



Media and Communication studies  
Communication for Development  
Tutor: Anders Hög Hansen

Irina Bernebring Journiette  
"Final Paper" (TFDK:Final Paper)  
2013-06-14

# “Theater as the Elicitive Third Space”

How Theater for Development has been used to prevent  
violence in Kenya.

Irina Bernebring Journiette

# Abstract

In this paper theater is understood as a tool to communicate social transformation and the purpose of this study is to investigate the use of Theater for Development in relation to preventing violence and explore if, how and why the use differ in relation to preventing direct or structural violence. By analyzing the narrated experiences of Kenyan theater-practitioners work through the theoretical perspectives presented by Homi K. Bhabha and John Paul Lederach this paper then argues that theater can create an elicitive Third Space where the passive spectators in the audience can be turned into empathetic, conscientized spect-actors and where conflicting communication can occur without violence. It then goes on to theorize on how the explanation to the differences exists in what the performance need to achieve in the elicitive Third space.

*Key Words:* Theater for Development, Preventing Violence, Conflict Communication, Elicitive, Third Space, Conscientization, Empathetication.

# Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>2</b>
1.1	Foreword.....	2
1.2	Statement of Purpose .....	3
1.2.1	Limitations.....	5
1.3	Clarifying Key Concepts .....	7
1.3.1	Defining Development .....	7
1.3.2	Defining Theater for Development.....	8
1.3.3	Understanding Communication in relation to Theater .....	11
1.4	Previous Research .....	12
<b>2</b>	<b>Method</b> .....	<b>16</b>
2.1	Ethical Considerations .....	19
2.2	Material and Evaluation of Sources.....	20
<b>3</b>	<b>Theoretical Framework</b> .....	<b>22</b>
3.1	An Elicitive Approach to Development .....	22
3.2	Cultural Communication in the Third Space.....	23
3.3	Theatre as the Elicitive Third Space.....	25
<b>4</b>	<b>Theater for Development in Kenya</b> .....	<b>29</b>
4.1	The Narrated Field-Work Experience .....	29
4.1.1	Expressed Possibilities with Theater for Development.....	29
4.1.2	Expressed Challenges with Theater for Development .....	31
4.1.3	Expressed Important Factors for a Successful Endeavor .....	32
4.2	The Observed Field-Work Experience .....	35
4.2.1	Puppetry, Peace and Good Governance .....	35
4.2.2	Sex, Condoms and HIV/AIDS.....	37
<b>5</b>	<b>Theater to Prevent Violence</b> .....	<b>40</b>
5.1	Understanding Differences in Theory .....	40
5.1.1	Dealing with the Root Causes .....	40
5.1.2	Contextualization.....	42
5.1.3	Identification.....	43
5.1.4	Provocation.....	44
5.2	Understanding Differences in Practice .....	46
5.2.1	Framing the Dilemmas .....	46
5.2.2	Use of Time .....	47
5.2.3	Use of Local Resources .....	48
5.2.4	Use of Objects as Representation .....	49
5.3	Preventing Direct Vs. Structural Violence .....	50
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>52</b>
6.1	Preventing Violence in the Third Space .....	52
6.2	Suggestions for Further Research.....	54
<b>7</b>	<b>References</b> .....	<b>55</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Appendices</b> .....	<b>60</b>
8.1	Example of Interview Transcript.....	60
8.2	Codification of Same Transcript.....	68
8.3	Final Codification of All Narratives.....	72

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Foreword

George Bernard Shaw once said that, “Without art, the crudeness of reality would make the world unbearable.” The artistic expression has since the early days of human culture been used to escape the mundane into an entertaining world of imagination. This space that is imagination, however, has endless possibilities to not only provide a fictional escape but also to reflect reality in a way that can evoke social change and transform society.

My interest of using art for social change spurred out of my own experiences with using theater as a tool for non-formal education. During an international seminar on intercultural dialogue, multiculturalism and theater, theater became the space in which all of us as participants with different cultural backgrounds and understandings could communicate clearly despite our cultural differences. In an attempt to understand how this space came to be and what possibilities it offered, I during my undergraduate studies within Peace- and Conflict studies decided to focus on exploring the idea of theater for reconciliation and how specifically Augusto Boal’s (1979) method of forum theater could be used to promote psychosocial reconciliation in war-shattered societies. The research concluded that the space offered by theater is the concept of the Third Space as presented by Homi K. Bhabha, a space in which otherwise static cultural identities can be negotiated. In this paper, published within Communication studies, I intend to once again return to the subject to explore the possibilities that exists within the space that theater offers, but with focus on using theater to communicate development in the sense of preventing violence and studying how and why Theater for Development, TFD, to prevent structural violence differ from TFD to prevent direct violence. In my bachelors thesis, where the focus was on war-shattered societies, the political context of the Balkans offered an interested regional focus. For this thesis, where the focus is on

the idea of development it became imperative to focus on a region in which the concept of development has been a part of the discourse for a prolonged period of time. Since this is a master's thesis it was also essential that previous research existed within the field that I could build upon. Since the 1980's research relating to the idea of theater as a tool to communicate social change with attention directed towards the work conducted in sub-Saharan Africa has gained momentum. This is for example made evident by Ross Kidd's (1984b) work in which he outlines the progression of TFD in Africa since the early 1950's, as well as Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's reflection *Decolonizing the Mind* (1986) in which he describes his experiences with the pioneering community theater project in Kamiriithu, Kenya. Based on this possibility to contribute to an already established field of research I decided to focus my research on the East-African nation of Kenya.

## 1.2 Statement of Purpose

The primary question of this study is what role interactive theater can play within development communication in relation to preventing violence. The research is based on the fundamental belief that communication is imperative to any form of development and that theater is a form of communication. This assumption is based on the epistemology of valuing communication as the basis for human interaction and relationships and focusing on the centrality of the human being in a community as an communicating, social, actor. Individuals are subjects with human agency with the power to communicate and hence the power to drive development. Communication is however also seen as a complex process that can result in conflict.

Based on this another assumption of this study is that theater methodologies can play an important part within development in relation to preventing violence since it can provide an arena for local community, or individual, participation as well as a space where conflict communication can occur without violence. An interesting possibility in relation to the contextual factors of Kenya where ethnical nepotism, so called tribalism, is

said to have propelled the violent political clashes. With the aspiration to explore the possibilities that exists within the space that theater can offer, the purpose of this study is to see if there are any differences in what the space can offer in relation to different kinds of violence. Based on this the aim of this study is to closely analyze a group of Kenyan theater-practitioners' narrative in an attempt to answer the following research question:

- How does Theater for Development to prevent direct violence differ from Theater for Development to prevent structural violence?

Based on Galtung's (1969) definitions of violence TFD to prevent direct violence will be understood as process that prevent the prevalence of ethnically<sup>1</sup> motivated physical violence whereas TFD to prevent structural violence will be understood as processes that aim to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS. Structural violence is limited to preventing the spread of HIV/AIDS since many theatrical endeavors historically have focused on this. After initially exploring *how* preventing direct violence and preventing structural violence possibly differ, the intent is to move on and, by seeing the results in the framework of understanding based on the theories on cultural negotiation in the Third Space by Homi K. Bhabha and the work on building peace with community participation by John Paul Lederach, theorize about *why* they differ. In the concluding discussion it will then be theorized about what this can tell us as researchers within Communication for Development about the use of TFD in relation to preventing violence in the field. I would like to make it clear that this work not is to be understood as a handbook in how to use TFD, nor as an evaluation of TFD as a tool to communicate development. This work should be understood as a contemporary comment in relation to how we as researchers within Communication for Development relate to using TFD in relation to preventing violence in the field.

---

<sup>1</sup> The term ethnically motivated violence will be used throughout this paper to refer to the political violence that erupted along ethnic or so called tribal lines in the aftermath of the election in 2007.

### 1.2.1 Limitations

The focus of this paper is on the opportunities, that exists, to prevent violence within the unique space that theater can offer. Theater as a concept will in this paper be understood as a dramatic performance that can be accompanied by song, music, dance and puppetry. It is however important to point out that several projects that co-relate other forms of art and preventing violence have been carried out in the region that I've decided to focus on. In for example Kenya's neighboring country of Tanzania music is often used as a tool to discuss socio-political issues and projects have taken place through which youth have used hip-hop to teach their community about issues such as HIV/AIDS (Shank & Schirch, 2008, p.217). In Kenya there has been a lot of focus on promoting peace through film and in the aftermath of the 2007 post-election violence several movies based on events that occurred during the crisis have been made. One example is the drama *Ni Ni Sisi* (It is us) made by the Kenyan branch of S.A.F.E (Sponsored Arts For Education) which tells the story of a typical Kenyan village in the context of the post-election violence and which was released just days before Kenyans, for the first time since 2007, returned to the voting booth in March 2013 (Savane, 2013).

Besides its limitation to theater this paper is also, as mentioned earlier, limited geographically to the East African nation of Kenya. Kenya was chosen since it provided the opportunity to build upon already existing research but also since it offered an interesting socio-political context. Even though Kenya has seen violent clashes in between different ethnic and cultural groups since its independence in 1963, it has for a long time, with neighboring countries such as Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda, been seen as a stable node in an otherwise unstable region and hence been engaged in an prolonged and perceived stable development process. This however, became contested after the presidential election in 2007 when a violent two-month long crisis along ethnically or tribally grounded political lines erupted. A crisis which lead to over thousand casualties and left up to 350 000 individuals internally displaced (The Waki Report, 2008).

In Kenya TFD has since the early 1990's been seen as an increasingly important process within development (Odhiambo, 2008, p.13). Standing on the shoulders of pioneers such as Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o and the Kamiriithu project (1986), Kenyan theater-practitioners have with both local and global funding applied the use of theater methodologies to promote community development and social transformation. From the pioneering endeavors, such as the University of Nairobi Free Travelling Theatre's projects to combat illiteracy and promote adult education in the early 1980's (Odhiambo, 2005, p.85), to more contemporary projects such as the Raising Voices and UN-Habitat's Safer Cities Program's to prevent gender based violence (Michau & Naker, 2004, p.60), theater has been given privilege based on its preconceived ability to bring transformation through easily communicated information and education. During, for example, the rapid spread of HIV/AIDS in the early 1990's theater was seen as an appropriate form to inform communities about prevention of sexually transmitted diseases. The trend, however, of using TFD when addressing the issue of HIV/AIDS shifted in the aftermath of the post-election violence of 2007 when Kenya suddenly found itself having to deal with the idea of building, consolidating and maintaining peace. Suddenly many of the projects that previously had dealt with development in the form of preventing the spread of HIV/AIDS, or structural violence, were now re-directing their instances to also focus on preventing the prevalence of ethnically motivated physical violence, or direct violence. To limit the scope of the empirical data the decision was hence made to conduct interviews with a number of Kenyan theater-practitioners with experience from working in the field with preventing the spread of HIV/AIDS or preventing the prevalence of ethnically motivated physical violence. Besides the interviews the empirical data also includes the observation and in-depth study of two separate performances dealing with the previously mentioned subjects. The practitioners and performances were selected based on the criteria that they, besides the fact that they worked with theater as an art form to promote development and carried out their activities locally in Kenya, also were run without commercial interest, were non-governmental and politically independent.



## 1.3 Clarifying Key Concepts

### 1.3.1 Defining Development

One of the challenges when exploring the subject of TFD is that there is no broad consensus in regards what constitutes development. Questions such as development for whom and what kind of development have no uncomplicated answers. Depending on the epistemological approach the perspective upon the concept is likely to change. A neo-liberal might for example consider development economic liberalization and progression. Whereas a technocrat might, focus on the development of information and computer technologies. In this paper development will be seen to strive towards sustainable social change. Social change is understood as not focusing on, for example, specific economic development or technological advancement but instead on social transformation. This is a perspective upon development, that stresses the individuals, or populations increased control, over its own economic, political or social destiny and see development as liberation, empowerment and engagement. This resonates the idea of community development with local ownership.

In this paper development will also be understood in relation to the idea of building peace. Even though the relationship between the two concepts are complex the difference will be understood by seeing peace building as “a political endeavour entered into in response to security problems for a limited period of time, whereas development is a long-term strategy carried out under generally peaceful conditions” (Smoljan, 2003, p.234). Nonetheless the concepts are seen as integrated through their core ideals, such as bringing about a form of sustainable social transformation as well as preventing the occurrence of direct and/or structural violence.

The definitions of violence are derived from the work of Johan Galtung and direct violence is defined as violence that has an author, a perpetrator, and violence that kills quickly whereas structural violence, on the contrary, is violence that is anonymous and that kills slowly (Galtung & Höivik,

1971, p.73). Structural violence is hence violence that is indirect and caused by violent structures within a society (Galtung, 1969) such as cultural structures that for example does not allow for sexual education or the use of condoms which lead to an increase in sexually transmitted diseases such as the spread of HIV/AIDS. Based on this perception of violence TFD to prevent direct violence will be understood as processes that prevent the prevalence of ethnically motivated physical violence whereas TFD to prevent structural violence will be understood as processes that aim to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS.

### 1.3.2 Defining Theater for Development

Various terms such as community based theater, popular theater, forum theater, participatory theater and developmental theater can be and are currently used to describe endeavors that engages with using theater to promote development. According to Christopher Kamlongera (2005) each of these terms indicate what using TFD aspires to achieve, namely “helping the masses in the developing world to come to terms with their environment and the onus of improving their lot culturally, educationally, politically, economically and socially” (p.435). Kamlongera’s definition resonate the general approach towards TFD, namely that it is the idea of using different forms of theater as a method to encourage human and societal progression. For some authors, such as Samuel Kafewo (2007, p.162) TFD is described as popular theater, though not popular in the sense that its concerned with commercial issues, but rather that it deals with the issues that concerns the people, that, in difference from entertainment theater with the goal of distancing spectators from their reality, strive to tackle issues that exists within a societies reality. The notion of seeing TFD as popular theater is shared with Ross Kidd (1984b) who goes on to characterize it as theater that is performed in the language of the spectators and directed at engaging them as to build their “confidence, participation, self-expression, and critical awareness” (p.265). Ideas clearly reflecting the theoretical discussions by Paulo Freire (1970), (Kidd & Kumar, 1981). In *The Pedagogy of the*

*Oppressed* (1970) Freire argues that most transformational or educational endeavors fail because they don't take into consideration the reality of the target group. By seeing the education process as dialogic instead of solely didactic Freire argues that the process of education has to be mutually transformative and that both the educator and the educated continuously develop for the process to be successful—the process of transformation needs to be participatory. The notion of participation is hence also given privilege by Kidd (1984b, p.266) who argues that the idea of popular theater is an effective tool to build human capacity as it focuses on participation and exploring a communities own issues. Or, as expressed by Christopher Odhiambo, “the recipients of developments are expected to negotiate their own development through a dialogic process” (2008, p.47). The importance of the spectators participation is then even further emphasized by Zakes Mda (1993) who argues that participation within TFD goes beyond just a performance produced *with* the people and claims that an ideal TFD would be a performance produced *by* the people *for* the people (Mda, 1993, p.50). Mda's TFD hence become characterized in the terms of community based theater, “modes of theatre whose objective is to disseminate messages, or to conscientize communities about their objective social political situation” (Mda, 1993, p.48). This since he reflects that Freire's concept of conscientisation—to become critically aware of one's own social reality, is what drives development and that participation is imperative for the spectator to achieve this. Mda argues that, “conscientisation happens as a result of the target community's participation in *naming* their problems, in *reflecting* on them by exploring the reasons for their existence, and in community decision-making on the course of *action* to take in order to solve the problems” (Mda, 1993, p.164).

