

Symbolic Interaction and Intercultural Theatre Performance  
Dynamics in Uganda: The Case of Makerere University's  
Intercultural Theatre Collaborations

by

Richard Kagoloby

Dissertation presented for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy (Drama and Theatre Studies) at the Faculty of  
Arts and Social Sciences  
Stellenbosch University

Pectora cuberant cultus recti

Supervisor: Prof. Edwin Hees

December 2014

## **Declaration**

By submitting this dissertation, I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the sole author thereof (save to the extent explicitly otherwise stated), that reproduction and publication thereof by Stellenbosch University will not infringe any third-party rights, and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

Signature:

Date: 10-11-2014

Copyright © 2014 Stellenbosch University

All rights reserved

## Acknowledgements

I am grateful to my supervisor Professor Edwin Hees for his patience, articulate guidance and insightful counsel in the process of my academic rebirth and growth during my PhD studies.

I thank the Graduate School, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Stellenbosch University for the generous PhD scholarship that made this academic journey possible.

I also thank Makerere University for the study leave, travel facilitation and research funds which made this academic milestone achievable.

I would not have made it this far without the foundational guidance and mentorship of my teachers at the Department of Performing Arts and Film, Makerere University. In that regard I thank Assoc. Prof. Patrick Mangeni, Assoc. Prof. Mercy Mirembe Ntangaare, Dr Jessica Kaahwa, Dr. Michael Muhumuza, Mr Dan Isiko Kisense, Ms Hamida Namugga and Mr Augustine Bazaale. I also thank my colleague Mr. Mabingo Alfdaniels because whenever he came across an article related to my study, he generously informed me about it. In the same vein, I thank Assoc. Prof. Jill Pribyl for pointing out, and lending me some of the initial books on interculturalism that I read before I started my PhD studies.

I also thank professors Sylvia Nannyonga Tamusuza and Justinian Tamusuza for their support and encouragement when I was setting off for my studies. I am indebted to all members of staff and colleagues at the department; thank you for the physical, moral and spiritual support during the course of my studies, and for keeping our ‘garden watered’ while I was away.

I thank Dr. B. Rukooko, Dean, School of Liberal and Performing Arts Makerere University for his support while I was applying for my PhD studies.

I am grateful to my MPhil supervisor, Prof. Laura Castor, Department of Culture and Literature, Faculty of Humanities, University of Tromsø, for her unwavering support while I was searching for PhD studentships. And to all those who taught me while I was doing my MPhil in Indigenous Studies at University of Tromsø — thank you for introducing me to multidisciplinary studies.

My friends: Ssalango Wamala Kintu, Gregory Tukesiga alias Chief, and Synnøve Angell for the support and encouragement when you learnt that I was going for my PhD studies.

I thank my parents, brothers and sisters for the moral and spiritual support during the course of my studies.

My flat mates Ssentanda Medadi Erisa and Gibson Ncube for the warm environment you provided for me during my stay in Stellenbosch.

I thank all project leaders, coordinators and project participants who participated in this study – without you all, there would have been nothing to write home about.

I thank you all, and may the Good Lord reward you abundantly.

## Abstract

This dissertation investigates and examines the dynamics of intercultural theatre practice. Existing scholarship on interculturalism in theatre praxis regards intercultural theatre as a site for bridging cultures and cross-cultural performance traditions, and for investigating the performance of power between the collaborating parties, learning, cultural imperialism, cultural translation and hybridity, among other features. However, much of the existing literature does not offer a historical perspective allowing one to understand the dynamics of contemporary North-South collaborations. Moreover, most studies do not adequately weave the experiences of the participants in such collaborations into their analyses. This study contributes to filling that research gap.

This research specifically seeks to investigate and examine the dynamics of intercultural theatre collaborations in Uganda, taking Makerere University's Department of Performing Arts and Film's intercultural theatre activities in recent years as case studies. The inquiry was mainly driven by the impetus to explore the North-South intercultural theatre dynamics and to examine the socio-cultural, socio-political, socio-economic features and other notions that were manifested in these intercultural theatre collaborations and performances.

In order to pursue the above line of inquiry I used a multiple case study design by examining three cases: the Stanford-Makerere, New York-Makerere and the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaborations. The multi-case study model was reinforced by the use of personal interviews, direct observation, focus group discussions, document analysis and emails of inquiry in order to solicit the views of individuals who had participated in the above collaborations.

Theoretically, the study is hinged on a multiplicity of concepts and discourses: symbolic interaction, intercultural communication, theatre studies, postcolonial studies, international education and the discourse on globalisation.

In the analysis of the different cases it was discovered that the issue of economic inequality in the contribution towards the funding of the collaborations, among the different modes of power performativity manifested in the collaboration processes, sometimes leads to an imbalance in the decision-making process. Consequently, the power imbalance contributes to

the North-South intercultural theatre collaborations' unending crisis of identification with imperialism.

The study further shows that there are cultural, linguistic, pedagogical, structural and socio-psychological aspects of difference that are negotiated during the course of the collaborations.

It was found that the process of navigating the socio-cultural differences provides the participants with an experiential learning environment of living with/within and appreciating cultural differences, thus providing a bridge across the socio-cultural divide. The cultural bridge in theatrical terms, however, leads to the generation of theatrical hybridity and fusion, which again brings into play the debate on intercultural performance authenticity/inauthenticity in theatre discourse.

Also, based on the view that intercultural theatre collaborations are microcosms of multifaceted global intercultural interactions, it was seen that the socio-cultural differences that are negotiated through the intercultural theatre collaborations can give one a microcosmic platform for critiquing the grand concept of the "global village" and the associated notion of "world cultural homogenisation".

Since this study uses a novel multidisciplinary approach in the analysis of intercultural theatre phenomena, I believe it will contribute to critical theatre studies in Uganda and elsewhere. The findings will also hopefully contribute towards the assessment of intercultural theatre collaborations at Makerere University in order to improve them. The study will also advance the view that intercultural theatre's aesthetic and experiential processes can help in interpreting and understanding our respective multicultural environments. Broadly, it will contribute to the discourse on intercultural communication, performance and cultural studies.

## Opsomming

Hierdie proefskrif ondersoek die dinamika van interkulturele teaterpraktyk. Bestaande navorsing oor interkulturaliteit in die teaterpraktyk beskou interkulturele teater as 'n forum vir die oorbrugging van kultuurgrense en interkulturele opvoeringstradisies, en vir die ondersoek na aangeleenthede soos die uitvoering van mag tussen die deelnemende partye, leer, kulturele imperialisme, kulturele vertaling en hibriditeit. Die bestaande literatuur bied egter grotendeels nie 'n historiese perspektief waaruit die dinamika van kontemporêre Noord-na-Suid-samewerkings verstaan kan word nie. Verder verweef die meeste ondersoeke nie die ervarings van die deelnemers aan sulke samewerkings bevredigend in hul analyses nie. Hierdie ondersoek dra by tot die vul van daardie navorsingsgaping.

Hierdie navorsing poog spesifiek om die dinamika van interkulturele teatersamewerkings in Uganda te ondersoek deur van onlangse interkulturele teateraktiwiteite aan die Departement Uitvoerende Kuns en Film aan die Makerere Universiteit gebruik te maak as gevallestudies. Die beweegrede vir die ondersoek is hoofsaaklik die verkenning van die dinamika van interkulturele Noord-na-Suid-teatersamewerking en 'n ondersoek na die sosio-kulturele, sosio-politiese en sosio-ekonomiese kenmerke en ander opvattinge wat in hierdie interkulturele teatersamewerkings en -opvoerings gemanifesteer het.

Om hierdie ondersoek te onderneem, het ek drie gevalle in 'n meervoudigegevallestudie-ontwerp bestudeer: die samewerkings tussen onderskeidelik Stanford en Makerere, New York en Makerere, en die Norwegian College of Dance en Makerere. Die meervoudigegevalle-ontwerp is versterk deur die gebruik van persoonlike onderhoude, direkte waarneming, fokusgroepgesprekke, dokumentanalise en e-posnavrae in 'n poging om die opvattinge van individue wat aan die bogenoemde samewerkings deelgeneem het, te verkry.

Teoreties is die studie gefundeer in 'n veelvoud konsepte en diskoerse: simboliese interaksie, interkulturele kommunikasie, teaterstudies, postkoloniale studies, internasionale opvoedkunde en die diskoers oor globalisering.

In die analise van die verskillende gevalle is bevind dat die kwessie van ekonomiese ongelikheid in bydraes tot die befondsing van samewerkings, onder die verskillende modusse van magspersoonlikheid wat in die samewerkingsprosesse gemanifesteer het, soms 'n

wanbalans in die besluitnemingsproses tot gevolg het. Gevolglik dra hierdie magswanbalans by tot die nimmereindigende krisis van identifikasie met imperialisme waaronder interkulturele Noord-na-Suid-teatersamewerkings gebuk gaan.

Die ondersoek toon verder dat daar kulturele, linguistiese, pedagogiese, strukturele en sosio-psigologiese verskille is wat oorkom moet word vir suksesvolle samewerkings om plaas te vind.

Daar is bevind dat die hantering van sosio-kulturele verskille die deelnemers van 'n eksperimentele leeromgewing voorsien vir die beleving en waardering van kultuurverskille, waardeur die sosio-kulturele skeiding oorbrug word. Die kulturele brug lei egter, in toneelmatige terme, na die ontwikkeling van toneelmatige hibriditeit en versmelting, wat weer die debat oor die outentisiteit al dan nie van interkulturele opvoerings in die teaterdiskoers aktiveer.

Verder is daar, gebaseer op die siening dat interkulturele teatersamewerkings mikrokosmosse van veelvlakkige globale interkulturele interaksie is, bevind dat die sosio-kulturele verskille wat deur interkulturele teatersamewerkings oorkom word, 'n mikrokosmiese platform kan voorsien vir die kritisering van die begrip van die sogenaamde "wêrelddorpie" en verwante nosies van wêreldwye kulturele homogenisering.

Aangesien hierdie ondersoek 'n nuwe multidisziplinêre benadering tot die analise van interkulturele teaterverskynsels gebruik, glo ek dit sal bydra tot die teaterkritiek in Uganda en elders. Die bevindinge sal hopelik bydra tot die assessering van interkulturele teatersamewerkings aan Makerere Universiteit om hulle te verbeter. Die ondersoek sal ook die siening voortdra dat interkulturele teater se estetiese en ervaringsprosesse kan help met die interpretasie en verstaan van ons onderskeie multikulturele omgewings. Breedweg sal dit bydra tot die diskoers oor interkulturele kommunikasie, opvoering en kultuurstudie.



## Table of Contents

Declaration.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Abstract.....	iv
Opsomming.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	viii
<b>Chapter One: General introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Developing the idea for the thesis and motivation.....	1
1.3 Deriving the research topic from preliminary reading.....	2
1.4 General research design and methodology .....	3
1.5 Problem statement, research hypotheses and objectives.....	4
1.6 Specific objectives of the study .....	5
1.7 Contextualising intercultural theatre in Uganda’s socio-political history .....	5
1.7.1 Introduction .....	5
1.7.2 Contesting African theatre before colonisation.....	6
1.7.3 Precolonial theatre in Uganda .....	9
1.7.4 Uganda’s socio-political milieu during the colonial period.....	13
1.7.5 Uganda’s theatre landscape during the colonial era.....	16
1.7.6 The Makerere Department of Performing Arts and Film in Uganda’s history .....	21
1.8 Outline of the remainder of the thesis.....	23
1.9 Conclusion .....	24
<b>Chapter Two: Literature review/theoretical framework.....</b>	<b>25</b>
2.1 Introduction.....	25
2.2 Definition of key concepts .....	25
2.2.1 Dynamics.....	25
2.2.2 Intercultural theatre .....	25
2.2.3 Symbolic interaction .....	26
2.3 Literature survey .....	26
2.3.1 Reflections on symbolic interaction.....	26
2.3.2 Contextualising culture as symbolic interaction .....	28
2.3.3 Intercultural communication .....	30

2.3.3.1 The philosophy and meaning of intercultural communication .....	30
2.3.3.2. Historical contextualisation of the need for intercultural communication.....	31
2.3.3.3 The development of intercultural communication in the USA .....	33
2.3.3.4 The discourse of power in intercultural communication .....	36
2.3.3.5. Mechanisms for mitigating misunderstanding in intercultural communication .....	38
2.3.3.6. Charting intercultural communication analysis .....	40
2.4 Interculturalism in theatre .....	41
2.4.1 The meaning and characteristics of intercultural theatre/cross-cultural theatre.....	41
2.4.2 Historical perspective on the introduction and usage of the term “intercultural theatre” .....	44
2.4.3 Intercultural theatre and postcolonialism .....	52
2.4.3.1 Intercultural theatre’s crisis of identity with colonialism and imperialism .....	56
2.4.3.2 Other socio-cultural and socio-political reactions in the postcolonial era.....	60
2.5 Conclusion .....	64
<b>Chapter Three: Understanding interculturalism in the era of globalisation .....</b>	<b>65</b>
3.1 Introduction.....	65
3.2 Globalisation: a brief historical perspective .....	65
3.2.1 Origins of the terms ‘globalise’, the ‘global village’ and ‘globalisation’ .....	66
3.2.2 The meanings of the term ‘globalisation’ .....	68
3.3 Understanding cultural globalisation .....	70
3.3.1 Understanding cultural imperialism in the era of globalisation .....	73
3.4 Challenges to the notion of world cultural homogenisation .....	77
3.4.1 Different world feelings, personalities and identities .....	78
3.4.2 Differences in the conceptualisation of global reality .....	80
3.4.3 The concept of time and space in cultural and global studies.....	83
3.4.4 Institutional philosophical differences .....	84
3.4.5 “Othering” through preconceived stereotypes .....	85
3.5 Intercultural education in the global arena.....	86
3.5.1 Contextualising education and interculturalism in the globalising world.....	86
3.5.2 The meanings and implications of global education.....	87
3.5.3 Advantages of intercultural collaborations .....	92
3.5.4 Challenges of intercultural education.....	93

3.6 Recapping the theoretical framework in this study.....	97
3.6.1 Intercultural communication theory .....	97
3.6.2 Postcolonial theory .....	98
3.6.3 Ethnic boundary maintenance .....	98
3.6.4 Critical theory.....	99
3.6.5 Performance theory .....	100
3.6.6 Globalisation theory .....	100
3.7 Conclusion .....	101
<b>Chapter Four: Research design and methodology .....</b>	<b>103</b>
4.1 Introduction.....	103
4.2 Research procedure .....	103
4.3 Research design .....	104
4.3.1 Why I used case study methodology.....	106
4.4 Sample design and sampling methods .....	108
4.4.1 Sampling methods.....	108
4.5 Data collection methods and fieldwork practice.....	109
4.5.1 Personal interviews .....	110
4.5.2 Direct observation .....	111
4.5.3 Focus group discussion .....	113
4.5.4 Document analysis .....	113
4.5.5 E-mails of inquiry .....	115
4.6 Data management and analysis .....	115
4.6.1 Introduction .....	115
4.6.2 Data management.....	115
4.6.3 Transcription of interviews and focus group discussions .....	116
4.6.4 Coding and theming transcripts .....	116
4.6.4.1 Codes and coding.....	116
4.6.4.2 Themes and theming .....	118
4.7 Data analysis .....	118
4.8 Validity and reliability of the study findings .....	120
4.9 Research challenges and how they were mitigated.....	121
4.10 Conclusion .....	123
<b>Chapter Five: The case studies and the nature of intercultural theatre performances</b>	<b>125</b>

5.1 Introduction.....	125
5.2 Introducing the case studies .....	125
5.2.1 The New York-Makerere University collaboration .....	125
5.2.2 The Stanford-Makerere University Collaboration .....	127
5.2.3 The Norwegian College of Dance collaboration.....	128
5.3 Funding the collaborations.....	130
5.4 Nature of the intercultural collaborations .....	134
5.5 The collaborations in a global education perspective .....	136
5.6 Thematic concerns and notions in the Stanford-Makerere and the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration performances.....	143
5.6.1 Thematic and ideological notions in the Stanford-Makerere intercultural performance <i>Beyond My Circle</i> .....	143
5.6.2 The Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere intercultural performance – an introduction .....	143
5.7 Conclusion .....	185
<b>Chapter Six: Benefits of the intercultural theatre collaborations .....</b>	<b>186</b>
6.1 Introduction.....	186
6.2 Advantages of the collaborations.....	186
6.2.1 Learning environment .....	186
6.2.2 Marketing Uganda and her culture.....	193
6.2.3 Status symbol .....	195
6.2.4 Technological transfer and infrastructural improvement and enhancement .....	197
6.2.5 Legitimatising Makerere University’s Department of Performing Arts and Film’s relevancy and existence.....	198
6.2.6 Contributing to institutional social responsibility .....	198
6.3 Conclusion .....	199
<b>Chapter Seven: Challenges of the intercultural collaborations.....</b>	<b>200</b>
7.1 Introduction.....	200
7.2 Inequality of funding and the legitimatisation of the performance of power .....	200
7.3 Navigating the communicative cultural differences .....	218
7.3.1 Differences in dress codes.....	229
7.3.2 Differences in the concept of time and time management .....	230
7.3.3 Feelings of unequal cultural exchange .....	231
7.3.4 Negotiating the pedagogic and corporeal differences .....	238

7.4 Copyright issues.....	263
7.5 Conflicting project time .....	267
7.6 Negotiating with the elements of a new geographical space .....	269
7.7 Revisiting the global issues implied by Makerere University's intercultural collaborations.....	270
7.8 Conclusion .....	277
<b>Chapter Eight: Conclusions and recommendations .....</b>	<b>279</b>
8.1 Introduction.....	279
8.2 Conclusions.....	279
8.3 Recommendations.....	285
<b>List of Works Cited.....</b>	<b>288</b>

## **Chapter One: General introduction**

### **1.1 Introduction**

In this chapter I explain the way I came up with the idea for this study and its motivation. That will be followed by an explanation of how my preliminary reading helped in shaping the title of my dissertation. I shall also give an overview of the research design, methodology and the general thesis outline. I shall give an indication of the thesis problem statement, research hypotheses and an outline of the specific study objectives. I also discuss the pre-colonial and colonial socio-political and cultural milieu in Uganda in order to contextualise historically some of the North-South<sup>1</sup> intercultural dynamics in post-independence Uganda. And I will close with a brief history of Makerere University and its Department of Performing Arts and Film.

### **1.2 Developing the idea for the thesis and motivation**

Since 2007 the Department of Performing Arts and Film, Makerere University in Uganda has been involved in intercultural theatre workshops, which later culminated in joint theatre productions with universities abroad. The most recent collaborations started actively in 2007 with New York University, which then turned into a yearly intercultural encounter. In 2009 Stanford University, USA, engaged in a one-off intercultural theatre collaboration with the Makerere Department of Performing Arts and Film. After ten days of workshops and rehearsals, there was a joint theatre production staged by students of the two universities, first at the Uganda National Theatre, Kampala, and later at the Department of Drama, Stanford University. In 2010 the Norwegian College of Dance also entered into a partnership with Makerere University's Department of Performing Arts and Film. Then in 2011 workshops were held and later joint theatre performances by students of Makerere University and the Norwegian College of Dance were staged.

Since I am a member of the teaching staff in the Department of Performing Arts and Film at Makerere University, I have seen the above intercultural encounters and sometimes passively witnessed and heard about the different opportunities and challenges from both students and

---

<sup>1</sup> North-South in this thesis means the interaction between the industrialised countries in Western Europe and North America for example Norway and USA respectively, with the developing countries in Africa such as Uganda.

teaching staff. However, for the Stanford-Makerere University theatre project I was the Assistant Coordinator and Assistant Artistic Director, and I was actively involved in the process of the workshops and performances both in Uganda and in the USA. I have been in theatre practice for over ten years, and from the time of the Stanford-Makerere project I have experienced first-hand some of the challenges of intercultural theatre collaboration in terms of cross-cultural communication, performance and financing.

Based on my personal experience, and because there has not been a comprehensive study of this kind at the Department of Performing Arts and Film of Makerere University, I thought it was of paramount importance to purposively examine in a comprehensive manner the North-South intercultural theatre dynamics in Uganda, focusing specifically on Makerere University's intercultural collaborations. I believed that such an endeavour would contribute to theatre scholarship not only in Uganda, but also in the rest of the world.

On the theoretical level, issues of globalisation and its impact on the modus operandi of educational institutions also motivated me to carry out this study. It should be noted that nowadays many educational institutions are internationalising their outreach as well as the kind of education they offer to their students in order to equip them with skills suitable for the globalising/globalised world. And in the parlance of globalisation, the internationalisation of education has manifested itself in the resurgence of interest in intercultural theatre collaborations between universities from the West and the rest of the world.

Similarly, I also believed that North-South intercultural theatre collaborations and encounters could offer one a practical platform to critique or even deconstruct the notion of world cultural homogenisation, since some globalisation theorists have argued that the world is becoming culturally homogeneous.

Therefore, this study would hopefully contribute not only to theatre studies, but also to globalisation and intercultural communication studies.

### **1.3 Deriving the research topic from preliminary reading**

When I first thought of undertaking PhD studies, my first research proposal draft was entitled "Challenging or Managing Globalisation? Traditionalism in Indigenous Theatre Groups' Performances in Uganda." In that proposal I wanted to examine whether the continuation of

traditionalism in the local theatre groups' performances in Uganda was a silent revolt against the notion of cultural homogenisation in the globalisation discourse.

In 2007 the Department of Performing Arts and Film of Makerere University was involved in the New York collaboration, and later in 2009 a one-off Stanford-Makerere University collaboration was undertaken. I realised that examining these intercultural collaborations could involve addressing an array of theoretical issues, including globalisation. But at that time I hadn't read widely enough to understand the different theoretical issues that could be explored under the intercultural theatre umbrella.

After being admitted as a doctoral candidate at Stellenbosch University, and during my initial readings in the well-equipped library, I realised that globalisation has many overarching theoretical projections which are manifested not only in economic circles but also in cultural and political spheres. After the initial reading at Stellenbosch University, I revised my draft proposal and came up with two possible titles: "Globalisation and the Theatre Cultural Matrix in Uganda" and "Portraits and Dynamics of Globalisation in Uganda's Collaborative Theatre". With those new titles I still wanted to look at the North-South theatre collaborations, but there was still something missing. With more reading (see literature review) I realised that globalisation was also seriously affecting the educational arena; I further discovered that the intensified internationalisation of education today is a result of educational institutions' bid to give students worldwide relevant education so that students have global mindsets. I further realised that interculturalism in theatre was a postcolonial formulation and that intercultural theatre as a field of inquiry is a manifestation of an assemblage of different theoretical and practical forces, including globalisation. Given that discovery, I again revised my working title to read "Symbolic Interaction and Intercultural Theatre Performance Dynamics in Uganda: The Case of Makerere University's Intercultural Theatre Collaborations", a title I thought would cover the cultural, educational, theatrical and global issues that I had envisaged examining all along.

#### **1.4 General research design and methodology**

This study is a multiple case study and adopts a multidisciplinary research design referring to theatre performance analysis; globalisation theory; socio-political, economic, philosophical, postcolonial theory; and intercultural communication in order to examine the dynamics of



North-South intercultural theatre collaborations that Makerere University has been engaged with in the recent past.

Given the multiple perceptions that are usually projected in intercultural collaborations and intercultural theatre performances, I used what Beck (2000:30-3) calls “a theoretical pluralism”, since any analysis that operates with just a single logic excludes a crucial dimension of culture (cf. Pennycook, 2007:25). McCarthy (a) (1994:18) comments on cultural criticism thus:

Cultural criticism is not the self-sufficient, self-enclosed undertaking as its more textualistically inclined practitioners sometimes make it appear to be ... But they need not to prevent us ... from acknowledging the interdependence of ‘textual’ studies with social and cultural studies of various other sorts. One of the broadest goals of a genuinely multidisciplinary research practice would be a ‘critical theory of the present’.

Similarly, Pavis (1992:1-2) asserts that “confronted with intercultural exchange, contemporary theatre practice – from Artaud to Wilson, from Brook to Barba, from Heiner Müller to Ariane Mnouchkine – goes on the attack: it confronts and examines traditions, styles of performance and cultures which would never have encountered one another”.

Dimitriadis and Weis (2007:323) say that multi-sited ethnography offers a key response to the multi-sited nature of global phenomena. In the same vein, the multiple case and methodological design helped me in charting, comparing, analysing and understanding the dynamics of interacting cultures as they were configured through the different cross-cultural collaborations and theatre performances that the Makerere University Department of Performing Arts and Film has been engaged with in the recent past. In brief, I adopted a discourse-ethnographic approach – an approach that integrates discourse and textual analysis, and light ethnographic methods which included participant observation, individual interviews and focus group discussions in order to undertake a holistic analysis of the North-South intercultural theatre dynamics at Makerere University.

## **1.5 Problem statement, research hypotheses and objectives**

I believe that intercultural theatre collaborations and performances are micro examples of intercultural communication and global interactive cultural encounters. With reference to issues emanating from the intercultural environment like the intercultural theatre performances and the participants’ on- and off-stage intercultural experiences, the question that this study is intended to answer is:

*What dynamics and notions – theatrical, socio-political, cultural or otherwise – have been manifested in the intercultural theatre collaborations and performances that Makerere University has been engaged with in the recent past?*

I explored and investigated the above notions and dynamics through an examination of the intercultural theatre interactions and performances that the Department of Performing Arts and Film, Makerere University has been involved with in the recent past: Stanford University (2009), New York University (2008-) and the Norwegian College of Dance (2011-) projects.

## **1.6 Specific objectives of the study**

- (i) To analyse the nature of some intercultural theatre performances that Makerere University has been engaged with recently.
- (ii) To investigate the socio-political, cultural, economic and/or other notions that may be reflected in the intercultural collaborations and performances that Makerere University has been engaged with.
- (iii) To assess the benefits and challenges of intercultural theatre collaborations.
- (v) To examine the dynamics of intercultural communication in intercultural theatre engagements.
- (v) To examine how the intercultural theatre performances and collaborations at Makerere University can help us to evaluate the phenomenon of globalisation.

However, in order to understand contemporary North-South intercultural dynamics in countries such as Uganda, there is need for some historical perspective. This is in part going to be covered in the following section and some other historical perspectives will be explored in Chapter Two.

## **1.7 Contextualising intercultural theatre in Uganda’s socio-political history**

### **1.7.1 Introduction**

Sections 1.7.2, 1.7.3, 1.7.4 and 1.7.5 were adapted from, and relate closely to Chapter Two – ‘Theoretical Framework and Literature Review’ of a previous study I carried out between 2006 and 2007 for my Master of Philosophy in Indigenous Studies degree from Tromsø

University in Norway. That study was entitled “The Survival and Revival of Indigenous Theatre Art Forms in Uganda: The Case of Kampala District”.

I will proceed by first analysing and deconstructing the view in Western discourse that theatre did not exist in Africa before colonisation. Thereafter I will examine the nature of pre-colonial theatre in Uganda, followed by an account of the sporadic events during the colonial encounter and end by looking briefly at the post-colonial era, specifically focusing on the development of Makerere University and its Department of Performing Arts and Film.

### **1.7.2 Contesting African theatre before colonisation**

Numerous contesting views abound about the existence of African theatre before colonisation. This means that one cannot usefully write about North-South post-colonial intercultural collaborations without first analytically deconstructing writings about the apparent non-existence of African theatre before colonisation.

Therefore, there is a need to explain why most of the early European writers believed that Africa in general and Uganda in particular did not have theatre traditions before colonisation. And if one were to argue that there was no theatre tradition in Uganda before colonisation, this would problematise what is termed “intercultural theatre collaboration” between Makerere University and Universities from the so-called North. This is because there would be nothing “intercultural” to deal with, since the partnering institutions would be working on the same material that was introduced by the West during the colonial period – that is, if we are to bear in mind that interculturalism signifies difference and working with cross-cultural difference.

In line with the contesting views about pre-colonial African theatre, Mbowa (2000:204) says that

for a long time, Western critics held that Uganda and practically all the other African countries had no tradition in theatre before formal scripted theatre performed on the proscenium arch stage was introduced by colonial educators or missionaries. This is a valid remark only if one considers the urban bourgeois theatre forms of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries as the only valid form of theatre.

Kerr (1995:1) believes that implanting words such as “‘drama’, ‘theatre’ and ‘ritual’ which are loaded with meanings derived from European rather than African culture” may have caused a problem, because epistemologically European words have European symbolic

inscriptions guiding the observation, judgement and appreciation of European theatrical phenomena. The guiding inscriptions in those European words may contrast the phenomena being observed and judged in an African context, and the judgement may in the end turn out to be false, given the specificity of the African theatre phenomenon (cf. Horwich, 1997:423; Bauman, 1999:1).

Based on the above comments, one can argue that if varied meanings and contextualisations of a word can occur within the geographical and cultural space of its origin, what about when it is taken to stand for phenomena in another culture altogether? What would be the consequences of importing explicit definitions?

Ehret (2005: 86) introduces the linguistic perspective on understanding a peoples' past by saying that

every language is an archive of many thousands of individual artifacts of the past. These artifacts are the words of the language, hard evidence that can be rigorously placed into a linguistic stratigraphy. Each language contains the full range of vocabulary necessary to express all knowledge, experience, and cultural practice as pursued by the various members of the society using the language.

In line with Ehret, one should note that there are linguistic terms from central and western Uganda such as *amazina* meaning dance or dancing, and *enyimba* and *ebyeshongoro* meaning songs in Luganda and Runyankore respectively, which show us the prevalence of different theatrical forms in Uganda before colonisation. These particular terms have been used by those particular indigenous groups of people since time immemorial. There are also equivalent linguistic terms in other indigenous dialects from Uganda (cf. Kagolobya, 2007).

From Mbowa's (2000) and Kerr's (1995) views it is apparent that those who argue that there was no theatre in Africa tend to examine African theatre through the European paradigmatic lens.

Furthermore, it should be remembered that wherever the colonisers went, they tended to create an impression and discourse implying that they were the founders and initiators of almost everything in the colonised lands by changing place names and names of persons after Christian baptism. Sometimes narratives with a persistent hubristic tone ideally reduced other cultures and the people that practised them to inferior representations – mentally blank inanimate objects in a blank and nameless native universe. This was achieved through the work of missionary churches and through the medium of education. In that form of social-

political order one can argue that theatre, which is one vivid mode of human cultural expression, would not be an exception (Kagolobya, 2007).

However, in support of the existence of performance traditions in Africa before colonisation, Kerr (1995:16, 18) notes that

in 1497 Vasco da Gama was exploring the coast of Mozambique. He landed at a point he called Angra des Bras where he and his men were met by about two hundred Africans with cattle and other gifts. Da Gama recorded in his diary that the Africans ‘began to play on four or five flutes, some high pitched, some low pitched, and in concert, playing in a very pleasing manner for Negroes, from whom music is not to be expected, and they danced as Negroes do. And the captain-major ordered the trumpets to be sounded, and we in the boats fell a-dancing and the captain-major along with us’.

This confirms that performance traditions existed in Africa before colonisation. However, from this excerpt we see a conditioned mind-set of the early Western travellers when Gama characterises Negroes as people “from whom music is not to be expected”. It implies that music or theatre in general was assumed to be beyond Africans’ abilities. At the same time it signposts the superior-inferior relationship between the West and African cultures. It again shows that the non-existence of African theatre seems to have been a belief in the Western mind-set many years before colonial contact. Therefore the belief of Western artistic and cultural superiority took root seriously and influenced the interaction between the two groups during the colonisation period when the cultures met (Kagolobya, 2007).

To many European travellers the events in Africa were the direct opposite of the developments of the Age of Enlightenment in the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century in Europe and America. That period is sometimes referred to as the Age of Reason, and it was marked by the Classical era in music and the new classical period in the arts. In view of this, the Western world was seen as the enlightened and civilised world, while Africa was consequently termed the “Dark Continent” in many Western travelogues – a term, which is analogous to, and reminiscent of, the European “Dark Ages”, which had been characterised by backwardness, dubious traditions, irrationality, superstition, tyranny and lack of contemporary written history and material cultural achievements in general (cf. Kagolobya, 2007; Smith, 1999: 28-29, 36-37).

However, Kerr (1995) rightly says that the European reaction to indigenous performing arts was not one of “monolithic denigration”. He notes that some relatively enlightened travellers and ethnographers such as Delafosse (1916) and Labouret (1928) did appreciate the skills of

African performing arts, even though the appreciation was usually within the parameters of European theatre models (cf. Paul, 1990:9-10; Oliver and Atmore, 1994:76-77).

Writing about African theatre, Kennedy (1973:47) points out that

African Theatre addresses itself to an African way of life, stemming from its own unique traditions; it is addressed to African man, to African themes, to African moods, to African expression. In the beginning there was no need for paid theatre. The theatre went to the people. It was for the people. It was traditional theatre. It took place in the village and in the centres of African life. It was distinctly people oriented. It was a cultural, traditional experience.

Therefore, it can be argued that since African theatre addressed itself to the “African man”, to “African themes”, to “African moods” and “to African expression”, as Kennedy put it, then a foreigner who did not know the context of African theatre and performance would contest its existence and relevance (cf. Soyinka, 1976:37; Traore, 1972:64).

The negative colonial perceptions and negation of the idea of the existence of African theatre discussed in this section may in part explain why Schechner (1982) had to introduce the dialogic concept of intercultural theatre in the early years of African independent states in the 1970s, as we shall see in Chapter Two.

Even though most of the Western travellers negated the existence of African theatre, below are some accounts of what Uganda’s pre-colonial theatre looked like.

### **1.7.3 Precolonial theatre in Uganda**

From time immemorial Uganda has had a theatre comprised of dance, music, storytelling and popular epic performances. Some of the many examples of suitable situations for entertainment were wrestling matches, beer parties, circumcisions, funeral rites, bride price sessions, weddings and royal installation ceremonies (cf. Sempebwa, 1946:25). Mbowa (2000) notes that the traditional epic popular performance involved a communal cultural practice that was highly structured and yet spontaneous; it was open to improvisation and participatory actions. Such performances increased theatrical consciousness amongst the people. Indigenous theatre was performed mainly in the round and the performers were surrounded by the spectators, since there was no separation between the audience and the performers, as occurs on the traditional Western proscenium arch stage. The role of the audience was thus a central aspect in this traditional epic performance and all people present

took part. The artists did not get financial remuneration but social prestige (cf. Kennedy, 1973:47).

Uganda's pre-colonial monarchical system of administration supported and sustained the indigenous performances. Kings' palaces and chiefs' homes were vibrant hubs of Ugandan indigenous theatre. Kaahwa (2004:83), for example, acknowledges pre-colonial theatre activities in Bunyoro Kingdom in western Uganda when she says that

at the Bunyoro royal court, a traditional narrator assumed multiple roles that parallel today's writer, director, or actor, and was indeed a commentator on his own act ... According to Paul Byebandwa (1881-1983), once a player for King Sir Tito Winyi, a public performer was always alert not to be outwitted by the spectators ... To cope up with this task he carried *engalabi* (long drum) and *endingidi* (tube fiddle), which he used to alert the spectators of their rudeness or as transitional signals or reinforcement of the message.

Palace performances were also common in Busoga Kingdom in the East, Ankore Kingdom in the West and Buganda Kingdom in central Uganda.

The contemporary Kampala district, where Makerere University is located, was formerly part of the Buganda Kingdom in Central Uganda. Before colonial intrusion, this was one of the most formidable kingdoms in East Africa (cf. Nzita and Niwampa, 1993:12).

Writing about the craft of music in the pre-colonial Buganda Kingdom, Nannyonga (1995) says that the music of Baganda is called *Kiganda* music and that it can be traced far back in time. Nannyonga observes that the clan system of the Baganda gave the first king Kintu the basis for developing the traditional artistic professionalism in music in Buganda, both secular and sacred.

To add to what Nannyonga (1995) noted above, Sempebwa (1946:25) had earlier observed that

In most cases where music has been played in its fullness in Africa, it has been accompanied by dance. Such occasions as the birth of twins, the new moon, the succession ceremony, wedding feasts, a return of an ex-service man or on any beer party, to mention but a few, are celebrated with dance. Dancing in Buganda starts at the early age of three months, when the mother makes her baby dance on her lap.

Sempebwa goes on to list some of the instruments that were popular among the people in Buganda, for example, *amadinda* (xylophone), *enanga* (bow harp), *entongoli* (bow-lyre), *endingidi* (tube fiddle), *amakondere* (trumpets), *endere* (flute), *ensasi* (gourd rattle), *ensege* (flat basket rattle), *sekitulage* (ground bow) and *engoma* (drum). The foregoing are traditional



musical instrument names (that are still used up to this day), which were not invented at the dawn of colonisation. In this context, if we are to view traditional theatre as cultural praxis, Bauman (1999:96) argues that

each analysis of the phenomenon of culture must, it seems, take account of this universal precondition of all empirically specific praxis. The qualities which make social life possible must be, both logically and historically, pre-social, as linguistic capacity is prior to linguistic competence. Since all cultural praxis consists in imposing a new, artificial order on the natural one, one has to look for the essential culture-generating faculties in the domain of the seminal ordering rules built into the human mind. Since cultural ordering is performed through the activity of signifying – splitting phenomena into classes through marking them – semiotics, the general theory of signs, provides the focus for the study of the general methodology of cultural praxis.

The cultural specifics, markings and classification of traditional theatre practice in pre-colonial Uganda is thus exemplified by the traditional instrument names from Buganda Kingdom which were listed by Sempebwa (1946). My argument here corresponds to Ehret's (2005: 86) observation that languages are archives of peoples' historical cultural artefacts, experience, knowledge and cultural praxis.

Different sets of drums had different uses in Buganda Kingdom. For example, a drum ensemble called *mujaguzo* is one that is sounded on coronation day, at special feasts such as the Kabaka's birthday, and at the death of a member of a royal family. Sempebwa (1946) also notes that the *Lubiri* (name for the King's palace in Buganda) was the place where all kinds of musical instruments were assembled for performance to the Kabaka. Even today, a look at the structure of those instruments shows that they did not imitate Western musical instruments. There were (and still are) local folk songs in the local languages in Buganda and other regions in Uganda and there is no way they could have been introduced by foreigners who were not well versed in the local languages (cf. Kagoloby, 2007).

Roscoe (1911:3, 24-37) in his book *The Baganda: An Account of Their Native Customs and Beliefs* affirms the existence of performance/theatre activities in Uganda before colonisation.

Roscoe (formerly of the Church Missionary Society) tells us in his book's preface that

in this work my aim has been to describe the social and religious life of the Baganda in the old days before their country, Uganda, came under the influence of Europe. None of the Baganda who gave me information about their early institutions knew English ... their minds were uninfluenced by foreign ideas ... I venture to think that Government officials, missionaries, and merchants, may find the record useful in helping them to understand the religious and political questions of to-day, for the past customs and beliefs still, to some extent, influence the present life and thought of the Baganda.



Roscoe (1911) tells us that the people of Buganda had no literature of their own, and that all records of the past had been orally handed down from one generation to the next. However, Roscoe (1911) adds that the Baganda had a compensating advantage afforded by their remarkable system of inheritance. In accordance with this system an heir not only took the office of his predecessor, but impersonated him as well. Bearing the above system in mind, and taking into consideration the remarkably accurate memories of the people, their graphic power to recount the details of events long past, and their conservation in religious ceremonies and social customs, Roscoe (1911) argues that it was possible to obtain from them a fairly accurate account of past ages (cf. Kagolobya, 2007).

Roscoe (1911) further says that dancing among the young people took place nightly amidst the plantain groves during the time when the full moon was imminent, and especially on the night of the full moon, and for dancing and drinking feasts, a long drum was used. Neither the King's wives nor the wives of chiefs were permitted to dance, except amongst themselves. Roscoe (1911:31) says that

the King and some greater chiefs maintained bands which were called Busoga bands. Trumpets or horns from long bottle-gourds were made and covered with skin, and men learned to blow them in such a manner that, with a number of eight or ten, they managed to produce different sounds, and by blowing them at intervals they made up tunes which were not at all unpleasant, though they were somewhat weird. By making instruments in different shapes and sizes they obtained different tones ... The *madinda* was also a favourite instrument in the court of the King and of leading chiefs. It was like the zither in principle.

From the above it is clear that a performance culture was thriving in Uganda before colonisation. Roscoe's perception of traditional theatre in Uganda in some ways echoes da Gama's experience in 1497 on the coast of Mozambique, as noted by Kerr (1995:16, 18). To Roscoe, the tunes from the king's and chiefs' bands seemed "not at all unpleasant". Later Roscoe contradicts his initial appreciation and interpretation by saying "they were somewhat weird". They might have appeared to be weird to Roscoe because he grew up in another musical culture altogether. That is why in describing the *madinda* (xylophone), a popular instrument in the king's and chiefs' courts in pre-colonial Buganda, the zither (a Western instrument) comes to his mind for comparison purposes, thus influencing his perception and judgment of the musical culture artefact at hand (cf. Kagolobya, 2007).

Roscoe (1911) also notes that among the musical instruments of the Baganda, drums must be given the first place. The drum had multiple uses, quite apart from making music; it was the

instrument which announced both joy and sorrow; it was used to let people know of the happy event of the birth of children, and it announced the mourning for the dead. It gave the alarm for war and announced the return of the triumphant warriors who had conquered in the war. It had its place in the most solemn and in the most joyous ceremonies of the nation. The central nature of kingship is also reiterated when Roscoe tells us that the most important drums were the royal ones, called *mujaguzo* a celebrational drum ensemble, as its name traditionally suggests. The drum ensemble numbered ninety-three in all, and the drums were of various sizes. The theatrical aspect of the *mujaguzo* ensemble up until today is that there is jubilation when it is sounded, for example, on coronation day and at special feasts such as the Kabaka's/king's birthday (cf. Sempebwa 1946).

Roscoe's book was published in 1911, when memories about Uganda's pre-colonial theatre were still vivid. Roscoe was a Canon who worked with the Church Missionary Society in Uganda, which he joined in 1891. Roscoe tried to give a balanced account of the indigenous lifestyles, despite the fact that missionaries have been widely castigated for preaching against indigenous means of expression. Roscoe also deviates from other colonial writings, which tried to create the impression that 'the natives had a past, but no historical memory'. The Baganda's inheritance tradition, the musical instruments and the *mujaguzo* drum ensemble that he wrote about are still traceable in Buganda kingdom today (cf. Kagolobya, 2007).

However, one notes from the discussion of Ugandan pre-colonial theatre that the literature is not detailed. Roscoe's (1911) publication is one of the major books that give insights into pre-colonial theatre activities in Uganda, more so in kings' palaces. However, we should remember that the lack of well-documented information about pre-colonial theatre does not mean that there was no Ugandan indigenous theatre. Empirically, many of those traditions can be traced up to the present.

However, the colonial encounter is credited with the introduction of the tradition of writing, which helped to complement the shortcomings of the oral tradition and give future researchers a fully-fledged possibility of looking back into the past.

#### **1.7.4 Uganda's socio-political milieu during the colonial period**

Cook (1934:83) writes about Uganda that

If it be at all true that the interest of a country may be gauged by the amount of literature written about it, then the protectorate of Uganda must rank high among our

African dependencies. The romance of its discovery, its delayed appearance in the geography and history of that continent, the political and even religious struggles which convulsed its evolution in its earlier days, and let me add the remarkable response made by its peoples to Christianity and civilization, all mark it out as possessing exceptional interest and explain the way it has been 'written up'.

Cook here shows the ability of the written word in changing peoples' perceptions of a given phenomenon. McLeod (2000:38) lends support to my argument when he writes that "colonial discourse analysis ... situates texts in history by exposing how historical contexts influence the production of meaning within literary texts, and how literary representations themselves have the power to influence their historical moment". When one reflects on Cook's (1934) writing where he talks about "the political and religious struggles", and "the remarkable response made by its peoples to Christianity and civilisation", the place of the traditional ways of the Ugandan people at that time also comes to mind (Kagolobya, 2007).

However, before we go any further, it is important to first look at the missionary factor in Buganda kingdom, the place where present-day Kampala and Makerere University stand. The missionary factor was central in shaping the cultural (including theatre), educational and political dynamics in colonial Uganda.

Musisi (1999) describes the instructions given to the pioneer missionaries heading to Buganda in 1877. According to Musisi (1999), the missionaries were told to use discretion about whether to coerce Mutesa, the king of Buganda, at the outset to abandon some of the traditional Kiganda customs. The missionaries were encouraged to explain to Mutesa the laws of Christianity and to let him know that the cultural practices were the source of his kingdom's weakness.

However, Musisi (1999) notes that from 1887 to 1892 there were a series of religious wars first between the British and Roman Catholic teachers on one side against the Arab teachers; all of them wanted to control the person of the *kabaka*. Since from Rosceo (1911) we observed that the Kings' palaces were vibrant performance centres, it can be argued that during the periods of conflict, dispossession and deportation of the Ugandan Kings, the social-cultural system in the kingdoms went into disarray and the arts had to partly suffer.

Musisi (1999) argues that after all those political and religious struggles, opposition to traditionalism (indigenous theatre included) as prescribed in letters of instruction, seems to have motivated the missionaries' evangelising project. Missionaries and their converts were

involved in a process of self-identification and definition. During this process, converts had to adopt the Protestant or Catholic practical behavioural ethos, thereby distinguishing themselves from non-believers in belief and practice. The schism between tradition and religion was thus created where by traditionalism symbolised the ungodly and uncouth while religion and its associated behaviour symbolised godliness. It is from this perspective that missionary health centres, practical workshops and schools in Uganda were developed (cf. Kagolobya, 2007).

However, it should be noted that even though there were Islamic teachers in Buganda and Uganda, their teachings in mosques and madrassas were not as widely spread and influential as it was for the Christian missionaries who in one way or another had the British colonial government's support.

Mazrui (1971:58) writes about the influence of the missionaries arguing that

far from missionaries being excluded from operating in Buganda, they became major agents for the creation of a vigorous English-speaking sub-culture. The commitment to the creation of an educated African elite was stronger among missionaries in Buganda than in most parts of east Africa.

The charitable work performed by the missionary health centres, practical workshops, colleges and schools was maintaining a "morally upright" community and winning recruits for the Christian ministry and that was the model for the later pattern for education in many missionary founded schools in Uganda.

It should also be noted that missionaries set up educational institutions in all parts of Uganda, and for a long time the missionaries controlled the education system. This is corroborated by the Uganda protectorate's *Ministry of Education Annual Report* (1930), wherein it is noted that

the missionary societies must be given the sole credit for educational development in the country not only in these early years, but right up till 1924, when as a result of the Phelps- Stokes commission it was realized that it was incumbent upon the government to take a more direct part in the very difficult problems of African education in Uganda ... The main work of these schools was evangelization, but at the same time there were a few selected high and central schools which aimed at giving instruction in English and a secondary course.

Ssekamwa (2000:126) writes about missionary school administration boards saying that

the missionaries filled the boards with themselves and with people who had to support the missionary point of view ... the boards of governors of such very prominent schools as King's College Buddo, Saint Mary's College Kisubi, Namilyango College, Busoga

College Mwiri, Saint Peter's College Tororo, Gayaza High School and all training colleges and technical schools, were all chaired by the bishop of the foundation body ... The missionary strength in overshadowing government influence in education was further demonstrated through the de Bunsen Education committee of 1952.

The Catholic and Protestant missionaries denounced nearly all Ugandan cultural practices and institutions. The cultural institutions and practices like traditional Ugandan theatre performances were categorised as savage and ungodly and not worth retaining. These new beliefs were inculcated into the minds of the Ugandan youths in missionary schools (cf. Kagolobya, 2007).

### **1.7.5 Uganda's theatre landscape during the colonial era**

When it comes to theatre practice in particular, Mbowa (2000:208) tells us that the early missionaries considered traditional ritual performances as immoral, heathen practices and threatened newly converted Christians who attended traditional festivals with excommunication. Particularly the Baganda dance *Ndongo-mbaga*, which was performed at wedding ceremonies, infuriated the missionaries because of its overt sexual suggestiveness in choreography and bodily movements. Elsewhere Mbowa (1994) argued that political repression in Uganda relative to indigenous theatre had its earliest phase during the days of British rule in Uganda, specifically since 1893 when Uganda became a British protectorate and suppressed indigenous performance art practices, which they labelled as uncivilised and pagan (cf. Kagolobya, 2007).

Mbowa (1994) further notes that the colonial administrator Harry Johnson, like the missionaries, opposed the performance of *Ndongo-mbaga*, which he characterised as deeply immoral and remarkably indecent. This attitude inhibited the performance of this dance. This scenario also shows us the relationship between the missionaries' work and that of the colonial administrators, which has sometimes been summarised in colonial history by the phrase noting that 'the flag followed the cross'.

Hiebert (1988:10) introduces a book on his missionary activities in India by saying that

in many ways this book is autobiographical. It is based on long reflection on our years of ministry in India with the Mennonite Brethren Board of Missions and Services, and our many mistakes in that ministry. Unfortunately we cannot relive the past and undo our errors, but we can learn from them, and pass on our understandings to those who follow.

Heibert (1988: 53) expounds on some of the errors committed when he says

missionaries too often have equated the Good News with their own cultural background. This has led them to condemn most native customs and impose their own customs on converts ... conversion often meant a denial of their cultural heritage and social ties. A second danger in equating gospel and culture has been to justify Western imperialism.

Though Heibert was writing about his missionary experience in India, his views which express the power-inflamed and contentious centrality of culture in the West-to-East colonial encounter can partly explain why even missionaries in Uganda denounced and castigated the local cultural theatre practices as Mbowa (1994) indicated (cf. Kagolobya, 2007).

With regard to drama in English, Ntangaare and Breitinger (2000:224) say that

drama in English was introduced to Uganda through the educational institutions, the secondary schools, the teachers' training colleges and Makerere College. 'Scenes from Shakespeare' performed on parents day became a common experience for all Ugandan school graduates. The school and university curricula favoured the reading of English plays, Shakespeare in particular.

To reflect Heibert's (1988) observations, Macpherson (2000:24, 25), a Briton who was extensively involved in the development of literature studies in Uganda, particularly in the formative years of Makerere University, reiterates the impact of the missionary educational system on indigenous theatre practice in Uganda when she writes about her experiences at Makerere University in the 1940s. Macpherson says that

this was a time when young educated men and women ... tended to despise their own languages and culture. In their mission school days they had some times been discouraged from dancing traditional dances as primitive ... And although interested expatriates were examining traditional music and songs, and recording myths and legends, there was a subconscious feeling that such an interest among educated East Africans was beneath their dignity.

This passage illustrates one of the intricate and paradoxical situations during Uganda's colonial era. On the one hand, Ugandan theatrical traditions were devalued and the Ugandan students in missionary schools distanced themselves from their so-called valueless traditions, while on the other hand, some members of the colonial entourage found these traditions to be worthy study material. However, the interest shown by some colonial expatriates signifies the humble beginnings of ethnomusicology and ethno-dance studies that are upheld in theatre departments around the world today. Furthermore, Macpherson's insight about expatriates being interested in recording Ugandan culture points to why, after African states had attained independence, such interested persons and institutions from the West had to develop a

dialogical approach in order to continue dealing with postcolonial African peoples and institutions. This point will be discussed in detail in Chapter Two.

It should be noted that Makerere University started as a vocational school in 1922. Mamdani (2009:1) says that at the beginning the university was not envisaged to be a national university, but “a university for Britain’s East African colonies” (cf. Mazrui, 1971:58). However, later it developed from a technical school into a small-scale residential institution in the post-Second World War period (Mamdani, 2009:1). This will be explored further in section 1.7.6.

The current Literature Department at Makerere University was called the English Department in the 1940s. At this time the teaching of literature courses was mainly dominated by works of the mainstream English tradition. Macpherson (2000:25) tells us about the predominance of the Shakespearean texts in the Ugandan educational system when she writes about the methods of teaching students at Makerere University’s English Department:

if they were taking major English they were required to study a play by Shakespeare in their first year. How better to study it than by learning to act it? ... *Julius Caesar* and *Richard II* were performed out of doors. *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* was the first play to be acted in the Main Hall after the stage lights had been erected, and chairs bought. This was followed by *Coriolanus*, and *Henry IV* ... But Makerere’s young writers had a more Elizabethan reaction: this is great stuff. Let me make it more available for my fellows by putting it into a local setting. Let me use this shape, style, form to communicate what I am thinking about (cf. Ntangaare and Breitingger, 2000:224).

Works from other European, American, Asian and the Caribbean traditions were introduced later after Independence in 1962. The significant development after the attainment of independence was the promotion of African oral literature and creative writing (see School of Languages, Literature and Communication, Makerere University at <http://llc.mak.ac.ug/departments/literature>).

In reaction to colonial activities such as those Macpherson (2000:25) describes above, Mbowa (2000:206), a former teacher at Makerere University’s Department of Performing Arts and Film, argues that “the English colonial education system utilised theatre performance as an effective tool for their ‘civilising mission’” (cf. Ntangaare and Breitingger, 2000:224). Most of the early Ugandan dramatists went through this kind of training at some stage in their education.



Bearing in mind the above views, Kamanyi (1978:6-7, 12) a former student at Makerere University, argues that from the 1930s to the late 1960s expatriate groups performed some plays whose situations were typically Western and therefore perhaps a little difficult to be easily appreciated by Ugandan audiences. With reference to drama in schools, colleges and social welfare centres, Kamanyi (1978:12) says that the “natives had very little to offer in public theatrical presentations because traditional music and dance had always been our form of entertainment in all communities”. Kamanyi’s statement implies that during the colonial days, traditional music and dances were relegated to the periphery in order to bring into the public limelight the British theatrical order. In the same vein, Kamanyi’s statement implies that those who went through colonial schools were made to believe that traditional music and dance were not fit for public performance where elites, school children and college students were in attendance (cf. Macpherson, 2000:24, 25; Kagoloby, 2007). In this case, the education system created a rift between traditional and elite/scientific knowledge systems, and in an economic sense it created a rift between professional and amateur practices. The traditional theatre forms were bundled into the amateurish and non-scientific realm and its practitioners were seen as illiterate while, on the other hand, the mechanics of the proscenium arch stage and the written script represented the professional and scientific paradigms associated with advanced education. This relates to Loomba’s (1998: 25, 31) view that hegemony is power, sometimes achieved through a combination of coercion and consent (cf. Bourdieu’s concept of ‘habitus’ (1977:95)). The use of education as a route for inculcating British cultural ideologies was also representative of the British concept of indirect rule. The British colonial education milieu tends to substantiate Loomba’s (1998:43) argument that “knowledge is not innocent but profoundly connected with the operations of power”. Likewise, Tiffin and Lawson (1994:3) suggest that even though imperial relations may have been established initially by “guns”, they were maintained in their transitive phase largely by “textuality, both institutionally and informally”. The centrality of power is again hinted at both in institutional educational circles and colonial relations. This also clearly implies that colonisation involved the performance of unbalanced and unequal power relations. The presence of power in contemporary intercultural interactions will be explored further in Chapter Two section 2.3.3.4 and elsewhere in this thesis.

Politically, there were also laws enacted by the colonial government in Uganda that had an impact on the Ugandan theatre art forms. The British enacted the Criminal Law Ordinance Act of 1912. This Act ideally meant that any traditional performance – traditional dance,



rituals or rites – constituted witchcraft and a will to indulge in evil. With this law in force, many of the traditional communal festivities were stifled. Furthermore, Ntangaare (2001) says that the Native Arts Act, the African Arts Act, and the Buganda Arts Ordinance all made pronouncements against the “ungodliness” and “obscenity” of African dances and culture, thereby directly or indirectly encouraging the propagation of the more ‘righteous’ theatre conventions of European origin at the expense of the indigenous ones (Ntangaare, 2001:89).

It was also said that building the Ugandan National Theatre was a concrete symbol of British cultural imperialism. For example, Ntangaare (2001: 84) says that the selection of the first manager for the theatre was itself arranged under the jurisdiction of imperial Britain. Ntangaare notes that Maxwell Jackson, a British national, was the first Director of Uganda National Cultural Centre (which houses the National Theatre) in the late 1950s and during this time it appears that no African group was allowed to perform in the theatre (cf. Kagolobya, 2007).

However, Maxwell Jackson tried to involve some African groups at the National Theatre, but his endeavours were thwarted, as noted in *Transition* (1961:21):

Maxwell Jackson arrived in Kampala on the 28th of July 1959. He left the country a few days ago. Two things happened during his period. In the completed building of the National Theatre we saw for the first time imaginative and well-presented African presentations and a higher standard of other amateur productions; and, second, an increasing resentment of Mr. Jackson’s presence here, which at times reached a pitch of almost pathological obsession. This resentment was confined entirely to a section of Uganda’s multifarious communities, and which has been described as acting from ‘ignorance, prejudice or supreme complacency’. It is no secret that this section is largely composed of Europeans.

After the dismissal of Maxwell Jackson, Peter Marsh, the British Council representative at the time, became part-time acting Director until Peter Carpenter was appointed to the post in August 1962. Carpenter remained director till Okot p’Bitek succeeded him in 1967.

Commenting on the establishment of the Uganda National Theatre, Mbowa (2000:205) says that

this concept of commanding a cultural monopoly found its blatant expression in Uganda in the establishment and management of the national theatre ... The appointment of Okot p’Bitek as the first Ugandan director of the Ugandan National Cultural Centre is, therefore, more than a merely symbolic gesture; it signifies a change in paradigm, a change that made Ugandan culture step out of the shadows of colonial cultural marginalization.

Okot p'Bitek was the first Ugandan and African to become Director and Administrator of The Uganda National Cultural Centre (UNCC). He reported for duty as the administrator of the Uganda National Cultural Centre on 1 June 1967, five years after the country's independence on 9 October 1962 (cf. Kagoloby, 2007).

In the above sections I discussed the nature and perspectives of colonial operations in Uganda and their impact on the socio-political, socio-cultural development of Uganda. I believe this background will provide a historical context for understanding the post-colonial North-South intercultural collaborations dynamics in Uganda as discussed later in this thesis.

### **1.7.6 The Makerere Department of Performing Arts and Film in Uganda's history**

As already indicated, Makerere University was founded in 1922 in Kampala, Uganda as a small technical school to train African carpenters, construction workers and mechanics. It was modified two years later with courses to train medical, engineering, agricultural assistants, surveyors and primary school teachers. Its major purpose was to supply support staff for the colonial government and its missionary allies (Sicherman, 2008:13; cf. Mamdani, 2009:1). Some say there was also a latent purpose for Makerere University's existence during the colonial days, namely "controlling education to forestall the dangers of independent thought" (Sicherman, 2001:93-94). Makerere was admitting students from missionary schools in East Africa, and a few students came from as far as Malawi and Zambia.

By the late 1930s the Colonial Office had turned it into a university college. However, further development was thwarted by the Second World War. Nonetheless, in 1950, Makerere rebounded as a university-level institution whose degrees were granted by the University of London. It was one of the British 'Asquith colleges'.<sup>2</sup>

After the attainment of independence in East Africa, Makerere was modified into the University of East Africa offering courses leading to general degrees from the University of London. However, in 1970 the University of East Africa was split into three universities that

---

<sup>2</sup> Sicherman (2001:93-94) says that the name came about following a report issued in 1945 by a commission headed by Lord Cyril Asquith. The commission was responsible for making recommendations for the development of higher education in British colonies. The Asquith commission proposed that colonial colleges like Makerere should be developed in a 'Special Relationship' with the University of London. This arrangement presented a means of guaranteeing world-class quality and ensured continued British influence once the colonies ceased to exist.

is University of Nairobi- Kenya, University of Dar es Salaam - Tanzania and Makerere University in Uganda. That is the same period when Makerere University became a national university of Uganda (Sicherman, 2008).

Makerere University's Department of Performing Arts and Film,<sup>3</sup> which is the focus of this study, started from the English Department. It was established as an independent department in 1971 as a modification of teaching the subject of drama in the English Department, Faculty of Arts. Initially the Department of Music, Dance and Drama (MDD) was established as a result of the resolutions of a conference on African Music held at Makerere University College between December 15 to 17 in 1963 under the leadership of the Department of Extramural Studies of Makerere University and the Ministry of Education (Wasswa, 2007:11-23). The department was formed because there was need to cater for the practical component of drama, which was by then offered in the English Department. There was also a need to preserve the Ugandan performing arts heritage after colonial interference. Furthermore, the Ministry of Education had expressed a need for music teachers in secondary schools, a service they thought the new department could provide. The department was also established to train social and community workers, culture officers, performers for music groups and directors for the theatre movement in Uganda (*ibid.*)

However, at the time of the opening of the Music Dance and Drama Department there were few qualified local teachers. The first staff members consisted of Attah Mensah, a Ghanaian who was recruited from the University of Zambia and was responsible for music. He was also the first departmental head. Holmes, a Briton, was teaching drama and Moses Sserwadda, a Ugandan, was responsible for dance and African music. Other teachers were Dr Horn (drama), Dr Mbabi Katana (music) Dr Anthony Okello (music) and A. Rendle, a London theatre actor and director working with the British Council. These first teachers at the department were supported by other teachers from different departments at Makerere University (Wasswa, 2007). From this, one notes that at its inception the department had a multicultural staff and heritage. Even though the emphasis in the early years was on teaching Ugandan music, dance and folklore, this was coupled with teaching Western music, dance and drama approaches. This is the approach that the department has followed up to this day.

---

<sup>3</sup> The department got this new name in 2011. Before then it had been called the Department of Music, Dance and Drama (MDD).

But apart from the diverse nationalities of its initial staff, information about the department's international relations in the 1970s and 1980s is not readily available. However, in 1996 the MDD department, as it was called then, and Romerike Folkehogskole, Norway entered into collaboration aimed at promoting Norwegian and Ugandan culture. Between November and December 1997 thirty Norwegian students of Romerike Folkehogskole led by their principal Lars Hogset visited the Music, Dance and Drama Department. As a result of this exchange, later in 2000, two students from the department went for a three-month residence at Romerike. Nevertheless, by the year 2001 the collaboration was slowly phased out partly because it was predominantly characterised by North-to-South movement of participants with limited reciprocity from Makerere University (cf. Wasswa, 2007).

Similarly, the University of Bergen, Norway entered into a collaboration with the MDD Department. They launched an ethnomusicology project in Uganda coordinated by Sylvia Nannyonga-Tamusuza in 2003. Through this collaboration seven postgraduate scholarships were offered to Makerere University students and staff to undertake training in ethnomusicology both at masters and PhD level. This collaboration ended in 2011 (cf. Wasswa, 2007). Some of the other collaborations that the department has been engaged in recently are the ones examined in this study.

## **1.8 Outline of the remainder of the thesis**

Chapter Two examines the key concepts used in the study and discusses the literature and some theoretical perspectives related to this study.

Chapter Three continues the literature survey and further develops theoretical issues with a focus on globalisation. It summarises the main theoretical issues generated from the literature survey.

In Chapter Four I discuss the research protocol, research methods used, and why they were used. Data management, analysis, mechanisms for maintaining research validity and reliability, and the research challenges encountered and how they were mitigated are also examined.

In Chapter Five I introduce the case studies, discuss the sources of funding for the collaborations, their organisation, and their connection to the globalisation-driven education

perspective. In this chapter I also discuss the nature and thematic concerns of two intercultural theatre performances.

Chapter Six discusses the benefits of the North-South collaborations.

Chapter Seven covers the discussion on the challenges of the collaborations and ends with an examination of the phenomenon of globalisation based on Makerere University's North-South intercultural theatre experience.

Chapter Eight contains the conclusions generated by the study, and offers some recommendations based on the findings of the study.

## **1.9 Conclusion**

In this chapter I introduced the study, its motivation, design, problem statement and objectives. I also discussed the pre-colonial and the colonial socio-political and cultural milieu in Uganda. The centrality of issues of culture and power in the Ugandan colonial encounter was also hinted at, and I believe this historical information will help in contextualising my argument in the subsequent chapters. I also briefly discussed the history of Makerere University and its Department of Performing Arts and Film.

In the chapter that follows the major focus will be on discussing the concepts, literature and theoretical perspectives related to this study.

## **Chapter Two: Literature review/theoretical framework**

### **2.1 Introduction**

In this chapter I discuss the discourses and theoretical perspectives on which this study is based: symbolic interaction, intercultural communication, intercultural theatre and postcolonialism. My approach towards the analysis of the literature is a kind of analytical historicism, on the one hand, that takes into consideration the multidisciplinary nature of this study, and on the other, it involves my active engagement with the reviewed literature, since I am using discourse, postmodern and critical analyses as concurrent approaches. Commenting on discourse analysis, Loomba (1998:37, 47) argues that

Discourse analysis ... makes it possible to trace connections between the visible and the hidden, the dominant and the marginalised, ideas and institutions. It allows us to see how power works through language, literature, culture and the institutions which regulate our daily lives.

Writing about postmodernism, Pennycook (2006:62), says it is “a way of thinking and doing, a sceptical view of the world that tries to take nothing for granted”. Pennycook (2006:63) refers to Usher and Edwards (1994), who relate postmodernism “more to a state of mind, critical posture and style, a different way of seeing and working, than to a fixed position, however oppositional, or to an unchanging set of critical techniques”.

### **2.2 Definition of key concepts**

#### **2.2.1 Dynamics**

In this study the word “dynamics” has been used to mean “forces at work”, “undercurrents” and the revolving or evolving aspects of interaction in intercultural collaborations.

#### **2.2.2 Intercultural theatre**

In this study the term refers specifically to theatre activities conducted collaboratively between institutions from the so-called “North” with those from the so-called “South”. In this case I will examine the collaborations of the New York University (NYU), Stanford University (SU) and the Norwegian College of Dance (NCD) with Makerere University’s Department of Performing Arts and Film (PAF).

### **2.2.3 Symbolic interaction**

In this study “symbolic interaction” shall be used to mean the figurative or emblematic interaction of individuals, cultural values and theoretical discourses in the execution of intercultural collaborations to generate meaning.

## **2.3 Literature survey**

### **2.3.1 Reflections on symbolic interaction**

Denzin (1992:25) defines symbolic interaction as “the chief means by which human beings are able to form social or joint acts”; symbolic interaction is a convergence of the “self and social interaction”. Denzin (1992:26) looks at the “self” as connected to a person’s identity, and argues that the self is a multifaceted concept which constitutes the inner stream of consciousness of the person in the social situation, while the “interactional self” refers to “the self that is presented and displayed to another in a concrete sequence of action”. Denzin (*ibid.*) further posits that self is also immersed in a linguistic, emotional and symbolic process. If that is the case, then one may wonder how the “self” that is immersed in linguistic, emotional and symbolic processes is presented and projected in the group scenarios of an intercultural nature, such as the North-South intercultural collaborations that Makerere University has been involved with recently.

Commenting on identity, Denzin (1992:26) suggests that “the meanings of identity lie in the interaction process and emerge and shift as persons establish and negotiate the task at hand”. Denzin (1992:27), writing on the topic “communication as culture”, argues that the personal and structural elements are mediated through the process of interpersonal interaction and that this process is connected to the universe of cultural meanings. He further posits that cultural meanings are defined, in part, by systems of ideology and power in a particular social order. This means that in intercultural interaction, there is a symbolic interaction of the personal, structural and cultural elements that are embodied by the interacting parties. This dynamic, we are also told, is influenced by the power and the ideological orientations of the interacting individuals.

Denzin (1992:27-28) seems to imply that human beings do not interact at random. It seems that human interactions are multifaceted and conditioned by interactional structures:

[A]s interactional structures, ensembles are reified, patterned regularities of thought, action, and interpretation. They are often embodied in laws and official codes. They provide the bare outlines of lived experience; they are forms of interaction, whose contents must be filled in by the interactions, intentions, and experiences of interacting individuals ... These collective structures range from ... gatherings and encounters to fused, pledged, and organized groups to complex institutional structures.

From Denzin's (1992) discussion, it is noted from the onset that any form of social interaction between divergent human groups can be viewed as multi-layered and multifaceted, connoting a symbolic and dynamic convergence of many perspectives – cultural, political, interpersonal and ideological. The concept of symbolic interaction as explained by Denzin (1992) becomes relevant in this study because the Department of Performing Arts and Film of Makerere University has been involved in intercultural theatre collaboration with institutions from the North over many years. Hence one may ponder on the social, political and symbolic convergences and dynamics that have occurred through the intercultural theatre collaborations and performances of those collaborating institutions. Examining and attempting to explain those dynamics framed the quest in this study.

Pile (1996:53), on the other hand, says that the term 'symbolic interaction' hinges on the notion that "human behaviour is founded on shared meanings, meanings that are shared through symbolic exchanges of all kinds, where these exchanges are located in space and time." Consequently, he suggests that human behaviour and the meaning of things located in a particular social space are based on the shared meanings which surround them. Similar to Denzin's (1992:27-28) point about "interactional structures", Pile (1996: 53) says that "symbolic interactionism emphasises both the links between symbols of all kinds and the way in which individuals construct, and subsequently maintain, their self-images". The self-images referred to are at the same time symbolic expressions of both the individual and the place within boundaries of the social setting, or what Denzin (1992) calls "interactional structures." In other words, symbolic interaction tends to show that human interaction and communication are facilitated by words, gestures and other symbols that have acquired culturally conventionalised meanings. This implies that there is a need to analyse the culturally informed "interactional structures" in order to understand the dynamics of any form of intercultural collaboration.



### 2.3.2 Contextualising culture as symbolic interaction

The connotations and implications of symbolic interaction reveal it to be a feature of cultural operations, in the light of the concept of ‘culture’ as expounded by many writers, a few of whom are quoted below.

Geertz (1973:250), for example, points out that

A culture is a system of symbols by which man confers significance upon his own experience. Symbol systems, man created, shared, conventional, ordered, and indeed learned, provide human beings with a meaningful framework for orienting themselves to one another, to the world around them and to themselves.

Oyserman and Uskul (2008:145) say that

Culture can be broadly and briefly operationalized as a set of structures and institutions, values, traditions, and ways of engaging with the social and nonsocial world that are transmitted across generations in a certain time and space. Culture is thus temporally and geographically situated and multilevel. It is situated because it takes place in a certain time and space and is dynamically transmitted over time and across place, changing as time and place change. It is multilevel because its influence can be observed in societal-level constructs such as internalized norms, personally felt values, cognitive procedures, and behaviors.

And Rogers and Steinfatt (1999:1) define culture (drawing on the work of Stuart Hall) as

the total communication framework: words, actions, postures, gestures, tones of voice, facial expressions, [handling of] time, space, and materials ... works, plays ... All these things and more are complete communication systems with meanings that can be read correctly only if one is familiar with the behavior in its historical, social and cultural context.

Going by these definitions of culture, as I hinted while discussing the concept of symbolic interaction (see section 2.3.1), it seems that in cross-cultural encounters, cultural symbols and signifiers are part and parcel of the interactive/communication fabric; this is a scenario that can be looked at as interactional cultural engagement, cross-cultural dialogue or cross-cultural performativity.

The above perception is confirmed by Edwards (2007:1), who argues that the understanding of culture today has two dimensions. The first revolves around “notions of art, style and more widely the visual”, while the second means “ways of life – that is precisely what makes any of it ‘social’ – yet understandings of visual culture have tended to reside under the auspices of the arts”. Edwards (2007:2) further says that the emergence of studies of popular culture, media theory and visual analysis following their growing importance throughout the Western

world and beyond in the twentieth century slowly forced these two previously separate meanings to fuse, resulting in what is now commonly recognised as the “turn to culture”. Edwards (*ibid.*) says that the turn to culture is evident in developments in the media, economy, globalisation and language issues. All this shows the centrality of culture in human interactions and human interaction discourses and praxis.

In his paper “Culture, Pluralism and Globalisation” McLean (2005:21) looks at culture as “the combination of values and virtues that mark the life of a people.” McLean (2005:42) goes on to explain the epistemological development of the word “culture” saying that

the term [culture] is derived from the Latin word for tilling or cultivating the land. Cicero and other Latin authors used it for the cultivation of the soul or mind (*cultura animi*), for just as good land, when left without cultivation, will produce only disordered vegetation of little value, so the human spirit will not archive its proper results unless trained and educated. This sense of culture corresponds most closely to the Greek term for education (*paideia*) as the development of character, taste and judgment, and to the German term ‘formation’ (*Bildung*).

From this comment one notes that culture is learnt behaviour, which can also be influenced by the geographical space or “the land where it is cultivated”. Again, the same excerpt indicates the influence of educational structures in informing and reproducing that culture. Such insights can be crucial in the examination of intercultural theatre engagements, since they can be looked at as converging places of different cultural and structural behaviours.

Commenting on the multidimensional concept of ‘culture’, Wallerstein, (1993:31) declares that “culture is probably the broadest concept of all those used in the historical social sciences” because it “embraces a very large range of connotations, and thereby it is the cause perhaps of the most difficulty”. Wallerstein (*ibid.*) goes on to say that one of the elementary building blocks of the social sciences’ view of the world, and which is clearly emphasised by anthropologists, is the belief that even though people may share some traits, there are traits that they don’t share with anybody else. Wallerstein (1993:31) further argues that each individual can be understood to be comprised of different cultural components:

[T]he universal characteristics of the species, the sets of the characteristics that define that person as a member of a series of groups, that person’s idiosyncratic characteristics. When we talk of traits which are not idiosyncratic we often use the term ‘culture’ to describe the collection of such traits, or such behaviours, or of such values, or of such beliefs. In short, in this usage, each ‘group’ has its specific ‘culture’. To be sure, each individual is a member of many groups, and indeed of groups of very different kinds – groups classified by gender, by race, by language, by class, by nationality, etc. therefore each person participates in many ‘cultures’.

In brief, Wallerstein (1993) implies that human interaction is an amalgamation of different cultural forces. This implies that intercultural theatre practice can rightly be examined as some sort of culturally informed symbolic interaction between divergent human groups. The question that needs an answer – and which this study tried to find answers to – is to what extent were the Makerere intercultural theatre collaborations culturally informed by the different groups’ cultural bearings, and what were the dynamics involved in negotiating the cultural differences in order to produce smooth collaborations?

However, in order to investigate the above, I believe it is also paramount to understand the concept of intercultural communication in cultural and sociological discourse, which is discussed below.

### **2.3.3 Intercultural communication**

In this study I viewed intercultural theatre as a practical site of intercultural communication. In the following pages I am going to outline briefly some of the reasons why the field of intercultural communication was initiated in the USA in the 1940s. I believe that this historical understanding will help in exploring the dynamics of Makerere University’s intercultural theatre collaborations.

Looking at the vast range of definitions of the word ‘culture’ which I explored in section 2.3.2, it is evident that different people experience what is termed ‘culture’ differently. For example, Wallerstein (1993:31-32) believes that different peoples of the world have different cultural beliefs, and Asante (2008:47) argues that there are “three broad views of cultural reality: Afrocentric, Eurocentric, and Asiocentric”. Asante (*ibid.*) believes, and argues, that it is self-evident that “the cultural differences we face in the world are rooted in different views of reality”. Intercultural communication seems to have come into play precisely in order to bridge different world perceptions and/or cultures.

#### **2.3.3.1 The philosophy and meaning of intercultural communication**

Bauman (1993:146), for example, points out why we need intercultural communication when he writes about the problems of cross-cultural hermeneutics:

Cognitive (classificatory) clarity is a reflection, an intellectual equivalent of behavioural certainty. They arrive and depart together. How closely they are tied, we learn in a flash when landing in a foreign country, listening to a foreign language,

gazing at foreign conduct. The hermeneutic problems which we then confront offer a first glimpse of the awesome behavioural paralysis which follows the failure of classificatory ability.

Bauman (1993:146) argues that when we are in a foreign country we sometimes fail to decipher and interpret the culturally distinct situations we encounter. That is why cultural difference is sometimes “experienced as annoying ... At worst, it carries a sense of danger.” He adds that because of hermeneutical problems, sometimes there is need for the services of functional cultural mediators. In this case, the mediators are needed to help the “culturally undertrained” visitors because “boundary drawing is never foolproof and some boundary-crossing difficult to avoid ... The grey area is inhabited by unfamiliars; the not-yet classified, or rather classified by criteria similar to ours, but as yet unknown to us” (*ibid.*). Overcoming these fears calls on one’s capacity for intercultural communication.

Asante, Miike and Yin (2008a: i) state that “the field of intercultural communication seeks to understand the process of communicating across cultural boundaries with an aim toward promoting positive relations between different cultures and nations”. Writing about intercultural communication, Robertson (1994:172-173) tells us that:

The growing field of intercultural communication is an analytically neglected concrete site of practical communication between cultures (which while promoting, in a sense institutionalizing, difference and variety may also claim to be in the business of promoting ‘intercultural personalities’). Another area, which overlaps with that of intercultural communication, is that of tourism. International tourism has, from one perspective, been described as a ‘utopia of difference’.

