

Sense of Humor, Perceived Social Support, Subjective Life Satisfaction and Resilience Among Adults

Akhila Krishnan R. S.¹

¹Assistant Professor Department of Psychology Christ Nagar College, Maranalloor

Publication Date: 2025/11/21

How to Cite: Akhila Krishnan R. S. (2025) Sense of Humor, Perceived Social Support, Subjective Life Satisfaction and Resilience Among Adults. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 10(10), 3304-3339.
<https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25oct346>

ABSTRACT

As individuals navigate the multifaceted dynamics of contemporary existence, understanding the factors that contribute to holistic well-being of paramount importance. The primary objective of this investigation is to illuminate the nature of relationship between sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction, and resilience particularly within the context of adult individuals. The study employs a quantitative research design, adopting a descriptive methodology. A sample size of 150 adults, ranging in age from 18 to 40 years belonging to various demographic backgrounds from Kerala were collected using convenience sampling technique. Participants were tasked with completing structured questionnaires comprising the Multidimensional Sense of Humor Scale, the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support, the Satisfaction with Life Scale, and the 14-item Resilience Scale (RS-14). Preliminary findings suggest a significant positive association between sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction and resilience. Moreover, a strong positive correlation was observed between perceived social support and resilience. No obvious difference was observed based on age. Furthermore, the research revealed that individuals with higher educational attainments exhibited heightened appreciation for humor and resilience. Additionally, those engaged in employment displayed conspicuously elevated levels of resilience and life satisfaction relative to their unemployed counterparts.

Keywords: *Sense of Humor, Perceived Social Support, Subjective Life Satisfaction, Resilience, Adults.*

TABLE OF CONTENT

Title Page		3304
Abstract		3305
Table of Content		3306
List of Tables		3307
CHAPTER ONE	INTRODUCTION	3308
CHAPTER TWO	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	3315
CHAPTER THREE	METHODOLOGY	3318
CHAPTER FOUR	RESULT AND DISCUSSION	3320
CHAPTER FIVE	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	3330
	REFERENCES	3332
	APPENDICES	3334

LIST OF TABLES

Table No	Tittle	Page No
1	Relationship Between Sense of Humor, Perceived Social Support, Subjective Life Satisfaction and Resilience	3320
2	Sense of humor, Perceived Social Support, Subjective Life Satisfaction and Resilience based on Age.	3322
3	Sense of Humor and Resilience Based on Educational Qualification.	3323
4	Sense of Humor with respect to Educational Qualification.	3324
5	Resilience with respect to Educational Qualification.	3324
6	Social Support and Subjective Life Satisfaction based on Educational Qualification	3325
7	Sense of Humor and Perceived Social Support with respect to Employment Status.	3326
8	Subjective Life Satisfaction and Resilience with Respect to their Employment Status	3327
9	Subjective Life Satisfaction with respect to Employment status	3328
10	Resilience with respect to Employment status	3328
11	Tenability of Hypotheses	3331

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

In recent years, there has been a shift in mental health from a focus on individual weakness to a more enlightened focus on individual strengths. In contrast to psychological theories and research on well-being and quality of life that traditionally focused on the influence of negative factors, an alternative perspective has emerged in the past few decades that greatly broadens its focus toward a positive factor such as resilience, optimism, patience, hope, and happiness and others. This paradigm shift has thrown insight into the quality of human performance and, more recently, how these positive traits can help people resolve, function well and optimally in humans. The changes and occasions which cause stress must be experienced by individuals in very way of life. Unpleasant events will grow challenges for people. These challenge triggers humans' capacity to have a high exertion, enthusiasm and strength in confronting challenges and willingness to change. People apply a few methodologies related to change that can often assist them to adjust with the adverse circumstance. One such methodology is resilience which is one of the greatest ponders within positive psychology.

A. *Resilience*

The term resilience comes from the Latin verb 'resilire', which means to "bounce back" or "leap back." The capacity and ongoing process of handling stress and difficult situations while still keeping mental and physical health in good shape is termed resilience" (Russo et al., (2012); Rutter (2012; Southwick & Charney(2012). It is often described as the ability to "bounce back" or "overcome" hardship and end up in a better place. "Resilience is a process that changes depending on the events and challenges you face in life" (Lee et al., 2013). The idea of resilience may be divided into two categories: resilience as a characteristic trait ("bouncing back") and resilience as a developmental process (dynamic process) through which people cope successfully to significant life stressors which transform as time passes by. It is often swayed by protective factors. (Luthar et al., 2000; Dyer J. G & McGuinness T.M. 1996; Southwick and Charney, 2012; Masten & Obradovic, 2006; Connor & Davidson, (2003); Lee et al., 2013)). Theoretical hypotheses and empirical findings suggest that resilience can be conceptualized differently as unidimensional or multidimensional construct. Heterogeneity in the understanding the concept of resilience has emerged from debate about the difference between human limits (internal and external) as a stable protective factor and mechanism. Personality traits can be inherited genetically and can reduce the effects of negative stressors, support positive coping skills, facilitate individuals to achieve developmental goals, and help people achieve good adjustment. Understanding that resilience is a dynamic process of multiple interactions emerged from the interaction between various constitutional, biological, cognitive, personal, and contextual factors.

