




2016

Creating Peace in Our Communities: An analysis of community reconciliation techniques

Jessica Shanken

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/honors-theses>

 Part of the [Community-Based Research Commons](#), [Politics and Social Change Commons](#), and the [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Shanken, Jessica, "Creating Peace in Our Communities: An analysis of community reconciliation techniques" (2016). *University Honors Program Theses*. 171.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/honors-theses/171>

This thesis (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Honors Program Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Creating Peace in Our Communities:

An analysis of community reconciliation techniques

An Honors Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for honors in

Department of Political Science and International Studies

By

Jessica Shanken

Under the mentorship of Dr. Darin H. Van Tassell

ABSTRACT

Given the rise in efforts to resolve race issues in American communities and ethnic conflicts internationally through open communication techniques, I examine ways that these efforts can be carried out more effectively by analyzing the structure of dialogue centered on race at a large university in a rural area of the Southeast. For that purpose, survey data was collected from students before and after they attended an open forum about race and race relations on their campus to determine the impact of the forum on students' perceptions and attitudes regarding race in their community. In addition, I draw from two specific examples of intergroup dialogue to illustrate how communication methods employed in various communities facing conflicts impacted the conflict resolution process. Based on this research, I argue for the development of an improved model to facilitate difficult discussions surrounding conflicts based on race and ethnicity.

Thesis Mentor: _____

Dr. Darin H. Van Tassell

Honors Director: _____

Dr. Steven Engel

April 2016

Department of Political Science and International Studies

University Honors Program

Georgia Southern University

Table of Contents

Dedication.....	2
Acknowledgements.....	3
Preface.....	4
Introduction to dialogue.....	6
What is Dialogue: How is it used?.....	7
Washington, D.C.: Insight into Dialogue with a Young Population.....	10
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Insight into Dialogue in an International Setting.....	11
Georgia Southern University: Insight into Dialogue at a University in the American South.....	12
Methodology: The Process of Observing Dialogue at Georgia Southern University.....	15
Results and Discussion.....	17
The P.I.C. Model: Why Preparation, Innovation, and Coordination are Necessary.....	20
Further Research.....	21
Conclusion.....	22

Dedication

I dedicate this thesis to Rylie, who encourages me to make an impact in the world, and Brian, who ensured it was possible for me to do so.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dylan John for guiding me through the discovery of my passion, conflict resolution. Thank you to Giselle Devot for constant support throughout these last three years. This work could not have been possible without the amazing faculty at Georgia Southern University who assisted me in my academic pursuits and growth through rigorous course requirements and high expectations. I especially thank Dr. Darin Van Tassell for his unique teaching style, perspective on the world, and leadership in the community. His impact was felt from my Introduction to International Studies course through my Senior Seminar and throughout the completion of my thesis. Other professors who have been instrumental in helping me complete this thesis are Dr. Laura Agnich, Dr. Matthew Flynn, and Dr. Jacek Lubecki. This thesis would not have been possible without the support of my classmates over the years. Thank you to Kimberly Rudolph, Megan Bright, Caitlin Robertson, and Nicole Puckett for your encouragement, thought provoking discussions, and constant support. But most of all, thank you to the administration, faculty, and student leaders who have and continue to ensure Georgia Southern University is a more diverse and inviting home for all students to thrive.

Preface

Two young women entered the taxi cab in Statesboro, Georgia. One originated from the Caribbean and the other from South Georgia. The Haitian taxi driver immediately recognized them from their last trip a month or so ago and smiled. He said it wasn't often in our town a white girl and a dark skinned girl drove together in a car, so of course he remembered us.

For me, understanding the racial dynamics within our university quickly became a topic of key interest. I attended forums on race and soon recognized the same crowds talking about the same issues. Every once in a while, a non-ally White student would make an appearance and say an inflammatory remark that would be put to rest by those facilitating the event. In February of 2014, a local bar adjacent to campus replaced their business sign with one that displayed a confederate flag (McCray, 2014). The area and bar were well known for discriminatory practices towards Black students, and it was soon revealed they had an entire room inside dedicated to confederate memorabilia. A student led petition and protest soon started to influence the business to change the sign and name. The protest ended with vandalism of the sign and the businesses owners agreeing to remove the sign permanently. This controversy led to discussions between student leaders and administration representatives, urges for diversity education in the classroom, and increased opportunities to involve a diverse array of students in discussions about race on our campus. After a few years, campus organizations and university sponsored groups aimed to educate and facilitate discussion emerged as a reaction to various events at the local and national level. While I was present for many of these discussions and involved in the program Deliberative Dialogue, I wondered what impact this movement

