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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The literature on humor has grown steadily in the past 15 years, and the topic has been approached from many different angles. Keith-Spiegel (1972) has described no less than eight different groups of theories which attempt to account for the phenomenon of humor. Studies have proliferated on the cognitive, developmental, social, ethnic, and physiological (especially arousal) aspects of humor. Humor's functions and purposes, its techniques and content, and its relationship to "play," creativity, fantasy, and sports have been examined. Accompanying the increased quantity of humor literature and its growing diversity has been a trend away from theoretical and correlational works, toward a larger number of hypothesis testing experimental studies. Thus, humor theory and research form an extremely complex area of study. At present, however, humor remains outside the mainstream of modern psychology, with its theoretical models in the early stages of formulation and as yet lacking empirical support (Browning, 1977; Keith-Spiegel, 1972).

From the outset, the problem of definitions has plagued the study of humor. Just what is "humor" or "sense of humor"? Sully (1902), an early theorist, wrote of humor that "hardly a word in the language ... would be harder to define with scientific precision than this familiar
one" (p. 297). As will be seen below, Freud (1960) clearly distin-
guished among "humor," "the comic," and "jokes" (also translated as
"wit"). When his specific concept of "humor" is used in this thesis,
it will be clearly indicated as such. Otherwise, the terms "humor" and
"sense of humor" will be used here as they are colloquially and defined
as in the Random House Unabridged Dictionary (1973), i.e., "humor" as a
comic quality causing amusement; and "sense of humor" as the faculty of
perceiving and expressing what is amusing or comical.

The question of how to operationally define humor and the response
to humor (often referred to as a "mirth response") has also proved to
be perennially difficult. Is a series of printed jokes an appropriate
operationalization of a humor stimulus to be used as an independent
variable? Can the number of laughs be used as a sound basis for deter-
mining the extent of an individual's "humor appreciation"? Since the
problem of assessing sense of humor is central to this thesis, the
operationalization question will be considered in some detail in the
Review of the Literature.

Freud (1960, 1928) attempted to define different dimensions of
"the comic" and of "humor," to analyze and categorize the types and
techniques of "jokes," and to examine this entire subject within the
larger context of man's intellectual and emotional functioning, and of
his conscious and unconscious motivation. Later writers and researchers
have usually focused on one or more specific areas in Freud's work.
Particular emphasis has been given to the function of sexual and
hostile ("tendentious") humor. While the more circumscribed perspective of these studies has resulted in valuable findings, it sometimes seems that the topic of humor has been sliced too fine. It also seems that humor's seamy side has received the most attention. This contrasts with the generally favorable view of psychotherapists whose anecdotal accounts have stressed the positive effects of humor in therapy.

This thesis attempts to focus on several humor-related areas that have received little attention. Its orientation is toward the potential positive functions of humor within the total personality, in furthering interpersonal adjustment, and in the special interpersonal context of psychotherapy. Specifically, the study will investigate: (1) different methods of assessing sense of humor; (2) personality correlates of those with differing senses of humor, and (3) beginning psychotherapists' attitudes toward and use of humor in their therapeutic work.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Freud's Theory about Jokes, the Comic, and Humor

The influence of Freud's works on later humor-related theory and research can scarcely be overestimated. Therefore, they will be considered here in some detail. One of Freud's early writings was a book entitled *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious* (1960). Published in 1905, this work was seldom referred to in Freud's later writings; and unlike his other major works in this period, it remained almost entirely unchanged in later editions. Unexpectedly, after some 20 years, he returned to this subject matter in his short paper on "Humor" (1928), writing with the added perspective of his new structural view of the mind.

Freud's interest in jokes was stimulated by the relationship he believed existed between jokes, dreams, and the unconscious, as well as by his own sheer enjoyment of them. Over a period of years he put together a collection of anecdotes and jokes. He frequently quotes from this collection in his book. Freud (1960) was struck by the "peculiar and even fascinating charm exercised by jokes in our society. A new joke acts almost like an event of universal interest; it is passed from one person to another like the news of the latest victory" (p. 15).
In his book Freud (1960) distinguishes among "the comic" and two subspecies of "the comic" —"jokes" and "humor." All three have in common the aim of "regaining from mental activity a pleasure which has in fact been lost" during the course of one's development. They are all methods of recapturing the "mood of our childhood" when little psychic energy had to be expended for defensive processes. Freud writes that the pleasure provided by jokes results from both their technique and their purpose. He makes his well-known distinction between "innocent" (or "abstract") jokes and "tendentious" jokes. The former are jokes in their purest form, without substance and with no other purpose than to bring pleasure to the hearer. Here the joke is an aim in itself. Freud asserts that the technical methods of the joking process have in themselves the "power of evoking a feeling of pleasure in the hearer." The source of this pleasure is in the economy of expenditure derived from overcoming the inhibitions of criticism, i.e., derived from overcoming the scrutiny of criticism which demands the adult, rational use of verbal material and conceptual situations and which disallows the old play with words and thoughts of childhood. Tendentious jokes (including hostile, obscene, cynical and skeptical jokes) serve a particular aim and purpose and, therefore, run the risk of meeting with people who do not want to listen to them. Freud states that these jokes, unlike innocent jokes, are capable of achieving a sudden burst of laughter. Therefore, he concludes, tendentious jokes must have sources of pleasure to which innocent jokes have no access. These sources of pleasure are the satisfaction of lustful or hostile
instincts in the face of obstacles—particularly repression—that stand in their way. Civilization has forbidden the enjoyment of undisguised obscenity as well as the physical and direct verbal expression of hostility. Thus "tendentious jokes provide a means of undoing the renunciation and retrieving what was lost."

In differentiating between the comic and jokes, Freud begins with this basic distinction: "a joke is made; the comic is found." The comic requires only two persons: a first who finds what is comic and a second in whom it is found. In a joke the third person (the listener) is indispensable "for the completion of the pleasure-producing process." Freud describes several types of the comic: the "naive," the comic of situation, comic nonsense, and so on. In each of these, laughs result from the comparison we make between what we observe in the other person and what we should have done ourselves in his place.

Freud then turns to "humor" and relates it to jokes and the comic. Humor appears in situations when we would be tempted to release a distressing affect but "motives then operate upon us which suppress that affect." For example, someone who is the victim of an injury might obtain humorous pleasure, while the unconcerned person laughs from comic pleasure. Thus the pleasure of humor "arises from an economy in the expenditure of affect." Unlike the comic and jokes where two or three persons are required respectively, humor completes its course within a single person. Humorous pleasure derives from a "peculiar technique comparable to displacement, by means of which the
release of affect that is already in preparation is disappointed and the cathexis is diverted onto something else, often onto something of secondary importance" (p. 233). Freud then looks at humorous displacement as a defensive process. Humor "scorns to withdraw the ideational content bearing the distressing affect from conscious attention as repression does, and thus surmounts the automatism of defense" (p. 233). It finds a "means of withdrawing the energy from the release of unpleasure that is already in preparation and of transforming it, by discharge, into pleasure." Here again Freud sees a possible connection with childhood. The person who uses humor says in effect: "I am too big (too fine) to be distressed by these things." He thus seems to compare his present ego with his childish one.

In his brief 1928 article entitled "Humor" Freud explores the process of humor from the perspective of his structural theory of the mind and explains why he sees humor as a "rare and precious gift," "one of the highest psychical achievements," and the highest of the defensive processes. First he restates that the essence of humor is that one spares oneself affects and emotional displays (such as anger, complaining, manifestations of pain, fear, horror, and even despair) to which the situation would naturally give rise and overrides these with a jest. (He uses "gallows humor" as an example of this.) Freud sees something fine and elevating in this humorous attitude "by means of which one refuses to undergo suffering, asseverates the invincibility of one's ego against the real world and victoriously upholds the pleasure principle, yet all without quitting the ground of mental
sanity" (p. 3) as happens in the repressive and reactionary processes encountered in psychopathology.

Freud explains that when one adopts a humorous attitude he is "treating himself like a child and is at the same time playing the part of the superior adult in relation to this child." Thus, in the humor process the individual grants ascendancy to the super-ego over the ego. "To the super-ego, thus inflated, the ego can appear tiny and all its interests trivial." In this way the super-ego, which is usually associated with the strict and stern parental function, adopts another parental role and speaks "kindly words of comfort to the intimidated ego." While the pleasure derived from humor is less intense than that derived from jokes, high value is placed on humor because of its meaning. For humor seems to say: "Look here! This is all that this seemingly dangerous world amounts to. Child's play—the very thing to jest about!"

Humor and Psychotherapy

There is a small but growing literature pertaining to the role of humor in psychotherapy. Studies in this area have generally been purely theoretical or limited to analyses of case material. A handful of recent unpublished studies have employed experimental procedures to explore the place of humor in therapy. The vast majority of works on this topic have taken a decidedly positive stance toward humor, while containing cautions that humorous interventions, like any other type of intervention, are subject to abuse. Kubie (1971), however, cited case
history material in his warning against the use of humor in therapy. Too often, he wrote, the patient's stream of feeling and thought is diverted from spontaneous channels by the therapist's humor. Humor is described as a "dangerous weapon," an "easy, seductive, and self-gratifying device." The mere fact that it amuses and entertains the therapist is no evidence that it is a valuable experience for the patient or has a healing influence. Kubie recognized that humor has its place in life, noting its humanizing social influence. Humor, he wrote, can be a social lubricant, easing tensions and facilitating communication, and a way of expressing true warmth and affection. However, he concluded that humor has only a very limited role in psychotherapy.

Poland (1971) gently rebutted Kubie's arguments, describing two cases of his own in which humor played a constructive role. When humor is "integrated and spontaneous, it denotes a good therapeutic alliance and is a useful tool" for therapeutic intervention. Earlier H. S. Sullivan (1954) had written of the "life-saving" sense of humor. He urged interviewers to determine to what extent patients were gifted with real humor, "the capacity for maintaining a sense of proportion as to one's importance in the life situations in which one finds oneself." Such patients were seen by Sullivan as having a better prognosis and more likely to benefit from treatment.

Rosenheim (1974) focused on humor as a corrective experience, utilized in the service of broadening the patient's self-awareness and
developing his readiness for freer and fuller reactivity. He questioned those who are reluctant to admit humor into the therapeutic interaction, suggesting that they fear the closeness that humor involves. Humor is characterized by a measure of "warmth and affective liberty which demonstrates to the patient that the therapist can tolerate naturalness, which so many patients have yet to learn to tolerate. Humor is intimate" (p. 585). Humor shown by the therapist is also a challenge to the patient's reality-testing since the aim of the therapist's humorous remark is to extend the patient's ability to examine his own attitudes and behavior critically and realistically. The unique value of humor in psychotherapy, according to Rosenheim, derives mainly from its intrinsic attributes of intimacy, directness, and humaneness. Thus it draws patient and therapist into a closer alliance than is often possible through a more formal, purely rational modality.

O'Connell (1971) discussed how humor is used in Adlerian "action therapy." From an Adlerian point of view, the therapy client is capable of changing his life style, but he "purposively yet unwittingly exaggerates his symptoms, feelings of victimization and powerlessness." This exaggeration is accompanied by an underestimation of his own social worth and responsibility. Clients thus exhibit extremes at which they themselves may be able to laugh with therapeutic results. O'Connell illustrated how a combination of role reversal and mirroring techniques may be used to highlight the client's contradictory, self-defeating attitudes and demands, so that he gets the point while
laughing. The experienced therapist should be able to use such tech­
niques so that the client himself is not derogated even if his actions
are. Thus O'Connell believes that "successful therapy teaches the
patient a sense of humor."

Coleman (1962) and Rosenheim (1974) have written about the use of
humor by beginning psychotherapists. Coleman emphasized the usefulness
of bantering as a means for therapists, especially those just beginning,
to deal with their own reactions to patients' "masochistic maneuvers."
The masochistic maneuver is a certain complaintiveness on the part of
the patient regarding the therapist's lack of interest and concern, his
inexperience, lack of skill, or inhumaneness. Such a maneuver is
characterized by its tendency to elicit one of three responses from the
therapist: anger, anxiety or boredom. The therapist then has to deal
with his impulses to reject the patient for his self-pitying. He can
do so by dramatizing his reactions by means of "banter, irony, or
exaggeration—by playfully dramatic role-playing the content of his own
reaction... The therapist impersonates the self-belittling activity of
the patient's superego, but humorously and affectionately" (p. 72). In
reality, the therapist is addressing himself to the patient's aggression
which seems to say: "You have to like me, even though you think I'm
unattractive. It's your job, so you have no choice." A bantering
comment (e.g., "yes, who could possibly like you?") echoes the patient's
complaint with amiable exaggeration. The smile or laugh resulting from
such an intervention may make a situation which had previously been
serious and desperate no longer desperate and much less serious.
Impersonation like this, in a humorous, friendly atmosphere, also provides access to reserves of "infantile pleasure gratifications and pleasurable indulgence. It makes it possible for the patient to experience infantile pleasure as an end in itself, even when it is at the same time serving the purposes of interpretation" (p. 73). In his supervisory experience, Rosenheim found many beginning therapists reluctant to share in patients' humorous overtures. It often emerged that these beginners were "afraid of losing the omnipotent position they were striving for (mostly unconsciously)." They seemed to feel more comfortable making clarifications and interpretations than reacting affectively to an appropriate affective remark of the patient. Rosenheim sometimes saw therapists deprive themselves and their patients of the "meaningful therapeutic encounter of going through the ups and downs of the therapeutic situation as equals, which certainly does not contradict the role definitions of helper and helped" (p. 590).

