Hanna Bergeå	<b>Doctorial degree:</b> 2008-01-07
<b>Birthdate:</b> 19761010	<b>Academic title:</b> Doktor
<b>Gender:</b> Female	<b>Employer:</b> Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet
<b>Country:</b> Sweden	

## Educational history

### Research education

Examination	Organisation
Doctors degree, 50901. Social Sciences Interdisciplinary incl. Peace and Conflict Research, Studies on Sustainable Society, 2008-01-07	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Stad och land

### Basic education

Year	Examination
2002	10611. Ecology incl. Aquatic Ecology, Terrestrial Ecology, Biodiversity Conservation, Degree of Master of Science in Agriculture, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

## Professional history

### Employments

Period	Position	Part of research in employment	Employer	Other information
oktober 2012 - Present	Researcher, Permanent employment	40	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Stad och land	Arbetar med ledning/som chef och undervisning på övriga 60% av tjänsten
februari 2008 - september 2012	Researcher, Temporary employment	70	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Stad och land	Under denna period gjordes avbrott i tjänsten för att ha en postdoctjänst.

Period	Position	Part of research in employment	Employer	Other information
februari 2002 - januari 2008	Research assistant, Permanent employment	80	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Stad och land	
juni 2002 - juli 2002 (Present)	Research assistant, Temporary employment	100	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Ekologi	
juni 2001 - juli 2001 (Present)	Research assistant, Temporary employment	100	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Ekologi	

#### Post doctoral assignments

Period	Organisation	Subject
juli 2009 - maj 2012	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Stad och land	50901. Social Sciences Interdisciplinary incl. Peace and Conflict Research, Studies on Sustainable Society

#### Interruptions in research

Period	Description
2011-06-24 - 2012-04-09	Föräldraledighet barn 2
2008-11-20 - 2009-12-14	Föräldraledighet barn 1

#### Merits and awards

##### Supervised persons

Year	Supervised persons	Role	Number
2018	Postdoc, Annette Löf	Main supervisor	
2018	PhD student, Elvira Caselunghe	Secondary supervisor	
2018	PhD student, Paola Ledo Espinoza	Secondary supervisor	
2016	Licentiate, Christina Lundström	Secondary supervisor	
2014	Licentiate, Måns Norlin	Secondary supervisor	
	Student	Main supervisor	25
	Student	Main supervisor	10

##### Research grants awarded in competition

Period	Funder	Project leader	Your role	Sub amount (SEK)	Total amount (SEK)
2015 - 2018	VINNOVA - Verket för innovationssystem	Hanna Bergeå	Applicant	0	3300000
2014 - 2016	Riksantikvarieämbetet	Lars Hallgren	Co-applicant	1300000	5650000
2013 - 2016	Naturvårdsverket	Lotten Westberg	Co-applicant	1100000	4500000

##### Other merits

Period	Type of merit	Description
2016 - 2019	Vice-dekan med ansvar för samverkan	Vice-dekan med ansvar för samverkan: Ett uppdrag på 30-40% vid fakulteten. Ingår genom detta i fakultetsledningen, fakultetsnämnden samt samverkansrådet vid SLU.

Period	Type of merit	Description
2012 - 2016	Head of Division for Environmental Communication	Head of Division for Environmental Communication: Avdelningschef med verksamhetsledaransvar, budget- och personalansvar. I snitt ett 15-tal anställda och ytterligare en handfull personer knutna till avdelningen. 35% av heltid.
2013 - 2016	Member of the head of department council at Dept of Urban and Rural development, bitr. prefekt	Member of the head of department council at Dept of Urban and Rural development, bitr. prefekt.
2013 - 2016	Ledamot i samverkansnämnden vid fakulteten	Ledamot i samverkansnämnden vid fakulteten
2014 - 2016	Chair of the group for external collaboration at the Department of Urban and Rural development	Chair of the group for external collaboration at the Department of Urban and Rural development
2015 - 2016	Arbetsgrupp för ökad jämställdhet vid rekryteringsprocessen vid fakulteten	Arbetsgrupp för ökad jämställdhet vid rekryteringsprocessen vid fakulteten: Ingår i gruppen, som har ett tillfälligt uppdrag att ta fram en handelsplan för ökad jämställdhet vid rekrytering till högre tjänster.
2013 - 2016	Medarrangör och lärare på uppdragsutbildning: Dialog för naturförvaltare	Medarrangör och lärare på uppdragsutbildning: Dialog för naturförvaltare
2013 - 2016	Kursansvarig	Kursansvarig: Jag är sedan 2013 kursansvarig för en 20 hp-kurs vid SLU som riktar sig till en mycket blandad studentgrupp på avancerad nivå 110-120 studenter årligen. Ett centralt inslag i kursen är att studenterna i blandade grupper genomför ett projektarbete som initierats av och drivs i samarbete med näringslivet.
2011 - 2012	Director of Postgraduate Studies at Dept. of Urban and Rural Development	Director of Postgraduate Studies at Dept. of Urban and Rural Development

