UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG

Framing in negotiation and conflict

A literature review on dynamic approaches uncovering their theoretical background

FRANCESCO CARPANINI

Master of Science in Communication Thesis

Abstract

This thesis defines a literature review on the dynamic approaches to framing in negotiation and conflict research. The purpose of this paper is to uncover and delve into the theoretical background of the corpus of contributions. The review fills a gap in the literature, since it is the only one that outlines a systematic overview by involving a significant range of dimensions of analysis. After identifying the representative contributions, the dimensions of analysis figure out how the dynamic approaches have been applied to the concept framing and the set of dynamic features that shape their theoretical background. The results of the review are critically considered starting from the dynamic features identified in the contributions. The distinction between static and dynamic approaches is retrieved in order to explore the dynamic connotations of the approaches and clarify the role of social constructionism as a key theoretical foundation. The discussion section also points out that the rejection of the Cartesian view of inner-mental states and Wittgenstein's concept of language games are the main historical underpinnings. This paper outlines an original review that elucidates and develops the theoretical background of dynamic approaches. The body of knowledge elaborated by this study can be the starting point for further researchers with a focus on a dynamic perspective and a useful tool for practitioners.

Keywords: Framing, Frames, Dynamic approaches, Negotiation, Conflict, Social constructionism

Table of contents

1. Introduction

Communication scholars started conducting researches in the field of negotiation during "the 1960s and 1970s" (Putnam & Roloff, 1992, p. 2). Since "without communication there is no negotiation" (Fisher et al., 1991, p. 33), communication is considered a key aspect of negotiation. The Saga Annual Reviews of Communication Research entitled *Communication and Negotiation* (Putnam & Roloff, 1992) has been an essential volume in the literature about negotiation from a communication perspective because it provides an overview of the main issues debated at that time. Putnam and Holmer (1992) wrote a well-know contribution in the volume, which regards the concept of framing in negotiation. The framing metaphor is commonly adopted in several fields of study as it is "used to characterize the placing of limits around a particular phenomenon, object, or event" (Donohue et al., 2011, p. 1). The Putnam and Holmer's (1992) work is the starting point of this literature review on dynamic approaches to framing, since it highlights the importance of framing as a dynamic interaction process.

The contributions on the concept of framing in negotiation come from different disciplines and their number "has blossomed impressively over the last three decades" (Donohue et al., 2011, p. 2). Some of the reasons are related to the "potential power" of framing as a "metaphor" to study negotiation and to possibly understand "how negotiators reach or fail to reach their desired outcomes" (p. 2). By distinguishing between static and dynamic features, Putnam and Holmer (1992) outline an analysis of different approaches to framing in negotiation. Further developments of this analysis are elaborated, for example, in Dewulf et al. (2009) where the distinction is redefined as cognitive and interactional paradigms and regards approaches to negotiation and conflict as two complementary research fields. Theoretical elaborations of dynamic approaches to framing have generated researches in different negotiation and conflict situations where framing and reframing are primarily related to interaction processes and, thus, communication has a central position in the analysis. By adopting this point of view, it is possible to understand thoroughly how parties can reframe, converge, join an agreement with satisfying outcomes or reach a mutually acceptable solution as the focus of the analysis is on the dynamics of the ongoing interaction.

Dynamic approaches to framing in negotiation and conflict lack of a literature review that examines the most representative contributions in a systematic way, namely a review that defines a structured overview of the contributions in order to clarify in depth their theoretical roots. This paper aims at filling the identified gap by considering relevant contributions on the topic since 1992, the date of publication of Putnam and Holmer's work, which focuses on the comparison of different approaches to framing where the attention to dynamic elements represents its key aspect.

To sum up, the importance of this paper depends on a set of relevant points. Firstly, dynamic approaches to framing in negotiation allow researchers to conduct innovative detailed studies about how parties try to reach their desired outcomes because these

approaches focus mainly on interaction processes. Secondly, despite their increasing consideration in negotiation and conflict management due to the previous point, a systematic review of their main body of knowledge and applications has not been outlined yet. Thirdly, the results of this review can be the starting point to clarify their theoretical roots. Finally, the literature review outcomes can define a useful framework for future studies and practices in the areas of negotiation and conflict; they can help researchers to develop further their theoretical categories and provide important means to negotiators and disputants who want to improve their negotiation and conflict management skills through an in-depth understanding of the concept of framing.

2. Purpose and research questions

The main objective of this paper is to delineate a literature review on the concept of framing in dynamic approaches to negotiation and conflict. The literature review aims at outlining a structured overview of the most significant contributions in these fields. It figures out the common theoretical background of dynamic approaches and clarifies the areas where researchers have elaborated and applied them. In addition, this paper intends to increase the theoretical scope of the concept of framing by delving into the theoretical roots of dynamic approaches. Hence, the general purpose of this paper is to assist researchers in the specific field of study by outlining a literature review with a focus on the theoretical background of the contributions. "Relating ideas and theory to applications" (Hart, 1999, p. 27) is the starting point of the literature review, which intends to synthesize the most significant works and, at the same time, broaden their theoretical horizon by reconsidering the distinction between static and dynamic approaches.

The main research question is the following: How dynamic approaches to framing have been developed in the fields of negotiation and conflict? The answer to the main research question is shaped by exploring these issues: How dynamic approaches to framing have been elaborated in different contexts of application related to negotiation and conflict? What are the particular dynamic features of these approaches? Two other issues are considered to examine and broaden the answer to the main research question: What is the common theoretical background of dynamic approaches to framing in negotiation and conflict? How is it possible to delve into their theoretical roots?

3. Background

This section outlines the background in which dynamic approaches to framing in negotiation and conflict have been developed and, at the same time, introduces some fundamental categories adopted in this literature review. The two "terms *bargaining* and *negotiation* are often used in place of each other" (Abigail & Cahn, 2011, p. 88) in the literature. Scholars have delineated definitions of negotiation where interaction plays a key role. Negotiation occurs when "two or more interdependent parties who perceive incompatible goals" start engaging in "social interaction to reach a mutually satisfactory outcome" (Putnam & Roloff, 1992, p. 3). Negotiation is characterized by a condition of "interdependence" between parties since they "cooperate by competing for divergent ends" (p. 3). It is possible to identify negotiation as "the process of communication whereby two parties seek to resolve their conflicting interest in a manner that both parties prefer to the alternative" (Bülow, 2009, p. 142) or as "a process of communicating back and forth for the purpose of reaching a joint decision" (Fisher et al., 1991, p. 33). The link between negotiation and communication is rather evident in these definitions. "Negotiation and communication are inherently intertwined" (Putnam & Roloff, 1992, p. 1) as the parties must interact in order to pursue an agreement; therefore, "negotiation is usually a planned and structured process of communication" (O'Hair et al., 2010, p. 327).

What is communicated during a negotiation session can concern quite different things, such as offers, counteroffers, alternatives, outcomes, social accounts as explanations, and the negotiation process (Lewicki et al., 2011). As Putnam & Roloff (1992) point out, studies in negotiation conducted by researchers in the field of communication involve several elements, for example verbal and nonverbal messages, and "focus on language and discourse". The communication perspective on negotiation mainly regards three aspects. The first one is about "micro elements" that it is possible to find in, for instance, verbal utterance and nonverbal cues. The second one corresponds to the "dynamic features" of negotiation, e.g. the way in which strategies and tactics change over the negotiation session. The third one is the discovery of "systems of meaning" (p. 7), such as the ones related to covert verbal and nonverbal cues.

Negotiation can be considered a "fact of life" since "everyone negotiates something every day" (Fisher et al., 1991, p. xiii). The reasons for negotiation are different, as they can concern the sharing or division of a limited resource between the parties, the implementation of something new that the parties can only realize together, or the generation of solutions to a problem between the parties (Lewicki et al., 2011). Negotiation can be in dyadic composition or in group and can take place in many different situations, such as buyer-seller interactions and leader-follower interactions. Another situation where negotiation can take place is conflict management. Conflict is "traditionally defined as *the perception of incompatible activities*", such as goals, claims, and values, which can obstruct or make "less like or less effective another activity" (Gray et al., 2007, p. 1415). Conflict "is based on interaction",

since it is "the interaction of interdependent people who perceive incompatible goals and interference from each other in achieving those goals" (Folger et al., 1997, p. 4). Putnam (1985) delineates negotiation as the type of conflict management "characterized by an exchange of proposals and counterproposals as a means of reaching a satisfactory settlement" (p. 129). Donohue and Kolt (1992) stress the fact that only conflicts with parties in "good faith", namely where "parties sincerely want to work through the important issues dividing them" (pp. 88-89), can be called negotiation. Some situations can imply a third party intervention (p. 135), i.e. a neutral person who assists parties usually adopting a specific role (conciliator, mediator, arbitrator, or adjudicator) depending on the goals, the structure, and the context of the dispute resolution process.

Integrative and distributive represent two important concepts in negotiation which are also relevant to conflict management. Integrative interaction has a win-win orientation, namely the parties tend to converge on the maximization of common gains; in this case, the pie can be expanded through a joint problem solving and an exchange of information between negotiations in order to increase the gains of both parties (Putnam, 1990). Distributive interaction has an individualistic connotation represented by a win-lose process where a party wins at the expense of the other; thus, negotiators' aims are the maximization of individual gains in the light of a zero sum view because the available benefits are depicted as a fixed pie (Putnam, 1990). Integrative and distributive can be defined as two different processes, the former implies the "sequences of action" that aims at increasing flexibility and at achieving the maximizations of joint benefits, while the latter implies the "sequences of action" that lead to "rigidity, conflict escalation, and increased potential for win-lose or lose-lose outcomes" (p. 4). Putnam (1990) notes that integrative and distributive "subsume, but are not identical to, cooperation and competition" (p. 4). One can reach the maximization of joint gains by implementing both cooperative and competitive motives, while the other can reach the maximization of individual gains by both working cooperatively and making efforts to win (Putnam, 1990). She also argues that distributive and integrative are not two separated orientations since they are always "intertwined in a symbiotic bonding that pervades negotiations" (p. 5). Strategies and tactics are two other interesting concepts that can be defined in negotiation and conflict. Strategy is identified with the "overall plan to accomplish one's goal" and "the action sequences that will lead to the accomplishment of these goals" (Lewicki et al., 2011, p. 91). Tactics are "the communicative behaviors that operationalize strategies" (Putnam, 1990, p. 15). Strategies and tactics differ in "scale, perspective, or immediacy"; tactics can be defined as "short-term, adaptive moves designed to enact or pursue broad (or higher-level) strategies, which in turn provide stability, continuity, and direction for tactical behaviors" (Lewicki et al., 2011, p. 91).

