

# The Four Humor Mechanisms

K. A. Neuendorf

4/25/12

The scholarly literature on humor to date has identified four broad mechanisms of humor—ways in which we might find something funny. Each of these four emerges from a body of work that identifies the underlying assumptions of the particular approach to humor, and also provides a reasonable amount of empirical support for its existence (Martin, 2007). While most scholars writing within these literatures take the view that one particular mechanism is paramount (often to the exclusion of the other mechanisms), it is our view that multiple mechanisms are possible, and that these may come into play simultaneously when a receiver encounters a potentially humorous stimulus. Further, we contend that any examination of humor must begin with this taxonomy of humor types.

These four independent mechanisms are:

1. **Disparagement:** Among others, Freud (1960) recognized the aggressive basis in many 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 being derived from a sense of superiority over others. More recently, the superiority mechanism has been validated in work by the theoretic examinations of Gruner (1978) and the quantitative research of Zillmann and Bryant (1974; 1980; Zillmann & Cantor, 1976) and LaFave (LaFave, Haddad, and 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 at least back to 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 response include wordplay (e.g., puns), “pure” incongruity, absurdity, and sight gags.

3. **Arousal:** Although early attempts to explicate this possible mechanism for experiencing humor emphasized the humorous response as a method of relieving pent-up psychological strain or tension (e.g., the works of writers/philosophers Immanuel Kant and Herbert Spencer; 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 slapstick, dark humor, sick humor, and sexual or naughty humor.

4. **Social currency:** Although less often acknowledged as an independent dimension of humor apprehension, 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 joking to fit in, joking around socially, and parody (relying on a shared view of a known form, such as a film genre).

These broadly defined mechanisms may be found to manifest in a variety of ways in the mass media. Although some attempts have been made at typologizing mediated humor (e.g., Buijzen & Valkenburg, 2004), there is no consensus as to the number or types of humor utilized in mass media products (Vandaele, 2002).

Research by Neuendorf, Skalski, and others (Lieberman et al., 2009; Neuendorf with Fennell, 1988; Neuendorf, Skalski, & Powers, 2004) has established the validity of a multi-dimensional approach to the measurement of senses of humor (SOH). Additionally, links between specific SOH profiles and media use patterns have been established (Neuendorf, 2007; Neuendorf & Skalski, 2000; Powers et al., 2005), as well as links connecting SOH to perceived quality of life (QOL; Neuendorf et al., 2000). The four SOHs have been found to predict social values (Johnson et al., 2012; Skalski et al., 2012). And, some evidence has been found of a relationship between SOH profiles and reactions to public events—i.e., public opinions (Neuendorf et al., 1999; Neuendorf et al., 2011).

## References

- Apter, M. J. (1982). *The experience of motivation: The theory of psychological reversals*. London: Academic Press.
- 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.
- Buijzen, M., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2004). Developing a typology of humor in audiovisual media. *Media Psychology, 6*(2), 147-167.
- Chapman, A. J. (1973). Funniness of jokes, canned laughter and recall performance. *Sociometry, 36*, 569-578.
- 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.
- Chapman, A. J., & Chapman, W. A. (1974). Responsiveness to humor: Its dependency upon a companion's humorous smiling and laughter. *Journal of Psychology, 88*, 245-252.
- Devereux, P. G., & Ginsburg, G. P. (2001). Sociality effects on the production of laughter. *Journal of General Psychology, 128*(2), 227-240.
- Dundes, A. (1987). At ease, disease—AIDS jokes as sick humor. *American Behavioral Scientist, 30*, 72-81.
- 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.
- Freud, S. (1960 [1905]). *Jokes and their relation to the unconscious*. New York: Norton.
- Fry, W. F. (1963). *Sweet madness: A study of humor*. Palo Alto, CA: Pacific Books.
- Fuller, R. G. C., & Sheehy-Skeffington, A. (1974). Effects of group laughter on responses to humorous material: A replication and extension. *Psychological Reports, 35*, 531-534.
- Graziano, W. G., & Bryant, W. H. M. (1998). Self-monitoring and the self-attribution of positive emotions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 250-261.
- Gruner, C. R. (1978). *Understanding laughter: The workings of wit and humor*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Hobbes, T. (1651/1981). *Leviathan*. London: Penguin Books.
- Johnson, A. T., Neuendorf, K. A., & Skalski, P. D. (2012, March). *Joking with an agenda: Racial disparagement humor appreciation and social power value motivation*. Paper presented to the Intercultural Communication Interest Group of the Central States Communication Association, Cleveland, OH.
- Judge, M. (2003, May 8). Charlie Douglass RIP: Two cheers for canned laughter. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved February 13, 2008 from <http://www.opinionjournal.com/la/?id=110003464>.

