Sense of Humor and the Ratings of Jokes

An Honors Thesis (ID 499)

By

Judith Y. Johnson

Thesis Director
Dr. Lambert Deckers

Lambert Deckers (advisor's signature)

Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana

May, 1978
INTRODUCTION

Research of Literature

Laughter is often defined as the "overt expression of humor" (Keith-Spiegel, 1972, p. 16). Yet there is no consistent definition of humor. Humor is a very ambiguous term. Humor is basically defined by the social situation. Barnhart's definition of humor is "the faculty of perceiving what is amusing or comical." Often, humor and laughter are used interchangeably.

For years, there has been much interest and research in the area of humor and laughter. Various hypotheses have been tested involving many variables. Howard Leventhal has probably been one of the foremost researchers in this area. In 1974, Leventhal and Cupchik produced a series of experiments that had tremendous implications for the study of humor (Cupchik and Leventhal, 1974). Their studies investigated the relationship between the expressive behaviors of smiling and laughing (mirth) and the evaluations of the funniness of cartoons. In the first study, they found that feedback from mirth reactions directly influenced funniness ratings in female subjects but did not directly influence funniness ratings in male subjects. For women, they found that, when they utilized canned laughter, funniness ratings were increased. They found high correlations between mirth and ratings. Canned laughter also increased mirth in male subjects, but with no increase in rated funniness; males appeared to rate the cartoons di-
rectly. In the second study, they hypothesized that asking subjects to self-observe and rate their own smiling and laughing would isolate the mirth reactions and reduce their influence upon evaluation of funniness. The results showed that the elimination of influence of mirth lowered funniness ratings and eliminated any increase in rated funniness by canned laughter. This effect was found for females but not for males. Svebak (1974) also found differences in sex and humor. He found that females tended to score higher than males on his sense of humor questionnaire. He attributed this to the fact that females are, in general, more emotional than males.

Many theories on humor have been posed. One such theory is the disposition theory, which proposes that humor "appreciation is facilitated when the respondent feels antipathy or resentment toward disparaged protagonists and impaired when he feels sympathy or liking for these protagonists" (Zillman and Cantor, 1976, p. 93). It has also been thought that the problem posed by a joke's incongruity presents a motivational element of humor, or laughter. On the other hand, "sense of humor" also can be viewed as an emotional element of humor. According to McGhee (1972), there are two main factors that determine a person's response to an allegedly funny stimulus: (1) characteristics of the person and (2) properties of the stimulus. The latter factor is self-explanatory. A joke's incongruity, complexity, or surprisingness determines how a person may respond to a joke. One of the "person characteristics" mentioned above is the sense of humor. It is my contention that sense of humor is a product of many characteristics, therefore forming the basis of the first factor.
La Fave, Haddad and Maesen (1976) have derived two definitions of sense of humor. Firstly, sense of humor is present if a person is readily amused. Secondly, it is defined as the ability to laugh at one's own expense. According to Bergler (1956), sense of humor "represents a specific, individually acquired attitude" (p. 275). As stated by Zillman and Cantor (1976), "humour is thus nothing other than a particular interpretation of mirth to oneself" (p. 112).

According to Piaget (from Keith-Spiegel, 1972), the sense of humor develops with intellectual maturation, specifically with the emergence of sophisticated moral considerations. Psychotherapists have tried to help patients utilize their sense of humor as a means of coping with their problems. "The view that a person's sense of humor is in no way removed or independent from his total personality allows for healthy senses of humor in healthy people and unhealthy ones in unhealthy persons" (Keith-Spiegel, 1972, p.29). Keith-Spiegel also noted that "humor production and appreciation become less spontaneous and proceed with more awareness and control as the person matures" (p. 27). She also says that people laugh when they find opposite emotions struggling within them for mastery.

It has been found that children with a high appreciation of humor were extroverts rather than introverts. Hellyar (1927) says that "it can be strengthened through intellectual effort but cannot be achieved at all unless the appropriate inborn temperament is there" (Keith-Spiegel, 1972, p. 23). Menon (from Keith-Spiegel, 1972) says "the man of great humor is one with a
keen and reflecting mind richly stored with experiences and capable of alertness. Freud saw humor as a rare and precious gift" (Keith-Spiegel, 1972, p. 24).

