



Humor And Emotional Resilience Among College Students

Afrah

Post graduate student

Department of Psychology (SF)

PSG College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore, India

Abstract

The present study examined the relationship between humor and emotional resilience among college students. A sample of 150 students aged 18–25 years participated in the study. Humor was assessed using the Humor Styles Questionnaire (HSQ), which measures four humor dimensions, while resilience was measured using the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC-10), a widely validated tool. Results indicated a moderately strong positive relationship between humor and emotional resilience, suggesting that students who engage more in humor tend to demonstrate greater resilience in coping with challenges. These findings highlight the role of humor as an adaptive coping mechanism that contributes to psychological well-being and stress management among young adults. The study underscores the importance of fostering humor and resilience in college settings to promote positive mental health and social adjustment.

Keywords: *Humor, Emotional Resilience, Adaptive Coping Mechanisms, Psychological well-being*

I. INTRODUCTION

College students deal with a lot of stressors that extend beyond academics. With the growing competition in education and employment, rapid technological developments, and shifting social dynamics, young adults are often placed in situations that demand adaptability and strength. The transition from adolescence to adulthood comes along with its own challenges in terms of adaptation, independence, and future planning. Added to this are factors such as uncertainty about career path, financial responsibility, and the influence of social media, which together create an environment that can easily become devastating. In such an environment, exploring how students navigate stress, maintain balance, and find constructive ways to cope with difficulties becomes highly relevant.

Humor

From a psychological standpoint, humour can be defined in social, behavioural, emotional, cognitive, and psycho-physiological elements. The word "humour" can describe a mental process (the detection of hilarious incongruities), a stimuli (like a hilarious video) that is meant to elicit a humorous response, or a response (laughing, excitement). The most popular way to express a humorous event is to laugh. Laughter and humour are also frequently linked to positive emotional states (Martin, R. A, 2001).

One definition of a sense of humour is the capacity to view a situation or a particular facet of a situation, idea, or thought from a variety of angles. Therefore, humour is the emotional response that arises when someone views a situation from an unexpected or otherwise different point of view. Based on this idea of perspectives, this definition allows one to see a connection between all of the different facets of humour.

Puns, for instance, are a light-hearted way to examine different viewpoints on words, sounds, and meaning, whereas social humour is a light-hearted way to examine different viewpoints on people and groups.

Various humour measures aim to quantify a particular aspect of humour or a number of related aspects. Some of these tools rely on self-reporting techniques, while others use a rater to gauge humor-related traits like laughing and smiling (Kolb, 2013).

People's self-representations can be improved by humour, which can also promote constructive social connections. Both positive and negative effects on social interactions can result from humour. These elements work together to produce four different humour styles: aggressive, self-defeating, affiliative, and self-enhancing. While some types of humour might have a detrimental effect on one's physical and mental health, others can enhance health and wellbeing. Other humour scale surveys, like the Situational Humour Response Questionnaire, Coping Humour Scale, Sense of Humour Questionnaire, and Multidimensional Sense of Humour Scale, are used to measure various aspects of humour.

Extraversion and openness have been demonstrated to positively connect with affiliative humour, or the use of humour to improve social interactions. It has typically been discovered that self-enhancing humour, or the use of humour to reduce personal stress, is negatively correlated with neuroticism and favourably correlated with extraversion, agreeableness, and openness. According to research, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and honesty-humility are adversely connected with aggressive humour, which is the use of humour to disparagingly make fun of other people. It is positively connected with extraversion and neuroticism. It has been discovered that self-defeating humor—that is, humour that is excessively self-deprecating and used to gain favour with others—is negatively correlated with conscientiousness and favourably correlated with neuroticism (Schermer et al., 2013).

Humor styles

Previous theorists like Freud (1928), Allport (1961), Maslow (1954), and Vaillant (1977) have pointed out that certain types of humor—like affiliative, self-deprecating, or perspective-taking humor—are linked to healthy psychological functioning, while other types—like sarcastic, demeaning, or avoidant humor—may actually be harmful to wellbeing. Therefore, it appears crucial to look at how people use humour in their daily lives, both interpersonally and intrapsychically, while researching the connection between humour and psychological health. Furthermore, the existence of more constructive uses of humour may be just as crucial for psychological well-being as the absence of some potentially harmful ones.

Humour can be divided into two categories: (a) humour that is generally benign and benevolent (i.e., accepting and tolerant of oneself and others) and (b) humour that may be harmful to oneself or one's relationships with others. Hence, humour can be utilised to improve oneself in a way that is accepting and non-harmful to others (self-enhancing humour), or it can be utilised to the damage of one's interpersonal connections (aggressive humour).

