

PREFERENCE FOR HUMOR OF DIFFERING
LOGICAL TYPES

By

Louis Franklin Pearson
Bachelor of Science
Castleton State College
Castleton, Vermont

1967

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1971

PROCESSED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF
INTERNAL SECURITY

Thesis
1971
P 361 p
cop 2

CONFIDENTIAL
EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC
DOWNGRADING AND
DECLASSIFICATION

EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC
DOWNGRADING AND
DECLASSIFICATION
DATE 01/11/2001
BY 60322

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
AUG 12 1971

PREFERENCE FOR HUMOR OF DIFFERING
LOGICAL TYPES

Thesis Approved:

Julia L. Miller
Thesis Adviser
Kenneth P. Sandvold
D. D. Auburn
Dean of the Graduate College

788714

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Dr. Julia McHale for her invaluable assistance on my thesis research, and for her continued guidance throughout my program at OSU. Also I wish to thank Dr. Kenneth Sandvold for his warm support, and his willingness to allow me to actively contribute whatever my knowledge and nature demanded.

I offer special thanks to Dr. Harriman. To be able to support a level of consciousness so vast, in a sea of ignorance so pervasive, to proclaim his cynicism without embracing it, and to be so productive in his work, inspired my awe and admiration.

Most important, thank you Jerry and Judy for everything.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	1
Some Philosophers on the Nature and Perception of Humor	1
Psychological Investigations of the Nature and Perception of Humor	6
Developmental and Intelligence Variables of Humor Appreciation	9
II. THE PROBLEM	12
Definition of Joke Types	12
Some Theoretical Considerations	14
Statement of Hypotheses	15
Rationale for Hypotheses	16
III. METHOD	18
Subjects	21
Materials	21
Procedure	21
IV. RESULTS	22
V. DISCUSSION	26
VI. SUMMARY	28
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	29
APPENDIX A - JOKE PAMPHLET	31
APPENDIX B - HUMOR RATINGS OF MALE AND FEMALE SUBJECTS FOR TYPE 1 AND TYPE 2 JOKES	36

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Rankings of Judges for TYPE 1 Jokes	19
II. Rankings of Judges for TYPE 2 Jokes	20
III. Total Raw Scores Given by Males and Females for Each Type of Humor	23
IV. Mean Ratings Given for Each Type of Humor by Male and Female Subjects	23
V. Summary of AOV for Humor Appreciation as a Function of Type of Humor and Sex	24
VI. Summary of AOV for Humor Appreciation as a Function of College Class Level	25

CHAPTER I

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

"There is one tongue that everybody in the world could understand--the language of laughter" (Ausable, 1951). Grotjohn (1958) has suggested that humor and the ability to laugh is one of the distinguishing characteristics of the human race. Its universality as well as its inherent fascination has stimulated many theorists to attempt an explanation of what humor is, how it functions, and what purposes it might serve.

Greig (1923), Grant (1924), Piddington (1933), and Rapp (1947, 1949) have compiled excellent reviews of the philosophical theories of humor. Bergler (1956) lists and describes more than 80 theories of humor. While no attempt will be made here to summarize the work of the philosophers, we shall present some selected theories of humor that include early concepts as well as more contemporary formulations.

Some Philosophers on the Nature and Perception of Humor

Aristotle (see Greig, 1923) states that there are many types of situations that are laughable. For him the condition of deceptive surprise seems to be the underlying determinant. He says:

Laughter is a sort of surprise and deception and that is why people laugh when they are struck in the midriff; for it is not by being struck in any chance spot that we are made to laugh. What escapes notice deceives us;

and that is why the same thing sometimes is and sometimes is not a cause of laughter.

Cicero (see Piddington, 1933) speaks of the emotional disguise and veiled quality of humor. He suggests that its origin is something disgraceful to which attention is drawn in a manner not at all disgraceful. Schopenhauer sees humor as the feeling of intellectual triumph "in getting the joke," or the recognition of the incongruity involved in the joke. Hegel makes the following statement about laughter: "...little more than an expression of self-satisfied shrewdness; a sign that they have sufficient wit to recognize such a fact and are aware of the fact." Kant (see Greig, 1923) considers laughter as a "...sudden transformation of a strained expectation into nothing."

Thomas Hobbes, in his Leviathan, expresses a theory of superiority but also gives emphasis to the suddenness of the humor phenomenon. He sees humor as an experience of emotional dominance. He says that joy occurring from laughter is not merely due to the appreciation of wit, "...for men laugh at mischances and indecencies wherein there lies no wit or jest at all." He holds that laughter "is caused by either some sudden act of their (the laugher's) own, that pleaseth them; or by the apprehension of some deformed thing in another, by comparison whereof they suddenly applaud themselves."

Other philosophers such as Hartley, see the removal of fear as an essential predeterminant for humor and laughter. In his Observation of Men he makes the following observation:

Young children do not laugh aloud for some months. The first occasion of doing this seems to be a surprise, which brings on a momentary fear first, and then a momentary joy in consequence of the removal of that fear, agreeably to what may be observed of the pleasure that follows the removal of pain. This may appear probably inasmuch as laughter is a nascent

cry, stopped of a sudden; also because of the same surprise which makes young children laugh be a very little increased, they will cry (in Bergler, 1956, p. 7).

As shall be seen shortly, Hartley's speculations anticipate the formulations of Kris (1952) who deals with the relationship of humor to identification, ego mastery, and the ability of the individual to overcome half assimilated fears.

One of the first psychologists to discuss humor in his publications was Bain (1859). He expresses dissatisfaction with the idea that all humor could be explained on the basis of incongruity. He notes that there are many things that were incongruous that are not funny. He states:

The serious worshipper in church is shocked by the intrusion of a profane incident, while the irreverent and unwilling attender is convulsed with mirth... The mind wherein this is strongly cherished is deeply offended at the contact of anything degrading or vulgarizing, whereas anyone who feels the sentiment lightly will join in the laugh at his own expense (p. 283).

