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People find it important to know if a story is factual, but still the most popular stories, in such forms as books and movies, are fictional. Research suggests that a story being true may add value to the reader’s experience, but other findings suggest that fiction may increase enjoyment by providing fewer disruptions to narrative comprehension. In three studies we explored the appeal of stories when they are presented as fiction or as non-fiction. Subjects read (1) story synopses, (2) vignettes from two popular websites, or (3) narratives on relationships and war. Results indicate that readers preferred stories when they were presented, externally, as non-fiction. Readers also preferred stories that seemed internally — that is, because of how they were written — like fiction. Additionally the results suggested that readers rely more heavily on factual stories to update their notions of reality. This study contributes to a body of literature on reader enjoyment in relation to truth labels made explicit or implicit in narratives as well as on the efficacy of arts-based research.
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Amazing but true: A preference for fiction-like non-fiction

The British comedian Eddie Izzard has a famous bit in which he tells his audience that the singer Engelbert Humperdinck is dead. Izzard shakes his head to reveal this is merely a joke, but then ruefully nods to show it is actually true. He alternates between nodding and shaking his head for several minutes, to sustained laughter. The audience, wavering between partial belief and uncertain disbelief, reacts to his inappropriately glib confusion of what is true and what is not.

Izzard’s bit is so successful, not because the daily life of anyone in the audience would be impacted by Humperdinck’s death, nor because people are indifferent to
his possible passing, but, at least in part, because distinguishing what is fictional from what is not fictional is central to processing information (McDonald, 2012; Stelter, 2012). Separating truth from fiction underlies the organization of our libraries, our oaths in court, and our close relationships. When we hear surprising news, we draw upon our experiences and mental resources to determine whether it is true (Hatano & Inagaki, 2003; Hoover, 2012; Kagan, 2003).

Yet once something is determined to be fictional, it is not discarded. Indeed, fiction is an industry unto itself, available in bookstores and on e-readers, performed on theatre and ballet stages, and displayed on movie and television screens. People seek out untrue stories in a wide range of settings, from the solitary reading of a detective novel at the beach to communal consumption of opera in theatres. In fact, 49 of the 50 all-time top-grossing films are fictional (with much of the plot of the 50th, Titanic, also fictional), as are 9 of the 10 best-selling books (with the 10th, on how to get rich, arguably also in that category) (“21 Best-Selling Books,” “All-Time Box Office,” Grabianowski (2012)).

Research on the enjoyment of narratives suggests reasons for fiction’s popularity. Fiction may be especially good at providing access to the emotions associated with sympathy and identification with a character (Oatley, 1999). It may be viewed as a useful simulation of social scenarios (Mar & Oatley, 2008). Interpreting details as elements of scenarios, rather than as individual truths, may be more readily done with fiction, and may ease gestalt processes of comprehension (Hendersen & Clark, 2007). Evidence suggests that this sort of undisrupted processing is beneficial to global experiences, such as narrative cohesion (Trabasso, Secco, & van den Broek, 1984) and narrative impact (Nisbett, Zukier, & Lemley, 1981). Fiction may freely incorporate compelling details and thematically relevant confluences of events. In this manner, fiction represents purer “storytelling” with events coming together in an aesthetically pleasing way, unconstrained by the limitations of mundane reality. Evidence suggests that readers expect to find fiction more transportive than non-fiction (Appel & Maleckar, 2012). Fiction may generate increased fluency that can enhance aesthetic experiences (Chenier & Winkielman, 2009; Reber, Schwarz, & Winkielman, 2004) and may provide readier access to thematic concerns. All of these factors may give fictional texts a special hedonic appeal.

