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Editor's Notes

What a wonderful summer! When I suggested that the TAASP Newsletter would never make it to Volume 13, I should have been more precise. The Newsletter, under my editorship, will not make it to Volume 13.

IMPORTANT NEWS FLASH

The TAASP Executive (gladly/glee-fully/avec plaisir announces the appointment of a new TAASP Newsletter Editor. The announcement would have included more appropriate heraldry (heraldry), but his name is Dan: Professor Dan Hilliard Sociology Department Southwestern University Georgetown, Texas U.S.A. 78626

I encourage every member (every one of you) to write to Dan immediately, as he will appreciate (I would suggest) your support and contributions. Certainly, on behalf of TAASP, I wish him good luck, good fortune and good writing.
Before moving on to Hilliard's reign as editor, I wish to thank Kendall Blanchard (Middle Tennessee State University) for his enduring/endearing three years as our Associate Editor of the Newsletter. Kendall was burdened with the duplication/distribution responsibilities for the Newsletter, and I have appreciated immensely his efforts and sustained involvement.

1987 Pre-Conference News

The 1987 TAASP annual conference is scheduled for March 26-28th, in Montreal, Province Quebec (PQ), Canada. We will be meeting with the Popular Culture Association and the American Culture Association, whose dates are March 25-30th.

Proposals, abstracts, and suggestions should be sent (no later than) by November 14th, 1986, to Jay Mechling, TAASP President-Elect, American Studies, University of California -- Davis, Davis, California 95616 U.S.A. (or phone (916) 752-3377).

Further, the TAASP Executive has now confirmed that the Keynote Speaker for the 1987 Conference will be Richard Schechner of play and theatre fame. Actually, Schechner's text is titled, "Between Theatre and Anthropology". The conference promises (or at least Schechner's Keynote) to focus on the dramatic, theatrical, and performance aspects of play. As Meier (TAASP Newsletter, Vol. 10, No. 1) suggests that TAASP members are not good listeners, and TAASP Newsletter editors suggest that TAASP members are not consistent writers, perhaps this year, TAASP members will discover as well, that they are not performers. The challenge which I issue to all TAASP members (aside from coming to the 1987 conference) is to attempt this relatively new realm of display. What contributions can you suggest regarding play, theatre, and performance? I am certain that, by now, most of you are aware that Frank Manning (TAASP President) and Jay Mechling (TAASP President-Elect) often portray song and dance men, so we can anticipate great performances from them.

However, I suspect that TAASP members are typically more astute at exhibitions than displays (at least judging from past conference performances). Nevertheless, you will be afforded your day/night of potential glory, so be sure to leave those dates (March 26-28th) available in your busy schedules. More conference details will follow in a subsequent newsletter -- from Dan Hilliard, remember??, your new TAASP Newsletter Editor.

Editor's "Adieu"

This Volume of the Newsletter (aside from being my last) contains the usual yet exciting contributions to play. The papers by DeKoven and Salamone are especially intriguing. As well, Drake's book review of "Sport and Higher Education" is much appreciated. For the first time, and probably the last, this Volume also carries three (previously rejected) contributions from me. (I have been 'harbouring' this narcissism for some time and these papers for even longer.) Actually, these papers were presentations from previous TAASP conferences, which had not, until now, been published. (I trust that the Newsletter standards will improve substantially with Hilliard as Editor.) I was worried about accepting my own papers for the TAASP Newsletter, but I felt I owed it to myself as the last/terminal 'mad' act of an editor. In reality, though, I am saving my terminality for later (see Lynne Savage's poem, p.3 of this Newsletter).

Before I bid you all -- "adieu", I have one other unfinished task related to our 1986 conference at Tempe, Arizona. My goodbyes and some 'bad hellos' follow. At the moment, I am most grateful for "freedom of speech" and "freedom of the press", for allowing me to bid you all farewell with the liberties I am about to take:

Many thanks to Mike Salter (University of Windsor) and Kendall Blanchard (Middle Tennessee State University), two of the TAASP founding fathers (though I am more inclined these days to think of them as 'MOTHERS'), who entered my name in the
"Larry Wilde Joke Telling Contest" at Tempe, Arizona.

For their 'support', I offer the following:

I was told by Salter
I would not falter
Just to give it a try,
If all else failed
I could release my halter,
I had only to pull the clasp
and welcome the Audience
into the 'Bosom' of TAASP.

As well, of course,
I have Kendall to thank
for saying the following
from his think-tank,
"If you're no good on stage
they'll give you the 'yank';
If you screw up,
and you draw a blank,
just try to save face,
by flashing a flank."

While I was pouring my heart and soul into
these performances (along with the other
suggested body parts), the results were
disappointing (see clip from "Insight" on
opposite page). Not only did they misprint
my name but, of course, I thought (my own
humble, misguided, and biased opinion)
that I deserved to win first prize. So, my
retribution/retaliation/sour grapes/sweet
revenge is as follows: (I'll leave the
Cummings, Herb and Barbara, alone; they
already have to live with their surname.)

For the fair (if not badly mistaken)
judges -- James Boren, Peter London, and
Susan Steele, disqualifications are in order.
I am too familiar with all of them and such
nepotism should not be tolerated in
contests. I mean, whenever anyone asks if
I know Jim Boren (read Boring), I reply,
"Yes, he is!" As for Peter, we go back a long
way together. Why, I remember Peter
when you could borrow his comb and his
hair cream wasn't "Turtle Wax". And
especially Susan should have been
disqualified. I mean, I once challenged her
to a virginity contest, until I found out, she
had nothing to lose!

And for the rest, I have destructed/
constructed the following tribute:

TAASP is an organization,
credibility is what we want
With names like Park, and Fine,
and Chick,
we should have stuck with Kant.

Sutton-Smith they say
Now he's the key.
We all know him as Brian,
We'd even be willing to listen to him
If he wasn't always 'crian'.

Told to us by Gershon Legman,
his name is much 'mistaken'.
For he's a 'titman', through &
through
It's obvious he's so confused
For as a child, was much abused.

Larry Wilde's the child
Who wants on stage to make it
Don Nilsen says he loves his wife
but when in bed, she fakes it.

Actually, however, I appreciated the
opportunity to be among so many cunning
linguists who so firmly believe that once
you get past the smell, you've got it licked!!

As a part-time member of WHIM and a
full-time member of TAASP, that must mean
that I belong either with WHIMP's or to that
F'in TAASP!!

All wrathful retribution aside, the poem
by Lynne Savage, which follows, echoes my
sentiments more realistically, toward
relinquishing the Newsletter Editorship.

A Chance to be Alone!
by
Lynne Savage
7340 Fern Avenue
Niagara Falls, Ontario
L2G 5H2 CANADA

I do not want to bore you,
As I'm sitting here before you,
So I'll quickly read my lifting little verse
I've got tips for the consumer -
With an added touch of humour -
WHIM Humor Conference attracts nearly 1,000

Nearly 1,000 people attended the World Humor and Irony Membership (WHIM) Conference at ASU March 28 through April 1. The session, focusing on American humor, also drew 150 presenters who discussed topics ranging from "Humor Under Constraints" to "Erotic Adolescent Folk Humor."

Dan Ritchard, president of the Serious Organization for Unfunny Responses (SOUR) won the fourth annual Larry Wilde joke-telling contest, March 31 at Tempe's Holiday Inn. ASU liberal arts senior Claudia Foy, a deaf student from Glendale, was the runner-up. Ann Narie Guilmette, editor of the TAASP (The Association for the Anthropological Study of Play) Newsletter finished third.

Contest judges were James Boren, president of International Association of Professional Bureaucrats, a Washington, D.C. organization that satirizes doublespeak; Peter London, president of the Peter London Talent Agency, New Haven, Conn.; and Susan Steele, editor of the publication, "Comic Relief."

Don Nilsen, professor of English at ASU and conference chair, said the three minute performances were all visual in content and would suffer in translation to a written medium. As a result, Insight is unable to relate any of the winning jokes.

"Actually, the presenters told a series of jokes in their three-minute stint," Nilsen said. "The winner is a ventriloquist who made the audience believe he was talking to a little man inside the microphone."

He added that much of the presentation was improvisation and verbal play with Larry Wilde, the M.C., and with the audience. Also, much material was in dialect and involved special body language and voice effects.

The atmosphere was informal and salty language was a major aspect of the presentation. Participants were judged on stage presence and audience reaction.

Nilsen said he was satisfied with this year's WHIM session and is looking forward to next year's meeting which will be the last at ASU. Two dates — March 12 to 15, 1987 and April 1 to 5, 1987 — are being considered.

In 1988, Purdue University will host the seventh WHIM meeting. It moves to the University of Maryland in 1989 and to the University of Ottawa, Canada in 1990.

"I have mixed feelings about seeing WHIM go on the road," Nilsen commented. "The conference, starting in 1981, is now international in scope and has grown far beyond my expectations."

He said serving as conference chair is a tremendously time-consuming task which has become more complicated as the years pass.

"It is preventing me from doing other work," Nilsen revealed. "I like to write and that aspect of my career is suffering. I hope I will be able to concentrate more on writing and research after WHIM goes on the road."

Boren, who attacks bureaucratic inefficiency by hurling satiric barbs instead of blowing whistles, said the WHIM session was well-organized.

