Conflict Resolution and the Scholarship of Engagement

Conflict Resolution and the Scholarship of Engagement: Partnerships Transforming Conflict

Edited by

Cheryl Lynn Duckworth
and Consuelo Doria Kelley

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS
PUBLISHING

Conflict Resolution and the Scholarship of Engagement:
Partnerships Transforming Conflict ,
Edited by Cheryl Lynn Duckworth and Consuelo Doria Kelley

This book first published 2012

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-3766-0, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-3766-8

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The dialogue which launched this work initially took place at the house of contributing author, Dustin Berna, during a brief faculty retreat. He fed us well (with crème brulée for dessert!), and our Chair and Dean led us in a conversation about each of our faculty research and passions, looking for areas of overlap. We also challenged ourselves to consider who we really are as a department, and on which strengths we most wished to build. Students were also key in this dialogue—what sorts of students seek DCAR out? Where are they from, both literally and figuratively, and where do they hope to go?

From these questions, we developed strong consensus that we are a department who values a democratic, egalitarian view of knowledge production and is committed to community partnerships. Conflict resolution tends to be a field of scholar-practitioners who reject the divide between theory and practice, and DCAR is no exception. This ethos is consistent with the Graduate School of Social Sciences and Humanities overall and in fact with Nova Southeastern as an entire campus. The departmental synergy around exploring the Scholarship of Engagement and its utility for the field of conflict resolution was clear and the theme for this book thus emerged. Nearly each member of our faculty has provided an exploration of his or her own area of expertise and how research and practice into this particular area has been (or can be) enhanced via the Scholarship of Engagement.

There are a considerable number of people I'd like to thank. First, many thanks to our doctoral student, Heather Wellman, whose early and excellent research contributed significantly to the book proposal. My thanks, appreciation, and admiration also go to each of my DCAR colleagues who found the time to make this collaboration a priority and contribute a chapter. I would also like to thank my Dean, Dr. Honggang Yang, Dr. Tommie Boyd, and Dr. Jim Hibel, for graciously sharing their time with this project as well. As administrative leaders at NSU, their vision of engaged scholarship throughout SHSS, and their thoughts on how to institutionalize and sustain it, are an immense contribution. My thanks also to Amanda Millar and Carol Kolikourdi, our editors at

Cambridge Scholars Publishing, for their time, guidance, and support. Finally, I'm delighted to thank another of our intrepid doctoral students, Consuelo Kelley, whose leadership, tireless work, and eagle-eyed editing helped make this work what it is. It has been a pleasure to collaborate with her.

—Cheryl Lynn Duckworth
Assistant Professor
Department of Conflict Analysis and Resolution
School of Humanities and Social Sciences
Nova Southeastern University

The multi-faceted view that a kaleidoscope provides is often invoked as a visual metaphor by and for those who would analyze and resolve conflict's many facets; a similar visual has often helped me to consider the multiple facets of meanings that words can carry. I want to thank this anthology's contributors for their willingness to subject their words to my editorial kaleidoscope, as well as for their patience, understanding, and follow-through efforts. I also want to thank Tammy Graham, Project Manager of the Department of Multidisciplinary Studies in SHSS at NSU, for her generous technical assistance and unwavering support throughout this project. Finally, I want to thank Elena Bastidas, my dissertation chair, mentor, colleague, and friend, for her exceptional guidance on the Scholarship of Engagement, and for confirming by her actions on behalf of others its potential to change the lives of students and community members through the DCAR Global Course practicum platform. Like many I have had the privilege to meet during my graduate studies in conflict analysis and resolution at NSU, she lives her life every day in service to Nelson Mandela's rallying call: "Education is the most powerful weapon you can use to change the world."

—Consuelo Doria Kelley
Doctoral Student and Graduate Assistant
Department of Conflict Analysis and Resolution
School of Humanities and Social Sciences
Nova Southeastern University

INTRODUCTION

FROM ANALYSIS TO RESOLUTION THROUGH THE SCHOLARSHIP OF ENGAGEMENT

CHERYL LYNN DUCKWORTH
AND CONSUELO DORIA KELLEY

As the field of conflict analysis and resolution continues to grow, scholars and practitioners increasingly recognize that we can learn from one another. Theory must be informed by practice and practice must draw on sound theory. Above and beyond this lies a further recognition: without at least attempting to actually engage and transform entrenched conflicts our field cannot hope to achieve its potential. We will merely remain in a more diverse, multi-disciplinary ivory tower. This edition breaks new ground in explicitly connecting the Scholarship of Engagement to the work of conflict resolution professionals including those in the academy, those in the field, and those who refuse to choose between the two. The text explores a wide variety of examples of and thinking on the Scholarship of Engagement, from participatory action research to peace education and from genocide prevention to community mediation and transitional justice.