One of the analyzed issues in negotiation and conflict concerns the way in which parties figure out the session, direct the selection of information, and drive the outcomes during the negotiation. Frames and framing, which are concepts elaborated in different fields of study, are theorized and applied in several ways to understand this specific issue in negotiation and conflict research. According to Donohue et al. (2011), three elements can be

commonly associated with the framing metaphor. Firstly, it "gives shape to the relevance of some phenomena over others"; secondly, it organizes and interconnects phenomena within the frame in order "to create a recognizable system of information" that is able to influence "other phenomena outside the frame"; thirdly, it "plays a major role in driving outcomes" (pp. 1-2). The approaches employed to study framing in negotiation and conflict can be defined as static or dynamic depending on their features. Dynamic approaches stress the importance of interaction as a dynamic process where meanings arise from the ongoing interaction itself. Moreover, in dynamic approaches there are not static and a priori definitions of typologies about framing.

4. Methodology

This section outlines the method employed. After shaping the definition of literature review adopted in this work, it explains the ways in which relevant contributions were identified by describing the applied criteria and tools. The method of mapping is introduced by delineating and justifying its implementation. A set of limitations clarifies the boundaries of this paper.

4.1 Defining the literature review

A literature review is "more than a summary" as its general purpose is to "evaluate each article" and "assess its significance" (Treadwell, 2011, p. 68). It implies the "selection of available documents" related to the topic and their "effective evaluation" (Hart, 1999, p. 13) according to the purpose of the review. Fink (2010) adopts the term *research literature review* and defines it as a "systematic, explicit, and reproducible method for identifying, evaluating, and synthesizing" (p. 3). Cooper (2010) delineates two main types of literature review, *research synthesis* and *theoretical review*. The first one is used to "summarize past researches" and "to present the state of knowledge" highlighting "important issues that research has left unresolved"; the second one aims at showing and comparing "the theories offered to explain a particular phenomenon" and implies the "description", "assessment", and "reformulation and/or integration" (p. 4) of these theories.

This paper shapes a relevant group of contributions, presents and highlights significant concepts and their fields of application, and delves into their theoretical roots. By taking also into account the taxonomy of literature review reported in Cooper (2010), it is possible to define this literature review considering the following elements: *focus*, *goal*, *perspective*, *coverage*, *organization*, and *audience*. This literature review focuses on the theoretical background of the selected contributions, but it also intends to define an overview of the

connections between concepts and applications. The major goal is the clarification of relevant issues at theoretical level by adopting a neutral perspective. The contributions are representative of the works published about the topic over the identified period of time. The organization of the review considers the key concepts involved in the contributions. Academic scholars in the area of study are the main audience.

4.2 Identification of the set of contributions

The period of time selected to define pertinent contributions covers more than twenty years. The starting point of the data collection of this literature review is the work written by Putnam and Holmer (1992) and it involves articles issued by June 2013. Only contributions published over this period of time in peer-reviewed journals and volumes were taken into account in order to avoid considering possible low-quality articles. Relevant contributions must adopt or elaborate a dynamic approach to framing and involve negotiation and/or conflict. They can have theoretical, empirical or experimental orientation. The library catalogues and research tools employed belong to the University of Gothenburg and Chalmers University. The lists of databases are available on the two university websites at the following URLs: http://www.ub.gu.se/sok/db/ and http://www.lib.chalmers.se/en/search/databases/database-list/. The search of articles in peer-reviewed journals involved online archives of aggregated databases, such as platforms managed by Springer, ProQuest, ScienceDirect, Taylor & Francis Group, SAGE, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, and Wiley. Some interlibrary loans were provided to find volumes relocated elsewhere. Another source of information was Google Scholar. The search applied the following keywords: "framing", "frame", "negotiation", "bargaining", "conflict", "dispute", and "dynamic". They were combined by using Boolean operators ("and", "not", and "or"). The reference lists in relevant contributions were analyzed in order to find previous significant works; similarly, the citation indexes (provided by Web of Science) regarding the early identified contributions were taken into account to select later pertinent contributions.

4.3 Mapping

The method employed to work on the selected contributions can be defined as "mapping"; it aims at showing the "geography of research" in order to provide a pertinent "overview of the topic" (Hart, p. 144). The specific mapping outlined in this paper can be considered similar to "feature maps", namely a method to "produce a summary schemata" of the identified studies and to "locate any similarities and differences between other studies on the topic" (p. 145). This work maps the contributions by analysing the main concepts involved in the studies that define dynamic approaches to framing in negotiation and conflict, identifying their main

theoretical features, and shaping a synthesis of them in order to uncover their common theoretical background and discuss some related fundamental aspects.

This review defines six different dimensions to map the contributions. As introduction, the first two dimensions outline an overview of the research through the contributions. The first one figures out the research development about the topic by considering the number of contributions published by journal and year. The second one classifies the contributions according to their main research orientations (theoretical, empirical, and experimental). Beginning from this distinction, the third dimension analyzes early concepts of framing involved in the theoretical contributions in order to understand how framing has been defined outside negotiation and conflict research. In order to clarify how the dynamic approaches have been applied in the research contexts, the other two dimensions concern contributions classified as empirical and experimental. A dimension categorizes the contributions with regard to their research areas (negotiation, conflict, and negotiation and conflict) in order to examine how negotiation and conflict are related to dynamic approaches. The other one is retrieved from Dewulf et al. (2009) and focuses on how framing is conceptualized in the contributions according to the question "what is it that gets framed?" (p. 165). The categories are issue, identity and relationship, process, and multiple. The last dimension provides an overview of the dynamic features of the approaches to framing and lists their main references in each contribution. It highlights important aspects of contributions and their theoretical background analyzed thoroughly in the discussion section.

This paper does not involve meta-analysis, which can be defined as a set of "quantitative procedures used to statistically combine the results of studies" (Cooper, 2010, p. 6). A qualitative perspective characterizes the method of mapping employed, since it focuses on key concepts and aims at uncovering and clarifying their theoretical background.

4.4 Limitations

As Hart (1999) remarks, "there is no such thing as the perfect review" because the reviewer always writes it from a "particular perspective or standpoint" (p. 25). This paper has a focus on theoretical aspects related to framing and highlights the importance of interaction in negotiation and conflict. Thus, it is primarily written for scholars in the fields of negotiation and conflict research who take into consideration theoretical issues and communication perspectives.

The limitations of this literature review are also connected with the sources of information employed (Cooper, 2010). The search terms applied to look for contributions in online databases and on the Internet restrict the search results. Furthermore, searching online articles implies that they must be available online. The missing of recent research can be due to "a time leg between when a study is completed and when it will appear" (p. 70) in databases and in citation indexes. Considering the references at the end of contributions, the identification of other relevant contributions can involve "homogeneity" because "studies in

the same journal network are more likely to be cited" (p. 65). The fact that this literature review only takes into account published contributions over a specific period of time can be considered a limitation. Peer review processes can ensure standards of quality, but it is not possible to exclude the eventuality to find researches that fulfill qualitative standards in unpublished/not yet published papers. Since the selection regarded only contributions published in English, the language involved is another limitation.

5. Results

This section regards the results of the literature review that stem from the implementation of the elements outlined in the methodology. The method of mapping is particularly useful to show the set of concepts and features defining dynamic approaches in the contributions, to uncover similarities and differences between works, and to figure out their common theoretical background. The present results can be considered as representative of the research adopting dynamic approaches to framing in negotiation and conflict, since the coverage of this literature review is not exhaustive.

Taking into account dynamic approaches, the word *framing* seems to be more appropriate than the word *frame*, as it stresses the dynamic features of the concept. However, some researches outline dynamic definitions by employing the word *frame*. Thus, in this literature review the word *framing* refers to dynamic approaches, even the ones adopting the word *frame*.

The selected contributions involve negotiation and/or conflict and delineate or implement a dynamic approach to framing. This work considers an approach to framing as dynamic when meanings arise from the interaction between the parties and typologies related to framing research are not predefined statically in data analysis. Some contributions discuss main differences between static and dynamic approaches or develop the comparison within another distinction, which parallels the first one, where approaches are divided in cognitive and interactional. A couple of papers articulate mixed approaches where dynamic features play a significant role in the development of the researches.

The order of presentation of the results provides a gradual understanding of dynamic approaches according to the dimensions defined in the methodology section. The first step is the delineation of an overview of the research development by considering the number of contributions categorized by journal and year; furthermore, the contributions are classified according to their main orientation. The second step is the analysis of early concepts of framing in contributions categorized as theoretical. The third one regards the other contributions and their classification implemented by taking into account their research areas

and perspectives. The last step is the identification of dynamic features shaping dynamic approaches to framing in the whole set of contributions.

5.1 Overview of the contributions

It is possible to outline an overview of the research in the contributions by considering two perspectives. The first one concerns the journals involved in the literature review and the years of publication. The second one regards three categories concerning the main orientation of the contributions: theoretical, empirical, and experimental. The set of peer-reviewed journals, where the identified articles have been published, are listed in alphabetical order in Table I, which classifies the number of contributions by journal and year. The analyzed period of time is from the year of publication of Putnam and Holmen's (1992) work, which is fundamental for the definition of the distinction between static and dynamic approaches, to June 2013. Only a minority of these contributions comes from books. They are placed in the specific row called "Volumes". One of them is the already mentioned work, which was published in 1992 in the volume entitled *Communication and Negotiation* belonging to the series called The Saga Annual Reviews of Communication Research. All other works are contained in the same book entitled *Framing Matters* (Donohue et al., 2011), which is subtitled *Perspectives on Negotiation Research and Practice in Communication*, since it offers an important overview of the recent developments in framing research with a focus on communication perspectives in negotiation and also in conflict. Table I shows that the year of publication of this volume is the one with the highest number of publications (six articles along with the four book chapters in 2011). Furthermore, the number of the later publications can be considered as relevant (two articles in 2012 and two articles in the first half of 2013). Thus, the volume edited by Donohue et al. (2011) might prove the beginning of a growing interest in debating and applying different approaches to framing and the importance of dynamic concepts as one of the main concerns among researches in fields of negotiation and conflict.

Table I can also indirectly provide some general suggestions to exemplify the fields of application where researches have been developed, since only a minority of journals are entirely devoted to negotiation or conflict issues (*Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *International Negotiation*, *Mediation Quarterly*, and *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*). For example, some journal titles like *Conservation and Society*, *Ecology and Society*, *Forest Policy and Economics*, and *Journal of Environmental Management* imply that dynamic approaches to framing have been involved in researches connected to environmental and natural resources management issues. Further information regarding dynamic approaches to framing with reference to their fields of application can be acquired by elaborating the other dimensions that aims at clarifying the topic.

