Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi / The Journal of Social Sciences

Akademik Sosyal Arařtırmalar Dergisi, Yıl: 7, Sayı: 44, Şubat 2020, s. 349-366

ISSN: 2149-0821 Doi Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/SOBIDER.41778>

İbrahim DALBUDAK

Atabey Vocational School, Isparta University of Applied Sciences,

Öznur YAŞAR

Faculty of Science, Sociology, University of Namık Kemal,

dalbudakibo@hotmail.com

INVESTIGATION OF THE HUMOR STYLES OF ATHLETES WITH VISUAL IMPAIRMENT

Abstract

Humor as a means of communication varies from person to person. Therefore, humor styles also change. There are four types of humor classification according to humor styles. These are affiliative, self-enhancing, aggressive and self-defeating humor styles, respectively. In affiliative humor style, the person aims to entertain others. For this reason, people sometimes use humor types and variations. People who use self-enhancing humor style are able to look at life from a humorous perspective even in the case of stress and distress. People with aggressive humor do not consider how their humor affects the others. People who use self-defeating humor think that they will gain value by using humor at the cost of being mocked.

This study was conducted to find out the humor styles of athletes with visual impairment. The study was conducted with a total of 184 athletes with visual impairment with different degree of vision in clubs of athletes with visual impairment. The participation in the study was done on a volunteer basis. An analysis of the humor styles of the athletes with visual impairment was carried out according to the gender of the participants, their disability status, sports branches, marital status, age groups, educational status, level of income and degree of vision. "Humor Styles Questionnaire" was used in the study as the data collection tool. In this study, where humor styles were analyzed, SPSS 22.00 program was used in quantitative research methods. Data are summarized by giving percentage and

frequency tables. In this study, it was tested with 0, 05 significance level. It is seen that gender, status of the handicap, sports branches, level of income reveal a significant difference in athletes with visual impairment' humor styles ($p < 0,05$), but marital status, age groups, educational status and degree of vision do not reveal a significant difference in athletes with visual impairment' humor styles ($p > 0,05$).

In future researches, it is recommended to evaluate the humor styles of athletes with visual impairment on the other individuals with disabilities. In addition, it is recommended to conduct a new study on how athletes with visual impairment and other individuals with disabilities use humor and how they are affected.

Keywords: Humor, Visually Handicapped, Sports, Communication.

GÖRME ENGELLİ SPORCULARIN MİZAH TARZLARININ ÖN ARAŞTIRILMASI

Özet

Bir iletişim tarzı olarak mizah kişiden kişiye değişmektedir. Dolayısıyla mizah tarzları da değişmektedir. Mizah tarzları sınıflandırmasına göre dört çeşit mizah sınıflandırması bulunmaktadır. Bunlar sırasıyla katılımcı, kendini geliştirici, saldırgan ve kendini yıkıcı mizah tarzlarıdır. Katılımcı Mizah tarzında; kişi başkalarını eğlendirmek amacı gütmektedir. Bunun için kişiler kimi zaman mizah tür ve çeşitlerini kullanabilmektedir. Kendini geliştirici mizah tarzını kullanan kişiler ise stres ve sıkıntı anında bile hayata komik bir perspektiften bakabilmeyi becerebilmektedir. Saldırgan mizah tarzına sahip kişiler mizah yaptıkları tarafın yapılan mizahtan nasıl etkileneceğini dikkate almazlar. Kendini yıkıcı mizah tarzını kullanan kişiler ise kendini alay malzemesi yapma pahasına mizahı kullanarak değer kazanacağını düşünmektedir.

Görme engelli kulüplerindeki görme dereceleri farklı görme engelli sporculardan oluşan toplam 184 görme engelli sporcu ile yapılmıştır. Katılımda gönüllülük esası dikkate alınmıştır. Katılımcıların cinsiyetlerine, Engel durumlarına, Spor branşlarına, Medeni durumlarına, Yaş gruplarına, Eğitim durumlarına, Gelir durumlarına ve Görme derecelerine göre görme engelli sporcuların mizah tarzlarının analizi yapılmıştır. Araştırmada veri toplama aracı olarak "Mizah Tarzları Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Mizah tarzlarının analizi yapılan bu çalışmada nicel araştırma yöntemlerinde kullanılan SPSS 22.00 Programı kullanılmıştır. Veriler yüzde ve frekans tabloları verilerek özetlenmiştir. Bu çalışmada 0.05 anlamlılık düzeyi ile test edilmiştir.

Cinsiyet, engel durumu, spor branşı ve gelir durumuna göre görme engelli bireylerin mizah tarzlarında anlamlı bir farklılık olduğunu ortaya koyduğu ($p < .05$) gibi medeni durumu, yaş grupları, eğitim durumu ve görme derecesine göre görme engelli bireylerin mizah tarzlarında anlamlı bir farklılık olmadığı görülmektedir ($p > .05$).

İleriki araştırmalarda görme engelli sporcuların kullandıkları mizah tarzlarının diğer engelli bireyler üzerinde mizah tarzlarının değerlendirilmesi önerilmektedir. Ayrıca görme engelli sporcuların ve diğer engelli bireylerin, mizahı nasıl

kullandıkları ve nasıl etkilendiklerinin değerlendirileceği yeni bir araştırma yapılması önerilmektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Mizah, Görme Engelli, Spor, iletişim.

INTRODUCTION

Communication is an ability that all the creatures have. However, the communication style differs from one species to the other. The creatures that have the widest scale of communication are the humans. They can communicate sometimes by writing, by speaking, by gestures etc. In addition, humans can react to the events they experience in different ways during their lives. For example, they react to some event by getting angry, and some events by crying. And sometimes they react to some others by laughing. Barry Sanders (2001) explains humans' attitude of laughing at the world as "a natural line of defense". The ability to laughing towards the world is expressed with humor.

