Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi / The Journal of Social Sciences

Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, Yıl: 7, Sayı: 46, Haziran 2020, s. 438-449

ISSN: 2149-0821 Doi Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/SOBIDER.43150>

Dr. Taner YILMAZ

Faculty of Sport Sciences, Uşak University, taner.yilmaz@usak.edu.tr

Dr. Şihmehmet YİĞİT

School of Physical Education and Sports, Namik Kemal University, syigit@nku.edu.tr

Eyüp ACAR

Ministry of Education Turkey, eyupacar80@hotmail.com

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE HUMOR STYLES OF THE STUDENTS MAJORING AT THE FACULTY OF SPORTS SCIENCES IN TERMS OF SOME VARIABLES

Abstract

The aim of this study is to examine whether the levels of humorous approach which is a communication way of students majoring in the Faculty of Sport Sciences differ according to demographic characteristics or not.

This academic study consists of 275 students from 210 males and 65 females studying in different departments of the Sport Sciences Faculty of Uşak University. The data in the study were obtained by using the "Personal Information Form" developed by the researcher, "Humor Styles Scale" developed by Yerlikaya (2003) which has a structure with 32 items (11 items negative, 21 items positive) with four sub-factors. Analysis of the data related to the questionnaire and scale used in the research and the scale were analyzed with SPSS 22 statistical packet program, t test was used for independent samples and other variables were analyzed by one-way variance (ANOVA) analysis. In the case of a significant difference, the variance analysis results were compared using the Tukey test.

As a result of this study; the participants were examined according to their gender, age, family income level, and whether they had a athletic license or not ; and it was found that ;while there was no significant difference in gender variable ($p > 0.05$),

there was a significant difference in age variable, family income status and being a licensed athlete. ($p < 0.05$).

Keywords: Sport, Humor, Student.

SPOR BİLİMLERİ FAKÜLTESİNDEKİ ÖĞRENCİLERİN MİZAHİ YÖNLERİNİN BAZI DEĞİŞKENLER AÇISINDAN ARAŞTIRILMASI

Özet

Araştırmanın amacı; Spor Bilimleri Fakültesinde öğrenim gören öğrencilerin bir iletişim yolu olan mizahi yaklaşımları düzeylerinin demografik özelliklere göre farklılık gösterip göstermediğinin araştırılması amaçlanmıştır.

Bu çalışma; Uşak Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi'nin farklı bölümlerinde öğrenim görmekte olan 210 erkek 65 kadın toplam 275 öğrenciden oluşmaktadır. Araştırmada veriler, araştırmacı tarafından geliştirilen 'Kişisel Bilgi formu' ile Yerlikaya (2003) tarafından geliştirilen "Mizah Tarzları Ölçeği", 32 madde (11 madde olumsuz, 21 madde olumlu) ve dört alt faktörlü bir yapıya sahip ölçek kullanılmıştır. Araştırmada kullanılan anket formuna ve ölçeğe ilişkin verilerin analizi SPSS 22programıyla, bağımsız örneklem için t testi; diğer değişkenler ise tek yönlü varyans (ANOVA) analizi ile incelenmiştir. Anlamlı farkın olması durumunda varyans analiz sonuçları Tukey testi kullanılarak karşılaştırılmıştır.

Araştırmanın sonucunda; katılımcıların cinsiyet, yaş, aile gelir düzeyi, sporcu lisansı olup olmama durumlarına göre incelendiğinde; cinsiyet, değişkeninde anlamlı bir farklılığa rastlanmazken($p > 0.05$), yaş değişkeninde, aile gelir durumu ve lisanslı sporcu olma durumlarında anlamlı farklılığa rastlanmıştır ($p < 0.05$).

Anahtar kelimeler: Spor, Mizah, öğrenci.

INTRODUCTION

As a way of communication, humor varies from person to person. Therefore, humor styles also change. Humor is the way of expressing people's reactions differently to the situations encountered by their nature, psychologically positive or negative, healthy and unhealthy aspects of the consequences of this situation, and their feelings and thoughts. The humorous aspect of the athlete is one of the statements that affect the success / failure situation.

According to the Turkish Language Association Dictionary (1969), humor is defined as "a type of word or writing that equips and explains some thoughts with humor, fun and various jokes." Not every laugh is humor, since humor can only be seen where healthy smiles occur.

