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Pat had fallen headlong down a steep incline and lay motionless at the bottom.

Mike, fearful that Pat may be seriously injured, leaned over the lip of the incline and called out, "Pat are you dead?"

Pat groaned and called back, "I'm badly bruised, but quite alive."

Mike shook his head and said, "I hope you are, but you're such a liar, I don't know whether to believe you or not."

The preceding interaction of words is collectively referred to as a joke because it meets certain criteria. These criteria include a stem and a punch-line that are placed together so as to create opposing scripts or schemata in the reader's mind.

A schema is a cognitive device used to interpret information. It helps individuals to predict the outcomes of events by providing a script for them to follow. Without schemata, the world would seem to be a very chaotic place where one could never know how to react to or interpret any given situation. A violation of a schema could cause arousal in many forms. Some of these forms include; confusion, surprise, frustration, anger, and -- in a joking situation -- laughter.

Raskin (1985) sees opposing scripts as an essential part of creating humor through joking. In the opening joke, for example, the two opposing schemata might be:

1) One's idea of the proper concern that one friend
would show towards the other in such a situation.

2) One's distrust of his/her friend's word.

The first schema was created by the stem of the joke as it set up the emergency situation. The schema remains intact until after we learn that the victim of the fall was not fatally wounded. At this point the reader is forced to form a new schema of the victim being alive but his/her friend doubtng this because of the victim's past record of being less than truthful. The punch-line in this instance has created opposing schemata of what it means to be dead and what it means to be dishonest. The two schemata are opposing due to the fact that they cannot occur simultaneously in an ordinary situation. In other words, dead people cannot be dishonest!

To continue with Raskin's theory, he would hypothesize that the stem activated a schema that the reader would expect to end in a certain way. The punch-line creates an ending that is incongruous with the expected ending thereby creating a new schema which does fit the ending although in a different fashion. The opposing schemata create humor for the reader when they are resolved to become compatible in the reader's mind and they are able to create arousal that is released through laughter. Using the opening joke as an example, one might read the punch-line and reevaluate his/her original schema of Pat being seriously wounded or dead to one of Pat being so dishonest that his friend would doubt his word no matter how obvious it is that he is telling the truth. This new schema, when added, causes the two schemata of death and dishonesty to fit together
into a more humorous schema of the situation. If, however, the story of Mike and Pat were to end with Mike telling Pat to lie still while he went to get help, then two compatible schemata are presented together. If the reader of this story were expecting to hear a joke they should also be expecting to undergo the process of forming a new schema to make the preceding schemata compatible, and when the paragraph ends in a logical manner rather than the expected illogical one, confusion results.

Bernstein (1986) supports a schema theory of humor by showing how different types of jokes are processed by children at different stages of life. During the first two stages of humor development, jokes must be very concrete and not use ambiguity of words as their sources of humor. By the third stage, children are more likely to understand the language of the jokes meaning that they are more prone to "...understanding multiple meanings of words, metaphors, and idioms; detecting ambiguity; perceiving incongruity; and appreciating that the unexpected or a sudden shift of perspective is possible." (Bernstein, 1986, 66) Bernstein's (1986) observations that older children are more likely to appreciate jokes that play on language usage shows that joke schemata do develop and become stronger with time. Older children's ability to comprehend the language subtleties of jokes also gives them the tools that they need to connect the endings with the stems and integrate them into a new schema.

Another study shows the importance of being able to
interpret a joke's element of surprise as well as being able to integrate the meaning of the punch-line to the body of the joke. Brownell, Michel, Powelson & Gardner (1983), studied the preferred choices of "right hemisphere patients" when they were presented with a joke and three different types of endings per joke. They found that: "...right-hemisphere patients can understand the details of a story but may have difficulty weaving them together into a single coherent interpretation...", therefore, "they should detect when a punch line is at variance with the overt content of the rest of the joke and yet may prove unable to find in the joke a second level of interpretation that integrates the punch line with the body of the joke." (Brownell, et al 1983 p.22)

Iran-Nejad (1989) supports the idea of forming new schemata to make sense of nonconformist-type endings with his supporting evidence of a "Biofunctional schema theory" (p131). Basically, this theory says that the brain contains components which allows it to make sense of surprise ending stories. One aspect of the components allows for an understanding of whole situations or ideas, while another aspect can break up the whole into sub-units creating an ongoing process of adapting schemata to fit together in a infinite number of ways. Iran-Nejad (1989) also states that "Biofunctional schema theory...implies that incompatible interpretations can only be distinguished at the thematic level.", meaning that new schemata are constantly reintroduced to a larger ongoing and constantly adjusting master schema. The biofunctional theory can be used to support the
semantic theory of humor through its idea that schemata are constantly molded to incorporate new schemata. This idea lends credibility to the theory that punch-lines cause new schemata to be formed and integrated with the stem of the joke as the stem can be viewed as the master schema that is constantly collecting new schemata until it is resolved.