The idea of participation is also emphasized by Augusto Boal's *Theatre of the Oppressed* (1979) in which he encourages the spectator to break free from the oppression that s/he has been confined to as a passive agent and instead “take on the role of Actor and invade the Character and the stage” (2008, xxi). To foster the liberation of the spectator Boal presents key participatory theatrical techniques such as Invisible theatre, Image theater and Forum theater. Invisible theater is theater that takes place in a public

space and involves the spectators in the action without their knowledge of it whereas Image theater is a non-verbal process through which participants are asked to paint images of their lives, feelings and experiences to reveal truths about society. In Forum Theater, which is the most famous approach, an open-ended dilemma is portrayed for the spectators who then are invited on to the stage to enact possible solutions. This theater is then lead by a provocateur, known as the facilitator or joker whose role is to facilitate the performance and provoke the audience to act and re-act to what is happening on the stage. Theater of the Oppressed hence become the forum through which the otherwise muted spectator has the possibility to “occupy his own Space and offer solutions” to the conflict that’s presented on the stage (Boal, 2008, xxi). By being encouraged to invade the stage the passive spectators are encouraged to become active spect-actors and take control of the situation and change the dramatic action. Which means that the oppressed are invited to, negotiate power-relations in the dynamic space that the stage offer. The idea as presented by Boal is that by “taking possession of the stage, the Spect-Actor is consciously performing a responsible act. The stage is a representation of the reality, a fiction. But the Spect-Actor is not fiction. He exists in the scene and outside of it, in a dual reality. By taking possession of the stage in the fiction of the theatre he acts: not just in the fiction, but also in his social reality. By transforming fiction, he is transformed into himself” (Boal, 2008, p.xxi) and as the spectator “assumes the protagonic role, changes the dramatic action, tries out solutions, discusses plans for change” he also “trains himself for real action” (Boal, 2008, p.98). Boal’s Theater of the Oppressed, or TFD, is hence a theater of subject transformation. Interpreting Kidd and Byram’s (1981) work with *Laedza Batanai* Odhiambo (2008) also expresses the ideas of subject transformation but in terms of empowerment, by empowering the community in the role of spectator the community members are elevated “from being passive spectators to becoming more active participants in the enactment of their realities” (p.50). If the main objectives of Boal’s and Odhiambo’s theater is to change the audience, from “spectators’, passive beings in the theatrical phenomenon – into subjects, into actors, transformers of the dramatic action” (Boal, 2008, p.97) then Mda in an

appealing way moves beyond the transformation of the oppressed individual and onto the transformation of the oppressed society. TFD is then and will hence be understood in this paper as "taking theatre to the people, and using theatre not only to reflect and interpret society, but to transform it" (Mda, 1993, p.6).

### 1.3.3 Understanding Communication in relation to Theater

One of the underlying assumptions of this paper is that communication is imperative to any form of development and that theater is an expressive instrument for communication. For this paper two important processes within communication theory are of importance. Firstly, which communication model is in play, when talking about TFD, secondly the interpretative and potentially conflict-generating nature of communication.

Communication is defined as the act of conveying verbal or non-verbal information and the models that were developed within early communication theory to explain the mode of communicating can help describe in what way the actors studied in this paper relates and conveys information to the spectators. The conventional media communication model is one-directional and linear and based on the idea that a sender composes a message and transmits it for a recipient to receive. For example, is the case with conventional theater. Within face-to-face communication, when a spectator is allowed to talk back to an actor, the communication process instead becomes two-directional, circular and interpretative. And if several spectators and actors, or senders and receivers, engage in the exchange of information the mode of communication becomes non-linear and multi-directional (Nicotera, 2009).

In this paper communication will be understood as participatory communication, a form of communication which moves away from the traditional one-directional model of communicating to a more complex and multi-directional model of communicating. The discourse of participation within Communication for Development studies gain momentum in the 1970's and was the result of the strong reaction against the post World War II communication strategies that focused on top-down processes for social

change. The reaction instead emphasized the idea of bottom-up approaches as well as the possibilities to evoke a transformative process through dialogue and inclusion (Singhal, 2004, p.142). The idea of participatory communication is pinned on the underlying notion that there should be “an exchange of information between the parties concerned so that they understand one another’s point of view” (Mda, 1993, p.27). Framing development communication in terms of an understanding that requires the involvement of the community and individual also encourages the empowerment of the same and recognizes a local and community based knowledge and ability to make own decisions and negotiate power relations. Within the previously established definition of TFD this model of communication translates into the idea that spectators and “audiences are not merely recipients and consumers of messages, but can initiate, create and transmit messages to one another” (Mda, 1993, p.43).

The interpretative nature of the messages being transmitted can however at time lead to conflict. When communicating individuals and institutions in society exchange meaning by using a common system of symbols or codes. Communication is hence based on the idea that the sender and receiver can interpret these codes and symbols in a similar way. In other words, the receiver needs to be able to decode the senders code to extract the meaning of the message, a process that often occur unconsciously (Bouissac, 2010) (Kirsch, 1973) (Leeds-Hurwitz, 2009). This code however is culturally sensitive since individuals within different cultures tend to use language differently—“language is part of a process of communication which is culturally conditioned” (Kirch, 1973, p.340). People then, who do not share the same codex will have difficulties communicating. And in cases where the sender and receiver interpret symbols differently misunderstandings can cause conflict (Kirch, 1973) (Leeds-Hurwitz, 2009).

## 1.4 Previous Research

Research within the field of TFD in Africa and particularly East Africa, as outlined throughout this paper, is both extensive and versatile. Earlier

research seemed to aim at establishing the validity of the field of research in relation to already existing theories as well as document early attempts of using TFD (Kidd and Byram, 1981) (Kidd, 1984a) (Kidd, 1984b). Whilst more contemporary approaches, such as the work of Odhiambo (2005) (2008) seem to aim at mapping procedures, or like the work of Julie Koch (2008), at critically assessing current approaches. In his work Odhiambo outlines more than twenty Kenyan endeavors within TFD and argues that several of them have been unsuccessful since “they lack clear sets of procedures and or methodology within which Theatre for Development as a practice would operate” (Odhiambo, 2008, p.182). Focusing on neighboring Tanzania however, Koch claims the opposite. In her work *Karibuni Wanachi: Theatre for Development in Tanzania* she explores the methodology, philosophy and aesthetics that are shaping the current development of TFD in Tanzania and among other things concludes that the use of theater has been important for the success of the Tanzanian development process. Something Ola Johansson in his work *Community Theater and AIDS* (2011) also hints at when he mentions that “community-based theater is indeed the most site-specific cultural practice used against AIDS in Tanzania today” (p.5). Even though Johansson tries to distance himself from the use of the term TFD, seemingly referring to it as a concept with too commercial and too statically directed connotations (2011, p.5-6) this research benefits from reading his work. By studying how community based theater initiatives is deployed in relation to educate and inform about HIV/AIDS Johansson among other things assumes that a possibility with theater based initiatives is to exemplify the locality of an issue and argues that best-practices for community intervention is interactivity (2011, p.23, p.16).

Even though the theater-in-combination-with-development perspective builds upon the same foundations as previously conducted studies, the ideas of researching it in terms of preventing direct violence or building peace, is something that to a great extent so far has been unexplored. As stated by Michael Shank and Lisa Schirch, “there is very little solid theory, research, or evaluation of arts-based peacebuilding” (Shank & Schirch, 2008, p.217). In their article *Strategic Arts-Based Peacebuilding* they attempt to move

beyond just asserting that arts have great possibilities and into actually pinpointing and evaluating practical uses of arts within building peace. Even though they focus on the possibilities of several different forms of art, the advantages with using theater to negotiate conflict is highlighted throughout the text. Among other things they argue that methods such as Image theater can be used during the conflict transformation process to facilitate the process of replacing violence with peace (p.224). The use of theater in relation to transforming conflict is also explored by Samuel Kafewo in *The Rhythms of Transformation: Theatre And Conflict Resolution in Northern Nigeria* where he studies how the methods established by Boal has been used in an attempt build bridges and mend peace between different ethnic and religious groups in Nigeria (Kafewo, 2007). Even though Kawefo just like Johansson (2011) refrains from using the term TFD and instead focuses on the idea of popular theater, important parallels can be drawn between his research and the one presented in this paper. Such as his mention of the uniqueness in the space that theater offers when he explains that the audience of a performance he observed, “were able to identify with the characters because of the unique power of the theatre to occupy the same space as the audience” (Kafewo, 2007, p.168). Kafewo later concludes his article by claiming that theatre deployed in the context of conflict transformation “can be an effective tool, when plays are constructed which present actions as problems, thereby involving the audience in a new relation not as worshippers but as jurors who must resolve the problem by their collective decision and action” (Kafewo, 2007, p.169). He does also point to the challenges that faced the project he studied, such as participants demanding money to partake in workshops and issue he refers to as the “commercial imperative” (p.169). This, as well as the difficulties of theater groups becoming self-sustainable after the initial project has ended is also seen as problematic by Koch (2008) who takes the idea one step further and asks if one really can applaud projects for empowering the grass-root movements as long as the projects still are controlled through their funding from international donors. Something which is interesting to ask in relation to Boal’s idea that all “truly revolutionary theatrical groups should transfer



to the people the means of production in the theatre so that the people themselves may utilize them” (Boal, 2008, p.98).

By referring to the significance of empowering grass-roots movements important parallels can also be drawn between the research conducted by Koch and the theoretical approach of John Paul Lederach as used in this paper to construct the theoretical framework and through which the local context is seen as a resource and not a burden whilst building on the process of peace and development. This indicates that even though previous research that explicitly focuses on the relationship between TFD and the theories presented by, and terms coined by, Lederach does not exist, they do so implicitly by dealing with co-related approaches.

Research combining Homi K. Bhabha’s theory regarding the Third Space, and the notions of conflict-reformation in relation to peace and development is however almost non-existent. Research focusing on Bhabha’s Third Space seems to mostly have focused on the idea of identity formation and negotiation (English, 2004) (Harinen, 2001) (Mythen, 2012). The research conducted by for example English (2004) on how “two women negotiate and translate the Christian and feminist discourses that regulate their lives” (p.102) can however be related to the research conducted in this paper by arguing that the women portrayed are negotiating their inner conflicting identities, as in relation to outer conflicting entities as portrayed in this paper. English’s conclusion is that the Third Space offers a compelling inner space in which the women can resolve their internal conflict since it offers a place where “culture is being re/negotiated in the here and now” (p.124).

## 2 Method

The empirical data presented in this paper was collected during an eight week long Minor Field Study<sup>2</sup> (MFS) that took place during the spring of 2013 in Eldoret, Nakuru and Nairobi, Kenya. The approach to the fieldwork was qualitative and several research methods were combined to create the understanding necessary to answer the research question. The qualitative approach was in this case determined as preferable since the focus was on understanding how TFD had worked in the specific context of Kenya. The approach was hence interpretive and sensitive to the social context (Mason, 2002) (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007).

The research process had both inductive and deductive features and throughout the process it was imperative to move back and forth between the two approaches. Through literature studies different theories were combined to create a theoretical framework through which the empirical data collected during the fieldwork was analyzed. The methods used to collect the empirical data and extract results from it were the unstructured observation, the structured interview as well as the semi-structured interview and content analysis. The observations were conducted as to collect data on the practice, and the semi-structured interviews as to collect data on the theory, of using TFD in relation to preventing violence.

The observations were of two different performances and took place during the time spent in Kenya. The observation of a performance dealing with the issue of ethnically motivated physical violence, took place in the informal settlement of Kibera, Nairobi and was non-participatory and semi-overt, the actors had knowledge about my presence but not the spectators. The approach was favored as to try and minimize the impact of my presence. The observation of the performance dealing with the issue of HIV/AIDS, was conducted as an observation of pre-recorded material of a performance conducted in the town of Nakuru. The recording was taped by

---

<sup>2</sup> Minor Field Studies, MFS is a SIDA financed scholarship with the purpose to provide Swedish students with the possibility to gain knowledge about developing countries by conducting an academic field work in a developing country.

the performing group itself and had not been edited in any way that affected the presentation of it. During both observations particular focus was directed on the communication process, the level and character of audience participation and engagement, the relationship between actor and spectator as well as the use of theatrical space. Both of the performances were performed in the Kenyan official language of Kiswahili. The fact that I do not speak Kiswahili did not affect the outcome of the observations since I had access to a translator. The potential loss of meaning that can come from a translation-process was acceptable since it was the core meaning of what was being said and *how* it was expressed through theater and not through the use of language that was important. This also echoes one of the assumed possibilities with theater—conveying a message without verbal communication. Regarding the interviews they were all conducted in English, the second official working language of the country. Even though there are more than sixty known languages spoken in Kenya English is widely spoken in commerce, schooling and within government, this means that all the practitioners had enough command over the language to fully express themselves confidently in it.

Both observations were then followed by a structured interview with one actor with knowledge of the development of the performance as to establish further variables for comparison. In the structured interviews questions such as the motivation for developing the performance as well as the research and creative process<sup>7</sup> that preceded the performance were posed.

