

# **A funny companion: Distinct neural responses to perceived AI- versus human-generated humor**

Xiaohui Rao<sup>1</sup>, Hanlin Wu<sup>1</sup>, Zhenguang G. Cai<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Linguistics and Modern Languages <sup>2</sup> Brain and Mind Institute  
The Chinese University of Hong Kong Hong Kong SAR

## **ABSTRACT**

As AI companions become capable of human-like communication, including telling jokes, understanding how people cognitively and emotionally respond to AI humor becomes increasingly important. This study used electroencephalography (EEG) to compare how people process humor from AI versus human sources. Behavioral analysis revealed that participants rated AI and human humor as comparably funny. However, neurophysiological data showed that AI humor elicited a smaller N400 effect, suggesting reduced cognitive effort during the processing of incongruity. This was accompanied by a larger Late Positive Potential (LPP), indicating a greater degree of surprise and emotional response. This enhanced LPP likely stems from the violation of low initial expectations regarding AI's comedic capabilities. Furthermore, a key temporal dynamic emerged: human humor showed habituation effects, marked by an increasing N400 and a decreasing LPP over time. In contrast, AI humor demonstrated increasing processing efficiency and emotional reward, with a decreasing N400 and an increasing LPP. This trajectory reveals how the brain can dynamically update its predictive model of AI capabilities. This process of cumulative reinforcement challenges “algorithm aversion” in humor, as it demonstrates how cognitive adaptation to AI's language patterns can lead to an intensified emotional reward. Additionally, participants' social attitudes toward AI modulated these neural responses, with higher perceived AI trustworthiness correlating with enhanced emotional engagement. These findings indicate that the brain responds to AI humor with surprisingly positive and intense reactions, highlighting humor's potential for fostering genuine engagement in human-AI social interaction.

## INTRODUCTION

The rise of Large Language Models (LLMs) has marked a leap in artificial intelligence (AI), creating social agents capable of human-like language communication (e.g., Cai et al., 2024). These models are no longer just tools for text generation; they are increasingly integrated into social contexts, serving as psychological chatbots for mental health support (Casu et al., 2024), virtual tutors in educational settings (García-Méndez et al., 2024), reading companions for children (Liu et al., 2022), and AI friends (Maples et al., 2024). This integration raises questions about the nature of human-AI social interaction and the cognitive and emotional processes at play when humans engage with content traditionally considered the exclusive domain of human expressions.

One of the most complicated forms of human expressions is humor. Its comprehension and appreciation are not just about understanding words, requiring the ability to detect and resolve incongruity, social cognition and the interplay of various individual factors (Canal et al., 2019). Traditionally viewed as a unique human trait and a social glue that fosters cooperation and reduces social distance (Sherman, 1988), humor's landscape is evolving. Notably, AI companions are now capable of generating humor, such as puns (Chen et al., 2024), with some AI-generated jokes even indistinguishable from those created by humans (Gorenz & Schwarz, 2024; Joshi, 2025). However, the social functions of humor may hinge not only on its quality but also on the perceived source and intent (Martin & Ford, 2018). This leads to a question: when humans encounter high-quality AI-generated humor, does the brain's processing differ based on whether the source is perceived as artificial?

A challenge for AI companions is algorithm aversion, defined as the human tendency to prefer human over algorithmic judgment (Castelo et al., 2019). This aversion frequently occurs in social interaction, as it is a domain requiring uniquely human traits like personal taste, intuition, or experience (Bower & Steyvers, 2021). The findings from a series of nine studies by Rubin et al. (2025) illustrate this challenge: responses believed to be AI-generated were perceived to be less empathetic and supportive—and more emotionally negative—than those believed to be human-

generated. This bias extends to how people perceive being understood: while participants reported being heard more often by AI than by humans when the source was unknown, this effect reversed when the source was known, with human responses being preferred (Yin et al., 2024). This preference for human-generated content highlights a deeper issue: current AI models lack the capacity to “feel with us” (Perry, 2023; Shteynberg et al., 2024). While AI can mimic expressions of empathy, a key viewpoint in the literature is that their responses are largely based on an analysis of linguistic patterns rather than a genuine cognitive, affective, or motivational state (Chen et al., 2023; Rubin et al., 2024). They do not share our pain or joy, and their output requires no effort on their part. This lack of authentic caring, a key component of human empathy, may be why disclosing AI involvement diminishes the perceived social and emotional benefits of an interaction (Rubin et al., 2025).

Interestingly, while human-AI interaction requiring empathy suffer from a critical “caring” deficit, this bias is not absolute in the domain of humor. Research has shown that, when joke source was not provided, participants tended to attribute low-quality, human-generated jokes to AI, rating perceived AI-attributed jokes as less funny than those attributed to humans. However, when joke sources were disclosed, this aversion disappeared—identical human-generated jokes received similar funniness ratings regardless of whether they were labeled as human- or AI-created. This indicates that if there are aversions toward AI in this domain, they are easily overcome when presented with counterevidence such as well-received jokes framed as AI-created (Bower & Steyvers, 2021). Furthermore, people’s appreciation for AI-generated humor increases with repeated exposure (Joshi, 2025), indicating these attitudes are malleable. One possible reason for such malleability is that biases against AI are easily countered by evidence of its competence (Bower & Steyvers, 2021). Alternatively, humor perception may function independently of empathetic understanding, operating primarily through cognitive mechanisms of incongruity detection and resolution (Suls, 1972). Consequently, humor may be a domain where AI can achieve social success, offering a pathway to mitigate algorithm aversion and reduce social distance between AI companions and humans.

Early research distinguished machine from human joke-tellers based on two key factors: joke quality and perceived sociability. Binsted and Ritchie (1994) found that jokes produced by AI of the time were described as “pathetic ones” by schoolchildren. Concurrently, Morkes et al. (1999) reported that people felt less sociable and experienced less mirth when interacting with a computer compared to communicating with another human via a computer, suggesting that low machine sociability hindered effective joke-telling. However, as AI has evolved into a more advanced social agent, recent studies indicate this gap is narrowing. Avetisyan et al. (2023) demonstrated AI’s capacity to generate humorous and novel content. This is further supported by Gorenz and Schwarz (2024), who found that jokes generated by ChatGPT 3.5 were rated as equally humorous as, and sometimes even more humorous than human-generated jokes in a masked evaluation. Similarly, Joshi (2025) reported that participants struggled to differentiate between human- and AI-generated jokes. Taken together, these studies suggest that the perceived gap in humorous communication between humans and machines is narrowing, a finding that challenges earlier research on AI’s limitations as a social agent.

Despite the development of LLM-powered AI in generating humorous content, how people cognitively and emotionally comprehend humor from AI companions remains largely unexplored. Suls’s (1972) two-stage model of humor comprehension, supported by EEG studies on human-human interaction (e.g., Canal et al., 2019), provides a useful framework. The first stage is related to incongruity detection. Take a joke (e.g., a pun) for instance, *A bicycle cannot stand on its own because it is two-tired* (Zheng & Wang, 2023). The listener simultaneously activates the pun’s literal meaning, which is congruent with the bicycle’s two wheels, and its homophonic counterpart, “too tired”. This second meaning, though literally incongruous for an inanimate object, humorously applies a human state to the bicycle. This detection process is usually indexed by the N400 component—a negative deflection peaking around 400 ms post-stimulus. This response is more pronounced for humorous content than for non-humorous content. The N400, sensitive to predictability and semantic congruence (Kutas & Federmeier, 2011), reflects the brain’s response to semantic incongruity

during initial humor processing (Coulson & Kutas, 2001; Du et al., 2013; Ku et al., 2017). The second stage encompasses incongruity resolution, comprising both cognitive and emotional processes. The cognitive process, usually associated with the P600—a positive deflection around 600 ms post-stimulus—reflects active conflict resolution processes (Ku et al., 2017). In some cases, the initial N400 component was long-lasting, also indicating sustained cognitive efforts in conflict processing (Coulson & Kutas, 2001; Mayerhofer & Schacht, 2015). The emotional process emerges when listeners successfully integrate the competing interpretations (linking “two tires” to “too tired”). This successful elaboration is usually indexed by the Late Positive Potential (LPP), which reflects the emotional experience of mirth, amusement, or reward of “getting the joke” (Chang et al., 2018; Ku et al., 2017).

