

A JOKE FOR YOU, A STATUS-BOOST FOR MEN: MEN'S TENDENCY TO TELL AFFILIATIVE JOKES IS RELATED TO THEIR SELF-PROMOTION STYLE

<https://doi.org/10.21697/sp.2022.22.1.03>

ŁUKASZ JACH, GABRIELA PIETRZAK*
University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland

ABSTRACT

A sense of humor is a desirable characteristic in both romantic and platonic relationships, and people communicate their sense of humor by telling jokes. However, there are sex differences in joking, so men tell jokes more often than women. Men's benefits from joking correspond with such fundamental social motives, as mate seeking and mate retention, affiliation, and self-protection. However, less is known about the relation between tendency to tell jokes and more general styles of self-presentation, that is, tactical ways of behaving that can be used in many social interactions. In our study ($N = 139$ Polish men aged 18 to 60 [$M = 29.94$, $SD = 11.66$]), we wanted to examine the relationships between self-presentation styles (e.g., self-promotion and self-depreciation), humor styles (e.g., affiliative, self-enhancing, aggressive, and self-defeating), and tendency to tell jokes in adult men. We found that men focused on self-promotion produced humor more often and their humor styles contained more affiliative and self-enhancement aspects. Moreover, men's use of affiliative humor completely mediated the relationship between their self-promotion and their tendency to tell jokes. We also found that men oriented on self-depreciation use more self-defeating humor, but their self-defeating motivation does not correlate with their tendency to tell jokes. Our results suggest that men may tell jokes, especially those involving affiliative humor, to tactically achieve their self-promotion goals.

HUMOR STYLES
JOKES
PUBLIC IMAGE
SELF-PRESENTATION
SOCIAL STATUS

KEYWORDS

35	INTRODUCTION
37	METHOD
37	RESULTS
38	DISCUSSION
40	LIMITATIONS & CONCLUSION



ŻART DLA CIEBIE, WZROST STATUSU DLA MĘŻCZYŹN: TENDENCJA MĘŻCZYŹN DO OPOWIADANIA ŻARTÓW AFILIACYJNYCH JEST ZWIĄZANA Z ICH STYLEM AUTOPROMOCJI

ABSTRAKT

Poczucie humoru jest pożądaną cechą zarówno w związkach romantycznych, jak i platonicznych, a ludzie komunikują swoje poczucie humoru, opowiadając dowcipy. Istnieją jednak różnice płciowe w żartowaniu, mężczyźni opowiadają dowcipy częściej niż kobiety. Korzyści, jakie mężczyźni czerpią z żartowania, korespondują z takimi podstawowymi motywami społecznymi, jak poszukiwanie i utrzymywanie partnera, przynależność i ochrona samego siebie. Mniej jednak wiadomo na temat relacji między skłonnością do opowiadania dowcipów a bardziej ogólnymi stylami autoprezentacji, czyli taktycznymi sposobami zachowania, które mogą być wykorzystywane w wielu interakcjach społecznych. W naszym badaniu ($N = 139$ polskich mężczyzn w wieku od 18 do 60 lat [$M = 29,94$, $SD = 11,66$]) chcieliśmy zbadać zależności między stylami autoprezentacji (autopromocją i autodeprecjacją), stylami humoru (afiliacyjnym, samodeprecjonującym, agresywnym i w służbie ego) oraz skłonnością do opowiadania dowcipów u dorosłych mężczyzn. Odkryliśmy, że mężczyźni, którzy byli skoncentrowani na autopromocji, częściej wytwarzali humor, a ich style humorystyczne zawierały więcej aspektów afiliacyjnych i dotyczących wzmacniania siebie. Co więcej, używanie przez mężczyzn humoru afiliacyjnego całkowicie mediowało związek między autopromocją a skłonnością do opowiadania dowcipów. Odkryliśmy również, że mężczyźni nastawieni na samodeprecjonowanie częściej używają autodestrukcyjnego humoru, ale ich autodestrukcyjna motywacja nie koreluje ze skłonnością do opowiadania dowcipów. Nasze wyniki sugerują, że mężczyźni mogą opowiadać dowcipy, zwłaszcza te zawierające humor afiliacyjny, aby taktycznie osiągnąć swoje cele dotyczące autopromocji.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE

style humoru, dowcipy, wizerunek publiczny, autoprezentacja, status społeczny

INTRODUCTION

People have an ongoing interest in how others perceive them and even in relatively mundane encounters (e.g., at home, work, or school) people monitor others' reactions to them and often try to convey images of themselves that promote their attainment of desired goals (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Self-presentation styles manifest themselves in everyday situations and affect how a person is perceived by others (Leary, 1996). There are two styles of tactical self-presentation: self-promotion and self-depreciation (Wojciszke, 2002). Self-promotion is presenting oneself in a favorable light as a competent person, equipped with certain knowledge and numerous skills, successful and deserving, self-confident and worthy. Self-depreciation is presenting oneself as a modest, helpless, and incompetent person, burdened with flaws, suffering failures, and being personally responsible for them, unsure of oneself and one's skills (Wojciszke, 2002).