Four aspects of individual variations in humour usage:

1) **Affiliative humour:** People with high levels of this dimension frequently joke, say amusing things, and participate in spontaneous clever wit to make others laugh, build relationships, and ease tensions between people. They also frequently use self-deprecating humour to make others feel more at ease, making jokes about themselves and not taking themselves too seriously while yet being accepting of who they are.

2) **Self-enhancing humor:** This dimension includes a generally light-hearted attitude towards life, a knack to find humour in life's incongruities, and the ability to remain light-hearted even when faced with stress or hardship. This is closely related to perspective-taking humour, the idea of coping humour, and the use of humour as a coping tool or emotion management. This factor is thought to be positively correlated with psychological well-being, self-esteem, and openness to experience, and negatively correlated with neuroticism and negative emotions like anxiety and depression.

3) **Aggressive humor:** The use of sarcasm, teasing, contempt, ridicule, "put-down," or derogatory humour is related to this. It also involves using humour to control people by subtly threatening to make fun of them. It generally refers to the desire to express humour without considering how it can affect other people (such as sexist or racist humour), and it encompasses compulsive humour expressions, where one finds it hard to resist the urge to say amusing things that could offend or alienate other people.

4) **Self-defeating humor:** Attempting to satisfy people by saying or doing something amusing that makes oneself the laughing point and joining in on their laughter when others make fun of or laugh at them is known as self-defeating humour. According to Martin et al. (2003), this type of humour is a type of dysfunctional humour and cautious denial. In order to get others' praise or please them, people with this

humour style overly sacrifice themselves and repress their feelings. According to earlier research, having a high level of self-defeating humour was linked to higher levels of anxiety, sadness, and life satisfaction. (Fu et al., 2024)

Theories of humor

The definition of humor, its social purposes, and what constitutes humour are all attempted to be explained by a variety of theories. Three most common theories of humor that are used repeatedly include - relief theory, superiority theory and incongruity theory.

Today, the Superiority Theory is by far the oldest explanation for humour and laughter. Plato and Aristotle, its founders, examined laughter as a scornful feeling for those who were viewed as less than human. Thomas Hobbes, who wrote the basic form of the Superiority Theory in the 17th century, highlighted how people are always competing with one another. He claims that they joke when they believe they are doing better than others or better than they had been performing. When compared to the weakness of others or to our own past, laughter conveys "a sudden glory arising from some conception of some eminency in ourselves." If any of the versions of superiority theory is correct, then whenever we laugh in amusement, then the two things must be true: First, We have to start by evaluating ourselves against other people or against our past selves. Second, we have to evaluate our present selves as superior in that comparison. However, neither of them appears to be necessary for humour or laughter; there is no need to compare people because not all laughing is about people. Therefore, the Superiority Theory is insufficient as a theory of humour or laughing, even if it has dominated for two millennia (Morreall, J. 2009).

The Relief Theory, also known as the Release from Restraint Theory, emerged around the same time that Hutcheson was disproving the Superiority Theory. The theory's fundamental idea is that laughter is a release of nerve energy that has accumulated in the nervous system, and in Herbert Spencer's version, "Nervous energy always tends to generate muscular motion, and when it rises to a certain intensity, always does result in it" (Spencer 1911, 299). "Body action habitually vents itself when a certain pitch is passed." In his more complex version of the Relief Theory, Freud distinguished between three types of circumstances involving laughter: humour, the comic, and jokes (*der Witz*). In each, a distinct type of nerve energy abruptly stops being appropriate. As vague Freudian explanations occasionally claim, the energy released in jokes is not the energy of an emotion but rather the energy typically used to suppress emotions, particularly lust and rage. Freud's second laughter scenario, "the comic," involves the rapid release of surplus energy, which is thought energy. Similar to how Spencer examined laughter in general, Freud examines the third instance of laughter, which he refers to as "humour." Humour arises "if there is a situation where we should be tempted to release a distressing affect in accordance with our usual habits, and if motives then operate upon us which suppress that affect in the process of being born." The enjoyment of humor—which results from an economy in the expenditure of affect—occurs at the expense of an unrealised release of affect (Morreall, J. 2009).

Theory of Incongruity - The Incongruity Theory was the second explanation of humour that emerged in the 18th century to refute the Superiority Theory. Many later philosophers and psychologists, including Søren Kierkegaard, Arthur Schopenhauer, Immanuel Kant, and James Beattie, adopted this strategy. This viewed humor as a more cognitive process rather than defining humor as an emotion or as the release of nerve energy. This theory is based on the notion that hilarious amusement is a response to anything that deviates from our typical expectations and thought patterns. We become accustomed to such regularities after experiencing them repeatedly. However, we occasionally have unexpected experiences that defy our preconceptions and thought habits. We chuckle at that point. The Incongruity Theory further clarifies that humour and laughter cannot be derived from merely feeling better than someone as supported by superiority theory. Furthermore, it is not amusing when we laugh because we feel hatred for somebody else. We must find something humorous about our rival that is unexpected, unusual, or out of place, according to the Incongruity Theory, in order to be amused. Additionally, the Incongruity Theory appears more believable than the other two when we look at literary humour that doesn't entail overt sentiments of superiority or conserved nerve energy (Morreall, J. 2009).

