

Summer 5-14-2018

KENYAN YOUTHS' EXPERIENCES OF INTERCULTURAL CONFLICT: NEGOTIATING CONTEXT, INTERSECTIONALITIES, AND AGENCY

Lindsay Scott
University of New Mexico

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/cj_etds



Part of the [Journalism Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Scott, Lindsay. "KENYAN YOUTHS' EXPERIENCES OF INTERCULTURAL CONFLICT: NEGOTIATING CONTEXT, INTERSECTIONALITIES, AND AGENCY." (2018). https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/cj_etds/114

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Electronic Theses and Dissertations at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Communication ETDs by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

Lindsay Desiree Scott

Candidate

Communication and Journalism

Department

This dissertation is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

Approved by the Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Mary Jane Collier, Chair

Dr. Shinsuke Eguchi

Dr. Myra Washington

Dr. Nancy López

**KENYAN YOUTHS' EXPERIENCES OF INTERCULTURAL CONFLICT:
NEGOTIATING CONTEXT, INTERSECTIONALITIES, AND AGENCY**

BY

LINDSAY DESIREE SCOTT

A.A., Liberal Studies, Moorpark Community College, 2007

B.A., Communication Studies, California State University, Channel Islands, 2010

M.A., Communication Studies, California State University, Northridge, 2012

DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Communication

The University of New Mexico

Albuquerque, New Mexico

July 2018

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It's hard to believe that I am writing the acknowledgement section of my dissertation. I've learned that writing a dissertation is not a solo endeavor, and there are many people that I owe gratitude. I've also learned that earning a PhD is more about the process than the product at the end. As I reflect on each person who has lifted me up, cheered me on, and supported me during this process, I realize how fortunate I am to have your energy in my life.

To my son Jonathan. We have literally grown up together, and I am proud to be your mother. I'm energized by your love for learning and exploring. I cannot wait see where our next adventure takes us.

To my advisor Dr. Mary Jane Collier. Thank you is not enough. You have patiently guided me along every step of my program and supported me when I needed it the most. Your rigorous critique pushed me to expand my thinking and to never stop advocating for justice.

To Dr. Shinsuke Eguchi. I am grateful for your mentorship throughout my program and your thoughtful insights and critiques. Because of you I will always push further! You have shown me a model of mentorship that I will apply in my relationships with students.

To Dr. Myra Washington. I appreciate that I can always count on you to bring an alternative perspective to the conversation. You challenge what is commonly accepted and encourage me to do the same. Academia needs more professors like you! I will try, but it won't be easy living up to the standard that you've set.

To Dr. Nancy López. Thank you for sharing your light with me. Your support throughout my study is appreciated. You've enriched my understanding culture and

encouraged me to build connections with others to advocate for justice. Thank you for your contributions.

To Dr. Karambu Ringera. Thank you for being you! You are a warrior for peace and an advocate for justice. I am beyond inspired by the work that you do. Thank you for opening your home to me and supporting my project. Asante sana!

To my study participants. I am inspired by your motivation to create change in Kenya. Thank you for sharing with me and with each other. You are Kenya! You are amani!

To my family, friends and students. To each and every person who has laughed with me, cried with me, showed an interest in my wellbeing or research, asked me how things were, reminded me to pull it together, and told me how much I inspire them, THANK YOU! Each of those moments along the way helped me to get to the end on this PhD journey. I see you. I hear you. I appreciate you.

**KENYAN YOUTHS' EXPERIENCES OF INTERCULTURAL CONFLICT:
NEGOTIATING CONTEXT, INTERSECTIONALITIES, AND AGENCY**

BY

LINDSAY D. SCOTT

A.A., Liberal Studies, Moorpark Community College, 2007

B.A., Communication Studies, California State University, Channel Islands, 2010

M.A., Communication Studies, California State University, Northridge, 2012

Ph.D., Communication, University of New Mexico, 2018

ABSTRACT

Kenya is faced with a myriad of intercultural conflicts that impact youth. This study shifts attention to eleven diverse Kenyan youth leaders, to understand how they experience and respond to conflict. To collect data, I facilitated a conflict transformation and peacebuilding workshop in Meru, Kenya. I analyzed the participants' written reflections and workshop discussions using a critical textual analysis. Participants identified contextual structures, such as tribalism, politics, economics, and patriarchy as enabling and constraining conflict. I also found that accounting for intersectional subject positions is important during intercultural conflict because how participants are positioned influences their capacity to respond to conflict in particular contexts. I found four themes related to agency during conflict transformation. Participants enacted or proposed enacting agency by using individual conflict management strategies, stepping into third party roles, working for institutional and social change, and using critical reflexivity. This study demonstrates that youth in Kenya hold tremendous promise for reimagining communities that are equitable, inclusive, just and responsive to intercultural conflict transformation and peacebuilding.

Keywords: intercultural conflict, conflict transformation, peacebuilding, Kenya, intersectionality, agency, contextual structures, tribalism, patriarchy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Problem Statement.....	1
Government & NGO Responses to Kenyan Youth	9
Overview of Key Concepts in Conflict Transformation.....	16
Conclusion	20
CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND.....	21
Critical Intercultural Communication.....	22
Community Engaged Praxis	24
My Critical Feminist Approach	26
Intersectionality.....	31
Agency	28
Critical Reflexivity.....	37
Conclusion, Goals, Research Questions	44
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY AND METHODS	46
Critical Pedagogy as Methodology.....	47
Data Collection	49
Procedures.....	50

The Workshop on Intercultural Conflict Transformation	53
Data Analysis	58
Critical Textual Analysis	58
Conclusion	60
CHAPTER 4: CONTEXTUAL FORCES ENABLING AND CONSTRAINING INTERCULTURAL CONFLICT IN KENYA	62
Contextual Structures	63
Historical Background	64
Politics and Economics	70
Politics and Tribalism	73
Patriarchy	79
Inequitable Access to Resources	86
Tribal Hierarchies and Power Relations	96
Conclusion	100
CHAPTER 5: NEGOTIATING INTERSECTIONAL SUBJECT POSITIONS IN INTERCULTURAL CONFLICT IN KENYA	103
Identities	104
An Intersectional Approach to Identity	105
Discursive Repertoires and Social Identities	106

Regional Differences Intersecting with Other Identities	107
Gender Intersecting with Other Identities.....	107
Socioeconomic Class Intersecting with Other Identities	112
Religion Intersecting with Other Identities.....	123
Conclusion	127
 CHAPTER 6: ENACTING AGENCY DURING INTERCULTURAL CONFLICT	
IN KENYA.....	130
Conflict Transformation.....	130
Conceptualizing Agency.....	132
Conflict Management Strategies and Agency.....	134
Agency and Third Party Roles	140
Broader Engagement with Institutions.....	146
Reflexivity and Agency	150
Conclusion	152
 CHAPTER 7: SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND APPLICATIONS	
Summary of Research.....	155
Research Goals.....	155
Research Questions.....	158
Implications for Theorizing	165

Implications for Methods	171
Limitations	172
Future Research and Praxis.....	176
Applications of the Study for Participants and Community Partner.....	178
Implications for Research	180
APPENDICES	183
REFERENCES.....	194

LIST OF APPENDICIES

Appendix A: Consent to Participate in Research.....	182
Appendix B: Demographic Chart	185
Appendix C: Demographics Questionnaire	186
Appendix D: Concepts Introduced by the Researcher	187
Appendix E: Written Reflections #1	188
Appendix F: Questions used in Small Group Discussion.....	189
Appendix G: Conflict Transformation Strategies	190
Appendix H: Written Reflections #2	191
Appendix I: Written Reflections #3	192

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

Responding to intercultural conflict and developing peacebuilding initiatives requires an inclusive and multidimensional approach. For sustainable long-term change researchers and practitioners must work alongside the community members who are impacted by intercultural conflict and use mutually constructed intervention(s) that serve immediate needs, while simultaneously working to address the underlying contextual factors that enable intercultural conflict and act as barriers to conflict transformation and peacebuilding. One group that remains on the periphery of society and conflict transformation efforts are youth. There are a variety of reasons that youth are excluded or the very least, not taken seriously concerning their ability to take the lead in creating a more just, equitable, and inclusive social world. Camino and Zeldin (2002) state that some of the reasons that youth remain on the periphery include: segregation of youth from adults, negative stereotypes about youths' capabilities, and general negative beliefs about adolescents. Consequently, youth represent some of the most marginalized voices in our communities. Although youth participation in the public sphere is a concern throughout the world, my study calls attention to the ways that diverse youth in Kenya experience intercultural conflict and enact conflict transformation.

There is no universal, monolithic, or singular construction of youth. Therefore, it is important that youth are situated in the particular geopolitical context that is being studied. What it means to be a youth and who is considered a youth is negotiated and defined in a particular time and place and is connected to issues of power, authority, gender, and complex processes of globalization (Christiansen, Utas, & Vigh, 2006; Stephens, 1995). In the geopolitical context of Kenya, a youth is understood to be

between the ages of 15-30. According to the Ministry of Youth Affairs (2006) this “takes into account the physical, psychological, cultural, social, biological and political definitions of the term” (p. 1). I use the term youth because in the Kenyan context, youth is the appropriate term for that age group. In this study, I focused on eleven youth in Kenya who are between the ages of 19-23 and participants in the New Generation Leadership training that was held in Meru, Kenya from June 28-July 2, 2017. This training was sponsored by my community partner, Dr. Karambu Ringera and International Peace Initiatives, which is an international non-governmental organization based in Meru, Kenya.

Giving attention to the diverse youth in Kenya is important for several reasons. First, African youth are seldom portrayed as agents of change in academic research, which discounts the community capacity building that many are involved in. Christiansen, et. al. (2006) explain that youth in Africa play a role in community change as both, “social navigators of the present and social generators of individual and collective futures” (p. 21). As social actors, youth are navigating structural barriers, exercising agency and committed to conflict transformation and peacebuilding. This type of community generated change is important. The website of International Peace Initiatives (IPI, 2018) asserts that “only “homegrown” peace initiatives will liberate Africa from the current quagmire of persistent conflicts” (IPI, Our Programs, para. 4). Nigerian scholar Obijiofor (2004) agrees with those sentiments in his vision for Africa, by calling for “integration rather than division/disintegration, greater participation in decision-making rather than paternalistic dependence” (p. 131).

Outside interventions and decision-making often create a dependency on foreign

intervention and aid, and only complicate the “homegrown” initiatives that IPI refers to. I am sensitive to this dynamic and worked to mitigate this outcome. One way that I addressed this was by remaining in dialogue with my community partner, Dr. Ringera. During these conversations, Dr. Ringera identified concerns of the youth, rather than imposing my outside perspective. In addition, upon my arrival in Meru, Dr. Ringera and I spent time reviewing my study goals and workshop agenda. I was offered feedback that challenged my assumptions about tribal conflict in Kenya and the youths’ capacity to respond. Further, during the workshop, I asked the participants to critique the concepts and strategies and contribute to the conversation. This was my attempt to open space for the workshop to be partly driven by people who understand the needs and concerns of their communities.

Madison (2012) raises concern that research on Africa and Africans tends to essentialize diverse cultures, contexts, and peoples, which is problematic. Africans, youth and women in particular, are often positioned as helpless, subordinate, disadvantaged, and powerless. How researchers and practitioners represent subjects in academic literature has consequences. For example, Hall (1997) argues that how people are represented determines how they are treated. In this study I challenge the dominant narrative by offering particular insights about diverse Kenyan youth and how they are opening social spaces to transform intercultural conflict and engage in peacebuilding.

The second reason that this study focused on youth in Kenya is that they are marginalized and disenfranchised in their nation. Rapid population growth is one factor contributing to the inequities that Kenyan youth experience. As the population continues to grow, youth are further displaced and disenfranchised (Ministry of Youth Affairs,

2006). According to the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (2015 & 2005) the population increased from 30.2 million in 2000, to 39.5 million in 2011, and 43 million in 2014. Youth between the ages 15-30 accounted for 12.3 million or twenty-eight percent of the total population in 2014. There are an almost equal number of male and female youth in any given year. With twenty-eight percent of their population between the ages of 15-30, Kenya is experiencing what is known as a youth bulge. Hope (2012) explains that the youth bulge in Kenya presents challenges for the youth and for the country. On the one hand youth “represent the most abundant asset Kenya has or will have over the near future” (Hope, 2012, p. 221), yet they are faced with tremendous challenges. Some additional constraints that have made it difficult for youth to thrive in Kenya include: lack of appropriate skills, unclear and uncoordinated youth policies and programs, resource constraints, and attitudes that question youths’ capabilities (Ministry of Youth Affairs, 2006).

Third, Kenya is faced with a myriad of contextual challenges that impact youth. Context refers to a range of macro, meso, and micro structural forces and relations that influence material realities and lived experiences, such as intercultural conflict. Attending to contextual factors also reveals how differing levels of individual agency are enacted in particular settings (Collier, 2005), and how agency enables or constrains praxis (Broome & Collier, 2012). Examples of context that could be important include: histories, institutional policies, corporate norms, community organization practices, material conditions, education, judicial systems, religion, racism, whiteness, patriarchy, and global, national, political, and economic forces (Collier & Muneri, 2016; Collier, 2014). Collier and Ringera (2015) outline contextual structures that constrain youth and

women's agency in Kenya. The contextual structures that they identified include: Colonization, patriarchy, government valorization of democratization, poverty, political corruption, health challenges such as HIV/AIDS, and the lack of economic, human, and social rights.

Fourth, youth in Kenya are especially vulnerable to various forms of inequities, injustice, and exclusion. According to The Kenya National Youth Charter, "Kenyan youth continue to suffer structural marginalization in politics, economic and cultural and social spheres of our nation" (Centre for Multi-Party Democracy Kenya, 2013, p. 9). Youth are also faced with high unemployment and underemployment rates, harassment by the police, lack of education and health care, a variety of health related issues (malaria, malnutrition, HIV/AIDS, drug and substance abuse, female genital mutilation, teenage pregnancy, and a high mortality rate from abortions), high drop-out rates in school and college, crime, abuse and exploitation, limited recreational facilities, lack of decent housing, food insecurity, and limited access to information and communication technology (Hope, 2012; Ministry of Youth Affairs, 2006). Moreover, youth face uncertainty about the quality of the environment that will be passed to them because of pollution, deforestation, and poor waste management (Ministry of Youth Affairs, 2006). Even though these concerns are shared by all community members, youth in Kenya are disproportionately burdened by them. For instance, Ministry of Youth Affairs (2006) highlight that youth represent 33% of all AIDS cases reported. This study, therefore considers the specific contextual factors that impact youth in Kenya and how those factors enable and constrain intercultural conflict and agency to transform conflict.

Government & NGO Responses to Kenyan Youth

The disenfranchisement and marginalization of youth in Africa has been recognized by various governments and organizations. In the past decade there have been several notable policies/charters written by the African Union, the Kenyan government, and non-governmental organizations (NGO) in Kenya. These documents denounce the predicament of youth, promote youth issues and well-being, and/or call for youth participation in decision-making and leadership platforms. One example of such action is my community partner, International Peace Initiatives (IPI), which is located in Meru, Kenya. IPI's website describes their organization as envisioning, "a world where violence, poverty and disease no longer exist and every individual lives in dignity and with integrity" (IPI, 2018, Our Visions, para. 1). I expand on IPI's mission and community commitments in a later section of this study.

Kenya National Youth Policy. In 2006, the Ministry of Youth Affairs authored the Kenya National Youth Policy (KNYP). This policy was created in response to the "myriad of challenges facing the youth in Kenya" (Ministry of Youth Affairs, 2006, p. iv). Developed with the goal to involve youth in the development of their communities and civic affairs, the KNYP "visualizes a society where youth have an equal opportunity as other citizens to realize their fullest potential, productively participating in economic, social, political, cultural and religious life without fear or favour" (Ministry of Youth Affairs, 2006, p. 4). The policy acknowledges the innovative approaches that youth use to address their social, economic, health, environmental, educational, and recreational needs.

The KNYP outlines the five barriers that youth-oriented programs are met with

when the programs attempt intervention. First, population growth puts pressure on resources, as they are spread among the growing number of youth. Second, the education system and training institutions are graduating students that have not been prepared with life or labor market skills. Third, programs directed toward youth often have unclear and uncoordinated policies and programs, which hamper their effectiveness. Fourth, most programs for youth are operated by government or non-governmental agencies, which lack the adequate funds necessary to be successful. Fifth, attitudes about youth and existing structural barriers inhibit youth's full participation in society. For example, youth are the least represented group in political and economic spheres due to their low status, and sociocultural and economic barriers (Ministry of Youth Affairs, 2006).

The Kenya National Youth Policy argues that social systems need to change from working *for* youth, to working *with* youth to address their social concerns. They propose several strategies for accomplishing this, three of which have significance to this study. First, they encourage youth to take leadership positions. Second, they “encourage the youth to stand up against all forms of injustice and discrimination” (Ministry of Youth Affairs, 2006, p. 13). Third, the policy makes recommendations for how institutions can center the voices and experiences of youth. For instance, in efforts to enhance education and training, Ministry of Youth Affairs (2006) asserts that a curriculum should be developed that addresses the youth and their circumstances. This recommendation aligns with the goal of critical pedagogy, which uses the instructional space as a place where students can investigate and intervene for social justice (Fassett & Warren, 2007). This study contends that each of these three strategies for working *with* youth are important. However, they must be informed by the contextual forces that enable and constrain the

youths' social concerns and the intercultural conflict that they experience, along with their ability to respond to those concerns.

The Kenya National Youth Charter. In 2013 the Centre for Multiparty Democracy Kenya, an NGO, authored The Kenya National Youth Charter (KNYC). This Charter is focused on uniting youth in Kenya and transforming the country. The Charter asserts that the well-being of youth and the health of the Country are interconnected. Centre for Multi-Party Democracy Kenya (2013) states, "Kenya will only become prosperous when young people, who are the majority of our adult population, have access to basic rights including food, housing, health care, water and sanitation and social security" (p. 18). The Charter calls attention to multiple social inequities that the youth face. It begins by calling for an end to discrimination that infiltrates all spheres of life in Kenya. The Charter acknowledges the role that youth in Kenya played in the struggle and passage of the new Constitution by stating, "Many young Kenyans gave their lives, limbs, careers and education to fight for a new democratic Constitution that would establish equality and non-discrimination" (p. 7). However, the passage of the Constitution has not changed how these policies are applied to Kenya's youth or the opportunities that they have access to (Centre for Multi-Party Democracy Kenya, 2013).

Youth are faced with a myriad of types of discrimination. Young women are discriminated against in the public and private sector because of inequitable gender dynamics that are driven by patriarchy. The Charter states that unsafe abortions take the lives of more than six thousand women, mostly young, each year (Centre for Multi-Party Democracy Kenya, 2013). Providing youth with access to reproductive health services and education would reduce the likelihood that an abortion would result in so many

deaths each year. Discrimination based on ethnicity/tribe, gender, and religion limits youth's access to the workforce. The Centre for Multi-Party Democracy Kenya (2013) asserts that youth unemployment is a national crisis and that it was a key force driving the 2008 election violence. They proposed that addressing all aspects of discrimination against youth in Kenya is necessary for the youth and the country to prosper.

Increased youth leadership and representation is necessary for Kenya to achieve the country's Vision 2030, which is the blueprint for long-term development. However, the Centre for Multi-Party Democracy Kenya (2013) finds that youth cannot access leadership roles because they are discriminated against because of their age, and their inability to gather financial and social resources. The underrepresentation of youth is problematic because "Kenyan youth continue to suffer structural marginalization in politics, economic, cultural, and social spheres of our nation" (Centre for Multi-Party Democracy Kenya, 2013, p. 9). In terms of political representation, the Centre for Multi-Party Democracy Kenya (2013) recommends that political parties begin to recruit people under the age of 35 because 67% of Kenyan voters are under the age of 35. Moreover, to address the absence of young women in the political process, they call for programs that offer mentorship, support, coaching, and leadership development for young women. The Kenyan National Youth Charter outlines the numerous ways that Kenyan youth are burdened and provides recommendations for addressing those burdens.

African Youth Charter. Developed in 2006 by the African Union Commission, the African Youth Charter (AYC) underscores the importance of participation and involvement by youth in the development of Africa. The African Union Commission (2006) asserts that youth, which account for 40% of the population of Africa, is the

greatest resource available to respond to the difficulties that the continent faces. The Charter points to the role that youth can play in the process of decolonization, the struggle against apartheid, and recent efforts to promote democratic processes in Africa. The African Union Commission contends that youth are committed to reimagining their location, national, and regional situations.

The African Union Commission (2006) asserts that youth play an important role in promoting peace and non-violence, but they need the support of State institutions to actualize this. The Charter states the State parties must:

Strengthen the capacity of young people and youth organisations in peace building, conflict prevention and conflict resolution through the promotion of intercultural learning, civic education, tolerance, human rights education and democracy, mutual respect for cultural, ethnic, and religious diversity, the importance of dialogue and cooperation, responsibility, solidarity and international cooperation. (African Union Commission, 2006, p. 29-30)

In addition to the responsibility that the Charter places on institutional interventions, it also places responsibility on the youth to play a role in changing their lives, family, Kenya, and local and international communities, which shows assumptions about the agency of youth. The African Union Commission (2006) outlines the following responsibilities for youth: 1) To exercise agency over their own development; 2) To vote and engage in decision-making and governance; 3) To use peer-to-peer education to learn about violence prevention and peacebuilding; and 4) To work across cultural differences to encourage tolerance, understanding, dialogue, and respect for others. As outlined in the African Youth Charter, youth are a vulnerable population. At the same time, they hold

tremendous promise for reimagining communities that are equitable, inclusive, just and responsive to intercultural conflict and peacebuilding.

National Policy on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management. In 2012, Kenya's Ministry of State for Provincial Administration and Internal Security responded to the "lack of policy guidelines for a coordinated approach to peace building and conflict management" (p. 5) with the National Policy on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management. The aim of the policy is to "promote sustainable peace through a collaborative institutional framework between state and non-state actors" (Ministry of State for Provincial Administration and Internal Security, 2012, p. 6). The policy recognizes that when collaborative efforts are sensitive to the needs of the communities the potential to address conflict and create peace is increased.

The Ministry of State for Provincial Administration and Internal Security (2012) offers ten principles for peacebuilding and conflict management, each of which inform this study. First, proactive and preventive measures should be taken to respond to conflict. Second, a culturally sensitive approach must be used when working toward peace. This means that praxis must take into account political, social, and economic factors that create and sustain conflict and limit agency for peacebuilding. Additionally, Ministry of State for Provincial Administration and Internal Security (2012) states that being cognizant of "the cultural values and norms of the affected communities and building on the existing traditional conflict handling methods that have fostered peaceful coexistence within and among communities" (p. 12) is essential to the peacebuilding process. Third, interventions must be human rights based. The fourth principle states that awareness of the complexity of the conflict is necessary so that the intervention does not

escalate the conflict. The scope of awareness includes understanding the socio-political context of conflict, such as ethnic divisions, social and economic marginalization, inequitable distribution of resources, disregard for the law, and high unemployment among youth and how those factors complicate conflict and the peacebuilding process.

Fifth, community members should be included as active participants in the analysis of the situation, the decision-making, and the conflict response. Sixth, conflict analysis and interventions should be research-based. The seventh principle calls for interventions to be sensitive to a range of cultural/social groups. People experience conflict differently based on their social location, so the peacebuilding process must take into account the “different perspectives, needs, interests, roles and even resources reinforced by class, economics, politics, ethnicity or age” (Ministry of State for Provincial Administration and Internal Security, 2012, p. 13). The eighth principle demands that everyone is treated as equal human beings regardless of their social positions. The ninth principle calls for collaboration among all participants. The final principle asserts that accountability and transparency is necessary among all actors.

Although the National Policy on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management is directed toward peacebuilding and conflict management for all of Kenya, it does draw attention to the needs to youth. The policy asserts that youth are particularly vulnerable to conflict and that sustainable peacebuilding interventions must include their input. One way to engage youth is through capacity building. Ministry of State for Provincial Administration and Internal Security (2012) explains that capacity building is actualized by training social actors in areas such as conflict prevention, resource mobilization, and peacebuilding. Training in these areas helps to increase the capacity for community

members to respond to conflict in a manner that promotes long-term sustainable peace.

Kenya National Action Plan. In 2000, The United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 (UNSCR) on women, peace and security was passed. The 2016 Kenya National Action Plan (KNAP) was co-developed by the Ministry of Public Service, Youth, and Gender Affairs, and the Ministry of Interior & the Coordination of National Government to outline how the UNSCR would be implemented in the country. The plan is also known by its Kiswahili name, *Kuhusisha Wanawake ni Kudumisha Amani*, which means, “to involve women is to sustain peace”. Although the action plan focuses on the lives of women, it is more broadly concerned with the lives of women and girls in Kenya. Specifically, the Kenya National Action Plan is committed to working with the Government of Kenya to improve the lives of women and girls in five categories: participation and representation; prevention of sexual and gender-based violence; protection during conflict situations; promotion of gender perspectives; and relief and recovery measures that respond to security needs and priorities (Ministry of Public Service, Youth, and Gender Affairs, & Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National Government, 2016). The Kenya National Action Plan places the responsibility of including women and girls on local and national administrations. Although involving government entities is critical to transforming the lives and situated experiences of women and girls, how communities are facilitating inclusive engagement locally is important in this study.

International Peace Initiatives. International Peace Initiatives (IPI) is a Kenyan and U.S. based non-governmental organization with a mission “to promote cultures of peace by supporting sustainable initiatives that improve livelihoods and enhance quality

of life.” (IPI, 2018, about us, para. 1). The organization began in 2002 when Founder and President, Dr. Karambu Ringera, met a group of Kenyan women living with HIV/AIDS. Dr. Ringera sought a way to enable the women to take control of their lives, while dealing with the physical disease of HIV/AIDS and addressing the social and cultural contexts of HIV/AIDS. To accomplish this, IPI was developed to offer the community support that is necessary for healing, but also to enable the women’s agency to impact their lives. The work at IPI extends beyond “empowerment” for women with HIV/AIDS, to orphans, youth, survivors of violence, and women’s needs in general.

To realize their mission, International Peace Initiatives (2018) takes a comprehensive approach to programs; the approach has four components. First, the orientation to development and peacebuilding is participatory and holistic. Second, human rights, child rights and women's rights remain a central focus. Third, International Peace Initiatives embraces practices that enhance environmental, social and economic sustainability. Fourth, the various programs at IPI promote equality, equity and justice (IPI, 2018, About us, para. 4). This approach is both comprehensive and can help to build sustainable communities and peace.

International Peace Initiatives’ outcomes are recognized through a variety of programs, including trainings in peace education and conflict resolution. One such training is the New Generation Leadership (NGL) program. This study is an extension of that program by working with youth leaders on conflict transformation. My workshop turns attention to contextual forces and group identities that become salient during intercultural conflict, whereas the NGL training is more focused on internal transformation. In collaboration with Mind Transform Africa and Effective Change

Consultants, NGL is a youth leadership training that has been offered several times at IPI's site in Meru, Kenya. The training from which my study recruited participants from, was held June 28-July 2, 2017. During this training, approximately forty youth from diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds gathered at IPI's Tiriji Eco Center.

The purpose of the NGL program is to train African youth how to lead from within (New Generation Leadership, 2017). New Generation Leadership teaches youth to look within themselves to become leaders of change, rather than looking for outside leadership and solutions to social problems. Ringera (2017) states that NGL moves away from the idea that there is an "expert out there who can come and assess our situation and tell us what are the solutions that we need" (Ringera in New Generation Leadership video, 2017). The training encourages the participants to use intuition and emotion as forms of knowing, and uses guiding questions such as "Who are you?" and "Can you lead from the heart?" According to Ringera (2018) the program calls for leaders to focus on people rather than policies and institutions, and to see the humanity in each other.

This study built on the New Generation Leadership's approach that emphasizes individual orientations, by adding attention to understanding cultural difference, which leaders need to navigate; working with intercultural conflict, which all leaders experience; and applying conflict transformation moves in service of peacebuilding and justice. Therefore, this study is guided by four research goals. The first goal is to build understanding of the context of intercultural conflict in Kenya, including the factors that are identified and experienced by diverse Kenyan youth. The second goal is to build knowledge about the youth's intersectional subject positions that emerge in intercultural conflicts. The third goal is to study how the diverse youth negotiate those contexts and

subject positions to enact agency during conflict transformation. The fourth goal is to implement a youth leadership workshop that focuses on cultural difference, conflict transformation, and promotes peacebuilding.

Overview of Key Concepts in Conflict Transformation

Intercultural conflict. Conflict and violence exist in communities across the world, and nations throughout Africa are no exception. Sorrells (2016) defines intercultural conflict as “the real or perceived incompatibility of values, norms, expectations, goals, processes, or outcomes between two or more interdependent individuals or groups from different cultures” (p. 203). Intercultural conflict can manifest in varying and complex forms and be rooted in and perpetuated by multiple contextual factors. For example, Maphosa and Keasley (2014) point out that “Africa is home to over half of the civil wars in the world” (p. 3). Conflict in Africa is often connected to ethno-political conflict that is generated around basic needs not being met, asymmetric power relations, antagonistic histories, and fragile conditions that result in “the militarization of social life, politics, and economy” (Maphosa & Keasley, 2014, p. 3). This study found that a myriad of contextual factors continue to enable and constrain intercultural conflict.

Conflict transformation. Conflict transformation is a process that consists of “constructive change initiatives that include and go beyond the resolution of particular problems” (Lederach, 2003, p.4). Whereas conflict resolution implies that something is finished, conflict transformation takes a deeper look at presenting issues to analyze what drives intercultural conflict and includes developing relationships and practices that are consistent with justice and peacebuilding. Conflict transformation is essential to long-term sustainable change because it gives considerations to “ways of resolving rather than

just managing conflict, focusing on and seeking to address the root causes of violence” (Maphosa & Kearsley, 2014, p. 5).

Managing conflict becomes evident when people seek ways to respond to the presenting issues. While this is a necessary step, it will not result in an understanding of the complexities that drive conflict, nor does it have the potential to transform the conflict. Further, Maphosa and Kearsley (2014) state that the process “is based on eradicating something that is undesired (violence) and the building of something that is desired through the transformation of relationships and construction of the conditions for peace” (p. 6). Matyók and Kellett (2017) contend that transformation is:

Centered on communication, that works on and between the relationship of specific (micro-level) moments or scenarios that can include conversations, dialogues, rhetorical struggles, techniques and processes, and so on, and the more enduring structural and patterned dynamics (macro-level) of communication that generate and can be transformed by such momentary or specific efforts. (p. xii)

In this regard, the micro and macro level are operating in a continual feedback loop. Therefore, conflict transformation is enacted at the micro level to produce change at the structural level. However, it is oversimplified to think that using a specific behavior such as listening to people will create structural change. For long-term and sustainable transformation, researchers, practitioners, and community members must attend to contextual factors, cultural differences, and levels of agency, and work with the groups to address such macro level factors.

Peacebuilding. Broome and Collier (2012) call on intercultural communication scholars to “play a central role in advancing the study and practice of peacebuilding” (p.

245). This study responds to that call by investigating how contextual structures act as enabling and constraining factors of conflict and peacebuilding. Lederach (1997) defines peacebuilding as a “comprehensive set of concepts that encompasses, generates, and sustains the full array of processes, approaches, and stages needed to transform conflict toward more sustainable, peaceful relationships” (p. 19). Building on that, Lederach and Lederach (2014) explain that peacebuilding is widely understood as a process that “includes activities and initiatives to reduce violence and increase justice through peaceful means prior to, during and after open and often sustained periods of armed conflict” (p. 36). This study adopts Broome and Collier’s (2012) definition of peacebuilding as an approach that “requires attention to individuals’ orientations, relationships between individuals and groups, and the role of institutions and social systems that discourage violence, promote equity and offer mechanisms for dealing constructively with differences and disagreements” (p. 251).

As a process, peacebuilding has the potential to address the underlying causes of conflicts. Haugerudbratten (1998) proposes that there are six dimensions and two tendencies or aims of peacebuilding. The first dimension addresses the orientation to peacebuilding. Within that orientation, one aim is generally to promote a just process for managing conflicts and settling disputes. A second aim is to investigate and interrupt the underlying causes of the conflict. The second dimension of peacebuilding is the means that is used to achieve peace. Within the means, one aim is political intervention. A second aim has a broader focus, concerned with the “political, economic, security and humanitarian sphere” (Haugerudbratten, 1998, p. 7). The third dimension of peacebuilding is the temporal aspect, which is either short-term or long-term respectively.

The fourth dimension consists of the actors, such as the international community offering outside interventions and the community members who develop grassroots approaches. The fifth dimension is the process of peacebuilding, which is the actions taken for peacebuilding and the results of such actions. The sixth dimension of peacebuilding is concerned with the organization sponsoring the peacebuilding. Haugerudbratten's (1998) framework offers researchers and practitioners a starting point for understanding and analyzing peacebuilding.

In Africa, much of the funding for peacebuilding comes from foreign donors and is donor-driven (Karbo, 2014). Yet, African peacebuilding practitioners, such as Dr. Ringera of International Peace Initiatives, are also making strides toward grassroots peacebuilding. The text *Building Peace from Within* calls attention to the multiple approaches and programs that are being used in communities throughout Africa to engage in peacebuilding and conflict transformation. For example, in Ringera's chapter in the book (Ringera, 2014), the author centers women as peacebuilders, and argues that women have always played an important role in creating and maintaining peace, but patriarchy often becomes a barrier to their efforts. Ringera (2014) asserts that the characteristics of peacebuilding include: "inclusion, participation, emancipation, collaboration and empowering" (p. 172). However, in the context of Kenya, Ringera (2014) argues that many peacebuilding agencies do not embody these characteristics. In summary, the use of community-based efforts to build peace can involve community members who can account for contextual forces and cultural differences that are important in the peacebuilding process. Local efforts also better attend to varying levels of agency that are the result of contextual forces.

Conclusion

As I have outlined, youth in Kenya hold two simultaneous positions, as disproportionality disenfranchised and marginalized, and as a significant resource to their country. Youth participation in the public sphere is necessary for an inclusive society that desires to transform intercultural conflict and build sustainable peace. Mutuku (2009) found that when empowered, youth in sub-Saharan Africa have the potential to become “economically self-reliant, politically active and socially responsible for the sustenance of development and poverty reduction” (p. 1). The importance of youth participation in community capacity building and conflict transformation cannot be overemphasized. The next chapter outlines the theoretical and conceptual background and elaborates on additional key concepts in the research questions.

CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

This study applies a critical intercultural communication lens to study culture and communication in conflict transformation. The major theories and theoretical constructs that are used in this study are community engaged praxis, critical feminist theory, intersectionality, and critical reflexivity. The use of these theoretical frameworks and constructs are important for two reasons. First, each is concerned with how power relations and privilege operate to dis/enable agency, affect access to resources and to render people, at times visible and at other times invisible. Second, the first three are enhanced by critical reflexivity. This is a two-fold process of illuminating the positionalities of the researcher and how her political orientations and assumptions influence the study, and the centering of the lives and perspectives of the study participants in their lived context (Collier, 2014). This requires that I account for the locations from which I speak and interpret the world, those of the study participants and our relationships. Mohanty (2003) explains that one's standpoint is a combination of social locations, lived experiences, and epistemic perspective.

