

The battle of the sexes and humour on Facebook: the example of Ukraine

Tetiana Khraban

Kyiv Aviation Institute State University, Ukraine
xraban.tatyana@gmail.com

Abstract

This study utilizes critical discourse analysis (CDA), adopting a conflict-based approach and drawing on concepts from gender and media studies, to examine gender-specific humour present on Ukrainian-language Facebook pages. This study analyses 104 Facebook jokes, of which 66 target women (primarily disseminated by men) and 38 target men (primarily disseminated by women), as collected from major Ukrainian Facebook communities between December 2023 and February 2025. The jokes are examined as gendered discursive resources used to perform and negotiate gender identity through stereotypical or subversive content. The extant research demonstrates that the humour of men and women differs not only in style but also in purpose, structure, and socio-psychological function. Men's humour, frequently marked by its sexist undertones, operates as a regulatory mechanism aimed at perpetuating established gender hierarchies. It is marked by stereotyping, stigmatisation, objectification, and vulgarisation, and tends to perpetuate social dominance. Conversely, women's humour functions as a form of resistance, employing parody, irony, and grotesque exaggeration to challenge established gender norms and contest social inequality. The findings suggest the necessity of distinguishing between sexist and feminist humour, while also proposing the exclusion of humour driven by lookism and vulgarity due to its passive, cynical nature, which compromises humour's subversive potential.

Keywords: sexist humour, feminist humour, gender stereotypes, Facebook jokes.

1. Introduction

In the early stages of the digital era, social networking platforms have emerged as pivotal forums for the perpetuation of gender stereotypes and the dissemination of gender-based discrimination. However, these social virtual spaces may also function as significant arenas for challenging entrenched gender norms, thereby fostering the promotion of gender equality. The argument can be made that the online environment functions as a medium for gender confrontation, thereby shifting its scope from the interpersonal to a potentially global scale (Chen & Zheng, 2023). According to the prevailing legislative doctrine, specific forms of discrimination are deemed illicit and are, as such, formally proscribed by law. Consequently,

the principle of non-discrimination should serve as a foundational tenet guiding the functioning of social networking groups and communities. Nonetheless, a pervasive yet less overt form of discrimination has continued to persist (Khraban, 2024). It is plausible that covert forms of discrimination may exert a more deleterious effect than overt ones (Jones et al., 2016). This tendency can be attributed to the fact that such forms of discrimination are comparatively more difficult to identify (Mallett et al., 2016). This, in turn, has the effect of reinforcing existing gender bias and rendering such discrimination more tolerable (Lawless et al., 2020). A particular instance of disguised discrimination is the practice of sexist humour.

Sexist humour is a form of disparaging humour distinguished by its tendency to belittle, criticize, stereotype, victimize, and objectify individuals based on their gender (Argüello-Gutiérrez et al., 2023; Koszałkowska & Wróbel, 2019). The implications of sexist humour extend beyond mere entertainment, often evoking feelings of embarrassment, disgust, guilt, anger, or frustration (Ford & Olah, 2021). The observed emotional ambivalence may be attributable to the perception of sexist humour as ethically unacceptable. That is to say, the social context of sexist humour is often interpreted as hostile, injurious, and directed towards the social stigmatisation of individuals (Bartolo et al., 2021). Sexist humour is a manifestation of gender-based inequity, wherein a certain gender is presented in a manner devoid of egalitarian treatment, rendering it ineffectively positioned in comparison to its other gender counterpart. This dynamic is characterized by an implicit disparaging of qualities attributed to one gender and an elevation of attributes associated with the opposing gender. Consequently, this dynamic has led to the development of a societal belief system in which members of a specific gender are regarded as having a diminished value, as well as being inferior and as having been deprived of rights equal to that possessed by members of other gender groups (Ford & Olah, 2021; Aprianti & Ginting, 2022). The prevailing perspective suggests that sexist humour is directed towards women; however, it can also be directed towards men (Aprianti & Ginting, 2022). The utilisation of sexist humour has a long-standing practice in expressing gender bias, thereby reinforcing social hierarchy and asymmetry (Ford & Olah, 2021). In contemporary society, sexist humour persists in its significant role in gender stereotyping; however, an evolution in its usage is observed, with women increasingly employing it as a confrontational instrument to challenge prevailing forms of inequality and defy the limitations imposed by a stereotypical social identity (Saucier et al., 2018). In certain instances, the use of sexist humour can be observed to transition into discourse focused on coping mechanisms, thereby drawing attention towards gender-related issues within an affirmative or subversive context (Khraban, 2023a). The multifaceted nature of sexist humour, which functions to perpetuate gender disparities and social injustices at both the individual and collective levels, while concurrently serving as a medium for direct social confrontation and countering stereotypes entrenched in patriarchal norms, necessitates a more profound scientific comprehension of this phenomenon.

2. Men's and women's humour within the paradigm of sexist humour in the academic literature

For this study, works that focus on the social consequences of sexist humour and the psychological and behavioural reactions of individuals to sexist humour are relevant. The following Table 1 presents a systematic overview of the principal directions of these studies.

Table 1. Research focus areas of sexist humour

Scope of research	Object of study	Key findings of the study	Authors of published studies
Effect of sexist humour on stereotypes and prejudice	The factors that either reinforce or weaken the impact of sexist humour on fostering a culture of tolerance for gender discrimination	Sexist humour may have deleterious effects on society	Ford, Olah (2021); Horisk (2024); Siddiqi et al. (2018); Parrot, Hopp (2019); Mallett, Ford, Woodzicka (2016)
Perception, interpretation, and reaction to sexist humour	An individual's ability to recognize when they are the targets of sexist humour. Countering sexist humour	Women are not as entertained by sexist humour as men are. Men who hold prejudices and exhibit a hostile attitude toward women tend to enjoy sexist humour more than those who do not demonstrate such prejudicial tendencies.	Tabassum, Karakowsky (2023); Neoh et al. (2023); Lawless et al. (2020); Betz, DiDonato (2024); Prusaczyk, Hodson (2020); Bouckaert et al., 2024; Woodzicka, Mallett (2021); Vecina, Piñuela (2017); Caldwell, Wojtach (2020)
Sexist humour as a form of sexual violence	Factors that cause specific kinds of aggressive behaviour in the sexual context	Sexist humour has three main effects: 1) it increases cohesion among men in a group; 2) it serves as a form of sexual harassment; 3) it increases the likelihood of rape and the tendency to blame the victim	Aprianti, Ginting (2022); Thomae, Pina (2015); Romero-Sánchez, Megías, Carretero-Dios (2021)

Three primary domains of research can be identified within the broader context of sexist humour. These domains include the impact of sexist humour on stereotypes and prejudice, the role of sexist humour as a form of sexual violence, and the perception, interpretation, and reaction to sexist humour. According to Ford and Olah (2021), humour serves as a pivotal instrument that inherently functions within social contexts, facilitating the establishment and transformation of social norms. In light of this postulate, researchers argue that the employment of disparaging humour, which includes sexist humour, fosters a societal climate of tolerance for discrimination. This climate, in turn, serves to reinforce the expression of prejudice, operating as a set of variables that both strengthen and weaken the effect of prejudice. To elucidate this phenomenon, Ford and colleagues (Ford et al., 2015) utilize biased norms theory, positing that sexist humour fosters tolerance for expressions of prejudice and discrimination. They posit that this form of humour functions as a manifestation of the prejudices held by individuals or groups (in-groups) towards other, different out-groups, while concurrently challenging the boundaries of what is considered socially acceptable. In the context of sexist humour, its function is to establish a situational norm of flippancy that suggests acceptance of discrimination and violence against women as a permissible form of social behaviour. The researchers emphasize that an essential condition for enhancing tolerance for sex discrimination in contexts where sexist humour is employed is the activation of non-judgmental thinking. In the absence of this condition, the deleterious effects of sexist

humour on individuals with elevated levels of sexism are negated (Reich et al., 2021). The validity of these conclusions are corroborated in subsequent studies conducted by Chavez and Cuilan (2024) as well as Parrot and Hopp (2019). These researchers posit that the existence of sexist humour fosters a tolerance for sexist attitudes, rendering them less contentious. The humorous nature of these jokes serves to accentuate the comedic aspects, effectively obscuring the potentially derogatory content. Consequently, a normative standard of attitude towards the discriminated group is activated, and individuals with high levels of prejudice are more likely to employ it as a source of self-justification or as a framework for interpreting discriminatory events (Khraban, 2023b). Horisk (2024) underscores that the primary concern with sexist humour does not lie in its potential to cause emotional distress to the recipient. Rather, it is its role in perpetuating stereotypes and prejudices. Sexist humour functions as a catalyst for the reinforcement of these social biases, playing a significant role in the establishment of stigma-inducing environments that target historically marginalized groups.