## Publications

### Publications - Lars Hallgren

**Name:** Lars Hallgren

**Birthdate:** 19711204

**Gender:** Male

**Country:** Sweden

**Doctorial degree:** 2003-05-14

**Academic title:** Doktor

**Employer:** Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet

Scientific publication - peer-reviewed

### Original journal article

**Title:** Stakeholder Interaction in Participatory Land Restoration in Iceland: Environmental Officers' Challenges and Strategies

**Authors:** Brita Berglund, Aradóttir Ása, Lars Hallgren

**Date of publication:** 2015-04-23      **Volume:** 56      **Issue number:**

**Name of journal:** Environmental Management

**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Original journal article

**Title:** Adaptive management? Observations of knowledge coordination in the communication practice of Swedish game management

**Authors:** Lars Hallgren, Lotten Westberg

**Date of publication:** 2015      **Volume:** 21      **Issue number:** 3

**Name of journal:** WILDLIFE BIOLOGY

**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Original journal article

**Title:** Cultivating Communication: Participatory Approaches in Land Restoration in Iceland

**Authors:** Brita Berglund, Lars Hallgren, Ása L. Aradóttir

**Date of publication:** 2013                      **Volume:** 18                      **Issue number:** 2

**Name of journal:** Ecology And Society

**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Original journal article

**Title:** Farmers' Interest in Nature and Its Relation to Biodiversity in Arable Fields [Elektronisk resurs]

**Authors:** Johan Ahnström, Jan Bengtsson, Åke Berg, Lars Hallgren, Wijnand J. Boonstra, Johanna Björklund

**Date of publication:** 2013                      **Volume:**                      **Issue number:**

**Name of journal:** International Journal of Ecology

**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Original journal article

**Title:** Managing Impressions and Forests: The Importance of Role Confusion in Co-Creation of a Natural Resource Conflict

**Authors:** Elin Ångman, Lars Hallgren, Eva-Maria Nordström

**Date of publication:** 2011                      **Volume:** 24                      **Issue number:** 12

**Name of journal:** Society & Natural Resources

**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Original journal article

**Title:** Communicative Skills Development of Administrators: A Necessary Step for Implementing Participatory Policies in Natural Resource Management

**Authors:** Lotten Westberg, Lars Hallgren

**Date of publication:** 2010                      **Volume:** 4                      **Issue number:** 2

**Name of journal:** Environmental Communication-A Journal Of Nature And Culture

**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Original journal article

**Title:** To cut or not to cut - that is the question for Swedish pasture managers

**Authors:** Johan Ahnström, Camilla Winqvist, Linnea Björklund, Lars Hallgren

**Date of publication:** 2010                      **Volume:** 100                      **Issue number:**

**Name of journal:** Aspects Of Applied Biology

**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Original journal article

**Title:** Farmers and nature conservation: What is known about attitudes, context factors and actions affecting conservation?

**Authors:** Johan Ahnström, Jenny Höckert, Hanna Bergeå, Charles A. Francis, Peter Skelton, Lars Hallgren

**Date of publication:** 2009                      **Volume:** 24                      **Issue number:** 1

**Name of journal:** Renewable Agriculture And Food Systems

**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Original journal article

## Chapter in editorial collection

**Title:** Reframing conflict in natural resource management: mutuality, reciprocity and pluralistic agonism as dynamics of community constructivity and destructivity