"Resilience is defined as the effective mobilization of internal and external resources that can begin at any point in life, usually when facing adverse life situations or traumatic experiences and on whether that person adapts, copes, and recovers quickly from major challenges as such. "(Wagnild & Young, 1993; Lutha & Cicchetti, 2000; Mancini and Bonanno, 2009; Luthar et al., 2000; Wright & Masten, 2005; Feder et al., 2010; Fergus S. & Zimmerman M.A, 2005; Gartland D. et al., 2011; Masten, 2011; Bonanno et al., 2012; Masten A.S & Narayan A.J, 2012; Fletcher D & Sarkar M, 2012;). Werner (1995) cited three common uses of resilience: good developmental results despite high-risk situations; stress tolerance; and trauma recovery. Luther called resilience a 'two-dimensional construct:' critical adversity and positive adaptation and resilience is inferred indirectly from the evidence of these dimensions (Luthar, 2006, Masten, 2001; Yates et al., 2003; Sroufe L.A et al., 2005).

➤ *Sources of Resilience*

• *Personal Factors*

Resilience isn't just one trait; it's a mix of many personal strengths. Being outgoing and friendly, staying open-minded, and having a strong sense of self-worth all help us bounce back. Turning tough experiences into meaningful parts of our life story, keeping hope alive, and believing in something bigger than ourselves also strengthen resilience. Research from top scholars shows that mental sharpness, flexible thinking, strong social skills, and a clear self-concept are key components. Good emotional regulation, a positive outlook, and overall emotional well-being further protect us. Hope, optimism, creative problem-solving, and the ability to adjust to change all closely relate to resilient behavior.

Beyond the individual, factors like age, gender, race, and ethnicity influence how resilience manifests. The dynamics within groups and the quality of relationships also play a part. The exact impact of these factors depends on how researchers define and measure resilience, but it's clear that both personal traits and social context are essential in building a resilient mindset.

• *Biological Factors*

Recent exploration of research in biological and genetic factors found that harsh early environment can affect brain structure, function, and neurobiological systems which cause change in brain size, neural networks, the sensitivity of receptors, and the synthesis and reuptake of neurotransmitters. These physical changes can eventually exacerbate or enhance vulnerability to future psychopathology and can influence the capacity to moderate negative emotions, thereby affecting resilience to adversities. Strong evidence suggests that supportive, sensitive early caregivers in infancy and childhood can enhance resilience and reduce the effects of so-called toxic environments. Research on healthy people exposed to childhood maltreatment have found biological variables

associated with resilience. Studies have also found that personality, cortisol, and dehydroepiandrosterone were independent contributors of resilience.

- *Environmental–Systemic Factors*

Resilience is connected with a variety of microenvironmental characteristics, including relationships with family and friends. Safe connection, stable family, and secure bond to mother with a non-violent parent, good parenting skills and absence of maternal depression or substance abuse are associated with lesser behavioural problems and much better psychological well-being in maltreated children. On a macrosystemic level, Resilience is influenced by a number of community-based variables, including quality public schools, accessible services, chances for sports and the arts, cultural elements, spirituality, and religion, as well as a lack of violent trauma. In spite of strong findings, good social policy has been neglected in resilience in policy (Masten & Wright, 2010, p. 125).

B. Humor

The fundamental meaning of humor is "a positive emotion known as mirth, which is elicited in social contexts by a cognitive appraisal process that incorporates the perception of playful, nonserious incongruity and is demonstrated by laughing, both vocally and facially." (Martin, 2006). In relation to this notion, humour is composed of four segments: behavioral-vocal, emotional, cognitive-perceptual, and social (Martin, 2006). Humour is often communicated in regards to interactions with others and human contact. The mechanisms involved in creating and understanding hilarious communications as amusing are referred to as the cognitive perceptual module. The third focusses on the related emotional aspects. In summary, it is known that generating humour generates mirth, which is a pleasurable emotional response. Discussions of humour studies extend back to the era of the ancient Greek philosophers Plato and Aristotle. "Personal characteristics which promote resilience and mental health by promoting cognitive reappraisal in challenging circumstances" is the way positive psychology explains humour (Fritz et.al., 2017; Kuiper, 2012). Humor is an important personality trait. Freud saw sense of humor as one of the The most efficient defensive system and survival skills for dealing with adverse life situations and to overcome obstacles (Rice ,2009). In a broad sense, humor is a structure that includes combination of interest, knowledge and behaviour (Martin, 2004).

- *The Nature of Humor*

"Humour is basically a positive emotion called mirth, that is expressed by the facial and vocal behaviour of laughter and is usually elicited in social settings by a cognitive appraisal mechanism comprising the perception of playful, nonserious incongruity" (Martin, 2006). Humour is a complicated and multidimensional phenomenon that may take many different shapes and is made up of many elements. Humor is seen as a global and culture bound element.

