

**myriad voices:
a cross-cultural performance festival**

asif majid, lily kruglak, areebah ajani, and amanda andrei
the laboratory for global performance and politics
georgetown university
june 2015

Copyright 2015 by Asif Majid, Lily Kruglak, Areebah Ajani, and Amanda Andrei.
All rights reserved.

contents

i	from the research fellow
iii	acknowledgements
1	executive summary
2	introduction
4	case context
6	methodology
9	impact narrative
9	COHORT DESCRIPTION
10	COHORT JOURNEY
12	DATA
23	DISCUSSION
27	best practices
27	PERFORMANCE
31	RESEARCH
36	concluding thoughts
37	bibliography
38	appendices
39	APPENDIX A
41	APPENDICES B.1-B.4
54	APPENDICES C.1-C.6
60	APPENDIX D

from the research fellow

Evaluating a far-reaching arts program such as the *Myriad Voices* festival is a difficult task. The festival challenged pre-existing notions of preferred and promoted narratives, while corralling a number of diverse resources and stories from all over the world. The diversity of events complicated research design, while the core of celebrating story emphasized a qualitative approach. Ultimately, the goals of this project were clear: sharing the stories of others in a way that connects people to one another. This report aims to highlight the successes and challenges faced by The Laboratory for Global Performance and Politics (The Lab) in doing so.

Completion of this report is a direct result of the work of three outstanding individuals: Areebah Ajani, Lily Kruglak, and Amanda Andrei. Each demonstrated an uncanny ability to deconstruct and analyze the *Myriad Voices* festival. Moreover, their thoughtful engagement with the overall project, based on their keen observation, research, and facilitation skills, was a great asset and helped foster a highly reflective approach to arts research.

Tremendous thanks are also due to The Lab's staff. Co-Founding Directors Derek Goldman and Cynthia Schneider have been tireless supporters and allies in the process of developing this document and researching this festival. Additionally, Managing Director Jojo Ruf and Associate Director Rob Jansen have given a great deal of themselves to the project, and The Lab as a whole, enabling this research through logistical and other types of support. Together, The Lab has created a dynamic interdisciplinary endeavor for Georgetown, one that creates a sense of excitement and inspiration in bringing performance and politics together.

In a broader sense, the Georgetown community has been supportive of the *Myriad Voices* project as a whole. From the candid feedback of members of the evaluative cohorts to the backing of University President John DeGioia and from the long hours of the Davis Performing Arts Center's staff to the guidance of the Steering Committee's members, the Georgetown community has embraced this project in a number of ways. This report benefits from such sustenance, demonstrating the importance that the university places on this important work.

Beyond Georgetown, the staff from WolfBrown has been gracious and supportive in their efforts. Alan Brown, John Carnwath, and Anisa Mehdi offered constructive feedback and facilitated important discussions regarding the best ways to create this document, as well as the best ways to engage complexity and diversity in such a complex endeavor. Moreover, they created the context within which each of the Research Fellows was able to connect with and understand one another's perspective. These conversations created an important sounding board, such that the collection of Research Fellows developed its own sense of community and collaboration.

Finally, none of this work would have been possible without the backing of the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, the Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art, and the Association of Performing Arts Presenters (APAP). From the beginning of The Lab's receipt of the Building Bridges grant, Laura Benson, Zeyba Rehman, and Scott Stoner have given The Lab freedom to deliver and execute its programming in a way that encourages artistic and creative excellence. This has filtered down to the writing of this report. Truly, the work of the Duke Foundation and APAP has allowed The Lab to further its mission and goals in exciting ways.

It is always a challenge to curate and synthesize diverse sources of information - completing this evaluation was no exception. The richness of the discussions surrounding this project - both within and outside the official research armature - made clear the complexities of engaging in work at the intersection of performance and politics, whether at Georgetown or elsewhere. In writing this report, the research team and I sought to demonstrate the nuance of these issues and importance of tackling them with care and diligence. I hope that others will take this lesson to heart in their own work.

Asif Majid
Research Fellow

acknowledgements

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

President	John J. DeGioia, PhD
Provost	Robert Groves, PhD
Evaluative Cohort Members	Georgetown Community ¹

THE LABORATORY FOR GLOBAL PERFORMANCE AND POLITICS (THE LAB)

Co-Founding Director	Derek Goldman, PhD
Co-Founding Director	Ambassador Cynthia Schneider, PhD
Associate Director	Rob Jansen
Managing Director	Jojo Ruf

RESEARCH TEAM

Research Fellow	Asif Majid
Team Member	Areebah Ajani
Team Member	Lily Kruglak
Team Member	Amanda Andrei

WOLFBROWN

Principal	Alan Brown
Consultant	John Carnwath, PhD
Independent Consultant	Anisa Mehdi

ASSOCIATION OF PERFORMING ARTS PRESENTERS

Vice President, Programs and Resource	Scott Stoner
Programs Manager	Laura Benson
Programs and Resources Associate	Kalyn Saylor

DORIS DUKE CHARITABLE FOUNDATION

Senior Program Officer, Building Bridges Program	Zeyba Rehman
Program Associate, Building Bridges Program	Beth Woltering

¹ Members of the evaluative cohort were guaranteed anonymity as part of their participation in the study.

executive summary

Produced by Georgetown's Laboratory for Global Performance and Politics through a Building Bridges grant from the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, *Myriad Voices: A Cross-Cultural Performance Festival* featured three immense undertakings during its 2014-2015 season. The festival was slated to begin in September 2014 with *Syria: The Trojan Women*, a reinterpretation of the classical playwright Euripides' text interwoven with testimonies from Syrian refugee actresses. However, since the women were denied visas, the performance was replaced with *Voices Unheard - The Syria: Trojan Women Summit*, a multifaceted event that involved a Skype conversation with the women, a panel discussion, clips from the documentary about the developmental process, and speeches from the project's producer and director.

Amrika Chalo (Destination: USA) was the second event in the series and took place in January 2015. Written by Pakistani playwright Shahid Nadeem, the performance satirized the US immigration process from a Pakistani perspective. The final event of the season was *Generation (Wh)Y: Global Voices On Stage* in April 2015. A work devised and enacted by Georgetown students, it intertwined testimonies from young people around the world, poetry, projections, music, and dance to create simultaneous mini-performances along the themes of risk, discovery, laughter, and home. These three experiences - *Voices Unheard*, *Amrika Chalo*, and *Generation (Wh)Y* - formed the *Myriad Voices* 2014-2015 season.

Myriad Voices was an immense undertaking. It brought together a variety of audience members and diverse ethno-national narratives, diversifying the stories told and

approaches taken to DC theatre. It created deep rather than broad engagement with the themes and questions of the Building Bridges program, represented by the individual performances and the behind-the-scenes thoughtfulness that created them. It focused on the big picture, creating an experience that was deeper than an exercise in Islam 101. On the whole, it offered unique and innovative programming that highlighted the complexities of doing work at the intersection of performance and politics.

As with any massive project, there were ups and downs. Each of these served as learning moments, documented in part by the evaluative cohorts that provided many of the data points for this report. In so doing, a number of best practices emerged. Performance-related practices include engaging context-specificity, multiple and diverse stakeholders, and an introspective struggle. Research-related practices include enrollment characteristics, integrated cohorts, and a sense of community. These best practices help frame guiding questions that can be used by future practitioners, whether within or beyond the Building Bridges program.

In summary, this report points to The Lab's excellence in marshalling resources, leveraging unique relationships, creating innovative work, and developing thought-provoking artistic programming. The relationships created within the evaluative cohorts reflected valuable recognition of the moments of hope and pain that the *Myriad Voices* festival sought to highlight. Indeed, The Lab's intimate understanding of its place at the intersection of performance and politics enabled the festival to showcase underrepresented voices and illuminate hidden narratives from around the world.

introduction

In 2007, the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation launched the Building Bridges Program with the goal of “increas[ing] the public’s understanding of contemporary Muslim societies through the arts.”² The grant program hopes to enhance discussion around nuanced and varied Muslim experiences - particularly from Muslim-majority countries - among wider American audiences. In so doing, it aims to deepen the American public’s understanding of Islam. Given that 5 million Americans today are Muslim, the program hopes to combat the mistaken bases of Islamophobia.³ Building Bridges grants are disbursed to arts organizations that can address these stereotypes at a deep level through interactive arts programming.

Building Bridges encourages grantees’ programs to include activities that contextualize the history of artists and their work, often buttressing performances with discussion groups and opportunities to learn about artists’ lives and home countries. As such, Building Bridges grantees create explicit opportunities for audience connections to the art and artists. Past Building Bridges programmers “have found that a deeper awareness and level of cultural understanding occurs when audiences are able to immerse themselves in the experience and actively interact, collaborate, engage or have direct communication with the artists and other participants.”⁴ Indeed, the program is as concerned with measuring the success of informal education opportunities surrounding a performance as it is with the performances themselves.

Georgetown University’s Laboratory for Global Performance and Politics was one of six campuses to receive a competitive Building Bridges grant for the 2014-2015 cycle. Administered by the Association of Performing Arts Presenters (APAP), the grant project is funded by the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation and the Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art. At Georgetown, it has resulted in a two-year festival, titled *Myriad Voices: A Cross Cultural Performance Festival* (henceforth, *Myriad Voices*). *Myriad Voices* includes performances from artists visiting Georgetown from across the Muslim world, public forums, interdisciplinary courses, and the creation of new work starring Georgetown students in collaboration with youth around the world, including at other grant-winning campuses.

To a great extent, *Myriad Voices* relied on longstanding relationships between The Laboratory for Global Performance and Politics (henceforth, The Lab) and international arts organizations and thought leaders. The Lab’s first event, *Voices Unheard - The Syria: Trojan Women Summit*, drew on connections to Syrian refugee actresses, who had performed a reinterpretation of classical playwright Euripides’ *The Trojan Women*, interwoven with their own testimonies about the ongoing war in Syria. The second event, *Amrika Chalo (Destination: USA)*, featured Pakistani playwright Shahid Nadeem and the Ajoka Theatre Company, participants in prior Lab convenings. *Generation (Wh)Y: Global Voices On Stage*, the third event in the series, leveraged existing international relationships for testimonials that informed the devised piece. Similarly, the October 2015 conclusion of the *Myriad Voices* festival includes the premiere of a new

² See the “Building Bridges” page on the website of the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation for more.

³ Gallup has an introductory report on the term “Islamophobia,” which may be of interest. In general, Islamophobia refers to an exaggerated or unfounded fear of Islam. A Pew report from 2014, for example, stated 50% of Americans believe Islam encourages more violence than other religions.

⁴ “Building Bridges.”

adaptation by Iraqi-American performer and playwright Heather Raffo, with whom The Lab has previously collaborated.

Ultimately, The Lab's execution of *Myriad Voices* pushed beyond the scope of the Doris Duke Foundation's goals. It broadened programming, encouraging global in addition to religion-specific voices. It created original work and adaptations, putting students at the center of its process. It wrestled with complicated questions about ownership of story and narrative, as well as what it means to authentically and respectfully celebrate the work and lives of others. It created deep rather than broad engagement with audiences and the cohorts evaluating the festival. And perhaps most important, over the course of the festival, it grew into a collaboration that punches above its weight.

This report is an attempt to explore the aforementioned complexities of the *Myriad Voices* festival. It is divided into a number of sections. "Case Context" lays the groundwork of The Lab, highlighting the experiences and individuals that situated it for this endeavor. "Methodology" examines the evaluative orientation, technique, and practices used to understand the *Myriad Voices* festival. "Impact Narrative" highlights the experience of the cohorts, some of which the research team designed and some of which arts evaluators WolfBrown designed, including data and discussion. The "Impact Narrative" takes up the bulk of this report. Then, the report moves on to the "Best Practices" that can be drawn from this evaluation, breaking them into performance-related and research-related practices. It concludes with "Concluding Thoughts," bibliographic references, and a series of "Appendices" that house the research-related documents used in the study as well as a list of links regarding the individual performances and overall festival.

case context

Georgetown's Laboratory for Global Performance and Politics aims to create and present of work at the intersection of politics and performance. The Lab is committed to presenting and bringing work to Washington DC that gives voice to otherwise underrepresented voices. The Lab also invites policymakers and the general public to engage in discussion both before and after performances. Programming efforts take into account current topics in foreign affairs and hope to connect policy debates to human voices and experiences.

The Lab was conceptualized after the Convening on Global Performance, Civic Imagination, and Cultural Diplomacy was held in June 2012 at Georgetown University. Professor Derek Goldman from the Theater and Performance Studies Program and Ambassador Cynthia Schneider from the School of Foreign Service led the Convening, bringing together 75 practitioners of "applied arts" who were engaged in arts production, creation, and foreign policy discussions in DC and around the world.⁵ The Lab was an outcrop of that week's conversation and exchange, envisioned as a hub for organizing activities and programs that could address shifting trends in cultural exchange and politics. Professor Goldman and Ambassador Schneider are co-founders of The Lab and now direct it as a joint initiative between the Theater and Performance Studies Program and the School of Foreign Service. The Lab maintains its original mission to "humanize global politics" in a city abuzz with international relations and policy debate.

Since its inception in 2012, The Lab has been responsible for programming works such as South African playwright Athol Fugard's anti-apartheid classic *The Island*, staged by The Freedom Theatre from Jenin Refugee Camp in Palestine; US playwright Anna Deavere Smith's *On Grace* residency; and Czech dissident Vaclav Havel's *Anticodes* from Laterna Magika and the National Theatre of Prague. The Lab also invites leading policymakers and thought leaders to join conversations and post-performance reflection sessions, including personalities such as former Secretary of State Madeline Albright.

The Lab's home base is the Davis Center for the Performing Arts at Georgetown University, which also houses the university's Theater and Performance Studies Program. However, The Lab sustains relationships with prominent arts organizations around Washington DC and the world, as well as supporting programming beyond the Davis Center. Notable collaborators include the Kennedy Center, the British Council, Folger Shakespeare Theatre, the United States Institute of Peace, and Sudan's Al-Bugaa International Theatre.

Since the 2012 Convening, programmers at The Lab have brought and presented ongoing work that promotes the voices of groups often unheard in Washington DC. Indeed, The Lab has organized global residencies to bring artists from around the globe to DC. Most recently, The Lab hosted faculty and students from Baghdad University in an historic Georgetown residency in June 2013. Delegates from this residency presented an Iraqi-Arabic adaptation of *9 Parts of Desire* by Heather Raffo, acclaimed Iraqi-American playwright and performer.