The purpose of this experiment is to test for the presence of joke schemata by changing the situations in which jokes are presented. Because it is being postulated that there is a certain expectation of mental behaviors that should take place when reading a joke, they will be presented to two separate groups as either jokes or brief paragraphs which should affect their funniness and surprise ratings regarding three different types of endings. One type of ending will be the jokes' original punch lines which should be rated high in funniness in both the jokes and brief paragraph groups since they fit into the expectation of a normal joke. The second type of ending will be expected ending, which should be rated as more puzzling in the joke group since it will greatly deviate from the expectations one has for a joke, and should receive low ratings in funniness since there is no incompatible ending with which to compare and derive humor from. The third and final type of ending is the irrelevant ending which will have incompatible endings but will not have similarity to use in relating it back to the stem, consequently, creating high puzzlement and low funniness ratings.
Subjects

Introductory psychology students (N=72) participated for class credit. They were divided randomly into four groups of 18, two of which were told that they were reading jokes and two who were told that they were reading brief paragraphs.

Materials

The subjects were asked to sign special informed consent forms. The consent forms were different for the two groups. The joke group's consent forms told them that they would be asked to read a series of jokes, and the brief-paragraph group's told them that they would be reading a series of brief paragraphs. These were the only differences between the two types of consent forms. (See Appendix)

The booklets that were used contained 12 pages, each page containing one brief paragraph or joke. Each of the original 12 jokes had one expected- and one nonsense ending written by the experimenter. Every booklet had different combinations of the joke forms with no booklet containing a repeat of the same stem within it. There were a total of three different forms of paragraphs that were used, therefore, each booklet contained four paragraphs that remained in their original joke form, four that had expected endings, and four that had nonsense endings.

The paragraphs were rated for puzzlement and funniness using scales constructed from 0 to 9. A rating of 0 indicated that the paragraphs were either not at all puzzling or funny and increased progressively to a rating of 9 which indicated that the paragraphs were very puzzling or funny. (See Appendix)
Procedure

The subjects signed up for this experiment, choosing one of four times in which they could participate.

The first and second groups were the groups that were told that they would be reading jokes. At the beginning of these sessions they were asked to read and sign consent forms that told them they would be reading jokes. After the consent forms were collected the groups were read standardized instructions indicating that they would be reading jokes. The instructions also indicated that they were to read each joke carefully and rate it for puzzlement on the 0 to 9 scale. After the jokes were rated for puzzlement, they were asked to go back and reread the jokes and, on a new form, indicate how funny the joke was to them also on a 0 to 9 scale. (See Appendix)

Groups three and four were the groups that were told that they would be reading brief paragraphs. Groups three and four's sessions were run identically to the joke groups except that the words "brief paragraph(s)" were substituted for the word "joke(s)" on the informed consent forms, in the instructions that were read, and on the rating sheets. (See Appendix)

RESULTS

As predicted, there were no over all significant differences in the means of funniness ratings between the joke and paragraph groups. (see ANOVA, Table 1) There was no significant interaction between the group types and types of endings, however, absolute differences between the means of the punch line, expected ending, and nonsense ending jokes were
significant. (see Table 1) Table 2 shows that the intact jokes were most funny and the other two types of endings were less funny as was also predicted.

There were no significant differences between the puzzlement ratings of the joke and paragraph groups for either the punch-lines, which were rated the lowest in puzzlement, or the nonsense endings, which were rated the highest in puzzlement. (See ANOVA Table 3) Table 3 does show an interaction between the expectations of joke reading vs. paragraph reading and the type of ending. Also, the absolute difference in expected-ending puzzlement ratings between the means of the joke and paragraph groups is 4.64 which exceeds the calculated Tukey's hsd of 3.91 p<.05. Therefore, the prediction that expected endings would be rated higher in puzzlement in the joke group than in the paragraph group was supported. This indicates that expected endings violated the schema that the subjects in the joke group held for how a joke should end, therefore, causing confusion.

