DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 173 CS 506 944

AUTHOR Corder, Lloyd E.; And Others
TITLE Pilot Communication Research Project Utilizing the Human Relations Area Files (HRAF).
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 51p.; Appendices 3, 4, and 9 contain small print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Body Language; Case Studies; Communication Research; Data Collection; Graduate Students; Higher Education; *Humor; Research Projects; Resource Materials
IDENTIFIERS *Human Relations Area Files; Preliterate Societies

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the evolution of a group research project undertaken by six communication graduate students, using the Human Relations Area Files (HRAF), a collection of primary source materials on over 250 predominantly pre-literate cultures representing all major areas of the world. The paper narrates the students' research processes, from topic selection ("humor and gender differences in forming a sense of camaraderie in groups"), to a first attempt at using the files, from a pilot study to a search for methodology, from data collection to findings. The paper's first section is organized around a time line used as a basis for a narration of the group efforts in reviewing research literature, gathering pertinent information in the files, and presenting separate hypotheses in class. The second section discusses the development of a variable coding system, used to code all 60 HRAF probability sample files for both 201 and 522 categories. The third section discusses the results of the research review, methodological modifications, coding difficulties, types of jokes found, and the fact that the findings seemed to be congruent with the superiority theory of humor. The next section presents results of the gestures and signs research. The last section evaluates the HRAF study and offers six recommendation as to how the report could be strengthened. Fifteen references are attached, and 11 appendixes containing data, codes, definitions of terms, attitudes expressed and behavior patterns, lists of tribes, etc. conclude the paper. (SR)

# Pilot Communication Research Project

# Utilizing

# The Human Relations Area Files (HRAF)

**Lloyd E. Corder**
Department of Communication
1117 Cathedral of Learning
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260

**William D. McLean**
Penn State University at Erie

**Asli Gokhan**
**Amy Palma-Walters**
**Sheryl Tremblay**
University of Pittsburgh

## Table of Contents

# I

## Introduction

January 8, 1986, 3:31 p.m., Hillman Library

Rows of locked file cabinets faced us. The Document Librarian busily explained the use of the two source books which would unlock the code (if not the cabinets) and give us access to the data contained in these files. "Look at file OA19 (Ifugao) under 537 (oratory) and also under 195, 201, 516, 521, 544, 646, 666, 695, 789, 793 (preaching for related aspects of public speaking." The six "modern" communication graduate students looked at each other (They recognized the words "public speaking"). This was the HRAF (Human Relations Area Files). According to the librarian, the HRAF files were a collection of primary source materials on over 250 selected predominantly pre-literate cultures representing all major areas of the world. They are organized and coded in 710 numbered subject categories, from 10 (orientation) to 88 (Adolescent, Adulthood and Old Age). Each page of the original resources were coded line by line according to the categories and placed multiple times in each appropriate category. Basically, it is a major data retrieval system, in English, which is available at only 25-30 universities in the country--"A veritable gold mine of information" rearly untapped by the communication field. Our assignment (we were told to accept it) was to mine some of this information and apply it cross-culturally to a problem in the communication field.

What will follow in this paper is the evolution of a group research project undertaken by these graduate students, who were led kicking and screaming to an exploration of the HRAF files.

Uppermost in their minds at the beginning of the project was how these files, consisting of information about mostly primitive societies, could be of any value to their interests in the modern world. This paper will, hopefully, address that issue, but it will also be a saga--a story of challenges and problems: problems encountered and problems solved, problems raised and problems answered, and of problems understood, yet remaining unsolved. We would like to present a well-written, publishable study, yet the value of this project probably lies in the process of exploration, and the process of working through some of these problems. Thus, what we will present is basically a narrative of the evolution of the project: from topic selection, to a first attempt at "HRAF-ing"; from a pilot study, to a search for a methodology; from data collection, to some findings; and finally, it will culminate in a section entitled "What we would do now, if we could begin again." While it is not the ideal product we were striving for, it has great value toward an understanding of the vast amount of information available in the files, how to get at it, and how to relate it to the field of communication.

Before we could choose a topic, it was necessary for us to understand the uses that the HRAF files could serve. It would seem to have great versatility of application. It can be used for a study of a particular culture, to look in depth at a particular topic, or it can be used to dis over or test hypotheses cross-culturally. We were attempting to do one of these two later applications. Also, one is not limited to the concepts already coded; one can also create their own variables through an

extensive searching of the files for concepts and relationships which they wish to formulate their hypothesis. (And believe us, this is not an easy task, for that is what we attempted to do initially). These files seem to be very useful as a discovery technique, but it is also very useful in trying to test tentative hypothesis, to see if there is any supporting data for the idea.

February 19, 1986, 4:00 p.m.

After some deliberation, we decided to explore the use of humor and gender differences in forming a sense of camaraderie in groups. We had noticed that there was a section coded Humor (522) under the heading of Recreation (52) and it was crossed-referenced with several areas: Humor in fine arts (52), Humor in entertainment (54), Patterned expressions of emotion (201), Clowns (536), Joking relationships between kinsmen (602), Ridicule as a means of social control (626), ideas about laughing and smiling (827), and obscenity and pornography (831). It seemed like there should be adequate information on humor (Besides, one member of our group had an interest in the topic, and kept pushing the idea, saying that they had some preliminary information!)

The preliminary information we used to ground our study in on humor and camaraderie in social groups was taken from G. Philipsen, R. Lakoff, Bauman, Tiger, and Hennig & Jardin. It combined information from a wide range of fields--humor, language use, the importance of communal identity, and organizational communication. Thus, it was very difficult for the group to get a handle on it and to focus on the rather broad concepts of humor and camaraderie.

We began with the assumption that Philipsen's call for research, which would "explore the episodic sequence in contemporary society which affirms communal identity. . .and function of camaraderie", was an important area to research. One aspect of camaraderie which a previous study written by one member of the group on "The Discourse of Camaraderie in Football Broadcasts" had uncovered the use of humor by men. Support for this finding of the connection of humor and male-bonding was found in both Lakoff and Bauman. Lakoff stated: "The reason we tell a joke is to become part of a bonding relationship . . . joke-telling brings the teller and hearer together. Joking is particularly relevant to male-bonding activities." (Lakoff, 1975). Lakoff had connected the concept of discourse to camaraderie, saying:

> There are certain discourses which convey a sense of camaraderie, which create different communities whose value allow them the use or nonuse of some forms of discourse--thus creating a sense of commonalty or solidarity in those particular communities--a sense of "we're all in this together, we understand each other. We don't have to stand on ceremony with each other" (Lakoff, 1975).

