

Research Article

Sociolinguistic Inquiry on the Humor Production of Tagalog Tertiary Students

JOEL M. TORRES

Department of Secondary Education
College of Education, Central Luzon State University
joel_torres@clsu.edu.ph

JOSE CRISTINA M. PARIÑA

Department of English and Applied Linguistics
Bro. Andrew Gonzalez College of Education, De La Salle University

Abstract

The present quantitative-qualitative study utilized the dynamic sociological approach to analyze and describe how humor is gendered among 240 (equal distribution of male, female, gay and lesbian) middle-class Tagalog university students, ages 18 to 25. The 240 participants answered the Humor Production Sheet. Thirty-two participants (equal gender distribution), from the original 240 participants, also worked on a 21-day humor journal. The participants' humor scripts were described, compared, and contrasted among genders to illustrate how humor as a discourse mode enables individuals to celebrate their values, perspectives and multi-faceted experiences inclusive of their societal, cultural, and personal roles. The researchers also developed a framework for analyzing humor types. Results show that, of the 449 humor scripts produced, positive humor was the most prevalent. Aggressive, self-defeating, sexual and sexist humor followed. Participants did not produce ethnic or national humor type. Implications to gender and development as well as curriculum development were raised.

Keywords: culture, language, gender, humor production

INTRODUCTION

Gender conditions our presentation of selves, manner of dealing with others, and methods of communicating (Chiaro & Baccolini, 2014). Gender is not something a person is born with, and not something one has, but something one does (West & Zimmerman, 1987; Butler, 1990; Eckert & McConnel-Ginet, 2003). It is performed through a number of expressions ranging from attire, nonverbal behavior, and role enactment; all of which succeed because they fit others' pre-existing expectations (Kessler & McKenna, 1978). Gender is viewed as a system of meaning that affects access to power, status, and material resources, while, humor, as a discourse mode, is considered a strategy for social interaction. Humor is definitely not the most common way people do gender, but it is neither insignificant. Humor's role in constructing and presenting one's self is related to its ambiguity, flexibility and indirectness (Mulkay, 1988). It is within this theoretical underpinning that women and men use humor in same-gender and mixed-gender settings as a means of gender construction.

Gendered humor examines, underscores, and hyperbolizes differences in humor between men and women (Abedinifard, 2016; Connell, 2009). Kramarae (1981) stresses that men and women differ in how they look at the world, which might contribute to their varying humor interests. Hence, studies on gender have contributed to an expansion of the concept of humor (Crawford, 2003). Further, even though gender inclusivity is not evident in humorous activity, humor styles still have roles in social typification. The association between humor and gender has become increasingly complex. Furthermore, research on male and female humorous behavior have become more differentiated; in social and cultural studies, gender's theoretical conception has also changed (Davies, 2006). Such differentiation also exists in hierarchies that are generally structured around intersectional elements of identity, such as ability, age, ethnicity, race, religion, and sexuality. Goldstein (1976 as cited in Knyazyan, 2015) concludes that people enjoy humor that reflects what they believe, and they consider humor that opposes what they believe as not enjoyable. This implies that a listener, despite finding the humor in something, does not necessarily share similar beliefs as the humor implies.

Unlike the existence of a big body of literature on gender differences in humor appreciation, fewer studies have explored gender differences in the tendency to produce humor or the kinds of humor that men and women normally exhibit. This ability-based aspect of humor is normally measured by requesting participants to produce humorous responses to stimuli such as writing funny captions for cartoons, and these captions are then rated for funniness (Martin, 2014). There is few evidence (Crawford & Gressley, 1991) that men are more likely to tell formulaic or "canned" jokes in general as opposed to women who reported a greater inclination to produce anecdotal humor such as recounting funny stories on things they encountered or from the experiences of others. In a study by Brodzinsky and Rubien (1976), they provided male and female participants 12 cartoons with captions removed. Participants were then instructed to create humorous captions for each. Their captions were rated for funniness by both the male and female judges. Overall, captions produced by men garnered higher funniness ratings than those of women. Moreover, gender difference was only noted with the captions created for

cartoons with overtly sexual or aggressive themes. Consistent to the findings of the aforementioned researchers were the findings of a more recent study conducted by Greengross and Miller (2011) where they found a significant difference in the mean rated funniness of the captions. Specifically, the humor produced by males were rated as significantly funnier than those of women. They also found that humor production was higher in males while humor appreciation was higher in females.

On the other hand, different findings were noted in the study of Johnson (1991 as cited in Martin, 2014), who asked men and women taking introductory courses in psychology to write down their favorite joke. Though men told significantly more jokes that have both aggressive and sexual themes than women, Johnson found no gender differences in the frequency of men and women telling jokes that were classified to be either sexual or aggressive. This is in contrast with the view that women do not enjoy these types of humor as much as men do. No significant gender differences were also noted in the study of Clabby (1980 as cited in Martin, 2014) which involved undergraduate participants being asked to create witty responses on five items.

Findings of Johnson and Clabby are consistent with more recent research like that of Edwards and Martin (2010). To measure the humor production skills of 215 male and female undergraduate students, Edwards and Martin used two different tasks: (1) make funny captions for five captions less cartoons; (2) give descriptions of five potentially frustrating situations and imagine being there in each situation. Finally, participants were asked to record humorous things they could say about the situations when narrated to a friend afterwards. Data analysis revealed no significant differences between men and women in either task.

