

The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

College of Communications

**HUMOR PREFERENCES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH MOOD, USES AND
GRATIFICATIONS, AND PERSONALITY**

A Thesis in

Media Studies

by

Elise M. Stevens

©2013 Elise M. Stevens

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Arts

May 2013

The thesis of Elise M. Stevens was reviewed and approved* by the following:

Marie Hardin
Associate Dean and Professor of Communications
Graduate Program Chair

Mike Schmierbach
Assistant Professor of Communications
Thesis Adviser

Mary Beth Oliver
Distinguished Professor of Communications

Matthew P. McAllister
Professor of Communications

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School.

ABSTRACT

This study examined the effects of mood, uses and gratifications, and personality on humor choices. Participants ($N = 216$) in six conditions answered questions pertaining to each variable and then read four television sitcom episode descriptions. Descriptions included a workplace, domestic, or fantasy genre with a cognitive, affective, or social/interpersonal mechanism of humor or the control drama. Results demonstrated that those in a depressed mood state preferred the control drama condition. Uses and gratifications and personality also predicted humor mechanism choices.

Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	v
Chapter 1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Chapter 2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
Cognitive Mechanism.....	4
Affective Mechanism.....	5
Social/Interpersonal Mechanism.....	6
Situational Comedies.....	7
Mood Management Theory.....	9
Uses and Gratifications.....	13
Personality.....	15
Chapter 3. METHOD.....	17
Participant Sample.....	17
Study Stimuli.....	17
Study Procedure.....	18
Study Measures.....	18
Chapter 4. RESULTS.....	22
Zero-Order Analysis.....	22
Multivariate Analysis.....	25
Chapter 5. DISCUSSION.....	30
Theoretical Implications.....	32
Practical Implications.....	35
Limitations of Study.....	36
Directions for Future Research.....	36
APPENDIX A Questionnaire.....	37
APPENDIX B Block Example.....	41
REFERENCES.....	42

List of Tables

Table 1. Zero-Order Correlations Among Mood and Like to Watch.....	47
Table 2. Zero-Order Correlations Among Mood and Enjoy to Watch.....	47
Table 3. Zero-Order Correlations Among Mood and Funny.....	47
Table 4. Zero-Order Correlations Among Uses and Gratifications and Like to Watch.....	47
Table 5. Zero-Order Correlations Among Uses and Gratifications and Enjoy to Watch.....	48
Table 6. Zero-Order Correlations Among Uses and Gratifications and Funny.....	48
Table 7. Zero-Order Correlations Among Personality and Like to Watch.....	48
Table 8. Zero-Order Correlations Among Personality and Enjoy.....	48
Table 9. Zero-Order Correlations Among Personality and Funny.....	49
Table 10. Zero-Order Correlations Among Independent Variables.....	50
Table 11. Zero-Order ANOVA with Independent Variables and Humor Preferences.....	51
Table 12. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Workplace Like to Watch..	52
Table 13. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Domestic Like to Watch....	53
Table 14. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Fantasy Like to Watch.....	54
Table 15. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Cognitive Like to Watch....	55
Table 16. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Affective Like to Watch....	56
Table 17. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Social/Interpersonal Like to Watch.....	57
Table 18. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Control Like to Watch.....	58
Table 19. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Workplace Enjoy to Watch..	59
Table 20. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Domestic Enjoy to Watch...60	
Table 21. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Fantasy Enjoy to Watch.....	61
Table 22. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Cognitive Enjoy to Watch....	62
Table 23. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Affective Enjoy to Watch....	63
Table 24. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Affective Enjoy to Watch....	64
Table 25. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Control Enjoy to Watch.....	65
Table 26. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Workplace Funny.....	66
Table 27. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Domestic Funny.....	67
Table 28. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Fantasy Funny.....	68
Table 29. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Cognitive Funny.....	69
Table 30. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Affective Funny.....	70
Table 31. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Social/Interpersonal Funny...71	
Table 32. Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Control Funny.....	72

Introduction

Humor is an essential human function and can be found in all types of social interactions. The advent of television and other media has allowed people to participate in this human behavior whenever they choose to do so. Television viewers have the opportunity to turn on many different types of humor packaged in various types of ways. These options give viewers the opportunity to choose media in a way that satisfies their needs. In addition to choosing the type of humor, viewers are also given a choice of genres that include action, romance, drama, or horror. With all of these choices, the question arises of what leads people to make the content choices they do.

Much research has been done on both humor and genre preferences, but little research has been done that focuses on the two simultaneously. Studies that do include humor and genre preferences tend to only explore humor on a very basic and general level. They do not include mechanisms or types of humor that relate to preferences. Such research is needed in order to understand how people choose their content, which could result in better customization of viewing behaviors. If content providers and consumers of humor know what draws them to specific content, they can tailor their viewing accordingly. In addition, content providers may be able to schedule and program their shows in relation to their target audience and order programming in a schedule sequence that elicits the element that predicts viewing. When doing so, they may increase their fan base and increase viewership. While content providers and audiences are important aspects of this research, those who produce the actual comedy programs may also find value in it. Humorists may use the research to better provide content to their audiences.

Research that focuses on this topic of humor preference will further the theoretical framework in the field and better explain and predict viewing patterns and behaviors. Using the theories of mood management, uses and gratifications, and personality, this research will explore humor preferences among audiences. Although these theories have incorporated some elements of humor, they have not been tested to predict specific humor subgenres. This research can develop the literature further by finding out what moods, uses and gratifications, and personality types predict more specific humor subgenres, which in turn will not only develop the literature on humor preferences, but may offer insight on other subgenres.

Literature Review

Television provides numerous options for programming, which come in many forms called genres. In television, genres are a way a program is constructed and include actions, characters, and plot development, which enable the viewer to interpret the programming (Gray & Lotz, 2012). Genres also present norms and boundaries in the content showing different views of the world for audiences (Cohen & Weimann, 2000). In other words, different genres often show different aspects of reality and are interpreted in a different way than their counterparts. For example, the viewer will interpret a conflict in a drama differently than in a comedy. Because of the audience's expectation of specific interpretations, viewers arrange television watching accordingly (Gray & Lotz, 2012). Genres are grouped by program similarities and differences with each genre presenting expectations and boundaries for audiences.

Comedy as a general genre is often seen as more fun and less sad in relation to other genres (Dillman Carpentier, Brown, Bertocci, Silk, Forbes, & Dahl, 2008). It consists of puns, jokes, understatements, satire, and irony (Andrews, 1943; Sternthal & Craig, 1973). In general, 17% of a person's daily laughter is elicited from media (Martin, 2007). The genre of comedy is one of particular importance due to its accounting for more than 45% of the 100 highest rated television series of all time and its unmatched popularity (Bryant & Zillmann, 1984). In addition, it comes in many forms including situational, political, and sketch comedies, among many others. These subgenres generally carry one or more of the three humor mechanisms in a single episode. The three main mechanisms that are employed in comedy are cognitive, affective, and social/interpersonal (Cho, 1995). These three mechanisms of humor achieve the response of perceived humor by the viewer. These instances of humor can elicit different emotions or feelings but all share the component of perceived humor. Advertising-based research has found

that these categories of humor are mutually exclusive (Cho, 1995). For purposes of this research, the mechanisms may not be completely mutually exclusive within comedy television, but do have distinguishable qualities that categorize programs into different mechanism categories because of the predominate humor type used.

The present research strives to further the literature on humor, mood management, uses and gratifications, and personality in order to create a more explicit theoretical framework. According to Neuman and Guggenheim (2011), there are stages to communication theories including strong effects with a rejection and criticism of previous work and then a new model of minimal effects followed by another rejection and a rediscovery of strong effects. As will be discussed, early mood management theory displayed strong effects with hedonistic choices, followed by research that repudiated this finding that programming choices are not always hedonistic. Currently, the theory focuses on general genre preference and could benefit from research done on subgenres.

Cognitive Mechanism

The cognitive mechanism of humor is mainly psychological (Vandaele, 2002). It elicits surprise in the audience out of incongruity of events and is explained by the incongruity resolution theory (Cho, 1995). This theory posits that viewers watching a program recognize some sort of inconsistency taking place and then reassemble the events psychologically (Cho, 1995). In other words, the audience views an event that has an easily predicted ending but then is caught off guard by a surprise ending of the situation. This unexpected happening elicits humor in viewers (Alden, Mukherjee, & Hoyer, 2000). The humor trigger is a combination of a mental schema found in the audience, their problem solving modes, and their fantasy-reality distinction (Cho, 1995). Using this definition, viewers perceive entertainment as humorous when their

cognitive capacity perceives the incongruous event, notes it, and understands it (Buijzen & Valkenburg, 2004). This effect requires the humorous content to show something out of the ordinary happening. An example of this type of mechanism is below:

Two dog owners are having a conversation:

—Can you imagine, my Astor goes out for the paper on his own!

—I know, my Rex told me about it yesterday.

(Kiken, 1977, p. 45)

The above joke demonstrates this mechanism by beginning with a conversation that could be heard in everyday conversation. The surprise is elicited when the second character casually talks about their dog speaking, which is not possible and very out of the ordinary, but humorous in an everyday conversation about dogs.

Affective Mechanism

The affective mechanism of humor is thematic and focused on physiological arousal and tension release. During tension release, the body regains homeostasis by reaching an optimal level of arousal. When something is perceived as humorous, an individual psychologically releases tension so the brain can maintain equilibrium (Freud, 1940). It has been associated with disguising sexual drives and briefly escaping social norms by subtle sexual themes (Freud, 1940). These feelings allow the audience to gain a sense of pleasure from violating social standards (Spotts, Weinberger, & Parsons, 1997). It has been described as feelings of “physiological arousal, fantasy, feelings of freedom, and sympathy” (Cho, 1995, p.192). Media that contain jokes about death or other tragic human events are usually categorized with this mechanism.

A program displaying this type of humor contains a sequence that induces a high arousal level, usually with some sort of excitement or fear, and ends with a humorous message that reduces the level of tension (Cho, 1995). Humor in this situation gives off negative affect and then is followed by an emotional release (Wicker, Thorelli, Barron, & Ponder, 1981). An example of this type of mechanism is below:

A cat-owner on holiday is phoned by his neighbor back home with the sad news that his cat has fallen to its death from the roof of the house. The cat-owner reprimands the neighbor for breaking the news so abruptly: 'What else could I have done?' demands the neighbor. 'Well,' says the cat-owner, 'you could have led up to it gradually. One day you could have phoned to say you had seen the cat poking around on the roof among the chimneys. Then you could say it was straying near the edge, and so on.' A week passed. Then the neighbor phoned again. 'Hi, it's me. I'm phoning to say I've seen your mother poking around on the roof among the chimneys.'

(Freud, 1940, p. 9)

The above joke finds humor in a real life dark event. For instance, this joke is about death but tries to find humor in comparing a cat's death with a human's death.

Social/Interpersonal Mechanism

The social/interpersonal humor mechanism is centered on feelings of disparagement and superiority over others. Superiority theory posits that an individual holds a sense of arrogance over other characters in the humorous content (Cho, 1995). The program carrying this type of humor would display one character as being incorrect or defeated, which gives the audience a feeling of superiority (Cho, 1995). During this response, the audience feels hostility and aggressiveness toward the defeated character without any feelings of guilt or remorse towards

the victim of the humor (Cho, 1995). In addition, the audience may feel a sense of heightened self-esteem by targeting the victim and making fun of them using sarcasm and irony (Vandaele, 2002). Titze (2009) described the social/interpersonal mechanism as the perception that others are uninformed or ridiculous, which essentially requires content that shows another person being “laughed at.” An example of this type of mechanism is below:

Mop: Ever stop to think of the pain we cause people? I think we cause more messes than we clean up.

Mop bucket: Sure, but there is nothing funnier than watching people slip and fall. That's why YouTube exists.

(MentalHealthHumor.com, 2012)

The above joke demonstrates others laughing at people and using their failures or errors as a way to find humor.

Situational Comedies

All of the mechanisms described above appear in situational comedies. Situational comedies are the most widely recognizable television genre among audiences, which makes them a very important component in entertainment television (Mittell, 2010). Situational comedies usually occur in story worlds set in low-key settings with believable characters and possible scenarios. These scenarios can be exaggerated and presented as “over-the-top” while integrating elements of domestic, workplace, and fantasy sitcoms (Mittell, 2010).