Humor is investigated for centuries by numerous sciences and by several theoreticians such as Aristo, Hobbes, Baudelaire, Voltaire, Kant, Schopenhauer, Spenser, Freud, Shaftesbury, and Kierkegaard. All the theoreticians explained humor in their own way, but they didn't make a sole and universal description since it is very difficult to describe humor that changes from person to person and from community to community. However, the point where all the descriptions of humor intersect is the act of laughing (Yaşar, 2018).

According to Bergson, the act of laughing is a psychological event that is formed and developed in communal living. According to him, laughing is a correction, a reform. It leaves a bitter effect on the person that is laughed at. Society gets back at the levity towards itself by laughing. Also, according to Bergson, humor possesses the qualifications of conflict and contradiction. So, it means that when humans are laughing at something, they are comparing it with something else (Bergson, 1945:142). The act of laughing is formed as a result of humor.

Even if we do not mention a de facto description of humor, if we are to look at its meaning in dictionaries, The Oxford Dictionary describes humor as "the quality of being amusing or comic, especially as expressed in literature or speech", and it qualifies it as "the ability to express humor or amuse other people" (cited by Martin, 2007). According to TDK (Turkish Language Institution) dictionary, humor is described as "entertaining someone, making someone laugh, and an irony to tease someone for their behavior without hurting their feelings; meaning in literature: a literary type that can exhibit the funny aspects of the reality, irony".

Humor has several classifications. For example, these are classifying humor according to its theories, superiority theory, disjointedness, and relief theories. Classification of humor according to its variations: hoax, joke, lampoon, satire, and blunder. According to its types: these are joke, humorous story, humorous poem, caricature, puppet, and comedy. In this study, another classification of humor, classification of humor according to its styles, will be emphasized. The usage of humor has 4 different styles. These are the affiliative, self-enhancing, aggressive, and self-defeating humor.

In the affiliative humor style, people seek to entertain others in daily life. And while doing that, they can use humor types and variations. The people who use this type of humor are in a

tendency to make the environment they are in cheerful, and also reduce the tension between people (Martin et al., 2003; Yerlikaya, 2009; Güven, 2003; Çakmak et al., 2015).

The self-enhancing humor style consists of being able to look at life from a humorous perspective even under stress and distress. Therefore, generally, it has a humorous perspective in daily life, and having a tendency to protect this perspective even under difficult situations (Martin et al., 2003; Yerlikaya, 2009; Güven, 2003; Çakmak et al., 2015).

People with aggressive humor do not consider how their humor affects the others. As a result, people who use this humor style are in a tendency to use bitter speech, teasing, japing, hostility, humiliation, and waggish contempt (Martin et al., 2003; Yerlikaya, 2009; Güven, 2003; Çakmak et al., 2015).

The self-defeating humor style is the person's use of humor, with the main motivation to get himself/herself accepted, while ignoring his/her real feelings and entertaining others with a tendency to humiliate himself/herself in a humorous way (Martin et al., 2003; Yerlikaya, 2009; Güven, 2003; Çakmak et al., 2015).

This study discusses the athletes with visual impairment' tendencies in the mentioned humor style since humor has an auxiliary function on overcoming the difficulties and distresses of individuals. Humor has a detractive effect on stress, depression, and anxiety. Therefore, humor is considered a coping strategy (Martin, 1998). Thus, humor has an effect on managing the disabilities for the handicapped. For this reason, this study aims to investigate the humor styles of the athletes with visual impairment.

Thinkers such as Sigmund Freud (1905), Rollo May (1953) Abraham Maslow (1954), Gordon W. Allport (1961), Thorson and Powell (1993) also consider humor as a coping method. According to them, humor also ensures people to get away from their problems. Also, humor is effective on people's struggle against difficulties in their lives. Especially, the individuals' usage of humor that ends with the act of laughing when they encounter negative life experiences helps them overcome that experience. In this context, it would not be wrong to state that humor is a good defense mechanism.

This study, which aims to teach the humor styles, was conducted with a total of 184 athletes with visual impairment with different degree of vision in clubs of athletes with visual impairment. The participation in the study was done on a volunteer basis. Within this scope, the problems of the study are:

- What are the humor styles of athletes with visual impairment according to their gender?
- What are the humor styles of athletes with visual impairment according to their disability status?
- What are the humor styles of athletes with visual impairment according to their sports branch?
- What are the humor styles of athletes with visual impairment according to their marital status?
- What are the humor styles of athletes with visual impairment according to their age group?

- What are the humor styles of athletes with visual impairment according to their educational status?
- What are the humor styles of athletes with visual impairment according to their level of income?
- What are the humor styles of athletes with visual impairment according to their degree of vision?

MATERIAL – METHOD

Data collection consists of two parts which are: The “Humor Styles Questionnaire”, and a “Personal Information Form” which was prepared by the researcher. The first part has the students’ personal information form which includes their age, gender, educational status, sports branch, disability status, degree of vision, level of income, and marital status.

The second part, the Humor Styles Questionnaire, which was developed by Martin et al. (2003) and adapted to Turkish by Yerlikaya (2003), is a self-evaluation scale. It is a 7-point Likert type self-evaluation scale, (1) strongly disagree, (7) strongly agree, made up of 32 questions. The scale splits the humor into types by classifying humor styles into four sub-dimensions. In these four dimensions, there are four sub-scales that aim to measure four different humor styles which are the compatible-positive humor (affiliative and self-enhancing) and the incompatible-negative humor (aggressive and self-defeating). Each sub-dimension is made up of 8 items. The Humor Styles Questionnaire was adapted to Turkish and its validity-reliability tests were done by Yerlikaya (2003). During the adaptation of the scale to Turkish, the Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficients regarding each sub-scale were defined as 0,74 for Affiliative Humor; 0,78 for Self-enhancing Humor; 0,69 for Aggressive Humor; and 0,67 for Self-defeating Humor. The Cronbach’s alpha values are between 0,77 and 0,81 in the original scale developed by Martin et al. (2003). While grading the scale, the items 1, 7, 9, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23, 25, 29, and 31 are graded inversely. It is possible to get between 7 and 56 points from each sub-dimension. The points increasing in each sub-dimension indicates the usage frequency of that humor style. The items in sub-dimensions are: Affiliative (Social) Humor: 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29; Self-enhancing Humor: 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, 30; Aggressive Humor: 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31; and Self-defeating Humor: 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32.