When examining gender differences in the perception, interpretation, and reaction to sexist humour, researchers often regard it as “idiosyncratic” (Weinberger et al., 2017), that is, as a phenomenon capable of evoking both positive and negative emotions. A considerable body of research corroborates the hypothesis that gender disparities in the interpretation of sexist humour exist. Research findings demonstrate that sexist humour evokes divergent emotional responses that vary by gender. Specifically, female participants report experiencing heightened levels of irritation and resentment in comparison to the male participants (Lawless et al., 2020; Argüello-Gutiérrez et al., 2023). According to Tabassum and Karakowsky (2023), this phenomenon may suggest a heightened sensitivity among women for recognizing situations in which they become subjects of stereotyping and humiliation. Interesting results are obtained in studies on the integration of humour in advertising contexts. Hatzithomas (2021) confirms the hypothesis that identification (or lack thereof) with a character acting as an object of derision in a disparaging advertisement increases (decreases) feelings of inferiority and, in turn, decreases (increases) identified humorousness. To illustrate the aforementioned point, research indicates a persistent preference among men for the use of disparaging humour, irrespective of the gender of the individual towards whom the humour is directed (Manyiwa & Jin, 2020). Individuals demonstrating hegemonic masculinity exhibit an elevated proclivity for finding aggressive humour appealing, and frequently manifest an emotional attachment to the victim rather than the victimizer (Weinberger et al., 2017). These results align with the conclusions of prior studies addressing sexist humour. The findings of the studies indicate that the propensity to relish disparaging humour is intricately intertwined with pre-existing attitudes, including those of a sexist nature (Thomas et al., 2020). For instance, individuals who hold prejudicial attitudes or animosity toward certain gender groups exhibit a heightened inclination to appreciate sexist humour. Furthermore, these individuals demonstrate a greater readiness to share sexist jokes with their friends (Thomas et al., 2020). Bouckaert & colleagues (2024) argue that the heightened negative emotions triggered by sexist humour act as impediments to effective communication for both men and women. These emotions, including feelings of embarrassment, awkwardness, and resentment, hinder recipients from engaging in communication and cooperation with individuals who indulge in such humour. Moreover, the experience of negative emotions results in a perceived diminution in the professional competence of the interlocutor, that is, the individual from whom humour is received (Bouckaert et al., 2024). Woodzicka and Mallett (2021) posit that the employment of confrontation tactics, such as the practice of laughing off sexist humour, can serve to alleviate the societal harms associated with such humour.

Of particular interest is the research that focuses on the perception, interpretation, and reaction to sexist humour, which is anchored in the tenets of moral psychology. Yamane & colleagues (2021) posit an argument for a shared foundation between moral psychology and

humour, asserting that individuals' moral frameworks can be manifested in their sense of humour. Therefore, it can be concluded that the evaluation of humour in a joke, i.e., whether it is considered amusing or distasteful, is a moral judgment. According to Koszałkowska and Wróbel (2019), the emotional reactions of individuals to disparaging humour may elucidate the relationship between moral principles and moral judgments. Grounding their study in a theoretical framework, Koszałkowska and Wróbel (2019) employ the tenets of moral foundations theory. According to the moral foundations theory, there are at least five distinct principles that underpin morality. The following principles are of particular relevance in this context: Caring, Fairness, Loyalty, Authority, and Purity. The principle of Caring is rooted in a profound sense of compassion for those experiencing distress and suffering. The principle of Fairness underscores the necessity for cooperation, mutual interaction, equality, and social fairness. Furthermore, it fosters heightened sensitivity to deception and unfairness. The principle of Loyalty is characterized by the valorisation of one's in-group, the establishment of trust, and the willingness to make sacrifices for its members. Notably, the betrayal of this in-group elicits profound disdain, while distrust and competitive tensions with external groups are intensified. The principle of Authority is predicated on obedience and respect for the established hierarchy. Conversely, challenging the established hierarchy is regarded as antisocial behaviour. At last, the fundamental principle of Purity is invoked by a sense of disgust that assists individuals in recognizing all that is polluted and unclean, not only in the physical sense, but also in the religious and spiritual sense (Koszałkowska & Wróbel, 2019). Therefore, reactions to disparaging humour can be predicted based on a person's moral profile. Specifically, the individualizing principles of Caring and Fairness promote negative reactions to sexist, racist, and homophobic humour, while the principles of Loyalty, Authority, and Purity lead to negative reactions to religiously offensive humour, which can be perceived as an attack not only on one's established values but also on one's religious ingroup (Koszałkowska & Wróbel, 2019). Vecina and Piñuela's (2017) study underscores the pivotal role of the principles of Authority and Fairness in shaping sexist behaviours and beliefs. Specifically, their findings reveal a positive correlation between the principle of Authority and gender inequality, as well as a negative correlation between the principle of Fairness and sexist attitudes.

The specific behavioural risk factors for sexual aggression have been the focus of scholarly interest in studies examining sexist humour as a form of sexual violence. Most of the previous researchers on this subject concentrate on data concerning intergroup interactions between women and men. In these interactions, sexist humour is demonstrated to be associated with hostile attitudes and negative behavioural tendencies toward women as a marginalized group. Thomae and Pina (2015) identify several behavioural risk factors that contribute to the perpetuation of sexual violence. These factors include the adoption of rape culture, which encompasses victim blaming, sexual objectification, banalisation of rape, denial of its pervasiveness, and refusal to acknowledge its harmful consequences. Additionally, there is a societal endorsement of a victim-blaming culture, where the blame is shifted from the offender to the victim, who is subjected to the violence. Finally, there is a maintenance of sexist organisational and cultural attitudes that perpetuate gender inequality and sexual violence. Behavioural risk factors, manifesting at the linguistic level as sexist humour, prove to be robust predictors of men's sexual aggression toward women (Aprianti & Ginting, 2022). Romero-Sánchez & colleagues (2021) have contributed to the understanding of the influence of sexist humour and the attitudinal factors that motivate the display of aggressive sexual behaviour directed against women by men who exhibit sexist attitudes. The researchers' conclusions suggest that exposure to sexist humour may engender a socio-psychological context in which certain men feel at ease expressing aggressive tendencies toward women, including a propensity to commit sexual assault. The researchers attribute this phenomenon to

the ability of such humour to facilitate the expression of prejudices by men who hold antagonistic attitudes toward women, without the fear of social reprisal.

The present study utilizes an interdisciplinary framework situated at the intersection of the fields of sociolinguistics, gender studies, and critical discourse analysis, with a focus on communicative manifestations of gender asymmetry in virtual environments. This research endeavours to examine the role of humour as a discursive practice through which gendered power relations are articulated, maintained, or contested. Utilizing the methodological precepts of critical discourse analysis, the present study examines the manner in which manifestations of sexist humour in online interactions serve to perpetuate and legitimize established gender hierarchies, while concurrently creating opportunities for potential resistance. From a sociolinguistic perspective, particular attention is paid to the lexical, stylistic, and paralinguistic elements that encode gendered meanings and position speakers within specific socio-psychological frameworks. The gender studies perspective of the analysis highlights the symbolic mechanisms of domination and subversion present in humorous discourse. This integrative approach facilitates a comprehensive understanding of humour not merely as a linguistic phenomenon, but as a socially embedded and culturally charged form of communication within contemporary virtual contexts. This theoretical foundation enables the formulation of the subsequent hypothesis: despite the tendency in academic discourse to treat male and female humour as part of a single category of sexist humour, significant differences exist in their functions, structures, and socio-psychological implications. The purpose of this study is to empirically differentiate humour targeting women (typically labelled as men's humour) from humour targeting men (typically labelled as women's humour).

