

## Engaging the literature

By Associate Prof. Dr. Kanokwan Manorum  
*Capacity Building and Professional Development of Water  
Governance and Regional  
Development Practitioners in the Mekong, Salween and Red  
river basins (MK31, 32 and 33)*

WriteShop for Book Chapter/ Academic Paper Publication

23<sup>rd</sup> - 24<sup>th</sup> March 2017

Cat Cat View Hotel, Sapa, Vietnam

## Why we review literature?

- Situates your research focus within the context of the wider academic community in your field;
- Reports your critical review of the relevant literature; and
- Identifies a gap within that literature that your research will attempt to address.

[Source: www2.le.ac.uk/offices/ld/resources/writing/writing-resources/literature-review](http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/ld/resources/writing/writing-resources/literature-review)

You are asking is relevant?

- What research question(s) are you asking?
- Why are you asking it/them?
- Has anyone else done anything similar?
- Is your research relevant to research/practice/theory in your field?
- What is already known or understood about this topic?
- How might your research add to this understanding, or challenge existing theories and beliefs?

[Source:](http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/ld/resources/writing/writing-resources/literature-review)  
[www2.le.ac.uk/offices/ld/resources/writing/writing-resources/literature-review](http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/ld/resources/writing/writing-resources/literature-review)

## Writing it up (Wellington 2005:87)

- “It should be framed by your research questions.
- It must relate to your study.
- It must be clear to the reader where it is going: keep signposting along the way.

### Writing it up (Wellington 2005:87)

- Engage in a dialogue with the literature, you are not just providing a summary.”

### Writing it up (Wellington 2005:87)

- In most disciplines, the aim is for the reader to reach the end of the literature review with a clear appreciation of what you are doing; why you are doing it; and how it fits in with other research in your field. Often, the literature review will end with a statement of the research question(s).

### Connect and Synthesis

- Putting the authors in conversation with each other.
- Situates your work within the broader scholarly community
- Connects your work to the broader field and shows that your work has grown organically from current trends

Source:

<https://www.skillsyouneed.com/learn/literature-review.html>

### Topic sentences in lit review

The topic sentences in a literature review should illustrate the connection across multiple studies:

- the common agreement/disagreement,
- the similar focus or the related limitation

## Phrases to highlight agreement/Disagreement

### Agreement

“One trend in the research is....”

“Research seems to agree that....”

“Numerous authors support the claim that....”

“There is strong convergent evidence for....”

### Disagreement

“There is overall debate regarding....”

“A lack of consensus exists on the point of....”

“There are two conflicting camps on the issue of....”

Source: <https://www.skillsyouneed.com/learn/literature-review.html>

## The 1st paragraph in the introduction

“Contemporary processes of environmental governance exemplify the narrow techno-economic rationality that has long shaped development policy and practice (Escobar, 1999; Goldman, 2001; Harriss, 2002; Li, 2007). The neoliberal ideologies that often drive environmental governance deliberately sideline questions of complex, context-specific human–environment interactions through depoliticized and consensual governing and policy-making (Büscher, 2010). The discursive construction of hydropower development as a green growth strategy (World Bank, 2014), and the subsequent come back of large dams in developing and newly dominant economies (Cole, Elliott, & Strobl, 2014; Pittock, 2010) are particularly characteristic of such consensual politics of development”.

Source: Huber and Joshi (2015: 13) “Hydropower, Anti-Politics, and the Opening of New Political Spaces in the Eastern Himalayas”, World Development journal

“However, on the ground today’s large hydro projects are no less controversial and contentious than those of previous decades. Many proposed dam sites are concentrated in eco- logically and culturally diverse regions such as the Amazon, the Nile, the Mekong River, or the Himalayas, and frequently in indigenous territories (Coelho & Favaretto, 2008; Cole et al., 2014; Grumbine & Pandit, 2013; Orr, Pittock, Chapagain, & Dumaresq, 2012).

These riverscapes are climate vulnerable ecosystems, where dam construction is likely to exacerbate climate-related variability in water flows and biodiversity, as well as vulnerability to hydro-climatic disasters (Shah, 2013; Vagholikar & Das, 2010).

As a result, accelerated hydropower development has led to a multiplication of social conflicts over diverse issues such as cost–benefit distribution, hazard risks, and indigenous sovereignty among others (Baruah, 2012; Finley-Brook & Thomas, 2011; Matthews, 2012; McCormick, 2010; Sneddon & Fox, 2008).

Source: Huber and Joshi (2015: 13) “Hydropower, Anti-Politics, and the Opening of New Political Spaces in the Eastern Himalayas”, World Development journal

“ In this article we look at public–private hydropower development in the Eastern Himalayan state of Sikkim, Northeast India, where since 2000 the state government has proactively enabled private developers to implement a dozen large hydropower projects. To maximize the speed of dam construction, public participation in project-related decision-making has been undermined by hydro proponents through a mix of strategies we refer to as anti-politics. As a consequence, local resistance to hydropower development has been either conspicuously absent or unprecedentedly outspoken, calling for a nuanced analysis of such diverse expressions of popular political agency. The aim of this paper is to explore how high-handed anti-political maneuvering “from above” clashes with the articulation of “political voices from below”. Our case study shows how the use of depoliticizing and coercive strategies to stifle dissent and to maximize the speed of dam construction served to aggravate intrinsic social antagonisms. In the absence of legitimate channels of expression this set in motion radical grassroots political processes”.