The Scholarship of Engagement is a model of scholarship that bridges theory and practice. North Carolina State University (NCSU) defines it as follows: "Community engaged scholarship encompasses scholarly activities related to research and/or teaching that involve full collaboration of students, community partners and faculty as co-educators and co-generators of knowledge and that address questions of public concern." Barker (2004) offered a similar definition in his recent taxonomy of the Scholarship of Engagement: "Reacting to the disconnect between academics and the public, in somewhat dialectical fashion scholars are finding creative ways to communicate to public audiences, work for the

public good, and most important, generate knowledge with public participation" (123). He continued, clarifying that scholarly engagement is, "…research, teaching, integration, and application scholarship that incorporate reciprocal practices of civic engagement into the production of knowledge" *(*124). As we will see below, this notion of the *reciprocal* co-production of knowledge represents to our minds a key synergy between the academic framework of the Scholarship of Engagement and conflict transformation. Particularly in contexts where one or more conflict party has been oppressed or marginalized, conflict transformation practitioners and scholars risk reproducing that marginalization if we imagine that we hold objective answers that we can bestow upon conflict parties (see for example Lederach 2005, Cloke 2008). Rather, the process itself of generating solutions is fundamental to building the confidence, skills, capacity and trust with the other party needed to transform the root political, economic and socio-cultural drivers of the conflict. Similarly, as the above suggests, those committed to the Scholarship of Engagement embrace an epistemology that is harmonious with conflict transformation. The co-creation of knowledge, with respect both to initial setting of the agenda and priorities, as well as with respect to the ultimate "product" created, is essential to the values of this academic framework. This harmony between conflict resolution and the Scholarship of Engagement, of course, is a central reason for and theme of this volume.

Recently the Scholarship of Engagement has attracted increased academic interest. NCSU, for example, hosted a conference on developing and defining the Scholarship of Engagement. The University of Michigan now offers a graduate certificate in the Scholarship of Engagement; and, similarly, the University of Vermont hosts an "Engagement Academy." Amy Driscoll and Lorilee Sandmann argued that this model of scholarship is moving from "maverick to mainstream" (Driscoll and Sandmann 2001). Again, this trend is a natural fit for those of us who teach, study, and practice conflict resolution. Thriving, multidisciplinary, and potentially transformative, our field's expertise and practice is needed if the Scholarship of Engagement is to continue developing both in academia and communities worldwide. As Cheldelin, Druckman and Fast (2008) note, the praxis that results from integrating theory, research, and practice is a central tenet of the field of conflict resolution. As peace workers and conflict resolution professionals, we are drawn to this field as a vocation. As such, we should embody praxis—the collective study of a shared problem that then can lead to transformative action. As Sandmann (2008) observes, the Scholarship of Engagement as it has been evolving, argues

for the integration of theory, research, and practice, just as conflict resolution does. She writes, "More work reflects the two grounding principles of the Scholarship of Engagement: (1) mutually beneficial, reciprocal partnerships and (2) integration of teaching, research, and service" (98). The model of the Scholarship of Engagement is a natural fit for engaged conflict resolution scholars, yet until now, this link has not been fully explored.

Literature discussing the Scholarship of Engagement began emerging in the 1990's. In 1990 the Carnegie Foundation produced a report that denounced faculty focusing on research and placing teaching as a secondary function. In the report, four new categories of scholarship are outlined as discovery, integration of knowledge, teaching, and service (Boyer 1990). From there, scholars began discussing the future of faculty engagement in terms of both research and service. This discussion led many to conclude that the Scholarship of Engagement is the new paradigm of faculty engagement by building on service learning models. These Scholarship of Engagement models incorporate elements of service learning (applying taught concepts in the community through volunteer opportunities) and faculty creating with students bridges between theory and praxis (Boyer, 1996; Bringle, Games and Malloy 1990; Driscoll and Lynton,1999; Ehrlich 1995; Ellis and Noyes 1990; Fairweather 1996; Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff 1997; Harkavy and Benson 1998; Kellogg Commission 1999; Lynton 1995; Michigan State University 1996; Palmer 1998; Sandmann, Foster-Fishman, Lloyd, Rauhe, and Rosaen 2000; Schon 1995).

More recently, scholars have begun to assert that the Scholarship of Engagement has moved from the sidelines to a more mainstream concept (Driscoll and Sandmann 2001). Sandmann (2008) asserts that the Scholarship of Engagement as a concept has evolved from faculty being responsive to communities to developing more research and policy analysis. Driscoll and Sandmann (2001) explore the notion that as this evolution has occurred, more institutions of higher learning are expanding their Scholarship of Engagement programs, and this has created multiple definitions and models of engagement. Rice (2002) explores how the current literature has focused on developing a unified model and theory for the Scholarship of Engagement.

Similar to participatory action research (see Katz, this volume), the Scholarship of Engagement at its best moves beyond involving community

members in a pre-conceived research project. Rather, it engages communities in a democratic and equitable co-construction of knowledge, without presuming prematurely what community values, priorities or even epistemology should be (see Duckworth, this volume). O'Meara and Rice (2005) argue that the Scholarship of Engagement "requires going beyond the expert model that often gets in the way of constructive university-community collaboration…calls on faculty to move beyond 'outreach,'…[and] asks scholars to go beyond 'service,' with its overtones of noblesse oblige. What it emphasizes is genuine *collaboration*: that the learning and teaching be multidirectional and the expertise shared. It represents a basic reconceptualization of faculty involvement in community based work" (28).

Extending the conversation further, however, the Scholarship of Engagement more explicitly addresses the need for institutions of knowledge production (universities, think tanks) to reconsider and reform faculty reward systems (O'Meara and Rice 2005; Sandmann, et al. 2009). This means developing broader criteria for what constitutes scholarship, as well as rejecting the notion of the "great man" model of the scholar, a lone genius producing and disseminating knowledge for the masses to apply and be edified by. Praxis inherently must mean a more democratic, participatory, relevant, and frankly humble approach to scholarship. The dialogue about what this means for assessing students, hiring and promoting faculty, and even the conceptualizing itself of the purpose of universities must continue, we would argue, advancing the framework of the Scholarship of Engagement if the academy is to be able to improve communities and transform conflicts. This is especially true of academics, such as the present authors and presumably our readers, who wish to transform persistent or even violent conflicts.