	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Communication Research				1																			1
Conflict Resolution Quarterly					1																		1
Conservation and Society																				1			1
Ecology and Society																1				2			3
Forest Policy and Economics																				1		1	2
Human Communication Research	1																						1
Human Relations															1			1					2
International Journal of Conflict Management												1											1
International Negotiation											1												1
International Review of Administrative Sciences																				1			1
Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology													1										1
Journal of Environmental Management																					1		1
Journal of Language and Social Psychology							1																1
Language in Society								1															1
Mediation Quarterly						1																	1
Organization Studies										1										1			2
Policy Sciences											1												1
Research on Language and Social Interaction																						1	1
Sociological Inquiry													1										1
The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science																					1		1
The Journal of Conflict Resolution																		1					1
Volumes											1									4			5
Total	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	3	1	2	0	1	1	0	2	0	10	2	2	31

Table I – Number of contributions by journal and year (1992 – June 2013)

Considering the contents of the set of contributions, it is possible to classify them according to their main orientation by adopting three categories: theoretical, empirical, and experimental (see Table II). The papers belonging to the second category are studies that present results about empirical works directly conducted by the researches, whereas contributions described as theoretical are not empirical works, since they elaborate theoretical elements and debate issues by analyzing other studies. Contributions can be classified as experimental when the researchers recruit a group of people and create an experimental setting according to the purpose of the research. Only 16.1 percent of contributions can be considered as theoretical, while most papers are classified as empirical according to their main orientation, but some clarifications can be useful to explain this analysis. An example of empirical research is Kärreman and Alvesson (2001) where the empirical work involves a multiple data collection (observation in a company, interviews, and an account of a meeting) as in other contributions. Papers classified as empirical can also include some important theoretical contents if they elaborate empirical and theoretical aspects together. An example of this type of work is Drake and Donohue (1996), as they study a set of excerpts from divorce mediation disputes after defining a communicative approach to framing. The contribution written by Donohue (2011) belongs to the group of theoretical contributions, since it elaborates a specific dynamic approach called interactionist. A contribution can also be taken into account as a relevant theoretical one when it addresses the clarification of different approaches to framing as a central issue; for example, Dewulf et al. (2009) work on the definition of a meta-paradigmatic perspective which aims at creating a bridge between two different perspectives. Furthermore, a theoretical contribution can retrieve data related to already published empirical researches in order to exemplify and clarify their theoretical considerations, such as Dewulf et al. (2011a) extracts data from a previous empirical research analyzed in Dewulf et al. (2004) in order to better explain this approach. The only one experimental paper regards a collaborative writing task where the participants are some university students recruited from different speech communication courses (Bonito and Sanders, 2002).

Research orientation	Number	%
Theoretical	5	16.1
Empirical	25	80.7
Experimental	1	3.2
Total	**31**	**100**

Table II – Number of contributions classified into three main research orientations

For different reasons, some contributions outline a review about previous studies involving the concept of framing. These works lack of a systematic literature review, as they do not adopt a set of multiple dimensions in the analysis of dynamic approaches. The dimension delineated in Dewulf et al. (2009) and in Dewulf et al. (2011a), which regards different

categories of what is framed, is retrieved in Table V in order to develop the analysis of empirical contributions (see 5.3 Research areas and perspectives in empirical contributions). However, in these two works the selection of relevant contributions does not seem in line with the criteria established in this paper; their review tends to combine contributions implementing approaches to framing in negotiation or in conflict research with papers investigating human interactions without using the concept of frame/framing or without considering negotiation or conflict. These remarks uncover the need for a deeper and more systematic review.

Considering the distinction related to the orientation, it is possible to define two overall different analyses. The first one aims at clarifying the roots of dynamic approaches by focusing on the theoretical contributions and considering their analysis of early concepts of framing, which were developed outside the fields of negotiation and conflict research. The second one delineates two points of view on the empirical and experimental contributions; it sets up an overview of the general research areas and outlines a classification of the contributions according to their specific perspective.

5.2 Early concepts of framing analyzed in the theoretical contributions

The notion of faming, which is conceptualized and applied in several fields of study, has its roots outside negotiation and conflict research. Since almost all theoretical papers also mention the development of early concepts of framing and frame that contribute to the definition of dynamic approaches, this analysis intends to provide an overview of their historical roots as studied in the identified works. Table III shows the early concepts of framing and provides their main references mentioned in the theoretical contributions.

Contribution	Early concept(s) of framing	Main reference(s)
Putnam and Holmer (1992)	- Meta-communication - Definitions of the situation - Keying and fabrication	Bateson (1972) Goffman (1974)
Donohue (2003)	[not mentioned]	-
Dewulf et al. (2009)	- Meta-communication - Interpretations of interaction - Footing	Bateson (1972) Goffman (1974) Goffman (1981)
Dewulf et al. (2011a)	- Meta-communication - Footing - Keying	Bateson (1972) Goffman (1981) Goffman (1974)
Donohue (2011)	- Interaction and symbolic presence	Goffman (1974)

Table III – Early concepts of framing analyzed in the theoretical contributions

The references mentioned in the theoretical contributions regard Bateson and Goffman. Putnam and Holmer (1992) highlight some concepts related to Bateson and Goffman in order to define possible ways of developing approaches to framing. For Bateson (1972), "frames are *classes or sets of messages*" (Putnam and Holmer, 1992, p. 144) with a particular function called meta-communication, namely communication about the ongoing interaction. Bateson (1972) provides an example about meta-communication that refers to the observation of two young monkeys. While they are playing, they engage in a fight by exchanging signals and actions similar but slightly different to the ones in real combat situations. Meta-communication allows the monkeys to play by exchanging signals that "carry the message 'this is play' " (p. 179). Thus, "a frame is metacommunicative" since it is involved in "the evaluation of the messages" (p. 188) exchanged during the interaction. Frames are related to "social contexts through premises of communication, cues that signal the beginning and ending of events, and patterns of behaviour" (Putnam and Holmer, 1992, p. 145) in a dynamic way so that the social context is modified in the interaction. The importance of the concept of metacommunication in shaping dynamic definitions of framing is also stressed by the other theoretical contributions that mention Bateson's conceptualization of frame.

Frames are "definitions of the situation" in Goffman (1974). Both Bateson (1972) and Goffman (1974) focus on "how frames are modified or transformed" (Putnam and Holmer, 1992, p. 146); the latter defines frames as embracing "individual intentions, cultural and historical understanding, and natural forces" (p. 146) in contrast to what is outlined by Bateson (1972). Goffman (1974) is also taken into account with reference to his concepts of *keying* and *fabrication* that explain how reframing works. Dewulf et al. (2009) and Dewulf et al. (2011a) point out the concept of *footing* as a type of framing that regards the relationship between the communicator and the message. While Donohue (2003) does not mention early concepts of framing, since the contribution centers on the meaning of interaction, Donohue (2011) highlights the phenomenological roots of Goffman's (1974) definition of frame by pointing out the concept of typification as "standard ways of engaging in interactive behavior" (p. 37) that shape social order. Goffman's (1974) basic idea is that people manage their "symbolic presence" (Donohue, 2011, p. 37) in order to interact with others.

In summary, the early concepts of framing reveal a common origin of dynamic approaches in negotiation and conflict research. The idea of dynamic interaction stems from definitions that center on how frame can be changed, namely Bateson's (1972) notion of meta-communication and Goffman's (1974, 1981) concepts related to frame.

5.3 Research areas and perspectives

The set of empirical and experimental contributions is analyzed according to two dimensions in order to understand how the dynamic approaches have been developed and applied by

researchers in negotiation and conflict. The first one regards the general research areas connected with the contributions. The second dimension involves the different perspectives adopted by dynamic approaches in the empirical and experimental contributions.

Table IV shows how negotiation and conflict are related to the dynamic approaches by adopting three categories: negotiation, conflict, and negotiation and conflict. Some contributions regard empirical researches about framing only connected to either negotiation or conflict, but others involve both negotiation and conflict. Examples of contributions about either conflict or negotiation are Kusztal (2002), where the focus is on the conflict emergence in an organization, and Matoesian (1999), since the work regards the constitution of expert identity in which negotiation plays an important role. Negotiation and conflict are combined in the 50% of contributions for several different reasons. For example, in van Lieshout et al. (2011) negotiation and conflict are involved in analyzing the issue of scale frames in a particular decision making process, while Drake and Donohue (1996) inquiry conflict resolution studying the negotiation of frame in interaction between disputants.

Research area	Number	%
Negotiation	7	26.9
Conflict	6	23.1
Negotiation and conflict	13	50
Total	**26**	**100**

Table IV – Number of contributions classified into three research areas

The perspectives about framing adopted to analyze further the contributions are issue, identity and relationship, and process. Dewulf et al. (2009) outline these perspectives, also mentioned in Dewulf et al. (2011a), by answering the question 'what is it that gets framed?' in order to analyze different conceptualizations of frames. This literature review takes also into account a fourth category, since some contributions adopt a multiple point of view by considering two or three perspectives together. This dimension, as the previous one, is useful to understand how dynamic approaches have been elaborated and applied. It focuses on what is subject to framing: issue framing regard "the meanings attached to agenda items, events or problems", framing about identity and relationship is related to "the meanings about oneself and one's relationships with a counterpart(s)", and process framing denotes "the interpretations" (Dewulf et al., 2009, p. 165) of the interaction process elaborated by the parties. Table V shows that the perspective centering on issue reaches the highest percentage. The focus on issue framing can probably be connected to the fact that Putnam and Holmer's (1992) paper, which is a fundamental contribution in analyzing the distinction between static and dynamic features, analyzes the dynamic approach to framing as the perspective called issue development.

Perspective	Number	%
Issue	10	38.4
Identity and relationship	6	23.1
Process	4	15.4
Multiple	6	23.1
Total	**26**	**100**

Table V – Number of contributions classified into different perspectives

Issue framing is a perspective defined in different situations. For example, in Dewulf and Bouwen (2012) the framing regards complex issues, which are related to natural resources management, in conversation for change between multiple actors; on the contrary, in Bean and Hamilton (2006) the issue framing regards leader-follower interactions in the downsizing of a company. Donohue and Hoobler's (2002) study is classified into identity and relationship because it is an example of framing in international negotiation studied from a relational communication point of view; Kärreman and Alvesson's (2001) work is in the same category, since it inquires the identity construction in a newspaper publishing. An example of contribution categorized as a process framing is Bodtker and Jameson (1997) because they focus on conflict resolution by studying the influence of all parties in the mediation process. A multiple perspective is adopted by van Bommel and Aarts (2011) to study contested management related to nature conservation (framing of the issue of expertise, framing of expert identity, and framing of the process between actors).