- Koestler, A. (1964). *The act of creation*. London: Hutchinson.
- LaFave, L., Haddad, J., & Maesen, W. A. (1976). Superiority, enhanced self-esteem, and perceived incongruity humor 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.
- Lawson, T. J., Downing, B., & Cetola, H. (1998). An attributional explanation for the effect of audience laughter on perceived funniness. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 20(4), 243-249.
- Leventhal, H., & Cupchik, G. C. (1975). The informational and facilitative effects of an audience upon expression and the evaluation of humorous stimuli. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 11, 363-380.
- Leventhal, H., & Cupchik, G. (1976). A process model of humor judgment. *Journal of Communication*, 26, 190-204.
- Leventhal, H., & Mace, W. (1970). The effect of laughter on the evaluation of a slapstick movie. *Journal of Personality*, 38, 16-30.
- 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.
- Malpass, L. F., & Fitzpatrick, E. D. (1959). Social facilitation as a factor in reaction to humor. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 50, 295-303.
- Martin, G. N., & Gray, C. D. (1996). The effects of audience laughter on men's and women's responses to humor. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 136, 221-231.
- Martin, R. A. (2007). *The psychology of humor: An integrative approach*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- McKeon, R. (Ed.) (1941). *The basic works of Aristotle*. New York: Random House.
- 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., with Fennell, T. (1988). A social facilitation view of the generation of humor and mirth reactions: Effects of a laugh track. *Central States Speech Journal*, 39(1), 37-48.
- 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. 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.
- Olson, J. M. (1992). Self-perception of humor: Evidence for discounting and augmentation effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 369-377.
- Perlmutter, D. (2002). On incongruities and logical inconsistencies in humor: The delicate balance. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 15(2), 155-169.
- Platow, M. J., Haslam, S. A., Both, A., Chew, I., Cuddon, M., Goharpey, N., Maurer, J., Rosini, S., Tsekouras, A., & Grace, D. M. (2005). "It's not funny if they're laughing": Self-categorization, social influence, and responses to canned laughter. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 41, 542-550.
- 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.
- Shultz, T. R., & Horibe, F. (1974). Development of the appreciation of verbal jokes. *Development Psychobiology, 10*, 13-20.
- Skalski, P. D., Neuendorf, K. A., Dalisay, F., Denny, J., Campbell, R., & Egizii, M. (2012, March). *Exploring relationships among values, political orientation, media use, and the senses of humor*. Paper presented at the Top Paper Panel, Media Studies Interest Group, Central States Communication Association, Cleveland, OH.
- Smith, J. (2005). The frenzy of the audible: Pleasure, authenticity, and recorded laughter. *Television & New Media, 6*, 23-47.
- Smyth, M. M., & Fuller, R. G. C. (1972). Effects of group laughter and responses to humorous material. *Psychological Reports, 30*, 132-134.
- Spencer, H. (1860). Physiology of laughter. *Macmillan's Magazine, 1*, 395.
- Thomas, C. A., & Esses, V. M. (2004). Individual differences in reactions to sexist humor. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 7*(1), 89-100.
- Vaid, J., Hull, R., Heredia, R., Gerkens, D., & Martinez, F. (2003). Getting a joke: The time course of meaning activation in verbal humor. *Journal of Pragmatics, 35*, 1431-1449.
- Vandaele, J. (2002). Humor mechanisms in film comedy: Incongruity and superiority. *Poetics Today, 23*(2), 221-249.
- Veale, T. (2004). Incongruity in humor: Root cause or epiphenomenon? *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research, 17*(4), 419-428.
- 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. (1972). Directionality of transitory dominance as a communication variable affecting humor appreciation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24*(2), 191-198.

Read about the Four Humors, or the Four Temperaments, here. The Choleric humor is said to be the "leader temperament". Confident, overbearing and passionate, the Choleric person is full of bursting energy and ambition. Choleric are most commonly extroverted, although a certain minority can be introverted, but it's less common. The Choleric person is strong-willed, dominant and has a quick temper. Humor: Yellow bile. Organ: Spleen. Season: Summer. The four humors "black bile, yellow bile, phlegm, and blood" were a main belief in medical theory up until the 19th... When I think about these humors in this sense, humoral theory makes a lot more sense to me. I know that with metabolic and genetic illnesses, a lot of it has to do with how cells function or dysfunction. SteamLouis. Disease correlates: Humors. Disease causes: Imbalance of humoral elements. Basis of diagnosis: Restore balance to humors and organ systems. Chief diagnostic modality: . . . temperament assess for each of four humors. Pulse diagnosis: Reveals humoral imbalance in organ system. Taken with three fingers at radial pulse of wrist; more than 1,000 potential factors evaluated in seconds. [!] The four bodily humors were part of Shakespearean cosmology, inherited from the ancient Greek philosophers Aristotle, Hippocrates, and Galen. Organized around the four elements of earth, water, air, and fire; the four qualities of cold, hot, moist, and dry; and the four humors, these physical qualities determined the behavior of all created things including the human body. Melancholic. Humor: Black Bile. The Four Humor Styles. What does your humor style say about you? Bethany Wilhelm. Mar 14, 2016. Lindsey Wilson College. 6125. On the other hand, both humor and fear are coping mechanisms, and there is a fine line between them. Having a sense of humor shows people that you understand what is normal but that you are also able to step out of the norm. Constantly making remarks outside the norm in a non-ironic fashion will just make people think you're a psychopath. So what are all the different types of humor? And what do they say about us? Luckily, as of 2003, we have the Humor Styles Questionnaire (HSQ), a self-report inventory developed by psychologists Rod Martin and Patricia Doris to measure individual differences