Since intercultural theatre is a meeting site of divergent cultures, I believe an understanding of the above philosophy and meaning of intercultural communication is necessary in order to analyse the dynamics of intercultural theatre.

### **2.3.3.2. Historical contextualisation of the need for intercultural communication**

To understand the circumstances that led to the development of intercultural communication, more so in countries which were colonised, one has to first look at the colonialism and its operations (cf. Chapter One section 1.7.2, 1.7.4 and 1.7.5). Insights from this explanatory recourse will also hopefully assist in furthering our understanding of the dynamics of intercultural theatre.

For example, Shorter (1974:4-5) states that colonial governments used to employ anthropologists to advise them on “native affairs”. He argues that the anthropologists were in

high demand, especially in British colonies where an attempt was made to rule the people indirectly through their own traditional political institutions. Shorter (1974) asserts that although much good work was done by colonial anthropologists, it was often spoiled by a sense of “racial superiority” over the local cultures and peoples. They were also very fond of the word “primitive”, a term which meant “simple”, “pre-technical”, “exotic” or strange in European eyes. That is why McCarthy (1994:86) asserts that “rationality and relativism debates surrounding anthropology have political as well as philosophical roots. Anthropology as a discipline was embedded in colonialism.”

Likewise, Counsell and Wolf (2004:95) say that “the concept of ‘race’ which was used to polarise different peoples was established in the late 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century as a way of classifying individuals on supposedly ‘biological’ grounds. In doing so, it actually functioned ideologically, attributing to other peoples innately inferior qualities of temperament, personality, intellect and so on as justification of European colonization of their lands.” (Cf. Kerr, 1995:16, 18 in section 1.7.2.) Such views about other cultures led to intercultural conflicts between different peoples.

However, in the late 1920s into the 1930s, because of the cultural and political challenges the colonial governments were facing, new approaches towards colonial administration were being debated (Mair, 1933:367). During the same period, new social theories were coming to the fore which called for the proper cultural understanding of, and acquiring cultural knowledge about, the colonies (Mair, 1933:368).

Similarly, Grenfell and Hardy (2007:23-24) argue that before and after the Second World War American sociology was heavily influenced by a search to find an alternative to the controversial revolutionary theories of Marxism. To substantiate that proposition, Grenfell and Hardy (2007:23) point to Talcott Parsons (1949, 1951), who they say “sought a theory to prescribe the healthy, ‘functional’ state of ‘normal’ society, basically expressed in terms of individual and collective cohesion and complementarity”. It is therefore no surprise that continental structuralist philosophy hinged on the “idea that there are comparable generating structures behind diversity” (Grenfell and Hardy, *ibid.*). This was coupled with the cultural relativism perspectives of the 1940s (Mudimbe, 1992: xix).

Equally, McCarthy (1994: 86) says that during the decolonisation struggles after the Second World War there were new interpretive perspectives in ethnography that tried to “enter into

different systems of meaning and understand how the world looked from their [colonised peoples'] points of view". The ethnographic and cultural interpretive motif during this period was more often than not mixed with a metaphor of dialogue. McCarthy (*ibid.*) states that the Western anthropological enterprise involved seriously studying other peoples' cultures in a "kind of virtual conversation of humankind in which the horizons of 'our' form of life were expanded through sympathetically engaging with 'theirs'". McCarthy (1994:86) adds that these views were "associated with the cultural-political motif of recovering and redeeming authentic native traditions, customs, and identities in danger of disappearing precisely through having been discovered and colonized". Similarly, Burawoy (2000:33) notes that "when anticolonial struggles burst around their tents, when ethnography's imperial pillars collapsed, anthropologists rediscovered the global context of their studies". Burawoy (*ibid.*) further states that

Anthropology is now returning to its forebears of the nineteenth century, when European novelists, missionaries, colonial administrators, and sundry travelers painted the lives of 'distant, exotic peoples.' To be sure, today there is every attempt to hear multiple voices and perspectives, to deny difference's claim to superiority, and to recognize the location of the anthropologists relative to their subjects.

These historical insights offered by Mair (1933), Shorter (1974), Grenfell and Hardy (2007), McCarthy (1994), Burawoy (2000) and those discussed in sections 1.7.2, 1.7.4 and 1.7.5 build on, and give some credence to, the socio-political and socio-economic processes that may have led to the development of the field of intercultural communication in the USA in the 1940s. The same views may have later influenced the introduction of interculturalism in theatre theory and practice, as we shall later on see. But first, let us first look at the development of intercultural communication.

### **2.3.3.3 The development of intercultural communication in the USA**

Writing about the history of intercultural communication in the USA, Kumaravadivelu (2008: 212-17) says that intercultural communication was

born from the rubble of World War II when, as the leader of the winning Allied forces, the United States found its international diplomacy, commerce, and trade expand to unprecedented heights. Government officials, diplomats, business leaders, and other Americans sent to work overseas realized that their lack of knowledge of foreigners' cultural practices and communication styles impeded their effective functioning.

Kumaravadivelu (2008) further notes that in order to solve that predicament, the United States Congress passed the Foreign Service Act in 1946, which facilitated the establishment

of the Foreign Service Institute. After its establishment, the Institute hired a team of anthropologists, psychologists and linguists to develop methods and materials for training government officials in intercultural communication. It is noted that it was this team that laid the foundation for the field of intercultural communication and made the field of intercultural communication an American invention.

In particular, Kumaravadivelu (2008) notes that the Foreign Service Institute hired the anthropologist Edward Hall and the linguist George Trager, who picked concepts from their different fields and jointly produced a Foreign Service Institute training manual *The Analysis of Culture*, which was published in 1953. In this manual Hall and Trager presented the modes and dimensions of foreign culture, an understanding of which could guide both verbal and non-verbal communication. Kumaravadivelu (2008) posits that Hall and Trager “believed that since cultures are created and maintained mainly through language, language has an inherent capacity to provide a window into cultures.” Kumaravadivelu (2008) claims that Hall expanded the initial insights presented in the training manual and wrote a book called *The Silent Language* (1959), which became something of canonical founding text in intercultural communication. Kumaravadivelu (2008) quotes Hall (1959) as having declared that “culture is communication and communication is culture”. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that Hall’s definition of culture and his interpretation of intercultural communication continue to characterise the field of intercultural communication even today, as exemplified by Rogers and Steinfatt’s (1999:1) definition of culture quoted in section 2.3.2. However, since it is noted that “culture is communication and communication is culture”, and since culture itself is made up of codes that symbolise the individual and group cultural and structural referents of people located in a particular geographical space and time, then cross-communication between divergent cultural groups becomes a multifaceted symbolic interaction and engagement of cultures. The same applies to intercultural theatre collaborations.

Moon (2008:11), who largely concurs with Kumaravadivelu’s (2008:212-17) and Shuter’s (2008:37) arguments, states the presence of political overtones in academic discourses more explicitly when he outlines some of the aims of his writing by saying that “[t]he task is to highlight a historical moment in the formation of intercultural communication discourse in which particular statements came to be taken as ‘truth’ within the field.”



Moon (2008:11) investigates the era of the work of Edward T. Hall at the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) and shows how during the construction of intercultural communication discourse “certain statements became hegemonic and defining while others did not.”

Moon (2008) states that in order to overcome the training challenges at the Foreign Service Institute, Hall and his associates were compelled to forego an anthropological view of “culture” and to treat “culture” in a pragmatic and goal-oriented manner. Moon (2008:13) argues that this decision set the basis for intercultural communication as a field of inquiry and indicates the connection between Hall’s work and the current aims and interests of intercultural communication research, which I briefly summarise from Moon (*ibid.*) as follows: a comparison of national cultures rather than focus on a single culture; a move from macro analysis, that is culture in general, to microanalysis, that is smaller culture units such as tone of voice, gestures, time and spatial relations; a focus on interaction between members of different cultures; communication as patterned, learned and analysable; use of “real life” intercultural experiences as teaching tools; use of descriptive linguistics; and an expanded audience for intercultural communication training, i.e. international business. These insights can be useful in analysing the communicative dynamics of North-South intercultural theatre collaborations.

However, Moon (2008:15-17) also discusses some discontinuous developments in intercultural communication history when he points out that the year 1980 saw the displacement of the “heterogeneous notion of ‘culture’”. In trying to explain the displacement of ‘culture’ in intercultural communication discourse, Moon (2008:15) notes that the 1970s saw the rise of diffusion studies, which “addressed the diffusion of innovations from one culture to another, particularly so in the *Journal of Communication*.” Moon (2008:15) suggests that the influence of diffusion studies on the field of intercultural communication and discourse was in “moving the locus of communication research from the United States to various cultures in which communication concepts, structures, styles, and functions [were] not similar to our own.” Moon (2008:15) states that the “emphasis on defining ‘culture’ as nation-state is attributed to the international interest created by these diffusion studies,” as well as by the “political and capitalistic interests of the United States” (Moon, 2008:16).

Therefore, could intercultural theatre collaborations also be one way of diffusing or “moving the locus” of intercultural theatre research from the United States or Norway to other areas with dissimilar cultures? (Moon, 2008:15). Moon (2008:16) refers to Dirks, Eley and Ortnor



(1994), who state that “culture may be seen as multiple discourses, occasionally coming together in large systemic configurations, but more often coexisting within dynamic fields of interaction and conflict”. In that case intercultural communication seems to be a symbolic interaction of different practices, contestations and ideologies. And in the same vein, one wonders if it is the same with intercultural theatre.

With reference to the development of diffusion studies, Moon (2008:16) aptly says

this contested nature of ‘culture’ often gets lost in homogenizing views of ‘culture as nationality’ where dominant cultural voices are often the only ones heard, where the ‘preferred’ reading of ‘culture’ is the only reading. This is certainly the case ... of privileged members of the United States and Japan [representing] ‘culture’ for all cultural members.

Moon (2008:17) observes that the repercussions of having dominant cultural voices is that “diverse groups are treated as homogeneous, differences within national boundaries, ethnic groups, genders, and races are obscured, and hegemonic notions of ‘culture’ are presented as ‘shared’ by all cultural members.” This insight from the discourse of intercultural communication will help us in understanding the concept of intercultural theatre and at the same time help us to critique the notion of world culture homogenisation which is being put forward by globalisation theorists.

My exploration of the history of conceptual categories such as intercultural communication (and later on in this discussion I will turn to interculturalism in theatre and globalisation) is crucial and in line with the tenets of discourse analysis and multidisciplinary studies, because this approach clarifies our understanding of the development of concepts in a given discourse and highlights how sometimes national economic and socio-political interests can get entangled in what can easily be taken for granted as ‘innocent’ academic discourse when judged at face value, thereby missing the socio-political dimensions in the analysis. This calls for analytical vigilance and an interrogation of power, while examining social phenomena such as intercultural theatre collaborations.

#### **2.3.3.4 The discourse of power in intercultural communication**

The analysis in the last section showed how the development of intercultural communication as a field in the USA is strongly reminiscent of the discourse of colonial administration in Britain, as discussed by Mair (1933:366-371). It seems to show that as the leader of the victors after the Second World War, the USA wanted to position itself politically and

economically by using intercultural communication as a method of dealing with other nations which had different cultural underpinnings than its own in the 1950s. That way the field of intercultural communication became laced with socio-political and socio-economic objectives, and at the same time it can be seen as a multidisciplinary discourse, which is not immune from the operations of power.

Looking at recent studies on intercultural communication and its intermingled background, it should come as no surprise that there is a growing interest in analysing the power dynamics involved in intercultural encounters, of which intercultural theatre is part and parcel, as I have argued.

Asante *et al.* (2008b:3-4), for example, point to the need to examine the “impact of power on communication equality and mutuality” and “the nature and role of power in communication across cultures.” Asante *et al.* (2008b:4) point out:

Indeed, as propounded by Eurocentric social scientists, the idea of interaction may be the principal instrument for the transubstantiation of privilege and power into accepted reality. It legitimizes the values of a Eurocentric theoretical perspective on human communication and makes it possible for the strengthening of the established power relations by obscuring the power relations as power relations ... The dominated culture legitimizes its own domination by participating in the world view of the dominating culture ... As long as the legitimizing concepts are acceptable to the “illegitimates”, the dominated, then there is no need for the dominating culture to introduce brute reinforcement for the perception and domination of its views, because to do so would be to disturb the accepted balance of power and create an awakening in the “illegitimates” to the true nature of the communication interaction.

From this, it seems that even though European cultural and political power over other cultures was more explicit during colonial times, through the use of the concept ‘intercultural communication’ it becomes somewhat disguised. Additionally, Asante *et al.* (2008b:4) tell us that one of the major

challenges that interculturalists are facing today is to find a way to properly account for complex issues of power and privilege embedded in communication itself because ... intercultural communication as a harmonious endeavor seeks to create the sharing of power.

Similarly, Asante (2008:47) argues that there is a need to examine how power is defined, manifested and used in the interaction process between cultures. Elaborating on the power dynamics in intercultural communication, Asante (2008:48) further says:

I emphasize that intercultural communication at the international or national level is a matter of power. The proper discussion of intercultural communication seems to reside in the examination of power relationships between people. Societies where cultural

differences exist and are the bases for misunderstandings, the central problem is an imbalance of power ... Power relationships dictate so much of what is right, correct, logical and reasonable. The limits are drawn by those who wield the economic, political and cultural power.

Martin and Nakayama (2008:77) concur with Asante (2008:47) when they assert that in recent culture and communication research, there is a new interest in analysing the context of intercultural communication, power, relevance and the destabilising aspects of culture in intercultural communication encounters.

The issue of power is paramount in intercultural interactions and in this study I will analyse power performativity – how power was manifested, mediated and negotiated in intercultural theatre collaborations such as those the Department of Performing Arts and Film of Makerere University has been involved with in the recent past.

### **2.3.3.5. Mechanisms for mitigating misunderstanding in intercultural communication**

In view of the cultural misunderstandings that sometimes mar intercultural encounters, Zegarac and Pennington (2000: 166-67) introduce the concept of “pragmatic transfer” with which they try to explain why intercultural discomfort, misunderstanding and conflict sometimes occur. Zegarac and Pennington (*ibid.*) define pragmatic transfer saying:

The term ‘transfer’ is generally used to refer to the systematic influences of existing knowledge on the acquisition of new knowledge. People usually approach a new problem or situation with an existing mental set: a frame of mind involving an existing disposition to think of a problem or a situation in a particular way. Mental sets are largely determined by culture-specific knowledge. Therefore, communication between individuals from different cultural backgrounds may be influenced by their different mental sets.

Zegarac and Pennington (2000) further argue that individuals from different cultural backgrounds may be unaware of their culturally influenced mental visualisation of the world. Therefore misunderstanding may occur if individuals “carry over culture-specific knowledge from a situation of intracultural communication to a situation of intercultural communication” (cf. Hiebert, 1988:10, 53 in section 1.7.5). Zegarac and Pennington (2000) clarify that “in psychology, the term ‘transfer’ refers to any carryover of knowledge or skills from one problem situation to another.” In the context of intercultural theatre, for example, pragmatic transfer may mean that transferring practical theatrical pedagogical knowledge from the North into the Southern setting without proper dialogue may create intercultural misunderstanding.

From the discussion in section 2.3.3.4 and the above paragraph, it has emerged that even if intercultural communication aims at mitigating misunderstanding in communication between people from different cultures, it is at the same time a process riddled with power and other dynamics, which may be a breeding ground for conflict. How, then, can scenarios of conflict in intercultural communication be mitigated?

Ylanne-McEwen and Coupland (2000:191-92) point out that accommodation theory is both a conceptual resource and a pragmatic resource that can mitigate intercultural communication conflict. They state that the gist of communicative accommodation is that

speakers are motivated to reduce linguistic or communicative differences between themselves and their speaking partners under specifiable circumstances, principally when they want to be approved of and when they want their communication to be effective.

They add that the beginnings of accommodation theory may be found in social psychology, particularly in Howard Giles's (1973) studies of accent variation and accent mobility. The possibilities and efficacy of this theory in practically mitigating misunderstandings in intercultural communication will be tested while analysing the process of intercultural theatre collaborations that Makerere University has been engaged with recently.

In the same vein Holliday, Hyde and Kullman (2010:21), discussing the concept of communication, advise that being sensitive to other peoples' cultural way of life, and knowing how they present themselves and negotiate their cultural identity is crucial before intercultural interaction. This can also mitigate intercultural conflict.

Building on the above argument, Asante *et al.* (2008b:1-8) note that:

As globalisation and localization intensify in every corner of the world, however, the field is increasingly confronted by more fundamental issues of identity, community, and humanity. In effect, intercultural communication is the only way to mitigate identity politics, social disintegration, religious conflicts, and ecological vulnerability in the global village. Human survival and flourishing depends on our ability to communicate successfully across differences.

Therefore, it is worth investigating the way that issues of intercultural misunderstanding, conflict and communication accommodation as manifested in intercultural communication discourse are played out or manifested in intercultural theatre collaborations such as those that Makerere University has been engaged with in the recent past.

However, let us further see what other theorists say about intercultural communication analysis.

### **2.3.3.6. Charting intercultural communication analysis**

In trying to chart intercultural communication analysis, Spencer-Oatey (2000:4-5) first defines culture as “a fuzzy set of attitudes, beliefs, behavioural conventions, and basic assumptions and values that are shared by a group of people, and that influence each member’s behaviour and each member’s interpretations of the ‘meaning’ of other people’s behaviour.” She adds that culture is “manifested at different layers of depth, ranging from inner-core basic assumptions and values, through outer-core attitudes, beliefs and social conventions, to surface-level behavioural manifestations.” In this view, manifestations of culture at differing layers can be charted by looking at a people’s artefacts and products, systems and institutions, beliefs, attitudes and conventions, basic assumptions and values, and rituals and behaviour. This approach can be adapted for the analysis of the dynamics of intercultural theatre.

Martin and Nakayama (2008:79-84) discuss the concept of the dialectics of intercultural communication that may also be useful in discussing and analysing the dynamics of intercultural collaborations. They state that the concept of a dialectic can be traced back to the ancient Greeks and argue that the dialectical approach to culture and communication offers us the “possibility of engaging multiple, but distinct, research paradigms. It offers us the possibility to see the world in multiple ways and to become better prepared to engage in intercultural interaction.” I will sum up Martin and Nakayama’s (2008:82-84) categorisation of cultural dialectics as follows:

- Cultural-individual dialectic, which means that in any interaction there are some aspects of communication that are individual and idiosyncratic, for example, unique non-verbal expressions or language use;
- Personal-social/contextual dialectic, which is a dialectical perspective that emphasises the relationship between personal and contextual communication in intercultural communication encounters;
- Differences-similarities dialectic, which is a dialectic approach that recognises the importance of similarities and differences in understanding intercultural

communication, which is founded on the assumption that there are real and important differences between various cultural groups;

- Static-dynamic dialectic – this dialectic underscores the dynamic nature of culture and cultural practices, but also highlights the human belief that things are constant. This dialectic also offers the binary opposition that could characterise intercultural communication encounters, that is seeing culture as both static and dynamic at the same time;
- Present-future/history-past dialectic, which highlights the importance of history as a factor in understanding contemporary intercultural interaction between social groups and the degree of intergroup anxiety;
- Privilege-disadvantage dialectic, which means that persons display and communicate different kinds of privilege and disadvantage in intercultural encounters. For example, Martin and Nakayama (2008:84) refer to the case when ‘members of wealthy nations travel to less wealthy countries, the intercultural interactions between these two groups will certainly be influenced by their differential in economic power.’ But at the same time they remind us that ‘individuals may be simultaneously privileged and disadvantaged, or privileged in some contexts, and disadvantaged in others.’

Martin and Nakayama (2008:84) conclude their arguments on intercultural dialectics by saying that in everyday intersections, “these dialectics are not discrete, but always operate in relation to each other.” The different levels of intercultural dialectics that they refer to above are in many respects identical to the connotations of symbolic interaction that Denzin (1992) and Pile (1996) highlight. The way that symbolic interaction and intercultural dialectics are performed in intercultural theatre performances remains to be seen in the analysis of Makerere University’s intercultural theatre experience in Chapters Five, Six and Seven of this thesis. But before that, what is intercultural theatre? This concept is going to be examined in the section that follows.

## **2.4 Interculturalism in theatre**

### **2.4.1 The meaning and characteristics of intercultural theatre/cross-cultural theatre**

The literature suggests that the concepts ‘intercultural theatre’ and ‘cross-cultural theatre’ are sometimes used interchangeably.

Lo and Gilbert (2002:31), for example, describe cross-cultural theatre as theatre that

encompasses public performance practices characterized by the conjunction of specific cultural resources at the level of narrative content, performance aesthetics, production processes, and/or reception by an interpretive community. The cultural resources at issue may be material or symbolic, taking the form of particular objects or properties, languages, myths, rituals, embodied techniques, training methods, and visual practices – or what James Brandon calls ‘cultural fragments’. Cross-cultural theatre inevitably entails a process of encounter and negotiation between different cultural sensibilities, although the degree to which this is discernible in any performance event will vary considerably depending on the artistic capital brought to a project as well as the location and working processes involved in its development and execution.

From this conceptualisation of intercultural theatre, pertinent issues emerge related to the phenomenon of interculturalism. It can be inferred that intercultural theatre involves a process of encounter and compromise between different cultural sensibilities and we are informed that intercultural theatre can use cultural resources that are both material and symbolic. However, at the same time we have to note that material things can be symbolic of particular identifiable cultural resources. Bearing in mind the discussion on symbolic interaction in section 2.3.1, one can also infer that intercultural theatre involves the encounter with and negotiation of cross-cultural symbolic interactions, including the compromises entailed.

In trying to further define and classify intercultural theatre, Lo and Gilbert (2002:36) suggest that multicultural theatre is in most cases sponsored by the state postcolonial theatre contests a historical process of imperialism and or even neo-imperialism, while intercultural theatre is characterised as “a voluntarist intervention circumscribed by the agencies of the state and the market”. In my view, in the context of North-South intercultural theatre collaborations, there is almost no difference between postcolonial theatre and ‘voluntarist’ intercultural theatre, particularly in countries such as Uganda, which experienced colonisation (this perspective will be explored in section 2.4.2).

Lo and Gilbert (2002:36-37) note other characteristics of intercultural theatre:

Put simply, intercultural theatre is a hybrid derived from an intentional encounter between cultures and performing traditions. It is primarily a Western-based tradition with a lineage in modernist experimentation through the work of Tairov, Meyerhold, Brecht, Artaud and Grotowski. More recently, intercultural theatre has been associated with the works of Richard Schechner, Peter Brook, Eugenio Barba, Ariane Mnouchkine, Robert Wilson, Tadashi Suzuki and Ong Keng Sen. Even when



intercultural exchanges take place within the “non-West,” they are often mediated through Western culture and/or economics.

The argument presented by Lo and Gilbert that “even when intercultural exchanges take place within the ‘non-West’, they are often mediated through Western culture and/or economics” is a strong one, because it implies that North-South intercultural collaborations involve subtleties of power inequities and imperialist tendencies both in an economic and a cultural sense. Elsewhere, in regard to power, Lo and Gilbert (2002:31) explicitly state that:

Nonetheless, the increasing significance of cross-cultural theatre both within the academy and the performing arts industries in the West demands that this practice be critically situated within a historicized and politicized configuration. What is at stake in such an analysis is an attempt to articulate power relationships in more overt ways and thus to foreground agency as a critical issue.

This point underscores the importance of understanding the history of collaborating groups and maintaining a political point of view when critiquing intercultural collaborations. It again connects the task of analysing the dynamics of intercultural theatre collaboration with power dynamics. In that regard, Asante *et al.* (2008b:3-4) state the importance of examining the “impact of power on communication equality and mutuality” and “the nature and role of power in communication across cultures” as discussed in section 2.3.3. The Makerere University collaborations with Western institutions should give us an analytical window into understanding the power dynamics of such intercultural theatre collaborations.

Writing about the term “interculturalism” in theatre parlance, Pavis (1996:42) gives us a historical perspective by noting that Schechner started using the term in the 1970s as a contrast to internationalism in order to emphasise that the “real exchange of importance to artists was not that among nations, which really suggests official exchanges and artificial kinds of boundaries, but exchange among cultures, something which could be done by individuals or by non-official groupings, and it doesn’t obey national boundaries.”

Intercultural theatre discourse again adapts and converges with the intercultural communication lexicon when Asante *et al.* (2008a: i) say that “the field of intercultural communication seeks to understand the process of communicating across cultural boundaries with an aim toward promoting positive relations between different cultures and nations”; the same view is held by Kumaravadivelu (2008:212-17), who also reflects Schechner’s usage of interculturalism in theatre to indicate an “exchange among cultures”, as noted by Pavis (1996:42).



## **2.4.2 Historical perspective on the introduction and usage of the term “intercultural theatre”**

Putting the different perspectives of intercultural theatre practice aside for a moment, what is clear is that Pavis (1992, 1996), Bharucha (1993, 2000), Schechner (1982), and Lo and Gilbert (2002) all agree that cross-cultural theatre encounters between the West and other cultures are not new. For example, Bharucha (1993:13-41) tries to give some historical background to engagement with theatrical traditions from non-Western cultures in the East by Gordon Craig, Jerzy Grotowski, Antonin Artaud and Peter Brook.

But what becomes evident when one examines the existing discourse on interculturalism in theatre is that the term “intercultural theatre” was not used in cross-cultural theatre engagements before 1970. As Pavis (1996:42) puts it, the term was introduced in the 1970s by Schechner. This is corroborated by Bharucha (1993:13), who asserts that “in fact, it is Schechner who has been largely responsible for the propagation of ‘interculturalism’, both as a concept and a practice, much more so than Craig or Grotowski, who have merely confronted other cultures without systematizing their experiences.”

Therefore, the question that needs an answer at this juncture is: why did Schechner introduce the term ‘interculturalism’ into theatre studies?

The issues which I discussed in Chapter One sections 1.7.2, 1.7.4, and 1.7.5 (cf. 2.3.3.2) concerning colonisation and its perceptions of and impact on the African cultural milieu, and on Uganda’s cultural landscape in particular, give us a hint why Schechner introduced and popularised the concept of intercultural theatre.

However, some writers have argued recently that there have been intercultural theatre practices between the West and other cultures for many decades; for example, Lo and Gilbert (2002:32) say that

although one could argue that all theatre is in a sense cross-cultural in that performance work necessitates the negotiation of cultural differences both temporally (across history) and spatially (across geographical and social categories), what dominates critical and institutional interest in cross-cultural experimentations has been the encounters between the West and “the rest.” This Western fascination with non-Western performing arts has a long history, beginning in the early part of the 20th century and intensifying over the past three decades.

Even though some writers retrospectively call theatre before and during the colonial era “intercultural theatre”, many forget to take into account the sometimes blatantly hubristic, exploitative, racist, explicitly hegemonic and politically unbalanced colonial order characterised by divide-and-rule policies as well as assimilation and acculturation ideologies, as pointed out by Minde (2003). These writers also do not clearly put into context, or take into account, the historical beginnings of the usage of the term ‘interculturalism’ in theatre and its connotations. In order to address this shortcoming, slightly more detailed historical exposition is necessary.

Philips (2005:39) informatively argues that the claim that Africa had no history (or even theatre) because so much of its past was not documented in writing was a colonial creation and a misrepresentation of both history and Africa (cf. Martin 2011:61). In the same regard, Young (2004:19-20) writes about Althusser’s comments on “Hegel’s now notoriously Eurocentric account of history”; Young notes that “Hegel’s description of non-European societies ‘without a history’, was ‘strictly speaking a meaningless expression’”.

According to McCracken (1993:239), studies in African history in British institutions loosely started in the 1940s with “the seminal appointment of Roland Oliver as lecturer on the tribal history of East Africa at the School of Oriental and African Studies in 1948”, which was the period when cultural relativist theories started to emerge in Western cultural and anthropological discourses, as hinted at by Mair (1933). Writing about the 1960s, McCracken (1993:239) further tells us that:

those were the years of travail when Roland Oliver fought almost single handed with the powers of darkness in London’s Senate House only to emerge triumphant with the acknowledgment that African history based on African oral as well as written sources could indeed be accepted as a respectable addition to the syllabus.

McCracken (1993:240) follows up the above by saying that the 1960s were characterised by internationalisation of the British economy and expansion of

British higher education in the wake of the Robbins Report and the not unrelated creation of that network of institutions and agencies which continue to dominate much of the character of African history in British universities today: the launching in 1960 of the *Journal of African History*; the publication in 1961 of the Hayter Report with its still relevant assertion that the ‘political centre of gravity has now moved outwards, east, west and south’.

It should further be noted from the periodisation provided in the above quotation that studies of African history as a field within the discipline of history coincided with the rise of African

nationalist and independence movements. Martin (2011:61, 63) supports my argument by saying that:

as African nationalists swept aside colonial powers in the 1950s, the major U.S. foundations woke up to new conditions – and they responded, eventually, in ways that broke with the formal colonial paradigm ... African nationalist victories would prove critical in opening the space for the elite, academic study of Africa. The rapid pace of decolonization in the late 1950s and early 1960s quickly raised the geostrategic importance of Africa for the U.S., especially given deepening Cold War rivalries.

And finally Martin (2011:64) informs us that “independence in Africa and Asia broke up this club by forcing the issue of how to retain imperial networks and, in turn, how to study colonial subjects who were becoming rulers and citizens of independent states.”

Since the emergence of African history as a field within the discipline of history coincided with the rise of African nationalist and independence movements, in the same vein, one can argue that the emergence of African theatre within the field of theatre and performance studies coincided with the emergence of African independent states.

When one looks critically at Schechner's (1982:19) comment, with cross-reference to Pavis (1996:42), Traore (1972:64), Kerr (1995:16, 18), Macpherson (2000:24, 25), Minde (2003), Philips (2005:39), Ugor (2006:131-2) and Martin (2011:61, 64), one can see why there was a need of intercultural dialogue in theatre and performance practice. This need is made more clear when we revisit McCarthy's (1994: 86) assertion that:

During the decolonization struggles following World War II ... new types of interpretive ethnography came to the fore, whose purpose it was to enter into different systems of meaning and understand how the world looked from their [the colonised peoples'] points of view. The standard metaphor of reading cultural texts for their meaning was often mixed with a metaphor of dialogue to yield an essentially hermeneutic conception of the anthropological enterprise: seriously to study another way of life amounted to a kind of virtual conversation of humankind in which the horizons of 'our' form of life were expanded through sympathetically engaging with 'theirs'.

In regard to theatre studies in particular, Reinelt (2002:202) gives us more historical exposition of the 1950s to 1980s, saying that the field of performance in the 1950s was expanded by the works of anthropologists such as Milton Singer and Victor Turner to include cultural performances such as rituals, sports, dance, political events, and other “performative aspects of everyday life” (*ibid.*). Reinelt (2002:202) argues that linking theatre performances to other forms of cultural performance “enabled a political project of great potential as it developed through the 1970s and 1980s”.

Reinelt (2002:202) adds that the 1970s and 1980s were the period when differences between “high and low culture, primitive and mature, elite and popular” seemed to have been eroded, and a “methodology based on deliberate socio-political analyses of the operations of these performances began to develop in the work of Richard Schechner”. It was also the time when performance theorists started to recognise that cultural differences, geographically specific historical circumstances, race and gender influence the nature of theatre performance (Reinelt, 2002:202). Reinelt (2002:203) states that the widening of the understanding of what constituted performance was accompanied by debates and proposals, especially in the USA, to redefine theatre studies and call it “performance studies”. This, in an intertextual fashion, introduces performance theory as one of the important approaches in the analysis of intercultural theatre.

Writing about performance, Schechner (1988: xiii) states that

performance is an inclusive term. Theater is only one node on a continuum that reaches from the ritualizations of animals (including humans) through performances in everyday life – greetings, displays of emotion, family scenes, professional roles, and so on – through to play, sports, theater, dance, ceremonies, rites, and performances of great magnitude.

Schechner’s interpretation of performance is not far removed from the conceptualisations of symbolic interaction by Pile (1996:53) and Denzin (1992:25-28), on the one hand, it is similar to our understanding of culture as conceived by Geertz (1973:250), Rogers and Steinfatt (1999:1) and Oyserman and Uskul (2008:145) as discussed in sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2.

In a way, Schechner’s (1988) interpretation of performance or even performance theory is that in performance human beings express or perform ritualised acts which are culturally coded or culturally informed. In that sense, intercultural performance becomes a cross-cultural performance where ‘ritualised’ cultural symbols and signifiers are part and parcel of the communication and performance fabric, a scenario that can be looked at as an interactional cultural performance or intercultural performance dialogism.

Similarly, Morris (1995:571) argues that performance theory entered anthropology through the “back door of ritual studies – where life-cycle rites have provided a seemingly ideal venue” in anthropological praxis. (cf. Reinelt, 2002:202). Morris (1995) says that performativity theory addresses the omissions in structuralist explanation, namely the

problems of individual agency, historical change and plurality within systems. In this regard interculturalism in theatre points to the performance of a plurality of signs and systems.

From the above perspectives on performance theory, one notes that intercultural theatre performances become symbolic performances not only of the cultural history of a given people, but also of the socio-political and cultural practices of a given group of people. Therefore, this theory becomes relevant in the examination of the dynamics of intercultural theatre collaborations such as Makerere University's Department of Performing Arts and Film has been engaged with in the recent past.

Elsewhere, Jackson (2004:8) concurs with, and expounds, Reinelt's (2002) historical analysis saying that one of the factors that explains the change of Schechner's theatrical perceptions was his collaboration with "the anthropologist, Victor Turner, who took the study of performance beyond the proscenium stage and into the carnivals, festivals, protests, and other cultural rituals of an intercultural world". Jackson (2004:8) says that this historical period was coupled with

the avant-garde experimentation of the 1960s, the transfer of location and orientation of the *Tulane Drama Review* to New York's TDR, the hiring of an interdisciplinary faculty of anthropologists, folklorists, musicologists, and dance theorists at NYU's Tisch School of the Arts, the Performance Studies name change in 1980, and the hosting of the first meeting of the eventually incorporated Performance Studies International at NYU in 1995.

Similarly, Sullivan and Cottone (2010:357) argue that multiculturalism or even interculturalism developed from the culturally sensitive approach in social anthropology, sociology and intercultural communication that was in vogue in the 1960s and 1970s, because of the growing awareness that people from different cultures experienced and viewed the world or even what is termed "theatre" or "performance" in different ways. If we are to contextualise and use Young's (2004:19) words, this was "that revisionary moment in which intellectuals looked at the West from the outside as a first step in the long process of undoing its [cultural] hegemony." This shows that the 1950s to 1980s was a period of reworking, re-writing and re-mediation of the earlier attitudes and perceptions that Western theorists and practitioners in fields such as anthropology and theatre had towards "other" forms of practices which were non-Western.

Equipped with the above historical background, and the issues raised in Chapter One section 1.7.2 and 1.7.4, the question I posed earlier arises again: why did Schechner introduce the term ‘interculturalism’ into theatre practice?

It is now evident that Schechner introduced the concept of intercultural theatre in order to create an epistemological distance and historical disjuncture between the sometimes debasing and explicitly exploitative cross-cultural theatre encounters between the West and other cultures during the colonial period, and the events and circumstances of the post-colonial era. Or as Martin (2011:64) put it, Schechner wanted to establish “how to retain imperial networks and, in turn, how to study colonial subjects who were becoming rulers and citizens of independent states”. That way, interculturalism in theatre was/is at the intersection of the political-historical dynamics of colonialism and the revisionary or adaptive theoretical and practical circumstances of the postcolonial era. This is why in section 2.4.1 I suggested that in the context of North-South intercultural theatre collaborations there seems to be almost no difference between postcolonial theatre and ‘voluntarist’ intercultural theatre in countries that experienced colonisation. In that regard, to use Bhabha’s (1994:22) words, interculturalism in theatre, like other terms such as multiculturalism, introduces us to “the ‘recognition’ of the relation of politics to theory, and confounds the traditional division between them.”

It also seems plausible that in order to coin his phrase ‘intercultural theatre’, Schechner closely replicated and adapted the meaning and aims of the somewhat “neutral” concept of intercultural communication that was in vogue in the 1970s, as propagated by Hall and his associates in the 1960s and 1970s, an issue that is evident in Pavis’s (1996:42) argument. At the same time, it is also evident that in his invention of the umbrella term and discourse of performance studies, as shown by Jackson (2004:8), which also incorporated intercultural theatre, Schechner imitated the dialogic or “new types of interpretive ethnography” (cf. McCarthy, 1994: 86). All that seems to have been coupled with the synthetic adaptation of the interdisciplinary foundation of intercultural communication scholarship as reported by Kumaravadivelu (2008:212-217) (see section 2.3.3), and the avant-garde theatre experiments of the 1960s, as indicated by Jackson (2004:8).

In other words, Schechner’s conceptualisation of interculturalism in theatre is a sort of rebranding of cross-cultural theatre in order for the field (to use Martin’s (2011: 61) phrase) to break “with the formal colonial paradigm” and fit into the post-colonial scheme of political, linguistic, cultural and anthropological correctness – that is, to configure and adapt

the field to the requirements of post-colonial intercultural communication. Schechner's adaptation of the term 'intercultural' in theatre discourse in this case was a negotiation of political-historical circumstances. This is because the term 'intercultural' in both communication studies and theatre studies tends to connote a sort of dialogical, harmonious and equal partnership in a postcolonial cross-cultural encounter, or as Asante *et al.* (2008b:4) put it: "intercultural communication as a harmonious endeavor seeks to create the sharing of power."

Thus, with the introduction of interculturalism in theatre, Schechner seems to have introduced into theatre theory and practice the postcolonial politics of dialogic imagination in the North-South cross-cultural encounters related to the practice of intercultural communication. In other words, to contextualise Bhabha's (1994:25) words in this discussion, one can argue that intercultural theatre is a dialogical theory and practice that aims at remodelling the North-to-South contradictory and antagonistic instances of colonial cross-cultural encounters so as to open up hybrid sites to minimise the negative polarities between knowledge and its objects, and between theory and practical-political reason in the postcolonial setting. To this end, intercultural theatre practice gets entangled in and/or adapts to the multidisciplinary politics of post-colonialism.

This implies that while examining intercultural theatre collaborations or scholarship, one has to analyse the possibility of attaining absolute "equal partnership" and power sharing in the post-colonial intercultural theatre setting. I am basing the thrust of this analysis on the argument that if interculturalism in theatre was/is a post-colonial enterprise, it has to be analysed bearing in mind the colonial perspectives and practices that it wanted to put "under erasure" (Bhabha, 1994:26) – for example the superior-inferior/subaltern relatedness between the colonial masters and the colonised respectively.

In other words, to use Bhabha's (1994:28) words again, the question to ask in this analytical endeavour is: does the "rationalism and intentionality" that propelled interculturalism in theatre discourse and its "language of symbolic dialogism" exist in its practice in the postcolonial era?

The political-historical foundation of intercultural theatre discourse that I have discussed this far is a good example of what in a theoretical sense I will call inter-discourse mobility and in practical terms as inter-practice mobility. Inter-practice mobility is used to mean the way



practices in a given field may eventually have an effect on practices in other areas of scholarship. One may also view inter-practice mobility as interpracticality – that is, as an antithesis of intertextuality – whereby, given that intertextuality is hinged on literary discourse, interpracticality is concerned with physical and tangible practices. The implication of inter-discourse mobility and inter-practice mobility in intercultural theatre analysis, for example, is that one has to be aware of, or where possible trace such occurrences in, discourses and practices in order to account for, understand and analyse contemporary social phenomena of this kind. In other words, intercultural theatre discourse adapted to, and inserted itself into the history of myriad socio-cultural and socio-political circumstances. And by so doing engaged in dynamic dialogue with other discourses and texts (cf. Jackson, 2004:8). That is why one can argue that all these processes subscribe to Kristeva's (1986) concept of intertextuality. In the same vein, Aragay (2005:19) rightly argues that “specific adaptations need to be approached as acts of discourse partaking of a particular era's cultural and aesthetic needs and pressures”. Aragay (*ibid.*) continues that this approach requires both “historical labor and critical acumen”; that is an analytical negotiation of historical discourse. Based on this, one can again state that Schechner's configuration of the term interculturalism in theatre practice by borrowing from intercultural communication and McCarthy's (1994: 86) “new types of interpretive ethnography”, among other discourses, was itself an act of adaptation and intertextuality (cf. Jackson, 2004:8; Reinelt, 2002:202).

Also, from Aragay's (2005:21) insights one gets an impression, and can at the same time argue that, intertextuality is a key to intercultural theatre discourse intelligibility. To further integrate Aragay's (2005:21) argument into this discussion, a historical analytical approach helps us to understand the intertextual and/or interdisciplinary cross-pollination of both intercultural theatre and performance studies with methods and concepts originating in linguistics, psychoanalysis, sociology, anthropology, history, semiotics, deconstruction, feminism and gender studies, cultural studies, intercultural communication, globalisation, political and postcolonial studies, among others (cf. Jackson, 2004:8). One can argue that it is in part because of this transformative and adaptive inter-discourse mobility and influence that Schechner (2002:1) says that “there is no finality to performance studies, either theoretically or operationally”. This implies that the field of performance studies which incorporated intercultural theatre is literally a symbolic convergence and adaptation of many theoretical and practical perspectives. Moreover, Kristeva (1986:37) conceptualises ‘intertextuality’ by stating that “any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and



transformation of another”. In Bhabha’s (1994:25) terms, my analysis is “a sign that history is happening – within the pages of theory, within the systems and structures we construct to figure the passage of the historical.” Lewandowski (2001:ix) argues that “one of the persistent tasks of contemporary social theory appears to be not to conceive of ways to avoid interpretation but rather to develop an adequate account of interpretation and the kinds of truths that define it”.

I concur with Blommaert’s (2005:13-13) explanation for using a historical perspective in this literature review: “the reason is that concepts, methods, and viewpoints come with a history of use and interpretation, and this history matters.” Blommaert (*ibid.*) cites Darnell (2001) saying that “we must think historically while we think theoretically”. Blommaert (2005:14) elucidates this saying that

the history of concepts sometimes provides us with new opportunities for employing them, stretching them, connecting them to other concepts and methods – opportunities often seemingly impossible when one accepts a synchronic hegemony over the interpretation or ‘allowable use’ of a concept. We can, and should, sometimes take fresh looks at old and dust-covered concepts and approaches, for they often underlie a contingent history of further development often partially realising the original agenda of the approach.

Therefore, before I can analyse Makerere University’s intercultural theatre collaborations, I believe it is necessary first to understand the socio-political and socio-cultural circumstances that informed the beginning of the theatre discourse on interculturalism.

Having traced the multifaceted historical background of interculturalism in theatre, it also becomes plausible to propose multidisciplinary and multi-method analytical approaches as the appropriate tools in intercultural theatre research. The multidisciplinary approach used in this sense, to use Blommaert’s (2005:16) words, may sometimes lead one to “violate all kinds of disciplinary orthodoxies” in order for one to find the “freedom to use whatever can be useful for solving ... analytical [and/or methodological] problems” of interculturalism in theatre, which is at the intersection of myriad discourses.

### **2.4.3 Intercultural theatre and postcolonialism**

In section 2.4.2 above it was indicated that Schechner introduced the term “intercultural theatre” in order to fit cross-cultural theatre endeavours between the West and the formerly colonised people into the post-colonial scheme of things (cf. Dallmayr, 1996: ix). That may

have been the same spirit in which Schechner introduced the umbrella term ‘performance studies’ that later subsumed the concept of intercultural theatre.

Dallmayr (1996: ix) argues that the Western political transformation was insidiously expedited by a “subterranean process: the internal self-questioning or self-decentering of European or Western thought.” This Dallmayr (*ibid.*) says was mirrored in the “decentering” that is evident in “continental philosophy, especially in those intellectual perspectives commonly grouped under such headings as poststructuralism, postmodernism, and deconstruction” or even postcolonialism. This revelation again suggests that interculturalism in theatre was trying to decenter and deconstruct the colonial perspectives that we observed in Chapter One sections 1.7.2, 1.7.4 and 1.7.5.

The literature that has been surveyed this far and its myriad perspectives point to the complexity of finding a theory or theories that would suit the multidimensional nature of this study in particular, and the multidimensional nature of contemporary cultural scholarship in general.

However, postcolonial theory is one of the compound theories with many perspectives on which one can base the theoretical grounding for a study of this nature. Carter (2004:21), for example, believes that one can use postcolonial theory to analyse processes and concepts such as modernity, identity, representation and resistance that characterise many theorisations of culture and difference. To paraphrase Carter (2004:21), one can say that postcolonial theory and analysis reveal subtle lingering referents within cultural scholarship and open up thinking about the material, cultural, ideological and theoretical conditions within which intercultural theatre is produced and enacted. The above argument is in line with Loomba’s (1998:37, 47) reflections on discourse analysis that I noted in the introductory remarks in section 2.1.

Carter (2004) and Morton (2007) indicate that present-day cultural studies inevitably encounter the category of the postcolonial. Even though postcolonial theory has different perspectives, I believe Carter’s (2004:825) explanation aptly articulates the reasons I use postcolonial theory in this study when she says that

postcolonialism’s elastic and loose form allows for an eclectic and interdisciplinary approach, promiscuous even, that Lopez (2001), paraphrasing Foucault, describes as a condition of dispersion, of local kinds of criticisms not reducible to a single position or

school of thought yet efficacious in their interrogation of a range of practices, institutions, and discourses.

The application of postcolonial theory that Carter highlights above is coupled with postcolonialism's deconstructive tendencies that enhance its power as a reading or writing practice. Hence, postcolonialism as deconstructive or oppositional reading/writing practice offers intercultural theatre practice and performance a methodology that facilitates more incisive cultural critiques. That being the case, postcolonial theory also becomes more relevant in multidisciplinary studies, a category to which this study belongs.

Similarly, Krishnaswamy (2002:106), commenting on the "cultural turn" in current academic criticism, asserts that postcolonialism and globalisation "regulate contemporary knowledge production in the humanities and social sciences".

Krishnaswamy (2002:108) discusses the scope of culturalism in postcolonial theory arguing that even though postcolonial theory mostly functions within the "historical legacy of Marxist critique, on which it continues to draw", it at the same time extended its concerns

beyond traditional class categories (proletariat, peasantry) to include women, low castes, and other indigenous minority groups (subalterns), and psychological, semiotic, and ideological analyses were selectively assimilated within the broad parameters of a Marxist critique. As a result, postcolonial theory played a pioneering role in the growing culturalism of contemporary political, social, and historical analysis.

Krishnaswamy (2002:112) adds that scholars take the "culturalist tendency in postcolonial theory as entirely justified, given the nineteenth-century European emphasis on the primacy of culture and the historically critical role played by culture in various anticolonial revolutions in Latin America, Africa, and Asia."

Likewise, my historical approach in the analysis of conceptual categories such as intercultural communication, intercultural theatre and globalisation in order to lay the ground for us to understand contemporary North-South intercultural theatre collaborations falls within the ambit of postcolonial theory. For example, in 1.7.2, 1.7.4 and 1.7.5 we looked at power-inflamed colonial perceptions and their impact on indigenous cultures, with a particular focus on Uganda. In 2.4.2 I argued that Schechner introduced the concept of intercultural theatre in order to do away with biased and politically unbalanced perceptions and the relationship of the Western world towards other cultures, especially those which had been colonised.

To use Quayson's (2000:2) words in discussing the applications of postcolonial theory, intercultural theatre seems to include attempts to "formulate a language and paradigms that try to empower non-Western modes of discourse as a viable means of deconstructing the effects of colonisation on formerly colonised peoples", who in colonial discourse were considered to be subalterns/subjects/subordinates to the colonial order (cf. Sullivan and Cottone, 2010:357; Young, 2004:19 in section 2.4.2). In that perspective, postcolonial scholarship helps one to analyse, interpret and understand contemporary realities in formerly colonised nations. In the context of African theatre, this may involve examining the post-independence theatre paradigms such as the intercultural theatre collaborations that Makerere University has been engaged with in view of the historical processes and the philosophy that inform intercultural scholarship as discussed in 2.4.2.

Today, the icons of indigenous African theatre can be found in the mushrooming ethnomusicology and ethno-dance studies in theatre departments and schools of universities across the globe and at the same time the existence of African theatre is celebrated and recognised through post-independence intercultural theatre collaborations between Western academic institutions and African institutions such as Makerere University. That incidence is itself a practical deconstruction of colonial mentalities and shows the importance of discourse in the process, in this case, of deconstructing the negative perceptions of African theatre and performance.

Reinelt (2002:209-210) comments briefly on Mexican theatre history noting that "traditional theater history recorded Mexican theater's beginnings only in relationship to written texts, thus aligning that history with Spanish conquest". Uganda's theatre history is not different from the Mexican one in regard to the prominence of written scripts as characterising what was termed as theatre during Uganda's colonial era, as discussed in Chapter One (sections 1.7.2, 1.7.4 and 1.7.5). This supremacy of the writing tradition is what Smith (1999: 28-29, 36-37) was referring to when she stated that the traditional meaning of writing was used as "the mark of a superior civilisation and other societies [were] judged, by this view, to be incapable of thinking critically and objectively." That may be the reason why even the term 'literacy', which was "traditionally understood to mean the ability to read and write, in other words, to communicate through print culture", in the postcolonial environment, started to acquire other connotations of an ability to "read, to write, to listen, and to speak" (Reinelt, 2007:7).

Reinelt (*ibid.*) also refers to Pavis's (1982) phrase "languages of the stage" with which Pavis acknowledged that visual, corporeal practices and cultural memories were forms of social communication. In the same vein, Reinelt (2007:7) reminds us of Schechner (2002), who said that "People are increasingly 'body literate,' 'aurally literate,' 'visually literate,' and so on. ... These multiple literacies are 'performatives'". This redefinition and re-conceptualisation of literacy was itself part and parcel of the new socio-political order of including the "other" in the Western forms of naming and knowledge.

Therefore, the inclusion of rites, ceremonies and oral traditions was important in any inventory of what counted as "theater in the Mexican [or Ugandan] context. A postcolonial revision of that theater history [was] possible when 'performance' [was] deliberately defined to extend beyond traditional theatrical genres" (Reinelt, 2002:209-210).

This historical disjuncture in the fluid use of the term "theatre", as we have seen, was part of a postcolonial endeavour of including the formerly excluded theatre histories and practices of "other" cultures and people into Western mainstream theatre discourse. This shows us that the process of branding and naming is itself sometimes a performance of inclusion and exclusion executed by one who wields the economic and/or political power. Therefore, one wonders how this is handled in the postcolonial North-South intercultural collaborations.

Having noted the redefinition of 'literacy', suffice it to say that this period may have affected other areas of the humanities whereby in history studies oral history was also given an academic place and in literature – oral literature also became a recognised branch of study and literary inquiry in the 1970s. These issues show us how historical moments can influence meaning, and the way we perceive particular discourses and concepts. The foregoing also gives us a glimpse of how discourses and certain concepts can influence our perception of the world we live in. This validates Young's (2004: xi) suggestion that "theory really does pay attention to history on occasion". The way I use the term "theatre" in this study is based on my awareness of its fluid use in the post-colonial scheme of things. Nevertheless, I am aware of the continuing debate of its use in this fluid context.

#### **2.4.3.1 Intercultural theatre's crisis of identity with colonialism and imperialism**

Even though interculturalism in theatre was intended to erase the footprints of colonialism on non-Western cultures, it should be noted that right from the moment Schechner introduced

the use of the terms ‘intercultural theatre’ and ‘performance studies’ there were some doubts about the efficacy of these fields in a postcolonial context. Giroux (2005:1) reflects on this saying that

changing historical conditions posit new problems, define different projects, and often demand fresh discourses. In some cases, theories fashioned in one historical moment seem hopelessly out of date, if not irrelevant, in another. Any critical theory both defines and is defined by the problems posed by the contexts it attempts to address.

The questioning of interculturalism in theatre was recorded by Schechner (1982:19) himself:

people didn’t question too much whether or not this interculturalism – this affection for Kathakali exercises, the precision of Noh drama, the simultaneity and intensity of African dance – was a continuation of colonialism, a further exploitation of other cultures. There was something simply celebratory about discovering how diverse the world was, how many performance genres there were, and how we could enrich our own experience by borrowing, stealing, exchanging.

When Schechner states that “people didn’t question too much” one can deduce that there was some level of questioning of interculturalism in theatre, even though it was not too incisive. The questioning and suspicion of colonial exploitation which some people perceived in the interculturalism that Schechner refers to in the above comment is evident in Macpherson’s (2000:24, 25) point that, even though Ugandan students were discouraged from dancing traditional dances because they were viewed as primitive, “interested expatriates were examining traditional music and songs, and recording myths and legends” and later some may have published such works for academic recognition. One is led to believe that it is with this kind of colonial background that Bharucha (1993:1), in discussing the newness of the term interculturalism with respect to the theatre, says:

There is a new ‘ism’ in the theatre today that needs to be strongly questioned. Substituting, however nebulously, the older category of internationalism, interculturalism is opening up new possibilities of relationships between cultures that seem to transcend the specificities of history, race, language and time.

Here Bharucha looks at the new ‘ism’, i.e. interculturalism in theatre, with some mistrust but at the same time, like Schechner (1982:19), recognises its potential to open up new possibilities.

However, one can account for the scepticism with which some people received interculturalism in theatre by considering what Ugor (2006:133) says:

it is significant to note that when discourses ‘reappear’, they do not do so in a static and unchanged mode: they are reinvented anew. But this reinvention still embodies the structural frame of the original ‘discourse’, concealed in new social logics (cf. Casetti 2004:82).

What Ugor implies here is that since interculturalism in theatre was introduced by Schechner as a postcolonial rebranding of the colonial North-South cultural encounters, it could still embody some colonial hegemonic leanings in its postcolonial practice and execution.

In the light of the above, and with particular regard to performance studies, Reinelt (2007:10-11) is more explicit when she says that

in its association with the West, and particularly the U.S., performance studies can appear as one more imperial undertaking emanating from the U.S., designed to colonize local knowledges ... Schechner, for example, has been interested and involved in other cultures for his entire career, especially India and China. Yet, as the patriarchal figure in PS [Performance Studies], he is also an American who appears to appropriate the world and brand it with a U.S. brand: Performance Studies. It is not that this characterization is fair to Schechner – in fact, I do not think it is, but it may be part of the necessary critique of the global politics of scholarship in the early 21st century.

What Reinelt (2007) says in this excerpt becomes more plausible when one examines it in the light of the economic, political and historical circumstances that led to the development of intercultural communication in the USA exemplified by Kumaravadivelu's (2008: 212-17) interpretation in section 2.3.3.1. Similarly, Murphy (2012:49-50) points out that US economic development, which followed a capitalist course, was intensified during its socio-political conflict with the USSR after the Second World War. This eventually led to America's hegemonic status as the sole superpower after the Cold War. The impression created by the above scenarios is that Schechner's Performance Studies was a political or power-laced academic venture in line with the USA's political interests, thus implying that performance studies has a "double inscription of the political objective" (Bhabha, 1994:27).

Equally, Jackson (2004:8) notes a controversial episode in the development of performance studies stating that

another notorious moment in that history occurred at the 1992 meeting of the Association of Theatre in Higher Education where keynote speaker Richard Schechner called for the abolition of theatre departments, for the Kuhnian adoption of a performance studies 'paradigm' shift.

It seems that even though performance studies or even interculturalism in theatre was trying to correct the historically uneven relationship between the North and South, inversely its historical development was emanating from the privileged position of the North – in particular the USA – thus indirectly signifying another attempt at re-appropriating (having been unevenly appropriated before) other cultures through "new" interpretive and dialogical



theoretical discourses. But what is reported by Jackson (2004:8) may have been viewed by some postcolonial theatre scholars as hegemonic intellectually aggressive behaviour that was being shown by Schechner in promoting another USA brand – performance studies. To contextualise Blommaert's (2005:19) point in this argument, this registers how the “‘micro’ instances of social practice” of interculturalism in theatre or performance studies are connected with “‘macro’ levels of social structure and history” of the United States, on the one hand, and colonialism and postcolonialism in general, on the other. In the same vein, the foregoing shows that intercultural theatre is “discourse-as-discursive-practice, i.e. discourse as something which is produced, circulated, distributed, [and] consumed in society” (Blommaert, 2005:29). However, that production, circulation and distribution can more often than not be done by a person who has political and/or economic power. This again implies that power is still central in contemporary execution of intercultural relations, as it was during the colonial era.

Reinelt (2007:9-10) further reveals that at its inception, under Schechner's inspired organisation, Performance Studies International hosted conferences only in the USA. PSI opened up to the outside world in 1999, when it was hosted by the University of Wales in the UK. These developments again imitate the “imperial” development of intercultural communication and diffusion studies, which tried to move the “locus of intercultural communication from the United States to other cultures”, as noted by Moon (2008:15) (see section 2.3.3.1).

Performance studies and intercultural theatre's colonial connection as revealed by Reinelt (2007:10-11) reflect what Bhabha (1994:22) meant when he asserted that sometimes “the theoretical enterprise has to represent the adversarial authority (of power and/or knowledge) which, in a doubly inscribed move, it simultaneously seeks to subvert and replace” (cf. Ugor 2006:133; Casetti 2004:82). The foregoing connotes intercultural theatre's unending “crisis of identification” with the colonial mechanics that it aimed at replacing (Bhabha, 1994:23). This relates to the belief expressed by Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin (1995:2), Childs and Williams (1997:7) and McLeod (2000:7) that postcolonialism is an anticipatory discourse recognising that the condition of ‘post-colonialism’, which it tends to imply does not yet exist, is being worked on to bring it into being.

To this day one must not underestimate the use of the arts and language as multi-pronged political cultural instruments; consider, for example, Britain's Prime Minister David



Cameron's reaction to purported Russian comments noted by Chorley and Chapman (2013) in their *Daily Mail* article. Chorley and Chapman (2013) quote an unnamed Russian official as saying that Britain is a "small island that no one pays any attention to". They also reported that Russia "mocked the UK's size and boasted that oligarchs bought Chelsea" – a British football club. Writing about David Cameron's rebuttal, Chorley and Chapman (2013) say that

the Prime Minister hit back at reports that Russia had dismissed the UK as a 'small island that no one pays any attention to' with not one, but two passionate displays of patriotism. Quoting Shakespeare to hail the achievements of 'this sceptered isle', Mr Cameron added television, the internet and 'the world's language' to his list of the UK's inventions and triumphs ... Mr Cameron said: "We're a country that invented many of the things that are most worthwhile, everything from the industrial revolution and television to the world wide web". "Our music delights and amuses millions. The Beatles, Elgar and slightly less er ... congruously, One Direction have conquered the world" ... He went on: "We have invented most of the sports that the world most likes playing". "If I go on too long about our literature, our art, our philosophy, our contribution including of course the world's language..." He then quoted from Shakespeare's *Richard II*, saying: 'If I start talking about this blessed plot, this sceptered isle, this England, I may have to put it to music so I might have to leave it there.'

Based on the foregoing, one might understand why some people are suspicious of contemporary North-South intercultural theatre collaborations. Moreover, Lo and Gilbert (2002:37, with reference to Pavis's *The Intercultural Reader*, 1996), assert that "there is evidence pointing to interculturalism as a Western vision of exchange". Bharucha (1997:33) asserts that

those of us located in the so-called 'Third World' find that the routes of cultural exchange are already mapped for us, even before we enter them (if of course we are invited to do so in the first place). Invariably, we meet through the patronage of First World economies, which have the necessary capital, infrastructure and technology to "map" the world in the first place.

This implies that the practice of intercultural theatre has continued through the West's perspectives at the expense of the rest. This can sometimes be interpreted as imperial behaviour, thus connecting intercultural theatre practice to neo-colonialism and the operations of economic and political power.

#### **2.4.3.2 Other socio-cultural and socio-political reactions in the postcolonial era**

With regard to issues of postcolonialism and the arts, and the reactions of the people who are affected, Mosequera (2010:48) gives us examples from the artistic environment in Brazil and

highlights the metaphor of ‘anthropophagy’ which Brazilian modernist theoreticians coined in order to

legitimate their critical, selective, and metabolizing appropriation of European artistic tendencies. This notion [anthropophagy] has been used extensively to characterize the paradoxical anti-colonial resistance of Latin American culture through its inclination to copy, as well as to allude to its relation to the hegemonic West.

Mosequera (2010) tells us that ‘anthropophagy’ is informed by Brazil’s colonial history and settlement, transculturation, appropriation, creolisation and “goes beyond Latin America to point to a procedure that is characteristic of subaltern and post-colonial art in general.” To Mosequera (2010:48), anthropophagy is different from Homi K. Bhabha’s notion of ‘mimicry’, because it assumes the voluntary swallowing of the “dominant culture for one’s own benefit”.

However, if one were to say that intercultural theatre involves lopsided transculturation as a by-product, Mosequera (2010:49) notes that “an emphasis on the resistance and affirmation of subaltern subjects is also present in the term ‘transculturation’, which he says was “coined by Fernando Ortiz in 1940 to point out the bilateral exchange implicit in any acculturation”.

Mosequera (2010:49) asserts that

in reality, all cultures are hybrid both in anthropological and ... linguistic-Lacanian terms, due to a lack of unity in their signs. All cultures will feed from each other, be it from situations of domination or subordination, and cultural appropriation is not a passive phenomenon. The receivers always remodel the elements they appropriate according to their own cultural patterns.

Mosquera (2010:49), also argues that cultures may be acquired and appropriated “without an understanding of their place and meaning within the other cultural system, and receive a meaning that is absolutely distinct in the context of the receiving culture”. Mosquera (*ibid.*) indicates that the foregoing scenario can come about because the recipients or cultural appropriators are often interested in the applicability and productivity of the appropriated item and not its original form. Such “incorrections”, Mosquera says, are “usually at the base of the cultural efficacy of appropriation, and frequently constitute a process of originality, understood as a new creation of meaning” (Mosquera, 2010:49).

Mosquera (2010:50) briefly sums up his perspectives about the post-colonial cultural dynamics in Latin America thus:

Anthropophagy, transculturation and, in general, appropriation and resignifying are related to another group of notions that have been proposed to characterize cultural

dynamics in Latin America. These notions have been stereotyped as epitomes for Latin American identity: *mestizaje* (miscegenation), these notions respond to cultural processes taking place in the complexly diverse milieu of Latin America, with its contrasts of all types, its cultural and racial variety, its multiple, coexisting temporalities, its wishy-washy modernities.

Mosquera (2010) discusses crucial concepts which are not only relevant in postcolonial and cultural globalisation discourses, but also intercultural theatre discourse. Issues related to hybridity, acculturation, identity, cultural resignification and alterity, and the need to examine them, still apply to different modes of cultural interaction such as intercultural theatre.

In fact, one of the criticisms levelled against intercultural theatre is that it is a cultural hybrid, an assertion that is reflected in Lo and Gilbert's (2002:36-37) characteristics of intercultural theatre. In the same vein, Pavis (1992:1-5) calls intercultural theatre "the crossroads of cultures in contemporary theatre practice." Pavis (*ibid.*) goes on to say that this theatre at the "crossroads", involves the mingling of foreign cultures, unfamiliar discourses and various artistic effects, which make it difficult to define other than saying that it is a "theatre of culture(s)." Referring to intercultural theatre exchanges as laboratories difficult to comprehend, Pavis (1992:2) also highlights the analytical dilemma which confronts anyone studying intercultural theatre by stating that "in our desire to understand theatre at the crossroads of culture, we certainly risk losing substance, displacing theatre from one world to another, forgetting it along the way, and losing the means of observing all the manoeuvres that accompany such a transfer and appropriation." Pavis (1992:2) further asserts that:

It is no longer enough to describe the relationships between texts (or even performances) to grasp their internal functioning; it is also necessary to understand their inscription within contexts and cultures and to appreciate the cultural production that stems from these unexpected transfers. The term interculturalism, rather than multiculturalism or transculturalism, seems appropriate to the task of grasping the dialectic of exchanges of civilities between cultures.

Similarly, commenting on the dilemma of interculturalism, Bhabha (1994:20) says that cultural diversity always shows indeterminacy and a struggle between alternatives, or what he calls "hybridity", adding that "claims to inherent originality or purity of cultures are untenable." That same view is repeated by Lo and Gilbert (2002:32), who note that Jonathan Dollimore (1991) reminds us that "to cross is not only to traverse, but to mix (as in to cross-breed) and to contradict (as in to cross someone)". Lo and Gilbert (*ibid.*) further state that "one of the most popular manifestations of this generative conception of cross-cultural encounter is the idea of the hybrid (art form, culture, and/or identity)". All the above points

convey some of the dilemmas of interculturalism in theatre that one should bear in mind while appreciating intercultural collaborations – their organisation and execution.

In the light of our understanding of symbolic interaction and culture as discussed in section 2.3.1 and 2.3.2, the discussion in this section means that intercultural theatre is a convergence of cultures and a convergence of discourses, as Pavis (1992:1-5) puts it – not forgetting issues of power and suspicions about the continuation of imperialism in North-South collaborations, and with the possible reactions to such suspicions.

However, it should be noted that using postcolonial theory is sometimes problematic. Some academics and writers who use postcolonial theory have sometimes been castigated as being overtly political. In that sense, finding an ‘objective’ tone of writing when analysing contested multi-perspective intercultural phenomena becomes challenging.

But postcolonial theory allows some form of political discussion and postcolonial theorists like Said (1978:204, 273) acknowledge the political nature of as well as the need for discussing the dynamics of the power relations and politicised representations in the colonial or post-colonial settings:

My contention is that Orientalism is fundamentally a political doctrine willed over the Orient because the Orient was weaker than the West, which elided the Orient’s difference with its weakness ... As a cultural apparatus Orientalism is all aggression, activity, judgment, will-to-truth, and knowledge ... this system ... operates as representations usually do, for a purpose, according to a tendency, in a specific historical, intellectual, and economic setting.

It should also be noted that my discussion in this chapter is connected to critical theory. Edgar and Sedgwick (2008: 72) discuss critical theory saying that it is an Anglo-American umbrella term for a particular brand of textual analysis. However, in this study it is looked at from the perspective of Horkheimer, Adorno, Benjamin and Marcuse of the Frankfurt School, in whose hands, according to Edgar and Sedgwick (*ibid.*), critical theory was seen as a “rigorous critical engagement with social and philosophical issues which aimed at the cross-fertilisation of research methods derived from the social sciences a Marxist theoretical framework of conceptualising social relations.” In other words, critical theory sometimes has undisguised preoccupation with socio-political issues.

At the same I adopt a deconstructive stance in the analysis of concepts such as intercultural theatre, postcolonialism and globalisation. Discussing deconstruction, Edgar and Sedgwick

(2008:88) say that it grew out of structuralism. They point to Derrida's canonical work *De la grammatologie* (1967) in which Derrida enlists the aim of deconstruction to "dismantle the structures of meaning so as to expose the premises on which they are built and to reveal the concepts of objectivity and linguistic autonomy as constructs" (Edgar and Sedgwick, 2008: 72). When one looks at the historical critical analysis in Chapter One (sections 1.7.2, 1.7.4 and 1.7.5) and my analysis of concepts such as culture, intercultural communication, intercultural theatre and globalisation, then my application, and the viability, of discourse analysis, deconstruction and critical theory in this study are evident.

## **2.5 Conclusion**

The multifaceted discussion in this chapter implies that in order to analyse intercultural theatre and performance, there is need to adopt a multidisciplinary and multi-method approach. This also necessitates an understanding of globalisation as it is presented and configured in current cultural/intercultural discourse.

The chapter that follows is going to focus on interculturalism in the era of globalisation.

## **Chapter Three: Understanding interculturalism in the era of globalisation**

### **3.1 Introduction**

In this chapter I intend to investigate the development of the term globalisation, its interpretations and implications in order to help us understand interculturalism in the era of globalisation. However, my major interest in this study is the cultural dimension of globalisation and its relationship to, or convergence with, interculturalism. It should be noted that my pursuit in this chapter is in line with one of the objectives of this study of examining and investigating how intercultural theatre collaborations and performances can help us to understand our culturally globalising world.

### **3.2 Globalisation: a brief historical perspective**

In order to understand the modern passion for globalisation, one has to trace the beginnings of the internet, the source of the term ‘globalise’ and developments in media theory from the 1930s to the 1960s.

Writing about the beginnings of the internet *The Daily Mail* (2012) reported that it had been presaged by a Belgian scientist Paul Otlet in 1934, who suggested combining a telephone connection with a television screen. It is noted that in his treatise on documentation, Otlet said that the working station would no longer be crammed with books but with only a phone and a screen in that a question which would be asked on the phone would be made to appear on screen. Otlet called his vision the “televised book”. Thirty years later Otlet’s vision was put into practice by people like Vinton Cerf, who was at the vanguard of the development of the internet when it was still a US military project in the 1960s. The notion of an internet was put in place “when ARPANET was used to send a message between two computers set up side-by-side at 10.30 PM on October 29, 1969 at UCLA.”

The information from *The Daily Mail* is corroborated by Edgar and Sedgwick (2008:84-85), who discuss cyber-culture and the humble beginnings of the internet, which they also say was an original idea of the American military in the 1960s. Edgar and Sedgwick (2008) further say that the aim of devising the internet was to link many geographically dispersed computers in order to protect the computer system from a nuclear attack. Again Edgar and Sedgwick (*ibid.*), in line with *The Daily Mail* (2012), say that “beyond its military uses, the early

internet was the ARPANET that linked computers of four American universities in 1969.” Edgar and Sedgwick (2008) add that commercial attention and application of the internet dawned in the late 1980s and early 1990s, when Tim Berners-Lee created the necessary software that led to the development of the World Wide Web. With that discovery, the internet developed beyond the confines of government and the educational sphere, and increasingly started to play a fundamental role in “commercial activity, entertainment and many other forms of social interaction” (Edgar and Sedgwick, 2008:85).

Thus with its development and propagation, the internet today has become one of the forms of global electronic mass interconnection, or one of the gadgets fuelling what is today termed globalisation. Needless to say, the intercultural theatre collaborations that Makerere University has been involved with in the recent past have used the internet in one way or another in communication and planning.

### **3.2.1 Origins of the terms ‘globalise’, the ‘global village’ and ‘globalisation’**

Writing about the origin of the word globalisation, Scholte (2000:15-16) states that “when Oliver Reiser and B. Davies coined the verb ‘globalize’ in the 1940s, they took it to mean ‘universalize’ and foresaw a planetary synthesis of cultures in a global humanism.”

Zelinsky (2004:133) asserts that there has always been some form of globalisation, going back to the pre-modern past, which he termed “archaic globalisation” that “appeared in paleolithic times with long-distance transfers of relatively rare types of rock and shell and, possibly, pigments and certain artifacts”. However, he argues that because of the intensity and velocity of the on-going current process of globalisation, our minds are blinded to its existence at various stages in the past.

In consonance with Scholte (2000:15-16), Zelinsky (2004:133) also notes that “Reiser and Davies coined the neologism ‘globalisation’ in 1944”, but adds that the term did not achieve its popularity until the 1980s.

Robertson (1994:8-9) argues that the use of the word globalisation was “much influenced by Marshal McLuhan’s idea of ‘the global village’ introduced in his book *Explorations in Communication* (1960).” He adds that the concept of ‘compression’ and ‘shrinking’ of time and place created by the shared simultaneity of the media, especially television, appears in



McLuhan's book. Based on this, Robertson (*ibid.*) argues that the media have helped to consolidate the idea of the "global community".

Edgar and Sedgwick (2008: 146) concur with Robertson (1994) about Marshal McLuhan's use of the term 'global village' in the early 1960s. But they interpret McLuhan's use of the term 'global village' as denoting

simultaneous internationalisation and formalisation of forms of thought and communication as a consequence of the standardisation of methods of production, presentation, marketing, distribution and branding. In this sense, globalisation is explicitly tied to the realm of economics (Edgar and Sedgwick, 2008: 146).

It should be noted that it is the "standardisation of methods of production" and/or "presentation" of world cultural symbols that is sometimes said to be leading to world cultural homogenisation, according to commentators in the social sciences and cultural studies. However, it is crucial to observe that such standardisation and worldwide distribution can be accomplished by those with political or economic power, and thus globalisation like colonisation and intercultural communication is susceptible to the mechanics of power.

But before we proceed, I think it is apt to reiterate the point made by Bharucha (1993:1) that

there is a new 'ism' in the theatre today that needs to be strongly questioned. Substituting, however nebulously, the older category of internationalism, interculturalism is opening up new possibilities of relationships between cultures that seem to transcend the specificities of history, race, language and time.

The issue of modifying and reconfiguration of concepts (or discourses and practices to fit into contemporary times) that Bharucha refers to is an interesting one. It is almost the same issue that we saw when Schechner introduced "intercultural theatre" and "performance studies", as discussed in section 2.4.2, whereby interculturalism, as Bharucha (1993:1) put it, seemed to replace the "older category internationalism". Likewise, with the rise of globalism, the world seems to be configuring everything to fit into this new concept that is in vogue. It seems evident that globalisation/globalism is substituting all the older categories of 'internationalism', 'universalism', 'cross-culturalism' and 'interculturalism', and all their different connotations – and this makes it a crucial concept in contemporary cultural studies that should not be ignored.



### 3.2.2 The meanings of the term ‘globalisation’

There are various definitions of globalisation. However, a number of academics and theoreticians of the phenomenon of globalisation (e.g. Appadurai, 1996:10; Hirst and Thompson, 1996:48; Beck, 2000:11; Scholte, 2000:15-16; Saurez-Orozco and Quin-Hilliard, 2004:8; Pennycook, 2007:24-25; Mufwene, 2010:31) refer in varying ways to the intensified flows of capital, goods, people, images and discourses around the globe, driven by technological innovations mainly in the field of media and information, and communication technology, resulting in new patterns of global activity, community organisation and culture. However, one could say that cultural and technological migration and diffusion are not tantamount to world cultural homogenisation, because culture means more than symbolic technological and cultural migration. Moreover, communication on the World Wide Web between the world’s populations, which are geographically and culturally divergent, does not amount to world cultural homogenisation, as some writers seem to imply.

Scholte (2000:15-16) aptly asserts:

Disputes and confusion about globalisation often begin around the issue of definition. Some look at it as a stage of capitalism – yet such wholesale rejections are unfair. After all, most key notions in social analysis are frequently used loosely and vaguely. Where are the airtight concepts of ‘class’, ‘culture’, ‘money’, ‘law’, ‘development’, ‘international’?

He outlines the five major strands of globalisation which I have summarised as follows:

- globalisation in terms of internationalisation, which means cross-border relations between countries, interdependence and international exchange;
- globalisation as liberalisation – removing government-imposed restrictions on movement between countries in order to create an open “borderless” world economy;
- globalisation as universalisation – Scholte elaborates on this strand by referring to Oliver Reiser and B. Davies’s usage of the verb ‘globalise’ in the 1940s which, according to Scholte (*ibid.*), they took to mean “universalise in terms of planetary synthesis of cultures in a global humanism”; and lastly,
- globalisation meaning “Westernisation” or “modernisation”, especially in an Americanised form.

In line with Scholte (2000), Saurez-Orozco and Quin-Hilliard (2004:14) say that “while each discipline has generated its own idiosyncratic use of the term globalisation, certain

characteristics seem to converge.” They further note that many scholars who have studied globalisation in the recent years at best characterise it as “a set of processes that tend to de-territorialize important economic, social, and cultural practices from their traditional boundaries in nation-states” (Saurez-Orozco and Quin-Hilliard, 2004:14).

Boudreaux (2008:1-2) claims to offer a more simple definition of globalisation, which I also think is most fitting in the context of intercultural theatre, when he says “globalisation is the advance of human co-operation across national boundaries ... ‘co-operation’ is taken to involve each participating person’s intention to be part of a larger effort”. Boudreaux’s (2008) conceptualisation resonates with Scholte’s (2000:15-16) phrase “cultures in a global humanism.”

Thus it seems that contemporary intercultural encounters cannot be easily disentangled from the multifaceted discourse on intercultural communication and globalisation. This is evident when one looks at the conceptualisation of globalisation by Boudreaux (2008:1-2) as “the advance of human co-operation across national boundaries”, and Featherstone’s (1993:6) interpretation that the “globalisation process ... points to the extension of global cultural interrelatedness ... leading to a global ecumene, defined as a region of persistent culture interaction and exchange”, and also Asante, Miike and Yin’s (2008: i) conceptualisation of the aim of intercultural communication, when they say that “the field of intercultural communication seeks to understand the process of communicating across cultural boundaries with an aim toward promoting positive relations between different cultures and nations”. In the same vein Pavis (1996:42) asserts that when Schechner started using the term interculturalism in the 1970s, he wanted to emphasise that the “real exchange of importance to artists was not that among nations, which really suggests official exchanges and artificial kinds of boundaries, but exchange among cultures, something which could be done by individuals or by non-official groupings, and it doesn’t obey national boundaries.”