Bain's position here is very similar to the position taken by Kris (1952). Kris speaks of discomfort in the face of a joke when one is unable to dissociate oneself from the experience because of a strong identification with the butt of the joke. He goes on to assert that relative detachment is a preliminary condition for comic enjoyment.

Bain also speaks of the blessed relief of laughter. He refers to the energy released by withdrawal of restraint:

It would thus appear that whatever imparts a sudden elation to the spirits, by withdrawing restraint, or increasing the conscious energy, raises an emotion of the pleasurable kind, of which laughter is one manifestation (p. 233).

Bain herein anticipates Freud's psychoanalytic formulation of humor

involving the elements of suddenness, tension reduction, and economic process.

Freud's contributions to the psychology of humor fall into two categories. In his earlier work, Wit and its Relation to the Unconscious, published in 1905, he was primarily concerned with the understanding of topographical and economic relationships. Included as contributing elements in this category are the devices of condensation, ambiguity, double meanings, and representation through opposites. In his later writing, Freud concerns himself primarily with the dynamic and structural aspects of humor, and an effort is made to arrive at a clear view of the ego's position in the humor process. It is in this shift from studying the technique of wit to studying the tendencies of wit that he reaches what is perhaps his most important conclusion about wit--that the pleasure in wit results from the fact that a tendency whose gratifications would otherwise remain unfulfilled is actually gratified in a socially sanctioned manner. For Freud, humor is a non-pathological defense mechanism. It is interesting to note that Freud's contribution is unique only in that his formulations are set within psychoanalytic theory.

Ego psychology, which grew out of psychoanalytic theory, characterizes humor as representing a compromise between the tendencies of the Id and the Superego. Kris (1952) formulates what he calls "a double-edged" character of humor which he describes as follows:

...if the comic process is to succeed, we may conceive of this as dependent on two factors. The claims of instinctual life are satisfied by its content, the objection of the superego by the manner of its disguise. When the ego is so able to master the tension between the two, pleasure can arise from unpleasure. The double-edged character of the comic phenomena, however, is seen to be a quality

conditioned by the conflict in which they originate; at times it succeeds in opposing the work devolving upon the ego, so this impresses us as failure (p. 185).

By this he means that these comic phenomena, under certain conditions can cause displeasure or even pain instead of pleasure. He sees unsuccessful dissociations as one instance where humor can cause displeasure. If we identify with the person laughed at, we feel discomfort instead of pleasure. He says, "it is as if our old fear, the mastering of which is a necessary precondition of the comic, were suddenly strong enough to overwhelm our actual experience."

Arieti (1969) presents a theory of humor which encompasses the several major aspects of those theoretical positions already cited. He accepts the premise forwarded by both Cicero and Freud concerning the tendency of wit to allow gratification of forbidden impulses. Arieti also does not disclaim the effects of the various topographical devices which Freud delineated. Yet, for Arieti, these devices merely add charm or increase the power of the joke. He holds that the main determinant of perception of wittiness is the recognition of an incongruity between the logical meaning of the joke and an alternate meaning predicated upon pre-logical cognitive processes which Arieti refers to as paleologic. An "unexpected shift" in focus as the essence of wit is suggested, as we have seen, by Aristotle and Kant as well as by Freud. The fact that the incongruity needs to be understood, and felt in its comic contrast, captures the quality of "intellectual triumph" put forward in the theories of both Schopenhauer and Hobbes. This required moment of reflection (be it conscious or unconscious) implies an initial intellectual distance which alludes to the dissociation and disinvolvement which are described in the

positions stated by Bain and Kris.

Psychological Investigations of the
Nature and Perception of Humor

Many psychological investigations of humor have yielded experimental evidence that tend to corroborate the previously cited theoretical formulations in many aspects. Hall and Allin (1897) collected descriptions of humor provoking situations from 700 children of both school and pre-school age. They found that learning definitely plays an important part in the development of the ability to perceive humor. This occurs when the child learns, "how to cast our fear" and begins to substitute joy for dread. They describe this as follows:

These nursery experiences again tend to lift the child above some fears, so that the pleasure of transcending them and laughing at what has just been feared is also involved....

To be able to substitute joy for dread, to conquer a hitherto forbidden field of either thought or action, to enter by sympathy into a new item of life, formerly barred to it by dread, constitutes one distinct element in the very manifold causes of the laughter, because it again widens the range of the soul's activity, instead of contracting it as it does in pain (pp. 18-19).

Hall and Allin's position is very closely followed by Jacobson (1946) who sees appreciation of humor coming from anticipation of pleasure to come in addition to mastery of a situation where there once had been fear. She also sees laughter resulting from the gaining of new strength by the ego following a temporary identification with the inferior person in the joke.

Murray (1934) and his collaborators, in their investigation of the psychology of humor, related the appreciation of humor to the "disparagement of an unaffiliated object." They saw the joke as a

more or less socialized manifestation of the need to destroy the object. They conceived of a positive response to a joke as an index of negative sentiment in regard to a disparaged object. In their study which dealt with responses to race disparagement jokes, they concluded that:

Individuals...particularly those who are emotionally immature...do not laugh at the misadventurous experiences or discreditable aspects of objects for which it is certain they possess positive sentiments and...conversely, they do laugh at the expense of unaffiliated objects (p. 364).

Murray's findings, along with the findings of Hall and Allin, and Jacobson, seem to be in agreement with the position stated by Kris (1952) regarding disengagement of self from the situation if one is to appreciate a joke.