was having on our community. Were the forums and meetings influencing the opinions of our student body in a positive manner? Based on my observations of the anonymous app, Yik Yak, other forms of social media, and along with pieces in student media, I wasn't sure if these programs were impactful in creating peace in our community. This thesis is a culmination of my passion for diversity and conflict resolution in an effort to determine best methods for my community to increase the effectiveness of intergroup dialogue.

Introduction to Dialogue

The past fifty years have seen student led protests around the world that left their legacy, from Kent University in 1970 to Venezuela in 2007 and the Soweto Uprising in 1976 (Johnston, 2015; Voices of protest, 2014). Modern day student protests in 2015 and 2016 at universities across the United States and South Africa have gained recognition, such as those at Missouri State University and North-West University, as students are protesting to overcome racial injustices at a systemic level. These protests are met with confusion and distaste from many of their peers who are not directly impacted by negative rules currently in place, such as the official Afrikaans language in South African classrooms or lack of diversity among professionals in the classroom across the United States. These divides based on extensive histories of repression and injustice are often seen across the world in terms of ethnic and racial conflict that continues to thrive and destroy the lives of millions of people.

Given the rise in efforts to resolve race issues in American communities and ethnic conflicts internationally through open communication techniques, I examine ways in which these efforts can be carried out more effectively by analyzing the structure of dialogue centered on race at a large university in a rural area of the Southeast of the United States. For that purpose, survey data was collected from students before and after they attended an open forum about race and race relations on their campus to determine the impact of the forum on students' perceptions and attitudes regarding race in their community. A control group of students who did not attend the event was also studied using the same pre- and post- surveys. In addition, I draw from two case studies of community dialogue to illustrate how communication methods employed in multiple

communities facing conflicts impacted the conflict resolution process. Based on this research, I argue for the development of an improved P.I.C. Model to facilitate difficult discussions surrounding conflicts based on race and ethnicity.

What is Dialogue:

How is it used?

Conflicts between various racial and ethnic groups have been seen around the globe leading to negative effects including lack of economic development, human rights violation, increased violence, increased ethnic division, and more (Jalali and Lipset, 1992). Deutscher (2002) argues these racial and ethnic divisions were imposed by Western society during imperialistic times and the repercussions of these created outgroups are the cause for many of today's modern conflicts. Common past and current tactics to "solve" the issue of diversity have included assimilation, pluralism, territorial segregation, expulsion, and annihilation (Deutscher, 2002). While these methods were typically violent and/or dehumanizing, Deutscher makes an assumption that humanity will eventually find a way to accommodate our differences in a more peaceful society. One method that has developed over time to impact social justice has been dialogue (Walsh, 2007).

Dialogue is a community discussion process focused on divisive issues with facilitated assistance over a period of time lasting anywhere from a single day to many years (Dessel and Rogge, 2008; Walsh, 1992). It evolved from Western practices and is a process which aims to bring together communities when opposing sides have experienced conflict (Dessel and Rogge, 2008). Dialogue has been seen as a form of conflict reconciliation across the world in local, state, regional and international arenas. Studies

have been conducted in all areas of the world and recently, researchers have focused on efforts to determine the effectiveness of these dialogue programs (Dessel and Rogge, 2008). While the use of these programs is increasing rapidly, more research on the effectiveness of the method is still highly needed to make improvements and suggestions (Dessel and Rogge, 2008). The study of dialogue programs effectiveness on university campuses is especially in need of further study as it is becoming increasingly popular in areas known for racial or ethnic conflict and little research has been conducted compared to other sections of the field (Wayne, 2008).