Other definitions of situation comedies include television shows that feature a setting that is recognizable to audiences from past episodes with the same ongoing characters, who are faced with comedic problems that can be resolved by the end of the episode (Mittell, 2010). Others have also defined this type as having regular characters that face situations that are

predominately intended to make the audience laugh (Cantor, 1976). In addition, Mills (2010) defines sitcoms as having regular characters with a set design that is unlike a sketch comedy in that it is the same each episode. Situational comedies involve a regular narrative and format that is often repetitive and fits in an allotted time slot (Mittell, 2010). For purposes of this study, situation comedies are defined using all of these elements in addition to possessing believable ongoing characters in scenarios consisting of a repetitive set and regular narrative.

Another issue of sitcoms is the degree to which they deal with political and social issues. One scholar describes the content as having a simple structure that uses stereotypes and little engagement with social or political developments (Mills, 2010). However, others claim that present-day situational comedies deal with some social issues (Gray & Lotz, 2012). Tueth (2000) has described this subgenre as a depiction of American life and the ideal version of suburban life. Situational comedies in present day now focus on life in the city as well (Tueth, 2000). For purposes of this paper, we will not include political or social developments to keep with Mills's (2010) definition of more conventional situation comedies.

Three traditional styles of situational comedies are workplace, domestic, and fantasy (Mittell, 2010). Workplace comedies are defined as a group of characters connected through their place of work with a diversity of relationships and romantic dilemmas that are used as the sources of humorous conflict for the narrative. However, sometimes distinctions between these three types may not be always easily delineated. For example, in the workplace sitcom *The Office*, relationships in the workplace often mimic domestic sitcoms.

Domestic sitcoms are defined as shows that feature conflict and tensions between husbands, wives, siblings, and grandparents (Mittell, 2010). They show the struggles of everyday

home life in a comedic style. This type of sitcom displays conflicts within a family that can be solved in an allotted time slot. An example of this is *Everybody Loves Raymond*.

Fantasy sitcoms such as *The Munsters* incorporate the general elements of a sitcom but with a “supernatural dimension” (Mittell, 2010, p. 251). The supernatural dimension refers to aspects of science fiction, while still containing the traditional elements of a sitcom.

Television programs incorporating the humor mechanisms of cognitive, affective, and social/interpersonal can be seen in many of the different types of situational comedies. Situational comedies can incorporate more than one of the mechanisms with some being more prominent than others. For example, programs such as *Friends*, *30 Rock*, *Parks and Recreation*, and *Modern Family* have employed all three mechanisms with much success. It is not uncommon that different characters become associated with one mechanism. For example, Chandler from *Friends* often uses the social/interpersonal mechanism by poking fun at his friends through sarcasm. Few studies have researched what causes audiences to choose a specific mechanism within a situational comedy. We explore further the combination of these two components and viewer preferences.

Mood Management Theory

Everyday television viewers are confronted with many viewing choices. How they make these choices can be partially explained through mood management theory, which hypothesizes that different moods can predict viewing behaviors. Moods have been known to strongly affect thinking, memory, perceptions of others, and judgments on the environment in general (Knobloch, 2003). In addition, mood management theory has shown that media can help manage moods when an individual is in a positive or negative mood state (Greenwood & Long, 2009).

Because moods significantly impact people's everyday lives, they could also influence people's comedy viewing preferences.

Mood management theory suggests that individuals make entertainment selections in order to arrange their environments and manage their moods and affective state and that individuals seek different media to obtain a specific frame of mind. This theory does not necessarily argue that the individual consciously recognizes the motives or consciously makes these choices. It does state though that individuals will strive to reduce or eliminate the intensity of negative moods in a hedonistic way. Those experiencing good moods seek to maintain the intensity of the current state (Oliver, 2008; Kim & Oliver, 2011; Carpentier, Brown, Bertocci, Silk, Forbes, & Dahl, 2008).

The historic premise of hedonism that lies in mood management theory suggests that individuals rearrange their environments to improve their moods (Zillmann, 1988; Knobloch, 2003). When choosing darker or more aggressive comedies, individuals may be choosing content that is not exactly positive, but the mood that results may be a positive one. In order for individuals to make these choices with media, they must anticipate the feeling they will receive from a specific message that will improve their current mood state (Zillmann, 1988; Knobloch, 2003). The method of making the correct choice to improve mood is one that is done sometimes unconsciously. The memory generates traces of the behavior that cured the negative mood state and moving forward it will continue to trigger that same decision to solve the mood at another time. In other words, if the desired mood is accomplished, a positive reinforcement is traced in the memory and elicited next time the person desires the mood (Zillmann, 1988). It has been shown that these choices are mainly consistent over time (Knobloch-Westerwick, 2007). This mental process can be applied to the way individuals choose different media genres. If one type

of genre cured or prolonged a specific mood state, the individual is likely to go back to that genre when the mood reappears.

It may appear that since individuals always make hedonistic media choices, comedy would always be a popular choice. However, it would not explain an individual chooses darker humor. Recent studies have explored this question and have shown that preferences are not necessarily hedonistic but are made for the appropriate context or situation, which may not always be positive. This means that individuals do not always pick positive media such as humor. However, these choices are made to make meaning or gain insight (Oliver & Raney, 2011). In addition, individuals have chosen poignant, tragic, and touching fare, which are not explained through hedonism. However, it can be associated with people's feelings of sympathy and understanding (Oliver, 2008). This is another explanation why people sometimes choose content that does not perpetuate positivity (Oliver, 2008; Carpentier, Brown, Bertocci, Silk, Forbes, & Dahl, 2008).

There is a growing body of literature concerning mood states and how they predict specific media content preferences. People in positive and negative mood states have used media to regulate their moods (Greenwood & Long, 2009). Individuals have the ability to meet the specific requirements of their moods by choosing media content (Knobloch-Westerwick & Alter, 2006). Studies involving mood states and general genre preferences can help predict preferences for situational comedies and humor mechanisms. Specifically, Greenwood (2010) explored moods and choices of dark and slapstick comedies and Cho (1995) studied different mechanisms of humor while exploring preferences for advertising. Through much research on the typology of moods, five distinct categories have emerged including depression, positive affect, anxiety, hostility, and sensation seeking (Zuckerman, Lubin, & Rinck, 1983).

Specific mood states have been shown to predict preferences for specific types of content. For instance, depression includes feeling alone, destroyed, discouraged, forlorn, lonely, lost, miserable, rejected, sad, suffering, sunk and tormented (Zuckerman, Lubin, & Rinck, 1983). For instance, this sadder mood state has been shown to cause viewers to prefer more serious films (Strizhacova & Krcmar, 2007), while other studies show that depressed subjects preferred high excitement content (Wegener & Petty, 1994; Knobloch & Zillmann, 2002). Another study found that those in sad moods preferred dark comedies or dramas (Greenwood, 2010). Chena, Zhou, and Bryant (2007) found that sad participants tended to choose distressing music, while Kim and Oliver (2011) found that those who imagined an unhappy mood refrained from selecting happy content. These contradicting results lead to an important research question.

RQ1: For those in a depressed or sad mood state, which humor mechanism will they prefer?

Other studies have shown that those with positive affect mood states chose comedy to sustain the feeling (Wegener & Petty, 1994). Positive affect includes feeling affectionate, free, friendly, glad, good, good-natured, happy, interested, joyful, loving, peaceful, pleased, pleasant, polite, satisfied, secure, steady, tender, understanding, warm, and whole (Zuckerman, Lubin, & Rinck, 1983). The chosen media messages tend to be pleasant as well (Zillmann, 1988). In addition, people in these types of positive moods have been shown to choose fun media rather than serious fare (Dillman Carpentier, Brown, Bertocci, Silk, Forbes, & Dahl, 2008) and preferred slapstick comedy when given the option (Greenwood, 2010). Although it is indicated that comedy is the general preference, the question still remains of which type of humor tend to be chosen.

RQ2: For those in a positive affect mood state, which humor mechanism will they prefer?

Anxiety is another mood state that includes feelings of being afraid, fearful, frightened, impatient, nervous, panicky, shaky, tense, timid, and worrying (Zuckerman, Lubin, & Rinck, 1983). Studies on mood states such as anxiety have shown that viewers prefer more soothing content (Zillmann, 1988; Bryant & Zillmann, 1984). Another study found that stressed adults were more likely to choose comedy over news and documentary programming, but the type of humor was not specified (Anderson, Collins, Schmitt, & Jacobvitz, 1996).

RQ3: For those in an anxious mood state, which humor mechanism will they prefer?

A hostile mood state includes feelings of anger, annoyed, complaining, critical, cross, cruel, disagreeable, disgusted, enraged, furious, hostile, incensed, irritated, mad, and mean (Zuckerman, Lubin, & Rinck, 1983). One study found that subjects who were hostile or angry tended to intensely enjoy content that contained disparagement jokes (Murray, 1932). To test this mood state, the next research question is proposed.

RQ4: For those in a hostile mood state, which humor mechanism will they prefer?

Uses and Gratifications

Although mood management is a plausible explanation for humor choices, uses and gratifications theory could serve as a supplement. People seek uses and gratifications from media, which could serve as an even more in-depth explanation for humor choices. Uses and gratifications emerges when people are aware of their needs, evaluate various channels and content, look into alternatives, and select the media messages that they think will fulfill their desire (Nabi, Stitt, Halford, & Finnerty, 2006). Individuals who rely on a specific medium selectively expose themselves to content that will help them achieve their goals (Morton & Duck, 2000). These goals or needs are motivated by psychological and social factors that include

the need to communicate, options media provide, individuals' attitudes and expectations, alternatives to using media, behaviors, and expectations (Rubin, 2009).

There are five assumptions that guide the uses and gratifications theory. The first is that individuals' communication behavior is goal-directed and purposive. Individuals are active in making choices about media (Rubin, 2009). In fact, many people can actually articulate their motives for choosing particular media or content (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1973-1974). The second is that people use media to meet their desires and are active participants when using media (Rubin, 2009; Ruggiero, 2009). Next, social and psychological factors can mediate behaviors and choices. These can be the environment, interpersonal relationships, and channel availability. The fourth assumption of uses and gratifications is that media are competing with all different forms of communication, which could include the option to interact with others to gratify their needs. A last assumption is media may influence people after they have chosen certain media for particular uses and gratifications (Rubin, 2009).

Uses and gratifications studies have shown that people choose specific media technologies or media content for several uses and purposes, including relaxation, companionship, passing time, entertainment, social interaction, information, arousal, and escape (Rubin, 1983). Relaxation refers to when individuals use media because it relaxes them, allows them to unwind, and gives them a pleasant rest. Companionship includes uses such as addressing loneliness and substituting for someone to talk to or be with. Passing time refers to using media when there is nothing else to do, when an individual is bored, and when it serves to occupy time. Entertainment uses includes choosing media that are enjoyable, amusing, and entertaining. Fulfilling needs for thrills, excitement, and pep are examples of specific media use to raise arousal. Lastly, using media for an escape includes forgetting about school or other things, to get

away from family and others, and to get away from what they are doing (Rubin, 1983). This list of uses and gratifications are not exclusive but summarizing many of the main reasons people choose specific media.

Preferences for comedy subgenres have not been researched specifically but many studies have explored general genre preference with uses and gratifications. One study found that those who were seeking higher arousal or sensation typically chose content that contained violent genres (Greene & Krcmar, 2005). Curiosity and wanting to learn about others encouraged people to watch reality or fiction shows (Nabi, Stitt, Halford, & Finnerty, 2006). In addition Rubin (1983) found that those who watch television for entertainment and to pass time tended to choose content that was a realistic portrayal of life. However, he did not find that these individuals had any sort of program preference. The question of the relationship of media users' needs and their preference for humor mechanisms is still an open question, leading to RQ5.

RQ5: What is the relationship between uses and gratifications and choices of content containing different humor mechanisms?