Ghosh (1939) found that the overcoming of inhibition results in greater appreciation of jokes. In addition, he identified what he calls "pre-existing feelings, negative and positive to the subject matter, anxiety, humiliation, aggression, ambiguity, and self-reproach" as factors relating to the funniness of jokes. He further states that humor affords a defense against guilt feelings and consequent inferiority, and at the same time, provides a cover for aggression. He concluded:

Humor serves as an escape from reality, an expression of aggression, etc.: failure of humor is attended by unpleasant consequences, viz. The arousal of pity, anger, annoyance, sympathy; the search for humor is a very common phenomenon; humor affords a cover for the expression of many socially tabooed wishes; humor can make aggression, retaliation and humiliation innocuous...(p.99).

Ghosh points up the defensive nature of humor, but he does not go as far as Kris and Freud, who refer to it as a defense mechanism. Ghosh

also supports Freud's tenet that humor allows for gratification of forbidden impulses in an innocuous way.

In 1951, Redlich, Levine and Sohler, published a study designed to investigate the relationship between personality and humor. Three operational hypotheses were derived from Freud's theory of humor as a pleasurable release of inhibited wishes. On the basis of these hypotheses, inferences were made about the significance of responses to humorous stimuli.

The test consisted of a group of 36 cartoons depicting approximately 25 intra-psychic and interpersonal themes. The subjects were involved in three successive procedures, where the examiner observed and recorded the different forms of expressive and verbal responses to the humorous depictions. Analysis of test findings led to psychoanalytic inferences about the subject's aggressive and dependent needs, and the defenses mobilized against their expression. Diagnostic and dynamic formulations were then made concerning each subject, and these were checked against clinical diagnosis and overt symptoms. Correlation of test results with clinical findings tended to corroborate Freud's theory of humor.

The cognitive shift which Arieti (1969) proposes as the necessary ingredient in the perception of wittiness also finds some experimental support. Maier (1932) investigated humor in terms of Gestalt Psychology. He postulated that the humor experience depends upon a thought configuration which is unprepared for, and which presents suddenly a change in meaning. The elements of the configuration, according to Maier, must be experienced with emotion and be "harmonized, explained and unified." In the joke, he holds that the final

configuration is told to us; "we do not have to find it." In the same vein, Scheerer (1931) observed the similarity between problem solving and humorous experience. In each case, the organization of the material into a new gestalt is required. However, in humor a "recentering" is a requirement to the "solution" of the joke. We may point out here that this "recentering" could be conceived as analogous to Arieti's concept of paleologic shift.

Developmental and Intelligence Variables of Humor Appreciation

In the review of the literature on humor appreciation, the pertinence of developmental and intelligence variables emerge, and cannot, therefore, be ignored. Both Kris (1952) and Grotjohn (1957) speak of the comic sense appearing when some degree of mastery is achieved and the anxiety connected with achievement is partially overcome. Wolfenstein (1954) points out that intelligence, which is related to mastery in general, is also similarly related to the mastering of the joke format. She states:

While joke comprehension tends to increase with age, there are other important factors to which it is related. Intelligence and interest in both are relevant...other things being equal, the child of good intelligence who generally learns easily will also master, with greater facility the modes of joke formation. Dull children are slower to grasp jokes (p. 204).

Gesell and Ilg (1946) also propose that the humor sense is subject to the laws of growth. They suggest that it can be educated since, with age, it becomes increasingly identified with language and thought. Yet they warn that "the child's sense of the comic is one of the most difficult to measure by means of standardized procedure, and his re-

sponse to such a test as the present one (Gesell Developmental Scale), involves great difficulties in the matter of interpretation." They point out that the word "funny" in many instances has no connotation. Originally, it seems to be applied to any unfamiliar disposition of familiar things.

Hersfeld and Prager (1930) describe the changes in childrens' understanding of the comic as a function of intellectual development. They note, for example, that when children acquire a grasp of size relationships, they find amusement in inanimate objects that show a gross distortion in size, and at later ages, other forms of distortion and incongruity, including human frailties, become effective. They state that the child's most effective means of comic expression consists in his latest discovery, his most recent intellectual acquisition of the moment.

Chandler (1902) found that there was a steady developmental progression from the aggressive to the more humane; from the physical joke to wit, puns and funny sayings; from laughter at someone else to enjoyment of a joke on oneself. His sample consisted of children, age 8 to 15, who were asked to "describe the best joke you heard during vacation."

Kenderdine (1931) found children laughing at puns between the ages 3 and 5. Also in this age group were instances of laughter in response to inferiority in others. Kenderdine also noted that { children of higher intelligence tended to laugh more than children of average intelligence.

Lang (1939), in a study using subjects from 7 to 18 years of age, concluded that the development of a sense of humor parallels a child's

intellectual and emotional development. He also noted that in the range of 7 to 13 years, situations that were regarded as humorous were mostly visual, but between the ages of 14 and 18, there was an increased appreciation of verbal humor.

Stump (1939) using the ACE psychological examination failed to find a significant relationship between humor appreciation and intelligence. Omawake (1939) in studying subjects with IQ scores above 124, as compared with IQ scores below 110, found that intelligence "failed to show itself as a delineating factor in the comprehension of the 12 jokes used in the study". Kambouroupoulou, (1926, 1931) in two studies based on diaries kept by 100 college women, of incidents that caused laughter and humor, found that college students of lower academic standing reported more laughter at nonsense humor. However, she found no preference for different kinds of humor as a function of scores on the Thorndike Ability Test.

In summary, we can say that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that some aspects of cognitive growth are related to the ability to perceive humorous stimuli.

CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEM

Definition of Joke Types

The present study addresses itself to the subject of humor preference based on a syntactic differentiation of written humor stimuli. The two modes of humor stimuli that will be employed in this study are specifically characterized as follows:

TYPE 1 - Jokes which rely upon a presented shift from Aristotelean logic to the pre-logical processes of the primary process.¹

¹In An Outline of Psychoanalysis (1940) Freud defined primary process as follows: "We have learned that processes in the unconscious or in the id obey different laws from those in the pre-conscious ego. We name these laws in their totality the primary process, in contrast to the secondary process which regulates events in the pre-conscious or ego." Piaget (1952) has added much to our knowledge of how this type of thinking develops and prepares the way for the logical processes which are characteristic of secondary process thought. Drawing heavily from Piaget, Arieti (1969) formulates a theory of intra-psychic development. Arieti points out that before the child can distinguish between similarity and identity, he must first be able to form concepts. This requires the ability to abstract. Prior to the emergence of the ability to form concepts, the child (usually from age $1\frac{1}{2}$ to age $3\frac{1}{2}$) forms classes organized around some identical segment of experience. Because the segment of experience cannot be abstracted the total identification of very different subjects is possible since they both share one focal, common element and, therefore, both elicit the same response from the child. The common element which leads to the identification is called the identifying element. The child's first identifications are predicatively based in the action of the object. Freud calls this primal identification animism, wherein Piaget prefers to call it motor-recognition. In either case, when two objects are identified on the basis of a common predicate, we have a perfect example of a type of primary process thinking which Arieti terms Paleologic.

TYPE 2 - Jokes which rely upon word-play, including puns. In word-play humor, the shifts from the logical to pre-logical process aren't presented, but are evoked when either dual meanings, phoenetic similarities or structural similarities are expressed in one word or phrase.

Both TYPE 1 and TYPE 2 jokes demand a recognition on the part of the listener of the alternative meaning that can be derived by invoking primary process mechanisms. In discussing the nature and perception of wittiness, Arieti (1969), whose theoretical formulations suggested this study, agrees that jokes are made possible by the adoption of primary process mechanisms which he calls paleologic. However, he points out that it is not just the use of paleologic that confers the witty character to the joke. Says Arieti:

In my opinion one perceives a stimulus as witty when he is set to react to logic and then realizes that he is instead reacting to paleologic.

To illustrate the formal structure that Arieti identifies as essential to the joke, the following example is offered:

"Mr. Bodkin?"
 "Yes, Doctor?"
 "I don't like the way your wife looks."
 "You too, huh."

In this joke, the verb "to look" is identified although it is used in two distinct connotative modes. At the logical level, the listener or reader is set to react to the doctor's use of the verb "to look" in reference to Mrs. Bodkin's health. He finds instead that he is compelled to react to this same predicate; however, now its sense refers to Mr. Bodkin's negative aesthetic appreciation of his wife. He laughs when he becomes self-aware of the cognitive inconsistency he has fallen into. Identification (to treat as identical) by predicates instead of by subjects is an instance of primary process cognition.

In word-play humor, primary process mechanisms are invoked, but the humor is not derived in the same fashion as it is for TYPE 2 humor. Using the pun as an example, Arieti (1969) points out that in this type of humor the proposed logical level of the joke retains its primacy. There is no shift away from the logical level; instead primary process cognition serves only to give additional power to the logical meaning. Here is an example:

I used to work in a candle factory. It was a good job. I only worked on wick-ends.

In this pun-based joke, the tag line, "I only worked on wick-ends", can stand alone as a logical statement. However, the identification of "worked on wick-ends" with the phoenetically suggested predicate "worked on weekends" requires the primary process mechanism of identification by predicates. But here, instead of shifting the meaning away from the logical level as was the case in the first example, the primary process invocation merely adds additional emphasis to the logical meaning, thereby increasing its power.

Some Theoretical Considerations

Because this study is concerned with joke types which are different in their syntactical construction, it might be helpful to note some theoretical formulations which Arieti (1969) makes about language development. He posits that a child acquires language in three sequential but overlapping stages. The first stage is called the stage of denotation. In this stage, says Arieti, "names of actions and things accumulate at a great rate." This is followed by the stage of verbalization wherein the word no longer stands for the thing, but it acquires a power of its own. Like in the "word-magic" of the

psychotic, for the child at this stage the word becomes the thing itself. In the third stage, language reaches its greatest cognitive importance as words come to acquire connotative power. This happens when a word can stand for a concept.

In TYPE 1 jokes, since a shift occurs from a logical to a paleo-logical level, the acquisition of the ability to operate at a logical level is a necessary condition if the listener is to appreciate the joke. According to Piaget (1957), processes which are recognizably prototypical of Aristotelean logic do not begin to appear until well after the child has passed through his initial encounters with language as denotation, verbalization and connotation. In normal development, Piaget places the acquisition of full logical function at approximately the end of the pre-adolescent period. Clearly, TYPE 2 jokes, owing to their reliance on structural or phonetic similarity, or homonymous meanings, require cognitive processes which are ontogenetically more primitive than those required to appreciate TYPE 1 jokes. The implications of this conclusion are pertinent to the hypotheses postulated in the study, and will be discussed in the rationale.

Statement of Hypotheses

In this investigation ninety male and ninety female college students were given fifteen TYPE 1 and TYPE 2 jokes pre-selected for level of humor, and asked to rate them on a three point scale of funniness.

The following hypotheses are postulated:

1. That college students would show a significant preference for TYPE 1 humor.

2. That females will show a significantly greater preference for TYPE 2 humor than do males.
3. That males will show a significantly greater preference for TYPE 1 humor than do females.
4. That significant change in humor preference, shifting toward a greater appreciation of TYPE 2 humor, will be found to occur between the freshman and the senior year.

Rationale for Hypotheses

As we have already indicated, the ability to appreciate TYPE 2 humor is developed prior to the ability to appreciate TYPE 1 humor. The contention made by Hersfeld and Prager (1930) that a person's most effective comic expression consists in his latest intellectual acquisition, would lead us to assume that TYPE 1 humor, because of its reliance on more newly acquired, logical cognitive processes, would be favored among a college level population. It is true that, according to this reasoning, anyone who has failed to develop in their logical function would show a preference for TYPE 2 humor. We can assume, however, that by using college students as Ss we have avoided this pitfall.