- *Sense of Humor*

In positive psychology, bringing a sense of humour is a vital characteristic . People that have a sense of humour are able to laugh at jokes, comprehend humorous things, and see the humour in everything. The capacity to "see the funny side" of existence and challenges when under stress and to retain a humorous viewpoint in the face of stress are essential coping skills that support improved psychological wellness, according to Martin Seligman (Martin, 2007). Furthermore, a vital social skill for fostering social cohesion and support is the capacity to make people laugh and capitalise on humour to accelerate up communication while minimising interpersonal anxiousness. Contemporary psychology refers "Stable variations in humorous cognitions and behaviours" is how modern psychology defines sense of humour (Ruch, 1998; Martin,2007). Certain types of humour are more upbeat than others. The following are the four categories of humour. Affiliative humour fosters a sense of community and well-being. The capacity to laugh at oneself when something goes wrong is known as self-enhancing humour. Self-defeating humour (the capacity of making light of circumstances) and aggressive humour (the ability to laugh at or disparage others) are two distinct categories of humour. (Wilhelm, 2016; Martin, 2003).

C. Social Support

Social support is a crucial indicator of sound psychological and physical health. It is an individual's cognitive perception that helps people establish a reliable bond with others and by means, others provide support to them. Social support is defined as the "assistance available to form social connections with other groups, individuals, and the wider community" (Lin et. al., 1979). Perceived social support refers to "how individuals interpret the availability of reliable connections with others, believing that these relationships can offer assistance when needed "(Yamaç, 2009). This support manifests in several ways: emotional support, expressions of love, care, and kindness; instrumental support, ie., tangible help such as financial aid or material resources; informational support, which provides advice, suggestions, or useful information; and companionship support, which creates a sense of that one belongs to a group.

"Social support is also defined as a network of friends, neighbours, relatives, and community members who are available when needed and can offer psychological, material, and financial assistance" (Drageset,2021). "Asian cultures tend to rely as well as aim for support from the people around them because their culture is more collectivist when compared to western culture, which is more individualistic in nature" (Taylor et al.,2004). According to studies on gender disparities, "women have better social support than men" (Thoits, 1995). Social support also indicates clear links with the physical well-being of an individual, for e.g., "people with low social support are at a much higher risk of deaths that are caused by a variety of diseases" (Uchino, 2004). The role of social

support is very important as it can boost psychological health and well-being. “Social support can be considered as a coping mechanism” (Vungkhanching et al., 2017) to help people stand up against adversity. Studies on human has shown a lower level of social support linked with physiological and neuroendocrine reactivity to heightened stress and increased heart rate, bp, and cardiovascular and neuroendocrine reaction to laboratory stressors.

D. Subjective Life Satisfaction

Positive psychology often looks at how people can perform better, thrive well, feel well and be well in the long run. According to Peterson's 2008 study, positive psychology investigates the scientific examination of the elements that endow life with deep meaning. Subjective well-being serves as a framework through which we can comprehend how this inherent value is perceived variably by each individual. People interpret and evaluate their surroundings through the lens of their personal expectations, beliefs, principles, and past experiences, highlighting the essential role of the subjective viewpoint in influencing life quality. Well-being can be categorized into three distinct types: evaluative well-being, which pertains to satisfaction with one's life; hedonic well-being, which includes a spectrum of emotions such as sadness, happiness, resentment, anxiety, and discomfort; and eudemonic well-being, which relates to having a sense of purpose and meaning in life. Subjective well-being is a complex concept that has been characterized as “an individual's evaluations of their own life that encompass both their thoughts and feelings,” as noted by Diener and his associates in 2002. As a result, SWB is defined as “a combination of an overall evaluation of life satisfaction along with the comparative ratio of individuals experiencing positive emotions to those undergoing negative emotions” (Diener et al., 1991).

➤ Components of SWB:

Subjective well-being (SWB) is typically viewed as comprising three elements (Diener, 1984; Busseri & Sadava, 2011; Tov & Diener, 2013). These elements include frequent positive affect [such as joy and optimism], infrequent negative affect [such as sadness and anger], and cognitive assessments of life satisfaction. According to Diener, Emmons, & Larsen, "Life satisfaction is a judgmental and cognitive process." (Diener, Emmons, & Larsen, 1985) in which individuals assess the quality of their lives based on various criteria. Subjective life satisfaction is a salient philosophy within positive psychology framework. Apart from experimental calculation on well-being which involve extraneous factors like income or education, subjective life satisfaction focuses on individuals' internal assessment of existence and the extent to which individual feel content fulfilled and happy. Life satisfaction is an individual perspective i.e., general evaluation of the entirety of one's life or some aspects of life (family life and educational experience). The indication of harmony between a person's desires and their actual satisfaction with life. On other terms, "The larger the gap between a person's desires and their present circumstances, the lesser their satisfaction level" (Pavot & Diener, 1993; Diener & Diener, 2009). "Life satisfaction frequently serves as an indicator of the quality of individuals' lives and is regarded as a significant measure of subjective well-being (SWB)" (Diener et al., 2003; Schimmack, 2008).