The concept of intergroup dialogue as a form of conflict reconciliation originated from the Intergroup Contact Theory, which states continued contact between different groups will result in a decrease of conflict and increase in cooperation if certain conditions are met (Dessel and Rogge, 2008; Walsh, 1992). Many researchers believe this theory is hard to prove or disprove because of the number of variables that could affect the process. However, through analyzing over 500 studies regarding Intergroup Contact Theory, Pettigrew (2008) determined contact between different groups reduces prejudices by allowing for knowledge to be exchanged about both groups, lowers anxious feelings towards intergroup contact, and increases the ability of group members to empathize with members of the outgroup. These findings support the utilization of intergroup contact to make advances in the field of social justice.

Through analyzing multiple community dialogues in the United States, Walsh (2007) has acknowledged the dominant group in power and the disadvantaged outgroup group tend to focus on unity rather than the various differences the outgroup faces (Walsh, 2007). The groups studied by Walsh (2007) grappled with the balance between

unity and difference by utilizing the commonly discussed metaphor for the American cultural system as a melting pot or a fruit salad bowl. While Walsh did not specifically study the effectiveness of observed dialogue groups, she did expand upon the results the discussions produced, including the diversification of city first responders, leading a grassroots movement for reconciliation, legislative initiatives and more. These groups strengthened networks for diverse groups to communicate in their communities and provide a thoughtful environment to examine the differences and similarities between groups. This development of proper channels can be beneficial to the community as the theory of protest exclaims that protests erupt when participants lack the ability to communicate discontent with organizations through established methods (Boulding, 2014).

Many researchers tend to study post-conflict reconciliation, but peacemaking work during a time of conflict is also necessary to evaluate. However, this can be much more difficult to carry out and to measure. Orjuela (2003) examines the role of civil society peace builders in conflict zones in Sri Lanka and suggests conflict is continued through lack of interaction and education and these are the key areas civil society is interested in addressing. The Sri Lankan civil society community utilized an individual and community based plan with aims to make a large scale impact in the war through individual perspectives. It is suggested that civil society can contribute to the peace process by (1) providing education and opportunities to discuss ethnic issues, (2) utilizing diplomacy to mediate between those with power and those without, and (3) providing economic activities to reconfigure society. Orjuela (2003) provides more specific explanations of various methods used by Sri Lankan civil society such as committees led

by religious leaders, movements to respect the dead, NGO led mediations between civilians and military leaders, and the use of media. However, it is difficult to measure the effectiveness of violence prevention and the impact of various activities on the peace process.

Two previous examples of intergroup dialogue have been conducted in Washington D.C. and Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. I have providing information about the content of these programs and the analysis completed by Wayne (2008) and Svensson (2013), respectively. Selection bias in peacebuilding research has been a serious issue in studies to determine dialogue effectiveness (Svensson and Brounéus, 2013). To combat selection bias, Wayne (2008) utilized the responses of those who were accepted and those who were rejected to the program and collected responses from both parties at the end of the program. Svensson (2013) utilized a randomization process to select two groups: one was self-selected for the program and the other was nominated to participate. I provide further details over the programs and findings of these two studies and follow with more information about the Georgia Southern University case study and my findings.

Washington D.C.:

Insight into Dialogue with a Young Population

Wayne (2008) saw firsthand the effects of a yearlong program for African American and Jewish high school juniors and seniors. The program began in 1993 in an effort to rebuild the relationships between African-American and Jewish communities. The program focuses on developing education, providing safe space for communication, teaching open communication strategies, encouraging thoughtful dialogue, and encouraging activism. The program is broken down into three phases: (1) education and

relationship building, (2) travel to historical sights during the summer, and (3) focus on facilitation and communication skills. The study was conducted by utilizing data from forty-three program participants who completed pretests and posttests, survey data from nine students who were not accepted, survey responses from twenty-five program alumni, interviews, and observations.