The semi-structured interviews were conducted with theater-practitioners and centered on the topics of theater, communication, development and peace and the correlation between them. The practitioners consisted of both men and women in between the ages of seventeen and sixty. Some of them had worked with more famous endeavors such as the Amani Peoples Theatre<sup>3</sup> whereas others came from smaller organizations such as the TEARS<sup>4</sup> Group Kenya. All the practitioners had spent most of

---

<sup>3</sup> Amani People Theatre (APT) can be translated to the Peoples Peace Theatre and was founded in 1994 and has conducted acknowledge work in relation to peace. (Who we are, n/d APT)

<sup>4</sup> Theatre for Enhancement and Acceleration of Researched Solutions (TEARS) is a NGO founded in 2002 that is based in Nakuru and operates mainly within the Rift Valley. Their motto is to empower individuals and communities through art.

their life in Kenya and even though they perhaps were born and raised in other parts of Kenya they were now settled and working from the capital city of Nairobi and/or the Rift Valley Province. Interesting to note, even though it was not taken into consideration during the analysis, the practitioners also represented a variety of ethnical/tribal belongings such as kikuyu, lou, kalenjin. The practitioners were chosen based on their experience as well as their availability to meet within the time frame that the field work was limited by. The choice to focus on practitioners with experience from the field and for example not scholars or non-practicing experts was made to get a more pragmatic, even though theoretically grounded understanding of the phenomena. Likewise the audience or the spectator turned spect-actor was not given room in this paper as that would have added a dimension beyond the scope of this paper's aim. This is however something that would be interesting to further investigate during additional research within the subject.

In total nine interviews, with various theater-practitioners who all work with different forms of interactive theater and had experience from working in the field with preventing the spread of HIV/AIDS or preventing the prevalence of ethnically motivated physical violence were conducted in an attempt to capture their *experience* of the phenomena (Pickering, 2008, p.21-30). To elicit this narrative it was important during the interview-process to refrain from using my own expressions in relation to the topics mentioned and instead let the interview-subjects choose their own words through which the topics of the subjects were framed. This was important as to avoid affecting the expressions used to narrate the content since the personal narrative derived from the interviews then was analyzed using a qualitative and hermeneutic content analysis.

Content analysis has a long history of use within media and communication studies (Riff, Stephen & Frederic, 1998) (Krippendorff, 2004). However in this paper the method is understood in the qualitative, hence hermeneutic and interpretative, and not quantitative, sense. This means that the content analysis was not conducted based on the occurrence of a certain word or expression a number of times but rather how certain words and expressions were related to each other in the shape of dominant

messages within the verbal communication message that made up the interviews. A content analysis of the theater-practitioners' narrative was favored thanks to its content-sensitivity and the possibilities to develop an understanding of the concepts being communicated (Elo & Kyngäs, 2007, p.109). The methodological approaches of conducting a hermeneutic, qualitative content analysis are many and varied and there are no pre-determined systematic guidelines to follow. In this paper, the content analysis was focused on the directly expressed, the manifested content, with the intent to derive the dominant messages expressed by the practitioners. This was done by identifying meaning bearing units in each interview, verbal message, and then shortening and abstracting them, formulating them into codes (Graneheim & Lundman, 2003). From these codes different variables as well as three overarching themes that the practitioners related to their experience of working with TFD became evident: The possibilities they saw with using TFD, what challenges they had faced and what factors they considered important for the endeavor to be perceived as successful. These themes were then used as to frame the analysis and reflect upon the different variables.

## 2.1 Ethical Considerations

When in the process of conducting ethnographic work several ethical aspects were taken into consideration. As noted by Hammersley and Atkinson in *Ethnography: Principles in Practice* (2007) the idea of informed consent together with the notions of privacy, harm, exploitation and consequences for future research are some of the most important ethical issues to take in consideration in relation to the research-subject (p.209). By throughout the research-process keeping a continued dialogue with the interviewees and providing them with adequate knowledge about in which direction the study was heading they were able to provide continuous free consent and decide freely as to whether or not to partake in the study. All the participants also gave their consent in relation to writing and publishing scholarly articles based on the conducted research.

During the fieldwork it was also important to acknowledge the fact that theater and the issues dealt with by theater are sensitive, therefore the subjects and situations were approached with the intent to become private without intruding on the subject's privacy. To reassure that the subjects would not be exposed to harm or exploitation they dictated under what circumstances we met as to set boundaries that they were comfortable with. In relation to safeguarding the interview-subjects personhood it was also decided that anonymity did not harm the reliability of their narrative. This was also the case for the actors and groups whose performances were observed. Anonymity also ensures that none of their future theatrical endeavors are damaged by the opinions expressed in this paper.

Another important ethical consideration is to acknowledge my own role as a researcher within the research-assumption. My role as a researcher was overt and during the research process the idea of producing a new shared knowledge together with the interview-subjects was given priority. This approach is also connected to the theoretical framework of this paper and based on valuing Lederach's idea of seeing the local community as a resource, in this case whilst generating new knowledge.

Lastly I also want to acknowledge my own presumption of the Bhaktin unfinalizability—the impossibility of arriving at final conclusions (Bhaktin, 1984). This is also related to the difficulties with studying culture and the complex set of material conditions that are important to factor in when doing so. As Gray (2003, p.12) interprets the Morris' (1997) formulation: "Culture is not a free-floating set of ideas or beliefs, nor is it exemplified only by a canon of great works of art or literature." No, culture is dynamic and ever-changing and requires the research-process to be equally dynamic.

## 2.2 Material and Evaluation of Sources

The material presented in this paper consists of both primary data collected during the field-trip to Kenya as well as secondary material gathered through literature-studies. The primary data was collected as mentioned earlier.

The secondary material was foremost applied as to construct the theoretical framework. On the topic of elicitivity this material consists of John Paul Lederach's work *Preparing for Peace* (1995), *Building Peace* (1997) and *The Moral Imagination* (2005) and on the topic of the Third Space Homi K. Bhabha's *The Location of Culture* (1994) was used as foundation. To apply this approach to theater Augusto Boal's, *Theatre of the Oppressed* (1979), Zakes Mda's *When People Play People* (1993) as well as the work of Paulo Freire (1970) and Ross Kidd (1984a)(1984b) were read.

To evaluate the validity and reliability of the interviews with the practitioners the focus was on the interpretation of their consistency, their known merits as well as their credibility. Consistency was confirmed by systematically returning to focal points in their expressed narrative and asking follow-up questions. Their merits as theater-practitioners were evaluated in relation to how they were cross-referred to by other theater-practitioners as well as information publicly available about their work. The subjective notion of credibility was based on their motivation for agreeing to be interviewed. Since no gains were to be made by them besides furthering the knowledge of the use of TFD it was concluded that the theater-practitioners did not have any interest in forging a false personal narrative. In relation to evaluate the validity and reliability of the performance that was observed in person as well as the follow-up interviews the same approach was used as in relation to the theater-practitioners narrative.

The secondary sources were critically evaluated based on authenticity, author credibility as well as closeness in time and space. To verify authenticity confirming but independent facts among different sources and researchers were found. To evaluate the author credibility the author's research motives were critically explored and an independence in relation to outspoken subjective interests or stakes in relation to this research was established. The criteria of closeness in time and space was used as to guarantee that paradigms presented still were actual and not had been rendered inadequate by recent findings (Teorell & Svensson, 2007, p.104-106).

# 3 Theoretical Framework

## 3.1 An Elicitive Approach to Development

As stated earlier this paper argues that some of the core principles of building peace relate to the core principles of ‘building’ development. This means that already existing theories within peace-building have the possibility to provide a new framework of understanding in relation to development. Based on this assumption a part of the theoretical framework through which the research questions will be analyzed will be based on the theories in regards to building peace presented by John Paul Lederach in his works *Preparing for Peace* (1995), *Building Peace* (1997) and *The Moral Imagination* (2005). The relationship between peace and development or social change is also reflected upon by Lederach himself as he states the following: “*Building Peace* could be understood principally as a book about the engineering of social change. That was not the expressed intent nor language I used to describe it. But in all honesty that may well be a better way to situate the content” (2005, p.viii). This means that theories as presented by Lederach in relation to social conflict transformation will be hermeneutically studied, in the light of social transformation.

Throughout his work Lederach focuses on the importance of a contextual approach when conducting transformative work and highlights the involvement of local change agents. By arguing that a local community’s contextual knowledge is imperative for understanding and working with the issues that are affecting said community he reasons that individuals within a process of transformation should be seen as a resource and not a burden (1995).

Based on these ideas Lederach in his work *Preparing for Peace* (1995) presents a theory about building sustainable peace and transforming social conflict based on a contextual and grass-root based approach called the “elicitive model.” The hypothesis of the model is that methods for



transforming social conflicts need to be produced within their context and be considerate of the local conditions (1995, p.55). When this is done the stakeholders within the process together can create a sustainable environment where the conflict can be transformed (1995, p.62). The “elicitive model” is argued as an dichotomy to the “prescriptive model” in which already established templates in relation to building peace are imposed upon a conflict situation. This means that the goals of the conflict transformation process or process for social change should be formulated by participants within the process and not by outside actors. Which means that community members, are actively encouraged to take part in shaping and possibly re-shaping the process of transformation. In that way the participants work together to reach the root causes of the conflict to be able to understand it and are a part of creating the forum in which the process for transforming the conflict should take place (1995, p.64). Involving local change agents within the process of transformation is based on Lederach’s hypothesis that social conflict is generated and amplified by the social and cultural mishaps that arise when different cultural meaning have been ascribed to the same objects and when situations are interpreted differently based on different cultural, national or ethnic pre-understandings (1995, p.31). Since the conflict is derived from the local context so must the solution be. This also means that conflict and how it is continuously generated is connected to the conflicting groups cultural conception of it. To end or transform the conflict the conception of it need to change (1995, p.8). Which in turn means that somewhere within the transforming process a space need to be located in which the parties within the conflict can meet and reflect over their past, current and future relationship (2005), an elicitive, or contextually evoked, space where stakeholders can negotiate their mutual terms of transformation.

### 3.2 Cultural Communication in the Third Space

How is culture defined? And where is it located? As mentioned earlier this paper rests on an assumption that “Culture is not a free-floating set of ideas

of beliefs, nor is it exemplified only by a canon of great works of art of literature” (Gray, 2003, p.12). Instead culture is dynamic and ever changing. The complexity of culture is intriguing and many attempts have been made by researchers to capture and study the dynamic of culture. In his work, *The Location of Culture* (1994), English professor Homi K. Bhabha goes on to explore key concepts of our post-colonial world, such as identity, identification and nationality, to create a theory about cultural hybridity—the idea that human beings are subjects with the possibility to create and re-create social and cultural difficulties and contradictions. His theory is based on the idea that the contemporary human being is, inhabiting a world that has been divided and structured based on the different cultural, religious and sexual characteristics that individuals attribute to their identity. He then goes on to further argue that none of these characteristics are derived from a form of original culture or natural identity but rather that all culture is created in relation to other cultures. No culture can hence create itself or can be seen as original or natural, all cultures are rather hybrid cultures, created through assimilation through interaction. That means that the cultural identity of each individual consist of several different cultural identities that is continuously being shaped and re-shaped through interaction with other individuals with a different or conflicting cultural identity. This interaction is a moment that opens up for cultural hybridity and for re-negotiation to take place and is what Bhabha calls the Third Space—an in-between space where individuals can question and re-construct their own and their society’s cultural identity and identity formation (Bhabha, 1994, p.1).

This Third Space is a space where individuals can meet in a setting that is not bound by the subjective attributes that individuals use to define themselves and others. Instead, cultural attributes and symbols lose their static meaning and “even the same signs can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricized and read anew” (Bhabha, 1994, p.37). From this process a hybrid-culture is created that is *ours*. A common culture that is created in the interaction in-between individuals with “different” culture (Bhabha, 1994, p.38). The Third Space then becomes imperative in relation to recognized and conscious intercultural communication where cultures, ethnicities or nationalities meet and communicate. This, since language is a

vehicle of culture and since language often is based on significant cultural and contextual meaning. Which means that, it's not only the manifested expression, which is important in a communication situation but also, the latently expressed. For communication to be successful it's necessary that the receiver not only hear the words pronounced by the sender but also understand the words in the specific meaning in its interpretative context. In relation to communication, the Third Space is hence a space where the codes and symbols attributed to language can be de-constructed as differences and re-constructed as a hybridity. In the Third Space the receiver and sender can, even though their codes are different, communicate through commonly created and now hybrid codes and symbols. By creating a Third Space where cultural differences can meet and assimilate into hybridity the boundaries created in between individuals in relation to culture and language can be broken down. The Third Space is hence a forum where individuals with different cultural identities and perceptions can understand each other.

### 3.3 Theatre as the Elicitive Third Space

Based on these two theoretical reflections the theoretical proposition of this paper is that the Third Space is the elicitive, or contextually evoked, space that Lederach mean must exists somewhere within the transformation process, in which stakeholders within the conflict can negotiate their mutual terms of transformation and that interactive theater can create this space in which cultural identities can be shaped and reshaped to bring conscientisation, to raise a critical awareness of the target audience's own social reality. This since it offers a stage on which it allows for critique and negotiation of otherwise fixed ideas and opens up for a space in which history and cultural expressions or perceived truths are no longer static but instead debatable. Something specifically interesting to apply to the context in Kenya where there have been violent clashes along ethnic or tribal lines.

To elaborate, as Boal writes: "Dialogue is always dangerous, because it creates discontinuity between one thought and another, between two

opinions, or two possibilities—and between them infinity installs itself; so that all opinions are possible, all thoughts permitted” (Boal, 2008, p.xvi). On stage this infinity is given privilege to create Bhabha’s hybridity. On stage an empty space is provided where individuals can express their opinions and can listen to the expression of other individual opinions. By creating this hybridity in a space that is originally neutral the conflict as it is perceived can be presented by the different stakeholders and then be deconstructed and then reconstructed as non-conflict. It is the space where the conception of the conflict can be transformed and the space in which conflicting communication can occur. As linguist, Ferdinand D. Saussure argues, language is not a reflection of reality but the filter through which the world is understood and created (Bouissac, 2010). This means that the meaning ascribed to words inherently are dynamic and can be negotiated in the Third Space. In the Third Space the receivers and senders can through negotiating their language and de-constructing their different meanings, reconstruct hybrid meanings and hence decode each other’s code. It is also the space where the different cultural meanings that have been ascribed to the same objects can be deconstructed and negotiated.

TFD evokes this Third Space by forcing interaction, direct action and participation that transcends the national, cultural or ethnical boundaries of the participants. It then cements this Third Space and maintains it by actively engineering situations in which the cultural conflicts or disagreements become focal points and which the audience is forced to act and re-act to. The audience participation then echoes the values of elicitivity—for a TFD endeavor to be successful each performance should be an echo of its community context and local conditions. The performance can hence through its elicitive nature provide possibilities to promote a greater understanding among spect-actors who together in the hybridity can create something new and stipulate the conditions for community development. Based on Lederach’s approach that conflict erupts based on different cultural, national or ethnic pre-understanding and/or through misinterpreted communication, the Third Space is the space where cultural conflict can be negotiated since the Third Space is the space where cultural attributes and symbols lose their static meaning and “even the same signs

can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricized and read anew” (Bhabha, 1994, p.37). The participants can hence in the Third Space work together with each other and with the actors to reach the root causes of the conflict to be able to understand it and at the same time be a part of creating the forum in which the process for transforming the conflict takes place.

