

Relationship Between Humour Styles and Subjective Happiness Among School Going Children in India

Anita Malik

*Department of Education, Jadavpur University, Kolkata, West Bengal, India
E-mail: anitamalik2098@gmail.com*

KEYWORDS Affiliative Humour. Family Environment. Humour Potential. Laughter. School Environment

ABSTRACT People frequently experience humour, in many different kinds of social situations, making it an everyday phenomenon. Humour can be seen psychologically as a basic social phenomenon that takes many forms, such as satisfaction, jokes, fear, principles, illustrations, and funny acts. The objective of this research was to examine the connection between humour styles and subjective happiness among school going students. Students from grades 9 to 12 were chosen as a sample from two schools in Hooghly district of West Bengal, India. Socio-demographic characteristics of the students including gender, class, number of siblings, type of family and parent humour were considered as independent variables. The humour styles and subjective happiness were considered as dependent variables. A cross-sectional survey design was applied and 301 participants were chosen by a simple random sampling technique. The result showed that humour styles and subjective happiness are positively correlated to each other and the former has significantly ($p < 0.05$) affected the latter.

INTRODUCTION

Humour is a pervasive phenomenon that is commonly encountered by individuals across many social settings. From a psychological standpoint, humour can be regarded as a fundamental social phenomenon that manifests itself in various forms, including but not limited to joy, jokes, fear, ideas, images, and amusing acts. According to previous research conducted by Martin and Kuiper (1999) and Provine and Fisher (1989), it has been observed that individuals tend to engage in laughter and joking more frequently in the presence of others compared to when they are alone. There exist three fundamental psychological components that contribute to the phenomenon of humour. These components encompass a cognitive capacity, which involves a logical comprehension of the given situation, an emotion-related disposition that seeks to derive significance and purpose beyond one's own self, and a behavioural pattern that governs the verbal and nonverbal responses to the situation. The restoration of the equilibrium of the four bodily humours (blood, phlegm, choler, and melancholy) was achieved by ancient physicians by the utilisation of laughter. The ancient Greeks adhered to a medical system known as humoral medicine, which posited that the equilibrium of bodily fluids, referred to as humours, had an influence on several aspects of human well-being, in-

cluding physical, mental, psychological health, and emotional states. Humour can have both beneficial and harmful societal functions. There are two positive aspects associated with humour. The first is known as Affiliative Humour, which include the application of jokes and humorous anecdotes to strengthen interpersonal relationships. The second aspect takes advantage of comedy is the application as a coping strategy to safeguard one's own well-being, this particular type of humour can be classified as self-enhancing. The negative social function of humour occurs when it is employed as a means of manipulation, teasing, or belittling others, which is commonly referred to as Aggressive Humour. Gidwani et al. (2021) mentioned that humour has an impact on coping and psychological well-being, self-esteem is an essential precursor to personality processes. Additionally, the use of self-deprecating comedy, which involves damaging oneself, is known as Self-Defeating comedy. It is well acknowledged that individuals exhibit significant variations in their personality traits, propensity for laughter in response to jokes, and ability to effectively manage stress and navigate challenging situations, sometimes referred to as a sense of humour. Martin and Ford (2018) said that there are individual variances in humour and personality in addition to the physiological aspects of humour, its social roles, and its process of growth and development. The positive effects of laughter

and humour on the human body has been widely recognised in academic literature. Scholars such as Spencer (1860), Darwin (1872), Hecker (1873), Dearborn (1900), McDougall (1922), and Menon (1931) have all emphasised the ability of laughter and humour to restore homeostasis, stabilise blood pressure, enhance oxygenation of the blood, provide a gentle massage to vital organs, promote circulation, aid in digestion, induce relaxation, and generate a sense of overall well-being. Humour played a role in facilitating communication during prelingual periods, as noted by McComas (1923) and Hayworth (1928). Jokes, humour, and the comic genre collectively serve as defence mechanisms that facilitate the discharge of psychological energy through the expression of laughing. Humour is often regarded as a very efficacious and pivotal element in one's daily existence. It serves as a vital coping mechanism for individuals who encounter stress and strain as routine occurrences in their daily routines. Regardless of one's age, caste, colour, gender, or religion, comedy is considered the sole remedy for the challenges and hardships encountered in one's compassionate existence. The ability to alter human emotions and induce a sense of calmness, even amid circumstances of gravity, is a characteristic possessed by it. According to McGhee (1979), laughter is among the initial social vocalisations produced by human infants, following crying. Infants typically start laughing in response to the behaviours of others around the age of four months, suggesting that the neural mechanisms underlying Laughter is innate to birth. (Sher and Brown 1976). Establishing relationships and cultivating a welcoming environment are crucial in order to effectively transfer energy from the educator to the student. According to Herbert (1991), the utilisation of appropriate humour fosters the development of interpersonal communication skills, sustains attention and curiosity, cultivates a pleasant environment, encourages critical thinking, and alleviates tensions and anxiety within educational settings. Subjective happiness encompasses both emotional and cognitive dimensions, with the emotional dimension encompassing the presence of good impact and the lack of negative affect, while the cognitive dimension is characterised as life satisfaction. Additionally, it encompasses the equilibrium between good and negative effects, encompassing total life satisfac-

tion (Diener 2000) as well as psychological well-being, characterised by feelings of joy and happiness (Lyubomirsky 2001). According to Jolly and Lokesh in 2022, the results indicated that adaptive humour styles, affiliative humour and self-enhancing humour a strong factor of subjective happiness, Hiranandani and Bing Yue in 2015 in their study results indicated that Indian students' self-esteem increased with the amount of adaptive humour styles. According to Balmores-Paulino's (2021) study, results showed that while malevolent humour styles aggressive and self-defeating humour styles negatively connected with psychological well-being, benevolent humour styles that is, affiliative and self-enhancing humour styles are firmly associated with psychological well-being dimensions. In this study samples are selected from various demographic areas namely gender, class, type of family, number of siblings and parents' humour, which are the independent variables, while the dependent variables are humour styles and subjective happiness. The study's conclusions, as reported by Hayashi et al. in 2023, showed a negative correlation between subjective happiness and hypertension. According to this study, it could be crucial to have more possibilities for pleasure in order to prevent hypertension. According to the study findings of Caglayan and Eldeleklioglu (2016), mindfulness and a common humanity found a positive association with the subjective happiness and life satisfaction. The study by Dutta and Blangayil (2016) demonstrated a strong relationship between students' subjective happiness and life satisfaction where male students scored significantly more. Study by Gonzales and Mierop (2008), a correlational study of the dimensions of humour revealed a positive connection between greater levels of satisfaction and a higher degree of humour usage within familial relationships. Wilcox (2002) states that families can show a sense of humour and improve their family life by observing and gathering humour in the house. Erdogdu and Çakiroglu (2021) claims that humour may be used for humour breaks, attention-grabbing, remembering, and providing feedback. Jeder (2014) highlights that employing creative humour in classes is one of the most standard humanising methods for teaching, and the results show the necessity of increased attention for preparing instructors in this ethical attitude.