Both Roncoli (1974) and Rosenheim (1974) have reported the usefulness of humor in psychotherapy with obsessional patients. Roncoli has often found his role to be that of a "psychological humorist," helping obsessional patients to recognize the comic distortion of their behavior. The therapist can ask the patient to be a "participant-observer of his own behavior, to begin to appreciate the comic and the tragic, and the laughable and lamentable aspects of his obsessional way of life." Roncoli sees bantering not so much as an isolated technique as it is a process in the ongoing interpersonal setting:
In bantering, the therapist is taking the intrapsychic process of humor (as described by Freud) and making it interpersonal. In the intrapsychic process, the true humorist plays the part of a benevolent parent in relation to himself and refuses to suffer. In the bantering process, the therapist assumes the role of benevolent parent and refuses to allow the patient or himself to suffer" (p. 173-174).

In a note of caution, Roncoli recommends that the therapist seriously re-examine his use of humor with his patients, since bantering in therapy implies that the therapist is making a spontaneous attempt to mobilize constructively his own feelings of exasperation along with the patient's anger. If the therapist discovers that the bantering was motivated more by annoyance than by the patient's therapeutic need, then it only proves that the therapist too is not perfect. "When employing humor in therapy, the therapist takes the risk of appearing imperfect, fallible, and human. But he also gives the patient the license to behave imperfectly, fallibly, and humanly" (p. 175). Rosenheim (1974) has also found humor of particular value in working with obsessional patients. Quoting Rosen (1963) who wrote that obsessions are "grotesque parodies without laughter" and that compulsions are "ritual travesties devoid of fun," Rosenheim urges that the therapy not turn into a ritual of intellectual explanations, sound though they be. The therapist should not give in to the obsessive's defensive stand of affective isolation. "Our role is certainly not to amuse, but these patients need to be shown the lighter side of life." Rosenheim suggests applying gradual doses of humor, perhaps starting by sharing a joke with the patient or by aiming a humorous remark at oneself.
Domash (1975) wrote about the important role humor played in the progress she made during two and a half years of therapy with a borderline psychotic boy (age 9 when first seen). In this case the boy's wittiness was seen as one of his very few resources for treatment and as the only point of contact between him and the therapist during the early months of therapy. Domash suggests that if humor appears in this type of patient, it should be reinforced, as this helps bring about an overall strengthening of the ego structure. Seeing the therapist's obvious enjoyment of his wit helped the boy's self-concept by enabling him to make contact and to delight another person. The boy's humor also seemed to be a natural vehicle for expression of his aggressive impulses in a disguised enough form to be acceptable. The therapist provided the boy with an atmosphere of stability in which he could explore these impulses which frightened him. He could depend on the therapist to survive the onslaught, and he was able to see that he was not able to discuss more directly the same issues he had joked about earlier. His humorous treatment of these matters helped him gain some distance from his fantasy world so as to get a sense of mastery over them. Domash felt that each comical incident allowed the boy some triumph over apprehension and fear.

Smith (1973) and Ventis (1973) have reported favorable results when humor was made a part of systematic desensitization procedures. Smith described his use of humor in desensitization with a very anger-prone client. Initial attempts utilizing deep muscular relaxation were of no help. However, the insertion of humorous content into the
hierarchy items proved highly effective in inhibiting the client's anger responses both during the treatment sessions and in situations outside treatment. Smith concluded that humor probably exerted its effects in part by modifying the client's cognitive and mediational processes. Ventis reported an attempt to use the laughter response as an alternative to relaxation in systematic desensitization. A 20-year-old coed complained of distressful anxiety about attending a banquet that same day at which her ex-boyfriend would be present. Because of the brief time available and because the young woman had not yet learned systematic relaxation, laughter was chosen as an alternative response. A brief hierarchy was constructed by the therapist. The early hierarchy items were regarded as training trials for imagining the scenes and were presented in standard fashion. The later trials were to test for the presence of tension and finally to build up tension to be exploded in laughter. The woman left the one-hour session saying she felt much more comfortable and later reported that the evening went smoothly and that she had purposely recalled, with amusement, some of the humorous imagined scenes while she was at the banquet. The author saw the reason for this success as open to speculation. He added, however, that if laughter is effective in desensitization, the emotions and situations should be identified in which it is the treatment of choice. One possibility is that it results in a change in orientation or attitude toward the situation.

Labrentz (1973), Huber (1974), Hickson (1976), and Kaneko (1971) have employed experimental procedures in their (unpublished) investiga-
tions of humor and therapy. Labrentz's study explored the utilization of humor as a means of establishing rapport during an initial counseling interview. Subjects exposed to humor (25 cartoons which they were to read and rate) immediately prior to the interview tended to give the counseling relationship a considerably higher rating than clients in the non-humor groups. The author speculated that humor can be effectively utilized as a contextual variable in enhancing the initial client-counselor relationship. In another initial interview experiment, designed to measure the effect of humor on clients' level of discomfort, Huber found significant interactions among three variables: counselor, level of intimacy in the interview (high or low), and counselor use of humor or non-use. The researcher speculated that humor might be of benefit to the counselor-client relationship under specified conditions. Hickson's study explored the relationships among humor appreciation responses, sex type, and facilitative abilities of graduate counseling trainees. The results indicated that there are specific counselor personality characteristics, based on humor preferences, which are associated with facilitative ability. Counselors who scored high on the intelligence, anti-establishment, high anxiety, flirtatiousness, and introversion dimensions of the IPAT Humor Test of Personality were able to communicate with greater facility. The study found significant differences between the facilitative means of the male and female counselor groups. However, the results indicated that there are differential responses to humor stimuli by male and female counseling trainees in the areas of hostility, creativity, and interpersonal
interaction. The author inferred from these findings that humor appreciation is directly related to the helping process. The purpose of Kaneko's study was to develop a research model capable of investigating the role of humor in psychotherapy. Definitional, operationalization, contextual, and classificatory problems were tentatively resolved as follows: (1) a dictionary definition was employed; (2) operationalization depended heavily on overt behavior (laughter, smiling, self-report, etc.); (3) classification of humor behavior was made along dimensions differentiated by predominance of pleasure and nonpleasure; (4) one or two verbal transactions prior to and following each occurrence of humor behavior were included in the unit to be analyzed; and (5) intent, effect, and technique dimensions of the humor behavior were classified. Judges were initially trained and then asked to utilize the proposed model in the analysis of 54 incidents. Primary emphasis was on reliability. Reliability scores were higher in most areas than expected, although some of the "effect" scores dropped below the seventieth percentile.

**Personality Correlates of Humor**

Numerous studies have attempted to account for individual differences in humor preferences. Frequently these studies have explored some aspect of Freud's theory regarding "tendentious" jokes, namely, that jokes with sexual or aggressive content serve the purpose of briefly lifting an individual's inhibitions and satisfying to some degree his lustful or hostile instincts. Generally the research problem is stated in this way: What sort of person, under what
conditions, will find sexual or aggressive jokes (cartoons) funny?

Terry and Ertel (1974) explored the relationships between sex, personality factors, and humor preferences among college students. They found that sexual cartoons were liked more by males, especially by those tending to be tough or group-dependent, than by females, especially by those with relatively high general intelligence. Nonsensical cartoons were liked more by females, especially by those with lower general intelligence, than by males. The negative relationship between the personality factors of sensitivity and self-sufficiency in males and their liking of sexual cartoons seems to suggest that expression of sexual humor might be used by males to demonstrate their masculinity, thus aiding in their desired social acceptance.

Wilson and MacLean (1974) found that prisoners and "normals" shared the same order of preference among four humor categories: sexual humor was rated the funniest, then aggressive, nonsense, and satire in that order. The two groups did not differ significantly on any of them. Nonetheless, criminals were found to be less favorable toward sexual stimuli than controls. Ecker, Levine, and Zigler (1973) used a humor test in order to measure the degree of impairment in sex-role identification among schizophrenics and normals. While no differences between the groups were found on two other relevant tests, on the humor test the schizophrenics were less capable than the normals in comprehending cartoons depicting individuals engaged in abnormal or ambiguous sex roles. No such disability was found in the schizophrenics' comprehension of cartoons involving non-sex role or normal
sex-role behavior. The authors concluded that schizophrenics' inability to comprehend abnormal sex-role cartoons reflects a disturbance in sex-role identification. This study and earlier studies, they assert, have shown that failure to comprehend cartoons with particular themes indicates that such themes represent a problem or conflict area. Keith-Spiegel, Spiegel, and Gonska (1971) administered a humor appreciation test (cartoons) to four different groups: hospitalized male patients who had made recent suicide attempts (A); hospitalized male patients who had made recent suicide threats (T); depressed but non-suicidal male patients (P), and non-hospitalized males (N). Cartoon themes included "self-punishing," "other-punishing," "suicidal," and "nonsense." A and T found "self-punishing" and "suicidal" cartoons less amusing than did P or N, providing general support to the theory that disturbing humor (that is, jokes which reflect a person's intense predicament) is not appreciated. The theory is further strengthened by the fact that the funniness scores for the other types of humor, "other-punishing" and "nonsense," did not differ among the groups. However, the suicidal groups did not show significant differences between the suicidal and self-punishing cartoon ratings and the other-punishing and nonsense ratings. Wilson, Nias, and Brazendale (1975) investigated the relationship between the vital statistics and self-rated physical attractiveness of female student teachers and their preferences among a collection of humorous, risque postcards. Girls who rated themselves as attractive found the cartoons generally less funny than those rating themselves as unattractive. However, girls who
were "shapely" according to their bust/waist ratio were generally more appreciative of the cartoons. Neither of these measures of attractiveness was found to be related to social attitudes.

There is conflicting evidence regarding the relationship between humor and creativity. Schoel and Busse (1971) administered Mednick's Remote Associates Test and a version of the Unusual Uses Test, as measures of creative abilities, to a group of subjects chosen by their college professors as most humorous and to a group of controls. No relationship was found between humor and the creativity variables. This observation was contrary to previous studies with children which linked creativity and humor. However, the criteria for selecting humorous subjects in the previous studies (e.g., drawings, stories, clinical interviews) were substantially different from the teacher judgments used in this study. Rouff's (1975) study used Mednick's Remote Associates Test to measure creativity and a humor comprehension measure involving cartoons. A positive relationship was found, as predicted, even with the effects of intelligence partialled out. The author concluded that comprehension of humor and creative thinking are related and have a common basis in the ability to link disparities. Babad (1974) administered two creativity tests, one verbal and one non-verbal, to subjects who were also given a humor appreciation test and an active humor test (writing captions for cartoons). The subjects were also rated by their peers on their sense of humor. While the peer ratings failed to differentiate subjects on their creativity test performance, results of the two paper-and-pencil test situations
corresponded to some extent with each other. Significant positive correlations were found between creativity scores, on the one hand, and humor appreciation and the number of captions produced, on the other. The degree of funniness of the captions, however, was not related to any of the creativity measures.

Lefcourt and his colleagues have used the Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control in two humor-related studies. Lefcourt, Sordoni, and Sordoni (1974) found that persons who hold an internal locus of control smiled and laughed more than externals during the administration of a word association test containing a gradually increasing number of sexual double entendres. The results of the study suggest that internals are more apt to be amused by the discovery that they have been the object of a jest than are externals. The authors interpreted this display of humor as a reflection of a "distance from the immediate demands of the task which, if a general characteristic, would facilitate the acceptance of evaluative feedback." They proposed that their results might help explain earlier findings that internals can assimilate negative information without suffering increases in anxiety and/or depression. Lefcourt, Antrobus, and Hogg (1974), in a follow-up study, attempted to assess the likelihood of humor expression during more common and life-like situations. They used role-playing situations emphasizing success or failure and containing positive and negative reinforcements. Both humor responses (smiles and laughter) and humor production (exhibition of wit, jesting, etc.) were measured. Humor responses proved to be determined more by role characteristics
than personality variables. However, humor production seemed to be most common among internal-field independent subjects enacting serious failure roles, as predicted. The authors proposed that wittiness, an active process whereby individuals reshape their experience in some novel fashion, should be most useful for altering mood states that might result from receiving news of one's failures. Such a "self-generated shift in perspective," that permits one to see himself in an absurd light, appears to be an important part of the therapeutic nature of humor.

Humor Assessment

As McGhee (1972) and Babad (1974) have noted, most experimental studies related to humor have used cartoons and written jokes or riddles as independent variables. Dependent variables have typically been behaviors like laughter or smiling or subjects' verbal reports of funniness. Babad saw two major drawbacks in such studies: humor was operationally defined in terms of passive appreciation, and it was measured by a test. A further difficulty is the lack of standardized humor-related tests in print. At present the only such instrument available is the Cattell-Luborsky (1947) I.P.A.T. Humor Test of Personality. This test, developed after numerous factor analyses, contains 12 categories of jokes. Its purpose is to identify the individual's personality traits based on the types of jokes he likes and dislikes. Few humor researchers have used this test in their work. Most have preferred to design their own instruments. It seems that the vast majority of researchers has wanted a more general test—a broad
measure of humor appreciation—or else a very specific instrument meant to tap the effects of one particular type of humor (e.g., jokes of a sexual or hostile nature). As a result, there has been a proliferation of humor appreciation tests, each designed for a specific study and usually employed only once or twice.