In the study we conducted, there were four sub-factors and the Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficients were 0,797 for Affiliative Humor; 0,831 for Self-enhancing Humor; 0,419 for Aggressive Humor; and 0,606 for Self-defeating Humor. The total value of the Cronbach’s alpha of the scale was found to be 0,814.

DATA ANALYSIS

Before moving onto the data analysis, analysis assumptions were examined. The data were cleansed from lost and incorrect coding, and the normality assumption was tested with kurtosis and skewness values. Then, frequency, and mean standard deviation were used, also, in the analysis according to gender, disability status, marital status, and sports branch t-test; according to age, educational status, level of income, and degree of vision one-way variance analysis (ANOVA) test was done.

In the variance analysis, the Bonferroni method is a widely used multiple comparison test, and it requires the principle of “equal quantity of samples” (Miller, 1969; cited by Kayri, 2009). Thus, in the case of not finding a significant difference, the results of the analyses were compared using the Bonferroni test. The analyses were tested with SPSS 22.00 and a significance level of .05.

Within the scope of normality tests, definitive statistics regarding the participants’ humor styles were given in Table 1. It is seen that the kurtosis and skewness values regarding the variable are .179 and .356, and these values are in between -1 and +1. Thus, it can be said that the variable has a normal distribution.

Table 1. Definitive Statistics Regarding Humor Styles

Variable	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Kurtosis	Skewness
Humor Styles	184	3,999	0,836	.179	.356

FINDINGS

The study was conducted with the sample that consisted of athletes with visual impairment with different degrees of vision that are in clubs for the visually handicapped from different provinces of Turkey. A total of 184 individuals who are athletes with visual impairment with different degrees of vision from clubs for the visually handicapped voluntarily participated.

354

Table 2: The Distribution of the Individuals with Visual Impairment According to Their Age, Disability Status, Gender, Educational Status, Sports Branch, Level of Income, Degree of Vision, and Marital Status

		n	%
Gender	Male	119	64,7
	Female	65	35,3
Age	Below 18	34	18,5
	Between 18-30	104	56,5
	Above 30	46	25
Marital Status	Single	125	67,9
	Married	59	32,1
Disability Status	Congenital	157	85,3
	Acquired	27	14,7
Educational Status	Elementary	18	9,8
	High School	90	48,9
	University	76	41,3
Sports Branch	Individual Sports	140	76,1
	Team Sports	44	23,9
Level of Income	1000	28	15,2
	1000-2000	152	82,6
	3000	4	2,2
Degree of Vision	B1	62	33,7
	B2	76	41,3
	B3	46	25

The findings of the unpaired t-test regarding the participants' humor styles points according to their gender are given in Table 3.

Table 3. The Findings Regarding the Participants' Humor Style Points According to Their Gender

	Gender	N	Mean	Ss	T	Sd	p
Affiliative Humor	Male	119	5,8351	1,13577	4,732	182	,000
	Female	65	4,8673	1,61911			
Self-enhancing Humor	Male	119	5,4737	1,24372	5,237	182	,000
	Female	65	4,3096	1,74806			
Aggressive Humor	Male	119	1,9254	,78525	-,984	182	,327
	Female	65	2,0481	,84943			
Self-defeating Humor	Male	119	3,6502	1,37429	2,720	182	,007
	Female	65	3,1442	,80896			
Total	Male	119	4,2211	,65742	5,214	182	,000
	Female	65	3,5923	,97054			

When the findings regarding the participant's humor style points according to their gender are examined, it becomes clear that there is a significant difference on the humor styles of the participants according to their gender ($t(182) = 5.214$, $p < .05$). In other words, the males' humor style point ($X=4,2211$) is higher than the females' ($X=3,5923$).

When the sub-factors of the humor styles are examined, it was determined that there are significant differences according to gender in the Affiliative humor ($t(182) = 4.732$, $p < .05$); the Self-enhancing humor ($t(182) = 5.237$, $p < .05$); and the Self-defeating humor ($t(182) = 2.720$, $p < .05$). However, there is not a significant difference in the Aggressive humor ($t(182) = -.984$, $p > .05$). According to these findings, the males have higher points than females in the Affiliative humor ((male $X=5,8351$), (female $X=4,8673$)), the Self-enhancing humor ((male $X=5,4737$), (female $X=4,3096$)), and the Self-defeating humor ((male $X=3,6502$), (female $X=3,1442$)).

Table 4. The Findings Regarding the Participants' Humor Style Points According to Their Disability Status

	Disability Status	N	Mean	Ss	t	Sd	p
Affiliative Humor	Congenital	157	5,4323	1,46148	-1,425	182	,156
	Acquired	27	5,8472	,92399			
Self-enhancing Humor	Congenital	157	5,0231	1,49985	-,835	182	,405
	Acquired	27	5,2917	1,78098			
Aggressive Humor	Congenital	157	1,9697	,83366	,040	182	,968
	Acquired	27	1,9630	,65488			
Self-defeating Humor	Congenital	157	3,3479	1,21211	-3,386	182	,001
	Acquired	27	4,1898	1,07382			
Total	Congenital	157	3,9433	,84211	-2,202	182	,029
	Acquired	27	4,3229	,73272			

When the findings regarding the participant's humor style points according to their disability status are examined, it becomes clear that there is a significant difference on the humor styles of the individuals who have a disability whether congenital or acquired ($t(182) = -2.202, p < .05$). Accordingly, the congenital blinds' humor style point ($X=4,3229$) is higher than the acquired blinds' ($X=3,9433$).