"I've attended a lot of conferences in my time and organized scores of international meetings when I worked for the U.S. State Department," he said. "This conference was just beautiful. It was fun."

Herb Cummings, president of the Washington, D.C.-based Workshop Library of World Humor, a WHIM affiliated group, says the conference was carefully planned, ran smoothly and in most cases achieved excellence.

"It had good balance except for the international aspect. There were no Russian, Chinese, Indian, Near East or Arab humorists," he observed. "However, we will remedy that next year at ASU when the WHIM session will truly have an international flavor."

In 1987, Cummings' organization will co-sponsor the WHIM session. Its theme will focus on international humor. —JM
On what to wear when riding in a hearse

If you're planning on interment,
Rubber boots will be assurance
That at least your little feet will be quite dry.
If you're going for cremation,
Wear a summertime creation
As the temperature will be extremely high!

Keeping nails well-trimmed and polished
'Til the day that you're abolished,
Will show that in appearance you take pride.
For the hands are always folded
So embalmers won't be scolded
For the thumb and finger nails they try to hide.

If you hair is long and frizzy,
The mortician will be busy
As he tries to please your family and friends -
By curling, combing, spraying -
And it may take lots of praying,
If your hair is just a mass of splitting ends.

Just before you kick the bucket,
Check each eyebrow and do pluck it -
For you really want to look your very best.
If that well-groomed look you're craving
Take some extra time for shaving -
For with hairless body few of us are blessed!

As you take your final hurdle,
Please remove your panty girdle -
For this chore is one embalmers can't endure.
Everyone will see improvement,
As you lie there without movement -
For your bulging tummy will become obscure.

To your cleavage, say good-bye.
For it's true that when you die,
They don't prop you up to show that great divide!
If you really are concerned
And for bosoms you have yearned,
You can ask that you be tilted to one side.

If you're called by the Almighty
And you're wearing an old nightie,
You had best insure it has no rip or tear.
If you're naked when you croak,
You should have a handy cloak
And at least some clean or brand new underwear.

If your face is pale and ashen,
It is proper and in fashion
For embalmers to apply a colour base.
If mascara you desire
On the day that you expire,
Spend those dying moments making up your face.

Pucker up as you are dying
For it's really hard applying
Lipstick to a mouth that's very tightly drawn.
Tuck in that double chin.
Try to wear a little grin.
It's important to look life-like when you're gone.

As you're nearing the last round-up,
Just before they dig the ground up,
Think of words you'd like engraved upon your stone.
Like - "With love I've been abounded,
By my family, friends, surrounded.
But I'm glad to have this chance to be alone!"

I had the most fun preparing this Volume of the Newsletter. Maybe now, I can get, rather than taking, my "poetic licence"!!
Anyway, I look forward to returning to the obscurity from which I came. As well, while I may not behave as drastically as Lynne Savage's poem suggests, I gladly pass on the Newsletter Editorship to Dan Hilliard, and much appreciate my new-found "Chance to be Alone"!!

Contribution . . . DeKoven, B., Playworks!
2972 Clara Drive, Palo Alto, CA, 94303, USA

Getting Serious

As a professional player, I never seem to stop learning how to play. I also never
seem to stop learning how to be taken seriously.

The rest of this paper is an elaboration of the above statement. It is my latest attempt to document what I have observed to be a quantum change in our culture's collective capacities to play "for real".

According to Bateson, a central part of the experience of play is the ability to communicate the fact that we are ONLY playing.

It seems to me that another center for that same experience is our ability to communicate the fact that we are NOT playing.

In other words, it seems to me that the study of play and humor could actually be seen as having remarkable credibility, undeniable social significance, and frankly commercial appeal. Those who learn how a culture plays learn how a culture creates non-play, i.e. how the culture transmits the models for maturity.

As any parent can tell you, the communication of "I am not playing" is an art as well as survival skill, requiring finesse, clarity, and the willingness to scream.

Telling someone who is playing that you are not playing and that you don't wish to play nor do you wish to be considered as an object of play is often a game in itself. When we watch animals at play, we seek the metacommunication of not-playing as often as we see "this is play". The well-timed snarl by a mother coyote, the non-playful wag of these define the boundaries of play are as complex and artful as the most elaborate frivolity of puppyhood.

In the adult world as our culture has it, the ability to communicate one's workerhood can be central to one's survival. If we don't look like we're working, in school, at the job, we get punished.

In order to communicate workerhood we communicate non-playingness. The behaviors that are most effective in signalling our non-playerness are those that are most clearly antithetical to the behaviors we use to signal play. We act bored, angry, fearful, driven. We look serious.

This communication of non-playingness is so complex that only with Csikszentmihalyi has there been any serious research into the possibility that work is, for many people, actually an enjoyable experience.

It has been my experience that the behaviors connected with the establishment of being seriously engaged are in the process of becoming more and more like those that we have traditionally used to signal play.

In 1981 we moved to California where I had a job as a designer in the suddenly burgeoning field of computer games. I came as an expert in games, not as a programmer. I knew enough about programming to know that I could use the computer. I came to the computer as a player. Pong was my first teacher. My first programmable computer was an Atari 800. All I knew about programming I learned during the short period when there weren't enough games to play.

When I came to the Silicon Valley, games was business. At that time, it was positively fashionable to describe one's work as play. The captains of the industry wore jeans and sneakers.

This made perfect sense. Most of the masters of the technology were young enough. They were getting money because of skills they had developed playing on the machines that they had to borrow, beg, or build. They were self-taught. They were not only self-made, they were self-making. They were honestly, openly delighted with the toys they had created. Play was the thing.

I came to the industry at a time in which all the games were designed by programmers.
not game designers. I came as an advocate of social games, party games, New Games, co-operative games for the myriads. I was designing games with people who play alone. Nonetheless, I prospered. I discovered, and the programmers with whom I worked discovered that there was a unique contribution that we could each make to the other's efforts.

I learned to program by keying-in computer code so I could play a game. Oddly enough, it was this experience of learning I shared with every professional programmer I met, even the most severely technical.

The code was in the appendix of a manual that came with the computer. All I had to do was transcribe it, verbatim, and I would be able to play a game.

Of course, the first time I tried to make the program "run", it didn't work. Somewhere, I had miscopied. So, I had to examine the code and compare it to what I had typed. Every comma, every semi-colon had to be exactly as it was in the code, or it wouldn't run. So, again I looked, and again I found another mistake. And on and on. And by the time that I actually go to play the game I learned an amazing amount about the computer. And then, after I got bored of the game, I tried changing a number here or a letter there to see if I could make the game do something else. Etc., etc. Teaching myself, discovering not so much what the computer was for, but what I could make the computer do.

The mass market had its fill of computer games just as we were getting to produce our best work in home/education/arcade games. The effect of computer games on redefining the nature of education as not-play is no longer strong enough to support our efforts.

As I write this report, I am using the computer. Though I don't program and rarely play computer games and infrequently contribute to their design, I still use the computer most of my working day. I use it as a tool.

The computer gives play to my work. By writing on a word processor, I can, when I need to, play with my words. I can move things about, recombine sentences, paragraphs, reconnect ideas, redesign images. Gather my thoughts.

Using computing power to "what-if" is yet another kind of play that is re-defining
work. Here, too, is the discovery that many of the behaviors we have restricted from the realm of "not-play" are once again called for. The computer creates a flexibility that is impossible to reproduce on the printed page. It provides for play. It responds. Anything can be changed. Any possibility can be explored.

The computer I use, by the way, is a Macintosh. Living a short distance from Apple Computer, I have had the fortune to have had first-hand access to the evolution of this technology. The success of the Macintosh as a business tool is a study in the conflict between the metacommunication of seriousness and the metacommunication of play.

The computer is extremely powerful. It is designed to be as user-friendly as a good videogame. To allow for intuitive interface. To provide the uninformed user with almost immediate access to a rich environment for the manipulation and display of text, numbers and graphics.

It is capable of doing anything the more serious-looking business computers can do, and of doing it with graphic aplomb. But it doesn't look like a serious business computer. In fact, as any industry insider will tell you, the biggest barrier to the Macintosh's success in the business environment is that it doesn't look serious enough. The Macintosh looks and acts too much like a toy.

So, here again is evidence of the cultural value placed on the metacommunication of not-play. The Macintosh is a true silicon valley machine. It embodies the play/work ethic. It doesn't look like a business machine, but it can do anything that a business machine can do, and it can do it delightfully, almost intuitively. And, in the business community of today, the IBM computer is far more successful. Harder to use, but definitely more business-like.

As of this report, I, too, have become more business-like in my approach to the new not-play. I have discovered a new blend of insights. That which I learned while relating to the play community, and that which allowed me to discover the computer as a joyful tool combined. I have found a contribution I can make as a new kind of player in a kind of game that the business world calls "meeting."

I have learned how to help people make a most empowering reversal by using the personal computer as a tool to enhance communication in business meetings. I provide a meeting-enhancement service. Using a computer projector, I provide an electronic flip-chart with a voice-activated intelligent keyboarder - the person I call the "Secretary". The success of this high-tech meeting enhancement is due, in no small part, to its success at bringing play to display.

I am not, therefore, presently in the position to explore the broader implications of our insights into the nature of play/not-play. I am currently flowingly involved on behalf of Computer-Enhanced Meetings.

