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Recent research by Lanzetta, Biernat, and Kleck (1982) on the "facial feedback" hypothesis suggests that the pattern of our facial expression serves as a source of information for our subjective emotions. Thus, facial expressions of smiling or laughing lead us to experience positive emotions whereas frowning or crying lead to negative emotions. Facial reactions are elicited by specific environmental events such that gaining a positive incentive produces "happy" facial expressions and corresponding positive emotions and losing a positive incentive produces "sad" facial expressions and corresponding negative emotions. For example, earning an "A" on a difficult exam produces a smile and an emotion of happiness. Losing a possession with sentimental value, on the other hand, produces a frown, downcast eyes, and an emotion of sadness.

People attribute their emotions to environmental events according to emotion-attribution theory (Schachter & Singer, 1959). Facial reactions, however, may also serve as a source for the type and intensity of subjective emotion that is being experienced (Lanzetta, Biernat, and Kleck, 1982).

The current research is going to focus on the extent that facial reactions provide a source of feedback for emotions, specifically the emotion of humor. Thus, if I am smiling it must be somewhat funny, and if I am laughing it must be very funny. This research will attempt to examine what extent facial reactions serve as a source for our subjective feelings of humor. If facial reactions are amplified or inhibited by some "nonhumorous" means, will that increase or decrease one's subjective feelings of humor,
respectively?

The current research plans to examine three factors that are known to effect facial reactions to humor stimuli in order to determine if these factors will also effect the subjective degree of humor that is experienced. These three factors are: size of the audience, presence of silent versus laughing people, and the gender of the subject.

**Audience Size.** One way to increase facial reactions to a humor stimulus is to increase the size of the audience. It appears that as the size of the audience increases, the degree of humor increases. Levy and Fenley (1979) found that as the size of a movie audience increased from 125 to 976, the mean amount of laughter to 25 specific scenes also increased. Prerost (1977) found that as group size increased from three to nine subjects, the amount of humor appreciation as measured by a rating scale also increased. This data appears to suggest that audience size intensifies facial reaction, which in turn influences the degree of humor appreciation. The present research will also examine the effect of a smaller increase (1 vs. 3) in the number of confederates serving as audience on the subjects' humor.

**Silent vs. Laughing Confederates.** The presence of laughing others compared to silent others is also a way of manipulating facial reactions. Generally a person experiences a greater degree of humor when others around him/her are laughing than when they are silent. Smyth and Fuller (1972) showed that humor tapes dubbed with laughter produced more laughter in their subjects than the same tapes without the dubbed laughter. In addition, they found
that humor appreciation as measured by a rating scale also increased with the presence of dubbed laughter. Chapman and Wright (1976) tested 7-8 year old children to determine the extent which they were influenced by the frequency of laughter exhibited by a confederate of the experimenter. The results showed that as the confederate's frequency of laughter increased the degree of laughter in the children and their humor rating of the material also increased.

The data from these studies show that both facial reactions of humor and humor ratings increase as the degree of laughter by others also increases. Not all studies have found this relationship, however. Young and Frye (1966) had male undergraduates listen to jokes while they were alone or were in a group. Although there were more overt reactions to the jokes in the group, the humor rating of the jokes did not differ between the alone condition and the group condition. Similarly, Nosanchuk and Lightston (1974) had subjects listen to humor tapes with or without the presence of dubbed laughter. The laughter was believed by the subject to be that of other subjects in adjoining experimental booths. Although the subjects exhibited more laughter when listening to the tapes accompanied by laughter than to the silent tapes, their humor ratings of the taped material did not differ as a function of the presence or absence of accompanying laughter.

These latter two studies, although replicating the findings for facial reactions, fail to replicate the findings for subjective humor ratings. One possibility for this discrepancy is that Young and Frye (1966) used male subjects only, who may respond differently than a combination of male and female subjects. However, that does
not explain the differences obtained by Nosanchuk and Lightston (1974). Furthermore, the latter two studies suggest that subjects may ignore their facial reactions when making their humor ratings. This is not predicted in the "facial feedback" hypothesis. Consequently, the failure to obtain humor rating differences may have resulted from a lack of experimental control over extraneous variables. One of the purposes of the present experiment is to examine more closely the effects of silent versus laughing confederates on subjects' overt facial reactions and humor ratings.