Babad (1974) has noted several departures from the tendency to operationally define humor in terms of passive appreciation and to measure humor only by paper and pencil tests. Some recent studies have: (1) emphasized the conceptual differences between passive (reactive) humor and the active generation of humor (Ferris, 1971; Koppel & Sechrest, 1970; Levine & Rakusin, 1959); (2) divided generative humor into two types—production and reproduction (Babad, 1969); (3) utilized peer ratings, self-ratings and the ratings of instructors in the study of humor as a social, interactive phenomenon (Schoel & Busse, 1971; Levine & Rakusin, 1959; Koppel & Sechrest, 1970), and (4) employed tests of active humor in addition to those for humor appreciation (Treadwell, 1970; Ferris, 1966).

Babad (1974) used almost all methods previously employed in the literature to measure sense of humor. First, five humor groups were defined for the purposes of the study; Nonhumorous (N), Passive Appreciators (A), Producers (P), Reproducers (R), and Producers-Reproducers (PR). All the students at a women's college were then asked to name peers who fit these categories. Using a very strict consensus criterion, 77 students were selected and divided into five
"pure" groups. All of these subjects were nominated at least four times for one particular group and were not named at all in any other category. They were subsequently tested with the following instruments: a humor appreciation test (rating the funniness of jokes and cartoons); an active humor test (producing or reproducing funny captions to cartoons); two creativity subtests; a self-report in which each subject placed herself in one of the five humor groups; a 90-item questionnaire measuring defensiveness, introversion, and anxiety; and the F-Scale. The results showed the sociometric method and the humor tests in sharp contrast. The author interpreted the results as strong support for the validity of the sociometric method. She based this conclusion on three sources of evidence: (1) the system by which the sample was selected with great care from a large population and the actual consensus among peers that emerged; (2) the high correspondence between groupings by self-report and groupings by peers, indicating that the subjects were aware of their humor behavior and that their self-perception was consonant with their peers' perceptions; (3) the groupings by peers were clearly differentiated on introversion and anxiety (a negative relationship as groups went from N to PR); while the lack of differentiation on defensiveness and authoritarianism also corresponds to findings in several other studies. The evidence against humor tests includes: (1) the absence of any differentiation of the groupings by peers on any of the seven humor tests; (2) some of the humor tests were found to be positively correlated with introversion and anxiety; and (3) while the humor tests and creativity scores were positively related as
hypothesized, the groups by peers and by self-report were not at all
differentiated in their creativity scores. The author also concludes
that the humor types used (passive versus active humor; production
distinct from reproduction) were confirmed by both the sociometric data
and the tests.

Locus of Control (I-E)

The study of perceived causality has received increasing atten­
tion in psychology during the last two decades. Heider (1958), Kelley
(1967), Bem (1970), and Jones and Nisbett (1971) have all proposed
major theories of how individuals attribute causality regarding their
own and others' actions. Rotter and his colleagues (Rotter, 1966,
1975; Rotter, Chance & Phares, 1972) focused on the area of control
expectancies, investigating to what extent a person perceives a causal
relationship between his own behavior and the reinforcements he receives.
Rotter defined external control as the belief that reinforcements are
the result of luck or chance. Internal control is the belief that
one's reinforcements are a consequence of his own behavior or his rela­
tively permanent characteristics. For Rotter, locus of control is a
relatively consistent personality trait which varies greatly among
individuals and is an important component of various learning situations.

Rotter's scale, the Internal-External Locus of Control, was
originally devised to assess control expectancies in different rein­
forcement areas (achievement, dominance, affiliation, etc.). However,
Rotter's own factor analyses revealed only one general factor.
Consequently, with repeated item analyses the scale was eventually reduced to 23 items (plus six filler items to make a total of 29) that were viewed as being fairly homogeneous (Lefcourt, 1976). Rotter (1966) in view of the obvious restraints upon man's self-direction, hypothesized that locus of control should have a curvilinear relationship with assessments of maladjustment. Those who feel entirely at the mercy of external circumstances should be no more aberrant than those who feel responsible for every important event (e.g., delusions of reference, grandeur, and so on). Scores reflecting an internal locus of control have generally been viewed in a positive light because the focus of research has been on events that are largely within subjects' control, e.g., achievement-related events for middle-class persons. In his review of the literature, Lefcourt (1976) found high external scores consistently related to feelings of inadequacy, depression, tension, and anxiety. High internal individuals were typically found to be more vigorous and exuberant.

Contrary to Rotter's findings, Gurin, Gurin, Lao, and Beattie (1969) and Lao (1970) found two separate factors in the I–E— one which relates to beliefs about the causes of outcomes in general and one which relates explicitly to the respondent's own life situation. These authors concluded that high internal scores on the "personal control" items successfully predicted academic achievement, while high external scores on the general control ("control ideology") items allowed prediction of social action and civil rights activity. These findings, obtained with black college students, reveal some limitations in the
generalizability of control expectancies. In his review, Lefcourt (1976) cited other studies that point to further such limitations in generalization across persons (blacks vs. whites; "I" vs. people in general), across reinforcement areas (felt mastery over one's own life vs. impact on political institutions), across agents of external control (internality vs. control by powerful others vs. control by chance), and across types of reinforcement (positive vs. negative).

Lefcourt (1976) concludes that locus of control should not be regarded as an omnibus trait similar to "competence" or "intelligence" but is more fruitfully defined as a "circumscribed self-appraisal pertaining to the degree to which individuals view themselves as having some causal role in determining specific events." He states that there is sufficient evidence of validity and reliability to encourage investigators to continue their use of existing devices, especially Rotter's scale. At the same time he urges the development of more precise, criterion-specific measures.

The California Psychological Inventory (CPI)

In accord with Gough's original conception of the test, the CPI has been used for both idiographic and nomothetic interpretation. Since it was designed to measure the social functioning of "normal" people, it is not surprising that the CPI has been used most frequently in schools, colleges, and industrial settings. The CPI has also been used in clinical settings where people are treated for various emotional problems. The other major use of the CPI has been as a measure of
various personality attributes in research settings (Megargee, 1972).

The CPI has been used in a number of studies of conformity. Crutchfield (1955) reported the results of the first such investigation using the fledgling CPI. Using an Asch-type situation, he measured the amount of yielding engaged in by 50 men, all of whom were engaged in leadership positions. Yielding scores were correlated with the CPI; significant negative correlations ranging from -.30 to -.41 were obtained with the Sociability, Responsibility, and Tolerance scales. Tuddenham (1959) studied the relationship between the CPI and yielding in four samples; 27 adult men from the Oakland Adolescent Growth Study, 29 adult women from the same study, 37 college men, and 37 college women. Like Crutchfield, the statistically significant correlations that Tuddenham obtained were all in the negative direction, ranging from -.31 to -.78. However, the patterns differed considerably from one sample to the next, with one group having six significant correlations and the next only one. The scales bearing the strongest relationship to yielding were Capacity for Status and Achievement via Independence. Harper (1964) performed a similar investigation using 135 student nurses. Only four scales correlated significantly, but three of the four were Capacity for Status (-.17), Achievement via Independence (-.19), and Tolerance (-.20). Hase and Goldberg (1967) used a paper-and-pencil test of yielding; 174 college women responded to an opinion survey. Five weeks later, the questionnaire was readministered along with false information about the group means in the
first session. The amount of shift toward the false mean was the measure of yielding. The CPI scale correlating most closely with that index was the same scale which correlated most consistently in the other studies: Capacity for Status (−.24).

Numerous studies of creativity have used the CPI. Thirty writers nominated by English professors as being unusually creative were compared with a group of writers who belonged to a writers association. In a preliminary report of the data obtained, Barron (1965) listed the mean CPI scores of the two groups. No tests of significance were reported, but differences between group means of four or more T-score points were found on nine scales. Creative writers were higher on Self-Acceptance, Tolerance, Flexibility, and Femininity, and lower on Well-Being, Socialization, Self-Control, Good Impression, and Achievement via Conformance. Holland and Astin (1962) gave the CPI to Merit Scholarship finalists in their senior year of high school. After those students had been in college three years, they were sent a form listing ten artistic accomplishments. Unfortunately, the form was heavily biased in favor of performing arts and neglected creative writing and the graphic arts. Seven scales correlated significantly with that criterion among 681 boys and three did so among the 272 girls. The magnitude of these correlations was small, the highest being .22. Most notable was the fact that in the male sample, all Factor 2 scales (Responsibility, Socialization, Self-Control, Tolerance, Good Impression, and Communality) correlated significantly with artistic achievement. Garwood (1964) administered a battery of creativity tests
to 105 young male science majors. She selected 18 high and 18 low creative Ss on the basis of those scores and then tested them on ten CPI scales. One-tailed tests of the differences between the means supported seven of her ten hypotheses. Significant positive relationships were found between creativity and Dominance, Sociability, Social Presence, and Self-Acceptance, while negative relationships were found with Socialization, Self-Control, and Good Impression.

Scott and Severance (1975) tried to clarify the meaning and predictive utility of correlations among two personality indices, the CPI and MMPI, and the I-E dimension. They used Tatsuoka's method of discriminant analysis which yields a statistical measure of the ability of a battery of scales to discriminate between groups differing on a given dimension. They divided their subjects into internals and externals based on I-E scores; internals had scores of 7 or less, and externals had scores of 13 or more. The combined battery could not discriminate at statistically significant levels. Re-running the analysis with three groups (adding "moderates") also failed to show statistical evidence of ability to discriminate reliably among the three groups.

Tuma and Gustad (1957) investigated the effects of personality characteristics of clients and counselors on counseling outcomes. The subjects were 58 male undergraduates who had applied to the university counseling center for assistance with occupational choice. The dependent variable was client learning about self, as assessed by a
device called the Self-Knowledge Inventory, which was completed both before and after the counseling process. Counselors were Master's level psychologists with one to three years of experience. All subjects as well as the counselors were administered the following personality measures: the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale, the F-scale (Authoritarianism), and the Tolerance, Flexibility, Dominance, Social Participation, Social Presence, Impulsivity, Self-Acceptance, and Good Impression scales of the CPI. The results showed that all three counselors were well above the average on Dominance, Social Presence, and Social Participation, and that the closer the client and his counselor were on these measures, the better was the client's criterion performance. Whether these clients would have done as well or better with counselors who had lower scores remains in doubt.

Bohn (1965) attempted to clarify the relationships of counselor dominance, experience, and client type with counselor directiveness. Sixty male "experienced" (graduate) and "inexperienced" (undergraduate) counselors, matched on CPI Dominance scores, were divided into high and low dominance groups. Subjects responded to recordings of initial interviews of a typical, a dependent, and a hostile client, by means of a multiple choice questionnaire classified for directiveness and response category. Directiveness scores of the high and low dominance groups were not significantly different. Experienced counselors were significantly less directive than inexperienced ones and limited their responses primarily to a few categories. The dependent client elicited the most directiveness. Subsequently, in order to investigate the
effects of dominance with more extreme groups, another analysis was performed. Ten subjects were drawn from each of the extreme ends of the dominance distribution for the pool of inexperienced subjects. The difference between the directiveness scores of these groups was significant. These results suggest that there is some relationship between counselor dominance and counselor directiveness but perhaps not in the range of dominance available in this study.

Gough (1975) summarized the CPI data obtained from 572 male and 336 female psychology graduate students and from 187 male and 324 female social work graduate students. These groups scored consistently high (mean T-scores of 60 or above) on the following scales: Social Presence, Achievement via Independence, Intellectual Efficiency, Psychology-Mindedness, and Flexibility. The lowest scores for these students were on Socialization, Self-Control, and Good Impression, with mean T-scores of 50 or below.

Hypotheses

This study makes several specific predictions based on an examination of previous theory and research:

(1) Humor Assessment. It is predicted that results will follow those obtained by Babad (1974), with Peer Ratings relating positively to Self-Ratings but having no relationship with paper-and-pencil tests of humor.
(2) Personality Correlates. It is predicted that higher Peer Ratings of sense of humor (moving from Non-Humorous, through Appreciator, to Producer/Reproducer) will be related to better interpersonal adjustment as indicated by higher composite CPI scores and higher scores on individual CPI scales. Similarly, higher Peer Ratings are expected to relate to greater "internality" on Rotter's Locus of Control. These predictions are made based on the previous findings of Babad (1974); Lefcourt, Sordoni, and Sordoni (1974), and Lefcourt, Antrobus, and Hogg (1974). No significant relationships are expected between paper-and-pencil tests of humor and personality variables.

(3) Humor and Therapy. It is predicted that a more active sense of humor, as measured by Peer Ratings, will be positively related with therapists' increased use of humor in therapy and with a more favorable attitude toward humor in therapy.

