

Instructions for Blind Peer Coders

Participants were asked to fill out questionnaires assessing personality and write responses to an email. Creativity is assessed using Howrigan & MacDonald (2008) Humour Response Task in which participants were asked the following:

For this task, I want you to imagine that you've just received an e-mail by a fellow student asking if you could write some responses to the questions posed below. Your fellow student mentions that this is for a school project on the diversity of humorous responses, and asks that you try to write something funny for each question.

Please write at least 5-7 sentences and do not provide any identifying information (e.g., names of people you know or yourself, address, phone number).

1. *"If you could experience what it's like to be a different kind of animal for a day, what kind of animal would you not want to be, and why?"*
2. *"How would you make a marriage exciting after the first couple of years?"*
3. *"What do you think the world will be like in a hundred years?"*

Your job as the coder, unaware of study hypotheses, will code the content for creativity on the item: "How witty do you consider this response to be?" (1 = not at all, 5 = very much), originality "How original do you consider this response to be? (1 = not at all, 5 = very much), and use of lighthearted and mockery styles of humour "to what extent did the individual use humour in their sentence? (0 = no evidence of humour 1 = little humour 2 = some humour/lots of humour)".

Please see the next page for the rubric:

Coding Scheme for the Wittiness and Originality Scoring of the Responses Generated by Participants in the Creativity Task (please note: ; refers to OR, it does not need every criteria in the box to meet for a score)

Score	Level	Wittiness coding scheme	Originality coding scheme
5	Very high	Skilled play with ambiguities; creates thrilled surprise; invented additional information and details give the response an unexpected twist; artistically plays with sense and nonsense	Based on unusual associations that make sense; has an indirect or remote, but meaningful relation to the content provided; interprets the content in relation to an abnormal context
4	High	Is characterized by fascinating absurdity; successful word plays; wittily reverses expectations; matching transfer of absurd concepts; plays effectively with stereotypes	Skillfully combines aspects of the content that at first glance seems unrelated; thinks outside the box; overrides dominant impressions
3	Medium	Effectively represents physically impossible and unrealistic things; shows new and astonishing perspectives	Interprets the stimulus in an abstract, but still obvious way; chooses a form that is suggested by the stimulus; does not much think out of the box
2	Low	Unrealistic things and overstatements/understatements seem profane/ordinary; reinterpreting or applying idioms and word plays does not create surprise; idea is not effective or is only adumbrated due to lack of elaboration	Hardly disengages from dominant stimuli; does not transcend closely related terms and associations; lack of elaboration that only adumbrates the meaningful relationship of the unusual associations with the stimulus
1	Very low	Relationship of content and response is not convincing; describes real facts according to expectations; sheer reproduction of the depicted situation without an element of surprise	Only describes the stimulus; the writing along with the stimulus does not make sense and creates incomprehension
N/A	Missing	Responses that did not comply to the instructions (e.g., “without words”, “can’t think of anything”, “(not) funny”, “no comment”, “cfigzcfz”)	

Light hearted Rating: To what extent *did the individual use lighthearted humour in their response?*

Definition (could include the following): Mindfully detecting the incongruities in life, the capacity to describe them, and the relaxedness to deal with them in a lighthearted way; good-natured kidding, brightening others up, indulging in gibberish talk, and playing with meaning, sense and nonsense; shows wit, humor, fun, and/or nonsense

0=no evidence of lighthearted humour

1= little lighthearted humour used

2= some lighthearted humour/lots of lighthearted humour

Mockery Styles of Humour Rating

Definition: having malicious, mean-spirited goals and attitudes; intentions of hurting other people; demonstrating superiority, shows cynicism, sarcasm, satire, and/or irony

To what extent *did the individual use mockery styles of humour in their response?*

0=no evidence of humour

1= little humour used

2= some humour/lots of humour