The second and third hypotheses are based on several considerations. The literature is myriad showing that males and females, whether for constitutional or cultural reasons, approach or respond to a broad range of stimulus situations in different ways. Specifically in the humor area, O'Connell (1960) found that women respond to hostile wit in a way that is significantly different than do men. Erikson (1950) has suggested that males are constitutionally more interested in the formal aspects of experience, while females are more concerned with the internal and aesthetic qualities of experience.

It follows that logicality would be of greater interest to males than to females. For this reason we infer that the one-way cognitive shift off of the logical plane that occurs in TYPE 1 humor would be experienced more intensely by a male than by a female.

The fourth hypothesis was included as an attempt to determine whether there is an expansion or a shift of interest which parallels the rapid intellectual development that takes place between the freshman and senior year of college. The expectation that any significant shift would be toward a greater appreciation of TYPE 2 humor is suggested by Kris (1952). He states that the ability to invoke the more primitive cognitive process modes is an index of creativity. One might assume that the experience of a college education would tend to facilitate creative growth.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Fifteen TYPE 1 jokes and 15 TYPE 2 jokes were selected at random from a joke book.¹ In order to establish whether a uniform degree of humorousness existed among the jokes of each respective type, ten psychology graduate students acted as judges. The jokes were separated into two separate stacks, TYPE 1 and TYPE 2, and presented to the 10 judges along with the following oral instructions:

Please rank the jokes in each stack according to how funny you feel they are. There are 15 jokes in each stack. When you rank the jokes, place the funniest joke in each stack on the top of its stack, the next funniest next to the top...and so on, until the least funny joke in each stack is on the bottom of that stack.

The rankings of the judges are shown in Table I and Table II for TYPE 1 jokes and TYPE 2 jokes, respectively. Kendall's coefficient of concordance was computed to determine the similarities of rankings among the different judges for each joke. Of a possible concordance of 100%, the concordance for each joke type proved to be only 14%. This score was converted to a chi-square score, and subsequently referred to the chi-square distribution. It was found that there was no significant agreement between the judges as to the degree of funniness of the jokes with each joke type. It was then assumed that an adequate uniformity of humorousness had been achieved within each joke type.

¹Al Boliska, The World's Worst Jokes (New York, 1969).

TABLE I
RANKINGS OF JUDGES FOR TYPE 1 JOKES

Judges	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
A	6	15	10	7	1	9	3	4	5	8	2	13	14	12	11
B	2	6	1	9	7	4	11	12	5	3	14	8	10	15	13
C	3	10	5	12	11	14	13	15	7	4	8	1	6	9	2
D	11	7	3	9	14	10	2	6	12	15	5	1	4	8	13
E	1	7	11	2	15	9	10	8	6	12	4	13	5	3	14
F	10	2	13	7	4	3	12	5	15	14	6	1	9	8	11
G	3	11	1	15	9	8	5	6	12	14	10	7	4	13	12
H	11	8	6	5	3	14	9	15	12	13	7	2	10	4	1
I	2	12	9	6	3	13	8	7	14	10	5	15	1	4	11
J	8	3	5	12	1	7	14	11	10	2	6	15	9	4	13
Totals	57	81	64	84	68	91	87	89	98	95	67	76	72	80	101

$$W = \left(\frac{12 T^2}{m^2 N(N^2 - 1)} \right) - \frac{3(N+1)}{N-1}$$

$$S = .14$$

$$X^2 = m(m-1)W$$

$$X^2 = 19.6 \text{ not significant}$$

TABLE II
RANKINGS OF JUDGES FOR TYPE 2 JOKES

Judges	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
A	2	6	14	5	10	11	13	9	15	1	12	3	7	4	8
B	2	7	14	15	9	1	13	11	10	4	12	3	6	8	5
C	5	13	11	4	15	7	10	8	3	6	14	9	12	2	1
D	5	7	8	14	10	1	11	15	12	13	9	6	4	2	3
E	10	7	11	9	6	14	5	3	4	2	13	8	12	1	15
F	5	15	4	10	12	7	2	3	8	6	9	14	1	13	11
G	12	11	14	13	2	7	6	5	1	8	15	10	4	3	9
H	8	6	3	5	12	14	13	11	15	4	10	7	9	2	1
I	6	9	14	4	12	7	10	11	8	2	13	3	1	5	15
J	11	9	8	12	6	10	7	2	4	13	5	14	1	15	3
Totals	66	90	101	91	94	79	90	78	80	59	112	77	57	55	72

$$W = \left(\frac{12 \sum_j T_j^2}{m^2 N(N^2 - 1)} \right) - \frac{3(m+1)}{n-1}$$

$$W = .14$$

$$X^2 = m(n-1)W$$

$$X^2 = 19.6 \text{ not significant}$$

Subjects

The experimental subjects consisted of 180 undergraduate students enrolled in one of several different psychology courses at Oklahoma State University. There were 90 males and 90 females in this sample, and they represented a broad cross-section of major interest areas. The group was approximately evenly divided between the freshman, sophomore, junior and senior levels.

Materials

A total of 30 jokes, 15 of which were TYPE 1 humor and 15 of which were TYPE 2 humor, and which had previously been screened to establish their uniformity of humorousness within each type, were arranged in varying random orders in pamphlet form. (see Appendix A) Next to each joke there was a space provided where each S could rate each joke.

Procedure

The joke pamphlets were presented to the students in each class selected to participate in the study. The Ss were asked to read the following written instructions:

Directions: In this booklet you will find 30 jokes. Would you please read each joke and rate it on the line provided at the left. Ratings should be made according to the following scheme:

- ...if a joke does not strike you as being funny rate it 0.
- ...if you feel that a joke is funny give it a rating of 1.
- ...if you feel that a joke is quite funny, then rate it 2.