Other relationships will be examined in an exploratory fashion, including relationships among the general results of the Peer Ratings, Self-Ratings, humor tests, and questionnaire on humor and therapy; overall adjustment of this population and its degree of "internality" or "externality"; and sex differences on the variables measured.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects

The research site for this study was Loyola University of Chicago. The participants were graduate students in clinical psychology and social work. These students were asked to participate for two reasons: all were beginning therapists with a minimum of 500 hours of supervised training, and they had had sufficient contact with each other in order to do the Peer Ratings section of the study. Subjects were in three categories according to graduate program and training site: (1) social work students from several different universities who had completed a year's field placement at the Loyola Guidance Center during the 1976-77 academic year; (2) Loyola University clinical psychology students who had completed a year's training at the Loyola Guidance Center during the 1976-77 academic year (several had worked at the Center during one or two previous years as well), and (3) Loyola University clinical psychology students who had recently finished either their second or third year in the program. Those in this third group had received their supervised training at a variety of sites, generally in hospital settings.

Completed materials were received from 93.6% of those who agreed to participate (N=44). There were 24 male and 20 female subjects,
ranging in age from 23 to 51. There were wide differences in the age and sex breakdown of the three program/training-site groups, as shown in Table 1. Social work students were predominantly female and generally older than the other subjects. Non-Guidance Center psychology students, on the other hand, were mostly males and were younger than subjects in the other groups.

Materials

Questionnaire on Humor and Therapy. The questionnaire (Appendix A) was designed to explore beginning therapists' use of humor and attitudes toward humor in the therapeutic setting. No questionnaires on this topic were found in the literature; however, many of the items used in this questionnaire were based on theoretical writings on humor. Numbers 1-8 generally relate to therapists' awareness and use of humor in their therapy sessions. The remaining items pertain to attitudes toward humor in therapy.

Humor Appreciation Test. The 31-item "Joke Ratings" (Appendix B) was designed as a measure of humor appreciation. Subjects were instructed to rate the jokes on their funniness, in relation to jokes in general, using a six-point scale. The procedure used in preparing this test generally followed that of Babad (1974). Six judges rated 117 jokes from the I.P.A.T. Humor Test of Personality (Luborsky, 1947) and 112 jokes from a section of Henny Youngman's (1976) book entitled Don't Put My Name on This Book. The jokes used in the test were those which received the highest ratings (mean ratings of above 3.0 on a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Training Site</th>
<th>No. of Subjects</th>
<th>No. of Males</th>
<th>No. of Females</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23-26</td>
<td>27-30</td>
<td>31+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work/Guidance Center</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clin. Psych./Guidance Center</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clin. Psych./Non-Guidance Center</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
six-point scale). Jokes 1-11 were taken from the Humor Test of Personality, the remainder from Youngman's book. These two sources of jokes were used because both included jokes varying widely in content. In particular, there was not a heavy concentration of sexual or aggressive humor. Thus the test represents a broad measure of humor appreciation, with jokes rated on general funniness.

Humor Production Test. The "Humor Production" section (Appendix C) of the study was designed to measure subjects' ability to spontaneously create humor. The test contains 16 captionless cartoons. Subjects were instructed to write a funny caption for as many cartoons as possible within approximately 15 minutes. The general design of this test is similar to that used by Babad (1974).

Cartoons were selected by this author from old (1971 to 1973) issues of The New Yorker (five cartoons), Playboy (three cartoons), and The Saturday Evening Post (eight cartoons). Eight (#2,5,6,7,8,9,13,14) of the cartoons were chosen because of their obvious incongruity, i.e., the humorous point of the cartoon is rather clearly portrayed visually. The humor is not so dependent on the caption itself, and the caption is more easily predicted. The other eight cartoons were judged by the author to be considerably less incongruous, their humor coming largely from the caption. The groups of cartoons were also designed to be roughly parallel in their content. For example, within each group there are approximately the same number of cartoons dealing with male-female relationships, children, animals, sex, and so on. These criteria
for cartoon selection were used in order to create a test which would be fair to subjects regardless of their differences in humor preference.

The captions written for each cartoon were rated by judges. Judges were two males and two females, comparable in age and educational background to the subjects of the study. They were instructed to place each caption into a high, medium, or low funny-ness category, according to how funny they personally found it to be. Five scores were then recorded for each subject: (1) total production score (the subject's total number of points for all captions, with each high rating equal to five points and each medium, low, and unanswered caption equal to three, one and zero points respectively); (2) number of productions; (3) mean production rating (total production score divided by number of productions); (4) total number of high ratings, and (5) mean number of top ratings per production (the number of high ratings divided by number of productions).

**Humor Reproduction Test.** The "Jokes" section (Appendix D) was designed to measure subjects' ability to reproduce jokes. No tests of humor reproduction were found in the literature. This test was devised specifically for the present study in order to broaden the range of humor behavior to be measured and to provide a paper-and-pencil test which would parallel the Peer Rating category "Reproducer."

Subjects were instructed to write down their favorite joke from memory. Jokes were then rated by the four judges, who placed each joke
into a high, medium, or low funniness category in the same way as for the Human Production Test. The score derived for each subject was the total number of points his joke received, with high, medium, and low ratings equal to five, three, and one point respectively. Tests left blank were scored zero.

Peer Ratings and Self-Ratings. The "Peer Ratings" part (Appendix E) of the study was designed to provide a sociometric measure of subjects' sense of humor. The rating procedure used generally follows that of Babad (1974), with some changes in the wording of the category definitions and with the addition of a fifth category, Humor Type II. This category was added to provide a rating in between Babad's Non-Appreciator (I) and Appreciator (III) categories. It was felt that very few subjects would describe any of their peers in such extreme terms as Type I suggests ("no readiness to laugh"). On the other hand, Type III is quite a favorable category, a very large step above Type I. Type II then represents an intermediate step—"Low Appreciator"—between I and III and makes it possible for subjects to place peers in a mildly negative, rather than extremely negative, category.

Subjects were instructed to rate as many of their peers as possible—all those whom they knew well enough to rate intelligently. Each person was to be placed in the category which best characterized him. Five categories were listed and described. The same procedure was to be followed by each subject in rating himself.
Internal-External Locus of Control (I-E). Rotter developed the scale in 1966. The instrument consists of 29 forced-choice items: 23 of them account for the actual score, and six are "filler" items designed to disguise the purpose of the scale. The scale's purpose is to assess the degree of causal relationship a person sees between his own behavior and the reinforcements he receives. Scoring is keyed for "external" responses; thus, higher scores indicate greater externality. A very external person believes that reinforcements are more a result of luck, chance, or control by powerful others. A very internal person sees a close link between his own behavior and the reinforcements he gets.

Since its introduction in 1966, the I-E Scale has become the standard instrument for the measurement of the locus of control trait. Reliability and validity data were presented by Rotter in his original monograph. Numerous other investigators have supported the validity of both the locus of control concept and the I-E Scale, using such criteria as judges' ratings, interviews, survey results, and controlled laboratory tests. Test-retest reliability ranged from .49 to .72 in Rotter's original reports. Split-half reliability was .72, and Kuder-Richardson internal consistency was .74. Hersch and Scheibe (1967) also found the test-retest reliability of the I-E Scale to be consistent and acceptable, varying between .49 and .83 for various samples and interviewing time periods.
California Psychological Inventory (CPI). The CPI is a self-administering paper-and-pencil personality test, containing 468 statements, twelve of which appear twice for a total of 480 items. Most of the items relate to "typical behavior patterns and customary feelings, opinions, and attitudes about social, ethical, and family matters" (Megargee, 1972). While the two tests share 178 common items, the CPI has considerably less symptom-oriented material than the M.M.P.I. and its content is much less objectionable. The CPI is scored for eighteen scales, three of which (Communality, Good Impression, Well-Being) measure test-taking attitudes as well as having interpretive significance. Each scale was designed to identify individuals who will (a) behave in a certain way and (b) be described in a characteristic manner. Scale names were carefully selected to describe as closely as possible the kind of behavior they are designed to reflect. The eighteen scales are: 1 - Dominance (Do); 2 - Capacity for status (Cs); 3 - Sociability (Sy); 4 - Social presence (Sp); 5 - Self-acceptance (Sa); 6 - Sense of well-being (Wb); 7 - Responsibility (Re); 8 - Socialization (So); 9 - Self control (Sc); 10 - Tolerance (To); 11 - Good impression (Gi); 12 - Communality (Cm); 13 - Achievement via Conformance (Ac); 14 - Achievement via Independence (Ai); 15 - Intellectual efficiency (Ie); 16 - Psychological-mindedness (Py); 17 - Flexibility (Fx); 18 - Femininity (Fe). Scale descriptions, supplemented by a listing of characteristics frequently associated with high and low scores on each measure, are included in Appendix F of this study (Gough, 1975).
Gough followed an empirical procedure for scale construction similar to that used by E.K. Strong and by Hathaway and McKinley. Primary emphasis was placed on the relationship between the item and the criterion. For most of the 18 scales, a large item pool was administered to carefully selected groups at the extremes of the behavioral dimension in question. Those items that consistently differentiated such groups were selected for inclusion on the scale, regardless of whether the manifest content of the item made sense.

Test-retest reliability studies on the CPI indicate moderate stability over short-term (one to four weeks) and long-term (one year) periods. Short term coefficients, computed on samples of prisoners and first-year female college students, ranged from .49 to .90. Most of the coefficients were in the .70s or .80s, with a median correlation for the prisoner group of .80 and for the college group of .83. Long-term coefficients, computed on groups of adult men and women and high school students, were mostly in the .60s and .70s, with a range from .38 to .85.

Cross-validational studies comprise the bulk of the CPI validity research. Typically the ratings of high school principals, college staff, or military superiors were correlated with CPI scale scores. Gough (1975) reports correlations ranging from the .20s to the .50s, with most falling in the .30s or .40s.
Procedure

Participation in the research was requested of a total of 52 social work and clinical psychology graduate students. This included all trainees who had worked at the Loyola Guidance Center during the 1976-77 academic year and all clinical students who had completed their second or third year in the program and for whom current addresses could be found. These students were sent a brief letter explaining that the topic of the thesis pertained to several aspects of humor and that two to three hours of their time would be required. The letter was followed up by phone calls or personal contact, after which 47 students agreed to participate. Each student then received the test packet in a mail out/mail back procedure. The test packet included the following: General Instructions (Appendix G), a questionnaire on humor and therapy, a humor appreciation test entitled "Joke Ratings", a humor production test, a humor reproduction test entitled "Jokes," a peer rating form, the I-E Scale, and the CPI test booklet and answer sheet. Subjects were informed that code numbers had been assigned to them in order to insure anonymity and confidentiality. It was also made clear that, after the study was completed, each participant would receive a summary of the findings. Of the 47 students who agreed to participate, 44 returned completed test materials before the final deadline.

Design and Statistics

The present study was designed to: (1) generate a data pool from several different humor assessment measures from a population of
beginning psychotherapists; correlate paper-and-pencil measures of humor with peer ratings and self-ratings of sense of humor; (2) correlate humor scores and ratings with personality characteristics as measured by the California Psychological Inventory and the Internal-External Locus of Control, and (3) correlate humor scores and ratings, as well as personality findings, with beginning psychotherapists' attitudes toward and use of humor in their diagnostic and therapeutic work.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Humor Assessment

Distribution of Peer Ratings. Table 2 summarizes the results of the Peer Ratings for all subjects. It is clear that no "pure" humor types emerged from this procedure. Rather, ratings on individual subjects were widely scattered, as follows: 59% of the subjects received ratings in at least four of the five humor categories; 39% were given ratings in three categories, and only one subject was rated in just two categories. No one received a unanimous rating. Because of this lack of consensus, it was difficult to satisfactorily assign subjects to any one humor type. Simply using the mode for each subject was sometimes misleading (e.g., subjects #4 and #31 have the same mode but very different overall rating patterns). It also posed a problem because no subject's mode was in Category 1, only four were in Category 2, and just five in Category 5. Therefore, the following procedure was used to categorize subjects (see Table 2, the column headed "Humor Type: Peer Rating"): (a) Category 2 was renamed "Low Appreciator" and enlarged to include subjects who had a mode of "2" and also those with a mode of "3" who had relatively numerous "1" and "2" ratings; (b) Category 3 was renamed "High Appreciator"; it includes those with a mode of "3" who also had a relatively high number of "4" or "5" ratings; (c) Category 4
TABLE 2

PEER RATINGS FOR EACH SUBJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total No. of Ratings</th>
<th>No. of Categories*</th>
<th>No. of Ratings/Humor Type</th>
<th>Humor Type: Peer Rating**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The number of different categories, 1 through 5, in which the individual received at least one rating.

** As explained in "Results" section, "2" represents Low Appreciator; "3" represents High Appreciator, and "4" represents Producer/Reproducer.
TABLE 2 (CONT'D)

PEER RATINGS FOR EACH SUBJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>No. of Ratings</th>
<th>No. of Categories*</th>
<th>No. of Ratings/Humor Type</th>
<th>Humor Type: Peer Rating**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X=20.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The number of different categories, 1 through 5, in which the individual received at least one rating.