My social locations as an agnostic, White, heterosexual, cisgendered, female with United States citizenship and class privilege, matter in this study. Moreover, the meanings attached to these positions are not static. As I move throughout time and space, I am mindful that the meanings attached to my body change and these meanings impact how I relate to others. How I am positioned within social hierarchies influences my epistemic and ontological orientations, which I account for in this research. For example, my U.S. upbringing with race and class privilege has provided me with agency to navigate systems, structures, and spaces with some ease and conduct academic research

in an international environment. This type of agency is not always available to people from racially stigmatized communities, people read as queer, people whose first language is not English, and people who have not had access to higher education. In Kenya, my race, nationality, and education marked me as credible and participants often looked to me for answers. I was often treated as an expert and participants sometimes uncritically parrot back information that I shared with them. When I noticed this tendency, I probed for examples to enable participants to teach me.

Critical Intercultural Communication

This study is grounded in a critical intercultural communication framework. A critical intercultural communication approach is an important orientation to this study because it “foregrounds issues of power, context, socio-economic relations and historical/structural forces as constituting and shaping culture and intercultural communication encounters, relationships and contexts” (Halualani & Nakayama, 2011, p.1). As I built knowledge about how conflict transformation and peacebuilding skills are enacted by diverse Kenyan youth, I attended to the contextual forces that enabled and constrain conflict (Collier, 2014; Broome & Collier, 2012). Attention to context also helped to reveal how differing levels of individual and collective agency are enacted in particular settings (Collier, 2005). Agency is a central construct in critical intercultural communication because individual and collective agency is needed by social actors to respond to social issues, practice modes of resistance that perpetuate social change, engage in community capacity building, address intercultural conflict, and engage in peacebuilding practices. It is problematic to assume that agency is static, monolithic, or entirely self-derived. A critical intercultural lens allows me to interrogate such

assumptions and revealed how macro, meso, and micro contextual factors influenced the Kenyan youth leaders' agency as social actors.

Critical intercultural scholarship operates with broad goals that relate to interrogating the relationship between culture and communication and institutions, ideologies, domination, power, emancipation, agency, structural factors, representations, sociopolitical/historical/economic/cultural context, and social justice. Martin and Nakayama (1999) summarize critical intercultural communication as a perspective that seeks to “understand the role of power and contextual constraints on communication in order ultimately to achieve a more equitable society” (p. 8).

As a critical intercultural scholar, I have two objectives for this study. First, I uncover factors that operate in covert or normalized ways to develop social hierarchies and create inequitable material conditions. Halualani and Nakayama, (2011) argue that “Critical perspectives have always been finely attuned to revealing great insight on the larger, hidden (beneath-the-surface) and visible (what we see but take-for-granted given its naturalized appearance) aspects of power that constitute intercultural communication encounters and relations” (p. 5). Critical scholarship critiques macrostructures, ideologies, identity politics, master narratives, and representations because they play a key role in the knowledge production process. Further, Martin & Nakayama (2010) remind us that critical scholars “emphasize the importance of studying in the context that the communication occurs-- that is the situation, background, or environment” (p. 65). Situating the study in the context where intercultural conflict is occurring allows me to unpack the social and structural factors that influence the youths' individual experiences about intercultural conflict, subject positions, and agency. Consequently, my approach to

studying culture and communication includes attention to contextual forces such as poverty, inequitable access to resources, political tribalism, religion, intertribal conflict, violence, and patriarchy.

My second objective of this critical intercultural research relates to social justice. Martin and Nakayama (2010) remark that critical intercultural scholarship has a dual purpose, “to understand human behavior, but also to change the lives of everyday communicators” (p. 66). This type of scholarship can actualize change in different ways. For example, the act of revealing what is hidden or challenging what is normalized increases awareness and may challenge the status quo, perhaps producing change. In this study, I analyze how contextual factors such as, politics, tribalism, economic conditions, patriarchy, history, education, religion, resources (land, water, electricity, cattle, farm tools), rural and city residences, violence, and cultural values enables and constrains intercultural conflicts that act as a barrier to conflict transformation in Kenya. I also examine how such contextual factors, along with the youths’ subject positions create differing levels of agency to transform intercultural conflict. My commitment to supporting communities as they create change is realized through these efforts.

Community Engaged Praxis

Community engaged praxis is a complex approach to community-based research. Collier (2014) describes community engaged praxis “as a process through which researchers and practitioners work within and across communities to address issues of (in)equity, (in)justice, and ex/inclusion” (p. 3). This type of community engagement is different than community development or outside interventions because the goal is long-term, sustainable, community-based decision-making and action, which is community

driven and contextually contingent. To build community-based research at this level, the scholar/practitioner and the co-researchers must engage in praxis. Praxis is thinking and acting that is both critical and reflective (Sorrells & Nakagawa, 2008). Collier (2014) adds that praxis is critical and interpretively informed action that enhances social justice. Community engaged praxis requires that attention is paid to the historical, political, economic, and social context that creates conditions of (in)equity, (in)justice, and ex/inclusion and how different intersecting subject positions emerge and are impacted. This is important for this study because Kenya's complex context drives the intercultural conflicts that the youth have been experiencing and the youth identify with diverse cultural groups; all of which position them with varied capacities to respond to conflict.

Acknowledging Context in Community Engaged Praxis. Sorrells (2010) argues that, "Every participant in an intercultural interaction, every cultural text, or cultural product that is read or consumed and every attempt to enact and theorize interpersonal and intergroup interaction, relationships, identities, alliances, and conflicts is situated in particular historical, social, economic, and political contexts" (p. 172). It is essential to unpack these contexts because they construct subjective realities and shape intercultural interactions. Community engaged praxis is grounded in critical intercultural communication and emphasizes the significance of contextual forces. As someone who conducted research in Kenya as an international visitor, it would have been presumptuous of me to self-determine the contextual forces that shape the lives of the youth and their communities in Kenya. I kept up on events in Kenya through their local news outlets, engaged in dialogue with my community partner Dr. Ringera, and asked the youth participants to talk about contextual factors in Kenya. Examples of context that I looked

for during my study included: histories, institutional policies, corporate norms, community organization practices, material conditions, economics, education, judicial system, religion, racism, whiteness, patriarchy, and global, national, political, and economic forces (Collier & Muneri, 2016; Collier, 2014). The scope of this list is vast and still not an exhaustive list of contextual forces that might have influenced the youth, their community, and the material conditions that they navigate. Broome and Collier (2012) tell us that it is useful for researchers and practitioners to give attention to contextual factors when they function to enable or constrain actions and options for cultural groups to engage in peacebuilding. I examine both the contextual factors outlined in the previous research and ones that the youth described as salient in their conflicts in their written reflections and during workshop discussions. Questions to probe for context were asked during the workshop discussion and on the written reflections.

Attending to contextual factors sets critical community engaged praxis apart from other types of community engagement or community development. According to Collier (2014) community engaged praxis practitioners are concerned with a holistic picture of the community in all its diversity; thus, recommending actions that are specific to the community. Critiquing models that do not attend to macro contexts, Ledwith and Springett (2010) state, “By fixing our gaze on local and specific issues, our practice floats on the surface, engaging with the symptoms, failing to go down deep enough to identify the sources of structural injustices” (p. 36).

My Critical Feminist Approach

My theorizing about intercultural conflict and peacebuilding is steeped in particular feminist principles that I have developed from my experiences as a mediator,

reading the research literature and my teaching experiences. Important in my feminist approach is the reduction of violence, centering of marginalized voices, building alliances, and a commitment to social justice and praxis. These principles guide every aspect of this project and my interactions with the youth participants. Feminist theorizing and feminisms are contested, particularly in academic research in or about Africa. One point of contention is objections to Othering and universalizing about African women specifically, and Africans more generally. In efforts to mitigate a Eurocentric view of feminism, I used critical reflexivity to invite critique of my Western epistemic and ontological assumptions. For example, throughout my study I remained in dialogue with the youth participants and Dr. Ringera of International Peace Initiatives. I invited and was open to their critique and feedback about my assumptions and interpretations. More specifically, in the workshop I periodically asked “What am I missing here? What are we leaving out?”

Feminisms is written in the plural because there are multiple definitions of feminisms and feminist theories. However, hooks pushes back on the idea that everyone can define feminism for themselves. She argues that if feminism means everything, then it means nothing (hooks, 2000). My commitment to feminism is informed by hooks’ (2000) definition “Feminism is a movement to end sexism, sexist exploitation, and oppression” (p. viii). Mohanty (2003) adds that “The interwoven processes of sexism, racism, misogyny, and heterosexism are an integral part of our social fabric, wherever in the world we happen to be” (p. 3).

In both the United States and Kenya, patriarchy is a structural force that often drives intercultural conflict. However, although one or two used the term, the participants

rarely named patriarchy as enabling or constraining conflict. The structural forces that they considered to be the root cause of most of their intercultural conflict, was what they called political tribalism. Another important element of my approach to feminism is that my research is oriented toward social justice and praxis. For me, identifying the underlying causes of intercultural conflict and co-developing responses that may help transform conflict and promote peacebuilding responds to that commitment.

I am a U.S. trained scholar and therefore have many Western biases. There are many tendencies that I sought to reflexively prevent. Subjugating representations of Africans, particularly African women, are prevalent in Western Eurocentric academic literature. Mohanty (2003) describes “the production of the “Third World Woman” as a singular, monolithic subject” as problematic in some Western feminist texts. Other concerns about research from Western feminists include: the Othering of African subjects, and the presumption that there is a universal feminism and womanhood with shared values. This universality privileges the experiences and concerns of Western women as the standard for all women. Cole, Manuh, and Miescher (2007) critique work from Global North feminist scholars who position women in the Global South as disadvantaged, powerless, and controlled and defined by men. African feminist Achola Pala (2010) remarks that there exists the notion that African “traditional culture” is viewed as the enemy of women, whereas the word “Western” is conflated with women’s rights. Mohanty (2003) cautions that women should not be frozen as “objects-who-defend-themselves” and as the powerless group in every society (p. 24). Rather, through “the formation of autonomous feminist concerns and strategies that are geographically, historically, and culturally grounded” I can reduce the risk of using feminist discourses

that marginalize (Mohanty, 2003, p. 17).

Feminist Alliances. My study in Kenya demands that my feminist praxis work across and through difference, or what Mohanty (2003) refers to as borders. Navigating borders was necessary to meet my goal to build alliances between the diverse community members and myself. I define alliance here as people who share a political itinerary, similar orientations to conflict transformation and peacebuilding, and commitments to understand how context impacts their relationship and to work through cultural differences (Collier & Ringera, 2015). Carrillo Rowe (2008) remarks that “feminist alliances are also power lines that connect us to one another and to circuits of power. We build alliances to link our lives together, to transmit power, and potentially for the purpose of transforming power” (p. 1). When building alliances Mohanty (2003) calls for scholars, practitioners and community members, to acknowledge that borders exist between nations, races, classes, sexualities, religions, and disabilities and to be attentive to these borders while transcending them.

I used critical reflexivity throughout my study, so that I was open to recognizing and critiquing my own privilege based on, for example, nationality, race and class, and to recognize how those social locations shaped my agency, access, and relationships. Moreover, crossing borders required that I worked in solidarity with Dr. Ringera of International Peace Initiatives and the youth participants, while I danced with cultural difference (Collier, 2014). For Mohanty (2003) reflexivity can lead to solidarity, “mutuality, accountability, and the recognition of common interests as the basis for relationships among diverse communities...solidarity is always an achievement, the result of active struggle to construct the universal on the basis of particulars/differences”

(p. 7). Here, Mohanty (2003) points out that solidarity and alliances cannot be based on shared experiences or social identities such as gender, but that they are built while negotiating contextual and cultural differences. However, allies often have a shared political itinerary, such as deconstructing patriarchy or increasing equitable distribution of resources. Further, Visweswaran (1994) asserts that, “they [alliances] cannot be assumed, but must be consciously made--they must be “fought for” (As cited in Carrillo Rowe, 2008, p. 2).

As I worked with others to build alliances and solidarities, I encountered difference. Collier and Lawless (2016) explain that differences can manifest through identity positions, education level, histories, power relations, ideologies, contextual factors, and hierarchical positioning. These differences matter because they bring multivocality and different levels of status and resources as well as, agendas, and stakes to the study. For instance, my orientation to feminism may not have been shared by any of the participants that I engaged with. Further, my approach to peacebuilding and conflict transformation is steeped in Western Imperialism and whiteness, which has conditioned me to think that I have ideas that are valid and worthy of consideration, regardless of where I am. In the context of Kenya, sometimes I observed and heard that I was looked upon as the expert with solutions, which created difficulty when asking the participants to contribute to the workshop agenda. I tried to remind myself that the participants were the most informed about their own contexts.

I tried continually to account for differences between myself and the community, but also to recognize differences among community members. Youth in Kenya are not monolithic subjects, rather they are comprised of people from various tribes, who have

different class positions, genders, religious and ability identifications. Collier (2014) uses the metaphor of “dancing with difference” to explain how everyone involved in community engaged projects negotiate spaces of convergence and divergence in their relations with each other. At any given time throughout the research project, I was involved in a number of different dances. A community engaged feminist praxis moves through and across difference to address issues of (in)equity, (in)justice, and ex/inclusion (Collier, 2014), sometimes dancing together, sometimes as individuals, or sometimes inventing new steps to new music. I used this orientation to community engaged research to drive my collaboration with my community partner and to develop and implement the conflict transformation and peacebuilding workshop.

Intersectionality

As a theoretical and analytical tool, intersectionality is significant in this study because there is no singular or monolithic category of youth in Kenya. Their experiences with intercultural conflict, access to resources, levels of agency to respond to conflict, material conditions and how they relate to others, are the result of intersecting subject positions and locations within a social hierarchy. For instance, youth that participated in the workshop came from different tribe backgrounds such as Luo, Borana, and Kikuyu. Some of the youth identified as an ethnic or tribal minority or as marginalized because of their gender or regional identity. Subject positions, which are structurally produced, situated in particular contexts and emerge in relation to others, are an essential part of how participants experience intercultural conflict and engage in conflict transformation and peacebuilding.

The use of intersectionality revealed the complexities of subject positions and

gave a framework for understanding relationships between groups. It was also useful during the workshop because the youth did speak about many cultural and social groups as they engaged in conflict transformation. Combining intersectionality and critical reflexivity helped me to account for and examine my positionalities and how I was positioned as a U.S. visitor, White researcher, mediator, ally of Dr. Ringera, female and social justice advocate. The salience of these changed in the context of Kenya and as I interacted and built relationships with community members.

Intersectionality has been applied in a variety of ways in academic and community-based research. Collins (2015) provides the following list of the ways intersectionality is conceptualized by scholars: as a perspective, a concept, a type of analysis, a point for feminist theorizing, a methodological approach, a research paradigm, a theory, a measurable variable, and a type of data. Carastathis (2014) adds that intersectionality is used to identify and study structural, political, and representational intersectionality at the macro, meso and micro levels of society.

For this study, I adopted Collins (2015) definition of intersectionality, as a knowledge project that responds to social formations of inequalities. This is made possible through attentiveness to power relations and contextual forces that create social inequalities. Theorists advancing intersectionality assert that race, class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, nationality, ability, and age operate not as mutually exclusive entities, but as reciprocally constructing phenomena that shape complex social inequalities.

I am mindful that a Western theory about identity does not neatly apply in other contexts. However, Collins' theorizing has applications in Kenya. First, macro forces

such as whiteness, patriarchy, and globalization have a global influence that touches the United States, Kenya, and elsewhere throughout the world. Second, although meanings change, and the salience of cultural identities is contextually contingent; systems position people based on ethnicity, religion, sex, etc. regardless of where they are located in the world. Intersectionality helped to capture those relationships across the diverse youths in my study, and the diverse Kenyan contexts.

Black Feminist Epistemology. Collins links intersectionality with Black Feminist Epistemology. For Collins, epistemology and ontology are sites of power struggles. Collins argues that scholars can learn from Black women's knowledge because they stand at a point where two prevalent systems of oppression related to race and gender come together. Race and racial difference in Kenya are characterized historically by White Colonizers, and currently by mostly White representatives of international aid agencies, White political agents from Europe and the U.S. distributing and withholding resources, and White international researchers and volunteers. Racial difference manifests differently in intercultural conflicts in Kenya than in the context of interracial conflicts in the United States. However, gendered oppression due to patriarchy, age, international government aid and government influence, act together as joint forms of oppression. Consequently, Collins' premise about simultaneously examining multiple forms of oppression is useful in this study.

Collins (2000) proposes that a Black feminist epistemology challenges what constitutes knowledge and the way that knowledge is produced. Countering ways of knowing for Eurocentric, positivistic knowledge, Collins (2000) states that Black feminist epistemology offers four key contributions: 1) As alternative epistemologies that are built

on lived experience; 2) the use of dialogue, not adversarial debate; 3) engaging in an ethics of caring, and; 4) requiring personal accountability. Knowledge production is a part of the larger systems of power, which act to dominate and oppress particular groups. I have previously described the how knowledge about youth and Africans often subjugates, otherizes, and positions them as helpless. This type of narrative helps to support the narrative of the White savior, who has the answers to Africa's problems. In this study, I built knowledge about Kenyan youth that was contextualized and presented them as social actors who were navigating complex contextual forces, while enacting agency to respond to the intercultural conflicts that they were faced with.

Black Feminist Ontology. In addition to the epistemological significance of Black Feminist Thought, Collins (2000) contends that there is an ontological relationship between various axes of difference. At the intersections of gender, race, class, and sexuality is an ontological complexity. Studying these categories apart from each other or using an additive model, generates a fragmented and incomplete picture of complex subject positions. Intersectionality is concerned with how sites of difference mutually construct and constitute each other because identities are not experienced outside of each other. For example, I am always a White U.S. American educated woman, never just White or a woman or White + woman. In Kenya, the youth are Kikuyu, Luyha, Christian, Muslim, men, women, and so on.

As contextually produced, the complex ontological experiences of Kenyan youth across different axes of social division can only be captured through an intersectional analysis. For instance, patriarchy positions young men differently than young women and histories of land disputes and political favoritism position tribes with varying levels of

status and resources. These epistemological and ontological insights are applicable when studying marginalized identity positions and dominant subject positions. In the context of Kenya, youth represent a disenfranchised and marginalized group. Their subject positions produce different epistemic and ontological experiences and assumptions that an intersectional analysis helped me to capture.

Matrix of Domination and Domains of Power. Collins theorizes about social control using what she refers to as the matrix of domination (Collins, 2000). The matrix of domination makes visible the relationships between subject positions and domination and oppression. Collins describes how economy, polity, and ideology function as a web to subordinate some groups, while insuring that others remain in positions of power and privilege. In Kenya, this web manifests and is maintained through economic disparities, inequitable distribution of resources, corrupt elections and leaders, and tribal disputes.

Collins and Bilge (2016) offer four domains of power, the interpersonal (micro), disciplinary (meso), structural (macro), and cultural as analytical tools that can help to investigate how power relations are intertwined with intersecting social divisions such as race, gender, sexuality, class, and ability. These categories gain meaning from power relations such as racism, sexism, and class exploitation. The micro domain of power describes how people relate to each other, agency, everyday “isms” and resistance, internalization, and consciousness. The meso domain of power brings awareness to how rules and tools of social control are implemented. The cultural domain of power relates to how social inequalities are constructed related to social groups. The macro domain of power is concerned with how government is organized, who is exercising power and influence, and laws that are passed. Each of these domains are interconnected and create

a hierarchy of power relations. It is within these domains that “isms” are produced, sustained, and resisted, creating markedly different social experiences and material realities for people, based on where they fall within the hierarchy. I used these domains in my analysis of intersectional subject positioning because they shed light on how power relations are produced between groups.

As a theoretical approach, intersectionality offers tools to explain how youth in Kenya are positioned, experience, impacted, and respond differently to intercultural conflict. Identifying the four domains of power outlined by Collins & Bilge (2016) provided one window to study the relationships between contextual forces, identities, and power relations.

Agency

Agency is “the capacity of individuals or collectives to engage others and take action within the contexts in which they find themselves” (Lawless & Collier, 2014, p. 156). In this study, I investigate the relationship between contextual forces, subject positions and agency during intercultural conflict and conflict transformation. Attending to contextual forces is critical because it reveals how differing levels of agency are enacted and constrained in particular settings (Collier, 2005), and how agency enables or constrains practice in conflict transformation and peacebuilding (Broome & Collier, 2012). Shome and Hegde (2002) add that “agency is deeply bound to the politics of identity couched with the structures of gender, nation, class, race, and diaspora” (p. 267). Collier, Lawless and Ringera (2016) argue that women who engage in peacebuilding practices in Kenya navigate a myriad of contextual factors such as patriarchy, economic challenges and political changes as they negotiate agency. As I analyzed how youth in

Kenya enact and demonstrate agency during conflict transformation, attention to situated contextual forces was essential.

Critical Reflexivity

My critical approach to research included the need for me to engage in critical reflexivity, which among other things, captures the intersubjective relationships, recognizes and accounts for researcher influence on the project, and creates space for cultural difference to be negotiated. For example, throughout the study, I asked myself and Dr. Ringera questions such as, “What am I presuming here?” “What am I taking for granted?” “What might I be pushing or missing?” Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) explain that the conceptions of reflexivity range from self-reference in the study to a self-awareness of the impact of one’s body and social positions on the study. Further complicating the issue of reflexivity is that the terms reflective and reflexive are sometimes used interchangeably, which are two different moves that a researcher can make. Nonetheless, reflexivity is paramount because research, writing, and publishing are forms of political engagement that require a clear sense of where the researcher stands in relation to others, and recognition of the complications and implications of those standpoints (Alexander, 2006).

Being reflective is a way of thinking about ourselves, but it is without demonstrating awareness of the implications of self. In a research study, this may take the form of a confessional list of social positions. Providing the reader with a list of social identities highlights the researcher’s positions, privilege, and possible biases. However, it stops short of interrogating the meaning of those positions within a social hierarchy and in relation to the community or research collaborators. Identities are fluid and meanings

shift as the context changes. Therefore, providing a list of the social positions makes the assumption that the reader knows how the researcher perceives the world and what her/his blind spots are (Bettie, 2014). Madison (2012) explains that being reflective does not account for positionality, which is subjectivity in relation to others. Identities are situated in a particular social, political and historical context; simply naming them does little to explain their interdependence and contextual contingency.

For Madison (2006) being reflexive begins by contemplating self and then turning inward to contemplate how s/he is contemplating the self. Reflexivity is interpretation and critique of interpretation (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2009), and recognizing multiple ways that researchers are positioned and position their research participants. It is also important to analyze how these positions emerge in relation to community members and how positionality shifts as researchers move through time and place. Therefore, reflexivity is not only about the self, it is also about how others are implicated by the self (Adams & Holman Jones, 2011).

In the field of critical intercultural communication, I turned to Collier and colleagues for a comprehensive discussion and applications of critical reflexivity. Collier and Muneri (2016) tell us that critical reflexivity is a tool that can be used to address how the researcher positions frame, constrain, and enable the research praxis. Collier and Lawless (2016) theorize researcher/practitioners using critically reflexive praxis with five features: 1) acknowledging different levels of context; 2) engaging in critical dialogue with collaborators; 3) recognizing cultural differences and intersectionalities; 4) problematizing power relations and relationships among researchers and collaborators; and 5) using critical reflexivity throughout the entire research project.

Critical dialogic reflexivity, which I applied in my work in Kenya, is a negotiation between the researcher and collaborators about contextual structures, cultural identifications and relationships, status hierarchies and power relations, and the academic practitioner partnerships (Collier, 2015). A common theme throughout Collier and colleagues' theorizing is that contextualization is paramount to deeply engage with critical reflexivity. It is through contextualization that I unpack my (and others') positionalities, status hierarchies, and the relationship between social positions and macro, meso, and micro-level structures. Continually recognizing and talking through how historical, cultural, political and economic contexts shape and drive intercultural conflicts and how they influence agency in responding to those conflicts is essential. One way that I demonstrated this commitment is by having the participants select the conflicts that they want to focus on and to share their own views about the context that is relevant to understanding the conflict.

Another aspect of critical reflexivity is a commitment to remaining in critically reflexive dialogue with my community partner. Collier and Lawless (2016) argue that critically reflexive dialogic engagement is important throughout all phases of the project, from the design to writing up implications. My open communication with Dr. Ringera of International Peace Initiatives makes it possible for me to check my assumptions and to get her feedback and critique. Critical dialogic reflexivity is also demonstrated by continually recognizing that intersecting identities create varying status positions, which influence how cultural group members are seen and see the world.

Critical dialogic reflexivity is used when researchers identify that power relations among and between groups are influenced by a myriad of factors such as context and

subject positioning. To help understand these dynamics and check my assumptions, I asked questions about access to resources, leadership and employment opportunities, and tribal relations. Additionally, attending to the outcomes from the workshop and the consequences on community members is essential. For example, I asked participants about unintended consequences, such as teaching conflict transformation skills that could result in a backlash from others in one's own tribe or encourage punishment from community leaders for trying to transform conflicts through building alliances. Most often, participants expressed that these skills would be useful and that they did not anticipate that there would be consequences for learning skills that they felt would ultimately benefit the entire country.

Finally, as the study concluded, I invited dialogue about recommendations and applications (Collier & Lawless, 2016). I asked the participants to offer insight about what the workshop failed to adequately cover or missed altogether, and also how the data generated could be applied most effectively in a future intercultural conflict. At that time, the participants offered little feedback about possible changes. They assured me that the workshop was adequate and that they did not have additional suggestions. I suspect that my credibility as a White, researcher and teacher from the United States positioned me with authority, and to show respect they would not critique the workshop. In summary, critically reflexive dialogue was necessary to fulfill my commitments to building a study that was responsive to the community by centering their experiences, concerns, and respect for their boundaries.

Another approach to critical reflexivity that was applicable to my study is from performance scholars. In Kenya, I engaged in a performance of researcher, facilitator

international visitor, and White woman from the United States. In performance, critical reflexivity is vital because “performances are the sites where context, agency, praxis, history, and subjectivity intersect” (Denzin, 2003, p. 16). Interrogating these intersections would not be possible without critical reflexivity. Adams and Holman Jones (2011) explain critical reflexivity in performance studies as, “circling, pulling, and beginning again” (p. 108). Being reflexive is a move that turns back on language, thought, self, culture, and power to interrogate, critique, and connect with lived experiences. Calling out the confessional-type list, Alexander (2006) states that reflexivity is not about reflecting on our lives or reductively and romantically revealing feelings and experiences. Critical reflexivity is “an act of knowing the self--knowing the self and how that process of self-knowing and the results of such a process is always implicated by our relationship to others” (Alexander, 2006, p. xvii). Simply stated, critical reflexivity holds researchers accountable for their positions and what those positions do to community engaged praxis. Reflexivity can trace how some identities, situations, and cultural “facts” are made to appear natural and normal (Adams & Holman Jones, 2011) such as assuming democratic participation in elections is always warranted or assuming that using conflict transformation will result in transformed relationships that will serve peacebuilding. Such assumptions can be interrupted by critical reflexivity.

Regardless of approach taken, an important part of reflexivity is acknowledging status position and location of speaking and acting. The location from which researchers speak and act matters because those positions influence research design and process, relationships with research subjects, and outcomes from research. While my White Western female heterosexual classed body positions do not change as I move through

space, what is most salient and the meanings ascribed to those can change. Therefore, my self in relation to others is not static. My positionality is contingent on the subject-agent and agent-subject relationship (Alexander, 2006). This continual shifting makes critical reflexivity paramount to my project because it illuminates power relations, status hierarchies, and cultural differences that impact the researcher/participant relationships and all other aspects of the research process. Cervantes-Soon (2014) states that it is important for researchers to recognize and acknowledge that identities and histories are complicated and affect the entire inquiry process. In this regard, my positions became the frames through which I built knowledge, approached methodology, represented others, and co-constructed applications (Collier & Muneri, 2016).

Considering that my study was in an international context, I turned to Collier and Muneri (2016) who describe critical reflexivity in their international research in Zimbabwe and Kenya. First, similar to others, they call for acknowledging the complex context. Second, they recommend acknowledging the complexity of negotiating contextually contingent cultural identifications, representations, and positionalities. Third, Collier and Muneri (2016) suggest that the researcher benefits from problematizing power relations, status hierarchies and agency. Fourth, they recommend assessing outcomes, differential benefits, and consequences of the research. As outlined, these moves occur throughout all phases of my inquiry and are reflected in the written analysis and overall manuscript.

Additionally, Collier & Muneri (2016) describe the challenges of uncovering researcher ideologies that may converge and diverge from those of the research participants. The most difficult part of working in an international context, is that I

entered Meru, Kenya with my White, Western feminist worldview, and I was working with my own particular orientations to ideologies such as anti-patriarchy, anti-sexism, pro-democracy, and pro-social justice. Recognizing and problematizing this as I took on the role of facilitator, opened a space for me to try to interrupt my imperialist knowledge and neoliberal individualism. There were times that it was better for me to step back and listen, and other times that I needed to openly problematize my orientations to conflict transformation and peacebuilding with Dr. Ringera or the participants. Each of these were critically reflexive moves that I made during the study.

Alexander (2006) explains that “Critical reflexivity becomes especially important when we cross cultural borders, when we enter other realms of experience that call us to attend to the tracks that led us to that particular place, what our presence tracks over, and what we track into other people’s sacred territories” (p. xviii). I am accountable for my theoretical and methodological approaches to this research study because they guided me to particular places. Throughout the design, implementation, and analysis of this study, I interrogated the particular set of United States based ideological assumptions that I tracked into the research community. My own ideologies such as whiteness and individualism, U.S. imperialism, and Western feminism affected my research in Kenya; as ideologies of engaged feminism, anti-imperialism, community-driven change, and local sustainability likely affected the youth’s orientations to intercultural conflict and conflict transformation. I looked for these throughout my analysis. Engaging in critical dialogic praxis with my study participants and Dr. Ringera helped us to problematize those ideologies and other contextual factors that influenced the research praxis.

Conclusion

In this chapter I mapped my theoretical commitments and provided conceptual background for my study on intercultural conflict and conflict transformation with youth in Kenya. I outlined my approaches and assumptions related to critical intercultural communication, critical feminist theory, community engaged praxis, intersectionality, agency and critical reflexivity. Each of these theoretical commitments formed the foundation of my study and inform my methods and my analysis. This study is guided by four goals. The first goal is to build understanding of the context of intercultural conflict in Kenya, including the factors that are identified and experienced by diverse Kenyan youth. The second goal is to build knowledge about the youth's intersectional subject positions that emerge in intercultural conflicts. The third goal is to study how the diverse youth negotiate those contexts and subject positions to enact agency during conflict transformation. The fourth goal is to implement a youth leadership workshop that focuses on cultural difference, conflict transformation, and promotes peacebuilding.

Based on youth leaders' accounts of intercultural conflict and strategies for transforming the conflicts to enhance peacebuilding, the study answers three research questions:

1. How do contextual structures act as enabling and constraining forces to intercultural conflict?
2. How do intersectional subject positions emerge in intercultural conflict?
3. Given the particular contexts and subject positions being navigated in intercultural conflict transformation, how do the youth leaders enact agency?

This study is significant and makes numerous contributions to extant literature. First, I blend and apply a range of theoretical commitments in critical intercultural communication, feminism, intersectionality and critical reflexivity. Second, I analyze the relationships between three overarching and relevant constructs impacting research and practice related to intercultural conflict transformation and peacebuilding: contextual factors, intersecting subject positions, and agency. Third, the study extends knowledge about an understudied site where intercultural conflict has a long history due to Colonization. Fourth, the study is timely and relevant given Kenya's contested political elections in the recent past. Additionally, I offer applications of a model for community engaged pedagogical practice related to conflict transformation in the Kenyan context. Sixth, the study legitimizes youth's engagement in transforming conflict and promoting peacebuilding by showcasing their voices. Seventh, I apply and expand previous applications of critical reflexivity in community engaged scholarship and praxis in Kenya.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

To review, this study is guided by four research goals. The first goal is to build understanding of the context of intercultural conflict in Kenya, including the factors that are identified and experienced by diverse Kenyan youth. The second goal is to build knowledge about the youth's intersectional subject positions that emerge in intercultural conflicts. The third goal is to study how the diverse youth negotiate those contexts and subject positions to enact agency during conflict transformation. The fourth goal is to implement a youth leadership workshop that focuses on cultural difference, conflict transformation, and promotes peacebuilding.

Based on youth leaders' accounts of intercultural conflict and strategies for transforming the conflicts to enhance peacebuilding, the study answers three research questions:

1. How do contextual structures act as enabling and constraining forces to intercultural conflict?
2. How do intersectional subject positions emerge in intercultural conflict?
3. Given the particular contexts and subject positions being navigated in intercultural conflict transformation, how do the youth leaders enact agency?

To meet these goals and answer the research questions, this research study uses qualitative methods. Lindlof and Taylor (2011) explain that qualitative researchers, "study the performances and practices of human communication" (p. 4). I approach this study with both critical and interpretive orientations. The critical angle of my research is similar to that applied by Collier (2005) and Collier & Lawless (2016), seeking to uncover situated descriptions of how structures of domination impact those who are

oppressed and those who oppress, in order to inform strategies of social change. My interpretive approach is evident through how I examined youth leaders' accounts of their situated experiences of intercultural conflict and conflict transformation.

Critical Pedagogy as Methodology

This study uses critical pedagogy to inform the workshop design and delivery. A critical orientation to pedagogy is grounded in the belief that inquiry should be situated “in relation to larger, macro sociocultural, socioeconomic structures” (Fassett & Warren, 2007, p. 27) and that it must challenge the idea of instructor as holding the knowledge to be passed on to passive students (Freire, 1998). Kincheloe (2005, 2008) outlines the central aspects of critical pedagogy as: having a social and educational vision of justice and equality, the belief that education is inherently political and dedicated to alleviating human suffering, and the use of generative themes that allow first-hand knowledge to surface. The commitments of critical pedagogy align with my critical and feminist approaches to research and teaching, which make it an appropriate choice for this study.

Within the field of communication, scholars Fassett and Warren (2007) articulate what they refer to as critical communication pedagogy. This approach to pedagogy, research, and praxis is concerned with recognizing the contested nature of identities and subjectivities in the process of education. Fassett and Warren (2007) explain further that critical communication pedagogy is:

Engaging the classroom as a site of social influence, as a space where people shape each other for better and for worse; it is about respecting teachers and students and the possible actions they can take, however small, to effect material change to the people and world around them. (p. 8)

Fassett and Warren (2007) outline ten commitments that are commonly shared among critical educators. I highlight the three commitments that most informed my workshop design and delivery. First is the understanding that identities are constituted in and constructed during communication. Cultural identities are also constructed in relation to each other, which means they emerge in status hierarchies and matrices of domination and subjugation. This commitment rejects a positivistic approach to education, which constructs identities as “stable or natural demographic factors or traits” (p. 39); this decontextualized approach results in an oversimplified view of cultural identities and sometimes irrelevant delivery of learning material.

Second, “critical communication educators understand power as fluid and complex” (p. 41). Power is not something that someone has; it is produced in particular contexts and is negotiated in relations between groups and between groups and institutions and structures. This is important because the instructional site is a space where the complexities of power are continually negotiated. Atay and Toyosaki (2018) contend that “Critical intercultural communication pedagogy aims to understand, critique, transform, and intervene upon dynamics of power and domination embedded inside and outside classroom walls through careful, complex, nuanced, and intersectional analyses of educational practices and identities” (p. ix). I was aware that power dynamics were at work when the participants positioned me as the credible and knowledgeable teacher, even though I was an outsider in Kenya and had significantly less knowledge about contextual forces and conflict than the participants. Power dynamics also were present among workshop participants. Participants’ intersectional identities positioned them within relation to each other. I observed that some participants, dominated and held the

floor to provide lengthy contributions, some interrupted and spoke over other participants. This was mostly noted for male participants and participants from dominant tribes such as Kikuyu and Meru, which have ethnic ties. Kikuyus are widely represented in Kenya's political leadership, which offers examples of tribal members dominating airtime, which also contributes to their higher social status.