A transition from usual to unusual, from ordinary to extraordinary is seen in humor. When people goes beyond expectations; humor is formed by a sudden interruption of positive and negative emotions. Also, any subject that concerns people can be a material for humor (Aydın, 2006). While humor sometimes presents some aspects of daily life in a pleasant way; sometimes reveals painful situations, strange or absurd aspects of life with a unique perspective. (Uğur, 2007). In order to create humor, the individual must configure the information coming from his memory or the environment (Yazıcı, 2013). As a result of studies related to humor by Martin and et al. (2003), four different humor styles have been identified, in which the harmonious and incompatible aspects of humor are examined. While affiliative humor and self-enhancing humor

styles are in the harmonious category; aggressive humor and self-defeating humor styles are in the incompatible category. There are four different styles of humor use in everyday life, expressing individual differences that can be determined by being compatible or incompatible and intrapsychic or interpersonal (Martin, Puhlik-Doris, Larsen, Gray ve Weir, 2003). In addition to the fact that people have four types of humor in certain extends; which of the humor styles are more dominant than others may vary according to personal differences in the use of humor. (E.E.Yerlikaya, 2009). Affiliative humor; is the usage of humor in a good tempered way to develop social relationships. Self-enhancing humor: It protects the person in the face of tension, works like a defence mechanism (Zhao et al., 2014). Self-defeating humor: The individual who uses this humor style uses humor regardless of his or her own needs (E. E. Yerlikaya, 2009). Aggressive Humor: It is the use of humor by ignoring the negative effects of the individual towards others (Martin et al. 2003).

Humor, develops with cognitive development (Kahraman, 2008). It can be understood that humor is a very comprehensive concept that contains ridiculous behaviors and words that people do or say, perceived as funny and entertaining by everyone and thus leads to laughter, and also requires the use of cognitive and emotional processes (Martin, 2007). Humor: It is also defined as "entertainment", which contains love and tolerance, does not involve mocking and fun with people's flaws and deficiencies, and is performed without any benefit (Kuiper & Martin, 1998).

Kramer (2002) states that the written documents found in archaeological excavations are an indication of the humor understanding of people who lived in the Sumerian Civilization in Southern Mesopotamia towards the end of the fourth millennium BC. Again according to Kramer (2002); Compiling and writing Sumerian proverbs with cuneiform goes back over 3500 years, and many of these proverbs have been said mouth to mouth for centuries before they were written. Öngören (1983) it emerged with all the certainty that humor was used guided and on leave during the Middle Ages, and in a way became institutionalized. The monotheistic religions that determined the medieval have banned humor in some subjects. The unique Seljuk humor is seen with the humor diversity, folkloric qualities, fairy tale, nursery rhyme, jokes and stories of Anatolian tribal culture that we encountered in Dede Korkut stories. (Öngören, 1983). We can show Keloğlan fairy tales and Nasrettin Hodja jokes as other prominent examples of humor. Bayrak states that Nasrettin Hodja, who was chosen as a spokesperson for the people, was a legend who lived in the 13th century and has been carried as a legend to the present day. (Bayrak, 2001). The humor of Seljuk era produced works in different fields such as jokes, fairy tales, nursery rhymes, stories and poetry. Although it was not claimed by the palace end the sects, humor spread among the public, developed and owned. Products such as Dede Korkut stories, Keloğlan tales and Nasreddin Hodja jokes are among the best examples of the Seljuk era humor. (Öngören, 2001). In the Ottoman era, as one of the imperial features of Ottoman humor, in which all forms of humor are seen, as well as "waggery", "joke", "wit", as well as "Karagöz", "middle play", "meddah" and similar forms of humor. Drawing attention to the fact that the different colors and shapes that come together in the part-whole relationship, Türkmen states that all of these types from fairy tales to theater live in tolerance while performing their functions (Türkmen, 2000).

This study addresses the humor styles mentioned in the Faculty of Sport Sciences' students. Because in the Faculty of Sport Sciences, humor has a helpful function in overcoming the

difficulties and problems faced by students in school and sports branches. From this point of view, humor has an effect on students at the Faculty of Sport Sciences. For this reason, this research aims to examine the humor styles of students in the Faculty of Sport Sciences.