What remains needed from the body of Scholarship of Engagement literature is a presentation of successful Scholarship of Engagement projects. Sandmann (2008) notes something of a "definitional anarchy" regarding what actually constitutes the Scholarship of Engagement. We hope the chapters herein can inspire our conflict resolution colleagues to consider this model for their own peace building works, as well as to contribute to clarifying what we mean by the Scholarship of Engagement via specific examples of engaged conflict resolution scholarship. There are two primary works on the implementation of the Scholarship of Engagement. Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, and Tipton (1996) explore the Scholarship of Engagement through their research in faith communities in

their book *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. Chibucos and Lerner (1999) also look at a variety of successful stories in their book *Serving Children and Families through Community-University Partnerships: Success Stories.* In their book they look at community-university partnerships that serve children and families through faculty engagement.

Similarly, presentations of successful conflict resolution programs and projects, such as Zelizer and Rubinstein's recent volume *Building Peace* (2009), have not reported such programs through the lens of the Scholarship of Engagement. Such was simply beyond the scope of what seems to have been the intent of the volume. This enables such scholarship to offer compelling examples of peace-building praxis, but leaves open questions of needed reform of the institutions of knowledge production such as universities, as well as how exactly peace building programs constitute scholarship. Again, such has simply not been the intent of conflict resolution editions which present case studies from the field. The present volume intends to initiate a conversation between conflict resolution and the Scholarship of Engagement literatures. For the reasons noted above, they have much to contribute to each other.

Barker (2004) explores an approach in which students and faculty engage in community projects on the one hand and where students and faculty engage in research aimed at impacting a community on the other hand. He asserts that both models of Scholarship of Engagement are needed to create a fully engaged institution. In the current volume, faculty members engage in both community projects and in research that impacts the community through a meaningful examination of policy and practice and through the presentation of real world solutions to conflicts. By looking at community engagement and the development of research and policy analysis, the proposed book provides real-world examples of the Scholarship of Engagement for the purpose of conflict resolution and peace-building.

We can see from the above that there is a compelling need for an exploration of what the Scholarship of Engagement looks like within the context of conflict resolution praxis. Sandmann (2008) has called for an increased level of empiricism and scholarship as the dialogue around this framework continues to consolidate and mature. She writes:

> There is now a rich repository "making the case" for engagement in higher education, of cases of engagement enacted in a variety of contexts through

> a variety of means, and of cases of emerging institutionalization of engagement and engagement as a scholarly expression in a number of higher education institutions. However, beyond program evaluation of the programs or cases documented in the articles in this journal, there is a paucity of empirical studies and serious policy analysis leading to theory development. (99)

Regarding such empirical documentation and theory development, as detailed above, there currently is no work that explicitly bridges theory and practice employing the concept of the Scholarship of Engagement in conflict analysis and resolution. Hence this edition is a unique contribution to the field which this faculty, as a community of engaged conflict resolution scholars, are readily able to make. The chapters outlined below will elaborate precisely this bridge from the perspective of a variety of specific specialties. We hope they represent a contribution to two key related dialogues: the urgent calls that the academy embrace the Scholarship of Engagement, and the continued development of our understanding of how peace and conflict scholars can ultimately achieve praxis for conflict transformation by employing the Scholarship of Engagement.

Dr. Neil H. Katz begins this volume's exploration of Scholarship of Engagement by providing a contextual and historical setting for its methodology in action research, participatory action research, and participant observation. His chapter describes four studies as they may be viewed through the lens of the Scholarship of Engagement, assessing the effectiveness and objectives of interactions between researcher(s) and community participants in three different past social protest initiatives, as well as in a recent ongoing university-community partnership for enhanced understanding of conflict management in South Florida. The social protest initiatives (an anti-nuclear power protest, a protest against the development of cruise missiles, and a sustained peace march across the United States) provide a rich background for understanding the emergence of the Scholarship of Engagement and its enhancement by different research traditions and guidelines. In contrast, a Scholarship of Engagement approach has greatly informed the current ongoing South Florida conflict management study discussed in Chapter One. Dr. Katz makes a convincing case for how social protest research and other kinds of peace and conflict resolution research can benefit from the Scholarship of Engagement's full collaboration of students, community, and faculty as co-educators and co-generators of knowledge to address public concerns.

In Chapter Two Dr. Toran Hansen considers how conflict transformation and social movement scholarship contribute to the empowerment of social movement participants in their work. Discussing his own research with the peace movement of Minnesota as an example, he describes and analyzes engagement in social movements using conflict transformation. Included in his discussion are agent transformations, relational transformations, and structural, cultural, and issue transformations that occur over the course of conflict transformation, as well as special features of its processes. The comprehensiveness of analysis and practice of conflict transformation, and the high level of engagement demanded of its scholars and practitioners, illuminate the importance of the transformative conflict framework and process for the Scholarship of Engagement, to benefit surrounding communities and address pressing social concerns.

Dr. Cheryl Duckworth in Chapter Three argues that critical peace education and the Scholarship of Engagement can make reciprocal compelling and unique contributions to the successful facilitation of systemic conflict transformation. Critical peace education engages students in developing conflict transformation skills, empowering students and teachers through critical dialogue to become conscious of structural violence roots and causes of a particular violent conflict. As Duckworth notes, deconstruction of dominant social or political myths that reproduce structurally violent systems needs to be accompanied by an enhanced understanding of what might be reconstructed in their place; collaborative problem solving is key to the success of that reconstruction. The Scholarship of Engagement can frame student and academics' interaction with and among the conflicting parties as well as other stakeholders in the conflict region, in ways that facilitate critical peace education efforts to achieve enhanced understanding and co-create knowledge with and in communities that seek real and effective structural transformation of violent conflict(s) they face.