E. Theoretical Review

➤ Resilience

The notion of resilience, rooted in developmental research and systems theory, suggests that “even in the face of adverse or unpleasant life situations, protective factors can lead to favorable outcomes and the development of positive personality traits” (Bonanno, 2004; Ungar, 2004). “Among the protective traits identified are skills in emotional management, inner thinking, academic and career development, self-esteem repair, planning, life skills, problem-solving, and resilience” (Ungar, 2004).

Researchers have identified three models of resilience: the compensatory model, the challenge model, and the protective factor model contrasting immunity with vulnerability.

Werner and Smith pinpointed “four essential traits: an active problem-solving approach, a tendency to find the positive even in challenging situations, the ability to persuade, positive attention from others, and a strong reliance on faith to sustain a positive outlook on life” (Werner & Smith, 2001).

The compensation model better describes resilience as a factor that works against or in the opposite direction of risk factors. “Resilience factors have a direct effect on the results that are independent of the impact of risk factor's” (Andersson & Ledogar, 2008). The challenge model “views that if a risk factor is not excessively severe, it can actually aid with adaptation. In essence, the experience gets the person ready for the subsequent challenge” (O'Leary, 1998). The protective factor model of resilience, ‘there is an interplay between protection and risk factors that minimizes the likelihood of a negative outcome and moderates the effect of risk exposure’ (O'Leary, 1998).

• Transactional Model of Resilience:

This model, developed by Rutter emphasizes the “two-way connection between a person and their surroundings” (Rutter, 1987). It acknowledges that an individual's resilience can affect how they shape their environment, and vice versa. This dynamic interaction contributes to the development of resilience over time.

• Post-Traumatic Growth (PTG) Theory:

While not a traditional resilience theory, PTG suggests that individuals can experience personal growth and positive changes

after experiencing trauma or adversity. This growth can encompass aspects like increased appreciation for life, enhanced personal relationships, and a sense of new possibilities.

- *Socioecological Model:*

Building on the ecological systems theory, this model expands the concept of resilience to encompass not just individuals, but also communities and societies. It recognizes that resilience operates at multiple levels, from individual to societal, and is influenced by factors such as social networks, cultural norms, and government policies.

- *Resilience as Positive Adaptation:*

This theory focuses on an “one's ability to maintain their overall well-being and functioning despite challenging circumstances” (Joyce et al., 2018). Resilience is seen as a “holistic process that involves cognitive, emotional, and behavioural responses” (Folkman S., 1997).

- *Dual-Process Model of Coping:*

Folkman's “dual-process model suggests that Coping encompasses both problem-focused strategies, which involve directly addressing stressors, and emotion-focused strategies, which aim to regulate emotional responses” (Folkman S., 1997).

- *Dynamic Systems Theory:*

This approach views resilience as emerging from the dynamic interactions of various elements within a system. Resilience is seen as a result of the system's ability to self-organize, adapt, and find new equilibrium after disruption.

- *Transactional Model:*

Lazarus R and Folkman S's model highlights the “role of cognitive appraisal in stress and coping. Resilience emerges when an individual views a stressor as manageable and possesses ‘effective coping strategies’” (Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S., 1984).

- *Ecological Systems Theory:*

Urie Bronfenbrenner, “highlights the interconnectedness between individuals and their surroundings.. Resilience is seen as a product of interactions between an individual's characteristics, family dynamics, social networks, and broader societal factors” (Bronfenbrenner, 1977, p. 513).

➤ *Humor*

Contemporary renaissance theory on humor has focused on “deepening our understanding of the facilitative effects of humor” (Kuiper, 2010). A variation of three major traditional theories of humor involves the superiority theory, the relief theory, and the incongruity theory. Modern humor theories are revised and expanded using concepts the basic foundation (Morreall, 1987).

- *The Superiority Theory:*

Plato, Aristotle, and Hobbes saw humor as “a manifestation of an underlying vertical association among source and the target of the humorous message in a way that identifies the existence of a dominant-inferior relationship associated with parties involved in the humor” (Morreall, 1987). Superiority theories entail comparing others to one self in which the inferior qualities and subordinate position of the other relative to the self are acknowledged. the theory hence view mockery and ridicule are unavoidable in humor (Keith-Spiegel, 1972). Superiority theories also work to point a particular social function by means of social commentary. For instance, Bergson considered humor as a punishment inflicted on unsocial persons. Thereby, “humiliation is set off as a social corrective” (Bergson, 1911; Keith- Spiegel, 1972).