⁵ "Convening on Global Performance, Civic Imagination, and Cultural Diplomacy."

In addition to The Lab's work in the wider DC area, Professor Goldman and Ambassador Schneider are active within the Georgetown community. Professor Goldman has worked with many Georgetown departments in interdisciplinary collaboration, producing the nationally acclaimed Tennessee Williams Centennial Festival in partnership with the American Studies Program. He received his PhD in Performance Studies from Northwestern University in 2001. Ambassador Schneider was a faculty member in Georgetown's Art History Department from 1984-2004, receiving her PhD in Fine Arts from Harvard University in 1984 and serving as US Ambassador to the Netherlands from 1998-2001. Now as a Distinguished Professor in the Practice of Diplomacy, she teaches undergraduate level Culture and Politics courses within the School of Foreign Service.

Beyond Professors Goldman and Schneider, The Lab is run with the help of Managing Director Jojo Ruf, Associate Director Rob Jansen, and Research Fellow Asif Majid. Each comes to the Lab with diverse performance experiences in the United States and abroad. Jojo has a background in new work and arts management, Rob is an actor with experience devising and directing theatrical projects, and Asif researches the intersection of theatre and conflict. While supporting The Lab's efforts, each also pursues individualized research and creative work.

The Lab continues to draw from Georgetown's talents and interests, and works in conjunction with the larger community. The Lab's receipt of a Building Bridges grant from the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation enabled it to create four major performance events over the life of the grant, three of which are considered by this report. *Voices Unheard - The Syria: Trojan Women Summit* took place in September 2014 as a replacement for *Syria: The Trojan Women* after the Syrian refugee actresses were denied visas. *Amrika Chalo (Destination: USA)* took place in January 2015, bringing Ajoka Theatre Company from Lahore. *Generation (Wh)Y: Global Voices On Stage* was the latest production of *Myriad Voices*, incorporating Georgetown voices in collaboration with those of young people from LaGuardia Community College in New York City and around the world.

Certainly, The Lab's position at the intersection of global performance and politics has allowed it to connect with and engage a number of high-profile stakeholders from around DC, the country, and the world. The *Myriad Voices* festival is another exciting iteration of that interdisciplinary prowess, considered in depth in this report. Ultimately, such excellence sets the stage for high-quality theatrical work that underscores the socially transformative power of the performing arts.

methodology

This section focuses on the methodological approach of the *Myriad Voices* evaluative study. Due to the artistic and creative nature of the phenomenon being examined, it takes its impulse from grounded theory and the constructivist paradigm, which is explained in further detail below. This approach elicited data that cultivated unique and important conclusions, much of which was the direct result of the effective research design outlined in this section on “Methodology.”

Myriad Voices employed qualitative analysis to explore its research questions. This was accomplished primarily through grounded theory research design. Grounded theory is a method of qualitative research that builds theory directly from an inductive analysis of the phenomena examined - the theory emerges from the data, creating knowledge as occurs within the constructivist paradigm.⁶ As such, the research team generated findings and conclusions from a direct, and deep, exploration of the data collected.

To ensure internal validity and reliability in the study, data was obtained using a number of triangulated data sources (focus group discussions, pre- and post-performance word association surveys, general attitude surveys, and interviews). This report will help ensure external validity and reliability, as the results of the *Myriad Voices* project are compared with the findings of other institutions that have received Building Bridges grants.

Data used to analyze the impact of the three theatrical performances at Georgetown was generated through a series of activities with three cohorts from the Georgetown community. This report focuses on data collected from two of the three recruited research cohorts. A third cohort was added to create intentional over-enrollment, controlling for participants who found themselves unable to meet the requirements for inclusion in the study – attendance at all three theatrical performances, the completion of a pre- and post-performance word association survey for each event, completion of a survey at the start and conclusion of the study, attendance at the focus group discussions, and an exit interview.

Participants in the cohorts came from throughout the Georgetown University community: undergraduate students, graduate students, and Georgetown University staff. Participation in the study was advertised through an assortment of media; from emails to department heads, individual professors, and student club presidents, to in-person, informal presentations on campus. There was no remuneration for participation in the study, and participants volunteered their time.

Data was collected from September 2014 to April 2015 along three anchoring points that coincided with the three theatrical performances of *Myriad Voices*. The pre-project focus group discussions were held on September 13 or 19, preceding the first event. The focus group discussions debriefing the *Syria* event were held on September 21, two days after the event. The next series of focus group discussions occurred on January 25, two days after *Amrika Chalo*. The last set of focus group discussions occurred on April 19, two days after *Generation (Wh)Y*.

⁶ See *The Discovery of Grounded Theory* by sociologists Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss for more.

WolfBrown supplied protocols for the pre-project focus group discussions, but the protocols for each subsequent focus groups discussion were specific to the events preceding them, and thus developed by the research team.⁷ Each focus group discussion lasted approximately 90 minutes.

Another form of data collection employed was a series of three word associations, which participants completed and submitted in writing. Prior to each performance, study participants filled out a word association specific to the themes explored in the piece, with no additional context provided other than the words themselves. Participants were asked to complete the same word association again prior to the start of the post-event focus group discussions two days later.⁸

Bookending the entire study was a survey, filled out prior to the start of the pre-project focus group discussion (September 2014) and again before the exit interview (April 2015). This survey was part of the protocols provided by WolfBrown to all institutions receiving Building Bridges grants. Additionally, each study participant completed a one-on-one exit interview with a member of the research team, which lasted approximately 20 minutes. The questions for the exit interview were also part of the WolfBrown protocols, but the interviewers used a semi-structured format to allow for appropriate follow-up questions. The exit interview and survey was the final requirement for participation in the *Myriad Voices* study.

Due to the inclusion of human subjects in the *Myriad Voices* study, the research team took all necessary precautions to ensure no harm came to the participants and followed all Georgetown University standards of ethical research. The *Myriad Voices* study applied for and received approval from Georgetown University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) prior to the start of the study. Furthermore, all members of the research team who interacted with the participants underwent an online Human Subjects Protection Training from the Collaborative IRB Training Initiative.

Participation in the study was purely voluntary, and was conducted with non-vulnerable, adult participants. The risks faced by participants in the study were minimal to none; nonetheless, careful steps were taken to ensure participants felt no adverse effects from their involvement in the study. Prior to the beginning of the study, potential cohort participants were made aware of all requirements for participation - attendance at performances, focus group discussions, etc. - as well as how data would be used. Before the start of the first research activity - the WolfBrown entry survey - all participants were asked to read and sign the informed consent document (see Appendix A), and encouraged to speak with the research team regarding any questions or concerns. At each stage of data collection, participants were similarly encouraged to bring up any issues or questions.

Additionally, safeguards were taken to ensure the confidentiality of all data gathered and protect the privacy of the participants. Each cohort member was assigned an alphanumeric code at the start of the study, and any materials associated with participants (notes, transcripts, surveys, etc.) were immediately coded so that no mention of participants' names was ever associated with

⁷ For a list of the questions used in each of the post-event focus group discussions, see Appendices C.4-C.6.

⁸ See Appendices C.1-C.3 for the word association templates used for each performance.

those documents. Cohort information was shared only among the research team, and all written documentation connecting the codes to cohort members was kept under lock and key or password protected on encrypted computers. All information retained over the course of the project will be destroyed at the conclusion of the writing of this report.

impact narrative

This “Impact Narrative” is broken into four smaller sub-sections. “Cohort Description” discusses the demographics and makeup of the individuals who were a part of the evaluative study. “Cohort Journey” highlights the events, both performance- and research-based, that cohort members experienced as a part of the study. “Data” draws out raw quotes and numbers from the various data sources, considering WolfBrown’s bookend protocols (entry survey, exit survey, entry focus group, and exit interview) as separate from the research team’s event-related protocols (pre-event word association, post-event word association, and post-event focus group). “Discussion” interprets the data, putting it in the context of particular experiences and integrating behind-the-scenes knowledge of which many cohort members were unaware. In so doing, the “Impact Narrative” underscores The Lab’s growth over the *Myriad Voices* festival, depth of engagement, representation of diverse stories, and overall innovation.

COHORT DESCRIPTION

In evaluating *Myriad Voices*, this study benefited from the perspectives and thoughts of three 8-person cohorts. Though initially full, only 83% of the initial group (20 of the original 24) ended up participating in one or more aspects of the *Myriad Voices* festival (research, performances, or both). Nonetheless, this percentage met the basic requirement from WolfBrown, which was for each Building Bridges site to engage a minimum of 16 evaluative cohort participants in its various activities (see “Cohort Journey” below). For the purposes of the remainder of this study, mentions of the “cohort” or “cohort members” reflect the 20 individuals who participated.

Cohort members were selected through an open call to the Georgetown University community. Emails describing the scope of the *Myriad Voices* research endeavor were sent to relevant departmental and extracurricular email list-servs. The research team also made direct announcements to students in a number of classes for undergraduates, including those contributing to majors such as Culture and Politics, Linguistics, Public Health, Theatre, and others. Finally, members of The Lab’s staff reached out to individual students who had indicated some interest in the project and encouraged their participation.

As a result of these far-reaching efforts, the cohorts consisted of a diverse group of individuals, all of whom can be categorized as millennials.⁹ An overwhelming percentage of the participants were female (85%) and almost half (40%) were graduate students. A diverse number of majors were represented, including Culture and Politics; Government; Security Studies; Linguistics; History; Health Care Management; Theatre; and Communication, Culture, and Technology. In total, 13 majors were represented (8 undergraduate and 5 graduate), with multiple cohort members having double majors. One participant was a staff person rather than a student.

⁹ Other than the number of participants required, the only other stipulation from WolfBrown was that cohort members be millennials. Millennials are loosely defined by birth year: most commentators consider those born from the early 1980s to the early 2000s to be millennials. See “The Millennial Generation Research Review” for more.

Diversity was also found in the cohort members' cultural background: 35% white and the remaining 65% reflected the following world regions: South, Southwest, and East Asia; Western Europe; and the Caribbean. Further, 75% of the cohort members spoke another language. As a point of comparison, Georgetown's undergraduate Class of 2016 is nearly 60% white, and 33% speak a language besides English.¹⁰

COHORT JOURNEY

Upon their commitment to participate in the study, all participants were notified of the dates of the pre-project survey and focus group, the three major performances of the *Myriad Voices* festival and three associated focus groups, and a 20-minute exit interview and exit survey. Cohort members were grouped into three cohorts based solely on date of response. Each study participant was then given a pre-program survey, as per the Building Bridges program requirements. This initial survey was completed before the first performance of the season and measured attitudes toward Muslim people and cultures, attitudes towards performance art, and general demographics of each cohort member.

Myriad Voices' first performance was a last-minute event titled *Voices Unheard - The Syria: Trojan Women Summit*, which replaced the original *Syria: The Trojan Women* that was a reinterpretation of Classical playwright Euripides' 2,500-year-old text, scheduled for September 19-20, 2014 in the Gonda Theatre of the Davis Performing Arts Center at Georgetown University. As a replacement, the event featured a Skype conversation with the actresses and director of *Syria: The Trojan Women*, a panel of experts who discussed the ongoing humanitarian crisis in Syria, clips from the documentary regarding the development of *Syria*, and speeches by members of The Lab and others associated with the project.

Around the event, a number of experiences took place. One cohort completed the pre-project focus group a few hours before the event, while others cohorts completed it on September 13.¹¹ In both cases, graduate-level researchers with subject-area expertise in conflict resolution and theatre led the group. Focus group participants were asked to introduce themselves and their experience with the arts. Participants also explained why they were drawn to participate in the *Myriad Voices* evaluative study. At the event itself, all cohort members took the pre-event word association survey approximately 30 minutes before the event.

Cohort members reconvened on the Sunday after the performance for an 80-90-minute focus group discussion. Cohort members were provided with breakfast or lunch, depending on the time of their discussion. They briefly reintroduced themselves and answered questions prepared by the Research Fellow and research team. Four to five prompting questions were asked in an open-ended format, to which participants contributed at will. Focus group leaders added follow-up questions as needed, but intentionally kept the structure of the conversation loose. At the end of the discussion, students rated the production on four metrics. Follow-up emails were sent with materials from the focus group discussions, and participants had the option to email in any follow-up thoughts to The Lab's Research Fellow.

¹⁰ This statistic comes from Georgetown's Office of Undergraduate Admissions' profile of the Class of 2016.

¹¹ Last-minute cohort enrollment meant that one focus group had to be pushed to September 19 rather than being held on September 13, as was originally planned.

Amrika Chalo (Destination: USA), the second production of the *Myriad Voices* festival, took place from January 23-24, 2015. It was a theatrical production written by Pakistani playwright Shahid Nadeem, adapted for a Georgetown and DC-specific audience. The production was set in the visa-granting section of the US Embassy in Pakistan, in which six Pakistani citizens attempt to secure visas for travel to the US. Each visitor has a different reason for traveling: education, business, leisure, etc. The entire play pokes fun at the absurdity of the immigration and visa-granting process, using a folk and repetitive theatrical tradition to satirize the experience. The production occurred in the Gonda Theatre, where it featured live, English translations in supertitles, since the actors performed in Urdu and Punjabi.

Prior to the event, the research team notified participants of the upcoming show and focus group discussions. Some participants volunteered or were recruited as extras in the production, lending some of the focus group discussions to have an insider-esque nature. Again, participants in all three cohorts attended an 80-90-minute focus group on the Sunday after the show and were given the chance to type up additional thoughts to send in via email. Each received an opportunity to rank the event along a number of characteristics, and each was able to respond to the discussion questions.

Generation (Wh)Y: Global Voices On Stage, the final production of the *Myriad Voices* 2014-2015 season, took place during the weekend of April 17-18, 2015. *Generation (Wh)Y* featured an integration of testimonies - culled from interviews conducted by the student devising team - poems, and other forms of story. Combined with projections, music, and dance, the piece explored a number of universal, human themes: risk, discovery, and laughter. Audience members moved from location to location in order to experience each of these themes as 10-minute encounters, bookended by a performative articulation of the concept of home. Audiences concluded the evening in the Gonda, during which they engaged in conversation with strangers regarding each of the aforementioned themes.

A number of the members of evaluative cohorts were involved in the writing and production of this student-led piece, again adding a deeper “behind-the-scenes” experience to the focus group discussion. After seeing the show on the Friday evening, participants from all three cohorts attended an 80-90 minute focus group on the Sunday after the show. Each participant was able to rank the event using a number of qualifications, and they were given the chance to type up additional thoughts to send in via email after the Sunday session.