However, Bharucha (2000:5) warns that “in addition to the erasure of the ‘national’ in intercultural discourse, it becomes necessary to be extremely vigilant about how the ‘global’ is in a position to hijack the assumedly democratic interactions within the ‘autonomous’ agendas of interculturalism”. And Bharucha’s warning seems to indicate how in this era of globalisation frenzy interculturalism of whichever nature may become blurred by connotations of globalisation of different sorts, and intentions of different kinds. This again

shows why Bharucha (1993:1) expressed his reservations about the new ‘ism’ – interculturalism.

However, it should be noted that my interest is in a particular strand of globalisation, namely cultural globalisation and its connection to interculturalism. But, what is cultural globalisation?

### **3.3 Understanding cultural globalisation**

Writing about cultural globalisation Zelinsky (2004:110) states that

it is startling to realize that, amidst the incredible profusion of scholarly and journalistic print that has materialized around the theme of globalisation in recent decades ... the overwhelming bulk of the literature in question deals with economic matters or information media; only a tiny minority of authors ... have explicitly examined the cultural dimensions of globalisation.

Hopper (2007:1) illustrates cultural globalisation in writing about the award-winning film *The Last King of Scotland*, which he describes as

a film that from its subject matter to its production is perhaps an example of cultural globalisation in action. The film is about the former Ugandan dictator Idi Amin, who was played by a leading American actor (Forest Whitaker), and it was shot in Uganda, internationally financed and distributed, had a British director, contained a cast and crew from numerous countries, and involved a fictional Scottish doctor.

Borrowing from Hopper’s description here, one can argue that in today’s globalising universe intercultural collaborations between Makerere University and universities from the North can equally be considered cultural globalisation phenomena.

Hopper (2007:2) points out that “there are multiple dimensions to globalisation, reflected in its different histories, processes and forms of interconnectedness. As will become clear, such complexity, plurality and multidimensionality are similarly evident when it comes to culture.” It should be noted that cultures cannot be protected from globalisation processes, and that globalisation informs and at the same time disrupts culture. Arguably, it is through culture that we experience globalisation most directly (Hopper, 2007:2).

Hopper (2007:34, 45) also notes that one of the ways of understanding and examining cultural globalisation is by looking at the degree of world interconnectedness. This occurs, for example, in terms of migration, intercultural contact, trade and the movement of ideas or images from one area to another. Having said that, Hopper (2007:164) points to the need for

examining the “political, economic and other sides to globalisation in order to understand better its cultural dimension”

However, Giddens (1990:175-77) argues that cultural globalisation is “more than a diffusion of Western institutions across the world, in which other cultures are crushed”. Giddens’s view is reminiscent of Moon’s (2008:15), who wrote about the rise of diffusion studies that “addressed the diffusion of innovations from one culture to another.” At the same time, the foregoing points remind us of Mair (1933:368), who wrote about the practice of social anthropology in the 1930s, which was anxious about problems that would emerge from the contact of two cultures in cases where one was more powerful than the other. This reflects cultural imperialism and shows how economic and political power can influence intercultural encounters. This in part also reflects the postcolonial concerns discussed in section 2.4.3. The question that this study in part seeks to answer is: Taking Makerere University’s intercultural theatre collaborations as case studies, does this kind of power-induced “diffusion” of Western innovations and “crushing of other cultures” occur in the intercultural theatre collaborations in Uganda?

Appadurai (1993:295) argues that “the central problem of today’s global interaction is the tension between cultural homogenisation and cultural heterogenisation.” Appadurai (1993:295) proceeds by saying that “the homogenisation argument subspecies into either an argument about Americanisation, or an argument about ‘commoditisation’, and very often the two arguments are closely linked”. However, Appadurai (*ibid.*) states that what these arguments fail to recognise is that in the societies where these new forces go, they “tend to become indigenised in one or other way.” Appadurai (1993:295) and Androutsopoulos (2010:204) imply that the assumption that globalisation and/or even intercultural theatre can lead to world cultural homogenisation is somewhat fallacious, since the receiving group tends to localise the received cultural artefacts.

With reference to theatre in particular, Haus (1995:71) argues that

the easily assumed universality of theatre as an art form and medium is to be reconsidered, always with its cultural determinants taken into account and in the perspective of such oppositions as the centre and the periphery, global and local, conventional and nonconformist.

Haus’s (1995:71), Appadurai’s (1993:295) and Androutsopoulos’s (2010:204) arguments force us to think about the intercultural theatre dynamics; in their view there seems to be an

argument that under the rubric of intercultural theatre there is a need to investigate the tensions between sameness and difference, consensus and fragmentation, based on each culture's need to express its own cultural symbols in the theatrical symbolic interaction at the expense of the other. This creates an impression that there could be an identity, cultural homogenisation and hybridity struggle, on the one hand, and a sort of theatrical cultural boundary maintenance operation in cross-cultural theatre collaborations and performances, on the other (cf. Barth's (1969) theory of ethnic boundary maintenance).

Having looked at the different views of interculturalism and the fact that interculturalism and multiculturalism were/are postcolonial endeavours, one can say that there could be a binary-oppositional co-existence in the execution of intercultural collaborations. My argument here can in part be based on Krishnaswamy's (2002:106-7) argument that postcolonialism and globalisation are concerned with the consequences of

unequal power relations between different geopolitical locations on the globe: postcolonial theory focuses primarily on a (Eurocentric) colonial past and studies how subaltern practices and productions in the non-Western peripheries respond to Western domination.

Therefore, if in contemporary North-South collaborations there are unequal power relations, then the subaltern can resist that by creating some cultural boundaries, as exemplified in Haus's (1995:71) and Appadurai's (1993:295) arguments. Given such a situation, Barth's (1969:9-10) theoretical insights – even though originally applied in the examination of ethnic distinctions amongst different interacting cultural groups – could be helpful in analysing the similarities and dissimilarities of intercultural theatre practices. Barth (*ibid.*) expounds his theory of ethnic boundary maintenance by saying that:

First it is clear that boundaries persist despite a flow of personnel across them. In other words, categorical ethnic distinctions do not depend on an absence of mobility, contact and information, but do entail social processes of exclusion and incorporation whereby discrete categories are maintained despite changing participation and membership in the course of individual life histories.

I believe this could be useful in analysing the dynamics of intercultural theatre performances and their implications for the assumption of theatrical culture homogenisation in intercultural theatre practice. However, it should be noted that cultural globalisation sometimes can be taken to mean cultural imperialism, a concept that needs to be explored further.

### 3.3.1 Understanding cultural imperialism in the era of globalisation

Writing about the term ‘cultural imperialism’, Elteren (2003:173) notes that “cultural imperialism has traditionally focused on mass media and other cultural industries and the US fits that globalising framework.” He notes that the USA “enjoys a comparative advantage in the global media and popular culture industries”, because of the economies of scale that US companies have at home, making it possible to sell their products cheaply to other countries. This in part explains why some writers like Appadurai (1993:295) and Scholte (2000:15-16) envision globalisation as “westernisation in an Americanised form”.

However, Elteren (2003:169) argues that:

the concept of ‘cultural imperialism’ has been discredited. Today, it is primarily European intellectuals and politicians warning against the purported threat of Americanization of some part of European culture who employ the term ... the latest manifestation of opposition to US cultural imperialism occurred during the fierce debates over an exemption clause for ‘cultural works’ in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) negotiations of 1993. More recently a number of anti-globalisation movements have expressed similar sentiments about the United States’ cultural impact abroad focusing on US-based transnational corporations, but they usually do not speak explicitly of ‘U.S. cultural imperialism’.

Elteren (2003:169-170) notes that there has been a resurgence of interest in cultural imperialism in a different design and points to “some influential journalists and international relations experts affiliated to neoconservative think tanks such as the American Enterprise Institute, the Hoover Institution, and the Heritage Foundation”, who have theorised that US’s imperialism is of benefit to the rest of the world. Elteren adds that rather than talk and write about the “rebuke originally implied by the term ‘imperialism’ they imbue it with higher moral authority, boldly calling for a new proud American imperialism.” Elteren (2003:170) asserts that:

These new proponents of empire advocate a national moral renaissance and a self-conscious, interventionist role for the United States abroad based on its unique mission to spread freedom and democracy around the world, refurbishing a long-standing tradition of US missionary universalism.

Elteren (2003:170) gives us some historical background for the term ‘cultural imperialism’, noting that the term was popular in political discourse in the 1970s and 1980s. He adds that during that time some radical academics studying international mass communication, as well as intellectuals and politicians from Western Europe and the developing world, raised concerns about the homogenising and harmful effects of Western media that were

overwhelming the world culturally. They identified Western multinational companies, especially the USA's media companies, as the major aggressors.

Elteren (2003:171) notes that a number of UNESCO reports, seminars and deliberations, in particular the MacBride Report of 1980, raised these issues and called for "a New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO)" that aimed at democratising communications, reducing the power of the transnational media, and encouraging independent media policy frameworks in the developing world. Elteren (*ibid.*) argues that NWICO suggested, and provided, a restructuring platform in which media communication and control were distributed between the North and South.

However, Elteren (2003:171) states that NWICO focused its energies on the mass media, and was less concerned with questions of culture identity and globalisation, which were covered by writers outside of the field of communication research.

Importantly, and to show the sometimes confusing and double-edged historical metamorphosis and subsequent convergence of epistemological terms and discourses, Elteren (2003:171) notes that "by the early 1980s, academic writers had begun criticising the notion of cultural imperialism, preferring the term cultural globalisation instead". Elteren (2003:171) notes that in the 1970s and 1980s scholars preferred the term cultural globalisation and attacked the cultural imperialism thesis on the basis of the following points (summarised here):

- The emergence of new technologically developed countries challenged the conception of the world cultural system as one in which countries in the West impose their cultures on the rest;
- They argued that the idea of imperialism tends to confuse economic power and cultural impact without addressing the reception of cultural imports domestically;
- They argued that diversity may very well have increased as new hybrid cultural forms circulated within societies exposed to Western cultural influence;
- They noted that the idea of cultural imperialism undervalues the creative ways in which consumers use globally distributed cultural goods;
- They argued that the term 'cultural imperialism' often entails a patronising assumption that the 'authentic' cultures of the developing world are being 'overrun' by 'inauthentic' cultural influences from the West. The 'imperialising culture' tends



to be conceived of as homogeneous, and its internal diversity, which may result from the influence of large immigrant groups from Asia, Africa or Latin America in Western countries, downplayed or ignored.

Even though the issues raised in the above submissions are crucial in understanding and analysing contemporary global cultural complexity, one can still detect economic and political power as factors which contribute to an institution's or nation's global cultural influence.

Elteren (2003:172) introduces the concept of 'traveling cultures', which he says has a "powerful impact on current approaches to the global influence of US culture" and explains the term 'traveling cultures' by saying that it hinges on "how cultural languages travel to new areas and how they are appropriated by individuals of other cultures to tell their story". However, at the same time Elteren (2003:172) notes that the idea of traveling cultures ignores the imposition of cultural behaviours on other peoples' cultures through "behavioural and structural forms of power". Given the global intricacy of modern-day human interactions, he acknowledges that "the dynamics of 'imperialism' have become more complex and internally contradictory in the latter part of the twentieth century", but quickly remarks that this "does not mean that we should abandon the exploration of underlying power differences and forms of inequality" (Elteren, 2003: 172).

Elteren (*ibid.*) states that "although intercultural contact zones are inherently dialogical, this does not mean that exchanges always take place on a level playing field". He recommends that a more complete transcultural perspective should also encompass the study of the economic, technological, political and social structures of such exchanges that tend to "force" them into certain forms and "steer" them towards certain results. Elteren (*ibid.*) advises researchers and scholars to "maintain a critical awareness of transnational movement of people, capital, commodities and conditions of inequality, disempowerment, and exploitation that drive these movements."

Elteren points out crucial issues which need to be considered by any intercultural studies scholar in this era of globalisation. However, with regard to the metamorphosis of the conceptual preference for the term "cultural imperialism" to "cultural globalisation", we again witness how historical moments change the way we receive and perceive particular discourses and conceptual categories. This is the same issue we witnessed in the historical



process of including the terms “intercultural theatre” and “performance studies” in both theatre practice and theatre academic discourse, as discussed in section 2.4.3. It is important to again remind ourselves of Ugor’s (2006:133) argument that when discourses resurface, they may still embody their past social implications. This reveals to us why some writers have continuously expressed their suspicions about globalisation, and viewed its accompanying strand – cultural globalisation – as a new form of imperialism, as discussed in section 3.3. This is similar to Mooney and Evans’s (2007:30) view that in globalisation studies ‘colonialism’ is present in two primary ways – the first is as the synonym for imperialism – cultural, linguistic or economic, and involving a Western nation(s) or corporation as the coloniser. The second is in the context of postcolonialism.

Krishnaswamy (2002:106) fittingly argues that there are

two dominant theoretical discourses that regulate contemporary knowledge production in the humanities and social sciences: postcolonialism and globalisation. While the “cultural turn” in contemporary criticism has infected many disciplines, these two theoretical fields have been most influential in asserting the primacy or the constitutive role of the cultural in history, economics, and politics. Yet there has so far been relatively little explicit or systematic scrutiny of the links between postcolonialism and globalisation theory.

Krishnaswamy (2002) is arguably right to point to the centrality of the discourses of postcolonialism and globalisation in asserting the role of “the cultural” in contemporary studies in the humanities and social sciences. I believe that right from Chapter One, in the discussion on the colonial cultural encounter in Uganda, up to this point we have witnessed the central place of “the cultural” in colonial, intercultural communication, intercultural theatre, postcolonial and globalisation discourses. Since the operations of intercultural theatre revolve around the mediation of the cultural in the postcolonial global setting, I had to hinge my study on all these multidisciplinary theoretical perspectives, as we have seen thus far in this literature survey.

However, one can say that there has always been an attempt to faintly connect globalisation theory to postcolonialism. For example, Appadurai’s (1993:295) and Haus’s (1995:71) debates on ‘cultural homogenisation’ as part of the dynamics of globalisation, Giddens’s (1990:175-177) argument of ‘other cultures being crushed’ by Western culture, Appadurai (1993:295) and Scholte’s (2000:15-16) envisioning of globalisation as ‘Americanisation’, point to what Elteren (2003:171) puts explicitly when he discusses the historical moment when ‘cultural globalisation’ replaced the term ‘cultural imperialism’.

The historical approach that I took in the analysis of some conceptual categories in this study again shows the importance of intertextuality and multidisciplinary approaches in understanding socio-political and cultural phenomena in the world today. The literature survey has thus far shown how a person studying contemporary cultural expressions such as intercultural theatre cannot avoid engaging with multidisciplinary discourses, including globalisation and its various connotations. In the same vein, this historicism has helped us to understand why some writers have argued that globalisation/cultural globalisation is a euphemism for neo-colonialism. If Krishnaswamy (2002:106) thought that “there has so far been relatively little explicit or systematic scrutiny of the links between postcolonialism and globalisation theory”, I believe that in my literature survey and analysis in Chapter Two and this chapter, I have contributed towards filling that academic analytical vacuum.

However, even though some globalisation and interculturalist theorists sometimes tend to downplay the role of the state, Elteren (2003:173) maintains that another weakness of “the ‘traveling cultures’ theory of cultural globalisation is its neglect of the nation-state”. This is a weakness, because despite the current global influence of multinational organisations, state influence has not declined to the “extent assumed by proponents of transculturation” (Elteren, 2003:173).

Even though cultural globalisation and cultural imperialism tend to point to the possibility of having a world with a homogenised culture, still there are writers who have challenged the notion of world cultural homogenisation, as we shall see.

### **3.4 Challenges to the notion of world cultural homogenisation**

From the previous two sections we saw that some of the issues facing intercultural relations today include the debate about the continuation of distinct cultural practices versus the notions cultural globalisation and cultural imperialism. And even though conceptual categories such as intercultural communication, multiculturalism and intercultural theatre in their philosophy and formulation recognise the cultural differences among the different peoples of the world, one of the main purported effects of the multifaceted concept of cultural globalisation is world cultural homogenisation. Therefore, there is a need to survey what other writers have to say about the issue of world cultural homogenisation and the possibility or impossibility of attaining it. The views that are going to be explored may help in the

examination of the meanings and notions projected in the recent intercultural collaborations that Makerere University has been involved in.

### 3.4.1 Different world feelings, personalities and identities

Grenfell and Hardy (2007:105) discuss the complexity of the notion of a unified world and refer to Raymond Williams, Pierre Bourdieu and E. P. Thompson, who assert (in Grenfell and Hardy's words) that "feelings, the tempo of everyday life, and the making of class formations cannot simply be deduced from structural factors." In this sense, since globalisation is in part a structural phenomenon, it may not cater for different peoples' feelings in its universalist or homogenising pursuits. Grenfell and Hardy (2007:106) refer to cultural theorist Raymond Williams, who is more explicit about the notion of feelings:

structures of feeling differ from such concepts as 'world view' and 'ideology' because they are just emerging, still implicit, and not yet fully articulate. Instead, they so tightly interweave feeling and thought as to make them indistinguishable. We are talking, [Williams] says, about characteristic elements of impulse, restraint, and tone; specifically affective elements of consciousness and relationships: not feeling against thought, but thought as felt and feeling as thought: practical consciousness of a present kind, in a living and inter-relating community.

This implies that different cultural practices have their own distinct cultural rhythms, which can make world cultural standardisation difficult to accomplish and, in fact, not entirely desirable.

As we are debating the issue of world cultural homogenisation, it is worth noting that Pile (1996:59) introduces aspects of individuality when he refers to Thrift (1981), who suggests that "as the person travels through their time-space life path, they 'internalise' and 'interiorise' social relations". Pile (*ibid.*) points out that Thrift's view echoes the notion of symbolic interaction and asserts that, like the proponents of symbolic interactionism and psychoanalysis, Thrift says that a person is split into divisions of "subjectivity, identity and individuality, and ... into the unconscious, practical consciousness and discursive consciousness." Pile (1996:59) states that Thrift's argument is crucial because it implies that:

Questions of human agency need to be framed not only within the determinations (or power relations) of social structure, but also within the material properties of time-space relations, and also within the processes inherent in 'personality'. Whereas symbolic interactionism contributed a dynamism to humanistic accounts of the subject, it could be argued that Thrift's time geography furthers this by emphasising the materiality of social structures and the determinants which surround (but do not extinguish) subjectivity.

Pile (1996) and Grenfell and Hardy (2007) discuss crucial elements which one could consider while analysing social phenomena. From their discussions, it is evident that in many instances concepts and notions that generalise and homogenise human relations – for example, globalisation – tend to suppress the feelings, aspirations and voices of different individuals caught up in the conceptual generalist perspectives. In contrast, in this study I used personal interviews with a view to examining the different individual perceptions of those who were involved in intercultural theatre collaborations with Makerere University.

In order to have a culturally homogeneous world, ideally all peoples of the world should adopt a common identity. However, while discussing identity formation, Smith (1993:179) argues that cultural traditions are not formulated by inactive populations, but are products of historical circumstances set in time immemorial.

Smith (1993:179) concurs with Grenfell and Hardy's (2007:106) views about structures of human feelings in arguing that identity is formed by "the subjective feelings and valuations of any population which possesses common experiences and one or more shared cultural characteristics (usually customs, language or religion) of these feelings." He goes on and specifies three components of a peoples' shared experiences as a sense of historical continuity between the experiences of succeeding generations of a cultural group, shared memories of specific historical events and a sense of common destiny among a particular group of people. Smith (1993: 180) concludes his discussion of the dynamics of identity formation by saying that the major difficulty in constructing global culture or identity is that "collective identity, like imagery and culture, is always historically specific because it is based on shared memories and a sense of continuity between generations" (cf. Pile 1996:59).

The views expressed above imply that the recent intercultural theatre collaborations at Makerere University are, among other things, examples of human creativity. And the opinions expressed by Smith and Pile about identity formation and how identity formation involves a mediation of geographical, cultural and historical phenomena may be relevant in the examination of cultural and identity negotiation in the execution of intercultural phenomena such as Makerere University's recent intercultural theatre collaborations.

### 3.4.2 Differences in the conceptualisation of global reality

Featherstone (1993:6-10) refutes the possibility of world culture homogenisation when he states that the different responses to the “globalisation process suggest that there is minimal hope for a unified world culture because there are “global cultures in the plural.” Smith (1993:117) argues that

the initial problem with the concept of a ‘global culture’ is one of the meaning of terms. Can we speak of ‘culture’ in the singular? If by ‘culture’ is meant a collective mode of life, or a repertoire of beliefs, styles, values and symbols, then we can only speak of cultures, never just culture; for a collective mode of life, or a repertoire of beliefs, etc., presupposes different modes and repertoires in a universe of modes and repertoires. Hence, the idea of a ‘global culture’ is a practical impossibility, except in interplanetary terms (cf. Hannerz, 1993:237).

Appadurai (1993:296) argues that there is over-simplification in the discussion of the forces of, and fears about, global cultural homogenisation. He argues that the prevailing socio-political and economic events are complex and overlapping. He proposes a framework for examining the distinctions by looking at the connections between five dimensions of global cultural flows, which he stipulates as “ethnoscapes; mediascapes; technoscapes; finanscapes and ideoscapes”. He concludes by noting that

I use the terms with the common suffix ‘scape’ to indicate first of all that these are not objectively given relations which look the same from every angle of vision, but rather that they are deeply perspectival constructs, inflected very much by historical, linguistic and political situatedness of different sorts of actors: [like] nation states [and] multinationals.

From Appadurai’s argument, it seems that the human condition and cultural output are sometimes conditioned by particular geographically specific, historical, linguistic and political factors, which may stand in the way of the prospect of world cultural homogenisation, even if these different cultures meet (cf. Robertson, 1994:5-9).

Robertson (1994:26-27) introduces the concept of a ‘global field’. To illustrate this, he defines globalisation by saying that it “refers in this particular sense to the coming into, often problematic, conjunction of different forms of life. The model refers to the global field or sometimes the global human condition.” Robertson, like Appadurai (1993:296), highlights the ingredients of the global field which may create world cultural ‘disjuncture’. Robertson’s 1994 model consists of: the individual-society problematic, relativisation of societal reference, relativisation of self-identities, relativisation of citizenship, relativisation of societies and realpolitik, which he calls a humanity problematic. Robertson (1994:8-9) argues

that there are different complex global processes that challenge a belief in a stable and collective world order.

To concretise his concept of global complexity that may deter the pragmatic attainment of global cultural homogenisation, Robertson (1994:47) says that ‘culture’ is relevant in cultural studies in two ways: “on the one hand, cultural studies is cultural in its focus on symbolic expression, text, rhetoric, discourse and so on. On the other hand, it is cultural in its tendency to use the idea of culture to embrace virtually every facet of human life”. Robertson (1994:47, quoting Hall, 1986) defines culture as “the actual, grounded terrain of practices, languages and customs of any specific historical society.”

Looking at the different aspects and contingencies of what is termed ‘culture’ (refer to section 2.3.2) and what constitutes globalisation theory, Robertson (1994:61) asserts that “the overall process of globalisation, and the resulting single global arena, can best be treated in terms of what may be called a ‘voluntaristic’ theory.” At the same time, Robertson (1994:130) asks a fundamental question: “in other words, does the idea of having a general theory which applies to the world as a whole automatically lead to the diminution of civilisational (or, for that matter, societal) distinctiveness?” He tries to answer his own question by concluding: “I believe the temptation to respond in the affirmative to that question issues from equating theoretical generality with empirical homogeneity” (1994:130). However, as we have so far realised from the survey of globalisation discourse, globalisation theory itself is not homogenous, which again challenges the notion of the purported global cultural homogeneity.

Equally, Mosquera (2010:47) states that instead of having homogeneous artistic practices, “what we see is the plural construction of international art and its language.” Mosquera (2010:47) argues that “this activity is ‘local’, in the sense that it is the result of the personal and subjective reactions of artists to their contexts, or because it seeks a cultural, social or even political impact in their milieus.” Mosquera (2010:50), however, takes note of the implications of artistic intercultural encounters saying:

If this tension of ‘who swallows whom? ... is more or less present in any intercultural relationship, it is also true that ‘frequently one plagiarizes what one is ready to invent’, ... This emphasizes the agency of the appropriating subject through its volitional selectivity and its tactical characteristic use of the appropriated element.

Discussing his concept of ‘radial globalisation’, Mosquera (2010:51) argues that given all the arguments surrounding cultural processes, it is crucial to note that the global flow of culture cannot always remain circulating in the same ‘North-South’ direction, as dictated by the power structure, its circuits of diffusion, and accommodations to them. It does not matter how plausible the appropriating and transcultural strategies are, they imply a rebound effect that reproduces the same hegemonic structure, even if also contesting it.

To illustrate his concept of radial globalisation, Mosquera (2010:51) argues that “Coca-Cola is perhaps the maximum symbol of so-called ... ‘homogenization-produced-by-cultural-imperialism’ which is denounced as a serious cultural problem of globalisation.”

If one were to argue for world cultural homogenisation on the basis of the phenomena of Coca-Cola and McDonald’s, Mosquera (2010:51) would say that “not even Coca-Cola escapes what [is called] ‘processes of re-pluralisation’” because even the savour and flavour of Coca-Cola “varies according to public tastes, the water, and other factors specific to every place where it is fabricated.” And at the same, Mosquera (2010) argues that people in different locations take Coca-Cola in different ways and at different occasions: that is, while some take it straight as it is produced; others mix it with other local brands to make a totally new cocktail. Mosquera (2010:51) gives an example of Los Angeles which imports Coca-Cola from Mexico – “which is sweeter than the version produced in the United States – in order to satisfy its large population who are of Mexican origin.” He aptly posits that “the possible transformations of Coca-Cola challenge but at the same time increase the global dissemination of this symbol of ‘international culture’”.

Mosquera’s (2010) imagery of Coca-Cola tends to mirror to some extent what Elteren (2003:179) means when he says that

the U.S. flavor of globalisation stems from the culture of possessive individualism and consumerism that has its most radical embodiment in American society. The current world of consumer goods has an American face, even when the goods and services are produced outside the United States.

Mosquera (2010:51-52) asserts that even though the rhetoric of globalisation has created an illusion of a world engaged in multicultural dialogues,

to paraphrase George Orwell, it is far more global for some than others ... However, what we have in fact at planetary scale is a radial system extending from diverse centres of power of varying sizes into multiple and highly diversified economic areas.

The issues discussed here are relevant if one is to analyse contemporary global reality. They are also pertinent in the analysis of intercultural interactions, because individuals involved in



intercultural collaborations mediate and negotiate different cultural or economic realities in order to come to a common understanding.

### 3.4.3 The concept of time and space in cultural and global studies

Kirabaev (2005:85) says that theoretical approaches to the current challenges surrounding globalisation and cultural identity create contradictions. Kirabaev (2005:85) goes on to ask:

How do we relate globalisation, oriented to the values of unity, the whole and the general, as expressed in the social, economic and political spheres, to the very human aspects of particularity, personal identification, specific cultural roots and diversity of opinion? In other words, can pluralistic values be pursued within a shared social space?

Kirabaev asks an important question that problematises the notion of world cultural homogenisation. Kirabaev (2005:89), also points out that the concept of time is used as an organising centre in modernity, and because of its centralising role, various “local cultures are lumped into a single whole and experienced with the feeling and sense of being part of one community”.

However, Kirabaev (2005:89) says that in the postmodern world societies cannot be centralised using the concept of time because

cultural pluralism demands decentralisation. This affects both time and space. But space comes to the fore. Space, in the postmodern context, encompasses different cultures which differ from each other in value systems, and more importantly, in understanding of time. Postmodernity rejects the notion of a ‘general denominator’ and considers the cooperation of cultures, not in terms of subordination, but in terms of cooperation.

To further illustrate and elaborate on his views, Kirabaev (*ibid.*) states that space can be interpreted as “the boundaries among cultures, which separate each from the other, but co-exist in one time” He also argues that each local culture can “act as the center” and that the “coexistence of different cultures” can only be achieved through intercultural communication which allows us to talk about common points (Kirabaev, 2005:89).

Kirabaev (2005) points to fundamental aspects which I believe are crucial in the analysis of cross-cultural engagements such as intercultural theatre in this era of globalisation. In my experience, the issue of time awareness and management has been an element of contention between people from the West and Africans, where there is even a belief that there is “African time” and a Western mode of time awareness.



### 3.4.4 Institutional philosophical differences

Since cultural globalisation sometimes entails structural merging in situations where there are acute structural or philosophical differences, the differences may become stumbling blocks to philosophical or structural homogenisation.

With reference to art, for example, Edgar and Sedgwick (2008:6) expound on the political or institutional bases that help in defining what art is by referring to Dickie (1984), who argues that:

the criteria for defining and recognizing an object or activity as art emerge within those institutions, such as galleries and the journals, which deal with art. An artwork is an artwork because it has been 'baptised' as such through its recognition on the artworld of critics, connoisseurs, gallery proprietors, artists and audiences.

Edgar and Sedgwick (2008:6) say that recent developments in the study of aesthetics have demonstrated an awareness of the "social and cultural contexts within which art is produced and consumed". They note that Arthur C. Danto, an American philosopher, acknowledges that the way art is interpreted depends heavily on the historical, cultural and political conditions in which it is created; he recognizes that what art is, and the way in which a particular work of art is interpreted, will depend heavily upon the historical, cultural and even political conditions within which it is created.

In pondering the differences in the philosophical and structural underpinnings of art, Counsell and Wolf (2004: 123), argue that the body can also be an institutionalised entity:

The body of live performance is unique in that unlike the bodies represented by other media, it occupies the same time and space as the audience. Whereas mainstream film, say, presents only the fictional character, the live performer's emphatic physical presence has the capacity to remind viewers of the outside of the fiction, juxtaposing the body which is signified, performed, with the real, signifying body of the performer. This deals primarily with the cultural, signified body, that which is performed. The current, very widespread critical focus on the culturally coded body is informed by work from a different range of disciplines. Recent sociology has highlighted the body's institutional and discursive construction.

Issues like the ones highlighted here give us a glimpse into the kind of mediation that may occur in intercultural theatre collaborations. More crucially, they also imply that if differences in the structural, philosophical and body orientations of performers are not well mediated, they can become a stumbling block to smooth intercultural collaboration.

### 3.4.5 “Othering” through preconceived stereotypes

Another issue that challenges the attainability of world cultural homogenisation is the human tendency of “othering” other people through the use of stereotypes. Highlighting the effect of the media in creating stereotypes and perceptions about other people in intercultural exchanges, for example, Moon (2008: 18) argues that “the media produce representations of the social world, images, descriptions, explanations, and frames for understanding how the world is and why it works as it is said and shown to work.” Moon (2008:18) states that “much of how we understand ourselves as cultural members and our interactions with ‘others’ is too impacted by media representations. By examining these discourses, we can better understand these processes and how they affect and are played out in intercultural interactions.

Bauman (1993:148), however, argues that the advent of television and other media platforms have not erased the “institutional separation” of different peoples around the world and this has led to the failure of McLuhan’s notion of a ‘global village’.

Given the weaknesses of the media in fostering intercultural communication expressed by Bauman, Bharucha (1993:155) argues, and at the same time advises, that

There may be rules for the understanding of ‘other’ cultures, but these cannot be assumed through mere readings of ethnographies and anthropological accounts by ‘experts’. Nor can they be obtained through fake empathies with ‘natives’ on the basis of brief, intense ‘friendships’. I suppose that if one wants to understand another culture, there is no way out but to live there for long periods of time. Only then can one confront one’s own mediation of its realities, without which one can never truly understand how people represent themselves to one another.

Bharucha (*ibid.*) concludes by noting that “if interculturalism is born through the meeting of the self and the ‘other’, the real challenge is to maintain the reciprocity of this dynamic.”

As Bharucha notes, it seems that intercultural theatre can provide a pragmatic window of face-to-face interaction between people from different cultures, which can enhance the possibility of understanding each other in more ways than other media can achieve.

As we are thinking about the multifaceted nature, perspectives and dynamics of interculturalism, it is worth noting Fay’s (1996:90) argument:

If we insist too heavily on dramatic dissimilarity, then we lose the capacity to understand others (and therefore the capacity to appreciate their difference). If we insist on their dramatic similarity, then we lose the capacity to appreciate and understand

difference and therefore see ourselves everywhere we turn. In relating to others the choice is not difference or similarity; it is difference and similarity.

What we have discussed in this section implies that in any form of intercultural setting one should expect to find differences and similarities. The main issue in intercultural collaborations, therefore, is on how to negotiate and mediate the differences in order to achieve the goals of the intercultural collaborations. In other words, interculturalism of any nature involves “border crossing”. Giroux (2005:2) writes on this concept saying that

the concept of borders provides a continuing and crucial referent for understanding the co-mingling – sometimes clash – of multiple cultures, languages, literacies, histories, sexualities, and identities. Thinking in terms of borders allows one to critically engage the struggle over those territories, spaces, and contact zones where power operates to either expand or to shrink the distance and connectedness among individuals, groups, and places.

The issues of mediation of history, language differences, sexualities and identities plus co-mingling or hybridity and power that Giroux (2005) raises here are part and parcel of any form of intercultural interaction and thus become relevant to this study.

At the same time, the intercultural theatre collaborations that Makerere University has been involved with in the recent past can be looked at as educational phenomena related to the process of globalisation. This being the case, there is a need to understand the implications of globalisation for education policies and institutions.

### **3.5 Intercultural education in the global arena**

In this section I will discuss certain worldwide developments in education and show how the contemporary internationalisation of education within academic institutions is connected to globalisation. Given this educational turn to globalisation, the intercultural theatre collaborations at Makerere University are not exceptional. In this section I will also highlight how some theorists and researchers have commented on the advantages and drawbacks of international education in the globalisation era.

#### **3.5.1 Contextualising education and interculturalism in the globalising world**

In section 3.2.1 I indicated that with the rise of the globalisation phenomenon, almost all theoretical and operational undertakings of different institutions around the world have been configured to fit into the dictates of the imperatives of globalisation. As far as education is

concerned, globalisation is fuelling and insidiously amplifying old categories ‘international education’ and ‘study abroad programmes’, with all their different connotations, as the following literature survey will show.

I am introducing this educational perspective into the literature survey because, apart from being intercultural collaborations, Makerere’s collaborations with universities from the North are also part and parcel of the international educational endeavours of the different academic institutions that are involved. Therefore, in this section I will analyse the developments in higher education in relation to internationalism and interculturalism in the era of globalisation.

### **3.5.2 The meanings and implications of global education**

Writing about globalisation and curriculum inquiry, Gough (2000:79) states that while it was possible to make “some informed guesses about how globalisation” was to unfold in

changing school curricula (and in whose interests), there are many gaps in our current knowledge of the dynamics of the transnational imaginary in curriculum work and in the theoretical resources that may assist us in identifying problems and opportunities as they emerge.

Similarly, Bartell (2003:45) said that what he was seeing in the field of international education in the USA in the 1990s was “minimalist, instrumental, introductory, conceptually simple, disciplinarily reductionist, and static”. Mestenhauser (1998, cited in Bartell, 2003:45) had already noted that there was a pressing need to “study international education on the highest level of sophistication as a multidimensional, multiplex, interdisciplinary, intercultural, research, and policy-driven system of global scope at all levels of education”.

Even though Gough (2000) and Mestenhauser (1998) were still speculating about the manifestation and intensity of globalisation in changing the school curriculum, today there seems to be an upsurge of interest in the internationalisation of education. This current trend in the educational arena, and the adoption of globalising models in higher education by nation states, is what King (2010:583) describes as “policy internationalization”. This implies a negotiation of policy and structural formulations in academic intercultural collaborations.

In commenting on the relation of globalisation and education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, Altbach and Knight (2007:290) define globalisation as “the economic, political, and societal forces

pushing 21<sup>st</sup>-century higher education toward greater international involvement.” Similarly, Stier (2004:6) states that

responding to the needs of global man [sic], higher education policies have become increasingly internationalized ... Within the European Union the need for mutual exchange of ‘know how’, a strategic utilization of competencies and resources, and a constant quality-enhancement of higher education is emphasized. Internationalization is seen as one valuable path to achieve these goals.

Beck (2012:134) states that internationalisation of higher education is perceived by some educationists and theorists “as a process of integrating an inter-cultural and international dimension into all areas of the university” (cf. Robertson 1994:16). Even though some consider internationalisation to be different from globalisation, their meanings overlap and some internationalisation theorists have started using them interchangeably. Beck (2012:134), for example, says that some writers like de Wit (2011) have concluded that “both terms act like two connected universes, making it impossible to draw a distinctive line between them”

In my view, the theatre collaborations between Makerere University (MAK), Stanford University (SU), New York University (NYU) and the Norwegian College of Dance (NCD) are vivid examples of the global or international interest in higher education that Gough (2000), Stier (2004) and Altbach and Knight (2007) wrote about. And Beck’s (2012:134) interpretation of this addition of “an intercultural and international dimension” to the educational pursuits of the university aptly places the contemporary globalisation of education into the context of this study. Given the contemporary worldwide education sectors’ turn to global education, Bruner (1977:1) had years ago rightly stated that “each generation gives new form to the aspirations that shape education in its time.”

Therefore it is no wonder that these days different governments are adapting to global education, because they want cosmopolitan citizens with the necessary skills and competences to compete economically in a global setting (cf. Hopper, 2007:164; Brustein, 2007:383).

Zeszotarski (2001:65-66) writes about conferees at an American Council on International Intercultural Education (ACIIE) conference in 1996 embracing an outline for global education. The participants defined a competency as “an ability, a skill, a knowledge, or an attitude that can be demonstrated, observed or measured” – it also included cognitive as well

as affective attributes. Zeszotarski (2001:65-66) notes the following issues that were hinted at by the conferees as constituting education aiming at global competence:

- Recognition of global systems and their connectedness, including personal awareness and openness to other cultures, values, and attitudes at home and abroad;
- Intercultural skills and direct experiences;
- General knowledge of history and world events – politics, economics, geography; and
- Detailed area studies specialisation – expertise in another language, culture, or country.

When one looks at the objectives of international education initiatives of New York University and Stanford University, as the discussion of the two cases will show later in this thesis, one will discover that their objectives reflect some of the above ideals.

Discussing the pedagogy for intercultural adaptability, Zeszotarski (2001:70) states that globalisation had intensified intercultural interactions and that intercultural communication skills are becoming increasingly necessary not only in international business engagements, but also in interpreting world phenomena such as media transmissions. He also observes that this calls for intercultural adaptability – a term that involves speaking and listening skills “as well as the ability to interpret behavior in different cultural contexts and apply social or experiential learning in new cultural contexts” (cf. Paige, 2005:101).

This again shows the centrality of intercultural communication skills in contemporary cross-cultural encounters. At the same time, the issues highlighted above show how analytical tools used in intercultural communication, like the ones discussed in section 2.3.3.6, can help in the examination of educational collaborations in an intercultural setting.

With regard to the adoption of global education by nation states, Hopper (2007:164) refers to Tony Blair, the former British prime minister, who he says was explicit about globalising education during his period in office. Hopper (2007:164) quotes Blair as saying that “the increasing globalisation of the world economy means that the required levels of education and skills are now being set by international standards.” However, it is important to note that the term ‘international standards’ can hypothetically amount to a form of neo-colonialism that is not in consonance with the dialogical tenets of intercultural collaboration.

Writing about the internationalisation of education in the era of globalisation, Paige (2005:101) argues that the myriad definitions of globalisation “point to the rapidly changing world that will be facing our students”. She further observes that globalisation has an impact on universities because it influences what universities must teach to prepare students for their professional lives.

Paige (2005:102) further argues that “in the case of higher education, internationalisation at the national, sector, and institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education” (also see Beck, 2012:134). Paige (2005:102, with reference to Ellingboe, 1998), expands on the above definition of internationalisation by viewing it as

the process of integrating an international perspective into a college or university system. It is an on-going, future-oriented, multidimensional, interdisciplinary leadership-driven vision that involves many stakeholders working to change the internal dynamics of an institution to respond and adapt appropriately to an increasingly diverse, globally focused, ever changing external environment.

Commenting on the definition provided by Ellingboe, Paige (*ibid.*) aptly concludes that “this complex definition suggests that there are many dimensions of internationalisation and that it is a dynamic process of institutional change”.

A critical look at the above writings shows that the intensification of the contemporary internationalisation of education is a response to the needs of globalisation. It seems that the globalising world needs a culturally and educationally world-wise workforce and globally competent citizens, thus necessitating a paradigm shift in educational sectors. This means that in academic institutions with theatre studies as a discipline, such as Makerere University, intercultural theatre collaborations become part of the internationalisation of education.

Stromquist (2007:81, 83) recognises that the internationalisation of education “affects academic programs, faculty, and students”, because there are “localized responses ... cultural and environmental processes that create differences in the adoption of new ideas and practices”. This viewpoint is crucial, because intercultural collaborations may need a negotiation and mediation of both cultural and structural differences and in some instances some issues may not be mutually compatible, all the more so if we are to view internationalisation through Knight’s lens whereby “a university engages with another university situated in another country” (cited in Botha, 2010:201). This context of



international or global education initiatives may exemplify the practical reality of Makerere University's intercultural theatre collaborations.

Taking note of research on internationalisation in higher education, Kehn and Teichler (2007:261) argue that "the main topics of research on internationalisation in higher education reach from mobility, mutual influence of higher education systems, and internationalisation of the substance of teaching and learning to institutional strategies, knowledge transfer, cooperation and competition, and national and supranational policies" (cf. Altbach and Knight, 2007:291). Such views illuminate the influences and dynamics of intercultural theatre initiatives such as those that Makerere University has been engaged with, and have a bearing on educational policy initiatives.

Edwards (2007:376) argues that there are two major ways in which the internationalisation of education is handled in the USA. Some endeavours are based on particular isolated opportunistic needs and others on comprehensive plans for the internationalisation of an institution's education portfolio.

Stier (2004:5), with reference to Appudurai's (1996) edition on "ethnoscapes; mediascapes; technoscapes; finanscapes and ideoscapes", conceptualises the different strands of global education as follows:

the internationalization of higher education is intertwined with these 'scapes' in at least two ways. First, it enables or even initiates the transference of 'ethno-', 'media-', 'techno-', 'finance' and 'ideoscapes' ... For example, collaborative international research or international students by the thousands constitute significant actors in transferring capital (e.g. through study fees and by contributing to the local and national economies), life styles, 'know-how', ideas etc. Second, the internationalization of higher education is influenced by such 'scapes'.

Stier (2004:5) also says that "internationalization, among other things, is entangled with commercial, pragmatic and ideological motives of educational actors".

However, Zeszotarski (2001:65) in a way points to the conceptual preference that may have come into play as far as the globalisation of education is concerned by noting that the

analysis of this trend toward globalised or internationalised education invites a comparison with an educational trend of the last decade – multiculturalism. The "new" global competencies may represent a more palatable version of multiculturalism that is justified according to the economic imperatives of the dominant culture.



Zeszotarski (2001:67) goes on to say that the “internationalization of education can play a significant role in the cultural effects of globalisation by facilitating the harmonious interaction of world cultures”. This again replicates the prospects of “harmonious interaction” as reflected in intercultural communication and intercultural theatre discourse discussed in sections 2.3.3 and 2.4.

### **3.5.3 Advantages of intercultural collaborations**

Writing about the benefits of academic debates/discussions on developmental issues among culturally heterogeneous groups, Mitchell, Boyle and Nicholas (2011:95) argue that the “link between cognitive heterogeneity and debate stems from findings that interaction between group members with divergent preferences, interpretations and values can be sufficient to trigger behaviour that aims to challenge others’ opinions and justify alternative approaches.”

Mitchell *et al.* (2011:96) further say that the connection

between debate and knowledge creation in cross-cultural cognitively diverse teams is based on research indicating that positive effects of difference depend on groups’ use of processes that force members to critique and integrate their differences into decisions. By establishing the circumstances that facilitate the manifestation, analysis and integration of representations of specialised tacit knowledge, debate in cognitively diverse teams enables the integration of disparate knowledge.

Similarly, Sullivan and Cottone (2010:358) argue that “cross-cultural research provides tremendous opportunities to gain greater awareness and insight into how cultures and people differ ... Greater sensitivity to these differences is an important step forward in increasing contextual understanding of different cultural groups”. Since I view cross-cultural theatre collaborations as experience-through-practice encounters, I contend that they can give rise to intercultural understanding and respect for cultural differences.

Hubbard and Sofras (1998), for example, argue that the inclusion of African and African American dance in American dance curricula was in line with the philosophy of multicultural education. Hubbard and Sofras (1998) believe that such an enterprise enriches the students’ experience and leads to mutual respect for all cultures. Hubbard and Sofras (1998:80) say that such projects provide a means of incorporating “new material into the existing courses” and help in the acknowledgement of “African culture as a viable creative source.”

Pribyl and Johnstone in their 2011 paper “Who are we dancing for? Cross-cultural collaborations at Makerere University, Uganda”, wrote about some of the issues that seem to

be pertinent to intercultural collaborations at Makerere University's Department of Performing Arts and Film.

Among the advantages of the collaborations, Pribyl and Johnstone (2011) noted, for example, that the exchanges are platforms for learning and exchanging dance practice techniques between students and staff of the collaborating institutions. They also argued that the collaborations validate the relevance of dance or of the performing arts departments in the academic offerings and structures of the collaborating universities, among other things.

However this internationalisation of education also attracted criticism, as we are going to see in the next section.

#### **3.5.4 Challenges of intercultural education**

Taking note of the importance of language in postcolonial cross-cultural interactions and influence, Elteren (2003:173) says that US firms have the upper hand because they use the principal international language English and hence “profit from cultural exchange programs that bring large numbers of foreign students, academics, and other professionals to the United States who continue to consume U.S. cultural products when they return home”.

Even though using an “international language” is crucial in intercultural encounters, Sullivan and Cottone (2010:360) advise that there is need to “acknowledge culturally based variations in communication styles and arrangements.” This means that language barrier can become one of the things that need to be mediated in intercultural collaborations.

Spencer-Oatey (2013) in her article “Maximizing the Benefits of International Education Collaborations: Managing Interaction Processes” highlights issues which are relevant in intercultural collaborations. Spencer-Oatey discusses the experiences of staff who participated in a number of Sino-British collaborative e-learning projects that involved British and Chinese institutions of higher education. Spencer-Oatey points out the structural and cultural challenges that the participants faced and how they responded. Even though Spencer-Oatey (2013) was writing about e-learning projects between the British and Chinese institutions, her thematic concerns reveal some of the challenges of cross-cultural collaborations.

Spencer-Oatey (2013:246), for example, notes that international collaborations are often highlighted in university plans of action as a means of stimulating internationalisation and “achieving greater connectivity among staff from different backgrounds”. However, she observed that less attention is given to understanding “the challenges academic staff may face in participating in such collaborations.” In view of this, Spencer-Oatey (2013) observes that failure to give adequate consideration to such “interaction issues can hinder the added value that international projects can offer.”

Spencer-Oatey (2013:246) points out an important gap in institutional cross-cultural engagements whereby less attention is given to the evaluation of the participants’ experiences. In this study, apart from analysing the socio-cultural and socio-political issues/notions reflected in intercultural performances, I intended to examine the underlying dynamics or experiences of the cross-cultural participants in their behind-the-scenes interactions during the process of the Makerere University collaborations.

Spencer-Oatey (2013:249-255) broadly categorises and analyses the collaboration challenges on the basis of three themes: negotiating common goals, managing language and communication, and negotiating different pedagogic viewpoints. It is evident that these thematic concerns and ideas reflect some of the issues discussed in section 3.4 in regard to the challenges of attaining the controversial world cultural homogenisation. At the same time, Spencer-Oatey’s themes point to some issues that may call for negotiation in intercultural collaborations.

Spencer-Oatey (2013:255) further noted that a close look at all the above themes point directly at three “fundamental collaboration issues”, namely “(in)equality, openness to new thinking, and questions of time and timing”. Even though Spencer-Oatey was dealing with e-learning collaboration between British and Chinese institutions, I find her observations quite relevant to this study, because intercultural collaborations of any nature may involve the negotiation and mediation of different dimensions – cultural, economic and structural.

Jill Pribyl and Kristina Johnstone (2011:229-230) indicated some of the challenges involved in intercultural theatre collaborations, for example, differences in the perceptions about the performer’s body – that is, is the performer’s body supposed to be athletic or not? This was coupled with differences in pedagogical approaches between the collaborating parties. This

shows that the interpretation of the body and pedagogical approaches are sometimes culturally and institutionally influenced.

Pribyl and Johnstone (2011:228) also say that the general assumptions about dance that performers can interact using “movement as common language” underestimate the complexities of intercultural exchange. At the same time, that view underestimates the culturally informed physical differences and requirements of different dances around the world. This also underscores the centrality of culture in intercultural collaborations.

Pribyl and Johnstone (2011:228, 230) also question and problematise the notion of “equal exchange” in intercultural collaborations. Summing up the complexities of intercultural collaborations, Pribyl and Johnstone (2011: 232) say that it seemed that “collaborative parties at times showed little awareness and understanding of each other’s different cultural and educational constructs.” This implies that there is constant need to navigate and negotiate cultural differences in order for intercultural collaborations to work.

Spencer-Oatey (2013) and Pribyl and Johnstone (2011) highlight issues of intercultural collaborations which have a close bearing on the questions that this study seeks to answer.

Writing about internationalisation and globalisation in education, McCabe (2001:139) says that “internationalisation seems to suggest cooperation and understanding between two countries and/or cultures, whereas often the term globalisation has negative connotations that conjure up fears of neo-colonialism and cultural homogenization.”

Allegations of international education being an avenue for the imposition of neo-colonial power from the West cannot be taken lightly; consider Trilokekar’s (2009:131) comment that countries in the North such as “Canada [have] always recognized the importance of exercising ‘soft power’ through avenues such as international cultural relations, to promote [their] political, economic and cultural interests.” International academic relations are part of that ‘soft power’ that Trilokekar is talking about.

Trilokekar (2009:132) says that international academic relations were initially established purposefully after the Second World War. One has to remember that this was the same period when the USA, as the leader of the victors in the Second World War, was inaugurating studies in intercultural communication. It was the same period that saw the explosion of a new interpretative sociology. And it was also a period when most colonies were agitating for

independence around the world. Therefore it is no surprise that Trilokekar (2009:132) states that international educational relations “had a clearly political and cultural mandate to increase international understanding and collaboration”. Trilokekar (*ibid.*) notes that the institutions that carried out this work for different countries are “the United States Information Agency, UK’s British Council, Germany’s DAAD and Goethe Institutes, EduFrance and the network of Alliance Francaise, the Netherlands’s NUFFIC, or the Japan Foundation”, which are all concerned with international education. This again demonstrates that the globalisation or internationalisation of education is also connected to the operations of state power. Trilokekar’s observations also remind us of the point raised by Martin (2011:63, 64), who told us that as different countries around the world agitated for and attained independence from their colonial masters, the latter were faced with the question of how to “retain imperial networks and, in turn, how to study colonial subjects who were becoming rulers and citizens of independent states”. Martin (2011:60) explicitly says that

these initiatives were not without precedent, however. As U.S. power expanded worldwide during World War II, the need for trusted and dedicated analysts of areas outside the Americas — of which Africa was but one — grew rapidly, especially in the military and intelligence services. Early post-war commissions tackled this problem by making the case for the creation of new units within universities dedicated to “non-European” areas of the world.

Zeszotarski (2001:67) expresses the same fear that the globalisation of education will contribute to the rise of “imperialist attitudes, loss of indigenous cultures and the relentless imposition of Western values”. This points to the power dynamics and cultural imperialism that may crop up in cross-cultural educational exchanges and encounters between the West and the rest (cf. Lo and Gilbert, 2002:36-37; Akomolafe and Dike, 2011:1-3). Akomolafe and Dike (2011:4) further argue that the internationalisation of education has led to the “attained invisibility” and “normativity of [Western] higher education praxis”, a situation that has thwarted the evolution of “indigenous pedagogical alternatives” (cf. Hopper, 2000: 99-100; Elteren, 2003:171). This means that the globalisation of education or North-South intercultural collaborations create an imbalance of power. In this case, one can claim that perhaps Wallerstein (1996:124) was right to say that “what is needed educationally is not to learn that we are citizens of the world, but that we occupy particular niches in an unequal world”.

In the same vein, Bharucha (1993: ix) implies a connection between ‘intercultural transactions’ and ‘cultural colonialism’. Mooney and Evans (2007:22-23, 30) discuss issues

of ‘choice’, ‘power’ and ‘colonialism’ and highlight their presence in global studies, arguing that it is possible to claim that globalisation is not a new phenomenon but merely a new form of colonialism.

On his part, Krishnaswamy (2002:106-7) comments on the similarity and dissimilarity of postcolonialism and globalisation this way:

Despite differences in disciplinary origin (globalisation theory in the social sciences, particularly sociology, and postcolonial theory in the humanities, particularly literary criticism), both discourses emerge at the intersection of imperialism, capitalism, and modernity.

Krishnaswamy (*ibid.*) adds that globalisation and postcolonialism are concerned with the “effects of unequal power relations between different geopolitical locations on the globe”

Krishnaswamy (*ibid.*) elaborates on the above points by saying that theories of globalisation and postcolonialism critique the universality of Western modernity and attempt to deconstruct conceptual categories that are central to the narrative of Western modernity, and thus

both postcolonial and globalisation studies have frequently focused on various forms of economic, political, social, and cultural flows that exceed the boundaries of the nation-state and operate in a deterritorialized or transnational fashion. Through these accounts, postcolonial theory has emphasized the cultural basis of history (the cultural constructedness of history as well as the archival value of cultural productions) while globalisation theory, in turn, has highlighted the cultural basis of the economic (the economic value of cultural productions as well as the cultural production of economic value).

The discussion of different concepts and notions such as power, colonialism and culture seemed repetitive in some sections of this literature survey. This repetitiveness is significant because it shows how the different shades of certain concepts are closely linked in an intertextual mode to the different discourses that are relevant in this study.

### **3.6 Recapping the theoretical framework in this study**

#### **3.6.1 Intercultural communication theory**

In this study I viewed intercultural theatre as a practical site of intercultural communication. In the light of the above, Asante, Miike and Yin (2008: i) state that “the field of intercultural communication seeks to understand the process of communicating across cultural boundaries with an aim toward promoting positive relations between different cultures and nations”.

However, Asante *et al.* (2008:3-4) point to the need for examining the impact of power on intercultural communication, equality and mutuality. In the same vein, Asante *et al.* (2008:4) warn that the “idea of interaction may be the principal instrument for the transubstantiation of privilege and power into accepted reality.” I believe these perspectives make intercultural communication theory relevant in the analysis of North-South intercultural collaborations.

### **3.6.2 Postcolonial theory**

The literature review undertaken in Chapters Two and Three, with its myriad perspectives, points to the complexity of finding a theory or theories that would suit the multidimensional nature of this study in particular and the multidimensional nature of contemporary cultural scholarship in general.

However, postcolonial theory is one of the compound theories on which I have based the theoretical grounding for this study. Carter (2004:821) also believes that one can use postcolonial theory to analyse processes and concepts such as modernity, identity, representation and resistance that characterise many theorisations of culture and difference, including those that are underexplored. To adopt Carter’s (2004:*ibid.*) stance in arguing for postcolonial theory in contemporary cultural analysis, one may say that postcolonial theory and analysis opens up thinking about the material, cultural, ideological and theoretical conditions within which intercultural theatre is produced and enacted.

### **3.6.3 Ethnic boundary maintenance**

There is an indication that there could be ‘theatrical cultural boundary maintenance’ in intercultural theatre productions when one revisits Haus’s (1995:71) argument that “the easily assumed universality of theatre as an art form and medium is to be reconsidered, always with its cultural determinants taken into account and in perspective of such oppositions as the centre and the periphery, global and local, conventional and nonconformist”. The same view is reflected in Appadurai’s (1993:295) assertion that “the central problem of today’s global interaction is the tension between cultural homogenization and cultural heterogenization” as discussed in section (3.3).

Given such a situation, Barth’s (1969:9-10) theoretical insights, even though originally targeted at examining ethnic distinctions amongst different interacting cultural groups, could



be helpful in examining the similarity and dissimilarity positions of intercultural theatre.

Barth (1969) expounds his theory of ethnic boundary maintenance saying that:

First it is clear that boundaries persist despite a flow of personnel across them. In other words, categorical ethnic distinctions do not depend on an absence of mobility, contact and information, but do entail social processes of exclusion and incorporation whereby discrete categories are maintained despite changing participation and membership in the course of individual life histories.

I believe the above could be useful in analysing the dynamics of intercultural theatre performances and their implications on the assumptions of theatrical culture homogenisation in intercultural theatre.

### **3.6.4 Critical theory**

Edgar and Sedgwick (2008: 72) state that ‘critical theory’ is an umbrella term used in textual analysis. However, in this study it is looked at from the perspective of Horkheimer, Adorno, Benjamin and Marcuse of the Frankfurt School where, according to Edgar and Sedgwick (2008: 72), “critical theory was envisaged as a rigorous critical engagement with social and philosophical issues which aimed at the cross-fertilization of research methods derived from the social sciences a Marxist theoretical framework of conceptualizing social relations.”

At the same time, I use critical theory’s deconstructive stance in discussing globalisation and the associated notion of cultural homogenisation. Discussing deconstruction, Edgar and Sedgwick say that the theory grew out of structuralism, adding that Jacques Derrida coined the term “deconstruction” and is considered to be its main philosopher and proponent (2008:72, 88). Edgar and Sedgwick (2008: 72) point to Derrida’s canonical work *De la grammatologie* (1967) in which Derrida enlists deconstruction to “dismantle the structures of meaning so as to expose the premises on which they are built and to reveal the concepts of objectivity and linguistic autonomy as constructs”. They elaborate on deconstruction’s crucial tenets, which are crucial in this study:

Because deconstruction is aware of the potential failure of any methodology, it points out that production of meaning at any particular moment is far removed from being a spontaneous expression of ideas and instead involves conventions and preconceptions that are deeply ingrained in language. Meaning is an expression brought forth by an autonomous mind, which explains Derrida’s attack on the notion of ‘presence’, as suggesting control over the full range of meanings of any particular utterance. When deconstruction established itself in the later 1960s, its chief interest was formulating a critique of language and representation (Edgar and Sedgwick, 2008: 72)



When one looks critically at the historical background and analysis I have provided of concepts such as culture, intercultural communication, intercultural theatre, globalisation and postcolonialism, the viability of discourse analysis, deconstruction and critical theory in this study is evident, furthermore, they all reinforce each other.

### **3.6.5 Performance theory**

In Chapter Two section 2.4.2 we noted Schechner's (1988: xiii) interpretation of performance as a kind of "ritualization" of everyday life, dance, rites and ceremonies. Similarly, Morris (1995:571) argues that performance theory entered anthropology through the "back door of ritual studies where life-cycle rites have provided a seemingly ideal venue".

However, it is evident that Schechner's (1988) and Morris's (1995) interpretations of performance are related to the conceptualisations of symbolic interaction as expounded by Pile (1996:53) and Denzin (1992:25-28), while they also reflect our understanding of culture as seen through the work of Geertz (1973:250), Rogers and Steinfatt (1999:1) and Oyserman and Uskul (2008:145), as discussed in sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 respectively.

On the basis of Schechner's (1988) and Morris's (1995) interpretation of performance or even performance theory one could postulate that intercultural theatre performances become ritualised symbolic performances not only of the cultural history of a given people, but also of socio-political and structural dimensions as practised by a given group of people. Therefore, this theory becomes relevant in the examination of the dynamics of the intercultural theatre collaboration that Makerere University's Department of Performing Arts and Film has been engaged with in the recent past.

### **3.6.6 Globalisation theory**

In sections 3.2 and 3.4 I discussed the different perspectives on globalisation theory referring to its political, economic, historical, educational and cultural perspectives. Even though in this study I primarily looked at the cultural dimension of globalisation, at the same time I bore in mind what Pavis (1992:183) says about the need to balance the socio-political and socio-economic perspectives in analysing intercultural theatre performances. Similarly, Krishnaswamy (2002:113) points out that "the most seductive allure of globalization theory, for many social analysts, is undoubtedly its seeming potential to account for a diverse array

of changes around the globe". This means that one needs to heed Beck's (2000:30-3) advice to use "a theoretical pluralism involving economic, social and cultural approaches" in analysing globalisation issues.

Given the world's interconnectedness today and the multidimensional nature of globalisation theory, I argue that globalisation seems to be the new "ism" on the block that seems to incorporate almost all of the old conceptual and theoretical categories in the social and cultural sciences. This multidimensionality of globalisation makes it a credible theory to use in contemporary multi-perspective and multi-disciplinary intercultural studies.

### **3.7 Conclusion**

A lot has been written about interculturalism and its myriad practical and theoretical dynamics, including its strengths and weaknesses. In regard to the latter, different sections of the literature survey have investigated issues of inequality, postcolonial implications, the language and cultural barrier, difference in philosophical and pedagogical approaches, power imbalance, and inferior-superior relationships as some of the challenges in intercultural interaction.

However, putting aside the conflicting views on interculturalism, it seems that interculturalism – or in the specific context of this study, intercultural theatre – is literally a symbolic convergence of many philosophies and discourses, and practically a dialogical performance of cultural diversity in a collaborative mode. And I believe that on the basis of my multidisciplinary "discourse-historical method intent on tracing the (intertextual) history" (Blommaert, 2005:28) of conceptual categories such as intercultural communication, intercultural theatre, globalisation, postcolonialism and cultural imperialism, I have contributed to cultural and theatre studies in particular by showing how all these concepts converge in intercultural theatre scholarship.

In this literature survey, we have seen the centrality of notions of culture and power in any form of cross-cultural interaction and in contemporary studies in the humanities and social sciences. This chapter has demonstrated the central place of the cultural and of power dynamics in intercultural communication, intercultural theatre, colonial, postcolonial and globalisation discourses. Since the operations of intercultural theatre revolve around the

mediation of the cultural and power, these aspects become important in the analysis of intercultural theatre collaborations.

In the next chapter I am going to discuss the methodology that was used in collecting data for this study.

## **Chapter Four: Research design and methodology**

### **4.1 Introduction**

In this chapter I discuss the methodology used in the quest for answers to the research questions of this study. I discuss the methods, tools and approach to data analysis, and highlight the challenges that were encountered during the execution of the study and how they were mitigated.

Hypothetically and conceptually, this study is situated within intercultural studies. It was guided by the assumption that North-South intercultural theatre collaborations are microcosms of global intercultural interactions with a multiplicity of factors and concepts at play. This multidisciplinary study examines the dynamics of intercultural theatre collaborations in Uganda taking Makerere University's Department of Performing Arts and Film's recent North-South intercultural theatre collaborations as case studies.

### **4.2 Research procedure**

During the implementation of this study I followed the ethical guidelines of Stellenbosch University. I registered the study with the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology and its registration code is Richard Kagoloby (SS3004). At the same time, I had to inform the Directorate of Research and Postgraduate Studies of Makerere University of my study, since the data were to be collected from Makerere University's collaborative partners, staff and Makerere University students. Before I undertook the fieldwork, I also requested for a letter of introduction from the Graduate School, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences of Stellenbosch University. Copies of my research proposal and the introductory letter from the Graduate School, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Stellenbosch University were given to the aforementioned institutions in Uganda for clearance for my research.

As indicated above, my research necessitated my interviewing Makerere University's intercultural partners. Consequently, before I contacted these partners – for example, the New York University students and the Norwegian College of Dance students – I had to inform the Makerere University project coordinators, who in turn informed the project leaders at those institutions about my research. After that I was introduced by the project leaders to the student participants of these collaborating institutions.

After selecting the people who were going to participate in this study, for example, the interviews and focus group discussions, I had to tell them about myself and the kind of study I was carrying out, its objectives and anticipated benefits.

After collecting the data through the interviews and focus group discussions, the data were transcribed and coded. In order to abide by Stellenbosch University's ethical guidelines, I had to safeguard the identities of the persons who participated in this study. Thus, the participants' names were replaced with codes/pseudonyms (see section 4.6.3) during the analysis and reporting of data. Yin (2009:73) points out that the specific need to satisfy ethical considerations is intended to protect human subjects within a case study methodology, since "nearly all case studies ... are about contemporary human affairs".

Incidentally, two case studies that were covered in this research, namely the New York-Makerere University collaboration and the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere University collaboration, were still on-going at Makerere University at the time fieldwork for this study was carried out, while the third case study (Stanford-Makerere collaboration) was a one-off arrangement which took place in 2009. In view of this, and especially for the sake of the continuing collaborations, I made sure that I gained verbal informed consent from all persons who took part in this study. I also had to protect the privacy and anonymity of the research participants, so that in future they would not be put in any undesirable position as a result of their views and participation in this study. Moreover, the ultimate objective of this study was not to engage with the particular identities of individuals, 'who said what' during the interviews and focus group discussions, but to understand the dynamics and challenges of North-South intercultural collaborations, so that if any major challenging issues arise in their organisation and execution in future, they can be rectified in order to improve these collaborations.

Therefore, in line with the relevant research ethics, I ensured the anonymity of my respondents by giving them codes/pseudonyms (see section 4.6.3).

### **4.3 Research design**

Writing about research designs, Yin (2009:26) says that

Every type of empirical research has an implicit, if not explicit, research design. In the most elementary sense, the design is the logical sequence that connects the empirical data to a study's initial research questions and, ultimately, to its conclusions.

Colloquially, a research design is a logical plan for getting from here to there, where here may be defined as the initial set of questions to be answered, and there is some set of conclusions (answers) about these questions. Between “here” and “there” may be found a number of major steps, including the collection and analysis of relevant data.

Yin (*ibid.*) also refers to Nachmias and Nachmias (1992), who describe a research design as a plan that “guides the investigator in the process of collecting, analysing, and interpreting observations. It is a logical model of proof that allows the researcher to draw inferences concerning casual relations among the variables under investigation.”

This study followed a discourse-ethnographic multiple case study design. This approach integrated discourse and textual analysis, and light ethnographic methods, which included participant observation, individual interviews and focus group discussions in order to undertake a holistic analysis of the symbolic interactive dynamics of intercultural theatre collaborations that Makerere University’s Department of Performing Arts and Film has been engaged with in the recent past. Moreover, Yin (2009: 18) says that “case study research comprises an all-encompassing method – covering the logic of design, data collection techniques, and specific approaches to data analysis.”

Given that this study followed a multiple case semi-ethnographic design, it is worth noting that Dimitriads and Weis (2007:323) say that multi-sited ethnography offers a key response to the multi-sited nature of global phenomena, in this case intercultural theatre. This way, the multi-case and methodological design helped me in charting, comparing, analysing and understanding the dynamics of interacting cultures as they were configured through the different cross-cultural theatre collaborations and performances undertaken by Makerere University’s Department of Performing Arts and Film.

It should further be clarified that this study integrated discourse and textual analysis in its approach. Thus it is a multidisciplinary study referring to theatre practice and performance discourse, intercultural communication, postcolonial theory and globalisation theory, among others, as explained in Chapters Two and Three. Given that multiple images are usually projected in intercultural collaborations, I used what Beck (2000:30-3) calls “a theoretical [or methodological] pluralism”, since any methodological approach and analysis that operates with just a single logic excludes a crucial dimension of culture and/or intercultural theatre collaboration (also see Pennycook, 2007:25). Similarly, McCarthy (1994:18) comments on cultural criticism thus:

Cultural criticism is not the self-sufficient, self-enclosed undertaking as its more textualistically inclined practitioners sometimes make it appear to be ... But they need not to prevent us ... from acknowledging the interdependence of 'textual' studies with social and cultural studies of various other sorts. One of the broadest goals of a genuinely multidisciplinary research practice would be a 'critical theory of the present'.

In the same vein, in Chapter Two section 2.4.2 I argued that the multifaceted historical background of interculturalism in theatre compels one to adopt multidisciplinary and multi-method analytical approaches as appropriate points of departure/tools in intercultural theatre research. I further observed that the multidisciplinary approach used in this context, to use Blommaert's (2005:16) words, may lead one to "violate all kinds of disciplinary orthodoxies" in order to find the freedom to use whatever can be useful in solving analytical and/or methodological problems of interculturalism in theatre, which is at the intersection of myriad discourses and research methodologies.

#### **4.3.1 Why I used case study methodology**

The major aim of this study was to examine and understand the dynamics and notions – theatrical, socio-political, cultural or otherwise – that have been manifested in the intercultural theatre collaborations and performances undertaken by Makerere University. Bearing in mind the principal objective of this study, I found that a case study design was most appropriate. For example, Woodside and Wilson (2003:493) say that case study research is "inquiry focusing on describing, understanding and predicting and/or controlling an individual (i.e. process, animal, person, household, organisation, group, industry, culture, or nationality)". This means that a case study design would help me to cover the aspects of describing and understanding intercultural theatre dynamics that I wanted to look at.

Woodside and Wilson (2003:494) further say that the multi-method approach in case study research (CSR) – for example, the application of interviewing – helps to get views from individuals who are involved in the thinking-doing processes of organisations or groups. Since intercultural theatre is a thinking-doing performance activity, interviewing people who were involved in the intercultural collaborations helped me in understanding the intercultural theatre dynamics in Makerere University's intercultural theatre collaborations. Moreover, Woodside and Wilson (2003:497) say that

one or a combination of the following purposes may serve as the major objective of CSR: description, understanding, prediction, or control. However, we propose that deep understanding of actors, interactions, sentiments, and behaviours occurring for a

specific process through time should be seen as the principal objective by the case study researcher.

They add that “deep understanding in CSR includes: knowledge of ‘sensemaking’ processes created by individuals ... and systems thinking, policy mapping, and systems dynamics modelling ... what might be labelled appropriately as meta-sensemaking” (Woodside and Wilson, 2003:497).

Woodside and Wilson (2003: 498) also note that “achieving deep understanding in CSR usually involves the use of multiple research methods across multiple time periods”. However, they advise that if “long participation is impossible, the alternative includes adopting multi-method procedures, for example, interviewing all parties participating in conversations and events under study, and the collection of documents and additional unobtrusive measures” (Woodside and Wilson, 2003:500). Similarly, Yin (2009:11) says that “the case study’s unique strength is its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence – documents, artefacts, interviews, and observations”. In line with case study procedural requirements, I started the first phase of fieldwork for this study in November 2012 and ended it in June 2013. I was also able to visit the field again in December 2013 up to March 2014. Given this period I spent in the field, coupled with my use of multiple research methods in the collection of data, I believe I tried to follow Woodside and Wilson’s (2003) and Yin’s (2009) recommendations for successful case study research.

Through my readings on research methodology, I discovered that if one intended to do research on multidisciplinary intercultural phenomena, the results that are achievable through the use of case study research described by Woodside and Wilson (2003:497) are more compelling. After all, intercultural theatre collaborations are organisational endeavours involving human interaction and the exhibition of human ‘ritualised’ behaviours, which are sometimes influenced by the institutional and cultural beliefs of the participating groups. Similarly, Yin (2009:4) elaborates on the application of case studies saying that this approach can be “used in many situations, to contribute to our knowledge of individual, group, organisational, social, political and related phenomena.” Yin (*ibid.*) adds, more specifically:

In all these situations, the distinctive need for case studies arises out of the desire to understand complex social phenomena. In brief, the case study method allows investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events – such as individual life styles, small group behaviour, organizational and managerial processes, neighbourhood change, school performance, international relations, and the maturation of industries.



In line with case study methodology being applicable to real-life events, organisational and managerial processes (see Woodside and Wilson, 2003:497), it should be noted that two of the collaborations at Makerere University – that is, the New York-Makerere University collaboration and the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere University collaboration – were still on-going at the time of fieldwork for this study.

What Yin (2009) and Woodside and Wilson (2003) highlight about case study methodology made it the most appropriate for this multidisciplinary study on intercultural theatre.

#### **4.4 Sample design and sampling methods**

The design chosen for the study was a multiple case study design. In this study I dealt with three case studies: the Stanford-Makerere University collaboration, the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere University collaboration, and the New York-Makerere University collaboration. I believe that the three cases that were chosen and whose data were triangulated in this research report provide tangible and credible results about the dynamics of intercultural theatre collaborations at Makerere University. Yin (2009:53) argues that compared to single case studies, “the evidence from multiple cases is often considered more compelling, and the overall study is therefore regarded as being more robust”.

##### **4.4.1 Sampling methods**

The method of sampling used in this study was purposive sampling. Purposive sampling was used in order to target individuals who had particularly participated in Makerere University’s intercultural theatre collaborations. As indicated earlier, three case studies were chosen, namely the New York-Makerere collaboration, the Stanford-Makerere collaboration and the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration. The New York-Makerere collaboration was chosen because it has been on-going since 2007. Given that it had already been active for several years, I believed that it could provide rich data about the dynamics of intercultural theatre collaborations. The Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration is the only one among the three that involves a formal collaboration agreement with Makerere University and I thought that it could also provide crucial insights. Additionally, unlike New York University and Stanford University which are both from the USA, the Norwegian College of Dance is from Norway and I thought this could introduce an interesting inter-state comparative perspective. The Stanford-Makerere University collaboration was included

because, compared to the other two, it was a one-off collaboration. Also, unlike the New York University and Norwegian College of Dance collaborations, which primarily used dance as their major focus in the collaboration and intercultural performances, the Stanford-Makerere University intercultural production was more multi-medial; that is, it combined dance, song, poetry and dramatisation through which the participants verbalised their sentiments about each other. I believed that such a collaboration could illuminate some of the dynamics in the North-South intercultural collaborations. After all, in this collaboration there was reciprocity in the movement of participants whereby, after the Stanford group's visit to Uganda, the Ugandan group also visited Stanford University to stage the resultant intercultural performance *Beyond My Circle*. This never happened with the other two cases.

#### **4.5 Data collection methods and fieldwork practice**

In this study I used mixed methods to collect data. Yin (2009:98) says that data for case studies can be obtained from six main sources: documents, archival records, interviews, direct observation, participant-observation, and physical artefacts. In this study I had to peruse available documents relevant to the case studies as well as archival records on web pages; I also engaged in direct observation of intercultural performances, and at the same time I had to interview some of the individuals who were participating in the collaborations. The strength of this kind of mixed methods research is expressed by Yin (2009: 63), who says that it “forces the methods to share the same research questions, to collect complementary data, and to conduct counterpart analyses”. Yin (*ibid.*) asserts that mixed methods research can “permit investigators to address more complicated research questions and collect a richer and stronger array of evidence than can be accomplished by a single method alone”. As a researcher, I did all this because I wanted to engage in a richer dialogue with the evidence (Yin, 2009:69). Similarly, Woodside and Wilson (2003:500) rightly say that “some use of triangulation of methods and multiple informants is necessary to confirm and deepen information”. Yin (2009:69) advises that using mixed methods of data collection “calls for mastering different data collection procedures. Throughout, a major objective is to collect data about actual human events and behaviour”.

Since intercultural theatre collaborations are human events that involve human actions and behaviours, personal interviews were some of the appropriate tools for collecting data from participating individuals.

#### 4.5.1 Personal interviews

In order to understand the perceptions and views of individuals who were participating in the intercultural theatre collaborations at Makerere University's Department of Performing Arts and Film, I used the interview method. Yin (2009:106) says that "one of the most important sources of case study information is the interview". Similarly, Woodside and Wilson (2003:493) say that "interviewing multiple participants involved in the thinking-doing processes of organisations or groups helps us in deep understanding of their motivations in their thinking-doing processes".

In all, I interviewed 30 people; they were made up of project leaders, coordinators, teachers and students of the three institutions who were involved in the intercultural collaborations. Before I conducted the interviews, I requested the interviewees' permission for the interviews to be recorded and all of them accepted. I ended up with approximately 20 hours of recorded interview data. And because the interviews were recorded, this helped me in the transcription process later on.

I was able to interview New York students and their teachers who were involved in the January 2013 collaboration and at the same time I was also able to interview Norwegian College of Dance students and their teachers who were involved in the March-April 2013 collaboration. I was also able to interview Makerere University students and their teachers who were involved in the two collaborations at the time.

I was also able to interview some Makerere University participants who were involved in 2009 Stanford-Makerere University collaboration. The semi-structured interviews were closely guided by the objectives of the study, which were designed into an interview guide. I used semi-structured questions in the interview because Woodside and Wilson (2003:495,496) rightly say that using "fixed-point questions may fail to uncover the deep nuances and dynamic interactions between thought and actions within and between individuals". Therefore, acquiring respondents' answers to "fixed-point questions may not be enough for a deep understanding of the thinking and doing processes" in intercultural collaborations (*ibid.*). In this case, the interviews aimed at developing a deeper understanding of the nature of the performances, intercultural communication dynamics during the

execution of the collaborations, benefits and challenges of the collaboration and the place of the collaboration within the wider framework of globalisation.

