



Exploring Sexism in Humour: A Linguistic Analysis of Comedic Performances on the Churchill Show

Naftal Nyakundi, David Barasa & Benard Mudogo
Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya

Article History

Received: 14.07.2024

Revised: 23.09.2024

Accepted: 27.09.2024

Published: 04.10.2024

Keywords

Churchill Show

Ideology

Sexist humour

Stand-up comedy

Stereotype

How to cite:

Nyakundi, N., Barasa, D. & Mudogo, B. (2024). Exploring Sexism in Humour: A Linguistic Analysis of Comedic Performances on the Churchill Show. *Journal of Linguistics, Literary and Communication Studies*, 3(2), 9-17.

Copyright © 2024



Abstract

This paper examines the linguistic dimensions of sexism embedded within comedic performances on *The Churchill Show*, a popular Kenyan stand-up comedy program. Attention was paid to live performances broadcast on TV47. The paper seeks to uncover the subtle ways sexism is expressed through comedians' utterances. Utilizing Norman Fairclough's (2001) sociocultural framework of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), the paper employs a descriptive research approach. Utterances from select stand-up comedy acts performed in November 2023 were gathered using purposive sampling. The collection process involved transcribing humorous statements from live performances and performing linguistic analysis to identify linguistic features that convey sexist humour. Content analysis is applied to utterances identified as sexist on the basis that they manifest or reflect unequal power structures, societal stereotypes, or gender-based discriminatory attitudes. The findings indicate that comedians employ various linguistic strategies to generate sexist humour, including juxtaposition, hyperbole, ambiguity, wordplay, pun, and irony. By highlighting the linguistic techniques that perpetuate sexism in comedic discourse, this paper enhances the understanding of the relationship between humour, language, and gender dynamics in the context of Kenyan stand-up comedy.

Introduction

Humour, a fundamental aspect of human social interaction, permeates our daily lives. However, not all humour fosters positivity. Ford (2017) notes that certain forms of humour, such as sexist humour, can be harmful as they target and disparage specific groups. Verbal sexist humour, in particular, degrades, objectifies, insults, stereotypes, and victimises individuals based on their gender. It functions like a double-edged sword, simultaneously belittling both men and women while evading accountability for its sexist nature (Mills, 2008). Such humour is not only offensive but also detrimental to both individuals and societal groups (Bemiller & Schneider, 2010).

The proliferation of various media outlets has facilitated the rapid spread of sexist humour to a broader audience (Hasinoff, 2015). When broadcasted through media channels, such humour cloaks gender denigration in the guise of harmless amusement. Despite its widespread presence, the linguistic strategies that form and convey this type of humour, particularly in stand-up comedy, have received little scholarly attention. This paper, therefore, investigates this phenomenon by focusing on *The Churchill Show*, a popular Kenyan comedy program.



The Churchill Show hosted by Daniel Ndambuki, also known as Churchill, airs on TV47, a private Kenyan television station, and has become a cultural touchstone by blending humour with social commentary (Ndonye, 2015). The show has emerged as a significant platform for both seasoned and emerging comedians to showcase their talents, featuring a mix of skits, interviews, and live performances that entertain and reflect the Kenyan experience. The show's content has been widely praised for its reflection of societal issues, making it a beloved program in Kenyan media. This prominence makes *The Churchill Show* an ideal subject for exploring the intersection of humour, language, and societal dynamics in Kenyan stand-up comedy. This paper aims to analyse the linguistic techniques used by comedians in live performances aired on TV47, focusing on identifying sexist content in their humour. By doing so, the paper seeks to expose the subtle ways gender biases are embedded in comedic discourse, enhancing our understanding of the socio-cultural landscape of Kenyan stand-up comedy.

Sexist humour, a concept relatively unfamiliar in Kenyan society, has often been normalised and dismissed as harmless fun. Consequently, it remains one of the least understood and documented forms of gender violence. Research indicates that persistent exposure to sexist humour can lead to psychological and physical harm (Mills, 2008; Bemiller & Schneider, 2010; Ford, 2017). Those who object to such humour may fear being labelled as lacking a sense of humour, highlighting the need to examine how linguistic strategies in *The Churchill Show* propagate verbal sexist humour.