Thank you for your cooperation.

As much time as needed was allowed for the students to complete rating the joke pamphlets. The ratings were collected and the overall scores of both male raters and female raters were compiled. (see Appendix B)

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The total raw scores obtained by male and female subjects for each type of humor are shown in Table III along with the total ratings for TYPE 1 and TYPE 2 combined. The mean ratings given for each type of humor by male and female subjects respectively, are shown in Table IV. A quick glance at Table III and Table IV reveals that in this study, females gave higher ratings for both types of humor than did males.

An analysis of variance for a two factor experiment with repeated measures on one factor (Winer, 1962) was performed to test for an interaction between subjects and joke types, and sex and joke types. Results are summarized in Table V. As can be seen, the student sample showed a preference for TYPE 1 humor over TYPE 2 humor at the .01 level of significance.

The same type of analysis of variance was performed to test for an interaction effect between preference for joke type and college year. To offset the possible confounding effects of maturational factors, all subjects who were either two years older or two years younger than the mean age for their college class were eliminated from this analysis. The total number of those eliminated was five. Results are summarized in Table VI. No new significant interaction was found.

TABLE III
 TOTAL RAW SCORES GIVEN BY MALES AND
 FEMALES FOR EACH TYPE OF HUMOR

	TYPE 1	TYPE 2	TOTAL
Males	952	697	1649
Females	1034	798	1832
Total	1986	1495	

TABLE IV
 MEAN RATINGS GIVEN FOR EACH TYPE OF
 HUMOR BY MALE AND FEMALE SUBJECTS

	TYPE 1	TYPE 2
Males	10.57	7.74
Females	11.48	8.86

TABLE V
 SUMMARY OF AOV FOR HUMOR APPRECIATION AS A
 FUNCTION OF TYPE OF HUMOR AND SEX

Source	df	SS	MS	F
<u>Between Subjects</u>	<u>179</u>	7614.17	<u>42.54</u>	
Sex	1	93.03	93.03	2.202
Subjects within Groups	178	7521.14	42.25	
<u>Within Subjects</u>	<u>180</u>	2689.50	14.94	
Type of Humor	1	669.67	669.67	62.127***
Type of Humor x Sex	1	.997	.997	.092
Type of Humor x Subjects within Groups	178	2018.83	10.78	

***p < .01

TABLE VI
 SUMMARY OF AOV FOR HUMOR APPRECIATION AS A
 FUNCTION OF COLLEGE CLASS LEVEL

Source	df	SS	MS	F
<u>Between Subjects</u>	<u>171</u>	<u>7122.86</u>	<u>41.65</u>	
Class Level	3	26.82	8.94	< 1
Subjects within Groups	168	7094.04	42.23	
<u>Within Subjects</u>	<u>172</u>	<u>2465.00</u>	<u>14.33</u>	
Type of Humor	1	450.00	450.00	41.39 ***
Type of Humor x Class Level	3	19.50	6.50	< 1
Type of Humor x Subjects within Groups	168	1995.50	11.87	

***p < .01

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The results of this study support the hypothesis that TYPE 1 humor is appreciated by a larger audience among college students than is TYPE 2 humor. This, however, does not even remotely suggest that the theoretical considerations that led to this hypothesis have validity. Much more research is necessary if we are to understand with reasonable certainty the factors which underlie our significant findings.

The failure to find significant differences between male and female subjects in their humor preferences may possibly be related to the fact that a college population was used for this study. The level of cognitive development required to pursue a higher education may hold primacy over styles and directions of cognitive approach which have come to be a part of sex role expectancies. It is also possible that such expectancies are fallacious in the first place, and merely a part of a denigrating and self-fulfilling female stereotype which our culture is beginning to shift away from.

This study revealed no significant shift in joke preferences between the freshman and senior year. This may suggest that, in line with Piaget's (1952) research in cognitive growth, the full operational capacity of our cognition is functional in normal development by the beginning of the adolescent period. If this is so, then perhaps one's

cognitive style is set to a great degree by the time one enters college, and the ensuing growth is more a function of new content, and content configurations, than it is a function of developing new cognitive faculties.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

Many studies have been done which attempt to show a relationship between humor preferences and some identifiable differentiating criteria for segregating humorous stimuli into various types. This study segregates humor according to its logical syntax. The two types of jokes used were called TYPE 1 and TYPE 2 humor, respectively. TYPE 1 humor relied upon a presented shift from a logical to a pre-logical mode of cognition. TYPE 2 humor relied upon phoenetic or structural similarities, or homonymous meanings inherent in an identical word or word phrase.

It was hypothesized that college students would show a significant preference for TYPE 1 humor. It was further hypothesized that female students would show a greater preference for TYPE 2 humor than do males, and that male students would show a greater preference for TYPE 1 humor than do females. Lastly, it was hypothesized that students would shift their preferences in the direction of TYPE 2 humor as they progressed from their freshman to senior year.