Specifically, the interview method helped me in achieving a deep understanding of intercultural theatre dynamics by “probing and asking case participants for explanations and interpretations” on how and why particular things in the collaboration appeared to be done the way they were being done (Woodside and Wilson, 2003: 498). Woodside and Wilson (2003:498-499) further say that gaining deep understanding in research often includes learning the “‘mental models’ ... of the participants; a mental model is the set of propositions a participant in a case understands to be reality – that is, an accurate portrayal of the causes, events and outcomes relevant in the ... case”. This was also possible by using interviews, because I got to know verbally the different participants’ perceptions about intercultural collaborations, something that could not be achieved by mere observation.

All this means that data from interviewing participants in an intercultural environment represented symbolic intercultural discourse. Blommaert (2005:2) tells us that discourse analysis developed within linguistic theory, which called for more activity-centred approaches to analysis, and the recognition of “language-in-use as a legitimate object of analysis”. He says that language is meaningful symbolic behaviour and that discourse is language-in-action (Blommaert, 2005:2). This means that critical analysis of the intercultural language that was in use in the environment of Makerere University’s intercultural theatre collaborations exhibited through the personal interviews could provide vital insights to deepen our understanding of the dynamics of intercultural theatre collaborations. This will be shown by the discussion of the findings in Chapters Five, Six and Seven.

It should be noted that interviewing as a research method is in most cases used alongside other methods in order to enrich the data collected. One of the methods used in this endeavour was direct observation.

#### **4.5.2 Direct observation**

Woodside and Wilson (2003:498) say that one of the approaches of achieving deep understanding in case study research is “direct observation by the researcher within the environment of the case”. Yin (2009:70) similarly says that in order to be a good researcher, one should be a good listener. He argues that for case studies, “listening” means “receiving

information through multiple modalities – for example, making keen observations or sensing what might be going on – not just using the aural modality” (Yin, 2009:70). Yin (2009:110) states that “observational evidence is often useful in providing additional information about the topic being studied”.

I used direct observation in this study to detect what was taking place in intercultural theatre workshop sessions and intercultural live theatre performances during fieldwork in Kampala, Uganda. For the New York collaboration, on two occasions, I was allowed to observe two sessions of their rehearsals as I waited to interview some of the participants. I also watched the New York-Makerere University intercultural theatre performances at the Uganda National Theatre on 18 January 2013 and in January 2014. For the Norwegian College of Dance I was not able to watch any of their workshops. This was because of their reservations about an ‘outsider’ watching their training sessions and, because of research ethics considerations, I had to abide by their wish. However, I was able to watch the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere Intercultural performances on 27 and 28 April 2013.

One of the advantages of the observation method is that it can help one to cover events in real time and help in contextualising the cases. Yin (2009:109), for example, argues that “assuming the phenomena of interest have not been purely historical, some relevant behaviours or environmental conditions will be available for observation”. I also obtained operational data through spontaneous listening-in to the conversations of participants in the intercultural collaborations. Woodside and Wilson (2003:498) say that “operational data includes spontaneous conversations of participants in a case, activities engaged in and observed by the researcher”. Observation was also useful in getting to know interpersonal behaviours of persons in the study environment.

Through the use of the observation method of data collection I was, for example, able to see the performance texts, bodily displays and costuming, physical negotiation of difference in intercultural dance, and audience reactions during intercultural theatre performances at the Uganda National Theatre. During these direct observation interactions, I noted my observations in a notebook. This approach provided a basis for contextualising and comparing data obtained through other methods such as the personal interviews and document analysis.

### **4.5.3 Focus group discussion**

In this study I also used the focus group discussion method of data collection. I had two focus group discussions with the Norwegian College of Dance students and two with Makerere University students who had participated in the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration.

The Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration had a very tight schedule and to get the NCD students for personal interviews was quite difficult. Given this scenario, the focus group discussion was particularly useful. The first focus group discussion with the Norwegian students involved three people and the second one involved four people. The semi-structured discussion I had with them was guided by a focus group discussion guide that had the same line of questioning as that of the interview guide described in section 4.5.1.

Similarly, I also had two focus group discussions with Makerere University participants and each involved three people. The questions that framed the discussion were similar to those I put to the NCD participants. In all, through the focus group discussions I got additional insights into the language that was in use during the intercultural collaborations (see Blommaert, 2005:2), which I could use to cross-validate information obtained through other sources such as the personal interviews and direct observations. All this made it possible for me to triangulate the data and provide solid and comprehensive discussions as presented in Chapters Five, Six and Seven.

### **4.5.4 Document analysis**

In this study I also used document analysis. Bowen (2009:27) says that document analysis is “the systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents – both printed and electronic ... material”. Like other methods in qualitative research, document analysis helps us to gain understanding and develop empirical knowledge.

Bowen (2009:29-30) further states that since documents bear witness to past events, they provide background information as well as historical insight. Such information and insight can help researchers understand the historical roots of specific issues and can indicate the conditions that impinge upon the phenomena currently under investigation. The researcher can use data drawn from documents, for example, to contextualise data collected during interviews.

Bearing in mind my discussion in Chapters One, Two and Three, and my analysis which will be presented in Chapters Five, Six and Seven, the importance of historical documents is clearly evident. For example, in Chapters Two and Three I adopted a historiographical perspective to discuss concepts such as intercultural communication, interculturalism in theatre and globalisation. In Chapter Two section 2.4.3.1 I also showed how and why intercultural theatre has always faced a crisis of identification with colonialism.

Briefly, my analysis of historical documents showed that intercultural theatre was a product of a negotiation of, and adaptation to, historical-political circumstances. This form of discussion was possible through the analysis of historical documents. All this relates to Martin and Nakayama's (2008:79-84) concept of the dialectics of intercultural communication, especially the present-future/history-past dialectic that highlights the importance of history as a factor in understanding contemporary intercultural interaction between social groups and even the degree of intergroup anxiety (see Chapter Two section 2.3.3). In part, the historical background that was accessible through the analysis of documents provided a basis for my analysis in Chapters Five, Six and Seven.

Based on the available documents, I analysed discourses on globalisation, intercultural performance and intercultural communication in books, newspapers and journals in order to understand the various discourses and their intertextual relationship with intercultural theatre. Essentially, I relied on document analysis to come up with the multidisciplinary theoretical framework on which this study is based. This led to me to content analysis<sup>4</sup> and/or discourse analysis as some of the approaches that I used in the analysis of documents, as exemplified by my discussion in Chapters Two and Three. Commenting on discourse analysis, Loomba (1998:37, 47) argues that:

Discourse analysis ... makes it possible to trace connections between the visible and the hidden, the dominant and the marginalised, ideas and institutions. It allows us to see how power works through language, literature, culture and the institutions which regulate our daily lives.

Furthermore, even though I personally watched the intercultural theatre performances of the Stanford-Makerere collaboration, the New York-Makerere collaboration and the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration, I also acquired DVD copies of those performances

---

<sup>4</sup> Bowen (2009: 32) defines content analysis as the process of organising information into categories related to the central questions of the research.

in order to have a second critical look at them. The results of this critical analysis of these performance recordings are discussed in my analysis in Chapter Five.

#### **4.5.5 E-mails of inquiry**

I used emails of inquiry to get in touch with the Stanford University participants who were involved in a one-off collaboration with Makerere University in 2009 and who were not physically available for face-to-face interviews or focus group discussions. However, it should be noted that it was not easy to get feedback from a number of them, since some had changed their e-mail addresses since 2009. In addition to the four email replies I received, I had to rely on archival data on websites and other publicly available documents such as newsletters that had recorded the participants' views on this collaboration. This was also coupled with the analysis of the recording of the intercultural theatre performance between Stanford and Makerere University which involved the enactment of perceptions that each group had about the other. Therefore the lack of adequate e-mail feedback did not strongly affect the quality and strength of data gathered. For the New York and Norwegian College of Dance participants, there was no urgent need for email inquiries, since I was able to personally interact with them in January 2013 and 2014 as well as March 2013 and 2014 respectively during fieldwork in Kampala, Uganda. However, I was also able to write emails to some people I had interviewed in order to get some clarifications on some unclear issues that emerged as I was writing the draft research report.

### **4. 6 Data management and analysis**

#### **4.6.1 Introduction**

In this section I discuss the process I used to manage the data that I collected and how it was analysed.

#### **4.6.2 Data management**

To avoid data loss and misplacement, I made sure that after conducting each day's interviews and/or focus group discussions, I backed up the data on a computer and external hard drive. As per Stellenbosch's ethical guidelines, the data were password protected so that unauthorised persons could not gain access to the information. These data were later transcribed and coded.



### **4.6.3 Transcription of interviews and focus group discussions**

I did the transcriptions of the interviews and focus group discussions personally. This process helped me to develop a more personal understanding of the data. For example, through the personal transcription of the data I was able to identify salient issues and phenomena that were unfolding and their relevance to my research questions. When important issues were raised by the interviewees during the playback and transcription process of the data, I immediately highlighted them. This helped me in identifying the subject trends and thematic concerns of the data in relation to the overall study objective.

Personal transcription of the interviews and focus group discussions also helped me to identify the missing links in the data collected, as well as areas that needed to be backed up with the collection of more data. This scenario in the research process was aptly described by Yin (2009:69) when he suggested that “as you collect case study evidence, you must quickly review the evidence and continually ask yourself why events or facts appear as they do. Your judgement may lead to the immediate need to search for additional evidence”.

Overall, even though transcription of data was a tedious activity, it was a worthwhile one because it enhanced my personal connection and understanding of my data.

### **4.6.4 Coding and theming transcripts**

#### **4.6.4.1 Codes and coding**

As indicated in the above section, personal transcriptions of the interviews and focus group discussions brought me closer to my data. The process of transcription also helped me to identify portions of the data that were relevant to my study questions and I highlighted them by allocating them brief word codes<sup>5</sup> such as “intercultural benefit”, “intercultural challenge”, “globalisation issue”, “intercultural communication issue” and “power issue” among others. Saldana (2009:3-4) says that codes help in condensing data for easy management and quick analysis. It was through this process of coding transcripts that I was able to identify the unfolding themes in the data because the codes helped in capturing the data’s content and

---

<sup>5</sup> According to Saldana (2009:3), a code is a “word or short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing, and/or evocative attribute for a portion of language-based or visual data”. The data in this case can “consist of interview transcripts, participant observation field notes, journals, documents, literature, artefacts, photographs, video, websites, e-mail correspondence, and so on”.

essence. Allowing themes to emerge direct from the coded data is what Fereday and Muir-Cochrane (2006:4) call “inductive coding”. With regard to the importance of transcribing one’s data and the connection of this process to the analysis of meaning, Kvale and Brinkmann (2009:180) say that

researchers who transcribe their own interviews will learn much about their own interviewing style; to some extent they will have social and emotional aspects of the interview situation present or reawakened during transcription, and will already have started the analysis of the meaning of what was said.

In order to keep the identities of my respondents anonymous, I gave them specific codes. The codes showed the institution that the respondents were from and their status, for example student or teacher. Since the Makerere University participants were involved in all the three collaborations that were covered in this study, the respondents in this category were given codes indicating the particular collaboration that they were involved in. The codes that were generated in this process, were the same codes that were used to quote the respondents as the need arose during the discussion of findings in Chapters Five, Six and Seven. The codes are explained in detail below.

NYUT: This was used to mean New York University teacher and in case a respondent was interviewee number one, I refer to such an interview as NYUT1.

NYUS: This was used to mean New York University student and an interviewee number was also added.

NCDT: This means Norwegian College of Dance teacher.

NCDS: Norwegian College of Dance student.

Since participants from Makerere University were involved in all the three collaborations, I differentiated them with the following codes:

SU/MAK-MUS: SU/MAK was used to stand for Stanford University-Makerere University collaboration and MUS means Makerere University student. In all it means a Makerere University student who participated in this collaboration.

SU/MAK-MUT: MUT in this case means Makerere University teacher.

NYU/MAK-MUT: NYU/MAK means New York University-Makerere University collaboration. MUT means Makerere University teacher.

NYU/MAK-MUS: MUS in this case means Makerere student.

NCD/MAK-MUT: this means Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere University collaboration, and MUT means Makerere University teacher.

NCD/MAK-MUS: in this case MUS means Makerere University student.

I believe that using such codes protected the identities of my respondents in this study.

#### **4.6.4.2 Themes and theming**

As indicated in section 4.6.4.1, the process of reflective listening to recorded interviews and focus group discussions and their transcription and coding helped me to discover the themes and subthemes that were unfolding from the data. This helped in thematic coding of the data that I was transcribing. Saldana (2009:13) rightly says that a “theme is an outcome of coding, categorisation, and analytic reflection”. In this case, revisiting and reflecting on the coded data informed the development of themes and categories of data. As observed in section 4.6.4.1, this is what Fereday and Muir-Cochrane (2006:4) call “inductive coding”. It will be observed in Chapters Five, Six and Seven that my discussion and analysis is basically supported by views quoted from the study participants, thus ensuring that my themes emerged from and/or are closely linked to the opinions of the research participants and the language that was in use/in action in the environment of the intercultural theatre collaborations at Makerere University (see section 4.5.1).

#### **4.7 Data analysis**

In this study I used triangulation in the analysis of data. In section 4.5 I indicated that I used personal interviews, direct observation, focus group discussion, e-mails of inquiry and document analysis during the data-collection process. Therefore in the discussion in Chapters Five, Six and Seven where the need arose I had to refer to a multiplicity of sources in order to describe, analyse or discuss the findings. This is in other words what Yin (2009:40-41) calls “construct validity” in multi-case study research. He says that in order to construct validity, one has to use multiple sources and establish a chain of evidence from the different cases

used. Constructing validity is reinforced by what Yin (2009: 40-41) terms “external validity”. This is where one uses replication logic in multiple case studies in implementing the research design. Yin (2009:56-57) points out the steps that are taken in the replication approach to multiple-case studies “develop theory – select cases – design data-collection protocol – study each individual case and write individual report – draw cross-case conclusions – modify theory – develop policy implications”. Yin (2009:110) emphasises that all sources of evidence need to be reviewed and analysed together so that the case study’s findings are based on the convergence of information from different sources. Similarly, if we are to look at this study in terms of multi-sited ethnography, Marcus’s (1998:90) point is relevant that “multi-sited research is designed around chains, paths, threads, conjunctions or juxtapositions of locations in which the ethnographer/researcher establishes some form of literal physical presence, with an explicit, posited logic of association or connection among sites”.

In this study I used an analytical hybrid of Yin’s (2009) and Marcus’s (1998) advice in dealing with multi-case and/or multi-sited research. For example, Yin (2009:20, 57) says: “case studies can cover multiple cases and then draw a single set of ‘cross-case’ conclusions.” In my initial report drafts this is what I did, but in my subsequent analysis I had to merge the emerging thematic concerns together in a cross-case approach and thereafter drew a set of cross-case conclusions.

In line with Yin’s (2009:56-57) suggestions in particular, in Chapters Two and Three I discussed the multidisciplinary theoretical foundation of this study and in this Chapter I explain and discuss the research protocol and other methodological undertakings that I followed, and in Chapters Five, Six and Seven I present and discuss the cross-case findings, allowing themes to emerge directly from the fieldwork data, or what Fereday and Muir-Cochrane (2006:4) call “inductive coding”. After the thematic consideration of data from the personal interviews, focus group discussions and field observations supported by quoted views expressed by the study participants, I triangulated the findings by analysing the data putting into consideration the multidisciplinary theoretical foundation of the study that I discussed in Chapters Two and Three. In this case, Braun and Clarke (2006:81) described the thematic approach I adopted to data analysis better when they said that

thematic analysis can be an essentialist or realist method, which reports experiences, meanings and the reality of participants, or it can be a constructionist method, which examines the ways in which events, realities, meanings, experiences and so on are the effects of a range of discourses operating within society.

In Chapter Eight I draw the multi-case cross-cutting conclusions highlighting the implication of the findings on the theory and practice of the North-South intercultural collaborations, and at the same time suggest some recommendations for improving the collaborations in future.

In all, as Bogdan and Biklen (1982:145) put it, the analysis of data in this study confirms that qualitative data analysis is about “working with data, organising it, and breaking it into manageable units, synthesising it, searching for patterns, discovering what is important and what is to be learned, and deciding what you will tell others”.

However, all the above should be done in a valid and reliable manner as I am going to explain in the section that follows.

#### **4.8 Validity and reliability of the study findings**

Yin (2009:3) writes about case methodology saying that, like any other research method, case studies involve “protecting against threats to validity, maintaining a ‘chain of evidence,’ and investigating and testing ‘rival explanations’.” In order to ensure the validity and reliability of this study’s findings, I applied triangulation. As I indicated in section 4.5, I used multiple methods of data collection. And in section 4.7, I explained how I used the different sources of data to present and discuss findings in Chapters Five, Six and Seven. Using all these sources of data in the analysis helped in cross-validating the findings. This is what Yin (2009:40-41) calls “construct validity” in multi-case study research. In other words, in order to construct validity and ensure reliability of the findings, I used multiple sources of data, namely data from the interviews, focus group discussions, direct observation and document analysis in order to establish a chain of evidence from the different cases in this study. Constructing validity was also reinforced by what Yin (2009: 40-41) terms “external validity” as highlighted in section 4.7.

Fereday and Muir-Cochrane (2006:3, refer to Schutz’s 1973) “postulate of subjective interpretation”, which points to the need for preserving the research participants’ subjective points of view and at the same time acknowledging the context within which the phenomenon was studied. They further say that the researcher must show interpretive precision/rigour and this requires one to “demonstrate clearly how interpretations of the data have been achieved and to illustrate findings with quotations from, or access to, the raw data”. The essence of this is that “the participants’ reflections, conveyed in their own words, strengthen the face validity

and credibility of the research” (Fereday and Muir-Cochrane, 2006:3). Moreover, Spencer-Oatey (2013:246) states that “there have been surprisingly few in-depth case studies of international collaborations in the education field ... so there is a dearth of information on the details of people’s experiences”. In my presentation and analysis of phenomena in Chapters Five, Six and Seven I let the research respondents’ voices to be heard by quoting their views and experiences about particular issues that were manifested in Makerere University’s intercultural collaborations.

I believe that my use of multiple research methods, and triangulation in the analysis of findings (see Woodside and Wilson, 2003:500) and letting the voices of my respondents be heard in my presentation and analysis of data (see Fereday and Muir-Cochrane, 2006:3) helped me to deepen the information, thereby affirming its credibility, validity and reliability. I also believe that quoting the respondents’ views, on which I base my own analysis and interpretations, will hopefully encourage my readers to engage in some kind of debate with this study’s findings. This is because the basis of my interpretations will be open to the readers’ own analyses and interpretations.

#### **4.9 Research challenges and how they were mitigated**

One of the major challenges encountered during this study was inadequate fieldwork funds. This is because the study fellowship did not cater for fieldwork activities. In this case, Makerere University was supposed to contribute towards fieldwork funds. However, even though I applied for these funds in November 2012, and Makerere University acknowledged my application and replied confirming a fieldwork support award in April 2013, the research funds were released only in July 2014. I was nevertheless able to accomplish the fieldwork by carefully using my scholarship’s subsistence funds.

Given the fact that the New York and Norwegian College of Dance collaborations were still on-going at Makerere University (see Yin, 2009:73), some respondents were hesitant to talk freely about the challenges of the collaborations for fear of future reprisal. However, as I indicated in section 4.2, I had to explain to such respondents the significance of the study, and assure them of their anonymity if their views were to be quoted in the final report. With this assurance, I was able to win their trust and they freely opened up and shared with me their views.

Similarly, there was also my personal dilemma of occupying both an emic and etic position in this study. From an emic (insider) perspective, based on my experience, I have learnt that most researchers have an inherent fear of carrying out research at establishments where they are employed, because of the apprehension about how the ‘self-critical’ study results will be received by their colleagues and the establishment in general. However, given my etic (outsider) position as a researcher, I had to objectively analyse and report the study events as they unfolded. I mitigated this dilemma by letting my respondents to speak through the study results as already indicated, and as it will be seen in Chapters Five, Six and Seven.

As far as interviewing and conducting focus group discussions involving Makerere University students was concerned, I was aware of the fact that the researcher’s position in the research environment can influence the behaviour of the research participants, and affect the nature of data that is gathered. In this case, since I was a teacher at the Department of Performing Arts and Film before I was granted study leave, I was cognisant that this could possibly affect the study participants who knew my earlier position. I handled this possible loophole by introducing myself as a student at all times to my prospective focus group discussants and interviewees and this closed the potential direct power rift. Moreover, at the department I was a drama teacher while most of the students who were participating in the New York-Makerere collaboration and the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration were doing dance as a course, and this also helped in reducing the would-be teacher-student power divide during my interactions with my respondents.

Generally, over the years case study research has been critiqued because of the belief that it lacks rigor and that it does not follow systematic procedures. Other views are that case studies provide little or no basis for scientific generalisation. Some think that case studies are highly ethnographic and need a lot of time (see Yin, 2009:14-16). However, Yin (2009:15) refutes such accusations by saying that “in contrast, case studies are a form of inquiry that does not depend solely on ethnographic or participant-observer data”. That is because one can “do a valid and high-quality case study without leaving the telephone or internet, depending upon the topic being studied” (*ibid.*). Similarly, as indicated in section 4.3.1, Woodside and Wilson (2003: 498-500) say that deep understanding in case study research can be achieved by the use of multiple research methods. They further point out that in the absence of long researcher participation, interviewing case participants and document analysis can help in deepening one’s understanding of the case(s) under study.



Equally, Yin (2009:6) also reminds us about the major misconception that has always been levelled against case study methodology by saying that “many social scientists still deeply believe that case studies are only appropriate for the descriptive phase, and that experiments are the only way of doing explanatory or casual inquiries.” However, Yin (2009: 6-8) says that in more recent years case studies have produced the best explanatory studies, and further asserts that case studies can either be exploratory, descriptive or explanatory. I believe that through the use of multiple cases and research methods I was able to collect data that clearly describe and evidently explain the dynamics of intercultural theatre collaborations at Makerere University.

There was also a challenge of delimiting the theoretical scope of this study. As I indicated in Chapter Two section 2.4.2, the multifaceted/intertextual nature of intercultural theatre discourse might force one to “violate all kinds of disciplinary orthodoxies” in order to find the “freedom to use whatever can be useful for solving [its] analytical [and/or methodological] problems” (Blommaert 2005:16). Because of the multidisciplinary nature of this study, to some readers portions of this study may appear as ‘assemblages of all disciplines, which show no mastery in any’. This is a challenge that most multidisciplinary studies face. But I hope that when this thesis is read as a whole, the end will justify the means.

Even though I encountered some study-specific challenges during this study, and acknowledge the general reservations of using the case study research design, I strongly believe that the steps I undertook to mitigate them helped me to develop a secure discursive basis for this research. In the same vein, I believe that the issues which are reported in this research report are valid and reliable because the mitigation processes that were undertaken in the face of research challenges helped me to reduce the margin of error and researcher biases associated with case study designs, and this makes the findings fairly generalisable.

#### **4.10 Conclusion**

In this chapter I discussed the research processes, research design, methods used in the collection of data and the research challenges and how they were mitigated.



In the next chapter I will present the findings that were gathered using the processes that have been discussed in this chapter.

## **Chapter Five: The case studies and the nature of intercultural theatre performances**

### **5.1 Introduction**

This study aimed at examining the dynamics and notions that have been manifested in the intercultural theatre collaborations and/performances that Makerere University has been engaged with in the recent past. In order to find answers to the research questions of this study, in this chapter I present and analyse the data from three cases of intercultural theatre collaboration between Makerere University and New York University, Stanford University and the Norwegian College of Dance. Based on the interactive experiences of the individuals who participated in these collaborations, accessed through interviews, focus group discussions, an analysis of two intercultural theatre performances and my own observations, I will present the salient issues that characterised the above-mentioned collaborations in the light of the theoretical perspectives that inform this study. It should be noted that in the analysis of the performances I dealt with two and left out the New York-Makerere performance because my respondents had reservations about analysing the performance itself. They emphasised that the collaboration was putting more emphasis on the intercultural process and experience of the participants rather than the quality of the final performance. Taking into consideration the ethics of this research, I decided to leave it out. But I believe the two performances that I analysed generally illustrate the nature of North-South intercultural performances at Makerere University.

### **5.2 Introducing the case studies**

This section presents a brief background to the New York-Makerere collaboration, the Stanford-Makerere collaboration and the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration.

#### **5.2.1 The New York-Makerere University collaboration**

The initiative that propelled this collaboration started in 2004, when the Nnaabagereka (queen) Sylvia Nnaginda, an alumnus of New York University and wife of the King of Buganda kingdom, Ronald Muwenda Mutebi, established a Royal Ballet Academy at Nakasero, Kampala to offer professional classical ballet classes.

In 2005 Jill Pribyl, a dance teacher at Makerere University and the coordinator of the New York collaboration in Uganda, was doing consultation work at the Kampala Ballet School. This was the time when the Nnaabagereka wanted to make a connection between the New York dance community and her dance school in Kampala. Pribyl travelled with the Nnaabagereka looking for willing partners to go to Uganda and train the teachers, conduct outreach programmes and work with children at the Kampala Ballet School (also see Pribyl and Johnstone, 2011:227).

During Nnaabagereka's one-week trip to New York with Pribyl, amongst the many places they visited was New York University's Dance Education Department; Deborah Damast, a professor in dance education, was appointed there at that time. At New York University they saw children coming to the Dance Education Department from secondary schools and Nnaabagereka's group was shown the work the dance school was doing with the children. After witnessing this work, Damast and Pribyl started to talk about ways they could forge a collaboration related to a New York study-abroad programme. In that short week during which they were in New York they met with the study-abroad officials to discuss the possibility of a study-abroad programme with New York University.

After that initial meeting Pribyl and Damast, with the support of the Nnaabagereka, continued communicating (online) and planning the nature of the programme until the collaboration was formally approved by New York University in November 2006. That is why the New York University's inaugural group was able to visit Uganda in January 2007. Since then Pribyl and Damast have acted as co-directors and co-founders of this collaboration, at the initial invitation from, and inspiration of, the Nnaabagereka.

When I inquired about how Makerere University came into the collaboration, I was informed that since Pribyl was teaching at Makerere University, they thought that Makerere University students could also benefit from the intercultural exposure provided by the collaboration. At this level the idea was to forge a link between Kampala Ballet and Modern Dance School, New York University and Makerere University. I interviewed a New York University teacher – NYUT1 who put it this way:

So we thought this is like a triangle here, university to university and Kampala Ballet School, so we thought that joining the dots here would be great. Originally we had an affiliation not quite as formalized as perhaps as Makerere would like. We were collaborating with Makerere in terms of their teachers working with us as teachers –

faculty to faculty and Makerere students working with my students; designing lesson plans together, faculty meeting together, and students working together and then the next level of children working with them. (Extract 1)

The lack of a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between Makerere University and New York University was further explained by NYUT1:

My understanding is that the MOU could create an exclusivity clause with the university and that could perhaps close our doors with other institutions. And we are really interested in working with many different institutions and opening the doors to that. However the ... students ... at Makerere have always been the [ones] who connect with my students, because they are learning about dance education, my students are learning about dance education and there seems to be a natural connection. (Extract 2)

Some crucial implications emerge from these comments. One is that by not having a memorandum of understanding with the Department of Performing Arts and Film of Makerere University, the New York delegation remained entirely with the power and discretion to decide the direction of their activities in Uganda without serious constraints, obligations and implications from “restrictive” MOUs with institutions such as Makerere University.

It should also be noted that the time during which the yearly collaboration took place also favoured the New York University, Kampala Ballet School and Makerere University collaboration. This is because January is the holiday period for Makerere University students and staff, and during this time they can carry out their private activities without any administrative interference from Makerere University.

Since Makerere University is one of the very few intuitions of higher learning with studies in the performing arts in Uganda, it seems that Makerere University’s teaching staff and students are a strong attraction for the New York group as indicated by NYUT1 in Extract 2. After all, the accreditation of this intercultural exchange by New York University may have taken into consideration the fact that the NYU students were going to be taught Ugandan dances by qualified dance teachers of a university level. However, the lack of a memorandum of understanding made the collaboration fragile and fluid.

### **5.2.2 The Stanford-Makerere University Collaboration**

I conducted a personal interview with Augustine Bazaale (February 2013), who was the Ugandan coordinator of the intercultural theatre collaboration. From this interview I was informed about how the collaboration with Stanford started.

As a theatre designer, Bazaale first met Professor Michael Ramsaur (a lighting design professor at Stanford University and leader of the collaboration) in Prague during the Scenofest in 2007. The event brought together technical theatre practitioners dealing with set, light and sound design in order to showcase their work and discuss technical issues and trends in theatre.

When Bazaale met Ramsaur during this event, Ramsaur was planning to visit Africa for the first time in 2007. In particular, Ramsaur was planning to visit South Africa. However, after his interaction with Bazaale, he extended his trip to include Uganda. After the conference and during their subsequent online communications, Ramsaur suggested that during his trip to Uganda he might like to meet students from the Department of Performing Arts and Film of Makerere University and conduct a lighting workshop with them. In December 2007 Ramsaur visited Uganda and conducted a lighting workshop with Makerere University's second- and third-year drama students at the Uganda National Theatre in Kampala for two days.

During his discussions with Bazaale on this initial visit, Ramsaur talked about working out a programme which could bring students of Stanford and Makerere University together. The purpose of that programme was to see and learn about the different perceptions each of the two countries had about the other. After two years of online communication, the programme was realised in 2009 when Ramsaur informed Bazaale that he had received the necessary funding to run the programme.

What is evident about this collaboration is that the internet was used to bridge the geographical space to facilitate communication between the intercontinental collaborators. The use of the internet to ease intercontinental communication was also seen in the New York–Makerere collaboration, especially between Pribyl and Damast in the initial stages of the collaboration.

### **5.2.3 The Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration**

The collaboration between Makerere University's Department of Performing Arts and Film and the Norwegian College of Dance was initiated by Sylvia Nannyonga Tamusuza. She is the person who made the first contact and linked the two institutions.

I conducted personal interviews with Sylvia Nannyonga (March 2013) and Arne Kristin (April 2013), the project head and Norwegian coordinator, and the Rector of the Norwegian College of Dance, who all gave me the background to the collaboration. Nannyonga has had various links with Norwegian institutions since 2003, especially with Bergen University. It was through her contacts at Bergen that she came to know Arne Kristin.

In 2010 the Norwegian College of Dance had been collaborating with an institution in the Gambia for ten years. But this institution was not at a level of a university. It was around the same time (2010) that there was a change in the Norwegian government education policy, which required that, for Norwegian university students to get credits from collaborative international programmes, the collaborating institution had to be at a university level. This illustrates the way in which government policy can influence trends in the internationalisation of education.

This change benefited Makerere University, because in early 2010 when Nannyonga was at the University of Bergen for another programme, her hosts arranged for her to visit the Norwegian College of Dance. During this visit Nannyonga made a presentation, met the Norwegian College of Dance teachers, went to their classes, saw their facilities and developed a rapport with Kristin. A meeting was held and the participants brainstormed about the possibility of Makerere University collaborating with the Norwegian College of Dance. The discussion involved dialogue about the nature of the collaboration/programme that was to be formed. After the initial discussion they all thought there were some areas in which each institution would benefit mutually from the collaboration. Moreover, at the Norwegian College of Dance they believe that dance began from Africa and that, as dancers and theatre practitioners, they could not train students in dance without bringing them to Africa to witness and participate in African dance.

Nannyonga had been appointed a coordinator for dance at Makerere University in August 2009. And when the idea of the collaboration was fronted in 2010, it fitted into one of the possibilities of how the dance section at Makerere University could be improved.

In November 2010 the Norwegian delegation came to Uganda. There was a follow-up dialogue and subsequently a draft memorandum of understanding was signed by the Vice-Chancellor of Makerere University and Arne Kristin, the Rector of the Norwegian College of Dance.

The memorandum of understanding indicated that the partnership was to be a long-term cooperation to help in the development of both institutions, with a view to promoting exchanges, joint research and documentation. It was further indicated that each year all first-year students from the Norwegian College of Dance would be visiting Makerere University for a month of collaborative training and performance. In the collaboration the Norwegian College of Dance teachers would teach the Ugandan students modern and contemporary dance, as well as jazz dance, while the Norwegian College of Dance students were to be taught various African dances and culture by Ugandan teachers. The teachers from the two institutions would also exchange didactic and educational experiences designed to develop both institutions.

Secondly, the students from the two institutions were supposed to be involved in Dance in the Community programmes in which they would teach and work with children and/or the youth. At the end of it all participants were to cooperate in staging a joint theatre production. This meant the NCD-PAF collaboration has elements which are similar to the New York-Makerere collaboration.

In addition, it was envisaged that Ugandan teachers would go regularly to the Norwegian College of Dance in Oslo to teach and participate in the development of the Norwegian College of Dance programmes.

### **5.3 Funding the collaborations**

Initially the project costs of the Makerere-New York University collaboration were supposed to be shared between the participating institutions, specifically between Kampala Ballet School and New York University. In 2007, the year when the New York students first came to Uganda for the collaboration, the funding of the project followed this cost-sharing pattern. The cost sharing was made possible because the project coordinator in Uganda developed a concept paper and managed to solicit funding locally from embassies and private sources, who contributed to the cost of running the project.

In 2007, in order to connect with Northern Uganda – the part of the country which had been ravaged by the Kony insurgency for more than twenty years – the project organisers brought in children from Gulu, who were accommodated by families in Acholi Quarters, Kampala to

make it possible for them to participate in the programme. Because of this cost-sharing arrangement, I was informed by some Makerere participants that the 2007 collaboration was the best, because it showed “equal partnership”.

In 2008, the second year of the collaboration, it was difficult to get local funding for the same project, because the Ugandan funders were hesitant to raise money for the same project they had funded the previous year. Since time was running out, the Ugandan project coordinator had to inform her New York University counterparts about this development. After some deliberations with the International Office at New York University, New York University agreed to fund the programme.

Given the above background, since 2008 New York University has been solely responsible for financing the collaboration and so has the discretion to decide how and on what the project money is to be spent. The project is mainly funded through New York students’ study fees, as indicated in the course advert titled “MPADE-GE 2520.095 – Community Building through Teaching, Creating, Performing: Dance Education in Uganda (3 Points)”, which provided the particulars about the course costs for 2013:

2013 Graduate Tuition: \$1367 per point plus registration and services fees. If an undergraduate participant enrolls in an undergraduate course number, his/her tuition will reflect the current undergraduate cost per point. 2012 Undergraduate Tuition: \$1,204 per point plus registration and service fees. 2013 Housing Fees: \$800, 2013 Activity Fees: \$450 Final payment of the Housing and Activity Fees are due to the Office of Academic Initiatives and Global Programs on November 15, 2012. Tuition for the course is separate and will be due based on the Bursar's Payment Schedule for Spring 2013 ... International Airfare is not included. Students must purchase their own tickets. ([http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/study\\_abroad/programs/Dance\\_Uganda](http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/study_abroad/programs/Dance_Uganda)).

With reference to this fee structure, in Chapter Two section 2. 3.1 we noted that Denzin (1992:27) argued that “[t]he personal and the structural are mediated through the process of communication” and that this process is connected to the universe of cultural meanings. The fact that New York University foots the bill for executing the collaboration through its internal fees collection structures, as indicated above, in part implies that the intercultural collaboration is symbolically running through the economic and ideological structures of New York University. This is also connected to New York University’s organisational cultural orientation. Denzin (*ibid.*) further posited that such processes are not immune from the operations of power in a “particular social order.” This may have implications for the managerial and power dynamics of the programme as it is executed in Uganda, as we shall see when discussing the challenges of the collaborations in Chapter Seven section 7.2.



Like the New York collaboration, the Stanford-Makerere collaboration was not based on a memorandum of understanding. It came out of the mutual understanding and friendship that had developed between the project initiators, Bazaale and Ramusur.

From the initial communication the Makerere University team was informed that the collaboration was going to be funded by Stanford University sources. But Makerere University still needed in one way or another to make some courtesy contribution.

However, due to lack of a memorandum of understanding, on the one hand, and limited financial resources on the side of Makerere University, on the other, Makerere University did not contribute financially to the running of the programme. Therefore, the Stanford group had to foot the entire bill for the smooth running of the project, which culminated in a joint theatre production at the Uganda National Theatre. The project was funded by SiCa (the Stanford Institute for Creativity and the Arts), Stanford University's Bing Overseas Studies Program and Stanford University's Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (VPUE).

What was unique about the Makerere-Stanford collaboration compared to other North-South collaborations in recent years at Makerere University and particularly at the Department of Performing Arts and Film is that the programme also funded return air travel of an eight-member group of Makerere University staff and students in order to stage the intercultural performance *Beyond My Circle* at the Pigott theatre at the Stanford Drama Department. However, as observed during the discussion of the New York-Makerere collaboration, when one group provides the funding for a collaboration, there is usually a power imbalance in the decision-making process. The challenges of this will be discussed in Chapter Seven section 7.2.

Like the New York-Makerere collaboration, the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration was funded using students' tuition fees. A look at the Norwegian College of Dance's tuition structure at <http://www.dnbh.no/STUDIETILBUD/STUDIEAVGIFT.aspx>, which I have translated below, gives us more details on how the collaboration was funded:

Tuition for students who started the school during the year 2012/2013 amounted to NOK 60.000 per year and is paid in two instalments: the fall and spring semester. Included in the annual tuition fee is a 4-week compulsory study tour to Uganda. The cost of the trip that is estimated to be sufficient is NOK 16.000.

From this it is clear that the collaboration's cost was structured into the annual budget of the Norwegian College of Dance (NCD). The major costs incurred include travel expenses, accommodation and upkeep of the Norwegian staff and students.

The intercultural theatre shows at the Uganda National Theatre right from the first performance in 2011 were funded by the Royal Norwegian Embassy. To some, the involvement of the Norwegian Embassy in the PAF-NDC collaboration echoes what Trilokekar (2009:131) meant when he said that many Western countries have “recognized the importance of exercising ‘soft power’ through avenues such as international cultural relations, to promote [their] political, economic and cultural interests” (see Chapter Three section 3.5.4). This means that the activities of NCD serve the general international interests of the Norwegian government, since it is the same government that sets the international agenda, especially through the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) – a directorate under the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, whose task it is to ensure effective foreign aid, with quality assurance and evaluation. Such an arrangement, to use Bhabha's (1994:21) words, objectifies intercultural collaboration as a political activity, and shows us the relationship between the theory and practice of intercultural theatre (see Bhabha, 1994:22).

After all, Bhabha (1994:23) argues that “there is no knowledge – political or otherwise – outside representation”. In this case, the analysis of the Norwegian embassy's involvement in the PAF-NDC collaboration may to some extent require us to “rethink the logics of causality and determinacy through which we recognize the ‘political’ as a form of calculation and strategic action dedicated to social transformation” (Bhabha, *ibid.*). It should also be noted that even though Norway was not a colonial power, in the postcolonial times it has been involved in international relations connected to the application of soft power in form of giving aid to developing countries, and educational relations and collaborations.

Given the above funding scenario, it is also crucial to note that, as in the New York-Makerere University collaboration, the financial contribution from Makerere University towards the PAF-NDC was minimal. Makerere University essentially contributed in terms of goodwill, space, students and staff who were engaged in the collaboration. From this, one can understand how the imbalance in funding the collaboration could lead to uneven power dynamics. The dynamics of unequal funding as already indicated will be discussed in detail in Chapter Seven section 7.2.

#### **5.4 Nature of the intercultural collaborations**

The New York-Makerere collaborative programme involves Makerere University's Department of Performing Arts and Film students who take dance courses and those from New York University Dance Education Department who do a master's in dance education as well as other non-dance majors who sign up for the study-abroad programme. Recently at New York University the programme attracted students from different academic programmes such as international education, drama therapy, theatre education, dance education, politics, policy and public administration. Students from New York University who have attended the dance programme in Uganda, for example, came from countries such as South Korea, Japan, Bermuda, China, Mexico, and the islands of the Bahamas, Trinidad and Tobago and the USA.

Over the years during the programme students from New York University (NYU) take dance classes with Makerere University's Department of Performing Arts and Film (PAF) students and work towards the presentation of a collaborative performance as the culmination of the exchange (cf. Pribyl and Johnstone, 2011:227; Mabingo, 2014:1-2).

The students, with guidance from teachers from both universities, develop lesson plans to give dance lessons to children from the Kampala Ballet School and other selected children's groups in and around Kampala in a collaborative manner. That is, university students from Makerere pair up with students from New York University and work together to develop lesson plans to teach Uganda traditional dance, modern dance, ballet, or a combination of the three to selected Ugandan children. The nature of the programme is further elaborated at [http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/study\\_abroad/programs/Dance\\_Uganda:](http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/study_abroad/programs/Dance_Uganda:)

participants collaborate with professional dancers, educators, and students from the Royal Ballet Academy and Makerere University. Students take classes in traditional Ugandan dance, East African drumming and teaching methodology with faculty from NYU Steinhardt and Makerere University. Participants then put theory into practice by developing and implementing lesson plans with children from local community-based organizations. This program offers unique access to education and performing arts institutions in Kampala and provides a new global perspective on dance, education and community development.

I was informed that during the process of devising the structure of the programme, the programme initiators abridged a year-long course at New York University which covered issues concerning child development and pedagogy, using dance as one of the tools of

engagement. In brief, the New York-Makerere collaboration programme involved adapting New York University's year-long model into a two-week intercultural programme that is executed in Uganda.

However, even though the programme imitated the New York University course, it was suggested by the Makerere side to enlarge the idea to make it an outreach project whereby students from disadvantaged schools could come to the Kampala Ballet School and experience the intercultural concept and do a performance at the end of two weeks. That is how children from Gulu came to be involved in the first programme in 2007.

The idea of a performance was also included because it was believed from a Ugandan perspective that if people did not see a performance after the two weeks' intercultural workshops, they would not know that something intercultural had taken place. Secondly, it was also believed that even if the performance was a short one, students needed an opportunity to be at the Uganda National Theatre to boost their self-esteem by showcasing what they had been doing in the workshops. Besides, a performance could show the parents and the community what the collaboration was all about. This is the approach that the collaboration was following even at the time that fieldwork for this study was conducted.

It should be noted that combining the New York University education programme structure with Ugandan perspectives shows how intercultural collaborations lead to hybrid structures, practices and cultures. Such perspectives will be discussed further in Chapter Seven section 7.3.4.

Generally, the structure of the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration is like that of New York-Makerere collaboration in that students from the Norwegian College of Dance and their teachers come to Uganda to work in a collaborative manner with students and teachers at the Department of Performing Arts and Film of Makerere University. The Norwegian College of Dance worked with students and teachers from the Department of Performing Arts and Film in different subjects such as modern and jazz dance, which were being taught by Norwegian teachers. And the Norwegian students were taught Ugandan cultural dances by Ugandan teachers. Towards the end of their stay in Uganda the two groups staged an intercultural performance at the Uganda National Theatre. However, unlike the New York delegation, which is usually made up of students from different fields of study at

New York University, the Norwegian College of Dance brings students who are all dance majors.

Unlike the two collaborations listed above, the Stanford-Makerere intercultural theatre collaboration was a one-off arrangement. It was a month-long collaboration between Stanford University students and the Department of Performing Arts and Film at Makerere.

On the Stanford side, the team was made up of ten undergraduate students, two production directors who were postgraduate students, a project leader and project coordinator. On the Ugandan side, there were five Ugandan undergraduate students and three faculty members.

The Stanford group spent a month in Uganda. During this time they socialised with their Ugandan counterparts and toured parts of the Eastern region of Uganda. The performance-devising process involved Stanford University and Makerere University students under the guidance of their directors and teachers from both universities coming together and devising a performance on the cultural, socio-political and individual perceptions each had about the other's country. The performance-devising process took place over ten days and the performance that emerged was entitled *Beyond My Circle*. The performance was staged at the Uganda National Theatre on 14 August 2009 and later at Stanford University Pigott Theater on 1 October 2009.

## **5.5 The collaborations in a global education perspective**

It was one objective of this study to examine how the intercultural collaborations relate to the global education pursuits of educational institutions around the world. As far as New York University is concerned, its global educational interests are evinced on its information page at (<http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/global/>):

### *Mission for Study Abroad Programme*

The world we have and the world we want — these are the two great concerns of NYU Steinhardt.

At NYU Steinhardt we believe that the best education and research in this time of globalization does not, and perhaps cannot, happen in just one city. We anticipate that your commitment to actively engage with the challenges of globalization will propel you forward in your intellectual and career pursuits and prepare you for leadership in your field. NYU's transformation into a Global Network University puts us at the forefront of higher education in the 21st Century.

### *Global Integration*

Research and study abroad changes what we do on Washington Square, and integrating the two is a priority for the global programs office. NYU Steinhardt students, faculty, and staff participate in numerous international initiatives highlighted here. The channels below offer you an opportunity to learn more about how we engage with the world here on the Washington Square campus and abroad through exchange, partnerships, and research.

At New York University the intercultural initiative in Uganda is administered by the Office of Academic Initiatives and Global Programs, The Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development, while the academic content is designed by teachers from the Department of Music and Performing Arts Professions, NYU. Regarding the support given to the students who participate in the collaboration, NYUT2 said

They support financially, medical support, security and offer the students credits when they go back. So they make sure they have entered an academic profile on this course. And they enter it into the system when they go onto this programme. (Extract 3)

Again, with reference to New York University's support for global education initiatives NYUT2 said that

They are considered as one of the top world global network universities in the United States and they have different study abroad sites and you can go to New York University and earn your degree from another country, meet the network of different universities and meet the standards. So in terms of study abroad they are completely supportive of these programmes and working to spread and support more such programmes like this at the university level. (Extract 4)

The New York University's global education mission illustrated here connects with Paige's (2005:102) view that internationalisation of higher education at the national, sector and institutional level involves integrating an intercultural and global perspective into the functions and delivery of post-secondary education. Hence the New York University collaboration with the Kampala Ballet School and Makerere University's Department of Performing Arts and Film bears out that philosophy of the internationalisation of education.

Makerere University also has an interest in internationalising its educational offering by collaborating with other institutions. However, the International Affairs Office is relatively new at Makerere University, since it was created in 2005 as a section in the Vice-Chancellor's office. Before the office was formed, collaborations were mainly handled at the departmental and faculty level.

I conducted a personal interview in April 2013 with an official working in the International affairs office at Makerere University. I was informed that one of the major roles of the

International Affairs office is to oversee the running of international matters and issues relating to international relations of Makerere University in order to coordinate its effort and links with the international community.

The mission of the International Affairs Office is to create and strengthen the capacity of the university to attract international opportunities through her partnerships with international stakeholders and in the process help the university to become a centre of excellence.

The office was envisaged to serve international visitors, scholars, students and people who wished to set up collaborations with Makerere University. I was informed by the Makerere University official that some of the objectives of the office are

- To ensure internationalisation in all aspects of the university functions and activities at all levels;
- To ensure Makerere University's greater participation in international events;
- To ensure international linkages of Makerere university with other universities;
- To attract more international students to Makerere university.

All the issues pointed out here relate to Paige's (2005:102) point about the internationalisation of academic institutions.

However, from my interaction with the International Affairs Office at Makerere University I discerned that its main challenge was inadequate financial facilitation from the University's managers and this was derailing the office's stipulated mandate. The underfunding was not only affecting the International Affairs Office, but also other collaborative engagements that Makerere University undertook. Due to limited or no funding for Makerere's collaborative initiatives, the financial facilitation of many of the collaborations is left in the hands of external funding from Makerere University's collaborating partners. All this compounded the power imbalance and its consequences that will be discussed in Chapter Seven section 7.2.

Another challenge the International Affairs Office at Makerere University faces is that it has not been well streamlined into the university system. That is partly because initially all collaborations were handled at the departmental and faculty level, and many members of staff in departments and colleges still initiate collaborations and even come to the point of signing collaborative memoranda of understanding without involving the office. Due to this, the office can sometimes not follow up on such collaborations. From this, one observes that even



though Makerere University has a will to internationalise its education, there are still financial and structural challenges hindering this pursuit.

Furthermore, even though there is usually a clause in the memoranda of understanding that there would be an exchange of staff and students between the various academic institutions which are collaborating with Makerere University, due to limited funding it is usually staff who benefit and students are left out. On the other hand, while some of Makerere University's partners are able to send their students to Makerere University for a semester or two, Makerere University has often failed to reciprocate because of lack of funding.

From a global perspective, if one were to argue that globalisation leads to the movement of global participants (see Chapter Three), Makerere University has over the years witnessed an unbalanced North-to-South movement of intercultural participants. This situation in globalisation parlance shows how uneven economic power may lead to unequal exchange and unequal movement of individuals in the "global village". This economic imbalance means that North-South intercultural collaborations are still over-determined by institutions from the North. Unequal economic and political power in the era of globalisation thus creates an insinuation of imperialism, because imperialism and globalisation have a common characteristic – imbalance of power.

In Chapter Three section 3.5 my discussion showcased the different theorists' perspectives on contemporary education in the globalising world. For example, Spencer-Oatey (2013:245) noted that internationalisation of education is one of the major elements of "the strategic vision of many universities throughout the world. Aspirations typically focus on the development of 'global graduates', with an emphasis on the internationalisation of the curriculum and on student mobility."

Similarly, Stanford University is also one of the institutions of higher learning in the United States which have embraced internationalisation of education in order to fit the dictates of global education.

On Stanford University's Office of International Affairs (OIA) website we are told that the office

supports Stanford's international research, programs, and activities, and facilitates new collaborations throughout the world. The OIA provides coordination and communications services, administers a faculty seed-grant program for new global



collaborations, and supports the development of new overseas programs and facilities (<https://oia.stanford.edu/node/5957>).

The activities of OIA are supplemented by the Bing Overseas Studies Program, which was one of the supporters and funders of the Stanford-Makerere collaboration (see section 5.3). In her article “Stanford’s overseas studies program expands its offerings”, Sullivan (2013) tells us about the international outreach programmes being offered at Stanford University:

The Bing Overseas Studies Program delivers a Stanford education in 11 locations around the world – from Paris to Beijing, from Oxford to Kyoto, from Florence to Moscow, from Madrid to Cape Town, from Santiago to Berlin, and in Australia.

Furthermore, Sullivan (2013) describes Stanford University’s overseas studies model:

While many peer institutions send their students to other universities for overseas studies programs, Stanford runs its own program. Kennedy said it’s a model other universities are beginning to emulate. ‘Our overseas studies courses are developed by Stanford faculty with our program directors,’ she said. ‘The courses are vetted by academic departments on campus. Before we offer a history course overseas, for instance, the history department faculty here reviews that course to make sure it meets Stanford standards. That doesn’t happen if you’re using third-party providers.’

Sullivan (*ibid.*) adds that currently “Bing Overseas Studies has 40 overseas staff members who run ‘mini-universities’ abroad by providing classes, acting as registrars, and providing housing, meals, cultural events, field trips and athletic opportunities.”

The above shows the seriousness with which Stanford University is handling its policy of internationalisation of education.

However, even though internationalisation of education is an answer to global education needs, the model that Sullivan describes and which is being followed by Stanford University and some other universities has raised some criticism. Through that model one can say that the students who go for study-abroad programmes in Stanford “mini universities” still live and operate in a replication of Stanford or American educational structures, which seem to be over-protective, as well as pro-global and anti-global at the same time. Ideally, if they are to train students to be “global citizens”, one could argue that the students should be able to study and live through the educational systems and structures which are different from their own. And in this case the “old model”, where institutions send their students to other universities, would be better. The issues discussed here point to what Jackson (2004:5) noted:

[t]he modern university is itself a formidably complex and self-contradicting array of institutional practices. Its modes of knowledge production are propelled by the vagaries

of institutional power, pedagogical process, and occupational structure as much as by felt desire and intellectual curiosity.

Again, when Sullivan (2013) quotes Kennedy saying that “[b]efore we offer a history course overseas, for instance, the history department faculty here reviews that course to make sure it meets Stanford standards. That doesn’t happen if you’re using third-party providers”, one registers the implied positional and power dynamics in such an undertaking that Jackson (2004:5) hinted at. One notes that even though vetting of courses is paramount for any academic institution, the university official quoted by Sullivan implies that Stanford University maintains high standards and there is no other third-party provider who can meet those standards unless Stanford officials take centre stage in the design and execution of the programmes. This kind of view may in part explain why universities from the North usually want to take control of intercultural exchanges with universities in the South. And sometimes universities from the North implicitly or explicitly want such exchanges to follow their institution’s set procedures and structures. All this again bears out Mosquera’s (2010:48) opinion that “international artistic-cultural interactions ... always involve relations of power, positioning and marginality”.

At the same time, by designing its own programmes and having its own staff to directly administer its own programmes, Stanford University’s approach reminds one of Lo and Gilbert’s (2002:36-37) argument that “[e]ven when intercultural exchanges take place within the ‘non-West’, they are often mediated through Western culture and/or economics” (see Chapter Two section 2.4). This implies that North-South intercultural collaborations involve subtleties of power and inequity both in an economic and cultural sense. These views will further be examined in Chapter Seven section 7.2.

The issue pointed out in the previous paragraph means that during intercultural collaborations participants symbolically interact with each group’s institutional structures by interacting with individuals who symbolically embody and represent those institutions (see Denzin, 1992:27-28) as discussed in Chapter Two section 2.3.1. This may lead to temporary hybrid structures and hybrid cultures. In that sense, intercultural collaborations can lead to cultural translation, adaptation and cultural transfers. Such perspectives will be discussed in detail in Chapter Seven sections 7.3 and 7.3.4.

However, it should be noted that the one-off Stanford-Makerere collaboration did not follow the mini-university model, but still it could be sensed that the participants were following

particular Stanford University guidelines. This issue will be discussed further in Chapter Seven section 7.3.4.

In a global sense, the Stanford-Makerere collaboration was unique. This is because if globalisation is a phenomenon that leads to the movement of people and ideas across the world, that collaboration fairly catered for Makerere University's delegation to visit and stage *Beyond My Circle* at Stanford Drama Department's Pigott Theater. Without this reciprocal journey sponsored by Stanford University, Makerere University would possibly not have managed to sponsor its students and staff to visit Stanford University.

Like New York and Stanford University, the Norwegian College of Dance is also an institution with an international orientation. It also participates in global educational alliances. For example, the information page at <http://www.dnbh.no/ENGLISH/INTERNATIONALIZATION.aspx> indicates that the Norwegian College of Dance

collaborates with universities in Africa, France, Austria and Sweden; through the Erasmus programme our students get the chance to go to Paris, or Linz on a three-month exchange. All first-year students participate in a four-week long study trip to Makerere University in Kampala, Uganda. We exchange experience, knowledge, teachers and students with the Linné University in Sweden and through the EMD Network in the Nordic and Baltic countries.

Based on this, one can argue that in a bid to live up to the demands of contemporary global education, academic institutions have started to aggressively internationalise their outreach, and this affects their modus operandi in executing their educational work. These collaborations are not only an exchange of dance and performance cultures, but are also influenced by an array of global educational trends as discussed in Chapter Three section 3.5. The international outreach of the Norwegian College of Dance in Uganda is also augmented by some arms of the Norwegian government such as the Norwegian Embassy and NORAD's support and funding. This phenomenon again shows how it is sometimes difficult to divorce international cultural collaborations from the socio-political and socio-cultural interests of nation states. However, there is no doubt that intercultural collaborations like the NCD-PAF help to internationalise their respective institutions, thereby helping the institutions to develop an international perspective in their outlook, teaching, research and methods of operation.

## **5.6 Thematic concerns and notions in the Stanford-Makerere and the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration performances**

In this section I am going to discuss the cultural and other notions that were portrayed in the Stanford-Makerere and the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere intercultural performances. This will also help us to connect the issues that were highlighted in the performances to the other salient thematic concerns that evolved out of the study (to be discussed in Chapters Six and Seven).

### **5.6.1 Thematic and ideological notions in the Stanford-Makerere intercultural performance *Beyond My Circle***

In this section I will discuss the thematic and ideological concerns depicted in *Beyond My Circle*. In my discussion I will try to follow the sequence of the performance's segmented plot. My analysis will also examine how the ideologies/notions projected in the performance connect with the theoretical and conceptual categories such as symbolic interaction, intercultural theatre, intercultural communication, globalisation and other multidisciplinary insights that may emerge.

The performance *Beyond My Circle* was directed by Aida Mbowa and Isaiah Wooden, who were both doctoral drama students at Stanford University. On the Makerere University side, they were assisted by me (Richard Kagoloby) as assistant director and assistant coordinator, Grace Flavia Ibanda as the Choreographer and Augustine Bazaale as a coordinator and stage designer.

The Stanford Drama Department's 2009 Press Release on *Beyond My Circle* described it as a multidisciplinary performance which is the culmination of four weeks of cultural exchange between students from Stanford and Makerere Universities. Filled with music, poetry, dance, and storytelling, *Beyond My Circle* stages the anxieties and pleasures of discovering, knowing, and growing the self in unfamiliar spaces with new faces. Political and insightful, witty and provocative, this performance is a meditation on identity wherein differences and similarities, all, are causes for celebration.

This description of *Beyond My Circle* aptly points to what Stucky and Wimmer (2002: 10) say when they write about the diverse nature of performance studies. Since the performance was multidisciplinary, it called for the application of multidisciplinary analysis that I indicated in Chapter Four.

The performance was a devised piece that culminated out of ten days of workshops and rehearsals. The production's devising process illustrated the ability of working from scratch and staging a performance in a limited period of time that the funding could cover. As indicated in the press release, the performance illustrated and dramatised the intricacies of intercultural theatre collaborations as being "full of anxieties and pleasures of discovering, knowing, and growing the self in unfamiliar spaces with new faces", coupled with an understanding that intercultural theatre collaborations are a "meditation on identity wherein differences and similarities, all, are causes for celebration."

The title of the performance itself symbolised Giroux's (2005) concept of border crossing; it signposted an intercultural scenario of an individual crossing over or going beyond his or her cultural and geographical horizon. This crossing normally involves an encounter with hermeneutic issues described in the Stanford Drama's *Beyond My Circle* press statement. It should be noted that in hermeneutics parlance, the word "horizon" is used to indicate the finitude of human experience (Mul, 2011:629). In that sense, human beings and cultures are finite, because they are bound by time and geographical space. Cultures are finite in space, because they occupy a given and definite place in the universe. Because of this limitation of time and space, our experience is normally limited spatially, temporally, personally, culturally, literally and metaphysically. Therefore, stepping out of one's socio-political, socio-cultural or socio-economic circle involves interacting with unfamiliar and strange phenomena and experiences and this may create hermeneutic problems. In this respect intercultural theatre is related to Schechner's (1988) interpretation of performance [or even performance theory] in that in performance human beings express or perform ritualised acts which are culturally coded or culturally informed. Thus intercultural performance becomes a cross-cultural performance where 'ritualised' cultural symbols and signifiers are part and parcel of the communication and performance fabric. This scenario can be conceptualised as interactional cultural performance or intercultural performance dialogism (see Chapter Two section 2.4.2).

Similarly, *Beyond My Circle* also signified the symbolic interaction that is characteristic of intercultural encounters. Denzin (1992:25) says that symbolic interaction is "the chief means by which human beings are able to form social or joint acts". Denzin (*ibid.*) further looks at symbolic interaction as a convergence of the "self and social interaction" and notes that the self in this social interaction is engrossed in a linguistic, emotional and symbolic process (see

Chapter Two section 2.3.1). This means that since the Stanford and Makerere participants were interacting by crossing their socio-cultural and socio-political borders or horizons, they became involved in the negotiation of cross-cultural symbolic interactions in which their similar and dissimilar cultural symbols and perceptions intermingled.

However, it should be noted that the horizon of personal and cultural experience is not fixed. The horizon of personal experience changes as we move through different geographical and cultural spaces. Still, at the same time, cultures can be transformed when they move or are moved through time and space (Mul, 2011:629-630). Therefore *Beyond My Circle* involved introspection and the performance of hermeneutic experiences in the face of otherness, thus connecting the entire experience to Kolb's theory of experiential learning. The transformation of cultures that is a consequence of moving through intercultural time and space also evokes the notions of travelling cultures, cultural translation, cultural transfer, hybridity and alterity. (See Chapters Six section 6.2.1 and Seven section 7.3.4 for further discussion on experiential learning and cultural translation and hybridity respectively).

The *Beyond My Circle* performance was an amalgamation of different artistic pieces and therefore it had no linear plot-line. The fragmented theatrical pieces that involved songs, dances and poetry were joined together by the instrumental music played on a set of Ugandan drums, a xylophone and tube fiddle. Adapting Reinelt's (2002:207) words, one can say that *Beyond My Circle* encompassed "Anglo-American theorists' performance and performativity as [its] central organizing concepts". In this case, the terms performance and performativity are related to the history of the avant-garde which rejected the aspects of traditional Western theatre such as putting emphasis on plot and character. This means a creative work is staged as long as it has elements which can be performed (Reinelt, 2002:202-203). It should be noted that in part, it was because of the activities of the avant-garde movement that non-Western theatrical forms were welcomed into Western mainstream theatre (see similar discussion in Chapter Two section 2.4.3).

The *Beyond My Circle* performance started with two Ugandan students drumming a soft rhythm on a Ugandan set of drums at the back centre stage. The setting consisted of a white piece of rectangular cloth hanging from the stage lofts. This threadbare setting implied the challenges of finding a suitable locale for a multi-visual and a multi-cultural shifting performance. The stage set was reinforced with a lighting scheme to create the performance's locale and mood. The lighting design was created by Michael Rooney, a Stanford University

student with guidance from Ramsaur. To some, the automated lighting scheme, which was unprecedented in Makerere University's productions, symbolised the US's technological prowess. This was possible because the Stanford team came to Uganda with a digital lighting console and accompanying stage lights which were ridged on the Uganda National Theatre Stage in preparation for the performance. This also signified the technological transfer that can characterise intercultural collaborations.

During the soft drum rhythm on a set of Ugandan drums, other performers entered from the stage wings and assembled in the middle of the stage and the Uganda and USA anthems were sung. The two anthems symbolised the two countries' political ideals, distinctiveness and sovereignty; this was an element that deconstructs the notion of a "global village". In the same vein the anthems signposted the collaborative and hybrid nature of the performance. And the fact that cultural and political distinctiveness is evident in something which is intercultural bears out the theory of ethnic boundary maintenance (as discussed in Chapter Three section 3.3 and 3.6.3).

At the same time, the performing of difference illustrated by the anthems reflects Martin and Nakayama's (2008:82-84) categorisation of culture when they discuss the concept of cultural dialectics and point to one category of "differences-similarities dialectic", which is an approach to cultural analysis that recognises the importance of similarities and differences in understanding intercultural communication. That dialectic is founded on the assumption that there are real and important differences between various cultural groups. The following discussion on the thematic and ideological concerns of the Stanford-Makerere performance will further elaborate on those differences.

After the anthems, the performers exited and then reappeared in a creative dance symbolising the journey. At the end of this creative dance, they converged at centre stage, and one of the Stanford students started her poetic monologue on the subject of race.

It should be noted that race and racial tensions between whites and blacks characterise the American socio-political landscape. This thematic concern was addressed in a poetic segment performed by one of the Stanford participants in which she castigated the colour and societal differences that she said prevailed between "the white world and the black world."



It seems that the Stanford participants' intercultural experience in Uganda where there was no socio-political tension based on the colour of one's skin gave them the motivation to reflect on and castigate the racial tensions in their home country. This thematic concern and dramatisation shows how historical circumstances inform and shape peoples' perceptions about the world they live in. This scenario also shows that intercultural collaborations are symbolic interactions and symbolic dramatisations of myriad perspectives.

Given the psychological imprint of the racial divide in American society, it seems that the Stanford participants had to psychologically and physically relocate themselves in order to freely relate with Ugandans, who did not understand and live with issues of "racial political correctness". Such an issue again reflects Martin and Nakayama's (2008:82-84) view that having historical knowledge is an important factor in order to understand contemporary intercultural dynamics between social groups and the degree of intergroup anxiety (see their discussion on intercultural dialectics in Chapter Two, section 2.3.3.6). I remember in one of the workshops one Ugandan participant used "black" and "white" in referring to fellow participants and the Stanford University participants responded to such labelling with some shock, because use of such colour labels can lead to one being called a racist in American society. But in time they outgrew this shock, since they came to understand the difference between American and Ugandan socio-political history. It can therefore be argued that any form of interculturalism also encompasses the negotiation of historical perceptions.

One may wonder about the political nature of *Beyond My Circle*. However, such thematic concerns and analysis fall within the confines and pursuits of performance theory. Reinelt (2002:205) says that since performance is aligned to cultural studies, it opens up "a political project" that makes "sex, gender, race, and class central analytic categories of the new 'performance studies'" (cf. Lo and Gilbert, 2002:31).

In the same poem the performer also hinted at the pessimism about Africa's socio-political circumstances as portrayed in the Western media. In particular, the Stanford actress expressed how tired she was with the Western media's negative portrayal of an image of a "hungry black African child". That is because, generally, in the Western media Africa is seen as a place riddled with hunger and starvation. Moon (2008:18) also argues that a lot of what we know about ourselves as cultural beings and our interactions with other people is largely due to the impact of media representations. Normally, the information we know about others as profiled by the media is played out during intercultural interactions.



In line with the media influence, many of the Stanford participants I interacted with in 2009 during the programme said that the portrayal of Africa in the Western media was a poignant one. Many said that they had an intrinsic fear of visiting Africa because of the media's portrayal of conditions in Africa. The majority of those who had never visited Africa believed that many parts of Africa were in total chaos, without any hope of peace and social order. During their first few days in Uganda many of the Stanford participants were hesitant to drink or eat anything outside of their hotel because of a fear of contracting one of the many diseases that Africa is prone to, according to Western media narratives. This is because the media promote the construction of primary representations called "pre-notions" leading to "unconscious causes", which can lead a person to develop preconceived perceptions of the social reality being written about (Bourdieu, 1989:15). These media constructs can constitute "the structural constraints that bear upon [social] interactions" (Bourdieu, *ibid.*). And this definitely has an impact on the dynamics of interactions between Northern and Southern intercultural collaboration participants.

This analytical approach is in line with case study methodology, as Woodside and Wilson (2003:493) say that attaining "deeper understanding of processes" and actors' "perceptions of their own thinking processes, intentions and contextual influences [are] identified as the principal objective of case study research". All this again connects to the principal objective of this study – that is of analysing the dynamics of intercultural theatre collaborations.

After spending some days in Uganda the adventurous US participants broke their university's or the USA's "health and safety code of conduct" (which is part of the informational structures that construct the pre-notions) for its citizens while they are in Africa and mingled with their Ugandan counterparts in order to ease the tension. But all this was often done where and when there was no monitoring administrative eye in the vicinity.

Going by the above revelations, it is evident that the Western media fears about Africa's security and health hazards present a perceptual set with which people in the West visualise Africa. Such media-influenced perceptions become real mental and physical hurdles and boundaries to cross and negotiate by Northern participants in the North-South collaborations. The media constructions in this case form part of the psychological structures, or what Denzin (1992:27-28) calls symbolic "interactional structures", within which each group

consciously or unconsciously perceives and interacts with the other in the context of the dialogic shaping of North-South collaborations (as discussed in Chapter Two section 2.3.1.).

From another perspective, the portrayal of Africa in a negativistic way in the Western media creates another dimension which unsettles the balance of power in North-South intercultural collaborations. This is because the negative media portrayal creates a binary opposition between the collaborating parties. That is, the lopsided media representations symbolically show that the collaboration is between the “peaceful” and the “chaotic”, the “hygienic” and the “unhygienic”, the “fortunate” and the “unfortunate” other, the “rich” and “poor” with reference to the North and South institutions and/or persons involved in the collaboration respectively. Moreover, Blommaert (2005:25) argues that critical discourse analysis (CDA) “focuses its critique on the intersection of language/discourse/speech and social structure. It is in uncovering ways in which social structure relates to discourse patterns (in the form of power relations, ideological effects, and so forth), and in treating these relations as problematic”.

In relation to the pre-notions created by the media, some Makerere university student participants noted that when they were conversing with their Stanford counterparts, there were sometimes verbal indications of a continuous pitying stance regarding the economic and political circumstances in Uganda, which was sometimes symbolically domineering and indirectly offensive. One of the interviewees, for example, noted that it is a kind of “love-hate relationship; making remarks about my country, making comparisons about my country ... There are those small things that create tension in the air.” Such comments may reflect real existing differences between the two countries. However, the Western speaker may not have realised that he or she was doing it, but such unconscious verbal slips may in part be an exhibition of the preconceived generalised mental picture he or she has/had about the other as promoted by the negative media profiling or even it can be a result of cultural shock.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, Bourdieu (1989:18) observed that the mental structures, through which human beings interpret the social world, are in most cases the “product of the internalization of the structures of that world.” This relates to Moon (2008:18), who notes that a lot of what we

---

<sup>6</sup> Nueliep (2006:429) defines cultural shock by saying that “when people move to a new culture, they take with them the values, beliefs, customs, and behaviours of their old culture. Often, depending on the degree of similarity between the old and the new culture, the values, beliefs, customs, and behaviors of the native culture clash with those of the new culture. This can result in disorientation, misunderstandings, conflict, stress, and anxiety. Researchers call this phenomenon cultural shock”.

know about ourselves as cultural beings and “our interactions with ‘others’ is too impacted by media representations”. He further proposes that by examining such media discourses we can be in a better position to “understand these processes and how they affect and are played out in intercultural interactions” (see Chapter Three section 3.4.5).

Going back to the sequence of the performance, after the poem there was a transition into a performance of a dance from Western Uganda *ekitaguriro*. The dancers in *ekitaguriro* were accompanied by Ugandan traditional drums played by both Makerere and Stanford participants, an aspect which showed intercultural performance dialogism whereby some Stanford students learnt playing Ugandan drum rhythms and collaboratively played them for other Makerere and Stanford participants to dance *ekitaguriro*. The dancers were wearing cotton pieces of cloth tied across their shoulders and waists, costumes which are typical and culturally identified with the dance as it is practised in the Ugandan setting.

The *ekitaguriro* dance that was performed by participants from both Stanford and Makerere University showed the symbolic cultural interaction that characterises intercultural performances. During this process each group was collaboratively learning and negotiating the performance signs, motifs and traditions of the other in the dialogic shaping of intercultural theatre performance. Bearing in mind that *ekitaguriro* dance motifs are contrary to the principles of a “typical” Western dancer’s body alignment and dance motifs required to dance Western dances such as ballet, one can argue that when participants from Stanford or even New York University were learning such a dance with their Ugandan counterparts, the participants’ learning progression became a real-life learning experience of acquiring knowledge necessary to negotiate and live with and within cultural difference. The process that ran from the performance-devising workshops through the rehearsals to the final performances at the Uganda National Theatre and Stanford’s Pigott theatre was itself a real-life rehearsal of learning about each other, and the other’s culture. It was also a process of learning how to present the self in the representation of the other’s performing culture. Consequently, this form of applied intercultural theatre pedagogy is related to Kolb’s experiential learning theory whereby intercultural performances become an arena of self-presentation and representation in the process of learning about and representing the other individually or collectively in a theatrical mode. Thus, intercultural theatre becomes an adaptive and adoptive process of forming hybrid performance traditions (these issues will be discussed further in Chapter Six section 6.2.1, and Chapter Seven sections 7.3 and 7.3.4).

*Beyond My Circle* also involved the performance of pre-notions/perceptions Ugandans have/had about the USA and its people. That is what followed the *ekitaguriro* dance. This aspect was also reported by Haven (2009): “Stanford students’ team with their peers at Makerere University in Kampala to examine their preconceptions of each other.” Some of these perceptions were presented in a monologue by a Makerere student. The performer shared the semi-personal or semi-Ugandan perceptions and attitudes about the process and anxiety of applying for, and getting an American visa. He started his story with the Lord’s Prayer: “our Father who art in heaven ... please give each of us an American visa ... I waited, waited, waited and waited. And the achievement of getting an American visa was unbelievable.” To show how seriously people take the prospect of going abroad and particularly to America, he noted that some people sell their belongings and others even try witchcraft in order to succeed in getting an American visa. All this is because many think that life in the US is perfect and the best. In his narration he also talked about the American dream and the pre-notions/stereotypes most Ugandans have about American society: “all people are rich, own cars and the country is democratic”. A Makerere University teacher – MUT (as quoted in Haven, 2009) also commented on the stereotypes:

[MUT] relates the customs imbroglio wasn’t the first difficulty in the unprecedented collaboration. The Ugandan students had to struggle just to get their visas. The exchange program, he said, examined ‘how Africans think about America, and what Americans think about Africa.’ For Americans, he said, the stereotypes of Africa typically include “poverty, corruption.” And Ugandans’ preconceptions of America? The question elicited another of [MUT]’s characteristic infectious peals of laughter: ‘All of them rich, all of them driving.’

The stereotypes/perceptions Ugandans have about USA can in part be explained by looking at the generally rosy American media projections about their country. Where they present Africa and other third world countries as full of disease, poverty and wars, in most cases they create an impression that American conditions are the very opposite. And for most Ugandans who have never visited USA, Hollywood’s cocktail of glamorous films which are churned out and consumed worldwide become another symbolic window through which they visualise the general American lifestyle. Robinson (2013) captured some of these issues

When people imagine Hollywood, they envision streets filled with rich and famous people whose luxurious lifestyles are represented in movies. But one photographer ventured just a few miles away from the multi-million dollar mansions and film studios to experience a different side of the city. Visiting some of Los Angeles’ most down-trodden parts, he witnessed the struggle of people living on the streets ... Michael Pharoah, 22 from New Zealand was on holiday in the United States when he decided to take on the project. He said he was humbled by individuals who told him stories about

how they had ended up on the streets ... He said ... ‘It was fascinating to me because we don’t have the same plethora of homeless people as L.A. It was interesting to hear all of their stories and how they came to live on the streets. This project was both a sad yet humbling one.’

However, the generally received and perceived contrasting media imagery about the USA’s and Uganda’s socio-political and economic conditions can at times pre-frame perceptions people have about each other even before they meet (cf. Bourdieu, 1989:15). What was important about this case study is that it allowed the Stanford and Makerere University participants to verbalise their perceptions about each other and, by doing so, allow us to probe and corroborate the foundations of their perceptions and the psychological dynamics of intercultural collaborations.

At the same time we also get to know, for example, why the Stanford University participants related with the Ugandan participants the way they did in the first days of their arrival. This kind of information could not easily be obtained through the purely dance performances such as those of the New York-Makerere or Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaborations, even though from the anecdotal personal experiences of the people I interviewed I was able to get an impression of what some of the underlying dynamics of North-South intercultural collaborations were. In this regard, Woodside and Wilson (2003:500) say that “triangulation of methods” and having “multiple informants is necessary to confirm and deepen information” (see Chapter Four section 4.5). And Yin (2009:53) argues that, compared to single cases, “the evidence from multiple cases is often considered more compelling, and the overall study is therefore regarded as being more robust” (see Chapter Four sections 4.7 and 4.8).

Having noted that, let us go back to the issue of applying for a visa to enter each of the two countries. Arguably, the process of applying for the visa and the participants’ entry into each of the two countries shows how structural differences and issues of power are played out. We will look at a transcript of experiences of two female project participants, one from Stanford University and another from Makerere University. Even though the transcript that follows was not used in the final production, it was suggested in one of the performance-devising rehearsals. Moreover, Woodside and Wilson (2003: 498) say that documents written by participants and occurring in case environments are part of the operational data that a researcher can work with. In the following extract, the participants were supposed to speak taking turns while sharing their different visa application experiences with the audience.

*(Makerere student and Stanford student: The Journey)*

**Makerere student:** I went on the net to apply for my visa appointment. I could not get an appointment for three weeks.

**Stanford student:** We were told we didn't need a visa until we arrived in Uganda.

**Makerere student:** I cried and stayed in the [internet] café for a full day to get an appointment. I woke up at six a.m. to be at the Embassy. I was number 15, everyone before me was denied.

**Stanford student:** We arrived in Uganda on August 19th. There were only 4 people in the line ahead of us to get a visa.

**Makerere student:** I met a white man; he asked me "Who is paying? Where are you staying? What does your dad do?"

**Stanford student:** We got our yellow fever shot cards out so they could see. They didn't ask to see it.

**Makerere student:** He asked me what year I was. He was sure I was coming back because I had to finish school. I screamed and said thank you very much.