3. Materials and methods

This study employs a conflict approach to understanding humour, in which humour is regarded as both a weapon and a defence mechanism (Wolfgruber, 2023). It is conceptualized as an articulation of social conflict (Kuipers, 2008), particularly in cases where its use is deliberate and reflects group antagonism (Riquelme et al., 2021; Khraban, 2021). Furthermore, adopting a social constructivist perspective, we conceptualize gender as a dynamic, socially constructed phenomenon that is manifested through discursive practices comprising concepts and attitudes shared by communicative participants (Linares, 2019). These practices, in turn, serve as the foundational basis for interaction within a particular context as it unfolds through discourse (Langacker, 2001). Therefore, humour can be conceptualized as a gender discursive resource that is frequently employed by both men and women to negotiate their gender identity during interactions (Linares, 2019). The employment of humour is evident in the deployment of lexical, syntactic, phonetic, and other linguistic resources, which facilitate the attainment of humorous effects and the articulation of gender identity by speakers. These functions are further enhanced through the integration of prosodic, paralinguistic, kinetic, and typographic elements. Accordingly, humour is identified as an important gendered discursive resource. This particular rhetorical strategy is utilized by both men and women to construct or negotiate their gender identity in the context of interpersonal interactions (Ruiz Gurillo, 2012). In essence, discourse manifests as language, text, discussion, visual images, and the utilisation of symbols that are to be employed by actors in accordance with specific social directives. Consequently, discourses can be regarded as authentic social practices. Discourse analysis studies are centred on the reconstruction of processes that occur regarding the social construction, objectification, communication, and legitimisation of the structural elements of meanings in public arenas. A shift in focus towards discourse-analytical methodologies enables a more profound comprehension of humour's dialogical essence than conventional

laboratory-based studies can achieve (Kotthoff, 2006), and discourse analysis serves as a research framework firmly rooted in the sociological tradition, utilized to examine the discursive formation of symbolic structures.

This study employed a critical discourse analysis (CDA) approach to understand how constructs of gender are formed and deconstructed. In this study, we employed critical discourse analysis to elucidate the mechanisms through which gender is constructed, deconstructed, and co-constructed through humour discourse (Linares, 2019). CDA is characterized by its rigorous scientific approach, which aims to study the relationship between discursive and cognitive structures, on the one hand, and discursive and social structures, on the other. It necessitates the integration of interdisciplinary theories and methods (van Dijk, 2008). The CDA is generally concerned with the components of discourse that are contingent upon the relevant social conditions of language use, or that may result in particular social effects of discourse, thereby influencing the social beliefs and behaviours of the audience. These components include intonation, visual and auditory features (e.g., colour, typography, image characteristics, and music), syntactic structures, metaphors, argumentation (or sophistry), the selection of vocabulary, the semantics of presuppositions, rhetorical figures or argumentative structures, and the selection of specific speech patterns, as well as conversational strategies (van Dijk, 2008). A three-dimensional model can be proposed to represent the methodology of critical discourse analysis. This model involves the analysis of a specific speech case (communicative event) in three dimensions, each of which is subjected to a thorough informal analysis. The first dimension focuses on the spoken/written text (semantic, syntactic, and other features). The second dimension examines the discursive practices of its production (context of creation). The third dimension explores the discursive practice of social reality.

The material for the study is a collection of Facebook jokes whose objects of humour are women (conventionally labelled as men's humour) and humour patterns whose objects of humour are men (conventionally labelled as women's humour). The samples of jokes are obtained from the Ukrainian- language sector of the social network Facebook, specifically on the pages of the following groups:

- “HUMOR dlia vsikh 21+ [Humour for everyone 21+]”(Humor dlia vsikh 21+ [Humour for everyone 21+], n.d.) (the number of users is 69100),
- “Durdom na pryzbi[Madhouse on the Porch3]” (Durdom na pryzbi [Madhouse on the porch], n.d.) (the number of users is 103000),
- “Cekta Faniv Humorou [Humour Fans Club]”(Sekta Faniv Humorou [Humour Fans Club], n.d.) (the number of users is 29200),
- “VIDBIRNI ZhARTY [BEST JOKES]”(Vidbirni zharty [BEST JOKES], n.d.) (the number of users is 79700).

The material collection period encompasses the timeframe from December 1, 2023, to February 1, 2025. During this interval, a sufficient number of humour patterns were amassed for the purpose of analysis. Following a rigorous selection process, 104 Facebook jokes were identified, encompassing 66 men's and 38 women's jokes. The translation of jokes from Ukrainian into English is performed by the author of the article. During the research and preparation of the present article, adherence to the ethical requirements set forth by the International Sociological Association (ISA) (International Sociological Association, n.d.) and the Sociological Association of Ukraine (SAU) (Sociological Association of Ukraine, n.d.) was observed.

The present study employs thematic analysis (TA) as a qualitative analytical method. It is a systematic method that involves identifying, analysing, and interpreting meaning through a

systematic process of code generation. This process leads to the development of themes (Ayton et al., 2023). TA possesses several salient characteristics that render it a suitable method for this study. The initial consideration is adaptability to disparate research contexts and compatibility with an array of theoretical frameworks (Fuchs, 2023). As posited by Braun and Clarke (2024), the notion of “standardized TA” is a fallacy, and this perspective enables the conception of thematic analysis as a malleable research technique, characterized by its theoretical and design flexibility. In contrast to most qualitative analytical approaches – such as grounded theory, interpretive phenomenological analysis, and narrative analysis – that are constrained by their methods, thematic analysis is regarded as a versatile and adaptable research instrument. Secondly, thematic analysis provides a structured framework for organizing and interpreting qualitative data, thereby ensuring that valuable insights are not overlooked (Neuendorf, 2018). Thirdly, the iterative nature of thematic analysis enables a dynamic and evolutionary understanding of the data, thereby facilitating the exploration of multiple layers of meaning (Christou, 2023).

The process of thematic analysis in this research unfolds in several key stages:

1. Acquiring an in-depth understanding of the data by thoroughly reviewing its content. This process entails meticulous examination of data, encompassing both initial and subsequent readings. It involves the meticulous documentation of observations, facilitating the development of a nuanced and comprehensive understanding of the subtleties inherent in the data.
2. Initial coding. A rigorous examination of each Facebook joke is conducted, and they are assigned descriptive codes based on their content, style, rhetorical strategies, and underlying socio-psychological assumptions. For instance, the following codes are identified: “stereotyping”, “parody”, “objectification”, “resistance”, “benevolent sexism”, and “stigmatisation”.
3. Theme identification. The coding of data is then organized into overarching themes that encapsulate the latent and semantic meanings embedded in the Facebook jokes. The thematic framework is developed inductively, aligning with theoretical constructs derived from gender studies and critical discourse analysis. The overarching themes that emerged from this analysis are as follows: “Benevolent sexist humour”, “Hostile sexist humour”, “Disparaging humour” (with subthemes: “Stereotyping”, “Lookism”, “Objectification”, “Vulgarisation”, “Stigmatisation”), “Feminist subversive humour”, “Cynical humour”.
4. Theme refinement and categorisation. Themes are meticulously refined to ensure internal coherence and distinctiveness. To illustrate, disparaging humour is further subdivided based on its specific social function or stylistic expression, reflecting different mechanisms of gendered domination or resistance.
5. Interpretation and discussion: The thematic elements are interpreted within the framework of ambivalent sexism theory, social dominance theory, superiority theory, and feminist perspectives. This stage provides a contextual framework for understanding the results within the broader societal and cultural discourses, thereby demonstrating the manner in which humour functions as a gendered discursive practice, exhibiting both regulatory and subversive characteristics.

4. Limitations

This study contributes to the extant research on sexist and feminist humour; however, it is not without its limitations. Given that the study is conducted on Facebook, it can be argued that the focus is predominantly on adults, who represent the majority of users on this social network (Gemius, 2024). Therefore, the study's primary limitation pertains to the validity of its findings' applicability to other age demographics. The subsequent limitation arises from the requirements during the collection of the material. In accordance with established ethical principles, the samples under consideration exclude Facebook jokes that incorporate the use of invective or genital-related content. Given that, this style is predominantly characteristic of men's sexist humour, the exclusion of such patterns from the sample calls into question the accuracy of the results obtained in the study regarding the ratio of men's to women's Facebook jokes. The accuracy of the quantitative results of the study was also affected by the conditional division of Facebook jokes into male and female categories. Given that the material was collected on a social network, it is not possible to determine the gender of the Facebook jokes' author. The classification of the jokes was based on the gender of the object of humour. That is, jokes directed at women was classified as a pattern of men's humour, and vice versa. In reality, the gender of the producer of Facebook jokes is not invariably correlated with the gender of the subjects of the humour. For instance, when the gender identity of the joke's producer does not correspond with the gender assigned at birth or in cases of aversion to their own gender (internal misogyny and internal misandry), the correlation is not evident.