Extensive research on sexism in comedy has shown a widespread presence of gender discrimination and stereotypes in comedic content (LaMarrel et al., 2009; Miller, 2014). Women are often portrayed as objects of ridicule or as reinforcing traditional gender roles, perpetuating harmful attitudes (Davis, 2012; Ford & Ferguson, 2004). Studies have also shown that sexist humour helps normalise sexist attitudes and behaviours in society (Ford & Ferguson, 2004).

Gender disparities exist in the opportunities available to male and female comedians, with women facing more significant challenges in breaking into the industry and receiving stage time (Lynch & Acosta, 2018). Male comedians often rely on sexist stereotypes for comedic effects, reflecting gendered themes in their material (Steinberg, 2018). From a linguistic perspective, Attardo (1994) has explored how humour is conveyed through linguistic features like incongruity, superiority, and relief. Irony and sarcasm, as noted by Dynel (2009), are crucial linguistic tools in comedic discourse, capable of challenging dominant ideologies.

In Kenya, shows like *The Churchill Show* have become vital spaces for comedians to engage audiences and address social issues through humour (Onyango & Njoroge, 2017). However, there is limited research on the linguistic analysis of live comedic performances on the show, particularly concerning sexism. This paper aims to fill this gap by analysing comedic utterances from *The Churchill Show* to identify sexist undertones and the linguistic strategies comedians use. By examining the intersection of humour, language and gender dynamics, this study seeks to enhance our understanding of Kenyan stand-up comedy and advocate for more inclusive comedic discourse.

This study is grounded in Norman Fairclough's sociocultural framework of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), which examines the complex relationship between language, power, and societal structures (Fairclough, 2001; Van Dijk, 2009). CDA is crucial for this study as it reveals how language constructs and perpetuates sexist ideologies in comedic discourse. By scrutinising the linguistic techniques used by comedians on the show, this analysis highlights how language reinforces gender stereotypes, maintains power imbalances, and perpetuates discriminatory attitudes. Through CDA, this paper aims to uncover the underlying ideologies and societal structures that normalise sexism in



comedic performances, offering insights into the intricate relationship between language, humour and gender dynamics in Kenyan stand-up comedy.

Materials and Methods

The study employed a descriptive research design, as Creswell (2013) described. The Churchill show, a popular Kenyan comedy program, was selected as the primary source for data collection, focusing on live performances of various stand-up comedians. A purposive sampling technique was used to collect data, where specific episodes and performances aired in November 2023 were chosen based on their relevance to the research focus-humorous utterances that potentially contained sexist elements. Inclusion criteria identified utterances that manifest or reflect unequal power structures, societal stereotypes, or gender-based discriminatory attitudes. The selected performances were chosen due to their live and unscripted nature, ensuring authentic representations of the humour being studied. The data comprised seven specific utterances from the performances chosen. Each utterance was defined by a shift in the comedian's topic, meaning that once comedian transitioned from one joke or theme to another, a new utterance was considered. This ensured that the analysis remained focused on discrete units of humour related to the research objective. Data collection involved systematically watching and listening to the live performances, using audio-video recordings from the televised episodes of the Churchill show. The researcher took detailed notes and transcribed key segments verbatim, focusing on the sections that aligned with the research aim of exploring sexist humour. Multiple viewings of each performance were conducted to ensure accuracy and capture nuanced verbal strategies used by comedians. The researcher also noted the audience's reactions to the humour, as these responses provided additional context for understanding how the humour was received. Content analysis was used to examine the transcribed utterances for data analysis. This approach allowed for an in-depth exploration of the linguistic strategies use to construct sexist humour, with a focus on comedians' word choices, phrasing, and context.

Results and Discussion

Linguistic Strategies Used to Construct Verbal Sexist Humour

Language and humour are deeply connected. In stand-up comedy, comedians skillfully use language to craft humour that often disparages gender. As Mills (2008) notes, language is not a neutral medium that merely reflects reality; it is a strategic tool used by those with sexist intentions. This paper asserts that *The Churchill Show* employs language that subtly discriminates against men and women. By analysing the language used in the show, we can uncover how male and female representations are constructed through sexist humour. Examining language reveals much about its users' biases, concerns, and aspirations (Tannen, 1989; Itieba et al., 2023; Barasa, 2023).