Using a corpus of 148 narratives in Spanish on the same topic – a school trip – to Mars, Gurillo (2017) analyzed nine- to ten-year-old children's production of humor from a linguistic perspective. They found that the children involved can use a number of humorous markers, including exclamations, and humorous indicators such as metaphors and phraseological units to narrate their trip to Mars.

Most of those aforementioned findings (cf. Brodzinky et al., 1981 & Hasset & Houlihan, 1979 as cited in Parekh, 1999) may turn out to be a subject for verification especially that they were done from 1970-1980, a time when sex roles may be more rigid than they might be now. Furthermore, according to Myers et al. (1997), recent changes in gender role may have also decreased the gender divide in humor given the fact that, in the past, social roles for women made it inappropriate for them to engage in most humor as it would violate the norms of feminine behavior. In addition, though a number of literatures pointed out gender differences in humor styles among men and women in the foreign context, such study has remained unexplored in the Philippine setting. Likewise, even in the Western context, a few researches looked into individual genders' humor production and reproduction. It is also interesting to find out how other genders, beyond the male and female dichotomy, such as the self-identified lesbian and gay individuals, produce humor. Hence, this study addresses the following concerns:

- a. How may the participants' humor production be described in terms of humor type?
- b. Do heterosexual males and females, and self-identified gays and lesbians differ in the types of humor they produce?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

To determine participants' humor production skills, the study used quantitative-qualitative descriptive research design.

Participants and Research Setting

A sample of 240 middle-class Tagalog tertiary students (equal representation of each gender) from five state universities in the provinces of Bulacan, Cavite, Nueva Ecija, and Quezon were involved in the study. Age of participants ranged from 18 to 23 years old. Participants were self-identified heterosexual male, heterosexual female, gay, and lesbian.

To ensure that the relationship between gender and humor was fully captured and that gender is the sole results' predictor, the participants recruited in the study were from the same language grouping, age range, education level, and social class. This is in line with Martin's (2014) suggestion, based on his extensive overview of psychological research on gender differences in sense of humor, that scholars should tread lightly when drawing conclusions because different patterns could well be found in people from different cultural and ethnic groups, ages and social classes.

Instruments

Humor Production Sheet

The Humor Production Sheet is a researcher-made instrument that aims to determine the humor types the participants have produced. The 240 participants were presented with 18 humor scripts, each representing a specific humor type (i.e., positive, aggressive, self-defeating, sexual, sexist, aggressive, ethnic or national). First, positive humor type is considered genial, non-competitive, and harmless humor. Second, self-deprecating humor involves humor at one's personal expense to amuse others. Third, sexual humor refers to the bathroom humor and those that include reproductive organs as sources and subjects of humor. Fourth, sexist humor degrades, offends, typecasts, and objectifies a person on the basis of his/her gender. Fifth, aggressive humor deprecates other people and involves ridicule, teasing, and hostility. Lastly, national or ethnic humor underscores the traits or characteristics of certain ethnic or national group, which serves as the target and subject of humor. The participants were tasked to read

the humor scripts; after which, they were asked to identify their frequency of producing similar humor type like the one they have read.

The 21-day Humor Journal

The 32 participants (eight from each gender) from the original 240 participants were given a 21-day Humor Journal where they recorded the humor scripts they produced each day, the people involved and their reaction, as well as their personal assessment rating of the humor they produced. The humor scripts produced by the participants in the 21-day Humor Journal were coded according to humor types used in the Humor Production Sheet.

The task of maintaining diaries can be burdensome especially for students (Saldaña, 2011); hence, the participants were encouraged to only take notes if and when it was convenient for them, and it did not detract them from their studying.

Method of Analysis

The participants' responses in the first research instrument were tabulated. Next, the mean score and standard deviation for each item were computed. The mean scores were interpreted as follows:

Mean Scores	Interpretation
3.29 - 4.00	Never (N)
2.53 - 3.28	Seldom (S)
1.76 - 2.52	Often (O)
1.00 - 1.75	Always (A)

Participants' responses in the researcher-made Humor Production Sheet, as well as in the 21-day Humor Journal, were described according to humor types. These are positive or clean humor, self-deprecating humor, malicious or sexual humor, sexist humor, aggressive or putdown humor, and national or ethnic humor.

A clean or positive humor (Humor Script 1) is a type of humor that is considered non-hostile, non-competitive and benign humor. This is a type of humor that everyone can safely laugh at without fear of getting other individuals, groups or beliefs from being offended.

Humor Script 1 (Sample of clean or positive humor)

Boss ng mga Potato

Pedro: *Ma'am, ano tawag sa puting gulay?*

- Teacher: (What do you call a white vegetable?)
Ano?
 (What?)
- Pedro: *Putito mam. Eh ung mas maputi sa putito?*
 (Potato, ma'am. What about the vegetable whiter than potato?)
- Teacher: *Ano naman yan?*
 (What is that?)
- Pedro: *Mash Putito!*
 (Mash Potato)
- Teacher: Shut up!
- Pedro: *Eh ma'am iyong mga boss ng mga putito?*
 (Ma'am, what about the boss of potatoes?)
- Teacher: Sit down.
- Pedro: *Last na ma'am*
 (This is the last ma'am)
- Teacher: *Ano?*
 (What?)
- Pedro: *Putito Chiefs!*
 (Potato Chiefs!)