**Stanford student:** We paid our money and walked right through.

This excerpt supports the visa application experiences of the Ugandan participants as earlier expressed in a Makerere University student's monologue, and MUT (as quoted by Haven, 2009). The excerpt also strengthens our understanding of the dynamics of the North-South intercultural theatre collaborations as far as the visa application process, and the structural and power differences at the geographical border-crossing level, are concerned. The dramatic excerpt also implies that it is easy for a person from the "First World" to enter the "Third World", but quite difficult for the person from the Third World to cross over to the First World, implying the unbalanced requirements of going beyond each other's geographical circle. On a macro level this problematises and explains the unbalanced movement of people in the "global village". This situation also relates to Elteren's (2003:172) advice to researchers and scholars of intercultural relations to always "maintain a critical awareness of transnational movement of people, capital, commodities and conditions of inequality, disempowerment, and exploitation that drive these movements."

In the same vein, as far as the movement of people from the South to the North is concerned, there is a generalised inherent fear that people from the South who go to the North will always deceitfully refuse to return home, consequently contributing to the problem of illegal migrants in the North. That is why there is rigorous questioning during the visa application

and at the border-crossing level. This kind of fear existed among the project partners at Stanford University. They thought that some of the Makerere University students would not return to Uganda after the intercultural exchange in order to escape the preconceived “deplorable” socio-economic situation in Uganda. This kind of perception is part of the symbolic performance of socio-economic inequality that sometimes characterises the North-South intercultural collaborations. This again problematises the notion of mutual and equal partnership that is supposed to epitomise intercultural collaborations.

Similarly, Haven (2009) records the experiences of the Ugandan delegation at San Francisco International Airport:

It took more than an hour to get through customs. No surprise. When the small cluster of Ugandans brought eight large wooden drums, a 4-foot wooden xylophone and animal skins through U.S. Customs in San Francisco, the officials were flummoxed. The drums couldn't be dismantled to search for explosives, and they didn't understand why animal skins were needed for dancing, anyway.

As observed earlier, what Haven says here again reflects the structural power dynamics, and in particular the power imbalance, during the visa application process and at the border-crossing point. The same structures also accentuated the Ugandan delegation's otherness at the border-crossing level.

On the other hand, Haven's (2009) description of the Makerere delegation's border-crossing episode at San Francisco Airport reflected the global insecurity and the difference in cultural dance regalia between the USA and Uganda. In a globalisation perspective, the fact that participants in the Stanford-Makerere intercultural theatre collaboration had to seek for clearance to enter either of the two countries contradicts the theoretical implications of a culturally homogenous, free and borderless global village.

In *Beyond My Circle*, the media-influenced anxiety and fear that people from the North who have never visited Africa or countries like Uganda experience as they prepare for their journey was again poetically presented. This was done by three Stanford University students in a poem *Dear Momma*, which in part went like this:

Dear Momma,  
I made it. I'm here.  
24 hours later. I'm here.  
The plane food sucked. I'm here.

We fear nature, we fear uncertainty, we fear ourselves.



They keep telling me to stop trying to save Africa,  
but is it wrong that  
the whole plane ride here  
I kept thinking  
Who's going to save me? ...

We fear nature, we fear uncertainty, we fear ourselves.  
Kelly got sick in Russia. Rachel had to leave Kenya early when she caught something.  
They gave me good advice: bottled water, no raw vegetables.  
Vaccinate me, baby, and I'll be good to go. Mosquitoes are no match for Western  
medicine.  
Of course, Kelly drank bottled water and still got sick...

Who's gonna save me?  
I googled Uganda today  
all I got were facts and figures about how many people  
die from sleeping  
or something like that. I mean,  
I had to get a yellow fever vaccine before I left  
you know?

The above poem has a refrain which illustrates the gravity of the persona's fear expressed by the words "we fear nature, we fear uncertainty, we fear ourselves". The persona's fear is worsened by the different media reflections of a "diseased" Africa riddled with malaria. When the persona did some online research on Uganda, he/she was given facts and figures of people who "die from sleeping" — in other words, sleeping sickness. That was coupled with warnings not to drink unbottled water and raw vegetables.

The issue of Africa being in a dire and dangerous situation necessitating a saviour is also hinted at and these are the same common generalised narratives about Africa in the Western media. The representation of Africa in the poem and in the Western media reproduces the grim representation of Africa in colonial travelogues. These are the same issues that Ugor (2006) discussed when he examined how the Western media, especially film, revisit the nineteenth-century stereotypes of Africa as a "dark unknowable land." This again creates a perceptual rift and influences the psychological power imbalance even before people from these two geographical areas meet (cf. Moon, 2008: 18; Bourdieu, 1989:15).

To Bourdieu (1989:23), the ability of the media to create perceptual frames in peoples' minds means that the media hold symbolic power, because "symbolic power is the power to make



things with words” and/or images. Similarly, the media sometimes provide the “habitus”<sup>7</sup> through which groups view and position each other during the interactive encounter.

Based on the poem *Dear Momma* and the above observations, one can argue that the media’s images affected the Stanford University students’ feelings during their stay in Uganda by making them constantly fear for their safety. This kind of fear reflects Bauman’s (1993:146) view that culture or geographical distinction is sometimes “experienced as annoying ... At worst, it carries a sense of danger”. The sense of danger is illustrated by *Dear Momma*’s refrain “we fear nature, we fear uncertainty, we fear ourselves”.

It is also noticeable that the *Dear Momma* poem in an implicit way dramatised the perceptual categories “First World” and Third World”, which signify the structural inequalities and the different socio-political and socio-cultural binary oppositional circumstances between these two ‘worlds’, issues which are reflected in Bourdieu’s (1989:19) concept of habitus.

The poem *Dear Momma* also highlights the maintenance of the “them” and “us” distinction in intercultural encounters. This connects intercultural theatre collaboration experiences to Barth’s (1969) theory of ethnic/cultural boundary maintenance. This phenomenon at the same time shows how far the world is from being culturally and structurally homogeneous.

As far as the representation of Africa in the Western media is concerned, a Ugandan journalist Mpanga (2013) wrote that

reports on Africa in the Western media have become somewhat clichéd themselves. They [reports] tend to highlight the shallow understanding or lack of expertise of the Western journalists who report on African matters and point out glaring factual mistakes to support the contention that these journalists are ill equipped or even unqualified to comment on Africa. There is no doubt that Western coverage of Africa tends to be skewed ... we should expect the tone and subject matter of journalistic pieces, novels and films on or featuring Africa to only use Africa as a backdrop. Why? Because, in truth, that narrative belongs to the West, they are writing about themselves and largely for themselves.

This view was recently echoed by Kafeero Kathryn Barrett-Gaines, an American historian who has an interest in African history. Kafeero has visited and stayed in Uganda on several

---

<sup>7</sup> According to Bourdieu (1989:19), habitus is both a system of schemes of production of practices and a system of perception and appreciation of practices. Consequently, habitus produces practices and representations which are available for classification, which are objectively differentiated; however, they are immediately perceived as such only by those agents who possess the code, the classificatory schemes necessary to understand their social meaning. Habitus thus implies a “sense of one’s place” but also a “sense of the place of others”.

occasions. In her newspaper article “Many in America are still ignorant on Africa”, which was published by the Ugandan newspaper *The Observer*, Kafeero (2013) said that

last month, our president, Barack Obama, was in Africa. In fact, our president is African. But my fellow Americans persist in seeing Africa as little more about heat and killings ... After one hundred years of public education, fully-equipped libraries, public television, and internet access to every bit of information on this planet, Americans are left still with the impression that Africa amounts to little more than heat and killing.

This again conveys the general psychological imprints about Africa that the American/Northern participants arrived in Uganda with. In a personal interview, this was also reflected and corroborated by New York-Makerere collaboration participant NYUT1

What we receive in the United States is not always what really is. It may be coloured, it may be biased when it comes from different countries and what information finds its way to us about Uganda is limited and often honestly not always so positive. ... for instance they hear about the news of Ebola outbreak, the anti-homosexual law, they are killing this, there is Ebola outbreak, there is war ... there is Joseph Kony and the list goes on ... They talk about – ‘oh everyone in Uganda is illiterate nobody can read or write’ ... Their perceptions are not their fault because the media is feeding them with very negative limited information. (Extract 5)

Bearing in mind what was reflected in *Dear Momma*, Mpanga (2013), Kafeero (2013) and what NYUT1 said in Extract 5, let us then look at what some of the student participants said while reflecting on some of the interpersonal challenges of the North-South collaborations: in the New York-Makerere collaboration for example, Makerere participant NYU/MAK-MUS2 observed that:

When we go for the workshops the first days are not good, they are so reserved ... I don't know if they feel that we are dirty or what? Because in very many cases we tried to go out and they are like “we cannot eat from here, we cannot sit here” they take themselves to be very special everything special ... they come with a different thinking ... but after sometime they change after seeing everything differently ... I think before they come they are piled with a lot of information and the information they give them is not right ... you reach there and a person asks a question and then you say ah where is this question coming from? A person asks questions, questions and you wonder where they get all this information. One can even say ‘Ugandans they told us you steal’ ... I think it also affects us sometimes and to put this person right takes time. But I learnt how to handle people and to know where to end when dealing with them ... sometimes when they see you they think you have come to beg... like when you try to befriend them they think you have come to beg and someone says ‘how are you?’ And immediately says ‘by the way ... oh at home we are poor we don't have something to give’. So someone starts to explain and you say to yourself, ‘okay did I want something from you’. So we get such challenges. (Extract 6)

This interviewee did not have a clear overview of the different forces that framed some of the New Yorkers' initial behaviour and the kind of thinking they arrived with. From Extract 6, we also see the performativity of otherness among the intercultural collaboration participants.

However, apart from the influence of the media, the hesitation in interacting with Ugandans exhibited by the New York participants can be explained by looking at Neuliep's (2006:338) uncertainty reduction theory (URT). URT is built on the premise that

Given the high level of uncertainty present at the onset of the entry phase, as the amount of verbal communication between strangers increases, the level of uncertainty for each interactant in the relationship will decrease. As the uncertainty is further reduced, the amount of verbal communication will increase.

URT is connected to the anxiety uncertainty management theory (AUM), but specifically, AUM explains the interrelationships among uncertainty, anxiety, mindfulness and communication effectiveness (Neuliep, 2006:342). AUM and URT are similar because both focus on the effects of uncertainty and anxiety on communication. But on the other hand, they are different because URT's main aim is to reduce uncertainty among interacting groups or individuals, while AUM focuses on managing uncertainty and anxiety. AUM also integrates the concepts of mindfulness and communication effectiveness with strangers<sup>8</sup> (Neuliep, 2006:343). One can argue that in part, the initial hesitation showed by the New York students reflected their uncertainty and anxiety, and their failure to manage the two at the first phase of entry.

On the other hand, it seems clear from NYU/MAK-MUS2's words in Extract 6 that there was a mixture of forces that influenced the New Yorker's perceptions and stereotypes about their Ugandan counterparts. The American media's socio-political narrative structures and stereotypes about Uganda and Africa in general may have contributed to this initial misunderstanding and aloofness. From NYU/MAK-MUS2's insights, one can say that the New Yorkers were not feeling 'special' as NYU/MAK-MUS2 thought, but like the Stanford participants, they were symbolically performing the media influenced fears of a 'diseased Africa' as explored in the Stanford-Makerere *Dear Momma* poem. Similar sentiments and fears about a diseased Africa were exhibited by the NCD students while interacting with their Ugandan counterparts. This was hinted at in a focus group discussion I had with Makerere

---

<sup>8</sup> Neuliep (2006:43) says that, according to AUM, a stranger is "someone who is physically near and conceptually distant simultaneously". This means that interacting with strangers is replete with uncertainty and anxiety.

participants who participated in NCD-Makerere collaborations. From NYU/MAK-MUS2 in Extract 6, we again see that given the poverty stereotype, some New Yorkers thought that anybody they were interacting with was ultimately in need of a charitable donation. That way it seems discernible that the behaviour exhibited by the New York students when they first interacted with their Makerere participants was in part influenced by previously held perceptions. In a separate interview, while answering a question on the lessons learnt through the collaboration, NYUS2's reply verified my previous discussion on the effects of preconceptions on human interaction:

I think expectations and probably misinformation one may receive prior to the hands-on experience of another culture definitely does impact on how we intend to, or relate to others. But such information from other people may not be effective in forging a healthy intercultural relationship. (Extract 7)

During the same interview NYUS2 noted that some of the misinformation was coming from news reports, people who had visited Uganda previously and the preparatory talks about the dos and don'ts expected from them while in Uganda that were presented by the project leaders in the USA (cf. Mabingo's 2014:6-7 'pre-departure preparations' at NYU). One can say that all these sources increased on their anxiety and the self-restraining behaviour that they exhibited during the first days after they arrived in Uganda.

What NYU/MAK-MUS2 and NYUS2 highlight in Extracts 6 and 7 respectively connect to what Goffman (1959:1) observed about human interaction – “when an individual enters the presence of others, they commonly seek to acquire information about him/her or to bring into play information about him already possessed ... For those present, many sources of information become accessible and many carriers (or ‘sign-vehicles’) become available for conveying this information” (cf. Gadamer, 1975:270).

Consequently, one can argue that intercultural encounters involve the symbolic interaction and performance of spoken and unspoken socio-political and economic perceptions that each of the groups has about the other and these are part of the psychological dynamics of the North-South intercultural collaborations. This is what was in part confirmed by the *Dear Momma* poem. Bhabha (1994:20) describes the underlying power and economic divisions inscribed in both language and media representations

I am convinced that, in the language of political economy it is legitimate to represent the relations of exploitation and domination in the discursive division between the First and Third World, the North and the South. Despite the claims to a spurious rhetoric of ‘internationalism’ ... I am further convinced that such economic and political

domination has a profound hegemonic influence on the information orders of the Western world, its popular media and its specialized institutions and academics.

From this, we again see the performance of symbolic power in the media representations and the binary oppositions with which the North/First World and the South/Third World are understood.

The *Dear Momma* poem also hinted at the self-discovery that can occur when one is in a foreign country. One African American student who was part of the poem's dramatisation observed her Ugandan experience this way: "I am not black here – I have found out that I am light and take a different kind of space"; these are some of the indexes with which one can be identified as the "other". Another Stanford student reflected during the performance of the same poem on issues of identity and belonging — "people stare here, I am not sure how they know that I don't belong". This is similar to what was happening in the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration, when in a focus group discussion NCDS2 said that

sometimes we get a lot of attention and people look at us and maybe crowd around us if we do something somewhere. Call you *mzungu*<sup>9</sup> [white person]. Nobody does that at home because we look the same. (Extract 8)

From this we see how the Stanford University and NCD participants' foreignness sometimes attracted attention and name calling — *mzungu* whenever they moved around Kampala. For a person who had never travelled out of his or her country before, finding oneself in a situation where one is the centre of attention and explicitly branded as the 'white other' can be physically and psychologically disturbing. One has to negotiate with the self and adapt to the situation of being the centre of attention as the other. These are real-life situations when one travels to places which are culturally, racially, religiously or politically distinct. These scenarios again reinforce the notion of otherness, whereby if one is not directly or indirectly "othered" by the collaborating partners, there are instances when one discovers that one is the "other" because of the peculiar cultural indexical signs and differences one finds oneself entangled in and which he/she cannot adequately relate with within the new geographical and cultural space. At the same time, the experience may be understood as raising the hermeneutic issues that one may encounter when one goes beyond one's cultural or geographical circle/horizon, as pointed out by Mul (2011:629).

---

<sup>9</sup> *Mzungu* is a common general term used to mean 'white person' in Uganda. Since the white population is small in Uganda, whites usually attract attention, especially the attention of children who sometimes can call out amusedly saying '*mzungu, mzungu*' whenever they see one.

A performance of the Ugandan dance *baakisimba* followed the poem. *Baakisimba* is a dance of the Baganda people from central Uganda and it has a polyrhythm. The performers put on Ugandan costumes of animal skins and cotton clothes locally called *ebitambi* wrapped around their waists. Both Makerere and Stanford students were involved in the dance. Some Stanford students were involved in playing the Ugandan drums that accompanied the dance. This dance also demonstrated the spirit of interculturalism in theatre, which involves the interplay of cultural dialogue, negotiation, translation and adaptation between the two groups. Commenting on the same dance, Stanford University writer Haven (2009) said that

half a dozen men and women did the *baakisimba* – a traditional dance in which the upper body is fixed and immobile, as the hips gyrate rapidly (it’s performed in *Beyond My Circle*). Ramsaur said that Stanford students Kimberley McKinson and Natalia Duong ‘picked it up very fast. They’re considered as good as the Ugandans.’

Given the fact that the dance has extensive historical and philosophical meanings, and given the limitations of training and translating the culturally embodied dance motifs in cross-cultural endeavours, some Stanford group members faced challenges in learning the dance (in-depth discussion on these issues will appear in Chapter Seven section 7.3.4).

Keeping in mind that two Stanford students learnt *baakisimba* quickly and they were more or less as good as Ugandans, it is worth noting that those two students were part of a ten-member student delegation, thus implying that most of the students found encoding and decoding the Ugandan dance motifs in the intercultural setting challenging. And even though those two were as good as Ugandans, I observed that still they retained some habits from Western dance that interfered with their mastering of Ugandan dances, which Adams and Janover (2009:227) may have termed as “unbridgeable and ultimately untranslatable” elements. This shows that even though intercultural theatre collaborations and their resulting performances are dialogic symbolic interactions with both cultural and body motif fusions, there are still “unbridgeable” and “untranslatable” elements which maintain the cultural boundary between the collaborating groups. But even though dances in *Beyond My Circle* such as *baakisimba* were choreographed by a Makerere dance teacher, some Makerere student participants who were not dance majors equally faced challenges while learning them like the Stanford counterparts (these issues will be discussed further in Chapter Seven section 7.3.4).

As the dancers exited the stage, a poem accompanied by creative dance was presented. The poem was presented by an African American Stanford University student. The poem

illustrated her feelings of homelessness, an element that punctuated most of the African American participants' stories in *Beyond My Circle*. She started by giving a historical account of slavery and then narrated how while she was growing up she was told that being white was more beautiful than being black. She went on to say that "I am in Uganda and it is hard to know myself. I am displaced from Africa and America, leaving me lost somewhere in the middle". This implies that she was finding it difficult to decide on which place to call home. She ended her poetic piece with a song with a refrain: "sometimes I feel like a homeless child ... long lost from home". The same idea was also mirrored in the part presented by an African American student in the poem *Dear Momma Dear Momma*:

So I came here  
to in some way validate what blackness means  
validate what home means  
understand what it means to be strange in a strange land  
where everyone looks like me ...

Because I feel the same sun beating down  
on my skin  
another shade of hot  
like suddenly melanin is my identity  
and I'm traipsing along the line between  
"the other"  
and "the other"  
I was just looking to retouch my roots.

From the above two examples, we see the motivations of African American students who participated in the Stanford-Makerere intercultural collaboration. However, there is also an active recognition of being treated as the cultural "other" during the process of tracing their African roots and identity.

Similarly, from the interviews I had with people who had participated in the New York-Makerere collaboration over the years, I was informed that most of the African Americans that had participated in the collaboration have always had a feeling and desire to reconnect with Africa, the continent which is the cradle of their identity, an aspect which was also reported by Mabingo (2013:33). Again, this shows the importance of history in understanding intercultural dynamics between socio-cultural groups. It also confirms the view that intercultural interactions sometimes involve implicit or explicit enactments and negotiations of far-reaching historical notions and desires.



The wish of African American students to reconnect with Africa by participating in the collaborations also demonstrates that behind institutional objectives of having intercultural collaborations are various, sometimes untold individual aspirations and desires for personal involvement. Such theoretical insights provided by data from this micro case study provide important perspectives with which one can assess, and at the same time problematise, grand concepts and notions such as “global culture”, “global village”, “world view” and “African American” within which some peoples’ individual desires and aspirations are sometimes arbitrarily condensed and overshadowed.

The aspiration of reconnecting with one’s roots shown by African American participants involved in the Stanford-Makerere University collaboration was also noted by one of the Stanford University artistic directors (SUAD1) of *Beyond My Circle*. SUAD1’s perceptions were quoted by Haven (2009):

Kampala is ‘not a tourist destination,’ so foreigners are ‘exoticized.’ [SUAD1], an African American, said he was seen as *mzungu* – a white person – only ‘a *mzungu* with darker skin,’ he said. He watched American students who came to Uganda ‘in a search for home and roots’ come to grips with the size of Africa and the particularities of the region and its history ... For Uganda, in East Africa, race is ‘not part of the conversation,’ [SUAD1] said. The region did not participate in the slave trade, and the white population is small; hence, ‘there isn’t fluency or literacy in that particular history.’

In this excerpt SUAD1 also underscores the importance of history in understanding intercultural dynamics. SUAD1’s perceptions remind us of what was discussed in Chapter Two section 2.3.3.6, repeated at the beginning of this section while discussing the ideological portrayal of the racial tension in *Beyond My Circle*. In those sections I hinted at Martin and Nakayama’s (2008:82-84) concept of the “present-future/history-past dialectic” which calls for understanding historical circumstances in order to examine contemporary intercultural interaction between social groups and the degree of intergroup anxiety. Historiographical insights in the same way can help us to understand individual and group motivation for particular socio-cultural and socio-political actions. Consequently, as earlier indicated, intercultural interaction involves the negotiation of history.

SUAD1 at the same time highlights the notion of otherness in intercultural encounters whereby, even though African Americans in the Stanford-Makerere collaboration had a desire of reconnecting with Africa, they disappointingly found themselves othered and classified as *bazungu* (whites).



Similarly, when I asked a Ugandan participant SU/MAK-MUS1 (in a personal interview) about the lessons learnt from the collaboration, SU/MAK-MUS1 said that

There is always this notion that Africans have problems, they are stressed and that they are challenged. I was able to learn first-hand that Americans have personal and societal challenges; racism which they are struggling to live ... and to cope with. In the group there were black Americans and there was this girl who was always lamenting about the fact she is a black American girl. And even in our personal conversation and her piece in the play she kept on saying that I wish I was not a damned black American girl. And she always wished to find her roots. I was surprised to learn that this part of the world which we think is superior and where everything is perfect is facing such problems. This kind of first-hand exposure helped me to appreciate the theatre courses I did like ... Theatre of the Black Diaspora which covered plays like *Smile Orange*, *Mulatto* and *A Raisin in the Sun*. (Extract 9)

From this excerpt the informant tells us the stereotypes she had always heard about Africans; meaning that the continent and its people have problems. She also tells us about the African Americans' predicament of loss of identity. At the same time the respondent also hints at some of the stereotypes that Ugandans have about America: it is a superior and perfect society. However, through the collaboration, the participant confesses that she was able to learn that like any other country, America had individuals with personal and societal problems.

Back to the performance, participants from the two universities came on to the stage and performatively shouted out the different words with which America and Africa were identified with. Africa was described with words like 'culture', 'war', 'violence', and America with 'democracy', 'American dream' and 'peace', which again pointed to the binary constructions and socio-political differences between the USA and Uganda, and the people who symbolically represented and embodied the characteristics of those two states.

A Makerere University participant followed with her story of running away from home because of an abusive father and had to struggle to continue her schooling. However, even though the performance-devising process was generally democratic and participatory in nature, whereby the Stanford directors gave freedom to the participants to brainstorm and decide on the material they wanted to contribute to the production based on the participants' personal experiences and interests, in an interview I had with SU/MAK-MUS1, I was informed that the final story that she performed was not her original idea. According to SU/MAK-MUS1, the idea was suggested by the performance directors, adding that

we were told to tell our stories but the story I told was not my story and I felt that it was power that determined the story ... the story I told about me running away from home and my father being unhappy about it was a bit ... should I say Ameri-centric. (Extract 10)

During the same interview SU/MAK-MUS1 further commented about the power imbalance saying

I ... felt that even though we had our teachers who were supposed to be assistant directors, many of the decisions were made by the Stanford group which again brings in the power dynamics. (Extract 11) (cf. Pribyl and Johnstone, 2011:234).

What the respondent says here is borne out by my own experience. It should be noted that *Beyond My Circle* was directed by two Stanford postgraduate students. And since they were the artistic directors, they definitely had the upper hand in making the major decisions concerning the intercultural performance. All this brings in the notion of power in determining the content of collaborative intercultural theatre performances. This issue will further be discussed in Chapter Seven section 7.3.4.

However, on the other side, the play-devising process and approach may have signified the American ideal of individualism and an individual's freedom of expression. This approach may in part explain why the performance was multidisciplinary and multi-medial: filled with different artistic forms, music, poetry, storytelling and dance, partly signifying the expressive tastes, abilities and interests of the participants. At another level this aspect paints a wider picture if we are to look at the concept of globalisation and its notion of one global culture. It makes one wonder whether the world can have one global culture if it is populated by individuals with different interests and sensibilities at a personal level, and who have to engage and participate in other cross-cultural/ border-crossing acts in their lifetime.

In continuation with the performance, in order to show the exploits and possibilities of the computer age, whereby laptops can be used to store personal experiences, Stanford University students with their Macintosh laptops came on to the stage in a segment where they shared some of their personal experiences in Uganda ranging from meeting "malnourished children" to meeting young women in a Kampala discotheque who were crazy about dancing with an American young man. The young man was at the same time surprised to sense his popularity and marketability in his new geographical space. Some of the issues covered in this segment reflected real human encounters and surprises in an intercultural

setting. However, they also reflected the “them” and “us” dualism, and differences in the socio-political and socio-economic set up between Uganda and USA.

In *Beyond My Circle* there was also dramatisation of intercultural communication challenges. This was performed by a Ugandan Makerere University student and two Stanford University students – one American and one from Jamaica. They performed a comic rendition of how people in the different countries represented in the segment pronounced words like potato, water, tomato, aluminium, cucumber, guitar and pomegranate. This comic skit exemplified the different appropriations and adaptations of the English language, and showed that there are different “Englishes” around the world which can interrupt smooth intercultural communication. The existence of these “Englishes” points to the need for re-negotiation, re-translation and re-mediation in order for the collaborating/interacting persons to understand each other. This scenario forces us to rethink, and at the same time problematises, concepts such as international language, world culture and/or world cultural homogenisation.

The above language segment relates to some linguistic pre-notions/stereotypes that Ugandans have about Americans in general as was illustrated by a Makerere participant SU/MAK-MUS1 during a personal interview:

For instance I was always told that when Americans speak, they use a heavy accent which I would never understand. And when I came into the collaboration, I was thinking – will I catch up, will I understand what these people are saying. But surprisingly, I did not find it difficult to catch up. That was the problem ... should I call it stereotype? So I learnt first-hand that that is not as hard as people [Ugandans] assume. (Extract 12)

In this collaboration SU/MAK-MUS1 was relating with Americans at close range for the first time. What she said in Extract 12 indicates that negotiating the communicative differences is one of the challenges that people find in intercultural collaborations (the discussion on the perspectives highlighted here will be followed up in Chapter Seven section 7.3). Extract 12 also indicates that intercultural collaborations offer first-hand experience to the participants that they can base on to deconstruct previous stereotypes and construct new perspectives about other people.

A repetitive thematic concern in *Beyond My Circle* revolved around loss of personal identity and loss of a sense of home amongst the African American participants. The African American performer that followed the language skit came with a monologue in which she stated that

you know America has never felt like my home. I have always been the other and the other ... I went to Africa to find my people and I found that they were not there .... In school I was always told to go back to Africa. ... But I am American ... that is who I am.

After visiting Uganda and “searching for her home and people”, the narrator found out that it was difficult to find her “home” and her “people” in the geographically and culturally diverse Uganda, where she was also considered to be the “other”. This forced her to resignedly accept that she was American. From the above excerpt we again see the notion of otherness in intercultural collaborations re-emphasised. It seems apparent that African Americans who visit countries in Africa like Uganda in pursuit of discovering their roots and identity find themselves “othered” in a twofold fashion. That is because in the USA they are seen as the ‘other’, and when they visit countries like Uganda with hope of tracing their roots, home and identity they again discover that they are seen as the cultural ‘other’ because of their embodiment of cultural signs and behavioural codes which are more American than African. This implies that the notion of otherness cannot be avoided in intercultural interactions. It also means that encountering different modes of ‘otherness’ and negotiating ‘otherness’ is part and parcel of the dynamics of North-South intercultural interactions.

Similarly, the above monologue was followed by another Stanford University African American student who discovered that in Kampala she was “more American than I ever thought I would stomach”. This was because while in Uganda all Stanford University participants were generally totalised and identified by Ugandan students as being Americans. Yet some African Americans had some implicit or explicit dislike of America because of its historical participation in the slave trade and its subsequent effects on their loss of a sense of home and cultural identity. However, as Haven (2009) put it when she quoted SUAD1, while in Uganda they were seen as white persons with darker skins. Among other cultural habits, their otherness and cultural distinctiveness was enhanced by their American accent. The performer also talked about how it felt being away from home and country and how she felt “vulnerable for the first time”. The latter again replicates Bauman’s (1993:146) assertion that being in a foreign country sometimes “carries a sense of danger”, an issue which was also reflected in the *Dear Momma* poem. This sense of vulnerability and inherent fear and insecurity of being in a foreign geographical and cultural space sometimes has to be physically and psychologically negotiated and it is also part of intercultural dynamics.

During the time the Stanford University team came to Uganda in 2009 land wrangles were rampant and were widely reported in Ugandan newspapers. This influenced one Makerere student and his counterpart from Stanford to comment about this issue. It was indicated that the land question was partly created by colonisation as the Stanford participant lyrically portrayed it, saying “this is my land, and this is your land because the British said so”. Tribal differences within Uganda were also hinted at in this segment thereby showing the multidisciplinary nature of *Beyond My Circle*, and/or intercultural collaborations.

Issues of imperialism and domination reminiscent of the colonial days were further hinted at in the poetic monologue *White Jesus*, which was presented by a white Stanford University student. The performer castigated and satirised the power-inflamed imperial tendencies of Western powers towards other independent nations around the world. This again showed the political stance of *Beyond My Circle*.

Equally, the political nature of *Beyond My Circle* was also reflected in the “world news summary” segment led by a Stanford University student in which after every sad ‘news bite’, other performers in a biblical allusion fashion chorused “first, second, third ... commandment” somehow implying that the world has written new commandments which are in line with chaos, injustice and violence. The symbolic news commentator looked at issues such as the Rwandan genocide, which led to the death of hundreds of thousands of people because of ethnic difference. Commentary was also provided on a social injustice which was reported on news platforms with reference to an Afghan woman who was stoned to death for committing adultery, and yet the man who raped her was not punished in any way. War in Iraq and the torture of terrorist suspects in the Guantanamo Bay facility, where the USA army was implicated, were also criticised. The commentator ended by saying, “because it has not happened to people that we love, we cannot pretend that it is not happening”. *Beyond My Circle* can thus be categorised as a multi-disciplinary ideological performance critiquing world socio-political and socio-cultural phenomena.

The issue of privilege was also addressed in *Beyond My Circle*. In a dramatic monologue a Stanford University student talked about how she was lucky to have all the basic necessities in life, but wondered why people should make her feel guilty because of those privileges, which were a result of her hard work. She suggested that those in privileged positions should use their positions to change the world and gave an example of the USA government, which gives out millions of dollars every year in the form of aid to other disadvantaged nations. The

Stanford performer ended by noting that “we cannot feel bad because of our privilege, we can feel bad if we squander it away”. This partly showed that Stanford students were aware of the USA’s privileged position over other countries. This in part also implied that in relating with the Makerere participants, they were implicitly or explicitly performing their embodied “othered” selves that shared the fact of belonging to a powerful and privileged nation which is able to give aid to the underprivileged nations around the world. This again points at the invisible symbolic foundation, construction and performance of unequal power and positioning in the North-South intercultural collaborations. That is, a person coming from an aid donor country may perceive persons from aid recipient nations as all being “poor” and “needy”, which itself unbalances power in intercultural collaborations. There are practical examples of this in the Stanford-Makerere collaboration. That is, on the national or macro level Uganda as a country receives aid from USA. And on the micro level of the Stanford-Makerere collaboration, Stanford University footed the bill of the intercultural collaboration. Thus in the macro and micro sense, the Makerere University participants occupied an economically inferior position in relation to their Stanford University counterparts (cf. Lo and Gilbert, 2002:36-37 in section 5.5). The implications of economic inequality in North-to-south intercultural collaborations will further be discussed in Chapter Seven section 7.2.

In the light of the economic inequality dynamics of the North-South collaborations hinted at above, Bourdieu (1989:16) suggests such can be “one of those cases where the visible, that which is immediately given” – in this case the need for North-South collaboration – “hides the invisible which determines” or even frames it. Bourdieu (*ibid.*) argues that in such circumstances one “forgets that the truth of any interaction is never entirely to be found within the interaction as it avails itself for observation.” Bourdieu (1989: 16) posits that even though agents who occupy a higher position in the interactive space “symbolically deny the social [or economic] distance between themselves and others”, that does not imply that the social distance between them ceases to exist. The denial of social power distance in this case is tantamount to reaping the profits of “a purely symbolic denegation of distance” (*ibid.*). Given the economic and political imbalance between the Northern and Southern countries – say, America and Uganda – it means that the assumed mutuality and equal partnership in intercultural collaborations between institutions from the North and those from the South involve the enactment of a loose, hypothetical or symbolic negation of socio-political and socio-economic distance between those collaborating institutions.

Furthermore, in reference to the rich/privileged North and needy/underprivileged South dichotomy that emerges through the “privilege” monologue, one tends to see the replication of Bourdieu’s (1989:20) vision of a differentiated and relational power-induced social world because “the schemes of perception and appreciation, especially those inscribed in language itself, express the state of relations of symbolic power.” From the donor-recipient relationship we can at the same time recognise Bourdieu’s (1989:21) assertion that “symbolic relations of power tend to reproduce and to reinforce the power relations that constitute the structure of social space.” The discussion here again shows the multiple ways in which the operation of power characterises intercultural collaborations between Northern and Southern institutions.

The thematic concern with privilege was further developed by another Stanford University student. Her specific reference was to black privilege. She started by commenting on the stereotypes about black people in the USA: living in ghettos, their children dropping out of school. But she indicated that there are also blacks who are in privileged positions. Her visit to Uganda showed her the same state of affairs, where she found that some people were in privileged positions and their children went to good schools in and outside the country. By visiting such families and making contact with their seemingly pampered children, it was difficult to see the poverty and starving black babies as projected in the Western media. She concluded by noting that “in some ways power, wealth and privilege know no borders”.

That was followed by an instrumental piece by two Makerere participants using a tube fiddle and *adungu* playing “*Twara amate gaawe*” (Take your milk), a folk tune from Uganda, thus amplifying Ugandan cultural visibility.

In *Beyond My Circle* one of the Stanford students vowed to come back to Uganda to find out what brought “people together in song and dance under a big tree”. This was based on the Stanford group’s real-life experience and their fascination with a community event that they witnessed during their stay in Uganda. The Stanford team together with their Ugandan counterparts visited a village in the Eastern part of Uganda. During this visit a village performing group played its traditional instruments, sang and danced under the shade of a big tree. The sound of the instruments and the singing attracted other members of the community and by the time the performance ended, there was already a sizeable impromptu audience in attendance. The performer also said that she wanted to come back to Uganda and find out “how long it takes to practise *baakisimba* and really get it”. The impression is that intercultural theatre collaborations are normally short, which means that they are inadequate



in providing the necessary time for each participating group to satisfactorily learn the performing traditions of the other, thus making such collaborations pilot/experimental symbolic interactions. Indeed in 2011 the same Stanford University student came back to Uganda and re-visited Budondo, one of the villages in eastern Uganda that had fascinated her during the Makerere-Stanford intercultural exchange.

As the performance of *Beyond My Circle* was coming to the end, one of the Stanford University students who was involved in the *Dear Momma* poem accompanied by other participants converged at centre stage and summed up her Ugandan experience to her “momma” saying – “Uganda is not dark in all places, it’s home – home to children who were just surprised that my skin feels the same just like theirs” – thus acknowledging that Uganda (like any place on earth) has its ‘darker’, more problematic side. However, in that portrayal the performer also recognises that Uganda is still home to children who were amazed by the fact that even though the narrator was the “other”, they still shared a common human identity – the feeling of their skins. As earlier noted, this reinforces the centrality of the notion of “othering” and “otherness” in intercultural interactions. Nevertheless, amidst the human differences they are still things that world populations share as members of the human race.

The performance ended with a creative dance involving all the participants, thereby showcasing *Beyond My Circle’s* intercultural and multidisciplinary nature.

From my analysis of *Beyond my Circle*, one will notice that the Ugandan participants were minimally visible in the verbal articulation of their intercultural experiences in the performance. There are several reasons for this. First, it should be noted that the Stanford delegation spent a month in Uganda. During the first twenty days of their stay, they were involved in different activities around Kampala and this entailed visiting the Eastern part of the country. Having accumulated all this experience, the performance was devised almost in the last ten days of their stay. This made it possible for them to articulate their intercultural experience in the new geographical space in the performance. On the other hand, even though Stanford University funded a reciprocal visit of the Makerere delegation to Stanford, they spent ten days there.

However, even though there are days when the Makerere group was taken for guided tours around San Francisco City, their group/personal experiences such as the San Francisco Airport thorough checking that signified the Makerere group’s “otherness” and heightened

the delegation's nervousness of being in a foreign structural/geographical space were not put in the performance. Language barrier issues: for example, from my emic participant position in this collaboration I conducted a storytelling workshop at Stanford University and after the workshop some participants told me that they could not understand portions of my presentation because of my "unique English accent". This was coupled with some participants' surprise at the structural development difference between Kampala and San Francisco basing on the latter's iconic Golden Gate Bridge and skyscrapers. All these experiences were not incorporated in the performance that was staged at Stanford University because the few days that the Makerere delegation spent at Stanford could not allow introducing new items in the performance other than rehearsing and staging the performance that was devised from Uganda.

Furthermore, it should be noted that whereas ten Stanford Students performed in *Beyond my Circle*, only five Makerere students were funded to participate in the collaboration. And two of these were mainly involved in playing the drums that accompanied the dances and provided transitions to the performance. Such circumstances provided the numerical and verbal presence/supremacy to Stanford participants in *Beyond My Circle* as can be detected in my analysis. As already indicated in section 5.3 (also see Chapter Seven section 7.2), the institution that funds the collaboration determines the duration of the collaboration and the number of project participants. And as illustrated here, it affects the nature of the performance and may initiate other dynamics in the North-South collaboration.

### **5.6.2 The Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere intercultural performance – an introduction**

The 2013 collaborative performance which was staged at the Uganda National Theatre was made up of 17 different segments, each with its own title signposting the symbolic meaning that it was concerned with. The performance combined music, dance and drumming.

The show involved PAF students, NCD students and live transitional music; the drumming that accompanied the Ugandan dances was played by Peace African Children group – a Ugandan cultural group that uses indigenous arts to empower socially and economically disadvantaged children. However, it should be noted the modern dance and jazz dance items and the Norwegian folk dance *egerliteng* were accompanied by recorded music.

Like the Stanford-Makerere collaboration, the NCD-PAF performance started with the singing of the Ugandan National Anthem followed by the Norwegian National Anthem. One can say that the singing of the anthems had a symbolic political significance, because it showed the political duality of the collaborating institutions.

After the anthem, the performance opened with *amagunju*, a dance of the Baganda, an ethnic group from central Uganda. This dance has a long socio-cultural and socio-political history. Briefly, it was originally only performed in the palace of the Kabaka (title for the king of Buganda) by people from the *butiko* (mushroom) clan. It was performed outside of the palace only after the abolition of kingdoms in 1967, when Uganda was declared a republic. Recently, the dance has been part of the repertoire of dances performed in school festivals and by commercial indigenous dance performing groups around Uganda.

This socio-political context of the dance shows how theatre performances and in this case intercultural theatre performances adapt, and symbolically truncate and celebrate the lengthy histories and contexts of a given people's socio-cultural and socio-political performance traditions. This exemplifies the centrality of culture in intercultural collaborations. It also shows that intercultural collaborations involve the negotiation of history and the negotiation of explicit and implicit forms of culture (cf. Pavis, 1992: 9). Pavis (*ibid.*) argues that when a cultural performance is adapted for the stage, "it is reworked, cultivated, inscribed in a meaningful totality". Because of these processes, the performance tends to embody countless deposits and traces whereby the "actors' bodies, in training or in performance" appear to be "penetrated' by the 'body techniques' belonging to their culture". As already indicated, this means that the dialogic intercultural theatre performances are culturally embodied at multiple levels (see further discussion on this in Chapter Six section 6.2.1 and Chapter Seven section 7.3.4).

At the closure of the above segment the NCD students followed with a jazz dance entitled *The spirit of togetherness*. Even though this dance was performed by NCD students only, its title mirrored the overall nature and aim of the intercultural collaboration. However, it should be noted that jazz itself has a multi-layered socio-cultural and socio-political history which I cannot deal with in depth here. However, Savran (2006:460) gives us brief historical insights into jazz:

Whatever it was, jazz could not be delimited or quarantined. It consistently muddled (and challenged) class-based, racial, and ethnic hierarchies – both musical and

otherwise – and quickly became a touchstone for a wide range of social and cultural issues. Moreover, it was credited by both its supporters and detractors with being the first distinctively American art form to disseminate US style, culture, and modernity across the globe.

Even though Savran (2006:62) says that jazz represents the “American soul”, he recognises that it has “many manifestations, guises [and] contexts”, among which is its signification of the “cross-mediated performance in the 1920s: a form that undermined the autonomy of dance and concert music”. In the same vein, jazz “revealed the necessarily contingent nature of all performance practices.” Taking note of jazz’s troubled history in the USA, Savran (2006:63) further says that playwrights like Eugene O’Neill were reluctant to associate their plays with jazz, because it “emerged from African Americans and the working classes” and therefore some “conservative cultural critics” also supported “legitimate theatre’s ... dissociation from jazz” (*ibid.*).

From this brief history on jazz, we again note how intercultural theatre symbolically adapts different cultural traditions with deep-seated socio-political, socio-cultural and political-historical significance. However, the initial abhorrence towards jazz because it was introduced by African Americans and the working class symbolically illustrates the class, racial and power struggles in the USA. But later jazz was accepted and grew to symbolise the “American cultural soul” and became a worldwide “American cultural export”, performed in this case by the NCD participants. Given the troubled history of Ugandan’s indigenous arts during the colonial era (discussed in Chapter One sections 1.7.2, 1.7.4 and 1.7.5), and their acceptance and celebration in the postcolonial era in, among other ventures, the North-South intercultural collaborations, jazz and the Ugandan indigenous arts symbolically share a history of contestation, denial, and eventual acceptance. The double socio-political, socio-cultural and political-historical journey of the Ugandan indigenous arts and jazz was thus symbolically performed in the NCD-PAF intercultural performance in what I will term intercultural theatre’s socio-cultural, socio-political and political-historical symbolic dialogism. This scenario is what Pavis (1992:12) called “internalization of authority” which he said means in part “what the actor on the stage shows while hiding it”. But in regard to the history of the performances briefly highlighted above, which members of the audience cannot readily access as they watch the performances I will call it, inspired by Pavis’s term, the “internalisation of theatre history”. This is an element that characterises all performances, but more so the intercultural ones, whose complex history is suppressed by the

symbolic/condensed nature of theatre performances due to the philosophical limitations of art like time and space.

However, the history that cannot readily be accessed by the audience attending a live performance, because of its internalisation, may be examined by a cultural critic who adopts a socio-historiographical or cultural-historiographical mode of performance analysis. Pavis (1992:12) seems to acknowledge the fact that performance may isolate the cultural material from its socio-historical context. Due to this, a critic should not only apply a sociological approach, but also incorporate the historical and ideological context in performance analysis. Moreover, my interaction with multidisciplinary intercultural theatre discourse and practice has shown me that any approach that involves tracing adaptation and intertextuality in any field calls for historiographical analytical dialogism with a range of discourses and practices.

Given intercultural theatre's cross-cultural mix, Pavis (1992:1-2) maintains that intercultural theatre is a laboratory which is sometimes difficult to comprehend. Pavis (1992:2) argues that in our bid to understand theatre at the crossroads of culture, "we certainly risk losing substance, displacing theatre from one world to another, forgetting it along the way, and losing the means of observing all the manoeuvres that accompany such a transfer and appropriation" (see Chapter Two section 2.4.3).

A performance of *Pressure point* followed. It was performed by PAF students only. What was peculiar about this dance was that even though it was categorised as contemporary or modern dance,<sup>10</sup> it was made up of an amalgamation of different Ugandan indigenous dance cultural markers or motifs from dances like *mwaga*, *kizino* and *ekitaguriro*. This showed how indigenous performance forms permeate and influence the 'modern' theatrical output and creativity in Uganda, thus symbolising the dual existence and fluid continuity of the traditional in modern performances. And because the PAF dancers borrowed or adapted the Ugandan traditional dance motifs in the modern dance *Pressure point*, they seemed more confident and grounded in their movements. Because of this local cultural borrowing, according to my observation during the performance, the majority of the Ugandan audience members could easily identify with the cultural sources of the different dance motifs that

---

<sup>10</sup> According to Deborah (1989:7), modern dance is an American genre particularly associated with Angela Isadora Duncan (1877-1927), an American dancer. She was born in San Francisco, California, but also lived and practised dance in Western Europe and the Soviet Union from the age of 22 until her death in 1927. Duncan's dance style is noted to have consisted of a "focus on natural movement instead of the rigid technique of ballet".

made up *Pressure point*. The PAF participants' use of Ugandan indigenous dance motifs in the execution of *Pressure point* showcased the indigenisation and localisation of this Western dance form referred to as modern dance.

The above piece was followed by *Euphoria* — a modern dance that was performed by NCD students only. As the title signposts, the dance was eliciting a spirit of elation and excitement. This modern dance piece was in sharp contrast to *Pressure point* in terms of body alignment and swiftness of the performers. The performer's movements were more abstract for the ordinary Ugandan audience compared to those of *Pressure point* because of differences in cultural signifiers/resources or performance indexical signs used. This means that the usage of symbolic cultural signifiers from within and without in intercultural theatre performances can sometimes be challenging to members of the audience in their identification with, and recognition of the cultural resources being used in the performance. This also implies that the two-way process of performing otherness can easily be identified by members of the audience.

The next item was a musical piece *ajolina*, a tune from Northern Uganda performed by Peace African Children (PAC) ensemble. This musical piece was mainly played using Ugandan indigenous instruments, which again showed the visibility of Ugandan arts in the performance.

From the above segments, one notes that PAF and NCD students were still performing within their own groups. This symbolised the continuity of each group's independent cultural existence. Wallerstein (1993:31-32) argues that the term 'culture' summarises the ways in which "groups distinguish themselves from other groups. It represents what is shared within the group and presumably simultaneously not shared (or not entirely shared) outside it." That way, intercultural theatre becomes some sort of culturally informed symbolic interaction and negotiation between divergent human groups. This, to paraphrase Bhabha (1994:29), may imply that intercultural theatre practice is positioned and ambivalently grounded in acting-out of cross-cultural dialogical fantasies between one cultural symbolic bloc and another and the performance positions available to each. However, in between, one can find both a reflection of hegemony and divided wills.

The pattern of separate PAF or NCD in-group performance was erased in the sixth segment, when NCD and PAF students jointly performed an intercultural dance sequence that

combined *kitaguriro* (a dance of Banyankore from Western Uganda), *owaro* (a dance of Basamya from Eastern Uganda) and *kizino* (a dance of Bakiga from South Western Uganda). This dance was choreographed by a PAF teacher. These amalgamated dances reflected the spirit of interculturalism whereby the Makerere and NCD students together learnt and shared the symbolic cultural space of the Uganda National Theatre to celebrate Ugandan dance culture. However, what was culturally unique about this dance in the PAF-NCD performance is that there was gender role relocation. This is because in its traditional context in Uganda, the *ekitaguriro* dance has culturally gender-assigned dance motifs and roles for both men and women in its choreography. However, during the performance of this dance at the Uganda National Theatre, the female NCD students were allocated male gender dance roles/motifs and this amused the audience. To contextualise and use Curran's (2008:4) words, intercultural theatre and its gender role reallocation in this case, introduced cultural dissidence by constructing 'new macho women' in the NCD-PAF intercultural performance who were different from the Ugandan "woman in the social [and cultural] imagination" (*ibid.*).

The adoption of the gender roles that were performed in the NCD-PAF intercultural collaboration can be explained in different ways. First, it is a fact that 29 of the 31 NCD students who came to Uganda in April 2013 were females. The two males who were part of the team were former PAF students who were offered scholarships in August 2012 to go and study a Bachelor of Dance Education degree at NCD. Therefore, given the need to show that the NDC students had learnt all aspects of the Ugandan dance, some had to take on male roles. Secondly, it can also be argued that Norwegian society's perception of dance as a profession for women in part explains the gender imbalance at the Norwegian College of Dance. Therefore all these socio-cultural aspects influenced the nature and dynamics of the collaboration and the intercultural performance.

However, apart from the above explanation, I was told by one of the NCD teachers that the creative arts sometime call for breaking the cultural gender barriers in particular circumstances. This belief in performing arts circles is sometimes casually expressed by the phrase "an artist has no sex". This implies that an artist at any given moment should be ready to cross the culturally prescribed gender role divide and this signifies the symbolic artistic cultural dissidence and unorthodoxy. What is discussed here subscribes to Giroux's (2005:2) concept of border-crossing, where he says that it "provides a continuing and crucial referent



for understanding the co-mingling – sometimes clash – of multiple cultures, languages, literacies, histories, sexualities, and identities”. This seems to show that intercultural collaborations and performances sometimes involve a multiplicity of orthodox and unorthodox socio-cultural dialogism.

Even though during the performance some of the Norwegian performers showed some “stiff” and “elevated” body habits that come with the body being oriented to Western ballet and modern dance techniques, their performance with Ugandan participants largely showed their willingness and input in trying to dialogically learn and celebrate Uganda’s cultural heritage by participating in dancing the Ugandan dances in a cordial spirit of interculturalism. This connects to Denzin’s (1992) concept of symbolic interaction. Denzin (1992:26) also points to the concept of identity suggesting that the denotations of identity are based in the interaction process and “emerge and shift as persons establish and negotiate the task at hand”. This means that intercultural theatre collaborations involve the process of symbolic identity alteration as each interacting group tries to learn the culturally informed dances of the other group involved in the intercultural interactive process. This issue will be discussed further in Chapter Six section 6.2.1.

The Ugandan audience was excited and applauded the NCD performers as they performed the Ugandan dances. However, based on my observations, this excitement can be interpreted in two ways; first there were members of the audience who were happy because someone from without had mastered the Ugandan corporeal performance language, and there were others who laughed because they had seen some persons whose bodies were struggling so hard — negotiating the ability to dance Ugandan cultural dances but with some corporeal incongruities because their bodies were used to the Western dance corporeal protocols.

The above segment was followed by *mugudo*, a creative rhythmic drumming sequence performed using a set of large Ugandan drums. The sequence was staged by members of the Peace African Children group. As already noted, this group provided the music and drumming that accompanied the dances and at the same time they provided the musical and drumming components that bridged the different segments of the performance.

PAF students then performed the *agwara* – a processional or ceremonial dance of the Alur people from North Western Uganda. The dance gets its name from the *agwaras* – traditional trumpets that are used to accompany the dance. The performance of different cultural items

from the different regions of Uganda showcased the cultural diversity of Uganda and the intra-cultural dialogism, performance migration and adaptation amongst the different peoples of Uganda.

Norwegian College of Dance students followed with a Norwegian folk dance *egerliteneg*. It should be noted that this was the only distinctively Norwegian traditional dance that was performed in the production, given that jazz dance and modern dance have American origins. However, it was peculiar in an intercultural sense to see that Makerere University students were not taught, and were not involved in this dance. Even though intercultural collaborations are ideally dialogical and operate within culturally informed symbolic interactional structures, in this case we see the symbolic closure of intercultural theatre's "interaction structures" (Denzin, 1992:27-28), in the sense that Makerere participants were not taught this dance. In the same vein, by not involving the Makerere University participants in their cultural dance, the Norwegian College of Dance participants were symbolically constructing, and subsequently maintaining, their cultural images within the boundaries of the intercultural setting (see Pile, 1996: 53). However, this was not the first time this happened, since Pribyl and Johnstone (2011:230) wrote about the 2011 Makerere University students' experiences saying that "the Makerere dance students wondered why they were not given the opportunity to learn the Norwegian traditional dance that the NCD students perform[ed] in the final performance at the Main Hall at Makerere". It is possible that this issue mirrors instances of cultural exclusion and Barth's (1969) ethnic/cultural boundary maintenance in intercultural collaborations. This is the same issue on which some Makerere participants argued that the collaboration was not on a culturally level playing field (see further discussion in Chapter Seven section 7.3.3). However, when I inquired why the PAF students were not involved, I was told that the dance was complicated, and that there was a feeling that the PAF students would not master it given the short period of the collaboration. The second reason was that the choreography of the dance needed ample space and that if the PAF students were involved, the Uganda National Theatre stage could not accommodate all the dancers. My observation of the dance during its performance confirmed the fact that the National Theatre stage could not accommodate many dancers. And on the complexity of the dance, I felt that some versatile PAF dancers could possibly have learnt it given the three weeks of rehearsals. However, such a scenario shows the need for constant intercultural dialogism in order to iron out any cross-cultural misunderstandings.

After the NCD students' item, Makerere university students came on with a modern dance piece *Close to land*. It was choreographed by an NCD teacher and it involved six male PAF students. This was in line with the aims of the intercultural collaboration highlighted in section 5.2.3 whereby the Norwegian College of Dance teachers were to teach the Ugandan students modern dance. I had a personal interview with NCDT1, its choreographer. Commenting on *Close to land*, NCDT1 said that

I worked with six men because I wanted them to feel like men are an important part of dance. I chose to have a very powerful manly movement and very grounded because in my mind I was thinking — oh they are Africans, they are very grounded. But of course I did not realise that because the movement was new to them, they were going to lose the groundedness ... but the major aim was to make the students work together to show themselves as one company and not to show that one was weaker than the other ... and that is one of our goals to see that all students are participating and that they are important in the show. (Extract 13)

I watched the performance and noticed that the PAF participants in the modern dance *The pressure point*, which adapted Ugandan indigenous dance motifs, were more comfortable and grounded in their movements than those in *Close to land*. Even though being culturally destabilised is one of the experiential dynamics of intercultural interactions, on the other hand, what we observe in Extract 13 generally suggests the destabilising effects that well-intentioned cultural transfers can have on recipients, when the cultural materials are not rightly appropriated or adapted into a particular group's cultural body politic. That is, it can lead to cultural dislocation, disorientation and instability, as is evinced from the above interview excerpt.

The gender (and specifically masculinity) issues sometimes involved in choosing dance motifs during the process of artistic creation is also evident from the interview Excerpt 13. However, the interviewee's views may have been influenced by the gender imbalance in dance practice in Norwegian society as it is also mirrored through the unbalanced gender enrolment of students at Norwegian College of Dance (NCD). Pribyl and Johnstone (2011:227) also commented on this saying that "when one looks at the groups from NYU and the NCD, it is clear that the ratio of men to women is typical of Western dance institutions, one man and fifteen, or even twenty women". In recent years at PAF, it has been the direct opposite whereby the department has been having more men than women enrolling for its dance programmes. The discussion in this paragraph again reflects Giroux's (2005:2) concept of border-crossing, in this case negotiating and crossing performance sexualities.

NCDT1's interview Extract 13 also hints on how "othering" through preconceived stereotypes is part of intercultural theatre dynamics (see Chapter Three section 3.4.5). In regard to 'othering', there is a general romanticised view that most African dances are 'close to the ground' or 'close to mother earth' — with bent bodies and sometimes involve stomping the ground with flat feet as opposed to the Western dances which are aerial in orientation with elevated bodies and dancing on 'one's toes' — an element that is common in ballet dance. This is the general stereotype of the two cultures' dancing orientation that in part guided NCDT1. Even though the dialogic and mediatory concept 'intercultural' may create an impression of the erasure of 'othering' in intercultural collaborative practice, it is still observable that the collaborating participants operated within the 'them' and 'us' trajectory. This implies that intercultural theatre practice is a site and practical space in which each group fantasises and sometimes works within the framework of the other's preconceived otherness. This also symbolises intergroup cultural boundary maintenance.

Through NCDT1's experience illustrated in Extract 13, we realise that categorising and stereotyping are human information processing-strategies (Nueliep, 2006:383). However, from the same experience we realise that teaching, and in this particular case teaching new dance techniques in an intercultural setting, is more than working with a stereotypical perspective. That is because while stereotypes can be used as general guides to understanding a people, they can sometimes be misleadingly insufficient. Moreover, Bhabha (1994:75) argues that "the stereotype is not a simplification because it is a false representation of a given reality. It is a simplification because it is an arrested, fixated form of representation that ... constitutes a problem for the representation of the subject in significations of psychic and social relations". This means that because of the fixed representational perspective of stereotypes, they can be misleading in the judgment of interpersonal relations and situations in dynamic intercultural settings. Goffman (1959:1) and Gadamer (1975:270) similarly discuss the pitfalls of pre-conceptions.

To contextualise Gadamer's (1975:271-2) views on elements of a theory of hermeneutic experience in this discussion, it can be proposed that a person trying to understand something in an intercultural encounter should not rely on his or her own accidental pre-conceptions, which can thwart an understanding of the actual cultural meaning during the encounter with the "other". Rather, a person in an intercultural encounter should be ready and open to learn something from that encounter. That is why having a hermeneutically trained consciousness

should be present from the start; this involves being sensitive to any intercultural situation's alterity. However, this does not mean the extinguishing of oneself during the encounter, but one should be aware of one's own pre-perceptions, prejudices or what Bourdieu (1989:15) calls "pre-notions" about the other and how they could affect the process of learning and mutual dialogue. Gadamer (1975:172) further states that "it is the tyranny of hidden prejudices that makes us deaf to what speaks to us in tradition". Likewise, it is the domination of hidden biases that makes us oblivious to what speaks to us during intercultural encounters with otherness (cf. NYUT1 Extract 5; NYU/MAK-MUS2 Extract 6 and NYUS2 Extract 7 in section 5.6.1).

*Close to land* was followed by a fusion of *Semusaja agenda* and *Nsanji* performed by the Peace African Children group. The music and dances performed by this group were essentially informed by Ugandan folklore. The two songs that were part of this segment were picked from widely known folk narratives of the Baganda, an ethnic group from central Uganda. Even though these pieces were part of this collaborative performance, the NDC group may not have had sufficient time to absorb the contextual meaning and the culturally situated didactic application of such folkloric tales. This again shows why I argue that even though intercultural collaborations can contribute towards cross-cultural appreciation and understanding, they are often symbolic interactions.

*Semusaja agenda* and *Nsanji* were followed by a jazz dance piece entitled *We stand for each other*. The piece was choreographed by an NCD teacher and performed by PAF students only. From this dance piece, it was also observable that the PAF participants were free and natural in their movements. This was partly because jazz movements are closer to the body orientation needed for most Ugandan dances. Secondly, even though jazz is categorised as American, it has African origins. Based on PAF-NCD's engagement with jazz dance in the 2011 collaboration, Priby and Johnstone (2011:230) similarly observed that "it is fascinating that the NCD comes to Uganda to teach jazz dance, a form of dance that has its roots in Africa [and] is distinctly American". This scenario points to the notion of global cultural migration/cultural transfer of jazz dance which is intensified through intercultural collaborations. However, we should not forget the possibility of such dances being localised and indigenised wherever they go, thereby taking on a different theatrical feel and significance.

The above segment was followed by the modern dance piece *Odd Poetry* performed by NCD students, which was followed by a jazz dance *The Magnificent*, which was also performed by NCD students.

*The Magnificent* was closely followed by *We go together*, a jazz dance which involved NCD and PAF students. The title of this jazz piece again symbolically reflected the intercultural collaboration's project title "Together in the Art of Dance". I interviewed the NCDT2 who choreographed the dance and he said that:

I did two local dances from my country [Trinidad and Tobago], calypso dance, I did a blend of the two groups, two girls from PAF and two from Norway, rock and roll number from Greece, and music from a film *The Body Natural*. And if we are to talk about interculturalism, jazz dance is more than that; it has the African, Caribbean and classical ballet, modern ballet and all that in the spirit of interculturalism. (Extract 14)

This comment is again an indication of the multi-perspective dynamics and influences of intercultural performances.

Peace African Children followed with a Ugandan dance *mwaga*. *Mwaga* is a traditional male circumcision ritual dance of the Bagisu people from Eastern Uganda. The dance is widely performed by school children and commercial cultural performing troupes in Uganda. That way, this dance helps to propagate the Bagisu's cultural heritage and make their cultural heritage visible to the rest of the world. The dance's physical movement patterns and motifs are based on specific cultural referents and symbols of the Bagisu's male circumcision rituals, cultural symbols that Blommaert (2005:69-74) calls "orders of indexicality", which in this case I call orders of cultural performance indexicality.

The 2013 NCD-PAF segmented performance was closed with a song *Sing the body electric*. Interestingly, the title of this song comes from a famous American poem *I sing the body electric* by Walt Whitman. In the poem, Whitman celebrates the primacy of the body and its importance in forging connections between people. The song involved all participants in the production. The togetherness expressed in this last item symbolised the collaborative and intercultural intentions of the arrangement whereby through dance, they celebrated each group's culture.

When I looked closely at the 2013 NCD-PAF performance I noticed that whereas PAF students independently performed two pieces – that is, *Close to land* and *We stand for each*

*other*, choreographed by NCD teachers – in the whole production there was no single such item staged solely by NCD students trained by PAF teachers.

It was also observed that out of the 17 segments that made up the entire production, only three directly involved NCD and PAF students performing in the same item together: *Kitaguriro Owaro Kizino* choreographed by a PAF teacher, *We go together* and the closing song *Sing the body electric*, both choreographed by an NCD teacher. This may give a symbolic overview of issues of power, inclusion, exclusion and silent competition as some of the dynamics of such intercultural collaborations.

I talked to some participants and asked them about what they thought was memorable about the 2013 NCD-PAF performance and NCDS1 she said that

the dancing on stage with musicians behind me drumming the rhythms and of course with the traditional costumes, and the musicians giving us energy to dance, dance and dance even more, the singing and the smiles when we are turning to them in the dance and we responding with those smiles, the touch between the music and dance is really memorable and a nice experience for me. (Extract 15)

Some Makerere participants in a focus group discussion said it was inspiring for them to perform at the Uganda National Theatre for the first time and to learn new ways of professional approaches to performance from their Norwegian counterparts.

Answering the same question, NCDS3 said that the traditional African dances were very inspiring for her as a dancer. NCDS3 went on to say that

the PAF student and the relationship we had and the performance, and the audience was like something I have never seen before. In Norway you clap when you are supposed to, and keep quite when you are supposed be quite. But here the audience was quite energetic and they gave us the energy. (Extract 16)

This shows how the theatre experiences and etiquette in Norway and Uganda are different. I have watched theatre shows in Europe and I know how silent the audience sometimes can be. But in the NCD/PAF shows at the Uganda National Theatre, some members of the audience could make amused comments on what was on stage as the show was going on. In all, the analysis of this performance shows the centrality of culture in intercultural collaboration and the negotiation and adaptation of socio-cultural and socio-political histories of the cultural materials performed.

Based on the short sessions of the North-South intercultural theatre sessions at Makerere University, and putting aside some of the challenges of negotiating difference in intercultural



sessions that will be discussed later, the energies and willingness to learn exhibited by the participants in the intercultural performances I watched are commendable. Maybe one of the *Beyond My Circle* directors (SUAD1) put it better when he was quoted in the Stanford Drama Press Release saying

my history as an artist has taught me that theatre is the most efficient and effective medium through which to meet [intercultural] challenges indeed we very quickly discovered how to communicate through our bodies: in poetry, in song and in dance. This, in many and profound ways bridged gaps across the cultural divides. The students, all, met the challenges of our assignment with incredible spirits of enthusiasm and generosity.

## 5.7 Conclusion

This chapter introduced the case studies, provided a brief background, commented on source of funding, the nature of the collaborations and their connection to the global education perspectives.

I also looked critically at two intercultural performances, *Beyond My Circle* and the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere University performance. From these two performances it was observed that any given intercultural communicative situation, or in this case intercultural theatre performance, is influenced by an interaction of many socio-historical, socio-political, socio-cultural and personal factors. The multidisciplinary nature of the intercultural performances called for multidisciplinary and multi-method analytical approaches. I believe the efficacy of such approaches is seen through my analysis.

The discussion also showed the centrality of culture and power in intercultural performance dialogism. Even though intercultural collaborations are supposed to connect divergent groups and minimise their cultural polarities, it was observed that the participating groups still used stereotypes/othering and maintained the ‘them’ and ‘us’ trajectory. This in a way upholds cross-cultural boundaries between the interacting groups and implies the inclusion and exclusion dynamics of interculturalism.

In the chapter that follows I will discuss the benefits of intercultural theatre collaborations and their connection to some of the issues that have been highlighted in this chapter, and the thematic concerns that have been illustrated in the intercultural performances that have been discussed.

## **Chapter Six: Benefits of the intercultural theatre collaborations**

### **6.1 Introduction**

In this chapter I will present and discuss the benefits of the intercultural theatre collaborations at Makerere University's Department of Performing Arts and Film. I will examine them in the context of the dynamics of intercultural theatre collaborations.

### **6.2 Advantages of the collaborations**

#### **6.2.1 Learning environment**

From the interviews I conducted many of the interviewees said that the collaborations were a learning platform for them.

NYUT1 said that

these students getting masters degrees in dance think that 'I know, I know dance, I know this', yet they come here and they are starting over as learners from the beginning and that experience is humbling because they see masters here and they have to open their ears and open their eyes and learn something new and try to work hard to achieve something that on the first day they said 'I cannot do that'. And then in two weeks they have mastered new information, new skills, new styles; they have taught children, they have collaborated with people that at first may have been uncomfortable. I think that there is definitely a change. And also the application of that personal experience to learn something new and to start from a beginner again is important when they are teaching beginners because they can feel what it feels like, and know when they are teaching a Ugandan dance to their children, and their children say 'I cannot dance that, it is so difficult', their teacher can say 'yes – I felt that way too but I did it and I will show you the video of the first day I did it – this is me on the first day.' That sense of mastery, that sense of trying something new, going half way around the world not really knowing what to expect and having a wonderful successful time is a good experience. (Extract 17)

Magoba (2013) wrote about how the assistant coordinator of the 2013 New York delegation had benefited from an earlier programme

Yoko Sasaki, who first came to Uganda in 2009 as a 'study abroad' student, this year returned as a Programme Assistant. Sasaki recognises the competitive edge she attained after participating in the exchange. 'Right after leaving in 2009, I applied both the positive and challenging feedback that I either observed or was told, and out of that learned to be a better programme coordinator. Google is definitely no substitute for living and earning such an experience,' she noted.

Blakdance (2013) also quotes the experience one of the 2013 NYU participants saying

while in Uganda, I had the chance to choreograph working with over 60 candidates from a number of orphanages. I also danced with dancers from the Makerere University, learning the ‘*Owaro*’ and ‘*Kitaguriro*’ traditional dances, then performing them at the Uganda National Theater in Kampala (Uganda) ... This remarkable field work allowed me to develop more detailed practical skills from Uganda and to have the rare chance to gain first-hand knowledge, which will undoubtedly support my academic understanding of First Nation cultures as I complete Masters studies at NYU. It permitted me the opportunity to compare and contrast other traditional forms around the world, with the addition of developing skills and knowledge of First Nations dance forms.

From the above excerpts, from the NYU participants’ point of view, the educational value of intercultural collaborations is explicitly highlighted (cf. Mabingo 2014:4-5). The same views were held by Makerere University participants as indicated below.

NYU/MAK-MUT2 believed that the New York-Makerere collaboration helped individuals who have participated in it over the years to grow and learn to work together. NYU/MAK-MUT2 further said that the collaborative workshops helped the students to appreciate difference and to understand that teaching sometimes changes according to the cultural circumstances of the teaching environment. During the collaborative workshops, the Makerere and New York University participants witnessed the different pedagogical approaches of USA and Uganda, and negotiated the pedagogical differences in a first-hand context. The knowledge and skills acquired through this process could be applied by the participants to teach dance in an international setting after their studies. The intercultural pedagogical process also improved their range and ability of teaching within their own cultures.

NYU/MAK-MUT1 also noted that before any dance was taught to the New Yorkers, they had workshops, and Ugandan teachers had presentations which gave the background to the dances. NYU/MAK-MUT1 indicated that preparation for the workshops and presentations encouraged research on the side of Makerere teachers.

In the Makerere-Norwegian College of Dance collaboration, I interviewed NCD/MAK-MUT1 who noted that the collaboration offered an opportunity to Makerere University students to interact with and learn from their Norwegian counterparts about other ways of practising modern and ballet dances. NCD/MAK-MUT1 went on to say that

Since the Norwegian teachers also teach the Department of Performing Arts and Film students, the students are able to experience other ways of teaching; for example what it

takes and means to become a dancer. That does not mean that the students are not taught those basics by the Makerere University teachers, but hearing it from someone else; having another voice from without emphasizing important issues matters a lot in the process of learning. (Extract 18)

Similarly, at the Norwegian College of Dance, they believe that music and dance started from Africa. The NCD teachers and students I interacted with indicated that it was important for them to participate in the collaboration and see the source of break dance, street dance and jazz dance styles, which they believe are/were informed by indigenous African dance motifs.

NCDT2 noted that it was

very, very uplifting to see the progress, to see the joy of the African cultural dance and the music. And to see how the [Makerere] students express the joy and freedom of the dance, and for our students, I think it is the same thing how the joy comes out and the natural movement, and how the story behind every cultural dance comes out. (Extract 19)

The teacher went on to note that dance anthropologists have argued that Afro-Caribbean jazz originated from Africa and then went to the Caribbean and to America. Based on this, the teacher noted that the Norwegian students needed to know and understand where the Afro-Caribbean dances and their complex rhythms came from. In the same vein, NCDT1 said that the NCD students also needed to have first-hand experience of having live musicians accompanying them in dance and to see natural, energetic and physical movements and the joy of African dance, which is more than mere movement (cf. NCDS1 Extract 15 in Chapter Five section 5.6.2).

NCDT1 commented on the collaborative pedagogical experience, saying that for him it was a

good opportunity to meet students from a different background and learn more and figure out how to teach in this setting. And by observing the Norwegian students when they are being trained here, I believe they are gaining a lot. (Extract 20)

What NCDT2 and NCDT1 were saying in Extracts 19 and 20 respectively is similar to what NYU/MAK-MUT1 and NYU/MAK-MUT2 said concerning the pedagogical benefits of the New York-Makerere collaboration.

What the respondents pointed out in the above excerpts indicates that intercultural theatre collaborations are beneficial to the participants. Moreover, Deardorff (2006:252) says that while evaluating the impact of the study-abroad/intercultural programmes, there must be some indication of a meaningful and measurable outcome.

In the same vein, Sullivan and Cottone (2010:358) argue that “cross-cultural research provides tremendous opportunities to gain greater awareness and insight into how cultures and people differ ... Greater sensitivity to these differences is an important step forward in increasing contextual understanding of different cultural groups”.

Since cross-cultural theatre collaborations are a form of research through practice, or experiences-through-practice encounters, or forms of experiential learning (see Kolb, 1984), one can say that such collaborations lead to human understanding and mutual respect for cultural differences across the human racial and geographical divides. After all, Taylor (2000:1) posits that since drama, or in this case intercultural theatre, is a collaborative praxis, it can be used by educationists to help participants act, reflect and transform the human condition.

Similarly, the official from the International Affairs Office at Makerere University commented on the benefits of collaborations saying

when we get students they share their experiences with our students and teach them new ways of doing things ... Our members of staff benefit because they learn from students. The international students introduce a new perspective on how things are done in their countries. (Extract 21)

The above comment reflects Hamera’s (2007:19) view on the benefits of dance technique in interactive engagements

dance technique is relational infrastructure. It offers templates for sociality in the classroom and in the performance space. Technique translates individual bodies into a common ‘mother tongue’ to be shared and redeployed by its participants: a discursive matrix, a vocabulary and a grammar, to hold sociality together across difference and perpetuate it over time. At its most basic level, technique births new templates for sociality by rendering bodies readable, and by organizing the relationships in which these readings can occur.

Referring to Scholes’s (1989) ‘protocols of reading’, Hamera (2007:19-20) argues that that formulation is applicable to embodied practices. She says that “not only are such practices, and dance in particular, utterly enmeshed in textuality — from syllabi and lists of exercises to manifestos, trademarks and press kits – but Scholes’s view of reading also emphasises the highly situated nature of textual encounters: their materiality and contextuality.”

Hamera (2007:20) with reference to Scholes (1989) also says that “protocols of reading contain and organize critical, interpretive encounters with texts in both homogenous and diverse communities. They illuminate the flows of power and pleasure, and their points of

divergence and convergence, as these are encountered by students and teachers through the social processes of reading”. Similarly, Hamera (*ibid.*) argues that “dance technique generates metaphors and models used by dancing communities to organize the powers and pleasures of rendering the dancing body intelligible and communicable”. All these dynamic processes of negotiating differences and similarities in an intercultural setting equip the participants with cross-cultural communication techniques.

Equally, in an interview I had with a Makerere University student (NYU/MAK-MUS1), I asked about the benefits of the programme, and NYU/MAK-MUS1 said that

based on the different tasks we were given with my teaching partner to teach children from six to nine, there are some techniques I learnt, say, of organising the children so that they can bring all their attention and focus to you and not on any other thing. ... At first before meeting these people [New Yorkers] I had something very small, but after meeting them I found out that I improved a great deal which is very important in my life. (Extract 22)

Participants in the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration also expressed similar views on the educational benefits of the collaboration. NCD/MAK-MUS1 for example said that “I got skills from the Norwegian teachers which I can use to choreography my dance pieces”.

In an interview I had with NCDS1, the interviewee said that the collaboration helped her to learn “singing in a foreign language and dancing very different movements than what I was used to”. The same student said that she was going to use some of the Ugandan dance movements she learnt in her personal choreographies in future; which points to and affirms notions such as cultural migration and appropriation/adaptation that are said to characterise intercultural encounters.

Again, in a focus group discussion I had with some NCD students, NCDS2 likewise said that the collaboration helped her to learn African traditional dances. NCDS2 believed it was a

very good experience because we got to learn the African cultural dances and that is something I guess we would never have done if we weren't down here ... I think it is a very good experience to see how other people do their things. (Extract 23)

Correspondingly NCDS3 said that she got to

know the foundation for many dance styles and it has been very good to get deeper cultural understanding and to see different cultures, different people and get cultural dance contact, which is very nice for us. (Extract 24)

From this student, we see the reflection of the Norwegian College of Dance's belief that many dance forms around the world have their foundations in Africa. This deconstructs the colonial anthropologists' and colonial administrators' views that Africa in general and Uganda in particular did not have theatre before colonial intrusion (as discussed in Chapter One sections 1.7.2, 1.7.4 and 1.7.5). NCDS3 went on to say that "the [Makerere] university is nice; I did not think it was a country to visit because I thought it was not safe". From this again we see the Northern/Western apprehension about safety and security issues in Africa/Uganda, which emerged vividly in the *Dear Momma* poem in the Stanford-Makerere performance *Beyond My Circle* (as discussed in Chapter Five section 5.6.1).

NCD3 further said that the collaboration gave her an opportunity and a possibility to consider Uganda as one of her employment destinations after the completion of her studies, thus showing the cosmopolitan/global perspective that students can develop during and after participating in intercultural collaborations. This resonates with the objectives of global education that were discussed in Chapter Three section 3.5.

During the focus group discussion, NCDS6 stated this about her experience:

When we dance here [in Uganda]; when we are doing the traditional dances, we don't dance to that kind of music at home. And that is something totally different at home; to have someone cheering – it is much warmer here. The kind of energy you can draw from that ... we never get in our daily lives. (Extract 25)

From the different interviewee responses that have been highlighted above, it is clear that the learning that takes place in intercultural collaborations is connected to Kolb's experiential learning theory. Kolb (1984:41) perceives learning as "the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience. Knowledge results from the combination of grasping and transforming experience". Kolb's (1984) experiential learning theory (ELT) model posits that there are two ways of grasping experience and that is – through concrete experience (CE) and abstract conceptualisation (AC). The grasped experience can then be transformed through reflective observation (RO) and active experimentation. When one looks at intercultural theatre collaborations, they all use the above aspects of experiential learning in their different processes and individual and/or group cross-cultural negotiations.