In Chapter Four Dr. Alexia Georgakopoulos and Dr. Steven T. Hawkins explore the role that facilitation processes play in conflict understanding and transformation for community members. They focus on the application of two facilitator models, Dramatic Problem Solving and Interactive Management, to illustrate how understanding their effective use can enhance objectives sought by students and educators, with implications for effective Scholarship of Engagement. Community participant members are ultimately responsible for generating content in both models; in this and other ways Dramatic Problem Solving and

Interactive Management processes and objectives mirror the approach of Scholarship of Engagement, for academics who would benefit communities not by imparting wisdom and solutions but eliciting them via facilitated dialogue among the members of a community or organization. Both models feature culturally-relevant methodologies, involving member participants from design through idea generation to implementation and refinement of community-generated action plans. They also provide for the systematic and logical holistic framing of all facets of the conflict or dispute from the perspective of members and stakeholders. Through engagement of the collective democratic voices of all they promote a sense of ownership, collaboration, and commitment to conflict resolution tasks and outcomes. The authors provide specific examples of the models' use in community engagement projects, and how their application evolved into acquisition by participants of creative and critical skills sets for confronting conflicts.

In Chapter Five Dr. Judith McKay advocates for the embrace of Scholarship of Engagement by higher education programs that train conflict resolution specialists. For the students in such programs, hands-on experience in actual conflict settings is key to successful acquisition of the skills needed to apply what they have learned. That hands-on experience is in turn implicit in the approach of Scholarship of Engagement wherein academic institutions partner and engage with communities and organization. Dr. McKay describes how that engagement can be effectively accomplished through academic school practicum coursework and other collaborative projects that partner higher education with communities. She discusses the wide variety of conflict resolution programs in higher education, and specifically traces the evolution of practicum coursework for students in such programs at Nova Southeastern University (NSU), to illustrate how partnerships between the academy and the community can lead to successful and integrative conflict resolution strategies for community members. The benefits that conflict resolution students derive from the immersion component of their school practicum coursework are mirrored by the benefits experienced as a result of that partnership, by communities, organizations, educators, and individual members and stakeholders in conflict settings. Dr. McKay illustrates the power of student practicum opportunities and integration of the public in scholarship with numerous examples of university and community partnering objectives, research findings, and beneficial outcomes achieved by NSU's VOICES Family Outreach Project.

Drs. Claire Michèle Rice and Larry A. Rice in Chapter Six explain why a Scholarship of Engagement that involves community partnerships must also consider how the dichotomies of inclusion/exclusion and in-group/out-group dynamics affect relationship building among the individuals in the community being served. They broaden our understanding of the term *community* to encompass people within all their respective circles of influence, including the organizations within which they work and settings within which they 'live' and 'play," to discuss a phenomenon they have observed in various training situations wherein patterns of exclusion invariably lead to conflict: *The Recess Effect*. They discuss how its application and understanding can illuminate patterns of exclusion in community activities, to assist faculty, students, trainers, and trainees with effectuating successful partnerships between academic institutions and communities in the Scholarship of Engagement. Building on observations of children's patterns of inclusion and exclusion in playgrounds and classrooms, *The Recess Effect* has been observed by the authors in university classrooms and in training workshop participants in organizations. The exclusion and inclusion dichotomy evident in *The Recess Effect* has distinct implications for understanding possible roots of conflict, and therefore significant relevance for scholars who would engage with communities, organizations, and their members to achieve their respective conflict resolution and transformation objectives.

The compelling benefits of an international Scholarship of Engagement in the global arena are discussed by Dr. Ismael Muvingi in Chapter Seven. Through the lens of transitional justice in post-conflict situations in Africa, Dr. Muvingi explores the perceptions of community members' needs and challenges as framed by their own experiences, noting that a Scholarship of Engagement approach that elicits understanding of the multiple perspectives and meanings of differing stakeholder perceptions of specific conflicts in Africa is essential for higher education teachers and students, to contribute to just understanding and resolution of those conflicts. Two empirical studies are discussed in the context of those differing local perceptions: the first focuses on the Rwandan genocide and the *gacaca* system in Rwanda, and the second on the Tree of Life initiatives in the ongoing conflicts in Zimbabwe. Both studies illustrate how a Scholarship of Engagement approach necessarily entails eliciting local conceptualizations of justice, thereby enhancing knowledge creation through an effective exploration of African community members' understandings, objectives, and member-generated solutions. Despite challenges, applying such an approach helps to: 1) meet local needs; 2) counter the continuance of neo-

colonialist relationships between Africa and the world; and 3) bring the focus down from macro-level initiatives driven by elites to a micro-level focus on local particularities, realities, and desires for social transformation.

In Chapter Eight Dr. Jason Campbell explores the Scholarship of Engagement's considerable potential to advance the systematic spreading of genocide awareness on behalf of targeted group members by bridging the conceptual gulf between theory and action. He argues that Scholarship of Engagement as applied to genocide prevention and awareness would allow for greater understanding of local experience, critical to effectively countering state and perpetrator-generated narratives that create and perpetuate systems of dehumanization that legitimize the destruction of members of a targeted population. Such scholarly efforts must first recognize the potential for conflict escalation, most effectively by analyzing the discursive hegemonic modes for describing targeted group members as Other. Those narratives can desensitize populations of moderates to the plight of those outside the scope of state protection, while simultaneously absolving them from the moral obligation to care for their plight. Scholarship of Engagement can effectively access and elicit the narratives of marginalized populations, in turn facilitating the compilation of heterodox narratives of genocide victims and populations. By fostering greater genocide awareness through Scholarship of Engagement that is rooted in the voices of those targeted for extermination, conflict resolution educators and students can engage moderates to recognize the legitimacy and humanity of targeted group members for the ultimate preservation of all human dignity and human life.