The creation of this hybridity, that within theater comes from the unification of the actor and spect-actor, is also expressed by Boal when he argues that we as human beings through theater are allowed to think with the protagonists mind and dull our own emotions and feel the protagonists feelings instead of our own. We feel empathy and that it’s what “marries” the spectator and the protagonist. And through the characters catharsis we are cathartic as well. Through the protagonists confession we will be making our own confession and promise ourselves to never make the same mistakes again (Boal, 2008, pp.xvii). Through participatory or interactive theater the spectator is invited onto the stage, to live the characters catharsis. The form of theater is not didactic but based on a dialectic process of subject transformation through identification. When the spectator becomes a spect-actor the spect-actor assumes the role of the actor—the character. This means that the Third Space within theater is both an inner and outer exchange point. This since it provides both an internal and external space for struggle and conflict, both within the spectator and between the different spectators. When the spectator turns in to a spect-actor, s/he is forced, to actively reflect upon and engage with not only the others perspective upon the conflict but also her own. This complex struggle is necessary to transform the status quo of a conflict situation and to bring sustainable social transformation.

Within the boundaries of the stage there is nothing static that is perceived as right or wrong. Instead there exists a dynamic of debate and acknowledgment of the spect-actors perceived ideas of legitimacy—there are no objective truths. The realization of this is a way towards conscientization and a way for spect-actors to manage to negotiate the social conflict. The Third Space is hence a space that leads to inevitable change, this change is however unpredictable. The outcome of a process in the Third Space can therefore never be controlled and the goal of an endeavor must

never be imposed, instead the now empowered and engaged spect-actors must themselves realize their roles as change agents within the conflict. As Zakes Mda writes: “The ‘best’ solution is arrived at by trial, error, discussion, then audience consensus” (1993, p.66). By opening up the space and encouraging the spectator to invade the stage, the spectators are invited to formulate their own goals echoing the values of Lederach and letting the goals of the conflict transformation process or process for social change be formulated by participants within the process and not by outside actors.

When theorizing about the Third Space in relation to any other theoretical perspective it’s important to acknowledge the critique it’s received in relation to the concept of power. Power is in this paper understood as “the relational capacity that enables a social actor to influence asymmetrically the decisions of other social actor(s) in ways that favor the empowered actor’s will, interests, and values” (Castells, 2009, p.10). This opens up for reflecting upon the idea of unequal power-relations within the Third Space in relation to who for example takes the possibility to invade the space that is being offered. To create a functional Third Space you need a sense of shared power, and everyone needs to feel like they have the opportunity to invade the space and speak their mind, otherwise the negotiation that takes place within the Third Space becomes false. This paper does however also believe that power-structures derives its strength from the compliance and acceptance of the individual subjected to power which means that they can be transformed by resistance and rejection (Castells, 2009, p.11). This means that even though it’s important to acknowledge that the Third Space is also affected by the power-structures and relationships that exist in reality the space itself can also be a space in which the pre-existing and otherwise fixed power-relationships can be negotiated and hybridiated until they are transformed in the same way as social conflict can be transformed.

## 4 Theater for Development in Kenya

### 4.1 The Narrated Field-Work Experience

As articulated during the methodological discussion nine theater-practitioners with experience from working with TFD in the field were interviewed when collecting the empirical material. These practitioners consisted of both men and women between the ages of seventeen and sixty with experience working with TFD. Some of them had worked with more famous endeavors such as the Amani Peoples Theatre whereas others came from smaller organizations such as the TEARS Group Kenya. All the practitioners had spent most of their life in Kenya and even though they perhaps were born and raised in other parts of Kenya they were now settled and working from the capital city of Nairobi and/or the Rift Valley Province. Interesting to note, even though it was not taken into consideration during the analysis, the practitioners also represented a variety of ethnical/tribal belongings such as kikuyu, lou, kalenjin.

The narratives, or the expressed experience, provided by them during interviews in relation to TFD to prevent direct and/or structural violence were analyzed using content analysis. From the content analysis different variables as well as three overarching themes that the practitioners related to their experience of working with TFD became evident: The possibilities they saw with using TFD, what challenges they had faced and what factors they considered important for the endeavor to be perceived as successful. These themes were used as to frame the analysis and reflect upon the different variables.

#### 4.1.1 Expressed Possibilities with Theater for Development

When expressing what possibilities theater has as a medium to communicate social change both practitioners with experience from working with

preventing direct and structural violence perceived using theater as an affecting and accessible tool. Describing theater as a communication tool that is “near to the people,” (Int. 8) “get deep into the heart of people” (Int. 1) and is easy for people to understand. This echoes the practitioners expressed assumption that people are visual and that theater offers vivid and lasting communication.

“For theater, in terms of communication, it becomes very direct, and, you know, probably very clear, because, one they are able to see it and hear, and also, you know, you engage their emotions, like when a girl is being hit and she is crying, ‘ah stop,’ you feel her pain. It might not be the same when you are looking at a picture of a guy holding a stick and you start asking: ‘Did he hit her or did he not?’ ‘Was she injured or was she not?’ ‘Did she feel pain or did she not?’ But in theater you see it happening, and you hear the sound. And the physicality of it tells you that she is in pain, therefore, something needs to be done about that. The communication, what I was saying is, it's five formed in terms of the senses. Cause' all the senses are involved” (Int. 7).

The importance of theater being a tool to communicate is also expressed by one of the practitioners with experience with working with preventing direct violence when the practitioner expressed the idea that the lack of communication can lead to conflict and that communicating can transform a conflict.

“In the year 2007 my brothers and sisters fought simply because of one thing. We didn't communicate. I...we were only...we were living on assumptions. ‘I'll assume you are a Kikuyu, and you Kikuyus are thieves.’ But you have never stolen from me! So. Since, we didn't have that strong communication, many people end up slaughtering each other here. [---] And simply because we don't communicate we grow up knowing that these particular people are bad. We try to break this, try to make them communicate with one another. And we realize that *with time* some of these things have been washed away—the tribal things have been washed away, that is through theater” (Int. 5).

Further on theater was described as a medium with the possibility to inform the spectators on current issues. Providing information was valued based on the idea that information equals transformation, as expressed by one practitioner when talking about structural violence in general: “We want good toilets, to transform our lives to get to where everybody else is going. [...] So, for that transformation to take place—everybody needs to be able to make informed choices” (Int. 1). An idea that information, is a dialogical



form of education. This is in turn based on the by all expressed idea that TFD, independent if it is to prevent direct or structural violence strives to “empower the individuals to take control of their lives” (Int. 9). And as expressed by a practitioner with experience working with both TFD to prevent direct and structural violence, “what you are trying to do is to conscientize the people so that they are *empowered* to take a position, to take a stand and to *act* on their own behalf in a way that is not self-destructive” (Int. 9). And that theater does that “by engaging the people, by making them appreciate what the issues around them are, by making them appreciate their own potential to become change-agents and give them like a road map of how to become change-agents” (Int. 9). For this empowerment to occur and to be sustainable the practitioners expressed the shared ideas that TFD needs to be engaging, promote local ownership and be built on the notions of interaction, identification and reflection.

#### 4.1.2 Expressed Challenges with Theater for Development

Some of the challenges expressed by practitioners working with preventing direct and/or structural violence is that donor-driven project forces them to compromise, this since funding is expressed as handed out with strings attached. Further on, thanks to the substantial funding that has been available for endeavors using theater as a tool to communicate development it’s the general opinion that there are a lot of unserious practitioners doing a hurried job and who does not take the actual community needs into consideration and who are not educated enough on the ideology behind using TFD.

The practitioners also express a general worry in relation to reaching your target group and finding an audience. A worry of actually making a difference that is echoed even louder by the practitioners working with preventing direct violence who expresses that actually figuring out and dealing with the root causes of the political or ethnically motivated violence is difficult.

“I wouldn’t say, it’s peace building, because, I said, if we are to talk about actual peace-building you need to talk about the root cause of the

conflict. And I think, to a very large extent that most of the peace initiatives, which I have witnessed, which I have seen or heard talked about, mainly deal with just reconciliation. Let's just be good to each other, so to speak. Therefore very few have gone to the root causes why things flared up" (Int. 9)

Another challenge identified by a practitioner with experience from working with direct violence is the inability to control the outcome of a performance.

That is the tricky thing about theater for development, you don't quite have a control about what people will do after you've engaged them in a discussion. Because your objective is, you will engage them in a discussion, how will you know that the discussed will stick?" (Int. 8)

#### 4.1.3 Expressed Important Factors for a Successful Endeavor

During the interviews all practitioners expressed the importance of conducting research whilst initiating a project and involving the local community in the process of composing a performance that addresses whatever issue is at hand. And it's jointly expressed that a community needs to be able to identify their own issues as well as partake in reflecting on them to feel ownership over a subject and to be able to find a sustainable solution. As expressed by one practitioner: "You can't just come up something and do it in a particular community. Without you knowing their cultural issues, their tradition, their way of speaking, their expressions, you will be beaten, you know" (Int. 6). But when talking about contextualization the use of local resources was emphasized even further by the practitioners with experience from the field working with direct violence. As expressed by one practitioner, local resources, if they feel that they are missing out might sabotage the project. Which means, that they should be given space within the performance, to express themselves. The same practitioner also goes on to argue that "building the capacity of local artists" is important for the endeavor to be sustainable: "using local artist is, [important] because of the politics of the play. [...] If you are going to do a performance in Kibera, and there are artists in Kibera, it's better to use the artist in Kibera to play it. Because, they have an income in it.". (Int. 3). It's also expressed by practitioners with experience working with direct violence that when

dealing with preventing direct violence sustainability comes from defining the root causes and not only the manifestation of the root causes.

Following the idea of contextualization, interactivity was by all practitioners expressed as an important factor to achieve ownership. This since interactivity is understood as bringing out the real issues that are affecting a community and is motivated by the idea that when a community faces and resolves issues on stage, they can indirectly face and solve their own issues. The idea of interactivity is also seen as imperative for the dialogical process to refrain from being purely didactic, as expressed by a practitioner: “Unless you communicate...the two of us, I communicate and you reciprocate—that is what we call communication. The moment I come here and I communicate and you are silent—that is a lecture, according to me. So we don't go to that community to lecture them. We always encourage them to speak back.” If it's not interactive and solely didactic it is instead perceived as disempowering, as expressed by interview subject nine: “If it is only I talk to you, then you see, it becomes prescriptive, you are no longer a player, it is disempowering” (Int. 9).

The level of interaction is also by one practitioner expressed as a way to measure the impact of a performance.

“The level of interaction is a way to measure results. What, when we started are the level of interaction, what is the level of issues? People believe that we cannot use condoms, we cannot! But, when you are doing performances you will after a while hear them saying: ‘Can you show us how to use it?’ You know. And as we continue they will say: ‘Ah, so where can we get them?’ So, you see the kind of process, and that is what theater brings in” (Int. 6).

This interaction that aims at engaging spectators through empowering them means that everybody is supposed to be a protagonist.

“And that is why, even if you read, the writer of Augusto Boal he says that the aristocrats came and took theater, in order to be able to use it as a tool of dominion, so that it is them who are supposed to control the content. It is them who is supposed to control how people is supposed to react to the content. And the rest of the people are just chorus, just masses, who are supposed to follow. But that is *not* the way it's supposed to be. The barriers are supposed to be broken and everybody is supposed to be involved. Everybody is supposed to be a protagonist in this. In order for us to, be able to realize, the development that we are supposed to get” (Int. 8).

Interactivity is hence seen as a way to encourage the spectator to identify with the actors and/or issues. As expressed by a practitioner with experience working with preventing direct violence interactivity is a way to encourage the spectator to understand that, “We are not the actors and you, you are not the actors, *we are all* actors, *we must all* act. *We must all* be prepared for it” (Int. 8). Identification with an individual is, as expressed by theater practitioners working to prevent direct violence, seen as imperative to understanding the expression on stage. Whereas identification with an issue is, as expressed by theater practitioners working to prevent structural violence, seen as imperative for a community to feel ownership.

Besides identification the idea of reflection is present in the narratives presented by both practitioners working with preventing direct and structural violence. Theater is perceived as a mirror of society and a space where the community can reflect upon themselves. By reflecting society it’s expressed that theater provides a space in which rehearsal for reality can take place and a space for cognitive dissonance (Int. 9). A space practitioners see as an open space that “brings in ideas from all the people of the audience” (Int. 1) and an “artistic space for the issues to come in” (Int. 3). But also, as reflected upon above, a space where the spectator and actor can connect, as expressed by a practitioner: a “place where I can express my feelings and I can also express the feelings that others also feel and we can share the ideas” (Int. 5).

In addition to identification the idea of provoking the spectator was also expressed as important by practitioners with experience from preventing direct violence. First and foremost to provoke a discussion and to provoke engagement but the idea was also put forward that whilst working to prevent direct violence you can by provoking the grudge that exists release tension within a community between conflicting groups and find a solution to a problem without resorting to physical violence. As expressed explicitly by one practitioner when talking about preventing direct violence:

“For instance, right now we are talking about peace—we are heading to an election period. And there are these small tensions that have already started building up, unless they are addressed, and who will address them? There is no one who will address them! The politicians are busy making...doing politics. Pastors are busy preaching. And you can't preach

peace to me! You can't preach everyone in his doorstep! And that is where theater comes in. I need to come up with a piece that will *provoke* you. Actually the correct word is provoking. The pieces that we do, after we have researched on this problem. For instance now, this tribe has this burning grudge that has been developing, so what we do—is that we provoke that grudge. So you will end up speaking up and he and she will end up speaking up and the community, we as a community will find a solution to that problem, we ourselves. Without necessary, cutting each other up”. (Int. 5).

## 4.2 The Observed Field-Work Experience

### 4.2.1 Puppetry, Peace and Good Governance

The observed performance in relation to preventing the prevalence of politically or ethnically motivated violence was performed by a group of puppeteers in the informal settlement of Kibera in Nairobi. The performance focuses on the importance of voting in credible leaders and was developed after the post-election violence in 2007-2008 to remind citizens about the history and to prevent that similar atrocities happened again.

The group had on beforehand decided in which neighborhoods the play was supposed to be performed but not the exact location. When developing the script members from each community that they intended to visit was invited. This script was then used as a frame for the performance which, incorporated elements that were specific to each visited site. When they arrived in Kibera they scouted for a suitable location based on the criteria that there would be a lot of people naturally passing through the area, which meant that a lot of people would be able to see the performance without having to go out of their way.