Svebak (1974) states that a sense of humor is a personal disposition. His proposed theory of sense of humor distinguishes between the personal and situational components of a humorous process. Svebak divided these personal and situational components into three dimensions: (a) the $L_p$ variable, involving the social perception according to interpersonal likings with positive interpersonal sentiments; (b) $E_p$ variable, involving socio-emotional permissiveness of the individual; and (c) the $M_p$ variable, implying that a humorous message must be perceivable in the situation, the more explicit, the more laughter provoking. "These situational variables are not, by themselves, capable of causing laughter although they may inhibit such a response" (1974, pp. 185-186). Svebak constructed a questionnaire which measures the personal components. The situational components are reflected in the jokes.

The $M_p$ dimension, related to habitual sensitivity of an individual to humorous messages, is assumed to be the laughter activating dimension, with the other two being laughter inhibiting. "Laughter is expected to be suppressed by habitual tendencies of an individual to dislike humorous roles and comic situations ($L_p$ variable), and by defense strategems against emotional impulses of joy as such ($E_p$ variable)" (1974, p. 328). Questionnaire item numbers 1, 3, 5, 12, 15, and 20 compile the $M_p$ variable, indicating habitual sensitivity to humorous stimuli. Items 4, 7, 10, 14, 16, 17 and 19 compile the $L_p$ dimension, indicating habitual tendency to enjoy or dislike comical situations.
Items 2, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, and 21 compile the $E_p$ dimension of the questionnaire, indicating habitual tendency to permit or suppress emotional impulses of joy. (See Appendix B for questionnaire.)

In persons for whom the $M_p$ score is high, there should not be a great need for laughter suppressive strategems. In persons with low $M_p$ scores, however, the $L_p$ and $E_p$ scores should be low, too, indicating strong suppressive tendencies. "A person with high $M_p$ score and low $L_p$ and/or $E_p$ score is believed to have very strong defense mechanisms against emotional responses to a perceived humorous message, and such a state is supposed to be rather infrequent. In the opposite case, a person who scores low on the $M_p$ items and high on the $L_p$ and/or $E_p$ items may have a distorted self-image; or he may be one of the dull sort with respect to understanding humorous messages, but very enthusiastic every now and then when he gets the point" (Svebak, 1974, p.328). The person with low scores on each dimension should have low joke scores as well. On the other hand, we should find no correlation between joke scores and questionnaire scores for individuals with high $M_p$ score and low $L_p$ and/or $E_p$ scores. The same holds true for the individual with low $M_p$ score and high $L_p$ and/or $E_p$ scores. The defense mechanisms or distorted self image should thwart the perception of humorous materials.

"One person may have a 'poker face' in a laughter activating and permissive situation because of negative evaluation of comic situations in general (low $L_p$ score), while another does not laugh because he regards joyful emotional impulses as a
threat to his self image (low E\textsubscript{p} score). The predictive study gave significant and positive correlations between the M\textsubscript{p} and L\textsubscript{p}, the M\textsubscript{p} and E\textsubscript{p}, as well as the L\textsubscript{p} and E\textsubscript{p} scores" (p. 328).

According to Svebak (1974), "there is no reason for believing that one gender is superior to the other in such a predisposition (E\textsubscript{p} and L\textsubscript{p} dimensions), although they may differ in preference for special kinds of jokes" (p. 329). He did find a difference, however.

After developing these three dimensions, Svebak did a factor analysis to test the intended 3 factor structure of the attitude data. He found a high correlation between the mean number of laughter responses and the mean duration of the five longest responses ($r = .80$, $p < .001$, two tailed; $N = 25$) (Svebak, 1974, p. 187).

The Present Study

The questionnaire is composed of twenty one (21) questions with answers based on a 1 to 4 scale. A score of 4 is obtained on the M\textsubscript{p} items for answers expected to indicate great sensitivity to humorous messages, and on the L\textsubscript{p} and E\textsubscript{p} items for answers expected to indicate a very laughter permissive style.