Finally, critical reflexivity is an essential condition for critical communication pedagogy. This commitment acknowledges that the instructional space is not politically neutral, and the educator/facilitator influences the space. Fassett and Warren (2007) argue that being reflexive is "an ongoing effort to call out, to illuminate the (re)creation of our selves, our values, assumptions, and practices" (p. 50). As explained in the previous chapter, critical reflexivity is an important aspect of this research and praxis. I checked my assumptions with Dr. Ringera before and after the workshop, as well as with the participants during the workshop.

Critical pedagogy is used to inform the development and delivery of my workshop on intercultural conflict and conflict transformation because of its commitment to situating experiences within the context in which they occur, as well as critiquing how power and privilege operate to represent and position groups in relation to each other. Embracing the commitments of critical pedagogy also challenged me to develop a workshop that was relevant to the lives youth participants and one that allowed for generative themes to emerge and be negotiated in the learning space.

Data Collection

The data collection methods used in this study included a demographic questionnaire that was designed to collect the participants' cultural background

information and preferred labels for their cultural identities. There were also three written reflections which were collected at the start of the workshop, at the end of the workshop, and three months post-workshop. I also recorded and transcribed the large group discussion that took place during the workshop. While evaluation of the workshop design and implementation are not used to answer the research questions, information on the procedures and activities are relevant to the study since the workshop process was part of the context, and the workshop setting framed the participants' written and oral responses. With the exception of the post-workshop writing reflection, the workshop was the major event for data collection. The data consisted of the written reflections and transcribed discussions; these texts were analyzed using a critical textual analysis method.

Procedures

Study Site. The study took place at International Peace Initiatives (IPI) in Meru, Kenya. The physical address for the study site was: Meru-Ruiru Road, Chabuene Village; P.O. Box 2596-60200, Meru, Kenya. The workshop was held on July 2, 2017 in the Tiriji Eco Center meeting hall. Dr. Karambu Ringera, the Founder and President of IPI arranged for the meeting hall to be available and for the study site to welcome me. In addition to the data collected at the study site, a third set of reflections was collected via email message three months after the workshop concluded, in October 2017.

Study participants. For this study, the inclusion criteria to participate was being a person between the ages of 18-25, who is identified as a community leader, or a person who wants to build their leadership skills, who has experienced intercultural conflict, and who is willing to share those experiences in writing and with a group of peers and the study researcher. Potential study participants were identified by Dr. Ringera, the Founder

and President of International Peace Initiatives. Dr. Ringera agreed to identify study participants because she was co-sponsoring the New Generation Leaders (NGL) training. A NGL training occurred just prior to my workshop, and my workshop and study extended and built on that training. The NGL took place in Meru, Kenya June 28- July 2, 2017 and brought together approximately forty youth for leadership training. From this group, Dr. Ringera identified fifteen potential participants for my study.

Two days prior to the workshop, I met individually and privately with each of the potential participants that Dr. Ringera identified. During that meeting, I asked questions to determine if they met the criteria to participate. I began by introducing myself and explaining why I am doing the study. I have learned that narratives are important in Kenya and establish the basis for trust and credibility, and this is a dialogic reflexive move as well. I talked about the study goals, and went over the study procedures, workshop process, data collection process, and obtained informed consent.

The questions I used to determine inclusion and exclusion were:

1. What is your age?
 - If the potential participant was not between the ages of 18-25, s/he was not invited to participate in the study.
2. Do you identify as a youth community leader or want to build your leadership skills?
 - If the potential participant did not identify as a community leader or did not want to develop further leadership skills, s/he was not invited to participate in the study.

3. Do you have experience with intercultural conflict that you are willing to share with the researcher in writing and speak about in a workshop setting with peers?
 - If the potential participant said s/he has no experience with intercultural conflict or if s/he was not willing to share about those experiences s/he was not invited to participate in the study.

After I reviewed the study criteria with each of them, I determined that eleven were eligible to participate in the study¹. I reviewed the “Consent to Participate in Research” (See Appendix A) with each participant, and each participant signed the document.

As outlined earlier, youth in Kenya occupy multiple subject positions. The participants in this study align with diverse cultural groups and are positioned in multiple ways. All eleven participants identified as Kenyan. There were seven females and four males, they ranged in age from 19-23 years-old. The tribal identities included: two Kalenjin, three Kikuyu, one Luo, one Meru, one Kamba, one Luhya, one Borana, and one undisclosed. All participants identified as Christian. For race, seven participants identified as Black, three African, and one undisclosed. Eight had completed some university education, while two circled both university in progress or completed, therefore it is unclear which best represented their status. One participant had completed up to a secondary level of education.

¹ While there were eleven eligible to participate, there were twelve workshop participants. The responses of one, a thirty year-old Ugandan, were not included in the analysis. During the inclusion and exclusion questions, I determined that he did not meet the age range criteria. On the day of the study, Dr. Ringera requested that he participate. I chose not to use his responses because his experience with conflict was completely based in Uganda, which has a different African and tribal context. His age and university degree also gave him a different level of authority than other participants. Therefore, the analysis focused on the eleven Kenyan participants.

In terms of household facilities, five participants have water and no electricity, and six participants have water and electricity. Only one of the eleven participants were employed at the time of the workshop, which is representative of the high unemployment rate among youth in Kenya. The questions about education, household facilities and employment were asked to provide some indication of class status. None of the participants identified as having a disability. Finally, the participants spoke a range of languages, but each participant fluently spoke and wrote in English. See Appendix B for a chart with full demographic information.

The Workshop on Intercultural Conflict Transformation

Workshop Agenda. Although I designed the overall suggested agenda and general topics that were covered in the workshop, the youth were encouraged to provide feedback about the agenda and activities as we moved throughout the day. My goal was to build a workshop that was generative in nature. I gave space for the youth to help generate, analyze, and apply much of the material discussed about the topics of intercultural conflict and conflict transformation. However, they mostly deferred to me when I asked for their input. The workshop agenda is described below:

1. All participants were asked to complete a demographics questionnaire, using a self-selected pseudonym. This questionnaire collected information on how participants identified their social group identities (See Appendix C). I asked for this information as a first step in the workshop because the questionnaire invited the youth leaders to start thinking about their cultural identities, the range of groups with which they identify, and the labels that they prefer. This information set the scene for talking about the multiplicity of their cultural identities, the differences between avowed

cultural identities and the identities that others ascribe to them, and differences in salience or importance of particular cultural identities in particular settings.

2. Second, I introduced the concepts of cultural identities, context, intercultural conflict, conflict transformation, peacebuilding and agency. These concepts are defined in Appendix D. I asked for the participants to help to define these terms in the context of their role as youth leaders in their communities. The participants said that the definitions made sense. For example, when I explained intercultural conflict as “real or perceived incompatibility of values, norms, expectations, goals, processes, or outcomes between two or more interdependent individuals or groups from different cultures” (Sorrells, 2016, p. 203). Participants gave examples of political conflict and were able to identify the groups involved and the perceptions of incompatible political goals. Additionally, I asked if there were other concepts that the group wanted to introduce and discuss, and there were none.

3. To assess participants’ past experiences with intercultural conflict, a writing prompt, called Reflections #1, was given (see Appendix E). Leaders were asked to answer a series of questions related to their experiences with a recent intercultural conflict that they experienced. The conflict selected for their reflection had to involve issues of cultural difference and had to have the potential to be transformed to some degree by the youth leaders. They were asked to provide details about the nature of the conflict issues, the contextual factors impacting the conflict, the cultural identities and subject positioning of the groups involved, what was said and done, and the outcomes. The questions on the written reflections were designed to obtain information relevant to the research questions related to contextual factors important to the conflict, the

intersectional subject positions, and barriers and enabling factors related to enacting individual agency in the conflict. The written responses were collected after the participants completed them.

After they completed their responses, the participants were invited to share their experiences with intercultural conflict with the group. This allowed me to identify salient conflicts and ones that they were interested in probing further. Conflicts that emerged included politics and economics, politics and tribalism, patriarchy, inequitable access to resources, and tribal hierarchies and power relations. This generated a lengthy discussion.

4. Next I organized small group breakout sessions and asked the participants to generate strategies that they have used or could use to potentially transform these intercultural conflicts. I directed them to select a conflict that they had identified as relevant and ones that they would like to address going forward. The specific questions that I asked the small groups to consider were shaped by the earlier discussions about the key concepts and salient intercultural conflicts. The questions were discussed and responded to in groups of 3-4 and then reported back to the larger group. See Appendix F for questions answered by the small groups.

The questions were used to help generate small group discussion about the types of intercultural conflict the youth experience, their responses to those conflicts, and the outcomes to the conflicts. These discussions were designed to shape the larger group conversation about conflict transformation that continued after participants worked in their groups. The conflict transformation strategies that the groups discussed were presented to the larger group and contextualized and critiqued. They described such

strategies as: equitable allocation of resources, civic education, mediation, and inter-religious gatherings.

5. I then introduced additional options of strategies that have the potential to transform intercultural conflict. The strategies were couched in the S-TLC system, which is an acronym for Stop, Think, Listen, and Communicate (Cahn & Abigail, 2014). S-TLC is described in more detail in Appendix G. It is a practical and applied approach that is used to manage conflict between individuals and groups. It offers a flexible means to first analyzing the context, cultural factors and issues, and then using that information to inform behavioral responses to conflict. I adapted a version of these steps to be more relevant to my study and the leaders in the Kenyan workshop context. For example, I included identifying contextual frames, such as histories, economic stressors, and kinds of oppression and privilege experienced, under the “think” step of the model.

I asked the participants to contextualize, critique, and adapt the S-TLC model, but most deferred to my “expertise” and few critiques were offered. The one suggestion offered was related to probing for alliances. Emmy commented that tribalism magnifies differences, so people should focus less on differences and more on how they can work together to be allies (Workshop Discussion). The leaders contextualized and adapted the steps to conflicts that they discussed in Reflection #1 or in their breakout groups. The participants provided examples consistent with the intercultural conflicts they wanted to address within their communities. For instance, one participant proposed workshops on conflict transformation and dialogue that could be offered in his community.

6. A writing prompt, called Reflections #2, was provided at the end of the workshop (See Appendix H). This prompt directed the youth leaders to describe a conflict transformation strategy or strategies that they intended to try out following the workshop. In this set of reflections, they described their preferred intercultural conflict transformation strategy and wrote about the contextual issues, cultural identities and subject positioning relevant to the conflict. They were also asked to develop a plan for where and when they would use these strategies to attempt to transform intercultural conflict. They were asked to outline possible outcomes, describe unintended consequences, and describe how to make adjustments to their approach in the future.

This set of reflections was designed to invite the participants to develop an informed potential action plan for dealing with an intercultural conflict. By describing the first steps of action to transform conflict, the likelihood of the actions being carried out is increased.

7. In October 2017, three months after the workshop concluded, an email message was sent to each of the participants with Reflections #3 prompt (See Appendix I). This prompt focused on participants' descriptions of an intercultural conflict that they experienced post-workshop, the conflict transformation strategies used, the outcomes experienced, and lessons learned for intercultural conflict transformation in the future. During the three months following the workshop, Kenya held their presidential election, which was violent and contested. As anticipated, much of their reported conflict experiences were related to the election and conflicts over political tribalism.

Data Analysis

Critical Textual Analysis

The data analysis method I used for this study was critical textual analysis. A textual analysis allowed me to offer interpretations about the participants' descriptions of situated experiences with intercultural conflict. A critical lens orients me to look at how contextual structures influence those experiences, and how structures create different experiences for people based on how they are positioned in relation to those structures. Fairclough (1995) explains that a text is understood broadly to be written language, spoken words, or non-linguistic artifacts. Texts are important to study because they "are social spaces in which two fundamental social processes simultaneously occur; cognition and representation of the world, and social interaction" (Fairclough, 1995, p. 6). Texts can also bring about changes to knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, values, social relations, and the material world (Fairclough, 2003). The texts used in this study included three sets of written reflections and transcribed workshop discussions.

Through the use of a textual analysis, researchers can make educated interpretations about experiences within a social world. McKee (2003) states that "Textual analysis is a way for researchers to gather information about how other human beings make sense of the world" (p. 8). The data provided by the participants gave insight into their material realities, power relations between groups, how they are positioned and position others, how contextual forces create conditions for intercultural conflict, and how they enacted agency during attempts to transform intercultural conflict.

A textual analysis is an interpretive practice. Just as a discursive text is one "particular way of representing some part of the physical, social or psychological world"

(Fairclough, 2003), a textual analysis is selective. First, because reality is contingent, shifting, and partial, no analysis of a text is ever complete or definitive, nor can it tell us everything there is to know about the text (Fairclough, 2003). Second, as a textual analyst, I made decisions about how to interpret and represent the discourse (Fairclough, 1995). My feminist and critical orientations, Western worldview, education, and assumptions guided my overall approach to analyzing data. Critical reflexivity was used to help identify and problematize such orientations and assumptions, but the project is not completely void of them. Additionally, I contextualize the texts because they are produced and interpreted through particular social practices (Rose, 2012). Understanding the Kenyan context was essential for interpreting, developing and supporting my arguments.

Procedures for Coding. Jensen (2002) describes that a textual analysis examines a text(s) as closely and systematically as possible to answer the research questions. I analyzed data using a systematic process that included deductive and inductive coding and thematic categorization. The purpose of coding the data was to be able to identify how theoretical concepts emerged in the texts, how the concepts related to each other and allowed me to draw conclusions about what the texts accomplish. In my analysis I looked for evidence implicating concepts related to my three research questions, by focusing on intercultural conflict, contextual forces, intersectional subject positions, and agency.

To begin the process of analysis, I reviewed the statement of the problem, my research goals, and the research questions. Second, I read each of the texts several times to get an overview and holistic impression of the overall responses. When reading the written reflections, I read through each participant's complete reflection and then read

through each participant's response to each question. Third, I analyzed the content and made notes about who is speaking/writing, about what is s/he speaking/writing, and the general topic areas being discussed. Fourth, I used a deductive approach to identify and code theoretical concepts, such as contextual structures, intercultural conflict, subject positions and intersectionalities, and agency. During this step, I also noted how participants described or alluded to contextual conditions and forces in the intercultural conflicts they experienced. Fifth, I read through the texts using an inductive lens. I coded examples of other emergent concepts, such as how participants described tribalism or access to resources such as land and cattle. I also identified discursive repertoires that participants used to make sense of, maintain or challenge their social circumstances. Sixth, I organized the examples into categories using the theoretical concepts and other identified themes across the data. I selected the themes to discuss based on what was the most salient. This was determined by how frequently a theme appeared, if it was expressed with emphasis, or appeared across different contexts. For example, tribalism was discussed related to land, job opportunities, rigged elections, school settings, and leadership opportunities at universities. Finally, I made notes about concepts that did not appear. For instance, there was no discussion about race by any of the participants and sexism was only named by women.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided an outline of the critical pedagogy methodology, data collection procedures and the data analysis process that were followed in the study. To meet my goals and answer the research questions, this study used qualitative methods with critical and interpretive orientations. I facilitated a workshop on intercultural conflict

transformation on July 2, 2017 in Meru, Kenya, to generate study data. Critical textual analysis was used to uncover themes about how intercultural conflict, contextual factors, intersectional subject positions and levels of agency emerged in the texts. This analysis enabled me to extend previous theorizing in critical intercultural communication, feminism, and international community engagement, related to intercultural conflict, conflict transformation strategies, intersectionalities and agency. In the following chapters present my analysis of responses for each research question.

CHAPTER FOUR: CONTEXTUAL FORCES AS ENABLING AND CONSTRAINING INTERCULTURAL CONFLICT IN KENYA

In this chapter I analyze the workshop discussion and written reflection responses from the study participants to answer the first research question: How do contextual structures act as enabling and constraining forces to intercultural conflict? The texts I analyzed came from data collected during and after a conflict transformation and peacebuilding workshop I facilitated in Meru, Kenya on July 2, 2017. Data analyzed pulls from a written reflection at the start of the workshop (Reflection #1), one at the end of the workshop (Reflection #2), and one three months after the workshop concluded (Post-workshop Reflection). The recorded and transcribed workshop discussions were also analyzed. There were eleven study participants, seven females and four males, who ranged in age from 19-23 years-old. The tribal identities included: two Kalenjin, three Kikuyu, one Luo, one Meru, one Kamba, one Luhya, one Borana, and one undisclosed. Each participant fluently spoke and wrote in English.

Important to this study is whose experiences are being described because who is speaking matters. Participants speak from different social locations, these provide a particular perspective into how participants experience intercultural conflict. To situate the voices in the data, I provide the participant's chosen pseudonym and relevant general demographic information when using excerpts from participants. I select from each individual speaker's self-identified age, tribe, gender, religion, languages spoken, level of education, employment status, physical dis/ability, and if their household has water and/or electricity, where relevant to contextualize the statements made.

Contextual Structures

To analyze data, I use a critical approach to textual analysis. Textual analysis allows me to make educated interpretations about the participants' descriptions of situated experiences with intercultural conflict. A critical lens orients me to investigate how contextual structures influence those experiences, and create different experiences for people based on how they are positioned in relation to those structures. Contextual structure refers to a contextual or systemic condition that affects different groups in different ways. For example, some contextual conditions in Kenya are poverty, drought, or land ownership. In the case of poverty, it becomes a contextual structure when it is produced by social systems and institutions where women and children are disproportionately impacted by its effects. Further, contextual structures are systemic, influential, and long-standing because they occur over time and continue often throughout generations. Contextual structures are forces that act to frame, influence, set up boundaries, position groups, create power relations and affect people's actions, access, and livelihoods (Broome & Collier, 2012).

To answer the first research question, I first identified when the youth referred to contextual structures and how they indicated or alluded to those structures as enabling or constraining intercultural conflict. Because I am concerned with contextual structures in this way, I use the concept similarly to Broome and Collier (2012) to describe contextual forces, such as histories, poverty, patriarchy, etc. that enable or constrain actions for group members experiencing conflict. Consideration of the context in which conflict occurs is critical because as Sorrells (2010) tells us, "Every participant in an intercultural interaction, every cultural text, or cultural product that is read or consumed and every

attempt to enact and theorize interpersonal and intergroup interaction, relationships, identities, alliances, and conflicts is situated in particular historical, social, economic, and political contexts” (p. 172).

I identified eleven different types of contextual structures in participants’ discussion and writings. Examples include politics, tribalism, economic conditions, patriarchy, history, education, religion, resources (land, water, electricity, cattle, farm tools), rural and city residences, violence, and cultural values. I provide analysis of the most salient themes, which were: politics and economics, politics and tribalism, patriarchy, inequitable access to resources, and tribal hierarchies and power relations.

Intercultural conflict is driven by multiple structures that are interrelated and sometimes explicit and sometimes implicit. Participants implicated politics when speaking about tribalism, or how economic conditions and scarce resources such as cattle, land, and water are linked to violence between neighbours. I begin the next section by providing a brief overview of Kenya’s political history. Then I discuss how the youth participants discuss political and economic conflict. Second, I shift attention to politics and tribalism. Third, I analyze how patriarchy was named and implicated. Fourth, I focus on how the participants described inequitable access to multiple resources as enabling conflict. Finally, I discuss how tribal hierarchies and power relations act as structures and affect subject positioning and other outcomes and consequences.

Historical Background

To understand the political landscape of Kenya and its connection to tribalism, it is important to understand Kenya’s political history. Kenya was colonized by the British in 1895 and remained under British rule until December 12, 1963. In 1964, The

Independent Republic of Kenya was formed, and Kenya began operating under its own Constitution. The first President of Kenya was Mr. Jomo Kenyatta (Kikuyu), whose party affiliation was Kenya African National Union (KANU); he served from 1964 until his death in 1978. Mr. Jomo Kenyatta is the father of Kenya's current president, Uhuru Kenyatta. The first Vice President was Jaramogi Oginga Odinga (Luo) who withdrew from KANU in 1966 after a disagreement with the President; he became leader of the Opposition, Kenya People's Union (KPU) (*Africa News*, 2017). Jaramogi Oginga Odinga is the father of Raila Odinga, the current leader of the Opposition. *Africa News* (2017) points to the departure of Mr. Jaramogi Oginga Odinga from KANU and the formation of KPU as a contributing factor to the ethnically divided party lines of Kenyan politics. Jomo Kenyatta received support from members of the largest tribe in Kenya, the Kikuyu tribe; whereas Jaramogi Oginga Odinga, garnered the support of the Luo tribe. When Jomo Kenyatta died in 1978, the Vice President, Daniel Toroitich arap Moi (Kalenjin), became the president and went on to serve Kenya's longest presidential term, from 1978-2002.

Although the 1966 split between Mr. Kenyatta and Mr. Odinga created two political parties, Section 2A of the Constitution stated that parliamentary candidates could only be nominated by KANU, making Kenya a de facto one-party state (Khadiagala, 2010). KANU's dominance over Kenya's politics was weakened in December 1991, when an amendment to the Constitution reinstated multiparty politics. However, it was the 2002 election of National Alliance of Rainbow Coalition's (NARC), and Mwai Kibaki (Kikuyu) that brought an end to the forty-year KANU rule. The reinstatement of the multiparty system resulted in a significant rise in the number of political parties, and

by 2007 there were more than one-hundred and sixty registered political parties in Kenya (*Buzz Kenya*, n.d.). Since then, Kenya has passed two Political Parties Acts, which provided “the institutional, legal and regulatory framework for registration, regulation and funding of political parties in Kenya” (IEBC A, n.d.). These Acts have effectively reduced the number of parties in Kenya to forty-one (IEBC A, n.d.).

It was during the last decade, when Uhuru Kenyatta and the Jubilee Party of Kenya (JP) and Odinga, with the Orange Democratic Movement (ODM), began their political rivalry. Raila Odinga has made four unsuccessful attempts (1997, 2007, 2013, and 2017) to win Kenya’s presidency. Uhuru Kenyatta is currently serving his second and final, five-year term as the President of Kenya. The two ran against each other in the 2013 and 2017 elections. In 2002 Kenyatta ran, but Odinga chose to support Kibaki, so that he would win the election over Kenyatta. In 2007 when Kibaki (now a member of Party of National Unity (PNU), and Odinga ran, Kenyatta pulled out to support Kibaki, and Kibaki won his second term as Kenya’s president. It was after this election that Kenya experienced the worst election related violence to date. Human Rights Watch (2008) reported that following the December 27, 2007 election, there was a period of two months of protesting and violence, which left over 1,000 dead and 500,000 displaced. The 2007 election was what many Kenyans thought would bring change to the country. When elected in 2002, Kibaki “promised a new constitution, commissions to address large-scale corruption and arbitrary land-grabbing by the elite, as well as measures to tackle landlessness, unemployment and police reform” (Human Rights Watch, 2008, para. 7). However, as he settled into office, many of his promises were abandoned. The violence was the result of tensions that had been building for decades. The boiling point

was what many viewed as the fraudulent re-election of Kibaki and campaigns that focused on ethnic differences. Bloomfield (2008) reports that “Systematic electoral fraud including vote-rigging in a third of all constituencies, stuffed ballot boxes and election officials changing results had a decisive impact on the outcome of the Kenyan elections” (para.1). The inconsistent results, including totals of over 100% of votes going to candidates in some constituencies, deepened the mistrust that Kenyan voters had in their government and the election process. In addition to suspected fraud, the candidates sparked tribalism with their divisive rhetoric. Human Rights Watch (2008) explained that Odinga’s party, ODM gathered support by proposing that Kibaki ran a Kikuyu government that had entrenched tribalism and governed in the interests of the Kikuyu community. On the other hand, Kibaki’s party (PNU) emphasized tribal differences by claiming that Luo men (Odinga’s tribe) would be ineffective at governing because of their cultural tradition of not circumcising men. Many voters were outraged by the suspected illegitimate election process and were being further influenced by a rhetoric that was deepening already troubling tribal divides; therefore, violence erupted. Although Kenyatta and William Ruto (Kenyatta’s would-be running mate) were indicted by the International Criminal Court (ICC) for inciting violence against Odinga supporters, the charges were later dropped due to lack of evidence (BBC News, 2013; *Africa News*, 2017). In response to what was taking place throughout Kenya, Kibaki and Odinga reached a power-sharing deal, which made Odinga the Prime Minister of Kenya, a position that had not been occupied since Jomo Kenyatta held the position before becoming the first president. The power-sharing agreement also made Kenyatta Deputy Prime Minister. When this election took place the study participants were approximately

ten-years old, which means that the 2007 election is likely their first memory of a Kenyan election.

The 2013 presidential election was uneventful by 2007 standards. With Kibaki unable to run for a third term, Kenyatta and Odinga were the top two contenders for the seat. In 2011 the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission (IEBC) was formed with its mission to "To conduct free and fair elections and to institutionalize a sustainable electoral process. (IEBC B, n.d.). Kimenyi (2013) partly credits the IEBC for higher than average voter turnout and facilitating a free, fair, and credible election. Mr. Odinga, who received 43% of the votes, disputed the results on account of fraud; this led to a review by the Supreme Court of Kenya. Ultimately the Court ruled that the election results would stand, and Mr. Kenyatta took the oath of office. Because the Kenyan government has yet to address long simmering tribal grievances (Human Rights Watch, 2008) the tension once again surfaced during the 2017 elections.

The 2017 election had many twists and turns. In late July, Chris Msando the Manager of Information and Communications System for IEBC was murdered. Misiko (2017) reports that Msando had received death threats related to his job of overseeing the electronic transfer of election results. Next, Mr. Chebukati, the Chairperson of the IEBC announced that a few days after Mr. Msando's murder, there was an unsuccessful attempt to hack into the voting system (Solomon, 2017). On August 8th, 2017, 79% of registered voters headed to the polls and elected Kenyatta with 54% of the votes (Kimutai & Okumu, 2017). Later that evening Mr. Odinga held a press conference stating the results were compromised because of the attempted hack and that Kenyans must reject the results. After a final tally, on August 11th the IEBC confirmed that Kenyatta had won the

election. This news was met by angry protest and violence, which resulted in thirty-seven reported deaths, all but two caused by police (Solomon, 2017). Causing further outrage, homes and businesses were destroyed, and sexual assaults were committed by men in police uniforms (Human Rights Watch, 2017). On August 18th, Mr. Odinga filed a petition with the Supreme Court of Kenya citing vote tampering, fraud and other irregularities. On September 1st, the Supreme Court of Kenya nullified the election on grounds of illegalities and irregularities and ordered a new election for October 26th, 2017 (Solomon, 2017).

On October 10th, Mr. Odinga dropped out of the race, but refused to sign official documentation to that effect. This left Kenyans uncertain about the October 26th repeat election. The re-vote happened as anticipated, with voter turnout of 48% (Limo & Wekesa, 2010). However, journalist Limo and Wekesa (2010) from a major Kenyan newspaper, *The Standard* cited that voting did not take place in twenty-five constituencies because protestors prevented IEBC officials from delivering voting material. Additionally, most of Odinga's supporters stayed away from the polls in protest of the rigged election. Ultimately, the incumbent garnered 98% of the "valid" votes that were cast in the repeat election (Limo & Wekesa, 2010). Immediately afterward the Opposition party called for a boycott of companies that are affiliated with the Jubilee administration, such as Safaricom, Brookside and Bidco Kenya (*The East African*, 2017B). The use of major Kenyan companies in politics, points to economic interests that further complicate Kenya's political processes. Tracing the arc of Kenya's political history from democracy until late 2017 reveals how politics and related structures act as contextual forces that enable and intensify intercultural conflict.

Politics and Economics

Similar to many nations throughout the world, greed for wealth is often associated with Kenyan politicians. Moha, a twenty year-old Borana male is convinced that these conditions drive intercultural conflict. He explained:

The greediness for people to amass more wealth for themselves, this will create further division and increase hatred. This government [Kenyatta, a Kikuyu] initiates policies that favour only their side, especially the rich. This will hurt the rest of the people. This will happen because housing and healthcare costs increase and the costs of products, such as food will rise. (Reflection #2)

Here Moha focused on economic forces and political party bias. He called attention to economic disparities and Kikuyu privilege. He described Kikuyus constructing inequitable policies for housing, healthcare and food that will benefit Kikuyu business owners and service providers, and disadvantage others. The connection between politics and economics was also discussed by Laura in her Post-workshop Reflection. Laura is a twenty-one year-old who identifies as Kikuyu. During the 2017 election period, Laura experienced what she described as intolerance and verbal abuse related to the political climate. She reported that this occurred in person and on social media, which resulted in many relationships lost or permanently changed. Below she refers to the boycott of Kikuyu companies that took place after the 2017 election:

They, Odinga supporters, accuse the current government, which is viewed as a Kikuyu government, as vague and some Kenyans are not willing to accept it as the ruling government. Currently, there is a boycott of companies that allegedly supported the campaign and took part in rigging the elections. (Post-workshop

Reflection)

Laura characterized critiques of the Kikuyu government as “vague”. This is a very general term which connotes ambiguous leadership. Laura also uses the term “allegedly” when speaking about the companies that supported Mr. Kenyatta and “allegedly” took part in rigging the election. She casts doubt over the supposedly rigged election, which was ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Her use of “vague” and “allegedly” work to valorize and support the Kikuyu government and negatively position its critics. As a Kikuyu, Laura receives political and economic benefit from having a Kikuyu in leadership. In the Post-workshop reflection, she acknowledged this privilege, yet also called for people who are disadvantaged by it to accept it. Laura stated, “Being from my tribe I am privileged in so many ways. I have had three presidents from my tribe, who have brought development in my area. This is something most people don’t accept” (Post-workshop Reflection). Here Laura justifies her tribe’s status in Kenya and legitimizes the exclusion of other tribes in economic development by implying that they should “accept” the situation. Her discourse also works to normalize the status quo of Kikuyu political power and economic advantages.

Economic disparities and class struggles are outlined by Moha, a Borana youth who lives in the Mathare slums. He pointed to economic conditions as contributing to conflict in his diverse tribal community. Moha wrote:

The rich people view us as poor, thieves, dirty people, and backward in terms of our lifestyle. They think we are poor because we are lazy. Yet, most of our families were casual workers and somehow, we found ourselves in the circumstance of being on the “poor side”. In the past, our parents were working

for the rich people and they both lived in harmony and in the same place. But, as time went by and the world changed, we drifted apart...They have the money, the opportunities, and status. What we want is equity in society. We need healthcare, exposure to opportunities, and our economic status to improve a bit. (Reflection #2)

Moha described how economic conditions have polarized these two groups. While he says the rich and poor used to live in harmony, inequitable access to resources, which is driven by changing political and economic factors, has created disparities that disrupt the previous harmony. Further, Arero (2007) argues that “in the highly ethnicised social and political context of the Kenyan nation minority communities such as the Borana will always find themselves on the periphery...as the Borana still feel detached from the Kenyan nation” (p. 292-293). As Cushitic people, the Borana have roots in Ethiopia and Somali, but also inhabit the dry lowlands of Northern Kenya. From 1965-1969 the violent *shifita* (bandit) war took place in Northern Kenya, which Arero (2007) identifies as a factor that has led to the Boranas isolation from the rest of Kenya. According to Arero (2007) “in the aftermath of the war all Borana and Somali were lumped together and regarded with deep suspicion by the state” (p. 297). This history is important because it influences how Moha is positioned as the Other. These representations drive intercultural conflict and intensify an already volatile conflict climate.

Moha also called attention to how individual meritocracy works to blame people for their situations, positioning casual laborers as lazy and deserving to be poor, rather than blaming the structural factors, such as lack of jobs and political tribalism that create poverty. Bauman (2001) explains that individual meritocracy works as an ideology in the

following way:

When institutions for *overcoming* problems are transformed into institutions for *causing* problems; you are on the one hand, made responsible for yourself, but on the other hand are dependent on conditions which completely elude your grasp (and in most cases also your knowledge); under such conditions, how one lives becomes the biographical solution of systemic contradictions. (p.6)

Participants' comments show how a combination of political and economic conditions become structural factors that enable and constrain intercultural and intertribal conflict. Participants describe how politicians drive policies that favor particular tribes and their wealth and resources, while further marginalizing and putting others at a disadvantage. These policies create inequitable access to resources, such as healthcare, housing, food, employment, and economic and infrastructure development. In the excerpts provided, the status quo is both justified and critiqued and individual meritocracy is used to blame individuals for their lack of resources. Privilege is also acknowledged but justified due to necessary development. The comments offered by participants demonstrate that they recognize the relationship between politics and economics. They also describe patterns of tribal dominance. Some offer critique and others justification, depending upon their own tribal affiliation.

Politics and Tribalism

In this study tribe and tribalism are used to describe a social and/or cultural identification, representations of others, and means of organizing a society by tribe. James (2006) uses tribe and tribalism interchangeably to refer to an ontological formation, a subjectivity and ideology. First, as an ontological formation, it is understood

to be “a social frame in which communities are bound socially beyond immediate birth ties by the dominance of various modalities of face-to-face and object integration, for example, genealogical placement, embodied reciprocity and mythological enquiry” (p. 285). Second, James (2006) explains tribe and tribalism as a subjectivity and ideology, which “refers to the accumulation of practices and meanings of identity, practically assumed or self-consciously effected, that either take the social frame as given (as subjectivity) or as politicized in some commonsensical way (as ideology)” (p. 285).

Tribal systems in Kenya, are similar to ethnic systems in Europe and the United States. Ethnic systems can be understood as an organizing system based on ancestry, region, language, and are often associated with cultural language, values, norms, and status positioning. In Kenya and throughout many countries in Africa, tribal identity, rather than ethnic identity, is the more salient identifier. Tribe is the term used by Kenyan scholars, media, politicians, schools, businesses, and by the workshop participants to avow and ascribe cultural identities. Shilaho (2018) explains tribe by stating, “It is the word that Kenyans apply in discussing ‘ethnicity’ and related challenges” (p. 29-30). When asked about their ethnicity/tribe identity on the demographic questionnaire, participants identified their tribe. Therefore, in my analysis I focus on tribal affiliation.

Tribal structure in Kenya. Tribes, tribalism, and tribal conflict existed in Kenya before British Colonial invaders arrived. However, Shilaho (2018) argues that colonizers amplified tribal differences and division to organize the society and maintain power and control, a process that is continually reified by today’s politicians. Kwatamba (2008) asserts that the formation of ethnic and tribe identity is a “complex process of class formation intersected with attempts by the Colonial regime to manage the attributes of a

traditional society and its mobilization to develop a Colonial capital market” (p. 79). There are two primary reasons for how and why Kenya’s tribal consciousness became contentious. First, the Colonial administration drew boundaries based on cultural and linguistic lines, a decision based on the assumption that Africans lived in tribes (Sandbrook, 1985). For example, Lynch (2006) writes that culturally and linguistically related communities in the Rift Valley were given the name Kalenjin during Colonialism. Identifiers based on arbitrary boundaries are problematic because people with cultural differences or groups who are mutually hostile may be grouped together (Kwatamba, 2008). This practice of creating tribes for political purposes still takes place in Kenya today. In January 2017 the Kenyan government created the Makonde tribe, and in July 2017 Kenyans of Indian decent (sometimes referred to as Asians or Asian Indians throughout Africa) were recognized as a tribe (Shilaho, 2018).

