

Running head: DISPARAGEMENT HUMOR AND SOCIAL POWER

Joking with an Agenda:
Racial Disparagement Humor Appreciation and Social Power Value Motivation

Aaron T. Johnson
216-280-3848
aaronthejoe@yahoo.com

Kimberly A. Neuendorf, Ph.D.
216-687-3994
k.neuendorf@comcast.net

Paul D. Skalski, Ph.D.
p.skalski@csuohio.edu

All at:
School of Communication
2001 Euclid Ave., MU 233
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, OH 44115

Paper submitted to the Intercultural Communication Interest Group of the Central States Communication Association for possible presentation at the 2012 conference, Cleveland, OH

Key words: Schwartz Values, Senses of Humor, Race, Disparagement, Social Power

Joking with an Agenda:

Racial Disparagement Humor Appreciation and Social Power Value Motivation

Abstract

Humor that puts down others is prevalent in many cultures. The study investigated a theory proposed by Freud (1960) which claims that disparagement humor is actually a guised expression of power-seeking impulses. Using the Schwartz Values Survey (1992)—which identified “Social Power” as one of fifty-six motivational goals—and a multiple senses of humor scale, it was confirmed that social power value motivation correlated with appreciation for racial disparagement humor. Further, African Americans disliked racial disparagement humor more than non-African Americans; social power value motivation correlated significantly with dark/arousal humor, however this relationship disappeared when looking at the non-Black subsample; the relationship between social power value motivation and racial disparagement humor disappeared when examining only the African American participants. The results suggest that majority ethnicity groups may enjoy racial disparagement humor as an expression of social power motivation, while minority groups may gain social power through “taboo” humor (i.e., dark/arousal).

Joking with an Agenda:

Racial Disparagement Humor Appreciation and Social Power Value Motivation

Introduction

“By making our enemy small, inferior, despicable, or comic, we achieve in a roundabout way the enjoyment of overcoming him.”

(Freud, 1960 [1905], p. 103)

Laughing *at* others may be a universal, cross-cultural phenomenon. The Inuit of the Arctic region of Canada are known to hold drum-dancing contests in which contestants mock one-another in song (Proyer & Ruch, 2010). Workers on the island of Wetan “sing mournful or mocking songs at the expense of their companions” (Huizinga, 1938/1992; p. 123). Throughout much of Africa, derisive songs “used for social control still lampoon the pompous and condemn those who neglect their duties” (Pierson, 1976; p. 167). The West African “Songs of Derision” (Van Dam, 1954) may be the forerunner to the African-American ritual insult game known as *playing the dozens* (Garner, 1983; Ray, 2009).

There is substantial evidence to suggest that these examples of amusement derived from disparagement of others (i.e., “disparagement humor”) may reflect a mechanism through which submissive groups or individuals fulfill a need for social power (Lefever, 1981). The present research examines the relationship between “social power” motivation and appreciation for disparagement humor in the American context, with an emphasis on racial differences.

Humor Terminology

In a colloquial sense, humor may simply be defined as “something that is or is designed to be comical” (*Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary*, 2005). However, a review of the

academic literature reveals a more complicated multi-stage process. The first stage—the creation of humorous material—has been termed *humor production* (Lefcourt et al., 1974). The next stage—the determination of whether or humorous stimulus elicits the desired response—consists of a number of discrete steps including: *detection* (Moran et al., 2004) or *perception* (Roberts & Johnson, 1957), *comprehension* (Bartolo et al., 2006), and *appreciation* (Zigler et al., 1967). Finally, the diversity of reactions to humorous messages (e.g., laughter, smiling, or non-reactions) are considered the *humor response* (Lefcourt et al., 1974). Any of these individual components may be the subject of “humor” inquiry, and all of these components together form part of what has been called the “sense of humor.”

Martin (2007) attempts a comprehensive definition of “sense of humor” by consolidating the various interpretations existing in the literature:

Sense of humor may therefore be variously conceptualized as a *habitual behavior pattern* (tendency to laugh frequently, to tell jokes and amuse others with spontaneous witticisms, to laugh at other people’s humor productions), an *ability* (to create humor, to amuse others, to “get the joke,” to remember jokes), a *temperament trait* (habitual cheerfulness, playfulness), an *aesthetic response* (enjoyment of particular types of humorous material), an *attitude* (positive attitude toward humor and humorous people), a *world view* (bemused, nonserious outlook on life), or a *coping strategy* or *defense mechanism* (tendency to maintain a humorous perspective in the face of adversity). (p. 194)

Few theorists have referred to and operationalized the plural form “senses of humor”. Eysenck (1972; as cited in Ruch, 1998) identified three different “(good) senses of humor”: (1) appreciation of a particular humor type (i.e., “quality”), (2) frequency of humorous expression (i.e., “quantity”) and (3) the ability to make others laugh (i.e., “productive”). However, it is plausible that this approach may reflect a male perspective bias. For example, one study showed that a woman who delivers the same joke as a male counterpart may not be viewed as humorous

due to social expectations. Thus, it is not productive ability or quantity (i.e., “humor behavior”) that defines one’s sense of humor but how the listener receives and interprets the message.