5. Results and discussion

All patterns of Facebook jokes that focus on women (conventionally labelled as men's humour) fall into two main types based on the beliefs they manifest: benevolent sexist humour and hostile sexist humour. A compelling argument for this classification is provided by the theory of ambivalent sexism, which posits that gender relations are characterized by a combination of subjectively negative and positive attitudes and beliefs. Sexism, in its benevolent or hostile forms, can be regarded as two sides of a dual phenomenon, representing the ambivalent character of gender bias (Bosson et al., 2015). The concept of hostile sexism encompasses the belief that men should exercise dominant control over women and that women lack the traits necessary for high-status roles. The concept of benevolent sexism encompasses the belief that women should be shielded and cherished. However, benevolent sexist beliefs are predominantly exhibited towards women who conform to gender stereotypes, that is, towards women who assume domestic roles and do not challenge men's social or political authority. All patterns of Facebook jokes whose object is men (conventionally labelled as women's humour) were divided into such analogous theme groups, the content of which may be regarded as an imitation of men's sexist humour. The distinguishing trait of these types of groups is the absence of sexual aggression between men and women in hypothetical scenarios. Patterns of benevolent sexist humour are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Patterns of Facebook jokes characterized by absence of sexual aggression between men and women

The object of Facebook jokes	
Women	Men
<p><i>If you can figure out why a round pizza is packaged in a square box and eaten in a triangle shape, you'll have a much better understanding of women</i> (Prokhorova [Прохорова], 2025)</p> <p><i>Women see a car as just another handbag that can also drive</i> (Sushko [Сушко], 2023)</p> <p><i>Women's logic: you had better tell it yourself, or I will just figure it out on my own, and it'll be all the worse for you!</i> (Mykhailivna [Михайлівна], 2023)</p>	<p><i>"Honey, why are your eyes red?" – "I smoked weed." – "Don't lie. You cried again because of gasoline prices!"</i> (Prokhorova [Прохорова], 2024)</p> <p><i>"Hey, I need your advice. I'm going for a walk with a guy who's younger than I. Should I give him some kind of chocolate or something?" – "You need to ask your mom what food he should eat."</i> (Boroda, 2024)</p> <p><i>We're looking for a nanny who's between 23 and 29. The kiddie is 33</i> (GUMOR dlia vsikh 21+ [Humour for everyone 21+], 2024)</p> <p><i>Hey ladies, if you need to calm down a guy, just give him a boob. And age doesn't matter</i> (Belladonna Tia, 2025)</p>

The phenomenon of benevolent men's sexist humour exhibits a notable similarity to the characteristics traditionally attributed to affiliative humour. It is a form of politically correct humour that does not involve the use of insults or devaluation. It manifests as friendly teasing, but without personal attacks or the targeting of any characteristics related to appearance or personality (Yeo et al., 2022; Khraban, 2023a). The format of such humour is witty stories: *"Dad, how'd you hook up with Mom?" – "She was into all that astrology and numerology stuff, so I'd send her messages at 10:10 or 11:11. She thought it was fate."* – *"Dude, you're a legend."* (Spokushaï mene ukrains'koïu [Tempt me in Ukrainian], 2023); bland, allegorical jokes: *"Darling, do you remember the first time you saw me?" – "Oh, sure! It was a sunny day, and there was nothing to suggest problems were on the horizon!"* (Yurtyna, 2023); puns and humorous wordplay: *A woman's talent is to convince people that her harpoon is actually Cupid's arrow* (Kotenko [Котенко], 2023); situation comedies: *"Darling, come here quick. Look!" – "What's up, babe?" – "I made a problem out of nothing." – "My sweetie."* (Riabushko Polishchuk [Рябушко Поліщук], 2024) Although the objective of benevolent sexist humour is to entertain, alleviate interpersonal tensions, or establish rapport by attracting attention and forming a favourable impression, it remains a regulator of gender norms. These norms represent socio-psychological prescriptions dictating what it means to be a "real man" or a "real woman". As evidenced in the aforementioned examples, men's social dominance orientations are obscured by a veil of condescension, gentleness, leniency, benevolence, patience, and an amiable disposition towards women (see Tab. 2). The manifestation of tolerance for inconsistency and contradictory thinking, which is attributed to women, contributes to the formation of the image of a man whose ability to think pragmatically and the ability to recognize irrational thoughts allows men to occupy the highest position in the hierarchical structure of social relations regarding the distribution of power, property, income, status, etc. It is noteworthy that women often exhibit a degree of complacency towards this particular form of humour. This complacency can be attributed to two possible factors: either women are unaware of the potential dangers associated with perpetuating stereotypical gender

norms through benevolent sexist humour, or they choose to accept their historically marginalized position in society. The paucity of humour patterns that accentuate gender contradictions and challenge established normative gender stereotypes serves to confirm this fact. The ratio of men's to women's benevolent sexist humour patterns is 10:4. The hallmarks of benevolent sexist women's humour are its protesting nature. In such cases, humour may sometimes transcend its conventional role and assume a form that challenges established norms, thereby drawing attention to gender issues from a subversive perspective (Kotthoff, 2006). The manifestation of a protest character is achieved through the utilisation of parody, encompassing the mocking-imitative reproduction of men's humour, and frequently employed for the purpose of criticism. Concurrently, female humour maintains the conventional, hallmark style of men's benevolent sexist humour. The parodic undertone is evident in the caricatured depiction of traditional gender roles, where men are portrayed as the passive recipients of "care" and "guidance" (see Tab. 2). The most common techniques employed in the creation of a parody of men's benevolent sexist humour are the replication of a template and the hyperbolisation of the original, that is, deliberate exaggeration (see Tab. 2).

A comparison of the functions performed by sexist humour produced by men and women reveals that men's benevolent sexist humour primarily serves the functions of demonstrating friendliness, social regulation, self-expression, and overcoming insecurity. The primary objective of women's sexist humour is to critique and confront sexism. This form of humour functions as a means of addressing and challenging gender disparities and inequalities at both the interpersonal and societal levels, thereby contributing to the overthrow of gender asymmetries and injustices. Given the observation that the functions served by humour produced by men and women differ significantly, this paper will argue for the necessity of separating these two types of humour. This position is taken in accordance with the work of Riquelme and colleagues (2021), who claim that humour produced by women should not be defined as sexist, but rather as feminist – subversive feminist humour can function as a supportive tool to combat sexist attitudes, discrimination against women, and gender inequality. By critiquing, confronting, and questioning sexism, subversive feminist humour can raise awareness among people with below-average feminist identities, thereby engaging them in collective action (Riquelme et al., 2021).

The following group comprises patterns classified as a disparaging form of humour that target men and women as the direct objects. The fundamental characteristic of this group is its focus on humiliating, degrading, insulting, stereotyping, victimizing, and/or objectifying an individual based on their gender. As this study is predicated on a conflict approach to understanding humour, the group was divided into several subgroups according to the functions of disparaging humour. These functions include "Stereotyping", "Lookism" (appearance discrimination), "Objectification", "Vulgarisation and primitivisation", and "Stigmatisation". The patterns of such humour are presented in Tables 3-7.

Table 3. Examples of disparaging humour according to stereotyping function

The object of Facebook jokes	
Women	Men
<p><i>This recipe for borscht is perfect for a man. Put 55 kg of a woman in the kitchen for 40 minutes to cook the borscht</i> (Poduzova [Подузова], 2024)</p> <p><i>Before he died, Ivan wrote a will. In it, he said that he was leaving all his stuff to his neighbour Oksana, who never gets headaches. He also said that he was leaving his wife Nadia a headache medicine</i> (Ivanov [Иванов], 2024)</p> <p><i>“So, do you want to come to my place or yours?” – “Seriously? Why do you think I’ll agree?” – “Lady, let’s be real. Why else would a 35-year-old woman come to a carburettor exhibition?”</i> (Yaremenko, 2023)</p> <p><i>“My wife drives like a lightning bolt!” – “Does she drive that fast?” – “No, she bumps into trees!”</i> (GUMOR dlia vsikh 21+ [Humour for everyone 21+], 2023)</p>	<p><i>A man is looking for a marriage certificate in a desk drawer: “Darling, where is this paper about my imprisonment?” – “No, dear. It’s actually your lifetime guarantee of three meals a day.”</i> (GUMOR dlia vsikh 21+ [Humour for everyone 21+], 2023)</p> <p><i>Men should have money! So, girls, if you want everyone to envy what a great man you have, give him money</i> (GUMOR dlia vsikh 21+ [Humour for everyone 21+], 2024)</p> <p><i>Here’s some good advice for women, “Be decisive! If you like a man, take him home, cut some bread and bacon, pour him some borscht, and ask him right away, “What do you want for breakfast?”</i> (GUMOR dlia vsikh 21+ [Humour for everyone 21+], 2023)</p>