In Chapter Nine Dr. Dustin Berna seeks to enhance understanding of Islamic fundamentalism, to address the fears Americans and Westerners have toward the Muslim world, when their own world has come in great part to be defined by the events of 9/11, all too frequent terrorist attacks, and wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. While the Scholarship of Engagement is an essential and valuable tool for enhancing the public's interactive and integrative understanding about Islam, he notes it is a difficult process because of the lack of accurate information, the fear, and the intolerance that plagues American society. The Islamic world should not be feared; nevertheless it is human nature to fear the unknown and the Islamic world is unknown to most Americans. Dr. Berna thus believes that the power of Scholarship of Engagement to facilitate a more informed, active, and tolerant society can and should be used to enhance public understanding of

Islam and Islamic fundamentalism. To facilitate an informed dialogue between academia and the public on the issue of Islamic fundamentalism he describes differences between Islamic fundamentalist movements, to increase awareness of that knowledge among communities and academic institutions partnering for the mutual benefits derived from knowledge creation and dissemination of that knowledge.

In the book's final Chapter Ten, Dr. Elena Bastidas presents a framework for the development of graduate higher education courses that have the potential of becoming incubators for Scholarship of Engagement activities, based on courses developed as part of the graduate curriculum of the Department of Conflict Analysis and Resolution (DCAR) at Nova Southeastern University (NSU). These DCAR Global Courses are so termed because they incorporate an overseas field-immersion experiential component that enhances students' cross-cultural skills and fosters sensitivity to, and appreciation and understanding of, diversity and global issues in the context of specific, local conflict settings. The chapter's framework is based on the experiences of students and communities in two Global Courses, one in Ecuador (2010) and the other in Suriname (2011), which were designed to provide graduate students with learning experiences that have the potential for inspiring transformational effects in students' lives while making meaningful contributions to the field of peace and conflict analysis and resolution (CAR) studies. Specific pieces that make up the puzzle of effective academic incubation of Scholarship of Engagement activities in a Global Course are identified and described: 1) the institutional context, 2) the academic field of study, 3) a clear understanding of student needs, and 4) a learner-centered approach to the study of peacemaking and CAR. Dr. Bastidas suggests that Global Courses like these provide the necessary conditions for developing engagement activities that, with the appropriate follow-up, could become important Scholarship of Engagement projects. Moreover, the field immersion component has acted to ignite a passion in DCAR Global Course students for research and their own continued engagement to facilitate mutual learning in communities experiencing conflict. Local communities, academic, and government institutions served and studied during the Global Courses in turn have initiated ongoing partnerships with NSU, to continue the work of conflict analysis and resolution that students commenced with them during the course field component.

The Epilogue to this volume explores the many current benefits and still untapped potential of the Scholarship of Engagement for the School of

Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS) at NSU and other higher education institutions. NSU's SHSS Dean Honggang Yang, Chair of the Department of Family Therapy (DFT) Dr. Tommie V. Boyd, and Senior Associate Dean of the Division of Applied Interdisciplinary Studies (DAIS)[1] Dr. Jim Hibel provide in the Epilogue a stirring call for the integration of the Scholarship of Engagement in graduate study programs, to provide meaningful opportunities and elective platforms for town-gown partnerships at local, national, and global levels. Scholarship of Engagement projects have proven at SHSS and NSU to make a difference that becomes publicly known through the scholarly application and presentation of project outcomes. The bedrock of such projects is full collaboration between communities, their members, and all stakeholders with academic educators and students; it is that collaboration that distinguishes the Scholarship of Engagement from service learning and from activities where academics might prescribe or impose solutions on communities. Most significantly, the "impact factors" the authors describe for measuring the success of Scholarship of Engagement projects signal a promising empirical barometer by which to assess the union of higher education and communities in partnership-based endeavors. As the authors suggest, this means rethinking how we evaluate faculty and indeed even how we conceptualize scholarship. The pride and passion the authors feel about the Scholarship of Engagement's proven potential to bring together the expertise of the community with the expertise of the academy is shared by every contributor to this anthology.

References

Barker, Derek. 2004. "The Scholarship of Engagement: A Taxonomy of Five Emerging Practices." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 9 (2): 123-137.

Bellah, Robert N., Richard Madsen, William Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven N. Tipton. 1996. *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Boyer, Ernest L. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.* New York, NY: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

[1] NSU's Division of Applied Interdisciplinary Studies (DAIS) includes the Center for Psychological Studies, Criminal Justice Institute, Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Human Services Unit, and the Mailman Segal Institute for Early Childhood Studies.

—. 1996. "The Scholarship of Engagement." *Journal of Public Outreach* 1 (1): 11-20.

Bringle, Robert G., Richard Games, and Edward A. Malloy. 1990. *Colleges and Universities as Citizens.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Cheldelin, Sandra, Daniel Druckman and Larissa Fast, eds. 2008. *Conflict: From Analysis to Intervention*, 2nd ed. London: Continuum International Publishing Group, Inc.

Chibucos, Thomas R., and Richard M. Lerner. (1999). *Serving Children and Families Through Community-University Partnerships: Success Stories.* Norwell, MA: Academic Publishers.