Thus, the present study employs the Four Senses of Humor Scale (SOH Scale; Neuendorf et al., 2011) which assesses the receptive component of humor appreciation and utilizes a literal definition of the term “sense”—i.e., “the faculty of perceiving by means of sense organs.” As will be reviewed in the discussion section, there are neuroscience data which suggest that the different senses of humor stimulate distinct sensory regions of the brain which are then identified as a rewarding or pleasurable experience. This literal interpretation of “sense of humor” is also in line with the original 19th century conception of the term, which “had an aesthetic connotation, referring to a faculty or capacity for the perception or appreciation of humor” (Martin, 2007, p. 192).

A second defining feature of the SOH Scale is that it incorporates the wealth of previous humor appreciation theories and research. Previous researchers have typically focused on a particular type of humor (Martin, 1998), and “very few approaches to the assessment of humor exist that can be considered comprehensive” (Beermann & Ruch, 2009, p. 530). The SOH Scale attempts to fill this void with respect to humor perception and appreciation.

Researchers have employed a variety of terms to examine the relationship between humor and disparagement. “Ridicule,” which is derived from the Latin word for “to laugh,” implies a malicious expression of laughter. “Verbal dueling” (known historically as “flyting”) is an impromptu competition—usually between males—in which participants try to humiliate the other by generating humorous insults (Progovac & Locke, 2009). Verbal “bullying”—often intended to make an audience laugh—is characterized as a malevolent act of aggression (Mills & Carwile, 2009). “Teasing” is a potentially aggressive provocation which may or may not

malicious or humorous (Aronson et al., 2007). “Ritual insult” refers to socially acceptable or normal put-downs, and may or may not be in the context of a joke. Most recently, Ruch and Proyer (2009) used the term *katagelastocism* (from the Greek word for “laughing at”) to refer to the joy of laughing at others. The most commonly used term is “disparagement humor,” which simply refers to comedic put-downs.

There is substantial overlap between terms, with key distinctions. Jocular ritual insult (i.e., common insulting jokes) substantially overlaps with “disparagement humor” (i.e., insulting jokes), but jocular ritual insult is context-dependent. For example, a person who engages in jocular ritual insult may restrict such behavior in inappropriate settings (e.g., work), but their appreciation for disparagement humor has not changed. For this reason we prefer to use *disparagement humor preference* to refer to the condition of enjoying put-downs more than other forms of humor. This distinction also teases out individuals who generally prefer all types of humor more than others.

“Disparagement humor preference” is similar to *katagelastocism*, but with two important distinctions. First, a *katagelastocist* would “actively seek and enjoy situations in which they can laugh at others” (Proyer & Ruch, 2010, p. 52). While such behavior qualifies as “bullying,” bystanders who enjoy watching others being bullied play an equally important role in its consequences (and may also possess a preference for disparagement humor). Second, “*katagelastocism*” may be culturally-influenced. Chen and colleagues (2010) found a positive correlation between *katagelastocism* and *gelaophobia* (i.e., the fear of being laughed at) in a Taiwanese sample, but did not find the relationship in a European context. Their findings suggest that *katagelastocism* is used as a defense mechanism in some cultures but not others.

Thus, the measurement of “disparagement humor preference” identifies the individuals who derive the most amount of pleasure from the degradation of others, whether they are observers or participants. Another term which may be used to categorize both parties is “agents of ridicule” (Proyer & Ruch, 2010), however this term also does not specify individuals who enjoy disparagement more than all other forms of humor.

Disparagement Humor

Philosophers have long identified the relationship between disparagement and humor: Plato (428-348 B.C.) believed that all laughter originates in malice (Martin, 2007, p. 44); Hobbes argued that “the infirmities of others constitute the principal source of laughter and mirth” (Zillmann & Cantor, 1996, p. 94); and Aristotle claimed that comedy resulted from observing the “species of the ugly” (in *Poetics*, reprinted in Martin, 2007).

Freud believed that disparagement humor represented only one type—“*tendentious humor*” (1960)—which he also referred to as “humor that has a purpose” (Ferguson & Ford, 2008). He specified that disparagement was specifically a hostile form of humor used with the goal of gaining dominance over an adversary in a socially acceptable manner. Freud’s theory spawned a litany of research throughout the 1960’s, with contradictory findings.

The early studies used violence-themed cartoons as stimuli, and found that hostile cartoons were rated funnier than nonhostile cartoons (Epstein & Smith, 1956; Singer, Gollob, & Levine, 1967) or moderately disparaging humor is rated funnier than extremely low or high occurrences (Zillmann & Cantor, 1976). More recent studies could not confirm these findings, but instead found that other variables (e.g., gender) moderated the relationship (Herzog et al., 2006).