Humor Script 1 was classified as positive humor since it does not intend to offend anybody. Meanwhile, self-deprecating or self-defeating humor (Humor Script 2) involves humor at other person's self-expense to amuse others. The script was classified as self-deprecating humor since it is the speaker of the humor script who is also the target of humor.

Humor Script 2 (Sample of self-deprecating humor)
Diary ng Pangit

Dear Diary,

I'm so happy talaga. Nahuli ako ng crush ko na nakatitig sa kanya. Minura niya ako. Gosh! Narinig ko na rin voice niya. Ang gwapo niya talaga! Last time nga, tinulak niya ko, dumugo nose ko kasi sinadya ko syang banggain, nakakakilig diba? At least nagkadikit na kami. Humingi sya ng picture ko, ipapasalvage nya raw ako, so sweet!

(I'm really happy. My crush saw me staring at him. He cursed me. At last! I heard his voice. He is really handsome! Last time, our paths crossed, he pushed me, my nose bled because I intentionally hit my body to his body. The good thing is that I felt his warm body. He asked for my photo. He told me that he would have me salvaged. So sweet!)

A sexual humor (Humor Script 3) refers to the bathroom humor and those that use body organs and sexual activities as sources and subjects of humor. Humor Script 3 was classified as sexual humor since there is the mentioning of body organs, and sexual activity is implied in the script.

*Humor Script 3 (Sample of sexual humor)**Si Doc at ang Sexy*

Sexy Lady: *Doc, mainit pwet ko...*
(Doc, my anus is hot.)

Doctor: *Oh sige, lagyan natin ng thermometer...*
(Okay let's put thermometer.)

Sexy Lady: *Hiya ako eh...*
(I am shy.)

Doctor: *Sige patayin natin ilaw...*
(Okay, let us turn off the light.)

Pinatay ni Doc ang ilaw
(The Doctor turned off the light)

Sexy Lady: *Doc hindi pwet yan ha...*
(Doctor, that is not my anus.)

Doctor: *Okay lang... Hindi rin thermometer ito...*
(It is okay. This is also not the thermometer.)

Sexist humor (Humor Script 4) demeans, insults, stereotypes, and/or objectifies a person on the basis of his/her gender. Humor Script 4 is an example as it shows how an individual from a particular gender group becomes the target of humor.

Humor Script 4 (Sample of sexist humor)

Ama: *Hoy, Brando! Huwag kang babakla-bakla ha!*
(Dad: Brando, I don't like that you are acting like a gay.)

Anak: *Di po itay. Punta nga ako sa basketball court ngayon.*
(Son: Of course not, Dad. In fact, I'm on my way to the basketball court now.)

Ama: *Yan, astig!*
(Dad: That's my thug boy!)

Anak: *Ma, nakita mo pompoms ko?*
(Son: Mom, have you seen my pompoms?)

Aggressive humor (Humor Script 5) refers to those humor that attacks or belittles other people and involves disparagement, derision, hostility, ridicule, sarcasm, and teasing. Humor Script 5 is an example of aggressive humor, for it attacks or belittles a person with cleft palate resulting in speaking disability. Thus, it may be offending especially to people with such condition.

Humor Script 5 (Sample of aggressive humor)

Teacher: *Magbigay ng kulay na nagsisimula sa letrang M*
(Give me a letter that starts with letter M)

Pupil 1: Maroon!
 Teacher: *Ano pa?*
 (What else?)
 Pupil 2: *Mlue, mlawn, mlack, mink, maiolet*
 (Blue, brown, black, pink, violet)
 Teacher: *Melygood! Malakmakan!!!*
 (Very good. A round of applause.)

Humor about ethnicity or nationality (Humor Script 6) emphasizes traits or characteristics of a certain ethnic group or nationality, which is the source of humor. Humor Script 6 is classified as a national, cultural or ethnic humor since a particular nationality (i.e., Filipino) is the target of humor, and the stereotype about them was used as the subject.

Humor Script 6 (Sample of national, cultural or ethnic humor)

Host: Please welcome, America!
 American: I have 12 sons and 6 daughters!
 Audience: (clap! clap! clap!)
 Host: Our second contestant is from Japan!
 Japanese: I have 12 sons and 12 daughters! Beat that!
 Audience: (clap! clap! clap! wohoooooo! clap! clap! clap!)
 Host: Our last contestant is from the Philippines!
naghiyawan ang mga audience (Audience cheered)
 Audience: Daddy! Daddy! Daddy!