Overall the study by Wayne (2008) highlights the importance of building empathy and relationships between those who may not have been comfortable doing so before the program. While the first class observed created more positive connections and experiences, the second class experienced more overall strife, yet remained positive overall. The Wayne (2008) study shows that through education and open communication strategies, it is possible to create groups of young people who empathize with those different than themselves and develop an urge to advocate for social justice. With this education and awareness, came a significant decrease in optimism regarding intergroup contact. This means students were more likely to be negative about the possibility of ultimately reducing racial injustices after completing the program, which the researcher supposes is due to the increased awareness of racial strife and history. This study has significant contributions to the legitimization of intergroup contact theory and highlights key areas of future research to be studied

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia:

Insight into Dialogue in an International Setting

Svensson and Brounés (2013) studied the effects of a dialogue program at Addis Ababa University in Ethiopia from 2009 to 2010. The university being studied was chosen based on its history of ethnic violence and the history of the surrounding area

(Svensson and Brounés, 2013). Sustained Dialogue at Addis Ababa University was begun by a student-led Peace Club to (1) improve relationships between different ethnic groups and (2) create solutions to their issues (Svensson and Brounés, 2013). However, the Svensson and Brounés study focused solely on the effects of relationships between participants and non-participants.

Dialogue groups were attended by approximately 10 participants per session. The facilitators were trained in a two day session that familiarized them with dialogue as a concept and trained them in facilitation and active listening (Svensson and Brounés, 2013). Participants were randomly selected from two groups: one that chose to participate personally and one that was nominated to participate. Data was gathered from a total of 77 participants using attitudinal surveys and a trust game.

The results of the surveys showed an increase in trust between participants of different origins, but also a higher awareness of the ethnic divide in nominated participants as well as an increased perception of ethnic discrimination by all participants. While the trust game aspect of the study showed participants may have changed their attitudes as shown in the surveys, behavior had not yet been affected. The use of a trust game in a university dialogue setting is important to determine the short and long term effects of dialogue.

Georgia Southern University:

Insight into Dialogue at a University in the American South

Georgia Southern University has a recent history of racial events, and students have noted in student media their feelings about race on campus (Cannady, 2015; McCray, 2014; The Circle, 2016). The reaction from university administration has been

to support projects such as the Bias Incident Report and bringing diversity speakers such as Maura Cullen to educate students. An event entitled Courageous Conversations was held in February of 2013, a year after the death of Trayvon Martin. Trayvon was a black Florida teenager killed by a “neighborhood watchman” in February of 2012. In an interview with one of the event facilitators, Professor Nathan Palmer discussed the reactions of his students to the shooting of the unarmed 17 year old. The students were questioning the effectiveness of their university in dealing with racial incidents in the community and wanted more information about racial dynamics. Professor Palmer and Dr. Breyan Haizlip then organized the first Courageous Conversations event in which several hundred students attended.

A second event following the same format was organized for October 2015. The event was marketed to students as an opportunity to partake in a discussion on race and racism. The event was advertised through emails, flyers and digital signage throughout the campus. Many professors offered extra credit for attending or highly encouraged attending. This method of recruitment potentially led to an increase in students who are not typically interested in race issues on campus to attend the event.

The conversation centered around the following six key questions the facilitators introduced throughout the evening:

1. Why is it so hard to talk about racism?
2. What do you hope to get out of our discussion tonight?
3. What is white culture?
4. What is black culture?
5. What is racism?

6. If other people struggle with racism, why don't you?
 - a. What was the last racist thing you've done?

While confidentiality rules prohibit me from disclosing what students said during Courageous Conversations or the post-small groups, I took detailed notes on the format and scheduling of the forum. The venue had a maximum capacity of just under 600 students. The event was quickly filled and an overflow of students listened from the sides of walls. The event was on a Tuesday evening and lasted around two hours. The room was large and was organized into six blocks of seating. The layout of the room and size of the participants made it difficult to see and hear facilitators and other attendees.

Courageous Conversations was facilitated by two education professionals, one black female and one white male, who had conducted prior research to determine they were best suited for the facilitation based on their race and gender. The facilitators spoke using microphones and traveled around the room interacting with students to ask questions and hear opinions. Before the beginning of the forum, I noted students came with friends or actively searched for acquaintances to sit with. There was also a larger percentage of minority students in attendance compared to White students.

The event began with introductions in which the facilitators were vulnerable with the audience. They encouraged a safe space using the phrase "no judgement" and urged students to "be brave and (be honest." The crowd was then shocked when the black female facilitator, Dr. Haizlip, declared, "I am racist" in an effort to begin discussion.