DISCUSSION

The significant differences among endings in the funniness ratings show that the readers found paragraphs funnier when the endings caused an incongruity that allowed them to create a new schema. They did not find humor in a joke that ended expectedly, thereby not allowing them to complete the expected mental processes, nor did they find humor in an ending that could not be made to fit the original stem in either a humorous or expected way. This finding adds support to Raskin's (1985)
Semantic Theory of Humor since he bases the theory on the idea that it is opposing scripts that cause humor.

Confusion was shown to develop when the endings did not make sense to the reader. This explains why the nonsense endings received the highest puzzlement ratings from both the joke and paragraph groups. In either case the ending did not fit into the stem creating a comprehensible schema, and never allowed the incompatibility to be resolved. This finding is not unlike Iran-Nejad (1989) and his biofunctional schema theory. As the joke is being read, new schemata are systematically formed to fit the master schema only to be halted as the final schema (ie. the punchline) cannot be made to fit into the master schema.

The punch-lines were rated the lowest in puzzlement within both groups. In the case of the joke group, the ending fit their expectations perfectly and provided them with an ending that changed the schemata created by the stem and gave a new humorous schema. In the case of the paragraph group, the puzzlement rating was slightly higher, though not significantly so, possibly indicating that they were surprised to see a joke yet were still provided with an ending that could be assimilated into the stem creating a comprehensible paragraph.

The expected ending means between the two groups are different, unlike the other two ending types, supporting the hypothesis that a joke schema does indeed exist. In the paragraph group the expected endings rate low in puzzlement showing that a satisfactory ending was provided for the reader.
In the joke group, however, the endings appeared to be more out of context. The reader was not required to reevaluate the developing schema, but was instead provided with an ending that brought the paragraph to a normal close. Joke endings are supposed to cause a need to see the stem in a different "frame of mind" and not to contribute to a common ending.

The hypothesized existence of a joke schema was supported by the evidence. Support was also added to Raskin's (1985) theory of humor in the higher funniness ratings for punch-line endings and the high puzzlement ratings for expected endings in the joke groups and in the nonsense endings across both groups. Apparently, the jokes provided opposing schemata that could be assimilated into a new humorous schema, whereas, the other two types of endings did not provide such opportunity. In short, the evidence suggests that when one is told that he/she will be reading a joke he/she has certain expectations regarding what he/she should read. They expect to have to reevaluate the stem to fit the punch-line when the punch-line creates an opposing schema.
### TABLE 1. ANOVA OF FUNNINESS RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOKES VS. PARAGRAPHS</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERRORb</td>
<td>5094.93</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE OF ENDING</td>
<td>9288.69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4644.35</td>
<td>133.27</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOKES VS PARAG.</td>
<td>121.79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60.89</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X TYPE OF ENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERRORw</td>
<td>4878.85</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>34.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2. MEANS FOR FUNNINESS RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Punch-Line</th>
<th>Expected Ending</th>
<th>Nonsense Ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Read as Joke</strong></td>
<td>24.86</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>8.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Read as Paragraph</strong></td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>10.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X=24.31</td>
<td>X=11.32</td>
<td>X=9.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3. ANOVA OF PUZZLEMENT RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOKES VS. PARAGRAPHS</td>
<td>85.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85.63</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERRORb</td>
<td>5101.69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE OF ENDING</td>
<td>16093.45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8046.73</td>
<td>253.04</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOKES VS PARAG.</td>
<td>358.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>179.28</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>.0044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X TYPE OF ENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERRORw</td>
<td>4451.98</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>31.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4. MEANS FOR PUZZLEMENT RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PUNCH-LINE</th>
<th>EXPECTED ENDING</th>
<th>NONSENSE ENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>READ AS</strong></td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>14.61</td>
<td>26.61 X=15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOKE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>READ AS</strong></td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>25.86 X=14.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARAGRAPH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X=26.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X=5.50</td>
<td>X=12.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX
STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT

1. In this experiment you will be asked to evaluate a series of jokes. You will be asked to rate the jokes and to answer some questions about them. The experiment should take about 20 minutes of your time.

2. One possible discomforting aspect of your participation is that you may find some of these jokes to be boring and confusing to read.