**Authors:** Lars Hallgren

**Date of publication:**                      **Volume:**                      **Issue number:**

**Name of journal:**

**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Chapter in editorial collection

## Other publication including popular science

**Title:** Dialogprocessen om allemansrätten

**Authors:** Hanna Bergeå, Lars Hallgren, Lotten Westberg, Elin Ångman

**Date of publication:** 2013                      **Volume:**                      **Issue number:**

**Name of journal:**

**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Other publication including popular science

## Publications - Lotten Westberg

**Name:** Lotten Westberg  
**Birthdate:** 19570325  
**Gender:** Female  
**Country:** Sweden

**Doctorial degree:** 2005-09-29  
**Academic title:** Doktor  
**Employer:** Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet

Scientific publication - peer-reviewed

### Original journal article

**Title:** Participate for Women's Sake?  
**Authors:** Lotten Westberg, Stina Powell  
**Date of publication:** 2015      **Volume:** 28      **Issue number:** 11  
**Name of journal:** Society & Natural Resources  
**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Original journal article

**Title:** Adaptive management? Observations of knowledge coordination in the communication practice of Swedish game management  
**Authors:** Lars Hallgren, Lotten Westberg  
**Date of publication:** 2015      **Volume:** 21      **Issue number:** 3  
**Name of journal:** WILDLIFE BIOLOGY  
**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Original journal article

**Title:** Defining Peer-to-peer Learning - from an Old Art of Practice to a New Mode of Forest Owner Extension?  
**Authors:** Katri Hamunen, Marie Appelstrand, Teppo Hujala, Mikko Kurttila, Nadarajah Sriskandarajah, Lelde Vilkriste, Lotten Westberg, Jukka Tikkanen  
**Date of publication:** 2014      **Volume:**      **Issue number:** Online  
**Name of journal:** The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension  
**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Original journal article

**Title:** Peer-to-peer learning experiences in Sweden  
**Authors:** Lotten Westberg, Marie Appelstrand, Nadarajah Sriskandarajah  
**Date of publication:** 2011      **Volume:**      **Issue number:**      **Name of journal:** Working Papers of the Finnish Forest Research Institute  
**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Original journal article

**Title:** Communicative Skills Development of Administrators: A Necessary Step for Implementing Participatory Policies in Natural Resource Management  
**Authors:** Lotten Westberg, Lars Hallgren, Agneta Setterwall  
**Date of publication:** 2010      **Volume:** 4      **Issue number:** 2  
**Name of journal:** ENVIRONMENTAL COMMUNICATION-A JOURNAL OF NATURE AND CULTURE  
**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Original journal article

**Title:** Local selling as a driving force for increased on-farm biodiversity  
**Authors:** Johanna Björklund, Lotten Westberg, Ulrika Geber, Rebecka Milestad, Johan Ahnström  
**Date of publication:** 2009      **Volume:** 33      **Issue number:** 8  
**Name of journal:** Journal of Sustainable Agriculture  
**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Original journal article

**Title:** The role of learning in transdisciplinary research: moving from a normative concepts to an analytical tool through a practice-based approach.  
**Authors:** Lotten Westrberg, Merritt Polk  
**Date of publication:**      **Volume:** 11      **Issue number:** 3  
**Name of journal:** Sustainability Science 11(3) 385-397  
**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Original journal article



## Other publication including popular science

**Title:** Framtidens Flexibla Förvaltningsformer?

**Authors:** Thomas Norrby, Emil Sandström, Lotten Westberg

**Date of publication:** 2011                      **Volume:**                      **Issue number:**

**Name of journal:**

**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Other publication including popular science

**Title:** Dialog om framtida vattenförvaltning. (Dialogue about future water management)

**Authors:** Lena Gipperth, Lotten Westberg, Anna Jöborn

**Date of publication:** 2007                      **Volume:**                      **Issue number:**

**Name of journal:**

**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Other publication including popular science

**Title:** Aktörssamverkan i praktiken : om lärande och makt i samverkansprocesser mellan aktörer i livsmedelssystemet

**Authors:** Lotten Westberg

**Date of publication:** 2005                      **Volume:**                      **Issue number:**

**Name of journal:**

**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Other publication including popular science

## Publications - Hanna Bergeå

**Name:** Hanna Bergeå

**Doctorial degree:** 2008-01-07

**Birthdate:** 19761010

**Academic title:** Doktor

**Gender:** Female

**Employer:** Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet

**Country:**Sweden

Scientific publication - peer-reviewed

## Original journal article

**Title:** Small-scale resource tracking in a population of a long-lived insect

**Authors:** Olof Widenfalk, Christer Solbreck, Hanna Bergeå

**Date of publication:** 2012                      **Volume:** 2                      **Issue number:** 11

**Name of journal:** Ecology and evolution

**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Original journal article

**Title:** Farmers and nature conservation: What is known about attitudes, context factors and actions affecting conservation?