Objectives

In literature, there exists a correlation between humour and subjective happiness, whereby it may be posited that an individual who experiences happiness is also likely to possess a sense of humour and vice versa. This assertion is based on the understanding that a happy individual is characterised by a propensity for frequent cheerfulness, occasional sadness, and an overall sense of contentment with their existence. Both perspectives strive to achieve equilibrium by acknowledging and considering both the favourable and unfavourable characteristics inherent in the human lifespan. Keeping in mind the above, objectives of the study are specified as the following.

1. To examine the potential correlation between humour styles and subjective happiness in regards to school going children.
2. To understand the variation of various demographic variables namely gender, class, type of family, number of siblings and parents' humour.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study followed a cross-sectional survey method to obtain data from school going students. A sample size of 301 was obtained through a simple random sampling method from Hooghly District of West Bengal. The sample was chosen randomly from grades 9 to 12 to their various demographic nature namely, gender, class, type of family, number of siblings, and parents' humour as independent variables and who regularly attended school in Hooghly District. The humour styles and the subjective happiness are dependent variables. In this study two standardised questionnaires it

was used for obtaining the data. from school going students, that is, the "Humour Styles Questionnaire" developed by Martin et al. (2003), with 32 items and 8 items for each of the four scales. The scores of the Humour Styles scale ranged between 32 and 224. Reliabilities for the Affiliative Humour, Self-enhancing Humour, Aggressive Humour, and Self-defeating Humour respectively were 0.80, 0.81, 0.77 and 0.80. The Humour Styles Questionnaire (HSQ) demonstrates satisfactory discriminative validity through agreement between participants self-report on scale items and their perception individually. The instrument also showed good correlation coefficient with the Situational Humour Response Questionnaire (SHRQ, Martin and Lefcourt 1984) and the Coping Humour Scale (Martin and Lefcourt 1983). The "Subjective Happiness Scale" developed by Lyumbomirsky and Lepper (1999) had an internal consistency among the 4 items comprising the Subjective Happiness Scale was using 0.86 Cronbach's alpha reliability, the test-retest reliability 0.72 and convergent validity 0.62 found between Subjective Happiness and other happiness measurements. The score range of the Subjective Happiness Scale is 4 to 28.

RESULTS

Table 1 showed a mean score distribution of Humour Styles among school going students on the basis of various independent variables like gender, class, number of siblings, type of family, and parent humour. Gender wise mean distribution proved the mean scores of the male and female students were 133.10 and 138.28, respectively. Class wise mean distribution showed that mean scores of the secondary and higher secondary levels students were 136.68 and 135.60, respectively. Num-

Table 1: Overall Humor Styles score of school going students

| <i>Variables</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Number of students</i> | <i>Mean</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| <i>Gender</i> | Male | 114 | 133.10 |
| | Female | 187 | 138.28 |
| <i>Class</i> | Secondary | 199 | 136.68 |
| | Higher Secondary | 102 | 135.60 |
| <i>Number of Siblings</i> | No sibling | 31 | 135.45 |
| | One sibling | 187 | 135.98 |
| | More than one sibling | 83 | 137.40 |
| <i>Type of Family</i> | Nuclear | 208 | 137.10 |
| | Joint | 93 | 134.57 |
| <i>Parent Humor</i> | Father | 129 | 135.12 |
| | Mother | 172 | 137.21 |

ber of siblings wise mean distribution showed that mean score of the no sibling, one sibling and more than one sibling students were 135.45, 135.98 and 137.40, respectively. The type of family wise mean distribution indicated that the mean scores of the nuclear and joint family students were 137.10 and 134.57, respectively. Parental humour demonstrated a mean distribution of 135.12 and 137.21 respectively, for the father and mother. The findings showed that secondary level female students who belonged to a nuclear family, having sibling(s) and whose mother is humorous possessed more humour than other categories of students.

Table 2 showed mean score distribution of Subjective Happiness among school going students on the basis of various independent variables like gender, class, number of siblings, and type of family. Gender wise mean distribution indicated that mean scores of the male and female students were 18.81 and 19.79, respectively. Class wise mean distribution showed that mean scores of the secondary and higher secondary levels students were 19.63 and 19.00, respectively. Number of sib-

Table 2: Overall Subjective Happiness score of school going students

| Variables | Category | Number of students | Mean |
|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------|
| Gender | Male | 114 | 18.81 |
| | Female | 187 | 19.79 |
| Class | Secondary | 199 | 19.63 |
| | Higher Secondary | 102 | 19.00 |
| Number of Siblings | No sibling | 31 | 21.00 |
| | One sibling | 187 | 19.03 |
| | More than one sibling | 83 | 19.69 |
| Type of Family | Nuclear | 208 | 19.43 |
| | Joint | 93 | 19.38 |

Table 3: t-test result of Humor Styles means scores by all variables

| Variable | Category | N | Mean | Sd | t | df | Mean difference | p value | Remarks |
|----------------|------------------|-----|--------|--------|--------|-----|-----------------|---------|----------------|
| Gender | Male | 114 | 133.10 | 15.625 | -2.668 | 299 | -5.182 | .008 | $P < 0.05$ S |
| | Female | 187 | 138.28 | 16.770 | | | | | |
| Class | Secondary | 199 | 136.68 | 17.543 | .539 | 299 | 1.085 | .590 | $p > 0.05$ *ns |
| | Higher Secondary | 102 | 135.60 | 14.346 | | | | | |
| Type of Family | Nuclear | 208 | 137.10 | 16.595 | 1.227 | 299 | 2.526 | .221 | $p > 0.05$ *ns |
| | Joint | 93 | 134.57 | 16.279 | | | | | |
| Parent Humor | Father | 129 | 135.12 | 17.017 | -1.085 | 299 | -2.085 | .279 | $p > 0.05$ *ns |
| | Mother | 172 | 137.21 | 16.116 | | | | | |

(N=Sample size, sd=Standard Deviation, t=t-test value, df=Degree of freedom, p=value of t-test, S=significant, ns=Not Significant)

lings wise mean distribution showed that the mean scores of the no sibling, one sibling and more than one sibling students were 21.00, 19.03 and 19.69, respectively. The type of family wise mean distribution suggested that the mean score of the nuclear and joint family students were 19.43 and 19.38, respectively. The findings showed that secondary level female students who belonged to a nuclear family, having no sibling(s) have higher degree of subjective happiness.