On the other hand, the view that aesthetic enjoyment is related to the volume of information conveyed (Hekkert, 2006; Leder, Belke, Oegerst, & Augustin, 2004) suggests that readers might derive greater rewards from non-fictional stories. Likewise, Baumeister, Zhang, and Vohs (2004) argued that gossip contributes to the listener’s cultural knowledge as a complement to personal experience and observational learning. True narratives may similarly provide real-world knowledge with little acquisition cost. Since our perceptions and representations of reality are noisy and fluctuating (Harvey, 2003), information is valuable that contributes to
our estimates of the probabilities of events. Information found in non-fiction narratives can do this. In line with this view, Appel and Maleckar (2012) found that subjects expected non-fiction to be more useful than fiction. There is evidence that people as young as four years old show this greater generalization from true stories (Richert & Smith, 2011). If readers of non-fiction make contextual inferences analogous to those of listeners in a conversation (Schwarz, 1996), the mere fact of stories appearing in print may imply that they are relevant to knowledge of the world (Sperber & Wilson, 1986). Certainly, readers care about the distinction between fact and fiction, as there were public outcries when it was revealed that details of *A Million Little Pieces* (Bastone, 2006; Frey, 2005) and *Three Cups of Tea* (Kroft, 2011; Mortenson & Relin, 2006) were invented. Although these revelations did not change the content of the stories, readers may have felt they had mistakenly used them to update their notions of reality. In this manner, readers may ascribe less value to a story categorized as imaginary rather than actual.

Of course, questions about responses to fiction versus non-fiction are very broad. Fiction and non-fiction are read often for different reasons, in different contexts, and the texts themselves differ. There is a sub-question that is perhaps more approachable: How does the experience of a text depend on whether it is presented and read as fiction or as non-fiction? There is evidence that whether a story is taken to be fictional or not can impact how it is understood. This has been found to affect intermediate levels of comprehension of various elements, such as the significance of details (Hendersen & Clark, 2007), interpretation of references (Pihlainen, 2002), causal relationships (Strange & Leung, 1999), and situations and the perspectives of characters (Graesser, Olde, & Klettke, 2002). Details may be categorized in non-fiction as information, while they may be seen in fiction as abstractions in the service of a higher representation. Converging evidence also indicates that explicitly fictional narratives are incorporated into our perceptions of reality (Gerrig & Prentice, 1991; Green, Garst, Brock, & Chung, 2009; Prentice, Gerrig, & Bailis, 1997; Strange & Leung, 1999), consistent with fiction being not merely a popular escape, but a medium that influences individuals and society.

We conducted three experiments to examine the impact on enjoyment of readers’ belief that a text was fictional or non-fictional. We presented identical texts to subjects as either fiction or non-fiction. In the first experiment, subjects read brief synopses of longer stories and rated their interest in reading the full-length versions. In the second, subjects read, brief, real-life comic anecdotes posted on fmylife.com (FML) or textsfromlastnight.com (TFLN), and rated their enjoyment. In the third experiment, subjects read story-length selections of realistic fiction and narrative non-fiction on the theme of either relationships or war. While the impact of believing a text was fiction or non-fiction was our primary question, the evidence about the attractions of fiction and non-fiction is based partly on what
status the reader believes the text has, and also partly on qualities internal to the
text that are likely to differ between fiction and non-fiction. Accordingly, our ex-
periments also allowed us to examine how people responded to texts that seemed
fictional when subjects had not been told the category of the text. These experi-
ments additionally permitted some exploration of the way people were willing to
generalize what they read based on the text’s presented fictional status.

Experiment 1: Synopses

Method

Participants in all three experiments were undergraduates from the subject pool
at the University of California, San Diego. Sixty men and 194 women read eight
synopses of under 215 words each, written by the experimenters to be plausibly
seen as either fact or fiction. For example, one synopsis was about a man recruited
by the CIA to work on encryption, and another was about a collegiate female track
star battling to overcome injury. Synopses briefly described stories, with few de-
tails and without resolutions, to give subjects the impression they were finding
out about a story they could read. Of the eight synopses, the first four, selected
randomly, were presented in alternating order as fiction or non-fiction. Half of
participants started with a fiction designation and half started with a non-fiction
designation. Whether a given synopsis was factual or fictional was clearly and
prominently printed on the experimental materials both before and after the syn-
opsis. The last four synopses were not identified as fiction or factual, and subjects
instead rated their own impressions on a scale from 1 (definitely fiction) to 7 (defi-
nitely non-fiction). These ratings permitted us to categorize the stories as ones that
seemed like fiction versus ones that seemed like non-fiction.