Bauman also uses the concept of language, joking and bonding of social groups: "One of those forms of language which separate communities is joking or humor. In-group humor based on mutually shared background, knowledge and values, may be used to stress that shared background and shared knowledge." (Bauman, 1978)

What we wanted to do was extract from these ideas and the HRAF files, a concept of the difference in the use of humor and the formation of male-bonding and female-bonding groups. Hoping to connect this to the problem faced in organizations, in the work

place. It had been hypothesized that women don't function as well in groups, that they work more as individuals. Tiger states that, "Traditional male-male bonding which men use to form strong emotional ties with other men, are useful in the work men perform which takes place within the confines of a group." (Tiger, 1969) He had posited a real difference in the historical evolution of men and women and their ability to work in groups. This idea of women in organizations, and the changes which take place was also posited by Hennig and Jardin, although they didn't discuss humor. They said, "Working groups perform for their members as to confirm a sense of shared identity. . .you are a member of that group. A woman joining a male group. . .challenges the status of the group and alters it. . ." (Hennig and Jardin, 1978) By putting together these statements, we felt that we wanted to look at humor as just one aspect of this complicated process of forming social working groups, and the difference which seemed to be believed existed for men and women.

In many of the articles written about humor and gender differences, there seemed to be an underlying belief that "Women don't work well in groups," that "Women can't tell jokes," that women don't have a sense of humor." Even some women who have attended many professional meetings, commented (when they heard about the project), "Oh yes, I've been to many meetings, where the women just seem to lack a sense of humor." Were these actually universal truths?

By chance, we received some support for our inquiry from some popular sources in current newspapers and magazines, and although,

these don't seem to be academically or scientifically conclusive, they provide, again, some insight into the "common sense" understanding of women and humor as opposed to men and humor. A March 11, 1986, USA TODAY article stated:

> Male executives use more humor in the office than female executives. . . A study of 46 top-level federal executives and execs used humor on the job occasionally or often, but only 71% of the women executives. But 96% of the executive secretaries were likely to use humor . . ."

Does this mean that women lose their sense of humor as they become executives? Does it mean, that women only joke with other women (as do the executive secretaries)? Or does it just mean, that people perceive there to be a difference, thus they look for sex differences in their studies? An article in the March Working Women also discussed the importance of humor by executives. So at least we were into a subject which seemed to have some importance to current issues.

So, we had this background information, we felt we had the basis of an important question, but we weren't quite sure how to formulate a hypothesis, or how to define our terms and variables. So in the tradition of all great scholarship, we began a literature search, hoping a review of the literature would provide us with a way into our study. In retrospect, this might have been the wrong approach to take, because it seemed to lead us further and further away from the HRAF files, and what they contained.

We split up the assignments. Some of us looked at current communication research, so we could be sure that what we were studying was a communication topic. Some of us looked through any past HRAF studies from the Behavior Science Notes and Research to

see if any past studies on humor or groups existed which would facilitate our coding. And, we also looked through more HRAF categories and a couple of cultures to see what was available. We also looked through more HRAF categories and a couple of cultures to see what was available, (and the reports kept coming back that there wasn't much there in the Humor section of the files that pertained to our interests).

But we spent two weeks gathering more and more information from anthropology, psychology and communication, and began to see what a large field humor was, and how little effort had been made to connect it to camaraderie. Our research did little to focus our concerns, and kept branching out into many unrelated areas. And, what we did find,, did not assist us much. We found that:

1. There is a distinct difference between formal joking relationships and informal joking relationships--our main interest. The HRAF files concentrated on formal joking relationships (Apte, 1985).

2. There is a difference between jokes which occur with an audience present and those which occur with just members of the group present. (Often in the HRAF reports, you couldn't tell if it was members of the same group or relatives joking together.

3. Women, because of their status in many societies, had less of an opportunity to be in social situations where they might joke to form camaraderie. But, of course, you couldn't just look at humor related categories to discover this. It was a key factor, since if we were trying to detect a difference, we might be misled into believing women didn't joke, when actually, it was only that they didn't have an opportunity to do it socially, where it might be reported (Apte, 1985).

4. Anthropologists claim that there is a distinct difference in the joking relationships of industrial societies and pre-literate societies. Women in appropriate kinship categories in pre-literate societies do not seem to develop joking relationships, but in industrial societies they do form joking relationships on the job. (This

seemed to refute some of the background research we had done, which claimed women still didn't joke in industrial societies)(Apte, 1985).

5. Joking relationships in industrial societies are used for group identity. . . but not significant in pre-literate societies, because in industrial societies you are not with kinship based groups, so need a way of forming camaraderie, whereas in pre-literate societies social relationships are already defined by kin, age, clansmen, etc. Which seems to indicate that the whole idea of our study may not even exist in pre-literate societies (Apte, 1985)!

6. Very little cross-cultural research has been done by anthropologists (or anybody) relating to humor. (And, we were beginning to understand why!)

We seemed to be facing insurmountable problems for our study (at least in the time frame we were working in). Often the actual jokes (which would tell us about the humor) were not present in the files (they often just said, "They laughed.") We often couldn't tell who was present in the group, or in the audience. If we were going to concentrate on humor in groups, we would have to explore other parts of the files extensively, to try to get a comprehensive listing of groups in that society (both men, women, and joint). In the reports of these groups, they often indicated humor, which was not present under the Humor (522) category. We might need to know the status of the women in that society, to see if they had an opportunity for social humor which would be available for reporting. We needed to decide how we were defining humor (mere laughter, joking, gags, smiling--were we going to make a scale indicating degree of humor?), and we needed to define groups, camaraderie, cohesiveness. (And, these were just a few of the things we needed to do!!)

March 9, 1986, 3:15 p.m.

At this meeting, we were each to present a hypothesis, then proceed with our study. We had 15 minutes of the class period to make our presentations, then we were suppose to choose, outside of class. We chose: Is humor present or absent in sex-differentiated groups.?

Off we went to the files, "HRAF-ing." We were all going to do an extensive analysis of two cultures, then come together to finally refine our hypothesis, and give values to our variables. we were looking for groups, humor, cohesiveness, etc. We might be able to refute the idea that women didn't work in groups and use humor. Or we might find support of a cross-cultural nature for this concept. Only time and the HRAF would tell. Our list of categories had expanded (See Appendix I), and the possibility existed that even this list wasn't extensive enough to find all the groups which existed in the culture. It would take 4 or 5 hours and some of us would seem to find nothing, and that which was found was often only partial information for our needs. And, we weren't sure we were covering the culture well enough. Some of the information we found looked like this, in brief:

1. Blackfoot (NF6) -

> In male/male war parties, they would often give a new member a new name (which would be for purposes of ridicule). The young boy would have to tell his new name to the village women when he got back, and be teased and made fun of by both men and women.
>
> During the feast at childbirth, the men would meet the son-in-law and take and joke and tell stories, and pass a pipe. Women seemed to be in the audience.
>
> A man was expected, it was social custom, to tell obscene jokes and jest with his wife's sisters.

During the Dog Dance, a female dance, much laughter and joking took place. The men in the audience urged them on.

It was often seen that visiting bands would be the butt of pranks and mock family rows by the whole village.

2. Iroquis (NM9) -

Women cooperated in mutual aid societies, officially formed groups that were not necessarily kin-ship based. They would laugh and sing and be gay during planting. It often became a frolic when they were gathering berries. Men more often hunted, fished alone. During meal preparation, when the meal was unduly delayed the men would make fun of the women with a joke or witticism. Women laughed.

Unmarried had little contact between opposite sexes. Little conversation even in groups.

One had a joking relationship with one's father's clansmen, male or female.

When a man was sick, people went to visit him and tell him jokes. It was to encourage him to think that the people who visited him were his friends and wished him well.