Both self-promotion and self-depreciation are status-relevant individual activities (Chapais, 2017) and status seeking is another fundamental social motive (Kenrick et al., 2010; Neel et al., 2016) identified among people from different cultures (Pick et al., 2022). Self-promotion enhances social status, which in men translates into increased access to resources and desirable mates (Von Rueden et al., 2011). In groups, high social status is also associated with being a leader and having an influence on important collective decisions (Van Vugt, 2006). While the benefits of self-promotion are more pronounced, self-depreciation can also bring benefits. Being a follower of an effective leader can provide personal benefits without having to take responsibility for important decisions (Van Vugt et al., 2008). Self-depreciation also corresponds to the self-debasement tactic by which people manipulate others to elicit and terminate their actions (Buss et al., 1987). Moreover, when people are perceived as like others, they may benefit more from social interactions (Guéguen et al., 2011) and people feel uncomfortable when they believe that their higher performance poses a threat to another person (Exline et al., 2013), and they trust members of their group less when they perceive them as diverse (Zhang et al., 2022). Therefore, one's self-depreciation tactic may serve to calibrate one's perceived level of skills with the levels of other group members to increase the level of ingroup similarity (Kim, 2014; Laursen, 2017).

People can also influence their social image through humor. A sense of humor is a desirable characteristic in both romantic (Brauer & Proyer, 2002) and friendly relationships (Sprecher & Regan, 2002), and people communicate their sense of humor by telling jokes (Hurley et al., 2011). The ability to generate funny content is related to higher intelligence (Greengross & Miller, 2011; Howrigan & MacDonald, 2008), openness to experience, and extraversion (Howrigan & MacDonald, 2008), so telling jokes may communicate a high level of these traits. However, there are sex differences in joking, so men tell jokes more often than women (Jach et al., 2022) and men's jokes are rated funnier than women's jokes (Greengross et al., 2020). In men, telling jokes may be related to their mating strategies (Greengross & Miller, 2011). Men tell jokes to get the attention of their potential romantic partners (Wilbur & Campbell, 2011) and women are more interested in dating men who joke in social situations (Guéguen, 2010). Women more than men prefer partners who joke during dating and as long-term partners (Hone et al., 2015). Women whose partners have a better sense of humor are more likely to initiate sex and perceive their partners as more intelligent, more creative, more self-confident, and with better leadership skills (Gallup et al., 2014).

However, telling jokes may also have intrasexual functions. Under conditions of intrasexual competition, men are superior to women in humor production ability and exhibit enhancement in humor ability following exposure to attractive women primes (Barel, 2019), therefore, in the mating context men may try to outperform their mating rivals in joking skills. Telling, understanding, and appreciating jokes requires a specific background, so

through joking, men can communicate their knowledge, culture, and worldview to others (Flamson & Barrett, 2008). Jokes can also facilitate creating alliances because people have more positive attitudes toward others with a similar sense of humor (Curry & Dunbar, 2006) and affiliative humor helps to shape stable friendship dyads (Hunter et al., 2016). On the other hand, people use aggressive jokes to ridicule others and to damage their self-concept (DiCioccio, 2012). The function of aggressive humor may also be to manipulate others and make them more conforming and more afraid of failing through an implied threat of ridicule (Janes & Olson, 2000). Moreover, the aggressive humor of leaders translates into higher anxiety, more ruminations, and more withdrawal behaviors in their employees (Chen et al., 2022).

In addition to affiliative and aggressive humor, there are also self-enhancing and self-defeating humor styles (Martin et al., 2003). Self-enhancing humor focuses on intrapsychic aspects and its function is to help cope with stressors and adverse life events (Kuiper et al., 1993) as well as negative emotions (Ford et al., 2017). On the other hand, the motivation to use self-defeating humor is to entertain others by exposing one's weaknesses and failures (Martin et al., 2003). Self-defeating humor correlates positively with loneliness, shyness, and depression, and negatively with self-esteem (Steiger et al., 2011). However, self-defeating humor also correlates positively with seductiveness, manipulativeness, humorousness, and risk-taking (Kfrerer & Schermer, 2020), therefore, it may help in self-presentation as a weak person in need of immediate assistance (Doliński, 2016).