The first hypothesis was accepted at the .01 level of significance. A need for further research became apparent as a result of this finding. The remaining three hypotheses were rejected, suggesting that neither sex factors nor factors pertaining to college level are relevant to the further investigation of this type of humor research.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ames, L. B. Development of Interpersonal Smiling Responses in Pre-school Children. J. Genet. Psychol., 1949, 74, 273-291.
- Ariati, S. The Intra-Psychic Self. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1969.
- Ausable, N. A Treasury of Jewish Humor. New York: Doubleday, 1951.
- Bergler, E. Laughter and the Sense of Humor. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1956.
- Bird, G. An Objective Humor Test for Children. Psychol. Bull., 1925, 22, 137-138.
- Chandler, K. Childrens' Laughter. Century, 1902.
- Cunningham, A. Relation of Nonsense Humor to Intelligence. J. Soc. Psychol., 1962, 57, 143-147.
- Ding, and Jersild. A Study of the Laughing and Smiling of Preschool Children. J. Genet. Psychol., 1932, 40, 452-472.
- Erikson, E. Childhood and Society. New York: Norton & Company, Inc., 1950.
- Freud, S. Wit and its Relation to the Unconscious. In A. A. Brill (Ed.). The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud. New York: Modern Library, 1938, 633-703.
- Freud, S. Humor. In Collected Papers 5. (1928). J. Strachey (Ed.). London: Hogarth Press, 1950, 215-221.
- Gesell, A. and Ilg, F. The Child from Five to Ten. New York: Harper Bros., 1946.
- Ghosh, R. An Experimental Study of Humor. Brit. J. Educ. Psychol., 1939, 9, 98-99.
- Grotjohn, M. Beyond Laughter. New York: McGraw Hill, 1958.
- Greig, J. The Psychology of Laughter and Comedy. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1923.
- Hayworth, D. The Origin and Function of Laughter. Psychol. Rev., 1928, 35, 367-384.

- Kambouropoulou, P. Individual Differences in the Sense of Humor. Amer. J. Psychol., 37, 1926, 268-278.
- Kambouropoulou, P. Individual Differences in the Sense of Humor and their Relation to Temperamental Differences. Arch. Psychol., 1930, 19, 134-140.
- Kenderdine, H. Laughter of the Pre-School Child. Child Development, 11, 1931, 114-117.
- Kris, E. Psychoanalytic Explorations in Art. New York: Int. U. Press, 1952.
- Lang, A. The Sense of Humor in Childhood and Adolescence. Brit. J. Ed. Psychol., 1939 (Abstr. Ed.D. Thesis).
- Levine, J. and Redlich, F. Intellectual and Emotional Factors in the Appreciation of Humor. J. Gen. Psychol., 1960, 62, 25-35.
- Murray, H., Smith, C. & Wolf, H. The Psychology of Humor. J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 1934, 28, 341-365.
- O'Connell, W. E. The Adaptive Function of Wit and Humor. J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 1960, 61, 263-270.
- Piaget, J. The Origins of Intelligence in Children. New York: Int. U. Press, 1952.
- Piaget, J. Logic and Psychology. New York: Basic Books, 1957.
- Piddington, R. The Psychology of Laughter: A Study in Social Adaptation. London: Figurehead, 1933.
- Stump, N. Sense of Humor and its Relationship to Personality, Scholastic Aptitude, Emotional Maturity, Height and Weight. J. Gen. Psychol., 1939, 20, 25-32.
- Winer, B. J. Statistical Principles and Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962.
- Wolfenstein, M. Children's Understanding of Jokes. Psychoanal. Study of the Child., 1951, 6, 336-350.

APPENDIX A

JOKE PAMPHLET

Name: _____

Circle One: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Grad.

Male Female

Age: _____

Major: _____ (If either your major or minor is psychology, tell whether your

Minor: _____ interest is experimental, general, clinical, etc.)

What was your best subject in high school: _____

If you have decided, what life work do you aspire to: _____

What is your approximate overall grade point average: _____

What is your approximate grade point average in your major: _____

* * *

Directions: In this booklet you will find 30 jokes. Would you please read each joke and rate it on the line provided at the left. Ratings should be made according to the following scheme:

...if a joke does not strike you as being funny, rate it 0.

...if you feel that a joke is funny, give it a rating of 1.

...if you feel that a joke is quite funny, the rating is 2.

Thank you for your cooperation.

_____ "Would you buy a ticket? We're holding a raffle for a poor old lady."

"Why would I want to win a poor old lady?"

* * *

_____ In staggered the drunk dermatologist. He was a sight for psoriasis.

* * *

_____ "It's a nice place, but the landlord asks too much for the rent."

"Really?"

"Yeah. Last week he asked for it 5 times."

* * *

_____ "We have a dog with an ingrown tail."

"Really?"

"Yes, we have to X-ray him to find out if he is happy."

* * *

_____ Mrs. Smith sued the hospital for operating on her husband without her consent. She disliked the idea of people opening her male.

* * *

_____ My doctor was very accomodating. I couldn't afford the operation, so he touched up by X-rays.

* * *

_____ "Operator, this is Reverend Jones in Boston. Please get me the parish of Reverend Brown in Tulsa."

"Will you speak to anyone there?"

"No operator. You had better make it parson to parson."

* * *

_____ A psychologist became interested in changing the behavior of rats. In fact, he devoted all his research to pulling habits out of rats.

* * *

_____ 1st goldfish: "There is no God."

2nd goldfish: "There is so."

1st goldfish: "I said there is no god!"

2nd goldfish: "O.K., smart guy, if there is no God, who changes the water every day?"

* * *

____ Once a klansman went to a psychiatrist and asked to be checked under the hood.

* * *

____ Two kids were arguing about their dads:

"My father can beat your father," said the first boy.

"Big deal," said the second, "so can my mother."

* * *

____ I used to work in a candle factory. It was a good job. I only worked on wick-ends.

* * *

____ An astronaut might be defined as a whirled traveller.

* * *

____ "Hey, put your ear up to this box and listen."

"I don't hear anything."

"I know. It's been like that all day."

* * *

____ There was one girl who joined a nudist camp so she could be seen in all the right places.

* * *

____ "Mr. Bodkins?"

"Yes, Doctor?"

"I don't like the way your wife looks."

"You too, huh?"

* * *

____ A politician is a man who tries to make life a bed of ruses.

* * *

____ "I'm worried."

"What's wrong, Harry?"

"Well, yesterday the insurance company doctor gave me my annual physical."