They often joked (male/male) with outside tribes during the inter-tribal council.

In moieties, there were many stories to amuse and ritual jokes, mostly male/male, but some females joined groups. The victim of the joke varied, could be someone within your own moieties, or could joke about opposite moiety. You needed to form friendships with opposite moieties.

3. Cuna (SB5) -

Men were responsible for farming, fishing and hunting. No humor was mentioned.

Women were responsible for the drudgery. Always cheerful, laughing and happy, as if they did it by choice.

In mixed groups, women often made fun of men and laughed. Were trying to be polite.

Bonding ceremony with official friend. No humor mentioned.

Women held village meeting, headed by a man. No humor mentioned.

Important puberty ceremony only for women. No humor mentioned.

During a storm, when men were fighting the weather, together with a Spanish explorer, a man based his head on the side of the boat. Everyone began to laugh and tell jokes.

The women were very shy, but would try to make friends with the stranger. They would laugh and be in good humor. Very amiable. Would make fun of the explorer. M/F/

4. Ifugao (OA19) -

Men and women would work in the fields together. Many witticisms and humor as episodes passed among them. In the afternoon the groups would split up into the married and unmarrieds and the laughter would continue.

When men were clearing the fields, they would often joke. A young boy who was at his first work group became the butt of jokes, he didn't take it well and got mad.

Men often told obscene jo[illegible] and pranks on each other. The butt of jokes were ofte[illegible]omen.

Girls lived in dorms together. No joking was mentioned, until a story was told about some boys who came to visit, and joking took place.

When a girl was swimming, some boys stole her skirt, and laughed. She was angry.

Of course these are just a few examples, very brief and not all inclusive of the information which was given about the culture. There was much more for each of these societies, and since we wanted to get a good sample, we were planning to use all

60 of the chosen sample of cultures. It would take us why too long at the rate we were going!

We had made a tentative code of available variables, but we still weren't exactly sure what and how we would correlate our data. In looking at the aspect pertaining to groups, we had 5 variables (see Appendix II): sex of group, social setting of group(i.e., work, leisure, etc), situational variation (i.e., private, public, etc.), and sex of audience. In looking at humor, we also used 4 variables: presence or absence (minimum level equals laughing), direction of humor--victim (member of group, outsider, etc), sex of victim, type of humor (patterned, informal, etc). Of course, even with these variables, we hadn't really defined cohesiveness or camaraderie. We might need to look at the value of cooperation in that society, the status of women, the stability of the group. . . . .

It began (or continued) to look like we had more ideas here than we could possibly handle in such a short project. We just hadn't been able to boil it down to a feasible project. Also, we really didn't know an efficient way to abstract the data and code it on data sheets for better usage. The data was there, but we just didn't know how to "mine" it efficiently.

II

## Methodology

### Introduction

As stated above, many difficulties were experienced with the previous methodology. It quickly became apparent that a systematic coding process was needed. After several hours of simply staring at the HRAF files, a small, glimmering light was discovered by one of the quantitative members of the group. It was first decided that a coding sheet would work best and should contain the following items: name of the culture, HRAF code (e.g., 201 or 522), whether the code was in the files, the reporters name, and finally a description of what was in the file. It was hoped that each entry in the HRAF files could be recorded on a separate sheet of paper. The sheets could later be sorted for similarities.

The above process worked only briefly during a pre-test. It quickly became apparent that a number of different variables were coded in each section. Two choices seemed obvious: 1) make up several variables in which to code HRAF data or 2) use the variables coded by the anthropologist when they first entered the data into the HRAF files. The second possibility seemed to be most appealing in view of to the progress made to date.

An additional decision was made in regard to what files should be coded. Several members of the group decided that nonverbal gestures and signs (201) might yield useful "communication" observations. In fact, the 201 category is a related category of Humor (522). Furthermore, it was hoped that these nonverbal gestures and signs could easily be compared

across cultures.

Development of the Variable Coding System

After examining the category descriptions found in the Outline of Cultural Materials (Murdock, et al., 1961), it was theorized that these variables should be listed in the HRAF files. For example, the Humor category (522) contained several sub-categories (i.e., variables). One variable was "types of humor." It was expected that at least some of the entries found in any culture with a 522 category would have descriptions of "types of humor." This, indeed, was the case. A pre-test revealed that several entries in the 522 categories consisted of wit, puns, and/or practical jokes.

The key was found; now we could unlock the old chest. Each description found in the Outline of World Cultures (Murdock, et al., 1961) for the 201 and the 522 simply needed to be assigned a number. The numbers represented the variables that could be expected to be found in the respective categories. This number could then be placed on the coding sheet. Appendix III contains a copy of the descriptions (201 and 522) as they appeared in the Outline of World Cultures (Murdock, et al., 1961).

Serendipitously, one more helpful clue was found. A copy of Worldwide Theory Testing (Naroll, et. al, 1976) was discovered. Two exceptionally valuable pieces of data were extracted. First, the authors suggested several ways to set up variables. It was strongly recommended that information not found on a variable be assigned the number 0. This would help standardize future analyses. Given the above information, it was decided that a 0

should be incorporated on any coding scale that was created. Second, the authors provided (p. 17) an alphabetical list of the sixty HRAF Probability Sample Files. Appendix IV contains a copy of this list. The list was to become extremely useful in organizing the data obtained from the HRAF files.

Finally, it was decided that the variable sex be included on the coding sheet. It was theorized that men and women may communicate the same phenomena differently. It was hoped that by recording the sex of the participant(s), both similarities and differences would emerge. Appendix V and VI contain a copy of the final variables that were coded from the 201 and 522 categories, respectively. Each of these direction sheets were used with a standard coding sheet found in Appendix V.

After three group members pre-tested the method, it was determined that this coding system was an adequate means of recording HRAF data. Several hundred copies of the coding sheet were made and all group member were trained on how to code the data.

All sixty HRAF Probability Sample Files were coded for both 201 and 522 categories. The coding process took approximately two weeks. After all the cultures were coded, the sheets were divided into variable categories. For example, the 201 sheets were separated into six piles while the 522 sheets were separated into 9 piles. The presence or absence of a variable in a culture was recorded on the alphabetical lists provided by Naroll, et al. (1976). Each group member was then instructed to look for "common themes" or "groupings" that could be determined from each of the

variables. The findings are discussed in detail in the following sections.

## Results of the Humor (522) Research

With coordination between group members becoming a greater and greater threat to the successful completion of this project as the deadline loomed ever larger, the methods described in the last paragraph of the Methodology section of this paper were modified. Instead of each group member searching for predominant themes in their assigned subsections, or "variable categories", and then meeting to cross-compare and synthesize these individual findings, tasks were reassigned so as to assure greater conceptual unity and coherence. All coding sheets containing variables culled from the Humor category (522) were inspected and analyzed by one of the group members, with input as to potential commonalities provided by the other group members.