Source: Huber and Joshi (2015: 14) “Hydropower, Anti-Politics, and the Opening of New Political Spaces in the Eastern Himalayas”, World Development journal

## More multiple sources need!

- They are ineffective compared to sentences that connect multiple studies around one main theme
- “Large hydropower dams in Vietnam have often caused serious social upheaval and high environmental costs” (Hirsch, 1998; CRES, 2001; VUSTA, 2006 (Source Middleton et al., 2009: 37).

## Another example

“Much research has found that the livelihoods of ethnic minorities and women, and particularly ethnic minority women, have been particularly affected by hydropower dam development” (Asthana, 2012; Foran and Manorom, 2009; Lahiri-Dutt, 2012; Namy, 2007; Richter et al., 2010; Whitehead, 2009; Yong, 2001) (Source: Manorom et al., 2016)

“In the case of the Mekong region, large hydropower dam development has had devastating negative impacts on the environment but also the well-being of people dependent on resources, especially Indigenous Peoples and women” (Ho, 2014; International Rivers, 2014; WCD, 2000; Wyatt and Baird, 2007; Yauch, 2010) (Source: Manorom et al., 2016)

“Suffering for water, suffering from water: Emotional geographies of resource access, control and conflict” by Farhana Sultana (2011:163)

### Introduction

Feminist political ecology scholarship has enriched political ecology literatures, and resources management literatures more broadly, by drawing attention to the importance of gender in resource struggles in a variety of contexts (e.g. Carney, 1996; Rocheleau et al., 1996; Schroeder, 1999). Recent work in feminist political ecology has furthered existing debates by demonstrating that gender is performed and negotiated through resource struggles and power relations involving bodies, spaces, and environments (Gururani, 2002; Harris, 2006; Nightingale, 2006; Resurreccion and Elmhirst, 2008; Sultana, 2009a). Such scholarship has argued that subjectivities are negotiated and embodied through social processes, ecological practices, and intersectionalities with other subject positions of class, race, etc.

In making these arguments, I am aware of the critique that Smith et al. (2009, p. 230) have recently made: “the naturalized connection between women and emotion are akin to (and another version of) the naturalized connection of women and nature that feminists have sought so long to disrupt and historicize.” My hope is to engage emotional geography with (feminist) political ecology analysis without being reductionist or ahistorical, but adding an additional layer of explanation of everyday resource politics and struggles (see also Ettlinger, 2010). To this end, I agree with the Smith et al. (2009) that a focus on embodiment in feminist geography has been useful in emotional geographies research, pointing to the multiplicity of ways that emotions are not feminine, but are constituted as a result of spaces, places, bodies, and experiences. While Smith et al. (2009, p. 11) argue that, “In investigating these taken-for-granted emotional aspects of embodied experience feminists illustrate the intimate connections between the physical (material) and mental health”, I attempt to show the ways that emotions matter in the lived realities that shape the practices of access, use and control of natural resources.

“Suffering for water, suffering from water: Emotional geographies of resource access, control and conflict” by Farhana Sultana  
Geoforum 42 (2011:163) 163–172

#### Introduction

Feminist political ecology scholarship has enriched political ecology literatures, and resources management literatures more broadly, by drawing attention to the importance of gender in resource struggles in a variety of contexts (e.g. Carney, 1996; Rocheleau et al., 1996; Schroeder, 1999). Recent work in feminist political ecology has furthered existing debates by demonstrating that gender is performed and negotiated through resource struggles and power relations involving bodies, spaces, and environments (Gururani, 2002; Harris, 2006; Nightingale, 2006; Resurreccion and Elmhirst, 2008; Sultana, 2009a). Such scholarship has argued that subjectivities are negotiated and embodied through social processes, ecological practices, and intersectionalities with other subject positions of class, race, etc.

## Finding sources

- Good, well known, high, acceptable quality references (books, book chapters, peer review journals)

## Finding sources

<http://www.easybib.com/guides/students/writing-guide/ii-research/afinding-sources/>

- [EBSCO](#)
- [JSTOR](#)
- [Google Scholar](#)
- [Microsoft Academic Search](#)
- [Google Books](#)
- [oqlc](#)
- [Bing](#)
- [Sweet Search](#)
- [ipl2](#)
- [PubMed](#)
- [GoPubMed](#)
- [Medline Plus](#)
- [JURN](#)
- [NBER](#)
- [National Criminal Justice Reference Services](#)
- [OAlster](#)
- [Refseek](#)
- [PhilPapers](#)
- [Science.aov](#)
- [Scirus](#)
- [DOAJ](#)
- [US Census Bureau](#)
- [CIA World Factbook](#)

## Asking yourself?

- **How many literatures?**
- **Have you dialogued with the literature?**
- **Are you just providing a summary?**

Have you got any of the following phrases to highlight your argument?

### Agreement

“One trend in the research is...”

“Research seems to agree that...”

“Numerous authors support the claim that...”

“There is strong convergent evidence for...”

### Disagreement

“There is overall debate regarding...”

“A lack of consensus exists on the point of...”

“There are two conflicting camps on the issue of...”