The facilitators utilized a quick 2 and a half minute group activity in which strangers paired together and discussed why talking about racism is difficult for them for one minute each. The facilitators then laid out the ground rules over time in a way that

made them seem less burdensome to participants. They encouraged the use of I-statements, the telling of “your truth” and warned against invalidating others. They emphasized throughout the desire for students to empathize, be compassionate, communication, and develop a mutual understanding. They intertwined intellectual education on diversity issues such as the dichotomization of racism within the discussion so as to educate without overburdening the group with information. At the close of the event, students were anxious to leave and did not stay long enough to hear about a second opportunity for the night. Students had the option to stay behind for a small group session facilitated by the Courageous Conversations facilitators or staff.

Approximately forty people stayed after Courageous Conversations for the small groups. They were split into four groups. My group had fifteen people, including the facilitator who was a staff member we had not interacted with that night. Instead of a circular shape, our group made an oval that was ineffective in letting each participant be seen and heard. It was difficult to hear the small group facilitator from a few feet away.

Methodology:

The Process of Observing Dialogue at Georgia Southern University

For this study, I utilized participant observation during the event and I constructed pre- and post-surveys dispersed to students before and after an open forum about race in their communities entitled Courageous Conversations. These surveys were dispersed with the help of professors, some of whom offered extra credit for completion of the pre and post surveys whether they did or did not attend the event. The pre-survey was seventeen questions with seventy-nine respondents. The post survey was twelve questions with thirty-nine respondents: sixteen attended, twenty-four did not attend. Eleven out of

sixteen attendees and twenty out of twenty-four participants who did not attend the event completed the pre and post survey for extra credit. Sixty-five percent of participants were female, and thirty-five percent were male. The gender and racial make-up of participants was not representative of Georgia Southern's student body (Georgia Southern University, 2015).

The survey's focused on the following 10 key statements using the Likert scale with rankings 1 for strongly disagree and 5 for strongly agree.

1. Georgia Southern adequately addresses the concerns of minority student populations.
2. I have heard about the concerns of minority student populations.
3. I believe minority student concerns are important for our community to address.
4. Racism on campus is not a problem.
5. Racism in Statesboro is not a problem.
6. Georgia Southern has adequate opportunities for students to voice their grievances about race.
7. If a racially motivated event occurred in our community, I would participate in a protest.
8. Georgia Southern does not have minority racial groups
9. I feel my concerns about race and race relations are adequately addressed in our community.
10. If presented with a discussion on race, I feel adequately prepared for the conversation.

11. I talk with someone of a different race about race relations in our community often.

The eleventh statement was only included on the pre-survey. These statements were designed to determine the impact Courageous Conversations had on the opinions of students towards racial dynamics in our community. They coalesced around diversity education, diversity awareness, protest theory, and intergroup contact theory.

Results and Discussion

While the sample size of both groups ($n < 30$) was too small to draw statistical significance, important insights can be observed from the data. The survey data exposes three key findings: (1) significant changes were observed from data collected from students who did not attend the event, (2) students who attended Courageous Conversations increased their awareness of racial issues in the community, and (3) students who attended the event were less likely to participate in a protest if a racially motivated event occurred. Perceptions towards wanting opportunities to communicate about race were positively impacted by the event.

Overall, there were several significant changes from the control group of students who did not attend the event. Specific instances will be discussed with the next three results. I propose this is due to students who did not attend the event being exposed to classmates who did attend and discussions in the classroom about race on campus and potentially other events on campus I was unaware of at the time. I utilize the term boomerang effect for this phenomenon.

The second key finding is related to Statements One, Two, Six, and Nine. Both groups experienced a percentage increase for Statement One which concerns addressing

minority group concerns, but in regards to Statement Six and the opportunities available to discuss racial grievances, those who attended were increasingly neutral towards the statement that Georgia Southern offers adequate opportunities. Those who did not attend the event strongly agreed or agreed seventeen percent more than the pre-survey results. I propose this reaction from attendees is due to increased awareness towards racial issues on campus from attending the event personally and the reaction from non-attendees is a delayed result of the boomerang effect. Non-attendees believed the event and other similar events known about on campus were ample opportunities for students to voice racial concerns.

Courageous Conversations did produce a decrease of attendees and non-attendees who did not have concerns about race relations in their communities and increases in the response 'not sure' as a response to Statement Nine and feeling like their personal concerns were being addressed. This suggests the event provoked students to reflect on their feelings towards race in their community, whether through attending the event or discussing with those who did attend.