Men can benefit from joking in specific contexts, such as romantic relationships (Guéguen, 2010), creating alliances (Flamson & Barrett, 2008), and intrasexual competition (Barel, 2019). Therefore, men's benefits from joking correspond with such fundamental social motives, as mate seeking and mate retention, affiliation, and self-protection (Kenrick et al., 2010; Neel et al., 2016). However, less is known about the relation between tendencies to tell jokes and more general styles of self-presentation, that is, tactical ways of behaving that can be used in many social interactions (Leary, 1996; Wojciszke, 2002).

In the current study, we examined the relationships between self-presentation styles, humor styles, and tendency to tell jokes in men. Self-promotion reflects motivations for increasing social status and enhancing one's public image (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Two common strategies for achieving high status are a prestige-acquiring strategy based on benevolent sharing of knowledge and skills with community members, and a dominance-acquiring strategy based on formidability and aggression (Henrich & Gil-White, 2001). Therefore, we predicted positive correlations of self-promotion and self-enhancing humor because people may use self-enhancing humor to reduce the anxiety related to tasks they encounter (Ford et al., 2017) and performing tasks in a way that others can see may elevate their social status. We also predicted a positive correlation of self-promotion and affiliative humor because people can use affiliative humor to make others like them more and likeability is related to being higher on prestige (Cheng et al., 2013). Moreover, we predicted a positive correlation of self-promotion and aggressive humor because people can elevate their status through aggression that leads to domination over others (Henrich & Gil-White, 2001) and aggressive uses of humor are intended to belittle other people (Martin et al., 2003).

On the other hand, self-devaluation is aimed at strategically undermining one's social status, and people with lower self-esteem use more negative humor (e.g., aggressive humor and self-defeating humor; Ozyesil, 2012), therefore, we predicted a positive correlation between self-depreciation with self-defeating humor. The ability to generate humor is an indicator of desirable traits (e.g., intelligence; Greengross & Miller, 2011; Howrigan & MacDonald, 2008), therefore, we predicted that self-promotion would correlate positively with tendency to tell jokes. We also wanted to check if self-presentation styles predict tendency to tell jokes and if humor styles mediate the relationships between self-presentation styles and tendency to tell jokes.

METHOD

PARTICIPANTS AND PROCEDURE

A sample of 139 Polish men aged 18 to 60 ($M = 29.94$, $SD = 11.66$) consented to participate in an anonymous, online study via Lime Survey platform. The participants were informed of the nature of the study. If they consented via a tick-box, they provided information about their demographic characteristics and they filled out the questionnaires related to their humor styles, tendency to tell jokes, and self-presentation styles, such as self-promotion and self-depreciation. A G*Power analysis indicated that the sample size was large enough to detect relatively small effects in correlation analyses ($|\rho| = .23$) with appropriate power ($1 - \beta = .80$) given α equal to .05 (Faul et al., 2007). After the survey, participants were thanked, debriefed, and had an opportunity to contact the second author via e-mail in case of questions or concerns.

MEASURES

We measured humor styles using the Polish translation (Hornowska & Charytonik, 2011) of the Humor Styles Questionnaire (Martin et al., 2003). Participants were asked how much they agreed (1 = *strongly disagree*; 7 = *strongly agree*) with 32 items corresponding the affiliative humor (e.g., “I enjoy making people laugh.”, Cronbach’s $\alpha = .82$), self-enhancing humor (e.g., “If I am feeling depressed, I can usually cheer myself up with humor.”, $\alpha = .79$), aggressive humor (e.g., “If someone makes a mistake, I will often tease them about it.”, $\alpha = .76$), and self-defeating humor (e.g., “I let people laugh at me or make fun at my expense more than I should.”, $\alpha = .78$). The items were averaged to form indexes for each type of humor.

To measure tendency to tell jokes, we designed our own scale. Participants were asked how much they agreed (1 = *strongly disagree*; 7 = *strongly agree*) with five items corresponding to tendency to tell jokes (item 1: “If I hear a good joke I’ll probably repeat it.”; ; item 2: “I like telling jokes.”; item 3: “People laugh at my jokes.”; item 4: “I remember the jokes I hear and I repeat them.”; and Item 5: “I am good at telling jokes.”). The scale had good internal consistency ($\alpha = .86$) and satisfactory fit as a unidimensional scale ($\chi^2/df = 1.62$, $CFI = .992$, $TLI = .981$; $SRMR = .021$; $RMSEA = .067$) when we included a covariance between item 1 and item 4. The items were averaged to form an index for tendency to tell jokes.