Second, Leys (1975) contends that the emergence of an ethnic or tribal consciousness in Kenya was augmented by market capitalism when Kenyans changed from a barter to profit system. This change presented new insecurities and created increased competition for resources such as land, education, and employment. In present day Kenya these are continuing concerns and are often used by politicians to further divide groups and maintain tribal and ethnic voting blocs. Shilaho (2018) comments that “The elite and the populace vote along tribal lines in response to perceived fears and the opportunities of modernity at stake” (p. 29). Voting blocs are strong along tribal lines because Kenyans do not vote on issues, but on tribal affiliations to compete against each other for power and resources (Aguirre, 2017). Politicians feed into these tribal affiliations/competitions because these voting blocs provide politicians the “political

muscle” that they need to win campaigns (Paller, 2018). Since its democracy, Kenya has had five presidents and they have been from the Kikuyu or Kalenjin tribes. Although Kikuyus are the largest, these two tribes each have a large population, which means that the voting blocs will continue to serve representatives from these tribes. A Luo, Mr. Odinga, has served as Prime Minister. This corrupt political landscape becomes a structural force and contextualizes intercultural conflict.

Kenya’s tribes today. Kenya has three major ethnic groups, the Bantu, the Nilotes, and the Cushites. Researchers disagree on the exact number of tribes, however most concur that these ethnic groups comprise of between 42-60 tribes, with the most common number being 44. The Bantu represents about 70% of the country’s population, making it the largest ethnic group in Kenya. Bantu tribes include Kikuyu (22% of Kenya’s population), Luhya (14% of population), Kamba (11% of population), Meru (6% of population), Kisii, Swahili, Taita, Embu and Mijikenda. The Nilotic ethnic group includes the Luo (13% of population), Kalenjin (12% of population), Maasai, Samburu, and Turkana tribes. Finally, the Cushitic people include the Somali, Rendille, Borana, and Oromo tribes. (Kenya Information Guide, 2015; Sawe, 2017). Additionally, there are many people from Arab, European, and Asian descent who call Kenya home. In July 2017, the Kenyan government declared Kenyans of Indian descent as the country’s forty-fourth recognized tribe. In his report, Dahir (2017) writes that this change has been met with a mixed reaction. For some, “the acknowledgment was welcomed by many as long-due, a progressive gesture that would push the country towards a dream of inclusivity and equality” and for others, it was “an extension of the warped and divisive reality of tribal politics in Kenya. Some also pointed out that the Asian community in Kenya didn’t fit the

definition of a tribe, given their diverse religious, socio-cultural, linguistic and ancestral homelands” (Dahir, 2017, para. 2-3). The creation of an official tribal category has political, economic, and social consequences.

At the time of my workshop, Kenya was about one month out from their presidential election in 2017. Although there were eight candidates vying for the seat, the only two that were discussed by the participants were Uhuru Kenyatta (Kikuyu) and Raila Odinga (Luo). Mr. Kenyatta and Mr. Odinga come from two tribes that have a long history of conflict and violence. During my travels around Kenya, the importance of one of these two men winning the election was clearly apparent. I observed that most campaign billboards were about them. I observed small vehicles roll slowly through rural communities blasting messages of support for one of those two out of speakers affixed to the top of the car roof. I also witnessed large trucks that stopped traffic with high energy music, to start an impromptu rally in the middle of a busy highway. Online news reports on Kenyan politics from Kenyan, U.S, European, and Middle Eastern sources were also primarily concerned with the incumbent Mr. Kenyatta and his longtime rival Mr. Odinga. This coverage functioned to construct the election as between these two candidates only, which exaggerates the differences in positions and further polarizes tribal differences. Further, because these two candidates represent two dominant tribes in Kenya, and they have the capital to campaign heavily; this leads to their voices being heard by more Kenyans than other candidates. This positions them as the two most worthy candidates, giving them an advantage in the election.

In Kenya, tribal affiliations have a significant impact on social, economic, and political life (Dahir, 2017). Many of the conflicts that the workshop participants

identified had overt or covert messages about tribal identity. When asked about his experience with a recent intercultural conflict that involved politics, Chacha a twenty-one year-old Kikuyu explained, “The main issue that emerged was the differences in our tribal beliefs and practices being from different tribal backgrounds. Each one of us had his beliefs that seemed to differ in a big way” (Reflection #1).

As in many countries throughout the world, the political landscape of Kenya is marked by tribal conflict that is sometimes violent, and what some workshop participants described as corrupt elections and leadership. When asked to describe some of the most pressing intercultural conflicts, Emmy, a twenty year-old female from the Kamba tribe commented:

Our leaders have greed for power. They just want to be in power, and simply because they want to be in power, they go to their people and they encourage tribalism. They incite people. Then it’s a norm, tribalism, it’s a norm that people have accepted. It is a state of being in Kenya. (Workshop Discussion)

In Kenya, politics and tribe affiliation are often married in a conversation. Moreover, tribalism is ontological and a mechanism to enhance a group’s ability to dominate. Laura, a twenty-one year-old workshop participant who identifies as a Kikuyu described the connection between politics and tribal membership:

Kenya’s politics are mostly tribal. This is mostly where the conflict begins. If you say something, someone looks at your name so that they can give you a response. If you support a certain leader who is not from your tribe, you are labelled a traitor. (Post-workshop Reflection)

Laura’s comments reflect strong norms for tribal members to support their own members’

positions. When politicians from different tribes hold different positions, this intensifies conflict and increases polarization. Further, Laura's comment helps explain how Kenya has held strong voting blocs that are maintained along tribal lines.

The combination of politics and tribalism in Kenya enables and constrains intercultural and interethnic conflict. Participants described tribalism as highly salient and as ontological, "a state of being." Participants highlight their experience navigating a political landscape that has a history of corruption and favoritism. Moreover, participants identified that leaders use tribal politics to further divide groups, which drives conflict and maintains the status quo. Omitted from participant's reflections is critique of how their own tribe contributes to or benefits from political tribalism. Defense of one's own tribe is a strong norm throughout participant reflections.

Patriarchy

In Kenya, and throughout most of the world, women and girls continue to be subjugated. Although most women and men in Kenya are struggling to prosper, women face more disadvantages and exploitation than men (Collier, Lawless, & Ringera, 2016). They are disproportionately burdened in terms of access to healthcare, education, and employment. Although women represent slightly more than fifty percent of the country's population (Limo & Wekesa, 2010), their 2016 unemployment rate was 13.6%, compared to 9.3% for men. There are numerous contributing factors for this disparity, including: lack of education, child rearing, family responsibilities, production of food, and community responsibilities. Women also have higher rates of illness, disease, and malnutrition compared to men, and hold fewer elected offices than men.

In recent years there has been a push for gender equality and gender

mainstreaming in Kenya (Ministry of Gender, Children, and Social Development, 2011; The Constitution of Kenya, 2010). In 2010, an Amendment to the Constitution was passed that gave Constitutional protection to women, youth, persons with disabilities, and ethnic minorities. Article 27 was the first time in Kenya's history that every person had the right to equal protection and equal benefit of the law. The Article also banned the State from discriminating "directly or indirectly against any person on any ground, including race, sex, pregnancy, marital status, health status, ethnic or social origin, colour, age, disability, religion, conscience, belief, culture, dress, language or birth" (The Constitution of Kenya, 2010, Article 27).

In addition to the Constitutional changes, in 2011 the Ministry of Gender, Children, and Social Development created a policy for gender mainstreaming. Gender mainstreaming is a process of developing goals, strategies and actions to ensure that all genders can influence, participate in and benefit from development (Hamran, 2003). Gender mainstreaming policies recommend that women and girls are included, and their perspectives taken into account to identify issues, develop inclusive response strategies, and assess the effectiveness of those strategies. Gender mainstreaming moves beyond creating a gender balance and focuses on gender equality through recognizing a plurality of perspectives (Kiptoo & Kipkoech, 2011); this is what the Ministry committed to do in Kenya's national development processes. Yet, nearly a decade after Kenya implemented these changes, women are still underrepresented in decision-making positions; have inequitable access to education, land, and employment; and still live under the control of men (USAID, 2017; Khamasi, Maina, & vanHaegendoren, 2011). Although Kenya has made a commitment to inclusiveness in political representation, development, and access

to resources, it has been difficult to achieve. Morley (2007) explains this is a difficult task because “gender mainstreaming requires change in deep-seated values and relationships that are held in place by patriarchal power and privilege” (p. 617).

Patriarchy is an ideology that operates as a system of structures to perpetuate gender inequality, discrimination, and subjugation in society. Gordon (1996) adds that “patriarchy in Africa has its roots in African extended family systems and precapitalist familial modes of production that control women’s productivity and reproduction” (p. 8). Patriarchy is supported by institutional arrangements and practices that promote and serve male dominance. To understand patriarchy as a web of various social structures recognizes that patriarchy manifests not only in the dichotomy of private and public life. Rather, male dominance occurs in all aspects of societies and is used to protect a pervasive sexual hierarchy. Moreover, Gordon (1996) explains:

[Women] must cope not only with poverty and underdevelopment; they are also limited by patriarchal attitudes and practices, some predating capitalism, others established during the Colonial period. These patriarchal attitudes and practices, which privilege men, continue to permeate African societies from the level of the family up to the state. (p. 7)

Walby (1986) expands on patriarchy by defining it as “a system of interrelated social structures which allow men to exploit women” (p. 51). When pointing to patriarchy as a structure, cultural traditions also position men and women differently. Elaborating, Rich (1976) explains that patriarchy is:

A familial-social, ideological, political system in which men--by force, direct pressure or through ritual, tradition, law, and language, customs, etiquette,

education, and the division of labor--determine what part women shall or shall not play, and in which the female is everywhere subsumed under the male. (p. 57)

Study participant Laura, a Kikuyu, shared some strong opinions about women's participation in leadership positions and what she is doing to change that. In Reflection #1, Laura asserted, "I am not pleased by the fact that women have not been given opportunities and have not been empowered to serve the country. So, I feel I should be involved and empower those women around me." Laura holds an important Student Congress Leadership position at her university, and she is often challenged by male leaders. Her assessment of why men resist women as leaders is summed up in her following statement, "Men have been leading for a long time, from Independence until now, and there have been few women. This has gone to their heads and they want the trend to continue" (Reflection #1).

Women as political representatives and leaders are important in Kenya because they give voice to issues that concern women and girls. Some of the issues that are raised by elected women include: child marriage, access to sanitary pads for schoolgirls to reduce absenteeism, and advocating for girls to have access to quality education (*The East African*, 2017A). Laura, the university student leader, talked about the importance of including female perspectives, so that a plurality of issues are raised and can be addressed:

In Kenya almost all cultures do not recognize women in leadership. There are very few examples of women leaders available for us to see. When I am in the Congress with other female leaders, our opinions don't count that much. Sometimes when a female has a suggestion that is powerful and important, it is

brushed off by the male student leaders who are much larger in numbers than us. The issue is that our opinions don't count that much, and conflicts emerge in trying to defend the female opinions. This happens a lot in families, churches, and Parliament. (Reflection #1)

Laura pointed out that the silencing of women's opinions and lack of female leadership occurs in multiple institutions in Kenya and she implies that this trend is evident for women in many tribes. This patriarchal display of domination becomes a contextual structure that enables conflict because it sets up boundaries for interaction and what can be talked about, reifies the dominant position of men as leaders and agenda setters, and affects the livelihood of women who are not allowed to voice their concerns and participate equally in decision-making processes.

Kenya's government acknowledged that disparities in women's leadership is a nationwide concern, and in 2010 enacted policy to try to mitigate the issue. Article 81 was added to the Constitution which requires that no more than two-thirds of the members of elective public bodies shall be of the same gender (Africa Youth Trust, 2016). This policy has increased the number of female representatives in Parliament, but even after the 2017 elections, Kenya still falls short of this target. For example, the number of women elected members of County Assemblies is 96 of the total 1450 seats, and in the National Assembly there are 76 women, out of 349 members (Oluoch, 2017). Overall, only 16% of the 10,910 candidates in 2017 general election were women, and Kenya has the lowest representation of women in politics in East Africa (*The East African*, 2017A). The lack of representation of women in politics supports patriarchy and serves male politicians. Patriarchy in politics is reinforced by men and women who

maintain the voting bloc by supporting men from their tribes who run for political office, based on tribal association. The patriarchal political system in Kenya continues to benefit men, their tribes, and corrupt politicians.

Participants offered several examples of how tribal customs and traditions reinforce sexism and gendered roles. Male participants who identified gender in intercultural conflict described clear differences based on sex, positioning women as nurturers and caretakers and men as defenders and protectors. Harry, a twenty-one year-old Kalenjin youth, described cultural norms in his Post-workshop Reflection. He described a tribal conflict between the Tugens and Pokots, which occurred because of land, water and animal disputes:

Gender is important because men are allowed to fight, but women are not. Culture is also important because we believe that we [men] are supposed to defend our people, land, and animals...Each person had a role. The leaders incited one another, and older men were called to mobilize youth and men to go and fight for their community. The women were responsible for taking care of the children and older people, as well as supplying food and medicine.

Twenty-three year-old Sanchez, explained the responsibility that a young Luo male has to his tribe, "I must take my tribe's flag in the directions it deserves to go. As a man in my community, I have all eyes looking and depending on me. I should really work hard to ensure more people from my place are employed and respected" (Reflection #1). Sanchez places emphasis on the man's role to advocate for his tribe and ensure their well-being. His writing demonstrates that there are gender role expectations that allow him to demonstrate his masculinity. Laura, a twenty-one year-old university student

leader, named patriarchy to render it visible. Laura wrote about navigating patriarchy as she works toward social change in Kenya, and on her university campus more specifically:

I am a Kikuyu and patriarchy is a part of Kikuyus, but my mom has raised me the modern way. I am an individual, and I believe that both females and males can bring about change. My cultural identity is equality for both men and women.

(Reflection #1)

Laura wrestles with patriarchy being a tribal tradition that is collectively shared. She associates it with an antiquated way of treating women, whereas modern ways of thinking allow women and men to take on more equal roles as change agents. However, she also implicates individual meritocracy in her belief that individuals can change patriarchal systems.

Study participant Olive also raised concerns about the status of women in leadership in Kenya. Olive, a twenty year-old, stated “men are favoured compared to females when it comes to leadership in the Kalenjin tribe” (Reflection #2). She explained that communication within the tribe about who and what makes a good leader emphasizes males and masculinity. She also noted that the “lack of education for women to become leaders” upholds this trend, which is a critique of the patriarchal bias (Reflection #2).

As elsewhere throughout the world, women in Kenya are demanding change. There are women mobilizing and attempting to maneuver patriarchy (Rutere, 2011). Patriarchy is resisted when women stand up against men’s dominance in social, political, and economic spheres. Women are running for political positions and leading community organizations. An article in a popular Kenyan newspaper, *The East African* (2017A)

reports that a Kenyan woman was insulted, shot at, slapped by a colleague and cursed by tribal elders when she was running against a male incumbent in one region during the 2017 election. This type of violence was not an isolated incident. Yet, there are female chiefs in Meru for instance, who advocate for the needs of women and youth to male chiefs and the broader community.

Patriarchy and sexism produce and reinforce status hierarchies and power relations. Patriarchy and sexism are enacted by men and women to maintain the status quo and to protect positions and resources. Further, they both work together to create gendered roles that reify men's positions as leaders and women's place as in the home. These structures create standards for who get to speak and who must listen. For example, hooks (2000) describes this pattern when men listen to other men, and women are positioned to be seen and not heard. Some participants reinforce patriarchy by describing tribal norms and values that are reinforced by men and women, while a few call for resisting these norms. An intersectional approach reveals the ways in which gender, tribe, class, and age work together to create male dominance and economic disparity. Patriarchy is an influencing contextual structure in this study because participants identified it as enabling and constraining opportunities to lead and speak.

Inequitable Access to Resources

Tribalism, religion, and resources. Scarcity, access to, allocation of, and mismanagement of natural, social, political, and economic resources are structural forces influencing conflict for the Kenyan youth in this study. The group identified a robust list of resources that become issues in conflict, such as: water, electricity, better roads, cooperative relationships with different tribes, land, farm tools, money, hospitals,

schools, and higher economic status. Participants also described how access to resources impacts social relationships between tribes. During the workshop breakout session, a small group discussed this dynamic:

The most pressing intercultural conflict in our community is tribal clashes. Tribal conflict happens because we have to fight for resources. There is a mismanagement of public funds and a lack of enough social amenities (safe roads, healthcare, education, etc.) for everyone to have an equitable share. (Workshop Discussion)

Emmy, a twenty year-old female from the Kamba tribe, draws a clearer connection between inadequate resources and tribal conflict. When asked to discuss an intercultural conflict in Kenya, she explained the relationship between tribalism and resources:

We have inadequate resources [land, water, cattle, employment]. When two communities or different tribes are fighting for the same resource, it causes tribalism and then stereotyping. From this, a certain tribe is stereotyped to be maybe a bad community. Then people are judged just on that stereotype. (Workshop Discussion)

Emmy added that lack of both education and exposure to diverse groups enables tribalism because “if you don’t go to school, you don’t get to interact with people from different backgrounds and see that they are also human. So, this limits your thinking to what you’re told by people, what other people are” (Workshop Discussion). For Emmy this is connected to conflict over resources because “it prevents us from seeing the humanity in people...people can’t negotiate because they hate each other” (Workshop Discussion).

During the workshop another of the breakout groups also discussed resources. Reporting back for the group, a participant summarized their group discussion:

We find this [inequitable allocation of resources] to be a common cause of most conflict in Kenya. This creates conflict because some people are favoured and given so much more resources than others. (Workshop Discussion)

However, tribal politics is not the only reason credited for inequitable access to resources. Elsie, a nineteen year-old, who identifies as a Christian Luhya female, called attention to religious differences that impact community relations. She explained, “I grew up in an inter-religious based community with Christians and Muslims. The differences in their beliefs and way of living really interrupted the community peacefulness, especially when it came to resource management and allocations” (Reflection #1).

Although Christianity is the dominant religion in Kenya, the number of people who practice Islam is steadily increasing. This is creating struggles over religious differences. Here Elsie, discursively marks Muslims as responsible for the conflict because of “their beliefs and way of living”. This represents them as subordinate, as unacceptable, in relation to the dominant positioning of Christians. When asked about important resources for Muslims in her community, Elsie identified “mosques and the freedom to wear what they think is good for their community. They want to be recognized and have a 50/50 split of the resources” (Reflection #1). Although Elsie acknowledged that her Muslim neighbors want freedom and equality, she offered the following comments positioning Christians as superior, “We [Christians] want to have supremacy in all that we do, as it has always been” (Reflection #1). Here Elsie calls on the historical legacy of Christianity, since Colonization, as being the dominant and superior religion in Kenya. She uses a

positive in-group and negative out-group discourse (van Dijk, 1995), which discursively positions Muslims (them) as inferior and as the out-group compared to Christians (us). Elsie uses a strategy of citing the history of Christian supremacy and Biblical phrasing “as it has always been” to justify its continued dominance.

The relationship between tribalism and access to resources is clearly tied to politics and economics. Participants directed attention to the mismanagement of public funds and inadequate access to resources, which create and intensify intertribal conflict. One participant also shared her experience with an inter-religious conflict caused by inequitable management and allocation of resource, to demonstrate how intersectional identities complicate access to resources and create intercultural conflict.

Politics of land and natural resources. Many participants pointed to tribal politics as responsible for inequitable access to land, among other resources. Moha’s account is that “this government initiates policies that favour only their side, especially the rich” (Reflection #2). Policies drive access to a range of resources, such as employment, infrastructure, healthcare, education, and land ownership. For the workshop participants, the scarcity of, inequitable access to and mismanagement of resources were described by amplifying or highlighting tribal and religious differences. Sorrells (2013) points out that although such intercultural conflicts are often primarily economic and political in nature, they “are often framed in terms of ethnic, racial, religious, and cultural difference” (p. 211). Many participants articulated a connection between politics, tribalism and the disparities in access to land. Below, I focus on land disputes and natural resources because of the frequency and varied contexts in which these resources were discussed.

The history of land disputes in Kenya is complex and varies depending on the region and political climate at any given time. Workshop participant Moha, a member of the Borana tribe, reflected on the importance of land for all parties in an intercultural conflict:

One of the things I came to realize was that we all shared ancestral land. So, land was something that was very precious to them and very historical. The neighbour inherited that piece of land from his great grandfather. That is why he was so overprotective with it. Same case was with my family. We both had the same land from our great grandparents. This was supposed to be a united factor to us, but it only grew the tension. (Reflection #1)

Land ownership and rights were contested and fought over in Kenya before Colonial parties arrived and the conflict continues. When the British established Colonial rule in 1895, groups such as the Nandi in the Rift Valley were moved to reserves (Matson, 1993; Huntingford, 1950, as cited in Klopp, 2002). Kenya's fertile lands in that area attracted British settlers who built large farms, displacing Kenyans and calling those who chose to stay on the land "squatters". Their farms needed laborers, so the squatters became laborers whose work economically benefitted the settlers. With the help of squatter labor, by 1940 the northern part of the Rift Valley became what was known as the "bread basket of Kenya" because of its wheat and maize production (Youé, 1988). The British company Lonrho eventually took ownership of the land and forged relationships with the Kenyan government to insure political protection (Klopp, 2002). These relationships with key political figures including associates and family members of President Kenyatta Sr. and Vice President Moi (Kalenjin), lead to Lonrho acquiring more

land at government-controlled prices (Klopp, 2002). By the 1990s Lonrho began selling the land at prices that local people could not afford, making it possible for wealthy politicians to purchase large quantities of land in the Rift Valley. Klopp (2002) states, “The squatters viewed themselves as the deserving poor who laboured according to law. The graves of their ancestors on the land underscored their inter-generational commitment to the ‘contract’ as well as the validity of their claims to ‘ancestral land’, although many government supporters dismissed these claims” (p. 280). Rightful ownership of this land remains a point of contention to this day.

Land continues to be used as a political bargaining tool and often sparks violence during elections. Land related clashes tend to increase during elections because aspirants use issues related to land to attract supporters (Adan & Pkalya, 2005). This is particularly problematic because this rhetoric incites communities with already deep-seated issues over land ownership, rights, and boundaries. An example of this occurred in 1992 when land clashes erupted in most districts throughout Kenya. During this period “indigenous” communities evicted over 10,000 “invaders” from their farms (Adan & Pkalya, 2005). This scenario was replayed, but to a lesser extent, during the 1997 elections when politicians brought up past transgressions, a political tactic used to increase votes. Promises made by politicians to restore rightful ownership and establish clear and fair land laws continue to go unmet by those elected, enabling historical resentment and the need for struggle to continue.

Land disputes, just like other types of conflict, are rooted in structural inequality and unequal distribution of power. Although land ownership and boundary related conflict is an issue throughout all of Kenya, Adan and Pkalya (2005) explain that “the

situation is worse in pastoralist areas where poorly defined tenure rights have instigated clashes over access and ownership of grazing areas” (p. 18). In the case of pastoral communities, their conflicts are “largely caused by competition over control and access to natural resources, particularly water and pasture” (Huho, 2012, p. 458). However, there are a variety of intertwined variables that influence conflict in pastoral communities. These conflicts are driven by political, economic, and cultural factors, which are further complicated by the harsh climate which puts a strain on natural resources. Adan and Pkalya (2005) offer the following comments to show the complexity:

Starting in the early nineties, pastoralist regions have suffered a series of droughts that have seriously threatened the viability of pastoralism as a way of life. In addition, communities in these areas have suffered decades of neglect that have deprived them of the education, infrastructure and other prerequisites to diversification to other livelihood strategies that are not overtly dependent on natural resources. (p. 2)

The Turkana and Pokot communities in Kenya are examples of pastoral communities that have long been in conflict over limited resources such as pasture, water, and cattle. The conflict between these communities is exacerbated by drought, unregulated and widespread availability of small arms, marginalization of these pastoral communities from mainstream development, historical rivalries, and political differences (USAID, 2005; Huho, 2012). The conflicts that they experience are not rooted in one cause, rather they are caused by and mutually reinforced by different manifestations (Adan & Pkalya, 2005).

Climate conditions force the migration of pastorals and their herds to find water

and fields for grazing. The competition over scarce resources is often met with conflict and violence. The rate of droughts is increasing in Kenya, which has significant impact on pastoral conflict. For example, in West Pokot County droughts that were occurring every five to ten years, now occur at a rate of nearly one per year (Huho, 2012). During times of drought, water and pasture for herds to graze becomes scarce, causing pastoralists to move more widely in search for water and food for their herds. One study participant discussed an intercultural conflict deeply rooted in a history of land ownership disputes and tribalism. For Moha, a twenty year-old Borana male, tribalism and dominance present challenges to conflicting tribal groups. Moha wrote:

I grew up in a rural area of Isiolo. We had a neighbour who was from the Turkana language group and we were Borana. The whole community was Borana and very strong and tight knit, and our neighbour was isolated most of the time. The issues were land conflicts especially in terms of boundaries and sharing of resources. We used the same river, the same shopping kiosk and market and we were not allowed to interact with their children or play with them. (Reflection #1)

Moha recognized that both groups had resources needed by each other. The necessary sharing of the river and marketplace created some interdependence, but the Borana dominated by borrowing the tools they needed, keeping their large land holdings and withholding water. Moha added:

Occasionally we found ourselves going to our neighbour for farm tools like jembe, slashers, and a grinding stone for maize. That's what they have and treasured. What they really wanted was a large piece of land since they only had a small farm and we had a huge piece of un-used land. This is what led to land

issues and conflict of boundaries between our farms. (Reflection #1)

We had a bore-hole for water and we used to distribute water to most families in the community during times when water was a bit scarce. This was a huge resource. My family just had bitterness toward my neighbour that sometimes I could only wonder why. (Reflection #1)

Moha describes how the group with resources can exert dominance over other groups. He also describes tribal relations between neighbors as continued dominance.

Cattle rustling or raiding is one activity that creates significant conflict in pastoral communities. When a herd becomes depleted because of drought, floods, and disease, there are raids of livestock from near-by pastures. This activity is often seen in many regions including Marsabit, Samburu, West Pokot, Turkana, Marakwet, Trans Nzoia, and Moroto districts (Adan & Pkalya, 2005). Cattle rustling almost always results in a retaliatory attack or raid, which can lead to loss of livestock and human life. In one instance in 1995, the Pokot tribe raided the Turkana tribe, which resulted in the death of one person and two-thousand goats. A month later the Turkana retaliated, and three people died along with four-thousand cattle (Huho, 2012). It is worth noting that historically in some communities cattle rustling has a cultural significance and was overseen by community elders and carried out to show dominance. However, these events were carefully planned and carried out to prevent fatalities (Huho, 2012). More recently, Adan and Pkalya (2005) explain that “it has degenerated into a vicious criminal enterprise that has broken free of all checks offered by the respective cultures” (p. XI).

The topic of struggles over cattle and land was discussed by several participants. When asked to describe an experience with intercultural conflict, Harry a twenty-one

year-old Kalenjin described conflict between two groups who are “sub-tribes” of the Kalenjin:

It was between the Tugen community and the Pokots. The issues involved were cattle stealing, killing people, and displacing people in order to get more land, pasture and water. Also, there was the culture that they [Pokot] believed that they are the only people to own cattle that the Tugens have. (Reflection #1)

Harry stressed throughout his reflection that the Pokots believe that they had a God given right to own all the cattle in the area. When asked to describe some of the historical factors that were important to the Pokot tribe, Harry stated:

They believe that God gave them the power to own all the cattle in the entire region. They also instill the culture that the youth and men are supposed to steal cattle and displace people to acquire more land. By doing this, they acquire superiority. (Reflection #1)

Here Harry articulates a connection between land and cattle ownership and superior status, which is passed down from ancestors. This example also illustrates patriarchy since the acquisition of land and cattle is exclusively a male enterprise, justified by the church and past cultural traditions. Harry explained that this violent cattle rustling episode resulted in many being displaced, left without anything or even killed. He pointed out that “a lot of blood was shed, and women and children suffered a lot” (Reflection #1). Because of the violence, Harry and his community migrated to safer lands, and noted that “there was a revenge mechanism, I do this, you do the same but at a different time and occasion. Like attacking each other” (Reflection #1).

Access to land and natural resources is therefore a source of violent conflict for

some study participants. Contextual structures such as tribalism, politics, economics, and sometimes, religion help to drive these conflicts. Historical practices of land boundary changes and land grabbing, coupled with crippling drought has displaced groups and created a strain on resources. Moreover, Colonialism continues through corrupt politicians who direct and control resources. This creates inequitable distributions of a range of resources, including land, that benefit some groups and disadvantage others; this intensifies tribal conflict. Participant's reflections show how access to and control of land is determined by historical tribalism, violence by men and class positioning.

Tribal Hierarchies and Power Relations

Being organized by tribe is a way of life for Kenyans. The positioning of tribes produces hierarchies that enable and constrain intercultural conflict. Nevett and Perry (2000) explain that "Kenyans tend to have powerful beliefs about the superiority of their own tribe, and strongly held attitudes towards others" (p 28). This was evident in our workshop discussions as well as in participant written responses, particularly when speaking about people from the Kikuyu or Luo tribes. Positive "us" and negative "other" forms of discourse were pervasive in the participants' comments (van Dijk, 1995). For Chacha, a twenty-one year-old Kikuyu male from central Kenya, an intertribal conflict that he experienced dealt with a Luo male from the Lake Victoria Basin region. The two were hostel mates at the university they both attended when they began arguing about the forthcoming presidential election. Chacha stated:

As a Kikuyu, and being from Central Kenya, I have been brought up knowing that the Luos are our rivals, and as Kikuyus we cannot be led by a Luo as a president or anyone else of that political class. I also believed that the Kikuyu community

has a large influence on Kenyan politics. (Reflection #1)

He believed that the Luo tribe is and should be the most prominent group in terms of political and demographic influence. He also believed that his community has the “best culture” in terms of what they do (ceremonies), their food, and much more. (Reflection #1)

When asked how his hostel mate might view his (Chacha’s) cultural identities, Chacha once again focused on tribal membership:

He believed that the Kikuyus are an exploitive tribe and from what he may have learned from his elders that the Kikuyus are thieves. Usually in Kenya, we the Kikuyus are normally associated with theft from way before Colonialism. He also viewed that the Kikuyu is a “want it all” tribe since he cited that since we gained independence three of our presidents have been Kikuyus. (Reflection #1)

In defense of his Kikuyu tribe, Chacha asserted, “My tribe is one of a kind. Its people are very hardworking, and they excel in almost every venture” (Reflection #2). He contrasts the Kikuyu and Luo tribes using an “us” versus “them” frame, which reinforces a status hierarchy that positions Luos as inferior to Kikuyus. van Dijk (1995) explains:

Representations are often articulated along an us versus them dimension, in which speakers of one group will generally tend to present themselves or their own group in positive terms, and other groups in negative terms...Such discourse structures usually have the social function of legitimating dominance or justifying concrete actions of power abuse by the elites. (p. 22-23)

Further, discourses can serve to create, justify, perpetuate, transform, or destroy the status quo (Wodak, 2006). For Chacha, Kikuyu is considered the politically dominant tribe and

his comments serve to justify their dominance and perpetuate the status quo and abuse of power. Wodak (2006) explains that “through discourse social actors constitute knowledge, situations and social roles as well as identities and interpersonal relations between various interacting social groups” (p. 112). The positioning of Luos and Kikuyus in Chacha’s remarks indicates the relationship is a struggle for domination.

Sanchez a twenty-three year-old Luo male, uses positive in-group and negative out-group discourses (van Dijk, 1995) to position Luos and Kikuyus as “us” and “them” in his recount of a workplace conflict. When asked what group identities might be important, Sanchez explained, “The Kikuyu were protecting their culture because they have that mentality. It could also be true that they think Luos are more clever than them and if Kikuyus give Luos a chance they will take over everything” (Reflection #1). Here, Sanchez described that Kikuyus always protect their culture, but he does not acknowledge that Luos may also protect their culture. He positions the Luos as superior, “more clever than Kikuyus.” Sanchez also called attention to a history of his tribe not being respected or recognized, which reflects a long history of conflicted Luo / Kikuyu relations. Sanchez continued:

The Luo tribe are who they are and are supposed to be respected for who they are. Other tribes will not have us for the fact that we are too clever, and we produce important people. They use that as an excuse to make life expensive for us [by charging high rents]. (Reflection #1)

Sanchez’s ontological claim reflects the salience of tribal identity for all in Kenya. He highlighted that Luos are supposed to be “respected for who they are”, yet they are not treated as they should be by Kikuyus. He also called attention to the positive

characteristics attributed to his Luo tribe, such as being “clever” and producing “important people”. His remarks demonstrate how uneven political representation, economic struggle, regionalism, and tribalism drive their conflict.

Showing superiority over other tribes is also discursively accomplished by devaluing and or not recognizing them as part of the community. When writing about an intercultural conflict he experienced with a neighbour, Moha a twenty year-old from the Borana tribe stated:

What was important to my family was more than land. We wanted to show them (the neighbour) that we were better than them, that we were the ones who belonged on that land and that they were inferior and did not belong. My family took it up a notch higher, I remember one day bragging to them how my great grandfather was the Chief of that area. This was intentionally meant to hurt them and show how little my Turkana neighbour was in my community. (Reflection #1)

Moha referred to the ancestry and leadership in his family as a historical legacy with his grandfather’s high-status position as Chief. Turkanas are thus positioned as Other and those who do not belong.

In summary, the rivalry between tribes is visible in many examples taking the form of discursive Othering (van Dijk, 1995), that manifests in different ways and in varying degrees. As highlighted, workshop participants voiced strong feelings about members of tribes with whom their tribe historically had poor relations. Their reflections also showed examples of how inter-tribal struggles over political leadership and resources enabled and intensified intercultural conflict. With the exception of young

women calling out sexism across Kenya, participants speak from their own tribal locations and voice strong affiliations to their tribe. Such strong affiliations contribute to polarization and make it difficult for youth to form alliances, discourage inter-religious dialogues, discourage males to advocate for women and children, and make it very difficult for women to be elected. These strong affiliations also reinforce status hierarchies, reify the status quo and perpetuate power relations where the tribe of the president and ruling party is the dominant group. Power relations are viewed as being based on tribal positioning of politicians, and how all decisions of the ruling party reward their own tribe.

Conclusion

This analysis identified the relevant contextual structures that enable and constrain intercultural conflict for study participants. Politics and economics, politics and tribalism, patriarchy, inequitable access to resources, and tribal hierarchies and power relations all work together to create a context for intercultural conflict. These contextual and systemic conditions become contextual structures because they influence different groups in different ways and position groups within a social hierarchy that has consequences for different groups.

I was surprised that missing from participant's reflections was talk about Kenya's recently amended Constitution, which was amended to make it unconstitutional to discriminate based on gender, age, or ability. Youth actively pushed for the Constitutional changes because the changes were praised as a step toward equality and social change, but this was not mentioned or critiqued by participants. Also, although there was some acknowledgement, there was little critique of the election violence, vote

tampering and corruption by Kikuyus or Luos about previous elections. Their responses also ignored how non-Kikuyu and non-Luos figure into the political scene. For example, there was no mention of former President Moi, a Kalenjin, whose corruption was widely known in Kenya, who, acted to benefit his own interests, rather than those of his tribe or the Kenyan people. Participants valorized and avoided critique of politicians in office if they were from their own tribe. Participants brought up history, which began at Independence, and offered one-sided examples, privileged their own tribal perspective.