** As explained in "Results" section, "2" represents Low Appreciator; "3" represents High Appreciator, and "4" represents Producer/Reproducer.
was renamed "Producer/Reproducer"; it includes all subjects with a mode of "4" or "5". While this procedure did not clear up all questionable cases (e.g., subjects #14 and #40), it kept these at a minimum while preserving the concept of "humor type". No change was made in the Self-Rating categories. However, it should be noted that none of the Self-Ratings was in Category 1, and just one was in Category 2. For the sake of analysis, this single score was grouped in Category 3.

**Intercorrelations of Assessment Measures.** The two predictions made regarding Peer Ratings and other humor measures were confirmed: a positive correlation of .32 (p < .05) was found between Peer Ratings and Self-Ratings, but no significant relationships were found between Peer Ratings and paper-and-pencil measures of humor (see Table 3). The distribution of Self-Ratings and Peer Ratings is presented in Table 4. Subjects perceived their peers as generally of good humor, with over 80% of all ratings falling in the top three categories. However, they rated themselves considerably higher than they rated their peers. Almost two thirds placed themselves in the top two categories, while just one subject rated himself in one of the low humor categories.

Unexpected findings were the negative r of -.35 (p < .05) between Self-Ratings and Humor Appreciation and a negative trend between Peer Ratings and Humor Appreciation (r = .28, p < .10). In a post hoc procedure, the other four humor measures (Peer Ratings, Self-Ratings, Humor Reproduction, and the Average Number of Top Ratings per Production to represent Humor Production) were combined on the basis of cumulative
### TABLE 3

**INTERCORRELATIONS OF ASSESSMENT MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Productions</th>
<th>No. of Top-Rated Productions</th>
<th>Avg. No. of Top Ratings/Prod.</th>
<th>Total Score: All Prod. Ratings</th>
<th>Avg. Rating Per Prod.</th>
<th>Humor Reproduction</th>
<th>Self-Ratings</th>
<th>Peer Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humor Appreciation</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Productions</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.86***</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Top-Rated Productions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>.89***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. No. of Top Ratings Per Prod.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score for All Prod. Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Rating per Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor Reproduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10  **p < .05  ***p < .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Humorous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Ratings</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Ratings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Appreciator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproducer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer/Reproducer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relative frequencies. This score, the Total Humor Score, was also found to be negatively related \((r=-.33, p<.05)\) with Humor Appreciation. It should be noted here that subjects generally rated jokes as fairly low in funniness. The average rating was just under three, meaning that most of the jokes were considered to be "slightly below average in funniness."

The only other significant correlations among humor measures were between various scores which were derived from the Humor Production Test and which thus represented part-whole relationships. However, a positive trend was found between Humor Production, as scored for Number of Top-Rated Productions, and Humor Reproduction \((r=.28, p<.10)\).

Humor Assessment Measures and Subject Variables. Although no predictions were made in this area, several significant correlations were found between humor assessment measures and subject variables (see Table 5). Male subjects rated themselves higher and also were rated higher by their peers than were female subjects (correlations of .39, \(p<.01\), and .32, \(p<.05\), respectively). Younger subjects were rated higher by peers \((-0.40\) correlation with age, \(p<.01\)), as were subjects at training sites other than the Guidance Center \((r=.32, p<.05)\). Thus there was a confound among sex, age, and training site, with young, male, non-Guidance Center subjects receiving higher ratings than other subjects.\(^1\) Another finding was that clinical psychology students

\(^1\)It is the author's impression that age and sex are the more important variables here.
TABLE 5

METHODS OF HUMOR ASSESSMENT AND SUBJECT VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sex\textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Training Site\textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>Graduate School Program\textsuperscript{a}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg. No. of Top Ratings per Production</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Ratings</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Ratings</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>-.40*</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*p<.01 (for the other correlations, p<.05)

\textsuperscript{a}It should be noted that, because sex is a dichotomous variable, it technically cannot be used in a Pearson Correlation. Further, for the present investigation, training site and graduate program are also dichotomous variables.
scored higher on the Humor Production Test, based on the Average Number of Top Ratings, than did social work students \( (r=.32, p < .05) \).

**Humor and Personality Correlates**

**Locus of Control.** The predicted positive relationship between Peer Ratings of humor and internality on Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control was not confirmed. Indeed, none of the humor measures correlated significantly with locus of control. The correlations obtained were mixed, indicating neither a positive nor a negative trend. Subjects were more "internal" \( (\bar{X}=7.8) \) than Rotter's normative population, while the variance was found to be comparable to the norms (SD=3.62).

**California Psychological Inventory.** The predicted positive relationship between Peer Ratings and CPI Mean, as a measure of general interpersonal adjustment, was not borne out (see Table 6). Peer Ratings were, however, positively related with one CPI scale, Socialization \( (r=.31, p < .05) \). The findings were similar for Self-Ratings, which were not related to CPI Mean but did positively correlate with the Self-Acceptance scale \( (.42, p < .01) \).

While no relationships were expected between paper-and-pencil humor measures and CPI scores, a number of significant findings emerged (see Table 6). In fact, performance on the Humor Production Test proved to be the single best predictor of interpersonal adjustment. Two of the scores derived from this test, Average Number of Top Ratings per Production and Average Rating per Production, were positively
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humor Measures</th>
<th>CPI Mean</th>
<th>Dominance (Do)</th>
<th>Capacity for Status (Cs)</th>
<th>Sociability (Sy)</th>
<th>Social Presence (Sp)</th>
<th>Self-Acceptance (Sa)</th>
<th>Well-Being (Wb)</th>
<th>Responsibility (Re)</th>
<th>Socialization (So)</th>
<th>Tolerance (To)</th>
<th>Achievement via Conformance (Ac)</th>
<th>Achievement via Independence (Ai)</th>
<th>Intellectual Efficiency (Ie)</th>
<th>Psychology-mindedness (P'y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humor Appreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Produc.</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Rating/Prod.</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Top-rated Prod.</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. No. of Top Ratings/Produc.</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor Reprod.</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production/Reprod.</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Humor Score</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01 (for the other correlations included, p < .05)

Note: The Self-Control, Good Impression, Communality, Flexibility, and Femininity scales of the CPI do not appear in this table because no relationships were found between these scales and humor measures.
related to CPI Mean (correlations of .42, p < .01, and .36, p < .05, respectively). Humor Reproduction was also found to be positively correlated with CPI Mean (.31, p < .05). Nearly the reverse was true, however, of the third paper-and-pencil measure of humor, Humor Appreciation. A negative trend (-.25, p < .10) was found between this test and CPI Mean. Furthermore, two CPI scales were negatively related to Humor Appreciation, Intellectual Efficiency (-.36, p < .05) and Responsibility (-.33, p < .05).

In a post hoc procedure, subjects' scores on humor measures were converted to cumulative relative frequencies and combined to form two new scores, "Production/Reproduction" and the "Total Humor Score." The former combined the Average Number of Top Ratings per Production (derived from the Humor Production Test) and Humor Reproduction. The latter added Self-Ratings and Peer Ratings, as well, and thus formed a single score to represent all of the humor measures excluding Humor Appreciation. Both of these new scores were positively related to CPI Mean, with Production/Reproduction correlating .46 (p < .01) and the Total Humor Score .38 (p < .05). Each score also related positively to seven different CPI scales. The Production/Reproduction score proved to be the best predictor of interpersonal adjustment with slightly higher correlations than both the Total Humor Score and the Average Number of Top Ratings per Production.

While the high inter-correlations among scales somewhat limit the meaningfulness of profiles derived from the CPI, examination of Table 6
suggests at least the outline of a profile of the individual with a
good sense of humor. Such a person is characterized by high
Intellectual Efficiency, Social Presence, Sociability, Achievement via
Conformance, and Tolerance.

Humor and Therapy Questionnaire

Predicted relationships in this area were not confirmed. A more
active sense of humor, as measured by Peer Ratings, was not associated
with increased use of humor in therapy nor with a more favorable atti-
tude toward humor in therapy. Indeed, as Table 7 reveals, very few
significant correlations were found between the two parts of the
questionnaire and other variables in the study. Attitude toward humor
in therapy was positively related to Humor Reproduction (r=.37, p<.05)
and to Self-Ratings (r=.30, p<.05). Use of humor was related only to
subjects' graduate program, with social work students indicating
greater use of humor in therapy (r=.32, p<.05).

General findings from the questionnaire (see Appendix B) reveal
that most of these beginning therapists had a very favorable view of
humor's role in their work. At the same time, they were concerned
about the possible misuse of humor in therapy. Ninety-three percent
indicated their belief that humor has a place in the therapy setting
(Q.12). Most subjects found that sessions which clients enjoyed were
also helpful therapeutically (Q.5). Very rarely was the spontaneous
occurrence of humor seen as detrimental (Q.3). Most saw the use of
humor as beneficial in a variety of ways, particularly in helping both
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Humor in Therapy</th>
<th>Graduate School Program</th>
<th>.32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude Toward Humor</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor Reproduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward Humor in Therapy</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  
$p < .05$ for all the above correlations.
client and therapist to relax and in helping the client gain insight into his behavior (Q.14). Most subjects reported that the use of humor had been helpful with a wide variety of clients – adults, adolescents, children, and families (Q.8). Indeed, 65% agreed that the goal of therapy for some clients might profitably be viewed as the development of a better sense of humor (Q.11). Also, most subjects had at least occasionally found their clients' use of humor to be a helpful diagnostic indicator (Q.7).

Subjects' cautious approach to humor in therapy was evident. Sixty percent agreed that there is a real risk of humor being an outlet for the therapist's hostility or frustration (Q.9). Only 21% had consciously and purposively used humorous interventions with any frequency (Q.6). Most reported that they had at times made a point of avoiding the use of humorous interventions, though only 9% had done this more than occasionally (Q.4). Forty-five percent of the subjects wrote down additional comments (Q.15). Of these 60% included precautionary words about the possible negative effects of humor in therapy. Most indicative of subjects' cautiously favorable approach to humor were responses to items 10 and 13. Ninety-eight percent agreed that humor could be either helpful or harmful depending on who is using it and the way it is used. Seventy-three percent felt that therapists, for whom humorous interventions flowed quite naturally, should be encouraged to use humor in their therapeutic work.
Finally, over 80% of the subjects either said that they were "eclectic" in their therapeutic orientation or reported two or more major theoretical influences. The theories most frequently cited were: psychodynamic or psychoanalytic, family systems, and cognitive-behavioral.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This study investigated the validity of different methods of assessing sense of humor, the personality correlates associated with sense of humor, and beginning psychotherapists' attitudes toward and use of humor in their therapeutic work. Several specific hypotheses were made, while other aspects of the study were of an exploratory nature. Predictions were partially confirmed by the data.

Humor Assessment

The results related to the different methods of humor assessment are neither dramatic nor clear-cut, and they vary in some important respects from previous research. The pattern of relationships among the three methods of assessment—tests, peer ratings, and self-ratings—was as predicted and similar to that reported in previous research (Babad, 1974): Peer Ratings and Self-Ratings were positively related to each other, but neither was related to the humor tests. The only exception to this was the unexpected negative relationship found between Self-Ratings and the Humor Appreciation Test. Whereas Babad (1974) interpreted her results as a confirmation of the validity of the sociometric method and as strong evidence against humor tests, the interpretation made here is somewhat different. I believe there is some support for both ratings and tests, with stronger evidence in
favor of the tests. It seems likely that the different methods tap
different dimensions of humor. It also seems clear that each method,
in its present form, represents a rather rough-hewn tool for the
measurement of humor. The advantages and the limitations of each
method will be discussed below, followed by an examination of two
attempts to combine methods.

Peer Ratings. The case for the sociometric method of humor
assessment is weakened by three findings of the present study. First,
there was a lack of consensus among raters. No subject received
unanimous ratings in a single category. Indeed, most were rated in
four or five different categories. Babad had the opportunity to glean
77 individuals with unanimous ratings out of a total of 987 students
who received ratings. Although she did not report on the degree of
consensus achieved in the unused ratings, it is likely that she
encountered a similar difficulty. At any rate, the simpler procedures
of this research produced a bewildering lack of consensus. This raises
some doubts about the practical utility of Peer Ratings in their
present form. Second, the correlation between Peer Ratings and Self-
Ratings, while in the predicted direction and statistically significant,
was modest. It accounted for barely ten percent of the variance, and
some of this shared variance presumably was due to the close similarity
in method. The relationship was considerably weaker than that reported
by Babad. It seems likely that the strong relationship she found was
due in part to the use of what was essentially an extreme groups
approach. First subjects were selected on the basis of unanimous Peer
Ratings; then, these carefully chosen individuals rated themselves. In the present study, Self-Ratings provided only weak support for the validity of the sociometric method. Subjects' self-perceptions were not very consistent with the perceptions of their peers. Third, Peer Ratings produced only one significant correlation with a personality variable. Humor tests were considerably more productive in this regard. The positive relationship between Peer Ratings and Socialization was in the predicted direction, indicative of an interpersonal strength. However, it is somewhat surprising that only this scale, which indicates the individual's degree of social maturity, honesty, and industry, would be associated with high sociometric ratings of humor, rather than those scales which are more reflective of social skills (for example, Sociability and Social Presence). It may be that a halo effect was involved. Because a subject was seen by peers as nice and easy to get along with, he may have been rated higher on sense of humor as well.