Personality

Besides mood management and uses and gratifications, different personalities could also serve as a reason people choose different humor preferences, given that personality has been shown to affect media genre preference (Hall, 2005). The "Big Five" personality traits include extraversion, emotional stability, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. Extraversion is a trait of those who act assertively and talkatively. It is based along the two factors of ambition and sociability. Emotional stability includes attributes such as anxiousness, worry, and depression. Emotional stability and extraversion are sometimes referred to as the "Big Two" because of their importance to measuring personality (Barrick & Mount, 1991). The

personality factor of agreeableness includes a person's friendliness, flexibility, and trusting attributes and has elements associated with being hostile vs. non-hostile and feeling love. Conscientiousness includes being careful, thoughtful, and responsible. This personality trait has often been associated with academic achievement and the will to succeed (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Lastly, openness to experience includes attributes such as being imaginative, cultured, and curious. It has also been tied to intellect and intelligence (Barrick & Mount, 1991).

Personality has been shown to predict media preference for different genres. One study on the Big Five personality factors and viewing enjoyment of different television genres found that those with less emotional stability were more likely to watch violent media, while agreeableness was negatively associated with such viewing (Krcmar & Kean, 2005). Another study showed that those high on the emotional stability scale were likely to choose content that contained information or news and avoided any type of light-hearted comedy (Weaver III, 1991). Correa, Hinsley, and Zuniga (2010) found that extraversion, emotional stability, and openness to experience led people to use more social applications on the Internet, while emotional stability was a negative predictor. While these studies do not all predict preferences for specific genres, they may shed some light on the content that will be chosen. In addition, holding personality constant could help better understand mood states and choices of media. When personality is kept separate from mood state, the study can better predict that actual moods are causing humor preference instead of individual traits.

RQ6: What is the relationship between personality factors and choices of content containing different humor mechanisms?

Method

Participants ($N = 216$) in a between- and within-subjects experiment were randomly assigned to one of six conditions. All participants were asked about current mood state, personality, and uses and gratifications about comedy. Participants were then given one of the six conditions of sitcom descriptions with different humor mechanisms: (1) workplace with cognitive, domestic with affective, fantasy with social/interpersonal, and drama ($n = 28$); (2) workplace with affective, domestic with social/interpersonal, fantasy with cognitive, and drama ($n = 43$); (3) workplace with social/interpersonal, domestic with cognitive, fantasy with affective, and drama ($n = 40$); (4) workplace with affective, domestic with cognitive, fantasy with social/interpersonal, and drama ($n = 31$); (5) workplace with social/interpersonal, domestic with affective, fantasy with cognitive, and drama ($n = 27$); and (6) workplace with cognitive, domestic with social/interpersonal, fantasy with affective, and drama ($n = 33$).

Participant Sample. Two-hundred sixteen undergraduate students enrolled in several communication courses participated in the experiment for course credit. The sample was 40% male and 60% female and made up of 28% freshmen, 17% sophomores, 34% juniors, and 21% seniors. Ages range from 18-39-years old ($M = 20.3$, $SD = 2.30$). In addition, the sample was predominately White/Caucasian (72%).

Study Stimuli. The questionnaire was designed on university web space and including items measuring current mood, personality, and uses and gratifications. Participants were then given descriptions of workplace, domestic, and fantasy sitcoms that were each coupled with either cognitive, affective, or social interpersonal humor mechanisms.

Study Procedures. Participants were sent a link to the university web space that held the questionnaire. Participants were told they would be completing a study on television preferences.

Upon opening the link, participants were presented with a consent form. After giving consent, each participant completed a set of questions for each of the variables. Mood was assessed by the participants' mood in the current moment. This open format gave an "unconstrained look" into media choices (Greenwood, 2010). Participants were then given one of the six description sets of sitcoms with a humor mechanism and the control of drama. Each description was accompanied by a sample joke from the episode. These jokes were chosen for each category after a pretest was done to determine each was equally humorous and pertained to the type of mechanism. (See Appendix A for the questionnaire items and Appendix B for exact wording of the conditions.)

Study Measures

Mood. Mood states were assessed using 58 items taken from the Multiple Affect Adjective List (Zuckerman, Lubin, & Rinck, 1983). The mood state of sensation seeking was excluded. For each term (i.e., afraid, alone, free), participants indicated how well the term described how they were feeling at that moment using scales ranging from 1 (*Do Not Feel at All*) to 7 (*Feel Very Much*). To reduce these variables into subscales, indices were formed by taking the mean of each group of variables. Anxiety was made up of afraid, fearful, frightened, impatient, nervous, panicky, shaky, tense, timid, and worrying ($M = 2.46$, $SD = 1.13$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$). Depression included alone, destroyed, discouraged, forlorn, lonely, lost, miserable, rejected, sad, suffering, sunk, and tormented ($M = 2.16$, $SD = 1.08$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .92$). Hostility included anger, annoyed, complaining, critical, cross, cruel, disagreeable, disgusted, enraged, furious, hostile, incensed, irritated, mad, and mean ($M = 2.01$, $SD = .99$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .93$). Positive affect included affectionate, free, friendly, glad, good, good-natured, happy, interested, joyful, loving, peaceful, pleased, pleasant, polite, satisfied, secure, steady, tender, understanding, warm, and whole ($M = 4.37$, $SD = 1.21$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .96$).

Uses and Gratifications. Uses and gratifications were assessed using a 27-item scale (Rubin, 1983). For each item (i.e., It relaxes me, So I won't have to be alone), participants indicated how well the term described how they use comedy entertainment using scales ranging from 1 (*Not at All*) to 7 (*Exactly*). To reduce these statements into subscales, indices were formed by taking the mean of each group of variables. Relaxation included "Because it relaxes me," "Because it allows me to unwind," and "Because it's a pleasant rest" ($M = 5.56$, $SD = 1.42$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .94$). Companionship included "So I won't have to be alone," "When there's no one else to talk or be with," and "Because it makes me feel less lonely" ($M = 2.74$, $SD = 1.64$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .89$). Pass time included "When I have nothing better to do," "Because it passes the time away, particularly when I'm bored," and "Because it gives me something to occupy my time" ($M = 4.31$, $SD = 1.74$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .89$). Entertainment included "Because it entertains me," "Because it's enjoyable," and "Because it amuses me" ($M = 6.13$, $SD = 1.13$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .91$). Arousal included "Because it's thrilling," "Because it's exciting," and "Because it peps me up" ($M = 4.40$, $SD = 1.48$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .83$). Escape included "So I can forget about school or other things," "So I can get away from the rest of the family or others," and "So I can get away from what I'm doing" ($M = 4.69$, $SD = 1.49$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .76$).

Personality. Personality was assessed using a 10-item scale of the Big Five (Gosling, Rentfrow, & Swann, 2003). For each item (i.e., extraverted; enthusiastic, critical; quarrelsome), participants indicated how much these traits applied to them on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly Agree*). To reduce these adjectives into subscales, indices were formed by taking the mean of sets of variables after reverse coding one item in each set. Extraversion included "extraverted; enthusiastic" and reverse coded "reserved; quiet" ($M = 4.71$, $SD = 1.52$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .73$). Conscientiousness included "dependable; self-disciplined" and

reverse coded “disorganized; careless” ($M = 5.24$, $SD = 1.13$, Cronbach’s $\alpha = .59$). Emotional stability included “calm; emotionally stable” and reverse coded “anxious; easily upset” ($M = 4.73$, $SD = 1.39$, Cronbach’s $\alpha = .73$). Due to the low reliability of indices for agreeableness (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .29$) and openness to experiences (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .46$), just one item was used for each personality type due to their face validity. For agreeableness, “sympathetic; warm” was used instead of the reverse-coded “critical; quarrelsome.” For openness to experiences, “open to new experiences; complex” was used instead of the reverse-coded “conventional; uncreative.”

After testing for mood, uses and gratifications, and personality, participants were given four descriptions of television episodes (Appendix B) and told to rate them on how much they would like to watch them, enjoy them, and how funny they would find them. They also were asked which one they would watch at the moment if they had to pick just one.

Like to Watch. How much participants wanted to watch each description of the sitcoms at the current moment were assessed using 7-point scales ranging from 1 (*Not at All*) to 7 (*Very Much*). The variables were broken down into type of sitcom and type of humor mechanism. These included workplace ($M = 4.40$, $SD = 1.68$), domestic ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 1.74$), fantasy ($M = 3.45$, $SD = 1.74$), cognitive ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 1.80$), affective ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.80$), social/interpersonal ($M = 4.04$, $SD = 1.75$) and the drama control ($M = 3.96$, $SD = 1.80$).

Enjoy to Watch. How much participants would enjoy each description of the sitcoms at the current moment were assessed using 7-point scales ranging from 1 (*Not at All*) to 7 (*Very Much*). The variables were broken down into type of sitcom and type of humor mechanism. These included workplace ($M = 4.45$, $SD = 1.82$), domestic ($M = 4.07$, $SD = 1.81$), fantasy ($M = 3.41$, $SD = 1.77$), cognitive ($M = 3.92$, $SD = 1.80$), affective ($M = 3.98$, $SD = 3.98$, $SD = 1.90$), social/interpersonal ($M = 4.03$, $SD = 1.84$), and the drama control ($M = 3.99$, $SD = 1.82$).

Funny. How much participants would think each description of the sitcoms is funny at the current moment was assessed using 7-point scales ranging from 1 (*Not at All*) to 7 (*Very Much*). The variables were broken down into type of sitcom and type of humor mechanism. These included workplace ($M = 4.49$, $SD = 1.85$), domestic ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 1.89$), fantasy ($M = 3.58$, $SD = 1.75$), cognitive ($M = 4.01$, $SD = 1.86$), affective ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 1.92$), social/interpersonal ($M = 4.10$, $SD = 1.81$), and the drama control ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 1.77$).

Episode Choice. Which episode participants would most like to watch was assessed by a multiple choice question. These items were broken into two variables: humor preference and sub-genre preference. Humor preference included the affective mechanism ($n = 56$), cognitive mechanism ($n = 52$), social/interpersonal mechanism ($n = 48$), and the control ($n = 46$). Sub-genre preference included domestic ($n = 66$), fantasy ($n = 25$), workplace ($n = 65$), and the drama control ($n = 46$).

Results

Two models were run to test the relationships in this study. The first model tested the zero-order correlations of variables, while the second model tested the predictive power of variables. Model two also controlled for all other variables while testing the relationships. It is important to note that some relationships were present in the correlations and not in regression analysis, which shows that these relationships are not predictive of each other.

Zero-order analyses. Because the variables already meet the assumptions, a zero-order correlation test was run among moods, like to watch, enjoy to watch, and funny. Results showed that those who scored high on depression $r(201) = .17, p = .02$, were significantly positively related to liking to watch the control drama. There were no other significant relationships between mood, like to watch, enjoy to watch, and funny. These findings show that those in depressed, positive affect, anxious, and hostile mood states did not significantly prefer a type of humor mechanism, which shows null findings for RQ1, RQ2, RQ3, and RQ 4. Please refer to Tables 1, 2, and 3.

Because the variables already meet the assumptions, a zero-order correlation test was also run among uses and gratifications, like to watch, enjoy to watch, and funny. Results showed that using comedy for relaxation $r(200) = .26, p < .001$, was significantly positively related to liking the domestic sitcom genre and the fantasy sitcom genre $r(200) = .20, p = .01$. In addition, using comedy for relaxation was significantly positively related to liking to watch the cognitive mechanism $r(200) = .19, p = .01$, the affective mechanism $r(200) = .23, p = .001$, and the social/interpersonal mechanism $r(200) = .23, p = .04$. Using comedy for companionship $r(200) = .23, p = .001$, was significantly related to liking the control drama genre. Using comedy to pass time $r(200) = .15, p = .03$, was significantly related to liking the affective mechanism. Using

comedy for entertainment $r(200) = .20, p = .01$, was significantly related to liking the workplace sitcom genre, the domestic sitcom genre $r(200) = .19, p = .01$, the fantasy sitcom genre $r(200) = .16, p = .02$, the affective mechanism $r(200) = .21, p = .003$, and the social/interpersonal mechanism $r(200) = .19, p = .01$. In addition, using comedy for escape was significantly related to liking the cognitive mechanism $r(200) = .15, p = .04$ and the control sitcom genre $r(200) = .18, p = .01$. These relationships between uses and gratifications and humor preference show support for RQ5. Please refer to Table 4.