- *The Relief Theory:*

Spencer and Freud claim the capacity of humor to release tension and thereby bring relief, i.e., venting of excess energy (Morreall, 1987, p. 6). This surplus energy results in strain and tension in the person. Humor function as a mechanism by which the brimming tension is released and thereby provides reprieve to the person (Keith-Spiegel 1972). This is usually connected to societal taboos that are often closed in normal conversations but would then find their way to the shoal by way of comical behaviours and conversations.

Psychoanalytic theory holds a likely view with the relief-release theories which emphasis on how laughter is brought on by unused psychic energy. Freud view humor as a relief from societal demands of saintliness and reasonableness (McGhee, 1979). This characteristic explains for the experience of nervous laughter and also adds to the contention that humor help people to cope with adverse situations.

- *The Incongruity Theory:*

Kant, Schopenhauer, and Kierkegaard hold that the elements of surprise and novelty in humor are crucial in the humorous act or message. The key to humor is the unexpected turn in the sequence of delivery of the humorous event or message (Morreall 1987). The theory maintains that “humor is experienced when individual perceive a mismatch in the stimuli (usually ideas) presented that

are interpreted as being at odds with what is common or habitual” (Keith Spiegel, 1972). Closely associated with this theory is “surprise theories which give premium on the experience of 'suddenness' and novelty as an essential aspect in the acknowledgement of humor. Both theories involve an instantaneous breaking up of the routine course of thought or action” (Keith-Spiegel, 1972).

Sociological perspective, emphasized that the “attention of humor researches can be encompassed into three areas – 'as an indicator of intergroup conflict, as a way of managing intragroup behaviours, upholding a feeling of closeness and intimacy inside the group, and keeping a connection that is humorous” (McGhee 1979, p. 28). "Heartily laughing together forms an immediate bond, much like enthusiasm for the same ideal," (Lorenz, 1963). Laughter forms a link and simultaneously draws a line. (Levine 1969,).

- *Cognitive-Neurophysiological Theories:*

These theories explore the brain's response to humor by investigating the neural pathways and cognitive processes involved. They suggest that humor involves complex cognitive functions such as pattern recognition, semantic processing, and executive functions, all of which contribute to the experience of finding something funny.

- *Cultural and Contextual Theories:*

Humor often depends on cultural context, and what is considered funny can vary widely across cultures.

➤ *Social Support*

Perceived social support refers to an individual's perception of the availability of assistance, understanding, and emotional connection from their social network. It plays a crucial role in “mental and emotional well-being, affecting coping mechanisms, stress levels, and overall quality of life” (Wills & Shinar, 2000). The theoretical frameworks that underpin the concept often include the following:

- **Social Support Theory:** This theory emphasizes the “positive impact of social relationships on an individual's psychological and physical well-being. It suggests that having strong social connections and receiving support from others can buffer the effects of stress and promote better health outcomes” (Cohen, S., & Wills, T., 1985).
- **Social Network Theory:** This theory examines the structure of an individual's social network and how it influences access to various types of support. The size, composition, and quality of one's social network can impact the availability and effectiveness of social support.
- *“Theoretical Models of Social Support Subjectify Two Important Dimensions:*
- ✓ **Structural Dimension:** includes network size and frequency of social interactions, and
- ✓ **Functional Dimension:** includes emotional (like getting love and empathy) and instrumental (like receiving financial gifts or help with childcare) elements” (Gamper, M., 2022).

➤ *Subjective Life Satisfaction*

Some of the theoretical frameworks have been proposed to understand subjective life satisfaction are as follows:

- **Hedonic Well-Being Theory:** This theory suggests that “subjective life satisfaction is influenced by the “balance between positive and negative emotions” (Kahneman, 1999).
- According to this theory, “individuals assess their overall life satisfaction based on the net number of positive experiences and emotions compared to negative ones” (Kahneman, Diener, & Schwarz, 1999).
- **Self-Determination Theory** indicates that “people who believe they have control over their lives, are skilled in their endeavors, and maintain significant social relationships are more prone to experience greater levels of life satisfaction” (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Deci & Ryan, 2016: p9).
- **Sociocultural Theory:** Lev Vygotsky emphasizes the influence of social and cultural factors on life satisfaction. “It suggests that societal norms, values, and comparisons with others play a significant role in shaping an individual's perception of their own life satisfaction” (Vygotsky, 1978).
- **Bottom-Up vs. Top-Down Theories:** Bottom-up theories emphasize the role of individual circumstances and experiences in shaping life satisfaction, while top-down theories highlight the influence of cognitive processes and individual personality traits.

➤ *Statement of the Problem*

The study seeks to investigate nature of relation between factors such as sense of humor, perceived social support, individual satisfaction with life, and the capacity for resilience within adult individuals.

➤ *Variables*

The variables in the current study are sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction and resilience. Sociodemographic variable involves age, educational qualification and employment status. In the present study existing standardized research questionnaires were used to assess these variables. A number of studies have statistically analysed and tested the

questionnaires in order to corroborate the reliability and validity.

