1954

The relationship between conscious and unconscious hostility and responses to hostile cartoons.

Richard Smith

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/theses

Retrieved from https://scholarworks.umass.edu/theses/1983

This thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses 1911 - February 2014 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONSCIOUS AND UNCONSCIOUS HOSTILITY AND RESPONSES TO HOSTILE CARTOONS

SMITH - 1954
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONSCIOUS AND UNCONSCIOUS HOSTILITY AND RESPONSES TO HOSTILE CARTOONS

By

Richard Smith

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

JUNE 1954
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Background</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIMENTAL METHOD</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material and Apparatus</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of the Data</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTS</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

Historical background

Several studies have investigated humor by factor-analytic techniques. Andrews (1) attempted to determine whether humor was composed of a single quality or of several different qualities. He performed a factor-analysis on measures of preference to 24 jokes and extracted six factors which he labeled as follows: "derision-superiority," "sexuality," "reaction to debauchery," "subtlety," "play on words and ideas," and "ridiculous-wise-cracks."

Cattell and Luborsky (2,3) in a similar study uncovered the following five factors, which they considered to be general personality factors: "good natured self-assertion," "rebellious dominance and resentment of authority," "easy going sensuality versus sex repressed aggressiveness," "resigned-derision," and "urbane sophistication."

Eysenck (4) had 16 subjects rate how well they liked each of 189 jokes. He found three factors which indicated uniform differences in preference for sexual as opposed to non-sexual jokes, complex as opposed to simple jokes, and personal as opposed to impersonal jokes. Extroverts were found to prefer sexual and simple jokes, whereas introverts preferred complex and non-sexual jokes.

In a later study (5) Eysenck found three factors to
account for humor in jokes: a general humor factor (all subjects agreed to the funniness of some jokes), a "funny" factor, and a clever factor. When these factors were correlated with temperament, Eysenck discovered that introverts preferred jokes of the clever and complex type, and extroverts preferred jokes of the funny and simple type.

All of the above authors believe that humor is related to personality and that "responses to certain types of comic material may serve as subtle indicators of basic personality traits" (1, p. 224). Cattell and Luborsky (2) concluded that individuals were usually consistent in their preferences for certain types of humor and they expressed agreement with Freud's view (6) that a humorous response to jokes and cartoons involves the release of some repressed need or wish.

Factor analytic studies have shown that different people prefer different types of humor, and that preferences are related to certain personality characteristics. If we agree with Freud that humorous responses involve the release of a repressed need or wish, it seems reasonable to assume that sources of repression can be determined by finding areas to which persons react humorously. Two studies have some bearing on this matter.

Murray (3), using four questionnaire tests and a humor scale, investigated the relationship between "aggressively
asserted dispositions" and enjoyment of jokes of a cruel, cynical, and disparaging nature, and concluded that "subjects with strong self-assertive trends who assume a critical, hostile, and misanthropic attitude toward their fellow men are those who most intensely enjoy disparaging jokes and consequently the responses to such jokes may be used as criteria of specific sentiments toward particular objects of general aggressive attitudes. Aggressive, negativistic, and irritable behavior, however, does not necessarily accompany such sentiments and such disparaging laughter" (8, p. 81).

In evaluating Murray's findings, one must not overlook the limitation that only 13 subjects were used, and that only ten disparaging and six control jokes were used. The validity of two of the tests of aggressiveness is also questionable.

On the basis of a preliminary study, Redlich, Levine, and Sohler (9) suggest that humor can provide an important index of the personality dynamics within an individual. "As emotional behavior, humor lends itself particularly to experimental and clinical investigation. It is the one form of emotion in our culture that can be expressed freely without restraint or anxiety. It is public and communicable; it is pleasurable and unstressful. A great variety of stimuli can evoke it and it can be recognized without difficulty. As expressive behavior, it has acquired meanings which are
particularly revealing of basic feelings and tensions" (9, p. 718). They administered a humor test of 36 cartoons to 83 subjects, ranging from normal to psychotic, to test the following hypotheses: 1) When a stimulus elicits a humorous response it is assumed that there has been a momentary release of some primary suppressed or repressed need, without the usual accompanying anxiety. 2) When a stimulus, ostensibly humorous, is responded to with indifference, it is assumed that either: (a) no 'conflictual' needs are involved; (b) the needs are so deeply repressed that no affective participation is possible; or (c) rigid ego control is involved. 3) When a stimulus, ostensibly humorous, evokes anxiety, disgust, shame, guilt, or horror, it is assumed that the release of some primary suppressed or repressed need produces a threat with the resulting affect of displeasure" (9, p. 719). Their tentative findings were in general agreement with these hypotheses.