Humor and Stress

There could be two different ways that humour could be helpful. A person's humour may manifest as a consistent personal trait. One may be able to prevent some of the negative effects of a stressful incident by using their "sense of humour" as a buffer. To lessen the impact of the negative ideas brought on by a stressful situation, a person with a good sense of humour may find it easier to add competing positive thoughts or to concentrate less on the negative aspects of an event. A person may also experience humour as a result of an outside occurrence that makes them laugh. The psychological effects of a stressful event may be lessened if people are exposed to this kind of humour because it may cause a change towards a more positive emotional state that could compete with the negative feelings or ideas brought on by the stressful event (Cann et al., 1999). Numerous studies indicate that the impact of humour on a range of outcomes, including immune function and health, has been thoroughly demonstrated by empirical study and is thus widely acknowledged. A cognitive-affective shift and a decrease in physiological arousal are linked to humor's positive effects on the evaluation of stressful situations and its ability to mitigate unpleasant affective responses. Several coping mechanisms, including removing oneself from the stressor, making aggressive attempts to face and manage the stress, and resolving the issues that are producing the stress, have been connected to humour. Overall, the findings corroborated the idea that humour influences coping mechanisms (Abel M.H, 2002).

Emotional Resilience

Resilience has been defined as a dynamic process of maintaining positive adaptation and effective coping strategies in the face of adversity.

"The capacity, skills, or attitudes to accomplish good results despite hardships and threatening situations, to cope with traumatic experiences, and to avoid adverse outcomes related with risky situations" is one definition of psychological resilience (DEMIRCIOĞLU, 2017).

Wagnild and Young define "resilience" as an individual difference, characteristic, or ability to successfully cope with change or misfortune. According to their definition, resilient people are self-assured and aware of their own advantages and disadvantages. Even though they recover their balance following a time of hardship or transition, they may not perform or operate at their prior level. According to their definition, resilient people are self-assured and aware of their own advantages and disadvantages. Even though they recover their balance following a time of hardship or transition, they may not perform or operate at their prior level. According to Richardson (2002), resilience is defined more broadly to include developmental response to upsetting situations that arise in daily life. Richardson defines resilience as "the motivational force within everyone that drives them to pursue wisdom, self-actualization, and altruism and to be in harmony with a spiritual source of strength within a period of biopsychospiritual homeostasis." This adaptation process has beneficial effects on one's physical, mental, and spiritual well-being (Allen et al., 2010)

Emotional resilience is the capacity to respond constructively to stress, hardship, or trauma, allowing people to bounce back from challenging situations and carry on with their daily lives. When faced with life's obstacles, people who possess resilience are able to maintain their functionality and adaptability. It is a characteristic that differs from person to person and is impacted by a wide range of elements, such as coping mechanisms, social support, and genetic predispositions. The employment of self-comforting behaviors—methods people adopt to calm themselves during times of emotional distress—is one of the key elements that affect emotional resilience. A key element of psychological health is emotional resilience, which allows people to endure and bounce back from adversity. Adaptive coping mechanisms that enable people to control their emotional distress and adjust to difficult situations are generally what promote resilience (Tolamise Olasehinde, 2025).

Emotional resilience theory

Presenting the Emotional Resilience Theory Yoesoep Edhie Rachmad proposed the Emotional Resilience Theory in the year 2022. It was created to help people learn how to be emotionally resilient when faced with obstacles in life. According to the theory of emotional resilience, emotional resilience is the capacity of an individual to maintain composure, optimism, and the ability to manage emotional stress in the face of adversity. This theory's central idea is that emotional resilience includes emotional adaptability, the capacity to overcome adversity, and the application of useful coping mechanisms. In the process of developing emotional resilience, the idea highlights the significance of self-awareness, emotional regulation, and social support. This idea centres on the observation that a large number of people struggle emotionally with and experience stress, which might impair their wellbeing and performance. For instance, elevated stress levels and emotional disruption might result from challenging life events, interpersonal problems, and work related stress. This phenomena demonstrates that sustaining high performance and well-being requires the capacity to build and implement emotional resilience (Rachmad, 2022)

Theory involves a number of important steps. First and foremost, it's critical to cultivate self-consciousness and an awareness of one's own feelings. Second, it's critical to nurture useful coping mechanisms like mindfulness, relaxation, and social support. Third, it's critical to use constructive interpersonal relationships and create a solid social support system. In order to continuously improve emotional resilience, the theory also highlights the significance of introspection and experience-based learning. Implementing this theory successfully depends on a number of important elements. Establishing environments that promote emotional resilience requires the social and organisational environment's assistance.

