

## **Improv and the Trial Warrior**

**By Carl Bettinger TLC '02 and Cheryl Carpenter TLC '00.2**

Tell someone you are taking an improv class and this question is inevitably asked, "Are you going to do stand-up comedy?" Many people believe, wrongly, that the purpose of improv is to be funny. We believe this because we associate improv with comedy. But the purpose of improv is to be genuine, to be in the moment and to react to that moment. What is not so expected is the benefit that improv has for the trial warrior. Taking an improvisational comedy class is a wonderful way to put what you have learned at the Trial Lawyers College into practice without having to go to trial. You can work on being in the moment, on tapping into the emotions of another person and on communicating effectively.

Wikipedia defines improvisation as "the practice of acting and reacting, of making and creating, in the moment and in response to the stimulus of one's immediate environment."<sup>1</sup> In improv, you must be mindful of what your scene partner is saying and react spontaneously. There are no scripts in improv, just as there are none in trials. In both worlds, you need to feel what the other person is doing and respond in kind. This fusion of awareness and understanding allows you to react with a range of options that best fit the situation even when we have never personally experienced the situation. Does this not sound like what we learn at The Trial Lawyers College? We must listen to the jurors and respond with empathy and understanding for their feelings. We must examine our witnesses with an understanding of their motive for testifying. We must tap into the emotion at the time a statement is spoken. We can only do this if we are in the moment. Improv helps hone this important ability in the trial warrior. We would like to share our improv stories with you and show you how we have incorporated the principles of improv into our trials.

### **Carl's story**

In 2006, I showed up for the 5 pm orientation at the Improv Summer Intensive with Keith Johnstone at BATS in San Francisco. I had enrolled after hearing that improv might be of help to a trial lawyer, particularly a TLC trial lawyer, and after witnessing the wonderful improv work by Andy Robertson (King) and Meg Pageler Mourning at the Ranch, both in the Class of 2004.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Improvisation>

BATS is one of the premier improv groups in the country and Keith Johnstone is to Improv what Gerry Spence is to trial work. So in I walked to the BATS theater, not having appeared on any stage or theater since my third grade Thanksgiving debut (it ended badly), expecting a brief meet and greet and to be on my way. Instead I heard, “Hey, Carl, come on up on the stage and let’s begin.” Two hours later I knew all 30 of the other students, each of whom had real theater or improv experience, and all of whom seemed not the least put out by the fact that I couldn’t act, didn’t know any of the improv “rules” and had no answer to the question, “How do you use improv in your life?” The next day, after successfully hiding behind a pillar for most of the morning, thereby avoiding any stage performance, I glanced around the pillar for a moment, just to get my bearings, and Keith Johnstone pointed to me and ordered me up on the stage to join one of the experienced types already standing there. Here’s what happened:

Keith to my scene partner: “You – invite him (Carl) over to your house for a Saturday afternoon.”

Keith to me: “You – go with him.”

Keith to both of us: “Begin.”

Well, of course, the predictable happened. Unbeknownst to me, a well known talent scout was sitting in the theater, saw what I could do, and immediately offered to represent me. No, seriously, what happened was that my scene partner made repeated improv offers to me, tried to engage me in any activity under the sun that would unlock my frozen arms and legs and dissolve my thousand yard stare, and finally, after I had negated (if I responded at all) to every suggestion or offer made:

Keith Johnstone to me (in his clear British accent): “You – sit down. That was absolutely horrid!”

So, in the words of the sage, Carl Spackler<sup>2</sup>, “I had that going for me. Which is nice.”

As the workshop continued, however, I took baby steps out from the safe shadows of my pillar, played the improv games offered, ventured back on to stage, and began to have fun. When the last afternoon arrived, and Johnstone, with a devious glint in his eye pointed to me and a beautiful Japanese woman sitting next to me and said, “You two, come on up here. It’s time for a

---

<sup>2</sup> Bill Murray, *Caddyshack*

love scene.” I not only went up, not only spoke and moved, but had a great time<sup>3</sup>, and Johnstone let us stay up there for three to four minutes, which is an eternity in an improv scene.

Since then, I’ve returned to BATS and also taken what limited improv classes I can find in Albuquerque. It is a world that can help us all at TLC and one I encourage you to explore.

