

**GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution
(S-CAR)**

S-CAR Practice Project Report

**Prepared by
Athanasios Gatsias and Yves-Renée Jennings,
PhD Candidates, S-CAR**

November 30th, 2011

Table of Contents

	Page No.
A. Introduction.....	3
B. The Dean’s Vision.....	4
C. Project Objectives.....	5
D. Project Team.....	5
E. Methodology.....	6
F. Context: Discussion on the Relationship between Theory and Practice.....	8
G. Results and Findings.....	10
G. 1. Defining Conflict Resolution Practice.....	10
G.2. Personal History of S-CAR Faculty Members as Practitioners – Areas of Practice.....	13
G. 3. Level of Practice.....	13
G. 4. Stimuli for Practice.....	16
G. 5. Partnerships.....	17
G. 6. What Informs practice.....	18
G. 7. Methods of Conflict Resolution Practice.....	20
G. 8. Resources.....	21
G. 9. Challenges and Ethical Concerns.....	22
G. 10. Evaluation.....	28
G. 11. Defining Successful practice.....	30
G. 12. Communicating Practice.....	34
G. 13. Examples of Current Practice Projects.....	36
G. 14. Final Comments	39
H. Next Steps.....	40
Bibliography.....	41
APPENDIX 1: Interview Protocol.....	42
APPENDIX 2: Interview Consent Form.....	43
APPENDIX 3: S-CAR Definition of Conflict Resolution Practice.....	44

A. Introduction

The George Mason University School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution (S-CAR) is a leading institution in the field of Conflict Analysis and Resolution (CAR). S-CAR comprises a diverse community of world-renowned scholars, graduate and undergraduate students, alumni and organizations working in the field of Peacebuilding and Conflict Resolution. As such, S-CAR has a long and rich tradition in conflict resolution practice. Despite the multiplicity of conflict resolution initiatives carried out by S-CAR faculty, a comprehensive ‘map’ of S-CAR practice is still missing. Equally absent is a systematic way of communicating S-CAR practice both within and outside the community. Filling such gaps constitutes a step towards the further professionalization of the S-CAR Practice.

The intention of the study presented in this report was to map S-CAR practice work, based on an elicitive interview process with S-CAR faculty, and to seek their views about the development of a common template comprising different sections that could be used to systematically describe and communicate CR practice. As noted in the analytical part of this report, this aspect presented a level of controversy because many faculty members questioned whether it was possible to communicate S-CAR practice in a relatively set format given that different faculty have been engaged in diverse forms of practice. Furthermore, the issue of confidentiality of some of the practice work that S-CAR faculty members perform is of a delicate nature and it would not be appropriate to publish such work because of the possibility of compromising the identities and security of involved parties and other stakeholders.

Capturing the essence of S-CAR practice is an organic and dynamic process. Thus, this S-CAR Practice study intended to make the first contribution towards how to map and communicate such work effectively. A starting point for such an endeavor was to talk to S-CAR faculty members and elicit their views on their Peacebuilding and Conflict Resolution practice as they have experienced it. This study presents such views as the results of in S-CAR faculty’s insights based on personal interviews conducted between October 2010 and May 2011.

A number of CR related topics were covered during these interviews. These included: definition of practice, methods, scope, levels of intervention, partnerships, resources, challenges, ethical concerns, and evaluation attempts to define ‘successful’ practice. The findings of these interviews are presented in the analytical part of this study. The project team hopes that this initiative will yield multiple benefits, for instance: offering a comprehensive view of what constitutes S-CAR practice, helping S-CAR establish a dynamic practice knowledge-base as part of the new S-CAR online platform, and setting a foundation for regularly reviewing, reflecting on, and communicating S-CAR practice at multiple levels.

This report presents S-CAR Dean’s vision for the S-CAR Practice study and also includes the study’s objectives, methodology and findings. This report concludes with the prospect of developing a common format for communicating S-CAR practice.

B. The Dean's vision –why an S-CAR dialogue on CR practice

Based on an interview with the project team, this report presents Dean Andrea Bartoli's vision and thinking about practice at S-CAR, as well as the underlying logic and reasons as follows:

- In a multiplicity of types and forms, conflict resolution practice has been always present at S-CAR where practice has been at the fore front and at the core of S-CAR work, during the institution 30-year history. Thus, practice at S-CAR has been a part of a long tradition and will continue to constitute an essential component of its legacy.
- The majority of S-CAR faculty members carry out practice in a variety of forms. However, due to the absence of a systematic way to communicate this practice, their work often remains unnoticed, and is partly recognized and appreciated. Such penury indicates a need to find a systematic mode of communication of the Peacebuilding and CR work that takes place at S-CAR because it is critical to clearly know where faculty members stand as scholar-practitioners, and then discuss and agree how to move forward. Thus, a clear process of recognition and appreciation of practice occurring at S-CAR serves as a crucial first step to achieve such goals.
- As a higher educational institution, S-CAR develops its course offerings based on certain intellectual expectations that are set clearly and transparently. For instance, there are clear and transparent procedures to communicate within S-CAR the specifics of a course, such as competencies, number of hours, teaching time, and students' requirements. Such *modus operandi* does not happen systematically when it comes to practice and reveals an inconsistency between the management processes of courses and that of practice. One of the goals of the S-CAR practice project is identify how to encourage a dialogue on a similar kind of mutual accountability and transparency in regards to Peacebuilding and CR practice with the goal of developing of a set mode of communication. "Through this kind of mutual accountability, our practice will actually be better" says Dean Bartoli. Thus, setting up the foundations for a dialectic process will increase self-awareness and facilitate research on S-CAR practice work and its evaluation in ways that benefit the S-CAR community and our field.
- Moreover, this endeavor is an effort to engage S-CAR faculty in a systematic reflective process geared to develop a comprehensive idea of how S-CAR practice work can facilitate self-reflection at the institutional level. Such reflection (at the personal and institutional levels) can help S-CAR identify areas in need of improvements and explore ways to move forward institutionally. In this respect, Dean Bartoli explicitly stated that his intention "is not a matter of control; it seems to me that the more we recognize, the more we are self-aware of what we are doing in terms of practice, the easier it will be for us to improve what we do

by sharing it with researchers and our colleagues.... Unless we share what we are doing, it is very difficult to learn from it”. Thus, in order to bear fruits, a process of self-reflection and institutional reflection needs to be consistent and regular, and not an episodic or sporadic endeavor.

- Using mutual recognition and self-reflection as starting points, S-CAR will become more aware and intentional about embracing practice initiatives carried out by faculty and students while supporting various aspects of such practice work with whatever means the institution has at its disposal
- Finally, this project is meant to help S-CAR students learn more about conflict resolution practice and understand better its various facets. In this respect, systematically sharing insights drawn from S-CAR faculty’s practice experience will expose students to the different dimensions of practice and offer them more options to engage in practice.¹

The current study is not meant to address all the above goals which will require orchestrated systematic efforts at multiple levels. Rather, it constitutes an intentional first step towards achieving these goals. The objectives of this study are delineated below.

C. Project Objectives

Based on the insights offered in the previous sections, the objectives of the project could be summarized as following:

- Initiate among S-CAR faculty a dialogue on CAR practice.
- Elicit faculty’s views on what constitutes CR practice and develop a ‘map’ of the CR practices S-CAR faculty have been engaged in –Identify the areas of expertise in ICAR practice.
- Contribute to the systematic communication of practice work among S-CAR faculty and students through the development of a flexible template with different related sections that can describe such work.
- Take a first step towards the establishment of a systematic process of self-reflection that contributes to future efforts to revisit S-CAR practice work while increasing S-CAR’s awareness and intentionality in embracing practice.

¹ The importance of this point is illustrated by the findings of the project which indicate that S-CAR students are largely involved in conflict resolution practice carried out by S-CAR faculty.

- Assist in the creation of a knowledge-base of practice that can be shared within and outside our community. This knowledge-base will be part of S-CAR's new online platform.

D. Project Team

While the entire S-CAR community has been involved in this project in different capacities, the working team members are: Andrea Bartoli, S-CAR Dean; Susan Allen Nan, S-CAR Assistant Professor; Marc Gopin, S-CAR Professor and Director of Center for World Religions and Diplomacy; Thanos Gatsias, S-CAR Graduate Research Assistant and PhD candidate; and Yves-Renée Jennings, Special Assistant to the Cumbie Chair and S-CAR PhD candidate. In addition, individual Graduate Research Assistants were involved in the project conducting a series of interviews with ICAR faculty, eliciting insights from their experience as conflict resolution practitioners. Paul Snodgrass, S-CAR Technology and Knowledge Management Director and his team will also participate in this project work, in particular setting up the on-line knowledge-base, and collecting and processing of faculty's current practice projects information in consultation with faculty and their respective GRAs. The analysis of the data collected through the interviews was carried out by Yves-Renée Jennings and Thanos Gatsias, who are the authors of the present report.

E. Methodology

This study is a qualitative exploratory research, since the intention was to develop an understanding on a series of issues related to conflict resolution practice as carried out by S-CAR faculty. Based on the nature of this study there were no propositions or hypotheses to be confirmed or rejected. The intention of the research team was to explore questions related to conflict resolution practice as experienced by S-CAR faculty.

The team considered qualitative personal interviews to be the best method for eliciting the views of S-CAR faculty. Data were collected through structured interviews, which included a series of open-ended questions. The interview protocol used for the present study (see **Appendix 1**) comprised 15 questions, which corresponded to areas of practice the project team was interested in. Based on these interviews, an effort was made to search for “‘deep` information and understanding” (Johnson, 2002: 106) and to “elicit from the interviewees rich, detailed materials that can be used in qualitative analysis...and...to discover the informant's experience of the particular topic or situation” (Lofland & Lofland, 1995: 12).

Since in one of our initial team meetings the starting question was “what do we want to learn from S-CAR professors in regards to their practice?”, during a brainstorming process the team came up with a set of questions. This list was further discussed at the November 2010 S-CAR faculty meeting; after incorporating faculty's feedback the team

developed the questionnaire in its final format, which included questions related to the following areas: a) definition of CR practice, b) personal history of the interviewee as a practitioner, c) scope and level of practice, d) stimuli that drive practice work, e) partnerships in practice, f) processes that inform practice, g) methods of CR practice, h) resources needed, i) challenges, j) evaluation, k) components of successful practice, and l) current practice projects. Finally, one question in the protocol concerned the development of a set template that could be used in communicating S-CAR practice within and outside our community. This question asked interviewees whether this template would be plausible or useful and, if yes, what sections it could include.

Based on the intent of the study, the team used purposive sampling and the population was all S-CAR faculty members. A few faculty members declined the interview invitation. Nevertheless, the team conducted 17 interviews during October 2010 and May 2011. Interviewees responded in three forms: a) in person b) by phone, and c) in written form through email. Interviews in the first two categories were tape-recorded and transcribed with the respondent's informed consent (see consent form, **Appendix 2.**) Ten interviews were taken and transcribed by Yves Renee Jennings and Thanos Gatsias, whereas seven interviews were conducted by Graduate Research Assistants at S-CAR.

Method of Analysis

There is a number of ways to analyze data collected through structured interviews in which informants talk about their experiences in a given area. The research team considered thematic analysis as an appropriate method for analyzing the collected data as the intention was to look for `deep information` and meaning in regards to several aspects of conflict resolution practice. In this respect, the use of thematic analysis helped identify various themes and patterns of experience embedded within the S-CAR faculty's input.

As mentioned earlier in this report, before conducting the interviews, the research team identified a number of aspects which they were interested in, and accordingly developed the interview instrument. As a result, a number of proto-themes, which the research team wanted to explore, were identified at the beginning of the project and were formulated in the form of questions in the interview protocol. Such proto-themes included: a) definition of CR practice, b) personal history of the interviewee as a CR practitioner – areas of S-CAR practice, c) scope of practice and level of intervention, d) stimuli that drive practice, e) partnerships in practice, f) processes that inform practice, g) methods of CR practice, h) resources needed and ways to acquire them, i) challenges encountered in practice, j) evaluation of practice, k) components of successful practice, and l) current practice projects.

Based on the interview transcripts, the research team identified data related to each of the proto-themes. Since the protocol questions reflected pre-identified themes, the first step here was to list all faculty's answers to each question under the same proto-theme (e.g. the answers of all interviewees for the question related to the definition of CR practice

were listed under the theme `definition of CR practice`). As a second step, the team re-examined all data to identify relevant information throughout all transcriptions for each of the proto-themes. Essentially the team took each proto-theme separately and re-examined all data for information related to it (e.g. search for information related to the definition of CR practice beyond the interviewees' answers to the specific question). Once all relevant data were listed under the same proto-theme, the team looked for emerging sub-themes within each of the proto-themes. As a last step, the names of each theme and sub-theme were finalized based on their underlying meaning. In the presentation of findings, a number of quotations from the original transcriptions are cited (without attribution to specific interviewees) in order to illustrate and support each of the themes and communicate their meaning to the reader. These themes and sub-themes are analytically presented below throughout the sections of this report.

Before turning to a presentation of the findings of the present study, it would be useful to place the discussion on the definition of conflict resolution practice within a wider conversation in the social sciences that touches upon the relationship between theory and practice.

F. Context: Discussion on the Relationship between Theory and Practice

A central question to be addressed and a starting point for this endeavor is the definition of conflict resolution practice. The subject of the study, therefore, is part of a wider question that has long been discussed in different social science disciplines. However, in order to define practice one needs first to define the relationship between scholarship and practice. For many years the dominant view on social science practice was that of `technical rationality`, which viewed practice as the application of theory and research to solving problems (Kielhofner, 2005). At the foundation of this paradigm laid the assumption that knowing *how to do something* flows directly from *knowing about something*. The main consequences of such an approach were: a) a belief in the superiority of theory and research over practical knowing, and b) frequent isolation of scholars away from practitioners (Kielhofner, 2005).