In spite of these early differences, there is now a general consensus among humor researchers that disparagement humor is rooted aggressive impulses (Martin, 2007). There is, however, ambiguity surrounding the underlying causes of the impulses. Several factors have been suggested, including: trait aggressiveness (Byrne, 1955; Ullmann & Lim, 1962), antipathy toward the target (Zillmann & Cantor, 1976; La Fave et al., 1976), and competition as a form a “playful aggression” (Gruner, 1997). Gruner’s approach is supported by Zillmann and Cantor’s findings that extreme disparagement humor is typically viewed as less humorous (since the joke is no longer playful at extreme levels of disparagement).

Several studies further explored this issue by experimentally manipulating the mood of the participants, hypothesizing that: (a) aroused hostility would lead to a greater appreciation for hostile humor, and that (b) the viewing of hostile humor would have a “cathartic” effect, decreasing the level of hostility. The results were contradictory and inconclusive. Dworkin and Efran (1967) found that anger caused people to respond selectively to hostile humor, and that exposure to aggressive humor reduced anger and anxiety. Similar findings were reported by Strickland (1958). However, Singer (1968) found that “arousal of aggressive impulses had no effect on humor appreciation” (p. 10), but confirmed that hostile humor reduced aggression and tension. Several dissertation studies corroborated Singer’s findings (Byrne, 1961; Strickland, 1958).

In recent years researchers have revisited the early humor studies in an attempt to better understand the motivations behind the use of disparagement humor. Still, though, “knowledge about the causes and consequences is still rather limited” (Proyer & Ruch, 2010). The present study draws from various streams of social and behavioral science to seek to further understand the motivation(s) fueling disparaging humor. A potentially productive approach—prominent in

the field of sociology—was popularized by Brazilian author Paulo Freire, who claimed that individuals who are oppressed will often become the oppressors (Freire, 1971).

Nevo (1984) reviewed some anthropological and sociological support for this theory, citing scenarios in which minorities or submissive groups use humor in order to express forbidden aggression. For example, Oberdick (1942) conducted an analysis of humor among Czechs during the Nazi occupation, and found humor was viewed as a symbol of resistance against oppression. In West Africa, rites have emerged through which oppressed groups create songs of derision to mock their oppressors (Piersen, 1976). These phenomena coincide with Freud's hypothesis that humor is a way of gaining *power* over an enemy.

The “Social Power” Hypothesis

Social psychologists have long distinguished between social power and personal power. Social power refers to the ability to control others by administering rewards or punishments (i.e., “power over”), while personal power refers to “the ability to carry out action” (i.e., “power to”) (Overbeck, 2010). Most research on power has focused on “who seeks and secures [social] power over whom” (Vescio & Guinote, 2010), finding a variety of correlates of “the power motive” including aggression (Winter, 2010). However, no published study has demonstrated a direct link between the use of disparagement humor and the motive for social power.

Schwartz (1992), in creating the Schwartz Values Survey, argued that human values are motivational constructs which arise out of deep-rooted emotional needs. One of the fifty six universal values assessed in dozens of countries is “social power.” Using the Senses of Humor Scale (Neuendorf et al., 2011) and the Schwartz Values Survey (1992), it is hypothesized that:

H1: The Social Power value will positively correlate with enjoyment of racial disparagement humor.

To test the general notion that the oppressed will often become the oppressor (e.g., Freire, 1971), we also forward the research question:

RQ1: African Americans, traditionally oppressed group in America, will prefer disparagement humor more than will others.

In an effort to better understand how racial disparagement humor appreciate compares with the appreciation of other key humor types, the following research question is posed:

RQ2: Do types of humor (other than racial disparagement) relate to the Social Power value?

And, to focus further on the potentially unique case of African Americans and their appreciation of humor as related to Social Power, we query:

RQ3: Do the relationships between the various senses of humor and the Social Power value differ between Black and non-Black groups?

Method

Study data were collected in the Spring of 2010 using an online survey. The instrument was administered to a sample of undergraduates enrolled in Communication courses who received either course credit or extra credit for their participation. A total of 288 students completed the survey, which included measures tapping personal values as well as humor preferences. The study was approved by the university Human Subjects Board before data collection commenced.

Measures

Personal values. Values were measured using the Schwartz (1992) inventory. Respondents rated the importance of 56 values as a guiding principle in their life on a nine-point

scale that ranged from “opposed to my principles” (-1), and “not important” (0), to “of supreme importance” (7). Schwartz proposed five value types: power (social power, wealth, authority, preserving my public image), achievement (ambitious, influential, capable, successful), hedonism (pleasure, enjoying life), benevolence (loyal, honest, responsible, helpful, forgiving) and universalism (equality, wisdom, world of peace, unity with nature, world of beauty, social justice, broadminded, protect the environment). The present analysis used the items pertaining power and benevolence (proposed by Schwartz as being the “opposite” of power, meaning the being high in one should lower the score in the other).