Although speed and thematic integration were important considerations in deciding upon this methodological modification, another factor was equally, if not more, compelling--the conceptually impoverished nature of individual findings. This factor was comprised of two componential elements, the first being a haphazard fractiousness of concepts contained in humor literature across the variable boundaries as we had originally drawn them. For example, comparative analysis of superiority and incongruity theories of humor required data which was not neatly confined to any one of our variable categories. Any meaningful exploration of these concepts cross-culturally required an examination of data culled from each of our previously designated variable categories. The second element which suggested the desirability of changing our coding schema was the inconsistency

with which data was placed within each of the original coding categories. For example, some instances of humor were placed in 522 code #4 (expression of humor--smiling, laughter) if any reference was made to the presence of smiling or laughing, even though, when read in context, that presence was relatively incidental, and the instance would more properly be coded under one of the other variables. There were also inconsistencies arising from differing interpretations of the group members as to what kinds of information should be included. Using 522 code #4 again as an illustrative example, some group members listed frequency of expressions (ie. "humor--six instances"), with no attention to the quality of that expression (ie. "laughed hysterically"), while others noted only the quality but not the frequency. Even the applicability of code #4 to our purposes could be called into question in view of Hobbes' recognition that laughter and humor are not directly equatable: "Hobbes clearly and correctly views laughter as an externally observable behaviour. He does not, in other words, treat laughter as identical (ie. coextensive) with the mental experience of amusement" (La Feve, et al., 1976). (Although Chapman provides a practical justification for salvaging this code when he notes, "Hence humor researchers, particularly psychologists, have tended to focus on the content, structure, and psychological function of humor, and in so doing they have tended to disregard its immediate behavioral consequences. Yet in the layperson's mind humor and laughter are stored together. Indeed, for many people, the quality of a joke, a comic performance, or a humorous anecdote may be remembered by

the amount of laughter personally emitted [Chapman, 1983, p. 137]).

In view of the considerable difficulty encountered in uncovering any theoretically justified and/or supported themes in the coded data sheets as originally divided into the variables outlined in the methodology section of this paper, a decision was made to try to recode the data so as to more fruitfully utilize it in this enterprise. This is not to suggest that the literature on humore research was all-controlling; a definite effort was made to allow the data to suggest results, and not to artificially straitjacket it into existing theoretical molds. Instead, the literature was surveyed for possible guiding principles and constructs, the data was examined with these in mind (but not in control), and emerging commonalities in the data then pointed to a more focused reconsideration of certain hypotheses in the literature, which in turn necessitated a more rigorous reexamination of the data in terms of those hypotheses.

One persistent phenomenon in the data was the use of humor to ridicule members of a society who were in some way perceived as being less fortunate, capable (mentally or physically), or worthy of respect than those societal members which more closely conform to societal norms or which are higher-up the hierarchial social order. Accordingly, coding sheets including instances of this phenomenon were placed together in a pile, yielding 69 such instances across 27 of the cultures sampled. Illustrative examples are provided below (research and reporter data may be

found in the appended Index of Reporter Data and Field Research Dates):

1. King fired a gun loaded only with powder at his officers ("he leveled the gun from his shoulder and fired the gun into the faces of the squatting wakungu, and then laughed at his own trick.") (Ganda, Speke)

2. Young men would lasso and overturn tipis of old women at night (especially elderly single women who lived alone). The woman would be left sitting up among her belongings, frightened and embarrassed by her sudden exposure to the public view. (Ojibwa, McClintock)

3. Natives laughed at the loser in a droll story. (Negroes, Hurault)

4. The crowd sings mocking songs to the defeated opponent in the archery contest. (Khasi, Stegmiller)

5. The Lapps say of an idiot or an elderly person, "He is well acquainted with the late Mr. Stupid." (Lapps, Itkonen)

6. Debtor is made fun of in witty verse. (Toradja, Adriani and Kruyt)

7. The Ifugaos played a joke on an old man causing him to pull out what few hairs he had left in his beard. (Ifugao, Villaverde)

8. The Truks laughed at a "stinking" man because he is not married. (Truk, Kramer)

9. A topic for jest was a fat man who was accused of being pregnant. (Hopi, Titiev)

10. The Baganda look on physical deformity as something amusing. (Ganda, Mair)

11. A man can always have a joke at the expense of the inferior but never the reverse. (Kurd, Masters)

12. For the elders, any young person can be the butt of jokes. (Lapps, Pehrson)

13. The habitual drinker is a figure of fun and is regarded with contempt. (Santal, Culshaw)

14. The Koreans would jest about a 50-year-old man who was cripple and homesick. (Korea, Carles)

15. It is expected that a baby not yet old enough to walk will attempt to suckle every woman who holds him, and his frustration when he finds the breast dry always arouses considerable laughter. (Tiv, Bohannon and Bohannon)

Physical deformity, economic distress, an embarrassing mishap---conditions which seem to signal permanent, or even temporary, loss of social status were found humorous in a large number of the cultures sampled.

These findings appear to be congruent with the superiority theory of humor, as first developed by Hobbes: "Hobbes brought into being what has come to be known as the superiority theory of humor. He proposed that 'those grimaces called laughter' express the passion of glory, which people experience 'by the apprehension of some deformed thing in another, by comparison whereof they suddenly applaud themselves'" (Zillman, 1983, p. 86); "Hazlitt captured the thrust of the argument in his cynical comment, 'We grow tired of every thing but turning others into ridicule, and

congratulating ourselves on their defects'' (Zillman, 1983, p. 87); "The two most common alternative models for humor involve thinking of it as arising out of a sense of superiority...or as reflecting relief in being able to express previously unnacceptable emotions" (Fine, 1983, p. 161).

In each of the examples cited, the object or butt of the joke appears to be of a lower societal or cultural status than those cultural members who either performed the practical joke or who laughed at such a humorous incident or verbal episode. Those who enjoyed such humor could, consequently, perceive themselves, at least temporarily, as superior to those misfortunates at whose expense the humor was obtained.

Upon further examination of the data, a seemingly paradoxical trend appeared to be manifested. In this class of events, the object of the joke was not a percieved inferior, but a societal superior. Into this category were placed 44 instances across 24 cultures:

1. During theatrical performance, the audience always laughs at the priest. (Ifugao, Barton)
2. Children laughed when their father fell in the pool. (Truk, Gladwin & Sarason)
3. Laughter aimed at the chief. (Tikopia, Firth)
4. A clown has license to burlesque serious religious performances. (Hopi, Titiev)
5. A comic strip character portrays a sly and canny Highlander who tricks his landlord. (Highland Scots, Parman)

6. The others laughed when he drew an incident involving a policeman. (Aranda, Chewings)

7. An impromptu song was sung teasing his father for always calling out for ladies. (Hopi, Titiev)

8. There is always a great deal of joking and amusement when the role of the intermediary of disputes is mentioned, as well as when one is present. (Sinhalese, Yalman)

9. Monks are the subject of many obscene jokes. (Central Thai, Attagara)

10. When making fun of former town councilors, they called the councilors "old-old." (Aymara, Carreon)

11. The tenant, while watching the landlord, laughingly repeated over and over for all to hear, "King King." It was obvious the tenant was punning the landlord's name and everyone laughed except the landlord. (Taiwan Hokkien, Gallin)