Table 4. Examples of disparaging humour according to stigmatisation function

The object of Facebook jokes	
Women	Men
<p><i>Every woman has a story about a man who wanted to give her everything, but she didn’t accept his offer</i> (GUMOR dlia vsikh 21+ [Humour for everyone 21+], 2023)</p> <p><i>Mykola came back from a business trip and went straight to bed with his wife. The neighbour is behind the wall, “Can’t you be quiet? It keeps happening every day!”</i> (Nosenko [Носенко], 2023)</p> <p><i>A dentist tells a woman, “Don’t use your mouth for two hours.” The woman replies, “How am I supposed to settle the bill?”</i> (GUMOR dlia vsikh 21+ [Humour for everyone 21+], 2025)</p> <p><i>“I love you!” – “Well, I have a boyfriend.” – “You’re so beautiful that you deserve two.”</i> (Yurtyna, 2023)</p> <p><i>“Vasya, have you married Halyna?” – “No, she said I was poor!” – “But you have a rich uncle. Why didn’t you tell her?” – “I did...” – “So what?” – “Well, she’s my aunt now.”</i> (Pokutnyi</p>	<p><i>A man is calling his wife, “We are celebrating a birthday at work today. Can I be delivered later today?”</i> (Moro, 2025)</p> <p><i>“Halina, how was your date?” – “I had to slap him five times!” – “Did he really harass you?” – “He was feeling sleepy!”</i> (Osokina [Осокіна], 2025)</p> <p><i>She convinced you to have sex on the first date, and now you feel like a whore</i> (GUMOR dlia vsikh 21+ [Humour for everyone 21+], 2023)</p> <p><i>“After what happened, I’m a decent man, so I’ve got to marry you!” She answered, frightened, as she got dressed: “What happened?”</i> (GUMOR dlia vsikh 21+ [Humour for everyone 21+], 2025)</p> <p><i>Last night, my husband and I had a three-hour-long love session. It was a role play thing where we were like doctor and patient. I waited in the waiting room for 2 hours and 58 minutes</i> (GUMOR dlia vsikh 21+ [Humour for everyone 21+], 2025)</p>

[Покутний], 2025)	<p>“So, how was the sex?” – “Oh, don’t ask. I shaved my legs longer than the sex lasted.” (Nik, 2024)</p> <p><i>It snowed for about three minutes – or, as men say, it was all night</i> (Staryi Pen’ok [Старий Пеньок], 2025)</p>
-------------------	--

Table 5. Examples of disparaging humour according to lookism (appearance discrimination) function

The object of Facebook jokes	
Women	Men
<p><i>These days, you look at a girl and think, “Is she 18 or 35 or a man in disguise?”</i> (Prokhorova [Прохорова], 2025)</p> <p><i>“So, how was your wedding night, Ivan?” – “I don’t know. I fainted when she took off her eyelashes.”</i> (Bodoriak [Бодоряк], 2023)</p> <p><i>“You say I’ve gained weight and that all the dresses are too small for me. But this khaki one is even too big!” – “Halia, it’s a tent!”</i> (Orest, 2025)</p> <p><i>Hey, just a friendly reminder for the guys out there who are into skinny girls: remember, snakes are never fat!</i> (Staryi Pen’ok [Старий Пеньок], 2025)</p>	<p><i>Why is it that when a woman is compared to a cat, she’s considered gorgeous and graceful, but when a man is compared to a cat, he’s seen as being impudent and fat?</i> (Volkov [Волков], 2025)</p>

Table 6. Examples of disparaging humour according to objectification function

The object of Facebook jokes	
Women	Men
<p><i>A neighbour in the elevator says to her neighbour, “Maybe you can come over to my place tonight? We’ll have an awesome time!” – “Sorry, I can’t. I’m married!” – “You’re kidding, he’s a married man! Marriage is like cars.” – “What do you mean?” – “Well, do you have a car?” – “Yes, a low-cost one.” – “Well, what if they offer you a ride in a Lexus? Would you agree?” – “Of course!” – “Well, you see! So, will you come to visit?” – “No.” – “Why not?” – “Why do I need a second low-cost car?”</i> (GUMOR dlia vsikh 21+ [Humour for everyone 21+], 2025)</p>	<p><i>I got to that point where I made some borscht, fried some mushrooms, meat, and potatoes, and cut up some cucumbers. Then I was like, “Hmm, something’s missing. Either a man or maybe some vodka...”</i> (GUMOR dlia vsikh 21+ [Humour for everyone 21+], 2023)</p> <p><i>It’s getting colder. So I’m thinking: should I buy another blanket or look for a husband? My husband might hug me, but at least the blanket doesn’t ask for food all the time</i> (GUMOR dlia vsikh 21+ [Humour for everyone 21+], 2023)</p>

Table 7. Examples of disparaging humour according to vulgarisation and primitivisation function

The object of Facebook jokes	
Women	Men
<p><i>Hey ladies, here's a suggestion: when you're thinking about settling down, go for guys who have a cat. They're used to living with a creature that's always unhappy with everything, constantly wants to eat, sleeps around the clock, and leaves hair all over the house (GUMOR dlia vsikh 21+ [Humour for everyone 21+], 2024)</i></p> <p><i>I had such a great time in the sauna yesterday that I came home in a pair of men's boxers (Kovalenko [Коваленко], 2023)</i></p> <p><i>"Tell me, what's the most important thing for you in a woman?" – "For me, the most important thing is that they don't snore." – "And what about when it comes to sex?" – "Especially in sex." (Kovalev [Ковалев], 2024)</i></p> <p><i>Hey, just a friendly reminder: places where a girl has two pairs of panties are her home. Keep an eye on the first pair and give it back right away! (Belladonna Tia, 2025)</i></p>	<p><i>"Mykola, put some clothes on, the guests are coming!" – "Nah, let them see how skinny I am, how you feed me." – "Well, then take off your boxers, so they can see if you have something valuable to feed you for!" (Shtefutsa, 2024)</i></p> <p><i>Hey, guy who threw an XXL condom out the window, call me (Belladonna Tia, 2025)</i></p> <p><i>"And how long have you been wearing bikinis?" – "Since my wife found them in the car and I said they were mine." (GUMOR dlia vsikh 21+ [Humour for everyone 21+], 2023)</i></p>

Stereotyping as a function of the disparaging type of humour targeting women is geared towards maintaining the norms of a society where a person's gender determines their rights, responsibilities, opportunities, and access to economic and other resources. This is achieved through the propagation of a cultural ideology that legitimizes the prevailing state of gender inequality (Ford et al., 2015). Stereotyping is based on societal perceptions of the qualities and characteristics that men or women possess or should possess. The predominant stereotypes perpetuated by male sexist humour revolve around the following notions: the primary objective of a woman's existence is matrimony; women should be responsible for domestic chores; women demonstrate substandard driving skills; and women often resort to feigning illness (see Tab. 3). A significant instrument for women to engage in self-critical analysis of the prevailing stereotypes that influence their lives (Pahl, 2017) is the genre of humour, such as banter. This genre emerged as a form of protest against traditional and established norms, clichéd thinking, and stereotypes. The resource potential of the banter is derived from its postmodern nature, which involves a shift in perspective, thereby allowing women to explore diverse social constructions of womanhood when viewed through the lens of manhood. The escalation of the situation to a comedic or farcical level, accompanied by the introduction of elements of the grotesque and the playfulness with the conventional gender binary, is the hallmark of banter. Banter serves as a means of establishing an identity that deviates from the conventional notions of masculinity and femininity, thereby defying the confines of a rigid binary framework. It is crucial to acknowledge the distinction between the construct of non-binary gender identity and that of sexual orientation (Khraban, 2023a). In banter, women may distance themselves from societal expectations of femininity by ascribing traditional traits of masculinity to themselves. For instance, in the example *"I was on my way down the street*

when I looked behind me and saw a guy following me. So, I started running, but I wasn't fast enough to chase him down!" the stereotype that women should be modest and weak is disproven by creating an incredible story in which the plot does not correspond to gender expectations of how events should have unfolded (see Tab. 3). Consequently, the use of banter in the feminist tradition does not entail the humiliating of another individual. Rather, it is rooted in the notion of contesting control over what is deemed uncontrollable, thereby achieving its subjugation (Pahl, 2017).

In the context of disparaging humour directed at women, stigmatisation is manifested through the imposition of labels that bear negative emotional connotations. Stigmatisation can be considered a logical extension of stereotyping, as it is caused by negative stereotypes – that is, oversimplified beliefs about a certain group of people that often do not correspond to reality or only correspond to reality partially. The predominant labels attributed to women by men's humour include the following: women are prone to fantasy and dishonesty; women exhibit a proclivity for lechery, even in advanced age; and women are mercantile (see Tab. 3). A distinguishing feature of disparaging humour, which is directed towards men, is the adoption of traditional men's humour design elements. These elements include aggression and the use of easily identifiable categories, such as smart versus stupid, moral versus immoral, and right versus wrong. The primary labels that disparaging humour ascribes to men can be enumerated as follows: men consume alcoholic drinks in excess; men are less than truthful with regard to their sexual capabilities (see Table 4). Women's humour can function as a means of distancing themselves from stigmatizing labels. Women employ humour to argue that behaviours often ascribed to women, such as the pursuit of sexual pleasure, are disproportionate to the results obtained. The presence of a recurring template of sexist humour in the domain of female humour, along with the pervasiveness of a shared theme centred on sexual content, might indicate that its fundamental objective is to derive aesthetic gratification from the exchange of witty repartee. However, the aggressive undertones of the humour imply that it functions as a means of subverting traditional gender roles and social hierarchies, which have been perpetuated by gender stereotypes.