Humor preferences. Berger (1987) noted that “there are four important theories of humor” (p. 7). Each of these theoretical frameworks may also be explained in terms of perceptual mechanisms which enable a listener to interpret a message as humorous. They may operate independently or in conjunction with one another. The four mechanisms are:

1. Superiority/disparagement: Among others, Freud (1960) recognized the aggressive nature of most jokes. As far back as Aristotle (McKeon, 1941), laughter is seen as originating in malice. Seventeenth-century British philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1651/1981) reinforced the notion of humor as derived from a sense of superiority over others. More recently, the superiority mechanism has been validated by the theoretic examinations of Gruner (1978) and the quantitative research of Zillmann and Bryant (1974; 1980; Zillmann & Cantor, 1976) and LaFave (LaFave, Haddad, & Maesen, 1976). Common applications of humor aimed at engaging this mechanism include racist and sexist humor (Thomas & Esses, 2004). Attempts to generate a superiority mechanism in response to potentially humorous stimuli include “putdown” humor, satire, sarcasm, self-deprecation, and the display of stupid behaviors.

2. Incongruity: The juxtaposition of inconsistent or incongruous elements is the focus of

this oft-mentioned mechanism by which humor might be apprehended. Dating back to articulations by 19th century German philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer (Martin, 2007), this notion was further elaborated by Arthur Koestler (1964). His concept of bisociation is an attempt to explain the mental processes involved in the humorous resolution of incongruous stimuli, as well as the process of artistic creativity and scientific discovery. Briefly, these theoretical approaches indicate that humor is experienced when two disparate perspectives are simultaneously experienced; the joy of humor derives from the “solving” of the incongruous puzzle. Contemporary empirical support for this mechanism of humor includes a series of studies by Shultz and colleagues (e.g. Shultz & Horibe, 1974) and others (Perlmutter, 2002; Vaid et al., 2003; Veal, 2004). Particular types of humor intended to generate an incongruity mechanism include wordplay (e.g., puns), “pure” visual incongruity, absurdity, and sight gags.

3. Arousal/Dark humor: Although early attempts to explicate this mechanism emphasized the response as a relief of pent-up psychological strain or tension (e.g., the works of writers/philosophers Immanuel Kant and Harbert Spencer, 1860), a later articulation by psychologist Daniel Berlyne (1972) posited two arousal-related processes—arousal boost and arousal jag. The arousal boost mechanism operates when a pleasurable increase in generalized arousal results from a humorous stimulus. The arousal jag mechanism comes into play when arousal passes an optimal level, and a punchline or other resolution successfully reduces arousal to a pleasurable level once again. Arousal-provoking humor may be manifested in a variety of ways, such as dark or death-related humor, sick humor, and sexual or naughty humor.

4. Social Currency: Although less often acknowledged as an independent dimension of humor appreciation, social interaction humor has been studied as a means of building and maintaining relationships (e.g. Chapman, 1983; Fine, 1983; Lamaster, 1975). Humor may be

experienced as the pleasure derived from playful interaction (Apter, 1982), the establishment of a functional social hierarchy (Fry, 1963), or the achievement of a sense of group belonging or understanding (Dundes, 1987; Pollio, 1983). Particular behaviors meant to invoke this mechanism include the use of “inside jokes”, joking to fit in, and parody (relying on a shared view of a known form, such as a film genre).

Research by Neuendorf, Skalski and others (e.g., Neuendorf et al., 2011) has established the validity of a multi-dimensional approach to the measurement of Senses of Humor (SOH). It has been confirmed that the four humor mechanisms seem to operate independently, and that various combinations of preferences across the four can constitute sense of humor “profiles” that differ among demographic groups (Lieberman et al., 2009; Neuendorf, Skalski, & Powers, 2004). Additionally, links between specific SOH profiles and media use patterns have been established (Neuendorf, 2007; Neuendorf & Skalski, 2000; Powers, Neuendorf, & Skalski, 2005), as well as links connecting SOH to perceived quality of life (QOL; Neuendorf et al., 2000). Evidence has also been found of a relationship between SOH profiles and reactions to public events such as the O.J. Simpson murder trial and the Bill Clinton/Monica Lewinsky affair (Neuendorf et al., 1999).

More recently, qualitative work inquiring into respondents’ understanding of the deep meanings of the four mechanisms of humor has further validated the theoretical dimensionality of these humor type preferences with anecdotes collected from respondents (Neuendorf & Skalski, 2012). The present study utilizes the SOH scale to the same manner as most previous humor research—to reveal certain aspects the human personality, which may be defined as “an individual’s habitual way of thinking, feeling, perceiving, and reacting to the world” (Martin, 2007, p. 191; Magnavita, 2002, p. 16).

The four mechanisms of humor were in this study measured via a variety of survey items. The focus of this investigation is on racially-oriented disparagement humor, so a single item tapping that construct was utilized, a Likert-type item that asked people to respond to the statement “I like humor that puts down other racial or ethnic groups” on a 0 to 10 scale where 0=strongly disagree and 10=strongly agree. The three additional humor types were measured via three 4-item scales (previously validated by Neuendorf et al., 2011). Social Currency Humor included the Likert-type items “I find it amusing when others make reference to things I’m really familiar with,” “I like humor that is shared by a group,” “I find it humorous when I explore common knowledge or experiences with others,” and “I like ‘inside’ jokes (jokes only certain people ‘get’).” Arousal/Dark Humor was constituted from the items “I like dark comedy,” “I like humor about death,” “I think it’s funny when other people actually get hurt,” and “I like gross-out humor.” And Incongruity Humor included the items “Unlikely events seem funny,” “I think it’s funny when things are combined in unexpected ways,” “When something happens that is a “one in a million” occurrence, I find it funny,” and “I think incongruity is funny (i.e., when incompatible elements are put together).”