When the sub-factors of the humor styles are examined, it was determined that the acquired blinds' point ($X=4,1898$) is higher than the congenital blinds' point ($X=3,3479$) in the Self-defeating humor sub-factor ($t(182) = -3.386, p < .05$). It was determined that there are no significant differences in the Affiliative humor ($t(182) = -1.425, p > .05$); the Self-enhancing humor ($t(182) = -.835, p > .05$); and the Aggressive humor ($t(182) = .040, p > .05$).

Table 5. The Findings Regarding the Participants' Humor Style Points According to Their Sports Branch

	Sports Branch	N	Mean	Ss	t	Sd	p
Affiliative Humor	Individual Sports	140	5,4241	1,40238	-1,194	182	,234
	Team Sports	44	5,7131	1,39105			
Self-enhancing Humor	Individual Sports	140	5,0366	1,55291	-,405	182	,686
	Team Sports	44	5,1449	1,52092			
Aggressive Humor	Individual Sports	140	1,9357	,87062	-,989	182	,324
	Team Sports	44	2,0739	,56182			
Self-defeating Humor	Individual Sports	140	3,2446	1,02694	-4,727	182	,000
	Team Sports	44	4,1932	1,51577			
Total	Individual Sports	140	3,9103	,83550	-2,608	182	,010
	Team Sports	44	4,2813	,78158			

When the findings regarding the participant's humor style points according to their sports branch are examined, it becomes clear that there is a significant difference on the humor styles of the individuals who do individual or team sports ($t(182) = -2.608, p < .05$). In other words, the individuals who do team sports have higher humor style point ($X=4,2813$) than the ones doing individuals sports ($X=3,9103$).

When the sub-factors of the humor styles are examined, it was determined that the ones doing team sports has higher point ($X=4,1932$) than the ones doing individual sports ($X=3,2446$) in the Self-defeating humor sub-factor ($t(182) = -4.727, p < .05$). It was determined that there are no significant differences in the Affiliative humor ($t(182) = -1.194, p > .05$); Self-enhancing humor ($t(182) = -.405, p > .05$); and the Aggressive humor ($t(182) = -.989, p > .05$).

Table 6. The Findings Regarding the Participants' Humor Style Points According to Their Marital Status

	Marital Status	N	Mean	Ss	t	Sd	p
Affiliative Humor	Single	125	5,5710	1,27883	1,097	182	,274
	Married	59	5,3284	1,63061			
Self-enhancing Humor	Single	125	5,2460	1,35468	2,380	182	,018
	Married	59	4,6737	1,83066			
Aggressive Humor	Single	125	1,8260	,71436	-3,599	182	,000
	Married	59	2,2712	,91301			
Self-defeating Humor	Single	125	3,4000	1,04063	-1,151	182	,251
	Married	59	3,6229	1,54938			
Total	Single	125	4,0108	,63912	,277	182	,782
	Married	59	3,9740	1,15372			

When the findings regarding the participant's humor style points according to their marital status are examined, it shows up that there are no significant differences among the humor styles of the individuals depending on their marital status ($t(182) = .277, p > .05$).

When the sub-factors of the humor styles are examined, it was determined that the singles have higher point ($X=5,2460$) than the married ($X=4,6737$) in the Self-enhancing humor ($t(182) = 2.380, p < .05$); and the married have higher point ($X=2,2712$) than the singles ($X=1,8260$) in the Aggressive humor ($t(182) = -3.599, p < .05$). In the sub-factors the Affiliative humor ($t(182) = 1.097, p > .05$), and the Self-defeating humor ($t(182) = -1.151, p > .05$) there are no significant differences according to marital status.

The results of the one-way variance analysis regarding the participants' humor styles according to their age groups are given in Table 7.

Table 7. The Findings Regarding the Participants' Humor Styles According to Their Age Groups

		Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean of Squares	F	p
Affiliative Humor	Between-Groups	10,992	2	5,496	2,855	,060
	Within-Group	348,374	181	1,925		
	Total	359,367	183			
Self-enhancing Humor	Between-Groups	5,178	2	2,589	1,090	,338
	Within-Group	429,884	181	2,375		
	Total	435,062	183			
Aggressive Humor	Between-Groups	9,570	2	4,785	7,873	,001
	Within-Group	110,000	181	,608		
	Total	119,570	183			
Self-defeating Humor	Between-Groups	27,620	2	13,810	10,084	,000
	Within-Group	247,887	181	1,370		
	Total	275,506	183			
Total	Between-Groups	,915	2	,457	,652	,522
	Within-Group	126,991	181	,702		

		Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean of Squares	F	p
Affiliative Humor	Between-Groups	10,992	2	5,496	2,855	,060
	Within-Group	348,374	181	1,925		
	Total	359,367	183			
Self-enhancing Humor	Between-Groups	5,178	2	2,589	1,090	,338
	Within-Group	429,884	181	2,375		
	Total	435,062	183			
Aggressive Humor	Between-Groups	9,570	2	4,785	7,873	,001
	Within-Group	110,000	181	,608		
	Total	119,570	183			
Self-defeating Humor	Between-Groups	27,620	2	13,810	10,084	,000
	Within-Group	247,887	181	1,370		
	Total	127,906	183			

When the results of one-way ANOVA of humor styles according to age groups are examined, it is seen that there are no significant differences among humor styles of the participants in terms of their age groups ($F(2, 181) = .652$ $p > .05$).