These findings regarding Peer Ratings may be accounted for in several ways. One possible explanation is that they are due in part to the specific wording used in the instructions to this section. In her study Babad asked subjects to "name any persons within the college community who fit the (humor) categories." Here there were subtle differences in the wording. The participants were instructed to rate as many persons as they could, that is, "as many as you feel you have had sufficient contact in order to intelligently rate." Furthermore, they were told to "check the humor type which best characterizes the
person." It is clear that the latter directions encourage a higher number of ratings. It is also evident that, whereas the earlier study asked the students to pick persons to fit the categories, this study had subjects find the category which best fit the person. The data reflect these differences. Each subject received an average of slightly over seven ratings in Babad's study, while the average in this study was 20.3. It is very likely that subjects in the present study rated some persons that they did not know very well or knew only in a work or school setting. Knowing them only to this limited extent, they attempted to fit them into a humor category. Therefore, it may be that rewording the instructions would result in fewer ratings per subject, a better consensus, and higher correlations with Self-Ratings and personality correlates. Revised instructions should emphasize two points: (1) rate persons who fit the humor categories, and (2) rate those with whom you are personally acquainted, over and above your contact at work and school.

Another possible explanation for the unimpressive findings for Peer Ratings is that the specific humor categories that were used are inadequate. It may be that inherent weaknesses in these dimensions of humor were manifested here but were hidden in Babad's study because of the methodology (that is, first screening for "pure" types, then proceeding with all the other measures). Two possible weaknesses will be examined. First, the "Reproducer" type (Category IV) may be unnecessary or unclear. Only nine of 44 subjects rated themselves as reproducers, far fewer than the number rating themselves in either Category III (14)
or V (20). In Babad's study also only 11 out of 77 participants placed themselves in the reproducer category. Subjects may have found this humor type difficult to distinguish from "Producer." It also seems possible that this category was perceived as less socially desirable because it emphasizes that such individuals "do not invent their own humor." Second, the humor categories in their present form may be so broad that they encompass several different aspects of humor, thus diluting their predictive capability. For example, Peer Ratings such as these may confuse capacity for humor with frequency of humor expression. This might lead to a tendency to equate an active sense of humor with being a "performer." In this study, with over 20 ratings per person on the average, one would have to be very outgoing and quite a performer indeed for so many peers to rate him as a reproducer or producer. There is another way of looking at it. While there are few "false positives" using these categories (those rated high by peers no doubt are very active in their sense of humor), there may be many "false negatives." Persons with a very fertile sense of humor, but who typically express it only in certain situations, might be overlooked. More speculatively still, there may be individuals with an active sense of humor who keep it pretty much to themselves. Conversely, if one's sense of humor vanishes the moment his "audience" is gone, can he truly be said to have an "active" sense of humor? This latter point relates to Freud's (1960, 1928) notion of "humor" as the inner capacity to rise above difficult or painful events by means of a jest—by seeing the funny or absurd dimension of the situation. The Peer Ratings do not
deal with this aspect of humor. Similarly, the present categories do not explicitly include the ability to laugh at oneself, to "take a joke." Still another dimension of humor left vague in the humor types is the distinction between those who frequently attempt to be funny and those who succeed in being funny.

**Self-Ratings.** The results of the Self-Ratings reveal that subjects tend to rate themselves quite high, considerably higher than do peers. This finding is consistent with that of Babad's study. Here only one subject out of 44 rated himself in a non-humorous category; just two of 77 did so in the earlier study. There seem to be several reasons for this finding. First, humor is perceived as a very desirable characteristic. However, in my opinion, to simply write off this finding as due entirely to a social desirability response set would be short-sighted. While such ratings may be overly high, they may very well reflect the reality that these subjects represent a segment of the population that is very humorous. As graduate students who are in training to be therapists, such individuals are bright, verbal, and usually highly skilled interpersonally. In view of this, it would be surprising to find more than a very small percentage of subjects lacking in a sense of humor. A third probable reason relates to what was said earlier about "false negatives" obtained from Peer Ratings. Some individuals' Self-Ratings may be considerably more accurate than ratings made by a large number of their peers. The individual is aware of his humorous behavior in all possible situations, whereas most of
his peers are able to observe him in only a few, more "public" situations.

It was also found that Self-Ratings were positively related to both the CPI Self-Acceptance scale and to Attitude toward Humor in Therapy, and negatively related to the Humor Appreciation Test. These findings suggest a consistent approach on the part of subjects to these four self-report measures. To the extent that individuals saw themselves as having a good, active sense of humor, they also (a) expressed their favorable views about humor in therapy; (b) evaluated jokes according to higher standards, and (c) reported their strong sense of personal worth and their capacity for independent thinking and acting.

**Humor Production.** Turning to the paper-and-pencil tests, the present results suggest that the test of Humor Production may be a useful tool for the assessment of humor. There are also preliminary indications that a Humor Reproduction Test may have a place in humor assessment. However, the data from this study provide strong evidence that the Humor Appreciation Test, in its present form, is tapping variables unrelated to humor. The Humor Production Test, when scored for the Average Number of Top Ratings per Production, produced the strongest relationships with personality variables of any single humor measure. Most noteworthy were its relationships with CPI Mean, Intellectual Efficiency, and Social Presence. These relationships indicate that those with high quality humor productions tend to be better
adjusted interpersonally, to have more intellectual ability and to use it more effectively, and to be more poised, self-confident, and spontaneous in personal and social interactions. These findings were the kind that were expected for those with an active sense of humor as measured by Peer Ratings. Instead, they appeared with a paper-and-pencil test of active humor. This suggests that the Humor Production Test is a good analog of the situations in which humor arises. The task is a complex and difficult one. It requires subjects to look at the cartoon and be perceptive and sensitive to the nuances of the human interaction portrayed in it. They must be able then to shift from a reality to a fantasy perspective, see the potential incongruity in the scene, and then create a verbal response which is both clear and terse—enough to convey the gist of the humor without diluting the impact with excess verbiage. Although the immediate context for this process is a testing situation, the social perceptiveness and verbal facility required parallel that of a "live" social context. The test does not tap merely a "cognitive" capacity, as Babad (1974) suggests. Indeed, it seems clear that for an individual to do well on this test presupposes a lengthy history of awareness and expression of humor in a variety of social situations. Thus, the Humor Production Test demands that humor skills be demonstrated, rather than reported, as on the Self-Ratings. It relies on external raters as do Peer Ratings. However, it has the advantage of greater objectivity since the captions are rated "blind." There is not the likelihood of other personality characteristics inadvertently being rated along with sense of humor (e.g., a halo
effect for Socialization, as suggested above).

Very few false positives may be expected from this test. Anyone able to score high on it surely has a capacity to be funny. But how many actively humorous persons will fail to do well on such a test? By including a variety of cartoons (with both high and low visual incongruity and a wide variety of characters and themes), it was hoped that the test would be fair to most subjects, regardless of their area of humor "specialization." Obviously, however, the test can neither cover the entire range of humorous situations nor every mode of humor expression. It was for this reason that the Humor Reproduction Test was added.

These results for the Humor Production Test at first appear to be the direct opposite of Babad's findings. She reported a positive relationship between Humor Production and increased introversion and anxiety. However, it was specifically the score for Number of Productions that was involved in this correlation. Findings were similar in the present study. Number of Productions was negatively related to two CPI scales, Psychology-Mindedness and Well-Being. The latter scale has been found to be a valid measure of general interpersonal adjustment. Thus, sheer productivity has consistently been found to be negatively related to adjustment and seems to be measuring something other than humor. Certain subjects may have responded to the demand characteristics of the task. They may have been "over-achievers," aware at some level of their limited ability, but striving to compensate for it or cover it up by producing more captions. Some may have been unaware of
the poor quality of their productions simply because of a poor sense of what is funny.

Babad found no significant relationships with the other scores derived from the Humor Production Test. However, she did not compute a score analogous to the present study's Average Number of Top Ratings per Productions. This score specifically aims at partialling out the effects of sheer productivity, in favor of the quality of production. In view of this, the results of this study are not incompatible with Babad's findings.

Humor Reproduction. The results suggest that the Humor Reproduction Test holds some promise as an approach to humor assessment. However, the test's brevity, simplicity, and newness make the results difficult to interpret. The test was designed to tap a somewhat different dimension of active humor than that measured by the Humor Production Test. The positive trend found between the two measures, as well as the positive relationships that both had with overall interpersonal adjustment (CPI Mean), Intellectual Efficiency, and Achievement via Conformance, suggest that the two tests have some important common elements. Both require a demonstration of humor skills, and both involve outside judges. Humor Reproduction was also related to the CPI Tolerance Scale, suggesting permissive, accepting, and non-judgmental social beliefs and attitudes.

The test seems to distinguish, first of all, between those who are motivated to recall a joke and those who are not. Sixteen percent
of the subjects were in the latter category. For these individuals, joke-telling was apparently a very unfamiliar activity. Secondly, the test offers an analog of joke-telling ability which seems to be two-fold: to recognize what is a funny joke and then to retell it effectively. This task is less demanding of creativity and of verbal facility than is the Humor Production Test, but success on it implies a desire to make contact with others and to share a laugh.

The range of humor tapped by the Humor Reproduction Test might profitably be expanded by adding a second task. Subjects might be asked to describe a humorous personal anecdote—something funny that actually happened to them or that they personally observed. This type of "story-telling" capability is somewhat different from joke-telling. It seems likely that some individuals who cannot recall jokes, or simply do not care to do so, may be able to relate real life stores in a humorous manner.

Humor Appreciation. The data obtained from the Humor Appreciation Test were in marked contrast to the other humor measures. Humor Appreciation was found to be either unrelated or negatively related with all humor measures and personality variables. Those who rated jokes higher in funniness also (a) rated their own sense of humor lower; (b) were given lower ratings by their peers, and (c) tended to be less well-adjusted interpersonally (CPI Mean); less conscientious, responsible, and dependable in disposition and temperament (Re), and less capable and efficient intellectually (Ie). These results support the earlier
findings of Babad (1974). The only correlation she found between Humor Appreciation and a humor measure was a positive relationship with Number of Productions on the Humor Production Test. As discussed above, this score apparently taps something other than sense of humor. Babad also found those scoring high on the Humor Appreciation Test to be less well-adjusted interpersonally, scoring higher on measures of anxiety and introversion. Therefore, the results of this study and of previous research provide consistent evidence that tests of humor appreciation, in the form of joke (or cartoon) ratings, are in fact measuring something unrelated to humor. It seems clear that to simply rate jokes as funny does not represent one's sense of humor. Babad suggested that some people, perhaps the more anxious, may interpret the demand characteristics of the situation as calling for high funniness ratings. Expanding on this interpretation, it is likely that such individuals have a poorer self-image and are striving for social acceptance and approval. Conversely, those who frequently do tell jokes and/or invent their own humor presumably brought higher standards to this task. They very likely believed that they themselves could make up much funnier jokes than those they rated. Less humorous individuals may have felt less confident in being so critical.

Combined Measures. The Production/Reproduction score, which combined the scores on these two paper-and-pencil tests on the basis of cumulative relative frequencies, strengthened the relationship with personality variables. The Total Humor score, which combined all of the humor measures except Humor Appreciation, was also fruitful in its
predictions of interpersonal strengths. These results suggest that both tests and ratings may be valid means of assessing humor and that combinations of measures may be the most fruitful approach to humor assessment in the future. These findings also suggest that humor should be viewed as a multi-dimensional phenomenon, requiring several capacities and given to many forms of expression. There is also evidence that the presence of these capacities is associated with better overall interpersonal adjustment and with certain positive personality characteristics. In this study, the profile of the humorous person that emerges encompasses, above all, intellectual ability and effective use of that ability (Ie); poise, self-confidence, and spontaneity in personal and social interactions (Sp); and an out-going, enterprising temperament (Sy). The data also suggest that the humorous person is cooperative, organized, and responsible (Ac), as well as permissive, accepting and non-judgmental in social beliefs and attitudes (To).

Locus of Control. Locus of Control was not found to be related to any other variable in the entire study. This may be explained in part by the overall "internal" orientation of this group of subjects. There was considerable variability in scores, but this variability generally represented degree of internality. In a more heterogeneous population, perhaps some relationship would emerge. Earlier studies (Lefcourt, Sordoni, and Sordoni, 1974; Lefcourt, Antrobus, and Hogg, 1974) that found a relationship between Locus of Control and humor made use of experimental conditions and observational techniques and also defined
"humor" more strictly according to Freud's technical definition—as the capacity to be humorous in the face of personal difficulties.

Humor and Therapy

Subjects' generally favorable views of humor in therapy corresponded with their perceptions of themselves as possessing a good sense of humor. That the majority of subjects also stated that they were eclectic in therapy orientation also seems relevant. As eclectics, they are more likely to look for what works and less inclined to arbitrarily exclude something like humor from their therapy. The finding that Attitude toward Humor in Therapy was positively related to Humor Reproduction seems to reflect a common orientation toward therapy and interpersonal relationships in general. Subjects who make a point of recalling jokes in order to share them with others also see (a) humor as having a place in therapy; (b) the occurrence of humor in therapy as less risky, and (c) the development of a sense of humor as a possible therapeutic goal.