**Gender of Subject.** There appear to be gender differences in the reaction to humor material. Generally women appear to be more facially expressive than men even though subjective humor ratings may not differ. Leventhal and Cupchik (1975) presented male and female subjects with cartoons accompanied by different degrees of laughter recorded during a beer party or classroom setting. Female subjects were more influenced by the degree of accompanying laughter while tending to ignore the setting (party vs. classroom). Male subjects, on the other hand, were influenced more by the setting (party vs. classroom) than by the degree of laughter. Prerost (1977) compared humor appreciation in three versus nine all male or all female groups. Group size influenced female humor appreciation more than it influenced male humor appreciation. Deckers and Edington (1979) found that women showed more smiling and chuckling reactions to an incongruous stimulus than did male subjects. Furthermore, Deckers and Salais (unpublished data) replicated this finding illustrating that female subjects show greater facial reactions to incongruous stimuli than male subjects
despite the fact that there were no gender differences in humor and surprise ratings.

This data on gender differences suggest the possibility that men and women rely on their facial reactions to different degrees in determining their emotions. Perhaps because of social learning, women may be more facially expressive than men while also ignoring those expressions to a greater extent in forming their subjective emotions. Thus another purpose of the present experiment is to determine the extent, if any, that men and women differ in their facial reactions and humor ratings when those behaviors are influenced by "nonhumor" means.

METHOD

Subjects. The subjects used in this experiment were 24 male and 24 female college undergraduates recruited from beginning psychology classes at Ball State University. Each S was notified of and received $2.00 for participating in the experiment. The subjects signed-up to participate in the experiment according to sex for a pre-established date and time. These dates and times were randomly assigned under the conditions of one confederate versus three confederates, male confederates versus female confederates, series of cartoon, and silent confederates versus laughing confederates.

Design. A 2x2x2x2 factorial was used in this experiment. The factors include silent versus laughing confederates, one versus three confederates, male versus female confederates, and sex of the subject.
Materials. A Kodak slide projector was used to project the slides onto the screen against a wall. A videocamera with microphone was used to videotape the subjects' facial reactions to the cartoons. In order to videotape, a videotape machine was used along with a television monitor. Other equipment included a stopwatch in order to time the duration of which each cartoon was shown and two videotapes.

The data was collected through the use of three different forms (see Appendix I, II, and III). The first form consisted of a 6 page rating booklet on which each viewer rated the cartoons (see Appendix I). Each page was identical to the others and encompassed the categories of "funny," "confused," "puzzled," "surprised," "offend," and if viewers had ever seen the cartoon before. The first five categories stated above followed a Likert Scale format with 1 being "not at all" to 5 being "extremely". The last category was a yes or no question. A second form, called the Debriefing Form consisted of three questions (see Appendix II). They dealt with the degree of influence specific outside factors influenced the subjects. These also were of the Likert scale type with 1 being "not at all" and 5 being "extremely". The third set of questions dealt with the amount of insight which the subjects portrayed about the actual procedure of the experiment (see Appendix III). It also asked the the subjects to identify the cartoons shown as well as the sequence which they were shown.

Cartoons. A base of 36 cartoons, 13 each of Herman, Far Side, and Dennis the Menace were pretested by an Honors Psychology colloquium. The six cartoons of each type which were rated the most
funny were ranked according to their rating. The two highest of each type of cartoon was then paired with the second two highest rated cartoons of a second type and the lowest two rated cartoons of the third type. This created three sets of six cartoons, two of each type, which were equally humorous according to the pre-test results (see Appendix VIII).