As a result of the first, practice was seen as a less important locus of knowledge. The epistemological status of practical knowledge as a distinct mode of knowing in its own right was rarely recognized, and emphasis was given to theoretical knowledge as a key to understanding social life and deal with the phenomena associated with it. As a result of the second, practitioners often found scholarship insufficiently relevant to social reality as they experienced it, and more importantly as it was idiosyncratically experienced by social actors themselves. Thus, technical rationality has been often challenged, with critiques focusing on the assumption that theoretical knowledge contains all the necessary information for practice. (Kielhofner, 2005). Critics of technical rationality centered on the argument that theoretical knowledge about social phenomena, valuable as it may be, is not sufficient for solving problems related to these phenomena (Schon, as cited in Kielhofner, 2005: 233). Being generated by scholars distanced from the complex social

reality and in a mode devoid of dialectic processes with social subjects, theoretical knowledge seemed only partly able to capture social experience in a comprehensive and nuanced way. Furthermore, this scientific isolation led to inefficient ways of communicating knowledge, which did not facilitate its understanding, interpretation and application by a wider audience as might be intended (Van De Ven, 2007). In other words, even when scholarship was relevant to practical circumstances, due to this `transfer gap` it might not fulfill its total potential.

The above concerns gave birth to a new conception of scholarship which seeks to discover new ways to solve problems of people and society, by contesting the traditional understandings of theory and practice and, importantly, by bridging the gap between them. This new paradigm is called `engaged scholarship`. Scholarship of engagement is defined by Van de Ven as: “a participative form of research for obtaining the different perspectives of key stakeholders (researchers, users, clients, sponsors, and practitioners) in studying complex problems. By involving others and leveraging their different kinds of knowledge, engaged scholarship can produce knowledge that is more penetrating and insightful than when scholars or practitioners work on the problems alone” (2007: 9). This paradigm signaled a fundamental shift in the way social scientists viewed their relationship with society; within these parameters academics developed new ways to “relate their teaching, discovery, integration and application activities with people and place outside the campus and ultimately direct the work of the academy `toward larger, more human ends`” (Boyer, 1996). It was through these developments that practical knowledge found its place as a constituent element of scientific knowledge and professional ethos; the epistemological status of practical knowledge has been recognized and elevated to the level of a distinct mode of knowing in its own right (Van De Ven, 2007).

Scholarship of engagement brought with it a number of important developments that in many accounts reflected an evolutionary shift in social sciences: a) its dialectic nature facilitated the development of more elicitive and inclusive processes, rendering social sciences more responsive to the needs of society, through a creative combination of scientific work and social concern²; b) as a consequence of the ongoing dialogue between scholarship and society, sophisticated academic ideas have been reframed in an easily accessible language for a wider audience. This led to a `democratization of scientific knowledge`, amplifying in this way its transformative potential. Struggling with the dual hurdles of `relevance` and `rigor`, engaged scholars have managed to demonstrate that accessibility does not mean less rigor. Furthermore, the dialectic character of engaged scholarship leaves room for systematic self-reflection--a major mechanism of learning from experience and an indispensable part of self-development. Engaged scholarship has been detrimental in helping social scientists identify potential inadequacies of existing paradigms, explore new possibilities and develop innovative meaning perspectives.

² For Boyer engaged scholarship means “creating a special climate in which the academic and civic cultures communicate more continuously and more creatively with each other” (1996: 33).

It is largely within this context that discussions on conflict resolution practice are taking place because this conception of scholarship seems to be particularly relevant to the field of Conflict Resolution. It appears that by definition our field cannot be esoteric and isolated from social reality—because inherently, conflict resolution scholarship needs to be engaged with society. Accordingly, S-CAR, as a leading institution in the CAR field, has been always trying to question the scientific isolation in its systematic efforts to conceptualize ways for addressing conflict constructively.

The next section presents the findings of the interviews with S-CAR faculty.

G. Findings

G.1. Defining Conflict Resolution Practice

Proto-theme: Definition of Conflict Resolution Practice

This understanding of scholarship that was presented in the previous section has largely informed the way S-CAR faculty members define conflict resolution practice. Not surprisingly, there is extensive diversity in how S-CAR scholar-practitioners define practice and this reality reflects the multiplicity of ways that they have been engaged with society. An analytic look and attempt to identify several sub-themes that emerged throughout the interviews are as follows:

- **Multiplicity of Understandings and Definitions.** Conflict resolution practice is defined by S-CAR faculty in a number of ways ranging from narrow definitions that see conflict resolution practice as ‘a skillful intervention in a conflict system through well-known/traditional forms of intervention, such as mediation, facilitation, interactive conflict resolution, and consultation’, to broader definitions that view practice as ‘any action that intends to constructively influence a conflict system’. Despite the words ‘narrow’ and ‘broad’ used here, it would be misleading to think of definitions of practice as ranging across a linear continuum from ‘narrow’ definitions to ‘broad’ definitions. These would rather be seen as different understandings of what constitutes conflict resolution practice that do not necessarily fall within a given continuum.
- **Questioning the Traditional/Narrow Understanding of Practice/Boundaries between Scholarship and Practice.** Challenging the traditional understanding of what is included in conflict resolution practice was a central theme in many interviews with S-CAR faculty. This seems to show that a clear-cut separation of scholarship and practice is largely not seen as being relevant in the field of conflict resolution. In regards to this point an interviewee said: “the splitting off of practice from research and publication and scholarship – if you want to name that theory or whatever – I think is very problematic. I think we’re always doing all of those in different...and we may emphasize one or another, but going down the road of kind of drawing a line around practice, if that’s at all what’s happening, I think is

probably not a great direction”.

A metaphor that was used to describe the deficiencies associated with a narrow conception of practice is that this conception is a ‘little umbrella’ and some people may feel like they are getting wet. In that sense it falls short of including “what a variety of people – scholars, practitioners, and others – might be doing in the world to work against conflict”. As will be discussed more explicitly below, research and teaching are also considered by a number of S-CAR faculty members as a form of practice. One of the interviewees noted: “I guess I do find it, you know, problematic that there are these activities sort of bounded as practice, and that they are somehow separate from research that we do, and from teaching, and from ourselves as scholars. And I think we’re struggling with how to think about... as a community, how to think about those designations”. Similarly, another interviewee stated emphatically: “There is no clear separation. I’m not saying ‘today I’m doing practice!’”.

- **Scholarship with Commitment.** A number of S-CAR faculty see scholarship with commitment to be part of their practice; as the field of CAR cannot be esoteric, engagement with society constitutes a central dimension in CAR scholarship. They see this type of scholarship as having transformative potentials through teaching, publishing and media appearances. Education and publications may have important cognitive, discursive and behavioral consequences: they may influence the way people (students, policy-makers, civil society, actors involved in conflict) think about conflict, talk about conflict, and behave when in conflict. Within these frames, training, coaching and capacity building were also seen as a form of intervention.
- **‘Democratization’ of Academic Work as a Form of Practice.** An important theme that emerged during the interviews with S-CAR faculty members was the ‘democratization’ of academic work: translating sophisticated academic ideas into easily accessible language to facilitate understanding and application of academic knowledge by a wider audience. One of the interviewees referred to it as ‘massive classroom’ model, arguing that it is a way for the scholar to reengage with the world. Increasing awareness on issues of social concern, identify stakeholders and opening channels of communication between them in order to stimulate constructive public dialogue was also seen as an important component of conflict resolution practice. Here, there is a clear notion of speaking publicly and consciousness-raising as forms of practice.

A term that came up during the interview with one of the S-CAR faculty members was that of ‘informative prevention’. This idea centers on diagnosing issues of social concern, and identifying conflicts that are likely to emerge in the future. It also includes being proactive in using academic ideas and in communicating them to a wider audience with the objective of constructively changing the terms of the debate itself. Clearly, here the emphasis is placed on the social transformative potential of conflict resolution practice. It is also evident that the above insights

underline the relational aspect of practice meaning that it does not take place in a vacuum but rather occurs through interactive terms and engagement with society.

- **Research as a Form of Practice Dialectic in Nature.** Also, within the frames of engaged scholarship, research is seen as a form of practice, as it is a process that is dialectic in nature. Social actors may get from the researcher-intervener insights on conflict resolution practice that will enable them to consider new ways to deal constructively with the issues they face.³ At the same time, the engaged scholar through this interaction is also educated by social actors, acquiring insights that may render her/his practice more relevant and responsive to social concerns. This is “working with the public both in terms of speaking to the public and learning from the public...scholarship is the thing that is research and theory, and those things should not be separated off in the Eiffel tower, but in fact should be in dialogue with the broader civil society”. Importantly, this relates to the issue of where the questions come from. Apart from academic discussions, as one of the interviewees said “there are things happening in the world... people themselves are mini scholars, if you will, they are all engaged in reflective practice too. So, this...requires that we pay attention to the way people are talking”. This clearly points to the elicitive dimension of conflict resolution practice.
- **Teaching as a Form of Practice.** A number of S-CAR faculty members see teaching as a form of conflict resolution practice. This type of practice centers on sharing insights of conflict resolution expertise that people can incorporate in their own thinking and ethos. One of the interviewees stated: “I’d always seen teaching as a political practice. And my particular political practice, I think, is geared toward those aims of conflict resolution”. Another interviewee underlines the importance of “sharing some of the things I know how to do as a scholar and trying to teach them to others and how to have them be more politically relevant and supportive of social justice. So that's another, that's another form of practice that I consider to be practice there”. Here conflict resolution education is seen as a vehicle for positive social transformation: “I think spreading conflict resolution education around the world so far as we can is also form of practice”. Reference was also made in the different `practice` elements that exist in the S-CAR curriculum, such as the Overseas Experiential Learning Seminars, the Experiential Learning Activities (ELAs) and the Applied Theory and Practice programs.
- **Social Justice Component in CR Practice.** A number of S-CAR faculty argued that there is a social justice component in conflict resolution practice. For them, conflict resolution practice includes “a broad set of things like working against hierarchy, calling attention to power in all of its dimensions, and helping people to understand the nature of power, hierarchy, inequality, discrimination... So, I

³ It is important to note here that not everybody sees this as practice. One of the interviewees stated: “My answer is what I do in my role as a member of faculty at ICAR; I research, teach, write, talk and engage with policy makers, NGOs, think tanks. But to me what drives that is a research agenda, a research-theory agenda and I do not see that as practice”

actually see that as part of conflict resolution practice as well, and that's fundamentally an educative activity”.

The above points were largely an attempt to identify a number of underlying themes in defining conflict resolution practice, as reflected in the interviews the research team had with S-CAR faculty. As the reader might be interested in how each faculty member defines conflict resolution practice, **Appendix 3** lists verbatim quotes from the definition of practice that each faculty member came up with.

G.2. Personal History of S-CAR Faculty Members as Practitioners –Proto-theme: Areas of Practice

S-CAR is a community comprising scholar-practitioners with diverse backgrounds that span across different social science disciplines ranging from anthropology and political science to sociology and economics. Accordingly, the equally diverse practice carried out by S-CAR faculty covers a multiplicity of areas in social reality. The following areas were identified in the 17 interviews include:

- Democratization, human rights advocacy, genocide prevention, post-conflict reconstruction, elections monitoring, process design, peacemaking, peacebuilding, religion and conflict, inter-religious dialogue and peacebuilding, spiritual peacebuilding, intercultural dialogue, citizen diplomacy, inequality and social justice, law and social justice, restorative justice, transitional justice, reconciliation, community conflict, community-based peace education, civil society building, media/ social media & conflict, terrorism and `war on terror`, civil discourse, incivility, hate speech, identity conflict, gender & conflict, economy & conflict, development and conflict, poverty & social conflict, globalization and conflict, immigration, xenophobia, racism, capacity building, conflict resolution training, sustained dialogue, environmental conflict and climate change, facilitating communication, intergroup dynamics, relationship building, intergenerational conflict, organizational conflict, youth empowerment, educating/ training policy makers, conflict assessment, historical narratives and history education, evaluation, conflict prevention, HIV awareness, and death penalty

G.3 Proto-theme: Level of Practice

The intention of conflict resolution practice is to instigate cognitive and behavioral positive change of certain individuals/groups/social actors and to spread this change to as many segments of the larger society as possible. The scope of conflict resolution practice as carried out by S-CAR faculty has been very broad and practice has taken place at different levels and has engaged a multiplicity of actors. An important factor to remember is that the distinction between the different levels of intervention may be analytically

useful at a certain level of abstraction, but in reality they are in a constant interplay with each other and are not necessarily subject to such clear-cut distinctions. Across the levels described below S-CAR faculty members have been working with different actors and the focus of S-CAR practice has ranged from radical grassroots-level actors to elite-level actors. One of the interviewees stated: “So really the work has spanned from working with...very elite international organizations to extreme grassroots”. Among others, S-CAR faculty members have involved in their initiatives a large number of actors such as political, religious and economic elites, civil society actors, representatives of the legislative, university and high school students, the army, representatives of armed groups/ resistance movements, academics and teachers, local authorities, community leaders and grassroots, NGOs, human rights activists, youth, women, diasporas, journalists, museums and many more.

- **Individual/Intrapersonal Level.** A number of S-CAR faculty members have worked to achieve positive change at the individual level. One of them stated: “I did a couple of works on making peace in our own life... It has to do with how we manage our emotions and expectations”. Similarly, conflict resolution initiatives by S-CAR faculty at this level have attempted to achieve “attitudinal and perceptual change followed by the ego change”. The majority of initiatives at this level include capacity building and skills development training programs.
- **Interpersonal Level.** Some S-CAR faculty members carry out practice at interpersonal level. Emphasis here is place on the relational space between the parties and interpersonal dynamics. One of the interviewees responded that at this level his practice involves “sitting down with individuals and informing them of how a conflict resolution insight might be useful for them”. An important note that needs to be made here is that while some initiatives focus on interpersonal level, the overall goal is to achieve positive change at a meso or macro level through transfer of positive change. An example would be the development of an agreement and improvement of relations between religious leaders at interpersonal level, with the goal of achieving positive change of individual agents with regard to their communities.
- **Group/Communal Level.** Interventions at this level are very common among S-CAR faculty with the goal to help communities (in different countries throughout the world) engage in constructive dialogue about problems that community members face and for which they seek ways to deal with effectively. Examples of intervention at the community level include the Dialogue and Difference Project, the Arlington County Diversity Dialogue series, a series of workshops in Prague on issues of violence against Roma, community training in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Burundi and Indonesia and many more. An important note to be made here is that a number of community interventions have been carried out through the Applied Theory and Practice program. Finally at this level, a number of initiatives have dealt with organizational conflicts.