Research areas and perspectives are two dimensions of analysis that highlight how dynamic approaches have been elaborated and what is subject to framing. Negotiation and conflict co-exist in most contributions applying dynamic approaches, since framing is particularly studied as negotiation and conflict of meanings between parties in interaction. The categorization of frame can be developed in relation to different perspectives. Studies adopting a multiple perspective seem to avoid analyzing possible issues related to the combination of diverse perspectives. These two dimensions can enrich the understanding of the different contexts where dynamic approaches to framing can be elaborated and applied, e.g. hostage negotiation, organizational problems, and divorce mediation disputes. The areas of expertise of the researchers who have conducted important studies have probably affected the delineation of the set of contexts of application. For example, some researchers who work on dynamic approaches have applied them to the field of natural resources management, such as Dewulf et al. (2004), Dewulf et al. (2007), Dewulf et al. (2011b), Dewulf and Bouwen (2012), Idrissou et al. (2011a), Idrissou et al. (2011b), and Idrissou et al. (2013). Another group of contributions focuses on international negotiation related to peace negotiation, namely Donohue (1998), Donohue and Hoobler (2002), and Donohue and Druckman (2009).

5.4 Dynamic features of the approaches to framing

What is necessary to understand dynamic approaches to framing is a mapping of the whole set of contributions with reference to the dynamic features which shape the theoretical background of their approaches. Dynamic features are considered to figure out similarities and differences between contributions and to provide an overview of the theoretical background shared by the set of contributions. Table VI shows relevant dynamic features and their main references in each contribution listed in chronological order. The main references are traced to uncover the level of interrelatedness between the contributions and to outline the knowledge development regarding the topic. The list of dynamic features in each contribution also clarifies how the same references in different contributions have been mentioned and elaborated. Early concepts of framing in theoretical contributions are not in Table VI, since they are already analyzed in Table III. However, the references related to early concepts of framing are listed in Table VI when they are identified as important in the other contributions.

Contribution	Dynamic features of the approach to framing	Main reference(s)
Putnam and Holmer (1992)	- Interpretation and sensemaking - Issues are co-constructed by individuals - Issues are defined by a process of naming, blaming, and claiming - Issue development as assessment and reassessment of agenda items	Tannen (1979) Eden et al. (1981) Felstiner et al. (1980-1981) Putman (1990)
Donohue and Roberto (1993)	- Negotiated order theory, implicit negotiations, and relational development	Strauss (1978)
Drake and Donohue (1996)	- Frames defined as communicative structures - Negotiated order theory, implicit negotiations, and frames - Speech act theory and frame limits - Speech accommodation theory and frames convergence	Putnam and Holmer (1992) Strauss (1978) Searle (1965) Gallois and Callan (1988)
Bodtker and Jameson (1997)	- A frame delimits a set of messages and defines the interpretation of the interaction	Bateson (1972) Putnam and Holmer (1992)
Donohue (1998)	- Relational order theory	Donohue and Roberto (1993)
Matoesian (1999)	- Footing as a linguistic negotiation of identities in interaction	Goffman (1981)
Kärreman and Alvesson (2001)	- Identity is a relational concept as it is a social accomplishment	Potter and Wetherell (1987)

Bonito and Sanders (2002)	- Alternative footings as related to the issue of changes in footing	Goffman (1981)
Donohue and Hoobler (2002)	- Relational order theory	Donohue and Roberto (1993) Donohue (1998)
Kusztal (2002)	- Dispute transformation as a subjective process - Conflict as a discursive process of sensemaking	Felstiner et al. (1980-1981) Weick (1995)
Donohue (2003)	- Relational order theory and negotiated order in an interaction approach perspective	Donohue and Roberto (1993) Donohue (1998) Strauss (1978)
Dewulf et al. (2004)	- Issue framing as a practice of sensemaking - Interactive and communicative process of framing	Putnam and Holmer (1992) Wenger (1998) Drake and Donohue (1996)
Esacove (2004)	- Interpretive dimensions associated with a cultural perspective - Framing processes in social movement are related to meaning - Social psychological phenomena are socially constructed	Goffman (1974) Snow and Benford (1992) Billig (1995)
Bean and Hamilton (2006)	- Frames in sensemaking - Frames affect the organization of the structure of experience	Weick (1995) Goffman (1974)
Dewulf et al. (2007)	- Frame as a sensemaking device - Discursive approach to framing	Weick (1995) Dewulf et al. (2004)
Dewulf et al. (2009)	- Interactive frames as negotiated alignments focusing on communication - Co-construction of social realities through conversations - Framing constructs meanings - Conflict occurs in the social interaction between parties	Tannen and Wallat (1987) Pearce and Cronen (1980) Billig (2001) Edwards (1997) Gergen (1994) Donohue (1998) Dewulf et al. (2004) Putnam and Holmer (1992)
Donohue and Druckman (2009)	- Relational messages	Donohue (1998) Donohue and Hoobler (2002)
Aarts et al. (2011)	- Conversations create reality - Framing is related to making sense, interpreting, and meaning - Frames are not static as they are interactive	Ford (1999) Te Molder and Potter (2005) Goffman (1974) Bateson (1972)
Bijlsma et al. (2011)	- Frame as a interactional co-construction - Issue development as a process of	Dewulf et al. (2009) Putnam and Holmer (1992)

	social interaction	
Dewulf et al. (2011a)	- Meanings are created in interaction through supplement acts - Frames defined as communicative structures shaped during the ongoing interaction - Frames are connected with language choices and language accomplishes things - Discourse analysis and the idea of context as related interactions	Dewulf et al. (2009) Gergen (1994) Drake and Donohue (1996) Alvesson and Kärreman (2000) Wood and Kroger (2000)
Dewulf et al. (2011b)	- Issues frame as a sensemaking device - Language choices shape the meaning of issues	Dewulf et al. (2009) Drake and Donohue (1996)
Donohue (2011)	- Frames are communicative and co-created in interaction - Frames in relational development - Frames as rules related to communication and linguistic codes - Frames and linguistic synchrony	Drake and Donohue (1996) Donohue and Roberto (1993) Pearce and Cronen (1980) Shepard et al. (2001) Niederhoffer and Pennebaker (2002)
Idrissou et al. (2011a)	- Interactional frames as communication devices - Framing as a process of selection	Dewulf et al. (2009) Entman (1993) Bateson (1954)
Idrissou et al. (2011b)	- Framing process as a construction of understandings of social reality	Dewulf et al. (2009)
Mueller and Whittle (2011)	- Footing defined as the relationship defined by people between them and what they say	Goffman (1981)
van Bommel and Aarts (2011)	- Iterative discursive processes create meaning - Frames are argued and negotiated during the interaction - Interpretive approach focuses on the context of framing	Esacove (2004) Felstiner et al. (1980-1981) Yanow (2000)
van Lieshout et al. (2011)	- Issue framing as a interaction and negotiation process between actors	Dewulf et al. (2009)
Asah et al. (2012)	- Frames as interactional co-contractions and sensemaking processes	Tannen (1979) Dewulf et al. (2009)
Dewulf and Bouwen (2012)	- The understanding of issues is delineated in and through conversation - Meanings are defined in interaction - Linguistic choices outline	Dewulf et al. (2009) Ford and Ford (1995) Drake and Donohue (1996) Weick (1995) Edwards (1997) Wood and Kroger (2000)

	different descriptive versions of events - Issues are formulated through language at the level of discourse	
Idrissou et al. (2013)	- Production and negotiation of frame in interaction	Dewulf et al. (2009)
Van Herzele and Aarts (2013)	- Frames as transient structures that shape meanings in interaction - Frames as self-referential social systems	Dewulf et al. (2009) Goffman (1974) Bateson (1972) Luhmann (1990)

Table VI – Dynamic features of the approaches to framing in the contributions

By analyzing the variety of dynamic features, this part aims at outlining an overview of the theoretical background of dynamic approaches to framing, which are discussed thoroughly in the next section by delving into their theoretical roots. The presentation of the results related to dynamic features consists of two steps. The first one regards the identification of the main dynamic features in contributions that have relevant theoretical contents, because they also analyze other papers and debate theoretical aspects. The second step involves the other contributions in order to delve into dynamic features in their fields of application.

5.4.1 Introducing the main dynamic features

Putnam and Holmer (1992) analyze the concepts of framing and reframing in negotiation by making a comparison between three diverse approaches: cognitive heuristics, frame categories, and issue development. The only one approach to framing that can be seen as completely dynamic is the last one, since its concept of framing relays on "dynamic interaction processes"; furthermore, in the issue development approach there are not a priori categories as "superimposed and constitutive of discourse", because meanings "arise from discourse" and are "understandings of problems" (p. 143) transformed by means of reframing. Issues are "agenda items or topics of concern" (p. 138) framed and reframed by parties during the interaction. Issue development has been previously defined in Putnam (1990) as "a continual process of assessing and reassessing agenda items in light of attacking arguments, information exchanged, and interpretations that bargainers give to these activities" (p. 10); this definition implies that individuals are able to interpret their world (Tannen, 1979). Thus, the co-construction of frame entails a process of sense-making in which individuals shape the issues (Eden et al., 1981). Issues are not objective agenda items, as the parties define and redefine them through a process of naming, blaming, and claiming. Felstiner et al. (1980-1981) delineate this process in studying transformations in disputes. Naming occurs when a person starts to consider "a particular experience" as "injurious", blaming means that the

person defines the injurious experience as "grievance", and claiming takes place when the person "asks for some remedy" (p. 635); hence, a dispute can start if the claim is rejected.

In the issue development approach, framing "occurs through the *process of shaping issues*" jointly between the parties and is related to "multiple agenda items", while reframing regards the "transformation of a problem" or of the parties' "field of vision" (Putnam & Holmer, 1992, pp. 139-140) about an agenda item. Communication plays a key role in this approach because "changes in frames" occur through "social interaction" involving "argumentation, language use, and symbolic forms" (p. 141) in the co-construction of problems. Issue development is not a static approach because it defines framing neither as "conceptions of activities linked to choices" residing in "stable perceptual biases" located in cognition (cognitive heuristics) nor as a "interpretive schemas" related to "hierarchically arranged categories" that are "superimposed and constitutive" (pp. 142-143) of discourse (frame categories). Putnam and Holmer (1992) point out that the frame categories approach defines "pre-selected or a priori categories" (p. 137) despite its interpretive orientation. In the issue development approach, meanings are neither "in people" nor in the parties' "levels of interpretation" (p. 142), because they depend on interaction between parties that shapes the definition of problems.

The distinction between two different types of approach to framing is at the base of Dewulf et al.'s (2009) work. In order to disentangle approaches to framing, they define the distinction between cognitive and interactional approaches that echoes the one between static and dynamic approaches. By answering to the question 'what is the nature of frames?', Dewulf et al. (2009) outline a set of diverse assumptions explaining the differences between cognitive and interactional approaches. The interactional approach portrays people as "conversationalists or lay-rhetoricians" (Dewulf et al., 2009, p. 162) co-constructing meanings in interaction (Billig, 2001; Edwards, 1997) through "the meta-communicational aspects of conversations" (Dewulf et al., 2009, p. 162), in which meaning is positioned in the discourse. In the interactional approach, the concept of language as action implies that frames are made of language and the action of framing can be achieved by means of language. Meanings are not located "between the ears" of individuals, as in the cognitive approach, since they are situated "between the noses" of interactants. Thus, meanings are not based on individuals' private understandings, because they depend on people's "reactions to or supplementations of" (pp. 162-164) communication in the interaction (Gergen, 1994). Furthermore, "framing constructs the meaning of objects" and, thus, the research focus is on "variance between specific points or episodes" in the interaction, in which "the criterion for change lies" (Dewulf et al., 2009, p. 163), as it depends on the parties' reaction about the other's framing. The last assumption regards methodology and identifies in the analysis of interaction through observations (recorded and transcribed) the main perspective in interactional framing research.