3. There are several benefits to be expected from participating in this experiment. You will learn about psychological research, about human emotional reactions, and you may also gain some insight into your own behavior.

4. There appears to be no alternative procedure for conducting the experiment which would be more advantageous to you.

5. You may question the procedure at any time during the experiment. Your questions will be answered and clarified.

6. You have the right to withdraw your consent, to withdraw your individual data, and to discontinue your participation in this experiment at any time without prejudice to you. You also have the right to be fully informed of the results of this experiment after its completion. Your performance during the experiment will be held strictly confidential. The data will be reported in such a way as to keep your individual data anonymous.

I have read the above statement of informed consent.

Date: _______________   Participant's Signature: ____________________________

Principal Investigator: Lambert Deckers
Professor of Psychological Science
Department of Psychological Science
285-1706
STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT

1. In this experiment you will be asked to evaluate a series of brief paragraphs. You will be asked to rate the brief paragraphs and to answer some questions about them. The experiment should take about 20 minutes of your time.

2. One possible discomforting aspect of your participation is that you may find some of these brief paragraphs to be boring and confusing to read.

3. There are several benefits to be expected from participating in this experiment. You will learn about psychological research, about human emotional reactions, and you may also gain some insight into your own behavior.

4. There appears to be no alternative procedure for conducting the experiment which would be more advantageous to you.

5. You may question the procedure at any time during the experiment. Your questions will be answered and clarified.

6. You have the right to withdraw your consent, to withdraw your individual data, and to discontinue your participation in this experiment at any time without prejudice to you. You also have the right to be fully informed of the results of this experiment after its completion. Your performance during the experiment will be held strictly confidential. The data will be reported in such a way as to keep your individual data anonymous.

I have read the above statement of informed consent.

Date: ___________ Participant's Signature: __________________________

Principal Investigator: Lambert Deckers
Professor of Psychological Science
Department of Psychological Science
285-1706
How funny was the joke?
not at all = 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 = very funny
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How puzzling was the brief paragraph?
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JOKES

PUZZLEMENT RATING INSTRUCTIONS

I am Pam Avery and I am investigating how people process the information that is conveyed in a joke. I am examining the extent to which we are able to anticipate or predict the next idea that will be presented in a joke that we may be reading. For example, if we are reading about going out for dinner, we may expect to read about the waiter or waitress taking our order and about eating our food. We may also expect the situation to end with us paying our restaurant bill.

I am interested in how accurate people are in anticipating the ending of a joke. That is, to what degree does the ending make sense? Thus, on each page of the booklet you will see a joke which you are to read. Then you will be asked some questions about the joke.

You are to rate each joke according to how puzzling it was. The puzzlement rating scale is in front of you. In other words, how puzzled were you when you finished reading the joke? Notice that the rating scale ranges from 0 to 9. 0 means the ending was not at all puzzling and 9 means that it was very puzzling. The higher the number you use from 0 to 9 the more puzzling the joke was to you.

Carefully rate each joke for puzzlement. Please make your best judgments in rating the jokes.

Are there any questions before I pass out the booklets?
JOKES
FUNNINESS RATING INSTRUCTIONS

I would now like you to look at the jokes again and to rate each joke according to how funny you think it is. Notice that the rating scale for funniness ranges from 0 to 9, with 0 meaning the joke is not funny at all to 9 meaning the joke is very funny. Carefully rate each joke for funniness using this scale. The funnier you think the joke is, the higher the number from 0 to 9 you should use to indicate the degree of funniness.

Any questions before you start?
SHORT PARAGRAPHS

PUZZLEMENT RATING INSTRUCTIONS

I am Pam Avery and I am investigating how people process the information that is conveyed in a brief paragraph. I am examining the extent to which we are able to anticipate or predict the next idea that will be presented in a short paragraph that we may be reading. For example, if we are reading about going out for dinner, we may expect to read about the waiter or waitress taking our order and about eating our food. We may also expect the story to end with us paying our restaurant bill.

I am interested in how accurate people are in anticipating the ending or a brief paragraph. That is, to what degree does the ending make sense? thus, on each page of the booklet you will see a brief paragraph which you are to read. then you will be asked some questions about the paragraph.

You are to rate each brief paragraph according to how puzzling it was. The puzzlement rating scale is in front of you. In other words, how puzzled were you when you finished reading the paragraph? Notice that the rating scale ranges from 0 to 9. 0 means the ending was not at all puzzling and 9 means that it was very puzzling. the higher the number you use from 0 to 9 the more puzzling the paragraph was to you.