I am therefore more than interested in looking into your reflections on the cultural determinents of not-play, on the impact of the technology on how play/not-play is defined, etc., etc. I had hoped to stimulate a discussion about humor and seriousness as well. It seems to me that many jokes play with a certain "being serious" metacommunication. I thought perhaps we could communicate about that particular meta. I definitely encourage you to write or call: (415) 424-9675.

**Contribution.** Salamone, Frank A., Chair, Social Sciences, Elizabeth Seton College, Yonkers, N.Y., 10701, U.S.A.

**The Social Construction of Jazz Reality**

**Introduction.** It has always been part of jazz lore that various milieux produce distinct, albeit related, styles. Thus, there has been "New Orleans", "Kansas City", "East Coast", "West Coast", "Texas", and other regional styles of jazz. Certainly, these regional styles have been related to one another and were in a sense but dialects of one jazz idiom. Moreover, it is not unusual
to find leading exponents of one regional style to be from another region. Count Basie, for example, was not from Kansas City. He was from Red Bank, New Jersey. These non-native proponents of a regional dialect, however, only serve to strengthen the hypothesis that social and cultural milieux shape and limit the expression of artistic style. Basie underwent an almost stylistic sea-change in Kansas City. Again, as times and locales changed his style underwent a further abdication in evolution. (See Williams 1985: 17-37 for a powerful discussion of Basie's music within its social context.)

In this work, I simply set out to sketch the broad outlines of the type of mainstream jazz performed in London and New York. In fact, I draw heavily on the performance of American musicians within Great Britain for some of the material in the conclusions of the paper. By no means do I pretend that this broad sketch is a total picture of the "scene" in either New York or London. I do, however, maintain that it is accurate in its broad outline.

Methodology. In a sense I have been researching jazz since I was about ten years old. My father's brother brought me along with him one night to pick up some neighbors who were listening to music in a Rochester, NY, nightclub, the Golden Grill. Because I was underage, I had to wait in the lobby. But I could still hear the music pouring out of the club. Transfixed, I demanded of my uncle, "What is that music called?" Laughing, he told me that it was Dixieland and the group playing it was called the Dixieland Ramblers. Gently, he reminded me that it was time to leave. Reluctantly, I did so, but I wanted to stay for more and never wanted the music to stop. Even today, I never want the music to end. In a sense, I have never left the lobby of that club.

The fact that people can and do cross musical boundaries emphasizes the unity of the jazz idiom amid a rather healthy diversity. It also provides the researcher with a method for tracing the relationship of various jazz subcultures with mainstream jazz culture as well as providing a means for charting the mutual influence of the individual creative artist and milieu on one another.

The fact that jazz has become international and no longer is simply an American art form opens up exciting realms of research. (See Billy Taylor's Jazz Piano 1982, especially page 6 where he states, "Jazz, America's classical music, has, indeed, become multi-ethnic and multi-national in usage.") As an initial contribution toward that research, I have begun to study two general jazz worlds: the American and British. My initial goal has been the uncovering of the mainstream within each of these traditions. The purpose of that excavation has been to compare the general tendencies within each group's dialect in order to gauge how accurately these tendencies reflect or react against tendencies within their own "dominant" cultures. A further research effort would require systematic study of each of the dialects of the jazz idiom and analysis of their relationship with dominant elements within the jazz mainstream. In fact, Radano's current research holds promise that such an effort not only can be undertaken but that doing so would indeed prove worthwhile (Radano 1985: 71-79).
tourists, I had gone to Ronnie Scott's. That was in 1973 and I must confess that my feelings were somewhat prejudiced against jazz in Britain. However, since a good friend, Ali Ryerson, a jazz flutist, had recorded a fine jazz album in Britain and had praised the British musicians who appeared on the album, I felt that in the interests of fairness I had to hear some British jazz. Armed with a list of phone numbers and possible locales, I wryly began my odyssey.

My introduction to British jazz was fortuitous. I called one of the clubs she had recommended, Pizza-on-the-Park. I thought I would spend a quiet couple of minutes writing post cards and then get to bed early. Suddenly, I put aside my post cards, Italian sparkling water and fatigue and began to listen to the blind pianist who sat at one of the grand pianos. At the end of the set I went to his table to tell him how much I enjoyed his playing. I had expected a brief exchange, but he and his friend asked me to sit down. That was how I met my friend and "chief informant", Mattie Ross. Much of what I was and learned I did so because of the influence of Mattie.

But there were others who also took the time and trouble to talk to me about the British scene. Indeed, musicians and fans in Britain are, if anything, more open than those in the United States. Perhaps, they are less "interviewed-out" than those in the United States. (See Baliett 1985: 171 for a discussion pertaining to musicians of Roy Eldridge's generation.) Thus, although my time in Britain was relatively short I did double-check my conclusions with those who know the scene well.

In contrast, as I have indicated, my time in the United States has been long. My intensive study of jazz as more than a fan has now reached one year. My informal study has passed thirty-five. I have met hundreds of major figures and seen thousands in performance at one time or other. There are few whom I have not been privileged to meet. Most are quite open. The more difficult people to interview on tape are often the easiest to speak with "off the record". As in any other type of research constant integrity is its own reward. Being on the scene helps. My only point here is that there is an imbalance in my knowledge of the two scenes and my involvement in each of them that must be taken into account in assessing this paper.

Points of Comparison. There are a number of areas in which the American and British jazz scenes can be compared: styles of performance, settings, audiences, ambiance, and interactions between performers and audiences. There are, of course other valid areas but their exploration would require a far more detailed exploration and exposition than space allows.

In contrast with American groups, there is a rather unusual mixing of styles in British groups. The Pizza Express All Stars in London, for example, feature a rather modern trombonist, Roy Williams, while also using swing and Dixieland riffs behind soloists.

Their repertoire also ranges from early Dixie through Big Band songs to modern compositions, a rather unusual mixture in the United States. On one occasion they were joined by Milt Hinton, a venerable 75 year old American bassist.

Milt's performance encapsulated the strengths and weaknesses of the scene. The group played well behind him and Milt was at the top of his form. But it was obvious that he was coasting and not feeling challenged to his fullest powers. My impression was supported by Milt's performance a few days later when I heard him in performance in Edinburgh with a rather strange assortment of American musicians, strange in the sense of the diversity of their styles. There Ray Bryant's piano playing pushed Milt to a superb performance. As one British pianist said, "The American musicians always have the courage of their convictions, even, or especially, when they're wrong. They can carry it off. We British musicians are always a bit timid, especially in the face of Americans who are 'the real thing'." I
The rather motley collection of American musicians was one that would be found in New York only at the now demolished and lamented Eddie Condon’s, a club known for its openness to the casual jam session and its encouragement of stylistic mixture. Their performance, however, nicely illustrates the stylistic difference between British and American performances and performers. Both groups, the Pizza Express All Stars and the Ray Bryant All Stars, mixed styles. Indeed, when I discussed the personnel of the American group with Frank Foster in order to obtain his assessment, he simply laughed and asked me how they sounded, for he said he could not imagine that combination but he would pay to hear it.

In contrast the Americans expressed in their playing an attitude often expressed in interviews by American jazz musicians; namely, that jazz has to be a bit ragged, a little dirty. It has to at least appear spontaneous, and that means that at least in live performance there must be “mistakes”. Suspense is a big part of any live performance. A certain reckless abandon marks many performances, certainly those of pick-up groups.

The group consisted of Ray Bryant on piano; Milt Hinton, bass; Carl Fontana, trombone; Spanky Davis, trumpet; Gus Johnson, drums; and Buddy Tate, saxophone. It was a mixture of venerable swing musicians, Hinton, Tate and Johnson; with an early bop pioneer, Fontana; and more recent bop-influenced performers, Bryant and Davis. It was more racially integrated than the average American group. Bryant, Johnson, Hinton, and Tate are black while the other three members are white. The common language of the group was bop NOT swing. It was a modified bop to be sure, for Bryant is a very swinging pianist with a strong blues feeling. Moreover, these musicians have obviously listened to more contemporary movements in music and have incorporated these into their performance.

The group’s manner was very relaxed, almost casual. They knew they were deeply appreciated and managed to convey an impression of total confidence. Indeed, they appeared to know that they were the best the festival had to offer that night among all the international performances and that they were, perhaps, the only group that was not concerned with getting it perfect. The European performers, by and large, treated jazz as if it were classical music in the European sense; that is, something to be preserved in aspic and played totally faithfully to the composer’s wishes. Since jazz is a performer’s art, the soloist is the composer, even when, or especially when, improvising. The Europeans have begun to render faithful imitations of the original performances, down to the least vibrato of an improvised solo. One European band played the late King Oliver’s repertoire more faithfully than Joe Oliver ever played it himself.

The Bryant All Stars, in fact, came out swinging. They obviously had fun, and gave the impression that they were sure of what they were doing. “Errors” were simply cause for amusement among the musicians and gave impetus to brilliant recoveries. The tunes chosen belong to the mainstream of jazz. None was from any of the Dixieland styles. The two or three swing songs were associated with the Basie band and allowed former Basie saxophonist Buddy Tate moments in the limelight. In contrast with the Pizza Express group, there was almost no ensemble riffing behind soloists. The rhythm section supported any horn soloist so that except for openings and closing sections, the septet was generally a quartet or trio.