Ample training and resources are also essential for creating healthy coping mechanisms. The ability to use social support and emotional control in the face of stress and adversity is another factor that affects its success (Rachmad, 2022).

Determinants of emotional resilience

Modern students at higher education institutions experience heavy academic loads during their time there, which makes the issue of their emotional resilience especially critical. In this context, this refers to the sheer amount of educational tasks, the substantial amount of academic hours within professional and educational programs, and the generally more complex learning process brought about by the high intensity of science and technology development in contemporary conditions. Under such circumstances, preserving psychological well-being and succeeding at achieving greater mastery of their future professions depend on higher education students developing an adequate level of psychological and emotional resilience. The improvement of emotional resilience is crucial because it enables the learner to successfully and efficiently absorb the suggested course material while maintaining composure under the most difficult of situations.

As the primary component in preserving a student's mental health, emotional resilience is also critical for guaranteeing a suitable performance level and for building the capacity to complete additional assignments within the curriculum. From the perspective of the chances for developing the appropriate level of emotional and psychological resilience in the individual, the 17–25 age range should be regarded as the most suitable (Moroz et al., 2021).

Scientists have recently accumulated empirical data that can aid in developing a knowledge of the unique psychological traits and aptitudes that influence people's actions under challenging circumstances. Personality emotional resilience is one of the elements that affects the selection of behavioural methods that are useful in mental health-challenging environments. Strong correlations between emotional resilience and stability, sensitivity to emotional stimuli (neuroticism), optimism, self-control, high levels of obstinacy, resentment, isolation, irascibility, behaviour control, restraint, moodiness, acute sensing of pleasant and unpleasant impressions, timidity and phobia, inability to enjoy life, restlessness, thoughtfulness, concentration, ability to control asthenic emotions, emotional reactivity (agitation), a tendency to change emotions frequently, sociability, extraversion, introversion, and anxiety have all been found to be associated with emotional resilience (Malkhazov et al., 2021).

In their research on psychological resilience, Zolkoski and Bullock (2012) divided the risk variables into two categories: biological and environmental. Environmental factors include factors like poverty and low economic standing, while biological causes include things like congenital diseases, low birth rates, and premature births (DEMIRCIOĞLU, 2017).

Personality and Emotional Resilience

According to recent research, resilience is vulnerable to a number of personality traits, which can change among people depending on their degrees of adversity and culture. Research on the relationship between emotional resilience and five personality traits has shown that neuroticism in adults is negatively correlated with emotional resilience, while openness to experience, extraversion, conscientiousness, and agreeableness are positively correlated. Though there are few studies examining which personality attribute predicts emotional resilience, it is clear from earlier research that the Big Five personality traits have a major impact on emotional resilience (which is frequently defined as adapting and coping with adversity). These research all point to a conflicting association between resilience and the Big Five personality traits. One of the previous studies on relationship between personality factors and emotional resilience showed that, for working adults, emotional resilience is positively correlated with extraversion, conscientiousness, and neuroticism (lower emotional stability); for homemakers, agreeableness is positively correlated with emotional resilience; and for students, conscientiousness and openness to experience are positively correlated with emotional resilience. This could be explained by the fact that homemakers are typically seen as kind and prosocial, making them more resilient even under trying circumstances. At the same time, students are still in their learning stages and are therefore more likely to be well-organised, imaginative, and capable of divergent thought. Likewise, gregarious, lively, trustworthy, and self-assured working adults are more resilient (Sahni et al., 2020).

Humor, particularly adaptive styles like affiliative and self-enhancing humor, has been shown in prior research to act as a positive coping mechanism, allowing individuals to reframe stressful experiences and regulate emotions effectively. Emotional resilience, similarly, involves the capacity to adapt and recover from adversity. Since both humor and resilience contribute to how individuals interpret and respond to challenges, it is plausible that humor may support or enhance resilience.

In our study, we examine how humor is related to emotional resilience among young adults. Young adults, who frequently face academic, social, and personal pressures, may benefit from humor as a psychological resource that fosters adaptability and emotional strength. We propose that individuals who engage more frequently in adaptive forms of humor (such as self-enhancing or affiliative humor) are likely to show greater emotional resilience. Humor, in this context, functions not just as a momentary relief but as a long-term tool for emotional regulation, stress reduction, and psychological well-being.