Most participants primarily focused on Luo and Kikuyu relations. Most did not talk about the many groups that are marginalized by these two dominant tribes. Power relations reinforce the status quo and are maintained when groups are kept marginalized and struggling by the two dominant groups, current and past governments, and Colonialism. Sexism and patriarchy were named only by women, whereas, masculinity in the forms of justifying violence, fighting, and protection, was praised and justified by men.

Finally, noticeably absent was any discussion about race or international aid, which is primarily from Europe and the United States. Whiteness was unnamed perhaps because it continues to be invisible, or difficult to name with a White facilitator with resources. Racial hierarchies were not mentioned, although they may be so taken-for-granted and linked with tribalism that they weren't named. There was no mention of the White colonizers, White visitors to International Peace Initiatives, including the workshop facilitator, or White international aid providers.

These omissions are significant because through their discourse, participants are reproducing a history of continuing struggles related to tribalism, patriarchy, and political

representation. To understand intercultural conflict participants, and researchers, benefit from recognizing how current contexts are influenced by structural forces, such as Colonialism, imperialism and whiteness by international aid representatives, as well as workshop facilitators. Nonetheless, the participants' responses did demonstrate an appreciation of multiple contextual structures that both enable and constrain intercultural conflict, and awareness how these structures become influential in the intersectional ways cultural groups are positioned.

CHAPTER FIVE: NEGOTIATING INTERSECTIONAL SUBJECT POSITIONS IN INTERCULTURAL CONFLICT IN KENYA

In this chapter I analyze the workshop discussion and written reflection responses from the study participants to answer the second research question: How do intersectional subject positions emerge in intercultural conflict? This analysis expands to include multiple dimensions of social identities because a monistic approach leads to an oversimplified understanding of the complexity of the youths' identities and how those emerge in relation to others during intercultural conflict. My goal is to situate intercultural conflict within the context which it occurs, and to generate localized knowledge about cultural identities. Attending to the multiplicity of subject positions helps me to realize that goal. This is consistent with Moon's (2010) assertion that by attending to intersectionality "scholars are more likely to produce knowledge that is specific and local, rather than abstract and overly generalized. In addition, we are more likely to observe how power and privilege may play out in intercultural interactions" (p. 41). Collins and Bilge (2016) propose that one of the core ideas of intersectionality is examining identities and power relations in the social context in which they occur.

As I argued previously, the study of intercultural conflict is complex, and therefore it is important to understand the contextual factors to enable and constrain intercultural conflict. Second, it is necessary to understand the intersectional identities that emerge in conflict because these demonstrate that conflict is about how subject positions such as tribe and gender, work together and gain meaning in relation to each other. Intercultural conflict is often driven by issues of identity, historical injustices, and asymmetrical power relations. Ellis, Ron, and Maoz (2018) label these types of conflicts

as “identity conflicts”. Intersecting identities become visible in claims by the participants about their positioning, and emerge in representations by others, as well as in public discourses attributed to politicians, media sources or students. Moreover, intersecting vectors of social difference that emerge in the discourse have different consequences for identity positions.

Identities

The study of identities is important in the study of intercultural conflict because “identity issues permeate across various levels of intercultural communication—from the micro to the macro, and from human to mediated communication” (Bardhan & Orbe, 2012, p. 10). Moreover, studying multiple identities reveals insight into relationships with privilege and oppression (Chávez, 2012). Communication scholars offer different definitions of identity. Allen (2011) uses the term identity to refer to “an individual and/or collective aspect of being” (p. 11). Kim (2007) uses the term cultural identity to refer to subcultural, national, ethnolinguistic, and racial affiliations. In this study, I use identity to refer to affiliations with or positioning into social group-based categories, such as: tribe, region, class position, gender, and religion (Collier, 2014).

Social identities do not operate in isolation. Jenkins (2004) argues that social identity refers to the ways in which, “individuals and collectivities are distinguished in their social relations with other individuals and collectivities...It is the systematic establishment and signification, between individuals, between collectivities, and between individuals and collectivities, of relationships of similarity and difference” (p. 5). Social identities are historically constructed and performed in relation to others (Bettie, 2014), and primarily developed through communication (Allen, 2011). Communicators use

discourse to position and represent their groups, as well as others' groups within a social hierarchy. Institutions and policies also position and represent groups, which helps to create, sustain, and modify status hierarchies. Power is important in the study of social identities because power emerges in relation to others and it communicates meanings about social identities (Allen, 2011). Therefore, I give attention to subject positioning of groups in relation to one another because this helps to reveal how power, privilege, and oppression operate and also has implications for levels of agency.

An Intersectional Approach to Identity

An intersectional approach rejects the 'single-axis framework' and subverts binaries to theorize about identities in a more complex fashion (Nash, 2008). Paying attention to identity is critical because there are various ways in which tribe, class, gender, age, and religion interact to create a plurality of subject positions for the participants during intercultural conflicts. Also, within the same tribal group, participants often have markedly different descriptions of conflict based on the unique social positions that they occupy within that group. For example, in a conflict with a Kalenjin male elder, a young Luo female is not only navigating cultural differences and power dynamics in terms of tribe, but age, social class, and gender. Attention to intersectionality allows for intragroup and intergroup differences to be exposed.

Theorists studying intersectionality contend that identity is formed by interlocking and mutually reinforcing vectors. Collins (2015) states that "the term intersectionality references the critical insight that race, class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, nation, ability, and age operate not as unitary, mutually exclusive entities, but rather as reciprocally constructing phenomena" (p. 1). I use intersectionality in my feminist theorizing because

it “has become the predominant way of conceptualizing the relation between systems of oppression which construct our multiple identities and our social locations in hierarchies of power and privilege” (Carastathis, 2014, p. 304). This is relevant for a study about intercultural conflict because people’s views of and actions in intercultural conflict are based on how they are positioned in relation to each other and the contextual factors that drive conflict. Attentiveness to power relations and social inequalities provides me a way to think about conflict in an intersectional way (Collins, 2015). An intersectional approach also helps reveal how people’s experiences with their positioning vary depending on their combined identities and relationships to power (Chávez, 2012,).

Discursive Repertoires and Social Identities

Identity categories have discursive and material dimensions. Social identities are institutionally produced and are social constructs because the meanings behind them are created by and agreed upon by people in societies and cultures (Sorrells, 2016). What particular cultural identities mean is contextually contingent, dynamic and contested. Discursive repertoires are revealed in participants’ discourses about their own and others’ cultural identities. Enberg (2011) explains that “repertoires are patterns of meaning which evaluate our experiences and narrate events from a personal view-point. They create versions of reality which are always ideological, that is, constructed according to the values of the author or speaker” (p. 83). In this study, the ideologies reflected in participants’ discourse are reinforced by multiple institutions and social norms. Discursive repertoires are often used by participants to describe and comprehend their position in the social order, and to critique and/or reinforce the social order (Frankenberg, 1993).

Bettie (2014) argues that “identities are fashioned from the limited repertoire of understanding ourselves and our lives made available to us in public discourse...these discourses routinely offer depoliticized identities and work to naturalize hierarchies of inequality” (p. 195). Participant’s views of their own groups’ positions, others’ positions, and relations between groups are constructed through discursive practice. Frankenberg (1993) summarizes the relationship between the discursive and material dimensions, “discursive repertoires may reinforce, contradict, conceal, explain, or “explain away” the materiality or the history of a given situation” (p. 2). This is important in this study because participants often use discursive repertoires to position their groups as superior, while constructing other groups as inferior and use discursive repertoires to construct others as responsible for the material conditions in which they find themselves.

Below I begin by analyzing how participant responses demonstrate how regional identities became salient and intersect with other cultural identities during intercultural conflict. Second, I focus on how gender is salient, but also emerges in relation to other identities. Third, I analyze how socioeconomic class position intersects with gender and tribal locations. Finally, I discuss how religion emerges as a salient identity complicated by gender. Attending to salience and hierarchical identity positioning answers some of the serious critiques of intersectionality (Muñoz, 1999; Yep, 2010 & 2016).

Regional Differences Intersecting with Other Identities

In Kenya regional identity is used to position groups differently within a social hierarchy. Participants reference regional affiliation either explicitly or implicitly when speaking about themselves and others. Kenya’s landscape includes the urban center of Nairobi among other cities, coastal regions such as Mombasa, rural farms and villages,

and mountainous areas around Mount Kenya. The 2009 census, the last census conducted in Kenya, indicates that 67.7% of the population lives in rural areas and 32.3% live in urban areas (KNBS, 2009). Resources, such as infrastructure, education, food, cattle, land, transportation, and political voice are all regionally based. Although migration patterns, drought, and other economic factors have dispersed tribes throughout Kenya, particular tribes are often mentioned or implied when discussing particular regions. For example, members of the Luo tribe are often associated with Lake Victoria, the Kikuyu tribe with the central region near the Mount Kenya area, and the Kalenjin tribe with the Rift Valley Province. Also, regions in Northern Kenya are known for harboring refugees, and some cities, such as Mombasa, have a higher number of Muslims. Laura a twenty-one year-old Kikuyu discussed regional identity as it relates to historical injustices and political voice:

The coastal region of Kenya has been marginalized for a long time. This is an issue that has compelled them to support a leader (Mr. Odinga) who plans to include them in the Country's agenda. The Nyanza communities feel like power has always been taken away from them, even when they rightfully have it. (Post-workshop Reflection)

Laura pointed out that region and tribal identities position groups with dominant or marginalized status, exclude and include groups from decision-making, and create inequitable political voice, which determines policy, resource allocation, and infrastructure support. Although not explicit, socioeconomic class also emerges in this statement. When communities are not included in the national agenda, they can have inequitable access to resources, such as education, employment, housing, food, and

healthcare. This disparity of resources impacts quality of life, social class positioning and limits agency. Laura's comment also implies how institutions, such as the government are organized to marginalize particular groups over time (Collins, 2000). The political system works with other social institutions, such as the legal system, labor market, education, housing, and financial markets, to disadvantage and privilege groups based on their social identities and status (Collins, 2000). Intersectional subject positions are important in this example because power relations are established through combined tribalism, classism, and regionalism.

Another example of regional identities intersecting with other cultural identities is in Joy's positioning of herself and a classmate in her reflections below about an intercultural conflict. Joy, a twenty-two year-old who is a member of the Meru tribe, experienced conflict during the 2017 Presidential election with Luo male who was older than she. When asked what cultural identities were important in this conflict, Joy wrote:

I felt like it is because I am a second-year student and he is a third-year student. I am a female and worse, someone from the central region of Kenya. If I was a male and a year ahead, maybe he would have been nice to me. Because he is a male and Luo, this contributed so much to the conflict. (Post-workshop Reflection)

Joy's emphasis on being from the central region of Kenya stresses that regional identities matter, and these become more complex when they intersect with tribe, gender, and age. The central region of Kenya is inhabited by the Bantu ethnic group, which includes Merus and Kikuyus. Although Joy does not explicitly reference her tribe as being an important cultural identity, it is implied based on the region that she is from. Not only

does Joy's region and tribe impact the interaction, her age and gender do as well. Her comments are situated in her subject position as a young woman in Kenya's patriarchal society. Further, the already troubled tribal relationships between Luos and Merus are showcased in her reflections about this interaction. Attention to the structural context of patriarchy and tribalism is critical for an intersectional analysis because power relations are best understood in the context in which they occur (Collins & Bilge, 2016). Social context and power are both core ideas that are uncovered by an intersectional framework (Collins & Bilge, 2016).

Joy's intersecting group identities position her in a subordinate position in relation to her classmate. This interaction occurs in the interpersonal domain of the matrix of domination (Collins, 2000). The interpersonal domain is concerned with everyday interactions between people that are shaped by their many axes of social division. As Joy indicated, these axes of social division work together and build on each other to influence interactions during intercultural conflict. Such interactions are shaped by and support contextual structures and systems such as hiring practices, government programs favoring the tribe of the president and whose voice is valued; these reify tribal, gendered and age-related power relations and inequitable group interactions. Collins (2000) explains that "the interpersonal domain functions through routinized, day-to-day practices of how people treat one another. Such practices are systematic, recurrent, and so familiar that they often go unnoticed" (p. 287). These day-to-day practices position group members differently, reify social hierarchies and are evidence of power dynamics that have a long history in Kenya.

Moha, a male member of the Borana tribe provided an example of how multiple

identities, including regional affiliation, emerge in an intercultural conflict that he experienced. Moha stated:

The Turkana group perceives us [Borana] as very hostile people, as cattle rustlers, who steal pasture land and cattle. They say that we are evil, and that we are not even from Kenya. They think of us as people from Somalia. Yet, this is not true, it is just stereotyping. (Post-workshop Reflection)

The other people in the conflict viewed my group identities as outsiders who were not considered to have any political participation in my community. That our voices did not matter. The common phrase that I heard was ' Kenya ni yetu; hao wengine waende kwao' meaning 'Kenya is for Kikuyu people and the Luo people; but the rest of the Muslims are refugees; they should go back to Somalia' (Post-workshop Reflection)

Moha describes how his group is negatively positioned because of intersecting identities of tribe, region, nationality, religion and social class. Pastoralists live in rural parts of Kenya and sustain their livelihoods by raising cattle and producing agriculture. Years of drought have created a strain on water supply and suitable pasture for herds to graze. As a result, conflict over land and cattle has increased, particularly between the Borana and Turkana tribes. As Moha indicated in other comments, this negative positioning of his group was developed over time and through continuing contentious relations with the Turkana group. His own positioning needs to be understood in relation to Turkanas, Somalis and other Kenyans, as well as to Christians.

The discursive repertoire, “not really a Kenyan” works to reinforce the social order of Borana as the Other, and tribalism and Christianity as the norm. This discursive

repertoire is used to question national identity, to position the Boranas as Somalis, who are represented by Kenyans in general as refugees, pirates and terrorists; and due to large numbers in Kenya, a drain on the economy and resources. When these representations are widely circulating, they act together to justify inequitable treatment (Collins, 2000; hooks, 2000; Collins & Bilge, 2016) and to explain away social inequalities and material conditions (Frankenberg, 1993). This positioning (re)produces power relations that justify discrimination, religious persecution, protects land ownership that is already controlled by few, and encourages tribalism.

Gender Intersecting with Other Identities

Study participants described gender as a salient identity marker and used it to position themselves and others within a web of social hierarchy. In Kenya's patriarchal society there are clear gender roles that determine who can speak, protect, lead, be educated, and take responsibility for the care of others. These roles are further complicated when tribe, class, and age are considered. I return to comments from Laura, a twenty-one year-old university student leader, in which she focused on her tribe and gender when she wrote about her experiences with an intercultural conflict. She stated:

I am a Kikuyu and patriarchy is a part of Kikuyus, but my mom has raised me the modern way. I am an individual, and I believe that both females and males can bring about change. My cultural identity is equality for both men and women.

(Reflection #1)

Laura uses a discursive repertoire of individualism and equality for men and women to challenge and contradict the dominant repertoire, "women cannot be leaders or agents of change." She evaluates her experience being raised by a mother who instilled in her that

women can be leaders and are capable of creating change. She uses this repertoire to make sense of the male leadership at her university and to indicate her perceived agency and her commitment to social equality and social justice.

Ideas and images about women and their ability to lead reinforces power dynamics and continues to keep women marginalized within the Kikuyu tribe and in Kenya more generally. Laura provided the following example of a controlling image (Collins, 2000) of young Kenya women. She stated, “the male student leaders view the female as very disturbing and attention seeking, while we are all fighting for the students we represent and their needs” (Reflection #1). The production of women as emotional and irrational is a type of controlling image that justifies and supports the dominant position of men. Moreover, it advances the interests of one group over another by positioning men’s conduct as the norm and women as the outside Other. This also provides an example of the cultural domain of power. Collins and Bilge (2016) describe the cultural domain of power as a means of organizing power through how people explain social inequalities. In Laura’s example, male student leaders justify the social inequality of women by positioning them as attention-seeking Others. The cultural domain is also responsible for manufacturing messages that tell groups that opportunities are fair and achievable by all, which is not the case in a social context where patriarchy is so deeply embedded in the social fabric. This pervasive patriarchal context problematizes Laura’s view that she can bring about change.

The control of knowledge is also used by dominant groups to maintain their position of status and influence (Weber, 2010). Allen (2011) comments that the relationship between power and knowledge is recursive, insofar as power creates

knowledge and knowledge perpetuates the effects of power. According to participants, some women have a difficult time contributing to knowledge production because their thoughts, ideas, and perspectives are not taken seriously. For example, Laura wrote, “being a young lady, some people think that you cannot comment, and that you have nothing to contribute in a conversation” (Post-workshop Reflection). Laura identified that her gender and age operate together to prevent her ideas from being taken seriously. When women cannot contribute, knowledge is constructed without their perspectives and solutions.

This is also an example of the disciplinary domain of power, which helps to organize power relations by setting up relationships in which some people are treated differently by others through what rules and laws apply to them and how those are implemented (Collins & Bilge, 2016). When Laura is not invited or allowed to contribute, the disciplinary domain is operating by enforcing rules about who can speak and be taken seriously. The disciplinary domain is helping to support power relations, controlling images, and knowledge production. Power is operating by disciplining young women to think that their contributions are not wanted or valued by men and most women. Thus, censoring their voices limits their agency. This is one way that the disciplinary domain acts to, “put people’s lives on paths that make some options seem viable and others out of reach” (Collins & Bilge, 2016, p. 9).

The control of images and knowledge production also influences what women think about women’s status and position. In previous comments cited, Laura indicated that her vision that both women and men are change agents is not collectively shared; rather she expressed her view as one individual. While recognizing male chauvinism, she

stressed this again when asked what cultural identities were important in the intercultural conflict that she experienced:

The male chauvinism and ego is important to this conflict. Being raised in a patriarchal kind of society, both men and women have been raised that way.

There are a few exceptions for those who've changed with time. Some of us females have realized that we can also be agents of change. (Reflection #1)

Patriarchy, being explicitly named here, is an ideology that operates as a system of structures to perpetuate gender inequality, discrimination, and subjugation in society. As an ideology, it permeates every aspect of society, including micro, meso, and macro levels; this helps to normalize patriarchy and render it invisible and inevitable. Patriarchy becomes pervasive not only when men reinforce it, but also when women do. As Laura pointed out, most females in Kenya do not see their capacity to create change.

An intersectional approach reveals the ways in which Laura is simultaneously oppressed and privileged. As a young Kikuyu woman with access to a university education, she is privileged because of her tribe and elevated class status. Kikuyus have benefited from having three presidents in office, which favored policy and economic and social development in their tribe's direction. This created differing levels of access to employment, healthcare, and education depending on intersecting social identities. A position as a university leader indicates that she has the social and financial collateral to attend an institute of higher education. Further, a university education increases her credibility to speak in certain contexts, while helping to maintain middle class positioning. Attention to intersectional subject positions is critical because identities create different relationships with contextual structures such as patriarchy. In the

examples provided, she describes how both her gender and age position her with subordinate status, yet her dominant tribal status is named in other responses, but not mentioned here.

Related to gender, male participants focused on how their age and gender creates obligations and expectations that position them differently than women and older and younger males in their tribes. For example, Harry's previous comments also reproduce sexist norms. Harry, a twenty-one year-old Kalenjin youth, described cultural norms that govern men in his tribe:

Gender is important because men are allowed to fight, but women are not. Culture is also important because we believe that we [men] are supposed to defend our people, land, and animals...Each person had a role, the leaders incited one another, and older men were called to mobilize youth and men to go and fight for their community. The women were responsible for taking care of the children and older people, as well as supplying food and medicine. (Post-workshop Reflection)

When asked about the identities that were important to him, Harry wrote, "the culture that calls for men to fight for our community and give protection" (Reflection #1). When describing his needs and positions, Harry commented, "we wanted to protect our people, our wealth, and the land. Also, to fulfill what our culture and community expect a man to do" (Reflection #1). Harry's cultural identities reflect cultural norms and values that are driven by his being a man, a young adult, and a Kalenjin. Also, contextual structures, such as tribalism and patriarchy are implicated in his comments and act to reinforce status hierarchies.

Returning to his previously cited comments, Sanchez a twenty-three year-old Luo

male reflected on his gender, tribe and age as being salient during intercultural conflict. Sanchez wrote, “I must take my tribe’s flag in the directions it deserves to go. As a man in my community, I have all eyes looking and depending on me. I should really work hard to ensure more people from my place are employed and respected” (Reflection #1). Responses from Harry and Sanchez show a similar discursive repertoire that “men are leaders and protectors”. This repertoire is used by these two participants to justify the positions of men in their tribes. This discursive repertoire is used to justify male dominance over women and children, while normalizing and reinforcing tribalism and patriarchy.

The complexity of Harry’s and Sanchez’ orientations to themselves and others are shaped by the positioning of their multiple cultural identities. Collins and Bilge (2016) state, “the events and conditions of social and political life and the self can seldom be understood as shaped by one factor” (p. 2). Sanchez described his orientation to intercultural conflict being driven by several subject positions: his tribe, gender and age as a man, and historical actions of his ancestors. He added:

I grew up knowing how important it was for me to protect what’s mine. I was fair, but I had to fight for my tribe and for what was good. If it wasn’t for our great-grandfathers, I don’t think there would ever be this issue of us against them.
(Reflection #1)

Sanchez’ description of his multiple identities points to both privilege and oppression (Chávez, 2012). As a male in his tribe and in Kenya, Sanchez can look to leaders who reflect male perspectives and ideas. Policies that support male agendas and continue to position men with more agency to lead are in place. Although the Luo tribe have large

numbers, they have repeatedly failed at having a president elected from their tribe. The closest they have come is to have a Prime Minister during a power-sharing period. With their rival tribe, Kikuyus, in the highest office, the Luo tribe members position themselves as plagued with slow development and unequal access to resources, in relation to Kikuyus.

Socioeconomic Class Intersecting with Other Identities

Moha, a twenty year-old Borana male, lives in the Mathare slums, near Nairobi. Mathare is the largest (500,000 residents) and poorest slum in Kenya. Moha identified the complexity of historically situating social class when he wrote about class differences between people in his community and the “rich people living in the higher area outside the slum” (Reflection #2). He also understands how he is positioned and he contests that positioning. Moha stated:

Their group identity is [shows] the social class difference. Their lifestyle, the way they interact with people, their clothing style, and the way they raise their opinion, and the way they have their houses. It is completely different than the rest of us, and I feel this is important since this is how the “rich” associate themselves.

A historical factor is important is that most of their parents were wealthy and passed down the inheritance to them. They feel they need to maintain this class in the eyes of the people and to do the same for their children. The less privileged in our slums feel the need to become like them. That is their ultimate desire. We fancy their lifestyle. We want to associate with them since we feel they will offer opportunities, jobs, donations, and we will become like them. We don't want to be identified as poor people. (Reflection #2)

Moha identified that being sensitive to historical factors is necessary to understand that socioeconomic class status is not always a reflection of individual choices. Collins and Bilge (2016) argue that situating an intersectional analysis in the particular historical, intellectual, and political contexts in which it occurs, is one of the core ideas of intersectionality. Contextualizing social class positioning helps to reveal that it is related to one's net worth, which is influenced by the net worth of previous generations (Lui & United for a Fair Economy, 2006). Moha pointed out that the group members he experienced conflict with had wealthy parents and that they want to maintain their class status for their children. Moha's lower class position emerges in a conflict with group members from higher social class status. It is this relationship between social classes that becomes salient because it creates a status hierarchy that is reinforced through historical treatment and social and economic discrimination.

Moha uses a discursive repertoire that reinforces the idea that one's class position determines if s/he is desirable and worthy. He identified that wealth is often intergenerational but does not critique the social context that allows class disparities to perpetuate. For people born into a dominant social class position, life circumstances, networks and opportunities are different than for those who are born into poverty. Their access to resources such as employment, education, and healthcare are greater, which increases the likelihood that they will be able to maintain their socioeconomic class positioning and pass it to future generations.

Socioeconomic class status also implicates the region of past and current residence, and tribal position. This is evident in the representation of Boranas as the "not from Kenya" slum dwellers compare to the others residing in the more "desirable" area

outside of the slums. These positions influence their access to resources, which further enhances their status and broadens the gap between the rich and poor. Consequently, social inequality is better understood when intersectionality is used as an analytical tool. Here, the intersections of social class position, region, and tribal position add layers of complexity necessary for a more comprehensive understanding of social inequality. This reveals that social inequality is not only the result of one's class position, but in Moha's case, it is found at the intersections of his social class, his region of origin, current residence, and his tribal membership.

Other participant's comments also show how socioeconomic class status plays a significant role in how participants position themselves and others. Bettie (2014) tells us that "class is experienced in racial/ethnic-and gender-specific ways" (p. 194), which is demonstrated in participant data. Participants explicitly named class, as well as other differences, as a significant part of their intercultural conflicts. For example, Emmy, a twenty year-old female from the Kamba tribe who is currently pursuing a university education, recalled a conflict that occurred when she was not permitted to join a school club for students interested in journalism. When asked how others viewed her group identities, she wrote:

The others in the conflict view my group identities as that of minorities, people who are not civilized and not innovative. We are also people who cannot live up to their requirements. They also view us as a burden since we may not be able to afford the needs of our group. I come from the upcountry [Northern Kenya] and so they feel like I wasn't that civilized. Also, I did not come from a rich family and I was a first-year student. (Reflection #1)

Emmy's example complicates class standing by including her regional roots which are from the "upcountry," which implicates her tribal affiliation as well. She notes multiple ways her identities position her with minority status based on her tribe, being poor, uncivilized, and a first-year student, thus making her a burden to those who are in dominant groups at her school. However, for those outside her tribe as well as many within, people from the upcountry are positioned as minorities, poor, and unable to obtain any upward mobility. Emmy understands how she is being positioned by others and implies that this positioning organizes social power and creates a clear status hierarchy. Here class and tribe work together to create a subject position of the uncivilized Other. These subject positions show a power dynamic between Emmy and others that she describes to explain why she is not permitted to join the school club.

Emmy points to a discursive repertoire of individual meritocracy when she notes that those outside her tribe view Kambas as uncivilized and not innovative, therefore responsible for their own poverty. In this statement the materiality of poverty is explained as a condition caused by Kambas, which conceals the ways in which structures and institutions create and maintain poverty. This comment also points to a neoliberal logic of disconnecting the problems that people face from the broader social context in which they occur, thus placing responsibility for change on individuals. Further, this logic ignores the social conditions that help to create poverty and make it difficult for people to escape its tight grip. Bauman (2010) comments that this is evidenced when "poverty is labeled a 'pathological condition' rather than a reflection of structural injustice—a 'pathological dysfunction' of those who are poor, rather than the structural dysfunction of an economic system that generates and reproduces inequality" (as cited in Giroux, 2013,

p. 10). This is one of many examples of the interconnected discursive and material dimensions of identities, which work together to position groups within a social hierarchy and in relation to each other.

Identity categories are not static, rather they are dynamic forces that must be historically situated and at the same time understood as capable of changing over time. For example, class status is shaped by a variety of factors, such as: generational wealth, political representation, policy, laws, regulations, access to resources, employment, environmental conditions, health disparities, capitalism, and patriarchy. Yet, structural factors such as presidential and political influence, resources available and educational status do change for some tribal and gender groups. Thus, to understand class and other social locations, it is necessary to hold tension between the past and present. The historical factors are critical because although some group members can gain employment and/or education to obtain socioeconomic class mobility, a history of poverty and discrimination act as a barrier to mobility. Moreover, policies, representations and strong norms such as Christianity create inequitable access to resources are difficult to change, and the conditions created by these forces can impact groups for generations.

References to class status are indicators of relations between groups, and how dominance works. As Moha indicated, people with a middle and upper class status have the agency to raise their opinions differently than those who are positioned as “poor”. Having a platform to speak and to be listened to is an advantage to allows groups to advocate for their needs, participate in agenda-setting, and for males to occupy positions of leadership. At the same time, class and status hierarchies keep people in poverty from

achieving class mobility, because as Moha wrote, they control the jobs and opportunities in the community (Reflection #2). These experiences do not occur in a vacuum, rather are the result of a history of complex structural relationships that continue to reinforce social positions of groups.

Religion Intersecting with Other Identities

Kenya's religious landscape is diversifying. According to the United Nations Statistic Division (2017) the 2009 census recorded just above thirty-eight million people in Kenya, thirty-two million identified as either Catholic or Christian, and approximately four million as Muslim. The changing demographics are creating intercultural challenges. Zirulnick (2015) a correspondent with the *Christian Science Monitor*, a nonprofit news organization states "Kenyan Christians have long dominated political and social institutions. But an increasingly devout Muslim population is pushing for a greater voice, testing the ability of religious leaders to sustain longstanding religious harmony" (para. 1). In this context, some study participants identified religion as a salient cultural identity that was negotiated during intercultural conflict.

In her previously cited responses, Elsie, a nineteen year-old Christian Luhya female called attention to religious identities and class positions in her experience with intercultural conflict. She explained, "I grew up in an inter-religious based community with Christians and Muslims. The differences in their beliefs and way of living really interrupted the community peacefulness, especially when it came to resource management and allocations" (Reflection #1). Elsie positioned Muslims as interrupting peacefulness and as a community concern because of their need for resources. These comments point to a discursive repertoire about Muslims being problematic Others

compared with the Christian standard and norm. Elise engaged in what Rosenblum and Travis (2003) identify as the manufacturing of difference. This is accomplished when Elsie highlighted the differences that produce social inequality and implied that the dominant religious system of Christianity is clearly preferred over that of Muslims.

When asked what group identities were important to others in the conflict, Elise stated, “they insist on wearing hijabs and buibuis [the East African word for a shawl worn by Muslim females] at school which is not a part of the school uniform” (Reflection #1). Elise’s attention to religion and gender positioned her female Muslim classmates’ clothing choices as violating norms for school uniforms. In an interview with correspondent Zirulnick (2015) Hassan Ole Naado, head of the Supreme Council of Kenya Muslims stated, “there is this fear that Muslims are stepping on other people’s toes by demanding to practice their faith in places that don’t belong to them” (para. 7). An example of such a place is public schools in Kenya.

In Kenya, many schools have Christian or missionary roots (Zirulnick, 2015). The Kenya Education Act of 1968 established most schools as public, but some churches agreed to stay on as sponsors if the community agreed (National Council for Law Reporting, 2012). This complicates the relationship between the values and commitments of public schools and those of churches. Zirulnick (2015) tells us that, “administrators are struggling to figure out how to accommodate a growing and increasingly devout Muslim population in public schools founded and often funded by [Christian] churches” (para. 5). Head teacher, Mramba Kellian Mweni stated in the interview with Zirulnick (2015) that, “This is their culture and we have to respect their culture.... [But] the place is owned by the Catholics. We’re supposed to go by

the culture of the school” (para. 15). The assumption here is that each school has one culture. Elise’s comment reflects a similar sentiment, insofar as that females (and presumably males) should follow the same dress code at school, regardless of their religion.

The hegemony of Christianity is also shown in the following comment by Elise, “as Christians in that part of our country we believe that purity of a human is found on the inside, and not on the outside as perceived by our Muslim brothers” (Reflection #1). This statement reveals a contradiction, that purity is on the inside, yet clothing that covers more of the body is not acceptable. Also, the use of “Muslim brothers” is interesting because in Elsie’s earlier examples she focused on females’ clothing choices. When Muslims wear specific clothing for religious purposes they are marked as challenging the status quo and interrupting the dominant norm of Christianity. Elsie also highlights region, “in that part of our country”, as important to this conflict. Her remarks do not specify what region she is referring to, but Muslims tend to populate more heavily in the coastal regions of Kenya, such as Mombasa, and northern regions of the country. Elsie implies that there are places in Kenya where Christianity is dominant and most accepted.

Particular power relations are evident in the discursive repertoires used by Elsie. Collins and Bilge (2016) explain that an intersectional analysis helps understand power relations as mutually constructed. For example, Islamophobia does not occur in isolation of sexism. Rather, the power relations of Islamophobia and sexism gain meaning in relation to one another (Collins & Bilge, 2016). In this example, power relations are understood through the four domains of power (Collins

& Bilge, 2016). The disciplinary domain and the structural domain are salient in Elsie's description of this intercultural conflict. The disciplinary domain organizes power by treating people differently regarding institutional rules and laws. This is evident in the inequitable access to resources, which is also an example of the structural domain of power in operation. When religious attire is policed at school and by other groups, the disciplinary domain is operating to set-up domination by Christians. By creating policies that restrict or make it uncomfortable for Muslim females to wear hijabs and buibuis, they are being disciplined differently than Christian females. This feeds power dynamics by positioning Christian females as the dominant norm and Muslim females as the subordinate Other.

Sanchez a twenty-three year-old Christian Luo male also referenced religious identities when he discussed intercultural conflict. The conflict was about religious differences that occurred between two friends, a Muslim and a Christian. Sanchez commented that his age made it difficult to intervene because, "the people involved in the conflict were older than me, so it will be a bit difficult for them to listen to a solution from someone underage. Young people are known not to know anything about life" (Reflection #2). This shows that even in a conflict in which Christian norms were the accepted standard, age determines who should speak. When asked to describe the cultural identities important in the conflict, Harry offered the following assessment:

Muslims think they are better than Christians since they pray four times per day. They believe that Christians can go an entire day without saying a word of prayer. I think Muslims talk ill of Christians. It feels bad because I know that my connection with my creator is strong. I am not what they say I am. (Reflection #2)

Here, Sanchez is critiquing Muslims' representations of Christians as less connected to their Creator. He counters this representation by defending Christian prayer rituals. These examples show how Christians and Muslims position their own groups as superior and more deserving than the other. These relations establish standards for how they approach conflict with each other. Within the matrix of domination, this can be understood as interaction occurring at the interpersonal domain (Collins, 2000). The interpersonal domain in these examples show how power dynamics emerge related to religion, gender and class, during everyday interactions, and how such interactions reinforce "us" and "them" polarization (van Dijk, 1995).

Conclusion

This analysis identified how intersectional subject positions became evident in participants' reflections about intercultural conflict. Region, gender, class, religion, age, and tribe pointed to vectors of social difference in discourse about intercultural conflict. Missing from participant's discussion about identities is ability, sexual orientation, and race. First, ability status did not appear in any of the data. None of the participants identified on their demographic questionnaire as having a disability, nor did it emerge as a salient identity during any of the intercultural conflicts that the participants described. Second, discussions about sexual orientation are taboo in Kenya, and explicit or implicit references to sexual orientation did not appear in any of the participant data. I elected not to inquire about it on the demographic questionnaire and see if it would be referenced in narratives of intercultural conflicts. Considering the broader social context that establishes that conversations about sexual orientation are unacceptable, and possibly dangerous given that same sex relations are still illegal in Kenya, it was not surprising

that participants did not discuss it.

Finally, participants did not describe race as salient in any of their conflict descriptions. There were no examples of conflict with international visitors or people of other races that call Kenya home. Participants argued in our workshop that they do not see each other based on race, and for them, race is not salient during their interactions with each other. Although race is a category sometimes identifiable through appearance and social positioning, what was more salient in the responses included: tribal heritage, nationality, regional affiliations, religion, gender and age. Also, when asked on the workshop demographic form to identify their race, there were diverse responses. Seven responded Black, three responded African, and one left that question blank. The variation in responses indicates that some participants are unclear what is meant by race.

Participants might say they do not think about race in their day-to-day lives and interactions, but race matters in Kenya. The study researcher is White; race is a significant part of Kenya's history; and it is important in present day Kenya. The country was colonized by the predominantly White British; Christianity was introduced by mostly White outsiders; Kenya's economy is heavily dependent on international aid from European countries and the U.S; and Western volunteers and tourists who are White identified are frequently seen throughout the country. This omission of race from discussions about intercultural conflict points to a denial of racial positioning.