### **Cheryl’s Story**

I grew up watching Saturday Night Live every weekend with my parents. I loved how the actors interacted with each other and found it entertaining when one would laugh, in the moment and off script, to the lines of the other actor.

In 2007, I went to Graduate Seminar II. Here I met Carl and learned about improv for the trial warrior. Carl started each morning with a fun improv game. At first, I thought this was just a way to wake up the class. Then I realized that the games were actually teaching me things about interacting with my fellow classmates. I had to watch their movements and listen to their voices in order to play the games. The games failed if we as a group did not focus on each other and respond in the moment. This was a perfect example of how I should interact with my jurors and witnesses. I was excited about trying an improv class when I got back to Detroit.

Fearing the same rejection Carl describes during his first improv experience, I thought there would be strength in getting a number of novices to take the class with me. I somehow managed to persuade (or beg) my parents and Marjorie Russell, TLC '94, to sign up for the Detroit Second City improv class.

As I feared, a number of the students were actors and comedians. Professionals who would surely get the laugh and make me look "horrid." These professionals wanted to use the improv class to break into comedy and acting. I found comfort in an engineer from Ford Motor Company who said he took the class so he could use the other side of his brain.

To my amazement, the class was not about competition. It was about cooperation. Our teacher, Jamie Moyer, a member of the famed Second City troupe, encouraged every single one of us to fully participate and take risks. Jamie constantly told us there was no apologizing during improv. If we bombed, do not say sorry. It happens to everyone and it just means we are putting ourselves out there. She told us that the group would save us if we were having trouble. It reminded me of the TLC teaching principle that a jury will save me as long as I was real and

---

<sup>3</sup> A *love* scene, not a *sex* scene.

honest. I have always feared that during voir dire I will ask a question that is met with silence. Likewise, I worried in improv that I would participate in a scene that would be met with silence. But neither of these things has happened because of the common theme of TLC and improv - if one reacts in the moment with genuine feelings, the group will save the person.

During the Second City improv class, I played the improv games Carl introduced to TLC such as Zip, Zap, Zop with the addition of Elvis and his fans in the game. I have yelled and cheered as the class attempted to break a "tapeball" record of 23 hits in the air. I have tapped Marj on the shoulder as she sang "Me and Bobby McGee" so I could sing "My Sharona." I have yelled, "Freeze!" so I could jump into a scene and take it in another direction which was inspired by the body movement of my frozen classmate. I have watched my mother giggle like a schoolgirl and saw my father cry tears from laughing so hard.

What all the improv exercises have taught me is that I must really listen and watch my classmates. I have to be completely in the moment or the exercise will fail. I must work off what they give me and not reject their ideas. I will never fail because I do something silly or stupid. I will only fail if I do not play along with my classmates. I have learned to react to the moment spontaneously. I have learned that I love improve and hope that many of you will try it too.

### **Improv games**

Designed by greats such as Viola Spolin, Keith Johnstone, BATS, Second City and a host of other talents, these games are designed to be fun, while at the same time furthering the skill sets required to do passable improv. Some of you TLC'ers have now played one of the basic games, "Zip, zap, zop", as a warm-up for TLC exercises. The group stands in a circle, and starts by one person pointing and looking at another and saying "zip." The person receiving the offer of "zip" points to another and says "zap", the third points to another and says "zop" and the pattern repeats, becoming faster and faster until it breaks down. Then you start again. It is play. It gets you out of your head. It forces you to breathe, to move. It forces you to attend to all of the others in your group, because you never know when one of them may be handing off to you (it is incredible how many of us cannot even do this simple task of attending to our fellow group members), and it forces you to make an offer to another, getting her attention by voice, torso and

pointing.<sup>4</sup> There are lots of other games<sup>5</sup>, and reading about them will do nothing for you – you have to *play* them. Some of Moreno's early work involved children's games in Augarten, a park in Vienna, which involved invented tales, names and families.<sup>6</sup> Play is a spontaneous state, which is what we need for life. And it works pretty well for trial work too.

Cheryl was introduced to many improv exercises at Second City but there are two that stand out. The first one is called Hitchhiker. Three chairs are lined up in a row. Two people are sitting in the car with one driving and the other in the middle seat. They pick up a hitchhiker who sits in the third chair. As soon as the hitchhiker gets into the car, she plays a character which the other two occupants of the car are unaware. When I was the hitchhiker, I got into the car and screamed in the best teenage girly voice I could muster, "I can't wait until we get to the Hannah Montana concert!!! I sooooo love her. She's got the best voice ever! I would just die for her hair!" Then I let out a piercing scream. Marj sat next to me and played right along without missing a beat. Marj screamed back, "I love her new song!!! She's the best!" Marj and I then threw up our hands and pounded our feet in excitement. The engineer from Ford was driving the car and in the moment yelled, "I hope we didn't forget our juice boxes at home!"