Hypothesis Testing

H₀1: There is no significant mean difference between male and female school going students regarding Humor Styles.

Table 3 A t-test conducted independently to compare the average scores of male and female pupils found a statistically significant [$t(299) = -2.668, p < 0.05$] difference. It can be said that the female students found to be more humorous than their male counterparts in this study. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected at 0.05 level.

Comparing the average results of male and female students using an independent sample t-test with respect to Affiliative Humour found no statistically significant difference in between [$t(299) = -.845, p > 0.05$]. It can be said that for the female students found to be more humorous than their male counterparts in this study, it happened due to random chances.

Comparing the average results of male and female students using an independent sample t-test with respect to Self-enhancing Humour found no statistically significant difference in between [$t(299) = 1.614, p > 0.05$]. It can be said that for the female students found to be more humorous than their

male counterparts in this study, it happened due to random chances.

Comparing the average results of male and female students using an independent sample t-test with respect to Aggressive Humour found a statistically significant [$t(299) = -2.736, p < 0.05$] difference. It can be said that the female students were found to be more humorous than their male counterparts in this study. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected at 0.05 level.

Comparing the average results of male and female students using an independent sample t-test with respect to Self-Defeating Humour found no statistically significant difference in between [$t(299) = -.5.78, p > 0.05$]. It can be said that the male students were found to be more humorous than their female counterparts in this study, and this happened due to random chances.

H₀2: There is no significant mean difference between Secondary and Higher Secondary level school going students regarding Humour Styles.

A t-test conducted independently to compare the average scores of secondary and Higher Secondary level students found no statistically significant difference in between [$t(299) = .539, p > 0.05$]. It can be said that for the Secondary level students found to be more humorous than Higher Secondary level students in this study, it happened due to random chances (Table 3).

A t-test conducted independently to compare the mean results of students at the Secondary and Higher Secondary levels with respect to Affiliative Humour found no statistically significant difference in between [$t(299) = 1.780, p > 0.05$]. It can be said that for the Secondary level students found to be more humorous than Higher Secondary level students in this study, it happened due to random chances.

A t-test conducted independently to compare the mean results of students at the Secondary and Higher Secondary levels with respect to Self-enhancing Humour found no statistically significant difference in between [$t(299) = -.829, p > 0.05$]. It can be said that for the Higher Secondary level students found to be more humorous than Secondary level students in this study, it happened due to random chances.

A t-test conducted independently to compare the mean results of students at the Secondary and Higher Secondary levels with respect to Aggressive Humour found no statistically significant dif-

ference in between [$t(299) = -.069, p > 0.05$]. It can be said that for the Higher Secondary level students found to be more humorous than Secondary level students in this study, it happened due to random chances.

A t-test conducted independently to compare the mean results of students at the Secondary and Higher Secondary levels with respect to Self-Defeating Humour found no statistically significant difference in between [$t(299) = .793, p > 0.05$]. It can be said that the Secondary level students found to be more humorous than Higher Secondary level students in this study, it happened due to random chances.

H₀3: There is no significant mean difference between Nuclear and Joint family school going students regarding humour styles.

A t-test for independent samples that compares the average scores of Nuclear and Joint family students found no statistically significant difference in between [$t(299) = 1.227, p > 0.05$]. It can be said that for the Nuclear family students found to be more humorous than their counterparts in this study, it happened due to random chances (Table 3).

Comparing the mean scores using an independent sample t-test of Nuclear and Joint family students with respect to Affiliative Humor found no statistically significant difference in between [$t(299) = -9.27, p > 0.05$]. It can be said that for the joint family students found to be more humorous than their counterparts in this study, it happened due to random chances.

Comparing the mean scores using an independent sample t-test of Nuclear and Joint family students with respect to Self-enhancing Humour found no statistically significant difference in between [$t(299) = 1.157, p > 0.05$]. It can be said that for the nuclear family students found to be more humorous than their counterparts in this study, it happened due to random chances.

Comparing the mean scores using an independent sample t-test of Nuclear and Joint family students with respect to Aggressive Humour found no statistically significant difference in between [$t(299) = 2.155, p < 0.05$]. It can be said that for the nuclear family students found to be significantly more humorous than their counterparts in this study, it happened due to random chances.

Comparing the mean scores using an independent sample t-test of Nuclear and Joint family students with respect to Self-Defeating Humour found

no statistically significant difference in between [t (299) = .266, $p > 0.05$]. It can be said that for the Nuclear family students found to be more humorous than their counterparts in this study, it happened due to random chances.

H₀4: There is no significant mean difference between students having a humorous father and humorous mother.

A t-test for independent samples that compares the average scores of Fathers and Mothers humour found no statistically significant difference in between [t (299) = -1.085, $p > 0.05$]. It can be said that for the mothers found to be more humorous than their counterparts in this study, it happened due to random chances (Table 3).

The average Affiliative Humour score of Male students {t (113) = -11.353, $p = .000$ } and Female students {t = (186) = -11.353, $p = .000$ } is found to be significantly lower than the global average. The average Self-enhancing Humour score of Male students {t (113) = -4.035, $p = .000$ } and Female students {t = (186) = -.194, $p = .000$ }, where Male score found to be significantly lower and Female score found to be statistically not significant than the global average. The average Aggressive Humour

score of Male students {t (113) = -6.844, $p = .000$ } and Female students {t = (186) = 6.665, $p = .000$ } where Male score are found to be significantly lower and Female score are found to be significantly higher than the global average. The average Self-Defeating Humour score of Male students {t (113) = 7.528, $p = .000$ } and Female students {t = (186) = 15.853, $p = .000$ } was found to be significantly higher than the global average (Table 4).

H₀5: There is no significant mean difference between male and female school going students regarding Subjective Happiness.

Comparing the mean scores of male and female students through an independent sample t-test found no statistically significant difference in between [t (299) = -1.962, $p > 0.05$]. It can be said that for the female students found to be happier than their counterparts in this study, it happened due to random chances (Table 5).

H₀6: There is no significant mean difference between Secondary and Higher Secondary level school going students regarding Subjective Happiness.