That so few relationships were found between the two parts of the questionnaire and other variables is probably due to several factors: (a) subjects' consistently favorable view toward humor in therapy; (b) the presence of several items on the questionnaire which were not very discriminative and thus weakened the statistical usefulness of the instrument; (c) except for the distinction made between planned versus spontaneous occurrences of humor, there was no specification of different types of humor used in therapy; clearer differences among
subjects might emerge if they are asked their opinion about the therapist's use of specific types, such as: banter, satire, caricature, puns, parody, sarcasm, jokes to illustrate a point or moral, and therapist self-disclosure by means of personal humorous anecdotes; (d) the division of items into "Use" and "Attitude" sections failed to clearly delineate these two dimensions, and (e) the absence of behavioral items (e.g., pertaining to laughter and smiling in therapy sessions) in the "Use" section.

Conclusions

Several general statements can be made about the data obtained in this study. The vast majority of these beginning therapists:

(1) perceived themselves as having a very good sense of humor;
(2) were also seen as humorous by their peers, although Peer Ratings were not as high as Self-Ratings;
(3) reported that they were eclectics in their therapeutic orientation and expressed favorable, though cautious, views of humor's role in psychotherapy;
(4) rated the jokes in the Humor Appreciation Test as low in funniness, apparently using a high standard of humor in their ratings;
(5) were found to be more "internal" in their Locus of Control than the average; and
(6) were found to be well-adjusted interpersonally and psychologically healthy.
As these general findings suggest, there was not the variability among these subjects that would likely be found in the general population. This was due to the restricted range of scores obtained on most of the measures. Thus there was a reduction in the magnitude of the correlations between variables. Nonetheless, several significant results emerged which shed light on previous research and suggest some new hypotheses for further study. First, the data provided rather weak support for the sociometric method of humor assessment, while showing unexpected strength for two of the paper-and-pencil tests, Humor Production and Humor Reproduction. Striking confirmation of earlier research indicated that both the Humor Appreciation Test, in the form of joke (or cartoon) ratings, and the Number of Productions on the Humor Production Test are tapping variables other than humor. These two measures seem to be especially reactive to demand characteristics. It is recommended that they not be used in future humor research. The initial outline of a personality profile of the humorous person began to emerge, characterized especially by intellectual ability and effective use of that ability; poise, self-confidence, and spontaneity in personal and social interactions, and an out-going, enterprising temperament. This profile was seen particularly in the personality correlates of two combinations of humor measures. If this profile remains in a cross-validation, it offers information about what is measured by the tests of Humor Production and Humor Reproduction and about what humorous people are like. The potential usefulness of such combinations of measures was supported, as was the view of humor as a
complex, multi-dimensional phenomenon. The successful combination of tests with ratings suggests that these two approaches may profitably be considered as complementing each other.

Directions for Future Research

The study of humor is in a very early stage, and many humor-related areas are open for fruitful exploration. The results of the present study suggest some promise for future research on the positive aspects of humor. Below are outlined several avenues of study that might profitably be pursued:

One question plaguing humor research is this: If we had a valid measure of humor, how would we know it? At present there are no criteria for validity against which to evaluate the results of humor tests or sociometric ratings. In this thesis, different humor measures were (a) compared and contrasted to each other, and (b) evaluated according to the personality characteristics associated with them. Both methods, however, have pitfalls. The former may lead to subjective interpretations of which measure is better. The latter method is weakened by the lack of anything approaching a comprehensive and coherent theory of humor and personality. The replications and follow-up research needed to remedy this problem have not been forthcoming. One way to build on the present study would entail the administration of four assessment measures (humor production and reproduction tests, plus peer and self-ratings), with appropriate refinements to each, to a different population. Other personality measures should be employed,
including ones which assess characteristics related to "intellectual efficiency," "social presence," and "sociability," as well as other theoretically derived traits. In this way, there would be a cross-validation of the findings of this study. Ideally future research would also incorporate innovative humor assessment methods, for example, a fresh approach to measuring "humor appreciation."

Secondly, it might be profitable to expand the humor categories used here and to create a "profile of humor." In addition to the distinctions made between passive versus active humor and between reproducer versus producer, other dimensions might be incorporated, including: (a) a "performer" category which would be at the extreme "active" end of the humor continuum; (b) a category describing the "humorous" person according to Freud's strict definition—one who is able to rise above personal difficulties and pain by looking at the funny or absurd side of situations; (c) a category which relates to one's ability to "take a joke" or to not take oneself too seriously, and (d) categories which would allow raters to evaluate to what extent others succeed in their attempts to be funny. There are many more possibilities, of course. The point is that the use of these added dimensions (in peer and self-ratings and in humor tests) will help to sort out which aspects of humor are most closely associated with interpersonal adjustment. For example, it might be that a curvilinear relationship between active humor and adjustment will emerge, with the curve sloping downward at the "performer" end, as well as at the "non-humorous" end, of the spectrum. Or it might be found that the crucial
underlying dimension for better adjustment is the capacity for "humor" in the Freudian sense.

In addition, future studies also need to deal with the nature of the relationship between humor and adjustment, to determine whether sense of humor is (a) causally related to better adjustment; or (b) one resource among others--one part of the repertoire--of most well-adjusted people, or (c) if it is better understood as a manifestation or expression of the individual personality--hostile in some, warm in others, and so on.

Further, N=1 studies might explore in depth the development, content, and functions of humor in those individuals who both scored high on the active humor tests and received high ratings by peers.

Finally, psychotherapy clients' perceptions and experiences regarding humor and its use by therapists should be studied, to see if they share the positive views reported by experienced and beginning therapists in the present study.
SUMMARY

Graduate students (N=44) in clinical psychology and social work, all of whom were beginning therapists, completed a questionnaire about humor and therapy, peer and self-ratings of sense of humor, three paper-and-pencil humor tests, the California Psychological Inventory, and Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control. Several a priori hypotheses were made, while other aspects of the study were exploratory in nature. The data provided unexpected support for two paper-and-pencil tests of active humor as promising measures for assessing humor. Rather weak support was found for the sociometric method of humor assessment. Joke ratings as a measure of humor appreciation were found to be tapping variables unrelated to humor. Two different combinations of assessment measures were employed with encouraging results, supporting the conception of humor as a complex, multi-dimensional phenomenon and suggesting that tests and ratings be used in a complementary fashion. Several of the humor measures were positively related to better interpersonal adjustment. The initial outline of a personality profile of the humorous person began to emerge, characterized by intellectual ability and effective use of that ability; poise, self-confidence, and spontaneity in personal and social interactions, and an out-going, enterprising temperament. It was also found that the vast majority of these beginning therapists held favorable, though cautious, views about humor's role in psychotherapy.
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APPENDIX A

#1. HUMOR AND THERAPY. (PART ONE: USE OF HUMOR IN THERAPY)

Please put the number of your response in the space provided at the end of each statement. Use the following scale:

1. I have thought about the part played by humor in the therapy setting _____. 1-2%; 2-16; 3-50; 4-25; 5-7; 6-0.

2. I have been aware that humor was influencing interactions in the therapy setting _____. 1-0%; 2-7; 3-49; 4-35; 5-9; 6-0.

3. In my experience, when something humorous occurs spontaneously in a therapy session, it has been detrimental to the therapeutic process _____. 1-63%; 2-28; 3-9; 4-0; 5-0; 6-0.

4. I have made a point of avoiding the use of humorous interventions in therapy _____. 1-28%; 2-47; 3-16; 4-7; 5-2; 6-0.

5. I have found that therapy sessions that clients enjoyed have proved to be very helpful _____. 1-0%; 2-2; 3-29; 4-30; 5-30; 6-9.

6. I have consciously attempted to make humorous interventions in therapy sessions for a particular therapeutic purpose _____. 1-0%; 2-26; 3-44; 4-37; 5-2; 6-0.

7. In making diagnostic formulations, I have found that the way clients use their sense of humor is a helpful diagnostic indicator _____. 1-0%; 2-4; 3-2; 4-16; 5-7; 6-16.

8. I have found the use of humor** to be helpful in doing therapy with... (CIRCLE more than one if appropriate.)

   68% (a) adolescents (individual) 41% (e) groups of (specify)
   80% (b) individual adults               (f) other (specify)
   73% (c) families                      (f) not helpful with any of
   58% (d) children (individual)         these.

**Here and elsewhere, unless otherwise specified, "use of humor" refers to the therapist's use.
#1. (cont.) (PART TWO: ATTITUDE TOWARD HUMOR IN THERAPY)

Please use the following scale for the remaining questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The use of humor in therapy runs a real risk of being an outlet for the therapist's hostility or frustrations _____.
   1-7%; 2-33; 3-56; 4-4.

10. The use of humor in therapy can be either helpful or harmful depending on how it is used, who (i.e. what therapist) is using it, and so on _____.
    1-2%; 2-0; 3-41; 4-57.
    for some clients

11. The goal of therapy might profitably be viewed as the development in clients of a better sense of humor _____.
    1-7%; 2-28; 3-53; 4-12.

12. While humor has a place in the daily lives of many people, it has no place in the therapy setting _____.
    1-59%; 2-34; 3-0; 4-7.

13. Therapists--for whom humorous interventions flow quite naturally from their personality--should be encouraged to use humor constructively and frequently in their therapy sessions _____.
    1-2%; 2-25; 3-55; 4-18.

14. If the use of humor has been helpful in one or more of your therapeutic sessions, please indicate in what way it was of help.... (circle more than one if you wish)

   80% (a) getting client(s) to relax
   61% (b) getting therapist to relax
   66% (c) helping the client to gain insight into his behavior
   55% (d) letting the client see that the therapist is human, warm.
   52% (e) a sign to the client that the therapist does not see the client's situation as hopeless.
   50% (f) modeling for the client another way of dealing with stress, failures, frustrations.
   (g) Other (specify): developing a therapeutic alliance-7%; helping the client gain perspective on his behavior-5%; helping I gain insight into client's way of thinking-2%; helping client to not take his behavior so seriously-2%; introducing a painful insight with less threat-2%

15. In the space below (and other side of this sheet if necessary) please add any comments you have about humor and therapy....
APPENDIX B

#2. Joke Ratings.

On these pages there are a number of jokes. Please rate each joke according to its funniness, in relation to jokes in general. Use the scale below in making your ratings. Write the number you have chosen in the space provided next to each joke.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>BELOW</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY BELOW</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>ABOVE</td>
<td>FAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELOW</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY ABOVE</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>ABOVE</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

___1. --What do you think of the two candidates for mayor? --I'm glad only one of them can be elected.

___2. Sunday school teacher: And who do you think will get the biggest crown of glory in heaven? Little girl: The guy with the biggest head.

___3. First little boy: See this mark like a strawberry on my back? It's because my mother ate strawberries before I was born.
   Second little boy: This mark on my hand, like a mouse's ear, is because my mother was frightened by a mouse.
   Third little boy: (in a deep, slow voice) When I was born, my mother cracked a phonograph record, but I'm not superstitious yet.

___4. A politician burst angrily into the newspaper editor's office. "You've got a lot of nerve" he roared. "What's the idea of printing lies about me?"
   "Humph," grunted the editor, unperturbed, "You shouldn't complain. What would you do if we printed the truth about you?"

___5. --Tell me honestly, did you ever catch your husband flirting?
   --That's precisely how I did catch him.

___6. "To what do you attribute your longevity?" the reporter asked the 102-year old man.
   "To the fact that I never died," was the conclusive reply.

___7. Teenage youth (boasting to school girlfriend): I was out with a nurse last night.
   She: Cheer up! Maybe next time your mama will let you go out without one.

___8. Mrs. Plapper had a very violent argument with her husband, in the course of which she threw him out of the second floor window, landing him in the garbage can in the yard. Their Chinese servant, on seeing the husband in this condition, shook her head and said: "American women are extremely extravagant---he good for five years yet."
9. --Tell me what you eat and I'll tell you what you are, said the lunch counter philosopher.
--Waitress, said the weak little man, would you cancel that order of shrimp salad.

10. A drunk staggered up to the sandwich section of the Automat and deposited two dimes, and a ham sandwich came out. He had put in 20 dimes and had ten sandwiches when the manager came over and said: "Why don't you stop? Haven't you got enough?"
"What?" exclaimed the drunk, "quit when I'm on a winning streak?"

11. She: So you love me. Will you die for me?
He: No, mine is an undying love.

12. Drunk to traffic cop: "But nobody in the car was driving, Officer. We were all in the back seat."

13. There was a mix-up at the swank Fifth Avenue florist shop. Wrong cards were attached to two imposing floral wreaths. The one that went to a druggist moving to a new building read: "Deepest sympathy." The one intended for the funeral of a leading banker read: "Good luck in your new location."

14. I saved a girl from being attacked last night. I controlled myself.

15. I saw some swell ads in the paper the other day.
"Young man, Democrat, would like to meet young lady, Republican. Object: third party!"