We measured self-presentation styles using the Self-Presentation Questionnaire (Wojciszke, 2002). Participants were asked how often (1 = *never*; 5 = *very often*) they do things described in 30 items corresponding the self-promotion (e.g., “I give the impression that I know more than I really do.”, $\alpha = .87$) and self-depreciation (e.g., “I avoid talking about my successes.”, $\alpha = .85$). The items were averaged to form indexes for each type of self-presentation style.

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics and correlations are presented in Table 1. Older participants were more likely to use self-enhancing humor and younger participants were more likely to use aggressive humor and self-defeating humor and were more self-deprecating. However, the age of participants was not related to their self-promotion, affiliative humor, and tendency to tell jokes. Self-promotion correlated positively with affiliative humor, self-enhancing humor, and tendency to tell jokes. Moreover, we observed negative correlation of self-promotion

and self-depreciation. However, self-promotion did not correlate with aggressive humor and self-defeating humor. Self-depreciation correlated positively with self-defeating humor; however, it correlated negatively with self-enhancing humor and tendency to tell jokes.

Affiliative humor correlated positively with the other humor styles as well as tendency to tell jokes and self-enhancing humor correlated positively with tendency to tell jokes; however, self-enhancing humor did not correlate with aggressive humor and self-defeating humor. Aggressive and self-defeating humor correlated positively; however, neither of these two humor styles correlated with tendency to tell jokes.

Since age correlated with some variables studied, we also calculated partial correlations accounting for age. Tendency to tell jokes and self-promotion correlated positively with aggressive humor and the partial correlation between self-depreciation and self-enhancing humor was not significant. The remaining partial correlations were in line with previously observed correlations.

Subsequently, we run mediation analysis with self-presentation styles as predictors, humor styles as mediators, and tendency to tell jokes as an outcome. We showed direct, indirect, and total effects in Table 2. Our model explained 30.4% of tendency to tell jokes. The analysis revealed a positive total effect of self-promotion on tendency to tell jokes; however, this effect was fully mediated by the positive direct effect of affiliative humor on tendency to tell jokes. Moreover, we discovered some direct effects; self-promotion positively affected self-enhancing humor, and self-depreciation positively affected self-defeating humor.

DISCUSSION

As we expected, self-promotion correlated positively with affiliative humor. This result indicates that men more focused on presenting themselves as competent, multi-skilled, and valuable from the point of view of the group more often use humor aimed at building a positive atmosphere and strengthening group bonds. This is in line with results showing that prestige-oriented people are more approachable (Henrich & Gil-White, 2001) and that others perceive those who have adopted a prestige-acquiring strategy as likable (Cheng et al., 2013). This result is also in line with rules of influence based on reciprocation, and liking (Cialdini, 2007). People are more positive about others when they receive messages that make them feel good when they like them. Mentioned effects can be achieved through the use of positive, friendly humor that emphasizes community aspects.

Self-promotion also correlated with self-enhancing humor, suggesting that men who are more status-oriented tend to use humor to encourage themselves, comfort themselves, and reduce the anxiety related to the tasks they encounter (Ford et al., 2017). However, we did not observe a correlation between self-promotion and such humor styles as aggressive humor and self-defeating humor. Thus, men who are motivated to achieve high social status do not seem to tend to achieve their goals either by lowering other people's self-esteem and sense of competence or by jokingly portraying themselves as less competent or failing. This suggests that men seek self-promotion through positive rather than negative humor styles and avoid the ambiguity of implying that they often fail and behave incompetently. However, when accounting for age, we revealed a positive correlation between self-promotion and aggressive humor, thus the relationship between these variables may be more complex and needs more research. Moreover, a negative correlation between self-promotion and self-depreciation additionally suggests that men avoid the ambiguous presentation of their public image. In fact, people perceive targets who use more positive humor styles as having higher self-esteem and targets who use more negative humor styles as having lower self-esteem (Zeigler-Hill et al., 2013). Moreover, research conducted so far also suggests

that self-deprecatory humor might not serve the needs of self-promoting candidates within political, competitive settings (Stewart, 2011).