The jokes used for the study had been previously rated by a group of students in another study. Though the ratings of these jokes are crucial to the study, the researcher believes as is stated by LaFave, Haddad and Maesen, "humor lies neither in laughter nor in jokes but only in the minds of men" (1976, p. 83). Suls proposed a two stage process for perceiving jokes as funny: (1) the perceiver finds his expectations about the text disconfirmed by the ending of the joke, and (2) the perceiver engages in a form of problem solving to find a cognitive
rule which makes the punch line follow from the main part of the joke and reconciles the incongruous parts (1972, p. 82).

The writer became interested in this area because there appears to be no other research dealing with this specific area, at least not utilizing the questionnaire with jokes. In searching for testable variables for the effects of motivation and emotion on humor Svebak's questionnaire was discovered. Sense of humor is both those things combined. Sense of humor deals with the emotional aspects of "funniness," yet it may also present a motivational element, satisfaction of that sense of humor with a good laugh, the release of tension. The researchers' hypotheses are as follows: (1) There will be a direct correlation between sense of humor (based on the questionnaire) and the rating of jokes, and (2) that there will be a significant difference between the sexes; females will tend to score higher than males on the questionnaire, and thus rate the jokes as funnier. Support of hypothesis 1 would lend criterion validity to Svebak's questionnaire. Hypothesis 2 stems directly from findings made by Svebak (1974) and Cupchik and Leventhal (1974) which were mentioned earlier.
METHOD

Subjects

The subjects for this study consisted of 50 Introductory Psychology students at Ball State University. The population sample consisted of 22 males, 27 females, and one student who did not record a sex designation. These students ranged in age from 18 to 31. The 50 students participated on a voluntary basis for extra credit points.

Stimulus Materials

Stimulus materials for the study consisted of a questionnaire composed of 21 items and a series of six jokes. A cover letter explaining the study, but not the expected findings, and giving rating scales and directions accompanied the questionnaire and jokes. The jokes had all been previously prerated on a scale from 1 to 7, with 1 not at all funny and 7 extremely funny, by another group of students in a prior study. The means for the jokes as previously rated are shown in Table 1. See Appendices B and C for questionnaire and jokes.
TABLE 1
Mean Funniness Ratings of Jokes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joke</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedure

The examiner explained the instructions for the questionnaire and jokes to the 50 Introductory Psychology students. Anonymity was maintained though sex and age indicators were required. The students were not told about the assessment of a correlation between the two variables. They were told that their responses were being used for a research study for the Ball State Honors Program. A copy of the instructions are in Appendix A.

Each of the subjects were given a packet consisting of a cover letter including instructions, a sense of humor questionnaire, and a series of six jokes. They were also given IBM answer sheets and a #2 pencil. No time limit was placed on this task. They were asked to answer the questionnaire and rate the jokes as honestly as they possibly could. The jokes were rated on a scale from 1-not at all funny to 5-extremely funny. A copy of the scale is shown in Appendix A.

After the subjects had completed all the items, they were told the expected findings of the study and asked if they wanted the results of the study. These things were done on an individual basis since different subjects required different amounts of time to complete the task.
RESULTS

Mean, mode, range, standard deviation, and variance of the questionnaire scores and jokes are presented in Table 2. Correlation between the sense of humor questionnaire and the ratings of jokes was $r = 0.0218$, which was not significantly different from zero at the 0.05 level. This refutes hypothesis 1, stating that there would be a significant correlation between sense of humor (as measured by the questionnaire) and the ratings of jokes.

The overall mean for the questionnaire was 55.8, with the mean for males being 56.6818 and 54.78 for females. The mean for the jokes for the entire sample was 16.92, while the mean of jokes for males was 18.7273 and 15.41 for females. These two findings suggest that there is a significant difference in joke scores for males and females, $t(47) = 3.02$, $p < 0.01$. There was no significant difference in questionnaire scores for males and females, $t(47) = 0.98$, $p > 0.05$. However, on both criteria, male scores were higher than female scores. This partially refutes hypothesis 2, which states that there will be a significant difference between the sexes; females will tend to score higher on the questionnaire than males, and thus rate the jokes as funnier. The direction of the difference is refuted for both variables.

Table 3 shows the mean funniness ratings by males and females for each joke. The results show that for each joke the males rated the jokes funnier than the females.