Demographics. A variety of demographic measures were included in this study. Participants were asked to indicate their biological sex, age (in years), marital status, income, and race. Race was measured via an open-ended question, and responses were coded into African-American/Black and Non-Black for subsequent analyses.

Results

Sample Description

A total of 288 respondents completed the online survey, with a mean age of 22.6 and 44% male respondents. The majority (94%) had never married; the modal household income was less than \$25,000. Seventy percent of respondents self-designated as Caucasian/White, and 19% as African-American/Black.

Hypothesis and Research Questions

Correlational analyses were used to assess the hypothesis and research questions. Table 1 presents the critical linear correlations for the full sample. The first column of correlations in the table show the relationships between African-American/Black status and five variables of interest—endorsement of the Social Power value, and appreciation of Racial Disparagement Humor, Social Currency Humor, Arousal/Dark Humor, and Incongruity Humor. The first research question queried whether Blacks will be more likely to appreciate Racial Disparagement Humor than will others. This was found not to be the case, as reflected in a significant *negative* correlation between Black status and Racial Disparagement Humor ($r = -.163, p = .012$).

-----Table 1 about here-----

The sole research hypothesis predicted that Social Power values will be positively related to an appreciation of Racial Disparagement Humor. Endorsement of the Social Power value is positively and significantly related to appreciation of Racial Disparagement Humor ($r = .182, p = .005$), confirming this hypothesis. Research question 2 asked whether Social Power values are related to other senses of humor as well. In Table 1, we see that Social Power is positively related to an appreciation of Dark Humor ($r = .159, p = .015$). Social Power is uncorrelated with Social Currency Humor appreciation and with Incongruity Humor appreciation. The key finding—that of a positive correlation between Social Power and Racial Disparagement

Humor—maintains even when controlling for appreciation of the other three types of humor ($p = .138, p = .037$).

The third research question asked about race differences in the relationships between Social Power value and the senses of humor. To examine whether these relationships differ between the races, analyses were conducted separately for Black and non-Black samples. These analyses are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

-----Tables 2 and 3 about here-----

The results reveal key differences between the two subsamples. For Black respondents ($n=45$), endorsement of the Social Power value is very strongly correlated with appreciation of Dark Humor ($r = .434, p < .001$). However, Social Power is unrelated to Racial Disparagement Humor, Social Currency Humor, and Incongruity Humor.

The findings for non-Black respondents ($n=183$) show a different pattern. Endorsement of the Social Power value is significantly correlated with Racial Disparagement Humor ($r = .216, p = .003$), but not any of the other humor dimensions (Social Currency, Dark Humor, or Incongruity Humor). This relationship maintains when controlling for enjoyment of the other senses of humor ($p = .224, p = .002$).

Correlations among the four senses of humor are similar between the two race groups. Enjoyment of Racial Disparagement Humor is positively correlated with enjoyment of Arousal/Dark Humor for both groups. Enjoyment of Racial Disparagement Humor is positively related to enjoyment of Incongruity Humor for the Black subsample but not the Non-Black group. For both groups, Social Currency Humor appreciation and Arousal/Dark Humor appreciation are unrelated, while Incongruity Humor appreciation is positively related to both Social Currency appreciation and Arousal/Dark Humor appreciation.

Discussion

Research Question One explored the theory that oppressed groups will become the oppressor when possible. African-Americans, a minority with a history of subjugation in the United States, were expected to enjoy racial disparagement humor more than non-African-American participants. The results were significant, but in the opposite direction. African-Americans *disliked* racial disparagement humor significantly more than did non-African-American respondents. This finding corresponds with the view of theorists who argue that “those who are subject to racial inequality in America arguably are more sensitive to issues pertaining to race” (Banjo, 2011, p. 141; Nakayama & Martin, 1999).

Hypothesis One predicted that liking of racial disparagement humor would correlate with Social Power value motivation, and this prediction was confirmed. To further explore how race affects the relationship between “sense of humor” and “social power” value motivation, several additional research questions were explored.

First, for the full sample, Social Power value motivation correlated significantly with Dark/Arousal humor appreciation, however this relationship disappeared when looking only at the non-Black subsample (i.e., it held only for the Black subsample). And, the relationship between Social Power value motivation and racial disparagement humor disappeared when examining only the African American participants (i.e., it held only for non-Black respondents). The results suggest that majority ethnicity groups may enjoy racial disparagement humor as an expression of social power motivation, while minority groups may gain social power through “taboo” humor (i.e., Dark/Arousal).

Overall, our findings corroborate Nevo's (1984) assertion that "hierarchical relations in society are maintained in humor; the strong, who dominate in real life, are also more aggressive in humor" (Nevo, 1984, p. 183).