In stand-up comedy, humour creation involves various linguistic strategies. Successful stand-up comedians manipulate language, context and cultural references to generate humour. Our findings indicate that comedians on *The Churchill Show* utilise several linguistic strategies to produce sexist humour, including hyperbole, juxtaposition, punning and wordplay, ambiguity, and irony, as discussed below.

Hyperbole

Ross (1998) characterises hyperbole as a rhetorical device involving deliberate exaggeration to emphasise a point. Hyperbolic statements extend claims beyond the bounds of reality. While hyperbole is primarily verbal, it can also manifest visually. This figure of speech serves various discourse purposes, such as generating humour, clarifying points, and emphasising aspects of a discussion. Although not all hyperbolic statements are inherently humorous, they often enhance the clarity of the speaker's intent.



Hyperbole frequently uses words indicating extreme degrees, such as terms related to space (“huge”), intensity (“absolute”), quantity (“bucketsful”), number (“thousands”), and time (“eternal”). Exaggerations are not meant to be taken literally but are employed to amplify the humour in a situation by grossly overstating it. Hyperbole aims to exaggerate familiar scenarios, thereby making the narrative more amusing and eliciting laughter from the audience. Ross (1998) suggests that an utterance is hyperbolic when its meaning is extended far beyond its literal interpretation. Understanding hyperbole requires contextual awareness by both the speaker and the listener. Attardo (1994) states that a hyperbolic statement exaggerates a claim to a point that exceeds the truth. This device enhances the comedic effect by grossly overstating the situation being described. From the collected data, it is evident that this form of humour creates a dramatic impact due to its excessive overstatement, as seen in the following example:

Example 1

“...Men, have you noticed how ugly women and housemaids are often very fertile. (Laughter). Date a slay queen for ten years or twenty years. She will never get pregnant but touch your housemaid once. Actually, don’t even kiss her just shake her hand—and she’ll say she is nine months pregnant. (Laughter).”

In this segment, the comedian uses hyperbole to exaggerate the perceived fertility of ugly women and housemaids compared to the assumed infertility of slay queens. The comedian creates a humorous and stark contrast between the two groups by exaggerating the ease with which a housemaid could become pregnant (even from a simple handshake). This utterance taps into societal stereotypes and beliefs about fertility and social status, implying that less attractive women and housemaids are more fertile while slay queens are not. This reflects power dynamics related to beauty standards and social hierarchy, where certain groups are validated over others.

Humour emerges from subverting societal expectations and critiquing prevailing stereotypes. By presenting an exaggerated scenario in which fertility is attributed to ugly women and house maids rather than to slay queens, the comedian questions traditional ideals of desirability, beauty, and fertility. This reversal of expectations disrupts the dominant narrative surrounding these concepts and elicits laughter by emphasising the absurdity of the comparison.

The following statement also emphasizes the absurdity of the situation described and enhances the playful and exaggerated nature of the joke.

Example 2

“...Turn to the beautiful lady seated next to you and give her a high five, but do not touch her face because it might remain in your hand. Also, do not pull her hair; she might remain with hair bumps (Laughter).”

In this humour, the comedian amplifies the potential effects of touching the lady’s face, humorously suggesting that her face might detach or that pulling her hair could cause her hair bumps to be exposed. This exaggeration enhances the absurdity and adds to the playful tone of the statement. By doing so, the comedian juxtaposes the seriousness of the action with the ridiculous outcomes, thus generating humour.

The statement also reflects societal views on beauty, physical appearance, and societal norms. It implicitly critiques the artificial nature of beauty, often maintained through makeup and weaves, which are seen as temporary. The comedian uses hyperbole to stress the imagined repercussions of touching the beautiful lady. This humour centres on women’s physical appearance, possibly because society expects women to adhere to specific beauty standards (Weitz, 2004). Deviating from these



standards can lead to ridicule. In the following utterance, the comedian uses hyperbole to create incongruity, resulting in humour.

Example 3

"...Nilisikia stori ingine kwamba jamaa fulani alipigwa na mkewe kwa mwiko mpaka akafa. Familia yake haikutaka watu wajue chanzo cha kifo chake."

(I heard a story about a man who died after being struck with a cooking stick by his wife. (Laughter). His family did not want people to know the cause of his death).