When the sub-factors of the humor styles are examined, it was determined that there are no significant differences in the Affiliative humor ($F(2, 181) = 2.855$ $p > .05$) and the Self-enhancing humor ($F(2, 181) = 1.090$ $p > .05$), but there are significant differences in the Aggressive humor ($F(2, 181) = 7.873$ $p < .05$) and the Self-defeating humor ($F(2, 181) = 10.084$ $p < .05$) according to age groups.

As a result of the Post Hoc tests that were done in order to determine between which groups there is a differentiation, it was determined that in Aggressive humor, there are differences between ages below 18 and above 30, and between ages 18-30 and above 30; in Self-defeating humor, there are differentiations between ages below 18 and 18-30, and between ages below 18 and above 30.

Table 8. The Findings Regarding the Humor Styles According to Educational Status

		Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean of Squares	F	p
Affiliative Humor	Between-groups	5,644	2	2,822	1,444	,239
	Within-group	353,722	181	1,954		
	Total	359,367	183			
Self-enhancing Humor	Between-groups	11,128	2	5,564	2,376	,096
	Within-group	423,934	181	2,342		
	Total	435,062	183			
Aggressive Humor	Between-groups	5,884	2	2,942	4,684	,010
	Within-group	113,687	181	,628		
	Total	119,570	183			
Self-defeating Humor	Between-groups	2,145	2	1,072	,710	,493
	Within-group	273,362	181	1,510		
	Total	275,506	183			
Total	Between-groups	1,350	2	,675	,965	,383
	Within-group	126,556	181	,699		
	Total	127,906	183			

When the results of one-way ANOVA of humor styles according to educational status are examined, it is seen that there are no significant differences among humor styles of the participants in terms of their educational status ($F(2, 181) = .383$ $p > .05$).

When the sub-factors according to educational status are examined, it was determined that there are no significant differences in the Affiliative humor ($F(2, 181) = 1.444$ $p > .05$), the Self-enhancing humor ($F(2, 181) = 2.376$ $p > .05$), and the Self-defeating humor ($F(2, 181) = 0.710$ $p > .05$); but there is a significant difference in the Aggressive humor ($F(2, 181) = 4.684$ $p < .05$) according to education status.

As a result of the Post Hoc tests that were done in order to determine between which groups there is a differentiation, it was determined that there are differences between the graduates of elementary schools and the graduates of high schools; however, there is no differentiation between the graduates of elementary schools and the university graduates.

Table 9. The Findings Regarding the Humor Styles According to Level of Income

		Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean of Squares	F	P
Affiliative Humor	Between-groups	65,391	2	32,696	20,131	,000
	Within-group	293,975	181	1,624		
	Total	359,367	183			
Self-enhancing Humor	Between-groups	49,204	2	24,602	11,540	,000
	Within-group	385,859	181	2,132		
	Total	435,063	183			
Aggressive Humor	Between-groups	7,320	2	3,660	5,901	,003
	Within-group	112,251	181	,620		
	Total	119,570	183			
Self-defeating Humor	Between-groups	16,416	2	8,208	5,734	,004
	Within-group	259,090	181	1,431		
	Total	275,506	183			
Total	Between-groups	12,603	2	6,302	9,892	,000
	Within-group	115,303	181	,637		
	Total	127,906	183			

When the results of one-way ANOVA of humor styles according to level of income are examined, it is seen that there is a significant difference among humor styles of the participants in terms of their level of income ($F(2, 181) = 9.892$ $p < .05$).

When the sub-factors according to level of income are examined, it was determined that there are significant differences in the Affiliative humor ($F(2, 181) = 20.131$ $p < .05$), the Self-enhancing humor ($F(2, 181) = 11.540$ $p < .05$), the Aggressive humor ($F(2, 181) = 5.901$ $p < .05$), and the Self-defeating humor ($F(2, 181) = 5.734$ $p > .05$) according to level of income.

As a result of the Post Hoc tests that were done in order to determine between which groups these differences exist, it was determined that there is a difference between all groups of the level of income in the Affiliative humor and the Self-enhancing humor; in the Aggressive humor, between 1000 and 1000-2000; and in the Self-defeating humor, between 1000 and 1000-

2000 a difference was found. As for the whole scale, it was found that there is a difference between 1000 and 3000; and 1000-2000 and 3000.

Table 10. The Findings Regarding the Humor Styles According to Degree of Vision

		Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean of Squares	F	P
Affiliative Humor	Between-groups	1,395	2	,697	,353	,703
	Within-group	357,972	181	1,978		
	Total	359,367	183			
Self-enhancing Humor	Between-groups	21,823	2	10,911	4,779	,009
	Within-group	413,240	181	2,283		
	Total	435,062	183			
Aggressive Humor	Between-groups	1,495	2	,748	1,146	,320
	Within-group	118,075	181	,652		
	Total	119,570	183			
Self-defeating Humor	Between-groups	12,791	2	6,396	4,406	,014
	Within-group	262,715	181	1,451		
	Total	275,506	183			
Total	Between-groups	,438	2	,219	,311	,733
	Within-group	127,468	181	,704		
	Total	127,906	183			

When the results of one-way ANOVA of humor styles according to degree of vision are examined, it is seen that there are no significant differences among humor styles of the participants in terms of their degree of vision ($F(2, 181) = .311$ $p > .05$).

When the sub-factors according to degree of vision are examined, it was determined that there are no significant differences in the Affiliative humor ($F(2, 181) = .353$ $p > .05$), and the Aggressive humor ($F(2, 181) = 1.146$ $p > .05$) according to degree of vision; however, there are differentiations in the Self-enhancing humor ($F(2, 181) = 4.779$ $p < .05$), and the Self-defeating humor ($F(2, 181) = 4.406$ $p > .05$) according to degree of vision.

As a result of the Post Hoc tests that were done in order to determine between which groups these differences are, it was determined that there is a difference between B2 and B3 in the Self-enhancing humor; and between B1 and B2 in the Self-defeating humor.