In summary then, a review of the literature seems to indicate that relatively little work has been done determining the nature of the humor response. One of the more commonly accepted theories is the Freudian view that repression up to a point favors a humorous reaction. Some studies have supported this theory but the evidence is insufficient and of a questionable nature so that further investigation is required.
Statement of the problem

The present study was undertaken to investigate the relationship between hostility and responses to hostile cartoons. In line with Freud's theory of humor, it was hypothesized that repression up to a point is favorable to a humorous response, but beyond that point, a humorous expression of hostility is threatening, and a negative reaction occurs.

The study also undertook to empirically investigate the relationship between one's hostility as judged by others (social perceived hostility) and reaction to hostile cartoons, as well as the relationship between self-acknowledged hostility and reaction to hostile cartoons.
EXPERIMENTAL METHOD

Subjects

Subjects consisted of 32 volunteer college males in the same campus fraternity who had known each other for a minimum of one year. They were Sophomores, Juniors, and Seniors between the ages of 18-22, and all of the Jewish faith.

Material and apparatus

Thirty-two cartoons, 16 hostile and 16 control were selected from various sources, such as The Saturday Evening Post, Colliers, The New Yorkers, Esquire, and campus publications. Cartoons of a religious, political, or sexual nature were excluded to limit the heterogeneity of the cartoon sample, and in order to insure that reactions were predominantly to hostility, rather than to other emotional factors. In so far as it was possible, hostile and non-hostile cartoons were matched in subject matter. Five judges composed of faculty and graduate students in the Department of Psychology at the University of Massachusetts selected the hostile cartoons according to the following criteria of content: depiction of inconsideration; depiction of shortcomings of others; putting someone on the spot; making disparaging comments about others when unprovoked; making someone the butt of a practical joke; taking advantage of some-
one; or retaliation against any of the above situations.
The hostile cartoons were then sub-divided into the two
following groups: (a) unprovoked hostility (provocation not
depicted in the cartoon); (b) provoked hostility (provoca-
tion depicted in the cartoon). Only those cartoons which
were agreed upon unanimously by all judges were included in
the final sample, which consisted of eight cartoons depict-
ing provoked hostility, eight depicting unprovoked hostility,
and 16 control cartoons not depicting any hostility. (See
Appendix.) Each cartoon was then coded by number to facili-
tate recording.
A Q-sort board was used for S to rank cartoons in order
of funniness as well as to rank subjects, including oneself,
in order of manifest hostility. In the use of the Q-board,
S was instructed to place items in seven columns ranging
from least funny to most funny when humor in cartoons was
being judged, and from least hostile to most hostile when
manifest hostility was being judged. S was instructed to
place the following number of items in each of the successive
columns: 2, 4, 6, 8, 6, 4, 2. From left to right the frequency
columns were assigned weights from one to seven. The use of
a Q-technique (8,11,12) had the advantage that all judgments
were made relative to all other judgments, that ranks were
distributed in the form of a normal curve so that they were
in effect Z-scores which could be combined, and that judgments
of many items can be more conveniently and convincingly made by this method than by the method of rank-ordering.

The following five point check list was used by E to judge S's spontaneous reaction to each cartoon when it was first observed:

NV- negative audible verbal expression, i.e. statement of disapproval, groan, expression of disgust, etc. (weight of -2)

NF- negative facial expression, i.e. frown, grimace, appearance of annoyance or disapproval. (weight of -1)

O- no observable or audible reaction. (weight of 0)

PF- positive facial expression, i.e. smile, grin, beam, visible appearance of pleasure or approval. (weight of +1)

PV- positive audible verbal expression: laugh, chuckle, giggle, audible expression of pleasure or approval. (weight of +2).

A positive or negative observable expression is composed of more than a single definable reaction and included a host of minute cues which go into making up the final observed expression. E's judgments were made on the basis of the E's impression of the total configuration of the expression rather than any single definable quality. The above descriptions were strictly adhered to to assure that E was as objective as possible. The system was found to work successfully in practice as judgments were made with a high degree of
certainty. Whenever there was a degree of uncertainty, a response was underscored rather than overscored in the interest of caution.