"So?"

"So this morning my agent came around and took his calendar back."

* * *

_____ A nudist camp is a place where nothing goes on.

* * *

_____ "Bartender, did I spend \$100 in here last night?"

"Yes you did."

"Thank God! I thought I had lost it."

* * *

_____ A nudist camp is a place where people can go to air their views.

* * *

_____ "I left my job because of something the boss said."

"What did he say?"

"He said I was fired."

* * *

_____ Beggar: "Mister, I haven't eaten in three days."

Man: "Boy, what will power."

* * *

_____ So I said: "Juliet, Juliet, throw me the rose in your hair."

"Then what did you do?"

"I took the rose and threw back her hair."

* * *

_____ Judge: "Tell the court why you stole the purse."

Defendent: "Well your honor. I guess I thought the change would do me good."

* * *

_____ As the rake said to the hoe: "Hi, Hoe!"

* * *

_____ Have you seen the sign on the door of the church. It reads:

"Closed for Re-prayers."

* * *

_____ 1st girl: "Goodness! What a beautiful mink coat."

2nd girl: "Goodness had nothing to do with it."

* * *

_____ Have you seen the sign that the preacher's wife put up in her

house? It reads: "It's so nice to have 'amen' around the house."

* * *

_____ "For years I didn't know where my husband spent his evenings."

"And now you know?"

"Yes. One evening I came home early, and there he was."

* * *

APPENDIX B
HUMOR RATINGS OF MALE AND FEMALE SUBJECTS
FOR TYPE 1 AND TYPE 2 JOKES

Total Scores on Each Humor Type for Male Ss

Male <u>Ss</u>	TYPE 2	TYPE 1	Male <u>Ss</u>	TYPE 2	TYPE 1
1.	4	7	46.	7	11
2.	8	14	47.	5	6
3.	2	9	48.	0	2
4.	9	13	49.	2	8
5.	13	11	50.	5	5
6.	10	13	51.	3	11
7.	24	24	52.	5	14
8.	2	7	53.	2	0
9.	7	11	54.	14	21
10.	22	14	55.	16	21
11.	19	15	56.	6	7
12.	8	8	57.	10	16
13.	10	20	58.	0	4
14.	9	8	59.	2	10
15.	18	16	60.	5	9
16.	6	6	61.	2	10
17.	11	15	62.	5	10
18.	10	10	63.	16	15
19.	3	6	64.	9	15
20.	18	16	65.	12	14
21.	8	9	66.	0	1
22.	3	8	67.	9	8
23.	7	8	68.	5	7
24.	10	12	69.	1	3
25.	12	14	70.	16	20
26.	8	12	71.	6	8
27.	5	7	72.	9	11
28.	9	7	73.	2	7
29.	13	14	74.	23	26
30.	1	5	75.	8	5
31.	6	16	76.	5	16
32.	12	10	77.	5	9
33.	1	4	78.	13	16
34.	3	11	79.	15	11
35.	14	18	80.	5	17
36.	7	8	81.	8	11
37.	15	13	82.	5	8
38.	4	11	83.	8	6
39.	5	7	84.	4	2
40.	3	9	85.	8	16
41.	12	13	86.	8	14
42.	3	5	87.	2	14
43.	1	8	88.	6	5
44.	6	5	89.	6	19
45.	10	4	90.	3	2

Total Scores on Each Humor Type for Female Ss

Male <u>Ss</u>	TYPE 2	TYPE 1	Male <u>Ss</u>	TYPE 2	TYPE 1
1.	7	12	46.	16	21
2.	11	10	47.	4	5
3.	14	12	48.	9	4
4.	9	14	49.	2	6
5.	14	15	50.	5	12
6.	12	19	51.	7	6
7.	3	20	52.	13	14
8.	10	16	53.	6	8
9.	9	18	54.	11	12
10.	9	16	55.	6	9
11.	5	3	56.	3	5
12.	12	16	57.	10	12
13.	10	12	58.	11	12
14.	4	11	59.	17	16
15.	12	21	60.	13	20
16.	14	12	61.	11	12
17.	2	5	62.	1	0
18.	4	2	63.	8	13
19.	3	12	64.	10	4
20.	10	17	65.	13	18
21.	19	19	66.	11	9
22.	1	7	67.	13	13
23.	17	10	68.	10	15
24.	17	21	69.	10	10
25.	7	18	70.	11	6
26.	9	9	71.	8	9
27.	1	7	72.	23	19
28.	4	6	73.	3	13
29.	2	4	74.	11	4
30.	6	10	75.	8	5
31.	2	2	76.	9	19
32.	8	15	77.	19	9
33.	8	15	78.	6	6
34.	6	8	79.	11	17
35.	9	9	80.	4	19
36.	12	10	81.	12	19
37.	1	8	82.	6	12
38.	9	11	83.	9	13
39.	13	14	84.	9	20
40.	3	9	85.	12	19
41.	3	3	86.	1	10
42.	10	9	87.	15	15
43.	15	15	88.	16	12
44.	7	16	89.	4	7
45.	7	6	90.	11	11

VITA

Louis Franklin Pearson
Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: PREFERENCE FOR HUMOR FOR DIFFERING LOGICAL TYPES

Major Field: Psychology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Albany, New York, November 6, 1940,
the son of Harry A. and Rose Pearson.

Education: Attended grade school in Albany, New York; graduated
from Albany High School in 1958; received the Bachelor of
Science degree from Castleton State College, Castleton,
Vermont, with a major in Education, in January, 1967;
completed requirements for the Master of Science Degree in
May, 1971.

Professional Experience: Served as a Psychologist Assistant,
Vermont State Hospital, Waterbury, Vermont, from March, 1967,
to September, 1968; Graduate Teaching Assistant at Oklahoma
State University, from Fall, 1968, to Spring, 1970.