Stereotyping and stigmatisation, conceptualized as functions of men's disparaging humour, may serve to reinforce social hierarchy by functioning as a legitimate myth that provides a social justification for the expression of the motives associated with social dominance. The impact of women's humour stands in contrast to that of men's humour. It has the potential to function as a catalyst for social change, establishing a new social norm that enables the articulation of beliefs that are typically suppressed in contemporary society (Khraban, 2023a). Therefore, the present study corroborates the conclusions of Longjiao and Fang (2022) that the social effects of disparaging humour-catalyst and humour-response are usually contradictory, but their integration can result in distinctive outcomes. Specifically, when disparaging humour is employed by a marginalized social group to subvert an oppressive social hierarchy, the strategy of concealing a subversive message with humour can stimulate the articulation of defiance, thereby advocating for social equality.

Subgroups characterized by humour patterns that emphasize appearance-based discrimination, objectification, vulgarisation, and the primitivisation of the individual being humourized share a common stylistic tendency toward cynicism. Cynicism is exhibited through an overt, defiant, disdainful, and contemptuous attitude toward established standards of decency and morality. Cynics derive a sense of power from an assertive disdain for others (Kuin, 2019), though the manifestation of such contempt may assume various forms. Lookism, otherwise known as appearance discrimination, is a form of social bias manifested through a dismissive attitude toward individuals whose physical characteristics do not align with the cultural and social standards and norms of a given society. As demonstrated in Table 5, the predominant rationale for derision is the individual's weight. By reducing all features to

patterns and parameters, lookism in disparaging humour can be considered an attempt to impose a notion of beauty. Objectification is defined as the process of perceiving individuals as mere objects, thereby disregarding their inherent personal and intellectual capacities and abilities. In essence, this phenomenon involves the reduction of individuals to mere instruments for the performance of specific functions, as opposed to acknowledging their unique personalities (Ward et al., 2023). As illustrated in Table 6, women are associated with automobiles, while men are associated with objects that serve warming functions, such as blankets or alcohol. The employment of vulgarisation and primitivisation in the context of disparaging humour serves to establish the perception that an individual possesses qualities deemed as worthless or defective, and is devoid of moral integrity. As demonstrated in Table 7, the employment of undergarments in a humorous context serves the purpose of introducing a humorous element, with the concomitant intention of infusing the message with obscene connotations.

The phenomenon of stereotyping and stigmatisation of disparaging humour can be explained based on social dominance theory, which focuses on maintaining and ensuring the stability of hierarchy in social groups. However, the lookism, objectification, vulgarisation, and primitivisation of disparaging humour is better explained by psychoanalytic and superiority theories (Hatzithomas, 2021). Superiority theory posits that humiliation constitutes a fundamental element of humour. The process of engaging with disparaging humour prompts an elevation in the speaker's sense of superiority. Humour functions as a mechanism that fortifies the speaker's ego while concurrently eroding the listener's ego (Sakki & Martikainen, 2021). The conclusion is corroborated by the fact that the predominant style of humour in the analysed subgroups is cynical (see Tab. 3). As Kulin (2019) asserts, the cynic's derisive laughter emanates from a position of inferiority, while simultaneously projecting an aura of personal "unamusement". Cynicism refers to the desire to prevail in argumentation (Kuini, 2019), yet it does not constitute a coherent critique; therefore, it cannot function as a means to challenge established gender norms. Rather, cynicism can be interpreted as a form of acquiescence in the face of a perceived threat, a subtle manifestation of passivity and despondency (Korf, 2024). Disparaging humour, which is centred on lookism (appearance discrimination), objectification, vulgarisation, and primitivisation of the mocked subject, is more toxic than humour that incorporates elements of stereotyping and stigmatisation. According to Korf (2024), individuals who employ humour to project an image of brazenness and audacity are compelled to accentuate their emotions and express themselves using language that is typically regarded as socially unacceptable, as well as stylistic techniques that are regarded as provocative.

It has been observed that humour directed towards women tends to be more in demand than humour directed towards men. This phenomenon can be attributed to the cultural particularities of a specific country, where gender stereotypes rooted in patriarchy persist, and women remain underrepresented in political and social movements striving to broaden and equalize women's political, economic, personal, and social rights in relation to those of men, thus aiming to overcome sexism. The quantitative data concerning the ratio of disparaging humour directed towards men and women is reflected in Table 8.

Table 8. Numbers showing the ratio of different types of disparaging humour

Type of humour/functions	The percentage of Facebook jokes targeting women to the total number of jokes	The percentage of Facebook jokes targeting men to the total number of jokes	Ratio of men's and women's Facebook jokes
Affiliative humour	26,0	11,5	10:4
Disparaging humour and its functions	37,5	25,0	10:7
Stereotyping	11,5	9,6	10:8
Stigmatisation	8,7	6,7	10:7
Lookism	3,8	1,0	10:3
Objectification	5,8	4,8	10:7
Vulgarisation and primitivisation	7,7	2,9	10:3

6. Conclusion

At the inception of our study, we postulated that several characteristics are requisite for the delineation of sexist humour. Specifically, we theorized that humour involves the obligatory actualisation of the gender of the humour object, with humour objects encompassing both women and men. We further posited that humour functions as a tool of gender and social confrontation, employed to either strengthen or weaken gender asymmetries and inequality at the interpersonal and social levels. This approach to defining sexist humour fails to differentiate between humour whose object is women (labelled as a men's humour) and humour whose object is men (labelled as a women's humour). This study has demonstrated that, despite the presence of lexical and stylistic similarities, both men's and women's humour exhibit immanent differences. The benevolent (affiliative) type of men's sexist humour plays a regulatory role in maintaining gender norms, despite the fact that social dominance is obscured by a disposition toward women. Women's humour employs parody as a technique to create caricatures of conventional gender role performance, thereby demonstrating its outward resemblance to men's humour. Nonetheless, its principal emphasis is directed toward the critique and contestation of gender inequality. The disparaging humour, exhibited by both men and women, is characterized by the deliberate intention to humiliate an individual based on their gender. This process is facilitated by stereotyping, stigmatisation, lookism (appearance discrimination), objectification, vulgarisation, and primitivisation. Stereotyping and stigmatizing manifestations of men's disparaging humour may serve to perpetuate the social dominance motive. The humour exhibited by women frequently utilizes techniques derived from the farce genre, incorporating elements of the grotesque along with playfulness with the conventional gender binary. This stylistic approach suggests that the humiliation of an individual cannot be considered an absolute objective in itself. Instead, women's humour serves as a medium for challenging the established hierarchical structure within contemporary society, where gender stereotypes have led to men occupying the dominant social position. The phenomenon of both men's and women's benevolent (affiliative) humour, as well as the

stereotyping and stigmatisation of disparaging humour, can be explained using the framework of social dominance theory. This theory focuses on maintaining/destroying the stability of hierarchy in social groups. A fundamental principle of this theoretical framework pertains to the preservation or dissolution of hierarchy within social groups. To facilitate a more nuanced comprehension of the mechanisms that ensure the efficacy of these processes, it is recommended that benevolent (affiliative) humour, along with the stereotyping and stigmatisation forms of disparaging humour, be subdivided into sexist and feminist humour. Furthermore, it is recommended that humour falling into the categories of lookism, objectification, vulgarisation, and primitivisation be excluded from this group. The presence of a cynical undertone as a humour technique within this group does not appear to serve as a mechanism for challenging or maintaining established gender norms; rather, this cynicism seems to be a veiled manifestation of passivity and despondency.

While the study delineates general tendencies in function attribution, the absence of direct data on audience reception limits the scope of conclusions concerning the real-world impact of these Facebook jokes. Absent a comprehensive understanding of how readers interpret, internalize, or potentially resist the humour presented, any claims regarding its social effects must remain provisional. Consequently, further research is necessary to verify the identified patterns and to explore the nuances of reception across various demographic groups. In particular, subsequent research endeavours should encompass methodologies such as reader response analysis, interviews, or experimental testing to evaluate the manner in which humour contributes to the reinforcement or challenge of gender norms in everyday discourse. Furthermore, additional research is necessary to elucidate the dual role of humour – namely, its function as both a vehicle for perpetuating gender stereotypes and a potential instrument for their deconstruction. Pivoting towards an expansion of this line of inquiry will serve not only to further our grasp of humour as a discursive practice, but also to enhance the extant corpus of research in both gender and media studies, particularly within the ambit of culturally specific digital contexts, as evidenced by Ukrainian social media.