The performers were all Kenyan and in this case two of the performers, had themselves grown up in the area of Kibera that was being visited and still lived in the outskirts of the informal settlement.

The space used is the space claimed as “open” within the community. The stage, which consists of a steel frame covered by a black sheet behind

which the puppeteers act, is easily assembled before and disassembled after each performance. Whilst assembling the stage the use of the space is negotiated together with the people already present. Among them a group of young men who insist on being given monetary handouts to “let” the performers set up and perform their play. The performers refuse and one of the performers informs the young men that if they continue harassing them, then he and the other performers will leave and then the people of the community will not be given the possibility to hear the message and learn about their rights and responsibilities.

As they are setting up a crowd collects. Both, older and younger generations, men and women. As the group starts blasting music in Kiswahili, people who were passing the market place naturally and are curious about what is supposed to happen come closer. After setting up and mobilizing for about thirty minutes the performance starts.

The performance is first introduced by a member of the group, the facilitator, who introduces the group as well as the play about to be performed. They are there to talk about the upcoming elections as well as the importance of peace and good governance. The story focuses on the character Mama Kalondu and her and her friends struggle with the corrupt politician Musa-A. The performance consists of three acts and is led by the facilitator. Each act ends with a dilemma. What do we do when we are not satisfied with our political leaders? What are our options? In between all acts the facilitator steps in to attempt to create a dialogue with the audience. The spectators are asked to give their suggestions to the dilemma posed. After act one most of the audience members seem to hesitate as they reply to the facilitator's questions. No discussion erupts in between the spectators. The mode of communication is two directional in-between the facilitator and each individual spectator. The same happened after act two. One of the performers would later explain that it's necessary to be sensitive and take it slow when talking about ethnicity and tribes. The performance continues and the audience, laugh with and at the characters on stage. At the end of act three the audience is again invited to provide suggestions to the dilemma posed. The characters are protesting Musa-A. How does the protest take place? A man in the audience gives a suggestion: “We can go to his office!”

he says. “No, no, no,” someone else, comments and continues, “He will not listen. We have to show him!” “How do you show him?” the facilitator asks. The second speaker provides an example. Some of the audience members agrees, others disagree loudly, laughing at the suggestion. “Why are you laughing?” the facilitator asks. “What are your suggestions?” The discussion continues in between the audience with the facilitator posing new questions resulting in both sounds of agreement and disagreement. The mode of communication is now multi-directional and the spectators have turned into spect-actors offering solutions to the problems presented on stage.

After the last act the facilitator takes over the space and encourages people to “think as Kenyans, not as Luo, Kikuyo or Kaledjin.” As he finishes the crowd slowly begin dispersing and the crossway turns back into a marketplace. After the crowd has dispersed the performers wait a little bit with taking down the scene and instead walk around talking to people who have seen the performance and who are now back in their stands. A woman having her hair braided in a little beauty shop next to where the performance took place tells me and one of the performers that she has learned something that she didn’t know before.

In total the performance took about 45 minutes. After the performance had ended the performers spent about an hour more at the site, taking down the stage and making small talk with the spectators about the play and what it meant.

#### 4.2.2 Sex, Condoms and HIV/AIDS

The observed performance in relation to preventing structural violence in the form of preventing the spread of HIV/AIDS was performed by a group of actors from a local youth group in the town of Nakuru. The performing groups general objective is to educate, discuss and share matters of health affecting the people within the community and the performance took place at a bus-stop close to one of the markets in the center of the town and the location was chosen beforehand by the performers who all of them where from Nakuru but who did not have specific ties to the location at hand. The decision was made based on the fact that the bus-stop next to the market is a

space that is normally crowded and a space visited by most members of the community and that it meant that people could experience the performance in their own environment. In this case it also means that it is a space owned by the public.

The performance was developed based on some of the issues that affect “informal” workers and street vendors that engage within multiple sexual relations for favor or income and one of the goals of the performance was to expose the dangers with trading sexual favors without protection and to trigger a discussion about risky behavior. Some of the performers had beforehand visited the spot and asked the vendors at the market place and the workers who frequent there what issues they wanted to tackle. The frame for the script was developed based on the issues that the vendors around the market expressed and especially the relationship between the mechanics working at the site and the women supplying them with food at their work place. This meant that the script worked as a guide to the performance but was subject to change based on the specific issues and spectators, characters that were present at the venue during the performance.

The synopsis of the play is the following: A lady who sells vegetables is in a relationship with a mechanic who offers to lend her some money, but if she can't repay it in cash she will have to have sex with him. The lady doesn't manage to repay the money so the mechanic insists that they have sex but he doesn't want to use a condom.

After arriving at the venue the group mobilize the crowd by singing and dancing for about ten minutes. Whilst singing and dancing people in the area curiously approach the group and a crowd consisting of a varied demographic of men and women who are working close by or frequenting the market place gather around the performers in a circle. In this case the stage is the circle that is created by the spectators as they gather around the performers. After the performers have gathered a crowd the synopsis of the play is introduced by the facilitator. After he has introduced the play he takes a step back and lets the actors visualize the scenario. The play consists of a one act performance or a short skit that lasts for about ten minutes and ends with the dilemma. After, the dilemma is presented the facilitator break up the actors and step back into the scene to ask the audience what to do.



What should the lady do? Is the mechanic right or not? What should happen next? At first, the audience just mumbles, then, a man says, “She must keep her promise.” “She should keep her promise,” the facilitator repeats, “but she wants to use a condom. Why can’t they use a condom?” The mode of communication is two directional in-between the facilitator and each individual spectator. Some members in the audience laugh. “A promise is a promise,” someone else add. “But what if they are infected?” the facilitator asks. “What would you do?” the facilitator asks and invites a young woman onto the stage, into the circle. The discussion continues and the audience, start discussing in-between themselves hence shifting the mode of communication to multi-directional. Someone continues to argue that a promise is a promise others don’t understand why the mechanic can’t just use a condom. When reflecting over the possible solutions to the dilemma the spectators turn into spect-actors.

One of the performers who partook in the performance tells me that they spent about an hour after the skit ended to debate and reflect upon possible solutions.

# 5 Theater to Prevent Violence

## 5.1 Understanding Differences in Theory

Throughout the research project it became clear that the practitioners working with TFD to prevent direct violence and/or TFD to prevent structural violence framed their experiences of working with it in very similar terms and expressed that the two endeavors had similar possibilities, faced similar challenges and needed to be built upon similar principles. And when directly posing the question, some of the practitioners claimed that they did not see the difference when working with one form of development or another. Through the content analysis of the practitioners narrative it can however be extracted that critical and interesting, though subtle differences do exist within their narrative, even though they might not be apparent for the practitioners working with a more holistic approach towards development. For them differentiating between structural violence and direct violence is not a priority, however, for this paper it is as to be able to further understand how to relate to preventing violence within development.

These subtle differences based on the practitioners narrative are what will be analytically explored in the following segment and regards the, as expressed by the practitioners, variables of dealing with the root causes, contextualization, identification and provocation.

### 5.1.1 Dealing with the Root Causes

By the practitioners working to prevent direct violence reaching the target group and dealing with the root causes of the violence is expressed as difficult. Dealing with the root causes of the violence is of course also important when working to prevent structural violence but the fact that it was not mentioned, indicates that the practitioners working with preventing

structural violence did not feel that it needed to be mentioned, which indicates that this is something that already is established in relation to preventing the spread of HIV/AIDS but not in relation to preventing ethnically motivated physical violence. This in turn, as expressed by one practitioner point to the fact that TFD to prevent ethnically motivated physical violence sometime only deals with the manifestation of the root causes, such as a violent protest, and not the root causes themselves. Hinting at the fact that TFD endeavors to prevent structural violence might have seen greater success. The root cause of the ethnically motivated physical violence in the case of Kenya being tribal nepotism or ethnical conflict, a root cause that points to the fact that the social conflict Kenya has erupted based on different cultural, national or ethnic pre-understandings.

One of the practitioners argue that the reason the root causes in relation to preventing ethnically motivated physical violence is avoided is because ethnically motivated physical violence is more sensitive and more dangerous to talk about than HIV/AIDS. Instead of focusing in identifying the root causes and dealing with them, the theater endeavors to prevent direct violence, according to the practitioner, mainly deal with reconciliation and functions after the device: “‘Let’s just be good to each other,’ so to speak” (Int. 9).

Nonetheless the possibility to deal with the root causes in relation to preventing ethnically motivated physical violence exists within the Third Space even though the practitioners working with preventing ethnically motivated physical violence might not have experienced it. This since the stage, if the actors allow it, can provide and neutral empty space, where all thoughts can be permitted and where individuals can express their opinions and can listen to the expression of other individuals’ opinions. This is a process that happens continuously during performances to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS, that does deal with the root causes, where the spect-actors invade the stage and can talk about previously taboo subjects such as sex and the use of condoms. In this space they shed the previously static conceptions and negotiate their fixed beliefs and cultural pre-understandings. Just like it has happened in relation to preventing the spread of HIV/AIDS the similar process could occur in relation to preventing

ethnically motivated physical violence where the conception of the conflict can be transformed since the stage offers a space where cultural attributes and symbols lose their static meaning, be it relating to sexual habits or socially conflicting practices, and where “even the same signs can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricized and read anew” (Bhabha, 1994, p.37).

### 5.1.2 Contextualization

A difference is also detectable in how the practitioners reasoned that the endeavor should best make use of the local context. Practitioners working to prevent direct violence emphasized the use of the local resources even further than those working to prevent structural violence, pointing to examples such as the risk of sabotage by local resource people who were left out. An interesting perspective, in relation to the performance in Kibera, where the performers, were forced to negotiate the space used for the performance, with a group of rowdy young men. The argument was also made by practitioners working to prevent ethnically motivated physical violence that the local performers had an income from the outcome of the process of preventing violence. “If you are going to do a performance in Kibera, and there are artists in Kibera, it's better to use the artist in Kibera to play it. Because, they have an income in it.” (Int. 3). This might be seen as TFD in relation to preventing direct violence need to provide a greater space in which the local resources can develop. As Freire argues, most transformational or educational endeavors fail because they don't take into consideration the reality of the target group. Which in the case of theater, can be interpreted as, the fact that the reality of the target group, is not allowed to fully inhabit the stage. In the elicitive Third Space however, the issues centers around the target group's reality since the space is derived from the reality and created as to tackle the issues that exist within it. And by allowing the spectator to inhabit the same space as the actor the process of education becomes dialogical and mutually transformative. This means that when preventing violence in general in the Third Space and specifically when preventing direct violence, the Third Space, even though it might be

provided by an outside actor, must be overtaken and fully inhabited by the spect-actors in lieu with the perspectives to build peace as presented by Lederach it needs to be elicitive. As expressed by the same practitioner that is quoted above, “They [the locals] can be used to sabotage it, they can decide to sabotage what you are doing since they feel that they are missing out. And they say: “Oh, you people from outside are coming here to take our space.” So you don't want them to get involved in that kind of politics. So you work with them, give them the space—sometimes even when money is not involved, they just need room to express themselves” (Int. 3). In this space the spect-actors need to create the hybridity of their shared history and negotiate and re-negotiate shared events and preconceived notions about each other as to be able to overcome the root causes that are leading to violent outburst or conflicts.

### 5.1.3 Identification

In relation to identification the differences as expressed in the practitioner’s narrative can be found in relation to with what the spectator is expected to relate to. Working with preventing structural violence the practitioners expressed the importance of identifying with the issue at hand to feel ownership over it and find a sustainable solution. Working with preventing direct violence however, the practitioners expressed the importance of identifying with another individual, with the conflicting individual as to understand their expression on stage and in reality.

When analyzing the difference regarding the variable of identification and the fact that the practitioners focus on identifying with either an issue or an individual it’s interesting to consider the differences between direct and structural violence. Structural violence that is indirect and caused by violent structures within a society requires the structures within a society to change to bring social transformation, this transformation is possible if a majority of society changes. Regarding direct violence however, each individual who might commit to violence must change. Structural violence hence call for a societal transformation whereas direct violence call for subject transformation. This means that in relation to TFD to prevent direct violence

it's necessary to not only break down boundaries in-between actors and spectators but also in between spectators and spect-actors and reconstruct their conflict into non-conflict. An added dimension that is not necessary in relation for TFD to prevent structural violence since it does not require identification with an individual. This process of identification with an individual can occur in the theatrical Third Space that theater offers since we as human beings through theater are allowed to think with the protagonists mind and dull our own emotions and feel the protagonists feelings instead of our own. We feel empathy and that it's what "marries" the spectator and the protagonist. (Boal, 2008, pp.xvii). But this empathy does not only "marry" the spectator and the actor, it can also "marry" the spectator and spectator. This since TFD to prevent direct violence also needs to compel the spectator who is now the spect-actor to move beyond the first steps of conscientization and towards an 'empathetication'—and develop a critical awareness of not only their own but also "the others'," the conflicting, social reality.

#### 5.1.4 Provocation

Regarding the variable of provocation the idea of provoking engagement was a similarity between the practitioners with experience from preventing both structural and direct violence, but the idea of provoking a grudge and release tension that has built up within the community was specific to preventing direct violence. When preventing direct violence, the stage was directly expressed as the space, where conflict could occur non-violently, or as expressed by a practitioner, "Without necessary cutting each other up" (Int. 5).

The idea of provocation is interesting to in relation to establishing the Third Space. This since TFD evokes the Third Space through provocation, a provocation that compels the spectators to turn into spect-actors and to interact, act and participate in a way that transcends the national, cultural or ethnical boundaries of the participants. The notion of provocation on stage then cements and maintains the Third Space by being continuously provoking by actively engineering situations in which the cultural conflicts

or disagreements becomes focal points that the audience is forced to act and re-act to.