Statement Two focuses on the perception of hearing minority student population opinions. The post survey data for attendees of the event showed a seven percent increase in those who strongly agreed or agreed and a six percent increase in those who were neutral to Statement Two, suggesting the event allowed students to hear the concerns of minority groups. There was also a ten percent increase in regards to strongly agreeing or agreeing for those who did not attend the event, which I contribute to the boomerang effect.

The survey results indicated the event increased student awareness of racial issues on campus and in Statesboro. Statements Four and Five regarding racism on campus and in the local community experienced significant post-test increases in both attendees and non-attendees. Attendees experienced a fourteen percent increase for both questions and non-attendees produced an eight percent increase for Statement Four regarding racism on campus and a two percent increase regarding racism in Statesboro. Courageous Conversations provided an environment for students to share experiences and learn about various issues facing their communities.

My third observation focuses on Statement Seven regarding participation in a protest as a response to a racially motivated event. The pre-survey recorded fifty percent of those who attended would participate in a protest. The post-survey revealed a six percent decrease to forty-four percent of attendees who strongly agreed or agreed they would participate in a protest. However, the control group raised from thirty-one percent to forty-three percent. The post-survey results revealed a closing of the gap between those who did attend and those who did not attend the event. I suggest the lowering percentage of attendees who would participate is due to exposure to adequate channels to express grievances as predicted by Boulding's protest theory. While the event was much too large for individual students to express their personal dissatisfactions, there were periods in which statements made by students and facilitators were met with a large response of clapping for approval.

Based on my survey data the event was effective in providing an opportunities for students to share perspectives and gain information. Through participant observation, I noted the room and size of the group was much too large for meaningful impact on every

student due to lack of engagement and visibility of speakers. Ideas for more effective future programs include limiting space, having multiple sessions throughout a week, and providing small group interactions much earlier in the program.

The P.I.C. Model:

Why Preparation, Innovation, and Coordination are Necessary

Based on my observations of the event, survey data and studies of previous research, I have compiled a model to enhance community dialogue events and programs. The P.I.C. Model focuses on three interconnected concepts: (1) Preparation, (2) Innovation, and (3) Coordination. These three components will ultimately combine to create a more effective community dialogue program to address racial or ethnic concerns in a community.

The largest factor affecting preparation is continuity of preparation. Local leaders, such as faculty, staff, and student leaders at a university, must be continuously trained in diversity issues and conflict management skills in order to address the needs of those who rely on them. This includes the investment of resources into facilitation programs that build relationships and trust amongst differing groups. Continued research is also of the utmost importance. Many researchers have discussed the difficulty associated with researching dialogue programs, but continue to urge the need to learn more about the effects and potential best practices. Institutions or States with a diverse array of groups should encourage the continued research of current and potential methods to improve relations amongst various groups. Adequate preparation is key to addressing the innovation and coordination components.

Intergroup conflict is a global issue that continues to develop as global interests merge. Key points of innovation include (1) the effective use of popular social media outlets, (2) a balance between information and entertainment, and (3) the inclusion of all groups in the creation of the message and programming.

In an entity such as Georgia Southern, many organizations prepare events focused on diversity issues. This is similar to civil society organizations in a State. Effective coordination towards an ultimate goal by local leaders is key to creating an effective platform. However, it is also important to ensure the change is wanted by the constituents and therefore the local population (or students in this metaphor) must be prepared to significantly contribute their thoughts, experiences, and time to the initiative. These three aspects in combination set the stage for peace in our communities.

Further Research

While this research project was great grounds to start determining the effectiveness of diversity events on our campus, further research must build upon these findings to adequately assess impact the programs are having. More research needs to be conducted on the type of students attending these events, student reasoning for participating, and the boomerang effect.

Projects similar to those produced by Wayne (2008) and Svensson (2013) should be reproduced in the American university setting to better understand the effects of long term dialogue programs. Key insights into the use of the classroom or other spaces for learning may significantly bring about positive innovation in diversity education.

The concept of dialogue to reduce conflict is a historically western practice and given the increase in the use of intergroup dialogues to reconcile societies globally,

further study into other cultural modes of reconciliation must be conducted to evaluate current effectiveness and other options to reduce conflicts in our communities.