On the other hand, self-depreciation correlated negatively with self-enhancement humor and positively with self-defeating humor. This indicates that men motivated to lower their public image and status avoid using humor to cheer themselves up in the face of the tasks they face. In social situations, they also more often use humor aimed at showing their weaknesses and lack of useful skills. These results are consistent with the dynamics of self-depreciation as related to both self-identification and influence tactics. Men who consider themselves incompetent and helpless may avoid using self-enhancing humor in order not to distort their own opinion of themselves (Stopa et al., 2012). They may also use humor to present their failures to others to make their social image more consistent with their self-image (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). On the other hand, for men pragmatically striving for self-depreciation, the use of self-defeating humor may help achieve goals related to withdrawal from action and obtaining help from others (Speer, 2019). However, when accounting for age, the partial correlation between self-depreciation and self-enhancing humor was not significant. This result suggests that in men self-depreciation may be not related to less frequent self-enhancing behavior but rather have different functions, e.g., related to better group fit (Guéguen et al., 2011, Kim, 2014; Laursen, 2017)

The tendency to tell jokes correlated positively with self-promotion. The results indicate that men motivated to enhance their public image tend to tell more jokes. This is in line with the results showing that people associate the ability to create humorous content with such highly valued traits as intelligence (Greengross & Miller, 2011; Howrigan & MacDonald, 2008), openness to experience, and extraversion (Howrigan & MacDonald, 2008). On the other hand, men focused on self-promotion may act for increasing their social capital and humor may indicate their interest in initiating new relationships and maintaining existing ones (Li et al., 2009). However, the tendency to tell jokes did not correlate with self-depreciation. The lack of relationship between the tendency to tell jokes and self-depreciation may result from two motivations that are the source of self-depreciation. On the one hand, people who are truly convinced of their low self-worth may feel that they are not competent at telling jokes. On the other hand, people who intentionally seek to diminish their status may use self-defeating humor. However, there is a paradox in using self-defeating humor as an influence technique: its content indicates a lack of competence, but its form (joking) indicates possession of positively assessed traits (e.g., intelligence; Greengross & Miller, 2011; Howrigan & MacDonald, 2008). In fact, people using manipulation tactics (e.g., those high on Dark Triad traits) do not prefer to use regression tactics as a way of presenting themselves as weak and helpless (Jonason & Webster, 2012).

Mediation analysis revealed that men's motivation for self-promotion affects their tendency to tell jokes, but this effect is mediated by affiliative humor. Men who are motivated to enhance their public status joke more often, but the content of these jokes tends to focus on affiliative aspects, emphasizing friendly intentions and community issues. There were also positive effects of self-promotion on self-enhancing humor and self-depreciation on self-defeating humor, but neither of these effects affected tendency tell jokes. These results point to less social and more internal functions of these humor styles. Men focused on self-promotion may enhance themselves with humor, which may help them pursue goals related to such motives as mate selection (Guéguen, 2010) or intrasexual competition (Barel, 2019). Men oriented on self-depreciation may use self-defeating humor to convince themselves of low competence and lack of actions that could lead to an increase in their social status.

LIMITATIONS & CONCLUSION

Our study is not free from limitations. First, we did not compare men and women, so we cannot fully consider the results obtained to be specific only to men. Second, we only measured the general tendency to tell jokes without considering different social contexts of telling jokes (e.g., intersexual versus intrasexual, relationships with people with equal versus unequal social positions). Third, we did not distinguish between possible sources of motivation for self-depreciation (e.g., related to low self-esteem versus related to social influence). Fourth, we conducted our research in a convenience sample of Polish participants, so research in a more representative and more culturally diverse sample is needed to draw more grounded conclusions. Fifth, our study was cross-sectional and did not take into account longitudinal measures and mediation implies change over time (Maxwell & Cole, 2007). If self-presentation strategies, humor, styles, and tendency to tell jokes are relatively stable variables, the indirect effect we observed could be positively biased. Future studies should take into account longitudinal measures or use statistical methods that are less dependent on the aspect of time.

In our study, we examined the relationship between men's motivations for self-promotion and self-depreciation, their tendency to tell jokes, and the styles of humor they use. We found that men focused on self-promotion produce humor more often and their humor styles contain more affiliative and self-enhancement aspects. Moreover, men's use of affiliative humor completely mediated the relationship between their self-promotion and their tendency to tell jokes. We also found that men oriented towards self-depreciation use more self-defeating humor, but their self-defeating motivation does not correlate with their tendency to tell jokes. Our results suggest that men may tell jokes, especially those involving affiliative humor, to tactically achieve their self-promotion goals.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and correlations of age, self-presentation styles, humor styles and tendency to tell jokes