Dewulf et al. (2009) mention Tannen and Wallat (1987), since they define interactive frames as negotiated alignments centering on the ways in which communication can delineate aspects of interaction. The interactive meaning of frame regards "what is going on in

interaction" (p. 206) and how parties negotiate alignments as traced by Goffman's (1981) concept of *footing*. The role of communication in Tannen and Wallat's (1987) definition stems from Bateson's (1972) notion of meta-communication, namely communication about communication that frames the interaction in a particular way. Pearce and Cronen (1980) shape a theory on communication called coordinated management of meaning (CMM) that is similar to interactional approaches, as it highlights the idea of social realities co-constructed by individuals in conversation. The concept of conflict as a social construction implies that conflict is "neither a state of the world nor a state of mind", but something in the "social interaction", which "unfolds" (Dewulf et al., 2009, p. 161) between disputants. This idea is exemplified by Donohue's (1998) relational order theory and by interactional approaches to issue framing, such as Putnam and Holmer (1992) and Dewulf et el. (2004).

  As Dewulf et al.'s (2011a) work starts describing an interactional approach by mentioning the comparison between cognitive and interactional approaches defined in Dewulf et al. (2009), the following analysis of Dewulf et al. (2011a) takes into account only new concepts introduced in the contribution. Since framing is considered as an "interactive and communicative accomplishment" (p. 11) rather than as an individual and cognitive aspect, Dewulf et al. (2011a) remark that people's utterances acquire meaning only via supplementary action by other people in the ongoing interaction (Gergen, 1994). As frames are dynamic communicative structures realized by means of language choices (Drake and Donohue, 1996), it is essential the idea that language bears a performative aspect, since it is useful to "*accomplish* things" (Dewulf et al., 2011a, p. 13). Wittgenstein's (2001b) notion of *language game* and speech act theory are two important roots of the interactional approach to framing because it takes into consideration the concept of meaning as use and the performative component of language. Alvesson and Kärreman's (2000) article is a significant example of study in the field of organizational research that challenges the idea of language as a mirror of the world. Another important aspect of interactional approach is that the context is no longer defined as an external element in the interaction. Discourse analysis (Wood & Kroger, 2000), which is implemented in the methodology of different studies about framing, takes into account the context as "related interactions"; the context is "invoked and oriented to" (Dewulf et al., 2011a, p. 15) in interaction. Goffman's (1974) notion of keying implies a similar concept of context because it regards what is highlighted from the context during the interaction.

  Dewulf et al. (2011a) and Donohue (2011) are two contributions published in the theoretical part of the same volume related to framing (Donohue et al., 2011). Donohue (2011) defines an interactionist approach in order to shape a more radical perspective that focuses on interaction. He mentions two articles, in which he is a co-author, as fundamental works: Drake and Donohue (1996) and Donohue and Roberto (1993). The first one outlines an approach to framing that focuses on communication, while the second one centers on frames from a relational perspective. The interactionist approach has its historical roots in the symbolic interactionist, the concept of meta-communication, speech act theory, conversation analysis, and the idea of reality as a social construction (Donohue, 2011, pp. 35-37).

Linguistic code rules and linguistic synchrony are the two key points in this approach. Pearce and Cronen's (1980) theory is also mentioned in Donohue (2011), because it is important to understand how rules work in communication and, hence, to figure out the concept of frames as rules that guide "communicator choice and the construction of linguistic codes" (pp. 38-39). The overall idea is that the coordination of communicative acts defines meaning and a related set of rules that manages the interpretation of events. The communication accommodation theory (Shepard et al., 2001) is the starting point of the concept of frames related to "linguistic synchrony" (Donohue, 2011, p. 40), as it studies how people negotiate meaning by managing perceptions of difference and accommodating others' behavior during the interaction. In the important field of linguistic synchrony, Niederhoffer and Pennebaker (2002)'s article represents the "first systematic work" (Donohue, 2011, p. 41) regarding code choices and the interdependence of word usages between people in conversation.

5.4.2 Delving into dynamic features

The understanding of the interactionist approach to framing articulated by Donohue (2011) can be enhanced by identifying other dynamic concepts that he elaborated in his previous contributions. As already mentioned, Donohue and Roberto's (1993) and Drake and Donohue (1996) are two important works. Donohue and Roberto (1993) focus on relational development in hostage negotiation by adopting negotiated order theory (Strauss, 1978), which has symbolic interactionism in its theoretical background and relays on the idea that the "contextual proprieties" of interaction in negotiation depend on a "set of *limits*" (Donohue & Roberto, 1993, p. 176) tacitly negotiated. Drake and Donohue (1996) point out the concept of framing in order to develop a communicative perspective on conflict resolution called communicative framing theory. Beginning from the issue development approach (Putnam & Holmer, 1992), frames are defined as "transient communicative structures disputants build around a conflict issues during each turn at talk" (Drake & Donohue, 1996, p. 302). Hence, the cognitive concept of frame is rejected. Framing regards the shaping of an issue by identifying a relevant domain within a topic. The performative aspect of language (Searle, 1965) allows negotiators to manage their frame limits. The idea of frames convergence as a way to adopt other's communicative behaviors and to improve cooperation stems from speech accommodation theory (Gallois, 1988). Donohue (1998), Donohue and Hoobler (2002), and Donohue and Druckman (2009) develop some empirical researches by retrieving the relational prospective from the previous works, while Donohue's (2003) article is a theoretical work that describes an interactional perspective developed further in Donohue (2011).

Dewulf et al. (2009) and Dewulf et al. (2011a) clarify an interactional approach to framing that is articulated and applied in a set of empirical contributions regarding natural resources management in which Dewulf is one of the co-authors. In Dewulf et al. (2004), issue framing (Putnam & Holmer, 1992) as a transient communicative structure (Drake &

Donohue, 1996) is connected with the concept of communities of practice (Wenger, 1998) where the actors make sense of issues by shaping them. In Dewulf et al. (2007), the definition of frame as a sensemaking device stems from Weick (1995). Dewulf et al. (2011b) and Van Lieshout et al. (2011) implement the same concept of issue framing (Dewulf et al., 2009). The latter applies the interactional approach to the specific issue of scale framing in policy processes. Issue framing occurs between different actors through processes of interaction and negotiations, while policy process is a set of framings about the debated issues. Dewulf and Bouwen (2012) take into account the interactional approach (Dewulf et al., 2009) in the context of conversation for change considering that the understanding of issues is delineated in and through conversation (Ford & Ford, 1995) where "the enactment of a certain frame depends on the reactions of others to establish its meaning" (Dewulf & Bouwen, 2012, p. 170). The authors stress the fact that language is fundamental, since the linguistic choices outline different descriptive versions of events (Edwards, 1997) and the issues are formulated through language at the level of discourse or language-in-use (Wood & Kroger, 2000).

Several other papers confirm what is pointed out in theoretical contributions, namely the importance of the early concepts of framing. Thus, they have Bateson (1972) and/or Goffman (1974; 1981) in the main references related to their definition of framing (Matoesian, 1999; Bonito & Sanders, 2002; Esacove, 2004; Bean & Hamilton, 2006; Aarts et al., 2011; Idrissou et al., 2011a; Mueller & Whittle, 2011; Van Herzele & Aarts, 2013). The work of Bonito and Sanders (2002) is a clear example; its theoretical background centers on the concept of footing (Goffman, 1981), since it regards how people in a collaborative task solve disagreements in order to avoid conflict by managing footings. Felstiner et al.'s (1980-1981) dispute transformation process is mentioned as one of the main references not only in Putnam and Holmer (1992) but also in Kusztal (2002) and in van Bommel and Aarts (2011).

The interactional approach (Dewulf et al., 2009) also belongs to the theoretical background of different contributions that are not previously mentioned (Bijlsma et al., 2011; Idrissou et al., 2011a; Idrissou et al., 2011b; Asah et al., 2012; Idrissou et al., 2013; Van Herzele & Aarts, 2013). Various contributions published before 2009 have in common some dynamic features with the interactional approach, e.g. the definition of frame as an interpretation of interaction (Bodtker & Jameson, 1997), some aspects related to social construction (Kärreman & Alvesson, 2001), and the notion of interaction as a sensemaking process (Kusztal, 2002). A couple of contributions combine dynamic features with static ones. Asah et al. (2012) take into consideration interactional framing, as it can minimize the one-sidedness of the cognitive perspective, while Idrissou et al. (2013) stress the importance of the interactional dimension of trust, since it is useful to understand how cognitive levels of trust change and are negotiated in interaction.

A shared theoretical background emerges from the reviewed contributions despite their different contexts of application, such as peace negotiation, natural resources management, hostage negotiation, and organizational problems. The set of common features that characterize dynamic approaches to framing includes the focus on interaction, the idea of meta-communication, the concept of interactive discourse that creates meanings by means of

language choices, the definition of framing as a sensemaking process, and the co-construction of social realities through conversation. The next section discusses the results of this literature review by considering the possibility to develop further the characterization of dynamic approaches and the clarification of their theoretical roots.

6. Discussion

This section outlines fundamental critical considerations regarding the results of this review that focus on the common background of the dynamic approaches to framing. Theoretical underpinnings, like the ones elaborated by contributions regarding the issue development approach, the interactional approach, communicative framing theory, and the interactionist approach, have been shaped around a set of elements that defines their dynamic connotation. As clarified, during the developments of dynamic features some contributions integrate previous theoretical elaborations and try to elucidate their dynamic horizon. For example, the interactional approach described by Dewulf et al. (2009) and Dewulf et al. (2011) embodies some considerations from the issue development perspective (Putnam & Holmer, 1992) and attempts to boost the dynamic features by drawing the boundaries between cognitive and interactional approaches. In addition, the authors analyze some different contributions that can be considered as interactional. Since Dewulf et al.'s (2009) paper has been mentioned in several other reviewed articles, it is also possible to consider it as a recent fundamental theoretical landmark in analyzing the dynamic features with reference to the interactional approach. The importance of Putnam and Holmer's (1992) contribution, which is related to the issue development approach, might clarify the reason why issue framing has become the most employed perspective.