Procedure. The experiment took place in Room 351 of Lucina Hall at Ball State University. The room was approximately 20'x20' with a window on the north wall of the room. The screen was also located on this same wall with a desk below it. On top of the desk was the videocamera which was partially hidden from the view of the subjects by a wooden board placed vertically on the desk. A circle was cut out of the board in the center allowing only the lens of the videocamera to be seen. In the center of the room were either two or four chairs, depending on the experimental condition, facing the screen. Directly behind the chairs stood a table trolley which supported the slide projector, the videotape unit, and the television monitor. Hooks were also located on the south wall.

The hallway outside the room contained a chair with a sign above it asking the subjects to "Please wait here" until the experiment in progress was completed. The chair was positioned so as the subjects would have their backs to the door.

The subjects were run one-at-a-time. The experiment began by the subject and confederates being admitted into the room and asked to sit down (see Appendix V). The subject was always seated in the center right chair in order to be videotaped. Introductions of first names were made and a short introduction was read.
by the experimenter. Informed consent forms were then read and signed by the subjects and confederates (see Appendix IV). The experimenter then passed out $2.00 to everyone. The rating booklets were distributed to all and the rating procedure was explained briefly with each category defined. After time for questions was given to the raters, the rating began. One of a series of three sets of cartoons was shown by random selection to each subject. Each cartoon was shown on the screen for 10 seconds after which time the projector was turned off, and the raters filled out the scale. The videotape machine was also turned off after each cartoon showing and turned on before each new cartoon.

The confederates for the experiment were signaled to either laugh or remain silent by the signal of a hat hanging on a hook in the room. They maintained that cued condition throughout each entire cartoon series. Under the condition of laughing, the confederates began their chuckles approximately six seconds after the cartoon was shown. All confederates were instructed to chuckle in order for the subjects to hear them. Chuckling was determined by the confederates during the pretest to be a moderate level which was rehearsed.

After the cartoons were projected, the raters were asked to complete the second form, a short questionnaire about the influences on the subjects (see Appendix II). The confederates were then asked for their $2.00 back and the subject was debriefed. The third form (see Appendix III) was given to the subject to complete about the credibility of the confederates and the sequence in which the cartoons were presented. At this time the confederates left the room allowing questions or comments about the experiment.
after completion of the third form. It was then emphasized that the subjects were not to tell anyone else about the experiment in order to ensure clean data. This experimental procedure was standardized throughout as the experimenter read the same verbal remarks to all subjects (see Appendix VI). The experiment lasted approximately 15 minutes.

The videotapes of the facial reactions of the subjects were analyzed by two judges who independently rated the facial expression of each subject to each cartoon on a scale of 0 to 3 (see Appendix VII). The judges also rated the subjects' vocal responses from the videotapes on a scale of 0 to 2 (see Appendix VII). The judges were instructed and rehearsed as to the definitions of the scale in order to obtain reliability between the subjects and between each viewer. The data from these judges along with the rating booklet data was gathered and keypunched onto data cards to be computer analyzed.

RESULTS

Facial Expressions. The facial expression data was obtained through the analysis of two judges who rated the videotapes of the subjects reactions to the cartoons (see Appendix VII). The judges agreed in 75% of the time in assigning facial expressions to the four categories. The interjudge reliability coefficient was $r=0.86$. Since the majority (24%) of the disagreements were between adjacent categories, the median between the two disagreement scores was employed in all statistical analyses. These ratings are presented in Table 1.
The results of these ratings show that the sex of the confederates does not significantly influence the subjects' facial expressions. The sex of the subject also does not produce a significant difference between the ratings of the facial expressions. There is, however, a significant difference of facial expressions between the conditions of silent confederate (\(\bar{x}=0.601\)) and laughing confederate (\(\bar{x}=1.327\)), \(F(1,47)=18.454, p<0.001\). Another influence which shows significant difference between ratings is seen under the condition of one confederate (\(\bar{x}=0.705\)) versus three confederates (\(\bar{x}=1.222\)), \(F(1,47)=9.375, p<0.004\).

**Vocal Response.** The vocal response data was obtained by viewers who rated the responses on a scale of 0 being no sound to 2 being a chuckle heard (see Appendix VII). The judges agreed in 88.9% of the time in assigning vocal reactions to the three categories. The interjudge reliability coefficient was \(r=0.99\). Since the majority (10.8%) of the disagreements were between adjacent categories, the median between the two disagreement scores was employed in all statistical analyses. The vocal responses are presented in Table 1.