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Age	--							
2. Self-promotion	.14	--						
3. Self-depreciation	-.41**	-.35** (-.33**)	--					
4. Affiliative humor	-.11	.34** (.37**)	-.10 (-.16)	--				
5. Self-enhancing humor	.20*	.25** (.23**)	-.21* (-.14)	.28** (.31**)	--			
6. Aggressive humor	-.23**	.13 (.17*)	-.04 (-.04)	.20* (.18*)	-.16 (-.12)	--		
7. Self-defeating humor	-.27**	-.01 (.03)	.39** (.32**)	.23** (.21*)	-.07 (-.02)	.41** (.37**)	--	
8. Tendency to tell jokes	.06	.27** (.27**)	-.20* (-.20*)	.52** (.53**)	.25** (.24**)	.15 (.17*)	.08 (.10)	--
Mean (SD)	29.94 (11.66)	3.19 (0.60)	2.59 (0.61)	5.04 (0.84)	3.57 (1.04)	3.61 (1.03)	3.57 (1.04)	5.00 (1.24)

Note. Partial correlations when accounting for age are given in parentheses.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 2. Mediation analysis of tendency to tell jokes with self-presentation styles as predictors and humor styles as mediators

Effect type	Effect	b (SE)	Lower 95% C.I.	Upper 95% C.I.	β	z
Predictor → outcome, total	Self-promotion → Tendency to tell jokes	.47 (.18)	.12	.82	.23	2.63**
	Self-depreciation → Tendency to tell jokes	-.25 (.18)	-.60	.09	-.12	-1.43
Predictor → outcome, direct	Self-promotion → Tendency to tell jokes	.08 (.19)	-.27	.45	.04	0.45
	Self-depreciation → Tendency to tell jokes	-.25 (.18)	-.61	.09	-.13	-1.40
Predictor → mediator	Self-promotion → Affiliative humor	.49 (.12)	.26	.73	.35	4.20**
	Self-promotion → Self-enhancing humor	.33 (.15)	.06	.63	.20	2.27*
Self-promotion → Aggressive humor	Self-promotion → Aggressive humor	.24 (.16)	-.08	.55	.14	1.47
	Self-promotion → Self-defeating humor	.25 (.15)	-.06	.54	.14	1.61
Self-depreciation → Affiliative humor	Self-depreciation → Affiliative humor	.04 (.13)	-.23	.30	.03	0.27
	Self-depreciation → Self-enhancing humor	-.23 (.15)	-.50	.06	-.14	-1.56
Self-depreciation → Aggressive humor	Self-depreciation → Aggressive humor	.02 (.13)	-.22	.27	.01	0.17
	Self-depreciation → Self-defeating humor	.76 (.14)	.47	1.04	.45	5.26**
Mediator → outcome	Affiliative humor → Tendency to tell jokes	.67 (.13)	.42	.92	.46	5.23**
	Self-enhancing humor → Tendency to tell jokes	.12 (.09)	-.06	.28	.10	1.36
Aggressive humor → Tendency to tell jokes	Aggressive humor → Tendency to tell jokes	.08 (.10)	-.13	.28	.07	0.79
	Self-defeating humor → Tendency to tell jokes	.00 (.12)	-.23	.24	.00	0.00
Predictor → outcome, indirect	Self-promotion → Affiliative humor → Tendency to tell jokes	.33 (.11)	.15	.57	.16	3.03**
	Self-promotion → Self-enhancing humor → Tendency to tell jokes	.04 (.04)	-.01	.13	.02	1.04
Self-promotion → Aggressive humor → Tendency to tell jokes	Self-promotion → Aggressive humor → Tendency to tell jokes	.02 (.03)	-.04	.09	.01	0.60
	Self-promotion → Self-defeating humor → Tendency to tell jokes	.00 (.03)	-.07	.08	.00	0.00
Self-depreciation → Affiliative humor → Tendency to tell jokes	Self-depreciation → Affiliative humor → Tendency to tell jokes	.02 (.03)	-.15	.20	.01	0.27
	Self-depreciation → Self-enhancing humor → Tendency to tell jokes	-.03 (.09)	-.08	.02	-.01	-1.00
Self-depreciation → Aggressive humor → Tendency to tell jokes	Self-depreciation → Aggressive humor → Tendency to tell jokes	.00 (.03)	-.03	.04	.00	0.11
	Self-depreciation → Self-defeating humor → Tendency to tell jokes	.00 (.02)	-.18	.19	.00	0.00

Note. Confidence intervals (C.I.) calculated with bootstrap percentiles method (5000 samples).