Cloke, Kenneth. 2008. *Conflict Revolution: Mediating Evil, War, Injustice, and Terrorism.* Santa Ana, CA: Janis Publications.

Driscoll, Amy, & Lynton, Ernie A. 1999. *Making Outreach Visible:A Guide to Documenting Professional Service and Outreach.* Washington D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Driscoll, Amy, and Lorilee R. Sandmann. 2001. "From Maverick to Mainstream: The Scholarship of Engagement." *Journal of Higher Education: Outreach and Engagement* 6 (1): 9-19.

Ehrlich, Thomas. 1995. *The Courage to Inquire: Ideals and Realities in Higher Education.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Ellis, Susan J., and Katherine H. Noyes. 1990. *By the People: A History of Americans as Volunteers.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fairweather, James S. 1996. *Faculty Work and Public Trust.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Glassick, Charles E., Mary T. Huber, and Gene I. Maeroff. 1997. *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Harkavy, Ira and Lee Benson. 1998. "De-Platonizing and Democratizing Education as the Bases of Service Learning." In *Academic Service Learning: A Pedagogy of Action and Reflection. New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 73, edited by Robert A. Rhoads & Jeffrey P. Howard, 11-19. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities. 1999. *Returning to our Roots: The Engaged Institution.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Lederach, John Paul. 2005. The *Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Lynton, Ernie A. 1995. *Making the Case for Professional Service.* Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Michigan State University. 1996. *Points of Distinction: A Guidebook for Planning and Evaluating Quality Outreach.* East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Board of Trustees.

O'Meara, KerryAnn and R. Eugene Rice, eds. (2005) *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Palmer, Parker J. 1998. *The Courage to Teach.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rice, R. Eugene. 2002. "Beyond Scholarship Reconsidered: Toward an Enlarged Vision of the Scholarly Work of Faculty Members." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 90: 7-18.

Sandmann, Lorilee R., Pennie G. Foster-Fishman, James Lloyd, Warren Rauhe, and Cheryl Rosaen. 2000. "Managing Critical Tensions: How to Strengthen the Scholarship Component of Outreach." *Change* 32 (1): 44-52.

—. 2008. "Conceptualization of the Scholarship of Engagement in Higher Education: A Strategic Review, 1996-2006." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 12 (1): 91-104.

Sandmann, Lorilee, Courtney H, Thornton, and Audrey J. Jaeger, eds. 2011. *Institutionalizing Community Engagement in Higher Education: The First Wave of Carnegie Classified Institutions.* Indianapolis, IN: John Wiley and Sons.

Schon, Donald A. 1995. "The New Scholarship Requires a New Epistemology." *Change* 27 (6): 27-34.

Zelizer, Craig, and Robert A. Rubinstein. 2009. *Building Peace: Practical Reflections from the Field.* Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press.

CHAPTER ONE

PARTICIPATORY ACTION RESEARCH EFFORTS AND SCHOLARSHIP OF ENGAGEMENT

NEIL H. KATZ

Scholarship of Engagement is rapidly becoming more accepted in colleges and universities throughout the United States as an accepted mode of scholarship. This book chapter will trace some of the history and descriptions of "action research," "participatory action research," "participant observation," and "scholarship of engagement," and demonstrate some linkages between them. I will then present four previous research efforts to explore some compelling themes. The four case studies will be "Citizen Reaction to Protests at a Nuclear Power Plant," "Community Reaction to Protests at a Cruise Missile Military Site," "The Use of Mediation among Participants in the Great Peace March Across the United States," and "Understanding Conflict Management Systems and Strategies in the Workplace in Broward County, Florida." This chapter will also address how these research studies and similar research efforts could be enhanced by building bridges and borrowing from the different research traditions and guidelines.

During my 40-year professorial role in higher education at 5 different universities in the United States and Canada, I have witnessed many changes and reforms. One of the most significant innovations has been the fairly recent movement and acceptance of the "Scholarship of Engagement." Throughout my career during my 37 years at Syracuse University, scholarship that counted towards rewards, including tenure and promotion, was traditional or "pure" scholarship—mostly dispassionate, objective, academic writing that would find publication in peer-reviewed academic journals or in books published by a recognized academic press. A corollary system attached to this was a reward system that was heavily influenced by how many times a particular scholar was cited by his peers,

a measure then compiled and publicized in books such as the *Social Science Citation Index*.

This culture of privileging traditional, pure scholarship has been challenged by numerous scholars and research trends, but none of them have been as successful as the Scholarship of Engagement. First promoted widely by Ernest Boyer in 1991 from his prominent position as President of the influential Carnegie Academy for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, the Scholarship of Engagement has become accepted as a much desired goal for many universities that compete to become a member of an exalted list of schools honored for receiving Carnegie Community Engagement Classification. Annual conferences of scholars dedicated to Scholarship of Engagement have taken place over the past 12 years, with two recent annual conferences at North Carolina State University and Michigan State University drawing about 500 participants from over 75 United States colleges and universities, as well as representatives from universities from 29 states and 5 foreign countries (Crowgey and Futrell 2011). The widespread popularity and acceptance of Scholarship of Engagement is also supported by evidence of over a hundred journals publishing articles of this nature, as well as dozens of websites, electronic mailing lists, and regional gatherings and conferences.