At the final focus group discussion, participants scheduled their exit interview for the last week of April or the first week of May. During the exit interview (scheduled in-person, over the phone, or via Skype), they underwent the final WolfBrown protocol of a 20-minute series of semi-structured questions. They were also asked to complete a short online survey, which reposed some of the items from the pre-project survey and concluded their participation in the *Myriad Voices* research study.

DATA

In this study, there were two sets of data: WolfBrown's bookend protocols (pre- and post-project surveys, pre-project focus groups, and post-project interviews) and the research team's event-specific protocols (pre- and post-event word associations and post-event focus groups).¹² The two sets of protocols mean that this study can be considered in two parts: WolfBrown's attempted to ascertain changes in perceptions of Islam and Muslims, and The Lab sought to evaluate each event within the *Myriad Voices* festival. Notably, the exit interviews (categorized here as within the bookend protocols) were a data source that bridged this divide, given their capstone and open-ended nature. On the whole, both sets of protocols came together to offer a holistic picture of the successes of and challenges faced by *Myriad Voices*.

Bookend Protocols

Provided by WolfBrown, the bookend protocols took place before the first event occurred and after the last event concluded. Beforehand, an entry survey of 17 substantive and 5 demographic questions was administered. Additionally, a focus group protocol that sought to establish a baseline regarding cohort members' beliefs, attitudes, and experiences relating to Muslims was also administered. After the final event concluded, study participants were asked to respond to an exit interview protocol that asked for reflections on their *Myriad Voices* experience. Participants also took a 14-question exit survey that asked many of the same questions as the entry survey. This bookend set of protocols elicited quantitative and qualitative data, articulations of which are found below.

PRE-PROJECT FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Initial protocols for the pre-project focus group discussions (see Appendix B.3) focused inquiry around establishing a baseline for the group's knowledge and level of understanding. Both groups that underwent the protocol demonstrated a deep understanding of the assumptions that fuel many anti-Muslim sentiments in this country. For cohort members, this sentiment comes from an inappropriate Orientalist gaze that alienates the Other:¹³

...the US has a fascination with Arab world, Muslim world...different things that it doesn't have with Latin America, East Asia, Russia...the Muslim world is just this, like, awe-inspiring, big ambiguous, blob [*sic*] that we just can't forget and we'll never get to know or whatever.

As one cohort member put it: "It's like the new enemy...you need an enemy. So it was the Russians, and now it is the Muslims. And whoever is next is next."

It was not all bad news, however. There is a balance of positivity regarding Muslims, but the cohorts found it to be marginalized and suppressed rather than celebrated. It became evident that working against this premise and assumption was the basis for the *Myriad Voices* project:

¹² All protocols used in this study are found in the Appendices. Appendices B.1-B.4 house the WolfBrown bookend protocols, while Appendices C.1-C.6 feature the research team's event-specific protocols.

¹³ International education research Fred Dervin, citing interculturalist Martine Abdallah-Pretceille, defines the Other as a group that experiences "objectification" and a "creating [of] the other" in a manner that "puts aside and ignores the complexity and subjectivity of the individual." Much of this definition echoes the work done by postcolonial theorist Edward Said, author of the classic text *Orientalism*.

...there are some success stories, too. I think the whole scale is there; there is more attention on the negative because we want to improve things, so that's why we're doing this.

Cohort members were also quick to individualize rather than generalize. One cohort member indicated that Islam ought to be considered as one aspect of a person's identity rather than the only marker that defines them: "...you can't fit all of Islam or all of Christianity into one box...it's definitely on the person and the sect and whatnot." This extended to a particular question on the discussion protocol, which asked cohort members to respond to the following statement: "Some Americans think that Muslims pose a threat to American culture and the American way of life." One participant chose to write out a response, which - though lengthy - deserves to be quoted in full because it demonstrates the high baseline of critical understanding and thinking of the cohort members:

This statement is inherently problematic. To begin, it assumes a universal definition and understanding of what it means to be American, what it means to be Muslim, and what constitutes the American way of life. I will attempt to deconstruct each of these socially constructed labels, because I believe that the best way to answer this statement is to challenge the biases inherent within. Let's start with a bit of geography. The U.S. is located on the continent of North America, along with Mexico and Canada. The countries within Central and South America are also located in this Western hemisphere. Taken at face value, the term "America" should incorporate the experiences of all of the peoples located within the previously mentioned regions. Instead the term "America" connotes the U.S. and its people. The U.S. has monopolized the term "America", sometimes falsely operating as a representative body for the rest of these regions, which is not possible, as cultural and political climates differs from country to country. Most "Americans" (U.S. citizens) are racially classified under a sub-category of the term American, i.e. African-American, Asian-American, etc. American is rarely a term that stands alone. Based on these facts, I would claim that the term American holds little value at all, unless you are speaking to someone who's [*sic*] family has lived in this country for more than 3 generations. The question then becomes, who or what is truly American? What constitutes **the American way of life** [*emphasis in original*]? I don't believe that such a generic way of life, an "American Way" exists. The majority of Americans are from immigrant origins, transporting their traditions and culture with them while traveling to this country. I don't believe that there is one way to demonstrate an American identity. Furthermore this statement implies that Muslims are not American. This othering of that which is not White, Anglo-Saxon, and Protestant, is inextricably a part of this discourse. There are followers of Islam, living in the U.S., [who] have U.S. citizenship and have a life and a family here. To be Muslim and American are not mutually exclusive identities. When I hear statements like this one, I think about how narrow-minded many U.S. citizens can be about Muslims and their beliefs and contributions to society.

PRE- AND POST-PROJECT SURVEYS

Most cohort members self-reported a high knowledge of Islam - on a 7-point scale in terms of knowledge (1 is "nothing" and 7 is "a great deal"), only 3 of the 16 respondents ranked themselves as a 3, 2, or 1: the average was 5.19. They also self-reported favorable opinions

toward Muslims, with no respondent ranking themselves below a 4 on a 7-point scale (1 is “unfavorable” and 7 is “favorable”) - the average was 5.78. This matched responses to the series of agree/disagree statements on the initial survey, which invited rankings from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 7 (“strongly agree”). Table 1 highlights the Muslim-related responses compared to the results from the post-project survey, where the same statements were offered to participants.

Pre- and Post-Project Survey - Agree/Disagree Statements about Muslims

7-point scale, where 1 is “strongly disagree” and 7 is “strongly agree”

pre-survey: n = 16

post-survey: n = 12

STATEMENT	MEAN (PRE-SURVEY)	MEAN (POST-SURVEY)
“By and large, Muslims are peace-loving people.”	6.69	6.25
“Muslims should undergo more intensive security checks than non-Muslim passengers before boarding airplanes.”	1.19	1.75
“Muslim Americans have beliefs and values that are compatible with the beliefs and values of non-Muslim Americans.”	6.06	5.91

Table 1

In addition, cohort members documented having witnessed various forms of discrimination against Muslims in the past year. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had “personally witnessed” certain acts. Table 2 makes clear the severity and frequency of this.

Pre-Project Survey - Personally Witnessing Anti-Muslim Discrimination in the Past Year

pre-survey: n = 16

STATEMENT	# OF RESPONDENTS WITNESSING
“Acts of violence or intimidation against Muslims or people from Muslim-majority countries”	6
“Deliberate use of discriminatory language or offensive “jokes” about Muslims or people from Muslim-majority countries.”	11
“Targeting of Muslims or people from Muslim-majority countries by airport security or law enforcement officers.”	7
“Negative stereotyping of Muslims or people from Muslim-majority countries in the media.”	15
“Culturally insensitive or offensive remarks (whether intentional or unintentional) about Muslims or people from Muslim-majority countries.”	14

Table 2

Only 12 respondents completed the post-project survey, as a result of the end-of-the-semester rush, compared to the full 16 prior to the project. Even though the post-project survey posed a number of items again (particularly those regarding knowledge of and feelings toward Muslims), participant numbers did not change in a significant fashion. Compared to the 5.19 when asked how much they knew about Islam before *Myriad Voices*, cohort members averaged 5.08 afterward. Similarly, compared to the 5.78 ranking of favorable feelings toward Muslims before the project, cohort members averaged 5.55 afterward. Table 3 highlights average responses to these statements, both before and after *Myriad Voices*.

Pre- and Post-Project Survey - Self-Reported Feelings and Knowledge about Muslims

pre-survey: n = 16

post-survey: n = 12

QUESTION	SCALE (7-POINT)	MEAN (PRE- SURVEY)	MEAN (POST- SURVEY)
“Which of the following best describes your feelings towards the following religious groups? (Muslims)”	1 (“unfavorable”) 7 (“favorable”)	5.78	5.55
“Following is a list of five religions. How much do you know about each of them? (Islam)”	1 (“nothing”) 7 (“a great deal”)	5.19	5.08

Table 3

There was one post-project survey response to an open-ended question that is worth noting, as it addresses some of the assumptions that the survey made while touching on some of the concerns that the pre-project focus groups also unveiled:

Q: Since you initially got involved in the *Myriad Voices* project, have any world events (e.g. elections, wars, revolutions, protests) or events in your personal life (e.g. meeting new friends, new hobbies) that are unrelated to the *Myriad Voices* program changed the way you feel about Muslims, people from Muslim-majority countries, Islam, or religion in general? If so, please explain.

A: The question is incorrectly framed. Do we look at Christians as a unit of analysis as we are expected to look at Muslims? The shows were about humans and were nationally focused. Islam/Muslimness [*sic*] is one of various identity strands of the participants or topics in the events but it was not the only identifier.

This response to the survey question is a useful point of departure for investigations into the assumptions upon which the Building Bridges project was based, found below in the “Discussion” sub-section of this “Impact Narrative.”

EXIT INTERVIEWS

It was the intention of the research team to conduct exit interviews with each member of the two full cohorts for a total of 16. However, travel, schedule conflicts, and the end-of-the-semester rush made that impossible; 11 interviews were completed. Despite this, a number of cohort members criticized the protocol as something that furthered generalizations:

...the issue that I have with these questions is that, like, there’s the assumption...that we can have ideas about any religion or followers of a religion in general is already problematic for me...I don’t think we should ever think in generalized terms about any religion or any ethnicity or any culture...For me to assert my opinion on what I think about people, I assess the person as a person, as an individual.

Other cohort members were frustrated with the way in which they saw hidden agendas in performances:

My main point of criticism...is this whole hiding a nationalist agenda under the form of cultural diplomacy and cultural diversity and understanding is an absolute wrong. It’s a bad thing.

The extent to which this is true is considered in the “Discussion” sub-section of this “Impact Narrative.”

Despite this, multiple interviewees agreed on the reflective value of the focus group discussions. These conversations added value to the interviewees' experience because they featured a "diverse group of people" and reflected different "levels of involvement" in a particular production. Moreover, participants would come into the discussions with their own thoughts and then "look at everything deeper and think about it a lot more" after participating in the discussion. Multiple cohort members indicated that such intensive discussions might be the key to future studies, particularly in terms of increasing understanding:

I think that every important aspect of all of the events that came out really came out in the discussions, and I was like, extremely impressed by how, how deeply we touched on everything with detail...for the sake of future research or how else you would conduct it, [keep] that for sure. I would keep it the same, in terms of the discussion, because the most engaging and interesting ideas came out of that.

Such discussions fed personal learning for the cohort members. Though most came in with a solid understanding of the issues at hand, they gained a deeper ability to engage with the events in the *Myriad Voices* festival. This personal learning also benefitted from a sense of connection with others, which cohort members were quick to expand beyond Muslim societies, cultures, and peoples:

...one of the most rewarding parts was being able to interact with people...that's not a particularly new insight specific to Muslims, I guess. It's just a rewarding thing to make that connection with somebody who is a stranger.

Fulfilling connections with random people was an exciting aspect of the experience for cohort members. Such interactions created increased personal learning, as participants saw and experienced their point of view in a different way.

Finally, cohort members pointed to the importance of artists understanding the context in which they are presenting. Rather than leave this as the sole responsibility of the performing arts presenter, cohort members wanted artists to take some part in understanding. As such, in order to maintain the original message in a different context, adaptation becomes an important part of the artistic process. Understanding and allowing for this is an essential part of the cultural translation that was at the heart of much of The Lab's work during *Myriad Voices*.

Event-Specific Protocols

As the "Student Journey" sub-section of this "Impact Narrative" made clear, each cohort member underwent two protocols around each event: a pre- and post-event set of word association surveys, and a post-event focus group. The pre- and post-event word association surveys were administered just before cohort participants entered the event and 36 hours later before the post-event focus group discussion began. Each survey featured seven terms that were connected to the event, and each participant was asked to write down the first three words or concepts that came to their mind in association with each term. The same seven terms were used both before and after the event, presented to the participant in the same order. This set of data was initially conceived as a possible indicator of subtle changes, as well as a reinforcement/reminder of event content and experience before focus group discussions began.

For the *Syria* event, the set of word association surveys featured the following terms: home, refugees, women, Syria, exile, civil war, and family. Comparing the pre- to the post-survey, three interesting points emerge (words mentioned in highest frequency are found in Table 4, below). First, in association with the concept of ‘home,’ the idea of family (“family” or “parents,” for instance) was mentioned almost an equal number of times (13 before; 14 after). However, the tone of the surrounding connotative words changed. Beforehand, the connotation was one of warmth (terms such as “peace,” “sweet,” and “warmth”). Afterward, the surrounding connotation was one of security (terms such as “security,” “safe,” and “refuge”). Second, the term ‘refugee’ evoked victimization through movement in 14 instances prior to the event (phrases and words like “broken homes,” “unwelcome,” and “fleeing homeland”) compared to eight instances afterward (terms like “displacement” and “on the run”). Third, and perhaps most striking, use of a proper noun to connote a specific place or associated nation-state identity (for example, “Palestine” or “Palestinian”) occurred 23 times before the event compared to six times afterward. This movement from associating these terms with nation-state identities to more apolitical words and concepts was unexpected.