A t-test of independent samples comparing the average results of students in secondary and higher secondary classes found no statistically signifi-

Table 4: One sample t-test results based on Dimensions of Humor Styles

| Dimensions of Humor Styles | Category | Global average | Obtained mean | One-sample t-test value | P-value | Remarks |
|----------------------------|----------|----------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------|----------------|
| Affiliative Humor | Male | 47.3 | 39.18 | -11.353 | .000 | $p < 0.05^*s$ |
| | Female | 46.0 | 39.91 | -11.353 | .000 | $p < 0.05^*s$ |
| Self-enhancing Humor | Male | 37.9 | 35.25 | -4.035 | .000 | $p < 0.05^*s$ |
| | Female | 36.8 | 36.69 | -.194 | .846 | $p > 0.05^*ns$ |
| Aggressive Humor | Male | 32.3 | 27.51 | -6.844 | .000 | $p < 0.05^*s$ |
| | Female | 26.3 | 29.94 | 6.665 | .000 | $p < 0.05^*s$ |
| Self-Defeating Humor | Male | 27.8 | 32.75 | 7.528 | .000 | $p < 0.05^*s$ |
| | Female | 24.5 | 33.26 | 15.583 | .000 | $p < 0.05^*s$ |

(P=P-value of t-test)

Table 5: t-test result of Subjective Happiness means scores by all variables

| Variable | Category | N | Mean | S d | t | df | Mean difference | p value | Remarks |
|----------------|------------------|-----|-------|-------|--------|-----|-----------------|---------|----------------|
| Gender | Male | 114 | 18.81 | 4.416 | -1.962 | 299 | -9.79 | .051 | $p > 0.05^*ns$ |
| | Female | 187 | 19.79 | 4.061 | | | | | |
| Class | Secondary | 199 | 19.63 | 4.217 | 1.224 | 299 | .628 | .222 | $p > 0.05^*ns$ |
| | Higher Secondary | 102 | 19.00 | 4.212 | | | | | |
| Type of Family | Nuclear | 208 | 19.43 | 4.234 | .107 | 299 | .056 | .915 | $p > 0.05^*ns$ |
| | Joint | 93 | 19.38 | 4.206 | | | | | |

(N=Sample size, s d=Standard Deviation, t=t-test value, df=Degree of freedom, P= value of t-test, S=significant, ns=Not Significant)

cant difference in between [t (299)=1.224, p>0.05]. It can be said that the Secondary level students found to be happier than their counterparts in this study, it happened due to random chances (Table 5).

H₀7: There is no significant mean difference between Nuclear and Joint family school going students regarding Subjective Happiness.

The mean scores of Nuclear and Joint family students were compared using an independent sample t-test found no statistically significant difference in between [t (299)=.107, p>0.05]. It can be said that for the Nuclear family students found to be happier than their counterparts in this study, it happened due to random chances (Table 5).

H₀8: There is no significant mean difference in various siblings count of school going students regarding Humor Styles.

One-way ANOVA comparing the mean scores of schools going students based on numbers of siblings and their respective Humour Style score found no statistically significant difference in between [F (2,298) =.258 p>0.05]. Hence the null hypothesis is retained and that there exists no significant difference within the Humour Style score on the number of siblings of school going children (Table 6).

One-way ANOVA comparing the mean scores of schools going students based on numbers of siblings and their respective Affiliative Humor score found no statistically significant difference in between [F (2,298) =.985 p>0.05]. Hence the null hypothesis is retained and that there exists no significant difference within the Affiliative Humour

score on the number of siblings of school going children.

One-way ANOVA comparing the mean scores of schools going students based on numbers of siblings and their respective Self-enhancing Humour score found no statistically significant difference in between [F (2,298)=2.001 p>0.05]. Hence the null hypothesis is retained and there exists no significant difference within the Self-enhancing Humour score on the number of siblings of school going children.

One-way ANOVA comparing the mean scores of schools going students based on numbers of siblings and their respective Aggressive Humour score found no statistically significant difference in between [F (2,298) =.220 p>0.05]. Hence the null hypothesis is retained and that there exists no significant difference within Aggressive Humour score on the number of siblings of school going children.

One-way ANOVA comparing the mean scores of schools going students based on numbers of siblings and their respective Self-Defeating Humour score found no statistically significant difference in between [F (2,298) =.462 p>0.05]. Hence the null hypothesis is retained and that there exists no significant difference within the Self-Defeating Humour score on the number of siblings of school going children.

H₀9: There is no significant mean difference in various siblings count of school going students regarding Subjective Happiness.

One-way ANOVA comparing the mean scores of schools going students based on numbers of

Table 6: One way ANOVA based on Humor Styles and number of siblings

| | <i>Sum of square</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig</i> | <i>Remarks</i> |
|----------------|----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|------------|----------------|
| Between groups | 141.545 | 2 | 70.773 | .258 | .773 | p>0.05 *ns |
| Within groups | 81657.471 | 298 | 274.018 | | | |
| Total | 81799.017 | 300 | | | | |

(df=Degree of freedom, F=ANOVA test value, Sig= Level of significance)

Table 7: One way ANOVA based on Subjective Happiness and number of siblings

| | <i>Sum of square</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig</i> | <i>Remarks</i> |
|----------------|----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|------------|----------------|
| Between groups | 111.427 | 2 | 55.713 | 3.176 | .43 | p<0.05 *s |
| Within groups | 5227.663 | 298 | 17.542 | | | |
| Total | 5339.090 | 300 | | | | |

(df=Degree of freedom, F=ANOVA test value, Sig=Level of significance)

siblings and their respective Subjective Happiness score found no statistically significant difference in between [$F(2,298) = 3.176, p < 0.05$]. There is a substantial difference as a result, and the null hypothesis is rejected. within the Subjective Happiness score on the number of siblings of school going children (Table 7).