Ernest Boyer's (1991) influence in this revolution of accepted academic scholarship began to spike with the wide circulation of the 1990 Carnegie Foundation report on "Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Profession," which assigned 4 "interlocking functions" to the professorate and promoted new models of balancing 4 general scholarship areas:

1) The scholarship of discovery, which incorporated basic research that expanded the frontiers of human knowledge.
2) The scholarship of integration, which placed discoveries within a larger context and made interdisciplinary connections, often educating non-specialists as well by illuminating data in new ways.
3) The scholarship of teaching, which transformed and extended knowledge among a wider audience beyond the scholar's peers.
4) The scholarship of application in which theory and practice informed each other; it was applied to solve problems, to help individuals and institutions acquire "new intellectual understandings from the very act of application."

Boyer's (1991) publication surely provided an impetus for discussions of what kinds of scholarship should be accepted, promoted, and rewarded at Syracuse University and other colleges and universities across the country. However, it was the April 1996 publication of his clarion call for "Scholarship of Engagement" in the prestigious *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* that really began to have a major impact on the culture of higher education scholarship.

Boyer's (1996) main thesis, both in his *Bulletin* article and his subsequent book *Scholarship Reconsidered*, was that a new form of scholarship was needed to counter the trend toward mainstream academic scholarship emphasizing "increasing specialization, fragmentation of knowledge, and narrowly defined notions of faculty scholarship" (32). Boyer reminded his audience that universities historically served as partners to the local and wider communities in the "search for answers for our most pressing social, economic and moral problems," and higher education needed to reaffirm this commitment that had "become submerged to the pedestal of traditional scholarship" (18). He called for universities to "retrace their steps back to their civic responsibility" by engaging in scholarship that "makes connections across disciplines and places specialties in larger contexts" and "embraces academically relevant work that simultaneously meets campus missions and goals as well as community needs external to the campus environment to contribute to the public good"(32). Scholarship of Engagement would cut across Boyer's four categories of academic scholarship identified in this 1990 article (discovery, teaching, integration, application) and would have university researchers "form a reciprocal, collaborative relationship with a public entity to incorporate civic engagement into the production of knowledge" (Barker 2004, 124). Furthermore, it would "cut across disciplinary boundaries and teaching, research and outreach functions in which scholars would communicate to and work both for and with communities" (Barker 2004, 123).

Although Ernest Boyer's critique of mainstream scholarship, his compelling call for Scholarship of Engagement, and the prestige of the Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement listing and designation all lent visibility and credibility to this new wave of scholarship, one must not conclude that all of these elements are totally new initiatives in academic research and practice. To me, among the initiatives that provided powerful antecedents to the scholarship of engagement are research practices of action research, participatory action research and participant observation.

Throughout history there have undoubtedly been academic researchers who engaged in scholarship intended to produce social action and civic engagement. However, the term "Action Research" is widely attributed to social psychologist Kurt Lewin and some of his World War II contemporaries who committed themselves to conducting research that would have practical application and deal with compelling issues of the time, such as prejudice, authoritarianism, dogmatism, leadership, group behavior, and decision making. Lewin, a German Jew who had fled Nazism and Germany in 1933, involved himself and his colleagues in "a form of research which married the experimental approach of social science with programs of social action in response to social problems of the day to "advance both theory and needed social change" (Kemmis 1980, 29). And even as far back as 1944 when Lewin and his associates conducted studies of food shopping and eating habits of American and British citizens in relation to food rationing during World War II, Lewin believed strongly that "participants in the social world, under investigation, were to be involved in every state of the action research cycle…including a more central role in the formulation and execution of the action research cycle" (Kemmis 1980, 30).

The approach of Action Research was soon followed by several spin-off traditions, including participatory action research and participant observation. William Foote Whyte (1989), a leading theorist and practitioner of these approaches, distinguished participatory action research as the researcher "combining observation with explicitly recognized action objectives and a commitment to carry out the project with the active participation in the research process by some members of the organization being studied" (369). Participatory Action Research would also be explicitly "client centered research in that it was focused on practical problems of importance to the client organization" (382). Professional researchers and members of the client organization would "work together in defining the problem and gathering the data, as well as in the analysis and action phases of the project" (382).

Participant observation, an offshoot of participatory action research, distinguished itself as a research tradition by having the "researcher use participation to gain access to members of a group or organization to observe behavior as it occurs, and also to build relations of personal trust needed to elicit full and reasonably frank interview material" (Whyte 1989, 368). Ideally the researcher would be as inconspicuous as possible and "blend into the social scene in such a way to minimize the impact of

his or her presence on the behaviors of those observed" (368).With roots in traditional ethnographic research, the objective was to assist the research team to study the actual attitudes, motivation, and perspectives held by the study targets. Unlike Participatory Action Research, Participant Observation alone does not necessarily call for the same kind of involvement from members of the group being studied in the design, implementation, and results of the research study. In this regard, Participatory Action Research is more congruent with Scholarship of Engagement than pure participant observation methods (Mack et al. 2005).

Four Research Projects

In the next section of this chapter, I want to address four research studies I have been involved in during my academic career at Syracuse University and Nova Southeastern University, and relate how each of them borrows some elements from the traditions of action research, participatory action research, participant observation, and scholarship of engagement. I will then conclude with some observations of the relationship between research theory and practice, noting how research projects such as these could have been enhanced by combining some of the best features of each of these traditions.