The added dimension in relation to provocation in the realm of preventing direct violence is based on the fact that TFD to prevent direct violence or physical violence deals with a direct conflict and confrontation in contrast to structural violence that deals with indirect violence. Facing this direct conflict in the Third Space can be done since even though TFD in difference from entertainment theater with the goal of distancing spectators from their reality and instead strive to tackle issues that exists within a societies reality, still isn't reality, but merely a representation of reality. The spect-actor however, is not fiction. "He exists in the scene and outside of it, in a dual reality. By taking possession of the stage in the fiction of the theatre he acts: not just in the fiction, but also in his social reality. By transforming fiction, he is transformed into himself" (Boal, 2008, p.xxi). As the spectator "assumes the protagonic role, changes the dramatic action, tries out solutions, discusses plans for change" and "trains himself for real action" (Boal, 2008, p.98). By rehearsing on stage the spect-actor rehearses for revolution. The idea is that only a liberated spectator can launch into action. But, *Theater of the Oppressed* within the Third Space is not only a rehearsal for revolution towards the oppression seen on stage but also the oppression manifested within the spectator, such as ethnic stereotyping. As the spect-actor changes the dramatic action s/he, to uproot the notions that might drive her to commit crimes of direct violence, is also forced to change her perspective upon the action shown on stage. As the spectator is liberated from the idea of the external oppression s/he is forced to liberate herself from the ideas of her own ideas in relation to oppressing others. By being provoked to face both the outer and inner oppression through a direct confrontation on stage the conflict can be resolved in the fictive space offered by theater and hence be resolved in reality as well. As expressed by one practitioner: "I need to empower you to understand what the problem is, what the issues are, the root cause of it, and therefore you then are able to emerge as the person who takes hold of that problem by the scruff of its neck and deal with it. The whole interactivity is to involve you, to move you, to rehears your way of engaging with the issue and engaging with the

key players” (Int. 9). This can happen in the inner space provided by the Third Space that manifests itself in the outer elicitive space that the theatrical stage provides and where “culture is being re/negotiated in the here and now” (English, 2004, p.124).

## 5.2 Understanding Differences in Practice

In relation to the practice of using TFD the observed endeavors were also very similar. The two performances used the space in a similar way, claiming a public space and traversed space, finding an empty space within the community and also operated using the same multidirectional mode of communication and participatory theater methodologies similar to Boal’s Forum Theater method. This meant that the “audiences [were] not merely recipients and consumers of messages, but [could] initiate, create and transmit messages to one another” (Mda, 1993, p.43). However, even within the practical use of TFD subtle differences between preventing direct and preventing structural violence can be detected. These differences are what will be analytically explored in the following segment and regards variables such as framing of the dilemmas, the time spent at the site, the use of local resources as well as their different performances use of objects as representation.

### 5.2.1 Framing the Dilemmas

Framing in the theatrical sense is the way through which the performers focus the audience’s attention upon the subject. In this case that relates to the performance itself and the story used to deliver the message. In both cases the story needs to be built with the goal of the performance in hand. As mentioned earlier during the theoretical differences one very interesting theoretical difference is the difference in relation to identifying with an individual or an issue. This paper argues that theatrical endeavors with the goal to prevent direct violence, in difference from theatrical endeavors to prevent structural violence focuses on the importance of making the



spectators identify with an individual on and off stage. Theater to prevent structural violence in difference forces on the importance of making the spectators identify with an issue on and off stage. This means that framing in relation to preventing direct violence, in difference from structural violence, needs to be built on compassion and solidarity. This can clearly be derived from the different story-lines within the two performances. Within the performance to prevent direct violence the focus was on Mama Kalondu and her and her friends struggle with the politician Musa-A. It was a complex, story-line that required three acts to become complete. Within the performance to prevent structural violence the story-line only required one act to be delivered and focused on the confrontation between a female character identified only as a lady who sells vegetables and a male character identified only as mechanic. The lady who sells vegetables and the mechanic were not identified or characterized by anything besides their professions and can hence be seen as only representations of the two different perspectives upon the issue. In the performance regarding preventing ethnically motivated physical violence, in comparison, the main characters had names and were portrayed as complex characters, as individuals, that the spectators were asked to identify with.

### 5.2.2 Use of Time

Regarding time it's interesting to note that the performance in relation to preventing ethnically motivated physical violence lasted for about 45 minutes whilst the performance in relation to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS lasted for about 10 minutes. The follow-up of the performance and facilitated discussion however lasted for a similar length of time.

The added time in relation to the performance can be explained by theorizing that TFD in relation to preventing ethnically motivated physical violence takes more time since it is more sensitive, difficult and more complex since it's more difficult to compel the spectators to identify with an individual with a conflicting perspective than an issue. This is for example made evident by the fact that during the performance with the intention to prevent ethnically motivated physical violence it took two whole acts before

the mode of communication evolved from two-directional to multi-directional and the spectators started to relate to, and hopefully with, each other. The differences come from the need to understand not only how something affects me, but also how it affects the other. The difference in time also comes from the fact that TFD to prevent direct violence, in difference to prevent structural violence, need to be built upon the added dimensions that are mentioned as differences in regards to the theoretical foundation. Preventing direct violence requires more time since it requires a more complex process to take place within the Third Space. This means that the elicitive Third Space, when preventing direct violence, needs to be further grounded within the stage and performance than when preventing structural violence, as to be perceived as legitimate and to create a sense of local ownership and to foster sustainability. This space is what is founded during the performance and then effectively taken into use during parts that are facilitated and when the spectators are asked to become spect-actors. This indicates that it's perhaps not necessary to have more time communicating about preventing direct violence than structural violence but that that it takes more time to establish the elicitive Third Space in which the communication can occur.

### 5.2.3 Use of Local Resources

Regarding the use of local resources it's interesting to note that two of the performers in the performance with the intention to prevent ethnically motivated physical violence themselves had specific ties to the community in which the performance took place and still resided in the area. Something that was emphasized as important by the performers themselves and by Lederach (1995) when he argues that the local communities contextual knowledge is imperative for the understanding and working with the issues that are affecting said community. This was not the case in relation to the location chosen by the performers working to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS, even though all of the members partaking in that performance came from the communities surrounding the market place. This can at best however only be seen as a circumstantial difference since both of the

performances had been performed in other communities. In relation to the performance in relation to preventing ethnically motivated physical violence it is also important to point out that even though there were members representing the local community within the performing group the performance at first was disturbed by local young men who threatened to sabotage the performance if their demands were not met. Only after negotiation in-between the performers and the young men the performers could go ahead with the performance.

It is however still interesting to look at what it means that some of the actors themselves have close-tie ties to the community in which the performance takes place and where the Third Space is being generated. By using local performers, who have a relationship with the people frequenting the space that the performance is taking place in further narrows the gap between the actor and the spect-actor. Then the actors and spect-actors together become change-agents within their own shared reality. This since they then not only share the stage in the reality as it is represented in fiction but also in the reality that is present outside of the space and off the stage. The actors and spect-actors who all are stakeholders in the conflict can hence together create and sustainable environment where the conflict can be transformed (Lederach, 1995, p.62).

#### 5.2.4 Use of Objects as Representation

Another difference that can be derived from the observations is that of the use of objects to represent the issue at hand. The performance dealing with preventing the spread of HIV/AIDS did not include any objects besides the actor's bodies. This meant that the at all times limited the distance between themselves and the audience—the actors and the spectators—evoking a sense of shared space and belonging. This was however not the case with the performance about preventing ethnically motivated physical violence. Even though the space was shared with the audience with the facilitator who was also an actor, and the space was negotiated with the people frequenting it, the presence of a physical stage and the use of puppets actually distanced the audience from the actor as a human being. One of the motivations for

doing this is the stigma that each individual actor carries in their ethnic or tribal belonging. An actor can, even though s/he's acting, never shed the stereotypes attributed to the body. When reflecting topics such as ethnicity and tribes the body's perceived tribal or ethnical belonging might burden the issue. As expressed by one practitioner in relation to the use of object theater, "You want people to...to...to...to get from the abstract, so you can use object-theater and animal-theater to remain abstract and then the community will...because we are where we come from, and stereotypes are heavy and many. So if you use your...your...your words, to say what the issues are, you are labeled, and once you are labeled you lose out on your audience because of the sensitivity of what you've discussed" (Int. 3). Using puppet's or other forms of representations of the body is hence a way to circumvent stereotypes attributed to the body. Something not necessary, when talking about, preventing the spread of HIV/AIDS.

### 5.3 Preventing Direct Vs. Structural Violence

Based on this it is the conclusion of this thesis that TFD to prevent direct violence differs from TFD to prevent structural violence by being a more complex endeavor that demands that the spect-actor is engaged in several different dimensions within the elicitive Third Space that theater offers.

TFD to prevent direct violence in Kenya is more sensitive which makes it more difficult for the practitioners to identify the root causes, the tribal nepotism and ethnical conflict, and deal with them. Which means that the practitioners still have not been able to, in difference from the practitioners working to prevent structural violence, tap in to the possibilities that the elicitive Third Space can offer. Something that also can be attributed to the fact that TFD to prevent structural violence in the form of HIV/AIDS have been an important part of Kenya's development policy since the 1990's whereas TFD to prevent ethnically motivated physical violence only showed up on the agenda in the aftermath of the post election violence of 2007 when the country suddenly found itself having to deal with the idea of building, consolidating and maintaining peace. This sensitivity also impacts the

practice of TFD in relation to the use of objects as representation and how the endeavor to prevent ethnical violence needed to distance themselves, from the stigma that their own bodies came with, in sense of ethnical belonging.

One of the most interesting differences that this thesis points to is the difference in relation to identification with an individual or an issue. A theoretically expressed difference, that has clear repercussions for the practice of using TFD. The fact that TFD endeavors to prevent ethnically motivated physical violence need to compel the spect-actor to become not only critically aware of their own, but also “the others’,” the conflicting entities, social reality and hence move beyond Freire’s idea of conscientization and towards an ‘empathetication’ impacts the endeavor greatly, especially in terms of framing, requiring a complex and multifaceted storyline. At the same time this sensitivity and complexity means that the endeavor to prevent direct violence takes more time since it takes more time to establish the elicitive Third Space in which the conflicting communication can occur and in which the spectators can be provoked to act out their possible aggressions on stage and in the fictive reality posed by the stage instead of in the real reality off the stage.

The question that arises is however whether or not the endeavors actually do what they set out to, or what this paper theoretically have proven that they have the possibility to do.

## 6 Conclusion

### 6.1 Preventing Violence in the Third Space

Zakes Mda argues that “conscientisation happens as a result of the target community’s participation in *naming* their problems, in *reflecting* on them by exploring the reasons for their existence, and in community decision-making on the course of *action* to take in order to solve the problems” (Mda, 1993, p.164). This study clearly shows that even though the theatrical endeavors in relation to preventing direct or structural violence both of the observed performances and the narratives provided by the practitioners indicates that this is what the performances explored in this has done. In relation to all this it’s interesting to note that there was no real overlap in-between the differences as derived from the practitioner’s narrative and the differences derived from the observations of the two performances, besides in relation to the use of local resources. This perhaps indicates that there also exists a difference between the theory of using TFD as well as the practice of it. Which in turn is interesting to relate to Odhiambo’s study of TFD in Kenya where he argues that “most of these cases in a way indicates that most Theatre for Development enterprises has not been very effective, even though there have been many conferences and seminars organised to chart a way forward. They lack clear sets of procedures and or methodology within which Theatre for Development as a practice would operate” (2008, p.182). But then again the theoretical framework of this paper rests on Lederach’s approach that the goals of the conflict transformation process needs to be formulated by participants within the process and not by outside actors. If this is the case then who is to determine whether or not a process is effective or not? The answer from the perspective of this thesis is that it should be the recipients of the development-process who determine if an endeavor is successful. Which relates back to an idea, as expressed by a practitioner—the inability to control the outcome of a performance.

“Because your objective is, you will engage them in a discussion, how will you know that the discussed will stick?” (Int. 8). The actual outcome is however not the only goal, the process of engaging spectators is a goal within itself.

What then is there to do next after the spectator have become engaged? What is revolutionary? Perhaps it’s interesting to return to what Boal so boldly states, “I believe that all the truly revolutionary theatrical groups should transfer to the people the means of production in the theatre so that the people themselves may utilize them” (Boal, 2008, p.98). An idea echoed by Julie Koch (2008) when she asks if one really can applaud projects for empowering the grass-root movements as long as the projects still are controlled through their funding from international donors. The issue, with projects being donor-driven, being whether projects exist because they are funded, instead of being funded because they exist? Perhaps the revolutionary thus become seeing TFD from a different theoretical perspective, as the one presented in this paper. By seeing the possibilities of the space that TFD offers in relation to Bhabha’s theory it opens of for a new understanding of TFD and the possibilities that exists within it. At the same time being aware of Lederach’s ideas of elicitivity further stresses the importance of contextualizing a development process and focus on subject participation during all stages of a TFD endeavor and how everybody is supposed to become a protagonist.

A final conclusion of this paper is that it’s necessary to continuously acknowledge the importance of contextualized theater projects within development even though the outcome can’t be measured following systematic guidelines and even though there are challenges to be met in relation to funding. This, since endeavors using theater to promote development, have the possibility to liberate and empower people by providing them with knowledge so that they *can* develop a critical awareness of their own and/or "the others'," the conflicting individuals social reality. By doing so, TFD offers a unique space in which all kinds of violence, both direct and structural, *can* be transformed and serves as an illustration to what role theater as an artistic process can play within development communication as it can provide an actually stage in which the

elicitive Third Space can manifest itself and where conscientisation can occur through negotiation and hybridization of otherwise static historical and cultural expressions.

## 6.2 Suggestions for Further Research

Throughout this research project several different areas for future research projects became apparent. Most of them relating to the space that theater can offer and what could be achieved in that space. It would among other things be interesting to explore the use of theater as therapy as well as using theater for mediation. Perhaps the Third Space that can be created on stage can be a stage where political parties in conflict can negotiate their conflict. The conclusions of this thesis, opens up for formulating a hypothesis in relation to it. This also means that a future research endeavor could include generalizing the topic even further and compare the results found in Kenya with theatrical endeavors in other places. Would for example practitioners in South-America where TFD have been used to empower marginalized workers have a different perspective upon the use for TFD. If the Third Space becomes colored by the cultures that inhabit it does that mean that an African theatrical Third Space differs from the Latin-American Third Space? Or does the Third Space exist outside of culture? Can the idea of ethnicity be replaced with the subjective attributes that we as human beings ascribe to our identity, such as sexuality? Would that then mean that negative gender-stereotyping is something that could be fought in the Third Space? Perhaps the possibility to be able to meet in a Third Space is the possibility for human beings to meet in a forum free from all cultural preconceived notions and a place where we all could be free. As mentioned in the method chapter it would also be interesting to conduct additional research on the audience or spectator turned spect-actor and how s/he experience Third Space within theater.