In contrast, even though the Pizza Express All Stars had fun, they seemed a bit too correct. Their common language was swing and not bop. Their music was often rather derivative, even Roy Williams, who in another setting would be a very modern trombonist indeed, often held back full development of his ideas in deference to his British audience.
The British audience, in fact, does constrain the type of performance a musician gives. In fact, jazz musicians are unusually attuned to the mood of their audiences. "In many cases the kinesthetics of jazz have been directly related to the place where the performance occurred and the response of the audience ... a small room might produce a more subdued interaction between the jazz musician and the audience". (Taylor 1982: 7). Thus, it is important to provide some assessment of the British audience. It is, in general, an audience that has jumped over the Bop Revolution and went into the Cool period. It is also an audience given to fierce loyalty to various musicians and styles, expressed through the presence of various societies that meet periodically and frequently. It is, therefore, significant that although there are Louis Armstrong, Bing Crosby, Duke Ellington, and even Al Jolson societies there are no Charlie Parker, Dizzy Gillespie or Thelonious Monk ones. Indeed, there is a strong hostility against Bop on the part of many British fans.

Such a state of affairs strikes American musicians as strange. Frank Foster said, "I can understand that only one sax player is playing Coltrane, but how can Parker be so neglected?" There are, of course, bop influenced musicians in Britain and anyone playing "cool" music has been, even unknowingly, influenced by the bop revolution. What is interesting is that forty years later there is such open hostility to the purer form of the music that revolutionized jazz. Musicians who are too openly "boppish" will be shunned. Of course, what is true for bop is even more forcefully true of the jazz protest music of the sixties, a music that has never been overly popular even among American jazz fans and whose work has entered the mainstream only in watered down versions (Radano 1985).

The British jazz audience, therefore, is rather clannish and seeks rather predictable pleasures from its performers. It is also more of a sociable gathering. The atmosphere is one of gathering for a good time rather than one of gathering for new intellectual stimulation. The pleasure comes through the repetition of pleasureable experiences; these tend to be familiar and constant. In turn, the audience demands the same from its local heroes. It allows more elbow room to Americans, but, then, Americans, almost any American, is deemed to be an innovator and the source of the music.

There are sources for change within British jazz. These tend to be on the fringe of the scene. The same, of course, holds true for American jazz. The point is that the British tend to be at least a generation behind. Unfortunately, my explorations into that world were limited. Two brief examples, however, suffice for illustrative purposes.

In Harrow, I met a musician who is current with the latest movements in jazz. He does not, however, make his living through performing. Instead, he owns a record shop and provides his customers with personalized service and access to international jazz labels. In the evenings, he works one night stands, another feature of the British scene. Very rarely are groups booked for more than one evening per week. Even the weekend sees a change in personnel. Al Merritt is no exception to the rule, then, in his work habits.

He is, however, rare in his knowledge and love for the bop period in jazz. Most of the time, nevertheless, is spent performing with groups more in the British mainstream. Within that context, he can and does express himself. In fact, on the evening I saw him play, he was not part of the group but only sat in. His difference from the other performers was quite marked and emphasized the fact that the American mainstream is the British avant-garde. The fact that he was not booked to play that evening is of some significance.

On one other occasion, I heard modern playing. It was in a club owned by Peter Ind, an outstanding bassist who worked with many top American groups until his return to England. The club features a
different variety of Afro-American music each night in an effort to build an audience for "pure jazz". On the night I attended, a form of music called "Soca", for Soul Calypso, was being played. The group was Kalabash. The audience was loudly appreciative and had come to dance. I expected a spirited and cliche-ridden Caribbean variety of music. What I got was quite different.

The group members are warm and wryly witty. Except for the two female horn players, who are there for the variety and ornamentation they provide, the members are from Granada. The leader plays keyboards and grew up listening to jazz on the voice of America. He is familiar with the music of Monk and Coltrane and incorporates their ideas into the throbbing beat and social commentary of his version of Soca. His goal is to bring young people into jazz through familiarizing them with its vocabulary under the guise of music they can dance to. It appeared strange at first that one of the very few places to offer relatively advanced jazz in Britain was one featuring young calypso playing Granadans. But on further reflection it appeared quite logical, for jazz indeed has always come out of the contact of Afro-American with European culture and reflects their interpretation and response to it.

Conclusions. Even such a broad sketch as this reveals areas of significance reflected in the difference between British and American jazz. Obviously, both varieties are jazz. They are understood as such by fans from either culture. The British audiences had no trouble identifying the American All Stars as performing jazz. I had no difficulty in doing so with the fifteen or so groups whom I saw. Even when buried in a related art form, I could easily recognize the jazz roots in Soca music and identified them quite accurately. The styles, or dialects, are different. The basic language is the same.

A key to the basic differences between the two mainstreams lies in the identification of what is meant by considering jazz a "classical music". Increasingly, one hears jazz referred to as America's classical music (Taylor 1982: 8). To Americans that phrase simply refers to the need for jazz to gain more respect in the land of its origins. It is an indictment of the low esteem in which it is generally held and a rallying cry to gain it more respect. It also is an argument for it to be accepted on its own terms even while gaining a place in the conservatory.

To some extent it has been a successful rallying cry. Jazz has for some time been taught in conservatories and colleges. There are courses in jazz sociology and history. There are serious academic journals dedicated to its study. In sum, it is not novel for jazz to be taken seriously in the United States on its own terms. Those terms include the cultural belief that improvisation must be part of any jazz performance, no matter how rehearsed it may in fact be.

In Britain, in contrast, the term "classical" has a different connotation. It carries with it the meaning of performed in a particular manner. Although improvisation is expected. It is rather standardized and predictable improvisation. Moreover, more spectacular crowd pleasing effects are called for - trumpet high notes, complex passages, etc. These tend not to be improvised so much as packaged and pulled out for admiration. It is significant that there are no courses on the sociology of jazz, no regular conservatory courses - except summer one, and no academic jazz journal in Britain. It is further part of the British and continental interpretation of classical that groups performing authentic imitations of early jazz figures on period instruments are so popular and a feature of jazz festivals. Such performances rival the awe with which European classical composers are treated and are more appropriate for a dead than a living art form.

In contrast with the sometimes overt treatment of jazz as a period art of even a museum piece is the American attitude in which it is indeed a performer's art and even set pieces are supposed to sound improvised and spur of the moment. The
question of improvisation is, in fact, a thorny one. Suffice it to say here that it is a boundary maker of great symbolic valence in American jazz. In fact, much improvisation is thought out ahead of time and pulled out at the right time. One way to give the impression of improvisation is to be a bit "dirty" in one's playing and to recover, as a high rope walker appears to do, from a potentially dangerous, but often well-planned slip. The more familiar the material, the more calculated the slip.

The relaxed attitude most American performers convey is also part of the image. Even the most presumably staid groups, like the Modern Jazz Quartet, often poke fun at their image. Milt Jackson, the brilliant vibraphonist, communicates via body language his bemusement and amusement with the whole neo-classical charade the group puts on. The music itself, in contract with the self-consciously sedate and stiff impression conveyed, leading many jazz critics and fans to suspect that the quartet is gently putting them on.

Whether they really are having fun or not, the general presentation of most American groups is that they are and that they are relaxed in so doing. I am, remember, speaking here about the mainstream, not the avant-garde. Avant-garde's rarely admit to having fun. Mainstream American musicians tend to communicate directly with their audiences, play familiar enough compositions, increasingly of their own composing, and generate an air of casual competence.

American jazz audiences tend to be in the know. They do not come to joke around. Such behaviour is definitely considered old-fashioned or indicative of one who is not a true fan. They tend to view the British enthusiasm as a bit naive, especially when extended to any American musician. As one grateful but puzzled American musician said, "I really appreciated my reception but I am not a big name. What happened was that the British feel that any American performer must be authentic, especially a black one. Some over-the-hill and awful players get great receptions while some good British musicians are neglected."

America, then, is regarded as the Holy Land. So long as developments in the music are not too sudden they will be accepted as Holy Writ in Britain. Bop was rejected because it appeared to have come from nowhere. World War II and the US recording ban masked the links between bop and earlier forms of music. Moreover, bop was associated with race pride and, therefore, was perceived as threatening to many. Such a situation can only keep the mainstream a generation or so behind in Britain. Thus, what is the "fringe" in Britain is basically in the American mainstream.

The relationship, or dialogue, between the United States and British jazz communities is familiar enough in any situation where there is dealing with relations between the center and periphery. The rather touching but ultimately self-defeating homage toward American musicians, which masks some hostility, can only hold back the development of a progressive British jazz. The presence of jazz influenced Caribbean musicians, however, holds great promise for the future. These musicians are in touch with jazz's African roots and do indeed come from a milieu similar to that in which jazz in the United States progresses. They are not afraid to comment critically and with humor on the pressing social issues of the day, and that very irreverence is a hallmark of jazz. If jazz has come to symbolize freedom and experimentation, then the ease and grace with which Soca musicians perform may hold the key to a more indigenous dialect of jazz within Great Britain.

It is essential to note that the structure and practice of jazz in both countries reflects, in broad outline at least, the overall structure and process of society itself. In Great Britain there is a formality to a jazz performance that is usually lacking in the United States. If there is a degree of formality, it is usually carried off with a touch of self-mockery. There is a hierarchy of
performers, a sort of old boy network, that is more honored in the breach than in the observance in the United States. Although some of the great performers of the art are honored in the United States, it is often when they are past their peak. Moreover, there is a kind of open season on almost anyone who reaches star status in the United States.