Importantly, the perception of humor is also influenced by expectations about the joke-teller. Johnson and Mistry (2013) found that when a joke was attributed to a named comedian, prior exposure to that individual primed an expectation of humor, which in turn influenced humor ratings. This aligns with the theory of interlocutor modeling, where people construct a model of their conversation partner to adjust their language production (Cai et al., 2021) and comprehension (Cai, 2022; Wu & Cai, 2024a; Wu, Duan, & Cai, 2024). Interlocutor modelling, or the integration of the speaker identity into language comprehension, may be particularly relevant for human-AI interaction, especially when considering human comprehension. Research has shown that human comprehension of semantic and syntactic anomalies differs between AI and human sources, as people’s expectations about AI’s attributes modulate their processing (Rao et al., 2024). Specifically, Rao et al. (2024) demonstrated that people perceive AI to be superb at grammatical competence but susceptible to semantic hallucination. These perceptions lead to a smaller N400 effect for semantic anomalies and a larger P600 effect for syntactic anomalies in texts believed to be AI-generated, suggesting that our brains process language from AI with distinct expectations. Therefore, it is plausible that humor comprehension from an AI companion activates distinct expectations and cognitive pathways. Understanding these neural differences is crucial for creating AI companions that can genuinely connect with people.

To move beyond subjective funniness ratings, which are susceptible to reporting biases (Silvia et al., 2021; Suls, 1983), our study utilizes EEG to examine the cognitive and emotional processes underlying humor comprehension from an AI companion versus a human. Based on the established two-stage model of humor processing (Suls, 1972) and the theory of interlocutor modeling (Cai, 2022; Wu & Cai, 2024a; Wu, Duan, & Cai, 2024), we hypothesize that the brain's cognitive responses to humor will differ based on the source. Recent research shows that people's expectations of AI's capabilities, such as its propensity for semantic hallucination (Maynez et al., 2020; Rawte et al., 2023) and syntactic proficiency, modulate their language processing (Rao et al., 2024). Extending this to humor, we propose a set of exploratory hypotheses. We expect that humor (i.e., a pun) from AI will elicit a different pattern of ERP components compared to that from human. Specifically, we tentatively predict that people may be less sensitive to semantic incongruity in AI humor, given that they may have lower expectations for AI's semantic and logical consistency (Rao et al., 2024) or for its competence in generating humor with complex semantic incongruities. This may be reflected in a smaller N400 for AI humor. We predict that people may exert less cognitive efforts during incongruity resolution, indexed by smaller P600 or sustained reduced N400 components, as people may not be as engaged in fully processing the joke's intended meaning when they know it comes from a non-sentient AI. We anticipate that the LPP, a marker of emotional engagement, may be larger for AI humor, as people may find it surprising and amusing when AI tells good jokes. We also explore whether people's social perceptions of AI, such as perceived trustworthiness (Flanagin & Metzger, 2003) and sincerity (Liu & Sundar, 2018), modulate these neural responses.

## **METHODS**

### ***Participants***

Sixty-four neurologically healthy, native Mandarin speakers (28 males; mean age 22.6 years, range 18-35) were initially recruited. Seven participants were later excluded for reasons detailed below, leaving a final sample of 57 participants for data analysis. All participants gave informed written consent before participation. The study protocol was

approved by the Joint Chinese University of Hong Kong-New Territories East Cluster Clinical Research Ethics Committee.

### ***Design and materials***

We adopted a 2 (Type: humor vs control) × 2 (Source: AI vs human) factorial design. Type was manipulated within both participants and items, while Source was manipulated between participants and within items.

We developed ninety Mandarin jokes for the humor condition (see <https://osf.io/8796a> for the entire set of stimuli, data, and analysis scripts), which were either collected from online sources and books or were adapted from existing research on Mandarin humor (e.g., Feng et al., 2014; Li et al., 2025). The jokes were all puns in a question-and-answer format, with each setup containing 10-17 characters and each punchline containing four. For example, a pun was created when a word like 龟 (turtle, *gui*) in the setup sounded similar to, but had a different meaning and character from, the word 归 (return, *gui*) in the punchline. The humor stems from the unexpected connection between two logically unrelated meanings, linked only by their shared sound. We excluded aggressive and dark humors from the materials, reducing the elicited negative connotations and emotions. In a pretest, one hundred puns were rated by 20 participants who were not involved in the formal experiment on a 5-point Likert scale regarding to what extent they thought a pun was comprehensible and funny (1: not at all; 5: very much). Puns with an average rating below 3 in either comprehensibility (*how comprehensible was the joke?*) or funniness (*how funny was the joke?*) were discarded. We eventually selected 90 puns for the experiment (see Table 1 for example), with an average rating of 4.26 (*SD* = 0.45) for comprehensibility and an average of 3.69 for funniness (*SD* = 0.37). For the control condition, we created matched, non-humorous stimuli by using the same four-character punchlines with setups that prompted their non-punning, dictionary-based interpretations.

**Table 1.** Examples of the experimental materials.

Type	Setup sentence	Punchline
Humor	乌龟 的 心 是 弓箭 形状 的。 <i>Wu<sub>1</sub>gui<sub>1</sub> de xin<sub>1</sub>shi<sub>4</sub> gong<sub>1</sub>jian<sub>4</sub>xing<sub>2</sub>zhuang<sub>4</sub> de.</i> The heart of a turtle is shaped like an arrow.	归心似箭 <i>gui<sub>1</sub>xin<sub>1</sub>si<sub>4</sub>jian<sub>4</sub></i> yearn to return home immediately
Control	渴望 回家 的 心 非常 强烈。 <i>Ke<sub>3</sub>wang<sub>4</sub> hui<sub>2</sub>jia<sub>1</sub> de xin<sub>1</sub> fei<sub>1</sub>chang<sub>2</sub> qiang<sub>2</sub>lie<sub>4</sub>.</i> The longing for home is incredibly strong.	归心似箭 <i>gui<sub>1</sub>xin<sub>1</sub>si<sub>4</sub>jian<sub>4</sub></i> yearn to return home immediately


*Note:* 归 (return, *gui<sub>1</sub>*) is phonetically identical to 龟 (turtle, *gui<sub>1</sub>*). Combined with 心 (heart, *xin<sub>1</sub>*) and 似箭 (be like an arrow, *si<sub>4</sub>jian<sub>4</sub>*), the expression yields a homophonic alternative meaning that “The heart of a turtle is shaped like an arrow”.

### ***Procedure***

**General perception of chatbots.** Participants reported their general perception of AI chatbots in terms of trust and sincerity on a 1 to 7 semantic differential scale (i.e., a type of rating scale that uses bipolar adjectives) based on their previous experience. Firstly, in line with previous studies (e.g., Flanagin & Metzger, 2003; Rheu et al., 2024), three items (dishonest to honest, untrustworthy to trustworthy, unreliable to reliable) were used to measure participants’ trustworthiness of AI chatbots. Secondly, three items (insincere to sincere, artificial to genuine, performed to heartfelt) were used to evaluate participants’ perception of sincerity of AI chatbots (see also Liu & Sundar, 2018; Rheu et al., 2024). Participants in the AI condition completed these measures before the EEG experiment to capture initial perceptions, while those in the human condition completed them post-experiment to avoid compromising interaction authenticity.

**EEG experiment.** We employed the Wizard-of-Oz method to mitigate the influence of the confounding factors (Kelley, 1984): participants were introduced to believe that

they were interacting with an AI chatbot or a human peer, which was, in fact, a procedure via E-Prime 3.0 controlled by the experimenter. Participants in this EEG experiment were placed in a soundproof booth. They were divided into two groups: the AI condition and the human condition. Those in the AI condition were informed they would read jokes told by an AI companion (chatbot), and, to reinforce this, first interacted with the AI companion (i.e., an in-house interface with GPT-4 API) in Mandarin Chinese for three minutes. Participants in the human group, conversely, were told they would read jokes told by a human peer. Specifically, as illustrated in Figure 1, following a fixation (i.e., participants were informed this indicated that their partner was typing) appearing for 1 s, a picture of an AI companion or a human appeared, which reinforced participants’ impression of their interlocutor. The human interlocutors consisted of both a male and a female to ensure a balanced design. At the same time, a setup sentence “sent by the interlocutor” appeared for 10 seconds, during which participants need to guess a four-character expression. They were required to press the spacebar once they had made a guess. After a response or time-out, the answer (punchline) would be “disclosed by the interlocutor” for 3 s. Finally, participants read the punchline and reported the outcome of their guess as either correct, incorrect, or no idea. They then rated to what extent they thought this joke was funny and comprehensible (two separate ratings) on a 5-point Likert scale.