The humour in this statement arises from the incongruity between the everyday use of a cooking stick and the extreme consequence humorously depicted by the comedian. Cooking sticks are typically associated with kitchen activities and are not considered dangerous items. By exaggerating the effect of a cooking stick to a lethal outcome, the comedian crafts an absurd and, therefore, funny scenario.

From a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) perspective, this joke touches on societal norms and stereotypes about domestic violence and gender roles. Traditionally, violence by women is often minimised or not taken as seriously as violence by men. Moreover, the joke plays on the unexpected lethality of a normally innocuous household item like a cooking stick. The statement "a man who died after being struck with a cooking stick..." subverts the audience's expectations and provokes laughter.

Juxtaposition

Mitchell (2005) states that juxtaposition involves placing two people, things or events to highlight their distinct characteristics or qualities. As a linguistic strategy, juxtaposition showcases differences between two entities, whether people, subjects, places or ideas. Often, juxtaposition conveys irony by creating contradictory associations that result in humour, as illustrated in the following example.

Example 4

'...mwanamke anahitaji mwanume mmoja ambaye anaweza kutimiza mahitaji yake yote, lakini mwanume anahitaji wanawake wengi ili kutimiza hitaji lake moja. (laughter).'

(...a woman needs one man to fulfil her needs, but a man needs many women to fulfil his single need. (Laughter).

In this segment, the comedian juxtaposes a woman's needs with a man's. The humour and absurdity of the statement are highlighted by contrasting the idea that a woman needs one man to fulfil her needs with the notion that a man needs many women to satisfy his single need. This comparison suggests that a woman's needs are multifaceted and can be met by one man. From a critical discourse analysis perspective, this utterance reflects elements of sexism by reinforcing traditional gender stereotypes and power imbalances between men and women. It implies that women are dependent on men to fulfil their needs, while men are portrayed as requiring multiple women to meet their desires. This perpetuates the stereotype of women as reliant on a single man for satisfaction and reinforces the idea that men are entitled to multiple female partners. The humour plays on the stereotype of women being emotionally complex and seeking deep, intimate connections while depicting men as having straightforward singular needs (implied to be physical or sexual) that necessitate multiple partners. The underlying message is that physical desires primarily drive men and need several women to fulfill them. The humour arises from the exaggeration of these stereotypes and the juxtaposition of these contrasting ideas, which prompts the audience to question societal norms about gender and relationships.



Punning and wordplay

A pun often has multiple distinct meanings, making it a common device for generating humour. According to Ross (1998), this multiplicity of meanings can mislead the audience and create humour. Wordplay, another popular humour technique, also exploits the multiple meanings of words in entertaining ways. Ross (1998) notes that it is these multiple interpretations that mislead the audience and generate humour.

Punning, a form of wordplay can be intentional by the speaker or identified by the listener, who then exploits it for comedic effect. This paper argues that wordplay is used on the Churchill show to create humour with sexist undertones. Some audience members may laugh at sexist jokes by focusing solely on the wordplay, overlooking the implicit sexist meanings. They perceive the wordplay as more significant than the underlying sexism. The example below illustrates this.

Example 5

“Ladies, stop generalizing that all men are the same... who told you to taste all of them? (Laughter). That energy you are focusing on all of them, can you manage one? Have you tasted me? (Laughter).”

The statement “have you tasted me?” functions as a pun, blending the literal notion of tasting with an insinuation of a romantic or physical encounter while humorously suggesting the comedian is different or better than the other men. This dual meaning injects humour into the statement, enhancing its playful nature. Literally, the phrase “have you tasted me?” could be interpreted as asking if the women have tasted the comedian, similar to tasting food or drink. This interpretation is surprising, given in the context of a discussion about relationships and promiscuity, adding an element of surprise. However, the phrase also has a figurative meaning related to romantic or sexual encounters. In this context, “tasting” someone refers to engaging in intimate interactions, such as kissing or being in a relationship. By using “tasted” in this figurative sense, the comedian humorously suggests that he is somehow different or better than the other men, implying that women should focus their romantic attention on him instead. This pun relies on traditional roles and expectations. It suggests that men are entitled to women’s attention and affection, while women should prioritise men’s desire over their independence. This reinforces gendered double standards in relationships and society. The use of wordplay in the pun serves to conceal the subtle power dynamics and ideologies underneath.