Procedure

Each S was given the humor scale individually and instructed to look at the cartoons one at a time and to place them into three bins according to whether they were funny, mediocre, or not funny. This will be referred to as the first sort. As S observed each cartoon, E made a notation of S's immediate expressive reaction. (At the time of the judgments, E had no knowledge of the objective hostility scores, which were gathered at a later date, nor did E know whether a hostile or non-hostile cartoon was being judged.) S was next instructed to place the cartoons on the Q-board according to how humorous he believed them to be.

A week later, S was seen again and given individual cards with the names of all Ss and requested to rank each on the board according to the following description of an extremely hostile person: "This person is an individual who tends to be inconsiderate, antagonistic, and resentful. When talking about others he is very apt to emphasize their faults and weaknesses although he does not like this done to himself. He has little sympathy for the shortcomings of others and enjoys seeing others on the spot. He very often makes dis-
paraging comments about others and will argue just for the sake of argument. It is important for him to come out on top and he is a sore loser in competition." This composite description was obtained by combining elements from descriptions and definitions of hostility and hostile individuals taken from a great number of textbooks on general, abnormal, and clinical psychology. The elements of the description that were selected were chosen with the thought that they were the ones most applicable to the everyday behavior of university students.

When this was completed, S was told to pick out those individuals who fitted the following description: "These people are always quiet and reserved, they never stick up for their rights, do not express themselves even when provoked, and seem to keep everything to themselves; they are the individuals that you feel should express themselves more and in whose company you may not feel at ease because of the above." This definition was formulated in accord with the clinical view that individuals who measure up to it very likely have deeply repressed hostilities. If such is the case these individuals might provide a test of the hypothesis that if repression of an impulse is sufficiently great, even a humorous expression of it becomes threatening.

Each S was assured that all names were coded and all information would be held in strictest confidence.
Treatment of the Data

Correlations between the following variables were determined:

(a) hostility as rated by self and reaction to hostile cartoons

(b) hostility as rated by others and reaction to hostile cartoons

(c) degree of unacceptability of hostility and reaction to hostile cartoons.

Three measures of hostility were obtained from the Q-sort: mean rating by others (average rating given by all other Ss); self-rating (relative rating he gave himself); and unacceptable-hostility rating (mean rating by others minus self-rating). This latter measure is an improvement on a technique which has proven successful in the past (10). The logic behind the method is that when an undesirable trait is repressed, the degree to which it exists will be underestimated by the self.

Reactions to the hostile cartoons were obtained from three sources, the first sort, the Q-sort, and the check list of the spontaneous expressive reaction to the cartoons. Two measures of reaction to the hostile cartoons were obtained from the first sort: per cent of hostile cartoons placed in the "funny" category to the total number of car-


toons placed in the "funny" category, and per cent of pro-
voked hostile cartoons placed in the "funny" category to the
total number of hostile cartoons placed in the "funny" cate-
gory. Two measures of reaction to the hostile cartoons were
also obtained from the Q-sort: a total score of favorable
reaction to hostility in cartoons obtained by summing the
weights for all the hostile cartoons; and a provoked minus
unprovoked score, which was simply the sum of the weights
for the hostile cartoons with provocation depicted minus the
sum of the weights for the hostile cartoons where no provo-
cation was depicted. From the check list, two measures of
spontaneous expressive reaction to the cartoons were ob-
tained. One was the per cent favorable expressive reaction
(weights with positive signs) to total expressive reaction
(ignoring algebraic signs) on all hostile cartoons. The
other was the per cent favorable expressive reaction to the
total expressive reaction on all non-hostile cartoons.
RESULTS

Scatter diagrams were plotted to determine whether linear correlational techniques were appropriate. On the basis of the results Pearson Product Moment correlations were computed except in the case of spontaneous expressive reaction. In this case the scatter diagrams revealed that there were a considerable number of Ss who responded to the hostile and the non-hostile cartoons with 100% favorable expression, and therefore biserial correlations were computed with 100% used as the division point.