This very fun exercise taught me how important it is to feel what another person is feeling no matter how foreign the feeling may be to me. Hitchhiker puts the occupants of the car on the spot and they have to be just like the person coming into the car. One time I had to pretend to be a marathon runner who was hitching a ride in a car to cheat in the race and another time as a Star Trek geek going to a convention. I knew how to act because of the person who got into the car. I reacted in a similar manner. I got to feel what that person was feeling and picked up on the unique energy even if I have never experienced it in real life. This is what we have to do when we examine witnesses. We have to feel the witnesses' feelings even if we never were the victim of a gunshot wound or severely hurt from a fall from a third story window.

The other improv exercise that I found very applicable to trial practice is one where you must tell a story at the same exact time as your partner. I was partnered with a college student.

---

<sup>4</sup> Rafe Foreman is the best I've ever seen at this and most improv games which require attention to a group. I suspect this has become second nature to him through his experience as an auctioneer. Which begs the question of course: What is it about his nature that allows him to be so attentive?

<sup>5</sup> <http://fuzzyco.com/improv/games.html>

<sup>6</sup> Marineau, R (1989), *Jacob Levy Moreno, 1889-1974*.

We had to stand face to face to one another. Our teacher told us both to speak at the same time with the same words. Neither one of us should lead or follow. We looked at each other blankly. Then we tried it. We each uttered a single syllable, not knowing where it was going. We tried to get our language in tune and in sync. We had to work as one person speaking a single word. This was the slowest I have ever spoken in my life. I said, "Ahhh," and at the same time he said, "Ahhh." This eventually turned into the word about. Do not ask me how we managed to say the word about at the same time but we did. We spoke for five minutes and said approximately ten words. I had a headache after it was over. I realized how much concentration it takes to really listen to what another person is saying. How much energy it takes to listen and cooperate as a team. I know it would be silly if I tried to say the same words as a witness during an examination. The jury would think I was mocking the witness. But if I use this exercise as a reminder to be tune with the witness and not rush the story, I will be a much more effective storyteller.

Keith Johnstone created many of the improv games. Johnstone, as one of the parents of improv, has a great deal to offer. Here are some of his offerings:

Instead of always hearing someone say, 'Wouldn't it be funny if...?', it would be so refreshing to hear someone say, 'Wouldn't it be *true* if...'

Pay attention: watch and listen.

We often do hazardous things: drive too fast, drink alcohol, jump out of airplane, sleep with wrong person. So why can't we do that in this work? So often what we do is like jumping off a four foot wall with a parachute. Stop doing that. Make it dangerous for fun.

Your mind is the thing that takes credit for what something else does.

Average actors [read lawyers] look obedient, or they are in the future instead of here and now.

We are trying to show you that the best things happen when you stop planning.

We're trying to get you out of the way so that something else can function.

Accidents (i.e. the unexpected) are to be used. Often they give you things to inspire.

Mistakes are interesting, perfection is boring.

Be an expert on pleasing the other. But this is not just gratuitous flattery. It comes from giving the other what he needs.

Oscar Wilde found the least interesting person at the party and made him interesting to everyone else.

### **Stage fright**

We are afraid when we stand up to talk in front of others, including jurors. In a typical improv evening class, you will be asked to stand up and do a quick scene several times each night. Each scene only lasts a few minutes. Often you bomb. Sometimes there are brief moments when it works. Seldom does it work for the entire scene. And each time you do it, it gets easier and less frightening. Sure, sometimes I (Carl) still stand there with my finger in my nose, waiting for Keith Johnstone's spirit to tell me I am "horrid", but it is no longer so scary. Mostly it's kind of funny, in a goofy and self-deprecating way. Josh Karton tells us to "fail big, fail gloriously," and this is a fun way to do so. Improv has given us the courage to take risks in front of the jury. And with the training in improv and reacting in the moment in a genuine manner, these risks do not often fail.