Ambiguity

When a language form (such as a word, phrase, sentence, or any other form of communication) can be logically understood in multiple ways, it is considered ambiguous. While ambiguity can cause misunderstandings in everyday life, it also plays a significant role in verbal humour. Humour derived from ambiguity often involves the clash of different meanings. It can involve double or multiple meanings, sounds, or even gestures that are interpreted incorrectly or incongruously.

Example 6

“...Ladies wa Kiambu wanajaribungu kuongea Kizungu sana... eti “Hi guys from salon!” na ako ndani ya salon already. (Laughter). In fact, wanaita salon, saloon... (Laughter). Halafu wanasema, “actually mi nilikua nataka that hairstyle ya Chebesh. Anaingia kwa drier anachomwa kichwa for three hours...anatoka hapo amejam na ile joto anasikia kwa kichwa anashinda akiuliza watu “do I look hot?”

(... Kiambu ladies try hard to speak English... saying things like “Hi guys from salon!” (imitating a blend of English and Kikuyu accent) even though she is already in the salon. (Laughter). They even call a salon, saloon... (Laughter). Then they say, “actually, I wanted that hairstyle of Chebesh (mispronouncing the name “Shebesh”). She puts her head in a hair dryer then comes out angry. With the heat on her head, she keeps asking people “do I look hot? (Laughter)).



The humour in this example is driven by lexical ambiguity. Lexical ambiguity occurs when a single word or phrase has multiple interpretations. Here, the ambiguity arises from the phrase “do I look hot?” which can be understood in both a literal and a humorous sense. Literally, the lady could be asking if she looks attractive or if she feels physically warm due to the hair dryer’s heat. Given the context of the hair salon, the humorous interpretation suggests that she is asking if she looks attractive. This dual meaning creates a humorous tension as the audience toggles between the literal and the intended, playful meaning of the phrase, resulting in laughter and engagement.

The joke reflects and perpetuates sexist stereotypes about women. The comedian focuses on the way women from Kiambu speak English and behave in a salon, subtly mocking their efforts and appearance. This mockery implies that women’s attempts to speak English or engage in beauty practices are trivial or laughable. Additionally, the joke plays on the stereotype of women being overly concerned with their looks, reinforcing the idea that women are primarily valued for their physical appearance.

Irony

Comedians often employ irony to generate humour. Irony refers to situations that are peculiar or amusing because events unfold in a manner contrary to what one would expect. An ironic statement conveys a meaning opposite to what the speaker intends. It represents an indirect speech act and a breach of the maxim of manner.

Zhao (2011) states that understanding irony requires recognising the various incongruities of an ironic statement. The above scholar also notes that the mismatch between the contextual information and the explicit utterance identifies ironic statements. Irony is a prevalent technique used by comedians on the Churchill show. Mills argues that irony is one of the subtle methods utilized by sexists to marginalise and discriminate against both men and women through humour (Mills, 2008). The use of irony as a linguistic device in crafting sexist humour within Kenyan stand-up comedy has not been extensively researched. An ironic statement conveys a meaning contrary to what is explicitly stated, identified through the incompatibility between contextual elements and the explicit utterance.

Example 7

“If a man proposes to an African woman and she says ‘no’ she actually means ‘yes.’ (Laughter). When a man tells a girl he loves her he means that.”

The comedian begins by setting the expectation that a woman’s rejection of a romantic proposal signifies refusal, following societal norms where a no is taken as a negative response. The irony emerges when the comedian claims, “she means yes,” suggesting that the woman’s rejection is actually an acceptable. This statement contradicts the expected interpretation of her response presenting an unforeseen twist. The disparity between the anticipated rejection and humorous reinterpretation of acceptance creates a situational irony.

The comedian enhances the irony by comparing it to men’s direct expression of love, saying, “When a man tells a girl he loves her, he means that.” this contrast underscores the perceived simplicity of men’s communication against the perceived complexity or ambiguity of women’s responses. By placing the directness of men’s declarations of love against the humorous interpretation of women’s rejections, the comedian highlights the irony, increasing the humour of the statement. This joke carries an indirect sexist undertone, as it is rooted in a predominantly male perspective, casting men in a positive light while women negatively.