It had been hypothesized that, up to a point, repression of hostility is favorable to a humorous response to hostile cartoons. This hypothesis can be operationally evaluated in terms of two predictions: (1) with increasing repression there is an increase in the favorable humorous reaction to hostile cartoons; (2) a point can be established beyond which repression favors a negative reaction to hostile cartoons. Relevant to the first point, a biserial correlation of .60 was found between repression and spontaneous expressive reaction to hostile cartoons (Table 1). In order to test the significance of this relationship, a $t$ test of the difference between group means as to amount of repression in the 100% favorable group and the other group was computed. A $t$ of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How measures obtained</th>
<th>Reaction to hostility in cartoons</th>
<th>Mean rating of hostility as judged by others</th>
<th>Self-rating of hostility</th>
<th>Mean rating of hostility by others minus self-rating of hostility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First sort</td>
<td>% of hostile cartoons placed in funny bin to total number of cartoons placed in funny bin.</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of provoked hostile cartoons to the total number of hostile cartoons placed in the funny bin.</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-sort</td>
<td>Total hostile score</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provoked hostile score minus the uncompromised hostile score.</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous expressive reaction</td>
<td>% favorable expression to total expression for hostile cartoons.</td>
<td>.15&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.23&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+.60&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% favorable expression to total expression for non-hostile cartoons.</td>
<td>-.05&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.37&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+.48&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>b</sup> Biserial correlation.

** Significant at beyond the 1% level for appropriate df.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings of hostility</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean rating of hostility as judged by others</td>
<td>2.3 - 5.7</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-rating of hostility</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ratings of hostility by others minus self-rating of hostility</td>
<td>-2.4 - 3.1</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First sort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of hostile cartoons placed in funny bin to total number of cartoons placed in funny bin</td>
<td>27 - 100</td>
<td>63.30</td>
<td>20.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of provoked hostile cartoons to the total number of hostile cartoons placed in the funny bin</td>
<td>20 - 100</td>
<td>49.40</td>
<td>18.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hostile score</td>
<td>58 - 80</td>
<td>68.46</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provoked hostile score minus the unprovoked hostile</td>
<td>-10 - 16</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% favorable expression to the total expression for hostile cartoons</td>
<td>0 - 100</td>
<td>88.30</td>
<td>21.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% favorable expression of the total expression for non-hostile cartoons</td>
<td>0 - 100</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>39.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.95, 31 df, was found, which is significant at beyond the 1% level of confidence (Table 1). When a similar biserial correlation and \( t \) test was computed for the non-hostile cartoons, no significance was obtained.¹ All other relationships which were empirically investigated yielded statistically non-significant findings. (Although one might argue that one significant correlation in 13 could be a chance occurrence, this consideration is not completely pertinent to the present study for two reasons. For one, the significant correlation was the only one predicted beforehand. Secondly, the level of significance was great enough so that it is unlikely that it would have occurred on the basis of chance alone, even if it had not been predicted.)

Two methods were considered in evaluating the prediction that repression beyond a point is associated with a negative reaction. The first method involved inspection of the scatter-gram showing the relationship between repression (other minus self score) and response to hostile cartoons. There was no indication of an increase in unfavorable reactions associated with the higher repression scores. The

¹ Although the correlation could well have occurred by chance (probability for obtained \( t = .40 \)), the relationship is great enough to make one wonder whether such was the case, or whether a true relationship exists which was not significant due to the degree of error involved. This question will have to be left for future research to answer.
second method involved an evaluation of the difference between the mean of Ss who fitted the behavioral description of "strongly inhibited" hostility (as judged by at least three judges) with the mean of the rest of the group on per cent of hostile cartoons judged funny to total cartoons judged funny; on Q-sort score of favorable reaction to hostility in cartoons; on spontaneous expressive reaction measure of per cent favorable expression to total expression for hostile cartoons; on self-rating score of hostility; and on the repression score (Table 3). When the differences in response to hostile cartoons between those Ss who were strongly inhibited in hostility and others was evaluated by means of t tests, no significant differences were obtained (Table 3). The inhibited Ss did not demonstrate a greater repression score when their mean other minus self score was compared with that of the rest of the group.
Table 3
Summary of means, standard deviations, and t's for the group judged most repressed and the rest of the group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Judged most repressed</th>
<th>Rest of the group</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-rating of hostility</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean rating of hostility by others minus self-rating of hostility</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of hostile cartoons placed in funny bin to total number of cartoons placed in funny bin</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hostile score</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% favorable expression to the total expression for hostile cartoons</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

It was hypothesized that as unacceptability of hostility increased, up to a point, there would occur an increase in favorable response to hostile cartoons; but when the repression (unacceptability) became sufficiently great, even the expression of hostility in humor would be threatening, and a negative reaction would follow.