DISCUSSION – RESULT

This study was conducted with a total of 184 athletes with visual impairment, 119 males, and 65 females to learn the humor styles of athletes with visual impairment.

When Table 3, the findings regarding the participants' humor style points according to their gender, are examined, it is obvious that there is a significant difference in humor styles ($p < .05$). In other words, the males' humor style point is higher than the females' points. When the sub-factors of the humor styles are examined, it was found in the Affiliative humor ($p < 0.05$) sub-factor, according to gender, that there is a significant difference. According to these findings, males have higher point than females in the Affiliative humor. Akkaya (2006)

determined in their (his or her) study that the male students use the affiliative humor more. It was found in the Self-enhancing humor ($p < 0.05$) sub-factors, according to gender, that there is a significant difference. According to these findings, males have higher point than females in the Self-enhancing humor. Akkaya (2006) determined in their (his or her) study that the male students use the self-enhancing humor more. It was found in the Self-defeating humor ($p < 0.05$) sub-factors, according to gender, that there is a significant difference. According to these findings, males have higher point than females in the Self-defeating humor. Yerlikaya (2007) determined in their (his or her) study that the male high school students got more self-defeating humor style point than female students, and stated that the female students use humor in their daily lives in a harmless fashion. When the study of Traş, Arslan, Taş (2011) on teacher candidates' humor styles according to gender is examined, males have higher point than the females in the self-defeating humor style mean points. This is supported by the study of Kazarian and Martin (2006) that males use self-defeating humor style more in a significant way in comparison with females. It was determined in the Aggressive humor ($p > 0.05$) that there is not a significant difference. According to these findings, there is no significant difference between males and females. It was found in the study of Aslan (2006) which investigates the humor styles of teachers working in secondary schools, according to gender, that gender does not constitute a significant difference. In the study of Chen and Martin (2007), there is no significant difference between Chinese students' humor styles in terms of gender. Yerlikaya (2007) determined in their (his or her) study that the male high school students got more aggressive humor style point than female students, and stated that the female students use humor in their daily lives in a harmless fashion. Akandere et al. (2015) stated in their study that male students got more aggressive humor style point than female students. In Kazarin and Martin's study (2004) that was on Lebanon university students, and in Saroglou and Scaiot's study (2002) that was on Belgian high school students, the findings are in parallel. According to the results, the reason why the results show differences can be explained as humor differs from society to society, and this situation originates from culture. Also, we can say that it occurs because the studies consist of non-visually individuals with disabilities and that there are no studies on visually individuals with disabilities.

Table 4 which evaluates the study in terms of the findings on the participants' humor style points according to their disability status, shows that there is a significant difference on congenital and acquired visually individuals with disabilities' humor styles ($p < 0.05$). According to this, the acquired visually individuals with disabilities' point is higher than the one of the congenital visually handicapped ones. When the sub-factors of the humor styles are examined, it was determined in the Self-defeating humor ($p < 0.05$) sub-factor that the acquired visually individuals with disabilities' point is higher than the ones who are congenital visual impairment. We can say that the self-defeating humor is higher among the ones with a congenital disability than the ones with an acquired disability. We can say that this may be because the individuals with a congenital disability think that they cannot move independently, they are dependent on someone, and they cannot socialize. It was determined that there are no significant differences in the Affiliative humor ($p > 0.05$), Self-enhancing humor ($p > 0.05$), and the Aggressive humor ($p > 0.05$). Whether they are congenital or acquired when the visually individuals with disabilities' mutual point is examined, it can be said that they are individuals who can use Affiliative, Self-enhancing, and Aggressive humor effectively. It was seen that individuals who can use humor effectively are more hardworking, more productive, happier, and peaceful than

the other individuals. We think that Affiliative, Self-enhancing, and Aggressive humor has no effect on disability status, and whether or not a individual with a visual impairment is congenital or acquired, there are no significant differences between Affiliative, Self-enhancing, and Aggressive humor. Because there are no similar studies to ours, supportive findings could not be reached.

When Table 5, the findings regarding the participants' humor style points according to their sports branch, are examined, it is visible that there is a significant difference in humor styles of the individuals who are doing team and individual sports ($p < .05$). In other words, the humor style point of the ones who are doing team sports is higher than the ones doing individual sports. We think that there is a difference in the case that the visually individuals with disabilities who are doing team sports are able to turn a pickle that they experience into fun. We can say that the significant difference derives from multiple individuals in team sports because in individual sports, the person is alone, but in team sports there are many people. When the sub-factors, it is seen that of the humor styles are examined, in the Self-defeating humor ($p < 0.05$) sub-factor, it is seen that the point of humor style of the individuals who are doing team sports is higher than the ones who are doing individual sports. We think that this is because, the person with visual impairment is alone in individual sports whereas there is more than one athlete in team sports. Team sports athletes have characteristics such as to establish themselves and be close to the other athletes, but individual sports athletes do not have such characteristics, so, we think that this is the reason of the difference in terms of self-defeating humor style. It was determined that there are no significant differences in the Affiliative humor ($p > 0.05$), Self-enhancing humor ($p > 0.05$), and the Aggressive humor ($p > 0.05$) sub-factors of the athletes with visual impairment doing team and individual athletes. We can see that there is no difference in the understanding of Affiliative, Self-enhancing, and Aggressive humor styles of the athletes with visual impairment. We think there is no significant difference for the reasons that the team with visual impairment and individual athletes try to entertain others, make jokes, develop relationships with others whether handicapped or not, be positive, be good at communication, be respectful, accept the disability, make their presence felt in the society, be a part of the society and they think that they can do every sports branch even if they are handicapped, represent their country abroad; they try to tackle the life's difficulties, have a positive mood, renew themselves, be calm, be able to cope with biting words, and be rational, not sentimental.