A correlation matrix between the $M_p$, $E_p$, and $L_p$ dimensions and the funniness ratings of the jokes are given in Table 4. In assessing a correlation between the three dimensions of the questionnaire based on subjects' scores on the questionnaire, the correlation coefficients were relatively low, ranging from 0.1231
TABLE 2

Summary Statistics of the Questionnaire and Jokes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire Scores</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39-69</td>
<td>6.7370</td>
<td>45.3878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M_p Scores</td>
<td>22.04</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14-26</td>
<td>3.1230</td>
<td>9.7535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E_p Scores</td>
<td>18.44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>3.5002</td>
<td>12.2514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L_p Scores</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11-24</td>
<td>3.0911</td>
<td>9.5547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joke Scores</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6-24</td>
<td>4.1983</td>
<td>17.6261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3
Mean Funniness Rating of Jokes for Males and Females
(Scale of 1-not at all funny to 5-extremely funny)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joke</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>Male Mean (n = 22)</th>
<th>Female Mean (n = 27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.136</td>
<td>2.7037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.8636</td>
<td>2.4074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.6364</td>
<td>2.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.7727</td>
<td>2.9629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.5909</td>
<td>1.8148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.9048</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M_p$</td>
<td>$E_p$</td>
<td>$L_p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_p$ Dimension</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_p$ Dimension</td>
<td>.2411</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_p$ Dimension</td>
<td>.4161</td>
<td>.1231</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>.7182</td>
<td>.6901</td>
<td>.6446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joke Score</td>
<td>.0262</td>
<td>.0774</td>
<td>.0844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to .4161 with .4161 being the correlation coefficient between the $M_p$ and $E_p$ dimensions. The smallest correlation (.1231) was between the $M_p$ and $E_p$ dimensions. According to Svebak, this suggests that the sample used may have distorted self-images or are of the "dull sort." Or, he suggests that these people have strong defense mechanisms against emotional responses to a perceived humorous message. He also claims that there was a high predictive correlation between the dimensions of the questionnaire. The $M_p$ dimension tended to have the highest score, while the means for the $L_p$ and $E_p$ scores are the same.

A correlation matrix giving the correlation coefficients between the individual jokes is given in Table 5. In assessing a correlation between individual joke scores, there was no significant correlation among the jokes. The lack of correlation between the sense of humor questionnaire and the ratings of jokes and the lack of correlations among the individual jokes imply that humor is entirely situational, i.e., determined by the specific joke. A sense of humor would imply a correlation between the individual jokes for each subject. A strong sense of humor would imply high joke ratings, and a weak sense of humor would imply low joke ratings.

It is interesting to note that the individual with joke score of 6 had a questionnaire score of 65, with 22 on the $M_p$ scale, 19 on the $L_p$ scale and 24 on the $E_p$ scale. It is also interesting to note that the individual with the low questionnaire score of 39 had a joke score of 18. The individual with the highest joke score, 24, had a questionnaire score of 49, while the individual with the highest questionnaire score, 69, had a joke score of 18. These selected scores give the reader some indication of the range of results.
TABLE 5

Correlation Matrix for the Six Jokes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quest. Score</th>
<th>Joke 1</th>
<th>Joke 2</th>
<th>Joke 3</th>
<th>Joke 4</th>
<th>Joke 5</th>
<th>Joke 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quest. Score</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joke 1</td>
<td>.2553</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joke 2</td>
<td>.2464</td>
<td>.0199</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joke 3</td>
<td>.3040</td>
<td>.0839</td>
<td>.1109</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joke 4</td>
<td>.3427</td>
<td>.2012</td>
<td>.3351</td>
<td>.4266</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joke 5</td>
<td>.2750</td>
<td>.2581</td>
<td>.2149</td>
<td>.4358</td>
<td>.2746</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joke 6</td>
<td>.0595</td>
<td>.4479</td>
<td>.2432</td>
<td>.1386</td>
<td>.2785</td>
<td>.3737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

Upon administering Svebak's sense of humor questionnaire along with the six jokes, there was no significant correlation found between the questionnaire scores and joke scores nor among the joke scores themselves. The mean of the joke scores were significantly higher for men than for women. These findings refuted the hypotheses stated by the author.