The Pearson Correlation test, with a coefficient value of $r = .180$ ($p = .002$) indicates a positive correlation between the scores for Affiliative Humour and Self-enhancing Humour, which at 0.05 level of statistical significance (Table 8). Hence, it can be concluded that Affiliative Humour and Self-enhancing Humour, have a very weak positive correlation with each other. The Pearson Correlation test, with a coefficient value of $r = -.091$ ($p = .115$) indicates a negative connection between the scores for Affiliative Humour and Aggressive Humour, which is statistically not significant at the 0.05 level. Hence, it can be concluded that Affiliative Humour and Aggressive Humour have a very strong negative correlation with each other. The Pearson Correlation test, with a coefficient value of $r = .041$ ($p = .482$) indicates a positive connection between the scores for Affiliative Humour and Self-Defeating Humour, which is statistically not significant at the 0.05 level. Hence, it can be concluded that Affiliative Humour and Self-Defeating Humour have a moderate positive correlation with each other. The Pearson Correlation test, with a coefficient value of $r = .502$ ($p = .000$) indicates a positive correlation between the scores for Affiliative Humour and Total Humour Styles, at

0.05 level of statistical significance. Hence, it can be concluded that Affiliative Humour and Total Humour Styles have a strong positive correlation with each other. The Pearson Correlation test, with a coefficient value of $r = -.083$ ($p = .150$) indicates a negative correlation between the scores for Self-enhancing Humour and Aggressive Humour, which is statistically not significant at the 0.05 level. Hence, it can be concluded that, Self-enhancing Humour and Aggressive Humour have a very strong negative correlation with each other. The Pearson Correlation test, with a coefficient value of $r = .249$ ($p = .000$) indicates a positive correlation between the scores for Self-enhancing Humour and Self-Defeating Humour, which at 0.05 level of statistical significance. Hence, it can be concluded that, Self-enhancing Humour and Self-Defeating Humour have a weak positive correlation with each other. The Pearson Correlation test, with a coefficient value of $r = .609$ ($p = .000$) indicates a positive correlation between the scores for Self-enhancing Humour and Total Humour Styles, which is statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Hence, it can be concluded that Self-enhancing Humour and Total Humour Styles have a strong positive correlation with each other. The Pearson Correlation test, with a coefficient value of $r = .153$ ($p = .008$) indicates a positive correlation between the scores for Aggressive Humour and Self-Defeating Humour, which is statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Hence, it can be concluded that Aggressive Humour and Self-Defeating Humour have a very weak positive cor-

Table 8: Relationship between dimensions of Humor Styles

| Correlations | | Affiliative Humor | Self-enhancing Humor | Aggressive humor | Self-Defeating Humor | Total Humor | Styles |
|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------|--------|
| Affiliative Humor | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .180 | -.091 | .041 | .502 | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .002 | .115 | .482 | .000 | |
| | N | 301 | 301 | 301 | 301 | 301 | 301 |
| Self-enhancing Humor | Pearson Correlation | .180 | 1 | -.083 | .249 | .609 | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .002 | | .150 | .000 | .000 | |
| | N | 301 | 301 | 301 | 301 | 301 | 301 |
| Aggressive Humor | Pearson Correlation | -.091 | -.083 | 1 | .153 | .449 | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .115 | .150 | | .008 | .000 | |
| | N | 301 | 301 | 301 | 301 | 301 | 301 |
| Self-Defeating Humor | Pearson Correlation | .041 | .249 | .153 | 1 | .653 | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .482 | .000 | .008 | | .000 | |
| | N | 301 | 301 | 301 | 301 | 301 | 301 |
| Total Humor Styles | Pearson Correlation | .502 | .609 | .449 | .653 | 1 | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | |
| | N | 301 | 301 | 301 | 301 | 301 | 301 |

relation with each other. The Pearson Correlation test, with a coefficient value of $r=.449(p=.000)$ indicates a favourable association between the results for Aggressive Humour and Total Humour Styles, which at the 0.05 level of statistical significance. Hence, it can be concluded that Aggressive Humour and Total Humour Styles have a moderate positive correlation with each other. The Pearson Correlation test, with a coefficient value of $r=.653(p=.000)$ indicates a positive correlation between the scores for Self-Defeating Humour and Total Humour Styles, which is statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Hence, it can be concluded that Self-Defeating Humour and Total Humour Styles have a strong positive correlation with each other.

H₀10: There is no significant correlation between Family Environment and Humour Styles among school going students.

Table 9 The Pearson Correlation test, with a coefficient value of $r=.173(p=.003)$ indicates a positive correlation between the scores for Family Environment and Humour Styles, which at 0.05 level of statistical significance. Hence, it can be concluded that Family Environment and Total Humour Styles have a very weak positive correlation with each other.

H₀11: There is no significant correlation between Family Environment and Subjective Happiness among school going students.

The Pearson Correlation test, with a coefficient value of $r=.175(p=.002)$ indicates a positive connection between the scores for Family Environment and Subjective Happiness, which at 0.05 level of statistical significance. Hence, it can be concluded that Family Environment and Subjective Happiness have a very weak positive correlation with each other (Table 9).

H₀12: There is no significant correlation between Humour Styles and Subjective Happiness among school going students.

The Pearson Correlation test, with a coefficient value of $r=.207(p=.000)$ indicates a positive connection between the scores for Humour Styles and Subjective Happiness, at 0.05 level of statistical significance. Hence, it can be concluded that Humour Style and Subjective Happiness have a weak positive correlation with each other (Table 9).

H₀13: There is no significant correlation between School Environment and Humour Styles among school going students.

Table 10 The Pearson Correlation test, with a coefficient value of $r=.161(p=.007)$ indicates a positive connection between the scores for School Environment and Humour Styles, which is statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Hence, it can be concluded that School Environment and Humour Styles have a very weak positive correlation with each other.

H₀14: There is no significant correlation between School Environment and Subjective Happiness among school going students.

The Pearson Correlation test, with a coefficient value of $r=-.088(p=.138)$ indicates a negative connection between the scores for School Environment and Subjective Happiness, which at 0.05 level of statistical significance (Table 10). Hence, it can be concluded that School Environment and Subjective Happiness have a very weak negative correlation with each other (see Table 11).

DISCUSSION

This study’s goal was to investigate the connection between humour styles and subjective

Table 9: Relationship among family environment, humor styles, subjective happiness

| | | <i>Family environment</i> | <i>Humor styles</i> | <i>Subjective happiness</i> |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Family Environment | Pearson correlation | 1 | 0.173 | 0.175 |
| | Sig.(2-tailed) | | 0.003 | 0.002 |
| | N | 301 | 301 | 301 |
| Humor Styles | Pearson Correlation | 0.173 | 1 | 0.207 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.003 | | .000 |
| | N | 301 | 301 | 301 |
| S.H | Pearson Correlation | 0.175 | 0.207 | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.002 | .000 | |
| N | 301 | 301 | 301 | |

(S.H=Subjective Happiness)