- **Intergroup Level.** A number of initiatives have attempted to use a wide range of methods to positively change the relational space between different groups where members are often affected by a conflict. Practice work here entails group members' involvement in dialogical processes where they can share their views, become familiar with alternative views and seek for workable solutions in an effort to deal constructively with the problems they face.
- **Public Opinion (local, national and international).** As mentioned earlier in this report, a central goal in conflict resolution practice as carried out by a number of S-CAR faculty has been to positively change the terms in which social actors think about, talk about, and deal with social problems at different levels. This transformative impact on the public discourse has been one of the central aims of the conflict resolution practice as carried out by some interviewees.
- **With an Eye on the Macro Level: Working With Governmental Actors/State Structures/Elites.** Engaging track-one actors, policy makers and elites while carrying out conflict resolution practice is another common theme. The intention is to instigate positive change in decision making and have this change spread at the macro level through the influence these actors exert and through policy making mechanisms. A number of S-CAR faculty members have worked with actors that head different hierarchical structures, ranging from political leaders and state officials, to religious leaders as well as prominent socio-political and economic actors.
- **Bridging Different Domains.** An interesting theme that emerged in our interviews with S-CAR faculty was the notion of practitioner as a `translator`, where the practitioner becomes a bridge between actors across different levels, and opens channels of communication between groups that otherwise would not necessarily be in communication. An example would be a practitioner who becomes a link between grassroots and higher levels, voicing the views of communities to decision makers with the objective to develop policies that are more relevant and responsive to the needs of the concerned stakeholders and beneficiaries. In this respect, one of the interviewees stated: "I think in a lot of my work I've tried to bridge domains and groups of people that don't necessarily have a[n] obvious affinity...again the effort was to get groups talking to each other, who might not otherwise talk to each other".

G.4. Proto-theme: Stimuli for Practice

S-CAR faculty members' practice is driven by a number of factors. Practice initiatives are carried out either as personal initiatives of the practitioner or as a response to requests made by others. What follows is a list of sub-themes that emerged in our discussing with the interviewees in regards to what drives their practice.

- **Current events, Developments, Debates as Stimuli for Practice.** At S-CAR, conflict resolution practice may be stimulated by current developments in the social universe. S-CAR faculty members are attentive to events, processes or discussions in the public sphere and accordingly think of ways to positively intervene and constructively contribute to those developments. Of course, S-CAR faculty members focus largely on areas related to their interests, experience and expertise. One of the interviewees responded: “I do mostly policy-oriented work, practice if you wish, and is related to current events. It is often that something comes up in a country that I know something about...one that in my point of view I find an interesting scholarly academic puzzle”. Similarly another respondent stated: “much of my practice emerges from processes in civil society, that is by being attentive to civil society itself and what’s going on there, so that one can then intervene in that process as a scholar”. Here, it is worth noting that being attentive to developments in society is not tantamount to ‘ambulance chasing’, as the latter leads to crisis-driven responses instead of more proactive engagement.
- **Requests from Others.** S-CAR faculty members may choose to engage in practice initiatives as a result of requests made by various stakeholders, such as parties experiencing conflict or being affected by a social problem, colleagues, students, or policy makers. “One of the things that I do...is that I do things based on invitation, particularly into contexts that are not my own”. Within this context, important aspects are the role of reputation and the existence of networks of social relations that have been developed over time, where individuals know that S-CAR faculty members have a particular expertise that may be relevant in a given context.
- **Personal Initiative—A Sense of Commitment.** An important theme that emerged during our research with S-CAR faculty members was the positioning of the engaged scholar as a unique contributor and his/her sense of moral commitment to intervene as an expert in a given situation of social concern. This commitment is reflected in the will of the engaged scholar to share his/her expertise, fill existing gaps, identify social needs, and raise awareness of existing or emerging issues while suggesting ways of dealing constructively with them. Illustrative of such example was the answer of one of the interviewees who asserted “One of the main stimuli is when I see that there is a particular role that I can play and that hasn’t been played by the others and that the others are not in the position to play. When there is a unique contribution that I can make”, while another one pointed out “I think it is commitments probably more than anything”.

G.5. Proto-theme: Partnerships

In their efforts to deal constructively with conflict at different levels, S-CAR faculty members develop partnerships with a number of actors. These partnerships reflect collaborative processes that deal both with the diagnosis of a conflict/social problem/

social need and with the planning and implementation of related interventions.

- **Broad Understanding of Partnership.** `Partnership` here is not meant to be a contractual relationship. Rather it encompasses a series of formal and informal relationships between different actors that work towards the same end. As one of the interviewee put it such relationships represent “a very broad understanding of partnership reflecting I think a very broad understanding of practice”.
- **List of Partners.** S-CAR faculty’s practice partners may be internal or external and include:
 - STUDENTS
 - Colleagues –academics –alumni network
 - Other educational institutions
 - Governments and authority structures (local, national or international)
 - Diplomats
 - NGOs
 - Civil society actors –Human rights activists –advocacy groups
 - IGOs
 - INGOs
 - Think tanks
 - Social science scholar organizations
 - Journalists and analysts
 - Professional associations
 - Religious institutions
 - Community groups –community agencies
 - Museums
- **Partnering with Governments.** Some interviewees expressed concerns about working with governments. One interviewee when asked if he works with the government he responded: “No, if I can avoid it... part of the problem with working with governments is that almost inevitably you get identified as an agent of that government” and added “of course, it depends on what the politics of the government are and what the image of that government is”.

G. 6. Proto-theme: What Informs Practice

As part of the interviews with S-CAR faculty an attempt was made to identify the factors that inform their practice. The research team identified the following themes emerging from the interviewees’ responses.

- **Importance of Analysis Prior to Intervention.** All interviewees underlined the importance of sound analysis and diagnosis of a conflict/social problem, drawing from a wide range of theoretical traditions, before designing and implementing

practice. They viewed that interventions based on poor analyses/assessments of a conflict system are not only less likely to achieve their goals but they are also potentially dangerous with respect to resulting into unintended consequences. Critical here is the collection of data and information gathering that inform the potential intervener and help him or her develop an accurate understanding of the conflict. Conflict mapping also helps determine the right methodology with regard to a particular context. Useful in this endeavor are a series of analytic frameworks and scholarly frames and models that help potential interveners diagnose a given situation

Based on the insights offered by the interviewees, questions to be addressed before an intervention may include: who are the parties? Who is affected by the conflict? Are there any unrepresented voices? What are the parties' goals? Are they trying to address, manage or avoid a problem? Are there issues that the parties are not prepared to approach? What are the intervener's goals? What are the resources at the intervener's disposal? Whom do we need to engage? What are potential points of entry for the intervener? What are potential constraints/challenges and opportunities for the intervener? In what way can the intervener secure the sustainability and the viability of the intervention? This list of questions was not exhaustive and these just reflect some general questions that need to be taken into consideration before designing and implementing practice initiatives. Finally, since conflict interventions are dynamic processes that take place within a wide range of actors related to a particular conflict context or system, 'Scenarios Development Exercises' are also part of some S-CAR faculty tool-kit in their effort to be better prepared for field work and interventions.

- **Reflective Practice.** A number of interviewees emphasized the reflective component of their practice and the importance of being attentive in every step before, during and after the intervention. Reflection increases self-awareness and enables practitioners to identify potential inadequacies of existing paradigms or practices, explore new possibilities and develop innovative perspectives. This can be seen as learning from experience and from dialectics with society with an evaluative dimension in reflective practice during which individuals assess the adequacy and power of existing paradigms in the light of new experiences and insights.
- **Elicitive Processes:** Many interviewees shared that they use elicitive processes in their practice. Adopting such an approach relates to an increased realization that people, who have idiosyncratically experienced a conflict and are familiar with the overall context of a conflict context and system have a better understanding of the inside dimensions of such a conflict and their experience constitutes a major source of knowledge that often inform an intervention process. One interviewee noted that when one intervenes, one needs to be "very carefully and listen to the people there, cause they really know what the conflict is about from their point of view". Similarly, another interviewee stated: "elicitive peace-building is built on

an ethical position and that ethical position is that more often than not people that is in the situation have greater wisdom than even they themselves sometimes know”.

Moreover, many interviewees stated that there are no universal, one-size-fits-all models of intervention; and thus one needs to constantly seek input from people on the ground through dialectic inclusive elicitive processes. One respondent noted: “I focus on the process and not the resolution... The idea is not necessarily us resolving their conflicts. Instead it is us working with them to develop methods and processes on how they can resolve their conflict. We help them to think and find ways to talk about their conflict”.

Another respondent described the basic parameters of his elicitive practice as following: “I see theory and research as preparatory for my practice encounters...but when I am in the practice encounter I suspend those theories and I consider the experience I’m having in the encounter to be the raw material for a new theory or revised theory or confirmation of theory, but I don’t let the theory guide my interactions at all. My interactions are guided completely by the relationships and where those relationships are going to take me. So I don’t make any pre-determinations. If people ask my advice as part of the encounter, then sometimes I’ll draw on theory, but mostly it will be on an intuitive level as a practitioner”.

- **Commitments.** A number of interviewees underlined the importance of professional, political and social commitments as central factors that inform their practice. These commitments may take the form of moral obligation to work for social justice, for the best interest of the parties in conflict, or to contribute to the further development of knowledge related to conflict resolution practice. Finally, a number of S-CAR faculty members mentioned that it is a strong sense of public accountability that informs their practice.
- **Importance of Responsiveness and Flexibility.** Responsiveness to developments occurring on the ground and adaptability were also emphasized by S-CAR faculty members. In regards to flexibility, one interviewee noted: “We also have to be flexible; we also have a design that allows the facilitators to be flexible to make changes in the moment. And this is absolutely critical, this balance between planning a workshop and revising a workshop is absolutely critical. And then to understand where...you know, what the reactions are, and to try to be interactive and open to responses from whomever I’m trying to interact with, or wherever I’m trying to intervene. So to have a spirit of openness.... adaptability of some kind”. Here the interviewee talked specifically about facilitation, but his words reflected a general understanding of flexibility in conflict resolution practice.

Moreover, another responded seemed to share the same belief in the importance of flexibility and adaptability: “I spend a lot of time adapting what I’m doing to

the particular audience...I spend a lot of time thinking about who I'm going to be interacting with and how I might best couch my message". Finally, a related theme here has to do with the control the practitioner has over the intervention process as very often practitioners may not be in a position to control the process and the basic parameters of the design of an intervention. Here flexibility is also imperative. In regards to this point one of the interviewees stated: "there are times where I am asked to do training and I have a significant amount of control of the content and the direction of the training. There are other times where...I am not in charge of designing that system; so, it's me trying to create the platform on which I can act".

G. 7. Proto-theme: Methods of Conflict Resolution Practice

Only a few S-CAR faculty members have not had many opportunities to use CAR practice methods because of the nature of their work and focus. As noted above, the majority of S-CAR professors have used a multiplicity of conflict resolution methods given the multi-disciplinarity of approaches. These have ranged from traditional methods to non-traditional ones depending on the understanding of practice that each faculty member has. The traditional methods have included processes such as capacity building and training, conflict assessment, facilitation, forum gathering, interactive conflict resolution and problem-solving workshop, mediation. As presented earlier in this report other faculty members view their respective practice in broader terms and employ methods that do not necessarily match a traditional understanding of practice. Whether traditional or non-traditional, various methods S-CAR faculty has been using encompass the following based on their input during the interviews:

- Negotiation, Facilitation, Mediation, Interactive Conflict Resolution, Problem Solving Workshops, Public Dialogue, Empowerment, Active Listening, Process Design, Media appearances and use of Social Media for advocacy, Teaching and Mentoring, Leading by Example, Conflict Resolution Training, Confidence Building, Capacity Building, Relationship Building, Trust Building, Elicitive Peacebuilding, Citizen Diplomacy, Appreciative Inquiry, Conflict Assessment, Narrative Approaches/ Processes, Conferences, Opening channels of communication between experts and between interested parties, Resource mobilization, Traditional conflict resolution processes (e.g. Sulha), and Informative Provention (being attentive to developments in society and public dialogue, identify potentially problematic issues and toxic narratives, identify potential points of entry and use theoretical knowledge and research to positively transform public dialogue).

G. 8. Proto-theme: Resources

Faculty's input related to securing resources for their respective practice work at S-CAR

span relational networking, financial grants and awards from different governmental and non-governmental institutions, academic relationships and expertise within GMU or other universities (intellectual capital available due to the network of academic institutions); human resources through in-kind and volunteering from faculty and students, and conflict parties, or faculty members' own resources. Other resources are of a material nature and these include space, phones, computers and access to a wide-range of research and literature through a variety of sources.

It is important to note that a number of interviewees mentioned that sometimes receiving funds might be seen as compromising their work. Thus, in certain occasions they have refrained from seeking funding in order to avoid restraints that grants might impose on the interventions. One of the interviewees noted: "in my own practice [as an individual practitioner and not through his institutional position] I consciously decided not to try to get funds; because I found that the funds interfered with the work and distorted what I wanted to do... and it also sometimes endangered everything... On average, a lot of what you do, also, is that you seek funding for things that are more standard –like training- in order for you to do the more serious work that may not be fundable".

These practitioners have often relied on what they could do without seeking external funding. In regards to this last point, a number of interviewees noted that they consider one of the biggest resources is the freedom and independence they enjoy as part of an academic institution. Finally, although it did not appear in many interviews, it is important to note that some interviewees listed resilience as a critical resource for conflict resolution practitioners.

G. 9. Challenges and Ethical concerns:

In our discussions the interviewees identified a number of challenges and ethical concerns. Various challenges have included the difficulties that many S-CAR faculty members have encountered when they seek financial support for their practice work. Other challenges also encompass dealing with a wide-range of administrative, procedural, and practical hurdles. Impact and sustainability of practice, physical endurance and mental stress, time constraints, as well as security concerns were also identified as constant challenges that S-CAR faculty members have to deal with within their practice work. Other significant challenges and concerns include the management of information, the question of relevance, managing expectations of stakeholders, and the questions of independence, neutrality and impartiality. At times, some of the challenges also present ethical concerns which are embedded within the following analysis which cover both aspects as follows:

- **Availability of Time:** It seems that finding the time to carry out practice has been a challenge for many S-CAR faculty members. Carrying out many different endeavors/tasks at same time has posed serious constraints for S-CAR practice. Oftentimes such constraints have hindered S-CAR faculty members' willingness to go as far as they

would like in terms of practice. One of the interviewees stated: “At S-CAR we have research, teaching, practice, service, and then you know, [we] try to add in personal life, or something like that”. Similarly, another interviewee responded: “Now the challenge of that is that you are supposed to work full-time; you are supposed to be producing books, you are supposed to be teaching and you got to squeeze the practice somehow into your life as a professor; and that is enormously difficult –it’s basically like having two careers”.