Using comedy for relaxation was significantly related to enjoying the workplace sitcom genre $r(200) = .23, p = .001$, the domestic sitcom genre $r(200) = .25, p < .001$, the fantasy sitcom genre $r(200) = .21, p = .003$, the cognitive mechanism $r(200) = .25, p < .001$, the affective mechanism $r(200) = .25, p < .001$, the social/interpersonal mechanism $r(200) = .18, p = .01$, and the control sitcom genre $r(200) = .15, p = .03$. Companionship use was significantly related to enjoying the fantasy sitcom genre $r(200) = .15, p = .03$, the cognitive mechanism $r(200) = .14, p = .04$, the social/interpersonal mechanism $r(200) = .15, p = .04$, and the control $r(200) = .25, p < .001$. Entertainment use was significantly correlated with enjoying the workplace sitcom genre $r(200) = .27, p < .001$, the domestic sitcom genre $r(200) = .25, p < .001$, the fantasy sitcom genre $r(200) = .18, p = .01$, the cognitive mechanism $r(200) = .22, p = .001$, the affective mechanism $r(200) = .23, p = .001$, and the social/interpersonal mechanism $r(200) = .23, p = .001$. Those who use comedy for arousal were significantly more likely to enjoy the workplace sitcom genre $r(200) = .16, p = .02$, the domestic sitcom genre $r(200) = .32, p < .001$, the fantasy sitcom genre $r(200) = .17, p = .01$, the cognitive mechanism $r(200) = .22, p = .001$, the affective mechanism $r(200) = .16, p < .001$, and the social/interpersonal mechanism r

(200) = .26, $p < .001$. Escape use was significantly related to enjoying the control $r(200) = .17, p = .02$. Please refer to Table 5.

Those who used comedy for relaxation were significantly more likely to find the workplace sitcom genre $r(198) = .16, p = .03$, the domestic sitcom genre $r(198) = .26, p < .001$, the cognitive mechanism $r(198) = .20, p = .01$, and the affective mechanism $r(198) = .21, p = .003$, funny. Those who used comedy for companionship were significantly more likely to find funny the domestic sitcom genre $r(198) = .15, p = .03$ and the social/interpersonal mechanism $r(198) = .16, p = .03$. Using comedy for entertainment as significantly related to reporting that they found funny the workplace sitcom genre $r(198) = .20, p = .01$, the domestic sitcom genre $r(198) = .20, p = .01$, and the affective mechanism $r(198) = .19, p = .01$. Using comedy for escape was significantly correlated to finding funny the domestic sitcom genre $r(198) = .17, p = .02$, and the control $r(198) = .15, p = .04$. Please refer to Table 6.

Results also showed that those who had a more extraverted personality were significantly more likely to like to watch the cognitive mechanism $r(200) = .17, p = .02$. It also showed that those who were more conscientious were significantly more likely to like to watch the workplace sitcom genre $r(200) = .19, p = .01$ and the affective mechanism $r(200) = .17, p = .02$. Being agreeable was significantly related to liking to watch the workplace sitcom genre $r(200) = .15, p = .04$ and the control $r(200) = .13, p = .002$. Please refer to Table 7.

Being extraverted as significantly related to enjoying the cognitive mechanism $r(200) = .19, p = .01$. Being conscientious was significantly related to enjoying the affective mechanism $r(200) = .14, p = .05$. Agreeableness was significantly related to enjoying the control $r(200) = .19, p = .01$. Please refer to Table 8.

Being extraverted was significantly related to finding the cognitive mechanism $r(198) = .15, p = .03$, funny. In addition, scoring higher on emotional stability were negatively significantly related to finding the social/interpersonal mechanism $r(198) = -.17, p = .01$. Please refer to Table 9.

Zero-order analyses using ANOVA was used to evaluate the relationship between humor preference, mood, uses and gratifications, and personality. This test was run to determine if one humor mechanism was chosen over another instead of rating how much an individual would like to watch or enjoy each specific episode. No relationships were significant; therefore no one mechanism was more preferred than another. Please refer to Table 11.

Multivariate analyses. Multivariate analyses were done using three models. Model 1 was run with all independent variables when predicting the dependent variable. For Model 2, when predicting humor type, the other two humor types and control were included in regression. When predicting subgenre type, Model 2 included the other two subgenres and control. For Model 3, when predicting the control, regression was run separately for humor type and subgenre type.

When testing the multivariate relationship in Model 1, regression showed that conscientiousness was a significant positive predictor of liking to watch the workplace sitcom genre, $\beta = .20, t(185) = 2.04, p = .04$. It also showed that using comedy for entertainment was a significant positive predictor of liking the workplace sitcom genre, $\beta = .27, t(185) = 2.06, p = .04$. Model 2 showed that those who liked to watch the domestic sitcom genre also liked to watch the workplace sitcom genre, $\beta = .27, t(185) = 3.74, p < .001$ and the control, $\beta = .14, t(185) = 2.06, p = .04$. Please refer to Table 12.

When testing the relationships in Model 1, regression results showed that using comedy for relaxation was a significant positive predictor of liking to watch the domestic sitcom genre, $\beta = .26$, $t(185) = 2.39$, $p = .02$, and was also significant in Model 2, $\beta = .22$, $t(185) = 2.12$, $p = .04$. In addition, arousal was a significant positive predictor of liking to watch the domestic sitcom genre in Model 1, $\beta = .29$, $t(185) = 3.12$, $p = .002$. This was also the case in Model 2, $\beta = .29$, $t(185) = 3.25$, $p = .001$. In addition, those who liked to watch the workplace, $\beta = .27$, $t(185) = 3.74$, $p < .001$ and the fantasy sitcom genre, $\beta = .18$, $t(185) = 2.59$, $p = .01$, also significantly liked to watch the domestic sitcom genre. Please refer to Table 13.

When testing for relationships, regression results showed that hostility was a positive predictor of liking to watch the fantasy sitcom genre in Model 2, $\beta = .46$, $t(185) = 1.99$, $p = .048$. Regression in Model 2 also showed that those who liked to watch the domestic sitcom genre, also liked to watch the fantasy sitcom type, $\beta = .20$, $t(185) = 2.59$, $p = .01$. Please refer to Table 14.

Regression analysis for Model 1 showed that using comedy for arousal was a significant positive predictor of liking to watch the cognitive humor mechanism, $\beta = .20$, $t(185) = 2.08$, $p = .04$. This showed a relationship for RQ5, which was the relationship between uses and gratifications and choice of humor mechanisms. In addition, those who liked to watch the control, $\beta = .18$, $t(182) = 2.42$, $p = .02$ and the social/interpersonal mechanism, $\beta = .22$, $t(182) = 3.14$, $p = .002$, also liked to watch the cognitive mechanism. Please refer to Table 15.

Regression showed that there were no significant relationships among the independent variables and liking to watch the affective humor mechanism in both Model 1 and Model 2. This shows no support for any of the research questions. Please refer to Table 16.

Regression analysis in Model 2 showed that those who liked to watch the control, $\beta = .17$, $t(182) = 2.34$, $p = .02$ and cognitive mechanism, $\beta = .12$, $t(182) = 3.14$, $p = .002$ also liked to watch the social/interpersonal mechanism. There was no support for any of the research questions. Please refer to Table 17.

Regression analysis showed in Model 1 that using comedy for companionship was a significant positive predictor of liking to watch the control, $\beta = .18$, $t(185) = 2.03$, $p = .04$, in Model 2, $\beta = .19$, $t(185) = 2.15$, $p = .03$, and Model 3, $\beta = .19$, $t(185) = 2.22$, $p = .03$. Companionship was also significant positive predictor of liking the control over the any type of comedy when tested using binary logistic regression, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .12$, omnibus model $\chi^2 = 17.16$, $p = .04$. In addition, using comedy for an escape was significant positive predictor of liking to watch the control in Model 1, $\beta = .23$, $t(185) = 2.24$, $p = .03$, Model 2, $\beta = .22$, $t(185) = 2.12$, $p = .04$, and Model 3, $\beta = .22$, $t(185) = 2.13$, $p = .04$. In reference to RQ5, the uses and gratifications of companionship and escape showed support for the control choice.

Regression showed that agreeableness was a positive predictor of liking to watch the control in Model 1, $\beta = .27$, $t(185) = 2.41$, $p = .02$, in Model 2, $\beta = .24$, $t(185) = 2.20$, $p = .03$, and Model 3, $\beta = .24$, $t(185) = 2.23$, $p = .03$. In reference to RQ6, agreeableness predicted liking of the control choice. Gender was a significant predictor of liking to watch the control, with women liking the control in Model 1, $\beta = .65$, $t(185) = 2.42$, $p = .02$, Model 2, $\beta = .73$, $t(185) = 2.74$, $p = .01$, and Model 3, $\beta = .68$, $t(185) = 2.60$, $p = .01$. In addition, those who liked to watch the workplace sitcom genre also liked to watch the control in Model 2, $\beta = .16$, $t(185) = 2.06$, $p = .04$. In addition, those who liked to watch the cognitive mechanism, $\beta = .18$, $t(185) = 2.42$, $p = .02$, and the social/interpersonal mechanism, $\beta = .17$, $t(185) = 2.34$, $p = .02$, also liked to watch the control. Please refer to Table 18.

Regression analysis showed that a hostile mood was a significant positive predictor of enjoying to watch the workplace sitcom genre in Model 1, $\beta = -.61$, $t(185) = -2.56$, $p = .01$ and Model 2, $\beta = -.59$, $t(185) = -2.70$, $p = .008$. This showed that there was some support for RQ4. Using comedy for entertainment was a significant positive predictor of enjoying to watch the workplace sitcom genre in Model 2, $\beta = .29$, $t(185) = 2.16$, $p = .03$. This showed some support for RQ5.

Model 2 also showed that emotional stability was a significant negative predictor of enjoying the workplace sitcom genre in Model 1, $\beta = -.23$, $t(185) = -2.31$, $p = .02$, which showed support for RQ6.

In Model 1, gender was a significant negative predictor of enjoying to watch the workplace sitcom genre, with men enjoying it more, $\beta = -.52$, $t(185) = -2.01$, $p = .046$. Those who enjoyed to watch the workplace sitcom genre also liked to watch the domestic, $\beta = .24$, $t(185) = 3.51$, $p = .001$ and the control, $\beta = .29$, $t(185) = 4.16$, $p < .001$. Please refer to Table 19.

Regression analysis showed that using comedy for arousal was a positive predictor of enjoying to watch the domestic sitcom genre in Model 1, $\beta = .32$, $t(185) = 3.36$, $p = .001$, and Model 2, $\beta = .29$, $t(185) = 3.13$, $p = .002$. This showed support for RQ5. Those who enjoyed to watch the workplace sitcom genre also enjoyed to watch the domestic genre, $\beta = .26$, $t(185) = 3.51$, $p = .001$. Please refer to Table 20.

Regression analysis showed no significant relationships in Model 1 or Model 2 for enjoying to watch the fantasy genre, which showed no support for any of the research questions. Please refer to Table 21.

Regression analysis showed that extraversion was a significant positive predictor of enjoying to watch the cognitive mechanism in Model 1, $\beta = .20$, $t(185) = 2.25$, $p = .026$ and

Model 2 $\beta = .22$, $t(182) = 2.48$, $p = .01$, which showed support for RQ6. In addition, Model 2 showed that those who enjoyed the social/interpersonal mechanism, $\beta = .25$, $t(182) = 3.56$, $p < .001$ and control, $\beta = .16$, $t(182) = 2.14$, $p = .03$ also liked the cognitive mechanism. Please refer to Table 22.

Regression analysis showed that using comedy for relaxation was a significant positive predictor of enjoying to watch the affective humor mechanism in Model 1, $\beta = .24$, $t(185) = 1.99$, $p = .048$, showing some support for RQ5. Please refer to Table 23.