There appears to be a significant difference of ratings between the laughing (\(\bar{x}=0.395\)) and silent (\(\bar{x}=0.066\)) confederate conditions, \(F(1,47)=0.234, p<0.05\). Data showing significant difference was also found between the number of confederates (1 vs. 3) present during the experiment. The mean for one confederate is 0.114. The mean for three confederates is 0.347. This difference was significant, \(F(1,47)=0.350, p<0.05\). According to the data, there is no other significant difference seen for the variables.
of subject's sex or confederate's sex, nor the interactions.

**Funiness Ratings.** The rating of the degree of funniness of the cartoons was performed individually by each subject on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being not funny at all and 5 being extremely funny (see Appendix I). These ratings are presented in Table 1. There appeared to be no significant difference for the sex of the subject. The sex of the confederates also had no significant influence. A significant difference is shown, however, under the condition of the confederates. In the silent condition $\bar{x}=2.736$ which is less than in the laughing condition were $\bar{x}=3.486$, $F(1,47)=24.30$, $p < 0.001$. There was, however, no significant difference between the number of confederates present (1 confederate: $\bar{x}=3.007$, 3 confederates: $\bar{x}=3.215$), $F(1,47)=1.875$, $p < 0.05$.

**Perceived Confederate Influence on Facial Reactions.** The variable showing statistical significance which the subjects perceived as the confederates influencing their facial reactions to the cartoons include those of the confederates' reactions. The rating for this consideration ranged from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very strongly), (see Appendix II). These results are presented in Table 2. The mean of the silent confederates ($\bar{x}=1.417$) is less than that of laughing confederates ($\bar{x}=1.833$), $F(1,47)=5.882$, $p < 0.02$. There was no evidence of significance in the other variables of confederate sex, subject sex, or number of confederates.

**Perceived Confederate Influence on Funniness Ratings.** The rating of the subject's perceptions of the influence of the confederates upon the subjects individual ratings of the cartoons ranged from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very strongly), (see Appendix II).
TABLE 1

Mean Facial Reactions, Vocal Responses, Funniness Ratings with Silent or Laughing Confederates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SILENT CONFEDERATES</th>
<th>LAUGHING CONFEDERATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Confederates</td>
<td>Number of Confederates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funniness</td>
<td>2.653</td>
<td>2.819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These results are presented in Table 2. The sex of the confederate shows significance as the mean amount of influence perceived with male confederates was 1.415 which is greater than the mean amount of perceived influence by female confederates (\(\bar{x}=1.0\)), \(F(1,47)=11.111, p<0.002\). A second variable which produced significance was the confederate's reaction. Subjects perceived that laughing confederates (\(\bar{x}=1.375\)) influenced their ratings on the degree of funniness of the cartoons more than silent confederates (\(\bar{x}=1.042\)) \(F(1,47)=7.111, p<0.01\). The variables of sex of subject and number of confederates did not appear to the subjects to significantly influence their ratings.

The presence of the camera did not show a statistical significance as influencing the subjects ratings and reactions as perceived by the subjects. This is seen by the means in Table 2. The subject's knowledge of the true purpose of the experiment, as reported by the subjects (see Appendix III), did not show significance with any of the independent variables. The same result is seen with the number of cartoons recalled by the subjects after the rating was completed. The results of this data are presented in Table 2.

**DISCUSSION**

The variables of audience size, silent versus laughing confederates, gender of subject, and gender of confederates were manipulated in this experiment. These variables have been demonstrated to increase facial reactions. By manipulating these specific variables, facial expressions were manipulated. Consequently,
TABLE 2

Mean Influential Factors with Silent or Laughing Confederates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SILENT CONFEDERATES</th>
<th>LAUGHING CONFEDERATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Confederates</td>
<td>Number of Confederates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf. influence on laughter</td>
<td>1.417</td>
<td>1.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera influence</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>1.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoons</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
subjective data has been analyzed to determine if facial reaction influence subjective data. The subjective data obtained in this experiment was the individual's funniness rating of the cartoon.