➤ *Definition of the Key Terms*

- Resilience: The is the mental reserve of power and capacity to bounce back and overcome difficulties and failures.
- Sense of humor: “Ability to retain a light-hearted attitude in the midst of stress and to "see the funny side" of life's troubles and difficulties “ (Martin, 2001).
- Perceived Social Support: It is an individual's cognitive perception that helps people establish a reliable bond with others and by means, others provide support to them.
- Subjective life satisfaction: Life satisfaction is a judgmental and cognitive process where in, people evaluate the quality of their life based on an array of criteria.

➤ *Hypothesis*

- There will be no significant relationship between sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction and resilience.
- There will be no significant difference between age group with respect to sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction and resilience.
- There will be a significant difference between sense of humor and resilience with respect to education qualification.
- There will be no significant difference between perceived social support and subjective life satisfaction with respect to education qualification.
- There is will be significant difference between sense of humor and perceived social support with respect to employment status.
- There will be no significant difference between subjective life satisfaction and resilience with respect to employment status.
- There will be no significant difference between age group with respect to sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction and resilience.
- There will be a significant difference between sense of humor and resilience with respect to education qualification.
- There will be no significant difference between perceived social support and subjective life satisfaction with respect to education qualification.
- There is will be significant difference between sense of humor and perceived social support with respect to employment status.
- There will be no significant difference between subjective life satisfaction and resilience with respect to employment status.

➤ *Rationale of the Study*

The study seeks to navigate the intricate association with sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction, and resilience among adult individuals. These psychological constructs play crucial roles in shaping individuals' psychological well-being and overall adaptive functioning. This endeavour holds significance as it can throw light into the mechanisms that underlie individuals' ability to navigate challenges, maintain positive emotional states, and foster supportive social connections. Understanding the relation and potential causal mechanisms between these variables holds significance in both theoretical and practical contexts, as it provides insights on interventions aimed at enhancing humor appreciation, social support perception, and resilience which might positively impact individuals' subjective life satisfaction. Through a systematic exploration of these factors, the study plans to contribute to the to the current body of information in the realm of psychological well-being and set the stage for informed approaches to promote mental health and holistic thriving among adults. The rationale behind this investigation lies in the potential synergy between these factors. Empirical understanding on the relation of these factors on resilience throws knowledge on its potential as a tool for strengthening resilience. The solidarity study in understanding the protective role of sense of humor has been shown to have various psychological and social advantage. The study seeks to uncover the intricate connections between these psychological constructs among adults

Adults make significant contributions to the present and future of the nation, and their functioning is impacted by their mental health. Adulthood is usually a time when happiness and life satisfaction of individuals are met with life challenges like demands of education, academic success, finding a job, creating a good financial support, and maintaining a successful family life. Majority of the foreground studies have examined and explored resilience and subjective life satisfaction on high-risk population especially adolescents, young adults and elderly. Therefore, an empirical investigation concerning resilience on general adult population is necessary since resilience is an essential component in individual to enhance daily performance and engagement. Few research explored the interrelatedness of sense of humor, perceived social support and satisfaction with life on resilience especially in Indian adult population hence, a structured analysis on relation among this positive constraint can be useful in this particular context. Therefore, studying how resiliency connects to life satisfaction can be an important research topic because these factors are complex. These connections have been supported by theory. In the end, understanding how these psychological factors work together can help create better ways to support mental health and improve people's overall life experiences. This study can guide the creation of programs and support systems that help find ways to build resilience in adults. Practitioners can develop targeted strategies to foster a more robust psychological framework for adults. “Such interventions can be instrumental in equipping individuals with effective tools to maneuver through the intricacies of life, cope with stressors, and ultimately bolster their overall

mental and emotional health”(Leff, S. S., Hoffman, J. A., & Gullan, R. L., 2009). In doing so, it holds the potential to enhance the quality of life for adults and equip them with valuable resources to thrive amidst life's myriad challenges. As the global terrain continues to evolve, equipping individuals with the tools to cultivate resilience becomes paramount. This study endeavors to illuminate the interconnected web of subjective life satisfaction, social support, sense of humor, and their combined impact on resilience in building and bolstering adult population.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

➤ *Resilience - A Conceptual Framework*

Resilience is a multifaceted concept that has been studied in many fields such as psychology, education, organizational context, and sociology. Apart from conventional theories the last two decades have witnessed the emergence of alternative theories that expanded the “foundations of developmental psychology to examine the individual, quality of life environment and context” (Windle, 2011; Zautra, Hall & Murray, 2008).

Theoretical ideas and real-world studies show that resilience can be seen in different ways, either as one main part or as several parts working together. Seeing resilience as something with many parts comes from understanding it as an ongoing process where different factors like genes, biology, thinking, personal traits, and environment all play a role. The way a person interacts with their surroundings helps them learn and adjust over time, leading to long-term positive outcomes. “The study of resilience must be sensitive to sociocultural factors that contextualize its meaning among different populations” (Windle et al., 2011; Wiles et al., 2012; Wong P. T. P & Wong L. C. J. (2012); Donnellan W.J et al., (2015), Campbell-Sills & Stein M.B, (2007); Ungar M & Liebenberg L, (2011); Wyche et al., (2011); Aiena B.J et al., (2015).