Carefully rate each paragraph for puzzlement. Please make you best judgments in rating the paragraphs.

Are there any questions before I pass out the booklets?
SHORT PARAGRAPHS

FUNNINESS RATING INSTRUCTIONS

I would now like you to look at the brief paragraph again and to rate each paragraph according to how funny you think it is. Notice that the rating scale for funniness ranges from 0 to 9, with 0 meaning the paragraph is not funny at all to 9 meaning the paragraph is very funny. Carefully rate each paragraph for funniness using this scale. The funnier you think the paragraph is, the higher the number from 0 to 9 you should use to indicate the degree of funniness.

Any questions before you start?
1. A condemned spy was being led out at dawn to the wall against which he was to be shot at sunrise. It was raining with ferocious intensity. On either side of him was a line of soldiers and to one of them the condemned spy said bitterly, "What heartless animals you all are to march me out to be shot in a rain like this."

The soldier replied with equal bitterness, "What are you complaining about? We've got to march back!"

EE: The soldier replied with equal bitterness, "Shut up spy. You have betrayed your country and deserve to be shot."

IE: The soldier replied with equal bitterness, "My cat gave birth to kittens last night."

2. Smith met Jones in the clubhouse one day and said, "I understand you experienced a great tragedy last week."

Jones sipped his drink and nodded, his eyes growing dark with the memory. "I was playing a twosome with Brown," he said, "and the poor fellow dropped dead at the ninth hole."

Smith said, "I understand you carried him back to the clubhouse. That must have been difficult, considering that he weighed two hundred pounds."

Jones said, "Oh, it wasn't the carrying that was hard. It was putting him down at every stroke, and then picking him up again."

EE: Jones said "Oh, it wasn't the carrying that was hard. What was really hard was losing such a great friend."

IE: Jones said, "Oh, it wasn't the carrying that was hard. Tomorrow is the first day of my vacation and we're all going to Hawaii."

3. On the glorious day of July 20, 1969, when the first human being stepped onto the surface of the moon, one scientist from Ruritania said to an American scientist, "That is a great achievement, but I am assisting in the planning of a manned expedition to the sun."

"To the sun?!" exclaimed the astonished scientist. "But the heat? The light? The radiation?"

The other scientist chuckled. "Do you think that we Ruritanians are fools? We will send the expedition at night."

EE: The other scientist chuckled, "Ha! I sure had you fooled. No one can really send an expedition to the sun."

IE: The other scientist chuckled, "When my son grows up he says he wants to be just like John Wayne."
4. The two ladies were sitting in the living room, waiting for their hostess, who was slightly delayed. The daughter of the family was with them, on the theory that she would keep the visitors occupied during the wait. The child was perhaps six years old, snub nosed, freckled, buck toothed and wore thick glasses. She maintained a deep silence and the two ladies peered doubtfully at her.

Finally, one of them muttered to the other, "Not very p-r-e-t-t-y, I fear," carefully spelling the key word.

Whereupon the child piped up, "but awful s-m-a-r-t!"

EE: Whereupon the child piped up, "I can't spell yet."

IE: The child piped up, "I'm through eating."

5. The platoon was going into action, and Private Jones said to his buddy, "Listen, Bill, just in case you return and I don't, here's a letter to give Mary when you get back to the old neighborhood. Tell her my last thought was of her and her name was the last word I spoke. And here's a letter for Helen. Tell her the same thing."

EE: "And here's a letter for Helen. Tell her to comfort Mary."

IE: "And here's a letter for Helen. The water is cold today."

6. At the twelfth hole of a hotly contested match, the grounds overlooked the highway, and as Miller and Gibson approached the green, they saw a funeral procession making its way along the road.

At this, Miller stopped, took off his hat, placed it over his heart, and bent his head till the procession disappeared around a bend.

Gibson was astonished and, after Miller had replaced his hat and returned to his game, said, "That was delicate and respectful of you, Miller."

"Oh, well," said Miller, "I couldn't do less. I'd been married to the woman for twenty years, after all."

EE: "Oh, well," said Miller, "I couldn't do less. It is very important to show our respect to the dead."