The relationship between humor and emotional resilience is important to explore, particularly in young adulthood—a developmental stage marked by identity formation and increased emotional demands. Understanding this connection can contribute to mental health promotion by identifying humor as a protective factor in resilience. Furthermore, fostering adaptive humor could help individuals better navigate challenges and reduce vulnerability to emotional distress.

Humor and Emotional Resilience

A key element of psychological health is emotional resilience, which allows people to endure and bounce back from adversity. Generally speaking, adaptive coping mechanisms that enable people to control their emotional distress and adjust to difficult situations promote resilience. Numerous studies conducted throughout the years have emphasised the connection between emotional resilience and coping strategies. Self-comforting behaviours in particular are essential to this process because they have a direct impact on how people control their emotions under stress.

Since humour and emotional resilience are both adaptive coping strategies that aid people in overcoming stress and adversity, they are closely related. A lighter perspective on stressful situations is made possible by humour, that helps in cognitive reframing, lessens distress, and speeds up recovery. Humour improves mood, protects against negative impact, and builds resilience in the face of adversity by eliciting pleasant feelings. Additionally, it promotes social support and connection, two important resilience-protective aspects. Additionally, humour promotes different viewpoints and adaptive reactions, which entails cognitive flexibility, much like resilience. Therefore, whereas maladaptive humour, such as aggressive or self-defeating humour, may weaken emotional resilience, adaptive humour, such as affiliative and self-enhancing humour, may improve it.

II. METHODOLOGY

Aim

To study the relationship between Humor and Emotional Resilience among College Students.

Objectives

- To identify the level of Humour use and Emotional Resilience among College Students.
- To identify the relationship between humour as a coping strategy and Emotional Resilience among College Students.
- To identify whether there exists a significant gender difference in Humour and Emotional Resilience among College Students.

Hypothesis

- H_0 : There will be no significant relationship between Humour and Emotional Resilience
- H_1 : There will be a significant relationship between Humour and Emotional Resilience

Population

The population of the study is college students between the ages of 18-25.

Sample

The size of the sample is 150 college students from age 18 to 25 years consisting of males and females.

Inclusion criteria

- Both the gender from 18-25 years enrolled in College.
- Students who are able to comprehend English Language.
- Both undergraduate and postgraduate students were included.
- Students from distinct courses were also included.

Exclusion criteria

- Students who are not interested in taking part in the study.
- College students with special needs.

Sampling technique

Convenient Sampling technique was used to collect the data from the samples.

Research tools

1. Socio demographic data sheet
2. Humor Styles Questionnaire
3. Connor Davidson Resilience Scale

Socio demographic data sheet A socio-demographic information sheet was developed by the researcher to obtain basic background details of the participants. It included fields such as name (optional), age, gender, department, and designation/occupation. The purpose of this tool was to gather essential demographic data to describe the sample characteristics and provide context for interpreting the study findings.

The Humor Styles Questionnaire (Martin et al, 2003) assesses four dimensions relating to individual differences in uses of humor. These are: Self-enhancing, Affiliative, Aggressive, and Self-defeating. It consists of 32 items with a 7 point Likert scale (1= totally disagree to 7= totally agree). The Cronbach Alpha for 32 item is $>.80$.

The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (Campbell-Sills & Stein, 2007) The 10-item version (CD-RISC-10) is a shortened form of the original 25-item scale. Each item is rated on a 5-point Likert scale (0 = not true at all, 4 = true nearly all the time). The scale has demonstrated good reliability (Cronbach's alpha > 0.80) and validity in assessing resilience across various populations.

Research design

Correlational research design is used to establish the relationship between the study variables in the research study.

Procedure

Through review of literature, study variables were selected. Tools relating to study variables were selected based on its reliability and validity. The informed consent was obtained from the participants. The procedure to complete all three questionnaires were explained. The questionnaires with needed instructions were circulated to the students in printed forms. The Socio demographic data from the participants were collected (initials, age, gender). After completion the responses were collected and the data were scored based on the norms and analyzed, and discussions and conclusions were drawn.

Statistical analysis

- The study employed the latest version of SPSS for statistical analysis, utilizing Descriptive Statistics to calculate mean and standard deviation values for the study variables.
- The Karl Pearson product-moment correlation was used to examine the relationships between Humour and Emotional Resilience .
- Additionally, the study incorporated independent sample t-tests to assess differences in these variables among College Students, providing insights

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data for this study were collected using a structured questionnaire, which included tools measuring humor, emotional resilience, and a socio-demographic data sheet. The demographic details were obtained to provide a clear understanding of the background characteristics of the participants and to ensure that the sample was adequately described.