Pre-Syria Survey surveys returned = 18			Post-Syria Survey surveys returned = 16		
TERM	MOST FREQUENTLY ASSOCIATED WORD(S)/CONCEPT(S)	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE	TERM	MOST FREQUENTLY ASSOCIATED WORD(S)/CONCEPT(S)	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE
<i>home</i>	family	12	<i>home</i>	family	11
<i>refugees</i>	displaced	4	<i>refugees</i>	courage	3
<i>women</i>	strong/strength	8	<i>women</i>	strong/strength	7
<i>Syria</i>	war/civil war	9	<i>Syria</i>	war/civil war	10
<i>exile</i>	political	4	<i>exile</i>	distance; desire to return; looking back/yearning	4
<i>civil war</i>	rebellion/revolution	3	<i>civil war</i>	resist/rebel; blood	3
<i>family</i>	home	8	<i>family</i>	love	6

Table 4

Of all the post-event focus group discussions, the discussions that took place after the *Syria* event elicited the widest ranging feedback, in terms of cohort members’ views - in a general sense - about the positivity or negativity of the event. While a number of cohort participants found the event to be a positive, humanizing experience, others saw it as “disrespectful.” Nonetheless, all participants agreed with the sentiment of one cohort member, who indicated that the most powerful part of the evening was:

...hearing the stories of the ladies, themselves, whenever they spoke. It brought power. It empowered them in a way. And it was unfortunate that they were not allowed to speak as much as they should.

Simultaneously, cohort participants were quick to recognize the particular last minute and unfortunate circumstances surrounding the event, given that the women did not receive visas to present their work. Not to be confused with any sort of theatrical production, the *Voices Unheard Summit* was unique in this series because it was a combination of a panel of experts, clips from a forthcoming documentary regarding the original production, a series of speeches,

and a Skype conversation with the women. As a result, for some, it seemed as though “there were multiple events booked for the same space at the same time.”

Contextualizing the experience for uninformed audience members was a frustration for some cohort members. One participant stated, “I feel like from panelists and everything, we heard a lot of this is what happened to them, whereas we were really craving: who are you, and what have you experienced?” Indeed, The Lab catered toward a general, rather than highly informed, audience. As a result, informed audience members often took matters into their own hands to reach the women:

...that’s the number one reason they [some audience members] were speaking Arabic...they wanted to reach through that screen and speak right to them [the women] and deliver a message and connect with their heart. That’s what I really felt for the particular people who did it...I hear you. I have things to say to you.

At the same time, there were moments of humanization for cohort members. One cohort member, responding to clips from the documentary, indicated that a powerful moment “was when the director asked the woman to practice her line back at home and she was like I’m homeless, where’s my home, like, I’m living with someone else.” Yet another cohort member said:

...seeing them interact with each other and checking their phones and hanging out...and also hearing about their lives before...I didn’t realize how middle class of a life it was possible to have and she was saying, oh my husband was a shopkeeper, oh we went furniture shopping, and things that were so relatable. It was nice to see them as more than just a sad story, but a complete story of what their life was like.

In the end, for some, the content of the evening was unique and humanized the women. For others, the evening’s form did a great disservice to the women. Explored further in the “Discussion” sub-section of this report’s “Impact Narrative,” the above quotes make clear that there is experiential and subjective truth to each of these opinions and perspectives, given the interdisciplinary and diverse nature of these cohorts. As a final quote regarding the *Voices Unheard Summit*, one cohort member said: “the fact that something did happen today was good,” but it was “flawed in its execution.” Indeed, this balance is the main point of departure for the evaluative “Discussion” of this event.

AMRIKA CHALO (DESTINATION: USA)

JANUARY 23-24, 2015

In the set of word association surveys surrounding *Amrika Chalo*, the following terms were used to prompt participant responses: visa, embassy, terrorist, opportunity, Pakistan, America, and stereotype. No associated word or concept appeared more than six times, as Table 5 indicates. Relative to the *Syria* surveys, which had a much higher frequency in responses regarding ‘home’ and ‘Syria,’ the *Amrika* surveys demonstrated a greater diversity of associations. Moreover, multiple terms elicited multiple high-frequency responses - that is to say that ‘terrorist,’ for example, elicited both “violence” and “extremism” in equal number, rather than just one standout response. Indeed, in tallying the survey responses, a similar trend was apparent across the second and third most frequently associated word or concept for a given term; because of space limitations for this report, Table 5 does not show this. One possible explanation for this difference is the demographics of the cohorts. A number of the cohort members were connected

to South Asia (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, etc.) in some way - whether through family or friends, as an area of focus, or otherwise. Arguably, this diversified the narrative surrounding *Amrika Chalo*, as did The Lab's presentation of the production through the lens of the Charlie Hebdo shooting rather than through a Pakistan-specific perspective.¹⁴

Pre- <i>Amrika</i> Survey surveys returned = 17			Post- <i>Amrika</i> Survey surveys returned = 15		
TERM	MOST FREQUENTLY ASSOCIATED WORD(S)/CONCEPT(S)	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE	TERM	MOST FREQUENTLY ASSOCIATED WORD(S)/CONCEPT(S)	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE
<i>visa</i>	consulate/embassy; legality/regulation; complicated/difficult	4	<i>visa</i>	bureaucracy	4
<i>embassy</i>	ambassador; diplomacy	3	<i>embassy</i>	ambassador; visa	4
<i>terrorist</i>	bomb; violence; extremist/extremism	4	<i>terrorist</i>	violence; extreme/extremism	5
<i>opportunity</i>	chance	5	<i>opportunity</i>	America	4
<i>Pakistan</i>	Muslim	4	<i>Pakistan</i>	Islam	5
<i>America</i>	neoliberal/imperial/ colonial; freedom/liberty	4	<i>America</i>	opportunity	6
<i>stereotype</i>	ignorance/unlearned/ misinformed	4	<i>stereotype</i>	generalization/ generalized	4

Table 5

Discussions with cohort members after the *Amrika Chalo* event revealed some interesting lessons regarding the limits of cross-cultural humor, cultural and geographic adaptation and translation, and audience expectations. Though cohort members questioned some aspects of the event, progression and growth from the *Voices Unheard Summit* to *Amrika Chalo* was apparent. A number of the cohort members saw improvements between the two events, including in some cohort members' interactions with the artists responsible for the production (Pakistani playwright Shahid Nadeem and Ajoka Theatre). Throughout the event and its build-up, questions of what makes something funny, audience expectations, and effectiveness of cultural, linguistic, and geographic translation emerged.

Amrika Chalo takes place in the visa section of the US Embassy in Pakistan, concluding with a scene in which terrorists invade the office and secure visas for travel to the US by threatening the ambassador and other embassy staff. In the context of this satirical production, the scene was intended to poke fun at the goals of terrorists as well as their way of achieving those goals. However, for some cohort members, it did not sit well. Joking about violence and satirizing it

¹⁴ In response to the publication of cartoons and drawings that lampooned the Prophet Muhammad in the French satirical magazine *Charlie Hebdo*, two Frenchmen - Chérif Kouachi and Saïd Kouachi - attacked the magazine's offices on January 7, 2015. Using semi-automatic and other weapons, the two assailants killed 12 and wounded 11. In concert with the production of *Amrika Chalo* at Georgetown in late January 2015, The Lab hosted a pre-performance discussion with playwright Shahid Nadeem - writer of the satirical *Amrika Chalo* - which considered the use and limits of satire as a tie-in between the aforementioned events and the production.

presented a challenge for some cohort members who were unsettled by the forwardness of such a spoof. They wondered how such a scene would play or be presented in its original, Pakistani context:

I think the scene with the terrorists was a little unsettling because they were taking it so lightly and making fun of it, and I was just like wow. Would this fly in Pakistan?

This question, of what's funny and in what context, emerged as a major point of inquiry. When bringing international works and artistic styles to US audiences, it seems that a certain degree of audience and artist education and information is needed before full understanding can be reached.

Much of this relates to audience expectations, particularly from the perspective of domestic audiences unfamiliar with various non-US artistic work. The framing of the production, which hyped up and raised expectations, jarred some cohort members:

I think the expectations, at least for me, were set in an American academic dialogue...those were really present in the speeches before, and sort of in the speeches after...this piece in the middle that wasn't quite...the humor I'm used to, not the balance of comedy that I'm used to, at all...something was lost in translation there.

However, others had learned more about the folk theatre style that Ajoka and *Amrika Chalo* represented. This self-education seemed to make a difference, in terms of cohort members' ability to accept and understand Ajoka's approach:

I heard a lot of different things about it. Not that this is the utmost, but this is a folk play that's coming...a totally different set of humor...go into it looking for a totally different mode of thinking and mode of communicating...I've heard enough about what the tradition of satire looked like coming from outside the United States. So maybe I was more ready and able to, kind of, stand in between the two of them and look in both.

As a point of departure for the "Discussion" sub-section, the idea that expectations can affect an audience's ability to understand, appreciate, and value diverse art forms is an instructive one when considering ways in which unfamiliar art forms can be presented in the future.

As both the ideas of what's funny and audience expectations make clear, cultural translation played a key role in the effectiveness of *Amrika Chalo*. A cohort member who had access to some of the behind-the-scenes aspects of the production highlighted dialogue around the multiple caricatures of US President Barack Obama that were in the play:

...they photoshopped his [Obama's] face on a bodybuilder, on a homeless person...they also wanted ____ to wear, for that song, like, these Obama ears made out of Styrofoam...To me, it felt racially charged, and it wasn't any clever satirical, like, we are making a comment on race, we are subverting this in some way – it just felt racist.

Ajoka's staff was receptive to this hesitancy, scaling down the caricatures - in the final production, a number of photoshopped images were removed and nobody wore Styrofoam "Obama ears" - and adapting to the Georgetown, DC, and US context and expectations.

As a result of this cross-cultural tap dance, the strength of one message in particular - that Pakistan continues to face its own crisis of 9/11-esque proportions - came through clearly for one cohort member:

I got excited toward the end when the puppet spoke...there's these problems hunger, deaths, terrorism, many problems that are happening in Pakistan that have been going on prior to 9/11, whereas the experience of one country tends to be globalized because of the power dynamics...he [the puppet] spoke the truth...he was portraying an opinion that's out there, that people on this side of the hemisphere need to hear...I mean, look. People are dying every day. And it's very unfortunate that people are dying. But we all know that the death of a person on this side of the world is more valued than people dying in [that] part of the world.

Strong messages of political and cultural importance came through to cohort members and the audience. As such, the issues of what makes something funny, audience expectations, and cultural translation offer unique points of departure for the “Discussion” sub-section of this “Impact Narrative.”

GENERATION (Wh)Y: GLOBAL VOICES ON STAGE

APRIL 17-18, 2015

Surveys for the final event of *Myriad Voices*’ 2014-2015 season, *Generation (Wh)Y*, featured the following prompt terms: risk, discovery, laughter, home, encounter, conversation, and generation y. The first four terms related to the themes of the event, while the last three represented some of its sources of inspiration. This set of surveys was the first of the three to not feature any nation-state or other politically charged term. Much of this comes from the character of the piece, which avoided political judgment, came from the performative rather than the political aspect of The Lab’s mission, and reflected the work of the student devisers who created the piece. Further, in terms of the number of surveys returned, this set had 33% fewer surveys returned afterward compared to before. This disparity is explained by the end-of-the-semester crunch of finals, thesis and capstone presentations, and research-related travel. An interesting shift to note, found in Table 6, is the set of associations made with the term ‘generation y.’ Prior to the event, the most frequent association was “me.” Afterward, the idea of “youth” or “young” was more prevalent. The greatly reduced response rate in the post-surveys makes any type of meaningful generalization difficult, but the externalization is an interesting change. Finally, the term ‘risk’ seems to have taken on new meaning for cohort participants, transitioning from “danger” to both “danger” and “opportunity.”

Pre-Gen (Wh)Y Survey surveys returned = 15			Post-Gen (Wh)Y Survey surveys returned = 10		
TERM	MOST FREQUENTLY ASSOCIATED WORD(S)/CONCEPT(S)	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE	TERM	MOST FREQUENTLY ASSOCIATED WORD(S)/CONCEPT(S)	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE
<i>risk</i>	danger	7	<i>risk</i>	danger; opportunity	4
<i>discovery</i>	new	5	<i>discovery</i>	new	5
<i>laughter</i>	joy	5	<i>laughter</i>	relief/release	3
<i>home</i>	family	8	<i>home</i>	comfort	4
<i>encounter</i>	meet/meeting	4	<i>encounter</i>	meeting	4
<i>conversation</i>	speak/spoken; dialogue	4	<i>conversation</i>	dialogue	4
<i>generation y</i>	me	4 ¹⁵	<i>generation y</i>	youth/young	5

Table 6

¹⁵ One respondent placed a question mark after the word “me” in responding to this prompt, which is worth noting.

Most cohort members seemed to embrace *Generation (Wh)Y*. A possible reason for this is that the devising team, which conducted interviews and shaped the script that defined *Generation (Wh)Y* and formed its heart, consisted of Georgetown students.¹⁶ As members of the Georgetown community, the student devising team understood the audience of their peers that would be attending the production, which seemed to resonate. One cohort member indicated that the piece “felt a lot more direct...intimate and designed for the audience, where I felt the other two were designed for some other purpose.” There was little need for cultural translation, which cohort members recognized: “It was between us, you know, from us and to us. And it should be this way.”

The Lab’s promotion of homegrown excellence allowed it to create a shared experience between and among audience members. Indeed, numerous cohort members told stories of small, intimate interactions with other audience members, facilitated by the production’s thought-provoking content, unusual setup (audiences moved between the various encounters), and encouragement of connection:

I was standing with people I didn’t know at all; I had never seen them before, and we just started talking. It was that kind of a thing. We were all sort of bonding over the kind of awkwardness that was there, but we all kind of wanted to burst out in laughter at different points for no reason at all, and making friends out of nowhere. It was very cool.

Even in response to a production that was celebrated by nearly all members of the cohorts, two concerns emerged: the delicacy of telling other people’s stories, and the production’s fulfillment of its subtitle (*Global Voices on Stage*). When telling the stories of others, cohort members were concerned that the interviewees might have been taken advantage of in the production process. How to best embody others was accentuated by the fact that the student devisers also conducted the interviews. One cohort member, who had knowledge of the devising process, said:

I don’t think we would’ve been as conscious of it [embodying others] if it were a work of fiction...we were kind of ethically questioning it...If this were, you know, any other work, we would have done it without any questions, almost.

Blurring the line between theatrical illusion and lived reality proved to be a challenge and an interesting point of discussion when considering the implications of doing devised work involving testimonies, particularly from marginalized or underrepresented groups.