References

- Aprianti, R., Ginting, E. (2022). Sexist humor as a form of sexual violence and prevention effort from an Islamic perspective. *Psikis: Jurnal Psikologi Islami*, 8(2), 239-250. <https://doi.org/10.19109/psikis.v8i2.13755>
- Argüello-Gutiérrez, C., Cubero, A., Fumero, F., Montealegre, D., Sandoval, P., & Smith-Castro, V. (2023). I'm just joking! Perceptions of sexist humour and sexist beliefs in a Latin American context. *International Journal of Psychology : Journal internationale de psychologie*, 58(2), 91-102. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12884>
- Ayton, D., Tsindos, T., & Berkovic, D. (2023). *Qualitative research – a practical guide for health and social care researchers and practitioners*. Council of Australian University Librarians, Open Educational Resources Collective. Retrieved from: <https://oercollective.caul.edu.au/qualitative-research/>
- Bartolo, A., Ballotta, D., Nocetti, L., Baraldi, P., Nichelli, P. F., & Benuzzi, F. (2021). Uncover the offensive side of disparagement humor: An fMRI Study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 750597. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.750597>
- Betz, D. E., & DiDonato, T. E. (2024). Downward-punching disparagement humor harms interpersonal impressions and trust. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*/ 37(3), 439-458. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2023-0158>

- Bosson, J. K., Parrott, D. J., Swan, S. C., Kuchynka, S. L., & Schramm, A. T. (2015). A dangerous boomerang: Injunctive norms, hostile sexist attitudes, and male-to-female sexual aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 41(6), 580-593. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21597>
- Bouckaert, Y., Vofrei, L., Jonczyk, N., Mertens, A., Soliman, M., Venz, L., & Loschelder, D. D. (2024). Is the joke on you? The impact of sexist humour and gender dynamics on interpersonal work outcomes. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2024.2429850>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2024). Supporting best practice in reflexive thematic analysis reporting in Palliative Medicine: A review of published research and introduction to the Reflexive Thematic Analysis Reporting Guidelines (RTARG). *Palliative Medicine*, 38(6), 608-616. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02692163241234800>
- Caldwell, T. L., & Wojtach, P. (2020). Men are funnier than women under a condition of low self-efficacy but women are funnier than men under a condition of high self-efficacy. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 83(5-6), 338-352. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-019-01109-w>
- Chavez, J.V., Cuilan, J.T. (2024). Gender mainstreaming campaign as a casualty of the online gender-based humor: A discourse analysis. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(2), 2044. <https://doi.org/10.54517/esp.v9i2.2044>
- Chen, X., & Zheng, L. (2023). Relationships of modern sexism and misogyny to feminist attitudes and engagement in China. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 101, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2023.102847>
- Christou, P.A. (2023). How to use thematic analysis in qualitative research. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Tourism*, 1, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.4337/jqrt.2023.0006>
- Ford, T. & Richardson, K. & Petit, W. (2015). Disparagement humor and prejudice: Contemporary theory and research. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 28(2), 171-186. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2015-0017>
- Ford, T. E., & Olah, A. R. (2021). Disparagement humor and prejudice: Advances in theory and research. In M. Strick & T. E. Ford (eds.) *The social psychology of humor* (pp. 151-169). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003042440-9-13>
- Fuchs, K. (2023). A systematic guide for conducting thematic analysis in qualitative tourism research. *Journal of Environmental Management and Tourism*, 14(6), 2696-2703. [https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt.v14.6\(70\).17](https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt.v14.6(70).17)
- Hatzithomas, L., Voutsas, M.C., Boutsouki, C., Zotos, Y. (2021). A superiority–inferiority hypothesis on disparagement humor: The role of disposition toward ridicule. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 20, 923-941. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1931>
- Horisk, C. (2024). *Dangerous jokes: how racism and sexism weaponize humor*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197691496.001.0001>
- Jones, K. P., Peddie, C. I., Gilrane, V. L., King, E. B., & Gray, A. L. (2016). Not so subtle. A meta-analytic investigation of the correlates of subtle and overt discrimination. *Journal of Management*, 42(6), 1588-1613. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313506466>
- Khraban, T. (2021). Military dark humor as a form of adaptive processes and the individual's response to fear of death (psycholinguistic aspect).[in Ukrainian] *Alfred Nobel University Journal of Philology*, 1(21), 243-251. <https://doi.org/10.32342/2523-4463-2021-1-21-25>
- Khraban, T. (2023a). Feminist humor in the Ukrainian social media. *Ukrainian Society*, 84(1), 144-159. <https://doi.org/10.15407/socium2023.01.166>
- Khraban, T. (2023b). Humor as a resource for confronting wartime challenges. *East European Journal of Psycholinguistics*, 10(2), 47-61. <https://eejpl.vnu.edu.ua/index.php/eejpl/article/view/690>
- Khraban, T. (2024). Developing a well-balanced military identity among female military personnel. *Polish Sociological Review*, 1(225), 69-82. <https://doi.org/10.26412/psr225.04>

- Korf, B. (2024). After critique: cynicism, scepticism and the politics of laughter. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 41(4): 95–110. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02632764231211899>
- Koszałkowska, K., & Wróbel, M. (2019). Moral judgment of disparagement humor. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 32(4), 619-641. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2018-0023>
- Kotthoff, H. (2006). Gender and humor: The state of the art. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38, 4-25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2005.06.003>
- Kuin, I. N.I. (2019). Diogenes vs. demonax: Laughter as philosophy in Lucian. In D. Pierre, T. V. Franco (eds.), *Laughter, humour, and comedy in ancient philosophy* (pp. 263-284). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190460549.003.0014>
- Kuipers, G. (2008). The sociology of humor. In V. Raskin (ed.) *The primer of humor research* (pp. 361-398). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110198492.361>
- Lawless, T. J., O’Dea, C. J., Miller, S. S., & Saucier, D. A. (2020). Is it really just a joke? Gender differences in perceptions of sexist humor. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 33(2), 291-315. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2019-0033>
- Linares, B. E. (2019). The role of humor discourse in the construction of gender identity. *Pragmalingüística*, 27, 112-132. <https://doi.org/10.25267/Pragmalinguistica.2019.i27.06>
- Longjiao, L.I., Fang, W. (2022). Disparagement humor: Could laughter dissolve hostility?[in Chinese]. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 30(3), 670-683. <https://doi.org/10.3724/SP.J.1042.2022.00670>
- Mallett, R. K., Ford, T. E., & Woodzicka, J. A. (2016). What did he mean by that? Humor decreases attributions of sexism and confrontation of sexist jokes. *Sex Roles*, 75(5-6), 272-284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0605-2>
- Manyiwa, S., & Jin, Z. (2020). Gender effects on consumers’ attitudes toward comedic violence in advertisements. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 26, 654-673. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10496491.2020.1729314>
- Neoh, M. J. Y., Teng, J. H., Setoh, P., & Esposito, G. (2023). Perceptions of sexism interact with perceived criticism on women's response to sexist remarks in different relationship types. *Scientific Reports*, 13, 18393. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-44952-4>
- Neuendorf, K. A. (2018). Content analysis and thematic analysis. In P. Gough (Ed.) *Advanced research methods for applied psychology* (pp. 211-223). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315517971-21>
- Pahl, B. (2017). Pussy Riot’s humour and the social media: Self-irony, subversion, and solidarity. *The European Journal of Humour Research*, 4(4), 67-104. <https://doi.org/10.7592/EJHR2016.4.4.pahl>
- Parrot, S., & Hopp, T. (2019). Reasons people enjoy sexist humor and accept it as inoffensive. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 28(2), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15456870.2019.1616737>
- Prusaczyk, E., & Hodson, G. (2020). “To the moon, Alice”: Cavalier humor beliefs and women's reactions to aggressive and belittling sexist jokes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 88, Article 103973. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2020.103973>
- Reich, T., Maglio, S. J., & Fulmer, A. G. (2021). No laughing matter: Why humor mistakes are more damaging for men than women. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 96, Article 104169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2021.104169>
- Riquelme, A. R., Carretero-Dios, H., Megías, J. L., & Romero-Sánchez, M. (2021). Joking for gender equality: Subversive humor against sexism motivates collective action in men and women with weaker feminist identity. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 84(1-2), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-020-01154-w>
- Romero-Sánchez, M., Megías, J. L., & Carretero-Dios, H. (2021). Sexist humor and sexual aggression against women: When sexist men act according to their own values or social