In Mul's (2011:628-33) words, the intercultural collaborations helped to provide new "horizon[s] of experience", "widening of horizons" of experience and disseminating horizons of experiences among the collaboration participants. This is because during the interaction of



the New York-Makerere participants, Stanford-Makerere participants and the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere participants there was a meeting of persons that embodied different cultural ways of knowing or protocols of corporeal reading. Through the process of negotiating difference and hermeneutic<sup>11</sup> interpretation, the participating individuals, as evidenced from the interview excerpts, widened their horizons of understanding (see similar discussion in Chapter Five section 5.6.1). One can say that the widening of the participants' cultural horizons in these collaborations was an enriching experience theoretically, practically and aesthetically. It also enabled the participants to know the limitations of their own cultures. This is similar to the experiential learning process described by Kolb (1984). After all, Zeszotarski (2001:70) observed that globalisation has intensified intercultural interactions which call for intercultural adaptability, a term that involves speaking and listening skills as well as "the ability to interpret behavior in different cultural contexts and apply social or experiential learning in new cultural contexts" (see Chapter Three section 3.5.2). During the Makerere delegation's visit to Stanford University, for example, the parents of one of the Stanford University participants who had come to watch *Beyond My Circle* thanked the organisers of the collaboration saying that their son who, according to them, was an introvert before participating in the programme had greatly improved his social interaction skills by turning out to be more outgoing and positive about life after his intercultural visit to Uganda.

Another educational/learning benefit of intercultural collaborations is the possibility of awarding student scholarships. In 2011, based on his experience in the intercultural collaboration with New York University and with support from the latter, a member of staff was awarded a Fulbright scholarship to study a Masters degree in Dance Education at New York University. Similarly, in 2012 two students from the Department of Performing Arts and Film received full scholarships for a three year study towards a Bachelor of Dance Education Degree at the Norwegian College of Dance.

It is evident that there are learning benefits from the intercultural collaborations. Students from New York University, Stanford University and the Norwegian College of Dance and pointed out that they learnt new perspectives on theatre and other modes of doing things during the intercultural theatre collaborations with their Makerere University counterparts in

---

<sup>11</sup> Mul (2011:632-633), with reference to Dilthey (1914), says that hermeneutics is understood as a scientific method of interpretation which is a monological activity, a theoretical reconstruction of foreign horizons of experience in order to widen our own horizon. That way, according to Dilthey as cited by Mul (*ibid.*), the final aim of hermeneutical understanding is to overcome the limitations of our individual lives by widening the horizon of experience. In this sense, "understanding widens the horizon of our existence".

Uganda. This deconstructs and reverses the colonial mentality as discussed in Chapter One, where some colonial explorers and writers said that Africa in general did not have anything theatrical worth academic study and that everything had to be introduced from the North. In the same vein, the intercultural collaborations empower cultural actors who are not from “the West” to have a cultural voice and presence in the global cultural arena.

From the field revelations discussed in this section, it is observable that intercultural collaborations support the participating institutions’ core mandate of teaching, learning and knowledge transfer. All this contributes towards the internationalisation of education of the institutions involved as discussed in Chapter Five section 5.5.

### **6.2.2 Marketing Uganda and her culture**

When I asked NYUT1 about the interesting successes of the New York-Makerere intercultural programme, NYUT1 pointed out the activities of her dance students in New York which promote Uganda’s culture. NYUT1 noted that the dance students who have been to Uganda over the years get certification to teach in public schools when they go back to New York. When those dance teachers teach in public elementary or primary schools, they teach hundreds of children. NYUT1 went on to say that the dance teachers who have been to Uganda have at one point in their teaching taught a unit about Uganda:

They make raffia skirts from paper, teach the drumming and the songs, they have a map of Uganda, they teach the dances; they show pictures of their experience. (Extract 26)

NYUT1 further said that these teachers talk about Uganda’s natural beauty, the richness of the songs, the dances, and let children at their schools perform Ugandan dances. After all these activities in New York schools with hundreds of children, there is a multiplier effect whereby information and knowledge about Uganda is disseminated. In the same interview, NYUT1 said the following, which I quote at length

From 2007, ... Now after these many years, I go to workshops with the teachers, the administrators know about Uganda, the teachers, the families from this one programme ... It’s amazing. We have professional development workshops three times a year for all these 35 dance teachers to meet and discuss pedagogy, discuss assessment and all of those things and we have dance teachers. I look around the room and ask ‘How many of you have been to Uganda? You did *kimandwa*, you did *kizino* and all of these dances’, they are so proud of them. It is so interesting after almost a decade how much it has changed the New York City school system. The power of the performing arts and the intercultural connection is more than the dance. We are learning about our world and our role and our place in the world through dance. Dance is our conduit. (Extract 27)

Magoba (2013) captured the same ideas in his newspaper review of the 2013 New York/Makerere collaboration

[T]he ripple effect, on the students and the ones they teach, when they go back to their countries is how cultural exchange programmes can be a viable approach to marketing and globalising Uganda's cultural arts; combating unflattering stereotypes and generalisations, and raising inter-cultural appreciation. Professor Deborah Damast, the Programme Director of NYU's Study Abroad Programme to Uganda, explained the program's aspect of fractal theory – where its benefits reach even where the teachers and resources do not. She used the example of Vanessa Schneller, who participated in the inaugural programme in 2007. 'Every year since then, she has been teaching the *kimandwa* dance to children. Last year, when she brought her second graders to a community workshop, they performed *kimandwa* exactly as we all learned it, complete with lyrics and original dance moves.'

This not only recaps the educational nature and benefits of the programme, but we also see how the programme is making Uganda's culture visible in New York City.

NYU/MAK-MUT2 also believed that when the New Yorkers bought the Ugandan instruments and went with them to the USA, Uganda acquired an artistic voice and visibility in the USA in the process. With such perspectives, some argued that the collaboration helped in the international advertising of Uganda in New York, thus promoting Uganda's cultural tourism industry as well as international intercultural acceptance.

Again, from NYUT1's revelations in Excerpt 26, it is observed that Ugandan dances that were/are learnt by the New York University dance students have recently provided them with teaching material in their dance teaching careers around New York. This situation points to the notions of cultural migration/transfer, appropriation and hybridity that are a result of interculturalism in theatre. Mosquera (2010:49) (see Chapter Two section 2.4.3), with reference to the above concepts, argues that cultures may be acquired and appropriated "without an understanding of their place and meaning within the other cultural system, and receive a meaning that is absolutely distinct in the context of the receiving culture". Such "incorrections", Mosquera (2010:49) argues, are usually at the basis of the cultural efficacy of appropriation, and frequently constitute a process of originality, understood as a new creation of meaning (also see Blommaert, 2005:72). This phenomenon is clearly portrayed to us when NYUT1 said that the appropriating New Yorkers "make raffia skirts from paper" (see Extract 26), whereas in the Ugandan context raffia skirts are normally made from palm tree leaves.

The above scenario is also connected to Pavis's (1992) notion of levels of readability. Pavis (1992:17) says that levels of readability explain how a recipient of a cultural import freely decides the manner in which say, narrative, thematic, formal, ideological, sociocultural, to read and adapt the cultural facts presented. Pavis (1992:17) says that in this kind of cultural transfer, some elements are assimilated and disappear, while other elements "emerge and are integrated into the dominant ideology." The resulting "ideology can become a normative model of sociological or more generally cultural codifications".

Similarly, NYUT1's insights in Extract 26 point to the notion of "traveling cultures" – a trend that is further advanced by intercultural theatre practice. Elteren (2003:172) explains the term "traveling cultures" by saying that it hinges on "how cultural languages travel to new areas and how they are appropriated by individuals of other cultures to tell their story". What Elteren (2003) talks about is similarly discussed by Mosquera (2010:51), who writes about the concept of "radial globalization", arguing that given all the arguments around cultural processes, it is crucial to note that the global flow of culture "cannot always remain circulating in the same 'North-South' direction, as dictated by the power structure, its circuits of diffusion, and accommodations to them" (see Chapter Three section 3.4.2).

But one notes that intercultural collaborations sometimes lead to cultural flow reversals whereby there is a South-to-North flow of artistic influence, as evidenced from NYUT1's insights in Excerpt 26, something that de-centres or challenges the North's historical power. Instead of the Americanisation of Uganda, here we may have the Ugandanisation of New York – or even Oslo, if we are to look at the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration. This shows that one of the dynamics of intercultural theatre is that it leads to the travelling of cultures and/or cultural transfers. This cultural movement consequently leads to cultural hybridity when the "travelling" cultures are adapted by their recipients.

### **6.2.3 Status symbol**

Being part of collaborations is an institutional status symbol in this era of globalisation. This again connects to the myriad perspectives and signifiers of power. On the other hand, being able to take students for international excursions and academic exchanges has become a marketing tool for most Northern universities, because the allure or the possibility of visiting other countries and "exotic" lands attracts fresher men and women to particular university programmes. Some of the New York and Stanford University participants I interacted with

indicated that they joined the intercultural programme because of the possibility of visiting Africa for the first time.

For an institution to achieve all the above shows both its academic and economic power, and at the same time conveys its academic, social and cultural relevance in this era of globalisation. Tehranian (2002:61) argues that in the contemporary “informatic empire, the status of an individual is largely determined by whether or not he or she is logged into the global networks of state, corporate, academic, or criminal organizations.”

By collaborating with powerful institutions from the North, institutions from the South such as Makerere University, which may not have the money to fund its students for international academic exchanges, share the power with its Northern partner by association in the hierarchy of institutional needs for international visibility, outreach and relevance. There seems to be no doubt that international collaborations are these days an institutional status symbol and many universities and their managers more often than not refer to international collaborations as a show of institutional success, relevance and global outreach. In the same vein, referring to Makerere University, Pribyl and Johnstone (2011:238) said that the “coordinator of the NYU exchange at Makerere articulates the view that a partnership with New York University adds credibility to the Music, Dance and Drama Department’s position within the larger structure of Makerere University”.<sup>12</sup>

However, it should be noted that power is not only shared by institutions involved in the collaborations, but also by participating individuals. Africa has been widely projected as disease infested and a cradle of ceaseless civil strife, yet many Northern project leaders and their students who come to Africa and go back safely gain a competitive edge over those who have never travelled to a developing country (cf. Magoba, 2013 in section 6.2.1). They are seen as resilient, having an ability to work in adverse situations and conditions by their peers. However, it should be noted that all participants, whether from the North or South, who participated in these collaborations talked about acquiring an ability to work in intercultural settings and mentioned that their career prospects in that regard had been boosted.

Therefore by collaborating with Stanford University, New York University and the Norwegian College of Dance, Makerere University shared the visibility and symbolic power

---

<sup>12</sup> From 1971 to early 2011 the performing arts department at Makerere University was called the Music, Dance and Drama Department (MDD). Currently the department is known as the Department of Performing Arts and Film (PAF).

and relevance as far as global academic initiatives are concerned. Likewise, by collaborating with Makerere University, all those Northern institutions bolstered their international outreach portfolio and influence. This is in line with the internationalisation of academic objectives and benefits as discussed in Chapter Three section 3.5.3.

#### **6.2.4 Technological transfer and infrastructural improvement and enhancement**

When the Stanford group came to Uganda in 2009, they came with some lighting equipment, which was used during the performance of *Beyond My Cycle* at the Uganda National Theatre. After the performance the lighting equipment – that is, the lanterns and lighting console and all their accessories – was donated to the Department of Performing Arts and Film of Makerere University. This donation boosted the subsequent student project performances at the department, which did not have its own lighting equipment before this. This kind of technological transfer is part of the tangible benefits of the North-South collaborations.

Likewise, the Norwegian College of Dance funded the restructuring of two lecture rooms at the Department of Performing Arts and Film, which were turned into the department's first fully furnished dance studio. They came up with this idea because during the initial discussions about the collaboration, the Makerere University collaboration initiator informed the NCD delegation that if they wanted to teach modern and ballet dance to Makerere University students, there were no proper facilities that would accommodate that kind of teaching. The studio was officially opened in April 2013. The Norwegian Ambassador in Uganda, His Excellency Thorbjørn Gaustadsæther, was the guest of honour and he was accompanied by Professor John Ddumba Ssentumu, the Vice-Chancellor of Makerere University. In their speeches both leaders pledged to continue supporting the department and the performing arts.

In addition to the above, I was informed that the Norwegian College of Dance donated some books, dance teaching video recordings, dance studio sound equipment and a piano. These are some of the technical physical benefits of North-South collaborations to Southern institutions which at the same time show a sense of corporate responsibility of the Northern institutions (see section 6.2.6).

### **6.2.5 Legitimatising Makerere University's Department of Performing Arts and Film's relevancy and existence**

Given the Ugandan government's inadequate funding of Makerere University, Makerere University has recently been thinking of phasing out some courses, including some offered by the Department of Performing Arts and Film. For example, in August 2010 admissions to the Bachelor of Arts in Dance programme were put on hold. Therefore, by collaborating with institutions such as the Norwegian College of Dance, which is supported by the Norwegian government and which can attract institutional developmental funding from institutions such as NORAD, the Department of Performing Arts and Film's relevance and bargaining power for its continued existence at Makerere University improve greatly. Similarly, in regard to the suspended dance degree programme, Pribyl and Johnstone (2011:231) stated that the

degree may be reinstated because of the Norwegian collaboration which promises to bring in teachers, funds and opportunities for faculty members to travel to Norway, which likely suggests one of the most important contributions of such dance exchange projects with Makerere University.

This was the same feeling that existed during my time of fieldwork in March 2013. Furthermore, in my personal interview with NDC/MAK-MUT, I was told that the collaborative performances that crown the annual exchanges help to advertise Makerere University's Department of Performing Arts and Film by showing what the department is doing and how international the department has become. Since one of the strategic plans of Makerere University is to internationalise, by engaging in such collaborations the department of Performing Arts and Film is participating and contributing to the endeavours and strategy of internationalising Makerere University.

### **6.2.6 Contributing to institutional social responsibility**

In an interview I had with NCD/MAK-MUT, it was indicated that one of the advantages of such collaborations which have community interaction is that they give an opportunity to the community to see another mode of performance. This is because the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration involved modern dance, jazz and the Norwegian traditional dance *egerliteneg*. In Uganda modern dance performances at the Uganda National Theatre are normally watched by the economically and socially privileged Ugandans and expatriates who can afford to pay and attend such live performances. However, the final intercultural productions for the three collaborations covered in this study were presented free of charge



for all people. By doing this, all the collaborating institutions involved helped Makerere University in contributing to institutional social responsibility by providing free entertainment to the Ugandan audience.

### **6.3 Conclusion**

It is evident from this chapter that intercultural theatre collaborations help in equipping the participants with knowledge and skills needed for their personal development. One can argue therefore that intercultural theatre collaborations help institutions in achieving their core teaching mandate.

However, even though the collaborations have the above benefits, they also face particular challenges. In the chapter that follows I will discuss the challenges of the North-South intercultural collaborations at Makerere University.

## **Chapter Seven: Challenges of the intercultural collaborations**

### **7.1 Introduction**

This chapter contains the discussion on the challenges of the intercultural theatre collaborations at Makerere University's Department of Performing Arts and Film. The challenges will be examined in the context of the dynamics of intercultural theatre collaborations. In this chapter I will also specifically examine the ways in which the intercultural theatre collaborations can help us to interrogate the view that current global forces are moving the world towards a homogenised culture.

### **7.2 Inequality of funding and the legitimatisation of the performance of power**

As indicated while discussing issues concerning funding in Chapter Five section 5.3, inequality in funding was one of the challenges facing the collaborations.

For example, it was noted that except for the year 2007, when the New York-Makerere collaboration was inaugurated and the cost of running the collaboration shared, since 2008 New York University has been sole contributor to the funding for the collaboration. The Stanford-Makerere collaboration was funded by Stanford University, and since 2011 the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration has been funded by the Norwegian College of the Dance and the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Uganda.

Bourdieu (1989:16) advises that the sociological examination of human relationships should involve the "analysis of locations in the space of positions of power", or what he called "the field of power". Similarly, while writing about the foundations of power, Roscigno (2011:352) argues that "any consideration of power should begin with reflection on the basis through which it is derived".

In view of the above, it should be noted that North-South intercultural collaborations are essentially governed by the availability of financial resources and that is in most cases means hard cash. Given this operational reality of intercultural collaboration, the institution that funds the collaboration comes up with its direct and indirect terms and conditions of doing so. Such an institution has at its disposal the power to decide the duration of the collaboration, the duration of the intercultural performance, the themes to be dealt with and the number of people to participate in the project (see discussion on the participant imbalance in *Beyond My*

*Circle* in Chapter Five section 5.6.1). Therefore, when one institution provides the funding, this act becomes what Roscigno (2011:352) calls the base “through which power is derived”. Based on this, we have also to be aware of what Asante *et al.* (2008:4) point out:

Indeed, as propounded by Eurocentric social scientists, the idea of interaction may be the principal instrument for the transubstantiation of privilege and power into accepted reality. It legitimizes the values of a Eurocentric theoretical perspective on human communication and makes it possible for the strengthening of the established power relations by obscuring the power relations as power relations. (See also Chapter Two section 2.3.34).

The fact that one group provides the funding and the other does not points to the economic power dynamics that may have a snowball effect on other processes of executing the intercultural collaborations. For example, the imbalance in the contribution towards funding may lead to an imbalance in power, which may consequently lead to a lopsided decision-making process.

For example, in a personal interview I asked NYU/MAK-MUT1 how decisions were made, and the answer I received was:

so far we have been making the decisions of what dance we teach them, but they make the time schedules ... though they also try to consult. They do the handling of the finances. (Extract 28)

Similarly, in another interview NYU/MAK-MUT3 said that

It depends on the decisions that have to be carried out. They cannot make decisions on the content that they are going to be taught, because they are not competent in that area. So anything to do with the content here, the places to visit here, Ugandans make decisions. But Ugandans cannot make any decisions about the duration of the programme, for example ... And so we have that decision to design lesson plans and then get the dances to teach. The decision about the number of teachers to include depends on the budget for that year. So it is something that is agreed upon between New York and Uganda. The decision about how money is to be dispensed – in most cases the New Yorkers decide because they are funders giving the money. But you also need to know that the coordinator here is American. Maybe because of that, they speak a language that they understand and that simplifies the process or creates a picture of ‘we are making decisions’. I will not say that Ugandans make decisions, in that the representative in Uganda makes decisions; she is American and she deals with Americans. ... may be it would be different if it were a Ugandan coordinating that project here. I can only make a hypothesis. (Extract 29)

Later on in our discussion, NYU/MAK-MUT3 noted that

I think the interaction between the West and Africa, I think the West benefits more. Maybe we are too generous in giving out information. (Extract 30)

In the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration, responding to the question about power and the decision making process, NCD/MAK-MUT1 said that

We really don't have to question that a lot because if you are a funder you want to know how your money is to be spent, because it would be fair in that way. But generally ... what they have sometimes is micro management in a good and sometimes in a bad way; even minute things and they want to control them and it creates some kind of conflicts. But other areas I think have been when they are in charge of money. But it is not only here, by the way, it is generally everywhere, even in government, when they are offering us money for family planning, they tell you where you have to buy the condoms and who should supply them. (Extract 31)

While in another interview with NCD/MAK-MUT2, the response was that

too much power from the Norwegian College of Dance side is incapacitating our creative contribution to the collaboration. Every time you feel there is a critical eye hovering over you ... sometimes there is a feeling that they don't trust our capabilities of executing anything. (Extract 32)

All the above interview excerpts show the different perspectives on power imbalance in North-South intercultural collaborations which are exacerbated by inequality of funding. This to some extent reflects Beck's (2012:133) point that "uncritical pursuit of internationalization can result in the reproduction of economic globalization" — in this case capitalistic commodification and commercialisation of intercultural collaborations. This also echoes Elteren's (2003:172) view that "although intercultural contact zones are inherently dialogical, this does not mean that exchanges always take place on a level playing field".

Again, the interview excerpts highlighted this far echo Bharucha's (2000:36) observation that even though there is usually a micro human desire for intercultural creative interaction, the execution of that desire is usually riddled with tensions and compulsions because of "existing inequities of intercultural exchange".

Likewise, in her discussion on the challenges of Sino-British collaborative e-learning projects between British and Chinese institutions, Spencer-Oatey (2013:255) reported that project participants found that launching and upholding "equality between British and Chinese partners was often easier said than done", because it was soon discovered that the key inequality was "inequality of funding".

The interview excerpts NYU/MAK-MUT1 28, NYU/MAK-MUT3 29 and NCD/MAK-MUT1 31 imply that Makerere University's collaborative partners from the North sometimes worked out the time schedules, controlled the finances and micro-managed the running of the

projects. However, one has to understand that sometimes Makerere's partners had to meticulously plan for the days they were spending in Uganda depending on the funds that were available. This is because each day they spent in Uganda meant spending money on things like accommodation and food. This is why they actively and sometimes arbitrarily designed the programme schedules with minimal consultation. In the same vein, one also has to understand that if there were no conditions and timelines attached to the funding, the financial contribution may simply have turned out to be like pouring money into a bottomless pit. However, if there were instances where there was no cross-cultural dialogue while making important decisions on how to run the programmes, this definitely affected the psychological levels of creativity of some of Makerere University's participants as illustrated by NCD/MAK-MUT2 in Extract 32. If we bear this in mind, then we are able to understand what Blommaert (2005:44) meant when he stated that dialogue "does not presuppose cooperativity". This means that the existence of a 'dialogic' engagement implied by the term 'intercultural collaboration' does not necessarily mean an exchange of meanings between cooperative, willing and bona fide partners, who offer large spaces for negotiating meaning. Given such scenarios, Blommaert (2005:53) says that discourse analysis aims at explaining and clarifying the "hidden' power relations", the structures of which have been hinted at in the contextualising interview excerpts.

The power imbalance caused by economic inequality was directly hinted at when some Ugandan participants in the New York-Makerere collaboration informed me that 2007 was the "best year" that had the "best programme" because it showed "equal partnership" – this was because it involved programme cost-sharing (see Chapter Five section 5.3). This scenario also indicates that the notion of "equal partnership" at the time when fieldwork for this study was carried out was seemingly a phenomenon of the past. Pribyl and Johnstone (2011:233) equally made the same observations about the power imbalance in the decision-making process in cross-cultural collaborations at Makerere University by arguing that even though some may say that "any collaborative project is like a marriage that requires negotiation and renegotiation", what occurred on the ground could

demonstrate that the funding bodies make the final decisions and form programmes that they consider best suited to their own students. In what is a potentially fascinating meeting of cultural and dance contexts, one is led to question how much room there really is for dialogue.

Here, Pribyl and Johnstone highlight the prioritised positioning of the interests of New York University students while executing the New York-Makerere collaboration. It is important to

note that at the end of each working day, and at the end of each annual collaboration cycle, the New York University students evaluate the benefits of the programme. Their positive reviews influence future student sign-ups for the same programme and encourage New York University's Study Abroad Administration to continue supporting the intercultural exchange. Furthermore, New York University's students' financial contribution counts a lot towards the sustainability of collaboration as was highlighted in Chapter Five section 5.3, and thus their interests may hugely influence the programme setup and *modus operandi*.

Let us look at this issue in more practical terms. In Chapter Five section 5.3 I highlighted the fees a New York University student had to pay in order to participate in the 2013 collaboration: "Graduate Tuition: \$1367 per point plus registration and services fees." And for undergraduates it was "Tuition: \$1,204 per point plus registration and service fees", "Housing Fees: \$800, 2013 Activity Fees: \$450". On top of that, each student was required to pay for an international plane ticket, which is approximately \$2000. The total is approximately \$4,617. That means that the total cost paid for a two weeks' intercultural collaborative visit by a New York student is the equivalent of the total tuition fees of a three-year undergraduate degree in Arts and Social Sciences at Makerere University. Let us compare this with the Norwegian College of Dance, where students pay approximately 6,000 dollars per academic year. This breakdown gives us a vivid picture of the economic imbalance and shows us the reality of what may accentuate the complex power dynamics in the North-South collaborations. This economic disparity may therefore as a consequence create the intricate superior-inferior, benefactor-beneficiary dichotomy in North-South intercultural collaborations.

I also interviewed an official<sup>13</sup> in the International Affairs Office at Makerere University in April 2013. During this interview I asked a general question about the issue of power in Makerere's collaborative projects, since Makerere University in most cases does not contribute financially towards the running of the North-South collaborative projects. Without going into specifics, the official generally noted that more often than not people involved in collaborative projects at Makerere University complain that their partners want them to do particular things which they think were not beneficial to the University. This was because some partners always want to control the project funds and the nature and direction of the

---

<sup>13</sup> Details about this respondent have been withheld in order to ethically protect the interviewee's identity.

collaborative programmes, thus affecting the sharing of power in the decision-making process.

However, let me emphasise that my respondents generally acknowledged the benefits of intercultural collaborations as discussed in Chapter Six and wanted the collaborations to continue. Nevertheless, by pointing out these challenges, they indicated that there was constant need for stakeholders to transparently evaluate the collaborations and engage in continuous dialogue in a bid to come up with the best approaches and practices to intercultural engagements which can be adopted to make the interactions more beneficial to all parties concerned.

Some Makerere respondents indicated that based on the fact that the New York delegation has been coming to Uganda for the last eight years (counting from 2007-2014) and the Norwegian College of Dance four years (2011- 2014) meant that Uganda and the Makerere University participants had something valuable to contribute towards the intercultural collaborations and theatre scholarship in general. However, some felt that some Northern partners exhibited a domineering attitude signifying that since they were funding the collaborations, they were sort of “helping”: indicating a benefactor-beneficiary relationship, forgetting the equally valuable contribution of the Makerere participants (cf. implications of the phrase “they keep telling me to stop trying to save Africa” in the *Dear Momma* poem in *Beyond My Circle* in Chapter Five section 5.6.1). Some indicated that the ‘we are helping’ attitude exhibited by some Northern partners necessitated a need for engaging in dialogue to formulate better practices of intercultural interaction whereby if one party provided funding, the other could on equal terms provide the physical space of engagement, goodwill and the participants to participate in the intercultural collaboration.

As already indicated, the Stanford-Makerere intercultural collaboration was also funded by Stanford University. This also had implications for power sharing.

SU/MAK-MUT1, who was part of the Makerere team in this collaboration, commented on the power imbalance saying that

there is a sense that they are superior, which is not said, but it is almost understood that they have money and they will run things and they will go their way because they have the money. So that means that the money will take over what is supposed to be done, and because you don't want to annoy anybody, you either keep quiet or complain in the background. (Extract 33)



From this, we again see the psychological impact of unequal economic power in the North-South intercultural collaborations which can lead to an imbalance in the decision-making process. It is also discernible that the psychological fear of challenging power can lead to a culture of silence, and to a relationship based on superiority-inferiority dichotomy. The feeling of being inferior coupled with the culture of silence activated by the economic power imbalance in the North-South intercultural setting can in turn produce other undercurrents: complaints in the background, or what I could term as ‘project backyard anger and discontentment’ or ‘latent project discontentment’. This is because the economic imbalance takes away what Nueliep (2006:347) calls the “communication assertiveness” of the Southern participants, as is evidenced from interview Extract 33. Therefore, one can argue that the psychological fear of challenging the funder in part explains why sometimes power imbalances and other inequalities exist and are sometimes normalised without visible opposition in different project partnerships (cf. Asante *et al.* 2008:4). By pointing out and discussing these perspectives, I am indicating my awareness of Elteren’s (2003:172) recommendations (see Chapter Three section 3.3.1) that comprehensive transcultural studies should encompass the analysis of the economic, technological, political and social structures of such exchanges that tend to “force” them into certain forms and “steer” them towards certain results.

SU/MAK-MUT1’s views in Extract 33 also reveal the different shades of power that are manifest in some North-South collaborations — for example, there is power which is unspoken, that is invisible power which is felt and sensed by the other party in the relationship and this category of power can breed the superior-inferior binary-opposition; and there is also the visible economic power shown by the fact that one group is funding the intercultural exchange (also refer to the North-South power relations influenced by the Western media representations discussed in Chapter Five section 5.6.1). This challenges the philosophy of interculturalism both in intercultural communication and intercultural theatre discourse, as seen in the discussion in Chapter Two sections 2.3.3 and 2.4. In those two sections it was noted that the term ‘intercultural’ in intercultural communication and performance studies implies a dialogical, harmonious and equal partnership in post-colonial cross-cultural encounters (cf. Asante *et al.*, 2008:4). But in reality the imbalance in economic power becomes one of the foundations for unsettling all other forms and perspectives of power sharing.

The power imbalance discussed above reminds us of the dialectics of intercultural communication noted by Martin and Nakayama (2008:82-84) that I discussed in Chapter Two section 2.3.3.6. Here I am singling out the “privilege-disadvantage dialectic”, which means that persons display and communicate different kinds of privilege and disadvantage in intercultural encounters. This issue was also seen in discussing the thematic concerns of *Beyond My Circle* in Chapter Five section 5.6.1. Briefly, Martin and Nakayama (2008:82-84) argue that when people from rich countries visit “less wealthy countries, the intercultural interactions between these two groups will certainly be influenced by their differential in economic power”. After all, Blommaert (2005:33) posits that “discourse analysis should result in a heightened awareness of hidden power dimensions and its effects: a critical language awareness, a sensitivity for discourse as subject to power and inequality” (cf. Elteren, 2003:172). Based on the existence of economic inequality, it seems that the practice of “mutual equal partnership” in North-South intercultural collaborations becomes problematic. Moreover, Asante *et al.* (2008:4) point out that the idea of interaction can be used for the mutation of “privilege and power into accepted reality”.

Commenting on the lack of Makerere University’s financial contribution to the Stanford-Makerere collaboration and the impact it had on the power dynamics, SU/MAK-MUT1 incidentally used a marriage partnership analogy to illustrate the inequality:

It is like a marriage partnership: if you bring in something and I bring in something, then we will have some voice and room to negotiate. If Makerere was remitting some money it would be different. Therefore if I am coming and paying for accommodation and maybe I am giving your faculty lunch and transport money, I am going to have more power; not physical power but psychological power over you, because the world has become a money-minded thing. The one who has money has the power to shift you to his whims and you will go out of your way to accommodate or babysit them least the money is withdrawn. (Extract 34)

This comment points to the fact that members of an institution that does not contribute financially towards the funding of the collaboration may feel psychologically indebted to the participants from the institution that contributed the funding. This situation may escalate the power imbalance leading to a superior-inferior relationship as already indicated. After all, while discussing the intricacies of power, Roscigno (2011:353) says that

sociological evidence, especially over the last 20 years, suggests that power cannot be theoretically reduced to a singular attribute, position or a simple equation of tangible costs, benefits and balance/imbalance. Instead, it is best understood as an unequal relation, or inequality, based on personal attributes, institutional positioning and statuses that are defined, codified and acted upon within historical and cultural contexts.

What Roscigno (2011) observes here is similar to what Pribyl and Johnstone (2011:233) pointed out, namely that the power imbalance is aggravated by the historical, political and economic placing of Makerere University, which is situated in a “Third World”, “developing”, and “post-colonial” setting, compared in this context to New York University, the Norwegian College of Dance or Stanford University, which are affluent institutions from the “First World”. All this reflects Mosquera’s (2010:48) observation that “international artistic-cultural interactions ... always involve relations of power, positioning and marginality”.

Equally, Blommaert (2005:37) underscores the importance of history, saying that “power and inequality have long histories of becoming”. This means that what we may be analysing at a particular time could be a product of a long historical process which is systematic and not accidental. For example, in Chapter One section 1.7.2, I briefly discussed the colonial socio-political and socio-cultural history of Uganda and its effects. Uganda got independence in 1962 and to this day is still referred to as a developing and third-World country. Let us compare this to recent American history provided by Murphy (2012:49-50, in Chapter Two section 2.4.3) who points out that the economic development of the USA followed capitalist lines after being the leader of the victors in the Second World War. And after the Cold War, the USA assumed the hegemonic status as the sole world superpower (cf. Kumaravadivelu, 2008: 212-17 in Chapter Two section 2.3.3.1). This can help us to understand the historical inequalities symbolically embodied by, for example, Stanford and New York University from USA compared in this case to Makerere University in Uganda, Africa. Besides, Roscigno (2011:352) further tells us that “classical exchange theory and analyses tie power to rational calculations and associated exchange relations between at least two entities”, while political-economic approaches in the analysis of power have tended to overtly link power to “status, background, and institutional and organizational position”. This means that both economic power and the international status/ranking of the Northern institution collaborating with the Southern one can contribute to the complex imbalance of power and the superior-inferior relationship.

Roscigno (2011:353) asks a fundamental question: “must power and the inequality that underlies it be actuated, explicitly and clearly observable, to be of sociological relevance?” In line with that question, SU/MAK-MUT1 in Extract 33 stated that “there is a sense that they are superior, which is not said”, which we categorised as invisible power. In other sections of

the same interview SU/MAK-MUT1 gave another example of implied or symbolic power that sometimes manifests itself in the North-South intercultural collaboration settings by noting that:

in case of any friction, one may be forced to say that: ‘By the way, we paid for all this’, and this gives you an inkling about what they have been thinking about”. (Extract 35)

If someone were to say this in the middle of an intercultural negotiation or argument, then it gives us an idea about who would determine the final decision, and at the same time we can clearly imagine its psychological impact in aggravating the power imbalance. This relates to what Bourdieu (1989:20) implies when he says that “the schemes of perception and appreciation, especially those inscribed in language itself, express the state of relations of symbolic power.” Based on SU/MAK-MUT1’s words in Extract 35, Blommaert (2005:61) might have pointed out that “this is where language leads us directly to the heart of social structure: an investigation into language becomes an investigation into the systems and patterns of allocation of power symbols and instruments”.

Similarly, if we are to relate SU/MAK-MUT1’s words in Extract 35 to Austin’s (1975) speech act theory and the related concept of speech performativity, they imply the performance of power. And if we place this discussion in the context of discourse analysis, then Blommaert’s (2005:2) point that “discourse is language-in-action, and investigating it requires attention both to language and to action” becomes relevant.

The excerpts from the personal interviews I had with different respondents therefore symbolically exemplify the language that was in use in relation to the participants’ experiential memories of Makerere University’s North-South intercultural collaborations. This means that the interview extracts are legitimate objects which can be analysed in order to deepen our understanding of the power dynamics in North-South intercultural collaborations (also see discussion in Chapter Four section 4.5.1).

At the same time, NYU/MAK-MUT3 Extract 29, NCD/MAK-MUT1 Extract 31 and SU/MAK-MUT1 Extract 35 allude to the monetary contribution towards the running of intercultural collaborations as one of the legitimatising elements in the enactment or performance of unequal power (cf. Pribyl and Johnstone, 2011:234). Bourdieu (1989:23) aptly asserts that “like any form of performative discourse, symbolic power has to be based on the possession of symbolic capital”. This is the same issue that Roscigno (2011:352)

raised when he stated that “any consideration of power should begin with reflection on the basis through which it is derived”.

In the light of the power imbalances manifest in North-South intercultural collaborations, Roscigno (2011:354) advises that “understanding the explicit as well as the less obvious realities of power, and taking into account the full range of possibilities in both theoretical formulations and research design is essential”. In this regard, as I indicated in Chapter Four, I used case studies because I believed they would bring us closer to understanding the dynamics of North-South intercultural collaborations. Using the interview method in this case helped me to achieve a deeper understanding of intercultural theatre dynamics by “probing and asking case participants for explanations and interpretations” on how and why particular things in the collaboration appeared to be done the way they were being done (Woodside and Wilson, 2003: 498). This eventually helped to understand the “mental models” of the participants as they reflected upon their experiences in the intercultural collaborations (Woodside and Wilson, 2003:498- 499). Moreover, Blommaert (2005:2) says that language is meaningful symbolic behaviour and that discourse is language-in-action. This means that critical analysis of the intercultural language that was in use in the environment of Makerere University’s intercultural theatre collaborations exhibited through the personal interviews essentially provides vital insights to deepen our understanding of the dynamics of North-South intercultural theatre collaborations.

Stucky and Wimmer (2002: 10-11), commenting on the kind of performance studies which this study subscribes to, say that performance studies is a broad-based multidisciplinary field “with a continually moving center of gravity” that it concerns itself broadly with aesthetics, culture and identity; it “involves a study of the human as a performing being”. Stucky and Wimmer (*ibid.*) also point out that performance studies provokes a negotiating of borders within cultural, disciplinary, theoretical, personal, political and structural dimensions; these are all issues which my discussion has touched upon (cf. the discussion on the concept of border crossing symbolised by the title *Beyond My Circle* in Chapter Five section 5.6.1).

However, when the performance process and act are inter-institutional and intercultural, then the negotiation of the performance studies’ categories listed by Stucky and Wimmer (2002) may turn out to be more complex. Jackson (2004:5) concurs with this line of thinking when she writes about the dynamics which may even be found in a single institution:

The modern university is itself a formidably complex and self-contradicting array of institutional practices. Its modes of knowledge production are propelled by the vagaries of institutional power, pedagogical process, and occupational structure as much as by felt desire and intellectual curiosity.

Bearing in mind what Roscigno (2011), Stucky and Wimmer (2002) and Jackson (2004:5) say, I believe that my adoption of a multidisciplinary theoretical approach and a multiple case design in this study was appropriate. If I were to have used only theatrical analytical approaches in this study and relied only on looking at the final intercultural performances, I would have missed out important dimensions that inform the dynamics of intercultural theatre collaborations like the ones that Makerere University has been engaged with in the recent past.

Secondly, the multi-case study design was relevant for this study because power dimensions that were not clearly visible in the New York-Makerere or Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration could easily be seen through the Stanford-Makerere collaboration and its performance *Beyond My Circle*, thereby reinforcing and enriching the multifaceted nature of the discussion. Similarly, my usage of the interview method helped in the revelation and examination of the invisible/emotional aspects of power. Roscigno (2011:366) proposes that

efforts that are multi-level in nature and mixed methods in character have perhaps the greatest capacity to capture the relational features of power ... Moreover in doing so, problematic theoretical assumptions and associated tendencies toward structurally determined and reductionist portrayals of power and inequality can be avoided.

In Chapter One section 1.7.4 and 1.7.5 I discussed Uganda's colonial history and in Chapter Two I argued that with the introduction of the concept 'intercultural theatre' Schechner seems to have introduced into theatre theory and practice the post-colonial notion of dialogism in North-South cross-cultural encounters related to the practice of intercultural communication. Paraphrasing Bhabha (1994:25), I stated that intercultural theatre seems to be a dialogical theory and practice that aims at remodelling the North-South contradictory and antagonistic instances of colonial cross-cultural encounters so as to open up hybrid sites that would minimise negative polarities between knowledge and its objects, and between theory and practical-political reason in the post-colonial setting. This implies that in examining intercultural theatre collaborations one has to analyse the possibility of attaining "equal partnership" and power sharing in the post-colonial intercultural theatre setting. I based this analytical perspective on the argument that if interculturalism in theatre was a post-colonial enterprise, it has to be analysed bearing in mind the colonial perspectives and practices that it

wanted to put “under erasure” (Bhabha, 1994:26), for example, the superior-inferior/subaltern relationship between the colonial masters and the colonised respectively. I ended by stating that one of the fundamental questions to ask is: does the “rationalism and intentionality” that propelled interculturalism in theatre discourse and its language of symbolic dialogism exist in its practice in the post-colonial era? (Bhabha, 1994: 28).

In view of the above fundamental question, one can argue that even though Schechner’s concept of ‘intercultural theatre’ signalled the introduction of post-colonial revisionary and dialogic empowerment of cultures which were non-Western (Bhabha, 1994:4-5), nowadays the economic inequality that characterises such exchanges confronts the North-South intercultural collaborations with the paradox of empowerment and disempowerment for some Southern participants.

Equally, writing about the concept of borders, Giroux (2005:2) says that that concept provides us with a current reference point for appreciating the “co-mingling – sometimes clash – of multiple cultures, languages, literacies, histories, sexualities, and identities”. He further observes that if we think in terms of borders, it allows us to critically examine the “struggle over those territories, spaces, and contact zones where power operates to either expand or to shrink the distance and connectedness among individuals, groups, and places” (see Chapter Three section 3.4.5 and Chapter Five section 5.6.1).

From some of the views expressed by some respondents in this section, one can say that economic inequality in the North-South intercultural collaborations can sometimes contribute to the expansion of the interpersonal distance between North and South participants (cf. Neuliep’s 2006:319-20 concept of power distance<sup>14</sup>). That is because the economic disparity sometimes creates an ambivalent, unequal, asymmetrical and patronising reality out of these intercultural exchanges. Therefore, by using words such as “a project based on a mutual give and take arrangement”, such intercultural projects, to paraphrase Bhabha (1994:19-20), in most cases obscure the imbalance of power embedded in their practice and execution, and fail to draw attention to the underlying politics and dynamics of the North-South intercultural collaborations. From the interview excerpts highlighted in this section, it is observable that

---

<sup>14</sup> According to Neuliep (2006:319-20), power distance refers to the “extent to which less powerful members of a culture respect and accept that power is distributed unequally ... in high power distant cultures, interaction between persons of low and high power may be very restricted, thus limiting the amount of nonverbal interaction. In large power distant cultures, people without power are expected to express only positive emotional displays when interacting with those of higher power (e.g., smile more)”.



the unbalanced economic power had an impact on the agency or communication assertiveness<sup>15</sup> of the Makerere University participants in the collaborations. Agency in social science dictum refers to the capacity of individuals, in this case Makerere University participants, to act independently and to make their own free choices and decisions in the collaboration. This, in some instances, arguably turned some Makerere University participants into Spivak's (1992) post-colonial subalterns, who could sometimes not actively speak to their Northern partners about the intercultural projects' power-sharing or any other shortcomings (cf. SU/MAK-MUS1 Extract 10 and 11 in Chapter Five section 5.6.1; NCD/MAK-MUT2 in Extract 32 and SU/MAK-MUTI in Extract 33 in this section). My analysis here is borne out by Pribyl and Johnstone (2011:234), who had quoted one of the Ugandan mentors in the exchange programme in 2010 sharing her experience:

I don't know whether it's a colonialist mentality, where [the Americans] say something and that is it, because this is the fourth NYU exchange I was part of. Before, there hasn't been a lot of discussing and planning together. [The Americans] will talk ... So this year the mentoring was more into 'Look, we need to hear you [Ugandans] speak, we need you to be part of the discussion'

This reflects the imbalance of power in the decision-making process which led to insinuations of neo-colonialism, but at the same time shows the remedial steps that were being taken by the New York University side to rectify the managerial and interactional problems of the collaboration. However, generally, the Northern participants I interviewed tended to indicate that the collaborations were going on smoothly based on a mutual give and take paradigm. Others pointed out that they were in Uganda because they wanted to learn other modes of cultural performance; this ideally placed them in a 'powerless' position because of being learners. Moreover, Bourdieu (1990:69) suggests that in intercultural pedagogical settings, each of the participating groups possesses symbolic power (this will further be discussed section 7.3.4). However, in the light of these perspectives, it is important to remind ourselves of Bourdieu's (1989: 16) argument that even though agents who occupy a higher position in the interactive space "symbolically deny the social [or economic power] distance between themselves and others", this does not imply that the social distance between them ceases to exist. The denial of social power distance in this case is tantamount to reaping the profits of "a purely symbolic denegation of distance" (*ibid.*) (see similar discussion in section 5.6.1).

---

<sup>15</sup> Neuliep (2006:347) defines assertiveness in communication as "one's ability to make requests; actively disagree; express positive or negative personal rights and feelings; initiate, sustain, and terminate conversations; and defend oneself without attacking others".

This, as already indicated, problematises the notion of mutuality in North-South intercultural collaborations.

Martin and Nakayama (2008:82-84) discuss the present-future/history-past dialectic in intercultural communication which highlights the importance of history as a factor in understanding contemporary intercultural interaction between social groups and the degree of intergroup anxiety (see Chapter Two section 2:3.3.6). In this regard, even though USA and Norway were not colonial powers in Africa, when elements of power imbalance and patronisation creep into the execution of North-South intercultural collaborations, many co-participants in the South generally recall the European colonial experience in what I will term a ‘colonial experience evocation syndrome’; they will make some reference to cultural imperialism and neo-colonialism to provide a theoretical explanation for collaborations with institutions from the North that are characterised by unequal power dynamics. Such situations in part symbolise North-South intercultural theatre’s unending “crisis of identification” with the colonial mechanics that it aimed at replacing (Bhabha, 1994:23; cf. Lo and Gilbert, 2002:36-37).

In the Stanford-Makerere collaboration some Stanford participants were aware of such North-South neo-colonial trajectories. For example, SUAD1 was quoted in the Stanford Drama Department’s *Beyond My Circle* Press Release saying that “a project like ours can easily devolve into an exercise in imperialist objectification without careful interrogation and constant reflection”. This view is corroborated by Reinelt (2007:10), who argues that “in its association with the West, and particularly the U.S., performance studies can appear as one more imperial undertaking emanating from the U.S., designed to colonize local knowledges” (cf. Elteren, 2003:169 in Chapter Three section 3.3.1). This arguably might be possible, because with the economic power being wielded by the Northern partners in the collaborations, it may be possible for them to arbitrarily determine the decisions taken during intercultural theatre collaborations (see SU/MAK-MUS1’s views in Extracts 10 and 11 in Chapter Five section 5.6.1). In particular, giving an example of *Beyond My Circle* where the directors were from Stanford University, one can argue that their directorial approaches could have had traces of pragmatic transfer. This means carrying over Northern/Western culture-specific theatrical knowledge and skills to a situation of intercultural theatre interaction, which can end up having imperialistic significance (see Zegarac and Pennington’s 2000: 166-67 discussion on pragmatic transfer in Chapter Two section 2.3.3.5; Zeszotarski, 2001:67).

To paraphrase Carter (2004:21), who was arguing for the importance of postcolonial theory in contemporary cultural analysis, postcolonial theory and analysis in this case reveals the subtle lingering referents within cultural scholarship and opens up thinking about the material, cultural, ideological, psychological and theoretical conditions within which intercultural theatre is produced and enacted. This reflects Krishnaswamy's (2002:106-7) assertion that postcolonialism is concerned with the consequences of "unequal power relations between different geopolitical locations on the globe" (see Chapter Three section 3.3).

However, I am not ruling out a scenario where some Southern partners may point out the existence of imperialist tendencies in North-South intercultural collaborations when in the first place they did not discuss and formulate sound and mutually beneficial project objectives and guidelines with their Northern partners.

Nevertheless, even though one can argue that North-South collaborations are rife with power imbalances partly induced by economic power, we should keep in mind that at the very beginning of the New York-Makerere collaboration, for example, the spirit was that of cost-sharing (see Chapter Five section 5.3). The New York University partners started to solely fund the processes of the intercultural encounter because their Ugandan counterparts were unable to contribute towards the running of the collaboration. Yet we should ask ourselves the following question: would it be fair practice to condemn a person, group or an institution that uses its economically privileged position to make intercultural collaborations work? However, on the other hand, one can say that it is not good practice either if one were to use his/her privileged position to exploit others in any way (cf. discussion of privilege in *Beyond My Circle* in Chapter Five section 5.6.1).

However, in reply to critics like Reinelt (2007:10), Schechner (2007:8) argues that

To call performance studies [PS] imperialist is to disregard the discipline's instrumentality in engaging and including performance practices, scholars, and theories from all over the world. Clearly, problems and challenges exist — but dealing with these ... is what PS does. To dub PS imperialist is to engage in a hyperbole of metaphor. But what of the metaphor? Do those who practice and theorize performance studies intend to impose (by force of academic privilege, if not armed might) a set of 'alien' or 'outside' values on everyone else? What are these enforcers destroying with their 'imperialist' agenda? Many different scholars practice many different kinds of PS in many different locations. As with art movements, what is 'good' or 'bad,' 'right' or 'wrong' varies with place, time, and the reputations of those putting forth the ideas.

In this excerpt Schechner validates my use of a historiographical perspective in order to understand contemporary North-South intercultural theatre complexities. True, as discussed in Chapter Two sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 performance studies – and especially its strand of intercultural theatre – helped in the post-colonial involvement of non-Western theatre practices in mainstream theatre discourse (see Reinelt, 2002:209-210 in section 2.4.3). Schechner in the above excerpt also accepts that performance studies (in this case intercultural theatre) face problems and challenges. However, he does not acknowledge performance studies' crisis of identification with imperialism which is also a possible phenomenon as already indicated (also see Chapter Two section 2.4.3.1). By bringing this perspective into the discussion I am specifying my awareness that case studies involve “protecting against threats to validity, maintaining a ‘chain of evidence,’ and investigating and testing ‘rival explanations’” (Yin, 2009:3) (see Chapter Four section 4.8). In the same vein, I am also conversant with a research weakness of acquiring “presentational data”,<sup>16</sup> in this case through reviewed literature, or through personal interviews which cannot adequately help in acquiring deep understanding of multifaceted phenomena under study (Woodside and Wilson, 2003:498). However, in this study I mitigated this loophole by gathering “operational data” which as opposed to presentational data, Woodside and Wilson (2003:499) say is a core of case study research. Operational data involve directly observing phenomena in “real time” or in the case environment and asking participants why things tend to unfold the way they do (*ibid*). By use of the observation method in this study, I was able to collect operational data which I could analyse in comparison with the perspectives offered by writers such as Reinelt (2007) and Schechner (2007).

Given the intricate inequalities in Makerere University's intercultural collaborations discussed this far, one concurs with Asante *et al.* (2008:4) who said that one of the major challenges that interculturalists face today is to account for the complex dynamics of power and privilege since intercultural communication aims at the mutual sharing of power. The discussion in the previous paragraph and which has been followed up here echoes Elteren's (2003: 172) observation that “the dynamics of ‘imperialism’ have become more complex and

---

<sup>16</sup> Woodside and Wilson (2003:498) say that “presentational data” are the appearances and answers to inquiries that informants strive to establish and maintain in the eyes of the fieldworker, outsiders and strangers in general, work colleagues, close and intimate associates and to varying degrees, themselves. Data in this category [presentational] are often ideological, normative and abstract, dealing far more with a manufactured image of idealized doing than with routinized practical activities actively engaged in by members of the studied organization. In this case, “presentational data deal with appearances put forth by informants as these activities are talked about and otherwise symbolically projected with the research setting” (*ibid.*).

internally contradictory in the latter part of the twentieth century”. However, Elteren (*ibid.*) remarks that this “does not mean that we should abandon the exploration of underlying power differences and forms of inequality” (see Chapter Three section 3.3.1). After all, Trilokekar (2010:131) suggests that countries from the North have “always recognized the importance of exercising ‘soft power’ through avenues such as international cultural relations, to promote [their] political, economic and cultural interests” (see Chapter Three section 3.5.4).

Similarly, Schechner (2007:10), responding specifically to Reinelt (2007), articulates some of the complexities of interculturalism we have already highlighted saying

Reinelt argues for the term “international” and rejects “global” and “transnational” as descriptors of PS. I have long supported ‘intercultural’ because this term acknowledges, even celebrates, the fact that nations are not culturally ‘pure’ in terms of language, food, religion, or art ... The term ‘intercultural’ signals not only a tendency toward complexity and hybridity but also acknowledges that the process is lumpy, full of contradictions, and difficult.

In this excerpt, Schechner, who we observed (in Chapter Two section 2.4.2) to be the god-father of the term ‘intercultural theatre’, again acknowledges its complexity and the fact that its processes are sometimes problematic and full of paradoxes. This has been indicated in various ways in my analysis in this thesis. Schechner’s submission also implies that the North-South intercultural theatre dynamics that have been experienced at Makerere University in the recent past which we are witnessing through my analysis in this study are not completely outside the complexities of intercultural theatre practice and discourse experienced elsewhere in this world.

However, given the economic inequalities that characterise the North-South intercultural collaborations at Makerere University, Wallerstein’s (1996:124) comment puts it well when he states that “what is needed educationally is not to learn that we are citizens of the world, but that we occupy particular niches in an unequal world.” But as indicated earlier, this does not sanction the economically powerful group exploiting the other.

Ultimately, the lesson from the above discussion and particularly on inequality of funding and its resultant power dynamics in North-South intercultural collaborations is that there is always a need to evaluate and streamline the power lines in North-South intercultural collaborations. There should be a framework or an administrative structure of apportioning responsibilities in the process of executing the collaborative projects, so that at least there is a practical sharing of the positions and spaces of power.

### 7.3 Navigating the communicative cultural differences

It is important to remember that one of the objectives of this study was to examine the dynamics of intercultural communication in intercultural theatre engagements. In this section I will examine the challenges of intercultural communication as exemplified through the interaction of different participants in Makerere University's recent intercultural theatre collaborations.

In Chapter Two section 2.3.2 we looked at different definitions of the concept 'culture'. For example, Rogers and Steinfatt (1999:1) defined culture as:

the total communication framework: words, actions, postures, gestures, tones of voice, facial expressions, [handling of] time, space, and materials ... works, plays ... All these things and more are complete communication systems with meanings that can be read correctly only if one is familiar with the behavior in its historical, social and cultural context (cf. Gai 2013:23).

Similarly, Blommaert (2005:44) states that "people have contextualisation universes: complexes of linguistic, cognitive, social, cultural, institutional, etc. skills and knowledge which they use for contextualising statements, and interaction involves the meeting of such universes."

Bearing the above in mind, the analysis of the New York-Makerere, the Stanford-Makerere and the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaborations showed that participants faced verbal and non-verbal culturally influenced communication challenges, because they were meeting and negotiating issues beyond their cultural borders as the following discussion will show (cf. discussion on border crossing implied by *Beyond My Circle* in section 5.6.1).

In an interview I conducted with NYU/MAK-MUT2, she noted that many parts of Uganda have a touch culture, and sometimes men hold hands in public as a sign of closeness or friendship. This was also done by Makerere University participants during collaborative workshops. New York University participants, who were not used to this touch culture, were perplexed by Ugandans' behaviour in the first few days of their arrival and this created tension because they started speculating about the sexual orientation of some Makerere participants. That was because for the Americans, when men are too close to each other and show affection by holding hands in public, they may be suspected of being homosexuals.

Commenting on issues of contrasting culture in the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration, NCD/MAK-MUT1 said that

if they [NCD] bring thirty-two students and they have their teachers and they are thirty-six people, different culture, completely different culture; and that is one of the challenges. And in fact at one time we had to have some kind of dialogue – you know, talking about that and I expect that in any kind of collaboration. So the more you get to know each other, the more you clear up and so you can easily connect and collaborate. (Extract 36)

From my interaction with the Norwegian College of Dance participants in a focus group discussion, I found out that one of the cultural challenges they faced while in Uganda was non-verbal communication. This is indicated in the following exchange

NCDS3: I noticed that when you greet someone in Norway you hold the hand and then say your name and then let go. Here they keep on holding your hand, it was not a challenge, but it looked a bit funny because I was like — ok when do I get my hand back.

NCDS2: I think it is nice because it builds strong relationships between people.

NCDS4: People are different and they act differently. They are [more] friendly than people in Norway. (Extract 37)

Differences in body language were also highlighted by NCDS7 in another focus group discussion when she observed that

Also the way you [Ugandans] respond to people is different. You use a lot of physical contact. In Norway, when you walk on the street you don't look so much on the other person, you don't talk to the person next to you in a bus. You are focused on where you want to go and you go fast. (Extract 38)

Correspondingly, NYUT1 pointed at the communication subtleties that were faced by the New York University participants during the intercultural interactions:

listening to the language and the subtle interactions — the raised eyebrows meaning yes and you see a child, you ask a question, they raise their eyebrows and that is a communication, the nodding of the head, raised eyebrow, the body language is different, we have to pick up on that — 'mhh' that sound alright, so it is more than the language. All of these subtle ways of communicating which two weeks is a short time to pick up and learn. (Extract 39)

What is highlighted in the above interview excerpts, especially by NYU/MAK-MUT2, NCDS3 in Extract 37 and NCDS7 in Extract 38, is what Neuliep (2006:306) called “haptic or tactile communication”<sup>17</sup>. This means that Uganda, USA and Norway have different

---

<sup>17</sup> According to Neuliep (2006:306), haptic or tactile communication refers to the use of touch, or sometimes the terms used are ‘contact and non-contact cultures’ to differentiate between those that encourage touch and those that don't.



symbolic modes of non-verbal communication. And if we take NCDS3's experience in Extract 37 of the simple act of human interaction — that is the difference in shaking hands in the greeting process between Uganda and Norway — we can ideally get an impression of the complexities of symbolic cultural interaction that were actively and silently performed and negotiated in the North-South intercultural collaborations at Makerere University.

Still on the issue of non-verbal communication, NYU/MAK-MUT1 commented on the use of eye contact:

in Uganda we don't exactly look people in the eyes and which they [New Yorkers] want you to do. But when they do, you are like 'what have I done?' (Extract 40)

The insights shared by NYU/MAK-MUT1 mean that Ugandans, New Yorkers or even the Norwegians had differences in nonverbal regulators (see Neuliep, 2006:301). Neuliep (*ibid.*) defines non-verbal regulators as the “behaviors and actions that govern, direct, and/or manage conversation”. Neuliep (2006:301), for example, says that in the USA “direct eye contact and affirmative head nodding typically communicate agreement or that a conversant understands what is being communicated”. This means that direct eye contact and distance during communication are not the same in different cultures. In some cultures, as in Uganda, direct eye contact is sometimes prohibited between persons of differing status. In Uganda, looking intently into some one's eyes can sometimes be interpreted as either aggressive or accusatory behaviour. At the same time, in Uganda as in some Asian countries cultural power distance can also affect the use of non-verbal language; for example, a young person or a person of lower status sometimes avoids making direct eye contact with his or her superior as a sign of respect. Direct eye contact can sometimes be interpreted as insolence or as signal of challenging a person of higher status (cf. Neuliep, 2006:301). The concept of power distance as explained by Neuliep (2006:319-20) can also help us to explain why sometimes Southern participants in the North-South intercultural collaborations which are funded by the Northern partners lack communication assertiveness. The fact that the Northern partners are the funders of the collaboration accords them a high status and this affects the interpersonal intercultural communication dynamics (see the similar discussion in Chapter Seven section 7.2).

Since the New York-Makerere University collaboration involved children, it was culturally acceptable for the Americans to try to hug some Ugandan children, but some Ugandan children were culturally not used to being hugged and preferred being touched, whereas

touching a pupil or student in USA is seen as offensive and teachers are not allowed to touch children in any way. Such cultural perspectives and differences called for both sides to have some cultural dialogue and mediation in order to come to a common understanding.

The non-verbal communication differences we have pointed out above indicate that the New York University and NCD participants belonged to low-context cultures as opposed to Uganda, which is generally high-context. Neuliep (2006:324-25) says that members of a low-context culture, such as the USA, are less sensitive to the perceptual, socio-relational and environmental contexts. A low-context communication is one in which the mass of information is found in the explicit code; that is verbal messages are extremely important when information is to be shared with others. On the other hand, a high-context culture is one whose members are sensitive to the perceptual, socio-relational, and environmental contexts for information. High-context cultures have a restricted code system. Members do not rely on verbal communication as the main source of information. Silence and non-verbal behaviour are equally informative and members of the culture are expected to know how to perform in various situations where the guidelines are implicit (*ibid.*).

Differences in the contextual use of non-verbal communication may have also led to non-verbal expectancy violation. Neuliep (2006:320) says that the basic premise of non-verbal expectancy violation is that people hold expectations about the appropriateness of the non-verbal behaviours of others. Neuliep (2006:442) states that “verbal and nonverbal appropriateness and effectiveness are two important qualities of intercultural competence”. The concept of non-verbal expectancy violation also shows us the different shades of cultural clashes and misunderstandings that need to be tolerantly negotiated in intercultural collaborations. This relates to Dirks, Eley and Ortner’s (1994) argument that “culture may be seen as multiple discourses, occasionally coming together in large systemic configurations, but more often coexisting within dynamic fields of interaction and conflict” (as quoted in Moon, 2008:16).

The intercultural communication experiences shared by the respondents in this study also reflected Bauman’s (1993:146) view that when we are in a foreign country we sometimes fail to decipher and interpret the culturally distinct situations that we encounter, and we end up classifying them as “annoying” or even “funny” (c.f. NCDS3 in Extract 37). As already indicated, the intercultural communicative differences always point to a need for negotiating, mediating and breaking the communication cultural barriers in order to come to a common

understanding. And given that the intercultural theatre collaborations at Makerere University last for two weeks to one month, and since sometimes there are culture-specific philosophies that explain communicative behaviour, in the two weeks or a month of collaboration what Ugandans and their Northern partners shared were just scrapings of each side's wider cultural communication spectrum. This makes intercultural theatre collaborations symbolic interactions in the literal and figurative sense of the word.

Turning to verbal communication, there were also differences that we highlighted. NYU/MAK-MUT1 noted that there are some typical Ugandan verbal or vocal sounds used in conversations like "Mhh", which can mean yes, or which shows that a person is listening and paying attention to the conversation. However, sometimes this was seemingly irritating to the New Yorkers, and even NCD students, who needed confirmation and reaffirmation by listening to complete sentences or words. This also means that New Yorkers, Stanford and Norwegian College of Dance students and Ugandans had different paralanguages<sup>18</sup> (cf. Rogers and Steinfatt, 1999:1).

Commenting on verbal communication, NYUT1 said that the New York University students had to pay attention to how they pronounced particular words, for example:

pronounce the Ts in words like water bottle. So that is something I prepare them for. And the first day they said to me you speak totally different when you are in Uganda than you speak to us in New York. Because when I am in New York I know that I speak too fast and I know that if I speak especially to [Ugandan] children this way they will never understand me. (Extract 41)

What NYUT1 is pointing at in this excerpt is what Ylanne-McEwen and Coupland (2000:191-92) termed "communication accommodation" (see Chapter Two section 2.3.3.5). Communication accommodation means adjusting one's way of speaking in order to make communicating within an intercultural setting easy for all parties involved. From interview Excerpt 41 we get to know that Americans and Ugandans pronounce the words 'water' and 'bottle' differently. That is, whereas the Ugandans pronounce the Ts, for the Americans the Ts are more silent and this could lead to communication breakdown because of differences in intonation and pronunciation.

---

<sup>18</sup> Neuliep (2006:302) defines paralanguage as "vocal qualities that usually ... accompany speech. Paralinguistic voice qualities include pitch, rhythm, tempo, articulation and resonance of the voice." Other paralinguistic vocalisations are intensity and sounds such as "um", "ah" and "uk".

In a separate interview NYUT1's observation was corroborated by NYU/MAK-MUS1, who said that at times it was difficult to understand what the New York University participants were saying because

some talk as if it is a sewing machine. Even us the old ones before meeting the kids we used to listen and we were like 'excuse me what are you saying?' And for them they combine the words and you don't get what they are saying. With this one at first it was really, really challenging and we just told them to tone down their pace and if it was 'warer' we told them to say 'water' because the kids and the people they are meeting are not used to such language. At least by the end of the two weeks, they had toned down their speed ... At times we could say something and they would say 'what are you saying' and sometimes we could write down what we were meaning. So we used both writing and speaking. (Extract 42)

It should be remembered that the Makerere University and New York students worked with children during the collaboration. But since NYU/PAF-MUS1, a university student, said that even at her educational level she sometimes found difficulty to understand what her New York University counterparts were saying, I wondered how the Ugandan children were coping in this intercultural linguistic setting. Commenting on how the Ugandan children managed the American English in the intercultural workshops and rehearsals for the production, NYU/MAK-MUS1 said that

with the children it was easier because we met the New Yorkers in the first week and by the time it came to the second week, we had really got used to what the Americans were saying, but the children could sometimes not get what the Americans were saying. But it was our responsibility to put across what the Americans were saying which meant that we were translating; speaking in our Ugandan English, and if the students could not get that, we would put it in Luganda<sup>19</sup> so that they can get each and everything. (Extract 43)

The experience illustrated by NYU/MAK-MUS1 shows that even though the two institutions used English as a medium of interaction in the collaboration, there were still subtleties and situational differences, that is speaking/talking pace/speed, pronunciation and intonation of the "Englishes" used, that had to be negotiated, mediated and translated.

Similarly, when I asked about the intercultural challenges in the Stanford-Makerere collaboration, SU/MAK-MUT1 commented on language: "the way we speak English in Uganda is different. Much as it is English, the way we phrase our sentences is different", and this created communication challenges in the collaboration. In *Beyond My Circle* this aspect was symbolically handled in a comic segment that was discussed in Chapter Five section

---

<sup>19</sup> Luganda is one of the popular local languages spoken in Uganda. It is the language spoken by the largest ethnic group in Uganda, the Baganda in central Uganda.

5.6.1 where the performers showed how words like potato, water, tomato, aluminium cucumber, guitar, and pomegranate are pronounced in different countries, hence symbolising a language barrier and signposting the need for linguistic negotiation in cross-cultural interactions even when English is used as the shared medium of communication. This reflects Blommaert's (2005:69) observation that when individuals travel through physical and social space, "they move through orders of indexicality"<sup>20</sup> affecting their ability to deploy communicative resources". That is because movement within a new physical, social or cultural space requires the negotiation, understanding, adaptation and adoption of new indexical orders and value meanings that can function, and that are applicable, in that new physical and social space (cf. Blommaert, 2005:72). Ultimately, NYU/MAK-MUT2's insights and the comic language segment in *Beyond My Circle* exemplified how mobility within intercultural spaces can create problems of function in language. As already indicated, mobility in an intercultural setting is not movement "across empty spaces, but mobility across spaces filled with codes, customs, rules, expectations, and so forth"; in other words, such mobility is a journey across other peoples' cultural normative spaces (Blommaert, 2005:73). This again points to the centrality of symbolic interaction in intercultural encounters. Similarly, it also signposts the situated character of human understanding and communication (Hanks, 1991:14).

Turning to issues of postcolonialism, based on NYU/MAK-MUSI's scenario of intercultural linguistic negotiation in Extract 43, one observes that even though English as a language was introduced in Uganda during the colonial period, some sections of Ugandan society appropriated and adopted it in their own Ugandan way, which NYU/MAK-MUSI called "Ugandan English". The latter is sometimes influenced by the word pronunciation and intonation of Ugandans' indigenous languages, whereby they twist English into the Ugandan vernacular context coupled with code switching. This can be termed as localisation, naturalisation or indigenisation of the global/international English language to suit the

---

<sup>20</sup> According to Blommaert (2005:69-74), 'orders of indexicality' means that language is systemically reproduced, stratified to uphold meanings, often called 'norms' or 'rules' of language. Indexical meanings imply that linguistic signs and contexts are 'ordered' and not matters of random attribution but closely related to other social and cultural features of social groups. In other words, orders of indexicality are the grassroots displays of 'groupness', making the group recognisable both from the inside and from the outside. The particular group's norms have a specific place in the orders of indexicality to which members orient themselves. This, then, accounts for the differences between 'groups' (i.e. inhabitable identities, identities one claims and performs for oneself) and 'categories' (i.e. ascriptive identities, identities attributed by others). The difference lies in differences in indexability.

Ugandan or local context. In line with the argument I am making here, Bhatt (2010:523) writes about post-colonial language agency and awareness, arguing that

language choice in post-colonial countries reflects a complex and often contradictory linguistic identity-negotiation: on the one hand, the post-colonial subjects' desire for an identity that transcends, and at times even inverts, the politics of the linguistic and cultural dominance of English; on the other hand, a desire for a dual kind of identity – both local-indigenous and colonial English based on cultural negotiation, interaction and appropriation.

Moreover, the field of sociolinguistics recognises the fact that English is not homogenous, but fragmented (Blommaert, 2005:11). Blommaert (2005:13) further states that “language needs to be seen as a collection of varieties, and the distribution of such varieties”, because there are no “two human beings, even if they speak the same ‘language’, who have the same complex of varieties” (Blommaert, *ibid.*). As implied earlier, the different “Englishes” that are used around the world sometimes call for linguistic mediation, re-translation and negotiation amongst the different ‘English’-speaking peoples.

Similarly, in the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere University collaboration, I observed that even though some NCD participants were willing to participate in the focus group discussion, they experienced considerable difficulty in expressing themselves in English. This is because in Norway the official language mainly used in educational institutions is Norwegian. English is learnt as a second language. I also observed that these participants faced a problem in interacting freely with their Ugandan counterparts and they found it more comfortable to interact with their NCD counterparts who understood Norwegian. The language barrier in this case thwarted free intercultural interaction, socialisation and dialogue amongst some intercultural group members.

Since English was not a first language either for the Makerere participants or their Norwegian College of Dance counterparts, it means it was used in what I will term the communicative third space, where both groups' unfamiliarity with English was framed and negotiated. Commenting on the issue of language barrier, one of the interviewees — NCD/MAK-MUT1 said that

we are all using English and English is not our mother language, and we are liable to have miscommunication, and I think we are learning gradually and every year it is becoming better than before. (Extract 44)

I was informed that difference in the usage and contextualisation of particular English words in Uganda and Norway, and sometimes differences in pronunciation and clarity of speech, led

to misunderstandings. Because of that, there was always need for mediation and remediation to make sure that what the person intended to communicate was rightfully received/decoded by the other party to avoid unnecessary inter-personal or intergroup misunderstandings. For example, based on her intercultural experience, a Makerere University participant NCD/MAK-MUS1 shared one scenario by saying that

I met a girl [NCD participant] and I told her ‘You are smart’. And she said ‘What? What do you mean? No I am not smart.’ Then I explained to her what I meant. Then she told me to them ‘smart’ means being knowledgeable and intelligent and that when you want to say that you are ‘smart’ as we use it here [in Uganda], for them they say ‘You have dressed nicely’. (Extract 45)

I personally experienced such a real-life intercultural communication situation during my first few days in Stellenbosch, where the use of an English word “sharp” at first left me perplexed. In some South African communities “sharp” or “sharp sharp” is used in different contexts to mean ‘it is okay’, or as a greeting to mean “hi”, and in other instances it is used to mean “goodbye”. Another instance is when I was asking for directions around town and someone told me that ‘after the robots you turn to your right’. Robots? I was perplexed, thinking about Hollywood science-fiction movies. Later, I learnt to my amusement that ‘robots’ in South Africa referred to what would be called traffic lights in the Ugandan context!

These scenarios pointed out above, especially by NCD/MAK-MUT1 and NCD/MAK-MUS1, in a way are corroborated by Spencer-Oatey (2013:247) when she observed that

a key to successful negotiation of goals, as well as to the collaboration as a whole, is effective communication. This entails many different aspects, including both management elements (e.g. agreeing the choice of language(s) and the channels and frequency of communication) as well as all aspects of language use such as active listening, linguistic accommodation, negotiation of terms, and stylistic variation.

However, given that the NCD and PAF group used English in the communicative third space, I observed that the other languages known by the participants were used as tools of self-inclusion and exclusion. For example, the NCD participants would use Norwegian to exclude Ugandans from discussions that they did not wish them to follow, or they would do it unconsciously in order to easily connect with their fellow Norwegians in the group. Likewise, PAF members would consciously or unconsciously use any of the Ugandan local languages to exclude the Norwegians from their discussion. Mini-intercultural communication exclusions were in other cases performed through code-switching. The issue of a language barrier was also recorded by Pribyl and Johnstone (2011:235), when they quoted one PAF student’s comment in a project evaluation session:



this project also had challenges that include language barriers, whereby Norwegian students were so much into speaking Norwegian as we also spoke Luganda sometimes. This at times created a gap between Ugandans and Norwegians.

This implies that when communication exclusions were performed in the presence of the “other”, they created a sense of insecurity and explicit exclusion which was not good for intercultural cohesion. What I am discussing here also implies that intercultural interaction does not erase intergroup cultural boundaries and/or otherness (see discussions on otherness in sections 5.6.1 and 5.6.2). This is also related to Barth’s (1969:9-10) theory of ethnic boundary maintenance.

In discussing British-Chinese e-learning collaboration participant experiences, Spencer-Oatey (2013:250-252) made similar observations. Spencer-Oatey (2013:251) quotes one of her Chinese respondents saying that “the working language was English. Due to the language problems, when we couldn’t express ourselves clearly, it seemed as though we Chinese were at a disadvantage. But as a matter of fact, the British were thinking hard to get what we wanted to say” (cf. Spencer-Oatey, 2013:52; Reinelt, 2007:10; Sullivan and Cottone, 2010:360). From this discussion one learns that even though using a common ‘international language’ is crucial in intercultural encounters, one should at the same time be aware of the difficulty of negotiating the variations of the ‘Englishes’ in intercultural encounters.

It should further be noted that all the songs that accompanied the Ugandan dances that were taught to the New York University, the Norwegian College of Dance and Stanford University students were sung in the indigenous Ugandan languages. Since the visiting students could not master the languages in which the songs were sung during their brief stay in Uganda, this again presented a challenge for them to totally understand what the songs were about. The brief English translations that they were given on the meanings of the songs by their Ugandan counterparts could not adequately cover the songs’ total contextual socio-cultural meaning. This again points to what Spencer-Oatey (2013:52) meant when she asserted that effective communication does not depend only on the “accurate translation of linguistic meaning but also on the grasp of pragmatic meaning”. And since no form of translation can ever capture all cultural nuances, she noted, that this may lead to missing out on “many contextual issues” and failure to “pick up on a wide range of subtly communicated elements” (cf. Schechner, 2003: xii).

In the same vein, the language barrier led to cultural boundary maintenance which the collaboration could not erase, because each of the participating groups largely preserved its ‘conscience collective’.<sup>21</sup> Consequently the Northern partners ended up getting hybrid translations of the songs and Ugandan performing culture. Thus, the intercultural theatre collaboration turns out to be an incomplete symbolic cultural interaction in the context of Neuliep’s (2006:10) assertion that communication is a continuous, sometimes incomplete and dynamic process. This is similar to Zygmunt Bauman’s (1999: xlviii) observation that intercultural interaction, like translation, is an “on-going, unfinished and inconclusive dialogue which is bound to remain such. The meeting of two contingencies is itself a contingency, and no effort will ever stop it from being such”.

Bourdieu (1989) makes a social-cultural distinction which is close to our understanding of symbolic interaction as discussed in Chapter Two section 2.3.1. Bourdieu (1989:20) argues that the social world is a symbolic system which is based on the logic of difference and that

social space tends to function as a symbolic space, a space of lifestyles and status groups characterized by different lifestyles. Thus the perception of the social world is the product of a double structuring ... it is socially structured because the properties attributed to agents or institutions present themselves in combinations that have very unequal probabilities.

Marotta (2009:270) states that

A cross-cultural subject then understands that one cannot fully capture and comprehend the other in a dialogical encounter because another culture is never an enclosed horizon. Cultures like individuals are always involved with others, are always in motion. Although the in-betweenness of the interpreter fosters greater understanding, this is never complete understanding of the other’s situation. To adopt an intercultural mode of interpretation is to acknowledge that the other is not an end but a means with which to enlarge our understanding and knowledge of ourselves and others. The intercultural mode of understanding would also appreciate that understanding is never complete and final. Actors in cross-cultural encounters would seek to enlarge their horizons, or in Gadamer’s account, achieve a fusion of horizons, but this fusion is not premised on a transcendental position because self and other are always situated.

This in part explains why the participants in Makerere University’s intercultural collaborations encountered different communicative differences that needed mediation.

It should be noted that the term ‘culture’ is very wide as a concept and practice. And because of the limitations of space, I cannot deal extensively with all the cultural issues that were

---

<sup>21</sup> According to Durkheim (1893:79), ‘conscience collective’ is “the totality of beliefs and sentiments common to average citizens of the same society” (cited in Ransome, 2010:50).

negotiated in the collaborations. However, I am going to briefly discuss some of the other cultural aspects that had to be negotiated in the collaborations.

### **7.3.1 Differences in dress codes**

Connected to the negotiation of the cultural, the element of differences in dress codes emerged. It should be noted that Uganda is largely a conservative nation where an aspect such as the way a person dresses is sometimes prone to public scrutiny. This is especially so if a person wears something that shows “too much skin”. In February 2014, The Anti-Pornography Law was passed which has a clause prohibiting the exposure of the human body in public spaces. When the American and Norwegian participants in the collaborations, who were not used to tropical heat, came to Uganda it was summer time for them and the call to put on skimpy summer clothes in an American or Norwegian style seemed to be irresistible. But when an American or Norwegian participant did that, it would sometimes be discomfoting to the Ugandan participants. This happened during the Stanford-Makerere collaboration and SU/PAF-MUT1 commented on the need for “telling them [Stanford participants] that they are not dressing appropriately. Translating the discomfort so that it is not offensive to the other person sometimes was a challenge”.

Commenting on the differences in dress codes, NCDT3 said that while they were in Uganda they had to respect the country’s culture by advising their students not to put on bikinis or extremely short skirts. NCDT3 observed that what entailed “freedom in Norway is not freedom in Uganda ... we have to respect those differences”.