Regression analysis showed that using comedy for arousal was a significant positive predictor of enjoying to watch the social/interpersonal humor mechanism in Model 1, $\beta = .26$, $t(185) = 2.61$, $p = .01$ and Model 2, $\beta = .20$, $t(182) = 2.11$, $p = .04$, showing more support for RQ5. In Model 2, emotional stability $\beta = -.24$, $t(182) = -.29$, $p = .02$ was a significant negative predictor of enjoying to watch the social/interpersonal mechanism, showing support for RQ6. In addition, Model 2 showed that those who enjoyed the control, $\beta = .22$, $t(182) = 2.94$, $p = .004$ and cognitive mechanism, $\beta = .26$, $t(182) = 3.56$, $p < .001$ also enjoyed the social/interpersonal mechanism. Please refer to Table 24.

Regression analysis showed that using comedy for companionship was a significant positive predictor of enjoying the control in Model 1, $\beta = .21$, $t(185) = 2.31$, $p = .022$, Model 2, $\beta = .20$, $t(185) = 2.35$, $p = .02$, and Model 3, $\beta = .18$, $t(185) = 2.03$, $p = .044$. This showed more support for RQ5.

Regression in Model 2 showed that emotional stability was a significant positive predictor of enjoying the control, $\beta = .21$, $t(185) = 2.10$, $p = .037$. Agreeableness was a positive predictor of enjoying the control, $\beta = .25$, $t(185) = 2.24$, $p = .027$ and in Model 3, $\beta = .22$, $t(185) = 2.00$, $p = .047$, showing support for RQ6.

Gender was a positive predictor of enjoying the control in Model 1, $\beta = .70$, $t(185) = 2.55$, $p = .012$, Model 2, $\beta = .80$, $t(185) = 3.06$, $p = .003$, and Model 3, $\beta = .71$, $t(185) = 2.72$, $p = .007$. Those who enjoyed the workplace genre also enjoyed the control, $\beta = .30$, $t(185) = 4.16$, $p < .001$ and the cognitive mechanism, $\beta = .16$, $t(185) = 2.14$, $p = .033$ and the social/interpersonal mechanism, $\beta = .21$, $t(185) = 2.94$, $p = .004$. Please refer to Table 25.

Regression analysis showed that emotional stability was a significant negative predictor of finding the workplace genre funny in Model 1, $\beta = -.24$, $t(185) = -2.06$, $p = .041$ and in Model 2, $\beta = -.26$, $t(185) = -2.54$, $p = .012$.

In addition, finding the domestic genre funny, $\beta = .37$, $t(185) = 5.51$, $p < .001$ and the fantasy genre, $\beta = .15$, $t(185) = 2.09$, $p = .038$ were predictors of finding the workplace genre funny. Please refer to Table 26.

Regression analysis showed that using comedy for arousal was a positive significant predictor of finding the domestic genre funny in Model 1, $\beta = .33$, $t(185) = 3.23$, $p = .001$ and Model 2., $\beta = .28$, $t(185) = 3.02$, $p = .003$. Also those who found workplace funny, $\beta = .35$, $t(185) = 5.15$, $p < .001$ and fantasy funny, $\beta = .18$, $t(185) = 2.58$, $p = .011$ found domestic funny. Please refer to Table 27.

Regression showed that those who found workplace, $\beta = .16$, $t(185) = 2.09$, $p = .038$, domestic, $\beta = .19$, $t(185) = 2.58$, $p = .01$, and control, $\beta = .16$, $t(185) = 2.21$, $p = .028$, funny like fantasy. Please refer to Table 28.

Regression analysis showed in Model 1 showed that using comedy for arousal was a significant positive predictor of finding the cognitive mechanism funny, $\beta = .25$, $t(185) = 2.41$, $p = .017$, showing more support for RQ5. Model 2 showed that conscientiousness $\beta = -.203$, $t(180)$

= -2.05, $p = .04$, was a significant negative predictor of finding the cognitive mechanism funny.

This showed some support for RQ6.

Those who found the affective mechanism funny, $\beta = .16$, $t(180) = 2.49$, $p = .01$ and social/interpersonal mechanism, $\beta = .40$, $t(180) = 5.73$, $p < .001$ also found the cognitive mechanism funny. Please refer to Table 29.

Regression analysis in Model 2 showed that those who found the cognitive mechanism funny also found the affective mechanism funny, $\beta = .21$, $t(180) = 2.49$, $p = .01$. There were no other significant relationships therefore showing no support for any of the research questions. Please refer to Table 30.

Regression analysis in Model 1 showed that using comedy for arousal was a significant positive predictor of thinking the social/interpersonal mechanism would be funny, $\beta = .24$, $t(185) = 2.36$, $p = .019$, showing more support for RQ5. In Model 2, those who found the cognitive mechanism funny also found the social/interpersonal mechanism funny, $\beta = .39$, $t(180) = 5.73$, $p < .001$. Please refer to Table 31.

Regression analysis showed that in Model 1, companionship was a significant positive predictor of finding the control funny, $\beta = .29$, $t(185) = 3.25$, $p = .001$ and in Model 2, $\beta = .27$, $t(185) = 3.11$, $p = .002$. Also in Model 2, using comedy for entertainment was a significant negative predictor of finding the control funny, $\beta = -.30$, $t(185) = -2.18$, $p = .031$ and in Model 3, $\beta = -.30$, $t(185) = -2.14$, $p = .034$. In addition, Model 3 showed that using comedy as an escape was a significant positive predictor of finding the control funny, $\beta = .20$, $t(185) = 1.97$, $p = .05$. Those who found the fantasy funny also found the control funny, $\beta = .16$, $t(185) = 2.21$, $p = .028$. Please refer to Table 32.

Discussion

Theoretical Implications. In reference to RQ1, results from this study showed that for those in a more depressed mood state liked the control drama significantly, which aligns with Strizhacova and Krmar (2007) who found that those in more depressed states preferred serious fare. It also reinforced Greenwood's (2010) study that found that those in a depressed state would enjoy dramas. Those in a depressed mood state may have preferred the drama control condition because they are looking for a reflection of how they feel in the media. In addition, those in positive moods tend to choose media that they can heuristically process. Those in negative moods choose messages that they can systematically process (Bohner, Crow, Erb, & Schwarz, 1992). In relation to this study, this may mean that humor can be processed more heuristically while drama can be processed more systematically, which caused participants in a depressed mood state to choose the drama control condition. In addition, people may anticipate that the drama genre will contain a message that needs to be more systematically processed due to its complicated storylines as compared with comedy. It is important to note that this relationship was only found in the zero-order analysis, which shows a correlation but no predictive power. The table below displays the results for RQ1.

RQ1: For those in a depressed or sad mood state, which humor mechanism will they prefer?		
Humor Mechanism	Zero-Order Analyses	Multivariate Analysis
Cognitive	no significance	no significance
Affective	no significance	no significance
Social/Interpersonal	no significance	no significance
Control	+	no significance

In reference to RQ2, results showed that those in a positive affect mood state did not predict liking or enjoying any of the humor mechanisms. Participants in this mood state did not particularly like or enjoy one over the other in contrast to Greenwood's (2010) study which

found participants enjoyed a specific type of comedy, which was slapstick. As can be seen in the table, RQ2 held no support for any of the humor mechanisms.

RQ2: For those in a positive affect mood state, which humor mechanism will they prefer?		
Humor Mechanism	Zero-Order Analyses	Multivariate Analysis
Cognitive	no significance	no significance
Affective	no significance	no significance
Social/Interpersonal	no significance	no significance
Control	no significance	no significance

In reference to RQ3, results showed that the trait of anxiety did not significantly show a relationship with liking or enjoying a specific humor mechanism. The reason for this may be that the categories of humor were not explicitly stated. In sum, there was no support for RQ3 as can be seen in the table.

RQ3: For those in an anxious mood state, which humor mechanism will they prefer?		
Humor Mechanism	Zero-Order Analyses	Multivariate Analysis
Cognitive	no significance	no significance
Affective	no significance	no significance
Social/Interpersonal	no significance	no significance
Control	no significance	no significance

In reference to RQ4, results showed that those in a hostile mood state did not like or enjoy a specific humor mechanism. It did not show a significant relationship for disparagement and the social/interpersonal mechanism as it did in Murray's (1932) study. In sum, there was no support for RQ4 as can be seen in the table.

RQ4: For those in a hostile mood state, which humor mechanism will they prefer?		
Humor Mechanism	Zero-Order Analyses	Multivariate Analysis
Cognitive	no significance	no significance
Affective	no significance	no significance
Social/Interpersonal	no significance	no significance
Control	no significance	no significance

Uses and gratifications showed more significant results than mood management. In reference to RQ5, results showed a correlation between relaxation and significantly liking all humor mechanisms suggesting that all types of comedy are used for relaxation purposes. However, those using comedy for companionship liked to watch the control. This shows that there are times when they would choose comedy, but with these particular stimuli/examples, comedy was not likely to satisfy their need for companionship and was deemed undesirable. It was also shown that participants preferred the control over all types of humor. In the zero-order analysis, using comedy to pass time was correlated with liking the affective mechanism. When comparing this to Rubin's (1983) study that found those that use media to pass time chose programming that was a more realistic portrayal of life, it can be suggested that the affective mechanism is possibly the closest portrayal of real life. The aspects of this mechanism that make it realistic involve the mechanism's ability to find humor in serious life events such as death. Those who use comedy as entertainment were correlated with liking the affective and social/interpersonal mechanisms. In addition, arousal was related to liking the social/interpersonal mechanism and the cognitive mechanism. Greene and Krcmar (2005) study found that those seeking higher arousal chose more violent programs. In relation to this, it could be that the social/interpersonal and cognitive mechanisms had some commonalities with violent programs. It could perhaps relate to the aggressiveness of the humor. In addition, the control was also liked by those who used comedy for an escape. The table shows these results pertaining to RQ5.

RQ5: What is the relationship between uses and gratifications and choices of content containing different humor mechanisms?								
Uses & Gratifications (Like to Watch)	Zero-Order Analyses				Multivariate Analysis			
	Cog	Aff	SI	Ctrl	Cog	Aff	SI	Ctrl
Relaxation	+	+	+	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

Companionship	NS	NS	NS	+	NS	NS	NS	+
Pass Time	NS	+	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Entertainment	NS	+	+	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Arousal	NS	NS	+	NS	+	NS	NS	NS
Escape	+	NS	NS	+	NS	NS	NS	+

In reference to RQ6, results showed that those that were extraverted liked the cognitive mechanism, which could be a result of the surprising nature of the punch line that causes this effect. Another explanation may be that this type of mechanism requires a reaction that is extraverted, which comes natural to those with the personality trait. Characters who tell these jokes may also be extraverted making the extraverted audience members more drawn to the character like them. Lastly, extraverts could enjoy this kind of mechanism because they can talk to others about the jokes easily. In addition, conscientiousness correlated with liking the affective mechanism and predicted the cognitive mechanism. Agreeableness correlated and predicted liking the control drama. Krmar and Kean (2005) found that agreeableness was negatively related to viewing violent media. While none of the mechanisms were violent, some did incorporate conflict, which could turn the more agreeable away. It is important to note that some of these relationships were only found in the zero-order analyses and not the multivariate analyses, which means some do not hold predictive power but instead are correlations. These results can be seen in the table for RQ6.

RQ6: What is the relationship between personality factors and choices of content containing different humor mechanisms?								
Personality Traits (Like to Watch)	Zero-Order Analyses				Multivariate Analysis			
	Cog	Aff	SI	Ctrl	Cog	Aff	SI	Ctrl
Extraversion	+	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Conscientiousness	NS	+	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Emotional Stability	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Openness to Experiences	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Agreeableness	NS	NS	NS	+	NS	NS	NS	+

Practical Implications. The practical implications of this study are especially highlighted by the uses and gratifications findings. More depressed audiences or those looking for companionship for chose drama fare. Audiences looking to be relaxed choose all types of humor. Those looking to be entertained may choose humorous media containing the affective or social/interpersonal mechanisms. Those looking for an escape may consider the cognitive mechanism or drama fare to fill that void. Although caution should be taken due to the high number of variables and these relationships, the findings can lend practical implications. First, comedy writers can target their audiences accordingly and tailor jokes to fit the audiences' uses and gratifications. In addition to writers, advertisers can target consumers according to how the audience uses comedy. If the audience is segmented in this way, different jokes could reach specific audiences. Television programs can schedule comedy programs appropriately according to these uses as well. This does pose some ethical issues because many of these audience tendencies may be subconscious, which in turn can take advantage of the audience. On the other hand, it may help audiences make decisions if they can consciously acknowledge the different types of humor.