Another challenge that the cohort members pointed to was the way in which the production did or did not embody its subtitle: *Global Voices on Stage*. Given that the focus of the Building Bridges grant was to increase understanding of Muslim cultures, The Lab aimed to highlight specific Muslim countries with which it had theatrical or political connections. These included Egypt, Syria, Afghanistan, Sudan, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Palestine, Qatar, and Iraq.¹⁷ This

¹⁶ *Generation (Wh)Y* was a piece of devised theatre. Though devised work (also referred to as devised theatre or collaborative creation) resists definition, it tends to involve creating work around particular themes or areas of focus using improvisatory play and game-based techniques. Often, those who perform devised pieces also develop them; final results have a distinct form and sequence. *Devised and Collaborative Theatre* by performance practitioners Tina Bicat and Chris Baldwin is a useful resource.

¹⁷ The final description of *Generation (Wh)Y* specifically listed these countries, followed by the phrase “among other countries.” The original *Myriad Voices* press release did not specifically mention Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Palestine, or Qatar as countries that would contribute to *Generation (Wh)Y*.

“preferred narrative” was a source of frustration for some cohort members who wanted the production to better fulfill its subtitle. The overall desire to illuminate specific, underrepresented voices - a goal that filtered down to the devising team from the grant’s objectives via The Lab - may have challenged the production itself.

Ultimately, however, the task of negotiating these complex dynamics, subtleties, and nuances was taken on with care. Audiences (including cohort members, both with and without knowledge of the devising process) engaged with the end product in a way that showcased The Lab’s strength. Without a doubt, the greater goal of *Generation (Wh)Y*, as one cohort member put it - “this idea that, after everything - the cultural differences, the language differences, everything like that - this idea that we’re all human” - was clear and well received.

DISCUSSION

This section discusses the data found above, considering it in the context of information not found through cohort focus group discussions and survey responses. As becomes clear, the data (and the *Myriad Voices Festival* at-large) must be read in the context of The Lab’s exploration of diverse and underrepresented voices, creation of deep rather than broad engagement, and growth in stature as the season progressed. Ultimately, *Myriad Voices* offered The Lab a unique space to flex its performative and political muscles, creating new and original approaches to longstanding global challenges.

The Laboratory for Global Performance and Politics

The Lab is a well-connected partnership, benefits from the leadership of respected co-founding directors, and is an important part of the Georgetown community. These characteristics give The Lab a great starting point from which to lead, challenge, and push the wider field. Indeed, that may be one of The Lab’s greatest values: as a leader of thought and practice at the intersection of performance and politics. Particularly in a city like Washington DC, where politics tends to reflect polarization and performance often is for high society, The Lab pushes back against these trends by exploring the aforementioned connection.

Polarization in politics often comes from intractable debates and entrenched partisanship. For The Lab, performance is an appropriate and effective response to such difference and political Othering.¹⁸ The Lab’s execution of the *Myriad Voices* festival provided an explicit and distinct counter to this distancing, a combination that is recognized by few other scholars.¹⁹ This junction is an emerging area of academic research, despite having been recognized as an effective practical tool for many years. That a former Ambassador is willing to bring politics to performance in the form of The Lab’s partnership between Georgetown’s School of Foreign Service and the Theatre and Performance Studies program confirms this.

¹⁸ Building on Footnote 13, “Othering” is the process by which Others are created. See the work of Fred Dervin for more.

¹⁹ Drama and theatre researchers James Thompson and Cynthia Cohen are among the thought leaders working at this intersection. Their work focuses on the meeting of humanitarian and conflict issues and performance.

Thankfully, the Lab's partnership is reciprocal: equal weight is given to performance and politics. While this is problematic for some who prefer one to the other, the value of this approach lies in its ability to frame performance rather than presenting art for its own sake. Fundamentally, The Lab's understanding of performance and politics as partners has paved the way for it to execute projects such as *Myriad Voices*. These two poles strengthen rather than polarize one another, creating a structure for high quality, contextualized, and inventive programming.

Events

Any discussion of the *Voices Unheard Summit* must begin with the fact that it was a last-minute event. Not to be confused with a theatrical production, *Voices Unheard* was a substitute, a replacement. It sought to provide an opportunity for audiences to know the context and stories of the women, who would have been in attendance, were it not for the State Department denying their visas. Indeed, the data fail to show the extraordinary effort of The Lab, in terms of working through the overlapping complexities of the international refugee regime, immigration law in the United States, rules for visiting artists, and the multiple groups (artistic and otherwise), involved in the production. The Lab did everything in its power to make it possible for the production to take place.

When it became clear that the production would not be happening, fail-safes were activated. One of them was Skyping with the women, which was successful in a number of ways. For audience members, it humanized the women and created a link. However, the evening's ambitious nature meant that there was not enough time for the audience to deepen their connection: the conversation was just getting started when it was time to move on. The quick transitions in the event meant that many translations from English to Arabic were simplified or nonexistent. While there was no way to predict that the audience would establish an immediate sense of community with the women, it is possible that Skyping with the women and watching clips of the documentary would have been enough.

Amrika Chalo raised questions of context specificity. *Amrika Chalo* rested on satires of homosexuality, the visa and immigration process, and violence. Scenes that were funny for the older South Asian community - perhaps reflecting a long-lost Pakistani sense of humor - were disturbing or boring for younger Georgetown community members. This created an unexpected dichotomy of experience and reality. *Amrika Chalo* revealed the importance of context in marking the humor of a scene, line, or action, especially in a cross-cultural sense.

Cultural translation, too, was an important learning from The Lab's staging of *Amrika Chalo*. This was the first production of the season to occur in, primarily, another language. The use of live super-titling, based on translations that were reworked multiple times, was an exceptional idea that fell short in execution: some lines were partially translated. The Lab worked to maximize effective cultural and linguistic translation, but a number of non-Urdu- and non-Punjabi-speaking cohort members noticed that they were missing a portion of the experience. The challenge of cultural translation, related to the above point regarding generational differences in humor, was the biggest learning from *Amrika Chalo*.

Well received, *Generation (Wh)Y* resonated with The Lab's audiences. It featured a number of students who, as the core devisers, conceptualized, developed, and created the piece. Much of its resonance may have to do with its ability to create an experience that was closer to Georgetown theatrical expectations, and the fact that it emerged from the work of Georgetown community members. However, because of the requirements of the grant - that productions focus on Muslim societies - student devisers found themselves in the tricky position of choosing certain testimonies over others because of what countries those testimonies came from. A lack of guidance from above The Lab regarding whether voices should be regionally, culturally, or linguistically focused puzzled many devisers. As a result, the production wrestled with questions of what it means to tell and care for someone else's story, especially in a curatorial and selective sense.

Perhaps the greatest strength of *Generation (Wh)Y* was its ability to create an intimate link between the stories told and those who were watching. Audiences related to the stories, seeing themselves in the work and the way it was represented. The production also primed audiences to expect the unexpected. Whether it was physical movement between various encounters, the diversity of the stories told, the unconventional setup (both physical and temporal), or the devised and original nature of each encounter, the entire production challenged Western theatrical norms. In so doing, it created an experience shared by all that brought to light "moments of pain" and "moments of hope" that are the very essence of the human condition.

Myriad Voices: A Cross-Cultural Performance Festival

It would be a mistake to suggest that the effectiveness of *Myriad Voices* is the sole product of the events that took place within it. Rather, that was just a part of the work that took place throughout the season - both in front of and behind the curtain. Indeed, the broader whole is something to be celebrated, from its inception to execution. The festival represented a number of diverse voices, created deeper rather than broader engagement, and grew in stature as the season wore on.

On the whole, The Lab represented a number of diverse voices. It offered audiences an opportunity to connect with stories, traditions, and experiences from around the world that are often not a part of the Western/US theatrical narrative. By affording The Lab this opportunity, the Doris Duke Foundation allowed individuals to be exposed to unique and important theatre from around the world. At a high-profile institution such as Georgetown, this created a widening and diversifying experience for those who would not otherwise explore the intersection of international performance and politics. In many ways, this diversity of stories and "myriad voices" sets Georgetown's of the Building Bridges grant apart from other sites, given the new, international, and adapted works that featured in the *Myriad Voices* festival.

At the same time, The Lab remained conscious of avoiding describing Islam. At the initial convening of the steering committee and core artists in March 2014, Ambassador Schneider indicated that *Myriad Voices* was not "Islam 101." Instead, the season dove deeper, providing rich engagement with the questions and topics at hand. Audiences, cohort members, student devisers, and The Lab's staff all wrestled with issues of what it means to represent the stories of others, particularly when those individuals are members of globally and locally underrepresented

communities. Pushing those engaged with *Myriad Voices* to question their assumptions regarding these communities was one of the project's great strengths.

On the whole, the events grew in stature as the season progressed. Each event presented a different narrative and story, challenging biases. While *Voices Unheard* was a last-minute substitute, it created an opening for humanization of a highly judged refugee population. *Amrika Chalo*, similarly, grounded its humanization process in an unfamiliar folk theatre style that used humor and satire. *Generation (Wh)Y* opened the door for student involvement, using an innovative devised approach that can serve as a model for other student-centered work. Each of these increased in sophistication while retaining the core of sharing, respecting, and honoring the unique and exceptional stories of others.

Ultimately, *Myriad Voices'* 2014-2015 season took a positive risk. It sought to humanize through connection, linking audiences with unfamiliar stories and people. Certainly, it made some early mistakes in execution, but learned from them to deliver innovative programming. Perhaps more importantly, it crafted a space for conversation between and among interested stakeholders regarding the best ways to represent diversity while avoiding tokenism and embrace difference while rejecting prejudice. Facilitating these conversations are an important reason why The Lab should be considered a leader in the fields of performance and politics.

best practices

In an effort to acknowledge the path-breaking nature of this round of Building Bridges grants, this section highlights both practice and research. Extending from APAP's Creative Campus Initiative, Building Bridges reflected the pilot use of a Research Fellow. In this final report that focuses on the overall *Myriad Voices* festival, a direct result of the Building Bridges funding, it seems prudent to unveil the best practices, both in terms of performance and research. As such, this section is divided into two sub-sections: "Performance" considers the practical work of The Lab, and "Research" explores the most effective parts of the evaluation process, with particular reference to the student cohorts. "Performance" includes the importance of context-specificity, The Lab's connection to multiple stakeholders and communities, and the value of engaging in a struggle of introspection. Best practices articulated in the "Research" sub-section include: enrollment characteristics, integration within cohorts, and creating a sense of community. Each best practice is then translated into a guiding question that can direct future practitioners and researchers as they consider what makes the most sense, given their unique situation.

PERFORMANCE

Georgetown's *Myriad Voices: A Cross-Cultural Performance Festival* consisted of four presentations: *Voices Unheard - The Syria: Trojan Women Summit* (September 2014), *Amrika Chalo (Destination: USA)* (January 2015), *Generation (Wh)Y: Global Voices on Stage* (April 2015), and *A Doll's House* (October 2015). The performances considered by this study were limited to one academic year, thus excluding the October 2015 adaptation of *A Doll's House* by playwright Heather Raffo. Despite the unconventional nature of these events - *Voices Unheard* was a multimedia experience including a panel, clips from the documentary about *Syria: The Trojan Women*, and Skype conversations with the actresses, while *Generation (Wh)Y* was devised by students at Georgetown - the process of creating and staging offered numerous lessons: the value of context-specificity, multiple and diverse stakeholders, and the struggle of introspection.

Context-Specificity

As the above section on "Case Context" made clear, Georgetown is an institution that has a unique set of circumstances - private, well-funded, boasting an international reputation, and located in Washington DC, among other qualities. The student body is highly active, and is inspired by a faculty and city that is much the same. This means that there is much to stimulate the average student, from classes to theatrical productions to farmers' markets - competition is fierce. Moreover, the campus is globally aware, resulting in a highly informed community interested in the world around it. Much of this manifests in criticism - the student-led movement to push the university administration to divest from fossil fuels is one example.²⁰

Understanding this context is important, since it has served as an indicator of the types of work that The Lab ought to conduct. Not only has The Lab emerged out of a distinctly Georgetown context - as a partnership between the School of Foreign Service and the Department of Theatre

²⁰ "GU Fossil Free."

and Performance Studies - but it is also in touch with the types of audiences that attend productions at Georgetown. These audiences are, as mentioned above, busy, interested, globally aware, highly informed, and well connected.

As such, The Lab has developed, encouraged, and brought productions that are a good match for these types of audiences. The large Arabic-speaking and Arab Studies community at Georgetown was involved in preparing for the *Voices Unheard Summit*. The broader South Asian community in DC, Maryland, and Virginia (the DMV) was mobilized in support - financial, in-kind, and otherwise - of the *Amrika Chalo* production. Globally aware and highly active students were among the 9 core devisers of the *Generation (Wh)Y* ensemble - only one of these was a theatre major. Heather Raffo's adaptation draws on the active theatre scene at Georgetown as well as her personal background as an Iraqi-American playwright.

Though The Lab has its own resources by way of connections and relationships, it has been able to receive financial and other support from the university community because it understands and caters toward its context. The Lab's production and other choices reflect an intimate knowledge of the Georgetown community, resulting in buy-in from everyday staff and students as well as high-profile individuals such as university president John J. DeGioia. Indeed, a major strength of The Lab's choices in programming was that its performances were being offered to a community that was ready and willing to receive them.

These programming choices merit further exploration, insofar as context-specificity is concerned. Because of the diversity of interests, experience, and strengths present at Georgetown, The Lab chose to present a series of events that were varied. The choice of the overall festival's title - *Myriad Voices* - was no accident, since multiple narratives were being shared. Contrast this with other Building Bridges sites - the *Midnimo* project in Minneapolis, catering to the large Somali community, is one example - that reflected their own contexts through a more focused and thematic approach. At Georgetown, the multiple productions of *Myriad Voices* created numerous opportunities for The Lab to engage different groups of people from around the DMV, the topic of the "Multiple and Diverse Stakeholders" sub-section.

GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE WORK: *What characteristics does our context display? How can we build our production calendar or series of events to reflect and refine or expand and grow our community's strengths?*

Multiple and Diverse Stakeholders

As the above sub-section on "Context-Specificity" alludes to, the diversity of the productions and events found in the *Myriad Voices* festival was a major strength of The Lab's work. Pushed by its choice of events, The Lab engaged a number of diverse stakeholders, bringing together unique types of audiences and participants, including a number that are not traditional members of Georgetown's theatre scene. Each event required a different type of audience - especially since the *Myriad Voices* festival was the first time that The Lab engaged in a year's worth of standalone programming. Simultaneously, as The Lab produced the *Myriad Voices* festival, it used *Myriad Voices* as a launching pad for an in-built audience base.