Conclusion

Stand-up comedians employ a variety of techniques to both challenge societal norms and stereotypes and entertain their audiences. Our analysis of linguistic strategies revealed that hyperbole is the most frequently used method, exaggerating realities to elicit laughter and provoke thought on social issues. Irony was also pivotal, providing a means for social critique and commentary by defying expectations and exposing contradictions within societal norms. At the same time, wordplay and ambiguity engaged the audience more deeply with the humour. These linguistic strategies allow comedians to navigate sensitive topics, question existing attitudes, and inspire reflection among their listeners. The findings underscore the significance of linguistic analysis in understanding the intricate nature of comedic performances, illustrating how comedians skillfully use language to address critical social issues.

References

- Alison, R. (1998). *Language of humour*. Routledge.
- Attardo, S. (1994). *Linguistic theories of humour*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Barasa, D. (2023). Ideologies, policies, and practices within the multilingual Kenyan context. *Journal of Linguistics, Literacy and Communication Studies*, 2(1), 55–62.
- Bemiller, M. L., & Schneider, R. Z. (2010). It's not just a joke. *Sociological Spectrum*, 30(4), 459–479. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02732171003700149>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Davis, L. M. (2012). Humour and sexism in a sample of stand-up comedy. *Journal of Popular Culture*, 45(6), 1215–1232. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5931.2012.00950>.
- Gathatu, M. M., & Chai, F. (2015). Discursive structure of humour in stand-up comedy Kenya: Discourse topics and stylistic devices in Churchill's performances. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(6), 409–415. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.s.20150306.11>
- Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., & Swim, J. K. (2023). The harmful effects of persisting sexist humour: A psychological and mental health perspective. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 15(2), 123–140.
- Hasinoff, A. A. (2015). *Sexting panic: Rethinking criminalisation, privacy, and consent*. University of Illinois Press.
- Itieba, J. L., Mudogo, B., & Barasa, D. (2023). Contextual frames of reference in the translation of George Orwell's *Animal Farm* to Kiswahili. *Translation Studies: Theory and Practice*, 3(26), 29–39.
- Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tannen, D. (2022). Language as a reflection of society: Exploring the intersection of linguistics and social dynamics. *Language and Society*, 25(3), 123–140.
- Dynel, M. (2009). Beyond a joke: Types of conversational humour. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 3(5), 1284–1299. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2009.00160.x>
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. Pearson Education.
- Ford, T. E., & Ferguson, M. A. (2004). Social consequences of disparagement humour: A prejudiced norm theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8(1), 79–94.
- Ford, T. E. (2017). Humour and coping. *Humour: International Journal of Humour Research*, 30(3), 277–302. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humour-2017-0015>
- LaMarrel, H. L., Landers, R. N., & Snyder, J. K. (2009). Sexism and humour acceptance: A meta-analytic review. *Sex Roles*, 60(3–4), 231–244. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9543-1>
- Miller, M. K. (2014). Stand-up comedy as a mediator of audience response to sexist humour. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 38(2), 133–152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0196859914523175>
- Mills, S. (2008). *Language and sexism*. Cambridge University Press.



-
- Mitchell, W. J. T. (2005). *What do pictures want? The lives and loves of images*. University of Chicago Press.
- Miriam, M. M. (2022). Power performance in the digital space: An analysis of Kenyan online comedy. *University of Nairobi*.
- Onyango, D. O., & Njoroge, N. J. (2017). Comedy as a tool of social change: An analysis of *Churchill Show* on NTV. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Publications*, 1(5), 201–208.
- Steinberg, A. (2018). *Gender and humour in televised stand-up comedy*. Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2009). *Society and discourse: How social contexts influence text and talk*. Cambridge University Press.
- Weitz, R. (2004). Women's conformity to feminine beauty standards in society. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 10(3), 245–261.
- Woodzicka, J. A., & Ford, T. E. (2010). A framework for thinking about the (not-so-funny) effects of sexist humor. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 6(3), 174–195.
- Zhao, H. (2011). A relevance-theoretic approach to verbal irony: A case study of ironic utterances in *Pride and Prejudice*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 175-182.