12. A story about a Muslim clergyman and a woman demonstrated the illiteracy of the clergy. (Kurd, Masters)

Two other sub-categories of instances were placed in this larger category of "laughing at superiors." One involved jokes made at the expense of the researcher himself. An argument could be made that these more properly belonged in the first category ("laughing at inferiors"), but the amount of deference and respect paid to most researchers in other sections of the files seemed to indicate that most natives considered the reporters as somehow special, better:

13. The South Pigeons noticed that I was frequently scratching myself and seized the opportunity for a joke at my expense. (Blackfoot, McClintock)

14. When the pygmy was told that the reporter had fallen, he roared with laughter. (Pygmy, Turnbull)

15. Because of the nature of Tive jokes, we found it difficult, sometimes, to tell when they were pulling our leg. (Tiv, Bohannon and Bohannon)

16. A priest played an obscene joke on the researcher by giving the word nunkabuli the meaning of "the shape of a woman's vulva." The bystanders roared with laughter. (Ifugao, Barton)

17. Once I unwittingly juxtaposed a few English phonemes that had two informants and my assistant literally rolling on the floor with laughter. (Central Thai, Phillips)

Other examples were directed toward white people in general, of whom the reporters were representative:

18. The white man (who is the key figure in the politicat and social structure of the Indian community) is the butt of complaints and grudges, the target of sarcastic jokes. Significantly, he is the "father." (Ojibwa, Barnouw)

19. The people made fun of how white people danced. (Aymara, Forbes)

The second included subcategory dealt with humor which was linked to the supernatural, or the societal members most closely associated with the supternatural:

20. The shaman was possessed by spirits which moved those present to laughter. (Toradja, Adriani)

21. The devil man was a source of mirth (Aranda, Spencer and Gillen)

22. They laughed at strange people possessed by the gods. (Negroes, Hurault)

23. Laughter was caused by discussion of an unexpected scare resulting from a visit from a spirit. (Ona, Gusiude)

24. They laughed at the shaman. (Yakut, Krauss)

The supernatural, being the source of powerful and unexplained forces, and its societal agents (shaman, devil man), could be expected to be afforded special status within a culture, so that joking directed at these agents could be considered as being directed "up" the social ladder, toward a superior.

These findings presented us with the task of reconciling this class of events, or variable category, of joking aimed at superiors, with the initial category (joking aimed at inferiors). Were these radically different processes, or merely different manifestations of a larger principle?

A further examination of the literature seemed to suggest the former alternative. Even prior to this, it could be reasoned that jokes directed socially upward might be considered an attempt to undercut the special status enjoyed by those superiors, thereby enabling the inferior appreciator of this humor to equalize the existent power differential, and thus "superiorize" his own status.

We were first faced with the problem of justifying a

consideration of humor in such sociological terms. If humor were an idiosyncratic phenomena, then perhaps such readings as offered above would be too overreaching. However, the literature strongly supports a sociological analysis of humor:

> "... in all the other non-humorous events that can lead to laughter, the social environment again seems to be more than catalytic ... there are grounds for believing that an appropriate social context is crucial" (Chapman, 1983, p. 152).
>
> "Most humor and laughter imply a social relationship, a connection between self and other" (Fine, 1983, p. 159).
>
> "Humor, like all interpersonal behavior, is socially situated. That is, it is embedded in a particular social environment. For humor to work--that is, to be funny--it must be responsive to the immediate situation and to be appropriate to the normative properties of the more general social circumstance. Participants must define these behaviors of speech events as humorous, and this evaluation is socially constructed (or negotiated) in context" (Fine, 1983, p. 164).
>
> "...humor promotes group cohesion, it provokes intergroup (or intragroup) conflict; and it provides social control" (Fine, 1983, p. 173).
>
> "...without a social referent, humor would make no sense" (Fine, 1983, p. 176).
>
> "Taken as a whole, this research demonstrates in an unambiguous fashion that 'humorous laughter' is an important

social behavior. We may conclude that a thorough examination of humor is not possible unless it incorporates studies on the social dimensions of humor" (Chapman, 1983, p. 182).

Even more precisely, the literature seemed to offer support for our analysis of the data in terms of status differnces, power differentials, and hierarchial reordering of reaffirmance.

"...laughter can reveal group allegiances, communicate attitudes, and help in establishing and reaffirming dominance in a status hierarch" (Chapman, 1983, p. 135).

"Humor is by its nature an indication of some sort of discontinuity in the social system. This discontinuity is what gives humor its power, and, indeed, its humor" (Fine, 1983).

"There is evidence that the wit or joker is typically a high status group member, often dominant and gregarious, and strongly influences the direction of group interaction" (Fine, 1983, p. 163).

"The humorous remark must also be appropriate in light of the friendship and power relations in the group" (Fine, 1983, p. 170).

"A major theme recurring in anthropological theories is that expressions of humor are the result of attempting to resolve ambivalence in social situations, roles, statuses" (Apte, 1983, p. 207).

Thus, when a third major variable category emerged, that of jokes directed at status equals, that category was able to be seen not as disconfirmance of previous findings, but as a complementary

category. That is, joking among equals could be seen as a matter of fine tuning, of keeping in rough equilibrium the existent cultural power structure. This third category included 41 instances across 22 cultures:

1. The camp laughed as two men verbally abused and belittled each other. (Ganda, Speke)

2. There exists a right of allies, in each other's presence, to insult each other without any serious consequences. (Dogon, Paulme)

3. A man and his wife made use of the powers of ridicule to break up some serious disputes. (Pygmy, Turnbull)

4. The pygmies are good natured people with an irrepressible sense of humor--they are always making jokes about one anohter, even about themselves. (Pygmies, Turnbull)

5. Public joking and ribbing between certain persons is expected, almost obligatory. (Tlinglit, Olson)

6. Joking is used to help a relationship develop to a more serious state. (Aymara, Cole)

7. Children of the same clan joke with each other (Tlingit, Olson)

8. A woman crept behind another woman and kicked her in the butt, then ran off laughing. Even the victim enjoyed it so much that the two of them re-enacted it four times that one afternoon. (Pygmy, Turnbull)

9. They make a point of recounting the history of past jokes in each others presence. They were close friends. (Sinhalese, Leach)

10. The men and boys play practical jokes on each other. (Ifugao, Barton)

A fourth major category was more problematic. More than half of the cultures sampled yielded examples of obscene joking, or joking in which the relationship between men and women was addressed. This did not seem to be amenable to a neat fitting into the theoretical propositions as had been developed to this point. Upon further reflection, however, a tenative link was suggested. If either sex was regarded as having an inferior status in a given culture, then joking aimed at members of the inferior sex could be seen as performing the same function as that discussed under category 1. Conversely, joking aimed at the superior sex might function as did joking discussed under category 2. And if the sexes were given equal status, the functions of category three might be entailed. Any further analysis is predicated upon rechecking the respective cultural files from which these variant examples were gleaned for an indication of the relative status afforded each sex within the culture. Such rechecking, and further analysis, seems warranted by the sheer number of such episodes placed in this fourth category: 87 instances across 34 cultures.

These findings seem to support current humor theories which seek to expand upon and supercede the older superiority theories of humor, while retaining many elements of them.