Conceptual view on resilience have drawn attention to chronic stress and trauma, which are important throughout the stages of development. Nevertheless, studies have been conducted particularly among adolescent and youth across various aspects and contexts. Trait resilience as an individual variable has been found to improve well-being and cope with stressful situations. “Resilience also promotes more holistic thinking and innovation in different areas of life and are better able to manage themselves” (Catalano et al., 2011; Taku, 2014; Ining et al., 2014; Oginska-Bulik & Kobylarczyk, 2016, Sagone & De Caroli, 2013, 2014, Weselska et al., 2009).

Extensive literatures have demonstrated the different roles of resilience and its multifaceted effects on academic performance (Rao & Krishnamurthy, 2018); Mwangi et al., 2015; Lee, 2009). “A research study focused on the positive emotions experienced by students predicted a rise in resilience and life satisfaction (also serving as a mediator between initial and final resilience), whereas negative emotions showed a minimal or negligible impact and do not hinder the advantages of positive emotions.” (Liu et al., 2013, Kohn et al., 2009, p. 361). “Resilience is associated with adolescent life satisfaction, better subjective quality of life, better understanding of the educational environment and significantly better social problem-solving skills, especially in an academic setting” (Abolghasemi.A & Varaniyab.S.T, 2010; Tempiski et al., 2015; Patri & Ford, 2016; Bhawna Sharma, 2015). Mirza and Arif explained about “The individual factors related to creativity, internal locus of control, self-esteem, self-efficacy, autonomy, problem-solving abilities, optimism, sense of humor, stress management skills, and the teacher-student relationship that influenced resilience and academic achievement in high- risk students” (Mirza & Arif, 2018).

“Resilience is a key indicator of a person's successful adaptation to changing life circumstances” (Diener E. et al., 1999; Abolghasemi.A & Varaniyab.S.T, 2010). “Resilient youth have been found to be more resistant to negative peer influences associated with risky behaviour in connection to addictive behaviour” (Rubin et al., 1998, Ali et al., 2010). The study of resilience must be sensitive to sociocultural factors that contextualize its meaning among different populations (Windle et al., 2011; Wiles et al., 2012; Wong P. T. P & Wong L. C. J. (2012); Donnellan W.J et al., 2015, Campbell-Sills and Stein M.B, 2007; Ungar M and Liebenberg L, 2011; Wyche et al., 2011; Aiena B.J et al., 2015). Optimism is an important internal resource of resilience (Vaillant, 2007), Kumpfer 1999).

Windle et al. in conducted a multivariate analysis of psychological resilience in old age using confirmatory factor analysis to test validity found a low correlation between resilience indicators and socio- political dimensions and a moderate correlation with other measures (Windle & Bennett, 2011).

➤ *Humor- A Conceptual Framework*

“Humour is featured as a universally positive trait that makes the greatest contribution to enjoyment in life” (Peterson & Seligman, 2007). A wide array of mechanisms and processes contribute to these beneficial effects, which include “the emotional regulation of negative feelings through humor and cognitive reappraisals that help individuals distance themselves from stressful life situations” (Kuiper, Martin, & Olinger, 1993). Many researchers associate laughter with humor and use the two terms interchangeably. However, “humour and laughter are closely related but certainly not the same” (Mulder & Nijholt, 2002). Deaner & McConatha (1993) indicated that “students scoring high on all humor also tended to score high on the extraversion and emotional stability, and lower on the depression. Gender was not significant to these associations”. Franzini and Haggerty (1994) “compared sense of humor across mixed gender groups of program managers, humor seminar students and undergraduates”. Results from one-way analyses of variance suggesting that females, on average, tended to enjoy humorous interaction more than males. For participant groups, humor seminar students were particularly sensitive to potential sources of humor in everyday life. Studies on workplace comedy explained the influence motivation, affect, and cognition in reducing stress, alleviating tension, and maintaining cohesion. Humor studies have established themselves in fields such as “linguistics and social sciences” (Robert and Yanan, 2007; Wijewardena

et al., 2017). Malone (1980) posited ironic and counter-intuitive events “in the workplace, a growing literature in business management, leadership, and organizational psychology” has proliferated (Dekker & Rotondo, 1999; Schell & Goeckel, 2017). There is a history of research trying to “define the construct of humor”, however, this goal has always been “hampered by the complexity of conceptualizing it” (Pulhik-Doris, Larsen, weir, (2003); (Robert, Yan, (2007); (Warnars-Klever-Laan; Oppenheimer, (1996). Humour has been identified as a component of resilience that mediate adaptive coping (Erickson & Feldstein, 2007); (Kuiper et al., 1993) and has formed the ground for therapeutic treatments to reducing distress (Erickson & Feldstein 2007); (Kuiper et al., 1993). Humor is a natural coping mechanism against stressors of both personal and environmental nature and in combating fatigue (Gladding, 1995); (Chan, 2003). A study among young adults predicted reduction in negative humor style in enhancing happiness and act to as a protective factor of resilience (Shelia M. Kennison, 2021 Exercise is found to positively affects wellbeing and strengthens interpersonal relationships in reducing stress (Erickson & Feldstein, 2007; Cheng & Wang, 2015; Ruch, 1998).