Beyond the different types of audiences that have been mentioned above, each performance connected with unique parts of the campus community. *Voices Unheard* featured audiences from across the Arab Studies department, as well as expert panelists who are professors at Georgetown. *Amrika Chalo* cultivated connections with the South Asian student groups on campus, such that the dancers who performed in the piece were all Georgetown students. *Generation (Wh)Y* gathered together an ensemble of student devisers, both from the Culture and Diplomacy class and others, many of whom had no prior theatre experience. Indeed, the *Myriad Voices* festival attempted to be radically inclusive, inviting multiple parts of the campus community to be involved.

Beyond campus, The Lab established connections with a diverse group of artistic stakeholders. For *Voices Unheard*, the production team from Refugees International came to Georgetown to tell of their experience. Further, the director of *Syria: The Trojan Women* as well as a number of the actresses Skyped in from Beirut and Amman, respectively. During *Amrika Chalo*, playwright Shahid Nadeem directed the production, which featured a number of Lahore- and DC-based actors. And, the ensemble of *Generation (Wh)Y* culled testimonies from numerous individuals around the world who were willing to have their stories performed in DC, turning the everyday into art. This was combined with the unique Portals experience, an interactive public art installation that is the brainchild of multidisciplinary artist Amar Bakshi.²¹

Because of the diverse nature of these connections, The Lab played various roles throughout the festival. During *Voices Unheard*, The Lab was a curator and advocate. During *Amrika Chalo*, it was a producer and promoter. During *Generation (Wh)Y*, it was a deviser and performer. At all times, it was a facilitator, arts administrator, and educator. Though these roles often overlapped and interacted with one another, The Lab always sought to champion and forward the myriad voices with which it engaged.

Indeed, this engagement of multiple and diverse stakeholders is a direct product of the immense resources and breadth of topics that The Lab aimed to consider through *Myriad Voices*. The two figureheads of The Lab command tremendous esteem in their respective fields. Ambassador Schneider, given her tenure as a former ambassador to the Netherlands, has significant relationships and political clout in DC, which facilitated many aspects of the events. Dr. Goldman, given his position as an award-winning director and performance practitioner, has an established international reputation for artistic and educational excellence, which carried weight with artists. Indeed, tackling the broad range of topics considered by *Myriad Voices* - including refugee issues, migration, visa limitations, testimony, and others - was facilitated by the resources of The Lab, which made it possible to connect US audiences to artists abroad and create new globally informed work. Ultimately, The Lab's engagement with a variety of stakeholders allowed it to produce a series of diverse and wide programmatic offerings.

GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE WORK: *What relationships and resources are needed in order to develop, maintain, and execute productions that connect audiences to different and*

²¹ Portals allows users to enter a shipping container equipped with real-time translation and multimedia technology, creating a live link to another part of the world. One container was placed in DC at Georgetown University, while another was in Herat at Herat University. More information can be found on Amar Bakshi's website.

diverse performers and bodies of work while also meeting our programmatic and performance goals? How can we cultivate such connections in order to do so?

Introspective Struggle

Perhaps the single most important best practice that made The Lab's events possible - most prominently *Generation (Wh)Y* - was engagement in a long-term struggle of introspection. Though some events did so more than others, the build-up to and preparation for each production involved a degree of soul-searching. This became increasingly clear as the season wore on, given that later productions learned from the mistakes and mishaps of earlier works. As a reflection on each of these, this sub-section takes a look at how introspective struggle featured in each of the events throughout the 2014-2015 *Myriad Voices* season.

Voices Unheard, the summit regarding *Syria: The Trojan Women*, was never supposed to happen. It came together in a short 3-week window, after the refugee actresses were denied visas to perform the piece. As such, The Lab was under tremendous pressure to put together and create an event that still allowed the audience to know the women. As a result, combined with the intensity of the early part of the semester, there was no time for introspective struggle - only action. Making up for the loss of the production while still attempting to inform and educate audiences, the *Voices Unheard* event overstuffing the evening. A Skype conversation with the women and the director, speeches from the producer, clips from the documentary about the play, a panel of experts, and questions from the audience meant that the women's stories were more marginal during *Voices Unheard* than the *Syria: The Trojan Women* production promised.

The Lab learned from this lack of introspection in its next event. During the preparation for and work around *Amrika Chalo*, ongoing conversations between The Lab and visiting artist Shahid Nadeem made clear the importance of adapting *Amrika Chalo* for an audience in the US. Concerns about the sexual politics of the piece as well as the cultural and linguistic translation of its use of stark and satirical caricatures - both from Georgetown students performing in the work and members of The Lab's staff - led to significant cuts and changes in all aspects of the piece (translation, song lyrics, displayed images, etc.), up until opening night. The mostly positive, but substantively mixed, responses from audience members reflect the complexity and importance of engaging in introspective struggle - the older South Asian audience members who attended the event (mobilized by The Lab and other interested stakeholders) tended to view it in a positive light, while some first-generation audience members were unable to.

As the 2014-2015 season concluded, The Lab increased its self-reflection. In putting together *Generation (Wh)Y*, great care was taken to honor the words and respect the testimonies of the interviewees who inspired the work. On a daily basis, the devising team wrestled with how to best curate and sculpt the piece while also maintaining the voice of the interviewees. Throughout the creative process, numerous conversations reflected the spirit of openness and wholeheartedness that first invited stories. At the same time, these conversations highlighted the danger of appropriating or colonizing testimonies, which many of the students involved in *Generation (Wh)Y* believed the *Voices Unheard Summit* had done. This tension became a key feature of the developmental devising process. Indeed, the final production highlighted a spirit of radical inclusivity while taking care in its curatorial presentation of the testimonies and

narratives of others, which an overwhelming number of audience members approved of, valued, and appreciated.

Ultimately, The Lab's long-term introspective struggle allowed it to learn from its successes and failures. Over time, as the *Myriad Voices* festival developed its own identity, The Lab's introspective struggle grew in complexity and nuance. That sense of striving to be better, learning from past mistakes, and growing in sophistication was clear throughout the season. As one member of the evaluative cohort indicated:

There were moments of pain and there were moments of hope. And those came out. I think that's what matters. We'll never convey 100% accuracy. It's theatre at the end, you know...As long as you're going through that struggle, that's good. If every production goes through that, that would be worthy of emulation.

GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE WORK: *What types of questions should we ask ourselves during the development and execution processes? What lessons can be taken from previous productions and applied to ongoing or future works?*

RESEARCH

As earlier sections of this report have made clear, The Lab used evaluative cohorts to assess the *Myriad Voices* festival. To recap, each cohort experienced the three cornerstone productions of the *Myriad Voices* festival: *Voices Unheard - The Syria: Trojan Women Summit*, *Amrika Chalo (Destination: USA)*, and *Generation (Wh)Y: Global Voices on Stage*. Beyond the required WolfBrown research protocols of an entry and exit survey, entry focus group, and exit interview, the cohorts also engaged in a series of pre- and post-event word association surveys, as well as a post-event focus group discussion after each performance. From this experience, three valuable lessons that should be considered in the future emerged: the importance of particular enrollment characteristics, integration within cohorts, and creating a sense of community.

Enrollment Characteristics

The Lab's evaluation plan sought to fulfill the requirements established by research WolfBrown regarding two 8-member cohorts experiencing pre- and post-project surveys, pre-project focus groups, and post-project interviews. Given that the first event of the *Myriad Voices* festival, *Syria: The Trojan Women*, was scheduled for mid-September and the academic year began in early September, filling the cohorts with interested individuals and administering the surveys and focus groups occurred under a tremendous time crunch. Students, staff, and faculty alike were returning from the summer break and had not yet settled into a rhythm for the semester. Indeed, the pace of recruitment efforts was frenetic, even though initial cohort enrollment was slow.

Since The Lab's evaluation plan necessitated three 8-member cohorts, intense recruitment efforts resulted in full enrollment of the three cohorts. However, over the course of the year, maintaining the three full cohorts became an unrealized ideal that turned out to be a valuable failsafe. As other commitments arose and cohort members left the study for medical, personal, or academic reasons, the third cohort became an extra pool of individuals who underwent the same journey of experiencing all three performances. Though they did not take the entry and

exit surveys or participate in the entry focus group or exit interview, they added valuable content and demonstrated the importance of over-enrollment.

From the beginning, the evaluative study of *Myriad Voices* demonstrated a clear self-selection bias. Information and data offered by participants to the research team came out of participant interest in the topic at hand and the type of work being conducted throughout *Myriad Voices*. Not offering compensation was a decision made in an effort to elicit deeper and more meaningful feedback from the study participants. The thinking was that those who self-selected would be more invested than individuals who were involved only out of a desire to receive compensation. This assumption rang true in terms of participation and attendance at events, email responsiveness, and honesty/forthrightness in focus group discussions and interviews.

In a logistical sense, both of these enrollment characteristics (50% over-enrollment and no compensation) simplified the study's execution. Though it was initially planned as a third unit of analysis, the third cohort made it possible for The Lab to still meet the minimum required number of participants despite losing cohort members throughout the academic year. For The Lab, this was a real concern as conversations with other Building Bridges sites revealed similar struggles with cohort retention. Our lack of compensation also simplified matters, particularly in terms of gaining approval from Georgetown's Institutional Review Board (IRB), a requirement for any study involving human or animal subjects. Given The Lab's desire to receive concrete and in-depth feedback on its work from a combination of insiders and outsiders (which our integrated cohorts were - see the below sub-section on "Integrated Cohorts"), offering compensation to participants added unnecessary complications that outweighed potential benefits.

Interestingly, in this case, the self-selection created by the study's lack of compensation worked to The Lab's advantage. Much of the feedback received by The Lab was hard-hitting and critical, given the intense personal and academic investment that cohort participants brought to the discussions. Their involvement or interest in seeing this type of work be successful has offered constructive advice to The Lab, a nascent and emerging partnership at Georgetown intending to continue its globally informed performative work. As a result, the types of individuals who gravitated towards participation in the study approached the pieces with a critical eye befitting of the complexity, delicacy, and nuance with which such performances should be considered. Difficult as it can be to hear such analysis, The Lab's productions became increasingly well received as the *Myriad Voices* festival progressed, given that the cohorts' thoughts were respected and integrated into later works.

GUIDING QUESTION FOR FUTURE WORK: *What enrollment decisions and characteristics (in terms of study design and execution) best support the goals and requirements of this research?*

Integrated Cohorts

The Lab's initial evaluation and research plan consisted of three student cohorts, divided along disciplinary lines: 1 cohort of students that had STEM majors, 1 cohort of students with a strict foreign policy focus, and 1 cohort of students studying the intersection of culture and politics. Slow initial recruitment along these lines, as well as the minimal role played by key faculty

advocates as a result of unexpected personal and academic obligations, left the research team scrambling to fill the cohorts. As a result, as has been discussed above, the cohorts did not follow the initial outline of disciplinary biases.

Instead, they represented an interdisciplinary mix of undergraduate students, staff, and graduate students who fit the required age parameters. Students and staff brought diverse viewpoints into the focus group discussions, experiencing the performances from a number of different and, often, conflicting perspectives. This made for engaging and rich discussions that yielded tremendous fruit in terms of the thoughtful critiques and heartfelt intentionality that the cohort members brought to the focus groups. Indeed, moments of disagreement that occurred within the room regarding the performances, in reference to their effectiveness or ineffectiveness, generated a tremendous amount of knowledge as various discussants contested one another's approach.

This creative knowledge-generation process, which focus group discussions facilitate, was furthered by the involvement of cohort members as student participants in the productions. Though the students signed up to be members in the student cohorts in September 2014, opportunities to be involved with other aspects of *Myriad Voices* presented themselves throughout the academic year. These included being a student in the Fall 2014 Culture and Diplomacy course taught by Dr. Goldman and Ambassador Schneider, dancing and choreographing for the January 2015 production of *Amrika Chalo*, and devising and acting in the April 2015 production of *Generation (Wh)Y*. In total, 6 of the 16 cohort members were involved in another aspect of *Myriad Voices* besides the evaluative study.

The Lab encouraged and welcomed such overlap, reflecting the radical inclusivity that the *Myriad Voices* festival sought to encourage. Indeed, this study favored pragmatism above all else.²² In the context of the active college campus of Georgetown in the hectic city of Washington DC where students are over-involved in general, excluding interested individuals from participating based on involvement in another aspect of *Myriad Voices* was impractical. Further, while some may argue that the participation of the aforementioned 6 cohort members tainted the objectivity of the evaluative study, this research study favored an inductive and exploratory approach.²³ The insider knowledge that these individuals brought into the focus group discussions enriched the conversations and contrasted with the experience of those cohort members who were in the audience for the productions, offering unique insights into differences between performer/deviser and audience perspectives.

Throughout the evaluative process, it became clear that cohort members reacted to the productions more via their own experience than through any disciplinary or other label that was assigned to them. Their comments in focus group discussions and exit interviews, as well as informally, made clear that they were viewing the performances through their personal, rather than academic, lenses. Such reactions allowed The Lab to avoid the academic identity-based assumptions that were found in the initial evaluation plan, which divided cohorts along

²² Here, pragmatism is not to be confused with the pragmatic approach to research, which combines qualitative and quantitative methods, as a study demands it - see sociologist David L. Morgan's "Paradigms Lost and Pragmatism Regained" for more on pragmatic research. The *Myriad Voices* evaluation was strictly qualitative.

²³ Information systems scholar Anol Bhattacharjee's *Social Science Research* (pp. 3-6) offers a no-nonsense articulation of inductive and explanatory approaches to research.

disciplinary lines in the hopes of unveiling in-depth knowledge. However, the integrated cohorts meant that academics were secondary and personal experiences were primary, such that rich and unexpected stories and connections to the performances and topics at hand emerged from the cohort members. Indeed, the integrated cohorts made for deeper rather than wider change.

Despite not matching the initial outline, the integrated cohorts turned out to be one of the strongest aspects of this study. They contributed to a rich depth of knowledge that pushed members of the Georgetown community beyond the barrier of intense academic success, creating a sense of community. They created knowledge out of contesting and conflicting experiences of the same event. And, from a performing arts presenter's perspective, they put audience members in direct conversation with performers in an intimate, peer-to-peer setting. For Georgetown and The Lab, integrated cohorts were effective.

GUIDING QUESTION FOR FUTURE WORK: *Given that category-specific (discipline/major, gender, ethnicity, etc.) cohorts can create broader impact while integrated cohorts can create deeper impact, is this research more concerned with breadth rather than depth of impact or vice-versa?*

Sense of Community

Perhaps the most noteworthy of the best practices in this sub-section on "Research" is the sense of community. Within each of the cohorts, and indeed across the study, cohort members reported feeling a great sense of community and camaraderie with their fellow study participants. Certainly, this was assisted by the self-selection (mentioned in "Enrollment Characteristics") that developed as a result of no financial compensation being offered to the participants. The sense of community contributed to greater honesty in responses, a culture of openness, and positive relationships among and between cohort members. Though time will tell, creating a sense of community within the cohorts may be one of the most important legacies of this study.