The results of this literature review highlight some other important issues about the set of contributions. Firstly, there is not a strict correlation between a feature characterizing dynamic approaches and a specific field of application, namely the elaboration of particular dynamic features has influenced diverse research contexts. For instance, some contributions apply the idea of framing as a sensemaking process in the different fields of natural resources management, such as Dewulf et al. (2004), and organizational problems, such as Bean and Hamilton (2006). Secondly, some researchers elucidate and develop the theoretical background of their approach over the considered period of time, such as in Donohue and Roberto (1993), Drake and Donohue (1996), and Donohue (2011). However, in other contributions most theoretical considerations stem from other authors, e.g. in Bonito and Sanders (2002) where the theoretical background is shaped around Goffman's (1981) concept of footing. Finally, the early concepts of framing identified in the set of theoretical papers can be considered as hidden references in the contributions that do not mention them. In particular, the concept of meta-communication seems to be a basic theoretical landmark, since

"no communicative move" can be understood "without reference to a metacommunicative message" regarding "what is going on" (Tannen, 1993, p. 3), namely without a frame about the interaction.

In the following considerations, the distinction between static and dynamic approaches is underlined as a crucial element in order to investigate thoroughly the theoretical background identified in the previous section. The discussion is based on two main aspects of dynamic approaches and aims at clarifying their theoretical roots. The first one concerns the possibility to expand the distinction starting from the findings of this review. The second aspect regards social constructionism in dynamic approaches as an important theoretical foundation that can elucidate underlying elements in the reviewed contributions and contribute to clarify the comparison between different approaches.

6.1 Bolstering the distinction between static and dynamic approaches

An overview of the differences between static and dynamic approaches is the starting point for further considerations. Putnam and Holmer's (1992) contribution is fundamental because it outlines a demarcation between static and dynamic features by making a comparison of three different approaches. The main characteristics of the issue development approach are that frame is defined as a "conceptualization of a problem" in "dynamic interaction processes" and meanings arise directly from discourse as "understandings of problems"; in addition, reframing is a "transformation of understandings" that aims at furthering "joint problem solving" (p. 143). The other two approaches define frame in different ways. In the cognitive heuristic approach, the frame is a "stable or static feature", since it is the "perception of biases associated with choices" located in cognition, while this definition in frame categories approach is related to "interpretive schemes" that are "superimposed and constitutive of discourse" (pp. 142-143). The frame categories approach has its more dynamic feature in "the shifting of the form, content, and abstraction of frames reveled through language", while "framing is enacted in and revealed through argumentative discourse" (p. 142) in the issue development approach. Both cognitive heuristics and frame categories approaches can be defined as static, because the former "reifies" the construction of negotiation experiences "by making frames into mental fixtures" and the latter "reifies frame typologies into a priori categories" (p. 142).

The comparison of the cognitive and the interactional approaches, which is outlined by Dewulf et al. (2009), echoes the distinction between static and dynamic approaches and develops it. The concept of cognitive frames stems from Minsky's (1975) paper where it regards stored knowledge, since frames are defined as cognitive representations that can be employed to new situations. Different cognitive frames have been elaborated in diverse research fields; for example, Levin et al. (1998) indentifies three different framing effects in the literature related to the cognitive perspective: *risk choice frames*, *attribute frames*, and *goal frames*. In Dewulf et al.'s (2009) article, the cognitive and the interactional approaches

represent two diverse paradigms (Gioia & Pitre, 1990) because they have "divergent ontological, epistemological, and methodological assumptions" (p. 161). Furthermore, they are different from the distinction between the functionalist and the classic interpretive paradigms. The interpretive approach, which can be considered similar to the interactional approach, is "a generic category" defined by "the centrality of meaning in social actions" (Putnam, 1983, p 32) as a main assumption. According to Dewulf et al. (2009), the interpretive approach "often treats frames as cognitions", namely "subjective meanings or mental models" (p. 161), and thus it is not the same as the interactional approach.

The distinction between the two approaches regards a set of foundational elements listed by Dewulf et al. (2009). The starting point is the concept of social reality. The interactional approach describes social reality as produced by people in interaction that co-construct the meaning of their world, while in the cognitive approach social reality is related to the processing and representation of information. According to the interactional approach, meta-communication allows people to co-construct meanings, which are placed in discourse, "between the noses", and related to "the reactions of others"; furthermore, language is a "system of symbols" adopted to "enact social interactions" and "frames construct the meaning of objects". In the cognitive approach, the cognitive representation shapes the expectations regarding the situation, the location of meaning is "between the ears" (namely in the mind), language is a system of symbols adopted to represent the outer and the people's inner worlds, and frames "capture what people believe is external reality". The interactional approach focuses on "variance between specific points or episodes" (pp. 162-163) in interaction, defines frame change as dependent on others' reaction, and has in the observation of interaction its main methodology. On the contrary, the cognitive approach studies how information processing and representation vary between people, has its criterion for frame change placed in the cognitions, and adopts different types of data in order to infer frames.

By attempting to develop further the comparison about static and dynamic approaches to framing, it is possible to consider a distinction elaborated outside the areas of negotiation and conflict research. This distinction regards two perspectives on language and culture defined by Pike (1967) from the words *phonetics* and *phonemics*, namely *etic* and *emic*. The distinction between etic and emic has been widely discussed and employed in the fields of intercultural and cross-cultural communication (Gudykunst & Nishida, 1989). For example, Fang (1999) studies negotiation by adopting an emic approach in order to examine "how national sociocultural traits influence Chinese business negotiating style in interactional business negotiations" (p. 9).

Some of the main characteristics of this distinction are useful to draw an analogy that involves the static and dynamic approaches. The etic approach studies behavior in a particular system by adopting an external point of view, while the emic one defines an internal perspective on the system. The etic standpoint "treats all cultures or languages at one time", delineates its units and classifications "in advance" considering "prior broad sampling or surveys"; whereas the emic one is "applied to one language or culture at a time" and, thus, emic units are "discovered", namely they are "determined during the analysis of that

language" (Pike, 1967, p. 37). The etic approach implies that the researcher creates "a world-wide cross-cultural scheme" and, hence, its depictions are "'alien' in view", since criteria are "external to the system" and can be considered as "absolute, or measurable directly" (p. 38). On the contrary, the emic approach entails the discovery of the structure related to a particular system as well as descriptions with a view that adopts criteria selected from the inside of the system and relative to its internal features. Moreover, the approaches work on different kinds of data. Etic data are "partial", since they are available "early in analysis with partial information", while emic data are "total", as they involve knowledge about the particular "total system" (p. 38).

By making a comparison about the etic/emic distinction and the static/dynamic one, it is possible to delineate, to some extent, a set of useful parallelisms. The cognitive approach (Dewulf et al., 2009; Dewulf et al., 2011), considered as an example of static approach, has a point of view similar to the one external to the system defined by the etic standpoint because the cognitive perspective is external to the interaction since it focuses on what parties bring to the interaction, namely their cognitive frames that guide their expectations regarding the situation. Furthermore, the cognitive approach locates meanings outside the interaction as they are in the individuals' mind. On the contrary, dynamic approaches as the interactional and the interactionist ones (Dewulf et al., 2009; Dewulf et al., 2011; Donohue, 2011) center on what is co-constructed in interaction and here meanings are placed in discourse; thus they resemble the emic approach, since it studies the system by adopting an internal standpoint. This parallelism can also involve the research focus and the type of data collection (Dewulf et al., 2009; Dewulf et al., 2011). In the cognitive approach, the research focus is on the variance between people in the processing and representation of information by collecting different kinds of data on cognitions. Similarly, the frame categories approach (Putnam & Holmer, 1992) defines a priori categories that constitute the discourse. Hence, both static approaches echo etic standpoint in delineating a classification in advance related to prior observations. In contrast to that, the interactional approach is akin to emic standpoint. The latter has a perspective from the inside of the system; similarly, the perspective of the interactional approach is from the inside of the interaction where the research focus is on particular points or episodes and the data collection regards the direct observation of interactions. Thus, the purpose of the emic standpoint is to discover structures that belong to a particular system and, similarly, the interactional approach aims at studying meanings that arise from the interaction between parties.

The etic/emic distinction is a useful definition to develop the characterization of both static and dynamic approaches to framing. A further clarification of dynamic approaches and, hence, of the difference between static and dynamic approaches implies a consideration of social constructionism as a key theoretical foundation.

6.2 Social constructionism as a theoretical foundation

In the set of contributions that constitutes the corpus of this literature review there are several papers in which some ideas related to social constructionism outline the theoretical background of the research. For example, Putnam and Holmer (1992) define issues are co-constructed by people, Dewulf et al. (2009) point out that social realities are co-constructed in interaction, Bijlsma et al. (2011) stress the fact that frame is an interactional co-construction, and Idrissou et al. (2011b) identify framing process with a construction of understandings of social reality. Thus, it is necessary to clarify how social constructionism can be taken into account as a theoretical foundation of dynamic approaches and how it can develop further the distinction between static and dynamic approaches.

"There is no one school of social constructionism" (Lock & Strong, 2010, p. 6), but some main concepts can be considered as distinctive features. In particular, social constructionism defines "meaning and understanding as a central feature of human activities" and indentifies "their beginnings in social interaction" (pp. 6-7). In social constructionism, the explanation of human action regards the "relational sphere" (Gergen, 1994, p. 69) and it does not focus on the individual mind and its processes.

By considering the development of the European philosophy of knowledge, it is possible to figure out important historical roots of social constructionism. On the one hand, Descartes (1999) elaborates a theory where "the inherent character of individual mind is critical to the development of knowledge" (Gergen, 1994, p. 23). On the other hand, Locke (1975) centers on what is external to the mind. According to his perspective individual knowledge is "largely build up from experiences of environmental events" (Gergen, 1994, p. 23), since "human knowledge emerges through the impact of the environment" (Wertsch, 1991, p. 8). To some degree, social constructionism can be considered close to the empiricist tradition shaped by Locke (1975) since it avoids any "celebration of the individual mind" (Gergen, 1999, p. 220). Furthermore, rejecting the Cartesian dehistoricized rationality social constructionism is in line with Vico's (1977) critique of the method delineated by Descartes (1999). Vico (1977) uncovers "the role that humanly constructed language" (Lock & Strong, 2010, p. 23) plays in the shaping of knowledge. A significant and more recent contribution has "its roots in the sociology of knowledge" (Burr, 2003, p. 12) shaped by Berger and Luckmann (1966). This discipline aims at understanding "the process by which *any* body of 'knowledge' comes to be socially established as 'reality'" (p. 15).