The results supported the first part of the hypothesis, but failed to support the second part. A rather high degree of relationship (biserial correlation of .60), considering the probable limited reliability of the measures, was obtained between repression of hostility and spontaneous favorable reaction to hostile cartoons. In regard to the hypothesized relationship between greater repression and unfavorable reaction to cartoons, two different measures yielded negative findings. For one, there was no indication that the highest repression scores, when measured by average rating by others minus self-rating, were associated with a decrease in favorable reaction to hostile cartoons. Secondly, the few Ss judged by others to be the most overinhibited in expression of hostility failed to show excessive unfavorable reaction to hostile cartoons.

It is doubtful, however, whether this second measure was an adequate indicator of repression as Ss found difficulty in
making the judgments. Also, because those Ss finally selected failed to have high repression scores as measured by the first measure. Those selected may have been merely docile without it being a reaction formation to repressed hostility.

As to the first measure, one reason why it may have failed to reveal a relationship between intense hostility and negative reactions to hostile cartoons, aside from the possibility that such a relationship may not exist, is that the sample did not include individuals with a sufficient degree of repression. It would not be surprising if it is rare among University Ss to repress hostility to the extent of reacting with distaste to hostility cartoons, but that such behavior might be found in patients with pathological repressions. This remains to be determined.

The question may be raised as to why a significant relationship was only found when spontaneous expressive reaction was used as the measure of response to cartoons. Although there is every reason to believe that the other measures were more reliable, it may well be that the essence of the humor response is at least distorted if not entirely destroyed when a conscious evaluation of the humor is required. In light of the highly significant correlation found between a measure of repressed hostility and spontaneous expressive reaction to hostile cartoons, but with no
other measure of reaction to hostile cartoons, further investigation in the area of spontaneous expressive reactions is desirable. Particularly indicated is a need for establishing the reliability of this measure. This might be accomplished by determining the amount of agreement between several judges in evaluating spontaneous expressive reaction as measured in the present study. If sufficiently high reliability were found, it might be feasible to utilize expressive reactions to cartoons as a clinical method for discovering areas of repression in individuals rather than in groups. In this connection it should be understood that the present study was concerned with evaluating a theory, and not with individual prediction. Thus, if relatively low reliability were obtained, in so far as support for the theory under consideration is concerned, it would be indicated that the size of the true relationship between repression and spontaneous expressive reaction to humor might be yet greater than the one obtained. The importance of spontaneous expression as a response to cartoons and the difference between it and conscious sortings has been previously reported (9).

Behavioral hostility as judged by those who have observed in his everyday behavior for over a year failed to reveal a relationship between hostility and reaction to hostile cartoons. A self-reference viewpoint, namely, one's
own judgment of his own hostility, yielded a somewhat higher relationship, but it too was not statistically significant. However, when the self-rating was taken in relation to behavior as seen by others, the discrepancy being used as an index of repression, a relatively high relationship was found which was statistically significant. It may be that in other studies, as well, an approach using a self-reference viewpoint in relation to a behavioral viewpoint would yield more significant findings than either approach alone.
SUMMARY

The present study investigated the hypothesis that repression of hostile impulses up to a point is favorable to a humorous response to hostile cartoons; but beyond that point, even the expression of hostility in humor would be threatening and a negative reaction would follow.

Thirty-two undergraduate college males from the same fraternity who had known each other at least one year participated as Ss. Each S was seen individually and given a set of 32 cartoons (16 hostile, 16 matched control) which he sorted into "funny," "mediocre," and "not funny" categories. At the same time a notation was made of his spontaneous expressive reaction to each of the cartoons. Ss were then instructed to sort the cartoons on a Q-board from most funny to least funny. Thus, three measures of reaction to hostile cartoons were obtained: first sort, Q-sort, and spontaneous expressive reaction. Each S then sorted the names of all other Ss in the study as to degree of hostility manifested in everyday behavior. Three hostility scores were thereby obtained: a score of self-rating of hostility, a score of average rating of hostility by others, and a score of the discrepancy between average rating by others and self-rating. This latter measure was
interpreted as an index of repression.

The results supported the first part of the hypothesis when the measure of humorous reaction was determined by spontaneous expressive behavior, but not when it was determined by two different sorting techniques. The study failed to support a prediction that the most repressed individuals would react negatively to hostile cartoons. This latter finding may have been a function of the sample not including Ss with sufficiently intense repression. Further work with pathologically repressed individuals is indicated to determine whether such was the case.
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APPENDIX

Hostile cartoons with no provocation depicted

"But on the other hand, it might not be full of spades."

"Don't worry, Joe! With him as the groom, it's bound to be a simple wedding!"

"Nice try!"

"Jack 'em up!"
Control cartoons with no hostility depicted.
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