The first three research studies explored the use of nonviolent struggle to produce purposive change through social protest movements. As Gene Sharp (1973, 2010, 2011) and other scholars (Ackerman and Kruegler 1994, Ackerman and Duvall 2000) have documented over the past few decades, nonviolent struggle has an impressive history of accomplishments. The use of nonviolent action by social protest groups has recently received much attention and credibility by mass citizen actions during the "Arab Spring" and Occupy Wall Street movements. These noteworthy phenomena, coupled with the recent popularity of Scholarship of Engagement in our nation's colleges and universities, has prompted me to revisit some of my earlier research on social protest movements to speculate on how the older traditions of action research, participatory action research, and participant observation could be enhanced by some of the guidelines now being trumpeted by the Scholarship of Engagement.

In my earlier academic career at Syracuse University as Professor and Director of the Program in Nonviolent Conflict and Change, (PNCC), I headed several research projects attempting to address some salient unanswered questions about the dynamics of nonviolent struggle within

social movement organizations: (1) how do people come to participate in nonviolent struggle; (2) what are the strategies and tactics that various nonviolent action groups use; (3) how are third parties affected by various nonviolent action strategies and tactics; and (4) how does a protesting group's internal decision making and conflict resolution structure and procedures affect the group's performance of their effort? In general, I was interested in how social protesters think about and evaluate their own actions and how third parties perceive the behavior of nonviolent resistors.

As this action-research was carried out by members of the Program in Nonviolent Conflict and Change (PNCC) at Syracuse University, some words about the Program and its members are important. The program, initiated in 1970 during the height of demonstrations against American involvement in the Viet Nam War, concentrated its study on nonviolent means of resolving conflicts and influencing change. While the program emphasized undergraduate teaching, a number of graduate students were attracted to the interdisciplinary graduate programs of the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs because of PNCC. In 1986, the Hewlett Foundation provided Syracuse University with funding to launch the Program on the Analysis and Resolution of Conflicts (PARC), a research and theory-generating program, voluntarily attracting many graduate students and faculty from throughout the Maxwell School. Together, PNCC and PARC provided a focal point for those of us who were interested in researching questions of nonviolent struggle and conflict resolution. Some students, both undergraduates and graduate, and some faculty who were active in the programs, were advocates of nonviolent action and have had personal experience with its practice. The personal tension between studying versus doing nonviolent action was often evident.

The research projects that I will discuss are just a few of our attempts to wed these two concerns. The reasons for conducting the research itself were fourfold. We wanted to:

- Add to the literature of the impressive history of nonviolent struggle
- Assess the impact of the protest movement’s action on public opinion, particularly in the immediate local area
- Help the movement organizers to understand more about the impact of their actions on their own movement and on the intended audience.

- Assist the social protest movements by giving them valuable data to enhance their future strategy and tactics.

The specific data that our research team gathered and explored can be grouped into four categories: the motivation and personal characteristics of the participants, the strategies and tactics they used, the impact of their action on third parties and opponents, and the effect of the action on the participant group itself. Under each of these categories, there were several more specific questions which guided how we collected and analyzed our data:

I. Understanding the participants
   A. What types of participants are there in nonviolent action groups? What are the roles that they perform for the action groups? What factors contribute to the recruitment and retention of the different types of participants?
   B. What are the characteristics of participants in nonviolent action groups?

II. Strategies and tactics that nonviolent action groups used to wage conflict
   A. What are the strategies and tactics that nonviolent action groups use in order to gain concessions from the groups and individuals they are in conflict with?
   B. What are the strategies and tactics that nonviolent action groups use in order to gain adherents and supporters and to mobilize others for participation?

III. Impact of action on third parties and opponents
   A. The primary opponents -- how are they affected by protesters actions and the responses of third parties? How effective are opponents' actions in thwarting the protesters?
   B. Government officials and other key decision-makers - How do they respond in terms of attitude, behavior, and public policy questions? Can their changes be attributed to the action of the protesters?

IV. Effect of Action on the social protesters
   A. On the group itself—how effectively do members work together? What is the impact of internal communication and decision making structures and process on the group itself?

B. On individual protesters—does the protest action mobilize and motivate participants for future action? Under what conditions do individuals drop out of a movement?

The following brief discussion of our action research efforts offers a glimpse of the protest actions and of our research methods and results. My intent in each of these vignettes is not to thoroughly describe the actions or the research findings, but to comment on these research questions within the vignettes and then offer some general observations about how research on social protest movements could be assisted by the addition of some of the best features of research methods, such as action research, participatory action research, participant observation and scholarship of engagement.[1]

The Seabrook Anti-Nuclear Power Protests

In June of 1978 a team of nine PNCC researchers/participants traveled to Seabrook, New Hampshire, to study the Clamshell Alliance and its announced actions. The Clamshell Alliance, a loose federation of anti-nuclear power groups in and around New England, had engaged in several prior acts of civil disobedience to stop construction of the proposed Seabrook Nuclear Power Plant. Most notable of these was a 1977 mass civil disobedience action in which 1,414 protesters were arrested for trespassing after intentionally refusing to leave the Power Plant parking lot and entrance. The arrestees then applied the tactics of bail solidarity and non-cooperation with procedures in the armory where they were held for up to two weeks. The $50,000 cost-per-day to the state for the Clamshell incarceration influenced New Hampshire's Governor, Meldrim Thomson, to eventually offer a compromise to the protesters. The "Clams" accepted a mass verdict of guilty on misdemeanor trespassing charges (instead of demanding separate trials) and, in exchange, the state released them on personal recognizance.

In 1978 the State and the Public Service Company of New Hampshire were determined not to repeat the 1977 scenario, which cost them well over $500, 000 for the incarceration. The state and the utility hired consultants on nuclear power protesters and public relations, and

[1] For additional information on these social protest movements, see Katz, et al. 1981, 1984, 1988.