Table 10: Relationship among school environment, humor styles, subjective happiness

| | | <i>School environment</i> | <i>Humor styles</i> | <i>Subjective happiness</i> |
|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| <i>School Environment</i> | Pearson correlation | 1 | 0.161 | -0.088 |
| | Sig.(2-tailed) | | 0.007 | 0.138 |
| | N | 283 | 283 | 283 |
| <i>Humor Styles</i> | Pearson Correlation | 0.161 | 1 | 0.207 |
| | Sig.(2-tailed) | 0.007 | | 0 |
| | N | 283 | 301 | 301 |
| <i>S.H</i> | Pearson Correlation | -0.088 | 0.207 | 1 |
| | Sig. (2- tailed) | 0.138 | 0 | |
| | N | 283 | 301 | 301 |

(H.S- Subjective Happiness)

Table 11: Summary of hypotheses testing

| <i>S. No.</i> | <i>Statement</i> | <i>Status</i> |
|-------------------|--|----------------|
| H ₀ 1 | There is no significant mean difference between male and female school going students regarding Humor Styles. | Rejected |
| H ₀ 2 | There is no significant mean difference between Secondary and Higher Secondary level school going students regarding Humor Styles. | Fail to reject |
| H ₀ 3 | There is no significant mean difference between Nuclear and Joint family school going students regarding humor styles. | Fail to reject |
| H ₀ 4 | There is no significant mean difference between studentshaving humorous father and humorous mother. | Fail to reject |
| H ₀ 5 | There is no significant mean difference between male and female school going students regarding Subjective Happiness. | Fail to reject |
| H ₀ 6 | There is no significant mean difference between Secondary and Higher Secondary level school going students regarding Subjective Happiness. | Fail to reject |
| H ₀ 7 | There is no significant mean difference between Nuclear and Joint family school going students regarding Subjective Happiness. | Fail to reject |
| H ₀ 8 | There is no significant mean difference in various siblings count of school going students regarding Humor Styles. | Fail to reject |
| H ₀ 9 | There is no significant mean difference in various siblings count of school going students regarding Subjective Happiness. | Rejected |
| H ₀ 10 | There is no significant correlation between Family Environment and Humor Styles among school going students. | Fail to reject |
| H ₀ 11 | There is no significant correlation between Family Environment and Subjective Happiness among school going students. | Fail to reject |
| H ₀ 12 | There is no significant correlation between Humor Styles and Subjective Happiness among school going students. | Fail to reject |
| H ₀ 13 | There is no significant correlation between School Environment and Humor Styles among school going students. | Fail to reject |
| H ₀ 14 | There is no significant correlation between SchoolEnvironment and Subjective Happiness among school going students. | Fail to reject |

happiness among school going students. Grades 9 to 12 were chosen from two schools in Hooghly district. Socio-demographic features of the students including gender, class, number of siblings, type of family and parent humour was considered. Data was also sought regarding students' perception of humour in family and school environments. The results showed that more female students are humorous and happier than their male counterparts, which contrasts with the studies conducted

by Cooper et al. (2018) and Bensaber (2020). In addition, students of secondary level are more humorous and happier than higher secondary level students. Also, those students are more humorous and happier who belong to nuclear families, and in case of parental humour, mothers are found to be more humorous than fathers in case of school going students. According to Kazarian et al.'s (2010) research findings indicated that specific humour styles may be developed as a result of parental

acceptance or rejection, and that this may then contribute to an individual's future pleasure and well-being. In this study the result found that the family environment was positively connected with humour styles and subjective happiness. It also showed that the school environment is positively related to humour styles and negatively connected with subjective happiness. The study concluded that a positive connection between humour styles and subjective happiness among school youths is present where more humorous persons are found to be happier than others as found in studies by Ford et al. (2014); Yue et al. (2014, 2016); Jiang et al. (2020) and Amjad and Dasti (2022). Rastogi reports that research from 2023 showed a strong positive association between emotional intelligence, flourishing, and positive humour styles, as well as a negative correlation between emotional intelligence, aggressive humour, and negative humour styles. A study by Dyck and Holtzman (2013) shown that males who have an aggressive humour style may have higher levels of social support whereas women had lower levels. In addition, the research conducted by Elza and Lokesh in 2021 demonstrated a noteworthy affirmative correlation between self-enhancing and affiliative humour, as well as all the aspects of emotional intelligence. All aspects of emotional intelligence, with the exception of controlling one's own emotions, showed a strong negative association with aggressive humour. There was a notable gender disparity in the use of aggressive humour, as males use it more frequently than females. According to Leon-del-Barco et al. (2022) results found that children, especially females, are protected from internalizing difficulties by parental humour, which is characterized by calmness, happiness, and optimism. The study done by Yue et al. (2016) results showed that affiliative and self-enhancing humour styles are more prevalent in collectivistic societies than aggressive and self-defeating humour types. According to Jiang et al. (2020) who performed a meta-analysis, depicted that aggressive and self-defeating humour decreases subjective well-being, whereas affiliative and self-enhancing humour enhances subjective well-being. The research conducted by Borkowski (2022) found a positive correlation between the child's propensity to use humour to make fun of oneself (self-deprecating humour) and other people (aggressive humour) in jokes. Positive relationship building and self-en-

hancing humour were positively correlated with the father's attitude of autonomy (affiliative humour). Other studies suggested how school districts, colleges and educational institutions as well as administrators might use humour to their advantage (Matthias 2014) and promote high levels of optimism, self-esteem, extraversion, and locus of control to become happier in daily life (Ford et al. 2016). The study's (Ponselvakumar and Kaleeswaran 2023) results indicated same as school environment that the majority of teachers implement an affiliative style of humour, and their sense of humour is above average.

CONCLUSION

Based on this study on the relationship between humour styles and subjective happiness, and based on various independent variables, the findings showed that there are more female students humorous and happier than their male counterparts, and secondary level students are more humorous and happier compared to students at higher secondary levels. Additionally, children from nuclear families tend to be more humorous and happier and when it comes to parental humour, mothers are shown to be more humorous than fathers in the case of students attending school. The results also found that the family environment is positively connected with humour styles and subjective happiness. On the other hand, the school environment is negatively associated with subjective happiness and positively connected with humour styles. This study found a positive relationship between humour styles and subjective happiness.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Humour is exclusive but not limited to humans as other mammals also have funny bones as found in recent studies on animal psychology. It is a trait that drives individuals for a life worth living and has associations with positivity, life satisfaction, meaningfulness as well as other attributes of positive psychology. The present study therefore recommends inculcation and nourishment of humour in people, especially in children and adolescents irrespective of situations one is in or is bound to. It also suggests that humour be seen as a means for establishing joy, friendship, togetherness and life satisfaction through a non-violent and participatory way.