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Participants' Self-Reported Frequency of Producing Different Humor Types

To explore the participants' humor production activity, specifically on their self-reported tendency of producing different humor types, the 240 participants read each humorous script. They were, then, asked if they also come up with similar humorous script and how often. They reported the frequency by noting if humor production was *always*, *often*, *seldom*, or *never*. Frequency distribution showing participants' tendency of producing different humor types is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Tendency of Producing Different Humor Types as reported by the participants

Humor Types	Heterosexual Male			Heterosexual Female			Gay			Lesbian		
	Mean	SD	VD	Mean	SD	VD	Mean	SD	VD	Mean	SD	VD
Positive	2.76	0.73	S	3.01	0.51	S	2.71	0.72	S	2.70	0.62	S
Self-deprecating	2.96	0.66	S	3.28	0.52	N	2.68	0.84	S	2.89	0.69	S
Sexual	2.72	0.77	S	3.64	0.56	N	2.49	0.86	O	2.67	0.88	S
Sexist	2.84	0.74	S	3.23	0.58	S	2.62	0.75	S	2.78	0.70	S
Aggressive	2.81	0.81	S	3.12	0.67	S	2.73	0.75	S	2.66	0.66	S
National/ Ethnic	2.88	0.78	S	3.32	0.59	N	2.90	0.77	S	2.82	0.69	S
Legend	Verbal Description (VD)											
3.25 – 4.00	Never (N)											
2.50 – 3.24	Seldom (S)											
1.75 – 2.49	Often (O)											
1.00 – 1.74	Always (A)											

As seen in Table 1, it can be inferred that participants from all gender groups reported that they 'seldom' produced the following humor types: positive, sexist, and aggressive. In all those types, the mean scores of the female groups registered the highest, which means that they have the highest tendency in not producing humor of those types. For sexual humor type, only the gay participants reported that they 'often' produce sexual humor types, while the other gender groups (heterosexual males and lesbians) mentioned that they 'seldom' produce it. Notably, the female participants reported they 'never' produce sexual humor type, and this finding is in line with Legman's (1968 as cited in Mulkay, 1988; 1975 as cited in Bing, 2007) observation that respectable women generally do not throw sexual humor given that a woman who tells sexual humor is "effectively denying her own sex as woman" (p.35). In self-deprecating and ethnic or national humor types, it is only the female participants who reported that they 'never' produce such type, while the other gender groups reported that they 'seldom' do. The non-production of self-deprecating humor reported by the female participants does not concur with the findings of Kotthoff (2000 as cited in Bing, 2007) saying that women used more self-deprecating humor especially during informal dinner conversations.

Types of Produced Humor Scripts in the 21-day Humor Journal

The 32 participants (equal distribution of four genders) were asked to keep a 21-day humor journal, consisting of three tasks per day. One of their tasks in the journal is

to record the humor script they produced for 21 days. Table 2 summarizes the humor types produced by the participants.

Table 2. Humor Types Produced by Gender

Number of tokens of the humor types produced by gender						
Humor Type	Male	Female	Gay	Lesbian	Total	%
Positive	40	94	40	28	197	43.39
Aggressive	38	23	36	36	133	29.30
Self-defeating	5	19	22	27	73	16.08
Sexual	5	1	9	14	29	6.39
Sexist	10	1	3	3	17	3.74
Ethnic/National	-	-	-	-	-	
Total	98	138	105	108	449	

Based on Table 2, the participants produced a total of 449 humor scripts. The number of humor scripts produced for 21 days is lower than the perceived humor scripts within the same period. This suggests that it is easier for the participants to record the humor they have heard, read, or watched than to produce their own. The heterosexual female group has the greatest number of humor produced, followed by the lesbian and the gay groups. The heterosexual male group produced the least number of humor scripts. Previous result contradicts the claim of many humor scholars (e.g., Martin, 2014; Martin & Sullivan, 2013; Greengross & Miller, 2011; Wilbur & Campbell, 2011; Kuipers, 2006; Hay, 2000) that humor production is primarily a male activity and that women produce less humor than men. This, however, conforms to findings of Dunbar, Baron, Frangou, Pearce, van Leeuwen and Stow (2012) that female participants produced more humor.

Of the humor types, positive humor was the most prevalent with nearly half (43.39%) of the total humor produced. This was followed by the aggressive humor (29.30%) and self-defeating humor types (16.08%). It can be observed that the participants did not produce ethnic or national humor type. A plausible explanation for the non-production of ethnic or national humor is Hirji's (2009) observation that ethnic humor can offer a space, though one is fraught with risk, for discussing stereotypes about race and culture. This space is by no means safe for anyone, imbued as it is with the dangerous, constant possibility of legitimizing racist thoughts and discourse.

Positive humor (Humor Script 7) has the most occurrence since it is the one that everyone can safely laugh at without worrying about offending other individuals, groups, or beliefs. The heterosexual female group produced the highest number of positive humor (p value = 0.006). The gays and heterosexual males followed. The lesbians had the least number of positive humor. The abundance of positive humor produced by the

heterosexual female participants can be supported by the findings of various researchers (e.g., Holmes, 2006; Lampert & Ervin-Tripp, 2006; Martin et al., 2003; Robinson & Smith-Lovin, 2001; Hay, 2000; Jenkins, 1985; Maltz & Borker, 1982) stating that the goal of female speech is to establish solidarity. The gay participants came next to female participants when it comes to producing high number of positive humor. The result is in line with Gotman et al., (2003) and Reed's (2011) explanation that male homosexual humor is a third, liminal space, encompassing the speech and humor patterns of male and female. Hence, gay humor is viewed as an extension of one's feminine and/or masculine gender performance (Franks, 2015; Richardson, 1992 as cited in Thorne & Coupland, 1998; Cameron & Kulick, 2007). Meanwhile, positive humor is less frequent among lesbian participants (p value = 0.001). Humor Script 1 was labeled as positive humor since the script does not intend to ridicule, malign, or denigrate anyone. In addition, this is considered as the safest kind of humor for everybody since one can safely laugh at it without having the fear of offending others.