Method

Research Group

The research group consists of 275 students, 210 males and 65 females, in order to investigate the differences in the humorous approaches of students studying in the Faculty of Sport Sciences at Uşak University in the 2019-2020 Academic Year.

Collecting data

The “Humor Styles Scale” developed by Yerlikaya (2003) has 32 items (11 items negative, 21 items positive) and a structure with four sub-factors. The sub-dimensions of the Humor Styles Scale are in an order; 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. Self-defeating Humor: 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32. Items in the scale 1-7-9-15-16-17-22-23-25-29-31 are scored in the opposite direction. In the scale, it was used a seven-point likert-type rating ranging from 1-7. 1 = "strongly disagree", 2 = "disagree", 3 = "disagree a bit", 4 = "undecided", 5 = "agree a bit", 6 = "agree", 7 = "totally agree". In this context, as the average score obtained from the scale increases, people's humor styles increase. In the study by Yerlikaya (2003), the internal reliability coefficients of the “Humor Style Scale” and sub-dimension scores are as follows: Self-enhancing humor: .78; Affiliative humor: .74; Aggressive humor: .69; Self-defeating humor: .67 and the total of the scale is .81 (Yerlikaya, 2003).

Analysis of the data

Data obtained as a result of scale application are included in SPSS 22 Statistical package program; test for independent samples on gender, age, family income level, and whether they have a athlete license; other variables were analyzed by one-way variance (ANOVA) analysis. In the case of a significant difference, the variance analysis results were compared using the Tukey test.

Results

In this section, the answers given by students regarding their humorous aspects and their scores are presented by statistical method and compared and interpreted.

Table 1. Comparison of university (Faculty of Sport Sciences) students with gender differences and humor styles scores

Sub-dimensions of Humor	Gender	N	X	SS	T	P
Self-enhancing Humor	Male	210	38,8000	5,92359 6	-,319	.750

	Female	65	39,0769	6,673894		
Affiliative Humor	Male	210	36,4524	5,658556	,859	,391
	Female	65	35,7385	6,462094		
Self-defeating Humor	Male	210	35,6857	5,116470	-,327	,744
	Female	65	35,9231	5,078471		
Aggressive Humor	Male	210	39,5286	6,733594	1,234	,218
	Female	65	38,3231	7,344445		
Total Humor	Male	210	150,4666	16,38359	,586	,559
	Female	65	149,0615	18,48637		

When the table is analyzed, no significant difference was found between gender differences and humor styles of university students $p > 0.05$.

Table 2. Comparison of university (Faculty of Sport Sciences) students with age differences and humor styles scores

Sub-dimensios of Humor	Age	N	X	SS	F	P
Self-enhancing Humor	17-19 age	10	35,5000	6,8516	3.121	,026
	20-22 age	190	39,1842	6,0808		
	23-25 age	68	37,9852	5,8322		
	26.....	7	43,5714	5,1269		

Affiliative Humor	17-19 age	10	33,2000	3,8528	1,266	,286
	20-22 age	190	36,5526	5,9080		
	23-25 age	68	35,8676	6,0146		
	26.....	7	37,4285	4,1975		
Self-defeating Humor	17-19 age	10	33,4000	6,3456	1,202	,309
	20-22 age	190	35,9631	5,0167		
	23-25 age	68	35,3088	5,2069		
	26.....	7	37,2857	3,9880		
Aggressive Humor	17-19 age	10	38,4000	9,0209	1,948	,122
	20-22 age	190	39,5526	7,0975		
	23-25 age	68	38,0294	5,8666		
	26.....	7	43,8571	5,2734		
Total Humor	17-19 age	10	140,5000	19,3060	3,316	,020
	20-22 age	190	151,2526	17,0960		
	23-25 age	68	147,1911	15,5162		
	26.....	7	162,1428	9,8391		

When the table is examined; while there is no significant difference between the age differences and humor styles sub-dimensions of university students, affiliative humor, self-defeating, aggressive humor $p>0.05$, there was a significant difference between the age groups and the total scores of humor styles and the self-enhancing humor sub-dimension total scores $p<0.05$. In the post hoc Tukey test to determine between which groups the difference is; it has been seen that there was a significant difference between the total scores of humor styles and the self-enhancing humor sub-height between the 17-19 age group and the group of 26 and over. According to this difference, the humor style scores of the students of the Faculty of Sports Sciences aged 17-19 are significantly lower than the total score of the humor styles of the students of the Faculty of Sports Sciences aged 26 and over.