- **Mental and Physical Stress:** In relation to the previous point another challenge that S-CAR faculty members have had to wrestle with is the mental and physical difficulties that engagement in conflict resolution practice work often entails. One of the respondents stated that characteristically: “The exhaustion, the physical stress and the international travel have been huge challenges. Then, of course is the challenge, mental stress of working on conflicts that haven’t had any resolution –that’s absolutely exhausting”.
- **Acquiring Financial Resources.** Another challenge as identified by the interviewees is acquiring the necessary financial resources for carrying out practice. Although funding opportunities still exist, the number of actors competing over the same limited resources has increased, thus, rendering access to funding a more difficult endeavor.
- **Confidentiality.** A common challenge and ethical concern relates to the question of confidentiality. In general, S-CAR faculty’s efforts have centered on achieving a balance between open and honest communication among people involved in an initiative while ensuring that there is no attribution of ideas or statements to particular individual participants. To deal with this challenge and ethical concern, one of the interviewees stated: “I operate with the transparency about the processes I am engaged in and I don’t leave anything behind about the process and keep the content of the discussions confidential without attribution to anyone’s person”.
- **Reaching the Parties and Opening Channels of Communication:** A challenge that many S-CAR faculty members have faced involved determining the right ways of approaching the parties in a conflict, opening channels of communication among interested parties and creating a space for meaningful dialogue among them. As noted by one interviewee, “The greatest challenge is to really find ways in which the communication among the parties can create a space in which it is possible to make sense together”.
- **Challenge of Assessing Impact and Influence.** A central question that many S-CAR faculty members have faced entails how to assess the impact of an intervention. One interviewee asked: “How do you know that people are listening, paying attention, or somehow shaping policy?” The question of whether an intervention has positive impact in a given system has been one of the most discussed issues in the field. Taking into account the multiplicity of factors that exert influence on social reality it is

oftentimes difficult for an intervener to evaluate the impact of his/her work. A fact that has further complicate this challenge concerns the fact that some types conflict resolution practice may take unorthodox forms, which may not lend themselves to quantification and evaluation.

- **Managing Expectations:** In relation to the previous point a number of interviewees identified expectations management as one of the challenges that they have had to deal with in their practice work. Due to many reasons, very often conflict interventions only achieve small positive changes within a given system. Thus, the question of how to manage the expectations of both practitioners and parties involved in such intervention constantly looms such practice work. The fact that one decides to intervene does not necessarily mean that conflict is definitely going to end or that its positive transformation will occur in a short period of time. For this reason, those involved in such interventions need to be aware of what is attainable and when and what is not attainable. Often it is challenging to manage such reality. One interviewee noted: “How do we manage our own expectations and partners’?. We are not going to solve, for instance, the post-conflict problem in Liberia, but the partners might have bigger expectations than we do. To deal with that, I try to minimize my expectations and be open with my partners”.
- **Security Concerns.** Security of both the practitioner and the participants in a practice initiative is also a common concern among the interviewees. In conflict situations it is likely that authority structures or a number of social constituencies and actors may be hostile to conflict resolution initiatives. Under such circumstances S-CAR faculty members are concerned for their own physical safety and the safety of participants, especially in situations where faculty members are not fully familiar with certain political, social and cultural peculiarities of a given conflict, its environment and system. Illustrative are the following excerpts from the interviews with S-CAR faculty: “A major challenge has to do with security concerns. We were in a post-conflict country and not sure who among the community members is going to go off, how and why. So what we did was to encourage the students to put up their best behavior and be on the alert and respectful to the local customs and practices”. “In particular when you are working in settings like, like Tajikistan, for instance which is a deeply authoritarian state, not to be very aware that your actions could have repercussions... We cannot do interviews with people when we have security services on our tail because we’ll leave, we’ll be fine... [but people have worked with] will be intimidated...”
- **‘Do no Harm’:** In relation to the previous point a challenge that S-CAR faculty members’ have had to deal with in their practice work has been whether an intervention would be doing more harm than good. This challenge and ethical concern has been mainly a result of the faculty members being not in control of certain factors that might influence negatively the result of an intervention. In such cases it is challenging to know in advance what possible unintended consequences an intervention might have. S-CAR faculty members have dealt with such challenges

and ethical concerns by carrying out continuous reflection, staying attentiveness and responsiveness to the parties' needs and sensitivities, while regularly finding ways to identify potentially harmful aspects of their practice. In regards to this question one interviewee stated: "We try to be guided by the "Do no harm" concept. Nonetheless, we are not sure whether we have harmed someone's feeling or their views about themselves. And that's harm, but we might just not know. So to deal with this, we try to be careful but I can't swear that that hasn't happened. We try not to put anybody on the spot. Part of this is watching the cues".

- **The Challenge of Relevance.** Another challenge identified by some of the interviewees relates to rendering academic knowledge and practice relevant to social reality while remaining relevant. In order to do so S-CAR scholar-practitioners have remained attentive to what has been happening in society. Such process has helped them to a) inform their academic knowledge by current social realities, and b) frame their academic knowledge in ways that facilitate understanding and application within society. In this respect, an interviewee stated: "One of the biggest problems is that, because I'm so interested in respecting the narratives and categories of thought in more general public, that convincing specialists that they should be open to those ways of framing the problem [is challenging]...So, because I'm so interested in the broader public mind, there is a challenge in trying to convince people that they should actually be attentive to those categories, frames, and narratives. And that's a big challenge. Because people [colleagues] then think that maybe you don't understand that the debate has moved on. But, just because the intellectuals have moved on doesn't mean that the world has moved on".

A central principle here is to remain sensitive to and respectful of people's ideas and experiences and ask for their input. In regards to this point an interviewee adds: "So, we have these normative commitments towards peacebuilding and redressing injustice obviously, as I think we all do in this profession, but the implementation, the plan of action, the road ahead –as they say--we want to leave open to taking guidance and insight from the participants themselves, from the stakeholders, from the representatives. And this, in my opinion, is a normative stance; it's a stance we take by reflecting respect for the judgments for the ideas and the insight of the participants. It's respect that is not only strategic, because obviously they have to be committed to it in order for this to work, but, as I say, it is also a kind of ethical concern that I think underpins this method of practice. An ethical respect, a recognition and validation of how they see the road forward..."

- **Engaging Social Actors at Different Levels –Working against Established Views and Structures.** A number of interviewees responded that attracting public attention and attempting to change the way people think of and talk about certain issues of social concern has been particularly challenging. One of interviewees noted: "And this is probably one of the most common [challenges]; how you can convince these people, and what methods can you use to actually engage them in the process, because they resist it". Especially relevant here is the issue of power structures being

resistant to change. One interviewee noted: “Really getting attention and pushing people out of a sort of comfortable way of thinking... you know, if I see that as central to my practice there are so many things competing for attention that I do find that to be a challenge. I also think that sort of pervasive status-quo inequality out there in the world, I mean in some ways the way the world is organized, is a challenge because ...you know, it makes it harder to work against inequalities that people are living with”.

- **The Challenge of Affecting the `Macro` Level.** A relevant issue centers on how to instigate `macro` changes in a given system and become relevant to policy making. One interviewee stated: “The main challenges in this kind of work are getting people together, who are experts in a topic but also open-minded enough to consider that they might not have all the answers, and...moving.... After organizing discussions and so forth, the big challenge is to take the next steps to having make a difference in public policy...And this is very difficult...depending on the political state of the country it can be impossible”.
- **Sustainability.** Another challenge identified by many interviewees is that of sustainability. While achieving immediate goals is a valuable step, a number of interviewees argued that conflict resolution practice needs to prepare the ground for long-term social change. In other words, sustainability entails continuity and the pursuit of positive social change goals, even after the intervener leaves the ground. Effective capacity-building and empowerment of social actors are key ingredients to achieve sustainability. However, very often, for a number of reasons, conflict resolution practice focuses on immediate, first-order goals. While achieving such goals is a necessary step towards positive social change, it is equally imperative to help parties create the conditions for the pursuit of high-order goals in the long run. One of the interviewees stated: “what is important is [that] these people who are in the room to really [be in a position to] apply what they learn and you really change their everyday practice, perceptions, relations with others, and they will bring this knowledge to others”.
- **Question of Independence:** A number of interviewees mentioned that working with authority structures or getting hired by a conflict actor or an organization may potentially compromise conflict resolution practice work and interveners’ independence. This challenge and ethical concern exist because authorities or organizations that commission certain interventions may have their own agendas and may only be concerned with promoting their own interests. In regards to this challenge and ethical concern, one interviewee stated: “On the consulting thing, I say to the funder that you want me to write something about your question, but I decide the answer, you do not get to decide my answer if that is why you are hiring me. Maybe you do not like my answer that is fine, you get the question, I get the answer”. A related issue is that of conflict resolution practice being used as a pretext to promote certain interests or preserve given power arrangements. One interviewee describes an experience she had in a community dialogue initiative that she was asked

to organize and the dialogue was for a local development project. She stated: “It was an interesting project because it was positioned as engagement and participation, not as radical change... So, it was interesting because we were not sure about what we are being asked to do; are we just making it easier for the developers to chop down trees? It raised a lot of questions of justice and conflict... and where are [we] in the process... and we struggled with that one...and we got some unexplored conversations around what does it mean to engage in existing systems... So, I think one of the challenges is figuring out what people want and what would be ethical and possible to offer”.

- **Question of Impartiality:** Based on the interviewees, a number of S-CAR faculty members identified impartiality as a central challenge and ethical concern in conflict resolution practice because when they are being perceived as impartial interveners the success of the intervention may be in jeopardy. In such cases, transparency may be a useful strategy to deal with potential perils. The following excerpts illustrate this point: “well sometimes if I’m speaking with one group at a time, [I am] mindful of how that might be perceived by the other group with which the group I am addressing is in conflict, so I have to pay attention to that and address it and be very transparent about it”. “So, you sort of...you spend a lot of time trying to unify the rebels. Now, is that an ethical thing to do? Because from the government’s side, of course, it isn’t; because their attitude is “you do that, you make the rebels stronger, you make them more unified”; my attitude is “well, they are divided, you are not actually going to be able to negotiate with them in any meaningful way whatsoever; so, I am doing you a service by doing this, and you should let me get on with it... But ethically speaking, I may actually be strengthening these guys”.
- **Question of Neutrality:** Similarly, the issue of practitioners’ neutrality was also discussed in the interviews (although by only a limited number of interviewees). Here it was mentioned that practitioners must be perceived as neutral by the parties and as not having any personal interest in intervening in the given conflict system. In such cases, S-CAR faculty members have dealt with such challenge and ethical concern by being conscious and remaining aware of their own biases and how these biases may affect their understanding of a given situation.
- **Managing Information.** While attempting to analyze a conflict system and decide on the best course of action, S-CAR faculty members often face the challenge of how to effectively manage the various types of information as this challenge often has various dimensions. For instance, one dimension entails how to get information related to certain aspects of social reality in cases where such information is not available. Another dimension concerns how to manage an extensive amount of information while remaining attentive to what is happening on the ground. Moreover, another dimension is evaluating and assessing information sources while comparing different sorts of evidence against each other. Another final dimension relates to how to ensure that the conflict analysis includes the broadest possible set of perspectives that no voices remain unrepresented.

- **Corruption on the Ground.** Another challenge that some S-CAR faculty members encounter while carrying out their practice work is a level of corruption. In this context, corruption is not restricted to corrupt authority structures that pose obstacles to practitioners' work. One of the interviewees mentioned the corruption of non-governmental organizations where a number of them have monopolized access to resources while at the same time hinder access of services and programs (e.g. trainings and capacity building initiatives) to some social groups. In this respect, that interviewee stated "Again, the issue is that sometimes it is hard to identify the real people, because unfortunately with all these NGOs...you can say there is some corruption; there are the same people going to the same trainings, the same people getting money".
- **Challenges in Working with Colleagues:** One of the challenges identified by some interviewees relates to the disagreements among colleagues on how to proceed in a given case. Partners in an initiative may not see the same reality of the same situation. Thus, they may hold different views on what action to take. In such cases, having transparent and candid communication and dialectic processes may be useful in dealing with this challenge.
- **Relationship between an Academic Department and Society.** Some of S-CAR faculty members remarked that defining the relationship between S-CAR and society has been a challenge to them. As one interviewee noted: "A big challenge is: what is the relationship of an academic department to people that want consulting or help?... often the bridge that I can make then is: is this an opportunity for me and for students to learn something on the ground? Is this an opportunity for the university to give back to the surrounding community and in some way to break down sort of the theory role and to engage with the community and to establish some of those relationships ongoing. So, that's a challenge for me; figuring out whether I owe anything back to Arlington or Fairfax or local groups who are here, who see us as "You know something, could you help us"".
- **Importance of Collaboration to Deal with Challenges.** There are numerous challenges that S-CAR faculty members have encountered as they carry out their practice work. In order to deal with such challenges, some interviewees underlined importance of collaborative processes. Such processes can help promote seeking the views of colleagues (professional expertise) and local people involved in an initiative (idiosyncratic knowledge of the specifics of a given conflict system). This elicitive approach on how to deal with potential challenges may help S-CAR faculty members find effective ways to successfully overcome the challenges related to their practice work. With respect to this point one interviewee stated: "There are substantive procedural challenges related to the conflict and I address those by pointing them out to my local partners and together we are looking for solutions".

G. 10. Proto-theme: Evaluation

Despite the challenges highlighted previously in this report, systematic evaluation of conflict resolution practice work is imperative because assessing the impact of interventions can help improve the different dimensions of such practice.⁴ Within this context, some S-CAR faculty members use formal practice evaluation process; and others have not had the opportunity because of time pressure and/or lack of financial resources. An interviewee stated that evaluation “is the first thing that goes if it’s not a funded project or if it’s an ad hoc project”). Nevertheless, many S-CAR faculty members informally evaluate their activities by discussing with colleagues, partners and concerned individuals or groups. In such cases they have reviewed the summative and formative dimensions of their practice work while exploring how related activities have benefited participants. Such evaluations have helped identified areas for improvement although in such cases no formal evaluation method or process is used. Many S-CAR faculty members have also been subject of some type of evaluation process, for instance through the mid-term and end-of semester teaching mechanisms used at S-CAR or at the university. Importantly, a number of interviewees underlined the importance of reflection and the benefits it offers in terms of assessing conflict resolution practice. Below is a list with the themes that emerged during our discussions on evaluation with interviewees.