Humor Script 7

Q: Alam mo ba kung bakit July yung nutrition month?

A: Kase ang Tagalog ng vegetable ay July.

(Do you know why nutrition month is in July? Because the Tagalog term for vegetable is July [‘read as *gulay*’])

-F6

Among all groups, the heterosexual male group produced more aggressive humor (Humor Script 2). The gays and lesbians came up with equal number of humors of such type. Meanwhile, heterosexual female group produced the least number of aggressive humor. Though there is no statistical difference on the number of aggressive humor produced by the heterosexual male, gay and lesbian participants, it is still undeniable that the male participants produced more aggressive humor. This corroborates with the finding of Crawford (1997) that one of the objectives of the male speech is to assert their position of dominance, status, and control. This also supports Martin's (2014) claim that men consistently report using humor in aggressive way.

Aggressive humor entails disparagement, derision, hostility, ridicule, sarcasm, and teasing. All of these are gestures of showing dominance to others. Similarly, it conforms to the findings of various humor scholars (e.g., Holmes, 2006; Lampert & Ervin-Tripp, 2006; Martin *et al.*, 2003; Robinson & Smith-Lovin, 2001; Hay, 2000; Kotthoff, 2000; Jenkins, 1985; Maltz & Borker, 1982) arguing that men may use humor to demean others. One possible valid reason as to why the gay and lesbian participants were able to produce equal number of aggressive humor, and nearly equal with that of the male is that both genders have masculine traits in them. The least occurrence of aggressive humor type was among the heterosexual female participants, which supports studies of various language scholars (e.g., Maltz & Borker, 1982; Tannen, 1990; Leaper, 1991; Gray, 1992; Mason, 1994; Wood, 1996; Mulac, Bradac & Gibbons, 2001) arguing that language use among women is more in the performance of social and psychological ways showing their desire for equality and harmony.

In Humor Script 8, the humor scripts produced by participants M3 and G1 are labeled as aggressive humor since both the scripts aim to demean other persons based on their body smell (i.e., feet) and physical attribute (i.e., height). Both the scripts produced can be offending to their targets.

Humor Script 8

M3: *Ano ba yun? Ang baho, amoy patay na daga*
(What is that smell? It is like the smell of a dead rat.)

Shawn: *Hayop ka! Paa ko yun! Haha.*
(Those are my feet you are referring to. Haha!)

-M3

Noong magpamigay ang Diyos ng katangkaran, nakatulog ka ata.
Tignan mo mukha ka ng bonsai.
(When the Lord distributed height to humanity, you were probably sleeping.
Look at you, you are like bonsai.)

-G1

The lesbian participants wrote more self-defeating humor (Humor Script 9) than the other groups. This means that they prefer to entertain or amuse people even at their own expense. This is in consonance with Bing and Heller's (2003) premise that lesbians use humor to beef-up the in-group sense of community by using stereotyped references and making them sources of fun. Further, lesbian humor draws on lesbian frames of reference to reinforce their identity and community (Kulick, 2010; Bing & Heller, 2003; Queen 1997, 2005) and to insult, deride, and destabilize lesbian identity (Kulick, 2010).

Gay participants followed the lesbian participants on the most number of self-defeating humor produced, while the heterosexual female and male participants had the least. This validates Withers' (2018) remark that women and lesbians may take their stories of both physical and emotional violence, and find humor out it, turning their struggles into other's entertainment, and setting aside important, less funny details untold. It also confirms Jenkins' (1985) and Kotthoff's (2000) claims that women often engage in self-defeating humor to build rapport and intimacy. The findings that gay participants also produced more self-defeating humor reflects the widely accepted notion that it is common for gays to make fun of and laugh at one's self for it signifies a certain level of maturity, empowerment, and security (Haga, 2011). However, this does not coincide with the findings of Willard (2010, as cited in Seals, 2016) that lesbians can frequently use humor to work against the type of self-defeating humor that is usually seen in most society. From here, it can be noted that when the heterosexual female participants in the quantitative study were asked on their frequency of producing self-defeating humor, the verbal description of their mean score is 'never'. However, in the humor scripts produced by these heterosexual female participants (n=19) in the qualitative part, it can be said that female participants produced self-defeating humor scripts. From here, it can be deduced that female participants may not be aware or accepting of their tendency of producing self-defeating humor type.

The rarity of self-defeating humor among the male participants is congruent with Tannen's (1990) contention that men converse to increase their social status. Hence, they avoid engaging to self-defeating humor believing that production of such type might not help them in building up their image.

Humor Script 9

Minsan nalang makatanggap ng totoong rose galing pa sa fraternity na nagrecruit ng bagong member.

(I seldom receive a real rose. I received only once and it came from a member of fraternity recruiting me to be a member.)

-L1

Ginagawa namin lahat para magka-anak, pero di talaga kami makabuo, eh pareho kaming girl.