Table 1 shows sociodemographic details of college students

Sociodemographic Variables	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age		
18	58	5.8
19	45	4.5
20	39	3.9
21	5	.5
22	2	.2
23	1	.1
Gender		
Male	71	7.1
Female	79	7.9
Program		
UG	130	13.0
PG	20	2.0

Table 1 shows the frequency distribution of demographic data such as age, gender, and program of study. It is observed that the participants' age ranged from 18 to 23 years. The highest number of participants (58; 5.8%) were aged 18 years, followed by 45 participants (4.5%) aged 19 years, and 39 participants (3.9%) aged 20 years. A smaller proportion of participants belonged to higher age groups, with 5 participants (0.5%) aged 21 years, 2 participants (0.2%) aged 22 years, and only 1 participant (0.1%) aged 23 years.

With regard to gender, 79 participants (7.9%) were female, while 71 participants (7.1%) were male. In terms of educational programs, most of the participants (130; 13.0%) were pursuing undergraduate courses, whereas 20 participants (2.0%) were enrolled in postgraduate programs.

Table 2 shows mean and standard deviation of humor and emotional resilience

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation
Humor	134.17	17.345
Emotional Resilience	26.05	5.772

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for humor and emotional resilience. The scores on humor ranged from a minimum of 93 to a maximum of 193, with a mean score of 134.17 (SD = 17.345). This suggests that, on average, participants scored above the mid-point of the scale, indicating a generally favorable use of humor among the sample, though there was noticeable variability in individual scores.

For emotional resilience, the minimum score obtained was 11, while the maximum was 40, with a mean score of 26.05 (SD = 5.772). The mean value indicates that participants reported a moderate level of resilience overall. The standard deviation reflects some variation within the group, though the scores are relatively clustered around the mean compared to humor.

Table 3 shows correlational analysis between humor and emotional resilience

Study Variables	Humor	Emotional Resilience
Humor	1	.585**
Emotional Resilience	.585**	1

****Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**

Table 3 presents the correlation analysis between humor and emotional resilience using Karl Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient. The obtained value ($r = .585$, $p < .01$) indicates a moderate to strong positive correlation between the two variables. This suggests that higher levels of humor are associated with higher levels of emotional resilience among the participants. In other words, students who tend to use humor more effectively also demonstrate a greater ability to adapt to challenges and recover from setbacks.

The positive association is statistically significant at the 0.01 level, confirming that the relationship is unlikely to have occurred by chance. This finding aligns with the broader literature, which highlights the role of humor as a constructive coping strategy that can buffer stress and enhance psychological resilience.

Table 4 shows gender difference for humor and emotional resilience

Study Variable	Gender	Mean	Standard deviation	t value	p value
Humor	Male	134.59	15.82	0.28 (148)	.777
	Female	133.78	18.71		
Emotional Resilience	Male	26.51	6.13	0.91 (148)	.363
	Female	25.65	5.44		

Table 4 presents the results of the independent sample *t*-test conducted to examine gender differences in humor and emotional resilience. For humor, male students obtained a mean score of 134.59 with a standard deviation of 15.82, whereas female students obtained a mean score of 133.78 with a standard deviation of 18.71. The *t*-value of 0.28 ($p = .777$) indicates that there is no significant gender difference in humor among college students. Similarly, in emotional resilience, male students had a mean score of 26.51 with a standard deviation of 6.13, while female students had a mean score of 25.65 with a standard deviation of 5.44. The obtained *t*-value of 0.91 ($p = .363$) also suggests that there is no significant gender difference in emotional resilience among male and female students. Hence, the hypothesis that there would be no significant gender differences in humor and emotional resilience is supported in the current study.

DISCUSSION:

The descriptive statistics show that the sample's humor scores ranged from 93 to 193 ($M = 134.17$, $SD = 17.345$) while resilience scores ranged from 11 to 40 ($M = 26.05$, $SD = 5.772$). Interpreting these numbers in relation to the instruments' possible ranges is instructive: the Humor Styles Questionnaire (32 items) yields a theoretical range of 32–224; therefore the sample mean (134.17) sits modestly above the midpoint and suggests generally favourable—but not extreme—use of humour strategies across participants. The CD-RISC-10 has a possible range of 0–40; the observed mean (26.05) likewise indicates a moderate level of resilience in the sample rather than very low or very high resilience.

The Null hypothesis is rejected and an alternative hypothesis is accepted. The Pearson product-moment correlation of $r = .585$ indicates a moderate-to-strong positive relationship i.e., students with higher humour scores also tended to report higher resilience. This magnitude is sizable for psychological constructs measured via self-report and implies a practically meaningful association. The direction and strength are consistent with studies that find links between adaptive humour use (especially self-enhancing and affiliative styles) and indicators of psychological well-being, coping, and resilience. For example, recent research has shown that humour and particular humour styles can function as protective factors that support adaptive responses to stress and contribute to higher subjective well-being. However, the literature also emphasizes that not all humour is equally adaptive—“benign” humour styles typically predict better outcomes, while negative styles may not (Kennison, 2022).