### **Voir dire and the concept of "yes, and"**

Juror: There are too many lawsuits and too many greedy lawyers.

Traditional responses:

Well, that's not true for all cases and lawyers, is it?

Yes, *but* don't you think some lawsuits are justified and some lawyers are ok?

Yes, *but* let's talk about this lawsuit.

Yes, *but* let me show you how I'm different.

Improv responses:

Yes, *and* I'm so glad you spoke up and said what so many of us are thinking.

Yes, *and* what effect does that have?

Yes, *and* I'll bet there are others here who feel exactly that way. Are there?

Yes, *and* what should be done about that?

Yes, *and* what has been your experience with all of that?

A basic improv rule is that of “*yes, and...*”, which means that you accept the offer made, *and* you add something to it. In the above examples from a traditional voir dire, the lawyer has just taken what some might see as both barrels point blank to the chest, the traditional response to which is to pay lip service, then start to argue and cross examine - the “*but*”, in the examples. Such responses negate a relationship. A lawyer who has swam a few laps in the improv pool, however, will know to follow the “*yes, and*” precept: accepting, genuinely, the offer made by her scene partner, then offering something in return, something that builds the relationship based on what the other offered.

Think about it for a moment. Have you ever had a discussion with another where every time you make a suggestion (an offer), you get shot down? Ever said to the other, “It seems like you won’t listen no matter what I say?” Does that kind of negativism, or “blocking” to use the improv term, foster a relationship?

Suitor to his beloved: Will you marry me?

Beloved: Yes, but only on the following conditions...

Suitor to beloved, take two: Will you marry me?

Beloved after improv class: Yes, and let’s tell everyone right away!

Which couple would you rather be a member of?

Katlin Larimer speaks to the therapist’s goal of creating a “holding environment” where the patient is safe to be who they really are. Isn’t that what we are striving for during voir dire? Which fosters such a goal – *yes but*, or *yes and*? *And* once you offer something back to your voir dire scene partners, a rhythm begins to take shape, they in turn will offer something back to you. Gerry Spence and Don Clarkson remind us that jurors will not go where they sense *you* are unwilling to go. If you are not willing to accept them and make them an offer (*yes and*, instead of *yes but*) they in turn will stop making offers (useful information) to you.

Sound complicated? It’s not – it’s simple, but not easy. Josh Karton, whose vast theater experience includes improv, showed us at the Lake Arrowhead Regional in 2007 what a powerful exercise this can be. He set up a small voir dire group, had the lawyer start with any subject, and no matter what the juror says, the first words out of the lawyer’s mouth in response

had to be “yes, *and*.” People struggled, and stammered, and finally got into it and worked it – marvelous.

### **Openings and Closings**

TLC teaches us to set scenes. After a few scene setting exercises, I thought I had gotten pretty good at it. In fact, I thought I had become such a master that Steven Spielberg would be calling any moment for advice on his next film. Until, that is, that one of my improv coaches (well, to be honest, *all* of my coaches) pointed out that I just ignored every object in the scene: “Carl, why did you walk through that wall?”, “Carl, you just trampled the baby.” “Carl, where did the alligator go?” (You get the idea).

Since an improv stage does not have any props, or very few, object work, that is, respecting the objects in your scene, is a basic part of improv, since you have to improvise the objects out of thin air. Once improvised, however, they have to stay real. So, in my nursing home opening last year, I created Mrs. Barber’s death scene, with her in her bed, in a particular place in the courtroom. From that point forward for the next three weeks, whenever I or my co-counsel would approach that part of the courtroom, we would veer off and walk around the bed. Defense counsel, predictably, trampled the bed and Mrs. Barber’s body, which brought visible expressions of shock to the faces of some jurors.

In addition to scene setting, the concept of “yes and” is a wonderful improv technique for opening and closing statements. Think about a time a prosecutor has argued in opening statement that the criminal case is like a jigsaw puzzle. The prosecutor tells the jury that he will put all the pieces together by the close of evidence to prove that the defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

How does the defense attorney respond? Maybe she ignores the prosecutor's remarks and does not even touch upon the jigsaw puzzle analogy. She just sticks to her pre-planned opening statement without reacting in the moment.

Another option for the defense attorney is to acknowledge the jigsaw puzzle reference in opening statement. She tells the jury, “No, this case is not a jigsaw puzzle. This case is not a game that can be nicely wrapped up at the end. The prosecutor will not be able to put all the pieces together and you will have to find my client not guilty.”