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

REFERENCES

- Barel, E. (2019). The effects of mating cues and intrasexual competition on humor production. *Psychology, 10*, 320-335.
- Brauer, K., & Proyer, R.T. (2021). Sex differences in attractiveness of humor. In T.K. Shackelford, & V.A. Weekes-Shackelford (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Evolutionary Psychological Science* (pp. 7091–7094). Springer.
- Buss, D.M., Gomes, M., Higgins, D.S., & Lauterbach, K. (1987). Tactics of manipulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 1219-1229.
- Chapais, B. (2017). Psychological adaptations and the production of culturally polymorphic social universals. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences, 11*, 63-82.
- Chen, H., Wang, L., & Bao, J. (2022). Why does leader aggressive humor lead to bystander workplace withdrawal behavior?—Based on the dual path perspective of cognition-affect. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 925029.
- Cheng, J.T., Tracy, J.L., Foulsham, T., Kingstone, A., & Henrich, J. (2013). Two ways to the top: Evidence that dominance and prestige are distinct yet viable avenue to social rank and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104*, 103-125.
- Cialdini, R.B. (2007). *Influence: the psychology of persuasion*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Curry, O.S., & Dunbar, R.I.M. (2006). Sharing a joke: The effects of a similar sense of humor on affiliation and altruism. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 34*, 125-129.
- DiCioccio, R.L. (2012). Humor as aggressive communication. In R.L. DiCioccio (Ed.), *Humor communication: Theory, impact, and outcomes* (pp. 93- 108). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Doliński, D. (2016). *Techniques of social influence. The psychology of gaining compliance*. Routledge.
- Exline, J.J., Zell, A.L., & Lobel, M. (2013). Sidestepping awkward encounters. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 43*, 706-720.
- Flamson, T., & Barrett, H.C. (2008). The encryption theory of humor: A knowledge-based mechanism of honest signaling. *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology, 6*, 261-281.
- Ford, T.E., Lappi, S.K., O'Connor, E.C., & Banos, N.C. (2017). Manipulating humor styles: Engaging in self-enhancing humor reduces state anxiety. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research, 30*, 169191.
- Gallup, G.G., Ampel, B.C., Wedberg, N., & Pogosjan, A. (2014). Do Orgasms Give Women Feedback about Mate Choice?. *Evolutionary Psychology, 12*, 958-978.
- Greengross, G., & Miller, G. (2011). Humor ability reveals intelligence, predicts mating success, and is higher in males. *Intelligence, 39*, 188–192.
- Greengross, G., Silva, P.J., & Nusbaum, E.C. (2020). Sex differences in humor production ability: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality, 84*, 103886.
- Guéguen, N. (2010). Men's sense of humor and women's responses to courtship solicitations: an experimental field study. *Psychological Reports, 107*, 145-156.
- Guéguen, N., Martin, A., & Meineri, S. (2011) Similarity and Social Interaction: When Similarity Fosters Implicit Behavior Toward a Stranger, *The Journal of Social Psychology, 151*, 671-673.
- Henrich, J., & Gil-White, F.J. (2001). The evolution of prestige: Freely conferred deference as a mechanism for enhancing the benefits of cultural transmission. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 22*, 165-196.
- Hone, L.E., Hurwitz, W., & Lieberman, D. (2015). Sex differences in preferences for humor: A replication, modification, and extension. *Evolutionary Psychology, 13*, 167-181.
- Hornowska, E., & Charytonik, J. (2011). Polska adaptacja Kwestionariusza Stylów Humorów (HSQ) R. Martina, P. Puhlik-Doris, G. Larsena, J. Gray i K. Weir [Polish adaptation of the Humor Styles Questionnaire (HSQ) by R. Martin, P. Puhlik-Doris, G. Larsen, J. Gray, and K. Weir]. *Studia Psychologiczne, 49*, 5-22.
- Howrigan, D.P., & MacDonald, K.B. (2008). Humor as a Mental Fitness Indicator. *Evolutionary Psychology, 6*, 652-666.
- Hunter, S.C., Fox, C.L., & Jones, S.E. (2016). Humor style similarity and difference in friendship dyads. *Journal of Adolescence, 46*, 30-37.
- Hurley, M.M., Dennett, D.C., Adams, R.B. (2011). *Inside Jokes: Using Humor to Reverse-Engineer the Mind*. The MIT Press.
- Jach, Ł., Kubicius, D., & Jonason, P.K. (2022). Do they fit together like the Joker and Harley Quinn?: Joking, laughing, humor styles, and dyadic adjustment among people in long-term romantic relationships. *Personality and Individual Differences, 199*, 111859.
- Janes, L.M., & Olson, J.M. (2000). Jeer pressure: the behavioral effects of observing ridicule of others. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*, 474–485.
- Jonason, P.K., & Webster, G.D. (2012). A protean approach to social influence: Dark Triad personalities and social influence tactics. *Personality and Individual Differences, 52*, 521-526.
- Kenrick, D.T., Griskevicius, V., Neuberg, S.L., & Schaller, M. (2010). Renovating the pyramid of needs: Contemporary extensions built upon ancient foundations. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*, 292-314.
- Kfrerer, M.L., Schermer, J.A. (2020). Humor styles and the ten personality dimensions from the Supernumerary Personality Inventory. *Current Issues in Personality Psychology, 8*, 352-360.
- Kim, M. (2014). Why self-deprecating? Achieving 'oneness' in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 69*, 82-98.
- Kuiper, N.A., Martin R.A., & Olinger, L.J. (1993). Coping humor, stress, and cognitive appraisals. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 25*, 81-96.
- Laursen, B. (2017). Making and keeping friends: The importance of being similar. *Child Development Perspectives, 11*, 282–289.
- Leary, M.R. (1996). *Self-Presentation: Impression Management and Interpersonal Behavior* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Leary, M.R., & Kowalski, R.M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-component model. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*, 34-47.
- Li, N.P., Griskevicius, V., Durante, K.M., Jonason, P.K., Pasisz, D.J., & Aumer, K. (2009). An evolutionary perspective on humor: sexual selection or interest indication?. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*, 923-936.
- 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.
- Maxwell, S.E., & Cole, D.A. (2007). Bias in cross-sectional analyses of longitudinal mediation. *Psychological Methods, 12*, 23-44.
- Neel, R., Kenrick, D.T., White, A.E., & Neuberg, S.L. (2016). Individual differences in fundamental social motives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 110*, 887907.
- Ozyesil, Z. (2012). The Prediction Level of Self-Esteem on Humor Style and Positive-Negative Affect. *Psychology, 3*, 638-641.