- **Formal Evaluation.** A number of interviewees have used formal evaluation processes to assess different formative and summative aspects of their conflict resolution practice work. These have included focus groups, interviews with participants, practitioners and key local stakeholders (before and after the intervention), observations, pre- and post-test surveys, and analysis of written artifacts. Sometimes the drive behind conducting formal evaluations--apart from the desire to assess explicitly the intervention and to be able to easily present the results in a wider audience—comes from sponsoring funding organizations’ requirements. A number of S-CAR faculty members consider formal evaluation an indispensable part of their work. For instance of the interviewees stated: “I usually have an action plan that addresses impact and viability. I no longer conduct “trainings” without a sustainable plan. I have local actors work to maintain continuity (when working internationally). When I do week-long programs, I have follow-up with participants”.
- **Informal Evaluation.** Some interviewees responded that it has not always been possible for them to conduct formal evaluations for a series of reasons. These include lack of resources, difficulty in using standardized forms of evaluations of the type of practice. For instance and interviewee mentioned: “I have not had a formal methodology, because I don’t work on those kinds of standardized projects”. This, however, does not mean that S-CAR faculty members who use informal evaluation

⁴ In regards to the importance of evaluation one interviewee stated: “I am a great believer in evaluation for two obvious reasons: a) one is to get funding; you know, if we can use the results, that’s kind of a tactical reason; b) the other is to learn from our mistakes, obviously, since we are engaged in skillful intervention, hopefully, and skills always need to be honed and improved based on experience, ‘what works’, and this is a very important element of determining what works and what doesn’t work”

are not assessing their work. Some of the informal evaluation processes they have used have been internal and have included self-reflection, self-evaluation and self-criticism, as well as observations of what happens before and during the intervention, and identifying and assessing areas that change over time after the intervention. Other informal evaluation processes have encompassed discussions with colleagues, with parties involved and local stakeholders about their experiences before, during and after the intervention. One of the interviewees noted: “[we engage in a] kind of a reflection, we have reflection...and we have time...actually after every day we have time where we reflect on what happened during the day, what worked, what didn’t work, how do we make changes and so on.”

Other interviewees have assessed the impact of their work by remaining attentive to their projects’ impact developments over time in order to identify positive cognitive and behavioral changes of the parties involved, changes in the public discourse, or changes in public policy. For instance, one of them stated: “[it is a success when you get] some sense that you’ve actually changed the public categories...I know that I’ve changed that conversation because I see any time anyone writes about it they are using my research...Changing the public conversation and [finding] evidence of that”. Similarly, another one noted: “If public policy changes [as a result of our efforts] then I know it was a success. But, if it actually alters the national conversation so that people refer to it and ideas expressed get out, get into the public –bloodstream kind of- then I think you can say that you have at least a partial success.”

- **The Notion of `Incrementalism`.** An interesting concept that emerged in the interviewees was that of `incrementalism` in conflict resolution practice work. This notion centers on initially establishing first-order goals for practice work and followed by higher-order goals to be achieved in the long-run. Within these frames conflict resolution practice work can be assessed by identifying at different levels, small increments of positive change that follow an intervention. In this respect, one interviewee noted: “We must look at each intervention in its own place in time...We must judge our conflict resolution work one increment at a time, and then move resolutely with each increment toward lasting change that indeed addresses the deep roots of conflict through paradigm shifts in attitudes, behaviors, and worldviews”.
- **Importance of Assessing Sustainability.** A central concern in terms of conflict resolution practice relates to assessing the sustainability of an initiative. A number of interviewees noted that following up with the parties involved, and exploring whether the situation is progressing towards a positive direction over time are critical for the long term success of an initiative. As a case in point, one interviewee stated: “One of the big weaknesses has always seemed to me about this and it’s connected to the absence of resources is the follow-up...you know...you are hanging these people out to dry when they go back home. So, really and truly speaking, ethically [we] owe it to them to give them as much support as [we] possibly can. That means going back soon after they go back, checking on how they are doing, talking to the authorities, and trying to...basically sort of find out if the messages got across, if it is actually

resonating with anybody, if it is going to result in any action...and that's the methodology that [we] have to use" to assess and embed sustainability in our practice work.

G.11. Proto-theme: Success in Conflict Resolution Practice

With regard to the success of conflict resolution practice work, our interviews with S-CAR faculty centered mainly on two dimensions: a) what is successful practice, and b) what are the factors that increase the likelihood of successful practice.

- In regards to the first sub-theme (what successful practice is) S-CAR faculty members have looked at two dimensions. The first dimension entails the satisfaction of stakeholders, meaning if the parties feel that an intervention satisfies their interests, then it has been successful. One interviewee stated: "It was successful because the event was successful the client was very happy, we did a good design for what they were asking for". Similarly, another interviewee remarked: "A successful practice is when all the stakeholders find something satisfactory". The second dimension indicates that conflict resolution practice may be perceived as being successful if it instigates shifts towards positive communication, relational and behavioral patterns at different levels, and if it causes positive changes in dysfunctional and unjust structures. In this context, one interviewee remarked: "[In successful practice there is] positive recognition of the parties that [are] in a conflict as [they] discovered a way to be in a conflict differently." Another interviewee mentioned: "A common understanding between people on what the common goals are and how you go about that" can be considered as successful practice. Others noted: "I really think just kind of moving people to think differently than they might have when you first encounter them". "People go talking to each other across divisions, they adopt ideas that [are] developed during the workshop and they feed them into official track-one processes. Sometimes, you can tell this, by...you will see language suddenly appearing in official communication, you recognize this being part of what you did". All these are signs of successful practice work based on the views of many S-CAR faculty members.
- **Factors Increasing the Likelihood of Success.** In regards to the second sub-theme (what are the factors that increase the likelihood of successful practice), interviewees identified the following as key factors that increase the likelihood of success:
 - **Expertise.** Having the necessary knowledge, experience and skills is seen as a catalyst for success. Good theoretical knowledge, informed by insights acquired through prior experiences, and incorporation of this knowledge into practice endeavors are critical to toward developing a sound expertise that can drive success.
 - **Good Preparation and Good Research.** S-CAR interviewees asserted that

intervention based on poor research in all likelihood will result in unintended negative consequences. To avoid such pitfalls, many S-CAR faculty members mentioned that they have used good preparatory work and research, as well as sound thinking about what could potentially lead to unintended consequences regarding as a result of an intervention.

- **Team Work and Colleagues.** Many S-CAR faculty members remarked that collaborating with other colleagues in some aspects of their conflict resolution practice work have been crucial to the success of related projects. However such collaboration needs to be anchored in smooth, productive, and creative processes as well as respect, openness and good communication among the collaborators. For instance, one interviewee noted: “You and your partner should be learning from each other.” Another respondent talking about an initiative mentioned: “...it was also successful because the facilitation team worked really well together, we learned a lot from each other; we had a clear sense of if the client came back what we would do differently and offer for a next step.” Furthermore, many S-CAR faculty members shared that another key dimension of collaborating with other colleagues to carry out practice work has been the enjoyment of a strong collaboration. One interviewee confessed: “I have fun doing it (laugh); I enjoy it!”
- **Good Communication.** S-CAR faculty members stressed the importance of communicating effectively and meaningfully with colleagues and interested parties alike. According to an interviewee “[Success] is grounded in communication, a deep communication with the people.”
- **Creating Safe Space.** Creating an environment where parties feel safe to engage in conflict resolution processes is critical to successful practice. To create this safe space, the intervener needs to ensure that nothing jeopardizes the physical or emotional safety of those involved in a practice initiative. One of the interviewees stated: “[there should be] negotiated or agreed upon guidelines for confidentiality or anonymity or how you talk about this outside of the context of the project itself.”
- **Trustworthiness.** Many S-CAR faculty members shared that the trust parties place in interveners is also a core ingredient for carrying out successful practice work. Some interviewees also stated that during interventions where they earned the trust of the parties, the parties often seem to feel safe and more willing to open up. In this respect trustworthiness in conflict resolution practice work has helped parties become more confident and strengthened their engagement during peace processes.
- **Transparency.** S-CAR faculty members also highlighted the need to help interested parties develop a clear understanding of the specifics underlying an

intervention process. In their views, conflict resolution practice work needs to be designed based on a transparent intervention process where the goals and related objectives are effectively communicated to concerned or interested parties.

- **Commitment and Engagement.** S-CAR faculty members considered that commitment to both the wider and the specific goals of conflict resolution practice work has been a key determinant of success and continuous engagement is critical to this end. One interviewee stated: “what I bring to my work is a commitment to long-term engagements”, while another one noted: “I think [commitment] is being very tightly engaged with the problems that are emerging in the broader civil sphere. If I am successful it’s because I’m trying to be attuned. If I am attuned to what’s actually happening and not simply to what I wish were happening, but what it’s actually happening, and then I organize my research, let’s say, in a rigorous way so that people would respect it, I think that would help make these changes happen.”

However, it is important to keep in mind that apart from practitioner’s commitment and engagement, parties’ commitment is *a sine qua non* for success. With respect to parties’ commitment, one interviewee mentioned that “some of my colleagues call it confidence building, which I think is appropriate...and it’s enticing, encouraging and it’s more than convincing them about right or wrong. It’s drawing them in to an investment, to a kind of commitment to move forward as part of their professional and maybe personal lives... the participants’ investment and commitment and confidence building... that to me is the major locus of our success.”

- **Respect for the Parties, Active listening and Empathy.** Respecting parties in a conflict system has also been another key determinant of success according to interviewees. In this respect, they viewed humility extremely crucial as it has allowed many of them to acknowledge and honor parties’ way of experiencing a given reality. Some of their views include: “Practitioners have to be humble;” “If you think you’re doing them a favor, you have a wrong attitude.” As a companion to humility, interviewees also believed that actively listening to parties’ views and showing genuine empathy and respect have allowed them to establish sound foundation for meaningful communication and interactions. All these have also contributed to the success of their practice work.
- **Cultural Sensitivity.** In relation to the previous point, interviewees stated the need to be sensitive to the cultural nuances of the conflict as well as the cultural concerns of the parties involved. Many interviewees highlighted that such cultural sensitivity has allowed them to develop a ‘thick’ and nuanced understanding of the conflict as it is experienced by the actors in a given conflict system. It has also helped them avoid the perils of being seen as carrying out a ‘mission civilisatrice’, which could result to the withdrawal of parties from the process.

- **Elicitive Dimension.** Many interviewees asserted that incorporating elicitive processes in conflict resolution practice work has also been one of the key success factors of their projects. For instance, one of them shared that: “[In order to be successful], you really have to be sufficiently elicitive to just sit down and listen to what is concerning the people who are actually involved in the situation; and you have to be willing to go with what they say needs to be done, and what they say the problem is.”
- **With an Eye on Sustainability:** A number of interviewees mentioned sustainability as another determinant of success. Many voiced that a key aspect to sustainability includes building local capacity and capitalizing on local resources in a way that ensures the long-term continuity of conflict resolution work. However, true sustainability also requires avoiding the creation of dependent relationships between the intervener and local actors or interested parties. In this respect, an interviewee noted: “I think part of the definition of success of this kind of practice is that the group that you create, the network, stays together and continues to do things over a period of time”. Talking about a dialogue series organized at the local community level, one of the interviewees said: “so it’s a growing... They have capacity now in dialogue... it’s a living thing and it’s not dependent... there is not a dependency”, while another one asserted: “...I think for me good practice would have a sustained relationship; it is not a parachuting and leave... and it changes all the time; the relationship doesn’t stay the same”.
- **Reflective Practice.** Many interviewees also conceived that reflective practice was essential to carry out successful practice. As discussed in previous sections, reflective practice allows practitioners to be constantly aware of the developments related to their projects. In this respect, reflective practice has also helped them identify potential inadequacies embedded within their practice work while they explored innovative ways of correcting such inadequacies while staying engaged with the realities of their interventions.
- **Creativity, Flexibility and Adaptability.** S-CAR faculty members also considered creativity, flexibility and adaptability as valuable characteristics that increase the achievement of success within practice work. Due to the dynamic nature of conflict resolution practice work, it requires finding innovative ways to deal with unanticipated realities that often exist in intervention projects thus, increasing the potential for their success.
- **Accessibility.** Some interviewees talked about the accessibility aspect of conflict resolution practice work. In this respect, accessibility converges with the sub-theme ‘democratization of academic work’ which was discussed earlier in this report. As highlighted by a number of interviewees, conflict resolution practice was more successful when it was carried out in ways that promotes accessible understanding with regard to the public and society as a whole through the

democratization of academic work.

- **Networking.** Some interviewees also believed that networking and relational resources have played a significant role in ensuring the success of conflict resolution practice work. As a case in point, one interviewee noted: “having the right people involved is critical... ‘right people... meaning people with creative ideas on solving the problem, people with connections to the government or the media, or activist organizations... [...people] who have the capacity to put ideas into practice, to get them publicized, if necessary, if that’s part of the game, or to put ideas into practice.”
 - **Zeitgeist.** A number of interviewees mentioned ‘zeitgeist’ or ‘the spirit of the times’ as another factor that influences the success of conflict resolution practice work. The overall social, economic or political spirit of the times and climate of a social system may help facilitate success or failure of interventions. The specifics of what dimensions ‘zeitgeist’ encompassed were not discussed in the interviews. However, the authors of this report understand that, in this context, zeitgeist relates to understanding contemporary power arrangements, dominant discourses and narratives, intellectual ferment, the popular social trends and concerns into practice work whenever necessary.
 - **Other Aspects.** Based on the views of a few interviewees, other important aspects that contribute to successful conflict resolution practice work have included: sufficient funding, appropriate staff support, as well as sufficient time and energy.
- **The Burden of Utopian Expectations:** A final sub-theme that emerged during the interviews was again that of incrementalism in regards to what could be considered or defined as success. Some interviewees mentioned that oftentimes conflict resolution work has been preoccupied with long-term or ‘macro’ goals such as resolution of a conflict or achieving social justice. However, reaching such macro level goals may not be possible in certain cases and in many cases require a long time, sustained commitment and engagement. To deal with the burden underlying the utopian expectations related to macro goals, success need to be considered or define in incremental achievements.