Much of this came from the laidback and open facilitation style of the focus group facilitators. At one point or another, each of the authors of this report facilitated one or more of the focus group discussions. Overall, the facilitators were relaxed, honest, and flexible. Rather than use a structured interviewing style, the discussions took on a conversational approach. Facilitators contributed to the discussion beyond just asking questions, offering clarifications and insights into other parts of the production process without inserting personal opinions. Focus groups often run the risk of making participants uncomfortable through voyeurism, in which facilitators watch and observe as separate entities removed from the participants. Using a laidback facilitation style created a sense of community and increased the buy-in of the cohort members.

This sense of community was furthered by the way in which facilitators were attuned to each group's dynamics. Specific cohorts, based on the demographics of their membership, began to embody particular characteristics during discussions. Recognizing various types of relationships between cohort members, both subtle and overt, allowed facilitators to have an understanding of how to dig into a particular cohort member's comments as they made connections to previous conversations and remarks. Further, being aware of changing dynamics offered facilitators an opportunity to flex and move the conversation in relevant and useful directions.

Each focus group discussions' setting made possible the aforementioned flexibility of the facilitators. Conversations always occurred in the same space around a single table and in comfortable chairs. Times of the discussions were consistent, the room was well lit with natural light, and food was served. The point about food may seem banal, but offering participants food turned a potentially anxiety-ridden situation into a comfortable and family-like experience. With each participant sitting at the same table and facilitators eating alongside cohort members, the environment was one of conversation and respect rather than antagonism, despite the seriousness of the topics that were being discussed. Food contributed to the sense of community that bound together each cohort.

Ultimately, creating a sense of community came from the key principle that cohort members were treated like people rather than study participants. Little touches, such as facilitators answering the same personal introductory questions as cohort members and breaking bread while in conversation, provided the genuine feeling that the entire group - facilitators included - were members of the same experience. Too often, studies attempt to use inclusive methods such as focus group discussions, but keep a great distance between researcher and participant - to their detriment. For The Lab, global theatre work is about creating community, a principle embodied by this study.

GUIDING QUESTION FOR FUTURE WORK: *How does this research's goals align with the idea of creating a sense of community between and among study participants, whether as an explicit or implicit objective?*

concluding thoughts

What coherent conclusions can be drawn from as sprawling an experience as *Myriad Voices*? The 2014-2015 season of the festival featured a number of internationally recognized projects, drawing attention to the performance-based strengths of Georgetown. It brought together artists, researchers, students, and various domestic and international elements of culture to the DMV area. It highlighted diverse stories from underrepresented parts of the world. It represented deep rather than broad engagement with unfamiliar art forms and experiences. Indeed, it was an immense undertaking that required tremendous use of The Lab's resources and wherewithal, cultivating strong connections to and relationships with the Georgetown community. In so many ways, *Myriad Voices* was a colossus.

At the same time, the execution of some of the events was not up to the standards of some of the cohort members. Whether this had to do with the idea of the Building Bridges-inspired "preferred narrative" that found its way through some of the work or last-minute reactions to unexpected events, a number of cohort members were disappointed. However, this must be balanced against an equal number of participants who learned a great deal and were touched by their involvement in *Myriad Voices*. Being a part of the study, as any experience - theatre, in particular - has the capacity to do, evoked divergent and complex responses that reflect the dynamism of this type of work.

Ultimately, *Myriad Voices* put The Laboratory for Global Performance and Politics on the map as a collaboration to be reckoned with. It served as a beacon for innovative and exciting programming, fostered interdisciplinary dialogue and new work, and created a space for current and future growth at the intersection of performance and politics. Fundamentally, The Lab put its best foot forward and, despite some mishaps, delivered a thought-provoking season that engaged with numerous and diverse voices from the world over. For that, it is worthy of praise.

bibliography

Bakshi, Amar. (2015). *Amar C. Bakshi*. Web.

Bhattacharjee, Anol. (2012). "Social Science Research: Principles, Methods, and Practices." *Textbooks Collection*. Book 3. Web.

Bicât, Tina and Chris Baldwin. (Eds.). (2002). *Devised and Collaborative Theatre: A Practical Guide*. Ramsbury: The Crowood Press Ltd.

"Building Bridges." (2015). *Doris Duke Charitable Foundation*. Web.

"Convening on Global Performance, Civic Imagination, and Cultural Diplomacy." (2012). *Georgetown University*. Web.

Dervin, Fred. (2012). "Cultural Identity, Representation, and Othering." In Jane Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication* (181-194). New York: Routledge.

Glaser, Barney and Anselm Strauss. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago: Aldine.

"GU Fossil Free." (2015). *GU Fossil Free*. Web.

"Islamophobia: Understanding Anti-Muslim Sentiment in the West." (2015). *Gallup*. Web.

Morgan, David L. (2007). "Paradigms Lost and Pragmatism Regained." *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 48-76.

Georgetown Office of Undergraduate Admissions. (2012). "Student Profile: Class of 2016." *Georgetown University*. Web.

Said, Edward. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.

UNHCR. (2014). "Needs soar as number of Syrian refugees tops 3 million." *UNHCR*. Web.

----- (2015). "Syrian Regional Refugee Response." *UNHCR*. Web.

US Chamber of Commerce Foundation. (2015). "The Millennial Generation Research Review." *National Chamber Foundation*. Web.

appendices

39	APPENDIX A: INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT
41	APPENDIX B.1: PRE-PROJECT SURVEY INSTRUMENT - WOLFBROWN
46	APPENDIX B.2: POST-PROJECT SURVEY INSTRUMENT - WOLFBROWN
50	APPENDIX B.3: PRE-PROJECT FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL - WOLFBROWN
53	APPENDIX B.4: POST-PROJECT INTERVIEW PROTOCOL - WOLFBROWN
54	APPENDIX C.1: WORD ASSOCIATION (<i>VOICES UNHEARD</i>) - THE LAB
55	APPENDIX C.2: WORD ASSOCIATION (<i>AMRIKA CHALO</i>) - THE LAB
56	APPENDIX C.3: WORD ASSOCIATION (<i>GENERATION (WH)Y</i>) - THE LAB
57	APPENDIX C.4: FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL (<i>VOICES UNHEARD</i>) - THE LAB
58	APPENDIX C.5: FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL (<i>AMRIKA CHALO</i>) - THE LAB
59	APPENDIX C.6: FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL (<i>GENERATION (WH)Y</i>) - THE LAB
60	APPENDIX D: ONLINE DOCUMENTATION OF <i>MYRIAD VOICES</i>

APPENDIX A: INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of the *Myriad Voices* project. It seeks to demonstrate the impact of the performances that the *Myriad Voices* project have on participants. It will allow the Laboratory for Global Performance and Politics (the Lab) to develop an understanding of its best practices.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in 3-4 focus groups, 2 surveys, and 0-1 30-minute interviews. With your consent, each focus group and interview will be audiotaped for purposes of accurate data collection. Only the research team will have access to these audiotapes, and they will be erased at the conclusion of the project. The research team will make transcriptions of the audiotapes, which will be coded to contain no person-identifiable information to ensure confidentiality. All data will be kept on an encrypted computer and password-protected. Any hard copies will be kept under lock and key.

Your participation in this study is **voluntary** and you may withdraw at any time and for any reason without penalty. Any data you provide before such a withdrawal will be destroyed. In addition, all of the data collected in the study will be **confidential**. Unless you give explicit permission for the researcher to use your name, all person-identifiable data will be coded so that you cannot be identified. There are no foreseeable risks, costs, or anticipated negative effects to you or any other party for participating in the study.

Your participation in the study may help advance understanding of the intersection of performance and politics by developing more informed knowledge regarding best practices and effective uses of performance. Copies of the final report will be made available to you if you would like.

This study is being conducted in an effort to evaluate the *Myriad Voices* project, support the Lab's endeavors, and develop a case study report specific to Georgetown. If you have any questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to contact the project's Principal Investigator by e-mail (am3096@georgetown.edu). If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Georgetown University IRB at (202) 687-1506 or irboard@georgetown.edu.

By signing below, you are indicating your consent to participate in this study. Please indicate which of the below confidentiality options you prefer.

I agree to participate in this study.

Participant's Signature _____ Date _____

Options for Confidentiality:

_____ **Full Confidentiality:** No person-identifiable data will be used in the research. Your name will not appear anywhere in this project.

_____ **Selective Confidentiality - Option A:** No person-identifiable data will be used in the body of this research or associated with any substantive information about your thoughts and opinions. Your name and your status as a Georgetown student will appear in the appendix on a list of participants in this research.

_____ **Selective Confidentiality - Option B:** You will receive full credit and acknowledgment for any of your opinions and thoughts as described in this study. No person-identifiable data will be used for specific statement or views without your prior review and approval.

Key Constructs and Indicators of Success:

- ### Key Analytical Cross-tabulations:

1. Please enter the password that was assigned to you.
2. If you are in college, what is your major (or expected major, if currently undeclared)?

3. In general, how would you describe your political views on social issues? (*mark a number*)

4. How regularly do you attend performing arts events?

- 41

5. Generally, how interested are you in learning about the culture and traditions of people who live in different countries around the world? *(mark a number)*

Not at
All
1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7
Extremely
Interested

6. How important is religion in your life?

- ☐ Very important
☐ Somewhat important
☐ Not too important
☐ Not at all important

7. In general, which of the following best describes your feelings about people who...

Very
unfavorable Neither favorable
nor unfavorable Very
favorable

... are atheists 1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

... are not religious
1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

... are affiliated with a religion but do not practice it
1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

... regularly attend religious services
1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

... are devoutly religious
1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

8. Which of the following best describes your feelings towards the following religious groups:

	Unfavorable	Neither favorable nor unfavorable	Favorable	No opinion/ Don't know
Buddhists	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7			<input type="checkbox"/>
Christians	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7			<input type="checkbox"/>
Hindus	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7			<input type="checkbox"/>
Jews	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7			<input type="checkbox"/>
Muslims	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7			<input type="checkbox"/>

9. Following is a list of five religions. How much do you know about each of them?

	Nothing						A great deal
Buddhism	1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----	7
Christianity	1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----	7
Hinduism	1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----	7
Islam	1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----	7
Judaism	1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----	7

10. You indicated that you don't know very much about / are somewhat familiar with/ know quite a bit about Islam [Text modified to base on the response given to the previous question using skip logic]. How interested would you be in learning more about the following? *(mark a number)*

	Not at all interested						Very interested
History of Muslim peoples	1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----	7
Islam, the religion of Muslims	1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----	7
American Muslim communities	1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----	7
Art from Muslim-majority societies	1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----	7
Music from Muslim-majority societies	1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----	7

11. How much do you agree with the following statement?

Children should learn to appreciate cultures other than their own.

Strongly Disagree							Strongly Agree
1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----	7	

12. In which of the following countries is the majority of the population Muslim? *(Please check the box for all of the Muslim-majority countries in the list below.)*

- | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Albania | <input type="checkbox"/> Nicaragua |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cambodia | <input type="checkbox"/> Pakistan |
| <input type="checkbox"/> India | <input type="checkbox"/> Portugal |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Indonesia | <input type="checkbox"/> Somalia |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Iran | <input type="checkbox"/> Turkey |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Israel | <input type="checkbox"/> Yemen |

13. Which Muslim-majority countries or Muslim communities (abroad or the US) do you know most about? How do you know about these countries/communities? (e.g., learned about them in class, have family there, heard about them in the news)

[Text field for written response]

14. Which of the following most accurately reflects your social acquaintances? *(check one)*

- ☐ All of my close friends are Muslim

15. Which of the following, if any, have you personally witnessed in the past year? (*mark all that apply*)

16. How much do you agree with the following statements?

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

Disagree Neither agree Agree Don't know
nor disagree
1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7
☐

B. In general, relations between religious communities *worldwide* are likely to improve
(mark a number)

Disagree		Neither agree nor disagree		Agree		Don't know
1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7						<input type="checkbox"/>

C. Artists can play a role in easing tensions between people with different religious
beliefs (mark a number)

Disagree		Neither agree nor disagree		Agree		Don't know
1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7						<input type="checkbox"/>

18. What is your gender, or how would you identify in terms of gender?

[text field] ☐ Decline to state

19. In what year were you born?

[text field]

20. How do you identify in terms of race and/or ethnicity:

[text field]

21. Is your cultural identity significantly shaped by family connections to one or more
countries outside of the US?

☐ No ☐ Yes If yes, which countries: [text field]

22. What is your current religion, if any?

- ☐ Christianity
- ☐ Judaism
- ☐ Buddhism
- ☐ Islam
- ☐ Hinduism
- ☐ Additional faith not listed above: [text field]
- ☐ Unaffiliated (atheist, agnostic, or nothing in particular)
- ☐ Don't know/decline to state

APPENDIX B.2: POST-PROJECT SURVEY INSTRUMENT - WOLFBROWN

1. Please enter the password that was assigned to you.
2. Please mark all of the events/activities that you attended or participated in:
 - ☐ Performance 1
 - ☐ Workshop 1
 - ☐ Audience talk back 1

 - ☐ Performance 2
 - ☐ Workshop 2
 - ☐ Audience talk back 2
 - ...
 - ☐ Participated in [course title]
 - ☐ Participated in the production [production title] (include participation backstage)

 - ☐ Read the program booklet (where available)
 - ☐ Searched for more information online or elsewhere about Islam, Muslim cultures, the artists, or themes related to the events/activities
 - ☐ Posted something about the film on Facebook or another website
 - ☐ Discussed the events/activities with others
3. Generally, how interested are you in learning about the culture and traditions of people who live in different countries around the world? (*mark a number*)

Not at		Extremely
All		Interested
1-----	2-----	3-----
4-----	5-----	6-----
7-----		
4. How important is religion in your life?
 - ☐ Very important
 - ☐ Somewhat important
 - ☐ Not too important
 - ☐ Not at all important
5. In general, which of the following best describes your feelings about people who...