**Figure1.** The paradigm of the EEG experiment.

**Manipulation check for interlocutor.** To check whether participants believed that they were interacting with an AI chatbot or a person, after the EEG experiment, we asked them to recall and report their belief about the joke-teller’s identity they just had interacted with (Rheu et al., 2024). Sixty-three participants’ responses aligned with the experimental condition (i.e., they identified their interlocutor as a human or an AI

companion as intended), confirming the success of the manipulation; data from one participant in the human condition, who provided an irrelevant response (“a PC”), was excluded from the final analysis.

### ***EEG recording and preprocessing.***


EEG data were collected from participants using 128 active Ag/AgCl electrodes, following an extended 10-20 system and online-referenced to the left earlobe. Signals were recorded with a g.HIamp amplifier and digitized at 1200 Hz, with electrode impedances kept below 30 k $\Omega$ . Preprocessing involved customized scripts and the FieldTrip toolbox (Oostenveld et al., 2011) in MATLAB. Raw data were bandpass-filtered (0.1-30 Hz), and re-referenced to the average of both earlobes (Luck, 2014). For our high-density EEG data, Independent Component Analysis was applied to the 1-30 Hz filtered data with dimensionality reduction to 30 components to identify and remove ocular artifacts (Luck, 2022; Ghandeharion & Erfanian, 2010; Winkler et al., 2011). Data were then epoched from 200 ms before to 1800 ms after critical word onset, with a baseline correction by subtracting the mean amplitude from 200 ms to 0 ms before the critical word onset. Epochs exceeding  $\pm 150$   $\mu$ V were excluded (5.60 % of trials). Seven participants were excluded from analyses: six due to excessive EEG artifacts (>30% of trials) and one for failing the manipulation check. The final sample comprised 57 participants (32 females, 25 males; mean age 22.6 years). Trials where participants' guesses matched the punchline (31.26% of trials) were excluded, as the cognitive mechanisms for correctly guessing a punchline—likely involving predictive processing—are fundamentally different from the incongruity-resolution process central to humor comprehension (Suls, 1972). Funniness ratings also varied significantly between correct guesses ( $M = 2.12$ ,  $SD = 1.29$ ) and incorrect guesses ( $M = 2.55$ ,  $SD = 1.46$ ;  $t = -10.31$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

## **RESULTS**

### ***Behaviorial results***

We first conducted linear-mixed effect (LME) modelling on funniness ratings, with

Type (control = -0.5, humor = 0.5) and Source (human = -0.5, AI = 0.5) as main effects. Participant and Item were involved as random effects (see Table S1 for model structures). For all LME analyses, we used the maximal random-effect structure justified by the data and determined by forward model comparison ( $\alpha = 0.2$ , see Matuschek et al., 2017). The results showed a significant main effect of Type ( $\beta = 1.80$ ,  $SE = 0.11$ ,  $t = 16.29$ ,  $p < .001$ ). As shown in Figure 2, humorous stimuli ( $M = 3.33$ ,  $SD = 1.32$ ) were rated as significantly funnier than control stimuli ( $M = 1.54$ ,  $SD = 0.89$ ). The interaction between Type and Source was not significant ( $\beta = 0.36$ ,  $SE = 0.20$ ,  $t = 1.74$ ,  $p = .088$ ). This suggests that participants rated humorous and control stimuli as comparably funny, with no significant differences between the human (1.63) and AI (1.94) conditions see (Figure 2A).




**Figure 2.** (A) Mean funniness ratings across Type (Humor vs Control) and Source (Human vs AI); (B) Mean comprehensibility ratings across Type and Source.

We also carried out LME modelling on comprehensibility ratings, with Type (control = -0.5, humor = 0.5) and Source (human = -0.5, AI = 0.5) as main effects. Participant and Item served as random effects (see Table S1 for model structures). The results showed no significant main effect of Type ( $\beta = 0.08$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ,  $t = 1.11$ ,  $p = .272$ ), indicating that humorous stimuli ( $M = 4.17$ ,  $SD = 1.18$ ) were rated as similarly comprehensible to control stimuli ( $M = 4.04$ ,  $SD = 1.26$ ). Additionally, the interaction between Type and Source was not significant ( $\beta = 0.04$ ,  $SE = 0.11$ ,  $t = 0.34$ ,  $p = .735$ ), suggesting that participants were able to comprehend humorous and control stimuli

equally well, with no significant differences between the human (0.118) and AI (0.147) conditions (see Figure 2B).

### ***Overview of EEG results***

Our analyses of EEG amplitude focused on two key time windows after critical word onset: 300-900 ms and 1000-1800 ms. These windows were selected based on visual inspection of grand average ERP data (Figure 3) and established literature on the N400 (e.g., Kutas & Federmeier, 2011) and LPP (e.g., Ku et al., 2017; Dennis & Hajcak, 2009), respectively. The extended 300-900 ms window of the N400 captures the sustained negativity commonly observed in humor processing, reflecting prolonged cognitive effort during conflict detection and resolution (Coulson & Kutas, 2001; Mayerhofer & Schacht, 2015). LME models were applied to the mean amplitudes within these windows for each trial, as LME methods are considered more robust than traditional ANOVA-based approaches in amplitude analyses (Frömer et al., 2018).



**Figure 3.** (A) Amplitudes of humors and controls; (B) Amplitudes of humors and controls in the human and AI conditions

### *Topography analyses*

To investigate the topographical distribution of Type effects on EEG amplitudes, we conducted posteriority and laterality analyses following earlier practice (e.g., Martin et al., 2016; Wu & Cai, 2024b). Scalp sites were divided into four regions: left-anterior, right-anterior, left-posterior, and right-posterior, with each region comprising 17 sites (see Table S2). Mean amplitudes were collapsed across all sites within each region.

For the posteriority analysis, we fit LME models with Type, Source, and Posteriority (anterior = -0.5, posterior = 0.5) as interacting main effects (see Table S3 for model structures). In the 300-900 ms time window, there was no significant three-way interaction of Type  $\times$  Source  $\times$  Posteriority ( $\beta = -0.71$ ,  $SE = 0.59$ ,  $t = -1.21$ ,  $p = .225$ )

or significant two-way interaction of Type  $\times$  Posteriority ( $\beta = -0.05$ ,  $SE = 0.29$ ,  $t = -0.19$ ,  $p = .853$ ). However, in the 1000-1800 ms window, a significant Type  $\times$  Posteriority interaction emerged ( $\beta = -1.31$ ,  $SE = 0.40$ ,  $t = -3.30$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating differential scalp topographies for Type effects. Subsequent analyses revealed a significant main effect of Type ( $\beta = 1.27$ ,  $SE = 0.51$ ,  $t = 2.47$ ,  $p = .016$ ) and a significant Type  $\times$  Source interaction over anterior sites ( $\beta = 2.61$ ,  $SE = 1.11$ ,  $t = 2.36$ ,  $p = .021$ ). The interaction reflected a larger Type effect for AI humor (2.48  $\mu$ V) than for human humor (0.04  $\mu$ V). Conversely, over posterior sites, there was no significant main effect of Type ( $\beta = -0.06$ ,  $SE = 0.55$ ,  $t = -0.12$ ,  $p = .907$ ) or significant interaction between Type and Source ( $\beta = 1.68$ ,  $SE = 1.10$ ,  $t = 1.52$ ,  $p = .132$ ), suggesting comparable Type effects between AI and human conditions.