Subjects were informed that the experiment was about differences in “what
people want to find out when reading fiction and non-fiction.” For each synopsis,
subjects rated from 1–10 their interest in reading the full-length version. Subjects
also ranked their interest in seven issues they might want resolved in the full story:
“What is the point of the story/article?”, “What happened to the central individu-
al/character?”, “How did the problem get resolved?”, “How did the central individu-
al/character feel about what happened?”, “How did other people/characters feel
about these events?”, “How often does this sort of thing happen (in real life)?”, and
“What caused the problem to exist in the first place?” The issues were ranked from
7 (most important) to 1 (least important). These rankings allowed for comparison
of the goals readers had when reading fiction versus non-fiction.
Results

In order to assess the impact of presenting a vignette as fiction or non-fiction on a participant’s interest in reading the full version, we averaged each subject’s fiction and non-fiction ratings and compared those means with a paired $t$-test. This revealed that subjects expressed more interest in reading full versions of synopses presented as non-fiction than those presented as fiction $t(253) = 3.18, p = .002$ Cohen’s $d = .40$ (non-fiction = 6.24, fiction = 5.83). The data were also analyzed using a factorial model, with condition and vignette as fixed effects, subject as a random effect, and all main effects and interactions entered (other than the three-way, fully determined interaction). This analysis also revealed the effect of presentation as truth versus fiction $F(1,246.2) = 13.7, p < .001$. Because of the simplicity of the former analysis, and because the two analyses produced nearly identical effects throughout, for the remainder of this paper, we will present only the $t$-test results.

In the unspecified condition, participants provided fiction/non-fiction ratings for the synopses. Each synopsis could then be categorized, based on the mean of these ratings, as seeming more like fiction or more like non-fiction. This permitted us to test whether subjects preferred the semblance of factuality or fictionality. While the earlier analysis looked at the effect of presenting a text as fiction or non-fiction, the current analysis looked at the impact of a text categorized as fiction or non-fiction based on internal, textual features. The eight synopses ranged in these ratings from 3.32 to 5.38 on the seven-point scale, with four of them above the midpoint at the non-fiction end of the scale (these averaged 4.92), and three below at the fiction end (averaging 3.45). One synopsis had a mean rating almost exactly at the midpoint (3.95), and since it was regarded, on average, as seeming neither like fiction nor non-fiction, it was excluded from this analysis. Subjects expressed more interest in reading full versions of the synopses rated more like fiction than non-fiction $t(253) = 8.69, p < .001, d = 1.09$ (fiction = 6.41, non-fiction = 5.49).

When ranking which questions they would most like answered, subjects reported that finding out the point was more important for stories presented as fiction $t(253) = 2.36, p = .018, d = .30$ (fiction = 3.74, non-fiction: 3.45), while finding out how common such events were in real life was reported as more important for stories presented as fact ($t(253) = 2.80, p = .006, d = .35$ (fiction = 3.11, non-fiction = 3.42). None of the five other ratings differed for stories presented as fact or fiction (all $p’s > .45$).
Experiment 2: Web anecdotes

Method

Subjects (197 male, 335 female) read posts from the websites fmylife.com or textsfromlastnight.com. Both sites provide textual posts that could be either fiction or non-fiction because the sites publish reader-submitted anecdotes that are supposedly true, but potentially fabricated. The posts on fmylife.com (FML) are ironic, often rueful, and frequently humiliating. FML anecdotes are first-person accounts that begin with “Today,” end with “FML,” and in-between briefly describe something possibly tragic that happened to the poster. The website is extremely popular, with thousands of users clicking approval or disapproval of new posts, and such raters representing only a fraction of readers. The majority of our participants had viewed FML multiple times. There are well over 20,000 anecdotes archived online, however, making a random encounter with the anecdotes chosen for our study unlikely.

Textsfromlastnight.com (TFLN) posts actual text messages, sent between cell phones, depicting outlandish events, crass insults, and unconventional ideas. It is less popular than FML and new posts receive only a few hundred responses. However, the site does have over 35,000 texts and text exchanges. Approximately half of our participants were familiar with TFLN.

Subjects were told that a website called “Urban Myths” investigates whether anecdotes posted on FML or TFLN are true, and reposts selections as true, false, or unverifiable. Since our aim was to investigate subjects’ responses to true and false anecdotes in general, rather than to capture responses to specific anecdotes, FML’s and TFLN’s were presented and rated in batches. Subjects read either three collections of anecdotes from FML, or three from TFLN. One collection of anecdotes was presented as true, one as fictional, and one as being of indeterminate veracity. These three collections were presented in a randomized order. (In reality, all batches were of indeterminate veracity.) Material deemed too crass or offensive was eliminated and inappropriate words were redacted, such as in t***. The resulting collections of anecdotes were about half a printed page long and consisted of 7–8 FML’s or 9–12 TFLN’s posts (see Appendix for example sets of each sort of anecdote.) Subjects rated each collection and indicated on a scale from 1–10 how much they liked a particular text and how commonly such events took place in real life. In the indeterminate veracity condition, subjects rated whether the collection seemed true or invented on a scale from 1 (almost all invented) to 7 (almost all true).
Results