- pressures. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(21-22).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519888518>
- Ruiz Gurillo, L. (2012). *La lingüística del humor en español* [The linguistics of Spanish humour]. Arco Libros.
- Sakki, I., & Martikainen, J. (2021). Mobilizing collective hatred through humour: Affective-discursive production and reception of populist rhetoric. *The British Journal of Social Psychology*, 60(2), 610-634. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12419>
- Saucier, D. A., Strain, M. L., Miller, S. S., O'Dea, C. J., & Till, D. F. (2018). “What do you call a Black guy who flies a plane?”: The effects and understanding of disparagement and confrontational racial humor. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 31(1), 105-128. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2017-0107>
- Tabassum, A., Karakowsky, L. (2023). Do you know when you are the punchline? Gender-based disparagement humor and target perceptions. *Gender in Management*, 38(3), 273-286. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-01-2021-0026>
- Thomae, M., & Pina, A. (2015). Sexist humor and social identity: The role of sexist humor in men's in-group cohesion, sexual harassment, rape proclivity, and victim blame. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 28(2), 187-204. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2015-0023>
- Thomas, E. F., McGarty, C., Spears, R., Livingstone, A. G., Platow, M. J., Lala, G., & Mavor, K. (2020). ‘That's not funny!’ standing up against disparaging humor. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 86, Article 103901. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2019.103901>
- van Dijk, T. (2008). *Discourse and power*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Vecina, M. L. & Piñuela R. (2017). Relationships between ambivalent sexism and the five moral foundations in domestic violence: Is it a matter of fairness and authority? *The Journal of Psychology*, 151(3), 334-344. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2017.1289145>
- Ward, L. M., Daniels, E. A., Zurbriggen, E. L., Rosenscruggs, D. (2023). The sources and consequences of sexual objectification. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 2, 496-513. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-023-00192-x>
- Weinberger, M. G., Swani, K., Yoon, H. J., & Gulas, C. S. (2017). Understanding responses to comedic advertising aggression: the role of vividness and gender identity. *International Journal of Advertising*, 36, 562-587. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2016.1186411>
- Wolfgruber, D. (2023). I'm only joking!(?) the role of disparaging humor in the communicative constitution of inclusion/exclusion in organizations. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*, 42(9), 35-55. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-08-2022-0223>
- Woodzicka, J. A., & Mallett, R. K. (2021). Addressing the challenges of confronting disparagement humor. In M. Strick & T. E. Ford (eds.) *The social psychology of humor* (pp. 189-205). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003042440-11-15>
- Yamane, H., Mori, Y., & Harada, T. (2021). Humor meets morality: Joke generation based on moral judgement. *Information Processing & Management*, 58(3), 102520. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2021.102520>
- Yeo, S. K., Becker, A. B., Cacciatore, M. A., Anderson, A. A., & Patel, K. (2022). Humor can increase perceived communicator effectiveness regardless of race, gender, and expertise—if you are funny enough. *Science Communication*, 44(5), 593-620. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10755470221132278>

Electronic Sources

- Belladonna Tia. (2025, January 1). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=1161148468938494&set=g.570306114531785>
- Belladonna Tia. (2025, January 17). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=1168465134873494&set=g.570306114531785>
- Belladonna Tia. (2025, January 7). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. [https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=1161831732203501&set=g.570306114531785&l
ocale=ru_RU](https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=1161831732203501&set=g.570306114531785&locale=ru_RU)
- Bodoriak [Бодоряк], S. (2023, August 24). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=785920879944424&set=g.213318143508057>
- Boroda, S. (2024, December 27). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=902788105176117&set=gm.1155253622504713>
- Durdom na pryzbi [Madhouse on the porch]. (n.d.). *Home* [Facebook page]. Facebook. Retrieved February 9, 2025, from <https://www.facebook.com/groups/546067933423288>
- Gemius (2024). *Zahalnyi ohliad sotsialnykh merezh v Ukraini – kviten 2024* [General overview of social media in Ukraine – April 2024]. Retrieved March 17, 2025, from <https://gemius.com/ua/%D0%B1%D0%BB%D0%BE%D0%B3/zagalnij-oglyad-socialnih-merezh-v-ukrayini-kviten-2024>
- GUMOR dlia vsikh 21+ [Humor for everyone 21+]. (n.d.). *Home* [Facebook page]. Facebook. Retrieved February 9, 2025, from <https://www.facebook.com/groups/580893099468640>
- International Sociological Association. (n.d.). *ISA code of ethics*. Retrieved February 9, 2025, from http://www.isa-sociology.org/about/isa_code_of_ethics.htm
- Ivanov [Іванов], S. (2024, March 1). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=145792675047489&set=g.213318143508057>
- Kostenko, Y. (2023, August 19). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=6588460621214150&set=g.213318143508057>
- Kotenko [Котенко], V. (2023, May 8). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=254113873692066&set=g.213318143508057>
- Kovalenko [Коваленко], Y. (2023, October 23). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=1279419276111402&set=g.213318143508057>
- Kovalev [Ковалев], A. (2024, January 8). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=2123648424650786&set=g.546067933423288>
- Moro, A. (2025, February 1). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. [https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=2036656423518276&set=g.591048147912424&l
ocale=bg_BG](https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=2036656423518276&set=g.591048147912424&locale=bg_BG)
- Mukhailivna [Михайлівна], K. (2023, November 27). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=603161301854045&set=g.213318143508057>
- Nik, J. (2024, November 19). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=593435353136026&set=g.219634652469729>
- Nosenko [Носенко], N. (2023, September 6). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=1706248849889948&set=g.213318143508057>
- Orest, O. (2025, January 28). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. [https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=8951893391561917&set=g.591048147912424&l
ocale=bg_BG](https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=8951893391561917&set=g.591048147912424&locale=bg_BG)
- Osokina [Осокіна], N. (2025, January 29). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. [https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=8932573573458638&set=g.570306114531785&l
ocale=ru_RU](https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=8932573573458638&set=g.570306114531785&locale=ru_RU)

- Poduzova [Подузова], Y. (2024, February 24). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=7435075803205059&set=gm.970208067675937&idovanity=546067933423288>
- Pokutnyi [Покутний], R. (2025, February 7). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=3885615375100352&set=gm.1578244182928361&idovanity=621293765290079&locale=ru_RU
- Prokhorova [Прохорова], A. (2024, December 29). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=1132909188243644&set=g.621293765290079>
- Prokhorova [Прохорова], Alusik. (2025, January 6). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=1138291427705420&set=g.621293765290079&locale=bg_BG
- Prokhorova [Прохорова], A. (2025, January 7). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=1138898504311379&set=g.621293765290079>
- Riabushko Polishchuk [Рябушко Поліщук], O. (2024, January 17). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=681580840801006&set=g.21331814350805>
- Sekta faniv humoru [Humor Fans Club]. (n.d.). *Home* [Facebook page]. Facebook. Retrieved February 9, 2025, from <https://www.facebook.com/groups/621293765290079>
- Shtefutsa, L. (2024, December 4). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=954749206526648&set=g.219634652469729>
- Sociological Association of Ukraine. (n.d.). *Kodeks sotsioloha* [Code of the sociologist]. Retrieved February 9, 2025, from <http://sau.in.ua/app/uploads/2019/07/kodekssocziologa.docx>
- Spokushai mene ukrains'koiu [Tempt me in Ukrainian]. (2023, December 25). Facebook post [Media post]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/groups/spokusaukr/media>
- Staryi Pen'ok [Старий Пен'ок], M. (2025, January 8). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=1389314565363745&set=g.621293765290079&locale=bg_BG
- Staryi Pen'ok [Старий Пен'ок], M. (2025, January 9). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=1389731021988766&set=g.621293765290079&locale=bg_BG
- Sushko [Сушко], T. (2023, November 3). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=1398403664077541&set=g.213318143508057>
- Vidbirni zharty [Selected jokes]. (n.d.). *Home* [Facebook page]. Facebook. Retrieved February 9, 2025, from <https://www.facebook.com/groups/219634652469729>
- Volkov [Волков], M. (2025, January 16). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=1277546803518661&set=g.591048147912424&locale=bg_BG
- Yaremenko, I. (2023, November 24). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=865314861920249&set=g.213318143508057>
- Yurtyna, V. (2023, January 17). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=938362860659983&set=g.213318143508057>
- Yurtyna, V. (2023, March 10). Facebook post [Image attached]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=972055927290676&set=g.213318143508057>