In the long run, incremental achievement allows the progression from one positive move to another, ultimately leading to positive and long-term paradigmatic shifts and the realization of macro goals. In regards to this point one interviewee noted: “while you want conflict resolution not to become a mechanical process that is isolated from outcomes that really change relationships and make them more equal, make them more non-violent in every way, you also don’t want to be held hostage to utopian notions of success and outcome. So, I try to come up with the notion of increments. So, for me if you have done more good than harm, and you have created a symbol of

positive change that doesn't just address issues of 'feel good peaceniks,' but actually challenges people to a new set of relationships based on equality and justice; and even if it is very small then I consider it successful."

G. 12. Communicating Practice: Template or not?

One of the goals of this project was to elicit S-CAR faculty's views on a template that would be used to systematically communicate S-CAR practice work through the new S-CAR online platform and to publicly recognize practice initiatives carried out by S-CAR faculty members. Faculty members had a wide-range of views with regard to the general idea of communicating information related to their practice through a standardized template. Some, who are involved in traditional forms of conflict resolution practice, expressed the opinion that such a template would systematize the communication of their practice. Many expressed hesitation to communicate their practice work through a template, either because of issues of confidentiality related to the delicate nature of their practice work, or because the form of practice they have been engaged in could not be framed in similar terms as traditional practice. Others were concerned that such a template would fail to capture the different dimensions and the essence of their work.

The suggested structure of such template was the following:

- a) Title of the Practice Project
- b) Team Members
- c) Start Date and End Date
- d) Summary
- e) Context
- f) Objectives
- g) Methodology
- h) Challenges & Ethical Dilemmas
- i) Theoretical Implications
- g) Funding/Sponsors, and
- k) Timeline.

Reactions to these suggestions again varied. Some faculty members expressed concerns regarding specific sections and argued that several of these sections would not be appropriate for certain practice work, for instance, long-term projects that often do not have an end date. Another issue that emerged involved the term 'syllabus' which was used by the research team to refer to this template. This terminology was not embraced by S-CAR faculty. Various reactions to this term were: "I wouldn't call it a syllabus because a syllabus is a contract between a professor and a student of sorts and this is something that needs to be flexible, adaptable. Preliminary guidance, a working plan – that's what I would call it".

A similar concern had to do with the initial use of the word 'reporting' practice instead of 'communicating' practice, as a number of interviewees thought that it sounded like

managerial language, which connotes control. Such concerns were manifested in reactions like: “I think `reporting` sounds like `you have to tell people what you are doing, you have to be accountable`...I think the language of reporting doesn’t make it sound like...”. Others views included for instance, “Why would we do this other than to have a record of what we are doing...it should reflect that the purpose of this is to have a way of thinking more deeply about practice, or identifying what are the leading edges and conversations that we could be having”. Others remarked that a set template might not satisfactorily or appropriately capture the multidimensionality of S-CAR practice work.

A suggestion from some interviewees was to have the option of regular updates of long-term projects given that the conflict context might change causing shifts in related plans as well. Similarly, a number of interviewees mentioned that if a set template were to be used, it would need to have some space to indicate whether a project was ongoing. Others believed that only interested faculty members should volunteer to use the template and join the online communication process.

Moreover, some respondents noted that the suggested structure is missing a reflective element and evaluation dimension. As noted by one interviewee, when filling out the template, faculty members would say: “Yes we did this; yes we had the right people.... but the questions that linger are: How great was it? Was it really great, as we thought? How do we know that we had used the right methodology? How did you do this to fit the context better? What do we need to look at to know this? That is the reflective practice part of the practice. Practitioners need to do continuous evaluation of their work. Practice is very intimate”... “The question is: what can I learn from their experience? ... Others mentioned: “It must include room for second-loop learning.... Or what are my limitations? What are my biases? How can I overcome these limitations and biases? ...What about pre- and post-project learning, the background, the assumptions, and the alternatives in the practice methodology?” Finally, a general concern about the template was the over-bureaucratization that would result and this would render burdensome a process that was meant to be dynamic and flexible.

The overall conclusion that the authors of the present report drew from the various views of the interviewees is that no-matter what sections this template included, it might need to provide flexibility to faculty members with the understanding that they would only fill out sections relevant to their practice. Such flexibility would also allow faculty members to add other sections they might find appropriate to communicate based on the specific dimensions or constraints of their practice work. The following excerpt from one of the interviews reflects a general view of S-CAR faculty members in regards to using a template: “It’s fair enough for people to do reports on the projects that they’re engaged in, and I don’t see any reason not to have some minimal way of making a record of projects that people are carrying out, and, you know...I mean, if that’s what you’re looking for then this isn’t a bad way of doing it. If we then presented that series of reports as the sum total of practice at ICAR I think it goes toward, you know, more conventional notions in the field of, you know, a dialogue project, a problem solving workshop. And that’s fine, but I think you’re likely to miss a lot of the practice work that people do on a daily basis that you’re not going to sit down and write a report about it.”

G. 13. Examples of Current Practice Projects

S-CAR faculty members have carried out a wide range of practice projects and some have included the following:

- The Georgian –South Ossetian conflict resolution process
- The genocide prevention program
- The Basque country practice
- The Darfur, Somalia, Uganda initiatives which deal with the tension between traditional state actors and nation state
- The Ivory Coast pre-election seminar at Point of View in 2010 with high-ranking civil society leaders in collaboration with USIP
- The documentary film project on social engagement which involves practice and research dimensions what I think of as social engagement or practice
- The Syrian interventions, which at the present time, due to various circumstances, is limited to a yearly class we bring to Syria, [and] which is also a kind of cover for ongoing diplomatic work or citizen diplomatic work. Seminars in Israel and Palestine that have now taken the form of supporting of honest businesses...
- The ongoing exploration of the possibility of more formal trainings and education in Palestine in alliance between CRDC and S-CAR and Palestinian training and conflict resolution –our studies in conflict resolution...
- Ongoing activities of interfaith engagement with Islamic, Jewish and Christian clerics in various auspices and various organizations that I work with...in consulting with them, advising them, helping them...some of them domestic, some of them overseas...
- Consultations on the cultural sensitivity training with corporations and with others that we have engaged in...and then ongoing is consultancies with the military on better approaches to American interventions in cultural and religious contexts, particularly in Afghanistan and Iraq...what other practices am I involved in...that's all I can think of right now...
- Ongoing dialogue projects with University Life and the Liberia Summer Field Study program
- Lecturing in Ethiopia at the Addis Ababa University Department of Political Science

which involves: training professors to become better scholars on Africa, helping them improve how to shape debate and academic works, respond to conflicts, how to design syllabus, organize academic work resources

- Working on some publications to be published by Johns Hopkins **with the purpose** to reengage scholars with regard to some of conversations on politics as an attempt to create a new political sociology of higher education. That's one of them.
- The "meet the press" book, which is attempting to look at the ways the broader political traditions, what I call the faces of the American and to stimulate a conversation about what is it that makes conservatives and liberals, what are they fighting about. And by, again, informing through my analysis of this development of this national conversations of "meet the press."
- Initiatives on extreme poverty in America as a source of conflict...asking how [does one, as a scholar-practitioner] resolve that conflict, a serious social conflict. These initiatives aim at establishing a National Commission on Persistent Poverty and Social Conflict, which will be an ongoing project.
- An ongoing project related to American attitudes towards war and peace, which is a follow up from my book on that subject...so I'm now planning a conference either in late spring or early summer where we will get, again, scholars and policy makers and journalists talking about the attitudes among Americans...well, you know my stuff...attitudes among Americans that make them relatively easy to persuade to go to war.
- The possibility of facilitating a meeting or a series of meetings among people who want to talk about the economic crisis and alternative economic models. I don't know if that's gonna happen, but I'm thinking about it.
- At the international level, one part of that comes out of the discussion on war and peace issues... is 'how can you convert an economy based on the military industrial complex to a peaceful economy'. And the other, which is the structural issue, there are a lot of people, including some economists, who want to get together and talk about if capitalism, as is currently being practice, isn't working very well, what alternatives are there...that are not being considered now, because their advocates have been marginalized, because they are too left, or too green, or too individualistic or too something.
- Alternatives within the frames of capitalism or outside capitalism would be one thing to consider. I think a major issue to consider is how flexible is the frame anyway? No, it would include alternative outside...I've talk to the Ebert foundation about this and they are very interested in this one. So, we are bringing Europeans especially to talk about this...may some Chinese, as well...we'll see...

- Probably, the Benjamin Franklin Institute, which I think yesterday we got invited to turn in a proposal again for a non-competitive award –I think that’s considered practice. And I’ve got ongoing through NVMS, there is continued interest in some assistance with community conflict kind of things, I don’t know what to do with any of them right know... So, I have some ongoing relationships, but other than Benjamin Franklin I don’t thing an ongoing current practice project.
- I am involved in a multi-year project rebuilding the higher education system in Liberia. I am seeking funding to develop a psychosocial repair system to address trauma. I am involved with a multi-year Appreciative Inquiry intervention with a protestant church in DC. I provide organizational consultation weekly to a large investment/mortgage company.
- We got this huge grant to develop experiential learning... modules and, and, and courses and so forth geared towards undergraduate education. So we’re in the process of developing those experiential learning modules that we’re going to be running in the classrooms starting, umm, one of them already run the other day. You know, so there’s that whole aspect. ... We are co-editing book series, key study book series that will be geared towards undergraduate education.
- The FIPSE project, which I think will in the end acquaint many people with various kinds of practice. You know, facilitating, mediating, dialogue, depending on what direction the projects themselves go. And then the project that I’m working on with Frank Dukes, Frank is much more involved in active projects, I think, that would fit under that rubric in terms of actively bringing together parties to the conflict, but I think this is one of those instances where I think writing about it from a scholarly perspective, and making an analysis of the conflict itself, might have a trickle-down effect on practitioners. But for me it’s also writing a case study book about this mining conflict does, for me, the work of, again, calling attention, pushing ideas about structural violence, about cultural difference, about oppression in part of our country, about exploitation. So writing that book and coming out with that message will for me be a form of practice, and it’s one that I’m engaged in right now. I also continue to speak about uncivil speech and hate speech, work on that.
- Speaking about some of the issues around terrorism around the time of...around some of the debates around Guantanamo and what to do about that, that sort of thing, I’ve definitely tried to have a media presence... But that goes off and on, I mean partly because of interest, you know interest of others out there, but partly because it’s not...I don’t find it easy to do a lot of those media appearances and also continue to do the kind of serious work of scholarship and engaged teaching. I don’t move as easily across that...
- There is actually another one that I should briefly mention that I have been a part of; it’s the Problem Solving Workshops Program. There is a Program of Problem Solving Workshops that has been launched in the past two years... in cooperation with AU.

This involves my colleague Susan Allen Nan, and Chris Mitchell, and Ron Fisher, and Mohamed Abu-Nimer (and others). So, we co-facilitated a few of these workshops and that was very rewarding. So that's a kind of practice training, which I think has been very popular.

- (In the Sudan Task Group, which is an intervention in the Darfur crisis)...I am very fortunate to be able to work with two people who were major figures in formulating this method, which is professor Ronald Fisher and professor Chris Mitchell...We have implemented this method in two major problem-solving workshops. The method is basically interactive conflict resolution and the method is problem-solving workshops.
- I am doing the Nagorno-Karabakh project; we got 3,000 USD from Point of View, Phil got additional money from a private foundation which is not giving its name – that's why I'm telling sometimes, you know-, and we are applying also to several other foundations to do it. We also applied for a project in Bosnia to work with youth, a project in Liberia to work with women, ... and I am doing more like a research-type of project in Ukraine for the whole summer on history education

G. 14. Final Comments

One concern expressed by some faculty members related to what they perceived as an assumption that all S-CAR faculty members should be doing theory, research and practice. This is an assumption that they would like to challenge. In regards to this point one interviewee noted: “I also want to push back against the assumption that all faculty at [S-CAR]...should be doing theory, research and practice...We have this image that we try to integrate all things together – what you want is diversity, not one integrated type of thing. And then you have a faculty where one is on theory, another in research, and you will have an ICAR that has that totality without having an individual constituting all that totality. And so you do not have the expectation that everyone will have an answer to practice, because my answer is that I do not have a practice and that should be OK at [S-CAR].”

Another comment has to do with the distinction between personal-private domain and professional-S-CAR domain, as engagement with society is not always a part of professional life and S-CAR faculty members have been involved in initiatives that could be called practice but are not necessarily affiliated with their job. Thus, an open question exists in regards to what is to be shared with the community and what not.

Finally, a number of interviewees noted that there is a need to have deeper conversations on the ethics of practice and research –a conversation that has already started to take place at S-CAR.

H. Next Steps

Next steps of this project may include:

- Presentation of Main Findings and Report to the S-CAR Faculty Board.
- Online Template through the S-CAR Knowledge Management System:
 - Based on the input provided by the interviewee, the research team provided to Paul Snodgrass some ideas that could be used to develop a prototype template last winter 2011. Paul mentioned that the developers were working on this prototype online platform which would allow the necessary flexibility to S-CAR faculty. This is to be followed up with Paul.
 - As part of the original plans for this project, once the prototype template was completed and accessible through the S-CAR online platform that Paul would put in place, a pilot phase was envisaged where volunteer faculty, for instance Andrea Bartoli, Marc Gopin, and Susan Allen Nan, would enter the practice projects information using the prototype template with the assistance of the Burton Library staff.
 - Also, as part of the original plans for this project, after the pilot phase and incorporation of any feedback from the volunteers, other S-CAR faculty, would enter their practice work information with the assistance of the Burton Library. However, based on the views of many S-CAR faculty members during out interviews, entering the practice projects information should be voluntary. However, the initial the intention was to use the template through the online platform as a locus of information and as a mechanism for systematically communicating practice within and outside our community.
 - Initially, this project was meant to be a dynamic process. Thus, other steps that would include the exploration of ways to regularly review and evaluate the utility and function of the on-line template/platform, while identifying and implementing necessary enhancements as the S-CAR online platform evolves and matures.

Bibliography

Boyer, E. (1996). The Scholarship of Engagement. *Journal of Public Service Outreach* 1:11-20.