Intersectional subject positions became clear in the responses of participants and these were used in service of "us" and "them" comparisons that placed their own tribe, sex and religion as superior. The subject positions also contested particular cultural identities as "not Kenyan," "deserving of poverty," "unable to be change agents," and

overall “underserving of resources.” These descriptions of vectors of difference were contextually contingent and structurally produced, as well as socially constructed. What these intersectional positions produced, and how the participants described navigating their contexts and subject positions to enact agency during conflict transformation is the topic of the final analysis chapter.

CHAPTER SIX: ENACTING AGENCY DURING INTERCULTURAL CONFLICT IN KENYA

In this chapter I analyze the workshop discussion and written reflection responses from the study participants to answer the third research question: Given the particular contexts and subject positions being navigated in intercultural conflict transformation, how do the youth leaders enact agency? In previous chapters, I analyzed the contextual structures that enable and constrain conflict and the intersectional subject positions that the youth navigate during intercultural conflict. Now, I turn to understanding how the participants view their own abilities to enact change. I examine the ways that participants applied knowledge of contextual factors and their positioning as subjects as they designed or carried out moves to transform the intercultural conflicts they described.

Conflict Transformation

As social actors who are faced with intercultural conflict, my goal was to identify the ways in which participants' comments implicated agency to transform intercultural conflicts. In the workshop, I defined conflict transformation similarly to the following definition. Matyók and Kellett (2017) explain conflict transformation as:

We take transformation to mean efforts, centered on communication, that works on and between the relationship of specific (micro-level) moments or scenarios that can include conversations, dialogues, rhetorical struggles, techniques and processes, and so on, and the more enduring structural and patterned dynamics (macro-level) of communication that generate and can be transformed by such momentary or specific efforts. (p. xii)

Conflict transformation includes broader consideration of the structural, cultural, personal, and relational dimensions that shape conflict and communication (Lederach,

2003). Conflict transformation is contextually contingent and can be realized in a variety of ways.

Conflict transformation requires structural and relational changes. Reimer (2017) tells us that, “By considering historical relationships, opposing circumstances, values, power, resources, and other relationships, the narratives of people in conflict are meaningful communication. In this way, communication can improve understanding while identifying opportunities for potential positive or constructive change” (p. 31). Reimer identifies broadly, that many types of constructive changes can be considered conflict transformation. This can be realized when individuals perceive or experience something in a new light, when group interactions are reshaped, or when a goal or outcome is refocused (Connaughton, Kuang, & Yakova, 2017). Although changes at the relational level are an important part of conflict transformation, structural change is also necessary. Structural change requires a commitment from multiple people at multiple levels. One example of structural change is when community members work across cultural differences to demand policy change from school administrators or members of Parliament.

Conflict transformation is driven by social actors in the context in which the conflict occurs. To guide participants’ thinking about conflict transformation, I proposed broad strategies as a part of the workshop. The participants were asked to critique, discuss application for the strategies in the particular contexts and conflicts that they navigate, and to propose additional strategies. Although, strategies are essentials, to enact conflict transformation in any degree, participants must have agency to respond within the constraints in which they find themselves.

Conceptualizing Agency

Dutta (2011) defines agency as, “the capacity of human beings to engage with structures that encompass their lives, to make meanings through this engagement, and at the same time, creating discursive openings to transform these structures” (p. 13). In this study, I focus on individual and collective agency and the relationship between the micro-level communicative experiences and macro-level structures (Matyók & Kellett, 2017) that limit and encourage various level of agency. Structures such as tribalism, patriarchy, religious discrimination, and classism are grounded in everyday interactions; such structures help to sustain a continuous loop between the micro-level interactions and macro-level structures (Ellis, Ron, & Maoz, 2017). For example, the Borana tribe are positioned as refugees, poor, and without land or resources. They have less agency to change their relationships with Kikuyus, who have government support from elected officials in their tribe, and increased access to jobs and education. Participants have different resources available for them, and consequently different capacities to respond. Levels of agency vary because agency is enabled and constrained by contextual structures and relations with other groups and institutions. Agency is always contextually contingent and enacted in relationship to the structures that are being navigated (Collier, Lawless, Ringera, 2016; Dutta, 2011).

Considering the relationships between agency, contextual structures and transformation, it becomes necessary to situate transformation efforts in the context in which they occur. This becomes important when intervening in one’s own conflicts or taking third party roles as educator, trainer, or mediator. Deetz (2017) states, “Specific techniques of intervention in conflict or in community attempts at making creative,

mutually satisfying, choices can make little sense or be misunderstood without an understanding of the larger issues” (p. 3). For example, in Kenya it is necessary for researchers and practitioners to understand the legacy of tribalism and patriarchy that becomes contextually salient during an interaction with a young Luo woman and her older Kikuyu classmate. Her agency to respond is contextually constrained or limited because of her subject positions in relation to the other person’s group positions. Understanding enactment of agency must be situated and contextualized. If not, actions such as walking away or remaining silent might make little sense. Although structures and subject positions might limit agency, Dutta (2011) reminds us that “even as structures define the palette on which the terrains of agency are constituted, these terrains of agency create openings for disrupting and transforming those structures” (p. 93). Even with complex and deeply entrenched conflicts, some degree of transformation maybe be possible in the conflicts addressed by participants.

In participants’ responses about conflict transformation, I found four themes related to agency. I begin by analyzing levels of agency in how participant responses point to individual conflict management strategies that they intend to or had enacted during intercultural conflict. Second, I focus on implications for agency in responses that described third party roles, such as mediators and educators. Third, I discuss agency related to the conflict transformation strategies that extend beyond the self and include engaging in institutional and social change. Finally, I analyze how one participant used reflexivity and acknowledged her own contextualized subject positions and levels of privilege in her plans to transform conflict.

Conflict Management Strategies and Agency

Participants discussed several conflict management strategies that they engaged in or intended to use during intercultural conflict. Cahn and Abigail (2014) define conflict management as communication behavior(s) that a person employs based on the conflict situation. Conflict management skills are designed to help to deescalate conflict, reduce defensiveness, and create an opportunity for the parties to communicate more effectively. Conflict management skills are an important aspect to improving interactions with others in face-to-face communication, but these skills are focused on one individual's conduct and are often employed with little attention to relations between group members, histories, contexts, or subject positions. The conflict management strategies used by the participants reflect an individual approach to social change (Dutta, 2011). These individual approaches are based in assumptions that changes to knowledge, attitude, and behavior will lead to changes in individual behaviors and practices, which will lead to broader social change (Schramm & Lerner, 1976, as cited in Dutta, 2011). Such individual approaches reflect a Western philosophical orientation to conflict, one that places the responsibility for change on the individual and renders the complexity of the situation invisible.

At the time of my workshop the participants had just completed the New Generation Leadership training with International Peace Initiatives. This four-day intensive training had a strong focus on social-psychological self-assessment and self-transformation as building blocks to develop their own capacity to lead others. It is possible that NGL's heavy focus on the individual influenced participants' responses to the conflict transformation workshop questions. Since individualism and the presumption

of high agentic qualities are aspects of conflict management approaches, it is not surprising that a majority of respondents described such strategies for transforming intercultural conflicts.

Chacha a twenty-one year-old Kikuyu offered a recommendation for conflict transformation. Calling for dialogue, Chacha wrote, “To overcome rigidity, I’d propose we have some more time together, so we can fathom the situation and come up with a short-term and long-term solution” (Reflection #2). Recommendations like these require that individuals acting as representatives of their communities have the agency to engage in dialogue in the context in which they find themselves (Collier, 2014). Chacha’s description reflects a presumption that group members enter such meetings with similar levels of agency and subject positioning to participate as equal dialogic partners. However, individuals have various levels of agency depending on how they are intersectionally positioned in their unequal social world. For example, tribe, class positioning, gender, and religion can position groups with differing degrees of status privilege, tribal favor, and consequently agency. Not everyone has the status to call for dialogue; not everyone is welcome to hold the floor for extended periods.

Another example is from Moha, a twenty year-old Borana male. When asked how he will overcome barriers to conflict transformation in the future, Moha stated:

I see most of the limitations boil down to individual choices. I feel if we work on ourselves and how we view other groups, this is key in conflict transformation.

We can write blogs, articles, talk with people, and try to highlight and appreciate the differences and uniqueness of each side. (Reflection #2)

Moha outlines some personal strategies that will help him to better understand how he

positions others and how to communicate his personal views. He proposes that learning about others is a personal responsibility and that appreciation of differences is important. In this example, Moha places the burden of change on individuals. He does not mention the structural factors that make this move easier for those positioned with higher status and privileges.

The intercultural conflicts that participants described were not only based on cultural differences, but issues such as access to resources, tribalism, women's access to leadership, poverty, and politics. In this regard, appreciation for cultural differences does not respond to, let alone act to change the inequality, injustice, and exclusion that drives these types of intercultural conflicts.

Another participant also suggested that she would enact conflict transformation by focusing on changing her thoughts and actions. Natalia a twenty-three year-old female from the Kikuyu tribe gave the following response when she was asked when and where she would employ the conflict transformation strategies that were discussed in the workshop. "Today, starting with a personal change in mindset. Then work with my friends and people I interact with to do the same" (Reflection #2). Natalia took an approach that was similar to Moha's. Her comments imply that she has the capacity to act by changing herself and then inviting others to make individual changes in "mindsets" too. Her comments also show a common "default" in Western approaches to conflict management. There is a presumption that a change in thoughts and awareness will automatically transfer to behavior, and that these changes can impact conflict to lessen defensiveness, increase trust, and result in conflicts being managed.

Emmy, a twenty year-old female from the Kamba tribe, who is currently pursuing

a university education, offered strategies that she could use in a conflict that occurred when she was not permitted to join a school club for students interested in journalism. Emmy's proposed strategies included her own information gathering, checking for understanding, and generating options. More specifically, when asked what steps she would take, Emmy commented:

I could ask questions about the club members' and leaders' interests and what they would expect from me. I would then check the meanings by summarizing what I have heard. I could also try to find common ground, such as humanity.

(Reflection #2)

Emmy indicated that these are strategies that she could take as an individual to transform the conflict. In the intercultural conflict, Emmy was positioned as the outside Other because of her tribe, class, and regional affiliation. Dominelli (2006) contends that agency is exerted when "an individual is configured as the subject of action rather than the object at the receiving end of another's behaviour..." (p. 46). Emmy's discourse shows that she positions herself with some individual agency. It is notable that the responsibility is hers to gather information, check meanings, and generate solutions and her request about what others expect from her is somewhat deferential. Because she doesn't name power relations or contextual constraints it isn't clear how she could use additional information and more options to increase her agency or her ability to join the Journalism club. She ultimately puts herself back as the object in this interaction, by focusing on learning, when she adds "What are their interests and expectations of me?" Clearly negotiating the power dynamics here is challenging.

Other individual conflict management techniques that were identified included

listening and taking a “time out” to assess the situation. Listening allows people to understand other perspectives and taking time to reflect allows space for people to think about the causes and possible outcomes of the conflict. Both moves are designed to help reduce defensiveness and deescalate tension. However, most often these conflict management strategies are recommended to those who are likely to become angry and overly emotional in conflict. These behaviors also tend to be suggested more often to people who are marginalized and disadvantaged rather than people with higher status. Therefore, these strategies offer the most benefit to those who already have highest levels of privilege during the interaction and can reinforce existing power relations.

Chacha a twenty-one year-old Kikuyu reflected on how he could have used the conflict transformation strategies that were discussed in the workshop during a conflict that he experienced over political differences. Chacha reflected:

I would have stopped defending myself so much. I would have had some time to listen to his argument and try to identify and understand differences in our cultural identities. Then I could come up with an appropriate response. If the issue is not solved by then, I'd ask him to give me time to go think about the issue and come back to him later. (Reflection #2)

Chacha's reflections indicated that he has agency to listen, try to understand and to recommend taking time out to reflect. Chacha positioned himself with choices around his own conduct in this intercultural conflict. Agency is contextually contingent, and agency is enabled and constrained based on one's subject position (Collier, 2014; Dutta, 2011). As a Kikuyu male in conflict with a Luo male about the divisive presidential election, which historically has been won by a member of his tribe, Chacha's subject positions are

advantaged compared to Luos. Collier (2014) states that “it is most often members of higher status groups who orient to their relationships from the positioning of individual choice and high individual agency because the context enables that positioning” (p 78). The political context that positions male Kikuyus as dominant with government, political, and economic support in Kenya, enhances Chacha’s agency during this interaction. Chacha risks little by taking time to better understand the issues. He has the choice to listen or not and can request reflection time without consequences.

Chacha also calls attention to identifying and understanding differences in cultural identities, which is a move that can broaden his understanding of other views. Probing for cultural differences during intercultural conflict is important because it helps to reveal the myriad of ways that contextual structures position people in relation to those structures. By identifying and understanding differences in cultural identities, Chacha gestured toward creating space to identify how the two of them are positioned within a broader social context and why that is important. This can open possibilities for more equitable relations.

Individual meritocracy. When describing conflict management strategies, several participants use a discursive repertoire of individual meritocracy. Individual meritocracy is a neoliberal logic that makes people responsible and accountable for their circumstances, by disconnecting the problems that people face from the broader social context in which they occur. Individual meritocracy also places responsibility for change on individuals, by implying that if someone wants different outcomes in life, they have the agency to make that a reality. I return to Moha’s example about the steps he would take to transform intercultural conflict. Moha stated:

I see most of the limitations boil down to individual choices. I feel if we work on ourselves and how we view other groups, this is key in conflict transformation.

We can write blogs, articles, talk with people, and try to highlight and appreciate the differences and uniqueness of each side. (Reflection #2)

Individual meritocracy suggests that outcomes are based on individual qualities, skills, and efforts, and that hard work will be rewarded, which is present in Moha's comments. Similar ideologies are reflected in Natalia's previously presented conflict transformation strategy. Natalia commented that her plan to transform intercultural conflict was, "Today, starting with a personal change in mindset. Then work with my friends and people I interact with to do the same" (Reflection #2). Both participants use a discursive repertoire of individual meritocracy to reinforce ideological assumptions about individual abilities, responsibilities, and agency.

Agency and Third Party Roles

Participants discussed transforming conflict by embodying a third party role. Third parties are people who act as intermediaries during other people's conflicts. Third parties often help establish communication between people in conflict, so that those in conflict can identify, assess, and respond to their own conflict. Some participants showed sensitivity toward context, as they moved outside of themselves and into their third party role. The roles that participants identified included being an educator, a mediator, and a leader. Maphosa and Keasley (2014) write about the importance of using third party actors to move the African continent toward peace. In efforts to find relevant approaches to responding to conflict, Maphosa and Keasley (2014) state, "Consideration must be given to ways of resolving rather than just managing conflict, focusing on and seeking to

address the root causes of violence” (p. 5). As with the conflict management strategies, the focus on these third party roles could have been influenced by the leadership training that the participants completed just prior to the study workshop. Since that training was focused on clarifying values, and building confidence and peace from within, it is possible that messages related to leading and educating others on peace, are reflected in participants’ descriptions of third party actions.

When describing her role in intercultural conflicts related to political tribalism, Olive a twenty year-old female from an undisclosed tribe wrote, “Most politicians are involved in conflicts. My role is to tell them about good leadership skills. For people who like tribalism, my role is to meet with them and discuss ways to solve tribalism” (Reflection #1). Olive outlined very ambitious goals. She positioned herself as teacher, acknowledging what she should or could do with two general audiences. Olive situated herself as neutral in her third party role. She wrote as if she is removed from political conflict and tribalism, which touches all Kenyans in one way or another. She also wrote with an authority that proposes that she would be able to sit down with politicians and with people in tribal conflict and lead conversations with them. Because agency is gendered, and patriarchy is pervasive, Olive’s ability to respond as described is constrained, particularly in relation to male politicians. Here the context suggests she would have to be invited to teach or even speak, and given even recent history, this move would violate social norms.

Lowesly a twenty-one year-old Kalenjin female, shared ideas about how she can transform intercultural conflict by taking on a third party role. When asked about the specific steps that she would take to transform intercultural conflict, Lowesly stated, “By

acting as a leader in conflict and to motivate peace. To try to be a mediator between parties and to try to identify the root of the conflict” (Reflection #2). Similar to Olive, Lowesly positions herself as neutral and as someone with agency to speak and facilitate. A mediator’s role is to act as a neutral third party who facilitates a conversation between people in dispute.

Both participants’ remarks could represent a possible response bias. Their responses lack sensitivity to context, are overly general, and to a certain extent are unrealistic given the contextual constraints and their intersectional subject positions. But, they do illustrate ideal strategies that could be used by highly resourced and respected third parties. These responses also reflect a Western Imperialist orientation to conflict, insofar as an individual is taking control of the situation and using behavior and communication skills to help resolve the situation for others. Their participation in the NGL training and this workshop could have also prompted responses that reflect what they have identified as desirable and leader-driven behaviors during conflict. The objective stance and presumed authority that Olive and Lowesly take in their attempts to transform intercultural conflict is notable.

Participants also identified that becoming an educator was a means of transforming intercultural conflict. Here educating others meant participants took action by shaping others’ understandings about the contextual factors that influence intercultural conflict, as well as to help develop effective response strategies. Joy, a twenty-two year-old who is a member of the Meru tribe, described the specific steps that she would take with a Luo male classmate. Joy wrote, “I will educate people on the importance of peace, and the causes and consequences of conflict” (Reflection #2). The Meru and Luo tribes

have a long history of tribal conflict, which is complicated by regional differences. Further, the Meru tribe is from the Bantu ethnic group, which is the same ethnic group of the Luos' main political rivals, the Kikuyus. Patriarchy, which is a salient part of the context in Kenya is also ignored here. In her response, Joy presumes that she will be permitted to speak, teach and viewed as a credible educator. Given her gender, tribe, and regional association, she is likely to be faced with constraints as she attempts to educate others. Further, her description of the steps that she would take offers an overly general suggestion that presumes her agency and lacks contextual adaptation. Joy's response might also reflect a positive response bias, where she is providing a response that is expected after participating in the NGL training and the study workshop.

To share localized knowledge and training requires some agency. In Joy's reflection, she did not expand on what she identified as the causes and consequences of conflict. During the workshop, Joy identified contextual structures that enabled the intercultural conflict that she experienced, such as tribalism, inequitable access to resources, politics, and education. Therefore, she did demonstrate awareness of causes and consequences at earlier points.

As an example of an enacted third party action, Moha described how he educated youth and children during a cultural event in the Mathare Slums outside of Nairobi. Moha, a twenty year-old from the Borana tribe previously explained how tribalism, politics, access to resources, and class positioning has enabled the intercultural conflicts that he has experienced. In his Post-workshop Reflection, he discussed a community event that was designed to bring peace to his community after the contentious and violent presidential election of August 2017. In his reflection, Moha referred to the S-TLC model

(Cahn & Abigail, 2014). Describing his third party action, Moha wrote:

We did a mitigation process in our integrated community in Mathare. We held a week-long cultural week conference at the Chief's camp. Various representatives from each community in Mathare sat down together and took time to be educated on the importance of peace and sustainability. We took the time to appreciate the beauty that each community has to offer through arts, cultural cuisine, artifacts and dances. I was in charge of leading a session with the youth and children on the theme of how youth can participate more effectively in community healing. I was a bit nervous at the beginning, but I coped well. I took the opportunity to introduce the S-TLC model that I learned during the conflict transformation workshop. It was something that was quite unique and blended perfectly with the theme. (Post-workshop Reflection)

Moha's facilitation of an educational session with youth and children on community healing is an example of enacted individual agency and intercommunity capacity building. His earlier comments show he recognizes contextual structures and intertribal violence. Moha engages others in discussion about the importance of peace and strategies to build community capacity. Moha is positioned as a co-facilitator, a leader of youth, a Borana male and a local resident of the Mathare integrated community. Dutta (2011) states that "structures define and limit the possibilities that are available to participants as they enact agency to engage in practices that influence their health and wellbeing" (p. 12). Moha, navigates tribalism, shared class status and gender to enact agency to take transformational actions in the intercultural conflicts in his community. His position as a member of the Borana tribe, which is considered throughout Kenya to be inferior because

of their ethnic ties to Ethiopia and Somalia, his lower class positioning as a resident of a slum, his enrollment in a university, and being a twenty-three year-old male impact his level of agency, and when and where he can act as a facilitator. His description showed he is using his knowledge and positioning to mitigate and pre-empt violent conflict.

Moha's engagement with youth and children in his community is an example of how he enacted agency for the purpose of both individual and collective capacity building. Karbo (2014) defines capacity as "the overall ability of an individual, organization or broader system to perform, bringing together individual competencies and collective capabilities" (p. 16). Although details about the content of Moha's session were not provided, the title of his session, "How Youth can Participate more Effectively in Community Healing," implies that he was collaborating with others to bring together individuals for the purpose of collectively transforming their intercultural community. Moha's enactment of individual agency is used to build knowledge about cultural differences and healing in Mathare.

Additionally, Moha enacted a similar role at his university. Moha described another example of applying strategies from the workshop:

I lead a group of young people in my university where we offer volunteering services in children's homes and schools. That's a great place to start. I feel more exposure to this workshop [the study workshop] and trainings to equip us with relevant skills will be important for us to pass on the message. (Reflection #2)

Moha's position as a group leader at his university likely is limited due to his tribe and residence in Mathare. However, in a previous section of this chapter, he explained that overcoming "limitations boils down to individual choices" (Reflection #2). Moha did not

describe his tribe, class positioning, or gender as having an impact on his ability to take a position of leadership. Moha had previously outlined that being Borana and being viewed as “poor” living in the Mathare Slums positions him with minority and subjugated locations, but he did not comment on that in the context of his university experience.

Broader Engagement with Institutions

Some participants identified strategies to transform intercultural conflict that extended beyond their individual capacities or beyond third party interventions with groups. In these instances, participants’ responses showed that conflict transformation needs to involve macro institutional structures, such as the political system, government, and the educational system, and meso-level organizations, such as churches and community-based groups. In this regard, participants pointed to bridging individual skills and abilities with collective efforts and support, to create the necessary momentum for longer-lasting transformation of social systems that perpetuate intercultural conflicts.

One example of broader engagement with macro and meso-level institutions came from Joy, a twenty-two year-old who is a member of the Meru tribe. When asked for strategies that could be used to respond to intercultural conflict, Joy described the importance of community collectives taking a grassroots approach to conflict transformation. She stated, “There are neighbors in small towns or villages who collaborate. They work together and do things that should be done together, such as fight grassroot problems [crime, tribal violence]. If countries and heads of states could think like that, then they could end conflict” (Workshop Discussion). Joy identified that when individuals come together to enact collective agency in the local or national contexts, they can create change. In Joy’s example, grassroot organizations are comprised of

individuals who have identified a problem and collectively work toward responding to that problem. For example, in Meru women met and coordinated a march through the local community to protest an individual who was illegally distributing tainted alcohol, and subsequently his business was shut down by tribal chiefs. Individual agency is important in this example because as Collier, Lawless, and Ringera (2016) point out, “Individual capacity building is linked to collective agency and systemic change” (p. 415). As previously argued, the intercultural conflicts that the participants experienced are linked to contextual structures that to a large extent are influenced by the government representatives and local leaders.

Harry, a twenty-one year-old Kalenjin youth also described how the government can play a more effective role in responding to and helping to transform intercultural conflict. Harry suggested the following ideas:

First, have the government on the ground to calm the situation and disarm people. Second, the Boundary Commission needs to create clearly defined land boundaries. Also, there needs to be education, so that people can break the cultures that are passed down with time, such as the way to become superior is to acquire the most cattle and land. (Reflection #1)

Here, Harry’s comments show that he recognized the need for institutional intervention. He asserted that the government needs to intervene in instances of violent land disputes and he offers suggestions for such interventions. Harry recognized that individuals cannot transform conflicts of this nature on their own, therefore individuals exerting action is not sufficient. He described the role of institutional policies, such as unclear land boundaries, that promote violent tribalism by positioning groups against each other to fight over

limited resources. He proposed that intercultural conflict that is triggered by tribalism and that land disputes requires a multi-level response. These comments show appreciation of the role of contextual structures, and governmental and educational change in such conflicts.

Harry's suggestions for institutional changes were followed up with a recommendation for communities to meet, attention to long-term responses, and perhaps implies the need for a third party or an intercommunity process. Harry wrote, "The two communities need to come together to talk about the cause of the conflict and to find a lasting solution (Reflection #1).

Emmy also offered an example of broader institutional strategies that can be used to transform intercultural conflict. For example, Emmy, a twenty year-old female from the Kamba tribe discussed the role national [public] schools can play in conflict transformation. Emmy stated, "National schools incorporate students from different tribes, and that helps us to understand people from other tribes. It helps to reduce the misconceptions and stereotypes that people have about particular tribes" (Workshop Discussion). Emmy indicated that increased contact with people who do not share the same group identities, will result in improved groups relations. This is similar to early research on the contact hypothesis or the Intergroup Contact Theory by Allport (1954). This theory argues that intergroup contact helps to reduce prejudice and increase intergroup cooperation, thus qualifying as a conflict transformation strategy. This theory lacks attention to context and subject positions, which are necessary when designing intercultural contact in conflict. Macro structures, such as histories, policies, laws, and access to resources, operate to create different material realities for people based on how

they are positioned in relation to those structures. Acknowledging subject positioning and context help illuminate relationships between groups and build understanding about what drives those relationships. The initial Intergroup Contact Theory proposed by Allport suggests that for the contact to be effective, people must come to the interaction with equal status and voice. However, more recent reviews (Pettigrew, 2008) call for four areas in need of further research. First, there needs to be more understanding of the process of intergroup contact and the many third party intermediaries that are involved. Second, there is limited focus directed toward intergroup contact that leads to increased prejudice. Third, researchers need to study intergroup contact longitudinally and across multilevel contexts, rather than situationally. Finally, to build an understanding of intergroup contact in specific institutional settings and applications for social policy.

Attention to context and subject positioning reveal that people's status manifests in relation to each other and it is driven by a myriad of contextual factors and group identities; therefore, entering an interaction with equal status is unlikely. Furthermore, subsequent research has shown that proximity or contact alone is not sufficient to reduce prejudice or contest stereotypes, nor does a positive attitude about an individual change attitudes toward the group (Hewstone & Brown, 1986). Proposing more contact with people with different group identities oversimplifies the difficult work that must be done to challenge group stereotypes and transform intercultural conflict.

Moha offered similar comments related to increasing contact with diverse groups of people. When asked about the specific steps that he could take to transform intercultural conflict, Moha, a twenty year-old Borana male wrote:

Sometimes we share the same platforms, such as schools, churches, social events,

social media, and the work environment. I feel that through these interactions we get to learn something different or new about other groups, that they are not different. In schools and the University, we have started clubs like Rotaract, Kenya Red Cross, and other volunteering clubs that incorporate the people from both sides. These groups provide a venue for getting to know each other and provide opportunities equally. (Reflection #2)

Moha argued that shared platforms and clubs allow people to discover “that they are not different” from each other. These similarities can serve as a starting point for youth to work together to transform intercultural conflict. However, focusing only on similarities obscures differences, which are important because intercultural conflict is often rooted in how contextual forces impact people differently, or how their various social identities position them in relation to other groups and macro-level structures. As previously stated, interacting with people who are from different groups does not necessarily lead to de-intensifying conflict or conflict transformation. Spence (2004) tells us that conflict transformation “calls for new attitudes and practices: ones that are flexible, consultative and collaborative and that operate from a contextual understanding of the root causes of conflict” (as cited in Maphosa & Keasley, 2014, p. 6).

In other words, Moha’s strategies would benefit from including interactions that are contextually informed and with energy directed toward understanding and addressing the root causes of intercultural conflict.

Reflexivity and Agency

Reflexivity is the act of recognizing and critiquing one’s own sites of privilege based on social locations and subject positioning, and recognizing how those social

locations shape agency, access, and relationships. Study participant Laura, a twenty-one year-old Kikuyu female, gestures toward reflexivity as she described the cultural identities that were important to her during the intercultural conflict that she experienced about political tribalism. Laura demonstrated reflexivity when she explained, “Being from my tribe I am privileged in so many ways. I have had three presidents from my tribe, who have brought development in my area. This is something most people don’t accept” (Post-workshop Reflection). Here, Laura described how she is privileged because of her tribe identity. She begins interrogating the meaning of those positions within the social hierarchy and in relation to the people with whom she experienced intercultural conflict by saying, “most people don’t accept” her privilege. When asked to discuss the conflict transformation strategies that she enacted during the intercultural conflicts that she experienced during the election period, Laura commented:

Giving someone a chance to speak and then listening to them with compassion, worked for some people. Acknowledging that I am privileged and speak from that point. In the case of a similar conflict again, I would be more patient with everyone without giving up on them. (Post-workshop Reflection)

In this example, Laura acknowledged her position of privilege, namely tribal privilege and acknowledged that others recognized her privilege. Laura’s response to this conflict is to revert to an individual behavior of having patience with others. Laura can choose to be patient or not, without jeopardizing her Kikuyu status. Further, her position(s) of privilege that emerged in this particular context influenced her level of agency, which enabled her to exercise individual choice and respond to conflict in way that might not be available to others or could come with a risk for them. Nonetheless, Laura demonstrated

an awareness of her privilege, which is an important reflexive step in perhaps recognizing how her subject positions give her agency and how others' tribal affiliations constrain their agency and choices of conduct.

Conclusion

This analysis identified how youth in this study situated themselves and others in intercultural conflict transformation efforts, and these descriptions implicated different levels of agency. Agency is important in a study about intercultural conflict and conflict transformation because individuals and collectives have different abilities to respond to conflict because they are constrained by the contextual factors and subject positions that they are navigating. The four themes that emerged related to agency were: individual conflict management strategies, stepping into third party roles, calling for broader engagement with systems and institutions and engaging in reflexivity.

The participants' responses revealed a positive response bias in several cases in that the comments were overly general, lacked contextual details or examples and reflected what was a desired or expected response. This trend could be based in Western Imperialism and positioning me as the White educated workshop trainer from the United States, with authority and credibility. This deference to authority was evident in my observations of participants' conduct with a U.S. White male trainer who co-facilitated the NGL training with Dr. Ringera. Additionally, at times it appeared as though some participants were repeating back strategies that they learned during the workshop without consideration of the need to adapt them to the structural and social contexts. This was most obvious when very general strategies were given without any specific application.

Intercultural conflict transformation requires change that the relational and

structural level. Participants' reflections demonstrate that they are responsive to changes at the relational level, but strategies that move beyond interpersonal interactions are still emerging. In the context of Kenya, where tribalism and other types of structural conflict are pervasive, participants are reaching for ways to build long term sustainable peace. In this challenging context, the youth expressed that they are hopeful for change. Their responses showed that they described strategies based in individual agency and an ability to manage conflict, step into third party roles, and work at the institutional level. In future trainings, attending to processes of assessing contextual structures, intersectional subject positioning and the potential for transformation of structures and intercultural relationships is certainly warranted. As well as discussions of how to overcome barriers to enacting individual and collective agency in service of socially just conflict transformation.

CHAPTER SEVEN: SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND APPLICATIONS

Kenya is faced with a myriad of complex intercultural conflicts, which are driven by a range of contextual forces. Youth in Kenya are disproportionately impacted by these conflicts and other social issues. However, youth are participating in social change and peacebuilding initiatives, such as the NGL training sponsored by International Peace Initiatives. Although their agency is at times constrained, the participants in my study are seeking ways to be more responsive to the intercultural conflicts that they are faced with, and they are hopeful and optimistic that change is possible. Study participant Moha, summarized this sentiment in his following reflection:

We are tired of this non-ending cycle of conflict of power between these two communities [Luo & Kikuyu]. We need a change from this primitive thinking and for people to realize Kenya is bigger than all of us; bigger than two tribes. We have more than forty-four tribes in Kenya and each person has a say. (Post-workshop Reflection)

Intercultural conflict transformation was introduced to participants as one way to disrupt the “non-ending cycle of conflict” that Moha described. Conflict transformation is essential to long-term sustainable change because it considers “ways of resolving rather than just managing conflict, focusing on and seeking to address the root causes of violence” (Maphosa & Keasley, 2014, p. 5). Intercultural conflict transformation is responsive to a broad scope of intercultural differences and conflicts because it offers the flexibility to adapt to the ever-changing dynamics of conflict. Although there is not a specific process that social actors must follow to successfully engage in intercultural conflict transformation, attention to context and salient cultural identities is paramount.

Summary of Research

In this study, I applied a critical intercultural communication lens to study written and oral texts about conflict transformation. I used community engaged praxis, critical feminist theory, intersectionality, and critical reflexivity to theorize about intercultural conflict, subject positions, conflict transformation, peacebuilding, and agency with youth participants in the context of Kenya. Data for this study was collected during a workshop for youth leaders on July 2, 2017, at the site of International Peace Initiatives in Meru, Kenya, and three months post-workshop via email message. The workshop had twelve diverse participants that were between the ages of 19-30. I elected to use data from the eleven Kenyan participants who were 19-23 years-old and excluded reflections from the thirty-year-old Ugandan participant. The data collection methods used in this study included a demographic questionnaire, three sets of written reflections, and recorded and transcribed group discussions that took place in the workshop. The data was analyzed using the qualitative method of critical textual analysis.

Research Goals

My study was built on four overarching goals that investigated youths' experiences related to intercultural conflict and conflict transformation. The first overarching goal was to implement a youth leadership workshop that focused on cultural difference, centered intercultural conflict transformation, and promoted peacebuilding. I accomplished this goal by designing and facilitating a workshop for twelve youth participants of the NGL training, held in Meru, Kenya on July 2, 2017. During the workshop we discussed key concepts related to intercultural conflict and conflict transformation such as: intercultural conflict, peacebuilding, agency, conflict

transformation, contextual factors, and cultural identities. We spent considerable time contextualizing the intercultural conflicts that were most salient to the youth participants and discussing skills that could be used to respond in service of intercultural conflict transformation.

My second goal was to build knowledge of the context of intercultural conflict in Kenya, including the factors that were identified and experienced by the eleven diverse Kenyan youth. I accomplished this goal through the workshop design and questions that prompted participants to engage in open discussions and written reflections about the intercultural conflicts that were relevant to their experiences in the context of Kenya. I asked questions that urged them to think about underlying contextual factors, such as asking them to identify historical factors and resources that were important to the parties who were involved in the conflict.

In keeping with my critical pedagogical and critical community engagement orientations, this goal relied upon participants generating descriptions of the context, their experiences with structures and institutions, and offering relevant examples. Although it was important that I asked probing questions, it was also necessary that the participants felt comfortable answering them, both verbally in the workshop and through written reflections that would only be read by the study researcher. Since the workshop participants had spent several days prior to my workshop in the NGL training, they had already built a sense of community with each other. I took additional steps to become acquainted with the participants by making myself visible at the study site while they were attending the NGL training and engaging with them at breaks and mealtime in the days leading up to my workshop. Additionally, with Dr. Ringera's permission, I observed

the NGL training.

There are many barriers to speaking up in a group in Kenya. There are norms of politeness, deferring to the authority of international visitors and teachers, age-based rules to respect whomever is older, and male dominance. In my workshop, simply having a level of familiarity with others did not ensure equal participation. Some participants, particularly the women, were reserved during the large group discussion and infrequently contributed verbally. I developed small group break-out sessions to give participants who did not feel comfortable contributing in the large group, the opportunity to share in that environment. I also encouraged the women to offer their opinions.