The clarification of the function of language in social sciences is important for the development of social constructionism. As Winch (2008) points out, Wittgenstein (2001b) delineates fundamental concepts related to language that influence social sciences. Gergen (1994) considers social constructionism as "a congenial companion" (p. 52) to the concept of meaning elaborated by Wittgenstein (2001b). After working on the idea that language makes pictures of the world explained in the *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (Wittgenstein, 2001a), the rejection of the Cartesian view of inner-mental states allows Wittgenstein (2001b) to shift significantly the focus of his research. In the *Philosophical Investigations* Wittgenstein

(2001b) shapes the key definition of *language games* that challenges the concept of meaning as representation. Wittgenstein (2001b) defines language games as the many functions or uses of language, such as asking a question and translating. An analogy can be drawn between language games and playing a game according to its rules, because the notion of meaning is related to the idea of "rule-following" (Winch, 2008, p. 30). Furthermore, a relationship between meaning and understanding delineates understanding "in terms of know-how" (Mangion, 2011, p. 191), namely how to use an expression and how to follow the rules related to its usage. Since understanding is delineated as a matter of "knowing how to use language" (p. 192), Wittgenstein (2001b) outlines a "relational view of language" (Lock & Strong, 2010, p. 157) where language games can be seen as "the social rules that are implicit in meaningful behavior" (Benton & Craib, 2001, p. 96). Hence, "understanding, belief, and meaning" can refer to "a person *only within* a practice over time" (Williams, 1999, p. 242). Thus, "meaning of words is derived from the historical context of the discourse itself" (Dewulf et al., 2011, p. 13) and language can also be studied in what speech act theory highlights as its performative feature.

The traditional dichotomies of mind and world, knowledge and reality, and "in here" and "out there", are challenged by social constructionism in rejecting the "view of individual mind as a device for reflecting the character and conditions of an independent world" (Gergen, 1994, p. 68). Social constructionism considers knowledge and reality as "cultural categories, elements of discourse, invented, used, and defended within social practices" (Edwards, 1997, p. 52). Mind and world do not receive "ontological status", since the terms for them are "constitutive of discursive practices" and, thus, "socially contested and negotiated" (Gergen, 1994, p. 68). Hence, "descriptions of mental states are discursive social practices" (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 180). There is not an "out there" in opposition to an "in here"; social constructionism attempts to "articulate 'what there is'" by entering "the world of discourse" (Gergen, 1994, p. 72). To delve into this topic, Wittgenstein (2001b) can play again a key role, as he also questions another traditional dichotomy, the one between necessity and possibility. A practice is shaped by rules that can be seen as contingent from the outside and as necessity within the practice, but to apply "straightforwardly" this distinction between what is internal and what is external to a practice is "a mistake" (Williams, 1999, p. 236). The different understanding of necessity shaped by Wittgenstein (2001b) does not consider fundamental the distinction between "necessary truths and contingent truths", but rather the one between "necessary propositions and empirical propositions" (Williams, 1999, p. 238).

In this theoretical horizon, the conventional view of communication is rejected because it implies the idea of transmission of mental contents between individual minds. In order to avoid adopting this conventional view in research, some concepts and techniques from discourse analysis, conversation analysis, and discursive psychology are parts of several methodologies implemented by the reviewed contributions, such as Kusztal (2002), Dewulf et al. (2004), Aaerts et al. (2011), and Dewulf and Bouwen (2012). Some key ideas of discourse analysis are the focus on "talk *as* action" (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 4) and "the constructive

effect of discourse" (Phillips & Hardy, 2002, p. 4). Conversation analysis and discursive psychology also emphasis on talk, since it is considered as a "medium of action" (Potter & te Molder, 2005, p. 3); the study of talk-in-interaction entails "examining how meanings are interactionally accomplished" in contrast to the view of talk as an "expression of speakers' intentions and mental contents" (Edwards, 1997, p. 107).

By taking into account this clarification about the theoretical foundation of the reviewed contributions, the comparison between static and dynamic approaches can be further developed. Social constructionism in dynamic approaches to framing regards their focus on interaction as a source of meanings. Dynamic approaches and social constructionism share the same historical roots regarding the philosophy of knowledge. They reject the Cartesian concepts of inner-mental states and of a dehistoricized rationality by centering on sensemaking processes in conversation where even the context is internal to the interaction. Wittgenstein's (2001b) view of language as use is a fundamental landmark because framing implies a concept of language as action that allows people to make sense of the situation. On the contrary, the cognitive approach is close to Descartes (1999) and the early Wittgenstein (2001a). In this approach, meanings depend on individual understanding and the purpose of language is to generate representations by means of symbols. The idea of language as action allows dynamic approaches to reject the traditional dichotomies of mind and world, knowledge and reality, and "in here" and "out there". The cognitive approach involves a concept of language based on these dichotomies where language represents the outer world and the individual inner world. Hence, social constructionism plays a fundamental role not only in the clarification of the theoretical background of dynamic approaches but also in the development of the distinction between static and dynamic approaches.

7. Conclusion

This literature review has examined the theoretical background of dynamic approaches to framing in negotiation and conflict. The dynamic approaches are interesting because of their focus on interaction processes which can increase our understanding of negotiation and conflict management. This work, as a systematic review, fills a gap in the literature about the topic by covering a relevant range of dimensions of analysis, which provide a representative overview of the corpus of contributions regarding the most significant elements that characterize the theoretical background. The results have clarified a sets of aspects related to the contributions, especially the knowledge accumulation, how the concept of framing is elaborated and applied with reference to the research areas and the different perspectives, and the group of dynamic features that shape the approaches beginning from the early concepts of framing outside negotiation and conflict research.

The discussion about the dynamic features has started from some preliminary critical comments about the results of this review. Putnam and Holmer (1992) and Dewulf et al. (2009) are considered the key papers in the set of contributions where the concept of meta-

communication seems to be a basic one, even when it is not mentioned. The development of the argumentation was based on the distinction between static and dynamic approaches as a crucial element in understanding the theoretical background. Another distinction, which is related to an anthropological context, has been retrieved to enrich and clarify the comparison; it is the one between etic and emic which defines a set of useful parallelisms. Hence, the discussion has taken social constructionism as a key theoretical foundation of the dynamic approaches. The critique of the Cartesian view of inner-mental states is a fundamental historical turn in the philosophy of knowledge. Wittgenstein's (2001b) rejection of the concept of meaning as representation is another important landmark, especially the notion of language games that stresses the relationship between meanings and practices. The discussion has also showed how some traditional dichotomies are challenged by social constructionism. As a result, the dynamic approaches do not embrace the conventional view of communication as transmission of mental contents. Thus, social constructionism is the fundamental basis for the concept of framing in dynamic approaches beginning from what can be identified as its historical roots.

This paper is a theoretical work that also involves a practical relevance. Negotiators, disputants, and third party interveners can understand thoroughly the interaction from a dynamic perspective by being aware of the theoretical implications of the concept of framing discussed in this paper. Hence, practitioners can develop their ability to join an agreement or to reach a satisfying solution if they are able to figure out the interaction by rejecting the traditional dichotomies and by focusing on the pragmatic aspects of language that define and redefine framing over the course of the conversation.

This literature review outlines not only an overview of the researches about the topic with important theoretical clarifications but also a starting point for further researches that aim at bolstering the dynamic connotations of the reviewed approaches both at theoretical and empirical level. For example, researchers should avoid adopting a terminology that involves meanings related to the traditional dichotomies challenged by social constructionism. Furthermore, it would also be interesting to develop further the theoretical inquiry. In particular, it would be useful to extend the analysis of the traditional dichotomies in order to delve into other distinctions, such as the one between nature and culture (Latour, 1993; Foucault, 1994; Descola & Pálson, 1996; Descola 2005), which can define a broader theoretical horizon and shape innovative empirical works.

References

Abigail, R. A., & Cahn, D. D. (2011). *Managing conflict through communication*. Boston, MA: Pearson, Allyn & Bacon.

Alvesson, S, & Kärreman, D. (2000). Taking the linguistic turn in organizational research: Challenges, responses, consequences. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Sciences*, 36 (2), 136-148.

Bateson, G. (1954). A theory of play and fantasy. *Psychiatric research reports*, 2, 39-54. In Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind* (pp. 177-193). New York: Ballantine.

Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind*. New York: Ballantine.

Benton, T., & Craib, I. (2001). *Philosophy of social science: The philosophical foundations of social thought*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Anchor books.

Billig, M. (1995). Rhetorical psychology, ideological thinking, and imagining nationhood. In H. Johnston & B. Klandermans (Eds.), *Social movements and culture* (pp. 64-81). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Billig, M. (2001). Arguing. In W. P. Robinson & H. Giles (Eds.), *The new handbook of language and social psychology* (pp. 241-251). Chichester: Wiley.

Bülow, A. M. (2009). Negotiation studies. In Bargiela-Chiappini F. (Ed.), *Handbook of business discourse* (pp. 142-154). Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.

Burr, V. (2003). *Social constructionism* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Cooper, H. (2010). *Research synthesis and meta-analysis: A step-by-step approach* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Descartes, R. (1999). *Discourse on method and related writings*. London: Penguin Books.

Descola, P. (2005). *Par-delà nature et culture*. Paris: Gallimard.

Descola P., & Pálson, G. (Eds.), (1996). *Nature and society: Anthropological perspectives*. London, New York: Routledge.

Donohue, W. A., & Kolt, R. (1992). *Managing interpersonal conflict*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Donohue, W. A., Rogan, R. G., & Kaufman, S. (Eds.), (2011). *Framing matters: Perspectives on negotiation research and practice in communication*. New York: Peter Lang.

Eden, C., Jones, S., Sims, D., & Smithin, T. (1981). The intersubjectivity of issues and issues of intersubjectivity. *The Journal of Management Studies*, 18 (1), 37-47.

Edwards, D. (1997). *Discourse and cognition*. London: Sage Publications.

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43 (4), 51-58.

Fang, T. (1999). *Chinese business negotiating style*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Felstiner, W. L. F., Abel, R. L., & Sarat, A. (1980). The emergence and transformation of disputes: Naming, blaming, claiming. *Law & Society Review*, 15 (3/4), 631-654.

Fink, A. G. (2010). *Conducting research literature reviews: From paper to the Internet* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (1991). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in* (revised 2nd ed.). New York: Penguin Books.

Folger, J. P., Poole, M. S., & Stutman R. K. (1997). *Working through conflict: Strategies for relationships, groups, and organizations* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman

Ford, J. D. (1999). Organizational change as shifting conversations. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 12 (6), 480-500.

Ford, L. W., & Ford, J. D. (1995). The role of conversations in producing intentional change in organizations. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20 (3), 541-570.

Foucault, M. (1994). Bio-histoire et bio-politique. In M. Foucault, *Dits et écrits: 1954-1988* (vol. 3; pp. 95-97). Paris: Gallimard.

Gallois, C., & Callan, V. J. (1988). Communication accommodation and the prototypical speaker: Predicting evaluations of status and solidarity. *Language and Communication*, 8 (3), 271-283.