Challenge to authority is part of the system in American jazz. It is expected and predictable that anyone on top must watch out for the new gunslinger in town. A type of adversary system prevails, but it is one that is mitigated somewhat by a master-apprentice relationship that develops across generations. There is also a grudging respect for the new star who can displace the old lion. The rites of passage are rigid and known and one's manhood must be proven for all to see.

In Great Britain there is no expectation that anything new will develop anywhere else but in the United States. British musicians, by and large, view themselves as conservators of the music, guardians holding the fort until something new develops in America. In America, the expectation is the opposite. Indeed, the myth prevails that something new is produced at every session. In the backstage area, however, musicians are quite honest in pointing out that the magic occurs rarely and that it strikes when it wills through them. Their job is to work hard, be good craftsmen, and to be ready to receive the spirit and let it speak through them. It is a perspective the British would find rather odd.

There is a pretext, then, in American jazz that set pieces are foreign to the spirit of the music. Informality, or a show of the same, prevails. Talent alone is supposed to matter in the music. There is a general reluctance to put down a fellow performer for general consumption, among outsiders. However, there is a brutal honesty, bordering on bitchiness, within the confines of the backstage area. Since so many very talented musicians must live never to get a taste of fame while patently less talented youngsters steal the limelight, the bitterness that is so much a part of the professional scene is understandable.

Therefore, the real royalty tend to hide their status as traditional priests do. Duke Ellington, Count Basie, Louis Armstrong, Dizzy Gillespie, et al., tended to hide their royal status behind informality. These giants, moreover, all shared an ability to coopt "radicals" within their music. Dizzy is still doing so. This dynamic provides an impetus for the stability and change of jazz, a reflection of American society itself.

Finally, in place of the "old boy network" that prevails within British jazz, there is the fact of American race relations. Jazz is culturally black within the United States. That is not to deny the contributions made by many white musicians. Nor does it in any way argue against the fact that most of the money in the field winds up in white hands - musicians, agents, promoters. The ethos of the music is black. Its standards of performance are black and the judgement of those performances equally derive from the black American experience.

Jazz, in its most creative aspect, is a continual commentary on American culture and the black man's place within that system as he perceives it. For a white man to survive and be accepted within the mainstream of jazz, then, he has to be or become culturally black. The curious phenomenon sometimes arises of some whites being more culturally black than many black musicians, for contrary to popular opinion most jazz musicians come from the middle class and are well-trained in music. Mere popularity does not ensure acceptance within the mainstream of jazz, indeed it often hinders it. What does ensure acceptance is the ability to tell one's own story no matter what the cost and to relate that story to the overall American situation of which one is a part.

In American jazz is a living and integral part of American culture. It thrives most it seems, when it is most neglected by the mass audience, for its creative flow needs distance even while its performers do thirst after recognition. Rejection feeds their
perception of American life. In Britain jazz is an import and a symbol of American life. It is treated as a museum piece and reflects British life in the rather reserved manner in which it is performed. The deference and care with which it is deservedly treated, however, often saps it needed anger which rules its very creative soul.

References Cited.


Contribution ... Guilmette, A.M. (Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, Brock University, St. Catharines, Ontario, L2S 3A1, Canada) and Duthie, J.H. (Faculty of Human Kinetics, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3P4, Canada).

Deceit and Deception: In Search of a Human Releasor Mechanism.

Deceit, as conceptualized in this paper, does not refer to untruths or lying. Neither does deceit refer to contradiction. Play permits the individual to be that which (s)he is not. The focus of this paper is on deceit and deception which originate in incongruity. By incongruity, we mean, the individual's ability to conceptualize of a simultaneous juxtaposition of ideas, or the violation of belief expectancy. For example, consider the statement: "Be safe, drink till you can't find your car." This statement is neither an untruth, nor a contradiction, but the recognition of the incongruity involved represents a playful deception.

Miller (1969) shows in animal studies that deceit is viewed as pretense. Bateson (1969) describes how this process of pretense manifests itself in a metacommunicative message "This is play". The message is interpreted (at a higher level) through biological releaser mechanisms as nonserious or not intended to injure. Releaser mechanisms, as Tinbergen (1951) identifies, are those biological triggers which permit interspecies cues to be identified correctly. In humans, however, where instincts assume secondary importance for survival, there must also be triggers by which messages can be interpreted unambiguously.

Deceit and deception are mutually exclusive in the sense that they imply a two-person communication network. A network in which one individual emits a signal for the other individual to detect or receive. However, when deceit and deception occur, under what conditions do they come to be regarded as play? The central issue revolves around the questions: How and when does a particular stream of ongoing social activity come to be defined by participants (and observers) as playful in nature? Garfinkel (1967) suggests that participants can be said to share a common understanding of what is happening. Goffman (1974), Bateson (1972) and Handelman (1977), describe a metacommunicative system which permits participants to organize their behaviors and activities in a way which creates a shared understanding of what is happening. Goffman (1974), Bateson (1972) and Handelman (1977), describe a metacommunicative system which permits participants to organize their behaviors and activities in a way which creates a shared understanding of what it is they are doing together. Goffman (1974) refers to the process as "the assumption of shared consensus". Bateson's (1972) metacommunicative message "this is play" parallels Goffman's (1974) notion of a "keying device". A keying device in the sense that the metacommunicative message unlocks the deception. The message "this is play" permits the activity to be regarded as a benign fabrication (Bowman, 1980). A play frame is established. The activity undergoes a systematic transformation. A
radical reconstruction of what appears to be happening takes place.

Bowman (1980) argues that in order for deceit or deception to be regarded as play, the signals need to be explicit and unambiguous; just as with releaser mechanisms, Tinbergen (1951) argues that they serve to validate activity. However, counter to Bowman and Tinbergen, play signals can be ambiguous, provided they are nonthreatening. Rothbart (1973) provides evidence in the humour literature that ambiguous or incongruous messages which are nonthreatening provide a potential source for humour.

Alford (1979) regards humour as a form of play; one which is defined as the perception of a nonserious violation of salient expectations. Again, though, play in the form of deceit may be a very serious violation of salient expectations, nevertheless, a violation which will continue to be regarded as play only as long as it remains nonthreatening. In deceit, then, we do not strive for clearer and clearer representations of reality, yet, our message must avoid contradiction. The situation becomes paradoxical in the sense of playing with us.

As Bateson (1972), Garfinkel (1967), and Goffman (1974) seem to suggest, the mutual understanding of social norms is imperative. However, as Poincare (1952) maintains: "The definition of what is normative is based on neither synthetic a priori intuitions nor experimental facts—they are conventions. Our choices among all possible conventions are guided by experimental facts but they remain free and are only limited by the necessity of avoiding contradiction". The young child's play is not just an occasion to explore a world of pretense, but also represents an early lesson in the establishment and embellishment of social norms (i.e., we become socialized in the process). To return to our earlier question: How and when do deceit and deception come to be regarded as play?

Metaphor, one form of deception in language, represents a communicative device which instructs at the metacommunicative level the participants as to how to structure the play context. Extended and cumulative play relationships involve a series of negotiations which establish intimacy. Intimacy (Alford, 1981), degree of friendliness (Tsang, 1981), or being defined as a member of the ingroup, all guarantee an accurate interpretation of norms. Bowman (1980) argues that deceptions (in the form of practical jokes) are usually limited to close friends and family members. As Alford (1981) argues, the intimacy of two persons creates a secure (i.e., non-threatening) social climate in which people can step out of their ordinary roles. For example: I befriended three Cree Indian children in Split Lake, Manitoba. During Halloween (a festive occasion of great importance), these girls came to my door for the usual trick or treat. I did not know beforehand what costumes they would be wearing, as it is considered taboo to reveal this information to anyone; yet I was able to recognize them because of their metacommunicative signals—giggles, tone of voice, pronunciation of my name, winking behind their masks, and in part, their clothing. I maintained their pretense or disguises and allowed myself to be deceived. I would have disgraced them amongst their friends, had I revealed the slightest indication of recognition. The prior in-group contact established with these children became an important signalling device, through which play could be achieved. The characteristics which are shared by the participants in a deceit/deception exchange represent one mechanism through which incongruity operates.

So far, we have discussed how intimacy leads to play, and we recognize also that play leads to further intimacy; just as play sometimes serves the function of social control, while other times that of social change. The circularity of these statements suggest that intimacy alone cannot supply sufficiently the answer to our question. Another variable, not to be overlooked,
involves contextual characteristics. Tsang (1981) suggests that there is a three-way interaction between degree of friendliness, degree of realism, and the extremity of the insult which renders a non-literal pseudo-insulting (deceptive) interpretation of an objectively insulting remark.

The context in which deceit or deception occurs provides cues which help to define play. The importance of understanding the social norms is established again, as in my example, the fact that the occasion in question was Halloween, a priori allowed me to establish a play frame. However, as Bowman (1980) demonstrates, disputes may arise concerning the appropriateness of a playful definition when groups are in conflict or individuals are members of the outgroup. Victims of deceit (practical jokes) get angry when they are in a position to dispute the appropriateness of a playful definition of the situation. For instance: A family of Vietnamese immigrants arrived in Southern Ontario on October 30, 1980. Following the October 31st Halloween festivities, their contact person found them huddled in one room, terrified for their lives. At the metacommunicative level, the statement "that's not funny" indicates an unacceptable (i.e., threatening) violation of a social norm.