## 7 References

- Agar, M. H. (1986a). *Independents Declared*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Agar, M. H. (1986b). *Speaking of Ethnography*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bhabha, Homi K.. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984) *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Boal, A. (1992). *Games For Actors and Non-Actors*. London: Routledge.
- Boal, A. (1979). *Theatre of the Oppressed*. London: Pluto Press.
- Boal, A. (1995). *The Rainbow of Desire: The Boal Method of Theatre and Therapy*. London: Routledge.
- Bouissac, Paul. (2010). *Saussure: A Guide For The Perplexed*. London: Continuum International Publishing.
- Castells, M. (2009). *Communication Power*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Elo, S. & Kungäs, H. (2008) The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107–115.
- English, Leona M. (2004) Feminist Identities: Negotiations in the Third Space. *Feminist Theology*, 13(1), 97-105.
- Freire, P., (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Seabury Press, New York.
- Galtung, Johan. & Höivik, Tord. (1971) Structural and Direct Violence\* A Note on Operationalization. *Journal of Peace Research*, 8(1), pp.73-76.
- Galtung, Johan. (1969). Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal for Peace Research*, 6(3), 167-191.
- Glazer, B. C. and A. L. Strauss (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Graneheim, U. H., & Lundman, B. (2004). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today*, 24(2), 105-112.
- Gray, Ann (2003) *Research Practice for Cultural Studies. Ethnographic Methods and Lived Cultures*. London: Sage.

- Hammersley, Martyn & Paul Atkinson (2007) *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. 3rd edition. London: Routledge.
- Harinen, Päivi. (2001). Young dual citizens- people of 'the Third Space'? *Young*. 9(3), 29-41
- Hollway and Jefferson (2000) *Doing Qualitative Research Differently*. Free association, narrative and the interview method. London: Sage
- Johannessen, Asbjörn, and Per Arne Tufte, (2003). *Introduktion till: Samhällsvetenskaplig metod*. Malmö: Liber.
- Johansson, Ola. (2011) *Community Theatre and AIDS*. Hampshire UK: Palgrave.
- Jorgensen (1989). "The Methodology of Participant Observation." *Participant Observation*. Ed. Danny L. Jorgensen. SAGE Publications, Inc., pp.12-26. *SAGE Research Methods*. Web. 19 November 2012.
- Kafewo, Samuel A. (2007). The Rhythms of Transformation: Theatre And Conflict Resolution in Northern Nigeria. *New Theatre Quarterly*, 23, pp 161-170.
- Kamlongera, Christopher. (2005) "Theatre for Development in Africa." In Hemer, Oscar. & Tufte, Thomas (Ed.) *Media and Glocal Change. Rethinking Communication for Development*. (pp.435-452) Buenos Aires; Göteborg: CLACSO; Nordicom.
- Keough, Noe I. (1998). Participatory Development Principles and Practice: Reflections of a Western Development Worker. *Community Development Journal*. 33(3) pp.187.
- Kidd, R. Byram, M. (1981) *Demystifying Pseudo-freirean Non-Formal Education: A Case Description and Analysis of Laedza Batanani*, Toronto, Mimeo.
- Kidd, R. & Kumar, Krishna. (1981) Co-opting Freire: A Critical Analysis of Pseudo-Freirean Adult Education. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 16(1/2) pp.27-29+31+33+35-36
- Kidd, R. (1984a) *From People's Theatre for Revolution to Popular Theatre for Reconstruction: diary of a Zimbabwean workshop (The Hague/Toronto, Centre for the Study of Education in Developing Countries, CESO)*.

- Kidd, R. (1984b) Popular Theatre and Nonformal Education in the Third World: Five Strands of Experience. *International Review of Education*, 265-288.
- Kirch, Max S. (1973) Language, Communication and Culture. *The Modern Language Journal*, 57(7), pp.340-343
- Koch, Julie (2008). Karibuni Wanachi: Theatre for Development in Tanzania. Bayreuth: Bayreuth African Studies.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: an introduction to its methodology*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Lederach, John Paul. (1995). *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures*. New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Lederach, John Paul. (1997). *Building Peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies*. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace
- Lederach, John Paul. (2005). *Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace*. Cary, NC, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Leeds-Hurwitz, W. (2009). Semiotics and semiology. In S. Littlejohn, & K. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of communication theory*. (pp.875-877). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Mason, Jennifer. (2002). *Qualitative Researching*. London: Sage.
- Mda, Zakes. (1993) When People Play People: Development Communication Through Theatre. London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Michau, L. & Naker, D. (ed) Preventing Gender-based Violence in the Horn, East and Southern Africa: A Regional Dialogue. Raising Voices and UN-HABITAT, Safer Cities Programme
- Mohan, Giles. (2001). Participatory development. In: Desai, Vandana and Potter, Rob eds. *The Arnold companion to development studies*. London, UK: Hodder, pp.49–54.
- Morris, Meaghan (1997) 'A *Question of Cultural Studies*', in Angela McRobbie (ed.) *Back to Experience: Social Experience and Cultural Studies*. Manchester: Manchester.
- Mythen, Gabe. (2012). Identities in the Third Space? Solidity, elasticity and resilience amongst young British Pakistani Muslims. *The British Journal of Sociology*. 63(3), 393–411.

- Mwanzia, Josephine & Strathdee, Robert. (2010). *Participatory Development in Kenya*. London: Ashgate.
- Nicotera, A. (2009). Constitutive view of communication. In S. Littlejohn, & K. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of communication theory*. (pp.176-180). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc
- Nightingale, Virginia (2008) "Why Observing Matters" in *Research Methods for Cultural Studies*. Pickering, Michael. (ed) pp.105-122. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Odhiambo, C. (2005). *Theatre for development in Kenya: in search of an effective procedure and methodology* (Doctoral dissertation, Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University). Retrieved on April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013 from <http://www.google.se/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&cad=rja&ved=0CDQQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Ffir1.sun.ac.za%2Fbitstream%2Fhandle%2F10019.1%2F20919%2FJoseph%20theatre%202005.pdf%3Fsequence%3D1&ei=AMtmUZmwCYiC4gTthYHYDg&usg=AFQjCNFCJaWhIQobhHI2MyFyrcGmNa55WA&sig2=moMdIz-cAGLr3dggO-2ojA>
- Odhiambo, Christopher. J. (2008) *Theatre for Development in Kenya: In search of an Effective Procedure and Methodology*. Germany: Bayreuth. Pickering, Michael (ed.) (2008) *Research Methods for Cultural Studies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Riff, D. Stephen, L. & Frederic, F. (1998) *Analyzing media messages : using quantitative content analysis in research*. Mahwah, N.J. :L. Erlbaum
- Savane, K. (2013, March 4) Ni Sisi: It's up to us to move Kenya away from electoral violence. *The Independent, Online*. Retrieved April 11, 2013 from <http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/comment/ni-sisi-its-up-to-us-to-move-kenya-away-from-electoral-violence-8519711.html>
- Shank, M. & Schirch L. (2008). Strategic Arts-Based Peacebuilding. *Peace & Change*, 33(2), 217-243.
- Singhal, A. (2004) Empowering the Oppressed Through Participatory Theater. *Investigación y Desarrollo*, 12(1). Universidad del Norte. Barranquilla, Colombia, 138-163.

- Smoljan, Jelena. (2003) The relationship between peace building and development. *Conflict, Security & Development*, (3)2, 233-250.
- Spradley, J. (1980). *Participant Observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Song & Parker, (1995). 'Commonality, difference and the dynamics of disclosure in in-depth interviewing' *Sociology* 29(2) 241-256.
- The Waki Report (2008) The Waki Report of the Findings of the Commission of Inquiry into the Post-Election Violence in Kenya. Kenya: The Commission of Inquiry on Post Election Violence.
- Who we are (n/d) Amani Peoples Theatre. Retrieved June 14, 2013 from <http://www.aptkenya.org/howeare.html>
- Znaniecki, F. (1935). *The Method of Sociology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

# 8 Appendices

## 8.1 Example of Interview Transcript

### **Interview Transcript no. 03 (TFDK: TSo3)**

**Interviewer:** Irina Bernebring Journiette

**Respondent/ Interviewee:** Anonymous

**Location:** Undisclosed location, Nairobi, Kenya

**Time/Date:** 3.11 p.m. Jan 29<sup>th</sup> 2013

**Topic:** Theater for Development / Preventing physically motivated violence.

START TRANSCRIPT:

1. **Interviewer:** So I was hoping we could start with you telling me about your experiences with theater.

Interviewee: Yeah. I think first of all it's entertainment. Theater is entertainment, very much. I used to enjoy myself watching, starting from slowly telling parents and friends, and also myself telling stories in school. And because of my Christian background, then how biblical stories were done into, yeah, narratives, entertaining narratives. And growing from what we are calling gospel-theater, basically it's an evangelicalisation, then back in school it had to do with entertainment, drama for competition and then you get into drama and literature and it becomes more serious. A bit academic at time. So I, enjoyed all that time, until the 80's, when I became more conscious of the war of independence of several African countries, liberation theology in Latin America, social movements in Asia. So we—from the charge we got to know a lot of what was happening in South Africa. So people in exile were staying in our college, and taught us liberation songs, South African. They opened to us that. We learned more about the terms of their struggle. And the way that they were using music and theater for their liberation. So we came back with local productions, to conscientize Kenyans about what was happening in South Africa.

(*Ehm*) People first enjoyed the entertainment but then they asked: "Is this real, that this is happening?" Then we would have older people who have either struggled and have them share their stories. Here, it was not a project as such, because it was just a youth thing. Youth expressing themselves and say: "Why don't we do this kind of thing?" We got some money, collection and sponsorships until late 80's, early 90's, when we were thrown out of the university, our lecturers were arrested and we became more conscious that we have a dictatorship within us. So we, yeah, we went into Human Rights, at the same time HIV was also rising up. And then we had our own clashes with violence in 1991 and that was when we started working with theater for peace. And we were calling ourselves the Amani Peoples Theater. So later we connected with Sophie, who are Human Rights Theater and focused for Theater for Peace and Human Rights. Some of us joined me for Human Rights, others were like: "We are peace, peace." So.

**2. Interviewer:** And this was Amani Peoples Theatre?

Interviewee: Yah, Amani Peoples Theatre, yah. We formalized it in 1994. But before that I would work with refugees, we were calling it drama therapy, to catch up with their situation, children and adults and youths. And we would organize the refugee day. An arts-festival, initially it was just drama, then we promoted it to arts to include fine arts and other kinds of theater.

**3. Interviewer:** One of the things I'm very interested in is how people I interview, which are theater-practitioners view theater. So how do you define theater?

Interviewee: (*Ehm*) It's *entertainment*. It's entertainment first. I...I prefer to see it as entertainment. Then, when it comes to...It's a communication tool. But, the entertainment side of it remains.

**4. Interviewer:** How come you see the entertainment-part first?

Interviewee: It's entertainment first because the artist, you are not born and you encounter these issues. You come to learn about issues when you are an adult and think: "Now I can use this as a tool for communicating issues." But what are you before that? A player. You use it for your personal entertainment. You get some...what do you call it, satisfaction, when you act. Aha. And, "oh, I acted well, I acted badly," that is what you are interested in. "I entertained my audience." Then

when you are old enough to say: "Nah, OK, we are being exposed to social issues, political issues." Now you see it as a communication tool for social change. But even then, the entertainment aspect is not taken away. Who wants a boring play, even if it is about human rights or peace?

**5. Interviewer:** Going off this, I kind of wonder, how come you think theater is a communication tool? What are the benefits and challenges of using theater as a communication tool?

Interviewee: It's a communication tool because, first of all it is intrapersonal. When I take a script, the script communicates to me the writers imagination, then this becomes issues depending on the theme. Even if the writers are not interested in the theme but interested in the imagination. Then they who watch it start structuring in terms of their own interpretation. "Oh, it's a love play because of these scenes." So that classification comes later. Imagination comes first. So that imagination is creativity, which is based on a free consciousness. So you are communicating, you are communicating your imagination. Then it is scripted. Sometimes it is located in a setting were you as now a more senior writer, want to take in situations around you that are more real. But you put them in imagination, for theater survival, not money, theater survival means avoiding direct oppression—censorship. And that is part of the creativity, to hide issues coveted in arts. So you are communicating this now intentionally to a direct audience. And, some artist have been bold to face it and say "I don't care whether I'll be arrested or not." Some artist are shy from confronting, so they will want to do the scripts but not be the ones acting. Things like that. But communicating their imagination, their situation, the reality. And it is sometimes, not intentional to provoke action, sometimes you have been intentional to provoke action. So that is why it is a communication tool.

**6. Interviewer:** So have you ever faced any repercussion because of your work?

Interviewee: Plenty, you, you got arrested, jailed and come out and on-and-off. Sometimes you have three or four cases running. I think Sophie told you. You even forget some of the cases.

**7. Interviewer:** So what keeps you driven?

Interviewee: Ideology. Ideology. I think the indoctrination... Sorry... *(Interrupted by*



*phone-call*).

8. **Interviewer:** So what is this, indo...

Interviewee: Motivation! Motivation! Indoctrination. I think that believing that (*ehm*) human beings are to live in dignity and that dignity is based on sovereignty, that we are all born free and equal and to oppose any form of power to oppress others...(Interrupted by phone-call). (*Is joined by a friend.*) This is N.N. [Name excluded]. He is coordinating some peace activities, if you saw that banner.

9. **Interviewer:** Yes.

Interviewee: So, we are working together reducing violence in Nairobi. Mine is more national but with him we focus on Nairobi, Kibera.

10. **Interviewer:** Interesting. So do you also use theater-initiatives?

Interviewee: Plenty. You can not do community mobilization without arts.

11. **Interviewer:** How come?

Interviewee: Huh?

12. **Interviewer:** How come you can't do community mobilization without arts?

Interviewee: Because, entertainment clicks. Yeah. People will and if you—sometimes people try and separate and say "OK. Now we are going to have speeches. Now we are going to have performances." If you do that, they disappear after the performances. (*Laughs*) So you either do both or put the whole message in theater and leave it there. But if you say: "Oh, now is it the guest of honor," then people will just walk away.

12. **Interviewer:** So what are the advantages of using entertainment, theater, within development?

Interviewee: (*Ehm*) Because even when people have problems, emotionally, they want to remain happy as long as they can. And they get some sense of healing and refreshment and inspiration. Laughing at themselves--even when they are crying. Because a moment of joy is there. In my mother tongue we say 'Lauk-chogo'. 'Lauk-chogo' [I do not have the correct spelling] means, your teeth are bones, your teeth are

bones. So you are allowed to laugh even when things are serious or painful. Yah. Yah. So we and...people at the community are interested in simple formats for communication. Yeah. And when you use big language and written volumes and so on, they get bored.

13. **Interviewer:** So what are some of the challenges you have faced with using theater for development?

Interviewee: OK. Still we have had scripts burned. Because there are several formats. Creative design that are not scripted and that evolved on stage. And then there are those who are scripted from the get go. And oh, sometimes you come back and script what you have did. The spontaneity ones you do it several times until it gets formatted. Because you liked what you did last time. That is good, but when it is not formatted you can loose it. So we lost a lot of good scripts because we didn't write them down. And sometimes people wanted to do exactly what we did. But you cant get it all right. So they would say: "But last time you did like this. Why is this missing?" And to pass it on to other artist. So there is that challenge. Some imagine design artists are not good in scripting. The way the language is structured or not, they want to be just like comedians and express it. So that is is and when in that case, when you are not feeling well or you can not be in several places at the same time. You see with a play you can have so many people acting the same script in different places at the same time. But if you are the same person you worked with caution.