Table 3. Comparison of university (Faculty of Sport Sciences) students' family income and humor styles scores

Sub-dimensions of Humor	Family Income Status	N	X	SS	F	P
Self-enhancing Humor	1.000-1.1999	76	40,3158	6,59739	2,579	,054
	2.000-2.999	89	38,8876	5,50091		
	3.000-3.999	53	38,1321	5,32786		
	4.000....	57	37,5789	6,68406		
Affiliative Humor	1.000-1.1999	76	37,0789	6,23701	3,186	,024
	2.000-2.999	89	36,8090	5,58585		
	3.000-3.999	53	36,4906	5,37667		
	4.000....	57	34,2105	5,83015		
Self-defeating Humor	1.000-1.1999	76	36,8289	5,35758	2,950	,033
	2.000-2.999	89	34,5730	5,23730		
	3.000-3.999	53	36,2453	4,49318		
	4.000....	57	35,6491	4,78648		
Aggressive Humor	1.000-1.1999	76	40,4211	7,07533	1,749	,157
	2.000-	89	38,6854	6,80006		

	2.999					
	3.000-3.999	53	39,8679	6,72549		
	4.000....	57	37,9649	6,78487		
Total Humor	1.000-1.1999	76	154,644	17,4667	3,566	.015
	2.000-2.999	89	148,955	16,2543		
	3.000-3.999	53	150,735	15,0347		
	4.000....	57	145,403	17,5355		
			5	3		

When the table is examined, while there is no significant difference between the family income status of the Faculty of Sport Sciences students and their humor styles sub-dimensions, self-enhancing humor and aggressive humor ($p>0.05$), but there was a significant difference between family income status and humor styles total score, affiliative humorsub-dimension, self-defeating humor sub-dimension total scores. ($p<0.05$). In the post hoc Tukey test to determine which groups the difference is, it was seen that there was a significant difference between the groups with humor styles total scores and the family income status of the affiliative humorsub-dimension between 1.000-1.999 and 4.000 and above. In terms of family income status and self-defeating sub-dimension, there was a significant difference between groups with family income status of 1,000 and 2,000-2,999. Considering this difference, it can be said that those whose family income is between 1.000-1.999 and those whose family income is 4.000 and above, their humor styles total score and affiliative humorsubscale scores are significantly higher.

Table 4. Comparison of university (Faculty of Sport Sciences) students' athlete license status and humor styles scores

Sub-dimensions of Humor	Athlete License Status	N	X	SS	T	P
Self-enhancing Humor	Yes	138	38,8478	5,81202	-048	,637
	No	137	38,8832	6,39401		

Affiliative Humor	Yes	138	36,3261	6,39019	,121	,006
	No	137	36,2409	5,28250		
Self-defeating Humor	Yes	138	36,1522	5,41679	1,341	,080
	No	137	35,3285	4,74204		
Aggressive Humor	Yes	138	39,3261	6,72414	,199	,840
	No	137	39,1606	7,07339		
Total Humor	Yes	138	150,6522	17,14075	,510	,744
	No	137	149,6131	16,65932		

When the table is analyzed, while there is no significant difference between the athlete license status of the Faculty of Sport Sciences students and their total score of humor styles, self-enhancing humor sub-dimension, self-defeating sub-dimension, and aggressive humor sub-dimension $p>0.05$, there was a significant difference between athlete license status and affiliative humorsub-dimension total scores $p<0.05$.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The answers given by the students participating in the research according to their humorous status were compared with the results obtained by reviewing the literature and evaluation of the results was made.

Considering self-enhancing humor, affiliative humor, self-defeating, aggressive humor styles; when examined by gender, age, family income level, and whether they have a athlete license; the result is that; while there is no significant difference in gender, there is a significant difference in age, family income status and being a licensed athlete. It has been concluded that male students use aggressive humor style and self-defeating style more (N. Yerlikaya, 2007).

In a study on humor styles by E.E.Yerlikaya (2009), a negative correlation was found between coherent humor styles and perceived stress, anxiety, and depression by coping with humor.