References

- Andrews-Hanna, J. R., Reidler, J., Sepulcre, J., Poulin, R., & Buckner, R. (2010). Functional-anatomic fractionation of the brain's default network. *Neuron*, *65*, 550-562.
- Apter, M. J. (1982). *The experience of motivation: The theory of psychological reversals*. London: Academic Press.
- Aronson, E., Biegler, H., Mannone, S., Marshall, L., Pham, V., Porter, R., et al. (2007). Norms for teasing among college students. *Communication Research Reports*, *24*(2), 169-176.
- Banjo, O. (2011). What are you laughing at? Examining white identity and enjoyment of black entertainment. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *55*(2), 137-159.
- Bartolo, A., Benuzzi, F., Nocetti, L., Baraldi, P., & Nichelli, P. (2006). Humor comprehension and appreciation: An fMRI study. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *18*(11), 1789-1798.
- Beerman, U., & Ruch, W. (2009). How virtuous is humour? What we can learn from current instruments. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *4*, 528-539.
- Berger, A. A. (1987). Humor. *American Behaviorist Scientist*, *30*(1), 6-15.
- Berlyne, D. E. (1972). Humor and its kin. In J. H. Goldstein & P. E. McGhee (Eds.), *The psychology of humor: Theoretical perspectives and empirical issues* (pp. 43-60). New York: Academic Press.
- Byrne, D. (1955). The relationship between humor and the expression of hostility. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *53*(1), 84-89.
- Byrne, D. (1961). Some inconsistencies in the effect of motivation arousal on humor preferences. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *62*(1), 158-160.

- Chapman, A. J. (1983). Humor and laughter in social interaction and some implications for humor research. In P. E. McGhee & J. H. Goldstein (Eds.), *Handbook of humor research, Vol. I* (pp. 135-157). New York: Springer & Verlag.
- Chen, H. C., Chan, Y. C., Ruch, W., & Proyer, R. T. (2010). Being laughed at and laughing at others in Taiwan and Switzerland: A cross-cultural perspective. *Modern and contemporary approaches to humour in China (Vol. 2 of Humour in Chinese life and letters)*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Crocker, J. (2004). The costs of seeking self-esteem. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*(3), 597-615.
- Dundes, A. (1987). At ease, disease—AIDS jokes as sick humor. *American Behavioral Scientist, 30*, 72-81.
- Dworkin, E. S., & Efran, J. S. (1967). The angered: Their susceptibility to varieties of humor. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6*(2), 233-236.
- Epstein, S. & Smith, R. (1956). Repression and insight as related to reaction to cartoons. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 20*, 391-395.
- Ferguson, M. A., & Ford, T. E. (2008). Disparagement humor: A theoretical and empirical review of psychoanalytic, superiority, and social identity theories. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research, 21*(3), 283-312.
- Fine, G. A. (1983). Sociological approaches to the study of humor. In P. E. McGhee & J. H. Goldstein (Eds.), *Handbook of humor research, Vol. I* (pp. 159-181). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Freire, P. (1971). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freud, S. (1960). *Jokes and their relation to the unconscious*. (James Strachey, Ed.). New York, New York: Norton & Company.
- Fry, W. F. (1963). *Sweet madness: A study of humor*. Palo Alto, CA: Pacific Books.

- Garner, T. (1983). Playing the dozens: Folklore as strategies for living.. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 69, 47-57.
- Goldstein, K. (1939). *The organism*. New York, New York: American Book Company.
- Gruner, C. R. (1978). *Understanding laughter: The workings of wit and humor*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Gruner, C. R. (1997). *The game of humor: A comprehensive theory of why we laugh*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Hobbes, T. (1651/1981). *Leviathan*. London: Penguin Books.
- Huizinga, J. (1932/1992). *Homo ludens: A study of the play element in culture*. Beacon Press.
- Koestler, A. (1964). *The act of creation*. London: Hutchinson.
- LaFave, L., Haddad, J., & Maesen, W. A. (1976). Superiority, enhanced self-esteem, and perceived incongruity humour theory. In A. J. Chapman & H. C. Foot (Eds.), *Humor and laughter: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 63-91). London: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lamaster, E. E. (1975). *Blue collar aristocrats: Lifestyles at a working class bar*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Lefcourt, H. M., Antrobus, P., & Hogg, E. (1974). Humor response and humor production as a function of locus of control, field dependence and type of reinforcements. *Journal of Personality*, 42(4), 632-651.
- Lefever, H. G. (1981). "Playing the dozens": A mechanism for social control. *Phylon*, 42(1), 73-85.
- Lieberman, E. A., Neuendorf, K. A., Denny, J., Skalski, P. D., & Wang, J. (2009). The language of laughter: A quantitative/qualitative fusion examining television narrative and humor. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 53, 497-514.
- Magnavita, J. J. (2002). *Theories of personality: Contemporary approaches to the science of*