Personality traits can also have the same practical implications. They can help writers target their audiences in ways such as writing for extraverted individuals and the cognitive mechanism and agreeableness and drama. In addition to writers, advertisers may be able to tailor advertisements according to audiences' personalities as well.

Limitations. Some elements limited this study. First, more participants may have provided power to better detect significant relationships. In addition, having participants come in the lab to complete the study instead of an online questionnaire could lower the amount of disruptions and ensure that the participants are reading all episode descriptions. Also, making the

word comedy more clear in the uses and gratifications directions portion could remind participants they are answering questions about comedy and not media. A more lengthy pre-test could also have been done to ensure all jokes had the same degree of funniness. In addition, there seemed to be only a slight difference between the control condition and any of the sitcom conditions, which may reflect a failure of manipulation. In the future, manipulation of comedy types and drama types should be made more apparent. Future studies could work on developing stimuli that the participants could also watch, possibly in the form of trailers, to give them a better idea of what each episode is about. Lastly, the participants in this study were college students. Results may change with a different demographic. For example, another age range may find different mechanisms more appealing than others.

Directions for Future Research. Future research should continue to explore the relationships between mood and humor type. Developing a more specific typology for humor may aid in deciphering the differences in choices. These three broad mechanisms should be broken down further. Many significant findings were found within comedy subgenre type. That area should be explored further within the realm of the theories. When using a similar approach, visuals such as trailers, posters, or asking audiences which description is most like a current television show may help in finding these relationships. In addition, exploring the links between moods, uses and gratifications, and personality could also further research in the effects field.

Appendix A Questionnaire

Media Use Patterns

Please answer the following questions about your general media habits.

1. On a typical WEEKDAY, how many hours of television do you watch (including television programs watched on your computer)?

_____ hours

2. On a typical WEEKEND DAY, how many hours of television do you watch (including television programs watched on your computer)?

_____ hours

3. The following are specific genres of television programs. Please rate your liking of each.

Not At All							Very Much
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Comedy							
Animation							
Romance							
Action/Adventure							
Drama							
Sports							
News							
Science Fiction							
Other							

4. Please answer the following questions about your mood state at the current moment.

Do Not Feel At All							Feel Very Much
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Afraid							
Fearful							
Frightened							
Impatient							
Nervous							
Panicky							
Shaky							
Tense							
Timid							
Worrying							
Alone							

Destroyed
Discouraged
Forlorn
Lonely
Lost
Miserable
Rejected
Sad
Suffering
Sunk
Tormented
Anger
Annoyed
Complaining
Critical
Cross
Cruel
Disagreeable
Disgusted
Enraged
Furious
Hostile
Incensed
Irritated
Mad
Mean
Affectionate
Free
Friendly
Glad
Good
Good-natured
Happy
Interested
Joyful
Loving
Peaceful
Pleased
Pleasant
Polite
Satisfied
Secure
Steady
Tender
Understanding
Warm

Whole

5. Here are a number of reasons for watching comedy that may or may not apply to you. Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement. You should rate the extent to which the statement applies to you.

Exactly						Not At All
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

- I watch comedy because
- Because it relaxes me
- Because it allows me to unwind
- Because it's a pleasant rest
- So I won't have to be alone
- When there's no one else to talk to or be with
- Because it makes me feel less lonely
- Just because it's there
- Because I just like to watch it
- Because it's a habit, it's just what I do
- When I have nothing better to do
- Because it passes the time away, particularly when I'm bored
- Because it gives me something to occupy my time
- Because it entertains me
- Because it's enjoyable
- Because it amuses me
- Because it's something to do when my friends come over
- So I can talk with other people about what's on
- So I can be with other members of the family or friends who are watching
- Because it helps me learn things about myself and others
- So I can learn how to do things which I haven't done before
- So I could learn about what could happen to me
- Because it's thrilling
- Because it's exciting
- Because it peps me up
- So I can forget about school or other things
- So I can get away from the rest of the family or others
- So I can get away from what I'm doing

6. Here are a number of personality traits that may or may not apply to you. Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement. You should rate the extent to which the pair of traits applies to you, even if one characteristic applies more strongly than the other.

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I see myself as:

1. _____ Extraverted, enthusiastic

2. _____ Critical, quarrelsome
3. _____ Dependable, self-disciplined
4. _____ Anxious, easily upset
5. _____ Open to new experiences, complex
6. _____ Reserved, quiet
7. _____ Sympathetic, warm
8. _____ Disorganized, careless
9. _____ Calm, emotionally stable
10. _____ Conventional, uncreative

APPENDIX B Block Example

Workplace Social/Interpersonal

Focusing on a group of typical office workers, this sitcom takes place at their place of work with recurring characters of various diversities that encounter dilemmas and conflicts in the office throughout their day. In this episode, the characters get a good laugh by poking fun at one of the other characters. Character Joe is frequently the aim of every joke. A joke from this episode is below:

Joe who is 30 years old: I can't stay too long, I have to get up early for an audition where I'll be playing a 19-year old.

Jane: So when you said "get up early" did you mean 1986?

Domestic Cognitive

Revolving around a typical American family, this sitcom brings about the daily conflicts of an oddball family and the relationships between husband, wife, children, and grandparents. In this episode, the characters get a good laugh after a surprising and unintended event occurs. A joke from this episode with characters Jane and Joe is below:

Joe sitting in coffee shop: We love your music!

Jane playing a guitar on stage in a coffee shop: If you want to receive emails about my upcoming shows, then please give me money so I can buy a computer.

Fantasy Affective

Set in a fantasy world where a witch is married to an ordinary man, this sitcom brings you through the trials and tribulations their family and co-workers face. Problems are often solved by magic powers, while trying to keep them a secret. In this episode, the characters release some tension by getting a good laugh after an emotionally straining event. A joke from this episode with characters Jane and Joe is below:

Jane: I have some bad news. Jen was hit by a car.

Joe: What?

Jane: It happened this morning in the parking lot and I took her to the hospital. And, the doctors tried to save her, life, they did the best they could. And she's going to be OK.

Joe: Why would you phrase it like that?

Control Drama

Set in the workplace and at home, this drama follows the life of five friends trying to deal with everyday conflicts, tribulations, and stressors. In this episode, the characters deal with overcoming stressful and busy work events, while maintaining their personal and professional relationships. A line from the episode by character Jane to Joe is below:

[Jane to Joe on relationships]: At some point, you have to make a decision. Boundaries don't keep other people out. They fence you in. Life is messy. That's how we're made. So, you can waste your lives drawing lines. Or you can live your life crossing them. But there are some lines... that are way too dangerous to cross.

References

- Anderson, D. R., Collins, P. A., Schmitt, K. L., & Jacobvitz, R. S. (1996). Stressful Life Events and Television Viewing. *Communication Research*, 23(3), 243–260.
doi:10.1177/009365096023003001
- Andrews, G. (1943). A Factorial Analysis of Responses to the Comic as a Study in Personality. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 0022-1309(28), 209–224.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1), 1–26. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x
- Blumler, J. G., & Katz, E. (1974). *The uses of mass communications: Current perspectives on gratifications research* (Vol. 3). Sage publications Beverly Hills, CA. Retrieved from <http://www.getcited.org/pub/101431092>
- Bohner, G., Crow, K., Erb, H. P., & Schwarz, N. (1992). Affect and persuasion: Mood effects on the processing of message content and context cues and on subsequent behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 511-530. doi: 0046-2772/92/060511-20\$15.00
- Bryant, J., & Zillmann, D. (1984). Using Television to Alleviate Boredom and Stress: Selective Exposure as a Function of Induced Excitational States. *Journal of Broadcasting*, 28, 1.
- Buijzen, M., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2004). Developing a Typology of Humor in Audiovisual Media. *Media Psychology*, 6(2), 147–167. doi:10.1207/s1532785xmep0602_2
- Cantor, J. R. (1976). Humor on Television: A Content Analysis. *Journal of Broadcasting*, 20, 501.
- Chen, L., Zhou, S., & Bryant, J. (2007). Temporal Changes in Mood Repair Through Music

- Consumption: Effects of Mood, Mood Salience, and Individual Differences. *Media Psychology*, 9(3), 695–713. doi:10.1080/15213260701283293
- Cho, H. (1995). Humor Mechanisms, Perceived humor and Their Relationships to Various Executions in Advertising. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 22.
- Cohen, J., & Weimann, G. (2000). Cultivation Revisited: some Genres Have Some Effects on Some Viewers. *Communication Reports*, 13(2), 99.
- Correa, T., Hinsley, A. W., & de Zúñiga, H. G. (2010). Who interacts on the Web?: The intersection of users' personality and social media use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(2), 247–253. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2009.09.003
- Dillman Carpentier, F. R., Brown, J. D., Bertocci, M., Silk, J. S., Forbes, E. E., & Dahl, R. E. (2008). Sad Kids, Sad Media? Applying Mood Management Theory to Depressed Adolescents' Use of Media. *Media Psychology*, 11(1), 143–166. doi:10.1080/15213260701834484
- Do You Laugh When Someone Falls? Is it Superiority Theory or a Fact of Life? - Mental Health Humor. (n.d.). *Psych Central.com*. Retrieved September 21, 2012, from <http://blogs.psychcentral.com/humor/2012/07/do-you-laugh-when-some-one-falls-is-it-a-superiority-theory-or-fact-of-life/2712763.pdf>. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/stable/pdfplus/2712763.pdf>
- Freud, S. (1940). *The joke and its relation to the unconscious*. London, UK: Imago Publishing Co.
- Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., & Swann, W. B. (2003). A very brief measure of the Big-Five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37, 504-528. doi:10.1016/S0092-6566(03)00046-1

- Gray, J. & Lotz, A. D. (2012). *Television studies*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Greenwood, D. (2010). Of Sad Men and Dark Comedies: Mood and Gender Effects on Entertainment Media Preferences. *Mass Communication and Society*, 13(3), 232–249. doi:10.1080/15205430903186526
- Greenwood, D. N., & Long, C. R. (2009). Mood specific media use and emotion regulation: Patterns and individual differences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46(5–6), 616–621. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2009.01.002
- Hall, A. (2005). Audience Personality and the Selection of Media and Media Genres. *Media Psychology*, 7(4), 377–398. doi:10.1207/S1532785XMEP0704_4
- Kiken, M. E. (1977). *The grammar of humor*. Ph. D.(Brown University).
- Kim, J., & Oliver, M. B. (2011). What Combination of Message Characteristics Determines Hedonic and Counter-Hedonic Preferences? An Examination of the Interplay Between Valence and Semantic Affinity. *Media Psychology*, 14(2), 121–143. doi:10.1080/15213269.2011.573462
- Knobloch, S. (2003). Mood Adjustment via Mass Communication. *Journal of Communication*, 53(2), 233–250. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2003.tb02588.x
- Knobloch, S., & Zillmann, D. (2002). Mood Management via the Digital Jukebox. *Journal of Communication*, 52(2), 351–366. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2002.tb02549.x
- Knobloch-Westerwick, S. (2007). Gender Differences in Selective Media Use for Mood Management and Mood Adjustment. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 51(1), 73–92. doi:10.1080/08838150701308069
- Knobloch-Westerwick, S., & Alter, S. (2006). Mood Adjustment to Social Situations Through Mass Media Use: How Men Ruminates and Women Dissipate Angry Moods. *Human*