Conclusion

As the world becomes increasingly interconnected, intergroup conflict is on the rise. Researchers in the dialogue field need to continue the current base of research to determine how to effectively combat and reconcile these disputes. While more research must be done, the observations of the Georgia Southern event and the P.I.C. Model recommendations will be important to build upon for further research. The results of this study show students were impacted even if they did not attend the event, the event increased their racial awareness, and students who attended were less likely to participate in a racially motivated protest. We must be prepared, innovative, and coordinated in our efforts to build peace.

References

- Boulding, K. E. (2014). Towards a Theory of Protest, *ETC: A Review of General Semantics*, 71(2), 165-172.
- Dessel, A., & Rogge, M. E. (2008). Evaluation of intergroup dialogue: A review of the empirical literature. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 26(2), 199-238.
- Deutscher, I. (2002). *Accommodating Diversity*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.
- Georgia Southern University. (2015). *2014-2015 Factbook* (Data file). Retrieved from <http://em.georgiasouthern.edu/osra/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/fb141510.pdf>
- Jalali, R., & Lipset, S. M. (1992). Racial and Ethnic Conflicts: A Global Perspective. *Political Science Quarterly*, 107(4), 585–606.
<http://doi.org/10.2307/2152286>
- Johnston, A. (2015). Student protests, then and now. *The Chronicle Of Higher Education*, (16), 6.
- McCray, A. (2014). GSU community reacts to Rumrunners Plantation Room sign. The George-Anne. Retrieved from http://www.thegeorgeanne.com/opinion/article_a52b765a-ce04-5b95-ad9b-5c87231e7638.html
- Orjuela, C. (2003). Building Peace in Sri Lanka: A Role for Civil Society. *Journal of Peace Research*, 40(2), 195.
- Pettigrew, T. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38(6), 922-934.
- Svensson, I., & Brounéus, K. (2013). Dialogue and interethnic trust: A randomized field trial of ‘sustained dialogue in Ethiopia. *Journal of Peace Research*, 50(5), 563-575.
- [The Circle]. (2016, January 28). Being Black at Georgia Southern University (Pt 1). [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2eQdooJXAtY>.
- Voices of protest: interviews with student protesters in Ukraine, Turkey, and Venezuela. (2014). *Journal of International Affairs*, (1), 243.

Walsh, K. C. (2007). *Talking about race: community dialogues and the politics of difference*. Chicago, IL: the University of Chicago Press.

Wayne, E. K. (2008). Is it just talk? Understanding and evaluating intergroup dialogue. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 25(4), 451-578.

Appendix

Attended	
Race	
White	10
Hispanic or Latino	1
African-American or Black	3
Asian	0
Pacific Islander	0
Native Alaskan or American Indian	0
2 or more races	2
Prefer not to answer	0
Total	16

Did Not Attend	
Race	
White	12
Hispanic or Latino	1
African-American or Black	7
Asian	0
Pacific Islander	0
Native Alaskan or American Indian	0
2 or more races	3
Prefer not to answer	1
Total	24

Attended	How many total years at GSU	Did not attend	How many total years at GSU
0-1 years	8	0-1 years	2
1-2 years	4	1-2 years	7
2-3 years	1	2-3 years	7
3-4 years	2	3-4 years	4
4-5 years	1	4-5 years	1
5-6 years	0	5-6 years	1
Longer	0	Longer	2
Total	16	Total	24

Attended	
Gender	
Male	4
Female	12
Other	0
Prefer not to answer	0
Total	16
Did not attend	
Gender	
Male	10
Female	14
Other	0
Prefer not to answer	0
Total	24

Q1: Georgia Southern adequately addresses the concerns of minority student populations.								
Attended					Did not attend			
Pre		Post			Pre		Post	
Value	Number	Value	Number		Value	Number	Value	Number
5	2	5	0		5	2	5	0
4	3	4	2		4	5	4	5
3	5	3	6		3	10	3	9
2	4	2	6		2	3	2	6
1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1
Total	15	Total	15		Total	21		21