It has been observed that aggressive humor style was not related to perceived stress, anxiety and depression and also it was observed that there is a low level of meaningful relationships between self-defeating and perceived stress, anxiety and depression. Findings suggest that

humor styles do not have a regulatory role in the relationship between difficult living conditions and negative emotional mood. In the relationship between daily troubles and negative mood, only aggressive humor has been determined to have a regulatory role.

According to the findings of a study with high school students; it is concluded that prosocial behavior has a positive relationship with shyness, anger and humor. (Özdemir, 2010).

As a result of a research conducted by Ay (2011) with secondary school students, it was found that affiliative humor and self-enhancing humor had a positive meaningful relationship with life satisfaction, and aggressive humor and self-defeating had a negative relationship with life satisfaction. Apart from the affiliative humor style, it was seen that other humor styles have positive relationship with creativity. Nezelek & Derks (2001) conducted a study to investigate the relationship between social communication and psychological harmony by using humor as a coping mechanism. The results of the study conducted with university students showed that; those who use humor as a means of coping tool are satisfied with their social lives, they trust themselves more in their communications and their psychological adaptation is better. We see that the blind athletes differ in their aggressive humor as their education level changes. We can say that education is effective on aggressive humor (Dalbudak, & Yaşar, 2020). It was observed that individuals with self-concept (ego) had a lower level of making mistakes and exhibiting aggressive attitude (Yiğit, Yılmaz, Acar & Dalbudak 2019).

Saroglou & Scariot (2002), in a study with high school students, examined the mediating role of humor styles in the relationship between personality characteristics and school performance. Extroverted individuals tend to use more affiliative humor and aggressive humor, while neurotic individuals tend to use more self-defeating humor. In their study, Erickson & Feldstein (2007) concluded that affiliative and self-enhancing humor styles positively correlated with healthy coping styles, while aggressive and self-defeating styles positively correlated with unhealthy coping styles. The effects of sports affect the “self-esteem” of individuals positively (Yiğit, & Ramazanoğlu, 2016). When the studies in the literature are analyzed, it is seen that positive humor styles are the well-being, hope, and mental health of the individual (Westerman, Spies, Stahl & Hesse, 1996; Peterson & Park 2009; Jovanovic, 2011; Westerman, Spies, Stahl, & Hesse, 1996), and negative humor styles are negative variables (Torres-Marín, Navarro-Carrillo, & Carretero-Dios (2018) such as anger control. People who improve themselves by putting forward innovations, try to reveal their differences, and develop different solutions when faced with problems are those creative people who develop positive humor styles. Creative people are more sensitive to the environment and people (Yiğit, 2019).

As a result, when self-enhancing humor, affiliative humor, self-defeating humor, aggressive humor styles were examined in students of Faculty of Sports Sciences according to their gender, age, family income level, and whether they have a sports license; there is no significant difference in gender but a significant difference was found in the age variable of the students, their family income status and being a licensed athlete.