Since FML’s and TFLN’s differ in length and format, separate analyses were run for subjects who read FML’s and subjects who read TFLN’s. Subjects reading posts from either website preferred them when told they were true (FML: t(272) = 7.41, p < .001, d = .90; TFLN: t(252) = 6.67, p < .001, d = 0.84. Table 1 presents the means for this analysis.

Table 1. Average ratings (and standard deviations) of enjoyment for collections of stories when presented as true or as fiction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anecdote Type</th>
<th>Presented as true</th>
<th>Presented as fiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FML</td>
<td>6.68 (1.88)</td>
<td>5.56 (2.13) ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFLN</td>
<td>6.40 (2.06)</td>
<td>5.48 (2.05) ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001 for the effect of presentation.

Subjects also believed anecdotes presented as true occurred more frequently in real life (FML: t(272) = 8.68, p < .001, d = 1.05; TFLN: t(252) = 9.00, p < .001, d = 1.13). In the indeterminate condition, collections of posts were categorized as fiction or non-fiction. For the FML collections, the anecdotes that were rated as more fictional had higher enjoyment ratings, t(219) = 4.26, p < .001, d = 0.58. However, this preference was not found for the collections of anecdotes from the TFLN website, t(227) = 0.032, p = .750, d = .004. Table 2 summarizes the means for these analyses.

Post-hoc review suggested a mechanism underlying this observed difference. The anecdotes on the FML website are generally concrete (“Today, I got fired from a great babysitting job because the little girl said I was boring.”), while the anecdotes on the TFLN website express thoughts or provide commentary (“How young is too young to ask my kid to make me a drink?”) For anecdotes found on the FML website “seeming fictional” may represent a judgment of whether events really happened, while for anecdotes found on the TFLN website, “seeming fictional” may distinguish honest thoughts from those designed to shock or entertain. To explore this potential post-hoc explanation, a new study was designed. 184 subjects (51 male, 133 female) rated a collection of anecdotes from the FML and TFLN websites. Anecdotes were drawn randomly and rated on a scale of concreteness (from 1 “almost all abstractions” to 7 “almost all concrete events”). The findings support the claim that anecdotes from the FML website are considered to be more concrete that those from the TFLN website. The mean concreteness rating was 5.23 for FML anecdotes and only 3.38 for the TFLN anecdotes (t(182) = 3.14, p < .001).
Table 2. Average ratings of enjoyment (and standard deviations) for batches of stories when categorized as seeming to be true or fiction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anecdote Type</th>
<th>Seemed True</th>
<th>Seemed Like Fiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FML</td>
<td>5.88 (1.97)</td>
<td>6.35 (2.02) ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFLN</td>
<td>6.02 (2.04)</td>
<td>5.97 (2.20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** $p < .001$ for the effect of seeming true or seeming fictional.

Experiment 3: Narratives

Method

Subjects (165 male, 521 female) each read three published narratives presented in random order as fiction, non-fiction, or unspecified. Half of the subjects read three narratives about relationships, and half read three about the Vietnam War. Narratives were selected so they could stand alone, and included whole and abridged versions of short stories and book chapters. Four narratives from each of the two thematic domains, two of which were actually fiction and two non-fiction, were used in the experiment. Presentation to subjects as fiction, non-fiction, or unspecified was independent of whether stories were actually fiction or non-fiction. Subjects rated from 1–10 how much they liked each narrative and how common they thought the portrayed events were in real life.

Results

Subjects preferred narratives presented as true over those presented as fiction, $t(487) = 2.17$, $p = .030$ $d = 0.20$ (true = 6.02, fiction = 5.77). Subjects believed events depicted in narratives presented as true were more common in real life, $t(487) = 4.66$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.42$. The direction of this difference was consistent across all eight narratives (true = 5.45, fiction = 4.95).