My third goal was to build knowledge about Kenyan youth's intersectional subject positions in intercultural conflicts. Similar to the first goal, I asked questions during the workshop and on reflection prompts to encourage participants to consider the multiple cultural identities that were important to them during conflicts, how the other parties might view those identities, and what group identities might be important to the others in the conflict. These questions prompted participants to describe how they were positioning themselves and others, and the role those combined subject positions played in the conflict.

My fourth goal was to study how the diverse youth negotiated subject positions to enact agency in the complex context of Kenya. I accomplished this goal primarily through questions asked during the small group break-out session and with questions asked on the Post-workshop Reflection. I prompted participants to consider the strategies that they used to respond to conflicts, how well those strategies worked, and what would need to be transformed or changed to address those conflicts. These questions encouraged

participants to consider their ability to act in particular contexts, and also what barriers stood in their way. Based on youth leaders' accounts of intercultural conflicts and strategies for transforming the conflicts to enhance peacebuilding, my study answered three more specific research questions.

Research Questions

RQ1: contextual structures. The first research question dealt with understanding how participants described contextual structures as enabling and constraining forces to intercultural conflict. I defined contextual structures as contextual forces and conditions of life, such as histories, poverty, patriarchy, institutions and social systems. These structures, enable or constrain conflict and actions for group members experiencing conflict (Broome & Collier, 2012) and act to position groups differently (Collier, 2014). My analysis uncovered eleven different types of contextual structures. I focused on the five most salient ones, which were: politics and economics, politics and tribalism, patriarchy, inequitable access to resources, and tribal hierarchies and power relations. These structures were most salient because they were frequently discussed by the participants, found across various contexts, and emerged as interrelated and complicated by other contextual factors.

As previously argued, in Kenya, tribalism is interconnected with politics, economics, social status, and resource allocation. To a large extent, my analysis revealed that tribalism, politics, economics, resource allocation are complex, interdependent vectors of influence in Kenya. For instance, tribalism drives the divisive political landscape and the turbulent political landscape reinforces tribalism; elected politicians are accused of protecting the economic interests of their tribe(s) and favoring distribution of

resources on that basis; economic and resource related disparities further divide groups; all of which deepen tribalism and political difference. As Emmy asserted, "...it's [tribalism] a norm that people have accepted. It is a state of being in Kenya" (Workshop Discussion). My analysis exposed that tribalism was a factor in almost every intercultural conflict that my study participants experienced. In the conflicts where tribalism was not at the forefront, there were traces that its pervasive influence was present. Some participants referenced region and histories, rather than tribe when describing their conflicts; these comments were often an indicator that tribal relations were a factor, but not being named.

Another contextual force that was significant in the participants' intercultural conflicts were tribal hierarchies and power relations. Here I found that participants often employed positive "us" and negative "other" forms of discourse (van Dijk, 1995) when they described their intercultural conflicts. Most significantly this discursive form was used to reinforce a status hierarchy that positions their own tribes as superior and other tribes as inferior. This feeds tribalism and perpetuates existing status hierarchies. Most participants described how tribal hierarchies and power relations are complicated by other contextual forces, such as politics, economic disparity, and inequitable resource allocation, when their own tribe was at a disadvantage. In one case, a female Kikuyu did reflexively name her own tribal advantage, but also defended her tribe's deserving of the resources.

After analyzing how contextual structures acted as enabling and constraining forces to intercultural conflict, I next identified the most salient intersectional subject positions in the intercultural conflicts offered by the study participants. These are

discussed below.

RQ2: intersectionalities. The second research question asked, how do intersectional subject positions emerge in intercultural conflict? After identifying the contextual structures that were salient, I was able to build upon that contextualization to identify how intersectional identities position people in relation to those structures, to other groups and institutions, and in social relationships in intercultural conflicts. This is important theoretically because how participants are positioned influences their capacity to respond in particular contexts. Intersectional positions also point to the ways in which groups are privileged and marginalized.

To answer this research question, I analyzed how participants positioned their group identities in relation to other groups, how they positioned other groups, and how they described being positioned by the others in the intercultural conflicts they outlined. This analysis revealed intragroup and intergroup differences. For instance, young women in my study reported navigating gender differences and patriarchy within their own tribes, as well as during conflict with people from other tribes. My analysis also supported claims by Chávez (2012) that studying multiple identities reveals insight into relationships with privilege and oppression. Building knowledge about participants' subject positions indicated that subject positions emerge in relation to others' positions. For example, regional affiliation and tribe work together to position Moha, a Borana tribe member as “not really a Kenyan”, in a conflict he experienced with members of Kenya's dominant tribes, Kikuyu and Luo. This analysis also revealed that participants' subject positions are produced by systems and structures, such as politics and patriarchy.

A significant part of my analysis uncovered the ideologies that are reflected in

discursive repertoires and used by participants to reinforce institutions and social norms. I found several discursive repertoires: “Borana (and other tribes) are like Somalis or Northerners who are “not really Kenyan,” “women cannot be leaders or agents of change,” “men are the leaders and protectors,” “individuals should be judged on the merits of their individual performance,” and “Muslims are problematic Others.” The repertoires were used by the participants to describe their own position in the social order, to position others, and to critique and/or reinforce the social order (Frankenberg, 1993). For example, Christianity was established as the standard to which Muslim Others were compared.

I also found that discursive repertoires were used to justify privilege and oppression, such as who and why certain groups have access to resources. For example, a discursive repertoire of individual meritocracy was used to explain how outsiders view members of the Kamba tribe as uncivilized and not innovative (implying that members of the Kamba tribe should be working harder in recognizable ways), therefore responsible for their own poverty. In this regard, identifying discursive repertoires helped to overcome a shortfall of previous research on intersectionality, which is that some intersectional approaches do not account for dynamic social hierarchies and how those hierarchies shift depending on the context and who is involved in the conflict.

Rather than attempting to account for all identities as listed on the demographic questionnaire, I used participant descriptions and context to build an understanding about their salient identities. When the written responses and workshop discussions were placed alongside the demographics questionnaire, I learned that how participants are positioned is more complicated than an additive list of identities, such as tribe, gender, class and

educational level. I also learned that each subject position is more than a demographic category. For example, socioeconomic class is more complicated than living in a household with running water or electricity, or the level of education that has been achieved. In Kenya, people from various socioeconomic backgrounds and levels of educational attainment do not have access to water and/or electricity. Moha, who described and challenged his socioeconomic class as “poor” (Reflection #2), has access to water in his household and is currently attending a university, while his family residence is Mathare, the largest slum in Nairobi. Working with Moha’s reflections about his material reality and social position revealed far more than the information provided on the demographic questionnaire.

My intersectional analysis was designed to overcome several shortcomings of previous work on intersectionality. Yep (2010 & 2016) critiques an intersectional analysis that uses an additive model as lacking the complexities and contradictions that exist with subjects’ thick intersectionalities. This additive approach results in the homogenization of people inhabiting similar intersections. Kikuyus in particular regions might have higher socioeconomic status, however gender, sexuality and level of education complicate their positioning. Further, Muñoz (1999) argues that this approach also ignores how power is involved in the production of social categories. I sought to move away from a focus on the individual, and to move beyond lists of identities, to attend to structures and discursive repertoires that act to position participants and to feature salient subject positions as they worked with other cultural positions.

I contextualized my analysis to capture nuanced relationships and the dynamics of positioning. By first analyzing relevant contextual forces that enabled and constrained

conflict, I was able to identify salient subject positioning and histories between groups in relation to structures and institutions. This was particularly germane when I examined tribalism and patriarchy. A decontextualized analysis of intersectional subject positions lacks the depth needed to understand that subject positioning does not occur in a vacuum or in isolation of groups and institutions. I found that in participants' descriptions they were navigating a range of group categories, but what was most salient sometimes changed depending on their group categories in relation to others in the conflict. I also found that at times, there was more than one salient category of group identity. For example, in Joy's conflict with an older male classmate from the Luo tribe, the salient categories were gender, age, region, and tribe. It was at those intersections that Joy had a nuanced experience with the intercultural conflict based on her subject positions in relation to her classmate's. Additionally, a contextualized analysis of participants' intersectional subject positions had implications for agency.

RQ3: agency. For this research question I built on my analysis of contextual forces and intersectional subject positions to theorize about agency and intercultural conflict transformation. The question I answered was, given the particular contexts and subject positions being navigated in intercultural conflict transformation, how do the youth leaders enact agency? Situating agency after the analysis of contextual forces and intersectional subject positioning was an important move because agency is always contextually contingent and enacted in relationship to the structures that are being navigated (Collier, Lawless & Ringera, 2016; Dutta, 2011). Agency is complicated because of the contexts, conflicts, and identity positions being navigated; therefore, understanding these first is necessary for a thorough understanding of agency.

The pairing of agency and conflict transformation is not discussed in depth in the literature on conflict; this is an important gap that my study addresses. Building knowledge of what the participants identify as necessary to transform the intercultural conflicts and the extent to which agency was enacted during such efforts is important to gauge the relevance and feasibility of what is being suggested. I found four themes related to agency during conflict transformation: using individual conflict management strategies, stepping into third party roles, working for institutional and social change, and using critical reflexivity.

To a large extent, participants' descriptions revealed individualistic, overly optimistic, and ambitious plans when describing actions that they could use to respond to transform intercultural conflicts. These types of responses indicate a possible positive response bias and influences from the NGL training. For example, one young woman described her attempts to transform political tribalism as sitting down with politicians, teaching them leadership skills, and discussing ways to solve tribalism (Olive, Reflection #1). Optimism and ambition are important because they indicate that the participants envision an engaged leadership role for themselves in creating a more peaceful Kenya. Nonetheless, there are barriers, such as social norms around patriarchy, age-based authority, and tribalism, that make this type of action unwelcomed and sanctionable. As previously outlined, my workshop was held immediately after International Peace Initiatives' NGL training, which focused on youth taking individual responsibility and developing leader-driven attitudes and behaviors. To a certain extent, these types of responses might reflect what the participants learned in the days leading up to my workshop.

In terms of intercultural conflict transformation, participants focused primarily on strategies related to transformation of self and requesting changes from others, rather than the structures and institutions such as, political systems, churches, schools, and Western aid that reinforce tribalism, patriarchy and inequitable access to resources. Although difficult to facilitate, only one participant, Moha, described actual events, workshops, or meetings that were held in the months after the workshop. While the participants identified contextual factors that were relevant in their conflicts, few responses focused on addressing those factors. I agree that it is important to make changes at the individual level, however intercultural conflict transformation requires simultaneous attention to relationships and structures for long-term sustainable change to actualize. Patterns such as patriarchy and individual meritocracy reify assumptions about individual agency and individuals' capacity to create sustainable intercultural conflict transformation. In future workshops, such assumptions need to be addressed.

Implications

Implications for Theorizing

This study used theories of community engaged praxis, critical feminist theory, intersectionality, agency, and critical reflexivity. My findings offer several important implications. First, as an international outsider, I had a commitment to developing a critical/interpretive community-based project that would be collaborative and driven in part by the community. Dr. Ringera, my community partner made navigating my personal biases and assumptions, and the challenges of community-based research easier. I worked with Dr. Ringera prior to my arrival in Kenya, to learn about the context and needs of the participants. I asked about possible participants, their needs, types of

conflicts they were facing and contextual factors, such as the upcoming presidential election. Her guidance helped to increase the relevance of my workshop topics and the likelihood that material would be applicable.

When I arrived in Kenya, I walked Dr. Ringera through my goals, the layout of the workshop, the content to be discussed, and study questions. She alerted me to some of contextual factors that create barriers for youth to enact agency. This important because building skills to respond to intercultural conflict does not mean that the participants would have the capacity to use those skills. Upon reflection, this self-oriented approach to community-based research and facilitation is similar to my default approach when I don't utilize critical reflexivity. I found myself slipping into the role of an expert during the workshop, specifically when discussing potential strategies for intercultural conflict transformation with the participants. After suggesting to the group that they create dialogue circles in their communities to engage in difficult conversations about intercultural conflict, I realized that it was a presumptuous suggestion. I reminded myself that it was not my role to prescribe Western or U.S. developed solutions for their intercultural conflicts, but I was there to help participants tease out their response strategies and suggest other directions for their consideration.

Building a strong relationship with my community partner was essential for this community engaged praxis. Although this was my research project, it was made possible through my relationship with Dr. Ringera. There were two challenges that I carefully navigated because of the importance of our relationship. First, the participants in my study were participants in the NGL training, in which Dr. Ringera was a co-facilitator. I was invited to sit in on the training and had many critiques of the content and approach to

leadership that was being offered, particularly by her co-facilitator. This created tension because it is not my role to offer critique or offer feedback about the programs and trainings being offered by my community partner.

Second, there were several instances where Dr. Ringera supported participants joining my workshop after they were excluded or after the workshop began. In the case of the Ugandan participant, he was older than the age range than I was using in my study, therefore I told him during the screening interview that the training was not appropriate for him. Nonetheless, he arrived the day of the workshop and communicated that he had the support of Dr. Ringera. I allowed him to join the workshop out of respect for Dr. Ringera's request. In another instance, two young women were sent to join the workshop two hours after it began. I did not allow them to join because they had not been briefed on the study or signed the informed consent, and they had already missed a significant amount of workshop content. Later that evening, I explained to Dr. Ringera why the young women were not allowed to join the workshop and she understood. These are examples of tensions that I had to carefully navigate because of my desire to maintain a relationship with my community partner.

My critical feminist approach to studying about intercultural conflict and conflict transformation includes an orientation toward social justice and a reduction of violence in conflict. The findings presented in this study point to contextual constraints and intersectional subject positions that enable and constrain participants' agency in their attempts to create change and reduce intercultural conflict and violence during conflict. For example, as a critical feminist scholar I am oriented to look for patriarchy and sexism. Patriarchy and sexism did become visible in the participants' descriptions as

either named or implied contextual structures that enable and constrain intercultural conflict. International scholars and practitioners need a critical feminist theory to better understand the role of patriarchy and sexism in intercultural conflict in Kenya because it is pervasive and persuasive.

My approach to intersectionality engaged the matrix of domination (Collins, 2000). The findings presented in this study demonstrate that the matrix of domination emerges in the context that it occurs. For example, in Kenya tribe, gender, and age are at the top of the matrix of domination. In Kenya, tribe is the most significant group category. However, gender and age are important because Kenya's pervasive patriarchal influence and respect for elders. However, the matrix of domination becomes complicated by White, international visitors from the United States who have access to resources. This has important implications for race because participants use tribe to position self and others, but do not discuss race or ethnicity. However, informal conversations about tribes and positioning others into tribes incorporates racial phenotypes and language. Therefore, there is more to be studied regarding the role of race in the matrix of domination in Kenya.

As a critical feminist scholar, studying agency in relation to intercultural conflict offers insight into potential barriers that exist for creating more socially just communities. For example, the young women in my study are navigating patriarchy, lack of women's voice and lack of acceptance in politics and leadership, patterns of sexism, and their age and tribe, as they work to create change. Laura, a twenty-one year-old from the Kikuyu tribe acknowledged such barriers, but also remarked, "...I believe that both females and males can bring about change" (Reflection #1). Although my feminist agenda seeks to

accomplish change, situating agency in context and in consideration of intersectional subject positioning, provides evidence that there are barriers for women, members of some tribes, and Muslims to lead efforts to address social change and intercultural conflict transformation.

My study engaged critical reflexivity throughout and these moves have theoretical implications. As previously outlined, I turned to Collier and colleagues for a comprehensive discussion and applications of critical reflexivity. Collier and Lawless (2016) theorize researcher/practitioners using critically reflexive praxis with five features, each of which I used. First, acknowledging different levels of context was evident throughout my study. Additionally, as an international researcher and teacher, I am navigating context and intersectionalities such as international academic, White U.S. American, mediator, conflict transformation practitioner and friend of Dr. Ringera, which position me with some authority. Nonetheless, my default was to think as an individual and presume individual agency. When I found myself doing this, I problematized this within the context of Kenya.

Second, I engaged in critical dialogue with Dr. Ringera, my collaborator, and to some extent with my participants. I outlined earlier how I remained in dialogue with Dr. Ringera. While I had limited time prior to the workshop to thoroughly discuss with participants their needs and desired outcomes, I encouraged their contributions to the workshop by asking them to describe the salient contextual factors, relevant social group identities, and response strategies with critiques of those strategies. I also invited critique of my assumptions by asking why I might be missing, and what more would I need to know to understand different intercultural conflicts.

Third, I recognized cultural differences and intersectionalities in myself, my community partner participants, and study data. For example, I recognized that I was being positioned with significant authority on the topic of intercultural conflict when participants deferred to me for solutions to their conflicts. When I recognized this, I redirected the question to them and opened the discussion to the group for suggestions and recommendations. I found this to be helpful to create engagement that was driven by the participants. I also found that my default was to believe that my critical feminist stance aligned with all Kenyan women. However, I was reminded that the context of their lives and their approaches to feminism are different than mine. Upon reflection, I can see that it is imperialistic to assume that my feminist orientation would be shared by others.

Forth, I problematized power relations and relationships between myself, Dr. Ringera and my study participants. I previously described how I carefully navigated the dynamics with Dr. Ringera and her support of my study, as well as her support of participants entering my study. I have also described how I was positioned by participants as the expert, and how I problematized the implications of that positioning. Finally, Collier and Lawless (2016) argue that critical reflexivity must be used throughout the entire research project. For example, during the design of my study, I was in communication with Dr. Ringera to help me to better understand the context and participant needs. I did this to minimize asserting my own assumptions about Kenya, the intercultural conflicts that the youth experienced, and the skills that they needed to develop. I entered the project with assumptions about agency, but I learned that agency comes in different forms in Kenya. Also, I have discussed my general findings with her and plan to discuss them in much more detail as her schedule permits.

Implications for Methods

This study used critical pedagogy to design and implement a workshop on conflict transformation and peacebuilding. I had three pedagogical goals for the workshop. First, for participants to assess the intercultural conflicts that they experienced. At the end of the workshop participants were able to identify what the conflict was about, important contextual factors, and salient cultural identities and positioning of their cultural groups. The second goal was for participants to determine effective response strategies for their intercultural conflicts. At the end of the workshop, participants were able to determine response strategies for their particular conflicts. Some of the strategies that they used were taking a time-out to reduce defensiveness, thinking through their goals, probing for differences and possible alliances, and facilitating a workshop on community healing. The third pedagogical goal was for the participants to evaluate the outcome of the conflict. At the end of the workshop, participants were able to identify where the conflict stood, what more needed to be done to transform the conflict, and what they learned about their own needs and cultural identities.

Critical pedagogy was the appropriate choice for this project because of its learner-centered emancipatory commitments. Critical pedagogy emphasizes content that is relevant and applicable in the lives of the learners. As an international outsider, critical pedagogy created space for me to learn about the context and the study participants, reflexively interrogate my assumptions and biases, and to step down my presumed position of expert on intercultural conflict transformation. This approach was challenging because I was met with participants who deferred to me to direct the discussion and offer solutions to their intercultural conflicts. This was evidence of the “banking model” of

education (Freire, 1998), which is common in the British instructional format that the participants have experienced in educational institutions. When I observed them deferring to me, I redirected questions back to the group, asked them to provide examples, arranged small group discussions, encouraged contribution from all participants, and asked them to critique proposed conflict transformation strategies.

The data analysis method of critical textual analysis was appropriate for my critical analytical goals. Critical textual analysis oriented me to identify how context, power relations, and subject positions were interdependent in a study about intercultural conflict, conflict transformation, and agency. For instance, I learned that intercultural conflict in Kenya cannot be understood without accounting for the context and the intersecting cultural identities. How the youth participants are positioned in relation to contextual structures and other groups has implications for the types of conflicts they encounter, how they experience those conflicts, and their agency to respond. This critical approach also revealed that contextual structures and subject positions create differing levels of agency to transform conflict. For example, some participants from the dominant tribes of Luo and Kikuyu, described how they would ask for time out to reflect or solicit feedback from others. These strategies come with little risk for people occupying spaces of privilege and demonstrate differing levels of agency depending on group positioning and relationship with contextual structures.

Limitations

My study had several limitations. First, as an international outsider, I had somewhat limited and biased knowledge about the Kenyan context. To overcome this, I studied the context, spoke with my community partner and other researchers who have

conducted studies in Kenya, and familiarized myself with research relevant to my study. Additionally, as a White Western, researcher, and educator, participants often deferred to me by agreeing or parroting back things that I had said. Positioning me as the credible and authoritative Westerner is rooted in imperialism and colonialism. As previously mentioned, I managed this by redirecting the questions back to the group and soliciting examples and ideas from them.

Another limitation is that I didn't allow for sufficient time to develop relationships with my community partner and participants. Before traveling to Kenya, I attempted to be in contact with Dr. Ringera frequently while I was developing my study. Her schedule is very full and intermittent internet signals compromised our abilities to be in communication. While I was at the study site, Dr. Ringera was occupied with the NGL training, which also limited our time together. To develop a relationship with my participants, I made myself available during their mealtimes and breaks, and I was present at the NGL training. I also socialized with them at the end of the day when they were finished with the training. I did this so that I could get to know more about them and their needs and concerns, but also to build trust. In hindsight, I might have insisted that the workshop required two days of contact and sought funding to support participants staying an additional night and day in Meru.

A community-based research project demands that time and attention is paid to developing relationships and negotiating differences. I did collaborate with Dr. Ringera so that I could understand participant needs and develop content for the workshop, but we needed more time to do that in more detail. As previously mentioned, during the planning stage, we often struggled to connect because of the limited internet service at

International Peace Initiatives and her demanding schedule as a community organizer and advocate. I did provide Dr. Ringera a copy of my workshop goals and agenda prior to arrival in Kenya. While in Kenya, I was able to sit down with her and go over the study in more detail.

There were also limitations related to the study design. First, Dr. Ringera suggested that the participants for my workshop would be the youth who were also in the NGL training. This made building a participant pool easier than locating participants on my own. However, the NGL training was heavily focused on personal values, accountability and responsibility, which likely carried over into my workshop. My goal was to have participants identify, analyze, and respond to contextual forces that enabled and constrained conflict. This was difficult because the participants often defaulted to individualistic changes in their mindset, attitudes toward other groups, or individual behaviors they could enact. For example, several participants commented that if individuals spent time with others this would change attitudes and beliefs and, conflict transformation would be realized. In other words, the individual must change themselves and their actions to transform intercultural conflict. This overshadowed the importance of understanding the impact of contextual structures and subject positioning, let alone transforming them.

In the days leading up to my workshop, the participants were occupied with the NGL training from early morning until late evening. This is a limitation because although I was at the study site, I had limited time to engage with the participants or to solicit their views about the content for the workshop. I had anticipated meeting with them ahead of time and getting a better sense of their intercultural conflicts, and their needs for a

workshop on conflict transformation. Time to converse with this was difficult with their demanding training schedule. Moreover, four days of day-long training sessions might have resulted in fatigue and lack of energy during my workshop.

Another aspect of the study design that was a limitation was the small participant pool. I had twelve participants and elected to include eleven in my study. While this offered a limited range of responses, it also did allow for in-depth workshop discussions. This number ensured that the study environment felt relaxed and informal. I was able to give attention to each participant and they were given opportunity to thoroughly expand on their experiences during our discussions.

In addition, an unexpected limitation was the amount of time it took for participants to complete their written reflections. Both of the workshop reflections contained seventeen questions. It took participants approximately one hour to complete Reflection #1. This cut into our workshop time and also made it difficult for me to look over their responses to seek clarity or to identify incomplete responses. This is another example that this workshop would be better suited to take place over two or three days. This would allow for concepts to be introduced and for participants to reflect on those concepts and their experiences, prior to being asked to write about them. The written reflections could have been completed outside of the workshop meeting time. This would allow participants to take the time that they needed to reflect and write, rather than being asked to complete the questions within a particular timeframe.

The Post-workshop Reflections were collected via email message and yielded responses from eight of the twelve participants. I sent numerous reminders and requests to the participants via email message. When designing the Post-workshop reflection, I did

not anticipate that accessing internet in Kenya would be an obstacle to responding to the questionnaire. Most Kenyans do not have internet in their homes and it is costly for participants to pay by the minute at an internet café to complete my questionnaire. In future studies I could collect follow-up responses face-to-face or for participants with internet access, through a virtual meeting room. This would allow participants to seek clarity or elaborate and allow me to ask probing and follow up questions.

Future Research and Praxis

The results of this study provided directions for future research and praxis. First, future research on intercultural conflict in Kenya must problematize race and whiteness. When asked to identify their race, participants offered different responses as indicated in Appendix B, and they argued that race was not salient in Kenya. They did not refer to race during any of their descriptions of contextual structures or subject positions. There was no mention of whiteness, Colonialism, neoliberalism, or post-racial colorblindness in their oral or written reflections. Although the meanings and implications of race vary across time and place, race is a global phenomenon, so its denial and omission are worthy of study. In future workshops I see the need to problematize race, including my own whiteness and privilege, and that of other international trainers.

Future research using an intersectional lens should also probe for intersectionalities at the macro, meso, and micro level. In this study the primary focus was examining the meso level, which revealed group positionings and representations. It would be useful to analyze intersectional subject positions at the macro level. This type of analysis would reveal how groups are positioned by institutions such as government agencies and religious institutions. For example, I would probe further into how

Colonialism, international aid and resources, and imperialistic approaches from the United States and Europe complicate intersectional subject positioning. Further, understanding about micro level interactions and conversations would also be useful. An analysis of specific conversations and how intersectional subject positions emerge in those interactions would bring complexity to understanding intersectionality and agency.

My future research with Kenyan youth might include facilitating praxis sessions about topics that would further build participants' skills related to intercultural conflict transformation and peacebuilding. During my analysis, I identified three interconnected areas that the participants might benefit from learning and applying. First, a possible topic for a future workshop relates to cultural representations and subject positions of races, tribes, genders, religions, political parties, and socioeconomic classes. Participants identified how others represented their group(s) and at times offered critique of those representations. In this workshop, we would identify how groups are represented during intercultural conflict, and investigate the impact of those representations, as well as strategies for challenging those representations. Participants would focus on how cultural groups are positioned in media and public texts, as well as how they are representing and positioning others during conflict.

Second, a skills-based workshop on the principles and practice of critical intergroup dialogue would be a natural extension of this study. Most participants indicated on their Post-workshop reflections that they needed more help to develop their skills to respond to intercultural conflict and community capacity building. A praxis session on critical intergroup dialogue would be one possible way to respond to that request. This approach to intergroup dialogue would be informed by critical concepts,

such as contextual factors, intersectional subject positioning, social hierarchies, ideologies and power relations.

The last praxis session that could be developed is about critical reflexivity. Only a couple of participants demonstrated critical reflexivity in their responses, therefore this skill could be better developed. In a workshop on critical reflexivity, participants would identify and challenge their own biases, problematize their assumptions and subject positions, and recognize and interrogate how their social identities influence intercultural conflict.

Finally, in all praxis sessions, participants could provide suggestions for future workshops that they or others might offer. This would be beneficial for two reasons. First, when they were asked what I could change or add during my workshop, they offered limited feedback. Second, asking participants to generate topics for future workshops is consistent with commitments of critical pedagogy and community engaged praxis. If participants generated workshop topics, it would be more likely to respond to their ever-changing needs.

Applications of the Study for Participants and Community Partner

This study has applications for the participants in their day-to-day lives and offers contributions to the peacebuilding trainings facilitated by Dr. Ringera and International Peace Initiatives. I identified several applications for participants of the material covered during the intercultural conflict transformation workshop. First, at the end of my workshop the participants were able to demonstrate their skills of assessing the intercultural conflicts that they experienced. Participants were able to identify what the intercultural conflict was about, salient cultural identities and subject positions, and

important context, such as patriarchy, classism, tribalism, and inequitable distributions of resources. Second, participants were able to develop an action plan and determine effective response strategies. Additionally, in some cases participants were able to apply those strategies to conflicts that they experienced after the workshop. Some of the strategies discussed in the workshop included, attending to the context, taking a time-out to reduce defensiveness, probing for cultural differences and multiple cultural identities, identifying spaces for alliances, and inviting dialogue. Participants also evaluated the outcome(s) of the conflict and the strategies that they used to respond to the conflict. Finally, the participants assessed what more needed to be done, what they learned about their own cultural identities, and if their response strategies were effective. These are practical skills that participants could add to their intercultural conflict transformation toolboxes, so that they have a range of assessment skills and options to respond to conflict and to engage in peacebuilding.

This study contributes to the peacebuilding trainings that Dr. Ringera facilitates, including the NGL trainings that are held at International Peace Initiatives. First, Dr. Ringera's efforts and trainings promote skill development and intrapersonal transformation, while simultaneously focusing on broader contextual structures. My workshop supports and extends these efforts by taking a more specific and intensive focus on conflict transformation, context and multiple cultural identities. Further, my study provides data that can be used by Dr. Ringera to develop future trainings that are responsive to the conflicts and needs expressed by the youth. The data collected provides rich detail about contextual forces that drive the intercultural conflicts the youth experience, how intersectional subject positions emerge in those conflicts, and how the

youth participants enact agency. Dr. Ringera might use the data to provide specific training on a salient theme, such as hegemonic Christianity. The data can also be used to strengthen the trainings by offering insight into aspects of conflict transformation that challenged participants.

Implications for Research

This study makes contributions to the fields of Intercultural Communication, Conflict and Peace Studies, Feminist Studies, and Pedagogy. An overarching contribution is that this study theorizes about intercultural conflict and conflict transformation and offers practical applications for intercultural conflict transformation in Kenya. Broome and Collier (2012) call on intercultural communication scholars to “play a central role in advancing the study and practice of peacebuilding” (p. 245). This study responded to that call by investigating how intercultural conflict, intersectional identities, and agency are contextually and structurally influenced, which has implications for peacebuilding. Further, I showed that for scholars to understand intercultural conflict and thus peacebuilding, each must be situated in the context in which it occurs and account for subject positions that emerge in relation to others during conflict.

This study contributes to Conflict and Peace Studies by offering an in-depth account for the influencing factors that drive intercultural conflict in Kenya. Scholars seeking to interrupt violence related to conflict and engage in peacebuilding in Kenya, or similar African contexts, would be served by understanding the contextual factors. For instance, peacebuilding initiatives in Kenya need to address contextual forces such as patriarchy, tribalism, and Islamophobia. Addressing the underlying causes of intercultural conflict is key to potentially developing sustainable change and peacebuilding initiatives.

Feminist Studies scholars concerned with patriarchy, intersectionality, agency and the reduction of violence can find value in the evidence I offer that all of these factors are interrelated. My study demonstrates that because these are interconnected, they cannot be viewed in isolation from each other. Further, patriarchy, feminism and agency are contextually informed and therefore scholars can benefit from examining the examples of context and participants' orientations to each factor.

My study offers a particular framework and design for a workshop on conflict transformation and peacebuilding which might be valuable for scholars wishing to apply critical pedagogy in international contexts. The workshop also illustrates applications for community engaged pedagogical practice in the context of Kenya. I outlined my workshop design and described the challenges that I encountered during the design and facilitation phases. Pedagogues, as well as training facilitators, could adapt a similar design format when teaching and training in similar contexts or with related content. I utilized a pedagogical practice that was, in large part, driven by the community and shaped by participants. This increased the relevancy of the learning for participants and strengthened the potential for applications.

Finally, my study shows the benefits of blending a range of theoretical commitments in intercultural communication, feminism, intersectionality and critical reflexivity into a single project. This is useful because the combination strengthens understanding about how power relations and privilege operate to dis/enable agency, affect access to resources and to render people, at times visible and at other times invisible. Additionally, connections between conflict, context, subject positioning, and agency have been undertheorized in work about Kenyan youth. This study extends

knowledge about an understudied population in Kenya, who are navigating significant intercultural conflict that has a long history due to colonization; the study is even more timely and relevant given the contested political elections in the recent past in Kenya. This study offers insights for scholars researching in similar African contexts or studying similar types of conflict such as tribalism, or conflicts related to politics or patriarchy. Moreover, for scholars interested in understanding how agency is used to respond to intercultural conflict, this study offers insight into how the Kenyan youth participants proposed enacting agency.

These contributions demonstrate the need for this study and the importance of the findings. However, there is more work to be done to help create socially just and peaceful communities throughout the world. I call on Intercultural Communication scholars, conflict transformation practitioners, and community peacebuilders to work across differences to engage a new vision for justice, inclusion, and equity. I look forward to continuing and expanding this line of research in Kenya in the future.

Appendix A

Consent to Participate in Research

Kenyan Youths' Experiences of Intercultural Conflict: Negotiating Context, Intersectionalities, and Agency

Purpose of the study: You are being asked to take part in a research study that is being conducted by Professor Mary Jane Collier and Lindsay Scott, from the Department of Communication & Journalism at the University of New Mexico, U.S.A. The purpose of this study is to build an understanding about the factors of intercultural conflict that are identified and experienced by young adults (ages 18-30) in Kenya. The study will include a workshop that will be developed by Lindsay Scott and the participants. You are being asked to take part because you have been identified as a leader in your community who has encountered intercultural conflict.

This form will explain what to expect when joining the study, as well as the possible risks and benefits of participation. If you have any questions, please ask the researcher.

What you will do in the study:

If you choose to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire that will ask you to identify your demographics (age, nationality, religion, etc.). You do not need to answer any question that you do not want to answer.

In addition, you will be asked to help develop, participate in, and offer reflections on a workshop that focuses on conflict transformation, addresses cultural difference, and promotes peacebuilding. Your participation in this workshop will consist of written reflections and workshop conversations. The written responses will consist of answering questions and offering descriptions of conflicts you have experienced and strategies for transforming the conflicts. The written responses will be collected, and the conversations will be recorded. You can skip any questions that you do not want to answer. You can stop your participation at any time.

Participation in this workshop will take a total of 6 hours over 1 day. There will be periodic breaks given. If at any time you need to leave the room for a break, you are able to do that.

The date of the workshop will be provided to you upon confirmation from International Peace Initiatives. The location will be at the Kithoka Amani Children's Home Meeting Hall in Meru, Kenya.

Three months after the workshop concludes you will be sent a follow-up email. This email will ask you to reflect on your use of the conflict transformation strategies that you used. Your response is anticipated to take no more than 1 hour to complete.

Risks: There are risks of physical and mental exhaustion, stress, emotional distress, and possible loss of privacy and confidentiality associated with participating in a research study.

Physical and mental exhaustion- The workshop will last 6 hours. This can result in exhaustion. To maximize comfort, we will take a 10 minute break every 1.5 hours. You are encouraged to leave the room if at any time you need an additional break.

Stress/emotional distress- Conversations about intercultural conflict and the factors related to it, has the potential to cause stress and emotional distress. You will be asked to share your experiences in writing and by speaking with the group, which can bring feelings to the surface. You are not required to answer any question that you do not want to. Refusing to answer a question will not disqualify you from participation. If at any time you do not wish to continue, you can leave and will be compensated for the time you participated.

Possible loss of privacy and confidentiality- You will be asked to speak about your experiences about intercultural conflict and factors related to it, in a group of 20 peers and a researcher. Sharing information in this setting has an inherent risk of loss of privacy and confidentiality. You are only expected to share what you are comfortable sharing. At the beginning of the workshop all participants will be asked to keep all conversations private. However, this cannot be assured. The workshop will be audio recorded. The audio recording will contain your nickname and no other identifiers will be used, this will help maintain confidentiality.

You will also be asked to share experiences in writing. You will be asked to pick a pseudonym (nickname) that will be used on all study related materials. If you do not feel comfortable responding to any of the written questions, you can refuse to answer and that will not disqualify you from the study. All study related material will be stored in a locked bag or filing cabinet.