Similarly, a laterality analysis was performed, using LME models with Type, Source, and Laterality (left = -0.5, right = 0.5) as interacting main effects (see Table S3). In both the 300-900 ms and 1000-1800 ms windows, there was no significant three-way interaction of Type  $\times$  Source  $\times$  Laterality (300-900 ms:  $\beta = 0.09$ ,  $SE = 0.59$ ,  $t = 0.16$ ,  $p = .874$ ; 1000-1800 ms:  $\beta < 0.001$ ,  $SE = 0.80$ ,  $t < 0.001$ ,  $p = .999$ ) or significant two-way interaction of Type  $\times$  Laterality (300-900 ms:  $\beta = -0.09$ ,  $SE = 0.30$ ,  $t = -0.31$ ,  $p = .759$ ; 1000-1800 ms:  $\beta = -0.75$ ,  $SE = 0.40$ ,  $t = -1.87$ ,  $p = .062$ ).

Collectively, topographical analyses showed that the Type effect was more pronounced over anterior sites than posterior sites in the 1000-1800 ms window, but not the 300-900 ms window, and exhibited no hemispheric asymmetry.

### ***ROI analyses***

Based on the topography analyses, we selected two distinct ROIs (Region of Interest) for subsequent amplitude analyses. For the 300-900 ms window, the ROI comprised 49 whole-brain sites, while for the 1000-1800 ms window, the ROI consisted of 41 anterior sites (see Figure 4). In both cases, instead of collapsing the data within each ROI, we kept the individual channel data. This let us include Channel as a random effect in our LME models, consistent with the methods used by Ryskin et al. (2021) and Wu and Cai (2024b).

Our primary focus was to compare participants' neural responses to humor from AI versus from human sources. We fit LME models with Type and Source as interacting main effects for the mean amplitude, and Participant, Item and Channel as random effects within each time window (see Table 2 for model structures). The results revealed a significant interaction between Type and Source during 300-900 ms ( $\beta = 1.24$ ,  $SE = 0.10$ ,  $t = 12.18$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and during 1000-1800 ms ( $\beta = 2.51$ ,  $SE = 0.17$ ,  $t = 14.76$ ,  $p < .001$ ). In the 300-900 ms window, separate analyses showed a significant main effect of Type in both the human ( $\beta = -1.36$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ,  $t = -18.39$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and AI conditions ( $\beta = -0.22$ ,  $SE = 0.08$ ,  $t = -2.75$ ,  $p = .007$ ), such that humorous stimuli elicited more negative deflections compared to control stimuli (the N400 effect) in both conditions, while the N400 effect to AI humor ( $-0.26 \mu\text{V}$ ) was smaller than that to human humor ( $-1.31 \mu\text{V}$ ). In the 1000-1800 ms window, separate analyses showed significant main effects of Type in both the human ( $\beta = 0.25$ ,  $SE = 0.12$ ,  $t = 2.02$ ,  $p = 0.044$ ) and AI conditions ( $\beta = 2.34$ ,  $SE = 0.12$ ,  $t = 19.05$ ,  $p < .001$ ), such that humorous stimuli elicited positive deflections compared to control stimuli (the LPP effect) in the later time window in both conditions, while the LPP effect to AI humor ( $2.68 \mu\text{V}$ ) was significantly larger compared to that to human humor ( $0.27 \mu\text{V}$ ).



**Figure 4.** (A) The regions used in the ROI analysis during 300-900 ms after the critical stimulus onset; (B) The regions used in the ROI analysis during 1000-1800 ms after the critical stimulus onset; (C, D) Topographies of Type effects during 300-900 ms and

1000-1800 ms after the critical stimulus onset. See Table S2 for a detailed list of channels.


**Table 2.** LME models for main ROI analyses.

Main effects	$\beta$	$SE$	$t$	$p$
N400 (300-900 ms)				
Intercept	4.08	0.54	7.53	< .001
Type	-0.74	0.05	-13.54	< .001
Source	0.70	1.00	0.70	.485
Type : Source	1.24	0.10	12.18	< .001
LPP (1000-1800 ms)				
Intercept	1.12	0.55	2.03	.046
Type	1.30	0.09	14.92	< .001
Source	-0.62	1.01	-0.61	.542
Type : Source	2.51	0.17	14.76	< .001

Model for main amplitude analysis (300-900 ms): Amplitude  $\sim$  Type\* Source + (1 | Participant) + (1 | Item) + (Type + 1 | Channel); Model for main amplitude analysis (1000-1800 ms): Amplitude  $\sim$  Type\* Source + (1 | Participant) + (1 | Item) + (1 | Channel)


As research shows that people dynamically adapt their mental model of the interlocutor (Wu, Rao, & Cai, 2025), we further explored how ERP amplitudes varied over time, by fitting LME models with Type, Source, and Trial as interacting main effects (see Table S4 for model structures). The results showed a significant three-way interaction in both the 300-900 ms window ( $\beta = 0.02$ ,  $SE = 0.004$ ,  $t = 4.75$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and the 1000-1800 ms window ( $\beta = 0.03$ ,  $SE = 0.01$ ,  $t = 4.06$ ,  $p < .001$ ). As illustrated in Figure 5, separate analyses within the 300-900 ms showed distinct patterns for each source. For the AI condition, the Type effect significantly decreased as a function of trial ( $\beta = -0.01$ ,  $SE = 0.003$ ,  $t = -3.79$ ,  $p < .001$ ), suggesting a reduction in cognitive effort related to conflict processing over time. Conversely, for the human condition, the Type effect significantly increased over trials ( $\beta = -0.03$ ,  $SE = 0.003$ ,  $t = -9.04$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating more cognitive effort exerted over time. In the 1000-1800 ms window, the trend was reversed. For the AI condition, the Type effect significantly increased as a function of trial ( $\beta = 0.03$ ,  $SE = 0.005$ ,  $t = 5.32$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating a growing emotional response over time. In contrast, the Type effect for the human condition

significantly decreased as a function of trial ( $\beta = 0.01$ ,  $SE = 0.005$ ,  $t = 2.53$ ,  $p = .011$ ), suggesting a diminishing emotional response over time.




**Figure 5.** ERP amplitudes during 300-900 ms and 1000-1800 ms across trials in the AI condition and the human condition.

To investigate whether neural responses in the AI condition were modulated by participants' perceptions of AI trustworthiness and sincerity, we fit LME models with Type and either Trust or Sincerity as interacting main effects (see Table S5 for model structures). During the 300-900 ms time window, as shown in Figure 6, we found that neural amplitudes in the AI condition significantly increased with perceived AI trustworthiness ( $\beta = 2.05$ ,  $SE = 0.76$ ,  $t = 2.69$ ,  $p = .012$ ) and sincerity ( $\beta = 1.43$ ,  $SE = 0.66$ ,  $t = 2.17$ ,  $p = .040$ ). Later, during the 1000-1800 ms time window, we observed a significant main effect of Trust ( $\beta = 3.08$ ,  $SE = 0.78$ ,  $t = 3.94$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and a significant interaction between Type and Trust ( $\beta = 0.26$ ,  $SE = 0.12$ ,  $t = 2.06$ ,  $p = .039$ ). Specifically, the LPP effect to AI humor was significantly larger for participants with high AI trustworthiness (2.81  $\mu$ V) compared to those with low AI trustworthiness (2.53  $\mu$ V; see Figure 7). This interaction suggests that the LPP effect increases as a function of perceived AI trustworthiness. There was no significant effect of Sincerity ( $\beta = -0.07$ ,  $SE = 0.77$ ,  $t = -0.09$ ,  $p = .933$ ) or two-way interaction of Type  $\times$  Sincerity ( $\beta = 0.28$ ,  $SE = 0.61$ ,  $t = 0.45$ ,  $p = .656$ ) in the 1000-1800 ms time window.




**Figure 6.** The modulative effect of Trust and Sincerity on the ERP amplitude during 300-900 ms in the AI condition



**Figure 7.** The modulative effect of Trust on the ERP amplitude across Type during 1000-1800 ms in the AI condition

Moreover, to determine whether the positive deflections during 1000-1800 ms were predicted by the perceived funniness of stimuli, we fit LME models with Source and Funniness as interacting main effects (see Table S6 for model structures). The results showed a significant main effect of Funniness during 1000-1800 ms ( $\beta = 0.40$ ,  $SE = 0.03$ ,  $t = 12.59$ ,  $p < .001$ ), such that the positive deflections during 1000-1800 ms increased as a function of people's feeling of funniness (see Figure 8).