(We are doing everything to have a baby, but we really cannot conceive because we are both girls.)

-L6

The highest number of sexual humor (Humor Script 10) was produced by the lesbian participants. The gay and heterosexual male groups followed. This supports Davies' (2004) comment on lesbian humor that, in the inexistence of male interest, there are lesbians who endeavored to what was originally an all-male leisure, and that is the production of humor on sexual activity. The result also accords to what Fine (1976) argued that, despite changes in society, sexual humor has been primarily a male prerogative. Furthermore, this also supports the argument of Bing and Heller (2003) that lesbian humors reject the idea that lesbian culture has to be heard or affirmed by outsiders. This is because the lesbian participants had been very open in sharing such humor type. It can be noted that, although lesbian participants produced more sexual humor, such humor type be also accounted to male sex, to some extent, given that lesbians also consider themselves as masculine. Likewise, the gay participants also have a part of them, biologically and emotionally, that are still attributed to male sex. This proves that the humor patterns of the homosexual males and homosexual females are extensions of masculine and feminine speech blended with both the male and female qualities and motives (e.g., Franks, 2015; Nardi & Stoller, 2008; Cameron & Kulick, 2007; Richardson 1992 as cited in Thorne & Coupland, 1998). On the other hand, only one sexual humor was produced by the heterosexual female participants. One plausible reason why sexual humor is not part of the humor repertoire produced by heterosexual female participants is that a number of sexual humor is considered as anti-woman. In most cases, women, in sexual humor produced by any gender, are referred to as sex objects rather than as human beings (Bing, 2004). The humor scripts presented in Humor Script 10 produced by L6 and L7 were labeled as sexual humor given that sexual activity and female reproductive organs were emphasized in those humor scripts.

Humor Script 10

Mag make out kami ni jowa, naghubad siya, ni ra rub niya boobs niya sa likod ko. Sabi ko sa kanya sarap pala ng dalawang bundok i-rub sa kapatagan.

(My partner and I were lovemaking. She undressed herself and rubbed her breasts at my back. I told her that it felt good having her breasts being rubbed at my back.)

-L6

My friends and I were talking about getting new tattoos. When they asked me what tattoo would I want to get, I told them I want to have a tattoo on my genital with the word Elmo that will later become El Filibusterismo the moment I will spread my legs.

-L7

Male participants produced more sexist humor (Humor Script 11), which aims to demean, insult, and objectify a person on the basis of their gender. The produced humor script by M1 in Humor Script 5 is classified as sexist humor since it ridiculed two homosexual males. For O'Connor, Ford, and Banos (2017), sexist humor provides self-affirmation to men with more precarious manhood belief, especially when they feel that the typical gender norms assigned to them is being challenged or threatened.

Humor Script 11

I have two gay friends. I jokingly told them that since they are both single, why not they just be together. Followed by a threat to FLAMES their names. They happily responded "why not?"

-M1

CONCLUSION

The results underscore the fact that gender is always a relevant aspect in every throw of humorous act. They show the formation and continuation of gender distinctions within local communities of practice.

How a person differs what is humorous from what is not is reflective of his or her culture (i.e. gender) as well as his or her held beliefs on what and how communicative goals should be. This is in line with Kuipers' (2006), Lampert and Ervin-Tripp' (2006), and Goldstein's (1976 as cited in Knyazyan, 2015) contentions that humorous scripts and utterances are socially and culturally organized within a particular time and space. Bing's (2007) and Ancheta's (2011) observation that humor celebrates the values, traditions, quirks, eccentricities, and perspectives of individuals and society in which they belong are also notable from the findings. As such, the state of the participants who produced humor scripts mirror their day to day multi-faceted experiences as influenced by their social,

cultural, and personal roles. This also proves that gendered humor examines, underscores, and hyperbolizes differences in humor between men and women (Abedinifard, 2016; Connell, 2009) and that men and women differ in how they look at the world, which might contribute to their varying humor interests (Kramarae, 1981). This also echoes Coates' (1986) stand that linguistic differences are reflections of social differences. These realities about humor places the latter at the heart of social analysis, crucial to the shaping of meanings, situations, selves, relationships, and, most importantly, of one's gender.

From the analysis of the produced humor scripts, it was found that sexist humor is one of the less frequent humor types. Lesser frequency on producing humor regarding one's gender identity (i.e. being gay or lesbian) echoes the notion that the youth, nowadays, specifically the university students who are participants in the study, are more acknowledging and accepting of diversities in gender identity. In the past decades, male homosexuality was used to debase men and their masculinity while the female homosexuality is portrayed in humor as sex-starved, this was not seen in the present study. Thus, it can be concluded that, in the present generation, ridiculing one's gender identity is closer to extinction and it might soon just be a thing of the past. This development manifests that in the Philippines, the pursuit of gender equality and sensitivity has achieved major breakthrough in the past decades. This has been made possible through the continuing advocacy of the government and its partners like lawmakers, people's organizations, civil society groups and the academe to institute gender responsive laws, policies and programs in place (Women's Edge Plan 2013-2016, 2014).