This result supports the second hypothesis, which stated that there is a significant relationship between humor and emotional resilience. In line with this, previous research has also demonstrated that adaptive humor styles, particularly affiliative and self-enhancing humor, are associated with higher levels of resilience and psychological well-being (Kuiper, Grimshaw, Leite, & Kirsh, 2004). This suggests that students who are able to use humor constructively may be better equipped to manage stress, recover from challenges, and maintain emotional balance.

The independent samples t -tests showed no statistically significant gender differences for either humour ($t(148) = 0.28, p = .777$) or resilience ($t(148) = 0.91, p = .363$). This non-finding is informative rather than trivial, while some prior work reports small sex differences in certain humour outcomes (e.g., men sometimes score higher on humour production ability or on aggressive/self-enhancing humour), many studies find mixed or negligible gender effects for overall humour use or for resilience levels in college samples. In other words, gender differences in humour/resilience are not robust or universal and often depend on which humour dimension is examined, cultural context, or sample composition.

A recent meta-analysis revealed that men's humor output was rated as funnier than women's, with a small-to-moderate effect size ($d = 0.321$), and this pattern remained robust across various moderators and study characteristics (Greengross et al., 2020). The authors suggested both evolutionary explanations (e.g., humor as a mate-selection signal where men are more pressured to display humor) and cultural explanations (e.g., social expectations encouraging men more than women to produce humor).

However, other reviews have concluded that consistent gender differences are found only in specific humor styles, such as men scoring higher on aggressive humor, while no significant differences emerge in affiliative or self-enhancing humor.

A study conducted by Karou-ei, Shokouhnavard, and Hashemi (2012), which contradicts the findings of our study, found that males scored higher than females across humor styles, while gender differences in social skills were limited to only a few domains. This discrepancy may reflect sample and cultural differences (Salavera et al. sampled Spanish university students with particular degree profiles), measurement or scoring variations, or true population differences; it suggests the need for cross-cultural replication and careful attention to sampling and instrument translation when comparing gender effects on humor and resilience.

Therefore, this study demonstrates that humor and emotional resilience are positively associated, suggesting that the use of humor may serve as an important psychological resource in adapting to challenges during college life. While no significant gender differences emerged in either variable, this aligns with literature showing that gender effects in humor and resilience are often context-specific and not consistently observed across populations.

These results contribute to a growing body of evidence highlighting the role of positive psychological factors in student well-being. At the same time, the study underscores the need for future research to examine humor styles separately, explore longitudinal effects, and consider cultural and contextual influences. Taken together, the findings emphasize the importance of promoting adaptive coping strategies in higher education settings, with humor and resilience emerging as promising areas for intervention and mental health support.

IV. CONCLUSION

From the detailed analysis of this study, the researcher concludes the following points:

- There has been a significant positive relationship between humor and emotional resilience among the college students, i.e., higher the usage of humor, higher the level of emotional resilience.
- This correlation bears important implications for the field of psychology and education. Humor, as a coping mechanism and social tool, when combined with emotional resilience, can foster stress management, and adaptability in academic and professional environments.
- There is no significant gender difference in emotional resilience and humor among college students.

V. LIMITATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Limitations:

- **Generalizability:** The findings might not be applicable to college students from diverse cultural, socioeconomic, or educational backgrounds. These factors can influence humour and emotional resilience differently among various groups.
- **Sampling Bias:** The study might have relied on a specific sample of college students from a particular institution or geographic area, making it challenging to generalize the findings to a broader population of college students.

- **Temporal Variability:** College students' humour and emotional resilience levels may fluctuate over time due to academic, social, or personal factors. The study may not capture these fluctuations adequately.
- **No Experimental Manipulation:** If this study was observational rather than experimental, it cannot establish a causal relationship between humour and emotional resilience. Correlation does not imply causation.
- **Researcher Bias:** Potential bias from the researchers themselves, such as in data collection, analysis, or interpretation, could affect the study's outcomes.