IE: "Oh, well," said Miller, "I couldn't do less. Chocolate cake and ice cream are my favorite things to eat."
7. Johnson and Reeves, strolling down the road, spied two attractive women in the distance, walking together and approaching them.

Johnson said, "Good heavens, Reeves, what an unusual coincidence! Walking there toward us, arm in arm, are none other than my wife and my mistress!"

"Odd," said Reeves, thoughtfully. "Perhaps we should learn to know one another better, for I was on the point of saying precisely the same thing."

EE: "Odd," said Reeves, thoughtfully. "That seems like a rather unlikely coincidence. Do you think your wife found out and is coming after you?"

IE: "Odd," said Reeves, thoughtfully. "Tomorrow is my father's birthday and I'm not sure what to buy him. Maybe I will buy him a tie."

8. Miss Thompson complained to the police that the neighborhood boys swam in the nearby river in the nude. "I can see them from my kitchen window," she said, "and I find it most offensive."

The police spoke to the boys, who grumbled but agreed to move on.

A week later, Miss Thompson was on the phone with the police with the same complaint. The policewoman protested, "Madam, the boys have moved a quarter-mile downstream. You can't see them now."

Said the lady firmly, "With my binoculars, I can!"

EE: Said the lady firmly, "They were back again yesterday."

IE: Said the lady firmly, "My dog has bad fleas."

9. Ms. Perkins, the biology instructor at a posh suburban girls' junior college, said during class, "Miss Smythe, would you please name the organ of the human body which, under appropriate conditions, expands to six times its normal size, and define the conditions."

Miss Smythe gasped, then said freezingly, "Ms. Perkins, I don't think that is a proper question to ask me. I assure you my parents will hear of this." With that, she sat down red-faced.

Unperturbed, Ms. Perkins called on Miss Johnson and asked the same question. Miss Johnson, with composure, replied, "The pupil of the eye, in dim light."

"Correct," said Ms. Perkins. "And now, Miss Smythe, I have three things to say to you. One, you have not studied your lesson. Two, you have a dirty mind. And three, you will some day be sorely disappointed."

EE: "Correct," said Ms. Perkins. "And now, Miss Smythe, I have three things to say to you. One, you have not studied your lesson. Two, you have a dirty mind. And three, you will receive a grade of "F"."

IE: "Correct," said Ms. Perkins. "And now, Miss Smythe, I have three things to say to you. One, you have not studied your lesson. Two, you have a dirty mind. And three, sparrows, not chickadees, fly south for the winter."
10. An elderly woman was anxiously consulting a Psychiatrist.
   "Doctor," she said, "I have a problem. My husband is losing his potency
   and I am anxious to discover if his problem is physical or just in his head."
   The psychiatrist was shocked. Cautiously, he asked, "How old are you
   madam?"
   "Eighty."
   The psychiatrist thought about this and then a thought struck him. "Ah!
   But how old is your husband?"
   "Eighty-three!"
   Now the psychiatrist was really confused. He brooded a bit and tried
   again. "Well, when did you first notice he was losing his potency?"
   "Oh, I just noticed it last night, doctor; but what troubles me is that I
   noticed it again this morning."

   EE: "Oh, I just noticed it last night, doctor; but what troubles me is that
   he is really upset about it."

   IE: "Oh, I just noticed it last night, doctor; but what troubles me is that
   the bears won the Superbowl again."

11. Pat had fallen headlong down a steep incline and lay motionless at the
   bottom.
   Mike, fearful that Pat may be seriously injured, leaned over the lip of
   the incline and called out, "Pat are you dead?"
   Pat groaned and called back, "I'm badly bruised, but quite alive."
   Mike shook his head and said, "I hope you are, but you're such a liar, I
   don't know whether to believe you or not."

   EE: Mike shook his head and said, "I hope you are, but just lay still and
   I'll go get you some help."

   IE: Mike shook his head and said, "I hope you are, but you really shouldn't
   ever wash your jeans and your whites at the same time."

12. I was visiting my maiden aunt a while ago, and I noticed that her cat
    appeared to be pregnant. I asked her if that was true and she said it was,
    but that she absolutely couldn't understand how it had happened. "She's never
    been out of the house except when I've had her on a leash," she said. While
    we were talking I noticed her other cat, a male, leering at the female from
    under the sofa. "How about him?" I asked. "Don't be silly," my aunt said.
    "That's her brother!"

   EE: "That cat has been neutered."

   IE: "My roof does not leak."