- Pick, C.M., Ko, A., Kenrick, D.T., Wiesel, A., Wormley, A.S., Awad, E., Al-Shawaf, L., Barry, O., Bereby-Meyer, Y., Boonyasiriwat, W., Brandstätter, E., Ceylan-Batur, S., Choy, B.K.C., Crispim, A.C., Cruz, J. E., David, D., David, O. A., Defelipe, R.P., Elmas, P., Espinosa, A., . . . Varnum, M.E.W. (2022). Fundamental social motives measured across forty-two cultures in two waves. *Scientific Data*, 9, 499.
- Speer, S.A. (2019). Reconsidering self-deprecation as a communication practice. *The British Journal of Social Psychology*, 58, 806-828.
- Sprecher, S., & Regan, P.C. (2002). Liking some things (in some people) more than others: Partner preferences in romantic relationships and friendships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 19, 463-481.
- Stewart, P.A. (2011). The influence of self-and other-deprecatory humor on presidential candidate evaluation during the 2008 US election. *Social Science Information*, 50, 201-222.
- Stieger, S., Formann, A.K. & Burger, C. (2011). Humor styles and their relationship to explicit and implicit self-esteem. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50, 747-750.
- Stopa, L., Brown, M.A., Hirsch, C.R. (2012). The effects of repeated imagery practice on self-concept, anxiety and performance in socially anxious participants. *Journal of Experimental Psychopathology*, 3, 223-242.
- Van Vugt, M. (2006). Evolutionary origins of leadership and followership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10, 354-371.
- Van Vugt, M., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R.B. (2008). Leadership, followership, and evolution: Some lessons from the past. *American Psychologist*, 63, 182-196.
- Von Rueden, C., Gurven, M., & Kaplan, H. (2011). Why do men seek status?; Fitness payoffs to dominance and prestige. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 278, 2223-2232.
- Wilbur, C.J., & Campbell, L. (2011). Humor in romantic contexts: Do men participate and women evaluate? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37, 918-929.
- Wojciszke, B., (2002). Autopromocja i autodeprecjacja: Kwestionariusz Stylów Autoprezentacji [Self-promotion and self-depreciation: Self-presentation Styles Questionnaire]. *Psychologia Jakości Życia*, 1, 145-171.
- Zeigler-Hill, V., Besser, A., & Jett, S.E. (2013). Laughing at the looking glass: Does humor style serve as an interpersonal signal? *Evolutionary Psychology*, 11, 201-226.
- Zhang, H., Xin, S. & Liu, G. (2022). The effect of the perception of group members' identity diversity on intragroup trust. *Current Psychology*, 41, 2686-2696