**Figure 8.** The modulative effect of Funniness on the ERP amplitude during 1000-1800 ms

### ***Summary of EEG results***

Overall, humorous stimuli from both human and AI sources elicited similar neural components (i.e., N400, LPP). Nevertheless, the N400 effect to human humor was larger than that to AI humor, while the LPP effect to human humor was smaller than that to AI humor. As trials increased, the N400 effect to human humor grew larger, while the LPP effect diminished. In contrast, the N400 effect to AI humor decreased over time, suggesting greater cognitive efficiency, and the LPP effect progressively increased, reflecting an enhanced emotional response. Moreover, the amplitudes of humorous and control stimuli in the AI condition were modulated by people's perceived AI trustworthiness and sincerity during 300-900 ms. The LPP effect specifically increased as a function of perceived AI trustworthiness. Additionally, funniness ratings positively predicted the amplitudes of humorous and control stimuli during 1000-1800 ms.

### **DISCUSSION**

The present study investigated the people's neural responses during humor comprehension from AI versus human sources. Behavioral analysis of funniness ratings revealed a significant main effect of Type, with humorous stimuli rated as significantly funnier than control stimuli, validating the effectiveness of our humor manipulation. There was no significant difference in funniness ratings between humor from an AI companion and from a human, indicating that on a conscious level, participants found the humor comparably funny. We observed that the same ERP components were present in both AI and human conditions, indicating that the brain employs comparable processes for conflict processing and amusement derivation regardless of perceived source. This similarity broadly aligns with recent research suggesting that AI can effectively engage in social and emotional interaction with humans, potentially serving as viable social companions (Inzlicht et al., 2024; Ovsyannikova et al., 2025; Rubin et al., 2025). Despite these similarities, the magnitude and temporal dynamics of these components differed significantly between conditions.

Our results showed that humor from an AI companion elicited a smaller N400 effect than that from a human. Given that the N400 reflects cognitive effort during

semantic conflict processing in humor comprehension (Coulson & Kutas, 2001; Du et al., 2013; Ku et al., 2017; Mayerhofer & Schacht, 2015), the reduced N400 indicates that participants processed AI humor with diminished cognitive demand. The sustained N400 in humor processing typically encompasses both conflict detection and resolution phases (Coulson & Kutas, 2001; Mayerhofer & Schacht, 2015) in the absence of the P600, necessitating consideration of both mechanisms. Regarding incongruity detection, the smaller N400 for AI humor supports our prediction that participants would engage less vigilantly in semantic conflict detection when the source was AI, possibly because participants approached AI humor with reduced expectations for semantic coherence and logical consistency, consistent with previous findings on perceived AI-generated semantic anomalies (Rao et al., 2024). Another possibility is that lower expectations for AI's capacity to generate complex wordplay may diminish the cognitive effort in detecting incongruity. Concerning incongruity resolution, the sustained smaller N400 for AI humor may suggest shallow processing, where participants may be less motivated to fully infer pragmatic meaning from AI humor compared to from a human. These results demonstrate that perceived AI source modulates semantic conflict processing in humor comprehension, though the relative contributions of detection and resolution mechanisms warrant further investigation.

Conversely, our findings revealed that humor from an AI companion elicited a larger LPP effect than that from a human, indicating that AI humor elicited a larger emotional response than human one. The LPP reflects a later stage of processing associated with amusement, mirth, or reward after successfully "getting the joke" (Chang et al., 2018). Indeed, we found that perceived funniness positively predicted the LPP amplitudes in both AI and human conditions, indicating the LPP as a potential neural correlate of subjective humor experience and underscoring the validity of our findings. This result directly challenges, and adds a neural dimension to, the concept of algorithm aversion in humor (Castelo et al., 2019). While previous behavioral studies have shown people explicitly rate jokes as less funny when believed to be AI-generated (Bower & Steyvers, 2021), our EEG data provides novel physiological evidence suggesting a greater implicit positive affective response at the neural level for AI humor.

This effect presumably occurs because AI is perceived to be less likely to tell a joke, creating a greater sense of surprise when they do so. This unexpected comedic capability from an AI likely leads to a more intense, rewarding, and funnier experience for the human recipient, bypassing explicit biases in subjective ratings.

The dynamic changes observed over the course of the experiment revealed significant insights into how the brain adapts to different humor sources over time. As trials increased, the N400 effect to human humor grew larger, while the LPP effect diminished. This pattern suggests a process of habituation, where repeated exposure to a familiar humor style may reduce its novelty and emotional impact. The increasing N400 over time could reflect a growing cognitive effort to find novelty in increasingly predictable joke structures, while the decreasing LPP indicates a corresponding reduction in the associated emotional reward. In contrast, the neural responses to AI humor showed a completely opposite trajectory, with decreasing N400 amplitudes indicating reduced cognitive effort for conflict processing and increasing LPP amplitudes reflecting enhanced emotional engagement over time. This can be explained by the initial cognitive bias known as algorithm aversion (Bower & Steyvers, 2021; Castelo et al., 2019), which sets a low expectation for AI humor. The AI's well-received humor acts as a strong violation of this expectation, generating a positive reinforcement effect. As the brain becomes more cognitively efficient at processing the AI's joke-telling style (a decreasing N400 effect), the cumulative reward from these unexpected successes progressively increases (an increasing LPP effect). This neurophysiological evidence provides a mechanistic explanation for previous behavioral findings that people's appreciation for AI-generated humor increases with repeated exposure (Joshi, 2025).

This dynamic adaptation to humor from an AI companion provides a potential mechanism for mitigating algorithm aversion. While the literature suggests a critical "caring" deficit in human-AI interaction (Rubin et al., 2025), our findings support the idea that humor is a domain where AI's competence can effectively neutralize initial biases (Bower & Steyvers, 2021). The significant correlation between the LPP effect to AI humor and participants' perceived AI trustworthiness further supports this

interpretation. Participants who viewed AI more trustworthy showed a larger LPP, suggesting that favorable social attitudes toward the AI interlocutor led to a larger emotional response, possibly because the more trustworthy AI is perceived to be, the less likely to tell a joke, creating a greater sense of surprise and amusement when they do so. This phenomenon extends to the processing of AI language more broadly. Our results showed that neural amplitudes in the AI condition significantly increased (a reduced N400 effect) with perceived AI trustworthiness and sincerity, indicating decreased cognitive effort during early semantic retrieval stage. This is likely because the participants' positive expectations about the AI companion actively facilitated the language comprehension process. With a mental model of the AI as a reliable and trustworthy interlocutor, the brain may have been better primed to process its language, making it easier and faster to retrieve and integrate the semantic meaning of the words. This pattern indicates that social beliefs about the interlocutor—rather than the communicative content itself—modulate early semantic processing stages. This provides concrete evidence for interlocutor modeling effects (Cai et al., 2021; Wu & Cai, 2024a; Wu, Duan & Cai, 2024), demonstrating that people's mental models of their conversation partners—even non-human ones—actively influence humor comprehension at the neural level by altering the cognitive resources allocated to processing content from that source.

Our findings also align with a broader psychological phenomenon whereby people spontaneously attribute human-like characteristics to artificial agents. Previous research has documented this anthropomorphic tendency across multiple dimensions, showing that people attribute traits such as age (Dou et al., 2021; Powers & Kiesler, 2006), gender (Powers et al., 2005; Powers & Kiesler, 2006), language background (Cowan et al., 2019), and language competence (Dunn & Cai, 2025; Shen & Wang, 2023) to AI systems and adjust their interaction accordingly. These attributions suggest that people conceptualize AI as possessing specific knowledge bases and social profiles, which in turn shape their expectations and processing of AI-generated content.

These findings have important implications for human-AI interaction design. Our neural evidence demonstrates that humor from an AI companion elicits stronger

positive affective responses than identical content from a human, with this effect increasing with repeated exposure. This suggests humor represents a promising domain for overcoming algorithm aversion, as users exhibit genuine neural engagement with AI humor despite potential explicit biases. Furthermore, the correlation between positive social perceptions of AI and reduced cognitive effort in humor processing offers specific design guidance: AI systems that cultivate positive social impressions may benefit from enhanced processing efficiency and user engagement. Nevertheless, the implementation of AI humor must also recognize when authentic human connection is paramount. Human-generated content may be more beneficial in some social situations requiring genuine emotional resonance, shared vulnerability, or deeply personal understanding (Rubin et al., 2025). The challenge lies in identifying these critical moments where human humorous expression carries irreplaceable social and emotional value, allowing AI humor to complement rather than replace meaningful human interaction. This mechanistic understanding facilitates more targeted approaches to developing socially competent AI companions that enhance, rather than supplant, human social bonds.