14. **Interviewer:** So what theater methodology do you use when you work with Theater for Development?

Interviewee: The whole range. Objects, depending on community. The designs I'm telling you is because sometimes you want to remain (*ehm*) not a facilitator, directly. You want people to...to...to...to get from the abstract, so you can use object-theater and animal-theater to remain abstract and then the community will...because we are where we come from, and stereotypes are heavy and many. So if you use your...your...your words, to say what the issues are, you are labeled, and once you are labeled you lose out on your audience because of the sensitivity of what you've discussed. But if it comes from them, they say: "Oh, you know what you have said. We have seen it somewhere here. And it looks like here!" So. Different formats are important depending on where you are. Puppetry etcetera.

15. **Interviewer:** So how important would you say that the interactive feature is? Is it at all important?

Interviewee: In Africa is it. Because, as opposed to the western theater world where you sit until the play is over. Here people are part of...there is no stage, you can fix it sometimes, but when you are making it participatory or folk-lore, if you gone out here, for a live band playing, people interact with the musicians. "Give him some money!" "Play this song and not the other!" They can come and sometimes be allowed to sing-a-long, even given microphone and do numbers. So that interactiveness is there and here you take advantage of it.

16. **Interviewer:** So going of this, and talking about development, one of the questions that might seem off topic now but that I ask everyone I interview is: What do you define development as?

Interviewee: It is well-being of people. Either as individuals or group. Without making any comparison with others. Yah. So I'm not going to say you are developed or not because you are like..."the other people." This is *your* well-being and the well-being of your community. And this well-being is social, mental, economic—everything. And for me it has nothing to do with fast lanes or superstructures of lifts or big buildings.

17. **Interviewer:** So how do we relate this very holistic idea with theater?

Interviewee: Well, you see, theater is two ways...or three. It can use and help maintain the old--how people used to do things and remind people. So it's like an archive. But it's also a recollection of the present, a mirror of what is going on now. So people will say: "Your theater is as developed as you are--as your community is." And peoples imagination, you will see, sometimes oppression will increase a lot of imagination. Or, a free space can increase imagination. But we are also seeing currently, when there is more freedom, also imagination has gone down. People either, because they want to make money, or because they are not creative, copy other people. But then thirdly it can be projecting the future. Projecting the imagination. Like in the 60's and 70's people did plays around flying and things like that. There was flying but there was little flying in Africa. Or driving.

18. **Interviewer:** So I imagine that this idea of projecting the future is also quite

important to kind off predict what there can be in forms of development. Is that a correct assumption?

Interviewee: Yah. The thing is, if you want to tell people who the future will look like. Like in community development we call it envisioning the future. So when envisioning the future we can ask the community to draw where they are and where they want to go. And then you ask them to enact: "Now you move it from—you enact—where you want to go and how you will get there." So it gets through in that sense and then you end up at that place. On the other hand you can come up with a play that is based on the future, 100 percent, no connection with the present. Just say: "This is the future." And to inspire people. Ask them: "How do we get there?"

19. **Interviewer:** So how do you see this connection between for example development and peace. Or do you see a connection?

Interviewee: In my head it is the same thing. Yah. That is the way I said: "Development is your well-being." And peace is one of the well-beings. (*Ehm*) So long as what surrounds you, as an individual and a society, makes you complete. Of course there are usual worries and proactive of life. But those are again within the confines within development and peace. But if you are pushed into the margins, extremely, then, yeah.

20. **Interviewer:** So what factors do you think are important...(*interrupted by a friend of his*). So what factors do you think are important if you are supposed to perform a successful theater for peace?

Interviewee: Yah. It's important that you, you are familiar with the issues. Yah. There are two operatives, you might be familiar with the issues or you might be creating an artistic space for the issues to come in. So that. And that your facilitation approach allows those who need the space to handle the issues.

21. **Interviewer:** So what kind of facilitation approach have you experienced as the most successful?

Interviewee: I can't say most successful. (*Ehm*) Because what can be successful here can fail miserably in a different setting. And that we have learned also painfully.

22. **Interviewer:** Would you like to explain a little more how you learned that?

Interviewee: Well. You go out very excited with either a methodology or a particular skit. And you realized that you are not properly informed. And then instead of people now concentration on the issues they concentrate on correcting you and dismissing you. Yah. So. A little research of the reality is important. And using local artist is, because of the politics of the play, and including resourceful. If you are going to do a performance in Kibera, and there are artists in Kibera, it's better to use the artist in Kibera to play it. Because they have an income in it.

23. **Interviewer:** And what is this income in it? Why is it important to use local artists?

Interviewee: They can be used to sabotage it, they can decide to sabotage what you are doing since they feel that they are missing out. And they say: "Oh, you people from outside are coming here to take our space." So you don't want them to get involved in that kind of politics. So you work with them, give them the space—sometimes even when money is not involved, they just need room to express themselves. So that, as opposed to this traveling theater. And for the purposes and sustainability, both of arts and issues and approaches. Building the capacity of local artists is more important. Yah. So that skills are transferred. I see 20 years later things that I created, you know, get used in places I've never visited. But I can trace my style and sometimes when you ask they will say: "Oh, we were trained by so-and-so." And then I get to know how my ideas have traveled over time.

24. **Interviewer:** How it has trickled down?

Interviewee: Trickled down. Watered down. Made better! (*Laughs*)

25. (*Talk about acting as a possible gate-keeper*) **Interviewer:** Would you mind telling me a little bit more about the projects you are working on now.

Interviewee: Oh. Yes. (*Ehm*) This initiative is called My Kenya and it is a campaign for peaceful elections with the interests of my Kenya." So we are trying to promote more of the ownership of... (*interrupted by phone-call*) OK. So this is, I'm coordination all kinds of events for peaceful elections. So what people come up with—people come up with initiatives and I help, I endorse the initiatives so that they get some sense of creditability and extended financial trust.

26. **Interviewer:** So are any of these activities that are coming up before the election that I might be able to observe?

Interviewee: I think so. First of all, theater is what ever is happening. It can be structured or not. Sometimes people don't know what they are doing is acting. So on the 17th in Kibera there will be a one day concert, peace concert, and things like that. *(Interrupted by friend who wants to have lunch.)*

27. **Interviewer:** So let's end with a very direct question. I'm looking at the difference between T4D in relation to health and T4D deployed to prevent violence. Do you think that there is something extra that you need to do when talking about preventing violence?

Interviewee: Well, you see. Health is...is less political. It can be sensitive but less political. For example reproductive health is sensitive but it is less political. I'm not saying it is not political, it is *less* political. Yah. Violence prevention is highly political and life-threatening and highly sensitive. So that is the different. So that will make you employ different approaches and so on.

END TRANSCRIPT

## 8.2 Codification of Same Transcript

<b>Codification of Narrative Interview 3 (I3) (TFDK: CO03)</b>		
<b>Meaning Bearing Unit (MBU)</b>	<b>Condensed MBU</b>	<b>Code</b>
I think first of all it is entertainment. Theater is entertainment, very much. I used to enjoy myself watching, starting from slowly telling parents and friends, and also myself telling stories in school.	Theater is entertainment.	Theater is entertainment.
It's <i>entertainment</i> . It's entertainment first. I...I prefer to see it as entertainment. Then, when it comes to...It's a communication tool.	Theater is a communication tool.	Theater is a communication tool.

### Codification of Narrative Interview 3 (I3) (TFDK: CO03)

Meaning Bearing Unit (MBU)	Condensed MBU	Code
<p>It's entertainment first because the artist, you are not born and you encounter these issues. You come to learn about issues when you are an adult and think: "Now I can use this as a tool for communicating issues." (...) Now you see it as a communication tool for social change. But even then, the entertainment aspect is not taken away. Who wants a boring play, even if it is about human rights or peace?</p>	<p>Even though theater is an communication tool for social change the entertainment aspect is not taken away.</p>	<p>Entertainment is important when communicating social change.</p>
<p>It's a communication tool because, first of all it is intrapersonal.</p>	<p>Theater is a communication tool because it is intrapersonal.</p>	<p>Theater is intrapersonal.</p>
<p>You cannot do community mobilization without arts. (...) Because, entertainment clicks. Yeah. People will and if you—sometimes people try and separate and say "OK. Now we are going to have speeches. Now we are going to have performances." If you do that, they disappear after the performances. (<i>Laughs</i>) So you either do both or put the whole message in theater and leave it there. But if you say: "Oh, now is it the guest of honor," then people will just walk away.</p>	<p>You cannot do community mobilization without arts because people only want to see the performances.</p>	<p>Community mobilization needs art.</p>
<p>Because even when people have problems, emotionally, they want to remain happy as long as they can. And they get some sense of healing and refreshment and inspiration. Laughing at themselves—even when they are crying. Because a moment of joy is there.</p>	<p>Theater can offer a moment of joy for people to get a sense of healing, refreshment and inspiration.</p>	<p>Theater can offer joy.</p>
<p>So we and...people at the community are interested in simple formats for communication.</p>	<p>People are interested in simple formats for</p>	<p>People want easy communication.</p>

### Codification of Narrative Interview 3 (I3) (TFDK: CO03)

Meaning Bearing Unit (MBU)	Condensed MBU	Code
Yeah. And when you use big language and written volumes and so on, they get bored.	communication, otherwise they'll get bored.	
You want people to...to...to...to get from the abstract, so you can use object-theater and animal-theater to remain abstract and then the community will...because we are where we come from, and stereotypes are heavy and many. So if you use your...your...your words, to say what the issues are, you are labeled, and once you are labeled you lose out on your audience because of the sensitivity of what you've discussed. But if it comes from them, they say: "Oh, you know what you have said. We have seen it somewhere here. And it looks like here!"	For people to understand the subject on stage must be able to come from them so that they can identify with what is going on.	Understanding happens through identification.
[Development] It is well-being of people. Either as individuals or group. Without making any comparison with others.	Development is well-being.	Development is well-being.
Well, you see, theater is two ways...or three. It can use and help maintain the old—how people used to do things and remind people. So it's like an archive. But it's also a recollection of the present, a mirror of what is going on now.	Theater can be both an archive and a recollection of the present, a mirror.	Theater can be an archive and a mirror.
Like in community development we call it envisioning the future. So when envisioning the future we can ask the community to draw where they are and where they want to go. And then you ask them to enact: "Now you move it from—you enact—where you want to go and how you will get there."	Theater can be a way of envisioning the future and propel action to get to that future.	Theater can be an envision of the future.
It's important that you, you are familiar with the	It's important that you know	Knowledge of the



### Codification of Narrative Interview 3 (I3) (TFDK: CO03)

Meaning Bearing Unit (MBU)	Condensed MBU	Code
issues.	which issues you are dealing with.	issues are important.
There are two operatives, you might be familiar with the issues or you might be creating an artistic space for the issues to come in. So that. And that your facilitation approach allows those who need the space to handle the issues.	If you are not familiar with the issues you need to create an artistic space for the issues.	You need to create and artistic space for the issues.
I can't say most successful. ( <i>Ehm</i> ) Because what can be successful here can fail miserably in a different setting.	What is successful in one setting can fail in another.	Adapt the project to its context.
A little research of the reality is important. And using local artist is, because of the politics of the play, and including resourceful. If you are going to do a performance in Kibera, and there are artists in Kibera, it's better to use the artist in Kibera to play it. Because they have an income in it.	Use local artists who have an income in the project.	Use local resources local actors.
They can be used to sabotage it, they can decide to sabotage what you are doing since they feel that they are missing out. And they say: "Oh, you people from outside are coming here to take our space." So you don't want them to get involved in that kind of politics. So you work with them, give them the space—sometimes even when money is not involved, they just need room to express themselves.	If local resources feel that they are missing out they might sabotage you. Give them the space to express themselves.	Provide a space for local resources to express themselves.
So that, as opposed to this traveling theater. And for the purposes and sustainability, both of arts and issues and approaches. Building the capacity of local artists is more important.	Building the capacity of local artists is important for the project to be sustainable.	Sustainability through building the capacity of local artists.

## 8.3 Final Codification of All Narratives

Main Concept	Variables of importance for Theater for Development to prevent ethnically motivated physical violence										
Themes	Possibilities w TFD				Challenges w TFD		Necessities f TFD to be successful				
Variables	Communication	Understanding	Information	Engagement	Funding...	Reaching Target...	Ownership	Interaction	Identification	Reflection	Provocation
<b>Code</b>	Theater... is near to the people  is direct  is easy communication  People want easy communication  Communication ... can lead to conflict  can transform conflict  is understanding	Theater... is easy to understand  is vivid	... dialogical form of education  ...to empower the individuals  Theater brings transformation/education.	Help people become change-agents by engaging	is handed out with strings  Practitioners do a hurried job to receive funding  Lack of ideology among practitioners who seek funding	is difficult  Difficulty finding root causes and dealing with them.  Sustainability comes from dealing with the root causes.  You can't control the outcome	Involve and engage the local community for sustainability—find a sustainable solution  Contextualize, use local resources, use local actors that have an income in it.  Create a space the locals can use to hinder sabotage.  Sustainability by building local capacity  Imposing is ineffective	Interactiveness brings out the real issues  Solving an fictive issue whilst solving their own issue  Dialogue, not didactic  Everybody is supposed to be a protagonist.	through interaction  with an individual  understanding through identification	The stage becomes rehearsal for reality.  Theater... is a mirror reflects life  Create an open, empty, artistic, space, for reflection	Provoke... engagement the tension/grudge
Main Concept	Variables of importance for Theater for Development to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS										
Themes	Possibilities w TFD				Challenges w TFD		Necessities f TFD to be successful				
Variables	Communication	Understanding	Information	Engagement	Funding...	Reaching Target...	Ownership	Interaction	Identification	Reflection	
<b>Code</b>	Theater ... gets to the heart of people  is communication  Communication ... is understanding	Theater... is easy to understand  is vivid  leaves an image	...equals transformation  ...help people make informed choices	Empowerment through engagement	forces compromise  Donor-driven projects leads to unserious practitioners	is difficult	Involve and engage the local community for sustainability—find a sustainable solution  Contextualize, use local resources  Imposing is ineffective	Interactiveness brings out the real issues  Solving an fictive issue whilst solving their own issue  Dialogue, not didactic  Can measure impact	through interaction  with an issue	The stage becomes rehearsal for reality.  Theater... is a mirror reflects life  Create an open, empty, artistic, space, for reflection	