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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).
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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 Artic 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 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; Author, 2011a) 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 katagelasticism 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 katagelasticism 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, p. 86); 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, 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, Oberdlick (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 (Author, 2011a) 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 to 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 Author (2011a) and others has established the validity of a multidimensional 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 (Author, 2004; 2009). Additionally, links between specific SOH profiles and media use patterns have been established (Author, 2000a; 2005; 2007), as well as links connecting SOH to perceived quality of life (QOL; Author, 2000b). 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 (Author, 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 (Author, 2011b). 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 Author, 2011a). 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 (pr = .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.

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 (pr = .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 disliking 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/Arousual).
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).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Correlations—Full Sample.</th>
<th>African-American/Black (vs. other)</th>
<th>Social Power Value</th>
<th>Racial Disparagement Humor</th>
<th>Social Currency Humor</th>
<th>Arousal/Dark Humor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Power Value</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td></td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Disparagement Humor</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td></td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Currency Humor</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td></td>
<td>.337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal/Dark Humor</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incongruity Humor</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td></td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td></td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
<td>268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2. Correlations—Black Subsample.</td>
<td>Social Power Value</td>
<td>Racial Disparagement Humor</td>
<td>Social Currency Humor</td>
<td>Arousal/Dark Humor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Disparagement Humor</td>
<td>Correlation Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Currency Humor</td>
<td>Correlation Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal/Dark Humor</td>
<td>Correlation Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incongruity Humor</td>
<td>Correlation Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Disparagement Humor (controlling for Social Currency, Arousal/Dark, &amp; Incongruity Humor)</td>
<td>Partial Correlation Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Disparagement Humor</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Currency Humor</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal/Dark Humor</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incongruity Humor</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Disparagement Humor (controlling for Social Currency, Arousal/Dark, &amp; Incongruity Humor)</td>
<td>Partial Correlation</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>