## **CONCLUSION**

While humor from both human and AI sources engages similar core neural responses for conflict processing and amusement derivation, the magnitude and dynamic patterns of these responses reveal that humor from an AI companion elicits a reduced cognitive effort (smaller N400) and a larger emotional reward (larger LPP) than humor from a human. This neural-level preference, which appears to bypass the explicit biases of algorithm aversion, is a result of the brain's dynamic adaptation to a novel source. As the brain learns to process AI humor more efficiently, the cumulative effect of successful jokes that defy initial low expectations leads to a progressively enhanced sense of amusement. This underscores that a person's mental model of their conversation partner—even a non-human one—actively influences humor comprehension at a neural level. Ultimately, our findings suggest that humor is a potent tool for fostering genuine user engagement and serves as a promising domain for

mitigating initial algorithmic biases in human-AI social interactions.

## REFERENCES

- Avetisyan, H., Safikhani, P., & Broneske, D. (2023, December). Laughing Out Loud— Exploring AI-Generated and Human-Generated Humor. In *4th International Conference on NLP & Artificial Intelligence Techniques (NLAI 2023)*. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4707459>
- Benau, E. M., Morris, J., & Couperus, J. W. (2011). Semantic processing in children and adults: Incongruity and the N400. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, *40*(3), 225-239. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-011-9167-1>
- Binsted, K., & Ritchie, G. (1994). *An implemented model of punning riddles*. University of Edinburgh, Department of Artificial Intelligence.
- Bower, A. H., & Steyvers, M. (2021). Perceptions of AI engaging in human expression. *Scientific Reports*, *11*(1), 21181. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-00426-z>
- Cai, Z. G. (2022). Interlocutor modelling in comprehending speech from interleaved interlocutors of different dialectic backgrounds. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *29*(3), 1026–1034. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-022-02055-7>
- Cai, Z., Duan, X., Haslett, D., Wang, S., & Pickering, M. (2024, August). Do large language models resemble humans in language use?. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Cognitive Modeling and Computational Linguistics* (pp. 37-56).
- Cai, Z. G., Sun, Z., & Zhao, N. (2021). Interlocutor modelling in lexical alignment: The role of linguistic competence. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *121*, 104278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2021.104278>
- Canal, P., Bischetti, L., Di Paola, S., Bertini, C., Ricci, I., & Bambini, V. (2019). ‘Honey, shall I change the baby?—Well done, choose another one’: ERP and time-frequency correlates of humor processing. *Brain and Cognition*, *132*, 41-55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2019.02.001>
- Castelo, N., Bos, M. W., & Lehmann, D. R. (2019). Task-dependent algorithm aversion. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *56*(5), 809-825.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022243719851788>

Casu, M., Triscari, S., Battiato, S., Guarnera, L., & Caponnetto, P. (2024). AI chatbots for mental health: a scoping review of effectiveness, feasibility, and applications. *Applied Sciences*, *14*(13), 5889.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/app14135889>

Chang, Y. T., Ku, L. C., & Chen, H. C. (2018). Sex differences in humor processing: An event-related potential study. *Brain and Cognition*, *120*, 34-42.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2017.11.002>

Chen, A., Koegel, S., Hannon, O., & Ciriello, R. (2023). Feels like empathy: How “emotional” AI challenges human essence. In *Australasian Conference on Information Systems*. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4763428>

Chen, Y., Yang, C., Hu, T., Chen, X., Lan, M., Cai, L., ... & Zhou, A. (2024, August). Are U a Joke Master? Pun Generation via Multi-Stage Curriculum Learning towards a Humor LLM. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024* (pp. 878-890).

Coulson, S., & Kutas, M. (2001). Getting it: human event-related brain response to jokes in good and poor comprehenders. *Neuroscience Letters*, *316*(2), 71-74.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3940\(01\)02387-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3940(01)02387-4)

Cowan, B. R., Doyle, P., Edwards, J., ... & Clark, L. (2019). What's in an accent? The impact of accented synthetic speech on lexical choice in human-machine dialogue.

In *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Conversational User Interfaces* (pp. 1-8). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3342775.3342786>

Dennis, T. A., & Hajcak, G. (2009). The late positive potential: a neurophysiological marker for emotion regulation in children. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *50*(11), 1373-1383. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2009.02168.x>

Dou, X., Wu, C. F., Lin, K. C., Gan, S., & Tseng, T. M. (2021). Effects of different types of social robot voices on affective evaluations in different application fields.

*International Journal of Social Robotics*, *13*, 615-628.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12369-020-00654-9>

- Du, X., Qin, Y., Tu, S., Yin, H., Wang, T., Yu, C., & Qiu, J. (2013). Differentiation of stages in joke comprehension: Evidence from an ERP study. *International Journal of Psychology, 48*(2), 149-157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2012.665162>
- Dunn, M. S., & Cai, Z. G. (2025). Linguistic alignment of redundancy usage in human-human and human-computer interaction. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 46*, e22. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716425100118>
- Feng, Y. J., Chan, Y. C., & Chen, H. C. (2014). Specialization of neural mechanisms underlying the three-stage model in humor processing: An ERP study. *Journal of Neurolinguistics, 32*, 59-70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2014.08.007>
- Flanagin, A. J., & Metzger, M. J. (2003). The perceived credibility of personal web page information as influenced by the sex of the source. *Computers in Human Behavior, 19*(6), 683– 701. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-5632\(03\)00021-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-5632(03)00021-9)
- Frömer, R., Maier, M., & Abdel Rahman, R. (2018). Group-level EEG-processing pipeline for flexible single trial-based analyses including linear mixed models. *Frontiers in Neuroscience, 12*(FEB), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2018.00048>
- García-Méndez, S., de Arriba-Pérez, F., & Somoza-López, M. D. C. (2024). A review on the use of large language models as virtual tutors. *Science & Education, 1*-16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-024-00530-2>
- Ghandeharion, H., & Erfanian, A. (2010). A fully automatic ocular artifact suppression from EEG data using higher order statistics: Improved performance by wavelet analysis. *Medical Engineering & Physics, 32*(7), 720-729. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medengphy.2010.04.010>
- Gorenz, D., & Schwarz, N. (2024). How funny is ChatGPT? A comparison of human- and AI-produced jokes. *Plos One, 19*(7), e0305364.
- Inzlicht, M., Cameron, C. D., D'Cruz, J., & Bloom, P. (2024). In praise of empathic AI. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 28*(2), 89-91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2023.12.003>
- Johnson, A. J., & Mistry, K. (2013). The effect of joke-origin-induced expectancy on cognitive humor. *Humor, 26*(2), 321-341. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2013->

- Joshi, N. N. (2025, January). Evaluating Human Perception and Bias in AI-Generated Humor. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Computational Humor (CHum)* (pp. 79-87).
- Kelley, J. F. (1984). An iterative design methodology for user-friendly natural language office information applications. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)*, 2(1), 26–41.
- Ku, L. C., Feng, Y. J., Chan, Y. C., Wu, C. L., & Chen, H. C. (2017). A re-visit of three-stage humor processing with readers' surprise, comprehension, and funniness ratings: An ERP study. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 42, 49-62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2016.11.008>
- Kutas, M., & Federmeier, K. D. (2011). Thirty years and counting: finding meaning in the N400 component of the event-related brain potential (ERP). *Annual Review of Psychology*, 62(1), 621-647. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.131123>
- Li, X., Wang, H., Liu, H., Liu, S., & Wang, H. (2025). Attentional resource consumption of verbal-humor processing: An ERP study. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 73, 101224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2024.101224>
- Liu, B., & Sundar, S. S. (2018). Should machines express sympathy and empathy? Experiments with a health advice chatbot. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking*, 21(10), 625–636. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2018.0110>
- Liu, C. C., Liao, M. G., Chang, C. H., & Lin, H. M. (2022). An analysis of children's interaction with an AI chatbot and its impact on their interest in reading. *Computers & Education*, 189, 104576. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2022.104576>
- Luck, S. J. (2014). An introduction to the ERP technique, second edition. In *MIT Press*. MIT Press. <https://books.google.com.hk/books?id=y4-uAwAAQBAJ>
- Luck, S. J. (2022). *Applied Event-Related Potential Data Analysis*. [https://socialsci.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Psychology/Book%3A\\_Applied\\_EventRelated\\_Potential\\_Data\\_Analysis\\_\(Luck\)](https://socialsci.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Psychology/Book%3A_Applied_EventRelated_Potential_Data_Analysis_(Luck))