Sometimes, the negotiation of the dress codes occurred not only in real-life settings, but also in the production process. For example, I was told by the Norwegian College of Dance participants that some Ugandan participants were hesitant to put on leotards, which are sometimes necessary in the rehearsal and performance of modern or ballet dances. This was because the Ugandan participants had reservations about wearing tight leotards, which augmented the visibility of particular body parts both in rehearsal and on stage, compared to their Norwegian counterparts, who were used to this kind of dance costume. For the NCD students and New York students, on the other hand, the Ugandan traditional dance costumes were heavy and made them uncomfortable because of the heat and the sweating that the heaviness of the costumes led to. Therefore the two groups had to negotiate and transcend these cultural perceptions in order to come to a common intercultural understanding. The

performers had to accommodate and wear each participating culture's dance costumes in the final intercultural performances.

### 7.3.2 Differences in the concept of time and time management

This was also a cultural issue that was highlighted. For example, when I asked about some of the challenges of the collaboration in the focus group discussion, one of the NCD discussants said that

NCDS2: I also think about time, because it seems Ugandans have a different concept about time. If we are to meet at 7, we in Norway we meet at 7 or even before. But here people start leaving home at 7 when we are supposed to meet at 7.

NCDS3: Yes, the way we relate to time is different. In Norway we are usually hurrying, but here you are more relaxed all the time ... So we relate to time in a different way. (Extract 46)

This in part reminds us of Neuliep's (2006:317) discussion on monochronic and polychronic cultures; in brief it means that there are different modes of time awareness and management between people from the West and Africans. There is even a belief that there is "African time" (polychronic) which does not follow strict time and work scheduling and a Western (monochronic) mode of time awareness which is strict about time management in interpersonal engagements.

Asked about how the time management misunderstanding was handled, NCDS2 said that

I think the best thing to do is just to be patient and try to make them understand that this is how we do it to make it more efficient and to get more out of the collaboration. So be patient, try to explain it and maybe they will get it right the next time. (Extract 47).

It is observable from this that difference in time awareness may have also contributed to intercultural misunderstandings as far as work ethics are concerned. It is also evident from NCDS2 that the NCD-PAF participants operated within the "them and us" perspective, which seems very difficult to erase in intercultural encounters.

However, when I asked the Makerere students about the issue of time management, some pointed at the nature of the programme. They said that the PAF-NCD collaboration was not yet streamlined into the PAF programme structure. This meant that the project was conflicting with other classes the Makerere University students had to attend. Because of the conflicting programming, they were forced to come to the collaboration workshops late after attending the other classes for half of the time. This was interpreted by the Norwegian group

as bad time management. However, others confessed that they were challenged by the Norwegian participants' time consciousness, which they were not used to. This echoes Kirabaev's (2005:89) observation that the world cannot be centralised using the concept of time, because cultural pluralism means that the world is culturally decentralised and this also affects peoples' perceptions of, and relationship to both time and space (see Chapter Three section 3.4.3, cf. Neuliep, 2006:317).

### 7.3.3 Feelings of unequal cultural exchange

In section 7.2 I discussed the issue of inequality of funding. Apart from that inequality, I also discovered that among the Makerere participants in New York University and Norwegian College of Dance collaborations, there was a feeling of unequal cultural exchange.

Some Makerere University participants felt that culturally the exchanges were unequal because of their 'Ugandan' perception of what something cultural was. In Chapter Two section 2.3.3 I stated that a look at the myriad definitions of the word 'culture' shows that different people experience what is termed 'culture' differently. For example, Wallerstein (1993:31-32) stated that different peoples of the world have different cultural beliefs, and Asante (2008:47) looked at three broad categories of cultural reality: "Afrocentric, Eurocentric, and Asiocentric". And in the opening monologue of *Beyond my Circle* (see Chapter Five section 5.6.1) there was also an indication that there are differences between the "white world and the black world". Asante (2008:47.) tells us that it is self-evident that "the cultural differences we face in the world are rooted in different views of reality". Equally, some Makerere University participants felt that they were sharing with the New York University and Norwegian College of Dance participants Ugandan dances which were traditional and cultural, while on the other hand, what the New York University and Norwegian College of Dance participants were sharing with Ugandans were individually inspired modern or ballet dances which Ugandans thought were not 'cultural' enough. In a personal interview, while referring to the New York-Makerere collaboration, NYU/MAK-MUT1 said that

For example, you come here and I give you the history of my dance and the movements and when it is your turn, you give me a choreography of your dance and tell me 'I am inspired by this' without even a folk dance. I don't know if they don't have or they are keeping theirs. (Extract 48)

Pribyl and Johnstone (2011:237) reflected on the same, saying

the Ugandan dances taught to visiting students are ... community dances that require the group to ensure a successful performance. In contrast, it could be argued that western dance forms are often based on individual reinvention within a particular style.

Magoba (2013) similarly commented on the unequal cultural exchange by asking “is it really fair exchange when one side is giving authentic traditional dance and another is offering personalised choreography?”

In order to understand the different perspectives of what is cultural and what is not, we need to specifically revisit some of the definitions of culture discussed in Chapter Two section 2.3.2. For example, Oyserman and Uskul (2008:145) say that “culture can be broadly and briefly operationalized as a set of structures and institutions, values, traditions, and ways of engaging with the social and non-social world that are transmitted across generations in a certain time and space”.

This definition can in part explain the nature of traditional dances that the Ugandan participants shared with the New York and Norwegian counterparts. For example, in the 2013 collaboration the New York delegation learnt *owaro* dance, a ceremonial dance of the Basamia people from Busia in eastern Uganda. They also learnt the *ekitaguriro* dance from the Banyankore people from Western Uganda. Similarly, the Norwegian College of dance students learnt *ekitaguriro*, *owaro*, and *kizino* (cf. Chapter Five section 5.6.1 and 5.6.2 on the analysis of performances). The New Yorkers and the Norwegian College of Dance participants also shared their modern dance, ballet and jazz with Makerere participants.

Each of the Ugandan dances noted above has a communal origin and derives from time immemorial. That means each dance has its own history, costumes, songs and instruments that accompany it, plus the socio-cultural purpose of the dance among the people where it originated from. Before each dance was taught to the New York participants, the socio-historical and socio-cultural context of each dance was discussed by a Ugandan teacher in what I will call a process of cultural translation and contextualisation or intercultural socio-historical, socio-cultural and socio-political dialogism. From the Ugandans’ context, that is what they term/termed as a cultural or folk/traditional dance.

The above, for example, is different from the historical development of modern dance in the USA and Europe (cf. Deborah, 1989:7 in section 5.6.2; also Pribyl and Johnstone, 2011:237). For example, in the New York-Makerere collaboration I was told that before a modern dance

was taught by a New York teacher to the Ugandans, he or she would first share with the Ugandan participants what inspired him/her to create the dance, followed by showing them a DVD recording of a previous performance of the same dance. Thereafter, they would start rehearsing the dance. This is what Pribyl and Johnstone (2011:237) meant when they said that “Western dance forms are often based on individual reinvention within a particular style.” And this is fundamentally different from the communal origin and nature of Ugandan dances as earlier indicated. Because of this difference, Magoba (2013) and NYU/MAK-MUT1 in Extract 47 felt that the New York delegation did not have something “cultural” to share in the collaboration.

The contentious cultural issues highlighted above evoke Wallerstein’s (1993:31) declaration that “culture is probably the broadest concept of all those used in the historical social sciences” because it “embraces a very large range of connotations, and thereby it is the cause perhaps of the most [intercultural] difficulty” (see Chapter Two section 2.3.2).

In order to understand American society’s cultural landscape, we have to note that the USA is a culturally heterogeneous and complex nation. The USA’s cultural complexity was in part accounted for by NYUT1 while discussing the phenomenon of globalisation in a personal interview:

I think a lot of people [Americans] are disassociated with their own history and I find that some people are looking to find that, are looking to find some connection with the personal history of culture that seems to be lost ... after everything gets Coca-Colaised like brand names become household everywhere and capitalism has taken hold of every corner of the earth, I hope the pendulum will swing back to where we come from. Our [American] personal history through the performing arts, through dance, through song, through music, all those things share something that is imposed upon us in terms of what we are supposed to desire. I can speak for my culture, but in my culture we are taught to desire certain things through advertising and so we are never satisfied. So we are always dropping what we have towards something else that has no grounding (cf. Elteren, 2003:179). (Extract 49)

Because of the above socio-political, socio-economic and socio-cultural forces in the USA, it seemed difficult for the NYU participants to share something “culturally” American with their Ugandan counterparts. Today, it so seems Coca Cola, McDonalds, pop music and Hollywood’s cocktail of films are becoming part and parcel of American culture. All these products are in sharp contrast to the Ugandans’ conceptualisation of something cultural. From NYUT1’s views in Extract 49 we are also able to see that the New York intercultural



collaboration in Uganda was also a sort of cultural tourism aimed at experiencing and being inspired by culturally ‘exotic’ things which are not in existence in USA.

The feeling of unfair cultural exchange was also witnessed in the 2013 Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration, when a Norwegian folk dance *egerlitene* was performed without the Makerere participant’s involvement. This was also recorded by Pribyl and Johnstone (2011:230) (cf. Chapter Five section 5.6.2). To some Makerere University participants this was presumably a performance of cultural exclusion in an engagement which was supposed to be intercultural.

The sense of inequality in the benefits from the collaboration was also expressed by NYU/MAK-MUT3 who asserted that

I think from the interaction between the West and Africa ... I think the West benefits more. May be we are too generous in giving out information. A few continental Africans have published about Africa, but you find books and books written by Europeans about us; people who do not understand us talk about us and tell stories about our cultures and our society and we haven’t been able to tell our own story and I think we need to find a way of benefiting from these cultural exchange programmes as people from Africa. We contribute to the generation of knowledge; otherwise we design it in a way that people from Europe benefit more because they come with a clear agenda. And so we need to find a way of checking the excesses of these exchange programmes. (Extract 50)

From this one may get an impression that some Southern partners do not benefit from North-South collaborations partly because they do not stick to clear objectives before getting involved in the collaborations in the first place. Or else, because of a lack of communication assertiveness partly caused by economic inequality, they feel submissive in the entire collaborative setup, making it possible for their Northern counterparts who come with clear agendas to ‘exploit’ the situation.

From another analytical perspective, what NYU/MAK-MUT3 highlighted in Extract 50 relates to the concept of extraversion, whereby all the activities in intercultural collaborations in which the Northern partners are the funders seem to be geared toward satisfying their needs (cf. Pribyl and Johnstone, 2011:233,234 in section 7.2). In this case, North-South intercultural collaborations are in most cases “extraverted, turned toward the exterior, ruled by and subordinate to outside needs instead of being self-centred and destined, first of all, to answer the questions posed by the African society itself, whether directly or indirectly”, as Hountondji (1992:239) states in another context. In the same vein, North-South intercultural

theatre activities seem to be caught up in a web of a dependency syndrome which “is a result of the progressive integration of the Third World into the worldwide process of the production of knowledge, managed, and controlled by the Northern countries” (Hountondji, 1992:239-240; cf. Lo and Gilbert, 2002:36-37).

Another respondent in the New York-Makerere collaboration connected the unequal cultural exchange to the lopsided movement of participants between the two institutions. NYU/MAK-MUS3 said that

I [see] it as cheating, if they come and we share with them, and why not us going there [to the US] and we share ... have they ever asked any student to look for the money and go there? It is always them depending on us ... Let [Makerere] students have a chance and go there and experience. (Extract 51)

Even though one can account for the unbalanced movement of individuals in this collaboration by looking at the economic disparity and what it would mean in financial terms if the Makerere participants were to foot the bill of a reciprocal visit to New York, to some postcolonial critics the unbalanced movement of participants, and the supposedly extraverted nature of the collaboration, may be viewed with some suspicion as “exploitation” and “stealing” similar to the suspicions recorded by Schechner (1982:19) (see Chapter Two section 2.4.3). To other critics, the imbalance in the participants’ movement may seem to be a reappearance of the colonial condition, when the economically and politically powerful people from the North had to travel to other lands in the South in order to study the different peoples’ exotic ways of life (cf. Hountondji, 1992:238-248; Burawoy, 2000:33); also see the discussion on reappearance of discourse in Chapter Two section 2.4.3.).

Correspondingly, NYU/MAK-MUT1 expressed the same sense of imbalance and fear this way:

The only thing that I fear is that it will come to a level when we have given our all and the American people have our all and they don’t need us anymore. I see that as coming soon. Remember they come every year and every year we are giving them a new dance and whether they do it well or not is not an issue. We may end up having the whole Uganda in America. They do a recording remember; the way we teach; everything you do they are recording ... They have never talked about copyright ... they have come, you give them everything, but they are not giving enough in return. (Extract 52)

In this excerpt NYU/MAK-MUT1 disclosed how the Ugandan participants have been giving their all, while their New York counterparts were “not giving enough in return”. What NYU/MAK-MUT1 was talking about in Extract 52 was also talked about by some Makerere students in a focus group discussion. They noted that during the NCD-Makerere

collaboration, the NCD group was video recording and taking pictures of the proceedings in the workshops, while the Makerere side was not allowed to do so (see similar discussion in section 7.4). And the fact that the New Yorkers and the NCD group recorded the intercultural collaboration proceedings and went to New York and Oslo with everything points to the concept of knowledge transfer, another form of extraversion. What was disclosed by NYU/MAK-MUT1 in Extract 52 and similarly hinted at in the NCD-Makerere focus group discussion implies that the knowledge that was experimented on, collected and accumulated in Uganda was packaged and transferred to USA and Norway. To some, this borders on neo-colonial intellectual exploitation (Hountondji, 1992:242).

In order to deepen my understanding of the dynamics of North-South intercultural collaborations, I asked some of the Makerere University participants why they continued to participate in the New York-Makerere collaboration, even when they felt it was an unequal and unfair cultural exchange. One of the respondents replied saying that they had developed a kind of personal connection with the New York University partners, and absconding after being with them for several years (the collaboration had lasted 8 years by January 2014) would seem like a kind of betrayal. This feeling affirms what Kuwabara and Sheldon (2012:253) wrote about human exchanges:

through repeated exchanges, actors develop feelings of trust, affective regard and cohesion as they make casual attributions to make sense of exchange outcomes, tracing emotions and cognitions they experience to the exchange task, the relationship or each other.

From this we learn that in the absence of monetary or other rewards, and putting aside the tensions and misunderstandings that sometimes characterise intercultural collaborations, individuals can still develop affective regard for each other in the course of the collaboration. This can contribute to the project's continuity and sustainability. Similarly, Hamera (2007:17) states that

In dancing communities, politics of sociality, including friendships, are set in motion by myriad daily practices which serve as rhetorical and corporeal tools for interpersonal and intercultural communication and cooperation. These operations, in turn, organize complex, heterogeneous, productive social formations onstage and off.

Elsewhere, Hamera (2007:60-61) argues that “the vernacular landscapes constructed through dance technique are literal and psychic spaces ... that bind practitioners to one another.”

However, even though some Ugandan participants harboured some reservations about the collaborations, the Northern student participants and project leaders I interviewed were satisfied with the collaborations. For example NYUT1 said that

there are university programmes I see over and over again, they come to foreign countries as triage. They are coming to fix their flood system, ‘we are going to help them, we are going to look at their hospital system and give them tools’. There is always a sense of helping, giving, fixing and I think our programme is unique in that we are coming to learn. And that is beautiful and our students go back feeling different than some other intercultural programmes that they come back saying ‘wow we learnt so much’ and not ‘we were able to help them’. Hopefully everybody is helping each other in this programme, we are all learning and being enriched and that is what it is. (Extract 53)

The Northern partners may not have had a clear picture of the Ugandan participants’ sometimes aggrieved feelings, because of the Ugandans’ lack of communication assertiveness and power distance, partly exacerbated by the economic power imbalance between the Northern and the Ugandan participants. The Ugandan participants’ culture of silence could also have been partly sustained by the Ugandan cultural philosophy of being modest while relating with one’s visitors, no matter much one is unhappy with his/her visitor’s character traits. One can also argue that the Northern partners may have felt contented with the collaborations because they had achieved their set objectives. Or else, some of the respondents may have tried to offer “presentational data” in the face of an inquisitive researcher (Woodside and Wilson, 2003:498) (see similar discussion on presentational data in section 7.2). Whatever the case, all this means that there is always a need for open and sincere evaluation of North-South collaborations in order to make them more beneficial to all parties concerned.

I also observed that even though intercultural collaborations may have particular challenges and intergroup stressful moments for all participants, from each individual’s point of participation, project participants sometimes turn into patient stress absorbers who aim at attaining satisfaction from some of the benefits that accrue from their participation in such projects. This way, during moments of project-related stress, project participants silently say to themselves “after all, the project will end soon and I will benefit in some or other way”. Such self-restraining behaviour sometimes sustains the lifespan of potentially turbulent collaborative projects. However, the danger of this is that it may lead to normalising unbalanced and stressful intercultural relations.

### 7.3.4 Negotiating the pedagogic and corporeal differences

From my observations and the interviews I conducted I also discovered that Makerere University and the Northern institutions it was collaborating with had different pedagogic and corporeal orientations and this called for intercultural negotiation. However, it is also important to note that pedagogical orientations are largely influenced by the cultural orientations of a given society (cf. McLean, 2005:42 in section 2.3.2). In other words, pedagogical protocols can be viewed as extensions, carriers or signifiers of a particular culture. Due to this, in intercultural theatre collaboration processes, different realities of performance traditions and protocols are implicitly and/or explicitly contested and negotiated.

In a personal interview NYUT1 spoke about the differences in pedagogy saying that

this is interesting when we talk about the learning style and the pedagogy ... the first year we came, I said we did not know what to expect and these people here did not know what to expect how we were to receive the information. So, we came and [they] started singing songs and my students asked the Ugandan person next to them “how is that spelt” and they put out their papers and asked the Ugandan friends to write down the words for them. And the Ugandans said ok we will try and each person had a Ugandan friend. And they would write down the words and we would look and the words were all slightly different and the students said that this one is different from this one, and another one is different from this one and they said yes there are many variations. And the Ugandans said “we don’t write them but we learn them by ear”. So the next year before we went I told my students they are not going to write the songs for you, just don’t ask for it to be written down for you, just listen and try your level best to learn. And because we are visual learners we want everything written down. I said forget that – you really, really need to listen. So we came here and my students were really prepared to listen. Meanwhile, the Ugandans had said ‘these Americans cannot learn by listening, we have to try to write down the words’ ... They found chart paper to put them down, so they got together and tried to write down the words of the songs. We came and they had a chart paper and we were trying to learn the words and it was so funny, so we were all compromising and we were all trying to learn each other’s learning styles and to help support each other and I think that is really interesting at this point. But you hadn’t seen – all the teachers had the words written in order and organized, my students were reading a little bit and listening and we were almost developing a new pedagogy of learning that takes from both situations. (Extract 54)

From this excerpt we note that differences in pedagogical styles can present a challenge in intercultural educational settings. It is evident that in learning the indigenous songs that accompany the dances, Ugandans were more used to an auditory pedagogical approach and the New Yorkers preferred a visual approach. This called for mediation, compromise and patience from each group. From NYUT1’s words in Extract 54 we also notice that since the two groups had different culturally informed pedagogical structures or protocols of learning, the intercultural mediation process and compromise in order to find a middle ground led to

the development of a new teaching protocol which was an adaptation from the New York and Makerere University teaching approaches. This implies the creation of cultural and structural fusions – in other words, hybrid pedagogical structures, an element that this scenario affirms to be a product of intercultural pedagogical dialogism/interaction. Moreover, Hanks (1991:15) argues that the learning process is built on the “premise that meaning, understanding, and learning are all defined relative to actional contexts, not to self-contained structures” and that any paradigm “shift also alters the locus of learning”. In this regard intercultural theatre pedagogy points to the performance of a plurality of signs and systems. NYUT1 also hinted at the need for compromise in negotiating pedagogical differences and this points to Ylanne-McEwen and Coupland’s (2000:191-92) intercultural communication ‘accommodation theory’ discussed in Chapter Two section 2.3.3.5.

Referring to the negotiations on pedagogical approaches used while teaching children in the New York-Makerere collaboration, NYUT1 again shared the following experience she had with the New York and Makerere University participants:

I find that even when I tell my students our pedagogy styles will be different, the way we think about teaching is different, but you shall see on your own ... But sometimes I see them working and a Ugandan says ‘no it should be different they [children] should be in lines looking good and practicing’. And the Americans say that ‘maybe we should ask the children what they want to do’; so both are stereotypes about pedagogy alright to the extreme. Sometimes it falls somewhere in a spectrum; I sometimes let them work it out without interfering too much because that is part of this project. It is not me stepping in and fixing it, but just watching them and ask how would you resolve this – you think of two different things, you have to come to an understanding because you have to teach a class together and you gonna have to make it work and that is a metaphor for our world. (Extract 55)

Here we are informed that before the New Yorkers arrived in Uganda, they were warned about the pedagogical differences they were likely to experience, but this warning did not adequately prepare them for the lived experience when they arrived in Uganda. The moral of this experience is that it is one thing to talk and be told about something, and it is another to witness and live in that situation. From interview Extract 55 we get an impression of the dynamics of negotiating pedagogical differences in order to execute tasks in a collaborative intercultural setting. This experiential process can become a lifetime tool that can be applied by the participants in the outside world, because it can lead to the participants’ interactive personal human growth.



Connected to pedagogical challenges, NYUT1 also expressed the corporeal challenges the New York University students faced when they were learning the Ugandan dances for the first time:

When my students watch the physical actions of the Ugandan dances for the first time they say ‘oh no problem, I can do that’. Then they begin and they have habits from western dance which are not easily broken like the verticality of the spine, the bound muscle turn, there are a lot of typically Western body initiations and body stances that are in direct opposition. For some of these dances like *ekitaguriro* they have to let their weight go, even relax into it and I see my students working so hard, but almost working hard in a way that is not efficient and not so effective; they are sweating, breathing hard and the Ugandans are easy, easy no problem. And I think it takes a long time to get there in terms of movements but it takes a longer time to get the quality. And the first day is always interesting for me, because these two dances I learnt in 2008 already and so when I was learning them for the first time I was one of those as well. But now, having seen them and knowing them and seeing the students the first day here, I am starting to understand also why things are different for them. (Extract 56)

From this extract we get an impression that the dancer’s body is a symbolic embodiment of the cultural and structural constructs from the environment where the dancer comes from and this connects it to symbolic interaction.

Similarly, Pavis (1992:9-10) argues that actors possess a culture from their social group which “they acquire especially during the preparatory phase of the *mise en scène*” (cf. Synnot, 1993). Pavis says that this culture that is learnt either consciously or unconsciously makes the performers assimilate the traditions, especially the vocal, physical and rhetorical techniques of their group. And because actors belong to a given culture, they have “convictions and expectations, techniques and habits, which they cannot do without” (*ibid.*). Pavis (1992:9-10) thus states that actors are defined by “body techniques which they cannot get rid of very easily because they are inscribed by the culture on their bodies, then on the performance” (cf. Chapter Five section 5.6.2). From this, coupled with NYUT1’s insights in Extract 55, one can infer that negotiating differences in cultural attitudes and corporeal signs in the process of acquiring new performing techniques is part of the dynamics in intercultural theatre pedagogy. Hamera (2007:60) put it better when she shared her observations from community dance projects in Los Angeles, Long Beach and Pasadena in the USA:

The protocols of dance technique do more than just construct readable, reproducible bodies in diverse urban communities. They also rewrite bodies’ and communities’ relationships to space and time, and to the intersections of both. Over time, technique creates ‘vernacular landscapes’ within urban environments. Technique recreates neighborhoods as sites of productive, diverse allegiances.



From Hamera (*ibid.*) and my discussion above we can confirm that intercultural pedagogical processes involve the “rewriting of bodies” in space and time in order for those bodies to register new corporeal techniques in an intercultural setting. I will term this process intercultural theatre performance corporeal dialogism, which in a theoretical sense is relative to Kristeva’s (1986) concept of intertextuality or intertextual dialogism.

In support of the discussion on the embodied body, Shilling (2005:1) argues that the body is embodied with preconditions of agency and the physical effects of social structures. Therefore, if the New York University students’ bodies were in an American sense culturally and structurally embodied and the Makerere university participants were also in a Ugandan sense culturally and structurally embodied, then NYUT1’s revelations in Extract 56 are apt examples of the clashing and negotiations that happened when the two groups met. This is because Shilling (2005:16) states that

social constructionist analyses of the ordered body view human physicality as an object produced and regulated by political, normative and discursive regimes. They focus on the body as a location for society, implying that it is only through such an approach that we can appreciate the overwhelming structuring powers of the social system.

If we are to go by Shilling’s (1999) phrase “embodied interaction order”, or in the context of symbolic interaction, embodied symbolic order, and Hamera’s (2007) argument that the process of learning new dancing techniques involves the rewriting of bodies, one can say that the negotiation of difference between the New York University students’ cultural and pedagogical embodiment and that of Makerere University students gave rise to a double cultural embodiment which I will call in-between cultural embodiment/in-between symbolic interaction. This is connected to Bhabha’s (1994:1-2) notion/concept of “in between spaces”.

Bhabha (*ibid.*) defines in between spaces as “those moments or processes that are produced in the articulation of cultural differences ... that initiate new signs of identity and innovative sites of which in this case is the basis of the hybridity that is said to typify intercultural interactions. In the light of this, then, we are able to understand why NYUT1 said in interview Extract 53 that the participants were almost creating a new pedagogy of learning that took from both situations. The analysis of the interview extracts in this case has helped us to understand not only the symbolic interaction, but also the dynamics and some of the notions that are reflected through intercultural theatre pedagogical processes as per the objectives of this study.

However, at the same time we need to note that in intercultural theatre pedagogical processes not only are “corporeality and sociality ... remade”, but also the “contingent, situated nature of art’s norms and pleasures is exposed ... embraced or resisted by particular bodies in specific places and times” (Hamera, 2007:3). The New Yorker’s corporeal resistance of new dance technique protocols in an intercultural setting was expressed by NYUT1 in Extract 56, when she said that the New York students had Western dance habits which “they could not easily break like the verticality of the spine, the bound muscle turn”, which were in opposition to Ugandan traditional dancing protocols (cf. Pavis, 1992:9-10). This echoes Bourdieu’s (1990: 67) notions of “social field” and “habitus”. According to Bourdieu (*ibid.*), a social field is a set of dynamic organising principles, ultimately maintained by social groups, which identify and structure particular categories of practices that occur within a social space, for example, education, art, sport and economics. Social fields are “the products of a long, slow process of autonomization” (*ibid.*). This also implies that intercultural pedagogy involves the patient negotiation of different social fields and the habitus of the participants, thereby making intercultural theatre practice a culturally situated symbolic interaction.

However, Bourdieu (1990:69) suggests that in this intercultural pedagogical setting each of the participating groups possesses symbolic power. This is because, to Bourdieu (*ibid.*), power “works partly through the control of other people’s bodies and belief that is given by the collectively recognized capacity to act in various ways on deep-rooted linguistic and muscular patterns of behaviour, either by neutralizing them or by reactivating them to function mimetically”. This means that symbolic power is possessed by each of the participating groups in a sense that if the New Yorkers, for example, were to learn *ekitaguriro* or *awaro* dance from Uganda, they had to mimetically look up at the Makerere participants who were the “masters” of those dances. The same applied to the Makerere University students who were to learn modern or ballet dance from their New York or Norwegian counterparts. Based on this, one can state that the process of negotiating and sharing pedagogical protocols/styles in intercultural theatre collaborations is characterised by shifting positions of symbolic power in an empowering-disempowering seesaw dynamic pattern.

Elements of symbolic power explained above were expressed by NYUT2 in speaking about the challenges of learning Ugandan dances. NYUT2 said

I think the most challenging thing was singing and dancing at the same time, in most cases we [New Yorkers] sing or dance, but not doing the same things at the same time. We have one theatre dance major that is used to singing and dancing at the same time, but others are not. It is using two parts of the brain at the same time and I remember when I was still a student I said this was very challenging; sing, dance, to do different movements. And I think the best advice was relax and enjoy it, feel the music and enjoy it and not feel like it is a performance and I think that helped us a lot. At New York the dances are more structured but here it is different. (Extract 57)

NYUS1 similarly commented on the challenges of learning Ugandan dances, saying: “There are so many things going on at the same time; hands moving – hips and hands.” (Extract 58)

This was similar to some experiences in the Makerere-Norwegian College of Dance collaboration for example when NCDS3 said

I think what the biggest challenge was and different from what we are used to was getting the rhythm and the style; clapping, dancing at the same time was difficult at the very beginning. But I think with more practice you can do it. (Extract 59)

The above extracts show that some Northern participants were faced with two difficult situations at the same time. That is they were faced with new dances to be learnt, and the new dances were taught using new pedagogical approaches. This accorded symbolic power to Ugandans, who the New Yorkers in some instances believed had an ability to use “two parts of the brain”.

I asked more Norwegian College of Dance students about their experiences of learning Ugandan dances and in a personal interview NCDS1 expressed the pedagogical challenges this way:

The challenge was how to teach us how to do it ..., but we put on costumes and raffia skirts to see how the hips shake, some of the movements were not all that complicated because I have danced African dances before but the hips were not prominent in those dances, but here there was emphasis on the hips and some movements were a bit awkward but it was interesting to be part of this. (Extract 60)

In a focus group discussion, NCDS2 expressed similar sentiments:

I think the most difficult thing is to get the style, because we know the steps and we can do the steps like they do but will never look like authentic African style and I think they [Ugandans] have a problem with understanding that our bodies find it difficult to do the movements like they do. (Extract 61)

From NCDS1 Extract 60 and NCDS2 in Extract 61 we see the centrality of the body as a recipient and negotiating tool of corporeal signs of otherness in an intercultural theatre setting. From NCDS1 we also learn of the misgivings about the effectiveness of the new

pedagogical processes in equipping them with the new corporeal techniques. This is coupled with NCDS2's belief that their Makerere counterparts could not understand the limitations of their bodies. Basing on the limitation of her body to fully negotiate the corporeal signs in an intercultural setting, NCDS2 in Extract 61 also thought that whatever she was doing was not "authentic African style". This in part introduces us to the roots of the notions of authenticity and inauthenticity of intercultural theatre processes or even performances. In other words, it illustrates moments during intercultural pedagogical encounters when cultural otherness is envisaged as "alterity, as unbridgeable and ultimately untranslatable" (Adams and Janover, 2009:227).

The interview and focus group extracts referred to above (NCDS1 60 and NCDS2 61) echo Hamera's (2007:20) observation that a dancing technique is not totalising. There can be an ideal conception – that is what you want the body to do – but this is embodied with varying "degrees of success or failure". Hamera (2007:21) further observed that "dancers constantly apprehend the discrepancy between what they want to do and what they can do ... The struggle continues to develop and maintain the body in response to new choreographic projects." From this, it is evident that in an intercultural setting, corporeal negotiation and adaptation are both physically and psychologically demanding. This means that intercultural theatre involves the encounter with, and negotiation of, unfamiliar corporeal signs, which calls for patience, compromise and understanding from both the teacher and co-participants in an intercultural theatre setting, as was implied by NCDS2 in Extract 61 (also see Chapter Two section 2.4.1).

Still in the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration, NCDS6 said that "Following the beat and sometimes it seems as if they are going through the rhythm and then it changes. The polyrhythm ... is difficult to follow" (Extract 62).

However, while preparing for the NCD-PAF intercultural performance, the Ugandan drummers and musicians were advised not to stretch the Ugandan dances in an improvisational style, but to keep the dances within the time frame and structure that was agreed upon during the rehearsals. Even though some Ugandan participants argued that such a move would have made the performance unresponsive to the audience, there was a need to take this step in order not to throw the NCD students off balance during the intercultural performance. This relates to Ylanne-McEwen and Coupland's (2000:191-92) intercultural accommodation theory.

Going back to the New York-Makerere collaboration, NYU/MAK-MUS1 confirmed the New Yorkers' difficulty in learning the Ugandan dances by noting that

Some of the challenges were that we had students who were not good at dancing and it was challenging for us to first teach those New Yorkers before meeting the children. So we had to make sure that whatever we were to teach the children, the New Yorkers should have mastered them so that they don't feel ashamed in front of children. I for one had to choose movements that were a bit easier, that are not very complicated so that they can learn easier. (Extract 63)

I asked NYU/MAK-MUT3 why the New Yorkers were finding difficulty in learning the Ugandan dances and his views echo NYUT1's observations in Extract 56 and at the same time confirm Synnott's (1993), Pavis's (1992) and Bourdieu's (1990) views on the socio-cultural influence on human behaviour discussed above. In consonance with NYUT1 in Extract 56, when she talked about the New Yorkers' Western dance habits that interfered with their process of learning Ugandan dance motifs, NYU/MAK-MUT3 elaborated on particular cultural and psychological issues which I believe are pertinent, if one is to understand and appreciate intercultural dance/theatre pedagogy:

Now the dances that we grow up performing or interacting with determine how our bodies respond to movement challenges. So we have a different vocabulary altogether – our dance performances tend to emphasise movement towards the earth or what they call *plié*, we are always bent in some cases ecstatic and our dances are not about perfection or accuracy, it is about merry making and performing together and then you share that moment, that energy and then you go back to socialise. And so these students come from a background where the technique is different; ballet their bodies are up, their central beat is central beat, our central beat is down and so it is a challenge to kind of help them get to terms with this content, and this new vocabulary and technique. And so you have to figure out a safe place for them to learn this new vocabulary and to also assure them that they are not funny because some have that feeling of self-judgement – 'maybe I am looking funny, maybe I am not good, I am not rhythmic', and therefore you are dealing not only with your mind-set but also with their mind set, bodies, their psychology – their psyche. And so as a cross-cultural dance educator it is important to know that these differences exist and to know those differences and to point out those moments that you feel that your students are getting off track, their confidence is just going down, then you just need to jump in or just alternate the format or the template so that you bring them back to the line. (Extract 64)

In line with the triangulation analytical design used in this study, one observes that NYU/MAK-MUT3's views in this interview excerpt reflected the observations and fears expressed by NYUT2 57, NYUS1 58, NCDS3 59, NCDS1 60, NCDS2 61 and NCDS6 62 about the pedagogical challenges of learning Ugandan/African dances.

NYU/MAK-MUT3's remarks in Extract 64 also affirm Edgar and Sedgwick's (2008:6) clarification that recent developments in the study of aesthetics have demonstrated an awareness of the "social and cultural contexts within which art is produced". With reference to Arthur C. Danto, an American philosopher, they also say the manner in which a work of art is interpreted depends heavily on the historical, cultural and political conditions in which it is created (see Chapter Three section 3.4.4). This means that in intercultural collaborations there is need for negotiating different aesthetic orientations and processes of interpreting and creating a work of art. After all, Taylor (2000:83) refers to Doyle (1993) who says that "education is not a neutral process and cannot be denuded of the social, human, and historical elements that make up the process of teaching." Taylor (*ibid.*) adds that Doyle (1993) and Greene (1989) "remind us that each classroom is affected by its own cultural milieu. Students and their teachers bring to the educational event an array of cultural and particular ethnic biases."

In the same vein, NYU/MAK-MUT3's insights in Extract 64 reinforce the views I expressed earlier that intercultural theatre pedagogy calls for patience, compromise and an understanding of how to mediate and negotiate cultural differences. This means that a teacher in an intercultural setting has to be aware not only of the cultural differences that are at stake, but also of the corporeal/physical and psychological bridges that need to be crossed while negotiating those cultural differences. NYU/MAK-MUS1 in Extract 63 equally hinted at these psychological aspects when she talked about the steps she had to take to avoid the New Yorkers feeling insecure in front of children.

In the personal interview I conducted with NYU/MAK-MUT1 I also asked a question on pedagogy and NYU/MAK-MUT1 explained that some Ugandan dances are multi-tasking because they have what is termed as polyrhythm (cf. NCDS6 in Extract 62). She gave an example of the *baakisimba* dance from Buganda (central Uganda). In *baakisimba* the dancer's feet are a bit slow, while the waist or even the bottom is moving fast rhythmically and the torso is still (cf. NCDS1 in Extract 60 and Haven, 2009 in Chapter Five section 5.6.1). All these aspects of the dance have extensive cultural philosophical meanings which cannot be dealt with exhaustively here because of the limitations of space. NYU/PAF-MUT1 went on to say that the singing depends on the Ugandan culture a person is talking about. For example, in Northern Uganda many of the dances involve the whole person, meaning that a

person plays the instrument, sings and sometimes dances at the same time. But in general most Ugandan dances are polyrhythmic.

Conversely, many of the American or Norwegian dances like ballet and modern dance are mono-rhythmic. And because Americans and Norwegians are culturally generally used to that kind of dance structure, that is why NYUT2 57, NYUS1 58 and NCDS6 62 found the Ugandan dances difficult to grasp because there were “so many things going on at the same time”.

It is interesting to observe that the kinds of dance pedagogical orientations and styles between the Norwegian College of Dance, New York and Makerere University students are influenced by the general cultural concepts of time described by Neuliep (2006:317). Neuliep (*ibid.*) describes two general time orientations across world cultures: monochromic and polychromic. Monochromic (M-time) orientations, according to Neuliep (2006), emphasise schedules and the compartmentalisation and segmentation of measurable units of time. He further observes that many M-time cultures are low context and are found in geographical spaces such as the United States, Germany, Scandinavia, Canada, France and most of northern Europe.

Conversely, Neuliep (2006:317) says that polychromic (P-time) orientations see time as much less tangible and stress multiple activities with little emphasis on scheduling. Neuliep (*ibid.*) adds that P-time cultures stress the involvement of people and the completion of tasks as opposed to a strict adherence to schedules. Many P-time cultures are high context and generally include Southern Europe, Latin America, and many African and Middle Eastern countries. All this translates into the polyrhythmic orientation of Ugandan dance, as pointed out by NYU/MAK-MUT1 with the example of the *baakisimba* dance.

Having taken note of Neuliep’s (2006:17) observations, let us look again at NYU/MAK-MUT3’s comments. I asked NYU/MAK-MUT3 about pedagogy in an intercultural setting and he said that

Well, theirs [New Yorkers’] is a bit structured where you have a teacher and a student, the teacher takes lead and the student follows, and when it comes to dance they use something like mirrors, they have recorded music, they use counts, evaluation sheets, they have formation formats and methods, summative, formative, baseline assessment and then they have objectives for each and every lesson. You know everything is just structured and to just teach them in a context that is not that structured is challenging to them because they did not grow in this kind of environment and they did not find this



kind of orientation. And so in terms of pedagogy, I think you have to figure out how to depend on their orientation and teach them in this kind of pedagogy where we use drum signals or whistles for transition, we don't have counts, we don't have mirrors, we learn from one another, we do improvisation you know and so our structure is open ended and so that is one of the things; and the content and the material itself because you grow through dance and you grow in the discipline of dance, that depends on the forms of dances that you interact with. (Extract 65)

NYU/MAK-MUT3 concurs with NYUT2's comment in Extract 57 on the structural differences between dances at New York University and those in Uganda. It is also noticeable that NYU/MAK-MUT3's observations reflect Neuliep's (2006:317) monochromic and polychromic time-orientations. It is because of the above structural and pedagogical differences that some people erroneously argue that dances from the North are structured whereas most African dances are not. But the fact is that all dances – whether from the North or South – have structures but it is their culturally informed structure and pedagogical approach and orientations that differ. From NYU/MAK-MUT3 explanations in extract 64 and 65 and Neuliep's (2006:17) discussion of monochromic and polychromic time-orientations, we are in part able to understand the genesis of North-South intercultural theatre pedagogical differences and dynamics at institutions such as Makerere University. This is related to Suarez-Orozco's (2004:178) argument that culture

provides one with generally shared understandings and models for making of one's experiences. Cultural beliefs present standards of behavior that are internalized over time ... in which one is embedded.

This means that even though one may think that intercultural collaborations could lead to the elimination of particular cultural behaviours and practices of one of the participating groups, from NYU/MAK-MUT3 in Extracts 64 and 65, and NYUT1 Extracts 54, 55, 56 and Suarez-Orozco's (2004:178) views, we note that it is sometimes difficult to overcome culturally inscribed habits. This is in line with Barth's (1969) theory of cultural boundary maintenance, which argues that interaction across cultures does not necessarily lead to the erasure of cultural differences. This is also connected to the concept of symbolic interaction, Pile (1996: 53) says that "symbolic interactionism emphasises both the links between symbols of all kinds and the way in which individuals construct, and subsequently maintain, their self-images". The self-images that Pile refers to are not only symbolic expressions of the individual, but also of the boundaries of their social settings. It therefore seems that what intercultural interaction can lead to is cultural hybridity but not total cultural erosion.

Given the challenges of teaching dance in a cross-cultural setting, I asked NYU/MAK-MUT1 how they managed to teach the New Yorkers Ugandan dances. The teacher explained the cross-cultural teaching process by saying that before they taught any dance, they first gave a brief history of the dance, that is the socio-political, cultural and philosophical background to the dance. This to me signifies the geographical, cultural and historical mediation in the process of learning the Ugandan cultural dances. After this mediation, they would do a warm up, with an emphasis on the body part where the basic motif of the dance is located. After that they would start dancing, putting an emphasis on the footwork, position of the arms and later the movement of the hip. Afterwards the learners would be taught the song(s) and instrumental accompaniment of the dance, beginning with the central beat of the dance with drums and other instruments. This was followed with teaching the learners how to put on that particular dance's costumes. Subsequently the students would be taught a simple choreography of the dance. They would repeat this choreography and the accompaniment until they mastered it. NYU/MAK-MUT1 went on to say that

In order to teach the dances, the dances are broken into different movements and phrases and where necessary use the counting method [which the American are used to] in order for the Americans to learn the dance motifs. We love mother earth, we have bent knees and flat foot. We are closer to earth; we give images of what our dances are all about ... In teaching our dances we use more description and add some French words for their understanding. (Extract 66)

From this excerpt we see the romantic images/symbols or the figurative language used in intercultural pedagogy in order to account for particular dance motifs; we are also informed that in teaching the New Yorkers the Ugandan dances, a mixture of dance pedagogy approaches was used (cf. NYUT1 Extract 54). The Ugandan approach and the American approach plus the 'international' French pedagogical dance terminologies, for example, "*elevé*" (which literally means to rise), "*plié*" (which means "to bend" or a smooth and continuous bending of the knees) and "*grand plié*" (which means bending of the knees with the back straight and aligned with the heels, and the legs are turned out with knees over the feet) are sometimes used to simplify the different body postures and positions.

However, NYU/MAK-MUT1 also noted that even though they used the French terms to facilitate the New Yorkers' understanding of the kind of body posture that was needed for a given Ugandan dance motif, the French terms could not entirely communicate or translate the Ugandan dance body posture needs. In this case, the French terms were used as a starting point and then the teacher used English descriptions and demonstrations in order to achieve

what the Ugandan dances called for. Moreover, the French terms are mainly used in the teaching of Western ballet, whose corporeal protocols and motifs are in most cases different from the Ugandan traditional dances' corporeal/motif requirements.

In the intercultural theatre pedagogical translation process illustrated by NYU/MAK-MUT1, there is a double loss in the culturally symbolic encoding-decoding process. First, there is the verbal loss caused by the limitations of the multiple languages used in the intercultural theatre pedagogical translation process, and secondly there may be pedagogical insufficiencies in translating the corporeal/physical techniques/motifs of a dance for a person with a different culturally embodied body (cf. NCDS1's assertion in Extract 60 that "the challenge was how to teach us how to do it").

Similarly, Hamera (2007:20) asserts that "technique, as a set of protocols for mapping and reading the body, is simultaneously constituted by an overarching, ideal vision of the subjected body, and through the micro-practices which actually inscribe this vision onto specific bodies with varying degrees of success or failure." Maybe that is what some mean when they say that theatre products emanating from intercultural theatre collaborations are fusions which are not inherently authentic, because of the failure of some bodies to register new culturally informed dance protocols (cf. NCDS2's sentiments on inauthenticity in Extract 61).

Curran (2008: 1) writes about theatre translation theory by asking "how does one look at a theatre translator whose linguistic mediation is meant to be both embodied and performed?" Or at the translator who has to pay attention to "the sounds of the original texts, its rhythms and tempo that will be expressed on stage through the actor's body and vocal chords"? And yet for intercultural theatre this is in most cases translation into foreign voices, foreign bodies using foreign languages and pedagogical processes and protocols, which are foreign to some of the participants. Thus Curran (2008:1) notes that "translation as a process [involves] multiple languages speaking to each other and pluralized authenticities" or even inauthenticities (cf. NCDS2 Extract 61; Hamera, 2007:20). Similarly, O'Thomas (2014:120) rightly observes that "there is no such thing as a perfect translation and it is in translation's inherent fallibility that its central core of renewed discovery is located." O'Thomas (2014:122) posits that cultural translation seems inevitable in the globalisation era. However, he adds that this may lead to "cultural contamination" (*ibid.*). In the light of these dynamics,

then, it is not surprising to find that differences in pedagogical orientations are more often than not a bone of contention in intercultural theatre collaborations and processes.

It should also be noted that one of the major pedagogical differences between the Norwegian College of Dance (NCD) and the Department of Performing Arts and Film (PAF) was that while at NCD the teaching is more practically oriented, at PAF theory is mixed with practical. Pribyl and Johnstone (2011:235-236) also observed this pedagogical difference by saying that

the jazz classes taught by the instructor from the NCD employed a ‘skill and drill’ teaching strategy, a legacy that many dance teachers have inherited from their teachers in Western dance technique. In direct contrast, the MDD model for the teaching of dance technique includes both theory and practice and is more fluid in its approach, often involving co-instruction and a communal approach to teaching and learning. Although one instructor may be in charge of teaching the dance, the musician and other members of the teaching staff often help break down the steps and join in with the dancing, whereas in a typical Western style class where the teacher is the expert and lead the class from beginning to end. The MDD students notice that there is little time for questions during the jazz class that keeps everyone moving for the whole class.

Due to the difference in the two institution’s pedagogical approaches, Pribyl and Johnstone (2011:236) quoted one PAF teacher commenting on teaching in the PAF-NCD intercultural setting in one of the evaluation meetings by saying that

I realised that I had to change my teaching strategy when the students did not bring notebooks to class and did not appear to be interested in learning the cultural context in which the dance was situated. I quickly changed my approach and had them up and moving for the entire two hours.

This was because the general instructional approach at NCD is classified as “transmission ideology” and “command-style teaching”. The aim of the NCD teaching is ideally to produce skilled technical dancers and teachers (Pribyl and Johnstone, 2011:236). NYU/MAK-MUT3 (Extract 65) described the transmission style of teaching by saying that it is where “you have a teacher and a student, the teacher takes the lead and the student follows”.

Even though during the 2011, 2012 and 2013 collaborations the NCD teachers and students were a bit reluctant to learn the socio-historical and socio-cultural theoretical context of the Ugandan dances as illustrated by NYU/MAK-MUT1, the March 2014 collaborative session included lectures on Ugandan folk history, African religion and theatre applications in Uganda. But still there were some tensions about the Ugandan approach of teaching traditional dances, as a result of some of the issues that were expressed by NYU/MAK-MUT3 in Extract 65 (cf. Pribyl and Johnstone, 2011:236); for example, whereas in the NCD

approach “the teacher takes the lead and the student follows”, in the Ugandan context, since the country has more than sixty ethnic groups with different traditional dances, sometimes the teacher relies/uses the student from a particular ethnic group in his/her class who knows a particular motif better than the rest to demonstrate it to his/her colleagues, coupled with co-instruction and the communal teaching orientations that Pribyl and Johnstone (2011:235-236) hinted at. To some NCD participants this seemed to be unprofessional behaviour and showed lack of mastery of the subject by the Ugandan teacher. Also, Western dances like ballet and modern dance call for uniformity and precision of motifs by all performers, and yet most Ugandan dances are/were originally communal dances, which are/were not all about strict uniformity, perfection or accuracy of body motifs among the performers and sometimes allow/allowed improvisation (cf. NYU/MAK-MUT3 in Extract 65; Mbowa, 2000:204). The slight variations in dance motifs amongst Ugandan participants was therefore confusing to the NCD participants, who kept wondering about the right technique/motif amongst the many ‘inaccuracies’ that were exhibited by Ugandans. In part, it was because of cultural translation challenges and the above-mentioned pedagogical differences that NCDS1 noted in Extract 60: “the challenge was how to teach us how to do it”.

However, even though in the New York-Makerere collaboration the participating groups had learnt how to accommodate the pedagogical differences among them, in the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration it seemed there was still a need for intercultural communication and understanding in order to loosen the existing intercultural pedagogical tensions.

What was also observed, especially from the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration, is that the teachers and students from NCD had a different perspective on the ideal performing body from that of PAF. Due to NCD’s “skill and drill” pedagogical orientation, coupled with the Western perspectives of an athletic body orientation for performers, there was a feeling among the NCD team that the PAF participants lacked the physical bodies, stamina and resilience of “real” performers. In this regard, one of the NCD students commented on the challenges the PAF students faced during the collaboration, saying that “they were not flexible. And they could not point”. While in a personal interview NCDT1 said that he felt that some Makerere participants seemed to lack determination towards developing the practice of dance. At the same time, to NCDT1, some Makerere University participants seemed to lack an understanding that dance is a discipline where one

needs to be physically fit in mind and body, because the body is an instrument for a dancer.

NCDT1 went on to say that

but of course in a culture which I am beginning to understand where dance is not very important because it is kind of understood that everybody can do it for fun and not as a subject to be studied and written about and things like that, I think once people get informed that dance is also a career, a profession it will be much more better for the students. (Extract 67)

In part, NCDT1's observations were informed by the differences in the pedagogical orientations between NCD and PAF, and the incompatible programme structure and its effects on the Makerere student participants. NCDT1's observations may also have been influenced by what Zegarac and Pennington (2000: 166-67) called "pragmatic transfer" (see Chapter Two section 2.3.3.5); NCDT1 was analysing the Makerere situation based on his experience in Europe where dance is taken seriously as a profession and students enthusiastically enrol in dance academies from a very young age. It also seems that NCDT1's intercultural comparative assessment psychologically affected him as a teacher in an intercultural setting and caused him acculturation stress.<sup>22</sup> But at the same time we see from the interview extract that NCDT1 was starting to appreciate the differences in cultural orientation between the Norwegians and Ugandans towards the practice and teaching of dance.

My interpretations above are not meant to totally disqualify NCDT1's observations. The disorientation of the Makerere dance students that NCDT1 commented on was partly informed by the general educational structure of Uganda as a country. Generally the performing arts in primary and secondary schools in Uganda are offered as extracurricular activities, hence influencing the students' mind-set towards the arts. At Makerere University, during admission, there are no auditions for most of the performing arts courses, except for the Diploma Special Entry Examinations. Some of the subject combinations involving performing arts subjects are sometimes given to students by the Admissions Office, but they did not apply for them as their first choice, as long as they qualify for university admission based on the grading of their second or third choice subject combinations. All these issues

---

<sup>22</sup> Neuliep (2006:417) explains acculturation stress saying that "most people experience a degree of stress and strain when they enter a culture different from their own. Acculturation is often marked by physical and psychological changes that occur as a result of the adaptation required to function in a new and different cultural context. People adapting to new cultures face changes in their diet; climate; housing; communication; role prescriptions; media consumption; and the myriad rules, norms, and values of a new and (relatively) dissimilar culture ... The stress associated with such changes, known as acculturation stress, is marked by a reduction in one's physical and mental health".

definitely have an impact on the way some students relate to the practice of performing arts. Consequently, there has recently been a proposal that performing arts courses at Makerere University should involve mandatory auditions so that applicants who have a passion for the arts are enrolled.

Furthermore, for a long time in Uganda, training in the performing arts has always faced negative attitudes from the public, where the view prevails that one does not need training in the performing arts as long as one has natural talent, as NCDT1 observed in Extract 67. At the same time, one should not forget the colonial legacy that Macpherson (2000:24, 25) and Mbowa (2000:208) highlighted (see Chapter One of this thesis). The colonial perceptions of Ugandan theatre seem to be still haunting Ugandans' perceptions about the performing arts up to this day, when many still think that white-collar jobs are better than cultural professions that call for the use of physical energy or when some university students still think that doing dance/performing arts courses is "beneath their dignity" (Macpherson (2000:24, 25) (cf. Pribyl and Johnstone 2011:231-232). Another perception about the performing arts in Uganda is that it is a field for academic failures looking for some refuge because they cannot excel in other academic fields. Such attitudes both at the university and amongst the Ugandan public in a way influence the students' attitudes towards the performing arts professions in general. Such perceptions about the arts in Uganda mean that intercultural theatre collaborations at Makerere University also involve the mediation of cultural and societal attitudes towards the performing arts in Uganda itself.

However, going back to the pedagogical differences and challenges, the PAF students I interviewed admitted that the "skill and drill" approach of the NCD instructors and the workload of the intercultural collaboration was tiring and draining, since they were not used to this kind of instructional approach. Nevertheless, they said they were adapting to the instruction and beginning to enjoy the new predominantly practical mode of instruction.

As far as differences in the perceptions of performer's body are concerned, which NCDT1 also hinted at, Pribyl and Johnstone (2011:229-230) recorded similar views saying that

The dance programmes at NYU and the NCD require that the body be trained to be strong, mobile and conversant in a variety of dance techniques, which one could argue is a Western construct of how the dancing body should be trained ... Within this Western construct of what defines the dancing body, the dance students at Makerere University could be seen, and are often perceived by outsiders, as lacking in 'technical proficiency'. However, considering the athleticism needed to perform traditional



Ugandan dances such as *kizino*, one should question the notion of what is defined as ‘technically proficient’ and who defines ‘athletic’.

This is similar to Counsell and Wolf’s (2004: 123) observation discussed in Chapter Three section 3.4.4 that the body can also be an institutionalised entity which can

remind viewers of the outside of the fiction, juxtaposing the body which is signified, performed, with the real, signifying body of the performer. This deals primarily with the cultural, signified body, that which is performed. The current, very widespread critical focus on the culturally coded body is informed by work from a different range of disciplines. Recent sociology has highlighted the body’s institutional and discursive construction.

Similarly, NCDS3 shared with me a situation that was faced by one of her NCD colleagues during the course of the collaboration:

In Norway, the ideal body is not to be fat ... it is to be skinny and thin, and down here [in Uganda] it seems to be okay to be fat and have shapes. So somebody was telling another person ‘oh you are the fattest among the group’ and in Norway that is very, very offensive. So the person was very offended. But I think she also found out that it is different down here, but she was a bit hurt. (Extract 68)

In this regard, Petersen (2007:49) cites Popenoe (2004), who made a broad observation on societal perceptions of the human body:

in the vast majority of human societies body ideals tend towards a larger body size, especially for women, which is associated with health rather than illness, while in the contemporary affluent West, tall streamlined thin bodies are most highly valued and are seen as signifying health, success and happiness.

This shows how different societies have different perceptions of and sensibilities about the ideal human body. Such perceptual cultural differences are some of the issues that need to be mediated and negotiated in intercultural theatre exchanges.

Nonetheless, one can hardly say that Makerere dance students were not fit, as Pribyl and Johnstone (2011) put it, as Ugandan dances such as *kizino* and *ekitaguriro* require an energetic and resilient body and mind in order to be performed. Incidentally, many of the NYU and NCD participants I interviewed (for example, NCDS3 and NCDS6) were amazed by the kind of energy, resilience and mental agility needed to perform Ugandan traditional dances, which are polyrhythmic in nature.

Conversely, when I asked whether it was easy for the Makerere participants to learn the American dances in the New York-Makerere collaboration, the responses were varied. For example, NYU/MAK-MUS2 said that “when they [New Yorkers] are teaching us they are too

fast; one, two three, four, five. And they think that we learn like that". What NYU/MAK-MUS2 was referring to here is the counting method and speed that was used by the New York University instructors in illustrating the modern dance motifs and moves that they were using to teach the Ugandan participants. This was also the same feeling among the Makerere participants in the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration. To most Ugandans the American and Norwegian pace of teaching modern dance was too fast and gymnastic in approach. And since the Western dance motifs also called for an elevated body stance, Ugandans who were mostly used to dances which needed a relaxed or bent body had to do some physical adaptation, which was challenging.

In the light of the structural differences between the Ugandan and Northern/Western dances, I asked NYUS1 how Ugandans were coping with learning the dances, and the response was that "American dances are set and Ugandans were struggling". In the same vein, NYUS2 in a way concurred with NYUS1 when she said that "I was impressed by how they were so willing to learn though they had challenges in this. But their willingness to learn was impressive".

With regard to the Stanford-Makerere collaboration, the negotiation of the difference in theatrical pedagogical approaches was evidenced when another Stanford University artistic director (SUAD2) was quoted in the *Stanford Drama Press Release* saying that "a great challenge during the project was discovering how best to produce the work that would translate in the performance language of Uganda while simultaneously embracing our own, primarily American, theatrical styles". This simultaneous need to look for pedagogical approaches that would cater for the performance styles of the co-creating groups in an intercultural creative setting created a sense of indeterminacy and hesitation in the execution of the choreographic or directorial work. When one looks at the segmented plot line of *Beyond My Circle* (as discussed in Chapter Five section 5.6.1), one notes that this was essentially an American style. That is because most Makerere participants were used to the conventional play or performance plotting, where there is at least an evident beginning, middle and an end, and a central thematic concern. This is also generally the Ugandan theatre audience orientation to theatre. But *Beyond My Circle* was multidisciplinary and multi-medial with no central theme, and it was joined together by soft instrumental rhythms played on Ugandan drums, a xylophone and tube fiddle. But, perhaps the segmented plotline was better, given the spirit of interculturalism and the performance's central focus on human cross-

cultural interaction. If one were to proceed along this line of analysis, then Brook (1995:29) puts it better when he argued that “one is not bound by a unity of place, a unity of time, when the emphasis is on human relationships. What holds our attention is the interplay between one person and another”.

However, the pedagogical differences discussed above show the complexities of intercultural collaborations/performances, which were discussed in the literature review in Chapter Three section 3.3.1 In that regard, one could refer again to Bhabha (1994:20), who argues that cultural multiplicity always shows “indeterminacy” and a struggle between alternatives or what he calls “hybridity”. Therefore, what SUAD2 was quoted saying in the *Stanford Drama Press Release* (2009) for *Beyond My Circle* illustrates the silent or visible dilemma or Bhabha’s (1994:20) “indeterminacy” in the struggle for each group to be culturally visible in the intercultural performance (cf. Haus, 1995:71; Appadurai, 1993:295; Androutsopoulos, 2010:204 in Chapter Three section 3.3). When the middle point of co-cultural visibility that SUAD2 was grappling with is found in such intercultural-cultural performances, that is when notions such as “in-betweenness”, “hybridity” and questions about performance authenticity that characterise intercultural collaborations and performances come into play. Commenting on the issue of authenticity of intercultural collaborations, SU/MAK-MUT1 said that “performance is dynamic; none of us has an idea of what authenticity is. We all create our own authenticity where we are. Circumstances change, so our relationships change and our relationships with our environment change.” SU/MAK-MUT1 further noted that

the moment we have intercultural we bring in something and lose something. America is a place of diversity and Uganda is a place of diversity. And when I am teaching the different dances from Uganda, I don’t come from all these different tribes, but there are basics of teaching such dances, say the dance rhythm, so the issue of authenticity is fluid. Every performance has its own authenticity in its given time and environment. (Extract 69)

Similarly, SU/MAK-MUS1 commented on the issue of authenticity with specific reference to the Bakiga, an ethnic group from South Western Uganda:

the fact that it is a collaboration, critics should not expect authenticity if it is a collaboration. It can never be the real *kikiga* dance from Kabale. If one is to learn the *kikiga* dance it may take a whole year and if it is a cultural exchange one should not expect to have a performance to be totally Ugandan and totally American in a collaboration. (Extract 70)

Lei (2006:1-2) in her book *Operatic China: Staging Chinese Identity Across the Pacific* states that

Cultures change, but tokens seemingly don't; tokens offer an imaginary eternity for the culture, which is essential for identity performance. ... All identities – be they cultural, ethnic or national – owe a great deal to performance. Such staged identity is essential in any “contact zone” of international negotiation or multicultural collision.

What this means is that in most cases performances deal with tokens or symbols of culture to signify the cultures of the people or groups represented. Since in intercultural performance spaces questions of authenticity usually emerge, then intercultural performances are symbolic performances that involve the enactment of performative tokens of the cultural groups represented. Commenting on the dilemma of interculturalism, Bhabha (1994:20) argues that “claims to inherent originality or purity of cultures are untenable.” That same view is repeated by Lo and Gilbert (2002:32), who note that Jonathan Dollimore (1991) reminds us that that “to cross is not only to traverse, but to mix (as in to cross-breed) and to contradict (as in to cross someone)”. All this shows the complexity and contradictions and/or dynamics of intercultural practice that interculturalists have to negotiate and mediate (cf. NCDS1 in Extract 60). To use Blommaert's (2005:69-74) term, “orders of indexicality” in intercultural performance terms means that there is always a need to negotiate what I will call each participating group's orders of performance indexicality, so that each group's cultural signs are equally visible in the final intercultural performance. This is more often than not psychologically challenging for those concerned with choreographic or directorial work in collaborative intercultural projects, as SUAD2 mentions in the *Stanford Drama Press Release* (2009) for *Beyond My Circle*.

Regarding the difference in pedagogical approaches, Haven (2009) quoted a Stanford University teacher (SUT1)'s perception and interpretation of a particular scenario in one of the play-devising workshops:

[SUT1] noted that he bought pencils and paper to distribute to Ugandans, who live in an oral, rather than written, culture: ‘Our kids have it in their backpacks. It's what we do. It's not what they do. It wasn't just from poverty.’

The above quotation embodies the perceived cultural and practical differences in pedagogical approaches between Makerere and Stanford University. However, what SUT1 was describing may have been the result of the different meanings, interpretations and approaches attached by the participants from the two collaborating institutions to the notion of a performance based on “improvisation”.

It should be noted that from the project inception, the participants were told that the performance was going to be improvisational. To Makerere participants, the meaning they associated with improvisation was that the performance was going to be based on outright oral creation. However, unknown to the Makerere participants, the Stanford directors wanted the improvised material to be written down, which can be termed a structured improvisation. It so happened that during one of the performance-improvising workshops, the participants were told to write down what they were going to contribute toward a particular theme and it was then that some of the Makerere participants were caught off guard with no books or pens at hand, and that is when SUT1 had to step in with the offer of pencils and paper.

However, even though SUT1's comment typifies differences in pedagogical approaches, it at the same time shows how misreading and misunderstanding of meanings of conceptual categories can lead to cross-cultural misunderstanding. This relates to Spencer-Oatey's (2013:52) observation that in cross-cultural interaction "effective communication depends not only on the accurate translation of linguistic meaning, but also on the grasp of pragmatic meaning (which entails the understanding of background assumptions, implicit messages, etc.)." This underscores the importance of clarity of communication in cross-cultural or intercultural interactions, otherwise unintended intercultural conflict may result.

To introduce another interpretive perspective to the above scenario, one can visualise the power, inequality and cultural difference implied by positioning one culture as being oral and another as subscribing to the writing tradition. Blommaert (2005:73) concurs that while performing language use, speakers display both the immediate views they have in mind and non-immediate complexes of their words' perceived meanings. Here, comparing and contrasting the writing tradition with the oral orientation recalls Smith's (1999: 28-29, 36-37) argument that "writing or literacy, in a very traditional sense of the word ... has been viewed as the mark of a superior civilisation" (cf. NYUT1 Extract 5 in Chapter Five section 5.6.1). In the same vein, one can clearly see the "them and us" categorisation, and at the same time faintly register the "rich versus poor" trajectory in SUT1's situational interpretation quoted by Haven (2009). This last impression can in part be accounted for by again looking at the general socio-economic Western media narrative about poverty in Africa as portrayed in *Beyond My Circle* (see discussion in Chapter Five section 5.6.1). It is worth recalling Blommaert's (2005:34) comment here that critical discourse analysis "rightly focuses on

institutional environments as key sites of research into the connections between language, power, and social processes”.

SU/MAK-MUT1 elaborated on the different approaches to work by the Stanford and Makerere participants when she said that

in Uganda there is an approach of saying we will work with the resources we have and for them they believe that they will work if the resources they need will be available and if they are not it creates tension in the whole group. ... What is considered a priority in one culture is not a priority in another. (Extract 71)

From this we see the cultural difference and sensibilities in the materials at hand approach to theatrical work processes. Because of this, maybe that is why the Stanford group had to come with lighting equipment to cater for the intercultural performance in Uganda. From my experience, I have seen people from the West being surprised by how theatre practitioners in Uganda are able to stage theatre productions with minimal technical, material or financial resources and this also applied to the Stanford group. However, the materials at hand approach towards work between the Makerere and the Stanford group in this case can be accounted for by looking at the technological and economic disparities between the USA and Uganda.

From the above discussion we again see how concepts of cultural difference are enacted in intercultural interactions. The discussion also exemplifies the multidimensional process of constructing and maintaining the “them and us” rift or “otherness” in intercultural processes. In view of this, and in line with the sociological dimension of this study, it is worth noting Bourdieu’s (1989: 18) point that

sociology must include a sociology of the perception of the social world, that is, a sociology of the construction of visions of the world which themselves contribute to the construction of this world. But, having constructed social space, we know that these points of view, as the word itself suggests, are views taken from a certain point, that is, from a determinate position within social space. And we also know that there will be different or even antagonistic points of view, since points of view depend on the point from which they are taken, since the vision that every agent has of the space depends on his or her position in that space.

The implication here is that there will always be other points of view and the presence of “otherness” during cross-cultural encounters. However, because of the difference in pedagogical approaches, being rigid about compromising in order to find an intercultural middle ground of operation and interaction can lead to personality clashes in a cross-cultural encounter. When this occurs, it may lead to interpersonal apportioning of blame for project

failure and prejudicial judgments of each of the persons involved in the misunderstanding. This means that if one is involved in an intercultural collaboration, one should be able to accommodate other points of view, however different they may be from one's own socio-economic, political or cultural sensibilities. Hanks (1991:15) describes the context for pedagogy in an intercultural theatre setting as follows:

learning is a process that takes place in a participation framework, not in an individual mind. This means, among other things, that it is mediated by the differences of perspective among the coparticipants. It is the community, or at least those participating in the learning context, who 'learn' under this definition. Learning is, as it were, distributed among coparticipants, not a one-person act.

This is because intercultural collaboration is not only about negotiating physical cultural boundaries, but also involves mediating cross-cultural multidimensional point of views.

Another pedagogical difference between the collaborating parties concerned the accreditation of the students' participation in the collaborations. The collaboration activities were incorporated into the student participants' grades at New York University and Stanford University. For example, when I asked NYUT2 how New York University supported students who were involved in the collaboration, there was also reference to the course accreditation. NYUT2 said "they support financially, medical support, security and offer the students credits when they go back. So they make sure they have entered an academic profile on this course. And they enter it into the system when they go onto this programme" (see Extract 3 in Chapter Five section 5.5). Even though this was being done at New York University, at Makerere University the selected students participated in the collaborations mainly for the intercultural educational experience and not for academic credits. This aspect led to some intricate power dynamics among the students themselves.

Pribyl and Johnstone (2011:234) commented on the power imbalance evident in the pedagogical differences in programme accreditation between New York and Makerere University:

This imbalance of power is further exacerbated by the different motivations and expectations of the collaborative partners. For example, as the collaborative programme with NYU is an accredited Study Abroad Programme, the New York University students receive course credits and are graded for their work and the classes they teach. While the Makerere University students are required to submit a written report to their dance lecturer, the programme does not count as a course per se and students are not marked for their participation and performance during the running of the two-week collaboration.



Pribyl and Johnstone (*ibid.*) refer in the same vein to one Makerere participant saying that

It seems like the grade is high pressure for those New York students to take charge in the teaching and our students [Makerere students], they will just back down, that's how they are. And maybe it's colonialism, maybe it's because [the New Yorkers] are louder, they talk faster and [the Ugandan students] think, ugh, you're at NYU, you must know more than me. You're a graduate student. I'm just an undergraduate student. I mean, I'm sure there's a lot of inferiority complex going on with the students as well.

The same scenario was evident during the Stanford-Makerere University collaboration, because it was observed that the collaboration was following particular Stanford University guidelines coupled with the academic needs of Stanford University students. In that regard, it should be noted that *Beyond My Circle* was directed by two drama PhD students of Stanford University. When one peruses through the PhD Drama degree requirements at <http://www.stanford.edu/dept/drama/phd.html>, it is notable that some of the mandatory courses for PhD drama students are Performance Making, Production and Directing, which would lead to staging a fully developed production in consultation with a member of faculty. Moreover, one of the directors had research interests in cross-cultural performance. Therefore the process and execution of *Beyond My Circle* aptly met the Stanford student directors' academic needs and departmental student requirements. And because of the PhD student directors' study obligations, they had in one way or another to take the upper hand in the directorial decisions of the performance, thereby unsettling the sharing of power as far as the execution of the project was concerned (cf. SU/MAK-MUS1 in Extracts 10 and 11 in Chapter Five section 5.6.1).

The need to take control of the performance-devising process was also mirrored in the *Beyond My Circle* press release, when SUAD1 was quoted saying "in many ways our order was tall for the Ugandan Project .... We were tasked with developing a sense of trust and community amongst a diverse cadre of individuals and, within a short time frame, creating a meaningful experience on stage and offstage."

Another challenge in collaborations and pedagogy is heightened egos of some participants because of their roles or positions in the collaboration. However, one has to subdue one's ego and be able to work with others. Feelings of self-importance in a co-participatory intercultural setting can only worsen intercultural misunderstandings. Frantz Fanon (1967:25) observed that "every dialect is a way of thinking", thereby acknowledging the distinct "discursive universes" that can exist even within what is considered the same language.

The revelations shared by the different interviewees in this section exemplify the complexity of intercultural collaborations. They show that intercultural collaborations are a synergy of mediations at different levels. Navigating, mediating and adapting to cultural, structural, psychological and geographical aspects of difference, as the discussion has shown, is part and parcel of the dynamics of intercultural theatre pedagogy. Therefore an understanding of the different facets under which interculturalism operates is crucial if one is to have successful intercultural engagements. All this ultimately points to Martin and Nakayama's (2008:79-84) concept of the "differences-similarities dialectic", which was discussed in Chapter Two section 2.3.3.6. Briefly, this dialectic encourages us to know that there are similarities and differences in intercultural communication settings and that there are "real and important differences between various cultural groups". This means that part of the dynamics of interculturalism is the negotiation and mediation of these differences in order to come to a common understanding. The absence of such a dialectical engagement would exacerbate intercultural misunderstanding and conflict.

collaboration and contestation". The intercultural negotiation in "in between spaces" is at the same time said to be enacted in a creative and interactive "hybrid or third space",<sup>23</sup>

#### **7. 4 Copyright issues**

In section 7.3.3 Extract 52 NYU/MAK-MUT1 hinted at the issue of copyright, which seemed to be another area of contention in the collaborations, as we are going to see below.

We noted that NYU/MAK-MUT1's observation on the copyright issues related to the material generated out of the intercultural collaborations. Since 2007 the New York University delegation has been recording and seemingly constructing an archive of their activities in Uganda at their home university in what we termed as knowledge transfer. Since they were the current funders of the collaboration, it seemed they were under no obligation to share the materials recorded during their intercultural interaction or even discuss issues concerning copyright.

---

<sup>23</sup> Martin, Snow and Torrez (2011:300) say that in the "hybrid or third space, conceptions of differences, as divisive binary oppositions, are rejected in favor of 'both/and also' notions of a hybrid space. In this hybrid space partial understandings, held within each of the oppositions, give way to realignment: a going beyond customary boundaries". They further say that in the "openness of third space, ensuing creative combinations and restructuring of ideas can provide new alternatives to oppositional thinking. Fundamental to these perspectives are understandings of third space as socially produced through discursive and social interactions". Martin, Snow and Torrez (*ibid.*) also say that third spaces are also seen as sites for collaboration as well as innovation and at the same time are referred to as collective third space, in which both joint and individual sense making occurs.

However, it also seemed as if Ugandan participants had never openly discussed their reservations about the issue of copyright with their New York counterparts. And in other instances some Ugandan participants seemed not to care about the recordings, because they were living with and/or within the culture of their origin and with this sense of proximity there seemed no urgent need to possess the recorded material.

Besides that, other Ugandan participants said that they had always requested for copies of the recordings, but their New York counterparts were always reluctant to share the materials. However, in the January 2014 collaboration session, I was told there was sharing of the recorded materials since one of the Ugandan participants was assigned the responsibility of recording the intercultural activities. But still, there seemed a need for dialogue in order to solve the copyright misunderstanding.

What was happening in the New York-Makerere collaboration concerning copyright occurred almost in a similar fashion in the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaboration. The Norwegian college of Dance had been recording the proceedings in the workshops and the intercultural performances at The Uganda National Theatre since 2011. However, Makerere University participants were not allowed to do the same by the NCD side. In doing this, at the time of fieldwork, the NCD side was referring to the stringent Norwegian copyright laws, and the fact that the NCD instructors were international professional choreographers who hold the copyright of the material they choreograph which is staged by the students in the final intercultural performance. From this we get an impression that the status and positioning of NCD teachers was higher than that of the Makerere teachers in the context that the NCD teachers were more internationally experienced than their Makerere counterparts. This spoken or unspoken positioning of instructors in the collaboration may have contributed to the power dynamics in the collaboration.

On the issue of copyright for the material generated out of the collaboration, the stringent Norwegian copyright law in this case was compared to the laxity in the implementation of Ugandan copyright law. Therefore the NCD group somehow felt that the material would not be secure if it were left in some Ugandan participants' hands. It is true that there is laxity in implementing the copyright law in Uganda and there has often been infringement of peoples' copyright. However, some Makerere participants wondered why a non-profit intercultural educational engagement should have such stringent copyright reservations and others

wondered whether NCD had hidden commercial interests. Moreover, Spencer-Oatey (2013:246, refers to Dunn & Wallace, 2008) stating that “educational and commercial goals may not be fully teased out in initial negotiations, thus leading to ‘conflicting interests and a mismatch of expectations’ between the institutions”. To some, this seemed to imply that the NDC collaboration leadership tended to have forgotten that the Makerere participants were co-participants and co-creators of the material that was generated out of the collaboration who should have shared the intellectual rights equally. All this made the NCD’s copyright actions ethically questionable.

Elsewhere, such copyright issues were recently hinted at by Professor Mukadasi Buyinza, the Makerere University Director of Research and Graduate Training in his remarks at the annual review meeting of the research cooperation between Makerere University and the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA). Writing about the foregoing meeting, Anguyo (2014) reported that Buyinza observed that “many foreign researchers had not given credit to Ugandan dons on patents over joint innovations”.

The situation that existed during the time of fieldwork implied that if any member of the Makerere group wanted to use any material from the collaboration, he/she needed to first get clearance from the NCD project leadership – a scenario that arguably turned the Makerere participants into subalterns and not mutual and equal partners in the intercultural collaboration. All this problematised the dialogic implication of the term ‘intercultural theatre’ as discussed in Chapter Two, because to some Makerere participants the copyright impasse symbolised patronisation and neo-colonial exploitation.

Like the New York experience, the NCD copyright matter reflected the performance of power in the execution of the intercultural collaborations. Since New York University and the Norwegian College of Dance were the funders of the collaborations they were engaged with, this ideally legitimatised their custodial role over copyright. After all, Roscigno (2011:352) argues that “any consideration of power should begin with reflection on the basis through which it is derived”. It also reflected Elteren’s (2003:172) view that “although intercultural contact zones are inherently dialogical, this does not mean that exchanges always take place on a level playing field”. Similarly, Blommaert (2005:44) argues that dialogic engagement does not mean an exchange of meanings between co-operative, willing, and bona fide partners, who offer a wide space for negotiating meaning.

Furthermore, even though the Uganda National Theatre has a policy of having all productions which are staged there recorded, I was informed that both the New York University and the Norwegian College of Dance teams had always contested the recording of the intercultural productions.

However, the Stanford-Makerere collaboration was different. After the performance of *Beyond My Circle*, each participant was given a copy of the production. And during the collaborative performance at the Uganda National Theatre, management at the theatre was allowed to record the production. In addition, in order to balance the exchange, Stanford University funded the Makerere team to go to USA and stage the intercultural performance there. This in part shows that the Stanford group was cognisant of the need for not devolving this North-South intercultural collaboration into “an exercise in imperialist objectification” (as noted by SUAD1 in section 7.2).