Implications:

- **Mental Health Interventions:** If a significant relationship is found between humor and emotional resilience, it suggests that interventions for college students could incorporate humor-based strategies to strengthen resilience. Workshops using humor to reframe stressful situations may enhance students' capacity to cope with adversity.
- **Curriculum Development:** The findings may highlight the need to integrate resilience-building modules into the college curriculum. Humor-related activities and positive coping strategies could be included in life skills or stress management courses, equipping students to manage academic and personal challenges more effectively.
- **Preventive Screening:** Identifying students with low emotional resilience or ineffective humor styles could be valuable for early support. Colleges could implement resilience assessments to detect students at risk and provide targeted resources.
- **Counseling and Therapy Services:** College counseling centers could adopt humor therapy or laughter-based group activities as part of their services. Trained counselors might integrate humor into resilience-building interventions, helping students regulate emotions and adapt to stress.
- **Peer and Community Engagement:** Peer mentoring or student clubs could encourage the use of positive humor styles (affiliative, self-enhancing) as tools for resilience. Promoting shared humor among peers may foster supportive relationships and create a more positive campus climate.

REFERENCES

1. Abel, M. H. (2002). Humor, stress, and coping strategies. *Humor – International Journal of Humor Research*, 15(4). <https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.15.4.365>
2. APA PsycNet. (n.d.). Psycnet.apa.org. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2001-01085-003>
3. Cann, A., Holt, K., & Calhoun, L. G. (1999). The roles of humor and sense of humor in responses to stressors.
4. Demircioğlu, H. (2017). Psychological resilience at social-emotional development. *Educational research and practice*, 246-255.
5. Greengross, G., Silvia, P. J., & Nusbaum, E. C. (2019). Sex differences in humor production ability: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 84, 103886. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2019.103886>
6. Kennison, S. M. (2022). Humor and resilience: relationships with happiness in young adults. *HUMOR*, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2021-0079>
7. Kolb, E. J. (2010). The Definition of Sense of Humor: A New Perspective. Academia.edu. https://www.academia.edu/download/94744400/The_definition_of_humor._A_new_perspective.pdf
8. Kuiper, N. A., Grimshaw, M., Leite, C., & Kirsh, G. (2004). Humor is not always the best medicine: Specific components of sense of humor and psychological well-being. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 17(1/2), 135–168. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.2004.002>

9. Malkhazov, O. R., Zhadan, I. V., Poznyak, S. I., & Vella, G. (2021). PERSONALITY FACTORS OF EMOTIONAL RESILIENCE IN THE CHALLENGING ENVIRONMENTS FOR MENTAL HEALTH. *Wiadomości Lekarskie*, 74(11), 2794–2798. <https://doi.org/10.36740/wlek202111120>
10. Martin, R. A. (2001). Humor, laughter, and physical health: methodological issues and research findings. *Psychological bulletin*, 127(4), 504.
11. Moroz, L. I., Dikhtiarenko, S. Y., & Andrusik, O. O. (2021). Emotional resilience as a major factor in the mental health of prospective university students. *НАУКО В И Й В І С Н И К*, 117.
12. Morreall, J. (2009). Humor as cognitive play.
13. April Rachmad, Yoesoep Edhie. 2022. Emotional Resilience Theory. Hilversum Media Boek Internationale Uitgeverij, Speciale Editie 2022. <https://doi.org/10.17605/osf.io/eu687>
14. Riaz, R., & Malik, S. (2023). Relationship between attachment styles and mental well-being among young adults: Role of benevolent humor. *Current Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-04594-1>
15. Sahni, S., Kumari, S., & Pachaury, P. (2020). Building Emotional Resilience with Big Five Personality Model Against COVID-19 Pandemic. *FIIB Business Review*, 231971452095455. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2319714520954559>
16. Salavera, C., Usán, P., & Jarie, L. (2020). Styles of humor and social skills in students: Gender differences. *Current Psychology*, 39(2), 571–580. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-017-9770-x>
17. Schermer, J. A., Martin, R. A., Martin, N. G., Lynskey, M., & Vernon, P. A. (2013). The general factor of personality and humor styles. *Personality and Individual differences*, 54(8), 890-893.
18. Schermer, J. A., Papazova, E. B., Kwiatkowska, M. M., Radosław Rogoza, Park, J., Kowalski, C. M., Marija Branković, Doroszuk, M., Khanh, T., Dzintra Iliško, Malik, S., Lins, S., Ginés Navarro-Carrillo, Oviedo-Trespalacios, O., Torres-Marín, J., Włodarczyk, A., Dias, S., Volkodav, T., & Krammer, G. (2024). Predicting Self-Esteem Using Humor Styles: A Cross-Cultural Study. *Springer EBooks*, 103–127. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-52288-8_5
19. Tolamise Olasehinde. (2025, April 3). The Impact of Self-Comforting on Emotional Resilience. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/390446937_The_Impact_of_Self-Comforting_on_Emotional_Resilience
20. Tsai, P.-H., Chen, H.-C., Hung, Y.-C., Chang, J.-H., & Huang, S.-Y. (2021). What type of humor style do older adults tend to prefer? A comparative study of humor style tendencies among individuals of different ages and genders. *Current Psychology*, 42. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-02381-4>