As human beings, we employ these metacommunicative messages in much the same manner as animals employ releaser mechanisms. In deceptive situations, our comments "You're not serious!" or "Are you joking?" or "This is play", all serve as means of interpreting a situation. However, we cannot strictly apply biological releaser mechanisms to a psychological entity. For the ethologists, selection occurs on the basis of the group--survival of the species. Instead, we would argue, that the fundamental unit of selection is the gene. It is the individual’s survival which counts. Thus, the individual’s ability to select, to emit and detect what is play, becomes essential. Yet, some acts (in order not to have them betray us) involve self-deception. Two common forms of self-deception for humans, which interferes with a clear translation of play, are generated by the case of involuntary non-conformity.

LaFave and Teeley’s (1967) involuntary non-conformity model (with its basis in the socially accepted, the normative) now has an evolutionary base linked to deception generally and self-deception specifically. Here, we argue for the importance of these same mechanisms to promote the organism’s ability to render such activities playful, or to assist the organism in avoiding costly (i.e., destructive) mistakes.

One such mechanism is the recognition of the play cue, “this is play”. This mechanism remains vital by providing us a means of avoiding serious and even life-threatening errors. Since Mannell and Duthie (1975) have shown that habit lag occurs whenever one ceases to monitor the external environment, clearly, any cue or signal which causes an individual’s arousal level to decrease or increase beyond a certain point will lead to habit lag and involuntary nonconformity. Stressful situations, on the other hand, those which put pressure on an individual, will diminish incidental learning simply because our perceptual attention is focussed on, and presumably exhausted by the task at hand. Stress, may be easily induced socially. Consider for example a new teacher addressing the class. "Now children, I have written my name -- Miss Pussy with an R". Next day, she asks the class, "Who can remember my name?" Little Ernie’s reply, "Yes, your name is Miss Crunt", is an example of involuntary non-conformity or habit lag. As La Fave and Teeley (1967) argue, habit lag is the reproduction of automated responses which are incompatible with the current situation. In an attempt to economize our efforts, we become targets for error--our own self-deception.

Stress, in this situation, causes regression to some previously learnt/patterned response. Stress also leads to defense mechanisms. As Freud uses the term, these unconscious processes defend us against anxiety by distorting reality. Since, they do
not alter reality, they simply change the way we think about reality and thus there exists this element of self-deception. We often unconsciously distort reality through humour, as a racial coping mechanism. The Jews on the way to the gas chamber showed this denial of the facts, hence the term 'gallahs humour' (0brdljik, 1942).

However, the goal of reducing deception or reversing this denial process is one of rendering the unconscious conscious. Paradoxically, with involuntary non-conformity, the organism attempts the opposite, to render the conscious nonconscious. A process which Polyanii (1968) calls 'tacit knowing or automatization. Consider James' (1980) remarks: "We attempt to make our nervous system our ally instead of our enemy. The more details of our daily life we can hand over to the effortless custody of automatism, the more our higher powers of mind will be set free for their own proper work. For example, if a centipede stopped to think of how it walks, it would be unable to" (p.12).

There is a further economy of action suggested by Whiting (1969) -- the expectancy of an act speeds up to the perception and anticipation of appropriate response. Duthie (1972) argues that movements in a complex motor sequence are dependent upon previously established expectancies, many of which are of social origin (i.e., arise from human interactions). Consider the player who is not merely an individual capable of consistent reproduction of well-learned and automated molecular behavior units, but one who has blended these molecular components into molar unity by means of La Fave's (1972) concept of 'subadditive fusion' -- in a way which leaves the conceptual apparatus free for decision-making. Again, economy is generated, as the whole movement occupies less time than the sum of the former movements and during the interval the individual is free to plan new programs. Chipping off the corners of molecular components occupies less time and is essential in the acquisition of a complex motor skill as well as the implementation of such in a game situation.

However, the transformation of motor skills from the molecular to molar level provides an explanation for our second form of self-deception. Why do excellent athletes often make lousy coaches? They have become educated idiots -- victims of their own self-deception. The economization of their own efforts inhibits or prevents the communication of those skills to others, making for a stressful situation in which the athletes find themselves re-learning the skills. As Mannell and Duthie (1975) explain, anxiety induced by stress serves as a buffer which helps prevent involuntary nonconformity error. Stress rather than inducing involuntary nonconformity (as we suggested earlier) may serve to prevent such from occurring -- as under stress the individual is more likely to monitor continuously the external environment. Unfortunately, for the human organism, continued states of anxiety may cause a breakdown in other defense mechanisms, rendering the individual susceptible to other forms of attack.

Deceit is clearly fundamental in communication. However, there exists also selection processes which equip us to monitor deception. We often emit cues of which we ourselves are unaware: in animals, these cues are manifested as releaser mechanisms -- biological triggers of recognition; whereas, in humans, more typically, these cues are manifested as metalanguage frames -- psychological triggers of recognition. Hence, while play permits the individual to be that which he is not, the understanding of play remains difficult to ascertain, as the process required for clarity can be cloaked in self-deception.
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Research in humour, as with play, has been abundant in recent years. For instance, TAASP has held annual meetings since 1975; every April 1st, WHIM meets in Tempe, Arizona; the Workshop Library on World Humour publishes an interdisciplinary newsletter, entitled "American Humour"; and there have been five (5) International Conferences on Humour and Laughter. There have been several important books on humour: Goldstein & McGhee's (1972) Psychology of Humour, Chapman & Foot's (1976) Humour and Laughter: Theory, Research and Applications, and (1977) It's a Funny Thing.
Humour, Goldstein & McGhee’s (1983 -- 2 volumes) Handbook of Humour Research (Issues and Applications), and Apte’s (1985) Humour and Laughter. Additionally, humour has become the focus of topics courses in psychology, sociology, and anthropology.

There have been three major theoretical foci which humour research has investigated: 1) Superiority or Vicarious Superiority; 2) Incongruity or Interactive Incongruity; and 3) Arousal or Tension Relief. In this paper, these three (relatively distinct) perspectives represent humour’s trilogy.

Basically, from the work of philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1651), superiority theory argues that humour, in which we are victorious over some loathesome enemy, will be arising. Middleton (1959) attempted to experimentally test superiority theory with black versus white subjects. Middleton failed by not considering that his Black subjects could have held pro-White rather than pro-Black values. Wolff, Smith and Murray (1934) also attempted to test superiority theory but used Jews versus Gentiles as subjects. Wolff, Smith and Murray also failed as they selected (unknowingly) a Jewish-aligned Gentile control group (the Scottish).

La Fave (1961) transformed superiority theory into vicarious superiority theory, through a social psychological interpretation -- shifting the focus from the individual to groups. By carefully controlling for the identification class of subjects, La Fave (1961) successfully manipulated vicarious superiority humour. Thus, vicarious superiority suggests that amusement results when the “good guys” (in-group) win and the “bad guys” (out-group) lose. Through vicarious affiliation, we feel superior to, a sense of mastery over, the out-group -- vanquishing its members in the process.

Examples for this disparagement type of humour are numerous, and frequently, the butt (victim) of the ‘joke’ varies with the degree of vulnerability or low status that group has in a particular society. To avoid further disparagement of any particular group, “green people” will be substituted in each of the examples.

Question: How did “green people” get to Canada?
Reply: The first one swam and the rest walked across on the dead fish.

Question: What do you call a “green man” with half-a-brain?
Reply: Lucky!

Question: Why don’t “green women” purchase XL cars?
Reply: They’re so tired of seeing that same label on their underwear!

Question: What do you call a “green man” in a new car?
Reply: A thief!

Hence, vicarious superiority humour serves to denigrate the outgroup. Such minority groups as the Chinese, Indians, Jews, Polish, Blacks, Newfies, and East Indians have, at varying times, been the butt of such humour. Further, such attacks are rendered more prevalent during specific societal conditions, especially such conditions as economic restraint, job competition and scarcity of resources. As Allport (1958) observes, the love of the ingroup is often equal to the hatred of the outgroup. For instance, in Canadian society, with a rising aged population becoming a recognizable financial drain on an already over-burdened economy, a resurgence of anti-elderly put-downs can be witnessed. For example:

Question: Did you hear about the elderly feminist who went braless?
Reply: Yes, it took the wrinkles out of her face!

Question: Did you hear about the elderly man who was charged in connection with a series of rapes?
Reply: Yes, the charge was assault with a dead weapon!
—You know how you get herpes or aids? Well there is a new dreaded sexually transmitted disease called Burlap.

**Question:** How do you get that?
**Reply:** From sleeping with old bags.

—A birthday card which reads: Now that you've gotten so old, you'll have to give up half of your sex life. Which half do you want to give up? Talking about it or thinking about it?! 

The resentment toward some potential force (the elderly) making demands or taking control, leads to vicarious superiority humour, which is designed to perpetuate negative stereotypes and to ensure that the dominant in-group maintains the status quo while the minority out-group remains disadvantaged or disenfranchised.