LIMITATIONS

The study was covered in only one district and 301 samples of Hooghly district in West Bengal, India with a limited number of variables, mainly socio-demographic. Other resource factors of the individual like their emotional intelligence, motivation and psychological well-being could also be studied along with the present variables considered, which might have led to wider avenues of understanding of the interplay between subjective well-being and humour in a larger population of students.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The dataset can be accessed from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There are no conflicts of interest with the authors.

FUNDING STATEMENT

The author has received no funding from any agencies for conducting this study.

REFERENCES

- Amjad A, Dasti R 2022. Humor styles, emotion regulation and subjective well-being in young adults. *Current Psychology*, 41(9): 6326-6335. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-01127-y>
- Balmores-Paulino Rozel S 2021. The correlation of humor styles with psychological wellbeing and collective action among Filipino University Students. *Israeli Journal of Humor Research*, 10(2): 28-53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/jpsyg.2017.00616>
- Bensaber Y 2020. Humor and gender: Males and females' understanding and appreciation of humor in memes and written jokes: A case study of 3rd year students of English at Frères Mentouri Constantine 1 University. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3716928>
- Borkowski R 2022. Origins of sense of humor how people with different humor styles assess their parents' attitudes and their own happiness. *Educational Psychology*, 67(25): 28-41.
- Caglayan MO, Eldeleklioglu J 2016. What is the role of self-compassion on subjective happiness and life satisfaction? *Journal of Human Sciences*, 13(3): 3895. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14687/jhs.v13i3.4001>
- Cooper KM, Hendrix T, Stephens MD et al. 2018. To be funny or not to be funny: Gender differences in student perceptions of instructor humor in college science courses. *PLoS ONE*, 13(8). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0201258>
- Dearborn GV 1900. The nature of the smile and laugh. *Science*, 11(283): 851-856. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.11.283.851>
- Darwin C 1965. *The Expressions of the Emotions in Man and Animals*. London: John Murray. (Original work published 1872). <http://dx.doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226220802.001.0001>
- Diener E 2000. Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychological Association*, 55: 34-43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.34>
- Dyck KT, Holtzman Susan 2013. Understanding humor styles and well-being: The importance of social relationships and gender. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 55(1): 53-58.
- Dutta A, Blangayil F 2016. A study exploring the relationship between subjective happiness & life satisfaction. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 4 (8). <http://dx.doi.org/10.25215/0476.016>
- Erdogdu F, Çakiroglu U 2021. The educational power of humor on student engagement in online learning environments. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 16(9): 24-25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s41039-021-00158-8>
- Elza SE, Lokesh L 2021. Humor styles and emotional intelligence among young adults. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 9(2): 6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.25215/0902.188>
- Erdogdu F 2022. Online knowledge construction for teachers on social media: A community perspective for practice. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 17(1): 17-33. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5979705>
- Ford TE, McCreight KA, Richardson K 2014. Affective style, humor styles and happiness. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 10(3): 451-463. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v10i3.766>
- Ford TE, Lappi SK, Holden CJ 2016. Personality, humor styles and happiness: Happy people have positive humor styles. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 12(3): 320-337. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v12i3.1160>
- Gonzales SM, Mierop J 2008. Humor use and family satisfaction: A cross cultural approach. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 13: 125-138.
- Gidwani C, Chaudhary K, Banerjee D 2021. Laughing matters: The relationship between humor and self-esteem in school-going Indian children. *Indian Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(1): 53-57.
- Hecker E 1873. *Die Physiologie und Psychologie des Lachen und des Komischen*. Berlin: F. Dummler.
- Hayworth D 1928. The social origin and function of laughter. *Psychological Review*, 35(5): 367-384. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0073133>
- Herbert P 1991. *Humor In The Classroom: Theories, Functions, And Guidelines*. Chicago, IL: Central States Communication Association.
- Hiranandani NA, Bing Yue SR 2015. Humor styles in Indian university students. *Int J Psychol Behav Anal*, 1: 104. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15344/2455-3867/2015/104>
- Hayashi F, Shirai Y, Ohira T et al. 2023. Subjective happiness, frequency of laughter, and hypertension: A cross-sectional study based on the Japan Gerontological Evalu-

- ation Study (JAGES). *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, 20(9): 5713. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20095713>
- Jeder D 2015. Implications of using humor in the classroom. *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 180: 828-833. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.218>
- James LA, Fox CL 2019. Humor styles in younger children. In: E Loizou, SL Recchia (Eds.): *Research on Young Children's Humor: Theoretical and Practical Implications for Early Childhood Education*. Springer, pp. 43–60. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15202-4_4
- Jiang F, Lu S, Jia H et al. 2020. Does the relation between humor styles and subjective well-being vary across culture and age? A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11: 2213. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.02213>
- Jolly C, Lokesh L 2022. Humor styles, subjective happiness and self-esteem among Indian adolescents. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 10(1): 849-855. <http://dx.doi.org/10.25215/1001.087>
- Kazarian SS, Moghnie L, Martin RA 2010. Perceived parental warmth and rejection in childhood as predictors of humor styles and subjective happiness. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 6(3): 71-93. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v6i3.209>
- Lyubomirsky S, Lepper HS 1999. A measure of subjective happiness: Preliminary reliability and construct validation. *Social Indicators Research*, 46: 137-155. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006824100041>
- Lyubomirsky S 2001. Why are some people happier than others? The role of cognitive and motivational processes in well-being. *American Psychologist*, 56(3): 239–249. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.239>
- Leon-del-Barco B, Mendo-Lazaro S, Polo-del-Rio 2022. A protective factor for emotional and behavioral problems in children: The parental humor. *Children*, 9(3): 404. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children9030404>
- McDougall W 1922. A new theory of laughter. *Psyche*, 2: 292–303.
- McComas HC 1923. The origin of laughter. *Psychological Review*, 30: 45-55.
- Menon VKK 1931. *A Theory of Laughter*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- McGhee PC 1979. *Humor: Its Origin and Development*. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Martin RA, Lefcourt HM 1983. Sense of humor as a moderator of the relation between stressors and moods. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(6): 1313–1324. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.45.6.1313>
- Martin RA, Lefcourt HM 1984. Situational Humor Response Questionnaire: Quantitative measure of sense of humor. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47(1): 145–155. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.47.1.145>
- Martin RA, Kuiper NA 1999. Daily occurrence of laughter: Relationships with age, gender, and Type A personality. *Humor*, 12(4): 355-384. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.1999.12.4.355>
- Martin RA, Puhlik-Doris P, Laesen G et al. 2003. Individual differences in uses of humor and their relation to psychological well-being: Development of the Humor Styles Questionnaire. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(1): 48-75. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566\(02\)00534-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00534-2)
- Matthias GR 2014. The Relationship Between Principals' Humor Style and School Climate in Wisconsin's Public Middle Schools. *Theses and Dissertations*. <https://dc.uwm.edu/etd/472>
- Martin RA, Ford T 2018. *The Psychology of Humor: An Integrative Approach*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, United States: Academic Press.
- Provine RR, Fischer KR 1989. Laughing, smiling, and talking: relation to sleeping and social context in humans. *Ethology*, 83: 295-305. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0310.1989.tb00536.x>
- Ponselvakumar G, Kaleswaran C 2023. Sense of humour and its styles among prospective teachers. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, 11(4): 25-29. <http://doi.org/10.34293/education.v11i4.6607>
- Roeckelein J 2002. *The Psychology of Humor: A Reference Guide and Annotated Bibliography*. USA: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Spencer H 1860. On The Physiology of Laughter. *Macmillian's Magazine*, 1: 395–402.
- Sher PK, Brown SB 1976. Gelastic epilepsy: Onset in neonatal period. *American Journal of Diseases of Childhood*, 130: 1126-1131. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/archpedi.1976.02120110088013>
- Sambrani T, Mani S, Almeida M et al. 2014. The effect of humour on learning in an educational setting. *International Journal of Education and Psychological Research (IJEPR)*, 3(3): 52-55.
- Sagrikaa R 2023. Emotional intelligence, flourishing and humor styles: A correlational study among young adults. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 11(2): 1400-1407. <http://dx.doi.org/10.25215/1102.150>
- Wilcox WB 2002. Religion, convention, and paternal involvement. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64(3): 780-792. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00780.x>
- Yue XD, Liu KWY, Jiang F et al. 2014. Humor styles, self-esteem, and subjective happiness. *Psychological Reports*, 115(2): 517-525. <https://doi.org/10.2466/07.02.PR0.115c18z6>
- Yue XD, Leung CL, Hiranandani NA 2016. Adult playfulness, humor styles, and subjective happiness. *Psychological Reports*, 119(3): 630-640. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0033294116662842>