The results of the experiment suggest that the facial reactions do influence the subjective ratings of the subjects for specific conditions. According to the results, statistical significance was found between the condition of the confederate (silent vs. laughing) for facial, vocal, and funniness responses. Therefore, if people surrounding a viewer were laughing, the viewer would facially and vocally portray a more humorous response to the cartoons than if the people surrounding the viewer were not laughing. This same effect occurs for the subjective individual rating of the stimulus. These findings support the research of Smyth and Fuller (1972) and Chapman and Wright (1976).

The manipulation of audience size, however, does not support the above mentioned "facial feedback" hypothesis. According to the results, the number of confederates (1 vs. 3) did illustrate statistical significance for facial and vocal responses but not for the subjective funniness ratings. Therefore, when there were three confederates present the facial and vocal responses were more extreme than when one confederate was present. The number of confederates showed no significant difference for the subjective funniness ratings. These findings tend to support the research of Levy and Fenely (1979) to the extent that as audience size increases, so do facial responses. The results also tend to contradict the research of Prerost (1977) to the extent that even though audience size increased facial responses, it did not sig-
nificantly increase subjective funniness ratings. This might be
explained, however, by the fact that the difference between the
number of confederates present in this experiment was not a great
enough difference to influence funniness ratings. More research
must be completed in this area to suggest a significant finding.
The results of the other manipulations (sex of subject and sex of
confederates) illustrated no significant differences of the manipu-
lations on facial, vocal, and funniness data.

An area of interest for this experiment is seen through the
data of the subjects' perception of influence. A significant dif-
ference of subjects experiencing laughing confederates perceived
more influence over their facial and funniness ratings (subjects
were not questioned about vocal responses) than subjects experiencing
silent confederates. There was no significant amount of difference
shown between the amount of influence on subjects with one confe-
derate than with three confederates. According to the data, however,
the number of confederates did significantly influence the facial
and vocal responses but not the subjective funniness ratings.
This finding suggests that the subjects are not as aware of their
facial responses which appear to be more easily influence than
the individual funnines ratings. This does not support the
"facial feedback" hypothesis. It suggests more credibility to the
significance of the data which suggests that facial and vocal
reactions are independently influenced from the subjective funniness
ratings.

A second area of interest is found that the subjects' per-
ceived influence on funniness ratings is significantly different
according to the sex of the confederate. Subjects who experienced male confederates perceived a significantly greater amount of influence on funniness ratings than those subjects with female confederates. The data from the subjects actual funniness ratings, however, show no significant difference on ratings between the sex of the confederates. The reason for this perceived influence of confederate sex is not known. It is proposed by this researcher that males possibly are still seen as more authoritative and, therefore, male confederates lead the subjects to perceive them as more influential, although their reactions and ratings do not support this. More research is needed in this area in order to explain this occurrence.

This experiment appears to be a clean experiment as the subjects stated not being influenced by the presence of the videocamera. Therefore, it is deduced that the camera did not influence the results. Another factor is that the subjects reported that they did not know the purpose of the experiment approximately the same degree regardless of the condition the subjects experienced. The number of cartoons recalled also showed no significant difference between the subjects. Therefore, it is suggested that the experimental procedure was uniformly performed for all subjects whereby producing clean data.

In conclusion, this experiment partially supports the "facial feedback" hypothesis of Lanzetta, Biernat, and Kleck (1982). As the facial reactions are manipulated by the condition of the confederate (silent vs. laughing) so are the funniness ratings.
Subjects also perceived more influence under these conditions of facial and funniness ratings. The area of disagreement with the "facial feedback" hypothesis occurs under the condition of number of confederates. According to Prerost (1977) and Levy and Fenley (1979) as audience size increases, so should facial reactions and humor ratings. These were not the findings in this experiment. Although the increased number of confederates significantly increased facial reactions, it did not increase funniness ratings. Subjects also did not perceive significant influence on facial reactions or funniness ratings for these conditions. Therefore, it is suggested that the facial reactions do not necessarily influence the funniness ratings under all manipulations of facial reactions.
how funny does this cartoon appear to you? Circle the number.
1 = not at all  2 = slightly  3 = moderately  4 = very  5 = extremely