Given that ethnic or national humor type was also rare in both the participants' produced humor scripts, it can be concluded that the participants are acknowledging and are being respectful of one's cultural and national identity as well as heritage. It is rare that they make fun of it. This manifests participants' multicultural competence for being able to recognize and accept diversity.

Like gender education, the promotion and inclusion of gender and humor education as part of subject in rhetoric and discourse may also be explored so that individuals may become aware of their sense of humor and its dimensions. This is also to determine how the use of humor in the society can either solidify or break group cohesion. As such, humor competence can also be nurtured among individuals to ensure that harmony and respect for diversity are observed.

Conflict of interest:

None.

Ethical Clearance:

The study was approved by the institution.

REFERENCES

- Abedinifard, M. (2016). Ridicule, gender hegemony, and the disciplinary function of mainstream gender humour. *Social Semiotics*, 26(3), 234-349. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2015.1134817>
- Ancheta, M.R.G. (2011). Halakhak: Defining the national in the humor of Philippine popular culture. *Thammasat Review*, 14(1), 35-60.
- Bing, J. (2007). Liberated jokes: Sexual humor in all-female groups. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 20(4), 337-366.
- Bing, J. (2004). "Lesbian Jokes: A Reply to Christie Davies." *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research* 17(3), 323-28.
- Bing, J. & Heller, D. (2003). How many lesbians does it take to screw in a light bulb? *Humor*, 16(2), 157-182.
- Brodzinsky, D. M., & Rubien, J. (1976). Humor production as a function of sex of subject, creativity, and cartoon content. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 44(4), 597-600. Retrieved from <https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.44.4.597>
- Butler, J. (1990). Performative acts and gender constitution. In Rivkin, J., & Ryan, M. (Eds.) *Literary Theory an Anthology* (pp. 900-11). Malden, Mass: Blackwell.
- Cameron, D. & Kulick, D. (2007). Identity crisis? *Language and Communication*, 25(2), 107-125.
- Coates, J. (1996). *Women talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Connell, R.W. (2009). *Gender in world perspective* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity.
- Chiaro, D., & Baccolini, R. (2014). Humor a many gendered thing. In D. Chiaro and R. Baccolini (Eds.), *Gender and humor: Interdisciplinary and international perspectives* (pp.123-146). New York, NY, USA: Routledge.
- Crawford, M. (2003). Gender and humor in social context. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(9), 1413-1430.
- Crawford, M. (1997). *Talking difference on gender and language*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Crawford, M. & Gressley, D. (1991). Creativity, caring, and context: Women's

- and men's accounts of humor preferences and practices. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 217-232.
- Davies, C.E. (2006). Gendered sense of humor as expressed through aesthetic typifications. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(1), 96-113.
- Davies, C. (2004). Response to Bing and Heller. *Humor*, 17(3), 311–322.
- Dunbar, R.I.M., Baron, R., Frangou, A., Pearce, E., van Leeuwen, E.J.C., Stow, J. et al. (2012). Social laughter is correlated with an elevated pain threshold. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Science*, 279, 1161-1167.
- Eckert, P. & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2003). *Language and Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Edwards, K.R., & Martin, R.A. (2010). Humor creation ability and mental health: Are funny people more psychologically healthy? *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 3, 196-212. Retrieved from <https://doi:10.5964/eopv1a2i3.1213>
- Franks, T. (2015). Hair raising humor: A critical qualitative analysis of humor, gender, and hegemony in the hair industry (Unpublished dissertation). University of Arizona. USA.
- Fine, G. (1976). Obscene joking across cultures. *Journal of Communication*, 26, 134-140.
- Gotman, J.M., Levenson, R.W., Swanson, C., Swanson, K., Tyson, R. & Yoshimoto, D. (2003). Observing gay, lesbian, and heterosexual couples' relationships: Mathematical modeling of conflict interaction. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 45, 65-91. Retrieved from doi:10.1300/J082v45n01_04
- Gray, J. (1992). *Men are from Mars, women are from Venus: A practical guide for improving communication and getting what you want in a relationship*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Greengross, G. & Miller, G. (2011). Humor ability reveals intelligence, predicts mating success, and is higher in males. *Intelligence*, 39, 188-192.
- Gurillo, L.R. (2017). Humor production in children's narratives in Spanish 1. *Calidoscoio*, 15(2), 222-231. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/9817/6473049625f0a0c2b64fc3e0afd0ce8597d6.pdf?ga=2.125924365.1017694192.1552630497-1914998182.1516201656>
- Haga, C. (2011). How many comedians does it take to battle oppression?. *Star Tribune*.