Paper received for publication in December, 2023
Paper accepted for publication in January, 2024

HUMORSTYLES

Developed by Martin RA, Puhlik-Doris P, Larsen G, Gray J, Weir K (2003)

HUMORSTYLESQUESTIONNIRE

| S. No. Items | Response | | | | |
|--------------|---|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| | Strongly agree | Dis- agree | Slightly disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Slightly agree |
| 1. | I usually don't laugh or joke around much with other people. | | | | |
| 2. | If I am feeling depressed, I can usually cheer myself up with humour. | | | | |
| 3. | If someone makes a mistake, I will often tease them about it. | | | | |
| 4. | I let people laugh at me or make fun at my expense more than I should. | | | | |
| 5. | I don't have to work very hard at making other people laugh, I seem to be a naturally humorous person. | | | | |
| 6. | Even when I'm by myself, I'm often amused by the absurdities of life. | | | | |
| 7. | People are never offended or hurt by my sense of humour. | | | | |
| 8. | I will often get carried away in putting myself down if it makes my family or friends laugh. | | | | |
| 9. | I rarely make other people laugh by telling funny stories about myself. | | | | |
| 10. | If I am feeling upset or unhappy, I usually try to think of something funny about the situation to make myself feel better. | | | | |
| 11. | When telling jokes or saying funny things, I am usually not very concerned about how other people are taking it. | | | | |
| 12. | I often try to make people like or accept me more by saying something funny about my own weaknesses, blunders, or faults. | | | | |
| 13. | I laugh and joke a lot with my friends. | | | | |
| 14. | My humorous outlook on life keeps me from getting overly upset or depressed about things. | | | | |
| 15. | I do not like it when people use humour as a way of criticizing or putting someone down. | | | | |
| 16. | I don't often say funny things to put myself down. | | | | |
| 17. | I usually don't like to tell jokes or amuse people. | | | | |
| 18. | If I'm by myself and I'm feeling unhappy, I make an effort to think of something funny to cheer myself up. | | | | |
| 19. | Sometimes I think of something that is so funny that I can't stop myself from saying it, even if it is not appropriate for the situation. | | | | |
| 20. | I often go overboard in putting myself down when I am making jokes or trying to be funny. | | | | |
| 21. | I enjoy making people laugh. | | | | |
| 22. | If I am feeling sad or upset, I usually lose my sense of humour. | | | | |
| 23. | I never participate in laughing at others even if all my friends are doing it. | | | | |
| 24. | When I am with friends or family, I often seem to be the one that other people make fun of or joke about. | | | | |

| <i>S. No. Items</i> | <i>Response</i> | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|
| | <i>Strongly</i> | <i>Dis-</i> | <i>Slightly</i> | <i>Neither</i> | <i>Agree</i> | <i>Slightly</i> |
| | | <i>agree</i> | <i>disagree</i> | <i>agree</i> | | <i>agree</i> |
| | | | | <i>nor</i> | | |
| | | | | <i>disagree</i> | | |
| 25. | I don't often joke around with my friends. | | | | | |
| 26. | It is my experience that thinking about some amusing aspect of a situation is often a very effective way of coping with problems. | | | | | |
| 27. | If I don't like someone, I often use humour or teasing to put them down. | | | | | |
| 28. | If I am having problems or feeling unhappy, I often cover it up by joking around, so that even my closest friends don't know how I really feel. | | | | | |
| 29. | I usually can't think of witty things to say when I'm with other people. | | | | | |
| 30. | I don't need to be with other people to feel amused — I can usually find things to laugh about even when I'm by myself. | | | | | |
| 31. | Even if something is really funny to me, I will not laugh or joke about it if someone will be offended. | | | | | |
| 32. | Letting others laugh at me is my way of keeping my friends and family in good spirits. | | | | | |

SUBJECTIVE HAPPINESS SCALE
Developed by S Lyubomirsky, HS Lepper (1999)

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---------------------|---|
| 1. | In general, I consider myself: | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | Not a very happy person | | | | | a very happy person | |
| 2. | Compared to most of my peers, I consider myself: | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | Less happy | | | | | more happy | |
| 3. | Some people are generally very happy. They enjoy life regardless of what is going on, getting the most out of the everything. To what extent does this characterization describe you? | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | Not at all | | | | | a great deal | |
| 4. | Some people are generally not very happy. Although they are not depressed, they never seem as happy as they might be. To what extent does this characterization describe you? | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | Not at all | | | | | a great deal | |