How confused does this cartoon make you feel? Circle the number.
1 = not at all  2 = slightly  3 = moderately  4 = very  5 = extremely

How surprised does this cartoon make you feel? Circle the number.
1 = not at all  2 = slightly  3 = moderately  4 = very  5 = extremely

How puzzled does this cartoon make you feel? Circle the number.
1 = not at all  2 = slightly  3 = moderately  4 = very  5 = extremely

How much does this cartoon offend you? Circle the number.
1 = not at all  2 = slightly  3 = moderately  4 = very  5 = extremely

Have you seen this cartoon before? Check the appropriate response.
_____ Yes  _____ No

This form was duplicated five times and stapled together to form a booklet.
Debriefing Questions

To what extent did the presence of the video camera influence your reactions or ratings of the cartoons? Circle the number.
1=not at all  2=slightly  3=moderately  4=strongly  5=very strongly

To what extent did the person(s) sitting by you influence your facial or behavioral reactions to the cartoons? Circle the number.
1=not at all  2=slightly  3=moderately  4=strongly  5=very strongly

To what extent did the person(s) sitting next to you influence your ratings of the cartoons? Circle the number.
1=not at all  2=slightly  3=moderately  4=strongly  5=very strongly
THIRD QUESTIONNAIRE

My hypothesis was that the person(s) sitting by you would influence your reactions to the cartoons. Did you realize that this was the purpose of the experiment? Circle the number.

1=no, not at all  2=I suspected it, but was not sure  3=yes, I definitely knew

On these 3 sheets of paper are 36 cartoons numbered 1-36. Below write the number of the cartoons in order to identify which cartoon was shown 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th.

Cartoon shown 1st ____
Cartoon shown 2nd ____
Cartoon shown 3rd ____
Cartoon shown 4th ____
Cartoon shown 5th ____
Cartoon shown 6th ____
INFORMED CONSENT

1. In this experiment you will be asked to rate a series of cartoons on several factors dealing with your impressions of each cartoon. While you are making these ratings you will be videotaped. Please do not talk to one another. The experiment should last about 15 minutes.

2. There is one possible discomforting aspect to participating in this experiment. That is, you may feel ill at ease knowing you are being videotaped.

3. The benefits to be expected from participating in this experiment are educational. You will learn something about how psychology experiments are conducted, and you will aid in the understanding of human behavior. In addition, you will receive $2.00.

4. There appear to be no appropriate alternative procedure known at this time that 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 consent and to discontinue participation in this experiment at any time. Further, you also have the right to withdraw your data at any time. 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 videotapes will be erased after they are analyzed. The data will be reported in such a way as to keep all participants anonymous.

***************

I have read the above statement of informed consent.

Date ___________________________  Participant's Signature ___________________________

Julie Schoettinger
Undergraduate Psychology Major
Ball State University
CONFEDERATE NAMES

Females
Teresa Huffman
Joy Henderson
Dawn Hoblet
Diane Heribacka

Males
Tom MacKendrick
Clint Stotts
Jeff Fordyce
Mark Creamer
Thank you for assisting with this experiment today. My name is Julie Schoetteringer, and I am a senior Psychology major. I would like you both (all) to read the consent form and sign your names at the bottom. (Pass out rating booklets) As promised, here is your $2.00.

I will show you a series of six cartoons one-at-a-time on the screen that you see before you. I will then give you a few minutes to rate each cartoon. After you have completed rating the cartoon on the screen by circling the appropriate response for each question, please turn to the next page in the rating booklet as a signal to me that you are ready for the next cartoon. Now to explain the rating booklet terms—funny means does it make you laugh; confused means do you understand why it is funny; surprised means was the outcome unexpected; puzzled means are you not sure if you think it is funny; and offend means does it anger you. Please remember not to speak to each other during the rating. Are there any questions?