REFERENCES

- Ay, Ö. (2011). *Orta öğretim öğrencilerinin mizah tarzları ve yaratıcılık düzeylerinin yaşam doyumu düzeylerini açıklayıcı rolü.* (yüksek lisans tezi). Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi. Tokat.
- Aydın, İ. S. (2006). Türkçe derslerinde mizah kullanımının öğrenci tutum ve başarısına etkisi (İzmir ilköğretim 8. sınıf örneğinde) (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Bayrak, M. (2001). *Halk gülmecesi.* Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Dalbudak, İ. & Yaşar, Ö. (2020). Investigation Of The Humor Styles Of Athletes With Visual Impairment. The Journal of Social Science, Yıl: 7, Sayı: 44, Şubat 2020, s. 349-366.
- Erickson, S. J., & Feldstein, S. W. (2007). Adolescent humor and its relationship to coping, defense strategies, psychological distress and well-being. *Child Psychiatry and human development*, 37(3), 255-271.
- Jovanovic, V. (2011). Do humor styles matter in the relationship between personality and subjective well-being? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 52, 502-507
- Kahraman, F. (2008). Ergenlerde arkadaşlık ilişkisi ile mizah duygusu arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Kramer, S. N. (2002). *Tarih Sümer’de başlar.* İstanbul: Kalcı.
- Kuiper, N. A. ve Martin, R. A. (1998). Is sense of humor positive personality characteristic. W. Ruch (Ed), *The Sense Of Humor.* New York, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Martin, R. A. (2003). Sense of humor. *Positive Psychological Assessment: A Hand book of Models and Measures*, 313-326.
- Martin, R. A. (2007). *The Psychology of Humor An Integrative Approach.* USA: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Martin, R. A., Puhlik-Doris P., Larsen G., Gray J. ve Weir K. (2003). Individual Differences in Uses of Humor and Their Relation to Psychological Well-Being: Development of the Humor Styles Questionnaire. *Journal of Research in Personality*, (37), 48-75.
- Nezlek, J. B., & Derks, P. (2001). Use of humor as a coping mechanism, psychological adjustment and social interaction. *Humor*, 14(4), 395-413.
- Öngören, F. (1983). *Cumhuriyet dönemi türk mizahı ve hicvi (1923-1983).* Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Öngören, F. (2001). Mizahın değişkenliği. *Güldiken Mizah Kültürü Dergisi*, 10, 11-12.
- Özdemir, Z. (2010). *Lise öğrencilerinin prososyal davranışlarının; mizah, öfke ve utangaçlık düzeylerine göre incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Peterson, C. & Park, N. (2009). Classifying and measuring strengths of character. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of positive psychology* (2nd edn) (pp. 25-33). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Saroglou, V. ve Scariot, C. (2002). Humor style questionnaire: personality and educational correlates in Belgian high school and college students. *European Journal of Personality*, 16, 43-54
- Torres-Marín, J., Navarro-Carrillo, G., & Carretero-Dios, H. (2018). Is the use of humor associated with anger management? The assessment of individual differences in humor styles in Spain. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 120, 193-201.

- Türk Dil Kurumu Sözlüğü, (1969).
- Türkmen, F. (2000). Osmanlı döneminde Türk mizahı. *Türk dünyası incelemeleri dergisi*, 1,10.
- Uğur, İ. (2007). Televizyon reklamlarında mizahın kullanımı (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Westerman, R., Spies, K., Stahl, G. & Hesse, F. (1996). Relative effectiveness and validity of mood induction procedures. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 557–80
- Yazıcı, H. (2013). Bektaşî fıkralarının mizah anlayışı ve işlevi bağlamında bireysel ve toplumsal ruh sağlığı. *Türk Kültürü Ve Hacı Bektaş Veli Araştırma Dergisi*, 65, 281298
- Yerlikaya, E. E. (2003). *Mizah tarzları ölçeğinin uyarlama çalışması*. (yüksek lisans tezi). Çukurova Üniversitesi. Adana.
- Yerlikaya, E. E. (2003). *Mizah tarzları ölçeğinin uyarlama çalışması*. (yüksek lisans tezi). Çukurova Üniversitesi. Adana.
- Yerlikaya, E. E. (2009). Üniversite öğrencilerinin mizah tarzları ile algılanan stres, kaygı ve depresyon düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.
- Yerlikaya, N. (2007). *Lise öğrencilerinin mizah tarzları ile stresle başa çıkma tarzları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. (yüksek lisans tezi). Çukurova Üniversitesi. Adana.
- Yiğit, Ş. (2019). Spor Yapan Öğrencilerin Kişilik Özelliklerinin Yaratıcılık Düzeyleri Üzerine Etkisinin Araştırılması. *Spor Bilimleri Alanında Araştırma Ve Değerlendirmeler-2019* ss.117-131/Haziran.web:www.gecekitapligi.com.www.gecekitap.com.
- Yiğit, Ş. Yılmaz, T. Acar, E. & Dalbudak, İ. (2019). An Investigation Of Self And Aggression Levels Of Weightlifters. *International Journal of Applied Exercise Physiology* 2322-353Vol.8 No.3.
- Yiğit, Ş. & Ramazanoğlu, F. (2016). The analysis of self-esteem level of the school of physical education and sports students participating in intercollegiate football contests. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 13(3), 5587-5594.
- Zhao, J., Kong, F. & Wang, Y. (2014). Exploring the mediation effect of social support and self-esteem on the relationship between humor style and life satisfaction in Chinese college students. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 64, 126-130.