- personality*. New York: Wiley
- Martin, R. A. (2007). *The psychology of humor: An integrative approach*. London: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Maslow, A. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.
- McCauley, C., Woods, K., Coolidge, C., & Kulick, W. (1983). More aggressive cartoons are funnier. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(4), 817-823.
- McKeon, R. (Ed.). (1941). *The basic works of Aristotle*. New York: Random House.
- Martin, R. A. (1998). Approaches to the sense of humor: A historical review. In W. Ruch (Ed.), *The sense of humor: Explorations of a personality characteristic* (pp. 15-60). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.
- Mills, C. B., & Carwile, A. M. (2009). The good, the bad, and the borderline: Separating teasing from bullying. *Communication Education*, 58(2), 276-301.
- Moran, J. M., Wig, G. S., Adams, R. B., Janata, P., & Kelley, W. M. (2004). Neural correlates of humor detection and appreciation. *NeuroImage*, 21(3), 1055-1060.
- Nakayama, T., & Martin, J. (1999). *Whiteness: The communication of social identity*. London: Sage.
- Neuendorf, K. A. (2007, June). *Modeling the senses of humor in the context of mass media comedy*. Panel presentation to the International Society for Humor Studies, Newport, RI.
- Neuendorf, K. A., Jeffres, L. W., Skalski, P., & Atkin, D. (2000). Perceptions of quality of life and affective characteristics: An urban examination. *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Quality of Life in Cities, Volume 2* (pp. 401-422). Singapore: The National University of Singapore.

- Neuendorf, K. A., & Skalski, P. (2000, June). *Senses of humor: The development of a multi-factor scale in relationship to moving image utility*. Paper presented to the Mass Communication Division at the annual conference of the International Communication Association, Acapulco, Mexico.
- Neuendorf, K. A., & Skalski, P. D. (2012). *Qualitative validation of the four-part senses of humor construct*. Manuscript in progress, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, OH.
- Neuendorf, K. A., Skalski, P. D., Atkin, D., & Jeffres, L. W. (2011, May). *Public opinion, media use, and the senses of humor*. Paper presented to the Mass Communication Division of the International Communication Association, Boston, MA.
- Neuendorf, K. A., Skalski, P. D., Jeffres, L. W., & Atkin, D. (1999, November). *Public opinion and the senses of humor*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research, Chicago, IL.
- Neuendorf, K. A., Skalski, P., & Powers, J. (2004, May). *Senses of humor: Validation of a multi-factor scale*. Paper presented to the Mass Communication Division of the International Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Nevo, O. (1984). Appreciation and production of humor as an expression of aggression: A study of Jews and Arabs in Israel. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15*(2), 181-198.
- Oberdick, A. (1942). Gallows humor: A sociological phenomenon. *American Journal of Sociology, 47*, 709-716.
- Overbeck, J. R. (2010). Concepts and historical perspectives on power. In *The Social Psychology of Power* (pp. 19-45). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Perlmutter, D. (2002). On incongruities and logical inconsistencies in humor: The delicate

- balance. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 15(2), 155-169.
- Piersen, W. D. (1976). Puttin' down ole massa: African satire in the new world. *Research in African Literatures*, 7(2), 166-180.
- Pollio, H. R. (1983). Notes toward a field theory of humor. In P. E. McGhee & J. H. Goldstein (Eds.), *Handbook of humor research, Vol. I* (pp. 213-250). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Powers, J. I., Neuendorf, K. A., & Skalski, P. D. (2005, June). *Senses of humor and television program preference*. Poster presented to the International Society for Humor Studies, Youngstown, OH.
- Progovac, L., & Locke, J. L. (2009). The urge to merge: Ritual insult and the evolution of syntax. *Biolinguistics*, 3(2-3), 337-354.
- Proyer, R. T., & Ruch, W. (2010). Enjoying and fearing laughter: Personality characteristics of gelotophobes, gelotophiles, and katagelasticists. *Psychological Test and Assessment Modeling*, 52(2), 148-160.
- Raichle, M., MacLeod, A. Snyder, A., Powers, W., Gusnard, D., & Shulman, G. (2001). A default mode of brain function. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 98(2), 676-682.
- Raichle, M., & Snyder, A. (2007). A default mode of brain function: A brief history of an evolving idea. *NeuroImage*, 37(4), 1083-1090.
- Ray, G. (2009). *Language and interracial communication in the United States*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Roberts, A. F., & Johnson, D. M. (1957). Some factors related to the perception of funniness in humor stimuli. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 46, 57-63.
- Ruch, W., & Proyer, R. T. (2009). Extending the study of gelotophobia. *Humor*, 22(1/2), 183-

212.