Johnson, J. (2002). In-Depth Interviewing. In Gubrium J. and Holstein J. (eds.). *Handbook of Interview Research*. London: SAGE

Kielhofner, G. (2005). Research Concepts in Clinical Scholarship—Scholarship and Practice: Bridging the Divide. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 59, 231–239

Lofland, J., & Lofland, L. H. (1995). *Analyzing Social Settings* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth

Van de Ven, A. H. (2007). *Engaged Scholarship: A Guide to Organizational and Social Research*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press

**Interview Protocol
Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution (ICAR)
ICAR Practice Project**

Interview Questions:

1. How would you define conflict resolution practice?
2. What is your personal history as a CAR scholar practitioner? What type of practice have you engaged in?
3. What is the scope of your practice?
4. What events/processes provide the stimuli for your practice? (Current events, history, requests from others)
5. Who are, typically, your practice clients? What level does your practice focus on?
6. Who are typical practice partners (internal or external)?
7. What intellectual and practical processes do you follow when conceptualizing, planning and implementing CR practice?
8. What methods of CR practice do you usually use?
9. How do you acquire the necessary resources?
10. What challenges do you encounter in your practice? How do you respond to those challenges? Are there any ethical concerns?
11. What evaluation methodologies do you usually employ in order to assess the impact of your intervention?
12. What, in your experience makes a successful practice?
13. If S-CAR were to develop a `standard` syllabus for reporting CR practice, what could, in your opinion, be the structure of such syllabus? For instance a suggested structure for such standard syllabus might contain the following components: a) Title of the Practice Project, b) Team Members, c) Start Date and End Date, d) Summary, e) Context, f) Objectives, g) Methodology, h) Challenges & Ethical Dilemmas, i) Theoretical Implications, g) Funding/Sponsors, k) Timeline. What are your thoughts about this suggested structure? What would you add/change in it?
14. Are there any ongoing projects –practice work that you are engaged in?
15. Is there anything else you would like to share?

Interview Consent Form

INFORMED CONSENT FOR ICAR FACULTY INTERVIEWS

The following information is being presented to help you decide whether or not you want to take part in a research project. Please read this document carefully.

TITLE OF STUDY: Institute for Conflict Analysis & Resolution (ICAR) Practice Project

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR/CO-INVESTIGATOR-STUDENT RESEARCHER: Andrea Bartoli/Yves-Renée Jennings/Athanasios Gatsias

STUDY LOCATION: Institute of Conflict Analysis & Resolution, George Mason University, Arlington, Virginia

RESEARCH PROCEDURES: This research is being conducted for mapping ICAR practice and eliciting your views about a standard format for reporting and communicating ICAR practice. If you agree to participate, you will be interviewed for about 1 hour. This interview will be tape-recorded.

RISKS: There are no risks to participating in this study.

BENEFITS: You will not directly benefit from participating in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY: The nature of this research is for you to share your practice experience with the Institute for Conflict Analysis & Resolution community. Therefore, confidentiality does not apply. This research data will be kept at the George Mason University Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution Burton Library.

PARTICIPATION: Your participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason. If you decide not to participate or if you withdraw from the study, there is no penalty or loss of benefits. You will not be paid for your participation. There are no costs to you or any other party.

CONTACT: Yves-Renée Jennings, Ph.D. Candidate, Institute for Conflict Analysis & Resolution, George Mason University 703-401-3405, or yjenning@gmu.edu, or 3401 N. Fairfax Drive, MS 4D3, Arlington, VA 22201; or Athanasios Gatsias, Institute for Conflict Analysis & Resolution, George Mason University, 703-623-3657, or agatsias@gmu.edu. The ICAR principal investigator is Dr. Andrea Bartoli and he may be reached at 703-993-9716, or abartoli@gmu.edu; or 3401 N. Fairfax Drive, MS 4D3, Arlington, VA, 22201. You may contact the George Mason University Office of Research Subject Protections at 001-703-993-4121; or 4400 University Dr., MS 4C6, Fairfax, VA USA 22030; or hsrb@gmu.edu if you have questions or comments regarding your rights as a participant in the research.

This research has been reviewed according to George Mason University procedures governing your participation in this research.

CONSENT: I have read this form and agree to participate in this study

SIGNATURE

Approval for the use of this document EXPIRES

OCT 20 2011

DATE

Protocol # 7150 George Mason University

**Definition of Conflict Resolution Practice
Based on Interviews with 17 S-CAR Faculty**

1. CR practice includes efforts to address conflicts. Efforts are very broad – they can be focused on helping people understand the conflict; they can be dialogue, workshops, training, research of the specific areas that the parties want to cooperate on, research on the specific ways forward; consultation to one party and not the other or working with multiple parties; they can be undertaken by insiders or by externals. So it is very broad. The main thing they have in common is that they are efforts to address conflicts.
2. CR practice is a faculty of problem solving that we address when we have contradictory conflictual experiences. It is not primarily professional endeavor. In the context of ICAR, it becomes professional endeavor because it is structured in such a way that it focuses on specific problem, intervention, activity that is designed to obtain result. There are multiple meanings to the expression CR practice and I think when we move from the general meaning to the more specific professional one, we make a very significant leap. I think that this distinction is important because I think in the future we will have quite a bit to learn from everyday CR practice of regular people in different cultures, regular people in different societies and how CR strategies are learned and adapted in different contexts. In this particular setting, which is ICAR setting, looking at practice as a professional endeavor, then practice is an activity aimed to address conflict constructively involving parties that are currently in conflict or free of conflict.
3. I think that there's a range of definitions. I think that different faculty here... I'm not sure we all agree on the range either. We certainly set ourselves at different points along a continuum... some of us who consider ourselves to be more theorists some of us who consider ourselves to be more practice-focused. All of us acknowledge that you need both, that theory informs practice and practice, engagement in the world, reflects back on theory ideally. So I think all of us are committed to this as a place where both of those things get done. Um, personally, I think I have a rather broad definition of practice. I think that for me, and here I'm just brainstorming, thinking off the top of my head since I haven't been asked to define it previously, that it is... I like Pierre Bourdieu's discussion of scholarship with commitment. I think that the work I do as a scholar has the potential to be transformative in the world for social justice ends and so I think that the way I use my scholarship and my position as an academic to engage in those things -- that to me is practice. Some other folks would define it more narrowly as bringing together two conflicted parties and helping them in various ways through various techniques to reach some kind of resolution or transformation... umm... But my practice set doesn't include that and is much more... very... so I'm for a more open definition of practice.

4. I think of CR practice as being a set of steps of encouraged communication and reconciliation between parties that are polarized and have contradictions. I would probably think of any steps from problem solving workshops to forms of formal mediation that encourage that kind of reconciliation.
5. Conflict resolution practice to me is any activity designed to create increments of positive change in relationships that have been destructive; those increments should be guided by practice that has many factors in consideration, including issues of fairness and equality in addition to issues of basic human needs and interests; so what constitutes an increment that is really a positive change is something that I have written about in my books, but I would say that conflict resolution practice is about creating positive change in destructive conflictual relationships.
6. For me, conflict resolution (CR) practice involves intervening in some way, maybe just showing up in some way, at a place with the idea of participating with people in a certain event, like talking to groups that are in conflict or showing up in a certain setting and informally changing the dynamic and changing the mood of the setting and among the people. CR practice can be a formal training such as problem-solving workshops, mediation, facilitating a dialogue or restorative justice process. So for me anytime I engage with people on a contentious issue that enables me to work to perhaps change the dynamic that for me is practice.

So some of the research that I do are forms of CR practice because am engaging with people who are embroiled in a conflict about their concerns and also relaying to them information about CR practice in ways that they might consider in dealing with their own conflict. I think types of academic intervention like problem-solving workshops are all forms of practice.

7. This is getting into a challenge; well let me tell the story in this way, before I came to ICAR no one asked me what is your practice, or when I was studying political science, or working with think tanks, friends who work in advocacy like Amnesty International, or state department, this is why this question sounds kind of strange to me.

My answer is what I do in my role as a member of faculty at ICAR, I research, teach, write, talk and engage with policy makers, NGOs, thinks tanks, but to me what drives that is a research agenda, a research-theory agenda and I do not see that as practice.

I am a researcher, scholar, social scientist, I collect data to write, and teach. Now all of that shapes people, puts new ideas in the world, and I am hoping that by teaching my students I am in some way changing the world, and none of it may be practice but scholarship. Thant is where I get into trouble with this interview, because on a philosophical level I do not know how to wrestle with it.

Let me put it in a very different way, I and my friend Peter wrote a very academic article about transnational politics, appeared in a peer review journal, 60 pages and 100 footnotes, the kind of classic, you know, very deep scholarly writing for an audience of like graduate students and scholars. Nobody besides that would care to read it. We more or less took the same argument and turned it basically as an editorial that came out Abu Dhabi times, in a very accessible language. Starting with an anecdote about the new President of Somalia, using the same argument but in language designed to be sufficiently accessible to a different general audience that may be interested in reading it. But with the same argument in a very accessible way, it is the same, except that one has fancy words for social scientists and the other for a broad audience.

So imagine that this is practice, I am trying to shape how people think here, and the other is research because it has footnotes. I do not understand where you draw that line, here it is just a different tone, different language, and different audience, so if you want to say when your audience is academic it is research, and if your audience in non-academic is practice, I suppose you can make that argument, that distinction. But the work that I do with Think Tanks, or the Council on Foreign Relations, that is designed to be read by people like in the State Department, Embassies as an introduction to US foreign policy, I am just happy for that. So that is the struggle that I have, that is my kind of big philosophical way of thinking about it.

But let me take a different approach to it, that I do have a set of activities that I would call as my policy relevant research, policy oriented research. Some might look at that and say aah, policy relevant is practice because say if you are trying to change how State Department understand conflict in the Horn of Africa, trying to change how the US Congress should change approaches to whether or not sanctions should be put on Eritrea as an exporter of terrorism, or trying to influence how the outgoing US Ambassador to Ethiopia sees the challenges ahead - most of the policy work I do by the way is area focused with a bit of transnational politics - then that would be the practice.

But again I go back to the point that to me it is research, just a different audience. The same thing that I said to the outgoing US Ambassador, I wrote in the peer review journal, trying to explain to those two different audiences what I think are the political dynamics of Ethiopia, different language but the same fundamental conclusion I have come to about the nature of Ethiopian politics, put in different ways to different audiences. So that is my definition of conflict resolution practice.

8. The first thing I want to say about practice is that the issue of a university being involved in practice is hotly contested and it goes back to the early stages of the development of disciplines in the 20th century. So, if you look at how disciplines developed –and I’m talking sociology, anthropology, economics, political science– each of these struggled with the problem of practice and they all came up with a solution, which was what we might call the ‘scientific model’. And the ‘scientific

model` was one in which, in general the scientist was understood –and this is important, because just saw that the anthropological association has decided that it's not a science today I just read in NY Times, it's a fascinating issue that I think directly relates to what we are up to, because there is this issue of `Are you part of the humanities? Are you part of the social sciences? What does it mean to have a social science? Is it like physics? ` And so on. A lot of these issues of physical science came up and it's relevant to us because a lot of these problems are with us. So, one of the things that the problem is that “Should the scholar be influenced by their values in the process? Should they be advocates or not?” And there was a huge debate in Germany called `Die Methodenstreit`, the struggle of the methods that had to do with the issue of `were economists value neutral or not?`. And one of the ways that this played out is that people decided that science should be indifferent to its object and, therefore, they took the scientist out of the process. That was one of the moves towards `science`. And what this meant was that there were no longer out in public advocating their point of view. So, that was one of the things that happened.

To be seen as respectable, and to be seen as objective and outside of the process that you are not simply a partisan, but you are a professional. And so this is part of the definition of a professional scholar in the early 20th century

An interesting challenge and one of the reasons that anthropology is the site for a lot of rebellion against this idea, especially since 1960's and on, and after Clifford Geertz's work and so on, but I think that even anthropology went through the scientific process of being more objective...see, this is a great point...so the issue of report that is essential in anthropology is supposed to save the survey researcher, who gives you something as if they were not even there, like we are having a conversation and it would be better if you could give me the questions and I just answered them to a survey research in a close format. But the anthropologist wanted to be more objective than the objective sociologists say, by being there and seeing how things work in context. But it was not necessarily about being there and influencing, it wasn't about bringing your values to transform those societies; rather, it was about respecting their integrity and, so even there you had the same issue. So, again, the anthropologist in that classical is not an advocate. So, the one big distinction I would say is the distinction between advocacy, on the one hand, and what we might call more general public service; being useful, but not being involved. And so, what we call the `service model` emerged in the early 20th century, in that way. Another really important distinction, I think, is the issue of `where do the questions come from?`, and you think of, let's say, Thomas Kuhn's paradigm model. So, even within that notion, which is somewhat socially constructed or has a tendency to react to the internal dynamics of the research paradigm –it's what Dennis likes to talk about- the questions come from the paradigm itself, they come from the scientist. And this was another tendency of the scientific model, not to be driven overly sensitive to the concerns, to problems that emerge in the community...that you weren't putting out fires, but you were following the special guidelines of a set of peers. So, in a way what happened was

that scientists became closed off from the society in two ways: one was they didn't really advocate, they stayed inside their lab and don't go out and do anything and, two, they defined their problems, they are not really sensitive to society, they don't worry about what's happening out there, they worry about what their fellow scientists are doing. So, they become very esoteric and closed off.

Well, this is all background in the sense of conflict mapping, if you will, the sources of this current conflict, because I think in fact that there is a conflict around the university and around the issue of practice...and so this is my background for it.