- Hay, J. (2000). Functions of humor in the conversations of men and women. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(6), 709-742.
- Hirji, F. (2009). Somebody going to get hurt real bad: The race-based comedy of Russell Peters. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 34, 567-586. Retrieved from: <https://www.cjconline.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/2130/3004>
- Holmes, J. (2006). Sharing a laugh: Pragmatic aspects of humor and gender in the workplace. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(1), 26-50.
- Jenkins, M.M. (1985). 'What's so funny? Joking among women'. In N Caskey, S. Bremmer, and B. Moon-woman (Eds). *Proceedings of the First Berkeley Women and Language Conference* (pp.131-151). Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Women and Language Group, University of California.
- Kessler, S., & McKenna, W. (1978). *Gender: An ethnomethodological approach*. New York: Wiley.
- Knyazyan, A. (2015). Gender and disparaging humour. *Armenian Folia Anglistika*, 25-32. Retrieved from: http://publications.ysu.am/wpcontent/uploads/2016/04/Anna_Knyazyan.pdf
- Kotthoff, H. (2000). Gender and joking: On the complexities of women's image politics in humorous narratives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 55-80.
- Kramarae, C. (1981). *Women and men speaking: Framework for analysis*. Newbury: Rowley, MA.
- Kuipers, G. (2006). *Good humor, bad taste. A sociology of the joke*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kulick, D. (2010). Humorless lesbians. *De Genere*, 2, 125-141. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311544269_The_contrastive_use_of_humor_by_a_lesbian_comedian_for_LGBT_and_general_audiences
- Lampert, M.D., & Ervin-Tripp, S.M. (2006). Risky laughter: Teasing and self-directed joking among male and female friends. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(1), 51-72.
- Leaper, C. (1991). Influence and involvement in children's discourse. Age, gender, and partner effects. *Child Development*, 62, 787-811.
- Maltz, D., & Borker, R. (1982). A Cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In J. J. Gumperz (Ed.), *Language and social identity* (pp. 196-216). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Martin, R.A. (2014). Humor and gender: An overview of psychological research. In D. Chiaro & R. Baccolini (Eds.), *Gender and humor: Interdisciplinary and international perspectives* (pp.123-146). New York, NY, USA: Routledge.
- Martin, G. Neil & Sullivan, Erin (2013) Sense of humor across cultures: a comparison of British, Australian and American respondents. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 15 (2), 375-384. Retrieved from: <https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1G1-331348552/sense-of-humor-across-cultures-a-comparison-of-british>
- Martin, R.A., Puhlik-Doris, P., Larsen, G., Gray, J., & Weir, K. (2003). Individual differences in uses of humor and their relation to psychological well-being: Development of the Humor Styles Questionnaire. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(1), 48-75.
- Mason, E.S. (1994). Gender differences in job satisfaction. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 135, 143-151.
- Mulac, A., Bradac, J.J., & Gibbons, P. (2001). Empirical support for the gender as culture hypothesis: An intercultural analysis of male/female language differences. *Human Communication Research*, 27, 121-152.
- Mulkay, M. (1988). *On humor*. New York. Basil Blackwell.
- Myers, S.A., Ropog, B.L., & Rodgers, R.P. (1997). Sex differences in humor. *Psychological Reports*, 81(1), 221-222.
- Nardi, P.M. & Stoller, N.E. (2008). Fruits, fags and dykes: The portrayal of gay/lesbian identity in Nance jokes of the '50s and '60s. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 55(3), 388-410. Retrieved from <http://doi.org/10.1080/00918360802345107>
- O'Connor, E.C., Ford, T.E. & Banos, N.C. (2017). Restoring threatened masculinity: The appeal of sexist and anti-gay humor. *Sex Roles*. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316360248_Restoring_Threatened_Masculinity_The_Appeal_of_Sexist_and_Anti-Gay_Humor
- Parekh, M. (1999). *Humor perception in men and women: Effect of joke type and gender of joke target* (MA Thesis). Texas A & M University.
- Queen, R. (1997). I Don't Speak Stritch: Locating Lesbian Language. In Livia A., & Hall, K. (Eds.). *Queerly phrased: language, gender and sexuality*, 233-56. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Queen, R. (2005). "How many lesbians does it take...": Jokes, teasing and the negotiation of stereotypes about lesbians. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(2), 239-257.

- Reed, J. (2011). Sexual outlaws: Queer in a funny way. *Women's Studies*, 40, 762-777. Retrieved from <http://doi.10.1080/00497878.2011.585590>
- Robinson, D. T., & Smith-Lovin, L. (2001). Getting a laugh: Gender, status and humor in task discussions. *Social Forces*, 80(1), 123-158.
- Saldaña, J. (2011). *Fundamentals of qualitative research: Understanding qualitative research*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Seals, C.A. (2016). The constrastive use of humor by a lesbian comedian for LGBT and general audiences. *De Genere*, 2, 95-107. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311544269> The constrastive use of humor by a lesbian comedian for LGBT and general audiences
- Tannen, D. (1990). *Gender and discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thorne, A., & Coupland, J. (1998). Articulations of same-sex desire: Lesbian and gay male dating advertisements. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 2(2), 233-257.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, 1, 125-151.
- Wilbur, C.J., & Campbell, L. (2011). Humor in romantic contexts: Do men participate and women evaluate? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37, 918-929. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211405343>
- Withers, R. (2018, June 26). Hannah Gadsby's first Netflix comedy special is about why she's quitting comedy. *Slate*. Retrieved from: <https://slate.com/culture/2018/06/hannah-gadsbys-nanette-cameron-espositos-rape-jokes-and-amy-schumers-standup-test-the-limits-of-comedy.html>
- Women' s EDGE Plan 2013–2016 (2014). *Women's Empowerment, Development and Philippine Commission on Women and UN Women*. Manila: Philippine Commission on Women.
- Wood, J.T. (1996). *Gendered lives: Communication, gender and culture* (2nd ed). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.