Q2: I have heard about the concerns of minority student populations.								
Attended					Did not attend			
Pre		Post			Pre		Post	
Value	Number	Value	Number		Value	Number	Value	Number
5	0	5	2		5	3	5	4
4	4	4	4		4	6	4	5
3	5	3	7		3	6	3	9
2	2	2	1		2	6	2	4
1	5	1	2		1	2	1	1
Total	16	Total	16		Total	23	Total	23

Q3: I believe minority student concerns are important for our community to address.							
Attended				Did not attend			
Pre		Post		Pre		Post	
Value	Number	Value	Number	Value	Number	Value	Number
5	8	5	7	5	7	5	11
4	7	4	8	4	13	4	6
3	1	3	1	3	3	3	6
2	0	2	0	2	0	2	1
1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
Total		16	Total	16	Total		24
Total		16	Total	16	Total		24

Q4: Racism on campus is not a problem.							
Attended				Did not attend			
Pre		Post		Pre		Post	
Value	Number	Value	Number	Value	Number	Value	Number
5	0	5	0	5	2	5	0
4	2	4	1	4	3	4	2
3	3	3	1	3	4	3	5
2	7	2	6	2	8	2	9
1	4	1	8	1	6	1	7
Total		16	Total	16	Total		23
Total		16	Total	16	Total		23

Q5: Racism in Statesboro is not a problem								
Attended					Did not attend			
Pre		Post			Pre		Post	
Value	Number	Value	Number		Value	Number	Value	Number
5	0	5	0		5	0	5	0
4	0	4	0		4	2	4	1
3	5	3	2		3	4	3	5
2	5	2	5		2	8	2	9
1	6	1	9		1	8	1	7
Total	16	Total	16		Total	22	Total	22

Q6: Georgia Southern has adequate opportunities for students to voice their grievances about race.								
Attended					Did not attend			
Pre		Post			Pre		Post	
Value	Number	Value	Number		Value	Number	Value	Number
5	0	5	2		5	1	5	0
4	7	4	4		4	5	4	10
3	4	3	7		3	12	3	8
2	4	2	2		2	4	2	5
1	1	1	1		1	2	1	1
Total	16	Total	16		Total	24	Total	24

Q7: If a racially motivated event occurred in our community, I would participate in a protest.								
Attended					Did not attend			
Pre		Post			Pre		Post	
Value	Number	Value	Number		Value	Number	Value	Number
5	3	5	4		5	3	5	4
4	5	4	3		4	4	4	5
3	5	3	6		3	8	3	7
2	1	2	2		2	4	2	3
1	2	1	1		1	4	1	4
Total	16	Total	16		Total	23	Total	23

Q8: Georgia Southern does not have minority racial groups.								
Attended					Did not attend			
Pre		Post			Pre		Post	
Value	Number	Value	Number		Value	Number	Value	Number
5	0	5	0		5	0	5	0
4	0	4	0		4	2	4	2
3	4	3	2		3	2	3	3
2	5	2	4		2	3	2	2
1	7	1	10		1	17	1	17
Total	16	Total	16		Total	24	Total	24

Q9: I feel my concerns about race and race relations are adequately addressed in our community.								
Attended					Did not attend			
Pre		Post			Pre		Post	
Value	Number	Value	Number		Value	Number	Value	Number
Yes	4	Yes	4		Yes	3	Yes	2
No	4	No	4		No	7	No	6
Not sure	4	Not sure	7		Not sure	7	Not sure	11
I have no concerns	3	I have no concerns	1		I have no concerns	6	I have no concerns	3
I prefer not to answer	1	I prefer not to answer	0		I prefer not to answer	1	I prefer not to answer	2
Total	16	Total	16		Total	24	Total	24

Q10: If presented with a discussion on race, I feel adequately prepared for the conversation.								
Attended					Did not attend			
Pre		Post			Pre		Post	
Value	Number	Value	Number		Value	Number	Value	Number
5	4	5	3		5	6	5	3
4	8	4	9		4	9	4	10
3	2	3	2		3	4	3	9
2	2	2	2		2	3	2	1
1	0	1	0		1	2	1	1
Total	16	Total	16		Total	24	Total	24

Q11: Talk				
Attended	Pre		Did not attend	Pre
Value	Number		Value	Number
5	2		5	3
4	6		4	7
3	4		3	6
2	1		2	6
1	2		1	2
Total	15		Total	24