As with the prior studies, we divided the texts into those that seemed like fiction and those that seemed like fact, based on subjects’ ratings in the unspecified condition. Subjects gave higher ratings to stories that seemed more fictional, $t(494) = 3.68$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.33$, (non-fictionlike = 5.76, fictionlike = 6.10). This finding, however, must be interpreted with caution. Although subjects did not express doubt for narratives presented as true or fictional, and unspecified stories were not clearly factual or fictional (means from 3.3 to 4.7, with 4 = “can’t tell”), it was the case that overall, the fictional stories did seem more fictional (with a mean of 3.9 versus 4.4 for the non-fiction stories). Thus, the difference in liking between stories that seem fictional and those that seem factual may be explained by these...
fictional stories being preferred, rather than stories that seemed fictional generally being preferred. Despite these reservations, this finding matches the patterns seen in synopses and FML’s, lending support to the existence of a preference for stories that seem fictional.

**General discussion**

We presented the same stories as true or fictional, and subjects reported preferring them when they were presented as true. Subjects expressed more interest in hearing the full versions of synopses that were “true,” and reported enjoying realistic narratives more when they were “true.” The value of presenting stories as true is especially salient with our web anecdotes. Each is a tiny incident in the life of one total stranger, which certainly could have happened, but is significantly more entertaining if it seems it did.

One reason for the reported preference for true stories appears to be that people use non-fiction to update notions about the sorts of events that are likely to occur. When subjects read a story they had been told was true, they may have inferred that the events in that story, even ordinary ones, were more frequent in the world. This may be surprising, considering the only difference between true stories and plausible fictions is that the true story must have occurred at least once in the world. While a true story serves as an existence proof — men once fought in Vietnam, people have fallen in love — the distinction need not be consequential in estimating commonality. Readers seemed willing to generalize from supposed “realities,” despite their lifetimes of experiences prior to reading them, even when they had already considered the events described as perfectly commonplace.

Our findings also provide some evidence that readers are drawn to the surprising, aesthetically crafted forms associated with fiction. However, although subjects reported enjoying the fictional writing style, the stories we presented were reportedly preferred as non-fiction. If labeling a story “fictional” benefitted fluency or cohesiveness, these benefits seem to have been superseded by those of calling a story true.

Of course, these results only speak to the areas of overlap between fiction and non-fiction. True stories may be too mundane or poorly constructed to be of general interest, and fictional stories (including fantasy, science fiction, and magical realism) may be compelling even if they cannot be true. These results also may not generalize across all contexts, as our comparisons between fiction and non-fiction occurred within only one context. The results, though, do seem to generalize across two sorts of fiction. With the synopses of the first experiment, and the published stories of the final experiment, subjects read stories that were traditional
fiction, while in the middle experiment, subjects read web anecdotes that had been submitted to a website as true, but had, purportedly, been found to be false. That the essential findings were the same for the three experiments suggests that this distinction — albeit important in many contexts — was not critical for the outcomes of interest here.

While it is likely that stories that are presented as true and turn out to be false engender a special opprobrium, our findings suggest some of the diminished enthusiasm could be simply that stories presented as fiction are liked less. This may help explain why storytellers who fictionalize experiences and declare them to be true are often popular. Comedians present their absurd ideas as first-hand experience, authors of non-fiction exaggerate the challenges they have faced, and heavily-edited, utterly contrived television programs are marketed as “reality.” Our findings suggest that it would not be nearly as powerful for a comedian to say “Imagine if a horse walked into a bar,” for James Frey to propose, “What if I had caused a deadly train accident in my drug-addled state?” or for CBS to show viewers the craft services buffet and EMT’s standing by on the set of Survivor (Giesman & Misiewicz, 2001).

These results may also speak to the current movement of art-based research, which uses literary forms such as poetry or narrative to present qualitative research findings (Hanauer, 2010). As seen in the findings presented here, factual life stories combined with literary form can enhance enjoyment and engagement with research findings. Arts-based research builds upon the core assumption tested here that factual information presented in attractive artistic form fulfills an important communicative function and may make research information accessible to a broad audience.

That fictional forms may contain serious truths is of course a more general point. We do not suggest that non-fiction is the truth, and fiction falsehood. Neils Bohr, albeit talking more about theoretical quantum physics than narrative fiction, suggested that a lie was the opposite of a superficial truth, but that the opposite of a profound truth was another profound truth (Bohr, 1967, p. 328). Fiction and non-fiction are opposites, but only in a superficial sense is one a lie. They can both be profoundly true.