So, this is just a long background to try to help ground my thinking about this, because one of my issues is studying conflict in the university and so I'm trying to think about CR in this context. So, the two ways in which the scientists separated themselves off, and I think that...just to clarify...we are trying to question the scientific isolation; that's one of the things we are doing, and that's one of the ways in which ICAR has always been different. And one way is that we reframe it. One is your audience; is your audience a specific audience of your peers, or is it a more general audience, which is society itself? Which is more how does the scientist interface with society? And the other is: how does society interface with the scientist? Do your problems...do the terms that you use emerge from society itself or do they emerge only from your fellow scientists? So, I question both of those things and the way I think of practice is both of these dimensions. So, first, although I do believe in scholarly rigor and I am very dedicated to that and I am interested in research at the (tightest?) levels, I like to think of these problems that are being done say in anthropology and sociology and political science and conflict resolution—all these are very serious- as in potential dialogue with one other. So, I believe that the audience can be more general, that is traditional, say, in nuclear physics that maybe 20 people could ever understand what you are saying because the technical details are so fine that they could never make sense. But I feel that in the social sciences, although there are special problems, it is very important that as research paradigms develop they bump up against other research paradigms and we have to do this interdisciplinary work. So, I believe it's important to have conversations across disciplines, but also you can take the highest scholarly work and share some of that with the public. So, what makes my version of practice different than many other is that I'm not only interested in elites, but I'm interested in people; I'm interested in sharing that with the broader audience, so that... what I would think as something like deeper transformations...the transformation side of resolution can have as opposed to the management or the settlement side. Because I think unless you change the habits of the heart of the people it is very difficult to secure resolutions because they don't buy them. So, I can characterize much of my practice in that way, which is doing public work—taking what I think is...my interpretation of the cutting edge theory and research and, let's say, going on television and sharing that with a broad audience. A good example was the Jeremiah Wright's controversy, when Barack Obama...when his pastor was under that heat; I was already doing television performances, but I thought it's important to

way in with a more scholarly perspective. Another example was Ron Williams and his offensive comments about Muslims...and the issue of 'could an African American be a bigot?' was in question; and he thought 'well, I can't be, cause I am a civil rights leader! I can't be a bigot'. I think that it was important to talk about the various sources of privilege and how don't you see around privilege you have it. Ron Williams had a certain kind of Christian privilege he didn't recognize, because he only thought of privilege being, I suppose, housed in the white establishment; and so, it was an interesting thing to talk about. So, for my perspective it was important to be able to share that all of us can be bigots in different ways; so, that was a way to wane into a public conversation.

So, basically, doing that type of practice is really transforming minds, because you are trying to bring to the table, using television for instance, and various aspects that usually people don't take into account. So, that's the type of practice...

It's like a massive classroom. Because we do it in the classroom all the time...but I do think of it in a sense like a massive classroom. And I don't think...if you think of your own example at teaching, you don't dumb it down, right? You don't say 'oh, this is really a simple form and I'm giving it to you cause you can't understand'. You bring the best you can to the broadest audience possible, but you have to use language that is accessible. So, it's a different kind of communication, but it doesn't mean that the thinking is less rigorous. And that's an important thought of that massive classroom model. So, that's the idea of the scholar reengaging with the world.

And another example of the scholar reengaging with the world has to do with where the questions themselves come from. And usually you might say 'well, look, you know, John Burton, for example, has studied Basic Human Needs and then other scholars have reacted to the question of BHN, for example Kevin Avruch's cultural critic, and therefore there are a set of problems which are internal to those conversations of these scholars and therefore we ought to -in our own research- feed into that...let's say the conversation at that point. And I respect that and it's important. But, at the same time there are things happening in the world...people themselves are mini scholars, if you will, there are all engaged in reflective practice too. So, this model of reflective practice requires that we pay attention to the way people are talking. So, what I've done...and here is a term that I might use; I think what I do is 'informative provention'. You know John Burton's notion of provention. And although the word 'provention' is a little...clever for me to use, you know, all the time, but if I were to try to translate it into terms that I think we understand, provention being the idea of seeing that something is out there and going to happen in the future, being proactive to do something about it. But what I do -and rather than saying getting track two parties together to work on solutions that they can share with track one leaders, for example- my goal is to change the terms of the debate itself. So, the best example of this would be the work I did with professors in politics. And there what I and a colleague of mine, so happening...was that there was a brilliant conflict around universities themselves as being liberal

places, as being activist places, as being places that were no longer legitimate and couldn't be trusted. And we saw a number of quasi scholars, people who were short of not professionally trained to do work about...study the university...you know that's not to dismiss them...but the work was maybe being done that was largely intended to discredit the university. So, what we decided to do was to investigate in a scholarly way what was going on. And there are two examples of these that I think are helpful. One is that we decided to look at stereotypes about professors. One was that they were godless, or didn't believe in God and, therefore, they are outside the main stream of the moral community. And what we found was, in fact, that most professors believed in God. Now it sounds short of simple. But as with the function of any stereotype it's profound. Because when you find that, in fact, most professors do believe in God, suddenly this became a national story. And it's come back again and again and again, and people say `Oh, I was going to be upset with the professors, but maybe they are not as bad as I thought!`.

It's at least a contradiction. It'd be like demonstrating that African Americans have the same work values the whites do. And people say `I didn't think that was true!`. Use science to do that and it has a social transformative potential in it. So, this issue of professors and politics and religion was important in that way, because...and how do I know? There is a group called the American Family Association; and I saw in their major publication –which is a very conservative Christian Group by the way- even there they run a story about this issue of the professors were not godless in their own journal, which I think helped to share with that community, which is more important than sharing with communities that already suspect that professors are ok, but it works across the divide of the conflict, which is conservative Christians who see themselves as somehow alienated from the university, which is a secular place...and so that was an important thing.

Another is when Sarah Palin in her book –this just happened this month- attacked...in her book she writes that the university...the professors are godless or don't believe in God and, therefore this is one of the reasons why you have to mobilize against the university, so, there is a passage in her book. And the `Chronicle of Higher Education` was able to reference our research and suggest that, in fact, that wasn't true. And so, again, through information we prevented a conflict that could have otherwise happened.

Bringing these values into peoples' mind is a kind of practice, but it's in essence...we take the categories from society...which is a debate that not many people thought was interesting, `Are professors religious?`, no one was talking about it. And we said `the people are talking about that; and so, therefore, we need to help people make sense with the best that we can offer, which is scholarship and research`.

And there is one more example of the same kind, which is perhaps even more direct. There is this issue of political correctness. I am not interested in the concept of

political correctness myself. I don't think it's a helpful way to speak and to think about issues of social inequality. But, I know that lots of people in the community do use the term political correctness. So, what I decided to do was to say 'ok'...and in particular the American Enterprise Institute held a conference about the politically correct university. So, I decided that we needed to take this concept seriously, even though my tendency is to want to dismiss it, because I thought that most of what was interesting was already said about it in the early 1990s...but I said 'ok, let's assume that there is such thing called politically correct; what would it look like in the university?'. And so I used factor analysis and class modeling – things we've talked about- and I tried to say 'ok, what are those crucial things, all these accusations at what people think political correctness is, much of it being that people are not in fact liberal, or respectful of difference, that they don't believe in freedom of speech. That's usually the accusation that there is a hyper sensitivity...so, I tried to say 'is that the crucial piece of it? Is there any other thing?'. And so I used that as a way to, in essence, expose the fact that the concept was not a good concept, by showing that when you look at political correctness as a latent concept, in fact, it had much more to do with concerns about social justice and inequalities than it had to do with sensitivity of language. So, what most of the critics of the university were saying was 'oh, all these professors are so sensitive to language and they want to have speech codes and they want to control thought'. In fact that has more to do with worries about structural inequalities which are tied to ascribed characteristics, so say that are racial and gender inequalities that are structural...and so the structural sensibility was what was defined more than...the other one. So, that was another example of how I try to borrow a question from the community and then bring scholarship to... (Deal with it? analyze it?)

9. Putting conflict resolution concepts to work...to solve contemporary problems. So, it could mean lots of things; it could mean mediating disputes; it could mean setting out to influence public policy in ways that are consistent with conflict resolution thinking; it could mean facilitating dialogues and so forth...but in my opinion conflict resolution practice also includes convening groups, who ought to be talking to each other in order to solve the problems that produce conflict. So, certain kinds of conferences or workshops could be included in that even if they are not the classical problem solving workshop.
10. As I have a little bit of an advantage...short of advantage...because of the discussion last week...trying to think about it...I don't think we have a definition of conflict resolution practice. I think there is one definition of conflict resolution practice that is contrasted to scholarship...that practice is what we do out in the world trying to make something happen. That is a slight effort to induce or introduce change, or manage change in some way...and it is different from writing journal articles or doing scholarly research...there is a way of thinking about practice that's (e.g.) meeting with community groups or working on organizational conflict or doing a dialogue or running some kind of intervention...and I think that's one way of thinking about practice. But I think that also limits it

to...interactive conflict resolution efforts and I think that's too limited. I think it doesn't cover...for instance it wouldn't necessarily cover conflict coaching that would be working with the individuals close to the interaction. Then, I think we can identify practices if we are working within an established conflict resolution model, like mediation or dialogue or problem-solving workshops...but then how do we define practice that's doing assessments of the field or is doing training as a form of intervention. I think we can contrast practice to scholarship but I am not sure that we have a good definition of all that is included in practice. But there is something that practice is about `doing`, I think it's applied, I think it's in partnership or in relationship with others (inaudible) can do practice in the same way about yourself. So, I'm struggling with coming up with a definition, because I don't think we have a very robust one.

11. I define well... let me define practice as I see it. Whether I do it is another issue. Practice for me is somehow working with the parties to a conflict either together or separately. Working with them to elicit their views on what the conflict is about as well as their views on how the conflict might be handled by them as well as with the help of outside experts. So practice in general for me involves working with the parties directly or indirectly to help make a difference in the conflict situation. And I do that kind of practice every now and then; I met with Armenians, Azerbaijanis, Georgians with regard to conflicts in South Caucasus
12. To be quite honest with you, I don't define myself as a practitioner, per se. It just [...] probably falls under the rubric of practice but it's not the way I think of myself. Umm...

I think of myself as a researcher-scholar, uh, rather than a practitioner. Umm, there are things that I do that I think, you know depending on how you define practice and I don't have a good definition. I think people here do such different things so I am not particularly enamored with the idea of trying to put it in a box of some sort. You know and some things, I, I don't know, they're kind of grayer areas, I mean... Development of experiential learning modules, is that practice? I don't know. Some would probably put it in that category, others wouldn't. I'm sort of not particularly... it's not something that I preoccupy myself with very much, I have to say. How would I categorize that? It's something I do and then you know...

There's such a variety of things that I do that probably could be put into that category. It's just not the way I think of myself; but I'm thinking of doing an... umm, I just don't use that terminology, I guess is, is, is, is the point, you know. I do conflict assessments.

I go to Tajikistan to do a conflict assessment, you know stuff like that, you know and again in some ways it is practice because then I'm briefing the embassy about my findings and they use it in development of their programs in some fashion or not. Who knows what happens in that particular black box? You know, I don't know,

I'm going to USIP next week to, to give a talk... Is that my practice? Maybe? It's not, I mean... It can be, it's not something... as opposed to something else. It's... I'm, I'm giving a talk and so that's the way I think of it without putting a particular label on it, I suppose would be the, would be the um...

I'm a researcher but, you know, on the other hand, I do a lot of stuff that, as I said, could be considered practice, you know: I spent a year at the State Department working in the policy world for instance, I do these assessments, I do trainings on how to do assessments for people going off to work occasionally on PRTEAS Provisional Reconstruction Teams, for instance in Afghanistan. I don't know that could be, I suppose, considered practice. It's so, it's one of these things that I, not to sort of keep coming back to the same point, those sorts of things I do, you know but I'm not intentionally calling it one thing or another.

13. My conflict resolution practice, primarily based in organizations and community settings, ranges from prevention (planning, coaching, and designing) to intervention.
14. I think that is a difficult question to ask people to respond to. There's, you know, a short answer of the kinds of things that have been written about as central to the field, activities that are designed to intervene in ongoing conflicts and bring parties toward resolution, like mediation and dialogue and problem solving workshops, and any number of other things that are seen as central. And I think that, while that might be a sort of common-sense understanding, and widely accepted by many in the field, I find it very narrow and really sells short what I think a variety of people – scholars, practitioners, and others – might be doing in the world to work against conflict. And so, for me, I would really go with something that was...and for...if this was to pertain at all to ICAR, and our coming School, I would want to think about it in that broader sense, and think about the variety of activities that we engage in as a way of intervening in ongoing conflict, but doing peacebuilding on a daily basis toward the prevention of conflict. And I see that at all the levels, all the levels of conflict. So I think there could be a lot of practice that we do on a very local level and in very interpersonal ways, in ways in which we, you know, behave with our students, or what we're trying to teach our students, even about quite local interaction, as well as peacebuilding that we might do through various kinds of consultations that maybe even provide information to people that can be used toward prevention. Toward, maybe at the end of the continuum, very well worked out activities that one engages parties in to move toward resolution. So, I have a really broad view of it, and that is partly, you know, fueled from coming from outside the field, as such, but always feeling that I had practices that addressed, I think, some of the goals of the field. And so maybe it's important as well when one thinks about conflict resolution practice to take apart...to try and think about, well, what are the goals that are implied in that and, you know, I would think reducing direct violence, or preventing direct violence, you know, addressing situations of the aftermath of violence. Identifying and addressing the roots of conflict, I would think would be what some conflict resolution practice would be aimed at. Um,

peacebuilding...but then I think there's a whole, broad set of other things like working against hierarchy, calling attention to power, you know, in all of its dimensions, and helping people to understand the nature of power, hierarchy, inequality, discrimination. Again, all of those things that are sort of at the root. So I actually see that as part of conflict resolution practice as well, and that's fundamentally an educative activity.

You know, it's really a broadening of what conflict resolution is, and I guess I would wonder, even in starting with that term, whether...is that an umbrella for a set of other things that some of us might be interested in? Like, is peacebuilding under that? Is prevention under that? Is working toward a just society under that? You know, because I think for many of us when we think about the practice aspect of what we're doing it's some of those other things that we're involved with. And I kind of don't see how you have one without the other.

15. Well, my conception of practice is that it is a skillful intervention in a conflict setting...and there are many kinds of skills, there is many kinds of interventions – obviously- and there is many kinds of conflicts...but I think they all have that in common. And so it's incumbent upon the intervener, the practitioner, to not only develop skill but to improve the skill and then, of course, apply the method that is most suitable to the conflict setting. Because every method, obviously, has potential limits and limitations...and those have to be judged in relation to what's most suitable to the conflict setting. For example, at what stage is the conflict? Is it early, middle, late? Is it kind of so-called post-conflict, which is kind of a misnomer, since conflicts obviously oftentimes never completely disappear or many of the protracted conflicts don't disappear but they will just take different form. So, that's my short answer on this.
16. Everything which advances conflict resolution and conflict management. That's why if we define it widely...even publication, influential publications, books or even some articles...what i.e. Dennis Sandole is doing with a lot of publications in newspapers, I believe is still conflict resolution practice, because he is changing consciousness of people. If we define it very narrowly, we probably speak more about conflict resolution workshops and different types of projects, like what we did in Tajikistan on development of new curricula, conflict resolution educating people, trainings...so, all educational programs, trainings, workshops, and everything which probably can advance people's knowledge and change the perceptions of people in conflict.
17. Efforts to find a process, several processes through which conflicts can be ended by finding an acceptable and durable solution to those who are involved in the conflict