Correlation coefficients between the three dimensions of the questionnaire were relatively low with the highest being .4161 between $E_p$ and $L_p$ dimensions. There was little correlation between ratings for individual jokes, suggesting that sense of humor is entirely situational. If an individual has a sense of humor, there should be a high correlation between his scores for the individual jokes.

The findings indicate no criterion validity for Svebak's (1974) sense of humor questionnaire. From this questionnaire, one could never accurately predict one's response to a humorous situation. The results refute several claims made by Svebak, such as the expected correlations between the three dimensions of the questionnaire. His finding of a .80 correlation coefficient between the number of laughter responses seems very trivial at this point. Someone who laughs more often usually tends to laugh longer than the person who laughs seldom, as well. The lack of correlations between the three dimensions of the questionnaire does not correspond with Svebak's findings. It implies that the various dimensions are not true indicators of sense of humor, if such a sense exists. This finding suggests that these
dimensions measure entirely different, unrelated things. The author does not doubt that these dimensions measure factors of the personal characteristics of the individual, but she does not know that they measure a person's "sense of humor" as such. This conclusion stems from the lack of a correlation between the questionnaire and joke scores.

The lack of a correlation between the individual jokes indicates that "sense of humor" may not exist. A sense of humor would imply a high correlation among joke scores. Humor now seems to be entirely situational. As stated by Goldstein and McGhee (1972), "It now seems clear that a wide range of stimulus, personal, and cognitive processing variables influence measures of humor appreciation" (p.247). On the other hand, it is obvious that different people feel differently about different types of jokes. The correlation coefficient between the questionnaire and jokes is so low that if there is a sense of humor, the dominant factor in humor is still the situational factor.

The findings, in regard to the sexes, show that there is a difference, but it is not in the same direction as many people seem to think. In the past, it has been shown that women tend to rate situations as more humorous than men. This finding had been attributed to the idea that women are, in general, more emotional than men. As stated previously, Cupchik and Leventhal (1974) as well as Svebak (1974), found this to be true. From the findings of this study, it is suggested that maybe men are as emotional—if not more so—than females but tend to hide it because of the male-female stereotypes.

The selection of jokes may have played a role in the final result, but the selection was varied. The jokes were of differ-
ent types as well as of different degrees of funniness (based on previous ratings). The author worked under the assumption that the questionnaire was valid and that it was a true measure of the extent of one's sense of humor.

In conclusion, through the findings outlined above, it seems proper to say that sense of humor is highly complicated—more so than many researchers realize. It may be a highly flexible phenomenon, changing with the situation. Now it is clear as to why there is so much ambiguity in definitions of "sense of humor."
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Dear Student,

My name is Judith Johnson. I am currently in the process of completing my honors thesis for the Ball State Honors Program and would like your help in doing so. On the next few pages, you will find a sense of humor questionnaire and a series of jokes. The questionnaire is based on a scale from 1 to 4. The scale is available for you on the questionnaire. To rate the jokes, please follow these directions: Rate them on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being not at all funny and 5 being extremely funny. Please complete these pages as honestly as you possibly can.

If you would like to know the results of this experiment just leave your name and address with me before leaving. Your assistance in this research will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Judith Y. Johnson
APPENDIX B
Svebak's Sense of Humor Questionnaire

1. Do you easily recognize a hint like a twinkle or a slight change in emphasis as a mark of humorous intent?
   4-very easily
   1-very sluggishly

2. Do you feel that most people are more serious and solemn than is good for them?
   4-not at all
   1-yes indeed

3. Does it ever happen that you share in a hilarious situation only to wonder afterwards what was so funny about it?
   4-very seldom
   1-very often

4. A humorist is typically perceived by others as a person who lacks the courage of his convictions.
   4-not at all true
   1-really true

5. Would it be easy for you to find something comical, witty, or humorous in most situations if you really tried?
   4-very easy
   1-very difficult

6. I appreciate people who tolerate all kinds of emotional outlets.
   4-yes indeed
   1-not at all

7. Those telling jokes to make others laugh really do it to assert themselves.
   4-strongly disagree
   1-strongly agree