## 7.5 Conflicting project time

The time during which a given project is executed can sometimes create some discomfort for project participants. The Stanford group came to Uganda when both Stanford and Makerere University students were on their holidays. However, when the Makerere group visited Stanford, it was school time for all the participants and this created tension amongst the participants. The Stanford participants had to attend classes and also find time for the performance rehearsals, while the Makerere teachers and students who participated in the collaboration had to sacrifice their teaching and learning responsibilities respectively during the time they were at Stanford University. In line with this, SU/PAF-MUS1 noted that “they [Stanford group] came when we were in holiday and we went when it was term time and I almost missed a test” (Extract 72). This means that the time of such projects should always be critically considered by project organisers in order to avoid the stress and strain that project participants face due to unfavourable project timing.

What happened during the Stanford-Makerere collaboration also affected the Makerere-Norwegian College of Dance collaboration. Because of incompatible programme times, in the 2013 collaboration, students at Makerere University had to follow the one-month intercultural programme with divided allegiances. That is because while they attended the intercultural collaboration programme, other elective subjects that were part of their studies at the department of Performing Arts and Film and other departments at Makerere University were continuing without their participation. This in some cases led to friction between the students and teachers in other departments who thought that the students were intentionally dodging classes. On the other hand, some NCD instructors thought that the PAF students were careless time keepers, undisciplined or unreliable. However, this was different for the NCD students, since the intercultural collaboration is compulsory for all first-year students. In relation to this challenge, one respondent NCD/MAK-MUS2 said that “The time of the programme is a big challenge. We are [students] questioning whether next year we will participate in the project”. (Extract 73)

Secondly, the intercultural programme could not accommodate all students who were taking dance at Makerere University because of limitation of space to accommodate a big dance class, and the inadequate funding to cater for the participants’ welfare. And since NCD was funding the collaboration, they determined the number of PAF students who could participate

in the intercultural collaboration, because of the financial implications. For example, out of the more than 50 students who do dance as a subject at the PAF department, only 11 were chosen to participate in the 2013 collaboration session. Sometimes, this meant that some dance teachers at Makerere University were also affected, because they had to lead workshops in the intercultural programme and at the same time plan to teach other students who were not participating in the programme. Because the programme could not absorb all students who take dance classes at Makerere (as opposed to the NCD students, as the entire class of 31 was able to participate), some respondents said that this turned the programme into an avenue of selective inclusion and exclusion in intercultural dance pedagogy at Makerere University.

However, in the March 2014 session, some steps were taken to rectify some of the issues that emerged during the 2013 session. The Makerere University side, for example, was told to choose 20 students who could participate in the collaboration. But still this was made difficult because of the timetable complications. After careful analysis of the students' and teachers' timetables some had to be dropped as the programme schedule was being drawn. This left only 11 students who could meet at least 75% of the project's time requirements. The exchange timetable was designed in a manner that allowed students to attend their lectures and do their course works at least up to the time of dress rehearsals.

These complexities and discord within the intercultural collaborations at the PAF department – especially during the Norwegian College of Dance and the Department of Performing Arts and Film collaboration – were in part created by the programme restructuring and adjustment at Makerere University in 2010. During that period programmes which had limited enrolment and were deemed 'not economically viable' were frozen by the University administration. Since the Bachelor of Dance programme was attracting very few students, all its courses were turned into elective subjects which could be offered to any eligible and interested student in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. This made it very difficult for the department of Performing Arts and Film (PAF) to smoothly incorporate the dance-oriented activities of the collaboration into the departmental timetable, because the prospective participating students were scattered in different departments at the university, where they had other elective courses. This points to an urgent need for programme structural adjustment at Makerere in order to reduce the strain and stress that the incompatible intercultural theatre programme is causing to participants.



Because of the incompatibility challenges of the collaboration during the time of fieldwork, there was a proposal to start a joint Bachelor's Degree in Dance managed by the Department of Performing Arts and Film of Makerere University and The Norwegian College of Dance, whereby the students to be admitted to this programme were to undergo rigorous auditions. This reflects Altbach and Knight's (2007:291) argument that "internationalization includes the policies and practices undertaken by academic systems and institutions — and even individuals — to cope with the global academic environment."

The New York-Makerere intercultural programme did not face such problems of timing, because the collaboration has over the years been taking place in January, usually vacation time for both universities.

## **7.6 Negotiating with the elements of a new geographical space**

When one travels to a new geographical space, there is a likelihood of facing challenges of negotiating and navigating some of the physical and climatic elements that characterise that particular space. Since Norway is in the Arctic Circle, NCDT3 told me that it was a challenge for the Norwegian College of Dance students to adapt to the tropical environment in Uganda. Because Uganda is fairly hot, during the dance rehearsals the Norwegian students had to drink a lot of water compared to what they usually took in Norway to avoid acute dehydration. This was coupled with the challenges of getting used to new types of food which made some students digestively upset in the first few days of their arrival. The same issues were also observed among the New York and Stanford University participants.

The above experiences are confirmed by my personal experience during my academic stay in Stellenbosch. The most vivid example is my experience of psychologically and physically negotiating the cold winter nights. Before I came to Stellenbosch, I had occasionally heard about hot water bottles which were being used to warm premature babies in some Ugandan hospitals but I had never seen one. However, while in Stellenbosch, in order to warm-up my ice-cold bed during the winter season, I was introduced to sleeping with two hot water bottles for the first time in my life!

The above scenarios imply that when we are in a new geographical space we have to psychologically and physically negotiate and adapt to the new environment for our own

survival. This also problematises the notions “global village” and “world culture homogenisation.”

## **7.7 Revisiting the global issues implied by Makerere University’s intercultural collaborations**

One of the assumptions of this study was that the circumstances and the participants’ experiences in the interactive intercultural theatre collaborations and performances can be viewed as microcosms of intercultural communication and global interactive cultural encounters. On the basis of this assumption, I believe that interactive intercultural theatre encounters and performances could be used to examine the concept of globalisation and its accompanying notion of world cultural homogenisation and this was one of the objectives of this study. Moreover, Blommaert (2005:16) states that “it is, and always has been, an approach in which the analysis of small phenomena is set against an analysis of big phenomena”.

Bharucha (2000) made a similar attempt of analysing globalisation through theatre practise basing on his experiences in India. However, my analysis is based on a Ugandan experience. My analysis is also different from Bharucha’s treatise because I directly involve the voices and views of the participants in the North-South intercultural collaborations about the globalisation phenomenon. The objective of this section is aptly put by Blommaert (2005:17), who said that “my aim here is not to provide a comprehensive analysis, but to identify and illustrate various positions from which we can analyse social facts of globalisation”.

In my discussion of the fieldwork data in Chapter Five, Six and elsewhere in Chapter Seven, I have been commenting on the global implications of particular issues in the North-South intercultural collaborations at Makerere University. That is why this section can be termed as a recap/re-visitation of those issues.

There is no doubt that the internet is one of the instruments that is used to bridge the geographical communication rift between the North and South intercultural collaborators and coordinators in this era of globalisation. However, unlike in the North where internet speed is high and reliable, internet connections in countries in the South such as Uganda are sometimes quite slow and there are frequent power outages which sometimes hamper smooth communication. This issue was highlighted by the New York-Makerere collaboration

coordinators and by the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere participants. NCD/MAK-MUT1 commented on the communication challenges between people in developed countries and those in countries such as Uganda which have less developed internet capacity:

they [partners from the North] do a lot of communication on email and once they touch the button and email and it says sent, they are very sure that you have got the message and are expecting you to communicate. Like for myself I have had to subscribe for my personal email service which of course depends on when I am able to pay for the service because the university internet service is not very reliable; in fact right now I don't have it on my computer and I have been on line, so I have to use my own funding to foot that. So sometimes they would send a mail and sometimes there is no power and sometimes when you get it, it is already delayed. (Extract 74)

Some staff members at Makerere University are sometimes forced to have more than one email address (say Hotmail and Gmail), which they try to check as much as possible so that they do not miss important project email communications. Others go a step further to give the people they are collaborating with their Ugandan mobile telephone contacts so that when their counterparts from the North write emails, they can at the same time send a text message to their mobile phones informing them to check their emails for some more detailed information on a particular issue. This illustrates the technological divide between some countries in the North and those in the South. This challenges the notion of a “global village”, which proclaims the uniformity of world phenomena.

From a cultural perspective, one notes that since time immemorial cultural difference has always been a source of fascination and awe among different peoples. One can argue that so far, what has sustained the Makerere-New York University and the Norwegian College of Dance-Makerere collaborations, is the cultural magnetism that cultural difference produces. It should further be noted that the concept ‘intercultural’ celebrates and recognises cultural difference. It is debatable whether such exchanges could have been sustained for several years if all the collaborating institutions and individuals had the same performance culture. I asked different participants to comment on the notion of globalisation and world cultural homogenisation based on their intercultural theatre experience in Uganda. NCDS5 said that

I don't think the world will become the same. Even though we have much to learn from each other, although we can take things from each other, we still have different traditions from the start. And I don't think we should go off the traditions that we have. After all where is the exchange if we are all the same, it is not like everybody is supposed to be the same either. I think it is good that cultures are different; different traditions, different dances. These are the kind of things I think are good because we need to be different and I don't think people will turn out to be the same. I think people need to be different. (Extract 75)

Hannerz (1993:237) reminds us to critically examine what the term “world culture” means. He states that the world is based on an arrangement of diversity rather than by a “replication of uniformity.” This diversity was witnessed through the culturally influenced communicative differences amongst the collaborating groups even when an ‘international’ language English was used (as discussed in section 7.3).

One could therefore argue that the micro intercultural negotiations using English in the collaborations challenges and problematises the macro notion/concept of “international language” or even world cultural homogenisation. This scenario also illustrates the sometimes understated dynamics and contingencies of interculturalism, even when the ‘same’ language is used as a means of cross-cultural communication. For example, Blommaert (2005:44-45) points out one of the pitfalls of dialogism by observing that “dialogue does not presuppose sharedness”. That is because in most cases it is assumed that participants in a communicative event share lots of common ground, say, “language or language variety, referential and indexical meanings attributed to words, utterances or speech events, and so on”. Blommaert (*ibid.*) emphasises that this is a common mistake, since the “meeting of contextualisation universes is not necessarily a meeting of similar contextualisation universes. On the contrary, it may be more productive to take the non-sharedness of contextualisation universes as our point of departure.” It is no surprise therefore that one of the dynamic cultural issues that has to be negotiated in intercultural interactions is language barrier.

The language impasse was coupled with feelings of unequal cultural exchange (discussed in section 7.3.3), not forgetting the perpetual intercultural ‘othering’ amongst the collaborating groups, which highlighted the concept of difference and cultural boundary maintenance (as seen in Chapter Five sections 5.6.1 and 5.6.2 and elsewhere). All this shows that the world is built on a plurality of differences and is not politically, economically, socially or culturally homogeneous.

In the same vein, in a focus group discussion, NCDS3 argued that

I do not think the world will ever have one culture. We will always be different because of distance. But I think we are getting more connections between countries. But I think it is good we have differences and I think it is good we are not the same. (Extract 76)

In the same group, NCDS4 observed that

I think there are some things which are the same. But there are still differences and we will stay different because there are differences. We can get inspired here and we can take something home, but that will not change the entire culture. (Extract 77)

And in a separate interview NYUS1 said that “culturally we will remain different. Our cultures come from where we live ... The geography is quite different” (cf. the discussion in section 7.6). Similarly, SU/MAK-MUT1 observed that “humanity is the same, but what separate us are circumstances.”

In a personal interview SU/MAK-MUS1 responded to the same question by first asking a rhetorical question:

What is one’s culture? I think culture is influenced a lot by geographical location. Also to begin with, the fact that they are in America and we are here creates the first difference. Geography also includes infrastructure, our social surroundings social services. Secondly our educational approaches are different. We can appreciate by harmonising our differences in order to work together, but we cannot be the same. I think it is a huge imagination which is difficult to achieve. (Extract 78) (cf. discussion in section 7.6 and NYSU1 observation in the preceding paragraph).

Kirabaev (2005:85), as discussed in Chapter Three section 3.4.3, raised a fundamental issue that challenges the conceptualisation of globalisation and reflects the views in Extracts 76, 77 and 78. It is worth repeating here. Kirabaev (*ibid.*) asked:

How do we relate globalisation, oriented to the values of unity, the whole and the general, as expressed in the social, economic and political spheres, to the very human aspects of particularity, personal identification, specific cultural roots and diversity of opinion? In other words, can pluralistic values be pursued within a shared social space?

Robertson (1994:61) argues that the belief that the globalisation process can lead to world cultural homogenisation is “a ‘voluntaristic’ theory”. He also stated that believing in world cultural homogenisation is like “equating theoretical generality with empirical homogeneity” (Robertson, 1994:130). Similarly, to paraphrase Bhabha (1994:10), one can say that the historical specificities, geographical and cultural diversities that informed the three intercultural collaborations in this study make a cultural homogenisation argument purely gestural. This was similarly reflected in NCD/MAK-MUT1’s observation:

I think globalisation is some kind of mythology and some kind of dream or desire ... To be frank culture has been evolving over and over, and there is no way we can become one. There are may be aspects where we have similarities but definitely when we talk about being one that is not possible because even married people if they stay together they can never become entirely one. We are talking about entirely different cultures. (Extract 79)

Moreover, the theorisation of globalisation itself is not homogeneous (Saurez-Orozco and Quin-Hilliard, 2004:9). And Bourdieu (1989:19) argues that the social world is built in different ways and on “different principles of vision and division” (cf. Hannerz, 1993:237). The implication of this is that there is a plurality of differences in the world. Those differences can be seen in socio-political, socio-economic and socio cultural organisation of different societies in this universe.

The New York delegation, for example, was comprised of different people from different national and cultural backgrounds; Ugandans generally gave them a general identity of being “New Yorkers” or “Americans” in disregard of their national, cultural and individual particularities. Specifically, the 2013 New York group was made up of a person from Trinidad and Tobago, Chinese, Japanese, African-Americans, a Canadian, one with South American roots and another with a Jewish background, among others. Similarly, given that Uganda has slightly more than 60 ethnic groups, the Ugandan group was made up of Baganda, Banyankore, Basoga and Acholi, among others. But those cultural groups were in the New Yorkers’ general terms referred to as Makerere people or Ugandans. Furthermore, even though bringing together the different New York students’ nationalities and the Ugandan’s cultural diversity into one intercultural performance is in line with Hopper’s (2007:1) conception of cultural globalisation when he refers to the different persons that acted in *The Last King of Scotland* (see Chapter Three section 3.3), it is still paramount to say that his conceptualisation is overly simplistic, because having different persons from different cultures and nations acting together in a film or piece of drama does not lead to, or even imply, world cultural homogenisation as some cultural globalists have tended to imply. This again points to Kirabaev’s (2005:85) assertion that the notion of ‘globalisation’ is fallacious, because of its generalisation of world culture in disregard of “human aspects of particularity, personal identification, specific cultural roots and diversity of opinion”.

In other words, one can say that even though nationalism and other totalising concepts and theories, such as globalisation and its notions of “global village” and “world cultural homogenisation”, define and conceptualise cultural masses together, in reality there are still “permanently unfinished differentiations” (Carter, 2004:20) and Kirabaev’s (2005:85) fundamental questions that need to be considered.

After all, Anderson’s analysis of nationalism, as presented in his book *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (1983), shows that a

nation is an imagined community. In the same way, globalisation seems to theoretically imagine a unified universe with a global homogenised culture disregarding differences in peoples' cultural, economic, religious, technological and geographical settings. That is what Bourdieu (1989:17) might have called "exerting a theory effect [and] imposing a vision" of a culturally unified world.

Other aspects of differentiation were, for example, the concept of space. Some Makerere University interviewees talked about how the Americans had a particular concept of personal space, or what Neuliep (2006:305) calls proxemics.<sup>24</sup> Some Ugandan participants noted that in the first few days of their arrival, the New Yorker's American or Western concept of personal space was sometimes shockingly challenged when they interacted with Ugandans, who did not "respect" and sometimes "forcefully" entered individuals' personal spaces. That was because the belief in personal space does not culturally exist in Uganda. In an interview NYU/MAK-MUT3 commented on differences in the conceptualisation of space this way:

sometimes we have these cultural differences and some programmes just happen in a limited period of time that students who come here don't get time to get oriented; pure orientation into how Ugandans do things here. So you find out that they 'own' space and we don't 'own' space and sometimes these Ugandans don't know that there are some parts of the world where people own spaces. So they invade their space and hug and sit near these people and so it takes time for a person who comes from that background to come to terms with these new experiences. (Extract 80)

In Uganda complete strangers share public transport and their bodies are close and sometimes brush without any cause of interpersonal alarm. But to the Americans, or even the Norwegians, this kind of proximity needs special cultural or social mediation.

Grenfell and Hardy (2007:106) also point out that emotions do not follow concepts of world view and ideology, while Smith (1993: 180) argues that

The central difficulty in any project to construct a global identity and hence a global culture, is that collective identity, like imagery and culture, is always historically specific because it is based on shared memories and a sense of continuity between generations.

When I asked NCDT3 about globalisation and its accompanying notion of world cultural homogenisation, NCDT3 pointed at the different feelings that were/are elicited by the different dances from the North and those from the South. NCDT3 observed, for example,

---

<sup>24</sup> Neuliep (2006:305) says that proxemics "refers to the perception and use of space, including territorial and personal space; personal space refers to perceptual or psychological space – sometimes thought of as the "bubble" of space that humans carry with them in their day-to-day activities".



that Western ballet had a different feeling from that of the Ugandan dances. NCDT3 further noted that even though a trained Norwegian dancer can learn the technique of a particular Ugandan dance, it is difficult sometimes to master the feeling of the dance. In respect to this NCDT3 said “yes, our [NCD] students may know the technique of the dance, but it is the mastering of the style and the feeling of the dance that calls for great work” (cf. NCDS2’s sentiments in section 7.3.4 Extract 61 that “I think the most difficult thing is to get the style, because we know the steps and we can do the steps like they do but will never look like authentic African style”).

And NCD/MAK-MUS2 (in a focus group discussion) similarly said that

The history and cultures of countries are different. People will always love their culture. I noticed that even if the Norwegian students learnt and danced African dances, whenever they danced their piece you would feel that they were more into it. (Extract 81)

This again reflects Grenfell and Hardy’s (2007:106) argument that human feelings cannot be totalised on a worldwide scale.

Consequently, even though the forces of globalisation will lead to the acceleration of interculturalism/interaction and interconnectedness among different peoples around the world, the cases discussed in this study have shown that differences will continue to exist. What we will continue to have is mimicry, cultural adaptation, culture transfers/migration, cultural re-signification, alterity, culture appropriation and culture indigenisation, localisation or what Beck (2000:30-31) termed as “glocalization”. And all these notions contribute to cultural hybridity and problematise the concept of world cultural homogenisation. For example, NCDT3 noted that even though some dance motifs say in break-dance and jazz may seem the same in different parts of the world, they are still different because they are localised and indigenised by their recipients. The differences in audience behaviour are also a factor.

As far as audience behaviour is concerned, based on my personal observation of Ugandan audience behaviour during the intercultural performances at the Uganda National Theatre, the audiences clapped, shouted out ecstatic live commentaries and applauded the performers as the performances were going on. This was different from what I observed, for example, when *Beyond My Circle* was performed at Pigott Theatre at Stanford University in 2009,

where the audience was generally silent and applauded strongly only at the end of the performance.

## **7.8 Conclusion**

It was observed that the imbalance of economic power that characterises the North-South intercultural collaborations that Makerere University has been engaged with in the recent past challenges the notion of interculturalism as it has been conceptualised in this study as a dialogic endeavour that aims at sharing power. This is because sometimes the imbalance in power diminishes the Makerere participants' communication assertiveness and almost turns them into neo-colonial subalterns.

The centrality of culture and the challenges and dynamics of transcending communicative differences in the dialogical shaping of intercultural interactions have been discussed in this chapter. Negotiating the dress code, feelings of unequal exchange, the copyright contestations, the challenges and the dynamics of mediating pedagogical differences have been noted. The question of time and the timing of the collaborations, and the challenges of negotiating the differences in the geographical space have also been explored.

Numerous socio-political and socio-cultural notions exhibited and suggested in processes of North-South collaborations were also highlighted: knowledge transfer, experiential learning, intercultural corporeal dialogism, cultural transfer, adaptation, cultural appropriation, border crossing, intercultural dialogism, power and power performativity, othering, cultural boundary maintenance, intercultural exclusion, cultural translation and mediation, in-betweenness, indeterminacy, cultural hybridity, cultural authenticity and inauthenticity, patronisation, neo-colonialism, extraversion, inferior-superior relatedness, communication accommodation, symbolic cultural interaction and cultural difference magnetism.

Based on the different aspects that made the collaborating groups different, which in turn necessitated intercultural negotiation and mediation of difference, it has been seen that intercultural theatre collaborations are worthy micro groupings that can offer a secure base of examining macro concepts like globalisation and its accompanying notion of world global homogenisation. It was observed through the intercultural theatre cases examined in this chapter that even though the forces of globalisation have led to the acceleration of interaction and interconnectedness among different peoples around the world, concrete differences

between different regions and peoples of the world remain. Intercultural interaction contributes to cultural transfers and cultural hybridity, but these aspects still problematise the notion of world culture homogenisation.

Having investigated the multifaceted nature of intercultural theatre practice, I believe my usage of multidisciplinary and multi-method analytical approaches was appropriate for this study, because it facilitated a plurality of explorations and interpretations of the dynamics and notions exhibited through the North-South intercultural theatre collaborations that Makerere University has been involved with in the recent past.

The final chapter will discuss the conclusions generated by the study, and offer some recommendations for improving the North-South intercultural collaborations at Makerere University.

## **Chapter Eight: Conclusions and recommendations**

### **8.1 Introduction**

This study aimed to examine the dynamics, assumptions and notions manifested in North-South intercultural collaborations in Uganda, taking Makerere University's Department of Performing Arts and Film's recent North-South intercultural theatre collaborations as case studies. The study sought to understand the nature of the collaborations and intercultural theatre performances, the socio-political, cultural, economic and/or other factors that were reflected in the intercultural collaborations, the benefits and challenges of intercultural theatre collaborations, and to examine how the intercultural theatre performances and collaborations at Makerere University can help us to evaluate the phenomenon of globalisation, and how intercultural theatre performances and collaborations can help our understanding of how the intercultural/global world can function through the performing arts. In this final chapter I discuss the salient conclusions generated by the study, indicate some of its limitations, and make some recommendations based on the findings of the study.

### **8.2 Conclusions**

Bogden and Biklen (1982:145) say that qualitative data analysis involves "searching for patterns" while Yin (2009:3) posits that case study methodology involves "maintaining a chain of evidence". Even though the intercultural collaborations discussed in this study were based on different organisational arrangements and durations, they showed similar characteristics/dynamics that correlate with some theoretical perspectives observed from the literature survey in Chapters Two and Three.

The North-South intercultural interactions at the Department of Performing Arts and Film of Makerere University were a learning experience that enriched the participants' wellbeing socially and academically (see Chapter Six section 6.2.1). One can therefore deduce that intercultural theatre collaborations support the participating institutions' core mandate of teaching, learning and knowledge transfer, and contribute towards the internationalisation of education of the institutions involved. This was coupled with other advantages of the collaborations such as marketing Uganda, improving the status of institutions and individuals, technological transfer, legitimatising the existence of the Department of Performing Arts and Film, and contributing to institutional social responsibility.

The centrality of the varying notions of ‘culture’ and the concept ‘symbolic interaction’ at the different levels of the collaborations was identified. It was observed that any form of communication is to a large extent culturally coded/informed. This indicates that there is always a need to analyse the culturally informed “interactional structures” in order to understand the dynamics of any form of intercultural collaboration. I discussed the dynamics of negotiating socio-cultural aspects in the performance of *Beyond My Circle* and the Norwegian College of Dance and Makerere performance in Chapter Five sections 5.6.1 and 5.6.2. Corresponding symbolic interactions, mediations and translation of cultural aspects of negotiating the intercultural communication differences were described in Chapter Seven section 7.3. In this section I pointed out NCDS3’s experience in Extract 37 of the simple act of human interaction — that is the difference in shaking hands in the greeting process between Uganda and Norway – which gave a vivid indication of the complexities of symbolic cultural interaction that were actively and silently performed and negotiated in the North-South intercultural collaborations at Makerere University. All this affirms the centrality of culture and its different symbols in intercultural collaborations. It also means that in both on- and off-stage interactions the participants who were involved in the intercultural collaborations were symbolically interacting, performing and negotiating using verbal and corporeal cultural signifiers thus making the collaborations symbolic cultural interactions. In the context of the postcolonial North-South intercultural interactions, it was observed that scholars who accept the “culturalist tendency in postcolonial theory” are justified because of the nineteenth-century European emphasis on the pre-eminence of culture and its historically important role in the anticolonial struggles in Latin America, Africa and Asia (cf. Krishnaswamy, 2002:112 in Chapter Two section 2.4.3).

However, it was also noted that even though the concept of interculturalism in theatre presupposes mutual dialogic interaction involving breaking down intergroup cultural barriers, the participants in the collaborations still operated within the confines of stereotypes, othering and otherness. This was coupled by language barrier and difference in other cultural indexical signifiers such as body language, differences in concepts of time and sometimes use of personal space. This means that even though intercultural collaborations could contribute to intercultural understanding and acceptance, they do not lead to the total erasure of cross-cultural boundaries. This affirms the usefulness of Barth’s (1969) theory of ethnic boundary maintenance in analysing cross-cultural interactions.

The central position of power and power performativity in influencing the dynamics of North-South collaborations was acknowledged especially in the discussion in Chapter Seven section 7.2. It was observed that the imbalance in economic power in these collaborations sometimes led to superior-inferior relations and problematised the concept of mutual partnership in the North-South intercultural collaborations. I argued that even though the USA and Norway were not colonial powers in Africa, when power imbalance and patronisation creep into the execution of North-South intercultural collaborations, many co-participants in the South generally recall the European colonial experience in what I termed the 'colonial experience evocation syndrome'. The power imbalance and patronisation in this case may exemplify a form of neo-imperialism, thereby indicating the thin difference between post-colonial theatre and 'voluntarist' intercultural theatre in countries that experienced colonisation (see Chapter Two sections 2.4.1 and 2.4.2). All this contributes to North-South intercultural theatre collaborations' unending crisis of identification with imperialism and problematises Schechner's concept of 'intercultural theatre' which signposted the post-colonial revisionary and dialogic empowerment of cultures which were non-Western in a mode that is related to the practice of intercultural communication. Because of such historical perspectives, that is why I argued that having a historical approach in my analysis was crucial and this was borne out by Martin and Nakayama's (2008) present-future/history-past dialectic of intercultural communication which highlights the importance of history as a factor in understanding the dynamics of contemporary intercultural interaction between social groups and their degree of intergroup anxiety. In the light of this, and in line with the requirements of critical discourse analysis prescribed by Fairclough (1989:26), I believe my analysis in this study shows progression from description, to interpretation and explanation of the dynamics of the North-South intercultural theatre collaborations.

It was part of the objectives of this study to examine the notions exhibited in the North-South intercultural collaborations that Makerere University has been engaged with recently. Based on my discussions in Chapters Five, Six and Seven, a number of notions were identified that characterise the North-South intercultural theatre collaborations that Makerere University has been engaged with in the recent past. Some of these are knowledge transfer, experiential learning, intercultural theatre corporeal dialogism/intercultural dialogism, cultural transfer, cultural translation, cultural mediation, adaptation, cultural appropriation, border crossing, power and power performativity, stereotyping, othering, cultural boundary maintenance,

intercultural exclusion/closure, in-betweenness, indeterminacy, cultural hybridity, cultural authenticity and inauthenticity, patronisation, neo-colonialism, extraversion, dependency syndrome, superior-inferior relationship, communication accommodation and symbolic cultural interaction. This shows that intercultural theatre collaborations stimulate a multiplicity of theoretical perspectives and that is why in this study I have argued that the multifaceted nature of interculturalism in theatre makes it credible for one to propose multidisciplinary and multi-method analytical approaches in intercultural theatre research (see section 2.4.2). After all, given the relationship between intercultural theatre and cultural globalisation, globalisation theory, in particular its 'transformational' strand, allows what Beck (2000:30-3) calls "a theoretical pluralism involving economic, social and cultural approaches".

In this study it was observed that micro-level North-South intercultural theatre collaborations can help in examining the macro-level phenomenon of globalisation and global realities. For example, the challenges of attaining a 'global culture' were demonstrated by the differences in communication and cultural indexical signs between the participating groups, differences in pedagogical approaches and differences in the economic or financial standing of the participating institutions among others. These perspectives, relate to Appadurai's (1996) five dimensions of global cultural flows and distinctions which he terms as "ethnoscapes; mediascapes; technoscapes; finanscapes and ideoscapes" (Stier, 2004:5; see Chapter Three section 3.5.2), or Robertson's (1994:26-27) concept of 'global field', which involves disjunctures such as the individual-society problematic, the relativisation of societal reference, the relativisation of self-identities, the relativisation of citizenship, the relativisation of societies and realpolitik, which he calls a humanity problematic. All this indicates the "polycentricity" of contemporary "interactional regimes in 'global neighborhoods'" (Blommaert, Collins and Slembrouck, 2005:205). Consequently, it was observed that even though there is an intensification of interaction between people from different cultures and geographical positions of the world, still there are socio-cultural, socio-political and socio-economic distinctions that characterise the participants' interactions, thereby problematising the concept of globalisation and its accompanying notion of world cultural homogenisation.

Again on a theoretical level, it was observed that intercultural communication, globalisation and postcolonial theories, among others, intricately relate to contemporary North-South



intercultural theatre discourse and praxis. The main thread that was observed to have connected these theories together is power dynamics. First, it was observed that any form of intercultural interaction is influenced by the performativity of power. Secondly, in the parlance of globalisation we observed that the unbalanced movement of people in the North-South collaborations is influenced by an imbalance in economic power. Thirdly, it is the economic power imbalance in North-South intercultural theatre relations that in part turns the Southern participants into postcolonial subalterns. This affirms the centrality of power and the need to analyse its operations if one is to understand contemporary dynamics in North-South intercultural relations. After all, Krishnaswamy (2002:106-7) aptly says that globalisation and postcolonialism are concerned with the “effects of unequal power relations between different geopolitical locations on the globe”. And in the same vein Asante *et al.* (2008:4) observe that one of the major challenges that interculturalists face today is to account for the complex dynamics of power and privilege since intercultural communication aims at the mutual sharing of power.

On a methodological level, I was aware that, among other challenges, qualitative case study research is sometimes heavily influenced by the subjective interpretations of the researcher (see discussion in Chapter Four section 4.9). And owing to the fact that I work at the Department of Performing Arts and Film of Makerere University, this means that in this study I was both an emic (insider) and etic (outsider) researcher. From my emic position in this study, I was aware of a research weakness of acquiring “presentational data”, in this case through personal interviews which could not adequately help in acquiring a deeper understanding of the multifaceted phenomena under study (see Woodside and Wilson, 2003:498 in Chapters Four section 4.3.1, and Six section 6.3.1). However, I addressed this loophole by gathering “operational data” which, as opposed to presentational data, Woodside and Wilson (2003:499) say is a core of case study research. Operational data involve directly observing phenomena in “real time” or in the case environment, and asking participants why things tend to unfold the way they do (*ibid.*). My use of multiple data-collection methods in this study, including the observation method, enabled me to collect operational data which I could analyse in comparison with the already existing discourses on intercultural theatre that were discussed in Chapters Two and Three. Therefore, through this triangulation I believe my study has been sufficiently validated.

However, I was also aware of the challenges of taking an etic position as an ‘objective’ researcher in this study. Based on my experience, I know that many researchers shy away from carrying out studies on organisations or establishments where they are employed and feel freer and more liberated when they do research away from ‘home’. Even though many memoranda of understanding of the North-South collaborations indicate that such engagements should encourage research, many practitioners fear to do research within the framework of such arrangements. This is because there is usually apprehension on the side of the researcher wondering how his or her colleagues will receive the findings that open public debate on their organisation’s modus operandi. I am aware that the moment one’s piece of writing becomes public it is subjected to different interpretations to which one may have no control. However, I should make it categorically clear that my analysis of the challenges of North-South intercultural theatre collaborations at the Department of Performing Arts and Film of Makerere University should not be interpreted as a demonisation of those collaborations, or as academic “subversion” (Blommaert, 2005:25). Moreover, we observed that Schechner (2007:10), the god-father of ‘intercultural theatre’, admits that the “term ‘intercultural’ signals not only a tendency toward complexity and hybridity but also acknowledges that the process is lumpy, full of contradictions, and difficult” (see Chapter Seven section 7.2). This means that every intercultural theatre practitioner has to be aware of the challenges of intercultural praxis other than living in constant denial of their existence. From this informed perspective, then it becomes possible to constantly devise best practices. Therefore, my major hope is that the findings of this study will in future be used by both Makerere University, and other institutions around the world to predict and mitigate some of the challenges of North-South intercultural collaborations in order to make them more beneficial to all parties concerned. After all, Woodside and Wilson (2003:497) say that some of the objectives of case study research are “description, understanding, prediction, or control” of human behaviour or organisational undertakings (see Chapter Four section 4.3.1). Taylor (2000:83) put the importance of my etic perspective in this study better when he quoted Greene (1989) asserting that “professional growth ... is located in teachers’ ability to revisit their work with renewed eyes and possibly transform themselves through a deliberate and critical self-examination of their own fallible pedagogy.”

I was also cognisant of the fact that researchers doing multidisciplinary studies face the challenge of demarcating the theoretical scope of their studies. This study was not an exception because, due to its multifaceted nature, I was forced to “violate all kinds of

disciplinary orthodoxies” in order to find the “freedom to use whatever can be useful for solving [intercultural theatre’s] analytical [and/or methodological] problems” (Blommaert 2005:16). But let me hope that the end justifies the means.

However, even though I faced some study-specific challenges like the ones hinted at above, and acknowledge the general reservations of using the case study research design (see Chapter Four section 4.9), I believe that the steps I undertook to mitigate them helped me to reduce the margin of error and researcher biases associated with case study designs, and gather credible data which could be based on to write a fairly secure discursive research report.

On a personal level, before I was involved in this study, I thought on the basis of my previous experience in theatre that I knew what goes on in intercultural theatre theory and praxis. I was wrong! I must say that the processes that I went through, such as the initial readings and re-readings, data collection, data analysis, report drafting, until the time when this final report was written, have been tremendously enriching – every day of this process was a classroom and every single experience was a lesson. There is a belief that the role of education is to replace a closed mind with an open one. Let me say that this study opened my mind to the multifaceted dynamics of North-South intercultural collaborations that I had always taken for granted in my own practice of intercultural theatre. Moreover, Taylor (2000:84) says that “reflective practitioners empower themselves to contemplate critically some aspect of their own teaching and learning processes.” And I hope my readers’ will also be enriched in the same way.

### **8.3 Recommendations**

With reference to critical discourse analysis (CDA), Blommaert (2005:25) says that “apart from (passive) subversion, CDA also advocates (active) intervention in the social practices it critically investigates”. Blommaert (*ibid.*) says that Toolan (1997) “even opts for a prescriptive stance: CDA should make proposals for change and suggest corrections to particular discourses”, or even practices. In line with this perspective, the following are the recommendations generated out of the circumstances of the study.

Makerere University management should continue supporting intercultural collaborations in any way possible, because from this study it was observed that intercultural collaborations

support the participating institutions' core mandate of teaching, learning and knowledge transfer. The collaborations also contribute to the university's internationalisation drive.

I also recommend that before any intercultural collaboration is entered into in future at Makerere University, there should be open and comprehensive discussions by all stakeholders in order to clarify the collaboration's objectives and each group's contributions and expectations from the collaboration in order to mitigate future misunderstandings.

In line with the above recommendation, it was observed that there was an imbalance of power legitimised by the Northern partners' financial contribution towards the running of the collaborations discussed in this study. This could have been minimised, for example, if each group's mutual contributions and expectations were clear right from beginning. Or else, Makerere University should also find ways of contributing towards the funding of the collaborations in order to minimise the power imbalances emanating from an imbalance in funding the collaborations. The power imbalance could still be avoided in future if the parties involved engage in a dialogue aiming at formulating equal terms of engagement meaning, for example, that if one party provides the funding, the other could equally provide the physical infrastructure/space for interaction, goodwill and the participants to participate in the intercultural collaboration.

Given that intercultural collaborations are influenced by a multitude of dynamics in pursuance of the collaborations' objectives and expectations, there is always a need for adequate planning and transparent/open mandatory periodic evaluations of the collaborations by all stakeholders from all participating institutions in order to maximise their benefits. With such periodic evaluations, misunderstanding about issues such as copyright ownership and power imbalance could either be minimised or avoided.

Because of the incompatible timing of some of the collaborations, there is a need to streamline the programme structure in order to avoid the stress and strain on Makerere project participants as a result of mismatched time of the of the collaborations.

It was also observed that the intercultural stress and strain faced by some project participants was exacerbated by the fact that they were not conversant with the dynamics and compromises needed in the process of intercultural dialogism. Therefore there is need of intercultural communication workshops to equip the project participants with the basic

principles of intercultural communication prior to the collaboration itself in order to minimise the cultural misunderstandings that may surface, for example, during intercultural theatre pedagogical workshops.

Finally, let me emphasise that dialogue is a crucial ingredient at all levels of intercultural theatre praxis. Any form of intercultural misunderstanding can be avoided or mitigated, if the collaborating participants encourage and sincerely offer an open space for dialogue at all levels of intercultural engagement.

## List of Works Cited

- Adams, S. & Janover, M. 2009. Introduction: Theorizing the intercultural. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 30(3): 227-231.
- Akomolafe, A. C. & Dike, J. P. 2011. Decolonizing Education: Enunciating the Emancipatory Promise of Non-Western Alternatives to Higher Education. A Paper Presented at The XII International Seminar on *Globalization of Higher Education: Challenges & Opportunities*. 4-5 January 2011. New Delhi, India [Online]. Available:[http://www.academia.edu/4371355/Decolonizing\\_Education\\_Enunciating\\_the\\_Emancipatory\\_Promise\\_of\\_NonWestern\\_Alternatives\\_to\\_Higher\\_Education\\_A\\_Paper\\_Presented\\_at\\_The\\_XII\\_International\\_SeminarAkomolafe\\_Adebayo\\_Clement\\_Dike\\_Ijeoma\\_Precious](http://www.academia.edu/4371355/Decolonizing_Education_Enunciating_the_Emancipatory_Promise_of_NonWestern_Alternatives_to_Higher_Education_A_Paper_Presented_at_The_XII_International_SeminarAkomolafe_Adebayo_Clement_Dike_Ijeoma_Precious). [Accessed 8 May 2014].
- Altbach, P.G. & Knight, J. 2007. The Internationalization of Higher Education: Motivations and Realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11 (3/4): 290-305.
- Anderson, B. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- Androutsopoulos, J. 2010. Localizing the Global on the Participatory Web. In: Nikolas Coupland (Ed.) *The Handbook of Language and Globalization*. London: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 203-231.
- Anguyo, I. 2014. Foreigners stealing Ugandan innovations – New Vision online. The New Vision, 9 October 2014 [Online]. Available: <http://www.newvision.co.ug/news/660564-foreigners-stealing-ugandan-innovations.html> [Accessed 9 October 2014].
- Appadurai, A. 1993. Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy. In: Mike Featherstone (Ed.) *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. London: Sage Publications. 295-310.
- Appadurai, A. 1996. *Modernity At Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Aragay, M. 2005. Reflection to Refraction: Adaptation Studies Then and Now. In: Mireia Aragay (Ed.) *Books in Motion: Adaptation, intertextuality, Authorship*. New York & Amsterdam: Rodopi. 11-34.
- Asante, M. K. 2008. The Ideological Significance of Afrocentricity in Intercultural Communication. In: Asante, M. K., Miike, Y. & Jing Yin, J (Eds.). *The Global Intercultural Communication Reader*. New York and London: Routledge. 47-55.
- Asante, M. K., Miike, Y. & Yin J. 2008a. Preface: The Global Intercultural Communication Reader. In: Asante, M. K., Miike, Y. & Jing Yin, J (Eds.). *The Global Intercultural Communication Reader*. New York and London: Routledge New York and London: Routledge. i-I.

- Asante, M.K., Miike, Y., & Yin, J. 2008b. Introduction: Issues and Challenges in Intercultural Communication Scholarship. In: Asante, M. K., Miike, Y. & Jing Yin, J (Eds.). *The Global Intercultural Communication Reader*. New York and London: Routledge. 1-8.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. 1989. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. 1995. *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Austin, J. L. 1975. *How To Do Things with Words*. Second Edition. J.O. Urmson and Marina Sbisa (Eds.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Bartell, M. 2003. Internationalization of universities: A university culture-based framework. *Higher Education*, (45): 43-70.
- Barth, F. 1969. Introduction. In: Barth F. (Ed.). *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organisation of Culture Difference*. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.
- Bauman, Z. 1993. Modernity and Ambivalence. In: Featherstone, M. (Ed.). *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. London: Sage Publications.143-169.
- Bauman, Z. 1999. *Culture as Praxis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Beck, K. 2012. Globalization/s: Reproduction and Resistance in the Internationalization of Higher Education. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 35(3):133-148.
- Beck, U. 2000. *What is Globalisation?* New York: Polity Press.
- Bennett, S. 1997. *Theatre Audiences: A Theory of Production and Reception*. Second Edition. London: Routledge.
- Berry, J.W.1990. Psychology of acculturation. In: Berman, J. J. (Ed.). *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1989: Cross-cultural perspectives. Current theory and research in motivation*. Volume 37. Lincoln: NE: University of Nebraska Press. 201-234.
- Bhabha, H.K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bharucha, R. 1984. A reply to Richard Schechner. *Asian Theatre Journal*, 1 (2): 254-260.
- Bharucha, R. 1993. *Theatre and the World: Performance and the Politics of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bharucha, R. 1997. Negotiating the 'River': Intercultural Interactions and Interventions. *The Drama Review*, 41 (3): 31-38.
- Bharucha, R. 2000. *The Politics of Cultural Practice: Thinking Through Theatre in an Age of Globalisation*. London: The Athlone Press.



- Bhatt, R. M. 2010. Unraveling Post-Colonial Identity through Language. In: Nikolas Coupland, N. (Ed.). *The Handbook of Language and Globalization*. London: Blackwell. 520-539.
- Blakdance. 2013. Artist Profile - Ian RT Colless [Online]. Available: <http://www.blakdance.org.au/Profiles/ian-colless/>. [Accessed 18 October 2013].
- Blommaert, J., Collins, J. & Slembrouck, S. 2005. Polycentricity and interactional regimes in 'global neighborhoods'. *Ethnography*, 6(2):205-235.
- Blommaert, J. 2005. *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. 2010. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bogdan, R. C. & Biklen S. K. 1982. *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Botha, M. M. 2010. Compatibility Between Internationalizing and Africanizing Higher Education in South Africa. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 14 (2): 200-213.
- Boudreaux, D. J. 2008. *Globalisation*. London: Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Trans. Nice, R. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1989. Social Space and Symbolic Power. *Sociological Theory*, 7 (1): 14-25.
- Bourdieu, P. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. 1992. Thinking About Limits. In: Mike Featherstone (Ed.). *Cultural Theory and Cultural Change*. London: Sage Publications.37-49.
- Bowden, G. 2004. Reconstructing Colonialism: Graphic Layout and Design, and the Construction of ideology. *CRSA/RCSA: Canadian Review of Social Anthropology*, 41(2): 218-240.
- Bowen, G. A. 2009. Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2):27-40.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2): 77-101.
- Brockett, G. O. 1979. *The Theatre: An Introduction. Fourth Edition*. Orlando: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Brook, P. 1995. *There Are No Secrets: Thoughts on Acting and Theatre*. London: Methuen Drama.

- Bruner, J.S.1977. *The Process of Education*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press.
- Brustein, W.I. 2007. The Global Campus: Challenges and Opportunities for Higher Education in North America. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11 (3/4): 382-391.
- Burawoy, B. 2012. The Roots of Domination: Beyond Bourdieu and Gramsci. *Sociology*, 46(2):187–206.
- Burawoy, M. 2000. Introduction: Reaching for the Global. In: Michael Burawoy, Joseph A. Blum, Sheba George, Zsuzsa Gille, Teresa Gowan, Lynne Haney, Maren Klawiter, Steven H. Lopez, Seán O Riain and Millie Thayer. *Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections, and Imaginations in a Postmodern World*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.1-40.
- Cambridge, J & Thompson, J. 2004. Internationalism and globalization as contexts for international education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 34(2): 161-175.
- Candlin, C. N. 1989. General Editor's Preface. In: Norman Fairclough *Language and power*. London: Longman. Vi-x.
- Carter, L. 2004. Thinking Differently About Cultural Diversity: Using Postcolonial Theory to (Re)read. *Science Education*, 88(6): 819-836.
- Casetti, F. 2004. Adaptation and Mis-adaptations: Film, Literature, and Social Discourses. In: Stam, R. & Raengo, A. (Eds.) *A Companion to Literature and Film*. Malden, USA: Blackwell Publishing. 81-91.
- Chan, L. 2012. A survey of the 'new' discipline of adaptation studies: between translation and interculturalism. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 20(4): 411-418.
- Childs, P. & Williams, P. 1997. *An Introduction to Postcolonial Theory*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Chorley, M and Chapman, J. 2013. 'Small island? Britain has given the world The Beatles, Elgar and, er.... One Direction': Outraged Cameron hits back at Putin taunt with TWO bizarre outbursts defending 'this sceptered isle' — Mail online. *The Daily Mail*, 6 September 2013 [online] Available: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2413595/David-Cameron-says-One-Direction-prove-Britain-conquer-world.html>. [Accessed 6-September 2013].
- Clifford, J. 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Cochrane, C. 2001. The Pervasiveness of the Commonplace: The Historian and Amateur Theatre. *Theatre Research International*, 26(3): 233-242.

- Cook, Albert R. 1934. The journey to Uganda in 1896 and Kampala during the closing years of the last century. *The Uganda Journal*, 1(2):83-95.
- Cook, D. 2000. The Makerere Free Travelling Theatre: an Experimental Model. In: Eckhard Breitinger, E. (Ed.) *Uganda: The Cultural Landscape*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers. 37-51.
- Counsell, S. & Wolf L. 2004. *Performance Analysis: An Introductory Coursebook*. London: Routledge.
- Curran, B. 2008. *Theatre Translation Theory and Performance in Contemporary Japan: Native Voices, Foreign Bodies*. Manchester, UK & Kinderhook (NY), USA: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Daily Mail Reporter. June 2012. Was the internet invented in 1934? The scientist whose ‘televised book’ foretold the World Wide Web seven decades ago— Mail online. *The Daily Mail*, 8 June 2012 [online]. Available: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2156249/Paul-Otlets-idea-televised-book-foretold-internet-1934.html>. [Accessed 8 June 2012].
- Daily Mail Reporter. October 2013. School makes students (and their parents) sign an ‘anti-twerking contract’ before homecoming dance — Mail online. *The Daily Mail*, 27 October 2013 [online]. Available: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2477868/School-makes-students-parents-sign-anti-twerking-contract-homecoming-dance.html> [Accessed 27 October 2013].
- Dallmayr, A. 1996. *Beyond Orientalism: Essays on Cross-Cultural Encounter*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Davies, G. 1993 What Should Time Be? *European Journal of Marketing*, 28 (8/9): 100-113.
- Deardorff, D. K. 2006. Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as a Student Outcome of Internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, (10): 241-266.
- Deborah, J. 1989. *Time and the Dancing Image*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Denzin, N.K. 1992. *Symbolic Interactionism and Cultural Studies: The Politics of Interpretation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dimitriadis, G. & Weis, L. 2007. Globalisation and Multisited Ethnographic Approaches. In: McCarthy C, Durham A.S., Enget L.C., Filmer A. A., Giardina M.D. & Malgareca M.A. (Eds.) *Globalising Cultural Studies Ethnographic Interventions in Theory, Method, and Policy*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc. 323-342.
- Edgar, A. & Sedgwick, P. (Eds.). 2008. *Cultural Theory: The Key Concepts*. Second Edition. Routledge: London & New York.

- Edwards, J. 2007. Challenges and Opportunities for the Internationalization of Higher Education in the Coming Decade: Planned and Opportunistic Initiatives in American Institutions. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11 (3/4): 373-381.
- Edwards, T. 2007. Introduction. In: Edwards, T. (Ed.). *Cultural Theory: Classical and Contemporary Positions*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications. 1-4.
- Ehret, C. 2005. Writing African History From Linguistic evidence. In: John Edward Philips, J.E. (Ed.) *Writing African History*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press. 86-111.
- Elteren, M. V. 2003. U.S. Cultural Imperialism Today: Only a Chimera? *The SAIS Review of International Affairs*, 23 (2): 169-188.
- Fairclough, N. 1989. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fanon, F. 1967. *Black Skins, White Masks*. Trans. Charles Lam Markmann. New York: Grove Press.
- Fay, B. 1996. *Contemporary Philosophy of Social Science: A Multicultural Approach*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Featherstone, M. 1993. *Global Culture: An Introduction*. In: Mike Featherstone (Ed.). *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. London: Sage Publication. 1-14.
- Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. 2006. Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), Article xx. Available: [http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/5\\_1/pdf/fereday.pdf](http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/5_1/pdf/fereday.pdf). [Accessed on 10 April 2014].
- Foucault, M. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. Gordon, C. (Ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Friedman, M D. 2002. In Defense of Authenticity. *Studies in Philology*, 99 (1): 33-56.
- Gadamer, H. 1975. *Truth and Method*. London & New York: Continuum.
- Gai, F. 2013. Application of Multimodal Discourse Analysis in Intercultural Communication Teaching. *Cross-Cultural Communication*, 9(2):23-26.
- Geertz. C. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Giddens, A. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford-CA: Stanford University Press.
- Giddens, A. 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giroux, H. A. 2005. *Border Crossing: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. Second Edition. New York and London: Routledge.

- Goffman, E. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Gordon, L. R. 2011. The Market Colonization of Intellectuals. *Codesria Bulletin*, (1&2): 30-33.
- Gough, N. 2000. Globalization and Curriculum Inquiry: Locating, Representing and Performing Translation Imaginary. In: Stromquist, N.P. & Monkman, K. (Eds.). *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestation Across Cultures*. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers: Boston. 77-98.
- Grenfell, M. & Hardy, C. 2007. *Art Rules: Pierre Bourdieu and the Visual Arts*. Oxford: Berg.
- Hamera, J. 2007. *Dancing Communities: Performance, Difference, and Connection in the Global City*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hanks, W.F. 1991. Foreword. In: Lave, J & Wenger, E. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 13-24.
- Hannerz, U. 1993. Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture. In: Featherstone, M. (Ed.). *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. London: Sage Publications. 237-251.
- Haus, H. U. 1995. Theatre as a Transcultural Event. *History of European Ideas*, (20): 1-3.
- Haven, C. 2009. Stanford, Ugandan students bridge cultural divide through performance [Online]. Available: <http://news.stanford.edu/news/2009/september28/uganda-dance-collaborate-093009.html>. [Accessed 20 June 2013].
- Henrich, J., Heine, S.J. & Norenzayan, A. 2010. Opinion: Most people are not WEIRD. *Nature*, (466): 29.
- Hermann, E. & Wolfgang K. W. 2005. Introduction to Relations in Multicultural Fiji: The Dynamics of Articulations, Transformations and Positionings. *Oceania*, 75(4): 309-324.
- Hiebert, G. P. 1988. *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries*. London: Baker Book House.
- Hirst, P. & Thompson, G. 1996. *Globalisation in Question: The International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Holliday, A., Hyde, M. & Kullman, J. 2010. *Intercultural Communication: An Advanced Resource Book for Students*. Second Edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hopper, C. A. O. 2000. Globalisation and the social construction of Reality: Affirming or Unmasking the "Inevitable"? In: Stromquist, N.P. & Karen Monkman, K. *Globalisation and Education: Integration and Contestation Across Cultures*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc. 99-119.
- Hopper, P. 2007. *Understanding Cultural Globalisation*. Polity Press: Cambridge.

- Horwich, P. 1997. Implicit Definition, Analytic Truth, and Apriori Knowledge. *Noûs*, 31 (4): 423-440.
- Hountondji, P. J. 1992. Recapturing. In: V. Y. Mudimbe (Ed.) *The Surreptitious Speech: Presence Africaine and the Politics of Otherness 1947-987*. 238-248.
- Hubbard, W.K & Sofras A. P. 1998. Strategies for Including African and African American Culture in an Historically Euro-Centric Dance Curriculum. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 69 (2): 77-82.
- Huizhu, S. 2009 TDR Comment: Performing Arts and Cultural Identity in the Era of Interculturalism. *TDR: The Drama Review*, 53(2): 7-11.
- Huntington, S. P. 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Ishemo L. S. 2002. Culture, liberation, and 'development'. In: Eade, D. (Ed.) *Development and Culture: A Development in Practice Reader*. London: Oxfam GB. 25-37.
- Jackson, S. 2004. *Professing Performance: Theatre in the Academy from Philology to Performativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jenkins, K. 1991. *Rethinking History*. London: Routledge.
- Kaahwa, A. J. 2004. Ugandan Theatre: Paradigm Shifts. *SATJ: South African Theatre Journal*, Vol. (18): 82-111.
- Kafeero, K. B. G. 2013. Many in America are still ignorant on Africa. *The Observer*, 27 August 2013 [Online] Available: [http://www.observer.ug/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=27189:many-in-america-are-still-ignorant-on-africa&catid=37:guest-writers&Itemid=66](http://www.observer.ug/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=27189:many-in-america-are-still-ignorant-on-africa&catid=37:guest-writers&Itemid=66). [Accessed 27 August 2013]
- Kagoloby, R. 2007. The Survival and Revival of Indigenous Theatre Arts Forms in Uganda: A Case Study of Kampala District. MA Dissertation. Tromso: Tromso University Library.
- Kagoloby, R. 2011. The Post-colonial Theory: Reminiscences of a Ugandan Theatre Scholar. *Makurdi Journal of Arts and Culture*, (9):103-111.
- Kamanyi, J. 1978. A Comparative Study of Theatrical Productions in Uganda Today [Unpublished]. M.A Thesis. Kampala: Makerere University Library.
- Kasule, S. 1998. Popular Performance and the Construction of Social Reality in Post-Amin Uganda. *Journal of Popular Culture*, 32 (2):39-58.
- Kehn, B.M. & Teichler U. 2007. Research on Internationalisation in Higher Education. *Studies in International Education*, 11 (3/4): 260-273.



- Kennedy, S. J. 1973. *In Search of African Theatre*. New York: Charles Scribner's sons.
- Kerr, D. 1995. *African Popular Theatre: From Pre-colonial Times to the Present*. London: James Currey.
- King, R. 2010. Policy internationalization, national variety and governance: global models and network power in higher education states. *Higher Education*, (60):583-594.
- Kirabaev, N. 2005. Cultural Identity, pluralism and Globalization in Contemporary Philosophical Discourse. In: John P. & Hogan, J. P. (Eds.) *Cultural Identity, Pluralism and Globalization*. Volume One. Washington D.C.: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy.85-91.
- Kiwanuka M. S. 1970. Colonial Policies and Administrations in Africa: The Myths of the Contrasts. *African Historical Studies*, 3 (2):295-315.
- Kolb, D. A. 1984. *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Krishnaswamy, R. 2002. The Criticism of Culture and the Culture of Criticism: At the Intersection of Postcolonialism and Globalization Theory. *Diacritics*, 32 (2): 106-126.
- Kristeva, J. 1986. Word, Dialogue and Novel. In: Toril Moi (Ed.) *The Kristeva Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. 2008. *Cultural Globalization in Language Education*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kuwabara, K & Sheldon, O. 2012. Temporal Dynamics of Social Exchange and the Development of Solidarity: "Testing the Waters" Versus "Taking a Leap of Faith". *Social Forces*, 91(1): 253-273.
- Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. 2009. *Interviews – Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing* (Second Edition). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Lei, D. P. 2006. *Operatic China: Staging Chinese Identity across the Pacific*. New York: Palgrave.
- Lewandowski, J. D. 2001. *Interpreting Culture: Rethinking Method and Truth in Social Theory*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Lo, J. & Gilbert H. 2002. Toward a Topography of Cross-Cultural Theatre Praxis. *The Drama Review*, 46 (3): 31-53.
- Loomba, A. 1998. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism: The New Critical Idiom*. London: Routledge.
- Mabingo, A. 2013. New York University Dance Education Study Abroad Program in Uganda. (Unpublished) MA Thesis. New York: New York University Library.



- Mabingo, A. 2014. NYU dance education study abroad program to Uganda: impact on work experiences of study abroad alumni in New York. *Research In Dance Education*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.tandfonline.com/action/showCitFormats?doi=10.1080/14647893.2014.950641>. [Accessed 15 September 2014].
- Macpherson, M. 2000. Makerere: The Place of the Early Sunrise. In: *Uganda The Cultural Landscape*. Breitinger, E. (Ed.). Kampala: Fountain Publishers. 23-36.
- Magoba, B. 2013. How cultural exchanges market Uganda's arts – Monitor online. *The Daily Monitor*, 26 January 2013 [Online]. Available: [www.monitor.co.ug/artsculture/Reviews/How-cultural-exchanges-market-Uganda-s-arts/-/691232/1675184/-/view/printVersion/-/edIncq/-/index.html](http://www.monitor.co.ug/artsculture/Reviews/How-cultural-exchanges-market-Uganda-s-arts/-/691232/1675184/-/view/printVersion/-/edIncq/-/index.html). [Accessed 26 January 2013].
- Mair, L. P. 1933. Colonial Administration as a Science. *The Royal African Society*, 32 (129): 366-371.
- Mamdani, M. 2007. *Scholars in the Marketplace: The Dilemmas of Neo-liberal Reform at Makerere University 1989-2005*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers.
- Marcus G. 1998. *Ethnography Through Thick and Thin*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Marotta, V. 2009. Intercultural Hermeneutics and the Cross-cultural Subject. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 30(3):267-284.
- Martin, G. W. 2011. The Rise of African Studies (USA) and the Transnational Study of Africa. *African Studies Review*, 54 (1): 59-83.
- Martin, J. 2004. *The Intercultural Performance Book*. London: Routledge.
- Martin, J. N. & Nakayama, T. K. 2008. Thinking dialectically about culture and communication. In: Asante, M. K., Miike, Y. & Jing Yin, J (Eds.). *The Global Intercultural Communication Reader*. New York and London: Routledge. 73-91.
- Martin, S. D., Snow, J. L & Torrez, C.A. F. 2011. Navigating the Terrain of Third Space: Tensions With/In Relationships in School-University Partnerships. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(3):299-311.
- Mazrui, .A. A. 1971. The King, the King's English and I. *Transition*, (38):57-66.
- Mbowa, R. 2000. Luganda Theatre. In: Breitinger, E. (Ed.) *Uganda: The Cultural Landscape*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers. 205-206.
- Mbowa, R. 1994. Artists Under Siege: Theatre and the Dictatorial Regimes in Uganda. In: Breitinger, E. (Ed.) *Theatre and Performance in Africa: Intercultural Perspectives*. Bayreuth African Studies Series Volume 31. Bayreuth: Bayreuth University. 123-135.

- McCabe, L. T. 2001. Globalization and Internationalization: The Impact on Education Abroad Programs. In: *Journal of Studies in International Education*, (5):138-145.
- McCarthy, C., Durham, A.S., Enget, L.C., Filmer, A. A., Giardina, M.D. & Malgareca, M.A. 2007. Introduction: Confronting Cultural Studies in Globalising Times. In: McCarthy, C., Durham, A.S., Enget, L.C., Filmer, A. A., Giardina, M.D. & Malgareca, M.A (Eds.). *Globalising Cultural Studies: ethnographic interventions in Theory, Method and Policy*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc. xvii-xxxiv.
- McCarthy, T. 1994(a). On the idea of a Critical Theory and its Relation to Philosophy. In: Hoy, D. C. & McCarthy, T. (Eds.) *Critical Theory*. Cambridge: Blackwell. 7-30.
- McCarthy, T. 1994. On the Pragmatics of Communicative Reason. In: Hoy, D. C. & McCarthy, T. (Eds.). *Critical Theory*. Cambridge: Blackwell. 63-100.
- McCracken, J. 1993. African History in British Universities: Past, Present and Future. *African Affairs*, 92 (367):239-253.
- McLean, G. F. 2005. Culture, Pluralism and Globalization. In: Hogan, J. P. *Cultural Identity, Pluralism and Globalization*. Volume One. Washington D.C.: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy. 21-83.
- McLeod, J. 2000. *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Minde, H. 1995. The International Movement of Indigenous Peoples: An Historical Perspective. In: Brantenberg, T., Hansen, J. and Minde, H. (Eds.) *Becoming Visible - Indigenous Politics and Self-Government*. Tromsø: Centre for Sámi Studies, University of Tromsø. [Online] Available: <http://www.sami.uit.no/girji/n02/en/003minde.html>. [Accessed 20 November 2013].
- Mitchell, R., Boyle, B. & Nicholas, S. 2011. Cross-cultural group performance. *The Learning Organization*, 18 (2): 94 – 101.
- Moon, D. G. 2008. Concepts of ‘Culture’ Implications for Intercultural Communication Research. In: Asante, M. K., Miike, Y. & Jing Yin, J (Eds.). *The Global Intercultural Communication Reader*. New York and London: Routledge. 11-26.
- Mooney, A & Evans, B. 2007. *Globalization: The Key Concepts*. New York: Routledge.
- Morris, R. C. 1995. ALL MADE UP: Performance Theory and the New Anthropology of Sex and Gender. *Annual Reviews Anthropology*, (24): 567-592.
- Mosquera, G. 2010. Walking With The Devil: Art, Culture and Internationalization. In Anaheier, H & Isar, Y. R. (Eds.). *The Cultures and Globalization Series 3: Cultural Expression, Creativity and Innovation*. Los Angeles: Sage. 47-56.
- Morton, S. 2007. Poststructuralist Formulations. In: McLeod, J. (Ed.) *The Routledge Companion to Postcolonial Studies*. London and New York: Routledge. 161-172.

- Mpanga, D. F. K. 2013. Africa should learn to write, tell her own stories – Monitor online. *The Daily Monitor*, 5 October 2013 [Online] Available <http://www.monitor.co.ug/OpEd/Commentary/Africa-should-learn-to-write--tell-her-own-stories/-/689364/2018810/-/hobvi9/-/index.html>. [Accessed 5 October 2013].
- Mudimbe, Y.Y. 1992. Introduction. In: V.Y. Mudimbe (Ed.). *The Surreptitious Speech: Presence Africaine and the Politics of Otherness 1947-1987*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Xvii-xxvi.
- Mufwene, S. S. 2010. Globalization, Global English, and World English(es): Myths and Facts. In: Coupland, N. (Ed.). *The Handbook of Language and Globalization*. London: Blackwell.
- Mul, D. J. 2011. Horizons of Hermeneutics: Intercultural Hermeneutics in a Globalizing World. *Front. Philos. China*, 6(4): 628–655.
- Murphy, P. 2012. Class and Performance in the Age of Global Capitalism. *Theatre Research International*, 37(1): 49-62.
- Musisi, N. B. 1999. Morality as Identity: the Missionary Moral Agenda in Buganda, 1877-1945. *The Journal of Religious History*, 23(1): 51-74.
- Nannyonga, S. 1995. Selected Traditional Secular and Sacred Music of the Baganda People: A Comparative Study. MA Thesis. [Unpublished]. Kampala: Makerere University Library.
- Neuliep, J. W. 2006. *Intercultural Communication: A Contextual Approach*. Third Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Nketia, J. H. K. 1988. *The Music of Africa*. London: Victor Gollancz.
- Norwegian College of Dance. Tuition [Online]. Available: <http://www.dnbh.no/STUDIETILBUD/STUDIEAVGIFT.aspx>. [Accessed 20 November 2013].
- Ntangaare, M. M. 2001. Theatre and the Market in Uganda [Unpublished]. Ph.D. Thesis. Kampala: Makerere University Library.
- Ntangaare, M.M. & Breitinger E. 2000. Ugandan Drama in English. In: Breitinger E. (Ed.) *Uganda: The Cultural Landscape*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers. 224-249.
- Nzita, R. & Niwampa, M. 1993. *Peoples and Cultures of Uganda*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers.
- Oliver, R. & Atmore, A. 1994. *Africa Since 1800*. Fourth Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Onians, R. B. 1954. *The Origins of European Thought: About the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time and Fate* (Second Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- O'Thomas, M. 2014. Stages of the Loss, Translation as Contamination: How The Ritual Made It to the Royal National Theatre, London. *Theatre Research International*, 39(2):120-132.
- Oyserman, D & Uskul, A.K. 2008. Individualism and collectivism: Societal-level processes with implications for individual-level and society –level outcomes. In: Vijver, F.J.R, Hemert, D. A. & Poortinga, Y.H. (Eds.). *Multilevel Analysis of Individuals and Cultures*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: Taylor & Francis Group. 145-173.
- Paige, R. M. 2005. Internationalization of higher education: Performance assessment and indicators. *Nagoya Journal of Higher Education*, (5): 99-122.
- Paul, A. T.1990. *Tugende e Kampala: Notes on the Theatre in Uganda*. Freiburg: Freiburg University.
- Pavis, P. 1992. *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*. [Trans.], Kruger, L. London: London: Routledge.
- Pavis, P. 1996. *Towards a Theory of Interculturalism in Theatre? The Intercultural Performance Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. 2006. Postmodernism in Language Policy. In: Ricento, T. (Ed.) *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. London: Routledge. 60-76.
- Pennycook , A. 2007. *Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*. London: Routledge.
- Petersen, A. 2007. *The Body in Question*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Philips, J. E. 2005. What is African History? In: Philips, J.E. (Ed.). *Writing African History*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press. 25-48.
- Pile, S. 1996. *The Body and the City: Psychoanalysis, Space, and Subjectivity*. New York: Routledge.
- Pribyl, J. & Johnstone K. 2011. Who are we dancing for? Cross-cultural collaborations at Makerere University, Uganda [Conference proceedings] *Confluences 6 Physicality and Performance*. 21 - 23 July 2011. Cape Town: UCT School of Dance ,University of Cape Town [Online]. Available: <http://www.dance.uct.ac.za/confluen/confluences6.pdf>. [Accessed 20 November 2013].
- Quayson, A. 2000. *Postcolonialism: Theory, Practice or Process?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ransome, P. 2010. *Social Theory For Beginners*. University of Bristol: Policy Press.
- Reinelt, J. 2002. The Politics of Discourse: Performativity meets Theatricality. *SubStance; Special Issue: Theatricality 98/99*, 31 (2/3):201-215.

- Reinelt, J. 2007. Is Performance Studies Imperialist? Part 2. *TDR: The Drama Review*, 51(3): 7-16.
- Robertson, R. 1994. *Globalisation: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage Publications.
- Robinson, W. 2013. Homeless in Hollywood: Photographer captures the hard lives, humor and happiness of people living on the streets of LA — Mail online. *The Daily Mail*, 19 September 2013 [Online]. Available: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2425025/Homeless-Hollywood-Photographer-captures-hard-lives-humor-happiness-people-living-streets-LA.html#ixzz2fNJTPH8V> [Accessed 19 September 2013].
- Rogers E. M. & Steinfatt, T. M. 1999. *Intercultural Communication*. Illinois: Waveland Press Inc.
- Roscigno, V.J. 2011. Power, Revisited. *Social Forces*, 90(2): 349-374.
- Roscoe, J. 1911. *The Baganda: An Account of Their Native Customs and Beliefs*. London: Macmillan and Co Ltd.
- Said, E. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Saldana, J. 2009. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. London: Sage.
- Saurez-Orozco M. M. & Quin-Hilliard D. B. 2004. Globalisation, Culture and Education in the New Millennium. In: Saurez-Orozco M. M. & Quin-Hilliard D. B. (Eds.). *Globalisation, Culture and Education in The New Millennium*. Berkeley: University of California Press.1-37.
- Savran, D. 2006. The Search for America's Soul: Theatre in the Jazz Age. *Theatre Journal*, 58(3): 459-476.
- Schemo, D. J. 2007. In Study Abroad, Gifts and Money for Universities [Online] Available: [http://www.nytimes.com/2007/08/13/education/13abroad.html?\\_r=1&oref=slogin&ref=ed](http://www.nytimes.com/2007/08/13/education/13abroad.html?_r=1&oref=slogin&ref=ed). [Accessed 5 May 2013].
- Schechner R, 1982. *The End of Humanism* . New York: PAJ Publications.
- Schechner, R. 1988. *Performance Theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Schechner R, 2002. *Performance Studies: An Introduction* . New York: Routledge.
- Schechner, R. 2003. *Performance Theory*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Schechner, R. 2007. Is Performance Studies Imperialist? Part 3. *TDR: The Drama Review*, 51(4): 7-23.
- Scholte, J. A. 2000. *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. London: St. Martin's Press.

- School of Languages, Literature and Communication, Makerere University. Departments: Literature Home. [Online] Available: <http://llc.mak.ac.ug/departments/literature>. [Accessed 5 April 2014].
- Sempebwa, E.K.K. 1946. Some Social Aspects of African Music. In: *Towards The New Africa Lecture Series: 1946-1947*. Kampala: The Uganda Society. 25.
- Shine, J. 1955. Preface. In: Kyagambiddwa, J. *African Music From The Source of The Nile*. New York: Fredrick A Praeger Publishers.
- Shilling, C. 1999. Towards an embodied understanding of the structure/agency relationship. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 50 (4): 543-562.
- Shilling, C. 2005. *The Body in Culture , Technology and Society*. London: Sage Publications.
- Shorter, A. 1974. *African Culture and The Christian Church: An introduction to Social and Pastoral Anthropology*. New York: Orbis Books.
- Shuter, R. 2008. The Centrality of Culture. In: Asante, M. K., Miike, Y. & Jing Yin, J (Eds.). *The Global Intercultural Communication Reader*. New York & London: Routledge.37-43.
- Sicherman, C. 2008. Makerere's Myths, Makerere's History: A Retrospect. *JHEA/RESA: Journal of Higher Education in Africa/Revue de l'enseignement supérieur en Afrique*, 6 (1):11–39.
- Smith, A. D. 1993. Towards a Global Culture? In: Mike Featherstone (Ed.) *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. London: Sage Publications. 171-191.
- Smith, L. T. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. 2013. Maximizing the Benefits of International Education Collaborations: Managing Interactional Processes. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(3): 244-261.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. 2000. Introduction: Language, Culture and Rapport Management. In: Spencer-Oatey, H. (Ed.) *Culturally Speaking: Managing Rapport Through Talk Across Cultures*. London and New York: Continuum. 1-8.
- Spivak, G. C. 1992. Can the Subaltern Speak? In: Williams, P. & Chrisman, L. (Eds.) *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press. 66-111.
- Spring, J. 2009. *Globalization of Education: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Ssekamwa, J. C. 2000. *History and Development of Education in Uganda*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers.



- Stam, R. 2000. *Beyond Fidelity: The Dialogics of Adaptation*. In: Naremore, J. (Ed.) *Film Adaptation*. London: Athlone Press. 54-78.
- Stam, R., Burgoyne, R. & Flitterman-Lewis, S. 1992. *New Vocabularies in Film Semiotics: Structuralism, Post-structuralism and Beyond* London: Routledge.
- Stanford Drama. 2013. Stanford TAPS PhD Programme: Degree Requirements [Online]. Available: <http://www.stanford.edu/dept/drama/phd.html>. [Accessed 5 September 2013].
- Stanford Drama. 2009 Beyond My Circle Press Release [Online]. Available: [http://www.stanford.edu/dept/humanitiesout/drupal\\_files/file/Beyond%20My%20Circle%20Press%20Release.pdf](http://www.stanford.edu/dept/humanitiesout/drupal_files/file/Beyond%20My%20Circle%20Press%20Release.pdf). [Accessed 5 September 2013].
- Stanford Office of International Affairs. 2013. Learn About Stanford University Office of International Affairs (OIA): What we do [Online]. Available: <https://oia.stanford.edu/node/5957>. [Accessed 5 September 2013].
- Steinhardt, New York University. 2013 Dance Education in Uganda [Online]. Available: [http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/study\\_abroad/programs/Dance\\_Uganda](http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/study_abroad/programs/Dance_Uganda). [Accessed 6 September 2013].
- Stier, J. 2004. Taking a critical stance toward internationalization ideologies in higher education: idealism, instrumentalism and educationalism. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 2(1):1-28.
- Stromquist, N.P. 2007. Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education*, (53): 81–105.
- Stucky, N and Wimmer, C. 2002. *Teaching Performance Studies*. Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Suarez-Orozco, C. 2004. Formulating Identity in A globalized World. In: Marcelo M. Saurez-Orozco, M.M. & Quin-Hilliard, D.B. (Eds.). *Globalization, Culture and Education in The New Millennium*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 173-202.
- Saurez-Orozco, M.M. & Quin-Hilliard, D. B. 2004. Globalization, Culture and Education in The New Millennium. In: Saurez-Orozco, M.M. & Quin-Hilliard, D. B. (Eds.). *Globalization, Culture and Education in The New Millennium*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1-37.
- Soyinka, W. 1976. *Myth, Literature and the African World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sullivan, C. & Cottone, R.R. 2010. Emergent Characteristics of Effective Cross-Cultural Research: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, (88): 357-362.



- Sullivan, K. J. 2013. Stanford's overseas studies program expands its offerings [Online]. Available: <http://news.stanford.edu/news/2013/september/bing-overseas-expansion-090413.html>. [Accessed 5 September 2013].
- Synnott, A. 1993. *The Body Social: Symbolism, Self and Society*. New York: Routledge.
- Taylor, P. 2000. *The Drama Classroom: Action, Reflection Transformation*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Tehrani, M. 2002. Global Terrorism: Searching for Appropriate Responses. *Pacifica Review*, 14(1): 57-65.
- Tiffin, C. & Lawson, A. 1994. *De-Scribing Empire: Post-colonialism and Textuality*. New York: Routledge.
- Transition. 1961. The Transition Profile: 'Beyond the Fringe...'. *Transition*, (1):21-22. [Online]. Available: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2934707>. [Accessed 23 January 2014].
- Traore, B. 1972. *The Black African Theatre and Its Social Functions*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- Trilokekar, R. D. 2010. International education as soft power? The contributions and challenges of Canadian foreign policy to the internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education*, (59):131-147.
- Tsuda, Y. 2008. The Hegemony of English and Strategies for Linguistic Pluralism: Proposing the Ecology of Language Paradigm. In: Asante, M. K., Miike, Y. & Jing Yin, J (Eds.). *The Global Intercultural Communication Reader*. New York and London: Routledge. 167-177.
- Turner, V. 1986. *The Anthropology of Performance*. London: PAJ Publications.
- Uganda Protectorate. 1930. *Annual Report of the Education Department for the Year Ended 31st December 1929*. Entebbe: The Government Printer.
- Ugor, P. 2006. Demonizing The African Other, Humanizing The Self: Hollywood and The Politics of Post-imperial Adaptations. *Atenea: A Bilingual Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, XXV (1- 2): 131-150.
- Wa'Thiong'o, N. 1986. *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers Ltd.
- Wallerstein, I. 1993. Culture as the Ideological Battleground of the Modern World-System. In: Featherstone, M. (Ed.). *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. London: Sage Publications. 31-55.
- Wallerstein, I. 1996. Neither Patriotism nor Cosmopolitanism. In: Nussbaum M.C. & Cohen, J. (Eds.). *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*. Boston: Beacon. 122-124.

- Wasswa, J. 2007. Makerere University Music Dance and Drama Department: The Development of Performing Arts in Uganda. B.A Dissertation. [Unpublished]. Makerere University. Library Kampala.
- Woodside, A. G. & Wilson, E. J. 2003. Case Study research methods for theory building. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 18 (6/7): 493-508.
- Yin, R. K. 2009. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (Fourth Edition). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Ylanne-McEwen, V. & Coupland, N. 2000. Accommodation Theory: A Conceptual Resource for Intercultural Sociolinguistics In: Spencer-Oatey, H. (Ed.) *Culturally Speaking: Managing Rapport Through Talk Across Cultures*. 191-214.
- Young, J.C. R. 1995. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*. London: Routledge.
- Young, J.C.R. 2004. *White Mythologies: Writing history and the west* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). London & New York: Routledge.
- Zegarac, V. & Pennington, M. C. 2000. Pragmatic Transfer in Intercultural Communication. In: Spencer-Oatey, H. (Ed.) *Culturally Speaking: Managing Rapport Through Talk Across Cultures*. London and New York: 165-190.
- Zelinsky, W. 2004. Globalization Reconsidered: The Historical Geography of Modern Western Male Attire. *Journal of Cultural Geography*, 22(1):83-134.
- Zeszotarski, P. 2001. ERIC Review: Issues in Global Education Initiatives in the Community College. *Community College Review*, 29(1): 65-78.