Do either of these two options move you? We bet not. Ignoring a prosecutor's argument or a piece of evidence never works. The jury does not forget evidence just because we do not

say anything about it. We cannot hide bad facts or good arguments by the prosecutor from the jury. The defense attorney was on the right track when she acknowledged the jigsaw puzzle analogy. However, her response was not particularly persuasive because she blocked the prosecutor's argument with a "no." Eventually, all the blocking arguments will remind the jury of two toddlers fighting in the playground:

Johnny: "This is my swing."

Billy: "No, it is not your swing. It is my swing,"

Johnny: "No, it is not."

Billy: "Yes, it is."

We all know how the toddler argument ends. Neither toddler persuades the other with words so they eventually wrestle to gain control of the swing. Unfortunately, we cannot wrestle with opposing counsel to determine who wins. What we can do is to persuade the jury with the concept of "yes, and" to win our case.

Let's see how "yes, and" could work for the jigsaw puzzle analogy. Instead of saying "no" in opening statement, the defense attorney says "yes and." She reacts in the moment with the concept of "yes, and" to smash the prosecutor's jigsaw puzzle analogy and further her client's story.

Defense counsel: "Yes, this case is like a jigsaw puzzle. The prosecutor is giving you a hundred different pieces to jam together to make one complete picture. When I do puzzles with my son, we always end up with missing pieces. We have a half completed jigsaw on the living room rug. Pieces are hiding under the couch, thrown out in the trash or placed in the wrong box. My son tries to make the puzzle work. He tries to jam a piece from the Winnie the Pooh puzzle to complete the Dora the Explorer puzzle. We laugh but it just does not work. Just like in this case. The prosecutor is trying to jam all his pieces together and to give you a complete picture. But he cannot do it. It does not work. The picture is not complete because he is missing puzzle pieces and trying to use the wrong ones. Let me show you the complete picture of this case . . ."

The most persuasive way to handle opposing counsel's arguments is with "yes, and." Sometimes this cannot be done because of the story of the particular case or opposing counsel does not give us this opportunity as a gift. But when the time is right and the opportunity is

present, the trial warrior can further her client's story by reacting to opposing counsel's argument with an affirmative addition to the argument instead of ignoring the argument or reacting with a negative. The improv concept of "yes and" can be a very effective tool for opening statements and closing arguments.

### **Examining witnesses through improv**

The concepts of improv can also be used when the trial warrior is examining witnesses. Think back to the improv exercise of Hitchhiker. The actor has to take on the demeanor and character of the person getting into the car. In a recent aggravated assault case, I (Cheryl) used this exercise to get into the hide of the witness she was cross-examining. I also used the concept of "yes, and" to further my client's story.

The defendant, Paul, was accused of violently assaulting both a father and son at a trailer park. The 75- year-old father suffered a broken hip and the son suffered a head injury and deep laceration to his thumb. Both father and son said Paul caused the injuries. Paul admitted to the police he kicked the son to protect the father but that the son was the one who broke the father's hip. At every pre-trial hearing, the father came to court and demanded that Paul be held responsible for his actions, thrown into jail and pay the hospital bill totaling almost \$20,000.00. The father was extremely hostile and cranky. He was hell bent on getting a conviction.

At trial, I was expecting the same hostile and cranky father. But I could tell the father was different as he approached the witnesses stand. The father slowly hobbled to the stand with the assistance of a walker. I have seen my fair share of complainants who exaggerate their injuries for the benefit of the jury. This was different. I watched the father and felt his pain. The father was very quiet and meek during direct examination. He was a different man than the one I met at the pre-trial conferences. I had to get back into the car and pick up the father anew as a hitchhiker. I needed to take a moment to listen and feel. I then threw away my initial impression of him as an angry old man. He was now a sad old man. By feeling his emotions, I changed my approach with him during cross-examination. I was much more gentle and understanding than I would have been if I had ignored the change in this man's personality. I disliked the father immensely during my interaction with him prior to trial. I put this dislike aside, and viewed his as a broken, old man who was tired of protecting his alcoholic son.

During the cross-examination of the father, I knew I still had to get my client's story out. I had to show the jury that it was the son who assaulted the father. This father was acting as many would in his situation - do anything to protect a son. Plus, he was living on a fixed income in a trailer park. He had an enormous debt to the hospital that he could not pay. He wanted Paul to pay it. I had to develop the love this man had for his son and the duty he felt to protect his son.