"Necessary ingredients of an adequate theory of humor would seem to involve a (1) sudden (2) happiness increment (such as a feeling of superiority or heightened self-esteem) as a consequence

of a (3) perceived incongruity" (La Fave, 1983, p. 89). This HRAF study seems to validate the continuance of efforts to further refine humor theory along these lines.

## IV

### Results of the Gestures and Signs (201) Research

The sixty HRAF probability Sample Files were first examined for the presence or absence of the 201 (Gestures and Signs) category. Appendix VIII contains a copy of these results. As noted in the results section of the humor research (522), the newly constructed methodology attempt failed to produce any systematically reported variables that could be statistically compared. Although 226 separate entries in the Gestures and Signs category for 42 cultures were found, they could not be grouped based on originally conceived variables.

It was then decided that the data should be recoded based on Krout's (1942, 1971) classification schema. He had found a number of differing nonverbal gestures that were used to express the same phenomena. A copy of his results are found on pages 1 and 2 of Appendix IX. Several of the data from the 201 category supported Krout's findings. In addition, a few new expressions were discovered. Appendix X list the expressions that were found in the HRAF files using Krout's classification system. In addition to these findings, Appendix XI contains more variables that were discovered using the HRAF data.

In conclusion, the data that were found using the HRAF 201 category supported Krout's notion that differing cultures use an array of nonverbal gestures to communicate the same phenomena. Unfortunately, no large amount of information given any one variable was obtained. Had numerous reports on any one variable occurred, statistical analyses of the demographical variable of each culture could have been made. For example, if the expression

of anger was reported for a number of cultures, cross-tabulations could have been run between cultural regions, types of economy, kinship relationships, etc. It is possible that a significant relationship between variables could have been discovered.

## Evaluation of HRAF Study

Certain methodological weaknesses in the study as first conceived have been explored throughout the study to this point. Putting those aside, the HRAF files have proven to be a resource of untapped, not to say unt.appable, potential, especially for communication studies. Some difficulty is using the files for this purpose may be the result of the files not having been designed primarily as a communication research tool. A bias toward anthropological and sociological concepts reflected in the files requires an adaptation of the materials for communication research purposes.

In addition, coding errors made by members of our research team were compounded by what appeared to be coding errors of omissions on the part of the original HRAF coders. Some data used in this report were obtained serendipitously--instances of humor, uncoded as such, were uncovered from materials coded as other than humor. Cross-coding in the files is sporadic and haphazard, leading to a potential loss of valuable data. This could be rectified only through a complete examination of all material included within the probability sample cultures, a formidable task given the sheer bulk of material included therein.

Listed below are recommendations made by ourselves to ourselves pertaining to ways this report could have been strengthened: this might be subtitled, "What we would do it we were starting over":

1. Choose a topic to which each group member could wholeheartedly commit themselves. This might preclude the waning of interest in

the project evidenced by group members at various stages of the endeavor.

2. Heed the advice given by Charles S. Brant in "A Preliminary Study of Cross-sexual Joking Relationships in Primitive Society":

> Every method has its fallacies as well as advantages, making necessary certain cautions; to this rule statistics is no exception...First...carefully define our terms. This is perhaps more difficult in dealing with cultural data than any other kind of material...Secondly, the application of statistics to the data in any problem must be no more than a technique for verification of hypotheses elaborated independently.

3. Place more emphasis on the development of techniques earlier in the project, making sure that each group member fully understands the coding schema.

4. If possible, make better use of pre-coded data presented by Murdoch.

5. Have group members cross-validate placement of items into coding categories to a greater extent.

6. Exercise greater prudence in choosing a topic for research which is commensurate with the given nature of the HRAF files (not all topics can be successfully examined using the files).

In conclusion, the HRAF files do have a potential value for communication researchers, provided the above cautions are heeded. Our experiences this term have hopefully heightened our awareness of the availability of material contained in the files, as well as of the methodological pitfalls to be avoided. Future utilization of the files for the various purposes of the group members is warranted, and hopefully, facilitated.

## CITATIONS


Apte, M., "Humor Research, Methodology, and Theory in Anthropology," eds. McGhee, P., and Goldstein, J., Handbook of Humor Research: Volume I - Basic Issues, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1983.

Apte, M., Humor and Laughter: An Anthropological Approach, Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Bauman, R., "The La Harve Island General Store," Journal of American Folklore, Vol. 85, 1972, pp. 330-343.

Chapman, A., "Social Aspects of Humorous Laughter," eds. Chapman, A., and Foot, H., Humor and Laughter: Theory, Research and Applications, New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1976.

Chapman, A., "Humor and Laughter in Social Interaction and Some Implications for Humor Research," eds. McGhee, P., and Goldstein, J., Handbook of Humor Research: Volume I - Basic Issues, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1983.

Fine, G., "Sociological Approaches to the Study of Humor," eds. McGhee and Goldstein, J., Handbook of Humor Research: Volume I - Basic Issues, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1983.

Krout, M., Introduction to Social Psychology, New York: Harper and Row, 1942.

Krout, M., "Symbolism," in The Rhetoric of Nonverbal Communication, ed. Bosmajian, Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1971, pp. 19-22.

La Favo, L. et al., "A Disposition Theory of Humor and Mirth," eds. Chapman, A., and Foot, H., Humor and Laughter Theory, Research and Applications, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1976.

Lakoff, Robin, Language and Woman's Place, New York: Harper Colophor Books, 1975.

Murdoch, G., Ford, C., Hudson, A., Kennedy, R., Simmons, L., Whiting, J., Outline of Cultural Materials, 4th Revised Edition, Human Relations Area Files, 1961.

Naroll, R., Michik, G. & Naroll, F., Worldwide Theory Testing, Human Relations Area Files, Inc., New Haven, Connecticut, 1976.

Philipsen, Gerry, "The Prospect for Cultural Communication." Unpublished manuscript, December 1980.

Tiger, Lionel. Men in Groups. 1969.

Zillmann, D., "Disparagement Humor," eds. McGhee, P., and Goldstein, J., Handbook of Humor Research: Volume I - Basic Issues, New York: Springer-Vaerlag, 1983.

## APPENDIX I

### HRAF CODES

105 Cultural Summary

Sex Status

462 Division of labor by sex
562 Sex status

Groups

571 Groups and social relations
572 Friendships
573 Cliques
575 Sodalities, Clubs

456 Mutual Benefit Societies
467 Labor organizations
476 Cooperation and Mutual Aid in Work Group
477 Competition
628 Intercommunity relationships
701 Military organizations
794 Congregations
881 Puberty and initiations

We also needed to look at any specific work groups from agriculture, hunting, fishing, etc. which the overview suggests.