When Table 6, the findings regarding the participants' humor style points according to their marital status, are examined, it is visible that there is are not any significant differences in humor styles of the individuals who are doing single and married ($p > 0.05$). In the study by Dinç and Cemaloğlu (2018) on the usage of humor styles of elementary school managers, it was found that there is no significant difference between teachers' marital status and humor's other aspects. When the sub-factors of the humor styles are examined, it was determined in the Self-enhancing humor ($p < 0.05$) that the singles' point is higher than the married ones. We think that this is because the single athletes with visual impairment are able to get out of any pickle, overcome stress, and look at life from a different perspective. This case is better visible in sports matches. For example, in any visually handicapped sports match, an adversity is turned into a fun situation. In the Aggressive humor ($p < 0.05$), it was determined that the married individuals' point is higher than the single ones' point. Martin et al. (2003) stated that the goal of the ones with this humor style is to ridicule, tease, humiliate, criticize, and repress people in a sexual or racist way. We think that married are aggressive because the married athletes with visual

impairment are mockers and have characteristics such as humiliation and repression. It was determined that according to marital status, there is no significant difference in the Affiliative humor ($p>0.05$). According to Hampes (2006), affiliative humor is a type of humor that consists of the ability to use humor (telling jokes, jesting etc.) as a way of entertaining and relaxing others. Affiliative humor can be seen on the athletes with visual impairment as Hampes stated. The athletes with visual impairment are witty, banterer, eloquent and have a strong memory. They make their presence know in the society. They get married to individuals that are handicapped or not. They are not dependent and are sociable. We think that there is no difference because of this. In the Self-defeating sub-factor, it was determined that there is no significant difference according to marital status ($p>0.05$). According to Hampes (2006), this humor style encompasses telling jokes and entertaining others at the cost of humiliating oneself; being ridiculed; laughing with others when one is mocked or humiliated. We think that because of their disability, the athletes with visual impairment tend to put themselves in a bad spot to establish and prove themselves.

When Table 7, the findings regarding the participants' humor style points according to their age groups, are examined, it is visible that there is not any significant differences in humor styles of the participants according to their age ($p > 0.05$). In their study on teachers, Özdemir and Receptoğlu (2010) could not find a relation between humor styles and the variables age and seniority. When the sub-factors of humor according to age groups are examined, it was determined that there is no significant difference in the Affiliative humor ($p>0.05$) according to age groups. Even if they have different ages, the athletes with visual impairment use affiliative humor style to be in contact with people, show themselves up, and make their presence known in the society. In the Self-enhancing humor ($p>0.05$), it was determined that there is no significant difference according to age groups. In the study by Akandere et al. (2015), it was found that there is no difference in terms of age groups. The athletes with visual impairment who have self-enhancing humor cope with their problems and difficulties using humor. Thus, even if they are of different ages, they realize themselves and make their presence known in the society. In the Aggressive humor ($p<0.05$), it was found that according to age groups, there is a significant difference between different age groups. The athletes with visual impairment use aggressive humor to mock and humiliate others, dominate and depress their opponent. We think that the aggressive humor has a difference because the athletes with visual impairment are of different ages. In the Self-defeating humor ($p<0.05$), it was determined that there is a discrepancy. The individuals with self-defeating humor are in a tendency to ridicule themselves instead of others (Martin et al., 2003). We think that the difference is caused because the individuals are of different ages and they are handicapped. The visually individuals with disabilities' acceptance of the disability and ridiculing themselves on their disability shows that they have self-defeating humor. As a result of the Post Hoc tests that were done in order to determine between which groups there is a differentiation, it was determined that in Aggressive humor, there are differences between ages below 18 and above 30, and between ages 18-30 and above 30; in Self-defeating humor, there are differentiations between ages below 18 and 18-30, and between ages below 18 and above 30.

When Table 8, the results of the one-way test on humor styles according to educational status are examined, it is seen that there is no significant difference in humor styles of the participants in terms of educational status ($p>0.05$). When the sub-factors of the humor styles are examined, it was found in the Affiliative humor ($p>0.05$), the Self-enhancing humor ($p>0.05$), and the

Self-defeating humor ($p>0.05$), according to educational status, there is no difference. We can say that the educational status of the athletes with visual impairment is not effective on Affiliative, Self-enhancing, and Self-defeating humor styles. We can state that because the visually individuals with disabilities have mutual expectations and similar emotions, their humor styles show no difference in terms of their educational status. In the Aggressive humor ($p<0.05$), it was determined that there is a differentiation. We can see that as the educational status of the athletes with visual impairment changes, the aggressive humor also differentiates. We can say that education is effective on the aggressive humor. As a result of the Post Hoc tests that were done in order to determine between which groups there is a differentiation in the aggressive humor, it was determined that there are differences between the graduates of elementary schools and the graduates of high schools and graduates of elementary schools and graduates of universities; however, there is no differentiation between the graduates of high schools and the graduates of universities.

When Table 9, the results of the one-way test on humor styles according to degree of vision are examined, it is seen that there is no significant difference in humor styles of the participants in terms of degree of vision ($p>0.05$). When the sub-factors, in terms of degree of vision, are examined, it was found in the Affiliative humor ($p>0.05$), and in the Aggressive humor ($p>0.05$), according to educational status, there is no significant differentiation. In other words, when the humor styles and sub-factors of the individuals with B2 and B3 disability are examined, it can be said that the levels of the Affiliative and the Aggressive humor are at the same level. We can say that humor scale sub-dimensions are related to each other and our findings show no significant difference because the visually individuals with disabilities have different degrees of vision. We can say that even if the visually handicapped have different degrees of vision, finding no significant difference in the Affiliative and the Aggressive humor styles is the indication of the individuals have the same emotions and thoughts. In the Self-enhancing humor ($p<0.05$) and the Self-defeating humor ($p<0.05$), it was found that there is a differentiation. As a result of the Post Hoc tests that were done in order to determine between which groups these differences are, it was determined that there is a difference between B2 and B3 in the Self-enhancing humor; and between B1 and B2 in the Self-defeating humor. We can say that there is a significant difference in the self-enhancing and the self-defeating humor styles of the visually individuals with disabilities with different degrees of vision. So, we can say that degree of vision affects the humor's sub-factors, and that there is a significant difference, these are the indications of their emotions and thoughts are different. Because there are no similar studies to ours, supportive findings could not be reached.