The second area of humour research is derived from incongruity humour theory which focuses on an individual's ability to understand, conceptualize, or solve juxtapositions of ideas, events, or stimuli. Originally, incongruity was defined as inherent in the stimulus situation (Berlyne, 1972; Suls, 1972; Shultz, 1976) independent of any interpretation on the part of the humouree. In Guilmette (1980) there is a reconceptualization of incongruity humour as interactive incongruity, which does account for the humouree. Interactive incongruity is the conceived violation of expectancy, where amusement results when, by virtue of our cognitive capacities, we render sense from the nonsensical or nonsense from the sensical.

Two basic types of incongruity which have been examined in the humour literature are psychophysical and psychosocial phenomena. Nerhardt (1975), Deckers and Kizer (1975), and Gerber and Routh (1975) tested violation of expectancy from physical norms employing psychophysical weight-lifting tasks; while Mutuma (1976), Issar (1976) and Tsang (1976) tested violation of expectancy from social norms employing psychosocial cultural descriptions for Black Africans, East Indians, and Chinese, respectively, versus Canadian Caucasians.

McGhee (1979) cautions, however, that very few people really break up at the pure (simple) incongruitities which the violations of expectancy research suggests. Such “floor effects” have been reported by Deckers and Kizer (1975), Nerhardt (1975), and Guilmette (1980) in psychophysical experiments. When sexual or aggressive themes are added to incongruity, amusement rises greatly. For example:

**Question:** How do you tell a blind man in a nudist colony?
**Reply:** It's not hard!

**Question:** What do you call a man who doesn't use contraceptives?
**Reply:** Daddy!

**Question:** Why do they call camels ships of the desert?
**Reply:** Because they're always full of Arab semen!

**Question:** What do you call a prostitute with a runny nose?
**Reply:** Full!

Hence, like the Gestalt restructuralization of the stimulus which occurs with figure-ground relationships, individuals are provided with a sense of mastery in language and intense joy at one's own cleverness. Such interactive incongruity humour seems to pervade achievement motivation and competency-based societies, and appears most appealing at the five humour conferences, suggesting at least an attempt there at intellectual competency.

The third primary focus in the humour literature has been tension release or arousal. This research has lent itself more readily to looking at the functions which humour may serve to alleviate (wo)man's painful existence. Godke-witsch (1972) has argued that amusement results when we
experience a sudden release of tense
ergy, a cathartic effect, or reduction in
arousal level. The resultant amusement is
said to revitalize the ego and refresh the
human spirit. Due to the savagely tempestuous
times in which we currently live, there has been a resurgence of what
Obrdlik (1942) called "gallows humour".
For instance:

**Question:** What do you call a man
with no arms and no legs in a
swimming pool?
**Reply:** Bob!

**Question:** Did you hear about the
poker game at the leper colony?
**Reply:** Yes, somebody threw a
hand in!

**Question:** What do you call an
epileptic in a bowl?
**Reply:** A seizure salad!

**Question:** What kind of wood
doesn't float?
**Reply:** Natalie!

Through these tendentious forms of
sadistic humour, we render ourselves
insensitive to the pain and suffering of
others, insulating our delicate sensibilities
against the painful horrors of reality.
When we are most fearful, most personally
threatened, tension or arousal humour
emerges as our most prevalent safeguard or
coping mechanism.

Another important aspect, on which
humour research has been conducted, deals
with the context in which humour occurs
rather than the text of humour itself.
While these three types of humour
(vicarious superiority, interactive
incongruity, and tension relief) are
mutually exclusive, the forms are often
difficult to control in research. Research
on the contextualization of humour covers
the spectrum of the trilogy. McGhee (1979)
suggests that attention must be paid to the
importance of "play signals" -- cues in the
environment or in the behaviour of others
that communicate to the person pondering
the remark that "this is not a situation to be

taken seriously". McGhee's remarks parallel the joking relationship literature
of Radcliffe-Brown (1940), who suggests
that humour is institutionalized in an
attempt to remove threat, to permit cultural
approval of the humour and inevitably
provide cohesiveness within a society.

In my observations, humans have
always lived in crisis. In this regard, the
main function of humour appears to have
been compensation. Whether in the
vicious humour of vicarious superiority,
the caustic humour of interactive
incongruity, or the sick humour of tension
relief, humans have sought solace for their
social inequalities, intolerance, self-doubt,
fear, and pain.

Nevertheless, if our society were to
undergo change so as to remedy these
crises, the impact of such changes, on
humour's trilogy, could be terminal. If
ever a true equalization of power or
democratization of society occurs, vicarious
superiority humour might disappear. Or, if
an expansion of the parameters of social
norms occurs, with a wider acceptance of
behaviours, interactive incongruity
humour might disappear. Or, if an
understanding/empathy for the
pain/suffering/afflictions of our fellow
men/women occurs, tension relief humour
would disappear. From these "if ever"
perspectives, perhaps we would be better off
without humour.

However, until such time as the three
speculations (if evers) above occur, my
recommendation would be that, through
remaining attuned to the forms of humour
which pervade society, we can understand
the horrors, struggles, and social
challenges which men and women are
expected to endure and survive.
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Contribution ... Guilmette, A. M. & McCann, S. E., Department of Recreation and
Leisure Studies, Brock University, St. Catharines, Ontario, L2S 3A1, Canada.

**Playing the Horses: A Fallacy about Gambler's Riskiness.**

Research into risk-taking activities (rock climbing, sky-diving, racetrack and casino gambling, hang gliding) emphasize the high degree of risk (to life, limb, status, or finances) and the absurdity of those daring young men and women who pursue such activities.

Skolnick (1979) likened gambling to other recreational activities, different only in the degree of moral undesirability of the activity. Abt and Smith (1983) suggest that gambling could be considered as an activity analogous to other forms of mainstream role-taking. Further, McGurrin, Abt, and Smith (1984) demonstrate that, for the most part, racetrack gamblers are not pathological deviants. However, according to Geertz (1972) and Sutton-Smith (1984), an ongoing concern with risk-taking activities occurs at a point when the assumable risk transforms into risk which is no longer sensible. With racetrackers such extreme risks (unsensible risks/gambling addictions) become a concern when money (a measure of worth in democratic civilization) becomes less important than the action, play itself (and Smith, 1983). Such behaviour may be fool hardy (at least from an instrumental/functional perspective), but (as speculations later shall address) hardly foolish.

Influenced by earlier studies (Duthie and Salter, 1981; Guilmette and Duthie, 1982; Guilmette and McCann, 1984), the purpose of this research was to: 1) identify three levels of risk-takers; 2) distinguish objective risk-taking from subjective perceptions of risk-taking; and 3) discover when risk-taking becomes playful, such that paradoxically, risk-takers interpret objectively risky situations as minimally risky.

The three levels of risk-takers, previously identified with sky-divers (Duthie and Salter, 1981), are 1) those who have no frame perceptions for the activity (non-sky-divers), 2) those who have limited exposure frame perceptions for the activity (beginning sky-divers), and 3) those who have extensively developed frame perceptions for the activity (experienced sky-divers). What emerged from the sky-diving data (Guilmette and Duthie, 1982) is that the perceptions of the degree of risk in a particular situation can be altered rather drastically by the degree of the participants' involvement/expertise or ratio of competencies to abilities.

In an effort to distinguish objective risk-taking from subjective risk-taking, the frame perceptions of the participants must be acknowledged. Who takes the most risk in sky-diving? From an objective interpretation, the experienced jumper takes the greatest risk (more autonomy -- packing chutes, formation decisions, greater height to depart airplane; and decisions, in free fall to open chute), while the non-jumper (non-participant) takes the least risk. Paradoxically, from a subjective interpretation, the experienced jumper regards the activity as least risky (practiced/rehearsed appropriate and necessary behaviours, knows what they're doing, has the skills/competencies to succeed), while the non-jumper regards the activity as most risky (ludicrous to be involved, scary, foolish).

In the present study, a horse race betting game simulation (Wells, 1978) was utilized. (Guilmette acknowledges and is grateful for the recommendation to modify the gaming context from sky-diving to the horse racing game simulation. Guilmette recognizes and appreciates this insightful and creative adaptation which originated with McCann during a RECL 298hc (Principles of Play and Leisure) seminar, conducted by McCann and W. Ryan.)

**Method**

Subjects were 24 members of a TAASP conference session (Adult Risk-Taking, Washington, D.C., March, 1985). Prior to the start of the game, subjects were asked to
identify their degree of previous involvement in betting the horses. Subjects were not informed of the purpose of the study.

Two players were categorized as experienced horse betters (attended/bet a horse track more than 20 times), 12 players were categorized as limited experience gamblers (have attended/bet at a horse track fewer than 20 times), and 10 players were categorized as non-experienced betters (never attended/bet at a horse track). Each participant was given $5.00 ("play" money) and instructed to wager as much or as little as their discretion would allow. Wagers were made on the 4th race. Following the race, a discussion ensued.

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Wager Pool</th>
<th>Ave. Wager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjects in the EE (extra-experience) group wagered $5.00; while subjects in the LE (limited experience) group wagered, on average, $2.60; while subjects in the NE (no experience) group wagered, on average, $1.60.