**Authors:** Johan Ahnström, Jenny Höckert, Hanna Bergeå, Charles A. Francis, Peter Skelton, Lars Hallgren

**Date of publication:** 2009                      **Volume:** 24                      **Issue number:** 1

**Name of journal:** Renewable Agriculture And Food Systems

**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Original journal article

**Title:** I don't know what you're looking for

**Authors:** Hanna Bergeå, Cathrin Martin, Fritjof Sahlström

**Date of publication:** 2008                      **Volume:** 14                      **Issue number:** 4

**Name of journal:** The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension

**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Original journal article

## Book

**Title:** Negotiating fences : interaction in advisory encounters for nature conservation

**Authors:** Hanna Bergeå

**Date of publication:** 2007                      **Volume:**                      **Issue number:**

**Name of journal:**

**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Book

## Chapter in editorial collection

**Title:** Klander, identitet och professionell solidaritet  
**Authors:** Hanna Bergeå, Anna Lindström  
**Date of publication:** 2007                      **Volume:**                      **Issue number:**  
**Name of journal:** Interaktion och kontext : nio studier av svenska samtal  
**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Chapter in editorial collection

**Title:** Communicating emotions in conflicts over natural resource management in the Netherlands and Sweden: legitimation and delegitimation of communities  
**Authors:** Elin Ångman, Arjen Buijs, Irma Arts, Hanna Ljunggren Bergeå, Gerhard Verschoor  
**Date of publication:**                      **Volume:**                      **Issue number:**  
**Name of journal:**  
**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Chapter in editorial collection

**Title:** Social transformation and sustainability: communication and community construction/ destruction  
**Authors:** Tarla Rai Peterson, Hanna Ljunggren Bergeå, Andrea M Feldpausch- Parker, Kaisa Raitio  
**Date of publication:**                      **Volume:**                      **Issue number:**  
**Name of journal:**  
**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Chapter in editorial collection

## Editorial collection

**Title:** Environmental Communication and Community: Constructive and destructive dynamics of social transformation  
**Authors:**  
**Date of publication:**                      **Volume:**                      **Issue number:**  
**Name of journal:**  
**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Editorial collection

## Other publication including popular science

**Title:** Dialogprocessen om allemansrätten  
**Authors:** Hanna Bergeå, Lars Hallgren, Lotten Westberg, Elin Ångman  
**Date of publication:** 2013                      **Volume:**                      **Issue number:**  
**Name of journal:**  
**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Other publication including popular science

**Title:** From conservation heroes to climate villains – how changes in social recognition may contribute to changed identities of farmers  
**Authors:** Lars Hallgren, Hanna Bergeå, Johan Ahnström, Helena Nordström Källström  
**Date of publication:** 2010                      **Volume:**                      **Issue number:**  
**Name of journal:**  
**Academic publication - peer-reviewed:** Other publication including popular science

## Register

### Terms and conditions

Ansökan ska förutom av den sökande även signeras av behörig företrädare för medelsförvaltaren. Företrädaren är vanligtvis prefekten vid den institution där forskningen ska bedrivas, men ska i vissa fall utgöras av exempelvis rektor. Detta framgår i sådana fall av den aktuella utlysningstexten för bidraget.

Signering av *den sökande* innebär en bekräftelse av att:

- uppgifterna i ansökan är korrekta och följer Formas instruktioner

- bisysslor och kommersiella bindningar har redovisats för medelsförvaltaren och att det där inte framkommit något som strider mot god forskningssed
- nödvändiga tillstånd och godkännanden ska finnas senast vid projektstart, exempelvis avseende etikprövning.

Signering av *medelsförvaltaren* innebär en bekräftelse av att:

- den beskrivna forskningen, anställningen och utrustningen kan beredas plats inom institutionen under den tid och i den omfattning som anges i ansökan
- institutionen godkänner kostnadsberäkningen i ansökan
- projektet bedrivs i enlighet med svensk lagstiftning.

Ovanstående punkter ska ha diskuterats mellan parterna innan företrädaren för medelsförvaltaren godkänner och signerar ansökan.

*Ansökningar där en organisation är sökande signeras automatiskt vid registrering av ansökan.*