- Maples, B., Cerit, M., Vishwanath, A., & Pea, R. (2024). Loneliness and suicide mitigation for students using GPT3-enabled chatbots. *npj Mental Health Research*, 3(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44184-023-00047-6>
- Martin, C. D., Garcia, X., Potter, D., Melinger, A., & Costa, A. (2016). Holiday or vacation? The processing of variation in vocabulary across dialects. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 31(3), 375–390. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2015.1100750>
- Martin, R. A., & Ford, T. (2018). *The psychology of humor: An integrative approach*. Academic press.
- Matuschek, H., Kliegl, R., Vasishth, S., Baayen, H., & Bates, D. (2017). Balancing Type I error and power in linear mixed models. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 94, 305–315. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2017.01.001>
- Mayerhofer, B., & Schacht, A. (2015). From incoherence to mirth: Neuro-cognitive processing of garden-path jokes. *Frontiers in psychology*, 6, 550. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00550>
- Maynez, J., Narayan, S., Bohnet, B., & McDonald, R. (2020). On Faithfulness and Factuality in Abstractive Summarization. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (p. 1906). Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.173/>
- Morkes, J., Kernal, H. K., & Nass, C. (1999). Effects of humor in task-oriented human-computer interaction and computer-mediated communication: A direct test of SRCT theory. *Human-Computer Interaction*, 14(4), 395-435. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327051HCI1404\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327051HCI1404_2)
- Oostenveld, R., Fries, P., Maris, E., & Schoffelen, J. M. (2011). FieldTrip: Open source software for advanced analysis of MEG, EEG, and invasive electrophysiological data. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2011/156869>
- Ovsyannikova, D., de Mello, V. O., & Inzlicht, M. (2025). Third-party evaluators

- perceive AI as more compassionate than expert humans. *Communications Psychology*, 3(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44271-024-00182-6>
- Perry, A. (2023). AI will never convey the essence of human empathy. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 7(11), 1808-1809. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-023-01675-w>
- Powers, A., & Kiesler, S. (2006). The advisor robot: tracing people's mental model from a robot's physical attributes. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM SIGCHI/SIGART conference on Human-robot interaction* (pp. 218-225). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1121241.1121280>
- Powers, A., Kramer, A. D., Lim, S., Kuo, J., Lee, S. L., & Kiesler, S. (2005). Eliciting information from people with a gendered humanoid robot. In *IEEE International Workshop on Robot and Human Interactive Communication* (pp. 158-163). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ROMAN.2005.1513773>
- Rawte, V., Sheth, A., & Das, A. (2023). *A survey of hallucination in large foundation models*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05922.
- Rheu, M., Dai, Y., Meng, J., & Peng, W. (2024). When a chatbot disappoints you: Expectancy violation in human-chatbot interaction in a social support context. *Communication Research*, 51(7), 782-814. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00936502231221669>
- Rubin, M., Arnon, H., Huppert, J. D., & Perry, A. (2024). Considering the role of human empathy in AI-driven therapy. *JMIR Mental Health*, 11(1), e56529. <https://doi.org/10.2196/56529>
- Rubin, M., Li, J. Z., Zimmerman, F., Ong, D. C., Goldenberg, A., & Perry, A. (2025). Comparing the value of perceived human versus AI-generated empathy. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-025-02247-w>
- Ryskin, R., Stearns, L., Bergen, L., Eddy, M., Fedorenko, E., & Gibson, E. (2021). An

- ERP index of real-time error correction within a noisy-channel framework of human communication. *Neuropsychologia*, 158, 107855. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2021.107855>
- Shen, H., & Wang, M. (2023). Effects of social skills on lexical alignment in human-human interaction and human-computer interaction. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 143, 107718. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2023.107718>
- Sherman, L. W. (1988). Humor and social distance in elementary school children. *Humor*, 1(4), 389-404.
- Shteynberg, G., Halpern, J., Sadovnik, A., Garthoff, J., Perry, A., Hay, J., ... & Fairweather, A. (2024). Does it matter if empathic AI has no empathy?. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 6(5), 496-497. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-024-00841-7>
- Silvia, P. J., Greengross, G., Cotter, K. N., Christensen, A. P., & Gredlein, J. M. (2021). If you're funny and you know it: Personality, gender, and people's ratings of their attempts at humor. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 92, 104089. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2021.104089>
- Suls, J. M. (1972). A two-stage model for the appreciation of jokes and cartoons: An information-processing analysis. *The psychology of humor: Theoretical perspectives and empirical issues*, 1, 81-100.
- Suls, J. (1983). Cognitive processes in humor appreciation. *Handbook of Humor Research: Volume 1: Basic Issues*, 39-57. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-5572-7\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-5572-7_3)
- Winkler, I., Haufe, S., & Tangermann, M. (2011). Automatic Classification of Artifactual ICA-Components for Artifact Removal in EEG Signals. *Behavioral and Brain Functions*, 7(1), 30. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1744-9081-7-30>
- Wu, H., & Cai, Z. G. (2024a). Speaker effects in spoken language

comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.07238*.

Wu, H., & Cai, Z. G. (2024b). When A Man Says He Is Pregnant: ERP Evidence for A Rational Account of Speaker-contextualized Language Comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.17525*.

Wu, H., Duan, X., & Cai, Z. G. (2024). Speaker Demographics Modulate Listeners' Neural Correlates of Spoken Word Processing. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 36(10), 2208-2226. [https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn\\_a\\_02225](https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_02225)

Wu, H., Rao, X., & Cai, Z. G. (2025). Probabilistic adaptation of language comprehension for individual speakers: Evidence from neural oscillations. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, nsaf085. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsaf085>

Yeomans, M., Shah, A., Mullainathan, S., & Kleinberg, J. (2019). Making sense of recommendations. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 32(4), 403-414. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.2118>

Yin, Y., Jia, N., & Wakslak, C. J. (2024). AI can help people feel heard, but an AI label diminishes this impact. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 121(14), e2319112121. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2319112121>

Zheng, W., & Wang, X. (2023). Frame-shifting instead of incongruity is necessary for pun comprehension: evidence from an ERP study on Chinese homophone puns. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 38(8), 1068-1081. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2023.2192509>

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

**Table S1.** LME models for funniness and comprehensibility ratings.

Main effects	$\beta$	$SE$	$t$	$p$
Funniness ratings				
Intercept	2.45	0.07	36.50	< .001
Type	1.80	0.11	16.29	< .001
Source	-0.21	0.12	-1.71	0.093
Type : Source	0.36	0.20	1.74	0.088
Comprehensibility ratings				
Intercept	4.13	0.09	46.26	< .001
Type	0.08	0.07	1.11	0.272
Source	0.04	0.17	0.25	0.807
Type : Source	0.04	0.11	0.34	0.735

Model for funniness ratings: Funniness  $\sim$  Type\* Source + (Type + 1 | Participant) + (Type + 1 | Item); Model for comprehensibility ratings: Comprehensibility  $\sim$  Type\* Source + (Type + 1 | Participant) + (Type + 1 | Item)