	Very		Neither favorable		Very
	unfavorable		nor unfavorable		favorable

1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----	7-----
--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

A. ... are atheists

1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----	7-----
--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

B. ... are not religious

C. ... are affiliated with a religion but do not practice it

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

D. ... regularly attend religious services

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

E. ... are devoutly religious

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

6. Which of the following best describes your feelings towards the following religious groups:

	Unfavorable	Neither favorable nor unfavorable	Favorable	No opinion/ Don't know
Buddhists	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7			<input type="checkbox"/>
Christians	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7			<input type="checkbox"/>
Hindus	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7			<input type="checkbox"/>
Jews	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7			<input type="checkbox"/>
Muslims	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7			<input type="checkbox"/>

7. Following is a list of five religions. How much do you know about each of them?

	Nothing	A great deal
Buddhism	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	
Christianity	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	
Hinduism	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	
Islam	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	
Judaism	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	

8. You indicated that you don't know very much about / are somewhat familiar with/ know quite a bit about Islam [The text will be modified base on the response given to the previous question using skip logic]. How interested would you be in learning more about the following? (mark a number)

	Not at all interested	Very interested
History of Muslim peoples	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	
Islam, the religion of Muslims	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	
American Muslim communities	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	
Art from Muslim-majority societies	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	
Music from Muslim-majority societies	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	

9. How much do you agree with the following statement?

Children should learn to appreciate cultures other than their own.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

-----7

- ☐ All of my close friends are Muslim
- ☐ Most of my close friends are Muslim
- ☐ Some of my close friends are Muslim
- ☐ I am in regular contact with Muslims (e.g., colleagues, classmates), but I wouldn't consider any of them close friends
- ☐ I am not in regular contact with any Muslims

- ☐ Acts of violence or intimidation against Muslims or people from Muslim-majority countries
- ☐ Deliberate use of discriminatory language or offensive “jokes” about Muslims or people from Muslim-majority countries
- ☐ Targeting of Muslims or people from Muslim-majority countries by airport security or law enforcement officers
- ☐ Negative stereotyping of Muslims or people from Muslim-majority countries in the media
- ☐ Culturally insensitive or offensive remarks (whether intentional or unintentional) about Muslims or people from Muslim-majority countries

- A. By and large, Muslims are peace-loving people.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

-----7

- 1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

-----7

- 1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

-----7

13. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

A. In general, relations between religious communities *in the US* are likely to improve.

Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Don't know
1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7			<input type="checkbox"/>

B. In general, relations between religious communities *worldwide* are likely to improve (*mark a number*)

Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Don't know
1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7			<input type="checkbox"/>

C. Artists can play a role in easing tensions between people with different religious beliefs (*mark a number*)

Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Don't know
1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7			<input type="checkbox"/>

14. Since completing the last survey for this study, have any world events (e.g. elections, wars, revolutions, protests) or events in your personal life (e.g. meeting new friends, new hobbies) that are unrelated to [name of local program] changed the way you feel about Muslims, people from Muslim-majority countries, Islam, or religion in general? If so, please explain:

APPENDIX B.3: PRE-PROJECT FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL - WOLFBROWN

[The overall purpose of these group discussions is to build a safe, trustful and supportive learning environment, and to create a shared understanding of the “journey” that the students will take together. This protocol is intended as a discussion guide, rather than a fixed script. The moderator will have to adapt the protocol as the conversation unfolds. WolfBrown recognizes that the grantees may wish to add questions to this protocol that are specific to their own project, and this is encouraged.]

[A separate focus group will be conducted for each cohort of students. At the beginning of each focus group, the moderator will provide an overview of the research project, which will be followed by a semi-structured conversation. The moderator should encourage an open and frank conversation between and amongst the participants, rather than soliciting responses to the same question from each of the respondents in turn. Moderators may probe for additional information and ask respondents to elaborate on earlier points, or react to each others’ comments.]

Moderator’s Introduction and Explanation of the Focus Group – 5 minutes

- Moderator introduction
- Introduce any observers sitting in the room
- This is an informal focus group discussion, the purpose of which is to begin a conversation about some of the topics and issues that you’ll be learning about over the coming months as participants in the Building Bridges program
- We’ll talk for about 90 minutes; I promise to let you go by [time]
- The confidentiality of your remarks is assured – your comments will not be attributed to your name in the report, so please be as candid as possible
- If you’d like to add something to the conversation, please raise your hand and I’ll call on you as quickly as possible
- I may call on people from time to time, even if they don’t have their hand up, in order to make sure that everyone gets a chance to speak
- As we get into the discussion, please feel free to disagree with others - “I have a different opinion about that...” because it’s very important that we hear differing opinions, when you have them. OK?
- Do you have any questions before we start?

Module 1: Respondent Self-Introductions

1. Please introduce yourself to the group. In your introduction, we invite you to include where you're from or grew up, or where your family lives; your cultural background; your experience living outside the U.S., if any; your religion, if any; and what role the arts plays / has played in your life.
 - a. Where you're from, grew up, or where your family lives
 - b. Your cultural background
 - c. Experience living outside the U.S., if any
 - d. Your religion, if any
 - e. What role the arts play in your life

Module 2: Expectations for Building Bridges program

2. What led you to participate in the Building Bridges program/project?

[Probe for self-directed motivations vs. fulfilling class requirements, etc.]

3. Do you have any favorite styles of music, dance or theatre from Muslim-majority countries, or any favorite artists from Muslim-majority countries?

Probe: What do you enjoy about this [art/artist]?

Module 3: Feedback/Reflection on Survey

Earlier, you completed an online survey. The responses you gave online will be kept confidential, but I would like to ask you a few questions about the survey and your experience taking it. Please refer to the handout to help you remember the questions on the survey.

1. Are there any issues or particular questions or concerns about the survey that you'd like to discuss here?

Probe: Were any of the questions confusing or difficult for you to answer?

Probe: Did any of the questions make you uncomfortable?

Probe: Do you wonder why particular questions were included in the survey or why they were phrased that way?

Module 4: Dialogue about religious extremism and perceived threats

At the beginning of the Building Bridges program, it's helpful to get a general sense of your attitudes and viewpoints about some of the topics we'll be exploring during the program. We recognize and acknowledge that there may be a diversity of opinions within this group about topics such as religion and religious discrimination, and I encourage you to be as candid as possible about your own viewpoints.

1. In general, how concerned are you about religious extremism in our country these days, if you are concerned at all?

Probe: What are you concerned about?

2. Do you think that some religions are inherently more violent than other religions?

Probe: Which religions are most violent?

Probe: Some Americans think Muslims pose a greater threat to US national security than people of other religions. How do you feel about that?

3. Some Americans think that Muslims pose a threat to American culture and the American way of life. How do you feel about that?
4. Do you think that discrimination against Muslims in the US is increasing or decreasing? Why?

Module 5: Orientation and On-boarding of Student Cohorts

[Moderator to discuss the research components of the initiative, to prepare students.]

[Conclude by talking about next steps in the process.]

APPENDIX B.4: POST-PROJECT INTERVIEW PROTOCOL - WOLFBROWN

[These one-on-one interviews will be conducted as semi-structured conversations. Interviewers may probe for additional information and ask respondents to elaborate on earlier points.]

1. What are a few of the key things you learned over the course of this program about Muslims or Muslim cultures?
Probe: Did you learn more or less than you expected?
2. Looking back on the entire experience, what surprised you most? What weren't you expecting?
3. Of all the programs and activities you participated in (performances, workshops, classes, readings)...
 - a.... which one was most successful in opening your eyes to an issue or a point-of-view that you hadn't considered before?
 - Why do you think that event/activity was so successful?
 - b. ... which one engaged you most strongly emotionally?
 - What was so engaging about that experience?
 - Was there a particular moment when you felt a strong sense of connection or empathy with an artist?
 - c.... which one provoked the strongest sense of connection with other participants and/or others in the audience (either with a similar or different background from you own)?
 - Why do you think that event produced such a strong sense of connection?
 - d. ... which one increased your appreciation of unfamiliar art forms or unfamiliar cultural traditions the most?
 - Why?
 - e.... which one did you find most difficult to appreciate or connect with?
 - What was so difficult about this event/activity?
4. How realistic do you think it is that artists and programs like [name of local *Building Bridges* program] can increase knowledge and understanding of people from different backgrounds?
5. In our earlier focus group discussion we spoke about concerns or fears that some people have about Muslims. Have your thoughts about those concerns or fears changed since that initial focus group meeting?
6. When you look back on your participation in this project over the coming years, what one or two thoughts and ideas will stay with you?

APPENDIX C.1: WORD ASSOCIATION (*VOICES UNHEARD*) - THE LAB

Please list the first three words or concepts that you associate with each term.

home

refugees

women

Syria

exile

civil war

family

APPENDIX C.2: WORD ASSOCIATION (*AMRIKA CHALO*) - THE LAB

Please list the first three words or concepts that you associate with each term.

visa

embassy

terrorist

opportunity

Pakistan

America

stereotype

APPENDIX C.3: WORD ASSOCIATION (*GENERATION (WH)Y*) - THE LAB

Please list the first three words or concepts that you associate with each term.

risk

discovery

laughter

home

encounter

conversation

generation y

APPENDIX C.4: FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL (*VOICES UNHEARD*) - THE LAB

1. As an introduction, please tell us about yourself and your family. You may answer any of these questions.
 - a. Where did you grow up?
 - b. What is your cultural background?
 - c. Do you have family living in countries other than the US?
 - d. What was your experience with religion as a child? As an adult?
 - e. What role did the arts play in your life growing up?
2. What was the most powerful part of the evening for you?
3. What was the most problematic part of the evening?
4. What was the most evocative moment of the evening? The most provocative?
5. In your opinion, were the women humanized, essentialized, objectified, or something else-d?
6. Was the evening authentic?
7. How do you further a narrative that isn't your own while keeping the authenticity of the true narrator?
8. What, if any, impact did the intermediaries/translators have on the evening?
9. Is there a difference between storytelling and telling your own story? What, if any, is that difference?
10. Who owns the women's stories?
11. What was your biggest takeaway of the evening?

APPENDIX C.5: FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL (*AMRIKA CHALO*) - THE LAB

1. What was unsettling about the play?
2. What dichotomies and/or paradoxes did you notice in the play?
3. What social issues came across most clearly?
4. What role did violence play in the work?
5. Was the evening authentic?
6. If you were to give the event a grade based on these criteria – linguistic/cultural translation, intangibles, real-world connection, and entertainment – what grade would you give the event (5 pts. per criterion, total of 20 pts.)?

APPENDIX C.6: FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL (*GENERATION (WH)Y*) - THE LAB

- 1) What did you expect going in?
- 2) What moments resonated with you?
- 3) What moments made you uncomfortable?
- 4) In your opinion, what was the grounding force/soul of this piece?
- 5) To what extent did the piece give voice to the members of Generation Y whose testimonies were featured?
- 6) Rank the event from 1-5 (1 is lowest, 5 is highest) on how well it did in terms of the following criteria: globally representative, intangibles, authenticity, entertainment, and inclusivity.
- 7) What was the artistic value of this work?
- 8) How does this performance fit in with others that have occurred throughout the year?

APPENDIX D: ONLINE DOCUMENTATION OF *MYRIAD VOICES*

The Laboratory for Global Performance and Politics	http://globallab.georgetown.edu/
	https://globallab.georgetown.edu/Myriad_Voices
	https://performingarts.georgetown.edu/events-and-tickets/myriad-voices-cross-cultural-performance-festival
	https://spotlightoncooperation.wordpress.com/2014/03/31/georgetown-university-and-ajoka-theatre-launch-myriad-voices-a-cross-cultural-performance-festival/
	http://www.bridgesofunderstanding.org/blog/2014/11/25/we-are-giving-thanks-for-the-myriad-voices-festival
	http://www.thehoya.com/theater-and-politics-meet/
	http://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/style/world-class-new-theater-is-coming-to-the-kennedy-centers-world-stages-festival/2014/03/18/3536a13e-aec1-11e3-b8b3-44b1d1cd4c1f_story.html
<i>Voices Unheard Summit and Syria: The Trojan Women</i>	http://www.syriatrojanwomen.org/
	http://globallab.georgetown.edu/Voices_Unheard_Syria
	http://www.thehoya.com/after-setback-syrian-event-proceeds/
	http://www.thehoya.com/syrian-performers-denied-visas/
	http://howlround.com/listening-for-unheard-voices-syria-the-trojan-women
	http://georgetownvoice.com/2014/09/18/trojan-women-summit-presents-opportunity-for-syrian-voices-to-be-heard/
	http://www.washingtonpost.com/entertainment/theater_dance/denied-visas-syrian-refugees-still-get-a-platform/2014/09/21/ab111366-415c-11e4-a430-b82a3e67b762_story.html
	http://www.npr.org/2014/08/30/344317101/syrian-artists-denied-visas-and-a-voice-in-the-u-s
	http://guevents.georgetown.edu/event/voices_unheardthe_syria_trojan_women_summit#.VXeZWUbSnX4
	http://www.al-fanarmedia.org/2014/09/greek-drama-finds-new-life-syrian-women/
	http://www.washingtonpost.com/entertainment/theater_dance/visa-denial-scuttles-syrian-play/2014/08/28/e293bd00-2eee-11e4-be9e-60cc44c01e7f_story.html
	http://www.playbill.com/news/article/american-premiere-of-syria-the-trojan-women-syrian-refugees-denied-visas-328294
	http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2014/09/24-syria-women-of-troy-theater-refugees-schneider
	https://www.opendemocracy.net/5050/reem-assayyah/we-feel-that-we-found-our-self-after-we-lost-it-in-war
	https://www.middleeastmonitor.com/news/americas/13946-us-state-department-us-resettled-166-syrian-refugees-since-2011
	http://www.deepcor.com/progress/2014/12/3/syrian-actresses-denied-visa-but-show-goes-on
	http://thewellesleynews.com/2014/09/26/arts-in-the-news-18/
<i>Amrika Chalo</i>	https://globallab.georgetown.edu/Amrika_Chalo

	https://foreignpolicy.com/2015/01/26/the-art-of-u-s-pakistan-relations/
	http://www.dawn.com/news/1156276
	http://www.thefridaytimes.com/tft/amrika-chalo/
	http://embassyofpakistanusa.org/Newsletter/Newsletter%20_Jan,%202015.pdf
	http://tribune.com.pk/story/821765/ajoka-to-reach-destination-usa/
<i>Generation (Wh)Y</i>	https://globallab.georgetown.edu/GENERATION_WHY
	http://howlround.com/livestreaming-generation-why-global-voices-on-stage-laboratory-for-global-performance-and-politics
	http://www.usmeyouthnetwork.org/2015/04/an-ode-to-the-human-experience-2/