8. If you find a situation very comical, and nobody else seemed to be of the same opinion, would it then be easy for you to keep your face straight?
   4-very easy
   1-very difficult

9. Do you sometimes find yourself laughing in situations where laughter is quite out of place?
   4-very often
   1-practically never

10. Persons who are always out to be funny are really irresponsible types not to be relied upon.
    4-strongly disagree
    1-strongly agree

11. If you had an unrestrained fit of laughing, would you later suffer from misgivings in case others think that you were a bit of an exhibitionist?
    4-not at all
    1-very much

12. Would you say that you have much cause for amusement during an ordinary day?
    4-very much
    1-very little

13. Do you feel that you make mistakes in what kind of behavior is emotionally fitting in a particular situation?
    4-very frequently
    1-practically never
14. Even if they look different, humorous and dejected people have really many common traits.
   4-strongly disagree 1-strongly agree

15. Do you think that you are slow at perceiving humorous points?
   4-very quick 1-very slow

16. Humorists irritate me because they so blatantly revel in getting others to laugh.
   4-strongly disagree 1-strongly agree

17. When I engage in discussions where one person pokes fun at other people's arguments, I get the impression he is just trying to cover up his own ignorance.
   4-not at all 1-yes indeed

18. How often do you miss the comical point in a situation where others catch on?
   4-practically never 1-very often

19. It is my impression that those who try to be funny really do it to hide their lack of self confidence.
   4-not at all 1-yes indeed

20. Do you feel that humorists open your eyes to aspects of life you seldom think about?
   4-very often 1-almost never

21. Do you consider yourself to be of an impulsive nature?
   4-yes indeed 1-not at all
APPENDIX C

Jokes

1. When her husband died, one of the family friends consoles the widow and the oldest daughter. "A fine man. And what did he die of?" The widow answers, "Gonorrhea." A few minutes later, the daughter talks to her mother in private and blows her stack, "Mother, what on earth was in your mind? You know that father died of diarrhea!"

"I know that, but I want them to remember him as a sport rather than the dribbling shit ass that he was.

2. Jones, seated in a movie house, could not help being aware that the man immediately in front of him had his arm around the neck of a large dog which occupied the seat next to him.

The dog was clearly observing the picture with understanding, for he snarled softly when the villain spoke, yelped joyously at the funny remarks, and so on.

Jones leaned forward and tapped the man in front of him on the shoulder. He said, "Pardon me, sir, but I can't get over your dog's behavior."

The man turned around and said, "Frankly, it surprises me, too. He hated the book!"

3. A stranger came into a bar in which there were only the bartender, a dog, and a cat. As the stranger ordered his drink the dog rose, yawned, and said, "Well, so long, Joe," then walked out.

The stranger's jaw dropped. He said to the bartender. "Did you hear that? The dog talked."

"Don't be a jackass," said the bartender. "A dog can't talk."

"But I heard him."

"You just think you heard him. I tell you dogs can't talk. It's just that wise guy cat over there. He's a ventriloquist."

4. A student was delivering a long and complex report, when the professor arose and asked the student for documentary evidence in support of the various statements he was making. The student explained that there was an abundance of evidence which he could easily enough produce, but that of course he did not have it with him. "Well, sir," said the professor, "until you produce the documentary evidence, do you mind if for the time being I call you a liar?" Amid the stunned silence, the student asked the professor for his parents' marriage certificate. The professor of course was unable to produce it. "Well, sir," said the student coldly, "until you can produce documentary evidence, would you mind if I called you an obnoxious bastard?"
5. A man entered a tavern which he found empty except for the bartender, who was playing chess with a dog. The dog, watching the board intently, made his moves by grasping the particular chessman in his teeth. He wagged his tail wildly when he made a good move and, on occasions, would bark sharply to indicate "Check!" The customer, finally recovering from his stupefaction, gasped out, "Hey, that's a smart dog you've got there." And the bartender answered, "Not so smart! I've beat him three out of five times so far."

6. He rolled across the bed to his wife and began to caress her. "None of that tonight!" She said, "I've got to get up tomorrow at 6 a.m. to do the laundry." He replied, "No sweat. If I'm not finished by the, I'll just quit."