Our notions of reality, rather than being permanent, are in a constant state of flux and reconsideration. When we read that exotic animals from a local zoo were set loose in the town of Zanesville, Ohio, we adjust our expectations accordingly, even though we already know that zoos exist, and our likelihood of encountering a roving tiger on the way to work is unchanged. Whereas fictional stories have a propositional or “what-if” quality, non-fiction requires no translation and no suspension of disbelief. When we read of events that really happened, even plausible events that do not challenge our notions of how the world works, we generalize
from them, and are more likely to believe that they represent a sort of event that tends to occur more frequently.

Perhaps this is why case studies are such powerful persuaders. The data may indicate that bacteria cause ulcers (Marshall & Warren, 1984), vaccines do not induce autism (Taylor et al., 1999), and job interviews are not diagnostic (Hunter & Hunter, 1984), but when a true story appears to support a contrary position, it is taken not as the one-off that it is, but as a generalizable representative of reality. When we read that a man leaving his house for work encountered a tiger in the driveway, it seems fictional, and thus makes a great story, if true. And if true, it causes us to increase our probabilistic estimate of similar events, and perhaps to be ever so slightly more vigilant in our own driveways.
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Note

1. The four relationship texts were all or portions of (with the fiction listed first): “Pet Milk” by Stuart Dybek, “Misty Tiled Chamber” by Valerie Miner, “Granny’s Bridge” by Tony Early, Don’t Let’s Go to the Dogs Tonight: An African Childhood by Alexandra Fuller. The four Vietnam texts were all or portions of (with the fiction listed first): “The Things They Carried” by Tim O’Brien, “Wingfield” by Tobias Wolff, “Pararescue Jumpers’ Daring Rescue of Downed Fighter Pilot Deep Inside North Vietnam” by Brandon Darnell, and “U.S. Army Captain Thomas Pienta: Firsthand Account of a Vietnam War Helicopter Pilot” by Thomas Pienta.

References


All rights reserved


Appendix

Sample batches of web anecdotes from Experiment 2

FML
Today, my dad married a woman with a child who has the same name as me, and is the same age as me. She is also prettier and more popular. FML
Today, I was walking to work and saw three guys sitting at a table outside. One of the guys looks at me and says to his friends, “That’s the girl that works at the grocery store. She replaced the hot chick.” The other two guys glared at me. FML
Today, I had to explain to my son that his dad was too busy in a raid on World of Warcraft to be at his award ceremony. FML
Today, I was watching this TV show where a man was describing how much he loved this woman, how he made every opportunity to see her, and how he loved her in a way nobody else could. I smiled, because that’s exactly the way I feel about my crush. Then I realized the program was about stalkers. FML
Today, my landlord came over while I wasn’t home. My friend and her pets were thrown out by her husband. I’m the only person she knows in this state and she begged me to stay. I reluctantly told her fine; just don’t answer the door. She did, with the animals, and told him she was living here. FML
Today, I was eating some left over Easter peanut M&M’s at work when I exclaimed “oh cool they have E’s on them for Easter”. It took me a couple of minutes but I did eventually realize that I was looking at a regular M&M sideways. Definitely explains my coworkers uncontrollable laughter. FML
Today, I found out that my bank account is overdrawn. I have no money, no job, and no prospects. I am also overqualified for every job I apply for because I’m a lawyer. And whenever I apply for a job as a lawyer, I am told I am underqualified because I have no experience. FML
TFLN
Reply: I’m going by McDonald’s time. And since they stop serving breakfast at 10:30 and start serving lunch, it is now afternoon.
did all my christmas shopping this morning at 4am drunk. never went to sleep. i was walking home drunk last night when i passed a target and saw 3 kids having a dance off. had to join. somehow they convinced me to go shooping with them. i bought 4 disco balls and a lava lamp. That’s what you get when you play shuffleboard drunk.
she didnt even puke last nite, shes finally hit champion status. i think im in love
This guy just brought his piggy bank into the bar with him. Talk about corruption of childhood. You know… If I put the same amount of effort into school as I put into giving women orgasms I would be a Rhodes scholar
The hot Japanese girl in my class just said her “favorite sexy American actor is Nick Cage.” That, I can work with.
Text: You should dream of me :)
Reply: I’m going to dream of single life.
Text: my friend just told me “I dunno what u r doing but keep doing it cuz it makes u look fabulous”
Reply: LOL that’s cool. Guess u r gonna have to keep doing me
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