**Table S2.** Sites included in LME models for Topography analyses and ROI analyses.

Region	Sites
Topography analyses	
Left-anterior region	FP1, AF7, AF3, F7, F5, F3, F1, FC5, FC3, FC1, AFp5, AFF7h, AFF5h, AFF3h, FFT7h, FFC5h, FFC3h
Right-anterior region	FP2, AF4, AF8, F2, F4, F6, F8, FC2, FC4, FC6, AFp6, AFF4h, AFF6h, AFF8h, FFC4h, FFC6h, FFT8h
Left-posterior region	CP5, CP3, CP1, P7, P5, P3, P1, PO7, PO3, O1, TPP7h, CPP5h, CPP3h, PPO7h, PPO5h, PPO3h, POO5
Right-posterior region	CP2, CP4, CP6, P2, P4, P6, P8, PO4, PO8, O2, CPP4h, CPP6h, TPP8h, PPO4h, PPO6h, PPO8h, POO6
ROI analyses	
Whole-brain region	FFC5h, FFC6h, Cz, C1, C2, C3, C4, CPz, CP1, CP2, CP3, CP4, Pz, P1, P2, P3, P4, FCz, FC1, FC2, FC3, FC4, Fz, F1, F2, F3, F4, FFC3h, FFC1h, FFC2h, FFC4h, FCC3h, FCC1h, FCC2h, FCC4h, FCC5h, FCC6h, CCP3h, CCP1h, CCP2h, CCP4h, CCP5h, CCP6h, CPP3h, CPP1h, CPP2h, CPP4h, CPP5h, CPP6h
Anterior region	AF3, AF4, AF7, AF8, AFF1h, AFF2h, AFF3h, AFF4h, AFF5h, AFF6h, AFF7h, AFF8h, AFp1, AFp10h, AFp2, AFp5, AFp6, AFp9h, F1, F2, F3, F4, F5, F6, FC1, FC2, FC3, FC4, FCz, FFC1h, FFC2h, FFC3h, FFC4h, FFC5h, FFC6h, FP1, FP2, FPz, Fz, NFp1h, NFp2h

**Table S3.** LME models for Topography analyses.

Main effects	$\beta$	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Models for posteriority analyses				
N400 (300-900 ms)				
Intercept	2.81	0.44	6.43	<.001
Type	-0.45	0.36	-1.24	.218
Source	0.41	0.86	0.48	.633
Posteriority	0.54	0.43	1.24	.219
Type : Posteriority	-0.05	0.29	-0.19	.853
Source : Posteriority	0.85	0.87	0.98	.329
Type : Source	1.13	0.76	1.49	.139
Type : Source : Posteriority	-0.71	0.59	-1.21	.225
LPP (1000-1800 ms)				
Intercept	0.85	0.44	1.93	.058
Type	0.66	0.52	1.27	.208
Source	-0.14	0.88	-0.16	.874
Posteriority	-0.53	0.37	-1.44	.154
Type : Posteriority	-1.31	0.40	-3.30	<.001
Source : Posteriority	0.76	0.74	1.04	.304
Type : Source	2.23	1.11	2.01	.047
Type : Source : Posteriority	-0.82	0.79	-1.04	.301
Models for laterality analyses				
N400 (300-900 ms)				
Intercept	2.81	0.44	6.43	<.001
Type	-0.45	0.36	-1.26	.212
Source	0.41	0.86	0.48	.633
Laterality	-0.97	0.20	-4.86	<.001
Type : Laterality	-0.09	0.30	-0.31	.759
Source : Laterality	0.29	0.40	0.73	.471
Type : Source	1.13	0.76	1.50	.138
Type : Source : Laterality	0.09	0.59	0.16	.874
LPP (1000-1800 ms)				
Intercept	0.82	0.43	1.89	.063
Type	0.58	0.40	1.46	.150
Source	-0.16	0.88	-0.18	.858
Laterality	-0.85	0.20	-4.26	<.001
Type : Laterality	-0.75	0.40	-1.87	.062
Source : Laterality	0.41	0.40	1.03	.303
Type : Source	2.28	1.10	2.08	.040
Type : Source : Laterality	< .001	0.80	< .001	.999

Model for posteriority analysis (300-900 ms): Amplitude ~ Type \* Source \* Posteriority + (Type + Posteriority + 1 | Participant) + (Type \* Source + 1 | Item); Model for posteriority analysis (1000-1800 ms): Amplitude ~ Type \* Source \* Posteriority + (Type + Posteriority + 1 | Participant)

+ (Type \* Source + 1 | Item); Model for laterality analysis (300-900 ms): Amplitude ~ Type \* Source \* Laterality + (Type + Laterality + 1 | Participant) + (Type \* Source + 1 | Item); Model for laterality analysis (1000-1800 ms): Amplitude ~ Type \* Source \* Laterality + (Type + 1 | Participant) + (Source + Type \* Source + 1 | Item)

**Table S4.** LME models for ROI analyses across trials.

Main effects	$\beta$	$SE$	$t$	$p$
N400 (300-900 ms)				
Intercept	3.68	0.57	6.48	< .001
Type	0.49	0.44	1.12	.268
Source	1.59	1.01	1.57	.123
Trial	0.01	0.001	7.02	< .001
Type : Source	0.61	0.65	0.94	.349
Type : Trial	-0.02	0.002	-9.24	< .001
Source : Trial	-0.02	0.002	-11.64	< .001
Type : Source : Trial	0.02	0.004	4.75	< .001
LPP (1000-1800 ms)				
Intercept	1.20	2.44	0.49	.651
Type	1.41	3.33	0.42	.694
Source	1.08	1.04	1.04	.303
Trial	-0.003	0.002	-1.79	.074
Type : Source	1.29	0.35	3.73	< .001
Type : Trial	0.007	0.003	2.04	.041
Source : Trial	-0.04	0.01	-3.76	.605
Type : Source : Trial	0.03	0.007	4.06	< .001

Model for ROI analysis (300-900 ms): Amplitude ~ Type \* Source \* Trail + (1 | Participant) + (Type + Type : Source + 1 | Item) + (Type + Source + 1 | Channel); Model for ROI analysis (1000-1800 ms): Amplitude ~ Type \* Source \* Trail + (1 | Participant) + (cType+ 1 | Item) + (Type + Source : Trial + 1 | Channel)

**Table S5.** LME models for ROI analyses of trust and sincerity in the AI condition.

Main effects	$\beta$	$SE$	$t$	$p$
Models for trust analyses				
N400 (300-900 ms)				
Intercept	4.13	0.75	5.48	<.001
Type	-0.06	0.44	-0.13	.895
Trust	2.05	0.76	2.69	.012
Type : Trust	-0.13	0.47	-0.29	.777
LPP (1000-1800 ms)				
Intercept	0.59	0.95	0.62	.540
Type	3.08	0.78	3.94	<.001
Trust	1.09	0.93	1.17	.252
Type : Trust	0.26	0.12	2.06	.039
Models for sincerity analyses				
N400 (300-900 ms)				
Intercept	4.20	0.79	5.39	< .001
Type	-0.01	0.42	-0.01	.991
Sincerity	1.43	0.66	2.17	.040
Type : Sincerity	-0.52	0.39	-1.34	.192
LPP (1000-1800 ms)				
Intercept	0.84	0.92	0.91	.367
Type	2.54	0.66	3.82	< .001
Sincerity	-0.07	0.77	-0.09	.933
Type : Sincerity	0.28	0.61	0.45	.656

Model for trust analysis (300-900 ms): Amplitude ~ Type\*Trust + (Type + 1 | Participant) + (1 | Item) + (Type + 1 | Channel); Model for trust analysis (1000-1800 ms): Amplitude ~ Type\*Trust + (1 | Participant) + (Type + 1 | Item) + (1 | Channel); Model for sincerity analysis (300-900 ms): Amplitude ~ Type\*Sincerity + (Type + 1 | Participant) + (1 | Item) + (Type + 1 | Channel); Model for sincerity analysis (1000-1800 ms): Amplitude ~ Type\*Sincerity + (Type + 1 | Participant) + (1 | Item) + (1 | Channel)

**Table S6.** LME models for ROI analyses of funniness.

Main effects	$\beta$	$SE$	$t$	$p$
LPP (1000-1800 ms)				
Intercept	0.88	0.56	1.58	.119
Funniness	0.40	0.03	12.59	< .001
Source	-0.35	1.14	-0.30	.761
Source : Funniness	0.02	0.06	0.25	.801

Model for funniness analysis (1000-1800 ms): Amplitude ~ Source\*Funniness + (1 | Participant)  
+ (Source + 1 | Item) + (1 | Channel)