It is suggested that the effect of humor styles of the athletes with visual impairment on other individuals with disabilities' humor styles should be assessed in future studies. It is also suggested that a new study should be conducted on the investigation of how the athletes with visual impairment and other individuals with disabilities use humor and how they are affected.

REFERENCES

- Akandere, M., Yarımka, E., & Tekin, E. (2015). Investigation of Aggressive and Self-improving Humor Levels of University Students Doing and not Doing Sports, *International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports. Health and Medical Sciences*, 5(15), 1-11.
- Akkaya, M. (2011). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi becerileri ile mizah tarzları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi (İstanbul ili şişli ilçesi örneği). Yüksek lisans tezi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yeditepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Aslan, H. (2006). Ortaöğretim Kurumlarında Görev Yapan Öğretmenlerin Öğrenilmiş Güçlülük Düzeylerine ve Cinsiyetlerine Göre Mizah Tarzlarının İncelenmesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana: Türkiye.
- Allport, G.W. (1961), Pattern and Growth in Personality, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
- Bergson, H. (1945). “Gülme” (L Erire), Çev. Ord. Prof. Mustafa Şekip Tunç, İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Yayınları.
- Chen, G. & Martin, R.A. (2007). A comparison of humor styles, coping humor and menatl health between Chinese and Canadian university students. *International Journal of Humor Research*, 20(3), 215-234.
- Çakmak, S., Karakuş, G., Tamam, L., Taşdemir, A., & Karaytuğ, M.O. (2015). Tıp Fakültesi Dönem I Öğrencilerinde Mizah Tarzları Ve Benlik Saygısı İlişkisi: *Kesitsel Bir Çalışma. Çukurova Medical Journal*;40(4):782-793.
- Dinç, G.Ü., & Cemaloğlu, N. (2018). İlkokul Yöneticilerinin Mizah Kullanma Tarzları ile Öğretmenlerin Stres Yaşama Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişki ve Bazı Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi, <http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/482133>.
- Freud, S. (1905), Jokes and Their Relation to The Unconscious, London: Penguin Books.
- Güven, S. (2013) Cerrahi Kliniklerde Çalışan Hemşirelerin Mizah Tarzları ile Tükenmişlik Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin Saptanması, Başkent Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Hemşirelik ve Sağlık Hizmetleri Bölümü Cerrahi Hastalıkları Hemşireliği Programı Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara.
- Hampes, V.P. (2006). The relation between humor styles and empathy, *Europe's Journal Of Psychology*; 6:34–45
- Kayri, M. (2009). Araştırmalarda Gruplar Arası Farkın Belirlenmesine Yönelik Çoklu Karşılaştırma (Post-Hoc) Teknikleri, Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Fırat University Journal of Social Science Cilt: 19, Sayı: 1, Sayfa: 51-64, Elazığ.
- Kazarian, S.S. & Martin, R.A. (2004), “Humor styles, personality and wellbeing among Lebanese university students”, *European Journal of Personality*, 18, 209-219.
- Maslow, A. (1954), Motivation and Personality, New York: Random House
- Martin R.A. (1998), “Approachesto the sense of humor: A historical view”, (Ed:W. Ruch) The sense of humor, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Martin R.A. (2007). The psychology of humor: An integrative approach. San Diego, CA: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Martin, R.A. (1998), “Approachesto the sense of humor: A historical view”, (Ed:W. Ruch) The sense of humor, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Martin, R.A., Puhlik-Doris P, Larsen G, Gray J, & Weir K.(2003). Individual differences of 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.
- May, R. (1953), *Man's Search for Himself*, New York: Random House
- Özdemir, S., & Recepoğlu, E., (2010).Örgütsel sağlık ve mizah, V. Ulusal Eğitim Yönetimi Kongresi, Antalya, 219-229
- Sanders, B. (2001). “Kahkahanın zaferi yıkıcı bir tarih olarak gülme”, Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul,
- Saroglou, V. & Scariot, C. (2002). “Humor styles questionnaire: personality and educational correlates in Belgian high school and college students,” *European Journal of Personality*, 16, 43-54.
- Thorson, J. A. & Powell, F. C. (1993). Development and validation of a multidimensional sense of humor scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 49(1), 13–23.
- Taş, Z., Arslan, C., & Taş, A. M. (2011). Öğretmen adaylarında mizah tarzları, problem çözme ve benlik saygısının incelenmesi. *Uluslararası insan bilimleri dergisi*, 8(2), 716-732.
- Yaşar, Ö. (2018). “Siyasi Mizah Ve Y Kuşağı” *Turkish Studies Social Sciences*, 13/18, Summer, s.s. 1389-1407.
- Yerlikaya, E.E. (2003). Mizah Tarzları Ölçeği'nin (The Humor Styles Questionnaire) Uyarlama Çalışması, Adana, Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, s.48-59, Adana.
- Yerlikaya, E. (2009). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Mizah Tarzları İle Algılanan Stres, Kaygı ve Depresyon Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Doktora Tez.
- Yerlikaya, N. (2007). Lise öğrencilerinin mizah tarzları ile stresle başa çıkma tarzları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eğitim A.B.D, Adana
- www.tdk.gov.tr/index.php?option=com_gts&arama=gts&guid=TDK.GTS.5bc36cd1d863e5.59841451
erişim tarihi: 14.10.2019.