Gergen, K. J. (1994). *Realities and relationships: Soundings in social construction*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gergen, K. J. (1999). *An invitation to social construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gioia, D. A., & Pitre, E. (1990). Multiparadigm perspectives on theory building. *The Academy of Management Review*, 15 (4), 584-602.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper and Row.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gray, B., Coleman, T. P., & Putnam, L. L. (2007). Intractable conflict: New perspectives on the causes and conditions for change. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50 (11), 1415–1429.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T. (1989). Theoretical perspective for studying intercultural communication. In M. Kete Asante & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Handbook of international and intercultural communication* (pp. 17-45). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Hart, C. (1999). *Doing a literature review: Releasing the social science research imagination*. London: Sage Publications.

Latour, B. (1993). *We have never been modern*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Levin, I. P., Schneider S. L., & Gaeth G. J. (1998). All frames are not created equal: A typology and critical analysis of framing effects. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 76 (2), 149-188.

Lewicki, R. J. Saunders, D. M., & Barry B. (2011). *Essentials of negotiation* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lock, A., & Strong, T. (2010). *Social constructionism: Sources and stirrings in theory and practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Locke, J. (1975). *An essay concerning human understanding*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Luhmann, N. (1990). *Essays on self-reference*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Mangion, C. (2011). Wittgenstein on language as a form of life. In C. Mangion (Ed.), *Philosophical approaches to communication* (pp. 181-198). Bristol, UK: Intellect.

Minsky, M. (1974). A framework for representing knowledge. In P. H. Winston (Ed.), *The psychology of computer vision* (pp. 211-277). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Niederhoffer, K. G., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2002). Linguistic style matching in social interaction. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 21 (4), 337-360.

O'Hair, D., Friedrich, G. W., & Dixon, L. D. (2010). *Strategic communication in business and the professions* (7th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Pearce, W. B., & Cronen, V. E. (1980). *Communication, action and meaning: The creation of social realities*. New York: Praeger.

Phillips, N., & Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse analysis: Investigating processes of social construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Pike, K. L. (1967). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human*. The Hague: Mouton.

Potter, J., & te Molder, H. (2005). Talking cognition: Mapping and making the terrain. In H. te Molder & J. Potter (Eds.), *Conversation and cognition* (pp. 1-54). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage Publications.

Putnam, L. L. (1983). The interpretive perspective: An alternative to functionalism. In L. L. Putnam & M. E. Pacanowsky (Eds.). *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach* (pp. 31-54). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Putnam, L. L. (1985). Bargaining as organizational communication. In R. D. McPhee & P. K. Tompkins (Eds.), *Organizational communication: Traditional themes and new directions* (pp. 129-148), Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Putnam, L. L. (1990). Reframing integrative and distributive bargaining: A process perspective. In B. H. Sheppard, M. H. Bazerman & R. J. Lewicki (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (Vol. 2, pp. 3-30). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Putnam, L. L., & Roloff, M. E. (Eds.), (1992). *Communication and negotiation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Searle, J. (1965). What is a speech? In M. Black (Ed.), *Philosophy in America* (pp. 221-239). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Shepard, C. A., Giles, H., & Le Poire, B. A. (2001). Communication accommodation theory. In W. P. Robinson & H. Giles (Eds.), *The new handbook of language and social psychology* (pp. 33-56). Chichester: Wiley.

Snow, D. A., & Benford, R. D. (1992). Master frames and cycles of protest. In A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory* (pp. 133-155). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Strauss, A. (1978). *Negotiations: Varieties, contexts, processes, and social order*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass**.**

Tannen, D. (1979). What's in a frame? Surface evidence for underlying expectations. In R. Freedle (Ed.), *New directions in discourse processes* (pp. 137-181). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Tannen, D. (Ed.), (1993). *Framing in discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, D., & Wallat, C. (1987). Interactive frames and knowledge schemas in interaction: Examples from a medical examination/interview. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50 (2), 205-216.

te Molder, H., & Potter, J. (2005). Conversation and cognition. Cambrige: Cambridge University Press.

Treadwell, D. (2011). *Introducing communication research: Paths of inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Vico, G. B. (1977). *La scienza nuova*. Milano: BUR.

Weick, K. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Wenger, E (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Hardvard University Press.

Williams, M. (1999). *Wittgenstein, mind and meaning: Toward a social conception of mind*. London and New York: Routledge.

Winch, P. (2008). *The idea of a social science and its relation to philosophy* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Wittgenstein, L. (2001a). *Tractatus logico-philosophicus*. London: Routledge.

Wittgenstein, L. (2001b). *Philosophical investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wood, L. A., & Kroger, R. O. (2000). *Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Yanow, D. (2000). *Conducting interpretive policy analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.

Appendix
The corpus of the literature review

Aarts, N., van Lieshout, M., & van Woerkum, C. (2011). Competing claims in public space: The construction of frames in different relational contexts. In W. A. Donohue, R. G. Rogan & S. Kaufman (Eds.), *Framing matters: Perspectives on negotiation research and practice in communication* (pp. 234-252). New York: Peter Lang.

Asah, S. T., Bengston, D. N., Wendt, K., & Nelson, K. C. (2012). Diagnostic reframing of intractable environmental problems: case of a contested multiparty public land-use conflict. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 108, 108-119.

Bean, C. J., & Hamilton, F. E. (2006). Leader framing and follower sensemaking: Response to downsizing in the brave new workplace. *Human Relations*, 59 (3), 321-349.

Bijlsma, R. M., Bots, P. W. G., Wolters, H. A., & Hoekstra, A.Y. (2011). An empirical analysis of stakeholders' influence on policy development: The role of uncertainty handling. *Ecology and Society*, 16 (1), 51. [online] URL: http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol16/iss1/art51/

Bodtker, A. M., & Jameson, J. K. (1997). Mediation as mutual influence: Reexamining the use of framing and reframing. *Mediation Quarterly*, 14 (3), 237–249.

Bonito, J. A., & Sanders, R. E. (2002). Speakers' footing in a collaborative writing task: A resource for addressing disagreement while avoiding conflict. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 35 (4), 481-514.

Dewulf, A., & Bouwen, R. (2012). Issue framing in conversations for change: Discursive interaction strategies for "doing differences". *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 48 (2), 168-193.

Dewulf, A., Craps, M., & Dercon, G. (2004). How issues get framed and reframed when different communities meet: A multi-level analysis of a collaborative soil conservation initiative in the Ecuadorian Andes. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 14 (3), 177-192.

Dewulf, A., François, G., Pahl-Wostl, C., Taillieu, T. (2007). A framing approach to cross-disciplinary research collaboration: Experiences from a large-scale research project on adaptive water management. *Ecology and Society*, 12 (2), 14. [online] URL: http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol12/iss2/art14/

Dewulf, A., Gray B., Putnam, L., & Bouwen, R. (2011a). An interactional approach to framing in conflict and negotiation. In W. A. Donohue, R. G. Rogan & S. Kaufman (Eds.), *Framing matters: Perspectives on negotiation research and practice in communication* (pp. 7-33). New York: Peter Lang.

Dewulf, A., Gray, B., Putnam, L. L., Lewicki, R., Aarts, N., Bouwen, R., & Woerkum, van, C. (2009). Disentangling approaches to framing in conflict and negotiation research: A meta-paradigmatic perspective. *Human Relations*, 62 (2), 155-193.

Dewulf, A., Mancero, M., Cárdenas, G., & Sucozhañay, D. (2011b). Fragmentation and connection of frames in collaborative water governance: A case study of river catchment management in Southern Ecuador. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 77 (1), 50-75.

Donohue, W. A. (1998). Managing equivocality and relational paradox in the Oslo peace negotiations. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 17 (1), 72-96.

Donohue, W. A. (2003). The promise of an interaction-based approach to negotiation. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 14 (3/4), 167-176.

Donohue, W. A. (2011). An interactionist approach to frames. In W. A. Donohue, R. G. Rogan & S. Kaufman (Eds.), *Framing matters: Perspectives on negotiation research and practice in communication* (pp. 34-50). New York: Peter Lang.

Donohue, W. A., & Druckman, D. (2009). Message framing surrounding the Oslo I accords. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 53 (1), 119-145.

Donohue, W. A., & Hoobler, G. D. (2002). Relational frames and their ethical implications in international negotiation: An analysis based on the Oslo II negotiations. *International Negotiation*, 7 (2), 143-167.

Donohue, W. A., & Roberto, A. J. (1993). Relational development as negotiated order in hostage negotiation. *Human Communication Research*, 20 (2), 175-198.

Drake, L. E., & Donohue, W. A. (1996). Communicative framing theory in conflict resolution. *Communication Research*, 23 (3), 297-322.

Esacove, A. W. (2004). Dialogic framing: The framing/counterframing of 'partial-birth' abortion. *Sociological Inquiry*, 74 (1), 70-101.

Idrissou, L., Aarts, N., van Paassen, A., & Leeuwis, C. (2011a). The discursive construction of conflict in participatory forest management: The case of the Agoua Forest restoration in Benin. *Conservation and Society*, 9 (2), 119-131.

Idrissou, L., van Paassen, A., Aarts, N., & Leeuwis, C. (2011b). From cohesion to conflict in participatory forest management: The case of Ouémé Supérieur and N'Dali (OSN) forests in Benin. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 13 (7), 525-534.

Idrissou, L., van Paassen, A., Aarts, N., Vodouhe, S., & Leeuwis, C. (2013). Trust and hidden conflict in participatory natural resources management: The case of the Pendjari national park (PNP) in Benin. *Forest Policy and Economics*. 27, 65-74.

Kärreman, D., & Alvesson, M. (2001). Making newsmakers: Conversational identity at work. *Organization Studies*, 22 (1), 59-89.

Kusztal, I. L. (2002). Discourses in the use and emergence of organizational conflict. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 20 (2), 231-247.

Matoesian, G. M. (1999). The grammaticalization of participant roles in the constitution of expert identity. *Language in Society*, 28 (4), 491-521.

Mueller, F., & Whittle, A. (2011). Translating management ideas: A discursive devices analysis. *Organization studies*, 32 (2), 187-210.

Putnam, L. L., & Holmer, M. (1992). Framing, reframing, and issue development. In L. L. Putnam & M. Roloff (Eds.), *Communication and negotiation* (pp. 128-155). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

van Bommel, S., & Aarts, N. (2011). Framing nature conservation experts and expertise in the Drentsche Aa area in the Netherlands: A contextual approach. In W. A. Donohue, R. G. Rogan & S. Kaufman (Eds.), *Framing matters: Perspectives on negotiation research and practice in communication* (pp. 191-209). New York: Peter Lang.

Van Herzele, A., & Aarts, N. (2013). "My forest, my kingdom"—Self-referentiality as a strategy in the case of small forest owners coping with government regulations. *Policy Sciences*, 46 (1), 63–81.

van Lieshout, M., Dewulf, A., Aarts, N., Termeer, C. (2011). Do scale frames matter? Scale frame mismatches in the decision making process about a "mega farm" in a small Dutch village. *Ecology and Society*, 16 (1), 38. [online] URL: http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol16/iss1/art38/