- Communication Research*, 32(1), 58–73. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.2006.00003.x
- Krcmar, M., & Kean, L. G. (2005). Uses and Gratifications of Media Violence: Personality Correlates of Viewing and Liking Violent Genres. *Media Psychology*, 7(4), 399–420. doi:10.1207/S1532785XMEP0704_5
- Martin, R. A. (2007). *The psychology of humor*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Mills, B. (2004). Comedy verite: contemporary sitcom form. *Screen*, 45(1), 63–78. doi:10.1093/screen/45.1.63
- Mittell, J. (2010). *Television and American culture*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Morton, T. A., & Duck, J. M. (2000). Social identity and media dependency in the gay community: The prediction of safe sex attitudes. *Communication Research*, 27, 438-460.
- Murray, H. A., Jr. (1934). The psychology of humor. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 29(1), 66–81. doi:10.1037/h0074853
- Nabi, R. L., Stitt, C. R., Halford, J., & Finnerty, K. L. (2006). Emotional and Cognitive Predictors of the Enjoyment of Reality-Based and Fictional Television Programming: An Elaboration of the Uses and Gratifications Perspective. *Media Psychology*, 8(4), 421–447. doi:10.1207/s1532785xmep0804_5
- Neuman, W. R. & Guggenheim, L. (2011). The evolution of media effects theory: A six-stage model of cumulative research. *Communication Theory*, 21, 169-196. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2011.01381.x
- Oliver, M. B. (2008). Tender Affective States as Predictors of Entertainment Preference. *Journal of Communication*, 58(1), 40–61. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2007.00373.x

- Oliver, M. B., & Raney, A. A. (2011). Entertainment as Pleasurable and Meaningful: Identifying Hedonic and Eudaimonic Motivations for Entertainment Consumption. *Journal of Communication, 61*(5), 984–1004. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01585.x
- Rubin, A. M. (2009). Uses-and-gratifications perspective on media effects. In J. Bryant & M.B. Oliver (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*. (pp. 165-184). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tueth, M. V. (2000). Fun City. *Journal of Popular Film & Television, 28*(3), 98.
- Vandaele, J. (2002). Humor Mechanisms in Film Comedy: Incongruity and Superiority. *Poetics Today, 23*(2), 221.
- Weaver III, J. B. (1991). Exploring the links between personality and media preferences. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12*(12), 1293–1299. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(91)90203-N
- Wicker, F. W., Thorelli, I. M., Barron III, W. L., & Ponder, M. R. (1981). Relationships among affective and cognitive factors in humor. *Journal of Research in Personality, 15*(3), 359–370. doi:10.1016/0092-6566(81)90033-7
- Zillmann, D. (1988). Mood Management Through Communication Choices: Theoretical considerations effects of messages on moods, mood managing, selective exposure references. *The American Behavioral Scientist (1986-1994), 31*(3), 327.
- Zuckerman, M., Lubin, B., & Rinck, C. M. (1983). Construction of new scales for the multiple affect adjective list. *Journal of Behavioral Assessment, 5*, (2), 119-128. doi: 0164-0305/83/0600-0119\$03.00/

Tables

Table 1

Zero-Order Correlations Among Mood and Like to Watch

	Work	Dom	Fant	Cog	Aff	SI	Ctrl
1. Anxiety	-.01	-.05	-.03	-.06	-.07	.04	.17
2. Depression	-.05	-.08	-.03	-.07	-.08	.04	.17*
3. Hostility	-.08	-.08	.05	-.07	-.07	.03	.14
4. Positive Affect	.50	.07	.80	.11	.08	.01	.05

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

Table 2

Zero-Order Correlations Among Mood and Enjoy to Watch

	Work	Dom	Fant	Cog	Aff	SI	Ctrl
1. Anxiety	-.02	-.03	-.06	-.06	-.08	.05	.12
2. Depression	-.02	-.05	-.04	-.06	-.10	.05	.12
3. Hostility	-.14	-.10	-.02	-.13	-.10	-.01	.10
4. Positive Affect	-.02	.06	-.02	.04	.04	-.05	.03

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

Table 3

Zero-Order Correlations Among Mood and Funny

	Work	Dom	Fant	Cog	Aff	SI	Ctrl
1. Anxiety	.02	.03	-.00	-.06	-.00	.10	.09
2. Depression	.02	.02	-.02	-.07	-.04	.13	.07
3. Hostility	-.02	.01	.06	-.07	-.00	.12	.03
4. Positive Affect	.02	.05	.00	.10	.04	.12	.02

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

Table 4

Zero-Order Correlations Among Uses and Gratifications and Like to Watch

	Work	Dom	Fant	Cog	Aff	SI	Ctrl
Relaxation	.13	.26***	.20**	.19**	.23**	.15*	.12
Companionship	-.01	.08	.02	-.00	.04	.06	.23**
Pass Time	.02	.06	.10	-.03	.15*	.04	.02
Entertainment	.20**	.19**	.16*	.13	.21**	.19**	.03
Arousal	.03	.29***	.20**	.21**	.09	.20**	.07
Escape	.06	.10	.13	.15*	.10	.04	.18*

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

Table 5
Zero-Order Correlations Among Uses and Gratifications and Enjoy to Watch

	Work	Dom	Fant	Cog	Aff	SI	Ctrl
Relaxation	.23**	.25***	.21**	.25***	.25***	.18*	.15*
Companionship	.06	.11	.15*	.14*	.03	.15*	.25***
Pass Time	.00	.07	.10	-.02	.11	.07	.01
Entertainment	.27***	.25***	.18*	.22**	.23**	.23**	.04
Arousal	.16*	.32***	.17*	.22**	.16*	.26***	.12
Escape	.12	.12	.12	.12	.14	.10	.17*

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

Table 6
Zero-Order Correlations Among Uses and Gratifications and Funny

	Work	Dom	Fant	Cog	Aff	SI	Ctrl
Relaxation	.16*	.26***	.11	.20**	.21**	.10	.09
Companionship	.07	.15*	.06	.09	.03	.16*	-.03
Pass Time	.02	.03	.01	-.01	.02	.05	-.03
Entertainment	.20**	.20**	.05	.13	.19**	.12	-.05
Arousal	.15*	.32***	.13	.24**	.13	.22**	.06
Escape	.08	.17*	.06	.11	.14	.07	.15*

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

Table 7
Zero-Order Correlations Among Personality and Like to Watch

	Work	Dom	Fant	Cog	Aff	SI	Ctrl
Extraversion	.06	.12	.07	.17*	.09	-.01	.04
Conscientiousness	.19**	.11	.00	-.01	.17*	.13	.07
Emotional Stability	-.00	.02	.06	.05	.12	-.09	-.04
Openness to Experience	.02	.04	.00	.08	.01	-.03	.03
Agreeableness	.15*	.07	.01	.08	.08	.05	.13**

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

Table 8
Zero-Order Correlations Among Personality and Enjoy

	Work	Dom	Fant	Cog	Aff	SI	Ctrl
Extraversion	.06	.11	.07	.19**	.08	-.05	.04
Conscientiousness	.08	.13	-.00	.02	.14*	.04	.03
Emotional Stability	-.05	.05	.08	.08	.11	-.11	.02
Openness to Experience	.10	-.01	-.04	.06	-.01	-.08	-.03
Agreeableness	.13	.08	.03	.90	.08	.07	.19**

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

Table 9
Zero-Order Correlations Among Personality and Funny

	Work	Dom	Fant	Cog	Aff	SI	Ctrl
Extraversion	.04	.11	-.00	.15*	.04	-.04	.05
Conscientiousness	.06	.08	.03	-.01	.09	.08	.20
Emotional Stability	-.12	-.02	.01	.01	.04	-.17*	.00
Openness to Experience	.02	-.00	-.03	.07	-.04	-.06	.01
Agreeableness	.08	.01	-.04	.07	-.01	-.01	.11

* $p < .05$, two-tailed.

Table 10
Zero-Order Correlations Among Independent Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Anxiety		.81***	.74**	-.19**	.06	.17*	-.02	-.03	.04	.22*	-.15*	-.16*	-.14	-.08
2. Depression			.79***	-.32***	-.07	.34***	.01	-.15*	-.03	.15*	-.18*	-.22**	-.21**	-.10
3. Hostility				-.26***	-.04	.18*	.01	-.16*	-.03	.19**	-.12	-.17*	-.14*	-.14*
4. Positive Affect					.2**	-.24**	-.05	.22**	.16*	-.07	.21**	.23**	.27***	.29***
5. Relaxation						.16*	.17*	.51***	.31***	.40***	.18*	.10	.12	.12
6. Companionship							.22**	-.00	.14	.30***	-.04	-.13	-.11	.00
7. Pass Time								.19**	.09	.38***	.09	.00	-.03	.06
8. Entertainment									.44***	.31***	.22**	.21**	.21**	.21**
9. Arousal										.28***	.17*	.00	.15*	.10
10. Escape											.02	-.10	.01	-.12
11. Extraversion												.17*	.35***	.04
12. Conscientiousness													.14*	.34***
13. Openness to Experiences														.24**
14. Agreeableness														

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

Table 11
Zero-Order ANOVA with Independent Variables and Humor Preferences

	Affective <i>M</i>	Cognitive <i>M</i>	Social/Interpersonal <i>M</i>	Control <i>M</i>	<i>F</i>
Anxiety	2.46	2.30	2.49	2.61	.60
Depression	2.09	2.00	2.16	2.42	1.33
Hostility	2.05	1.85	1.99	2.19	1.06
Positive Affect	4.31	4.43	4.51	4.17	.71
Relaxation	5.66	5.58	5.68	5.30	.74
Companionship	2.64	2.67	2.40	3.23	2.21
Pass Time	4.52	4.09	4.33	4.26	.58
Entertainment	6.24	6.11	6.22	5.92	.81
Arousal	4.06	4.60	4.60	4.36	1.64
Escape	4.66	4.65	4.67	4.78	.07
Extraversion	4.70	4.81	4.64	4.70	.11
Conscientiousness	5.46	4.88	5.41	5.17	2.17
Emotional Stability	4.88	4.73	4.51	4.78	.62
Openness to Experiences	5.41	5.38	5.40	5.54	.14
Agreeableness	5.25	5.17	5.04	5.28	.33

Table 12
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Workplace Like to Watch

	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β
Anxiety	-.08	-.10
Depression	.37	.35
Hostility	-.35	-.31
Positive Affect	-.03	-.03
Relaxation	.04	-.03
Companionship	-.05	-.09
Pass Time	-.01	.00
Entertainment	.23	.27*
Arousal	-.10	-.18
Escape	.09	.07
Extraversion	.04	.02
Conscientiousness	.20*	.18
Emotional Stability	-.10	-.11
Openness to Experiences	-.04	-.03
Agreeableness	.14	.10
Gender	-.27	-.40
Domestic		.27***
Fantasy		-.10
Control		.14*
R ²	.10	.20

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

Table 13
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Domestic Like to Watch

	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β
Anxiety	-.01	.05
Depression	.01	-.08
Hostility	-.18	-.16
Positive Affect	-.04	-.04
Relaxation	.26*	.22*
Companionship	.03	.04
Pass Time	.01	.01
Entertainment	-.06	-.13
Arousal	.29**	.29**
Escape	-.04	-.07
Extraversion	.05	.03
Conscientiousness	.06	.01
Emotional Stability	-.02	-.01
Openness to Experiences	-.05	-.03
Agreeableness	.01	-.05
Gender	.13	.24
Workplace		.27***
Fantasy		.18*
Control		.03
R ²	.14	.24

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

Table 14
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Fantasy Like to Watch

	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β
Anxiety	-.21	-.22
Depression	-.11	-.13
Hostility	.44	.46*
Positive Affect	.03	.02
Relaxation	.14	.08
Companionship		-.03
Pass Time	.02	.04
Entertainment	.08	.12
Arousal	.16	.10
Escape	.02	-.00
Extraversion	.05	.03
Conscientiousness	-.07	-.08
Emotional Stability	.07	.06
Openness to Experiences	-.08	-.07
Agreeableness	.03	-.01
Gender	-.32	-.44
Workplace		-.01
Domestic		.20*
Control		.14
R ²	.10	.15

* $p < .05$, two-tailed.