Real names will not be used on the audio recording or any of the written data.

Benefits: By participating in this study you will learn skills that will help you respond to intercultural conflict. This benefits you by increasing the tools you have to respond in such situations.

Confidentiality of your information: We will take measures to protect the security of all your personal information, but we cannot guarantee confidentiality of all study data. The University of New Mexico Institutional Review Board (IRB) that oversees human subject research may be permitted to access your records. Your name will not be used in any published reports about this study.

Payment: In return for your time participating in this study, you will be paid KSH that are equal to \$5 USD at the end of the workshop. If you are not able to complete the study, you will be compensated for the time you invested.

Right to withdraw from the study: Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You have the right to choose not to participate or to withdraw your participation at any point in this study without penalty. If you want to withdraw during the workshop, you can simply leave the room. If you withdraw, data collected from you up until that point will be destroyed. If you complete the workshop and then decide that you no longer want to be a part of the study, you can contact Lindsay Scott, PhD Candidate, at lindsayscott@unm.edu, or her associate, Professor Mary Jane Collier at mjc@unm.edu to let us know. At that point, we will destroy any data collected from you.

If you have any questions, concerns or complaints at any time about the research study, please contact Lindsay Scott, PhD Candidate at lindsayscott@unm.edu, or her associate Professor Mary Jane Collier at mjc@unm.edu.

If you would like to speak with someone other than the research team to obtain information or offer input or if you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact the IRB. The IRB is a group of people from the University of New Mexico and the community who provide independent oversight of safety and ethical issues related to research involving people:
UNM Office of the IRB, 000-1-505-277-2644, irbmaincampus@unm.edu. Website:
<http://irb.unm.edu/>

CONSENT

You are making a decision whether to participate in this study. Your signature below indicates that you have read this form (or the form was read to you) and that all questions have been answered to your satisfaction. By signing this consent form, you are not waiving any of your legal rights as a research participant. A copy of this consent form will be provided to you.

I agree to participate in this study.

_____	_____	_____
Name of Adult Participant	Signature of Adult Participant	Date
_____	_____	_____
Researcher Name	Researcher Signature	Date

I have explained the research to the participant and answered all of his/her questions. I believe that he/she understands the information described in this consent form and freely consents to participate.

Appendix B

Demographic Chart

Name	Age	Nationality	Race	Tribe	Gender	Religion	Languages	Education	Household facilities	Employed	Disabled
Joy	22	Kenyan	Black	Meru	Female	Christian	Swahili, English, Kimeru	University in progress	Water	No	No
Natalia	23	Kenyan	Black	Kikuyu	Female	Christian	English, Kiswahili	University in progress or completed	Water and electricity	Carbon finance	No
Moha	20	Kenyan	Black	Borana	Male	Christian	English, Kiswahili, Borana, Kamba, Somali	University in progress	Water	No	No
Olive	20	Kenyan	African	N/A	Female	Christian	English, Kiswahili, Nandi	Secondary completed	Water	No	No
Emmy	20	Kenyan	African	Kamba	Female	Christian	English, Kiswahili, Kamba,	University in progress	Water and electricity	No	No
Lowesly	21	Kenyan	Black	Kalenjin	Female	Christian	English, Kiswahili	University in progress or completed	Water and electricity	No	No
Harry	21	Kenyan	N/A	Kalenjin	Male	Christian	English, Kiswahili, Kalenjin	University in progress	Water and electricity	No	No
Chacha	21	Kenyan	Black	Kikuyu	Male	Christian	English, Kiswahili, Kikuyu	University in progress	Water and electricity	No	No
Elsie	19	Kenyan	Black	Luhya	Female	Christian	English, Kiswahili	University in progress	Water and electricity	No	No
Sanchez	23	Kenyan	Black	Luo	Male	Christian	English, Kiswahili	University in progress	Water	No	No
Laura	21	Kenyan	African	Kikuyu	Female	Christian	English, Kiswahili, Kikuyu	University in progress	Water	no	No
Superman	30	Ugandan	African	N/A	Male	Catholic	English, Luganda, Kiswahili	University completed	Water	Social worker	No

Appendix C

Demographics Questionnaire

For this study, you are asked to pick a pseudonym (nickname) that you would like the researcher to use to refer to you. You'll write this name on everything you turn in, and you'll use this name throughout the workshop.

Please provide the name that you would like to be referred to in the study.

Please write the nickname on your nametag and put it on.

For the following questions, use the labels that you use to describe yourself. You can skip any question that you are not comfortable answering.

1. Age _____
2. Nationality_____
3. Ethnic/Tribal background (Kikuyu, Kalenjin, Luhya, etc.)_____
4. Gender_____
5. Religion_____
6. Language(s)_____
7. Please circle your level of education achieved:
Primary not completed
Primary completed
Secondary completed
University in progress or completed
8. Please circle the types of facilities in your household:
No water or electricity
Water or electricity
Water and electricity
9. Are you currently employed? _____ If yes, please describe your employment

10. Do you have a physical disability? Please circle yes or no.

Appendix D

Concepts introduced by researcher

Intercultural conflict: “real or perceived incompatibility of values, norms, expectations, goals, processes, or outcomes between two or more interdependent individuals or groups from different cultures” (Sorrells, 2016, p. 203).

Conflict transformation: A process that consists of “constructive change initiatives that include and go beyond the resolution of particular problems” (Lederach, 2003, p.4). Whereas a conflict resolution implies that something is finished, conflict transformation takes a deeper look at presenting issues to analyze what drives intercultural conflict and includes developing relationships and practices that are consistent with justice and peacebuilding.

Peacebuilding: a process that “requires attention to individuals’ orientations, relationships between individuals and groups, and the role of institutions and social systems that discourage violence, promote equity and offer mechanisms for dealing constructively with differences and disagreements” (Broome & Collier, 2012, p. 251).

Context: Context refers to a range structural forces and relations that influence our lived experiences and how we relate to one another. Examples include: histories, institutional policies, corporate norms, community organization practices, material conditions, education, judicial systems, religion, racism, whiteness, patriarchy, and global, national, political, and economic forces (Collier & Muneri, 2016; Collier, 2014).

Cultural Identities: “our situated sense of self that is shaped by our cultural experiences and social locations” (Sorrells, 2016, p. 11).

Agency: “the capacity of individuals or collectives to engage others and take action within the contexts in which they find themselves” (Lawless & Collier, 2014, p. 156).

Appendix E

Written Reflections #1 (completed at the start of the workshop)

Nickname: _____

Think of an intercultural conflict that you have experienced that is a barrier to peacebuilding. Remember it must be one where cultural differences can be seen and heard.

1. Describe what the issue(s) were.
2. Without giving names, who is involved in the conflict? What's your role in the conflict?
3. What are the cultural or group identities that might be important to the others in the conflict?
4. What are your cultural identities that are important in this conflict?
6. How do you think the others in the conflict view your group identities?
7. What are the others' needs and positions in the conflict?
8. What are your own needs and positions in the conflict?
9. What historical factors are important to them?
10. What historical factors are important to you?
11. What resources do they have and want?
12. What resources do you have and want?
13. Explain what happened during the conflict. (What was said and done?)
14. What strategies or responses did you use to respond to this conflict?
15. How effective were those responses?
16. What were the final outcomes?
17. How could a different outcome be realized?

Appendix F

Questions that participants discussed in small groups during the workshop

1. What are some of the most pressing intercultural conflicts that your community is experiencing?
2. What are the root causes of those conflicts?
3. In what ways do those conflicts prevent peacebuilding or make it hard to accomplish?
4. What are strategies that have been used to address these conflicts?
5. How well did these strategies work to transform the conflict, or what were the outcomes?
6. What would need to be transformed or changed to address those conflicts?

Appendix G

Conflict Transformation Strategies discussed and modified based on participants' discussions

The S-TLC system is an acronym for Stop, Think, Listen, and Communicate (Cahn & Abigail, 2014). S-TLC is a practical and applied approach that is used to address conflict. It offers flexible means to the analytical and behavioral responses to conflict. The version below is adapted to what may be useful to the leaders in the Kenyan workshop context.

Stop:

- Resist the urge to be defensive or react too quickly
- Take time out to interrupt increasing verbal and emotional attacks that could lead to violence
- Take time out to reconsider goals and strategies

Think:

- Engage in critical self-reflexivity
- Identify contextual frames, such as: histories for others and you in the conflict, economic stressors, kinds of oppression and privilege experienced, and resources present and needed
- Identify salient cultural identities for others and for you in the conflict to probe differences and look for spaces for potential allies
- Evaluate how your strategies of conflict transformation are working and plan necessary adjustments

Listen:

- Make a commitment to listen fully to other person
- Focus your attention on the other person
- Suspend judgment to the extent possible

Communicate:

- Communicate with empathy and compassion when you want to develop relational trust
- Ask questions to gather information about the other's positions and interests
- Check meanings by summarizing what you are hearing
- Generate options for dealing with the conflict through uncovering common ground or similar subject positions in need of resisting, or convergent identity positions
- Respond using a problem-solving frame

Appendix H

Written Reflections #2 (completed at the end of the workshop)

Nickname: _____

Recall the intercultural conflict that you described in the first writing activity, or another intercultural conflict; it must be one that you would like to work on in the coming months.

1. Describe what the issue(s) were.
2. Without giving names, who is involved in the conflict? What's your role in the conflict?
3. What are the cultural or group identities that might be important to the others in the conflict?
4. What are your cultural identities that are important in this conflict?
5. How do you think the others in the conflict view your group identities?
6. What are the others' needs and positions in the conflict?
7. What are your own needs and positions in the conflict?
8. What historical factors are important to them?
9. What historical factors are important to you?
10. What resources do they have and want?
11. What resources do you have and want?
12. Considering the strategies learned in this workshop, what conflict transformation strategies could you apply to this conflict or others like it?
13. What specific steps can you take to apply these strategies to try to transform this conflict?
14. What, if any, barriers or limitations will there be to transforming this conflict?
15. How will you overcome them?
16. Where and when do you plan to try out these strategies to transform this conflict?

Appendix I

Written Reflections #3 (sent via email message 3 months post-workshop)

Nickname: _____

Recall the conflict transformation strategy that you described in our last writing during our workshop. Describe the intercultural conflict situation where you used that strategy.

1. Describe what the issue(s) were.
2. Without giving names, who is involved in the conflict? What's your role in the conflict?
3. What are the cultural or group identities that might be important to the others in the conflict?
4. What are your cultural identities that are important in this conflict?
5. How do you think the others in the conflict view your group identities?
6. What are the others' needs and positions in the conflict?
7. What are your own needs and positions in the conflict?
8. What strategies did you apply in the conflict?
9. Specifically what did you say and do?
10. Specifically how did the other(s) respond; what did they say or do?
11. What were the final outcomes?
12. What, if any, barriers or limitations were there to transforming this conflict?
13. How did you try to overcome them?
14. What, if any, resources do you need to transform this conflict?
15. What worked or was helpful in transforming the conflict?
16. What might you want to do or say in a similar conflict?
17. What did not work as well and what might you want to avoid saying or doing in a similar conflict?
18. What else would you like to share about this experience of intercultural conflict transformation?

References

- Achola O.P. (2010) *The ground we stand on*. Retrieved from:
<http://www.womensmediacenter.com/feature/entry/the-ground-we-stand-on>
- Adams, T.E., & Holman Jones, S. (2011). Telling stories: Reflexivity, queer theory, and autoethnography. *Cultural Studies* ⇔ *Critical Methodologies*, 11(2), 108 –116b.
- Adan, M., & Pkalya, R. (2005). Closed to progress: An assessment of the socio-economic impacts of conflict on pastoral and semi pastoral economics in Kenya and Uganda. *Practical Action*. Retrieved from
https://practicalaction.org/docs/region_east_africa/closed_to_progress_report.pdf
- Africa News* (2017, October 25). A look at Kenya's elections history since independence in 1964. Retrieved from <http://www.africanews.com/2017/10/25/a-look-at-kenya-s-elections-history-since-independence-in-1964/>
- African Union Commission (AUC) (2006). *African youth charter (AYC)*. Retrieved from:
http://www.un.org/en/africa/osaa/pdf/au/african_youth_charter_2006.pdf
- Africa Youth Trust (2016). The two-third gender rule and its implementation in Kenya. Retrieved from <http://www.africayouthtrust.org/media-gallery/ayt-blog/the-two-third-gender-rule-and-its-implementation-in-kenya>
- Aguirre, I. (2017). Kenya elections: A tribal affair. Retrieved from:
<https://intpolicydigest.org/2017/07/02/kenya-elections-a-tribal-affair/>
- Allen, B.J. (2011). *Difference matters: Communicating social identity*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Allport, G. W. (1958). *The nature of prejudice: abridged*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Alvesson, M., & Skoldberg, K. (2009). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Alexander, B.K. (2006). *Performing black masculinity: Race, culture, and queer identity*. New York: Altamira Press.
- Arero, H.W. (2007). Coming to Kenya: Imagining and perceiving a Nation among the Borana of Kenya. *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, 1(2), 292-304,
- Atay, A., & Toyosaki, S. (2018). Introduction. In A. Atay & S. Toyosaki (Eds.). *Critical intercultural communication pedagogy* (pp. vii-xvi). Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.

- Bardhan, N., & Orbe, M. P. (2012). The importance of identity research in intercultural communication. In N. Bardhan & M.P. Orbe (Eds.), *Identity research and communication: Intercultural reflections and future directions* (pp. 10-20). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Bauman, Z. (2001). *The individualized society*. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- BBC News (2013). Q&A Kenya's 2013 elections. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-21478869>
- Bettie, J. (2003). *Women without class: Girls, race, and identity*. Berkeley: CA. University of California Press.
- Bloomfield, S. (2008, January 23). Kibaki 'stole' Kenyan election through vote-rigging and fraud. *The Independent*. Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/africa/kibaki-stole-kenyan-election-through-vote-rigging-and-fraud-772349.html>
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L.J.D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Broome, B., & Collier, M.J. (2012). Culture, communication and peacebuilding: A reflexive multidimensional contextual framework. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 5(1), 245-269.
- Buzz Kenya* (n.d.). 50+ political parties in Kenya: A comprehensive list. Retrieved from: <https://buzzkenya.com/political-parties-kenya/>
- Cahn, D.D., & Abigail, R.A. (2014). *Managing conflict through communication*. 5th Edition. Boston, M.A: Pearson.
- Camino, L., & Zeldin, S. (2002). From periphery to center: Pathways for youth civic engagement in the day-to-day life of communities. *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(4), 213-220.
- Carastathis, A. (2014). The Concept of Intersectionality in Feminist Theory. *Philosophy Compass*, 9(5), 304–314.
- Carrillo Rowe, A. (2008). *Power lines: On the subject of feminist alliances*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Centre for Multi-Party Democracy Kenya (2013). *The Kenya national youth charter (KNYC)*. Retrieved from: <http://cmd-kenya.org/cmdold/files/The-Kenya-National-Youth-Charter-2013.pdf>

- Cervantes-Soon, C.G. (2014). The U.S.-Mexico Border-crossing Chicana researcher: Theory in the flesh and the politics of identity in critical ethnography. *Journal of Latino/Latin American Studies*, 6(2), 97-112.
- Chávez, K.R. (2012). Power, privilege, and identities in political activist communities. In N. Bardhan & M.P. Orbe (Eds.), *Identity research and communication: Intercultural reflections and future directions* (pp. 21-32). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Christiansen, C., Utas, M., & Vigh, H.E. (2006). Introduction. In C. Christiansen, M. Utas & H.E. Vigh (Eds.), *Navigating youth, generating adulthood: Social becoming in an African context* (9-30). Stockholm: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.
- Cole, C. M., Manuh, T., & Miescher, S. (2007). *Africa after gender?* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Collier, M.J. (2005). Context, privilege, and contingent cultural identifications in South African group discourses. *Western Journal of Communication*, 69(4), 295-318.
- Collier, M.J. (2014). *Community engagement and intercultural praxis: Dancing with difference in diverse contexts*. New York: Peter Lang
- Collier, M.J. (2015). Partnering for anti-poverty praxis in circles USA: Applications of critical dialogic reflexivity. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 8(3), 208-223.
- Collier, M.J., & Lawless, B. (2016). Critically reflexive dialogue and praxis: Academic/practitioner reflections throughout a formative evaluation of circles USA. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 44, 156-173.
- Collier, M.J., Lawless, B., & Ringera, K. (2016) Negotiating contextually contingent agency: situated feminist peacebuilding strategies in Kenya. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 39(4), 399-421.
- Collier, M.J., & Muneri, C. (2016). A call for critical reflexivity: Reflections on research with nongovernmental and nonprofit organizations in Zimbabwe and Kenya. *Western Journal of Communication*, 80(5), 638-658.
- Collier, M.J., & Ringera, K. (2015). Intercultural allies dancing with difference: International peace initiative, Kenya. In K. Sorrells & S. Sekimoto (Eds.), *Globalizing intercultural communication: A reader* (pp. 155-166). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Collins, P.H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Collins, P.H. (2015). Intersectionality's definitional dilemmas. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41, 1-20.

- Collins, P.H., & Bilge S. (2016). *Intersectionality*. Malden, MA: Policy Press.
- Connaughton, S.L, Kuang, K., & Yakova, L. (2017). Liberia's Pen-Pen Riders: A case study of locally driven, dialogic approach to transformation, peacebuilding, and social change. In P.M. Kellett & T.G. Matyók (Eds.), *Communication and conflict transformation: Through local, regional, and global engagement* (pp. 71-92). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Dahir, A.L. (2017, July 25). Hyphenated Nationalism: Adding Asians to Kenya's list of tribes shows an unhealthy obsession with tribal purity. *Quartz Africa*. Retrieved from <https://qz.com/1037595/adding-asians-to-kenyas-list-of-tribes-shows-an-unhealthy-obsession-with-tribal-purity/>
- Deetz, S. (2017). Disarticulation and conflict transformation: Interactive design, collaborative processes, and generative democracy. In P.M. Kellett & T.G. Matyók (Eds.), *Communication and conflict transformation: Through local, regional, and global engagement* (pp. 3-24). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Denzin, N.K. (2003). *Performance ethnography: Critical pedagogy and the politics of culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dominelli, L. (2006). *Women and community action*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Dutta, M.J. (2011) *Communicating social change: Structure, culture, and agency*. New York: Routledge.
- Ellis, D.G., Ron, Y., & Maoz, I. (2018). Communicative contact and the transformation of ethno-political conflicts. In P.M. Kellett & T.G. Matyók (Eds.), *Communication and conflict transformation: Through local, regional, and global engagement* (pp. 205-226). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Enberg, C. (2011). *Discursive repertoires constructing a positive identity of the British National Front*. Retrieved from: http://www.vakki.net/publications/2011/VAKKI2011_Enberg.pdf
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Fassett, D.L., & Warren, J.T. (2007). *Critical communication pedagogy*. Thousand Oaks, C.A: Sage Publications.
- Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness*. Minneapolis. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Giroux, H.A. (2013). *Youth in revolt: Reclaiming a democratic future*. London: Paradigm Publishers.
- Gordon, A.A. (1996). *Transforming capitalism and patriarchy: Gender and development in Africa*. Boulder, CO: Rienner Publishing.
- Hall, S. (Ed.). (1997). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. London: Sage.
- Halualani, R.T., & Nakayama, T.K., (2011). Critical intercultural communication studies at a crossroads. In T.K. Nakayama & R.T. (Eds.), *The handbook of critical intercultural communication* (pp. 1-16). Hoboken, N.J: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hamran, C. (2003). *Overview of gender mainstreaming*. New York: United Nations Publication.
- Haugerudbratten, H. (1998). Peacebuilding: Six dimensions and two concepts. In *African Security Review*, 7(6), 17-26.
- Hewstone, M., & Brown, R.J. (1986). Contact is not enough: An intergroup perspective on the Contact Hypothesis. In M. Hewstone & R. J. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters* (pp. 1-44). New York, NY: Blackwell.
- hooks, b. (2000). *Feminism is for everybody: Passionate politics*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Hope Sr., K.R. (2012). Engaging the youth in Kenya: empowerment, education, and employment. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 17(4), 221-236.
- Huho, J.M. (2012). Conflict resolution among pastoral communities in West Pokot County, Kenya: A missing link. *Academic Research International*, 3(3), 458-468.
- Human Rights Watch (2008, March 16). [Kenya: Justice Vital to Stability Prosecutions Key to Ending Violence, Police Abuses](https://www.hrw.org/report/2008/03/16/ballots-bullets/organized-political-violence-and-kenyas-crisis-governance). Retrieved from <https://www.hrw.org/report/2008/03/16/ballots-bullets/organized-political-violence-and-kenyas-crisis-governance>
- Human Rights Watch (2017, December 14). Kenya: Sexual violence marred elections. Retrieved from <https://www.hrw.org/blog-feed/kenya-elections-2017>
- Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission (IEBC) (A) (n.d.). *Election: Political parties*. Retrieved from <https://www.iebc.or.ke/election/?parties>
- Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission (IEBC) (B) (n.d.). *Our vision, our mission*. Retrieved from <https://www.iebc.or.ke/iebc/?vission>

- International Peace Initiatives (IPI). (2018). *International peace initiatives: Inspiring action for peace*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ipeacei.org/>
- James, P. (2006). *Globalism, nationalism, tribalism: Bringing theory back in*. London: Sage, 2006.
- Jensen, K. (Ed.). (2002). *A handbook of media and communication research: Qualitative and quantitative methodologies*. London: Routledge.
- Jenkins, R. (2004). *Social identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Karbo, T. (2014). Capacity-building for sustainable peace-building in Africa. In S.B. Maphosa, L. DeLuca, & A. Keasley (Eds.), *Building peace from within: An examination of community-based peacebuilding and transitions in Africa* (pp. 15-35). Pretoria, South Africa: The African Institute of South Africa.
- Kenya Information Guide (2015). The ethnic tribes of Kenya. Retrieved from: <http://www.kenya-information-guide.com/kenya-tribes.html>
- Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (2005). *Facts and figures 2005*. Retrieved from: http://www.knbs.or.ke/index.php?option=com_phocadownload&view=category&id=20&Itemid=1107
- Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (2015). *Facts and figures 2015*. Retrieved from: http://www.knbs.or.ke/index.php?option=com_phocadownload&view=category&id=20&Itemid=1107
- Khadiagala, G.M. (2010). Political movements and coalition politics in Kenya: Entrenching ethnicity. *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 17(1), 65-84.
- Khamasi, W.J., Maina, F.W., & vanHaegendoren, M. (2011). Editorial. In W.J. Khamasi, F.W. Maina, & M. vanHaegendoren (Eds.). *Engaging patriarchy: Challenges and responsibilities for educators and policy makers in Kenya* (pp. x-xiv). Eldoret, Kenya: Moi University Press.
- Kim, Y. Y. (2007). Ideology, identity, and intercultural communication: An analysis of differing academic conceptions of cultural identity. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 36 (3), 237–53.
- Kimenyi, M.S. (2013, April 2). Kenya: A country redeemed after a peaceful election. *Brookings*. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2013/04/02/kenya-a-country-redeemed-after-a-peaceful-election/>
- Kimutai, C., & Okumu. P. (2017, August 12). Uhuru Kenyatta got 8.2 million votes against Raila's 6.7 million. *Standard Digital*. Retrieved from <https://www.standardmedia.co.ke/article/2001251033/uhuru-kenyatta-got-8-2-million-votes-against-raila-s-6-7-million>

- Kincheloe, J.L. (2005). *Critical pedagogy*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Kincheloe, J.L. (2008). *Critical pedagogy primer*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Kiptoo, P.J., & Kipkoech, L. C. (2011). Gender mainstreaming in Kenya's public institutions. In W.J. Khamasi, F.W. Maina, & M. vanHaegendoren (Eds.). *Engaging patriarchy: Challenges and responsibilities for educators and policy makers in Kenya* (pp. 73-86). Eldoret, Kenya: Moi University Press.
- Klopp, J.M. (2002). Can moral ethnicity trump political tribalism? The struggle for land and nation in Kenya. *African Studies*, 61(2), 269-294.
- KNBS (2009). *Kenya 2009 population and housing census highlights*. Retrieved from: <https://web.archive.org/web/20130810182358/http://www.knbs.or.ke/Census%20Results/KNBS%20Brochure.pdf>
- Kwatemba, S.W. (2008). Ethnicity and political pluralism in Kenya. *Journal of African Elections*, 7(2), 77-112.
- Lawless, B. & Collier, M.J. (2014). Dancing in Circles: Evaluating U.S. community-based initiative moving families out of poverty. In M.J. Collier (Ed.), *Community engagement and intercultural praxis: Dancing with difference in diverse contexts*. (pp. 137-163). New York, N.Y: Peter Lang.
- Lederach, J.P. (1997). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies*. Washington, D.C: U.S. Institute of Peace Press.
- Lederach, J.P. (2003). *The little book of conflict transformation*. New York: Good Books.
- Lederach, J.P., & Lederach, A. (2014). Let us talk: African contributions to peacebuilding. In S.B. Maphosa, L. DeLuca, & A. Keasley (Eds.), *Building peace from within: An examination of community-based peacebuilding and transitions in Africa*. (pp. 36-52). Pretoria, South Africa: The African Institute of South Africa.
- Ledwith, M., & Springett, J. (2010). *Participatory practice: Community-based action for transformative change*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Leys, C. (1975). *Underdevelopment in Kenya: The political economy in neocolonialism 1964-1971*. London: Heinemann.
- Limo, L., & Wekesa, G. (2010, September 1). Statistics: Women not that more than men. *The Standard*. Retrieved from <https://www.standardmedia.co.ke/business/article/2000017310/statistics-women-not-that-more-than-men>
- Lindlof, T.R., & Taylor, B.C. (2011). *Qualitative communication research methods*. Thousand Oaks, C.A: Sage Publications.

- Lui, M., & United for a Fair Economy. (2006). *The color of wealth: The story behind the U.S. racial wealth divide*. New York: New Press.
- Lynch, G. (2006). The fruits of perception: Ethnic politics and the case of Kenya's Constitutional Referendum. *African Studies*, 65(2), 233-270.
- Madison, D.S. (2006). The dialogic performative in critical ethnography. *Text and Performance Quarterly*. 26(4), 320-324.
- Madison, D.S. (2012). *Critical ethnography: Method, ethics, and performance* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Maphosa, S.B., & Keasley, A. (2014). Building peace from within: An introduction. In S.B. Maphosa, L. DeLuca, & A. Keasley (Eds.), *Building peace from within: An examination of community-based peacebuilding and transitions in Africa* (pp. 1-14). Pretoria, South Africa: The African Institute of South Africa.
- Martin, J.N., & Nakayama, T.K. (1999). Thinking dialectically about culture and communication. *Communication Theory*. 9(1), 1-25.
- Martin, J.N., & Nakayama, T. K. (2010). *Intercultural communication in contexts*. (Fifth Ed.) New York: McGraw Hill.
- Matson, A.T. (1993). *Nandi resistance to British rule*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge.
- Matyók, T.G., & Kellett, P.M. (2017). *Preface*. In P.M. Kellett & T.G. Matyók (Eds.), *Communication and conflict transformation: Through local, regional, and global engagement* (pp. xi-xvi). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- McKee, A. (2003). *Textual analysis: A beginner's guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ministry of Gender, Children, and Social Development (2011). Gender policy. Retrieved from: <http://www1.uneca.org/Portals/ngm/Documents/GenderPolicy.pdf>
- Ministry of Public Service, Youth, and Gender Affairs, & Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National Government (2016). *Kenya National Action Plan (KNAP)*. Retrieved from: <http://www.daogewe.org/index.php/publications/reports/57-kenya-national-action-plan-knap-20162018-for-the-implementation-of-united-nations-security-council-resolution-1325-and-related-resolutions>
- Ministry of State for Provincial Administration and Internal Security (2012). *National policy on peacebuilding and conflict management (NPPCM)*. Retrieved from: <http://www.nscpeace.go.ke/resource-library/downloads/category/4-publications.html>

- Ministry of Youth Affairs (2006). *Kenya National Youth Policy (KNYP)*. Retrieved from: http://www.youthpolicy.org/national/Kenya_2006_National_Youth_Policy.pdf
- Misiko, H. (2017, July 31). Chris Msando death: What we know. *Daily Nation*. Retrieved from <http://www.nation.co.ke/news/IEBC-ICT-manager-Chris-Musando-dead/1056-4039424-8r8f7v/index.html>
- Mohanty, C. (2003). *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Moon, D. G. (2010). Critical reflections on cultural and critical intercultural communication. In T. K. Nakayama & R. T. Halualani (Eds.), *The handbook of critical intercultural communication* (pp. 34– 52). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Morley, L. (2007). Sister-matic: Gender mainstreaming in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 12(5-6), 607-620.
- Muñoz, J.E. (1999). *Disidentifications: Queers of color and the performance of politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mutuku, C.M. (2009, April 2). *Youth perspectives on their empowerment in sub-Saharan Africa: The case of Kenya*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association 67th Annual National Conference, Chicago, IL.
- Nash, J.C. (2008). Re-thinking intersectionality. *Feminist Review*, 89, 1-15.
- National Council for Law Reporting (2012). *Education Act*. Retrieved from: <http://kenyalaw.org/kl/fileadmin/pdfdownloads/Acts/EducationActCap211.pdf>
- Nevett, T., & Perry, A.M. (2000). Tribalism and advertising effectiveness in Kenya: An exploratory study. *Journal of African Business*, 1(1), 25-39.
- New Generation Leadership (NGL). (2017). *New generation leadership program*. Retrieved from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oif9sgWuWqM>
- Obijiofor, L. M. (2004). The future for Africa lies in home-grown solutions. In O. Adesida and A. Oteh (Eds.), *African voices- African visions* (131-146). Stockholm: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.
- Oluoch, F. (2017, August 12). More women elected in Kenya, but the numbers still fall short. Retrieved from <http://www.theeastafrican.co.ke/news/Women-elected-in-Kenya-/2558-4054988-d8a9guz/index.html>
- Paller, J.W. (2018). From urban crisis to political opportunity: Africa slums. In N. Poku, & J. Whitman (Eds.). *Africa under neoliberalism* (pp. 76-94). New York: Routledge.

- Pettigrew, T.F. (2008). Future directions for intergroup contact theory and research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 32(3), 187-199.
- Reimer, L.E. (2017). Indigenous principles and communication strategies: Extending Lederach to design research for and as conflict transformation. In P.M. Kellett & T.G. Matyók (Eds.), *Communication and conflict transformation: Through local, regional, and global engagement* (pp. 25-43). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Rich, A. (1976). *Of woman born: Motherhood as experience and institution*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Ringera, K. (2014). The role of women in grassroots peacebuilding in Kenya. In S.B. Maphosa, L. DeLuca, & A. Kearsley (Eds.), *Building peace from within: An examination of community-based peacebuilding and transitions in Africa*. (pp. 172-198). Pretoria, South Africa: The African Institute of South Africa.
- Ringera, K. (2018). *New Generation Leadership program*. Retrieved from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=100&v=oif9sgWuWqM
- Rose, G. (2012). *Visual methodologies: An introduction to researching with visual materials* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rosenblum, K.E., & Travis, T.C. (2003). *The meaning of difference: American constructions of race, sex and gender, social class, and sexual orientation*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Rutere, A. (2011). Engaging patriarchy: Women's challenges and hoes in Ngugi Wa Thiong'o's *Wizard of the Crow*. In W.J. Khamasi, F.W. Maina, & M. vanHaegendoren (Eds.). *Engaging patriarchy: Challenges and responsibilities for educators and policy makers in Kenya* (pp. 15-30). Eldoret, Kenya: Moi University Press.
- Sandbrook, R. (1985). *The politics of African economic stagnation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sawe, B.E. (2017, April 25). Largest ethnic groups in Kenya. *World Atlas*. Retrieved from: <https://www.worldatlas.com/articles/largest-ethnic-groups-in-kenya.html>
- Shilaho, W.K. (2018). *Political Power and Tribalism in Kenya*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shome, R., & Hegde, R.S. (2006). Postcolonial approaches to communication: Charting the terrain, engaging the intersections. *Communication theory*, 12(3), 249-270.

- Solomon, S. (2017, October 14). Making sense of Kenya's election surprises: A timeline of events. *Voice of America's Africa Division*. Retrieved from: <https://www.voanews.com/a/making-sense-kenya-election-surprises-timeline-events/4070559.html>
- Sorrells, K. (2010). Re-imagining intercultural communication in the context of globalization. In T. K. Nakayama & R. T. Halualani, (Eds.), *The Handbook of Critical Intercultural Communication*, (pp. 171-189). West Sussex, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sorrells, K. (2013). *Intercultural Communication: Globalization and Social Justice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sorrells, K. (2016). *Intercultural communication: Globalization and social justice*. Thousand Oaks, C.A: Sage Publications.
- Sorrells, K., & Nakagawa, G. (2008). Intercultural communication praxis and the struggle for social responsibility and social justice. In O. Swartz (Ed.), *Transformative communication studies: Culture, hierarchy and the human condition* (pp. 17-43). Leicester, England: Troubador.
- Stephens, S. (1995). *Children and the politics of culture*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- The Constitution of Kenya amended 2010.
- The East African* (2017A, August 5). Kenyan women candidates face curses and violence. Retrieved from <http://www.theeastafrican.co.ke/news/Kenyan-women-candidates-face-curses-and-violence/2558-4046606-mbut07z/index.html>
- The East African* (2017B, November 3). Kenya opposition Nasa calls for boycott of Safaricom, Brookside and Bidco. Retrieved from <http://www.theeastafrican.co.ke/business/Kenya-opposition-boycott-Safaricom-Brookside-Bidco/2560-4172060-jjn3ec/index.html>
- United Nations Statistics Division (2017). *Population by religion, sex and urban/rural residence*. Retrieved from: <http://data.un.org/Data.aspx?q=kenya+religions&d=POP&f=tableCode%3a28%3bcountryCode%3a404>
- USAID (2005). Fact Sheet: The Turkana-Pokot-Sabiny cross-border conflict management initiative. Retrieved from http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pdach137.pdf
- USAID (2017). Gender equality and women's empowerment in Kenya. Retrieved from <https://www.usaid.gov/kenya/gender-equality-and-womens-empowerment-kenya>

- van Dijk, T.A. (1995). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In C. Schäffner & A. Wenden (Eds.) *Language and Peace* (pp. 17-33). Aldershot, England: Dartmouth Publishing.
- Walby, S. (1986). *Patriarchy at work*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Weber, L. (2010). *Understanding race, class, gender and sexuality: A conceptual framework*. Oxford University Press.
- Wodak, R. (2006). Discourse-analytic socio-linguistic approach to the study of nation(alism). In G. Delanty & K. Kumar (Eds.). *The Sage handbook of nations and nationalism* (pp. 104-117). London: Sage.
- Yep, G.A. (2010). Toward the de-subjugation of racially marked knowledges in communication. *Southern Communication Journal*, 75(2), 171-175.
- Yep, G.A. (2015). Intersectionality, identity, and positionality. In K. Sorrells & S. Sekimoto (Eds.), *Globalizing intercultural communication: A reader* (pp. 85-94). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Youé, C. (1988). Settler Capital and the Assault on the Squatter Peasantry in Kenya's Uasin Gishu District, 1942-63. *African Affairs*, 87(348), 393-418.
- Zirulnick, A. (2015). *In Kenya, religious coexistence feels pressure of stronger Muslim identity*. Retrieved from: <https://www.csmonitor.com/World/Africa/2015/0329/In-Kenya-religious-coexistence-feels-pressure-of-stronger-Muslim-identity>