(After rating) That completes the cartoon series. Thank you for your cooperation, and I'll collect the booklets. Now could you please answer these questions about the experiment. I would now like to ask N. (N., & N.) for his (her, their) $2.00 back and will explain why. N. (N., & N.) is (are) my helper (s) for this experiment. As I told you earlier, I am running this experiment to receive your interpretations of the cartoons. I also, however, have another reason for asking you to rate the cartoons. N. (N., & N.) was (were) previously instructed to either laugh or remain
silent while viewing the cartoons. I am going to analyze your ratings with other subjects' ratings to determine if the responses of my helper(s) influenced your ratings of the cartoons. Other studies of this kind have suggested that the presence of one laughing will make the cartoon appear to be more funny than if no one is laughing. I am also studying the effects of sex of the helper on your rating of the cartoons. I am running this experiment with 47 other subjects and should have my analysis completed around spring quarter. After I have completed my analysis I will erase the videotapes and destroy the list of subjects' names to ensure your anonymity. I would now like to ask you to answer this final questionnaire about the experiment itself. (After completion) Are there any questions or remarks that you would like to make? Thank you again for your cooperation, and I'd appreciate it if you do not tell anyone else what I have just told you. For this experiment to be authentic it is important that the raters rate the cartoons in as natural a situation as possible.
Appendix VII

RATING FOR VIDEOTAPING EXPRESSIONS

Mouth closed before cartoon is shown

0) No lip movement; no smile
1) Weak Smile, lip corners drawn back, teeth not visible
2) Moderate Smile, lip corners drawn back so that teeth are visible
3) Strong Smile, now mouth is clearly open. Eyes may also squint and nose wrinkles. This may be accompanied by chuckle or laugh

Mouth open before cartoon is shown

0) No lip movement; no smile
1) Weak Smile, same degree as on left, lip corners drawn back, teeth are slightly visible because mouth began open
2) Moderate Smile, same degree as on left, lip corners drawn back so that teeth are definitely more visible than the above
3) Strong Smile, mouth is open much more. Eyes may squint and nose wrinkles. This may be accompanied by chuckle or laugh

Please determine if the subject is emitting a sound similar to a laugh. The scale is as follows:

0) no sound
1) chuckle=slight sound, air escapes from the mouth
2) laugh
Try to relax, ma'am... You say it was dark, you were alone in the house, when suddenly you felt a hand reaching from behind and... JOHNSON! Knock it off!

"You gotta be real quiet, Joey, see those guys standing back there? They're HUGHERS!"

"My Mom told me to always say 'no thank you.' But I don't think she realized how small the helpings would be."

"The top keeps flying off this food mixer."

"Can you cut me a star-shaped piece of glass to fit that hole?"

"Wait! Wait! Listen to me! We don't HAVE to be just sheep!"

"Try to relax, ma'am... You say it was dark, you were alone in the house, when suddenly you felt a hand reaching from behind and... JOHNSON! Knock it off!"

"You gotta be real quiet, Joey, see those guys standing back there? They're HUGHERS!"

"My Mom told me to always say 'no thank you.' But I don't think she realized how small the helpings would be."

"The top keeps flying off this food mixer."

"Can you cut me a star-shaped piece of glass to fit that hole?"

"Wait! Wait! Listen to me! We don't HAVE to be just sheep!"

CARTOON SERIES A
"Good heavens, Ronald! ... I think something landed on the roof!"

"I think senior citizen means he hasn't finished high school yet."

"Can you fix me here, or do you have to take me into the shop?"

"In your case, we have no interest at all!"

"How am I supposed to know you're allergic to these if you don't tell me!"

"Why ... yes ... thank you ... I should ... like ... a ... knuckle ... sandwich."
"Oh! is that so? ... Well, YOU'VE got a big MOUTH!"

"Boy! You don't want dirt on my hands, you don't want dirt on the towel... where DO you want it?"

"George! For Heaven's sake! That's our WELCO MAIL!"

"Cindy's getting a job at a bank and needs you as a reference."

"Nurse... see if you can find my little rubber hammer."
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