- Samson, A. C., & Meyer, Y. (2010). Perception of aggressive humor in relation to gelotophobia, gelotophilia, and katagelasticism. *Psychological Test and Assessment Modeling*, 52(2), 217-230.
- Schwartz, S. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1-65.
- Shulman, G. L., Fiez, J., Corbetta, M., Buckner, R., Miezin, F., Raichle, M., & Petersen, S. (1997). Common blood flow changes across visual tasks: Decreases in cerebral cortex. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 9(5), 648-663.
- Shultz, T. R., & Horibe, F. (1974). Development of the appreciation of verbal jokes. *Development Psychobiology*, 10, 13-20.
- Singer, D. L. (1968). Aggression arousal, hostile humor, catharsis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Monograph Supplement*, 8(1), 1-14.
- Singer, D. L., Gollob, H. F., & Levine, J. (1967). Mobilization of inhibitions and the enjoyment of aggressive humor. *Journal of Personality*, 35(4), 562-569.
- Spencer, H. (1860). Physiology of laughter. *Macmillan's Magazine*, 1, 395.
- Strickland, J. F. (1958). The effect of motivation arousal on humor preferences. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 59, 278-281.
- Thomas, C. A., & Esses, V. M. (2004). Individual differences in reactions to sexist humor. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 7(1), 89-100.
- Ullman, L. P., & Lim, D. T. (1962). Case history material as a source of the identification of patterns of response to emotional stimuli in a study of humor. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 26, 221-225.

- Vaid, J., Hull, R., Heredia, R., Gerken, D., & Martinez, F. (2003). Getting a joke: The time course of meaning activation in verbal humor. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 1431–1449.
- Vaillant, G. (1977). *Adaptation to life*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.
- Van Dam, T. (1954). The influence of the West African songs of derision in the new world.. *African Music*, 1(1), 53-56.
- Veale, T. (2004). Incongruity in humor: Root cause or epiphenomenon? *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 17(4), 419-428.
- Vescio, T. K., & Guinote, A. (2010). Power: New understandings and future directions. In *The social psychology of power* (pp. 428-453). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Winter, D. G. (2010). Power in the person: Exploring the motivational underground of power. In *The social psychology of power* (pp. 113-140). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Zigler, E., Levine, J., & Gould, L. (1967). Cognitive challenge as a factor in children's humor appreciation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 6(3), 332-336.
- Zillmann, D., & Bryant, J. (1974). Retaliatory equity as a factor in humor appreciation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 10(5), 480-488.
- Zillmann, D., & Bryant, J. (1980). Misattribution theory of tendentious humor. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 16(2), 146-160.
- Zillmann, D., & Cantor, J. R. (1976). Directionality of transitory dominance as a communication variable affecting humor appreciation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 24(2), 191-198.
- Zillmann, D., & Cantor, J. R. (1996). A disposition theory of humour and mirth. In A. J. Chapman & H. C. Foot, H. C. (Eds.), *Humor and laughter: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 93-116). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Table 1. Correlations— Full Sample.		African- American/ Black (vs. other)	Social Power Value	Racial Disparage- ment Humor	Social Currency Humor	Arousal/ Dark Humor
Social Power Value	Correlation Significance (2-tailed) df	-.053 .420 232				
Racial Disparagement Humor	Correlation Significance (2-tailed) df	-.163 .012 236	.182 .005 230			
Social Currency Humor	Correlation Significance (2-tailed) df	.002 .976 236	-.063 .337 230	.147 .015 268		
Arousal/Dark Humor	Correlation Significance (2-tailed) df	-.189 .004 236	.159 .015 230	.426 .000 268	.050 .417 268	
Incongruity Humor	Correlation Significance (2-tailed) df	.060 .608 236	.007 .918 230	.164 .007 268	.352 .000 268	.259 .000 268
Racial Disparagement Humor (controlling for Social Currency, Arousal/Dark, & Incongruity Humor)	Partial Correlation Significance (2-tailed) df		.138 .037 226			

Table 2. Correlations— Black Subsample.		Social Power Value	Racial Disparagement Humor	Social Currency Humor	Arousal/ Dark Humor
Racial Disparagement Humor	Correlation Significance (2-tailed) df	.058 .699 45			
Social Currency Humor	Correlation Significance (2-tailed) df	-.080 .592 45	.215 .148 45		
Arousal/Dark Humor	Correlation Significance (2-tailed) df	.434 .002 45	.473 .001 45	.210 .156 45	
Incongruity Humor	Correlation Significance (2-tailed) df	-.069 .646 45	.330 .023 45	.536 .000 45	.397 .006 45
Racial Disparagement Humor (controlling for Social Currency, Arousal/Dark, & Incongruity Humor)	Partial Correlation Significance (2-tailed) df	-.140 .364 42			

Table 3. Correlations— Non-black Subsample.		Social Power Value	Racial Disparagement Humor	Social Currency Humor	Arousal/ Dark Humor
Racial Disparagement Humor	Correlation Significance (2-tailed) df	.216 .003 183			
Social Currency Humor	Correlation Significance (2-tailed) df	-.056 .448 183	.106 .152 183		
Arousal/Dark Humor	Correlation Significance (2-tailed) df	.054 .468 183	.417 .000 183	-.006 .941 183	
Incongruity Humor	Correlation Significance (2-tailed) df	.037 .620 183	.112 .129 183	.266 .000 183	.270 .000 183
Racial Disparagement Humor (controlling for Social Currency, Arousal/Dark, & Incongruity Humor)	Partial Correlation Significance (2-tailed) df	.224 .002 180			