16. A fellow tries to cross the Mexican border on his bicycle. He's got two big bags on his shoulders. The guard says, "What's in the bags?"
He says, "Sand."
The guard says, "Get them off--we'll examine them."
The fellow takes the two bags off, they empty them out, they look through it, find nothing but sand. The guy puts the sand back in the bags, puts the bags back on his shoulders and the little fellow crosses the border on his bicycle.
Every two weeks for six months this goes on.
Finally one week the fellow didn't show up and the guard meets him downtown.
He says, "Buddy, you had us crazy. We knew you were smuggling something. I won't say anything--what were you smuggling?"
The guy says, "Bicycles."

17. The other day a policeman stopped me going the wrong way on a one-way street.
"Didn't you see the arrow?"
"Arrow? Honest, Officer, I didn't even see the Indians."
18. I still love the oldie about the convict who was going
to the electric chair and called his lawyer for some last-
minute advice. The barrister replied, "Don't sit down."

19. I went down to Miami. They told me I'd get a lovely
room for seven dollars a week. My room was in Savannah, Georgia.

20. I bought her a mink outfit—a rifle and a trap.

21. A man was taking a survey on the vaseline industry. He
knocks on the lady's door. He says, "I represent a vaseline
company and we are taking a survey of the many uses of vaseline
in the home. Do you happen to use vaseline in your home, Madame?"
She says, "Yes."
He says, "How many ways do you use it?"
She says, "We use it for cuts, bruises and sex."
He says, "How do you use it for sex?"
She says, "We put it on the door-knob—it keeps the
kids out of the room."

22. If cars get any smaller! I got hit by one, I had to go
to the hospital and have it removed.

23. Want to drive somebody crazy? Send him a wire saying,
"Ignore first wire."

24. Two newlyweds—he's 64 and she's 23. She catches him
cheating with a 48-year old woman.
She says, "What has she got I haven't got?"
He says, "Patience."

25. A guy goes to court for a divorce. The judge says,
"Why do you want a divorce?"
He says, "Every night, when I come home from work,
instead of my wife being alone, I find a different guy hiding
in the closet."
The judge says, "And this causes you a lot of unhappi-
ness?"
The man says, "It certainly does, judge, I never have
any room to hang up my clothes."

26. I have a very fine doctor. If you can't afford the
operation, he touches up the X-rays.

27. The income tax people are very nice. They're letting
me keep my own mother.

28. After rushing into a drugstore, the nervous young man
was obviously embarrassed when a prim, middle-aged woman asked
if she could serve him.
"No-no," he stammered, "I'd rather see the druggist."
"I'm the druggist," she responded cheerfully. "What can
I do for you?"
"Oh,...well, uh, it's nothing important," he said, and
turned to leave.
"Young man," said the woman, "my sister and I have been
running this drugstore for nearly thirty years. There is nothing
you can tell us that will embarrass us." (see next page)
"Well, all right," he said. "I have this awful sexual hunger that nothing will appease. No matter how many times I make love, I still want to make love again. Is there anything you can give me for it?"

"Just a moment," said the little lady, "I'll have to discuss this with my sister."

A few minutes later she returned. "The best we can offer," she said, "is $200 a week and half-interest in the business."

29. The way she looks in the morning: She ran after the garbage man and said, "Am I too late for the garbage?" He said, "No, jump in."

30. A doctor gave a guy six months to live, and he didn't pay his bill. So the doctor gave him six more months to live.

31. "I understand your husband drowned and left you two million dollars. Can you imagine, two million dollars, and he couldn't even read or write."

She said, "Yeah.... and he couldn't swim either."
#9. Humor Production.

On the following pages are 16 cartoons without captions. Please write a funny caption for each cartoon. Do as many as you can in a reasonable amount of time—about 15 minutes.

#1.

#2.
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#4. Jokes.

In the space below, please write down your favorite joke of all or the funniest joke you can think of at this time. Please write it from memory, as best you can recall it, without consulting another person or source.
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#5. Peer Ratings.

On the following pages you are asked to rate persons you know on their sense of humor. There are five different humor types listed below, each with a general description of the type of person who fits that category.

In checking (x) off which types aptly characterize different persons, please be sure to note the following:

(1) Please rate as many persons as you can, that is, as many as you feel you have had sufficient contact in order to intelligently rate. This might be 25 or more; it might be 15 or 10 or less. If you do not know a person well enough to rate him/her, draw a line across the page opposite that person's name.

(2) Check the humor type which BEST CHARACTERIZES the person. Check only one type for each person. Follow the same procedure in rating yourself; but, in addition, please place an X in front of your own name, as well.

HUMOR TYPES

I. Someone with no readiness to laugh; never tells jokes or creates humor; never actively seeks out humorous situations or laughs at others' humor.

II. Someone who generally does not show a readiness to laugh; tells jokes or creates humor infrequently; in general, does not actively seek out humorous situations or laugh readily at others' humor.

III. Someone who shows readiness to laugh; enjoys the humor of others and seeks out humorous situations, but does not generally tell jokes or make up jokes or create humorous situations himself.

IV. A humorous person who appreciates humor as described in III but also retells amusing stories or jokes, or re-enacts amusing situations; in general, does not invent his own humor.

V. A humorous person who (a) appreciates humor as described in III, and (b) retells amusing stories or jokes as described in IV; but this person also invents humor; makes up jokes or witty, amusing stories, or creates humorous situations.
APPENDIX F

CPI scale definitions and frequently associated characteristics with high and low scores for each measure; (Gough, 1975)

**Dominance (Do)** To assess factors of leadership ability, dominance, persistence, and social initiative.

HIGH SCORERS: aggressive, confident, outgoing, planful, having initiative; verbally fluent, self-reliant. LOW SCORERS: retiring, inhibited, commonplace, indifferent, silent, slow in thought and action; avoiding situations of tension and decision; lacking in self-confidence.

**Capacity for status (Cs)** To serve as an index of an individual's capacity for status (not his actual or achieved status).

HIGH SCORERS: ambitious, active, forceful, insightful, resourceful, and versatile; as being ascendant and self-seeking; effective in communication; and as having personal scope and breadth of interests. LOW SCORERS: apathetic, shy, conventional, dull, mild, simple, slow; as being stereotyped in thinking; restricted in outlook and interests; uneasy and awkward in new or unfamiliar social situations.

**Sociability (Sy)** To identify persons of outgoing, sociable, participative temperament.

HIGH SCORERS: Outgoing, enterprising, and ingenious; as being competitive and forward; and as original and fluent in thought. LOW SCORERS: Awkward, conventional, quiet, submissive, and unassuming; as being detached and passive in attitude; and as being suggestible and overly influenced by others' reactions and opinions.

**Social Presence (Sp)** To assess factors such as poise, spontaneity, and self-confidence in personal and social interaction.

HIGH SCORERS: clever, enthusiastic, imaginative, quick, informal, spontaneous, active and vigorous; having an expressive ebullient nature. LOW SCORERS: deliberate, moderate, patient, self-restrained, and simple; as vacillating and uncertain in decisions; and as being literal and unoriginal in thinking and judging.

**Self-acceptance (Sa)** To assess factors such as sense of personal worth, self-acceptance and capacity for independent thinking and action.

HIGH SCORERS: Intelligent, outspoken, sharp-witted, demanding, aggressive, and self-centered; as being persuasive and verbally fluent; and as possessing self-confidence and self-assurance. LOW SCORERS: Methodical, conservative, dependable, conventional, easy-going, and quiet; as self-abasing and given to feelings of guilt and self-blame; and as being passive in action and narrow in interests.
Sense of Well-being (Wb) To identify persons who minimize their worries and complaints, and who are relatively free from self-doubt and disillusionment.  
HIGH SCORERS: ambitious, alert, and versatile; productive and active; valuing work and effort for its own sake. LOW SCORERS: unambitious, leisurely, cautious, apathetic, and conventional; self-defensive and apologetic; constricted in thought and action.

Responsibility (Re) To identify persons of conscientious, responsible, and dependable disposition and temperament.  
HIGH SCORERS: responsible, thorough, progressive, capable, dignified, and independent; conscientious and dependable; alert to ethical and moral issues. LOW SCORERS: awkward, changeable, immature, moody, lazy and disbelieving; influenced by personal bias, spite, and dogmatism; under-controlled and impulsive in behavior.

Socialization (So) To indicate the degree of social maturity, probity, and rectitude which the individual has attained.  
HIGH SCORERS: honest, industrious, obliging, sincere, modest, steady conscientious, and responsible; self-denying and conforming. LOW SCORERS: defensive, demanding, opinionated, resentful, head-strong, rebellious, and unpredictable; guileful and deceitful; given to excess, ostentation, and exhibition in behavior.

Self-control (Sc) To assess the degree and adequacy of self-regulation and self-control and freedom from impulsivity and self-centeredness.  
HIGH SCORERS: calm, patient, practical, self-denying, thoughtful and deliberate; strict and thorough in their own work and in their expectations for others; honest and self-controlled. LOW SCORERS: impulsive, shrewd, excitable, irritable, self-centered, and uninhibited; aggressive and assertive; overemphasizing personal pleasure and self-gain.

Tolerance (To) To identify persons with permissive, accepting and non-judgmental social beliefs and attitudes.  
HIGH SCORERS: enterprising, informal, quick, tolerant, clear-thinking, resourceful; intellectually able; having broad and varied interests. LOW SCORERS: suspicious, narrow, aloof, wary, retreating; as being passive and overly judgmental in attitude; and as disbelieving and distrustful in personal and social outlook.

Good Impression (Gi) To identify persons capable of creating a favorable impression, and who are concerned about how others react to them.  
HIGH SCORERS: cooperative, enterprising, outgoing, warm and helpful; diligent and persistent. LOW SCORERS: inhibited, shrewd, wary, and resentful; cool and distant in their relationships; self-centered and too little concerned with the needs and wants of others.
Co~unality (Cm) To indicate the degree to which an individual's reactions and responses correspond to the modal ("common") pattern established for the inventory.

HIGH SCORERS: moderate, tactful, reliable, sincere, patient, steady, and realistic; honest and conscientious; having common sense and good judgment. LOW SCORERS: impatient, changeable, complicated, nervous, restless, and confused; guileful and deceitful; inattentive and forgetful; having internal conflicts.

Achievement via Conformance (Ac) To identify those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any situation where conformance is a positive behavior.

HIGH SCORERS: capable, cooperative, efficient, organized, responsible, stable, and sincere; as being persistent and industrious; and as valuing intellectual activity and intellectual achievement. LOW SCORERS: coarse, stubborn, aloof, awkward, insecure and opinionated; easily disorganized under stress or pressures to conform; pessimistic about their occupational futures.

Achievement Via Independence (Ai) to identify those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where autonomy and independence are positive behaviors.

HIGH SCORERS: mature, forceful, strong, dominant, demanding and foresighted; as being independent and self-reliant; and as having superior intellectual ability and judgment. LOW SCORERS: inhibited, anxious, cautious, dissatisfied, dull and wary; as being submissive and compliant before authority; and as lacking in self-insight and self-understanding.

Intellectual Efficiency (Ie) To indicate the degree of personal and intellectual efficiency which the individual has attained.

HIGH SCORERS: efficient, clear-thinking, intelligent, progressive, thorough, and resourceful; alert and well-informed; placing a high value on intellectual matters. LOW SCORERS: confused, cautious, easygoing, defensive, shallow, and unambitious; conventional and stereotyped in thinking; lacking in self-direction and self-discipline.

Psychological-mindedness (Py) To measure the degree to which the individual is interested in, and responsive to, the inner needs, motives, and experiences of others.

HIGH SCORERS: observant, spontaneous, quick, resourceful, changeable; verbally fluent and socially ascendant; rebellious toward rules, restrictions, and constraints. LOW SCORERS: apathetic, serious, and unassuming; slow and deliberate in tempo; overly conforming and conventional.

Flexibility (Fx) To indicate the degree of flexibility and adaptability of a person's thinking and social behavior.

HIGH SCORERS: insightful, informal, adventurous, humorous, rebellious, idealistic, assertive, and egotistic; sarcastic and cynical; concerned with personal pleasure and diversion. LOW SCORERS: deliberate, worrying, industrious, guarded, mannerly, methodical, and rigid; formal and pedantic in thought; deferential to authority, custom, and tradition.
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GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

There are seven different parts to this study. It is important to do the seven parts in the order given below; however, it is recommended that the study be completed in several sittings. The parts of the test are numbered #1 through #7:

#1. Humor and Therapy
#2. Joke Ratings
#3. Humor Production
#4. Jokes
#5. Peer Ratings
#6. Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control
#7. California Psychological Inventory

Each person in the study has been randomly assigned a code number in order to insure anonymity and confidentiality.

The general purpose of the study is to explore the attitudes toward humor in therapy of beginning therapists and to compare different methods of assessing sense of humor. After the study is completed, each participant will be given a summary of the findings.

Please try to have the completed materials in by August 26, 1977. If there are any problems or questions, please contact me.

MANY THANKS FOR YOUR COOPERATION

Bob Cavanagh
6942 N. Wolcott
262-8798 (H)
274-5305 (W--till 8/30)
The thesis submitted by Robert W. Cavanagh has been read and approved by the following Committee:

Alan DeWolfe, Ph.D., Director
Professor, Psychology, Loyola University

John Shack, Ph.D.
Professor, Psychology, Loyola University

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the thesis is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

12/4/76
Date

[Signature]
Director's Signature