Humor

522 Humor
536 Clowns
602 Joking relationships among kinsmen
609 Behavior toward non-relatives
626 Ridicule as social control
827 Ideas about laughing and smiling
831 Pornography and obscenity

## APPENDIX II

### GROUP VARIABLES

1. Sex of group
   - Ø = no information available
   - 1 = m/f
   - 2 = f/f
   - 3 = m/m

2. Social setting of group
   - Ø = no information available
   - 1 = Work group
     - 1Ø = no information available
     - 11 = agriculture
     - 12 = hunting
     - 13 = gathering
     - 14 = fishing
     - 15 = war
     - 16 = construction
     - 17 = domestic
     - 18 = herding
   - 2 = leisure/informal group
   - 3 = governing/political
   - 4 = society/ritual
   - 5 = stranger/trading

3. Situational variation
   - Ø = no information available
   - 1 = public, in presence of audience
   - 2 = private, only group members present

4. Sex of Audience
   - Ø = no information available
   - 1 = m/f
   - 2 = f/f
   - 3 = m/m

### VARIABLES CONCERNING HUMOR

1. Presence or absence (minimum level = laughing)
   - Ø = not mentioned one way or other conclusively
   - 1 = humor present
   - 2 = humor absent

2. Direction of humor = victim
   - Ø = no information available
   - 1 = to member of group
   - 2 = to someone outside of group

3. Sex of victim of joke (see previous coding)

4. Type of humor
   - Ø = no information available
   - 1 = patterned or formal
   - 2 = fleeting, spontaneous, unique to situation
   - 3 = some aspect of both

## APPENDIX III

201 GESTURES AND SIGNS--patterned expressions of emotion (e.g., affection, aggression, derision, fear, disgust); gestures of affirmation and negation; indications of size and shape; directive signs (e.g., beckoning, warning); sign languages and their use (e.g., by the deaf, in intertribal communication); etc. See also:



522 HUMOR--conception of humor; sources of amusement (e.g., mishaps); types of humor (e.g., wit, puns, practical jokes); expressions of amusement (e.g., smiling, laughter); droll stories; coarse humor (e.g., anal, pornographic); humorists (e.g., wits, jesters, comedians); special elaborations of humor (e.g., comic strips); etc. See also:

## APPENDIX IV

| Society | Col No. | Code | Society | Col No. | Code | Society | Col No. | Code |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Amhara | 11 | | High Scot | 31 | | Santal | 51 | . . |
| Andamans | 12 | | Hopi | 32 | | Senussi | 52 | |
| Aranda | 13 | . | Iban | 33 | . . | Serbs | 53 | . . |
| Ashanti | 14 | | Ifugao | 34 | | Siluh | 54 | |
| Aymara | 15 | . | Iroquois | 35 | . | Sinhalese | 55 | . .. |
| Azande | 16 | . | Kanuri | 36 | . . | Somali | 56 | . ... |
| Bahia Br. | 17 | | Kapauku | 37 | . . .. | Taiwan Ho. | 57 | .. . |
| Bemba | 18 | | Khasi | 38 | . . | Tarahumara | 58 | . |
| Blackfoot | 19 | . | Klamath | 39 | . | Thai | 59 | . |
| Bororo | 20 | | Korea | 40 | . .. | Tikopia | 60 | . . |
| Bush Neg. | 21 | | Kurd | 41 | . ... | Tiv | 61 | .. |
| Cagaba | 22 | | Lapps | 42 | . | Tlingit | 62 | ... .. |
| Chukchee | 23 | | Lau | 43 | . . | Toradja | 63 | . .. |
| Copper Esk. | 24 | .. | Lozi | 44 | .. .. | Trobriands | 64 | . ... |
| Cuna | 25 | .. | Masai | 45 | .... | Truk | 65 | ... |
| Dogon | 26 | | Mataco | 46 | | Tucano | 66 | . |
| Ganda | 27 | | Ojibwa | 47 | . .... | Tzeltal | 67 | . |
| Garo | 28 | . . .. | Ona | 48 | . ... .. | Wolof | 68 | . .... |
| Guarani | 29 | | Pawnee | 49 | | Yakut | 69 | . .. |
| Hausa | 30 | ... | Pygmies | 50 | . .. | Yanoama | 70 | . . |

## APPENDIX V

### GESTURES AND SIGNS: 201

CODED AS:

0 NO INFORMATION AVAILABLE

1 PATTERNED EXPRESSION OF EMOTION (affection, aggression, derision, fear, disgust)

2 GESTURES OF AFFIRMATION AND NEGATION

3 INDICATION OF SIZE AND SHAPE

4 DIRECTIVE SIGNS (beckoning, warning)

5 SIGN LANGUAGE AND THEIR USE (by the deaf, in inter-tribal communication)

6 OTHER (write what category you think it might be)

PHENOMENON: (affection, pointing, warning, fear, etc...)

SEX: (person performing the phenomenon)

0 NO INFORMATION AVAILABLE

1 MALE

2 FEMALE

3 MALE/FEMALE

DESCRIPTION: (details of the phenomenon)

## APPENDIX VI

HUMOR: 522

CODED AS:

Ø NO INFORMATION AVAILABLE

1 CONCEPTION OF HUMOR

2 SOURCE OF AMUSEMENT (mishaps)

3 TYPES OF HUMOR (wit, puns, practical jokes)

4 EXPRESSION OF AMUSEMENT (smiling, laughter)

5 DROLL STORIES

6 COURSE HUMOR (anal, pornographic)

7 HUMORIST (wits, jesters, comedians)

8 SPECIAL ELABORATION OF HUMOR (comic strips)

9 OTHER (write what category you think it might be)

PHENOMENON: (mishaps, wit, pun, practical joke, smiling, laughter, etc...)

SEX: (person performing the phenomenon)

Ø NO INFORMATION AVAILABLE

1 MALE

2 FEMALE

3 MALE/FEMALE

DESCRIPTION: (details of the phenomenon)

## APPENDIX VII

PAGE _____ OF _____

PERSONAL INFORMATION:

NAME: _____

DATE: _____

CULTURE INFORMATION:

NAME: _____

HRAF CODE: _____

STATUS: PRESENT ___ ABSENT ___

REPORTER'S NAME: _____

DATA:

CODED AS: _____

PHENOMENON: _____

SEX: _____

DESCRIPTION: _____

## APPENDIX VIII

Sixty HRAF Probability Sample Files
For
Gestures and Signs (201)

### ASIA

Korea
Taiwan
Thai
*Garo
*Khasi
*Santal
*Sinhalese
Andamans

### EUROPE

Serbs
Lapps
*Highland Scots

### AFRICA

*Dogon
Twi
*Tiv
Ganda
Masai
Pygmies
Azande
*Bemba
Lozi

### MIDDLE EAST

Kurd
Somali
Amhara
*Hausa
*Kanuri
Wolof
*Lybyan Bedouin
Shluh

### NORTH AMERICA

Tlingit
Copper Eskimo
Blackfoot
Ojibwa
Iroquois
Pawnee
Klamath
Hopi
Tarahumara
*Tzeltal

### OCEANIA

Ifugao
Iban
Toradja
Aranda
*Kapauku
*Trobriands
Lau
Turk
Tikopia

### RUSSIA

*Yakut
Chukchee

### SOUTH AMERICA

*Cuna
Cagaba
Aymara
Ona
Mataco
*Guarani
Bahia Brazilians
Bororo
Yanoama
Tucano
Bush Negroes