Discussion

The degree of risk in betting the horses can objectively be defined by the amount of money wagered. The more money wagered, the greater risk. In this game simulation, a monotonically increasing function occurred. The greatest risk (highest amount wagered) occurred for the EE group, moderate risk for the LE group and minimal/least risk for the NE group. Yet, in the subjective interpretation of risk, a monotonically decreasing function occurs. In discussion, the EE group expressed the least concern about betting (could read the pre-race information, knowledgeable enough to determine the winner) and assumed the least/minimal risk (less sure of "picking the winner"); and the NE group regarded betting as extremely risky (too little information).

The weaknesses in this exploratory study are obvious -- too few subjects, arbitrarily set group parameters, only one race played, "play" money, and game simulation. However, the authors are encouraged from these and other game simulation trials (Guilmette and McCann, 1984) to propose a study that would examine "playing the horses" under more realistic conditions and with better/better control.

Further, we are most interested in determining the relationship between play and the subjective perception of risk. Perhaps, as previously suggested (Guilmette and Duthie, 1982), the development of competencies and abilities free us from the perception of risk and allow humans to discover and explore new realms of play.
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**Book Review** . . . V. Drake

Professor Val Drake, Department of Physical Education, Brock University, St. Catharines, Ontario L2S 3A1 CANADA


One of the tasks confronting editors of a collection of essays is the maintenance of quality from a wide variety of authors. In this collection, edited by Chu, Segrave and Becker, the chapters vary from academic through journalistic to impressionistic.

The common focus of the book is that United States intercollegiate sport is currently experiencing a crisis. The concern of educators about the place of sport in academic institutions has surfaced repeatedly in the last 50 years and still remains. As sport has changed from serving the needs of the students to accommodating the financial and publicity preferences of administrators. The editors address this issue by choosing to air the concerns of educators over the pros and cons of big business sports. The editors organized the book logically into five main areas. The first part gives three historical essays on the development of intercollegiate sport, with Chu's paper offering additional sociological interpretation.

Part II highlights the abuses and concerns that authors identify as infiltrating the intercollegiate sports scene. Boshoff, Beezley and Nyquist discuss such topics as the determination of the degree of cheating that is acceptable as a means of winning, to them an unethetical position. Education, to them, should be of primary importance in an academic setting. As a coach, Lock attempts to justify questionable recruiting procedures from the view of one whose job depends on a winning season. His personal impressions contrast to the solid research of, for example, Beezley. Nyquist's impressive list of morally questionable practices could have been better supported by empirical evidence rather than beliefs such as his suggestion that 54% of Texas A & M football team were black but "bets" only 5-10% of the student body were. Frey's well documented paper discusses the future prospects for intercollegiate sport based on an overview of current problems (e.g. injuries, academic levels, boosterism, insurance costs, and the professional versus the amateur status of the sports). Carpenter focuses on the legalistic aspects of compensation for injured players whereas Rose, in analyzing the views of the establishment, the reformers, radicals and sports scholars, is concerned whether the function of sport is educational or entertainment.

Part III is concerned with the Governance aspect of intercollegiate sports. Stern considers two basic questions: what rules of play should guide competition and who should be eligible to play? He outlines the environmental changes that influence network development but never really answers the questions he poses. Frey (a second essay) identifies one problem as external control of sports and suggests that institutional control may be recaptured if athletics and academics are re-integrated. Athletics should be financed through state funds, schedules and championships should be regionalized, athletics should be dissociated from professional leagues, and standards of admission and retention in academic institutions should be applied equally to all students.

Messengale and Merriman pose the question whether athletics should be
affiliated with an academic department or be totally independent. While outlining respective viewpoints in areas such as administrative responsibility, expendable programs, philosophy and ethics, faculty evaluation and tenure, budget sources, academic majors and degree programs, they avoid drawing any conclusions. Bok's essay takes a firm stance in the belief that control of athletics should be returned to academic leadership and insists that presidents must take on the responsibility to give guidance that will effect changes in questionable practices promoting the use of semiprofessional athletes.

Part IV is subdivided into four areas that provide possible rationalizations for intercollegiate sport. The papers dealing with "personal development" of the individual split between those studying the correlation between academic achievement and sport participation and those concerned with the age old debate over whether activity contributes to character formation or whether a pre-established character chooses to participate more successfully in a competitive environment. Most tend to ignore the fact that although they concede that an educated person should be competent physically as well as mentally this somehow loses its point when the majority of students are not involved in playing but simply observe competitive games. In a small subsection on the "economic benefits" of intercollegiate sports Begly draws interesting conclusions from the statistics he provides on the complex economics of athletics while Sack and Watkins focus on the non-academic contributions athletics makes to the community and especially to the effect on alumni funding. Considering how often the claim is raised that intercollegiate sporting events frequently make substantial financial contributions to educational institutions, it is surprising that only two papers review that aspect. Consideration of the "benefits (of intercollegiate athletics) for women" are reviewed in two papers, both written by Acosta and Carpenter, which assess the historical importance of Title IX, but further analysis of relevant issues would have added more depth.

A two essay subsection on the benefits of sport to racial minorities ("the Racial Question") in sport is hardly adequate. Grundman's essay neatly links the changing image of the intercollegiate sports to the Civil Rights movement, relying heavily on popular magazines as the main resources. Chu and Segrave outline a case for distinct racial differences in selecting playing positions but need to increase their data.

For the last part, V, the theme is Reform. Most essays consider the importance of enforcing ethical standards for entrance requirements and eligibility rules. Most authors strongly support the concept that if sport is to have value to an institution it must be controlled by the President and have faculty input to regain a closer link with the educative process. In defining unethical procedures, such as gambling on games, intimidation of officials, etc., Boyer makes suggestions to counteract these, for example, insisting faculty must get involved to protect academic interests, increasing the severity of penalties for violations, and soliciting support from the Board of Governors. Santomier and Cautilli also summarize methods for controlling deviance. One innovative aspect that they mention is the possibility of using the media to reinforce ethical values.

Each of the book's five parts has an informative introduction. Unfortunately with a work of this length and over 35 contributors, there is inevitably considerable overlap. Deja vu intrudes. Yet this is an important book for raising issues and airing the belief that American sport plays a significant social role in institutions of higher learning. There is no index.
Dear TAASP members:

I have been urged to write to you by June Factor, folklorist and lecturer in English at the Institute of Early Childhood Development in Melbourne.

The Powerhouse Museum re-opens in 1988 and one of the exhibitions examines the material culture of childhood. To complement the material produced by adults for children, there will be a presentation of children's own folklore; the games, chants, insults, riddles, rhymes and jokes that children invent for their own amusement.

We think that the best way to present this traditional physical and verbal play is through an audio-visual. At this stage of exhibition development, I am working my way through written sources. Unlike the States and England, research in Australia dealing with children's folklore is at an embryonic stage, and I am anxious to glean as much information as possible about work presented overseas. In particular, I'd like to view films that have dealt with children's traditional play.

Yours sincerely

Louise Mitchell
Assistant Curator
The Leisure Institute announces the publication of

"What Am I Doing" - THE WAID

An introductory guide designed to help you measure and improve the quality of your life.

by

JOHN NEULINGER

This text is intended for counselors and therapists and those on the road to professional careers. It teaches how to administer the newly revised WAID, a time budget instrument that explores psychological dimensions relevant to the quality of life. The scope of the guide goes beyond the administrative aspects of the task. Concepts and theoretical assumptions essential to the WAID technique are discussed. Topics include such issues as "Measuring versus Knowing," "Measuring Subjective States," "Subtleties of Subjective Dimensions: Sleep, Sex, Making a Decision and Having a Choice," as well as an impressionistic and a statistical approach to the use of the WAID. The WAID LOG is a 4-page form used for reporting daily time budgets.

PRICE SCHEDULE and ORDER FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WAID GUIDE</th>
<th>per copy</th>
<th>quantity</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52 pp, soft cover: one book</td>
<td>$12.50</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>$12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3 books</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 9 books</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WAID LOG</th>
<th>per copy</th>
<th>quantity</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 copies</td>
<td>$2.70</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 copies</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 copies</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 copies</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POSTAGE AND HANDLING:

U.S.A. & Canada: Send full remittance with your order and we pay postage and handling. New York State residents please include sales tax.

Foreign orders: Send full remittance (U.S. currency) with your order and we pay postage (surface mail) and handling. (Does not include airmail charges.)
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NAME: ____________________________________________

ADDRESS: ____________________________________________________________________________

CITY: __________________________ STATE: ____________ ZIP CODE: ____
The purpose of this form is to help you look at yourself and get to know yourself better. It is not likely that you have ever taken account of yourself in this particular way: exploring dimensions that are critically related to the quality of and meaning in your life.

What you are about to do will take time and effort. To be worthwhile, it needs to be done right. The task requires thoughtful consideration and you should not attempt it unless you have at least an hour’s time. Remember that you are doing this for a reason: to help you improve the quality of your life.

This method of looking at yourself is based on certain assumptions about what is important in life. These assumptions are outlined in full elsewhere (Neulinger, 1984). The procedure to follow is given in this form and is elaborated on in the WAID guide (Neulinger, 1986). This guide needs to be read prior to completing this form, unless you are completing the WAID under the supervision of a counselor.

What can you expect from completing these forms? Minimally, some enlightening hours exploring yourself and your particular life style. But it may well be more than that. You may not only attain a new sense of self, but also a direction as to where you want to go and some help in getting you there.

Your pay-off will be in direct relation to the amount of effort you are willing to put into this task and of course, to the degree to which the quality of your life needs improvement.
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