Attorney: You love your son, don't you?

Father: Yes.

Attorney: He means a lot to you?

Father: Yes.

Attorney: As a father, you want to protect your son?

Father: Of course. Do you have children? Do you understand?

I could approach this in two different ways. The first way is to tell the father, "It's none of your business if I have children. Answer my question." This would be termed blocking in improv. I would be telling my scene partner that what he said was stupid and I knew a better direction to go. In improv, this is the kiss of death. The same is true for trial. The scene abruptly ends and the scene partner shuts down. If I had said this to the father, I would have stopped the scene. I would not have been able to further my client's story. So instead of blocking, I used the concept of "yes, and."

Attorney: Yes, I have two children. Bradley and Dylan. I love them very much.

Father: (Softens even more, gets even sadder) Yes, this son holds a special place in my heart, more than my other children.

A little later in cross-examination, I asked the father about a statement he made to a treating doctor. The father said his son and Paul were in a fight, he tried to break it up and was pushed to the ground and broke his hip. When I started asking him about how he got pushed to the ground, the father got defensive and said it was Paul. No way it could be anybody but Paul who pushed him to the ground. I knew he was covering for his son. But I could not push the father too hard. I needed to show him I understood, as a mother, what a horrible place he was in. When I told the father how much it would hurt me if my son pushed me to the ground, the father looked at me. He grew quiet and reflective. When I asked him after several questions whether his son pushed him to the ground, the father said, "It's possible that my son was the one who pushed me."

The son testified at trial. I had never met him because he was in a locked, in-patient alcohol treatment facility. I knew he had been a secret service agent for Strom Thurmond but had been fired because his drinking interfered with his job. During cross-examination, the son tried to use his head injury to explain his memory loss. He conveniently forgot portions of the incident. I had a strong urge to say, "You didn't forgot the incident because you got an unspecified, alleged head injury. You are lying about what happened." I held back because I would have blocked the witness and we would have argued like two toddlers. So I used "yes, and" again to tell my client's story which was that he was an alcoholic who got violent when drunk.

Son: I have suffered memory loss. The hospital discharge instructions say that head injuries can cause memory loss and change in personality

Lawyer: Yes, head injuries are serious and can cause memory loss and the effects from alcoholism can cause memory loss.

Son: Yes.

Lawyer: Alcoholism like head injuries can cause serious problems.

Son: Yes.

Lawyer: Alcoholism can cause a change in personality.

Son: Yes.

Lawyer: Alcoholism can make you do things you would normally never do.

Son: Yes.

By using "yes, and," I acknowledged the son's use of his alleged head injury as a reason for forgetting the incident and a change of personality. I then added more to the story. By adding my client's story to the son's story, I was able to get the son to agree to my questions. He would never have agreed with me if I had blocked him.

As lawyers, it is much more effective to tell story with "yes, and" than a "no." We should listen to what the witness is saying. Acknowledge the feeling and statement of the witness. Tell the witness you hear what they are saying or see what their body language is saying. After we make this acknowledgement, a yes, then tack on the and. The and is crucial to presenting our client's story. Once we validate the witnesses' feeling, that witness is much more likely to agree with our story.

### **So you want to be an improv?**

Well, don't look at us. We're "horrid" and loving it. Far better you look to your local community for classes and, if you really want to do a love scene with a beautiful stranger, climb

the high dive by attending one of the major centers like BATS or Second City (see listing below). Or just Google “improv” in your area.

Yes, there are books you can read. We list some at the end of this piece. But you can't learn improv by reading, any more than you can learn to be spontaneous by reading Moreno or Nolte's *The Psychodrama Papers* (a must read for lots of other reasons).

We will leave you now with...

...Zip...!

### References

*Improvisation for the Theater*, Viola Spolin

*Imprvo*, Keith Johnstone

*Improv for Storytellers*, Keith Johnstone

*Improv Wisdom*, Patricia Ryan Madson

*Truth in Comedy*, Halpern and Close

*Improvise This*, Bergren, Cox and Detmar

*Improvising Real Life*, Jo Salas

### Improv Centers

BATS, San Francisco

Second City, Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles (and others)

Unexpected Productions, Seattle

Upfront Theater, Bellingham, WA