* Indicates cultures that contained no 201 category

# APPENDIX IX

| *Attitude Expressed* | *Behavior Pattern* | *Culture Group* |
|---|---|---|
| **Affection** | Embracing and kissing on mouth or cheek | Eur-Americans |
| | Smelling heads | Mongols |
| | Rubbing noses | Eskimos and others |
| | Pressing mouths and noses upon cheek and inhaling breath strongly | Burmese |
| | Juxtaposing noses and smelling heartily | Samoans |
| **Approval** | Smacking lips | Indians (N.A.) |
| | Back slapping | Eur-Americans |
| **Assent** | Elevating head and chin | New Zealanders |
| | Nodding | Eur-Americans |
| **Derision** | Closing fist with thumb protruding between index and middle fingers | European Jews |
| | Moving one index finger horizontally across the other | Russians, Germans |
| **Humility** | Throwing oneself on the back, rolling from side to side, slapping outside of thighs (meaning: you need not subdue me: I'm subdued already) | Batokas |
| | Bowing, extending right arm, moving arm down in horizontal position, raising it to the level of one's head, and lowering it again (meaning, I lift the earth off the ground, and place it on my head as a sign of submission to you) | Turks and Persians |
| | Walking about with hands bound and rope around one's neck | Ancient Peruvians |
| | Joining hands over head and bowing (ancient sign of obedience signifying, I submit with tied hands) | Chinese |
| | Dropping arms, sighing | Europeans |
| | Stretching hands toward person and striking them together with mutually synchronized movements | Congo natives |
| | Extension of arms, genuflection, prostration | Preliterates, European peasants |
| | Crouching | New Caledonians, Fijiians, Tahitians |
| | Crawling and shuffling forward, walking on all fours | Dahomeans |
| | Bending body downward | Samoans |
| | Permitting one to place his foot on the head | Fundah and Tonga Tabu peoples |
| | Prostration, face down | Polynesians |
| | Putting palms together for the other person to clasp gently | Unyanyembans |
| | Bowing while putting jointed hands between those of other person and lifting them to one's forehead | Sumatrans |
| **Negation (refusal)** | Moving arms sideways across the body; shaking head | Eur-Americans |
| | Throwing head back and making clucking noise with tongue | Turks |
| | Making smart, quick stroke of the nose with an extended finger on the right hand (if the negation is doubtful, they let the finger linger on the way, but finally rub it across the nose) | Inhabitants of Admiralty Islands |

## APPENDIX IX (CONT.)

| Attitude Expressed | Behavior Pattern | Culture Group |
|---|---|---|
| **Propitiation** (of rulers at graves at altars) | Extension of arms in making presents | Various peoples |
| | Kissing feet, hands, garments, uncovering and bowing head | Eur-Americans and others |
| | Jumping, clapping hands, and even drumming ribs with elbows | Various people |
| **Salutation** | Clapping hands (highest form of respectful greeting) | People of Loango |
| | Clapping hands and drumming ribs with elbows | People of Balonda |
| | Yielding up one's clothes (as a sign of surrender in salutation) | Assyrians |
| | Unclothing to the girdle | Abyssinians |
| | Doffing hat or merely touching it, handshake | Eur-Americans |
| | Grasping hands and pressing thumbs together | Wanyiika people |
| | Grasping hands and separating them with a pull so that a snapping noise is made by thumb and fingers | Nigerians |
| | Engaging in a sort of scuffle in which each tries to raise to his lips the hands of the other, kissing beards | Arabs |
| | Drawing hands from the shoulder and down the arms to the fingertips of the person greeted, or rubbing hands together | Ainus of Japan |
| | Blowing into each other's hands or ears | Some preliterates |
| | Stroking own face with other person's hands | Polynesians |
| | Smelling each other's cheeks and joining and rubbing each other's noses | Mongols, Malays, Burmese Lapps |
| | Snapping fingers | Dahomeans and others |
| | Silence for a time, then ceremonials varying in complexity | Australian preliterates |
| **Satisfaction** | Massaging stomach | Indians (N.A.) |
| | Striking hands together | Certain peoples Eur-American children |
| | Smacking lips, washing hands movement | East-European Jews |
| **Surprise** | Gaping mouth, raised eyebrows | Eur-Americans |
| | Slapping hips | Eskimos Tlingits Brazilians |
| | Lightly tapping nose or mouth | Ainus of Japan |
| | Pinching cheek | Tibetans |
| | Moving hand before mouth | Negro Bantus |
| | Protruding lips as if to whistle | Australian and West African preliterates |
| **Welcome** | Spreading arms | Europeans |
| | No sign of outer expression (when meeting after long separation) | Ainus of Japan, Australian Blackfellows |
| | Hand clapping | Certain Africans |
| | Jumping up and down | Natives of Tierra del Fuego |
| | Weeping | Australian tribes |

SOURCE Maurice H Krout, "Symbolism," in Haig A Bosmajian (ed ), *The Rhetoric of Nonverbal Communication* (Glenview Ill Scott, Foresman, 1971), pp 19–22, and Maurice H Krout, *Introduction to Social Psychology* (New York Harper & Row, 1942) Slight modification made by permission

## APPENDIX X

| Attitude Expressed | Behavioral Pattern | Culture Group |
|---|---|---|
| **Affection** | Wearing flowers over the ears | Truk |
| **Derision** | Shrug shoulders | Lau |
| | Pointing at the eyes of others | Toradja |
| | Clapping with half the palms | Masia |
| **Propitiation** | Kiss the gift before putting it away | Aymara |
| | Dancing around charred remains | Aranda |
| | Throwing a stick at the anthropologist feet | Ona |
| | Bowing | Tingit |
| **Salutation** | Raise both arms upward and forward | Aymara |
| | Kissing | Amhara |
| | Hand placed in others hand without clasping | Somali |
| **Welcome** | Set grass on fire | Pawnee |
| | Clapping | Lozi |

## APPENDIX XI

| Attitude Expressed | Behavior Pattern | Culture Group |
|---|---|---|
| **Affirmation** | Brief tossing back of the head | Masai |
| | Sitting on the ground | Lozi |
| | Nodding | Tarahumara |
| | Applause | Tikopia |
| | Single, brief nod | Ona |
| **Pointing** | Using the lips | Masai, Iroquois, Klamath |
| | Using the chin | Cagaba, Lau, Aymara |
| | Open hand | Tarahumara |
| **Beckoning** | Knocking on banana leaves | Ganda |
| | Palm down and fingers | Thai |
| | Downward sweep of the hand | Lau |
| | Extending the arm from above to below | Cagaba |
| | Beat their mouths with hollow of hands and yell | Tarahamara |
| **Silence** | Grasping upper lips with tips of fingers | Bahia |
| | Put finger on lips | Aymara |
| **Respect** | Clapping hands | Lau |
| | Placing palms together with hands pointed upwards | Thai |
| **Pleasure** | Shrills | Pawnee |
| | Smiling and laughing | Aranda |
| | Jumping and yelling | Hopi |
| **Appreciation** | Lift palm and bring it down slowly | Pawnee |
| | Paralanguage | Aranda |
| **Affection** | Hugging or patting | Ganda |
| | Pats head and stomach | Tiv |
| | Pressing bodies together | Aranda |
| | Caress nose and nibble lips | Tikopia |
| **Anger** | Wide open eyes | Amhara |
| | Stretching arms over head | Cagaba |
| | Spitting and stomping feet | Aymara |