Table 15
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Cognitive Like to Watch

	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β
Anxiety	-.19	-.20
Depression	.13	.09
Hostility	-.06	-.06
Positive Affect	.03	.02
Relaxation	.14	.11
Companionship	-.08	-.12
Pass Time	-.12	-.12
Entertainment	-.08	-.10
Arousal	.20*	.16
Escape	.18	.17
Extraversion	.16	.17
Conscientiousness	-.14	-.19
Emotional Stability	.02	.04
Openness to Experiences	-.04	-.02
Agreeableness	.15	.10
Gender	.07	.03
Control		.18*
Affective		.02
Social/Interpersonal		.22**
R ²	.12	.21

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

Table 16
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Affective Like to Watch

	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β
Anxiety	-.10	-.09
Depression	.08	.08
Hostility	-.01	-.03
Positive Affect	-.04	-.03
Relaxation	.20	.19
Companionship	.03	.04
Pass Time	.10	.09
Entertainment	.15	.12
Arousal	-.02	-.05
Escape	-.01	.02
Extraversion	.04	.05
Conscientiousness	.18	.16
Emotional Stability	.09	.12
Openness to Experiences	-.07	-.06
Agreeableness	.02	.03
Gender	-.23	-.16
Control		-.05
Cognitive		.02
Social/Interpersonal		.14
R ²	.11	.12

Table 17
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Social/Interpersonal Like to Watch

	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β
Anxiety	-.02	.02
Depression	.06	-.03
Hostility	-.02	-.00
Positive Affect	-.03	-.05
Relaxation	.10	.03
Companionship	.02	.01
Pass Time	.04	.07
Entertainment	.19	.22
Arousal	.17	.13
Escape	-.10	-.19
Extraversion	-.06	-.11
Conscientiousness	.15	.15
Emotional Stability	-.16	-.19
Openness to Experiences	-.07	-.05
Agreeableness	.01	-.07
Gender	-.30	-.40
Control		.17*
Cognitive		.23**
Affective		.12

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

Table 18
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Control Like to Watch

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	β	β	β
Anxiety	.09	.13	.12
Depression	.13	.08	.10
Hostility	.07	.08	.08
Positive Affect	.11	.11	.11
Relaxation	.07	.04	.04
Companionship	.18*	.19*	.19*
Pass Time	-.12	-.12	-.10
Entertainment	-.15	-.20	-.16
Arousal	-.01	-.03	-.08
Escape	.23*	.22*	.22*
Extraversion	.05	.04	.03
Conscientiousness	.07	.04	.07
Emotional Stability	.10	.10	.12
Openness to Experiences	-.02	-.00	-.00
Agreeableness	.27*	.24*	.24*
Gender	.65*	.73**	.68*
Workplace		.16*	
Domestic		.04	
Fantasy		.13	
Cognitive			.18*
Affective			-.04
Social/Interpersonal			.17*
R ²	.19	.23	.25

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

Table 19
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Workplace Enjoy to Watch

	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β
Anxiety	-.03	-.04
Depression	.35	.33
Hostility	-.61*	-.59**
Positive Affect	-.18	-.17
Relaxation	.17	.07
Companionship	-.04	-.12
Pass Time	-.05	-.01
Entertainment	.27	.29*
Arousal	.07	-.04
Escape	.07	.03
Extraversion	.04	.00
Conscientiousness	.03	.02
Emotional Stability	-.15	-.23*
Openness to Experiences	-.07	.01
Agreeableness	.19	.12
Gender	-.28	-.52*
Domestic		.24**
Fantasy		.08
Control		.29***
R ²	.16	.30

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

Table 20
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Domestic Enjoy to Watch

	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β
Anxiety	.04	.07
Depression	.15	.07
Hostility	-.33	-.21
Positive Affect	-.04	.03
Relaxation	.18	.12
Companionship	.06	.05
Pass Time	.01	.03
Entertainment	.08	-.01
Arousal	.32**	.29**
Escape	-.04	-.05
Extraversion	.05	.03
Conscientiousness	.09	.09
Emotional Stability	.05	.08
Openness to Experiences	-.12	-.09
Agreeableness	-.00	-.05
Gender	.22	.32
Workplace		.26**
Fantasy		.13
Control		-.02
R ²	.16	.24

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

Table 21
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Fantasy Enjoy to Watch

	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β
Anxiety	-.17	-.18
Depression	-.14	-.19
Hostility	.28	.36
Positive Affect	-.14	-.13
Relaxation	.18	.12
Companionship	.15	.11
Pass Time	-.01	.01
Entertainment	.15	.14
Arousal	.12	.07
Escape	-.03	-.06
Extraversion	.07	.05
Conscientiousness	-.07	-.08
Emotional Stability	.15	.13
Openness to Experiences	-.13	-.09
Agreeableness	.05	
Gender	-.11	-.21
Workplace		.08
Domestic		.13
Control		.13
R ²	.11	.16

Table 22
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Cognitive Enjoy to Watch

	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β
Anxiety	-.07	-.08
Depression	.21	.18
Hostility	-.32	-.27
Positive Affect	-.12	-.09
Relaxation	.19	.12
Companionship	.11	.07
Pass Time	-.13	-.12
Entertainment	.11	.06
Arousal	.17	.08
Escape	.04	.03
Extraversion	.20*	.22*
Conscientiousness	-.09	-.11
Emotional Stability	.11	.12
Openness to Experiences	-.06	.00
Agreeableness	.10	.04
Gender	.07	0.00
Control		.16*
Affective		.08
Social/Interpersonal		.25***
R ²	.16	.27

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

Table 23
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Affective Enjoy to Watch

	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β
Anxiety	-.11	-.11
Depression	.02	-.01
Hostility	-.04	.00
Positive Affect	-.14	-.12
Relaxation	.24*	.21
Companionship	-.02	-.04
Pass Time	.04	.06
Entertainment	.13	.11
Arousal	.10	.07
Escape	.05	.05
Extraversion	.05	.03
Conscientiousness	.13	.14
Emotional Stability	.10	.09
Openness to Experiences	-.12	-.11
Agreeableness	.06	.03
Gender	-.12	-.15
Control		.04
Cognitive		.11
Social/Interpersonal		.03
R ²	.12	.13

* $p < .05$, two-tailed.

Table 24
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Social/Interpersonal Enjoy to Watch

	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β
Anxiety	.03	.04
Depression	.13	.07
Hostility	-.29	-.24
Positive Affect	-.11	-.08
Relaxation	.10	.02
Companionship	.07	.01
Pass Time	.04	.10
Entertainment	.26	.26
Arousal	.26*	.20*
Escape	-.09	-.14
Extraversion	-.10	-.17
Conscientiousness	.01	.04
Emotional Stability	-.17	-.24*
Openness to Experiences	-.13	-.09
Agreeableness	.08	-.00
Gender	-.11	-.28
Control		.22**
Cognitive		.26***
Affective		.03
R ²	.15	.27

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

Table 25
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Control Enjoy to Watch

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	β	β	β
Anxiety	.05	.07	.05
Depression	.00	-.08	-.06
Hostility	.16	.30	.27
Positive Affect	.05	.12	.09
Relaxation	.13	.06	.07
Companionship	.21*	.20*	.18*
Pass Time	-.14	-.12	-.13
Entertainment	-.16	-.25	-.23
Arousal	.07	.04	-.02
Escape	.18	.16	.19
Extraversion	.06	.04	.05
Conscientiousness	-.02	-.02	-.01
Emotional Stability	.18	.21*	.20
Openness to Experiences	-.12	.10	-.08
Agreeableness	.25*	.19	.22*
Gender	.70*	.80**	.71**
Workplace		.30***	
Domestic		-.02	
Fantasy		.12	
Cognitive			.16*
Affective			.03
Social/Interpersonal			.21**
R ²	.18	.26	.28

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

Table 26
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Workplace Funny

	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β
Anxiety	-.08	-.07
Depression	.13	.18
Hostility	-.17	-.23
Positive Affect	.00	-.00
Relaxation	.09	-.02
Companionship	.02	-.06
Pass Time	-.02	.03
Entertainment	.24	.27
Arousal	.07	-.07
Escape	.00	-.03
Extraversion	.00	-.03
Conscientiousness	.03	-.00
Emotional Stability	-.24*	-.26*
Openness to Experiences	-.04	.01
Agreeableness	.11	.12
Gender	-.23	-.29
Domestic		.37***
Fantasy		.15*
Control		.11
R ²	.08	.27

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

Table 27
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Domestic Funny

	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β
Anxiety	-.07	-.03
Depression	.04	.05
Hostility	.03	.01
Positive Affect	.01	.01
Relaxation	.22	.17
Companionship	.11	.08
Pass Time	-.07	-.05
Entertainment	.01	-.07
Arousal	.33**	.28**
Escape	.03	.03
Extraversion	.08	.08
Conscientiousness	.07	.05
Emotional Stability	.02	.09
Openness to Experiences	-.11	-.08
Agreeableness	-.05	-.08
Gender	.08	.16
Workplace		.35***
Fantasy		.18*
Control		.03
R ²	.15	.33

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

Table 28
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Fantasy Funny

	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β
Anxiety	-.06	-.08
Depression	-.29	-.29
Hostility	.42	.45
Positive Affect	-.02	-.03
Relaxation	.11	.05
Companionship	.08	.01
Pass Time	-.05	-.01
Entertainment	-.02	-.02
Arousal	.14	.06
Escape	-.02	-.06
Extraversion	-.02	-.05
Conscientiousness	.04	.02
Emotional Stability	.05	.06
Openness to Experiences	-.07	-.04
Agreeableness	-.06	-.09
Gender	-.06	-.09
Workplace		.16*
Domestic		.19*
Control		.16*
R ²	.05	.17

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

Table 29
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Cognitive Funny

	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β
Anxiety	-.09	-.08
Depression	-.04	-.03
Hostility	-.06	-.14
Positive Affect	.08	.10
Relaxation	.18	.12
Companionship	.07	-.01
Pass Time	-.08	-.07
Entertainment	-.09	-.14
Arousal	.25*	.14
Escape	.05	.07
Extraversion	.12	.14
Conscientiousness	-.12	-.20*
Emotional Stability	-.03	.02
Openness to Experiences	-.03	.01
Agreeableness	.07	.08
Gender	.18	.25
Control		.10
Affective		.16*
Social/Interpersonal		.40***
R ²	.11	.31

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

Table 30
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Affective Funny

	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β
Anxiety	-.06	-.05
Depression	-.14	-.12
Hostility	.22	.23
Positive Affect	-.03	-.05
Relaxation	.19	.14
Companionship	.03	-.02
Pass Time	-.08	-.05
Entertainment	.19	.22
Arousal	.05	-.03
Escape	.07	.05
Extraversion	.01	-.01
Conscientiousness	.12	.13
Emotional Stability	.04	.06
Openness to Experiences	-.14	-.12
Agreeableness	-.04	-.06
Gender	-.20	-.25
Control		.08
Cognitive		.21*
Social/Interpersonal		.10
R ²	.08	.15

* $p < .05$, two-tailed.

Table 31
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Social/Interpersonal Funny

	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β
Anxiety	-.06	-.05
Depression	.06	.12
Hostility	.12	.13
Positive Affect	-.06	-.09
Relaxation	.07	-.02
Companionship	.11	.05
Pass Time	.02	.08
Entertainment	.12	.18
Arousal	.24*	.13
Escape	-.11	-.16
Extraversion	-.08	-.14
Conscientiousness	.14	.18
Emotional Stability	-.18	-.18
Openness to Experiences	-.06	-.03
Agreeableness	-.04	-.08
Gender	-.19	-.28
Control		.11
Cognitive		.39***
Affective		.08
R ²	.12	.30

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

Table 32
Multivariate Analysis with Independent Variables and Control Funny

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	β	β	β
Anxiety	.25	.27	.27
Depression	-.15	-.12	-.15
Hostility	-.07	-.12	-.09
Positive Affect	.05	.05	.05
Relaxation	.04	.01	.00
Companionship	.29**	.27**	.27
Pass Time	-.14	-.13	-.13
Entertainment	-.28	-.30*	-.30*
Arousal	.02	-.02	-.03
Escape	.20	.20	.20*
Extraversion	.10	.10	.09
Conscientiousness	.03	.02	.02
Emotional Stability	.11	.13	.13
Openness to Experiences	-.03	-.01	-.01
Agreeableness	.16	.16	.16
Gender	.34	.37	.36
Workplace		.11	
Domestic		.03	
Fantasy		.16*	
Cognitive			.11
Affective			.06
Social/Interpersonal			.12
R ²	.15	.20	.20

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.