Previous research has shown that “humor enhance the negative effects of life stress promote a greater level of social support than humourless counterparts” (Factor, M. H. , 1998). Apart from “study on use of humor as a coping mechanism, other researches involve the innovative use of humor in everyday filming to document adolescents at risk, the use of humor to improve their socio emotional functioning during typical encounters”; “the study of high school students use of humor to cope with stress during college preparation ; and the study on older women’s use of humor when confronted with upsetting situations” (Cameron & Cameron, 2010; Shaunessy & Suldo, 2010; Matsumoto, 2009). Sense of humor can be viewed as one of the most important facets of personal resiliency in individuals dealing with high levels of trauma, or other stressful circumstance. Process orientation model highlights the importance of managing negative and positive emotions in mediating coping and development. “Study on elderly residents assisted in living also reported to have “humor-related benefits for coping with stressful life events” (Kuiper, Nicholas A, 2012; Westburg, 2003). Epidemiological studies have provided consistent evidence and research on the importance of humor as a personal aspect of resilience. One such study showed that “Norwegian patients with end-stage renal disease” (survival rate across 2 years) had a 31% higher survival rate in individuals with great humor compared to people with low humor. (Svebak, Krisoffersen & Aasord, 2006). Svebak, Romundstad, and Holmen (2010) expanded “the scope by tracking the relationship between humor and survival in more than 50,000 participants in Norway (period of 7 years) and found a significantly lower hazard ratios for individuals with greater humor abilities regardless of gender and current health status (poor to good), but less so after the age of 65. In addition, the study might also benefit from individual difference in other models of sense of humor to broaden the spectrum of humor attributes that might be a characteristic attribute to resiliency approach” (Herzog & Strevey 2008; Svebak et al., 2010). A study by Mona et.al (2020) on creativity, “sense of humor and patience among 165 medical graduates found a significant relationship and interrelatedness among these variables and as an adaptation strategy in daily life can help stimulate creativity and energy”. Martin et al. (2003) explained “sense of humor as a complex attribute with individual difference involving four main styles: affiliative, self-enhancing (adaptive aspects of sense of humor) aggressive, and self-defeating humor (negative or unfavourable characteristics of this personality” (Kuiper, Kirsh, & Leite, 2010; Martin, 2007). A sample of 1,000 Indian students concluded that gender- related differences in resilience, emotional regulation, peer relationships, humor styles, and self-esteem concluded that “resilient individual experienced greater emotion regulation, positive humor, and peer relationship” (Singh.et.al, 2021). Therefore, many of these works addresses issues such as whether “humor can modulate coping with stressful events or whether humor can improve interpersonal and social relationships” (Martin, 2007).

➤ *Social Support- A Conceptual Framework*

Social support is the support an “individual receives from their relationships with other people, groups, and the wider community to help them cope with various problems in their lives” (Lin, N et. al., 1979). Social support is an key component for building healthy and good relations. Lin (2019) “investigated the effects of bullying experience on social support, personal resilience and self-efficacy in Chinese and German university students. The study showed that social support, personal resilience and self-efficacy influenced the mental health of victims of bullying”. Andrew (2019) “examined the influence of resilience social support, life satisfaction and gratitude among police officers with depression post-hurricane Katrina” (Andrew, 2019). The results indicated that “life satisfaction through social support and gratitude facilitate resolution of depressive symptom”. Wang (2018) “identified the relationship between social support, self- efficacy and job satisfaction among 747 nurses and found that co-worker support has a positive effect on nurses’ self-efficacy and resiliency, demonstrating the need for a positive work environment to support collaboration”. Li et. al., (2021) “research on the effects of social support and resilience on the mental health of different age groups during the COVID- 19 through interactive analyses indicated that resilience had a positive relationship with mental health, and social support served as a barrier against the negative influence of low resilience”. Research supported that “social support is important feature of resilience when it is viewed as a process or outcome” (Sippel L. M. et al., 2015). Social support is considered as a subjective “perception of meaningful caring and concern in others which promotes the formation of resilience and gives individuals the strength to face adversity and improves one’s adaptability and quality of life” (Spatuzzi et al., 2016). Yang (2018) looked at how “stress and life satisfaction were affected by resilience and social support” among 426 patients with drug use disorders in the rehabilitation centre “resilience and social support play a very significant role in alleviating patient’s stress level with SUD”. Narayanan (2016) found a “strong relationship between self-efficacy and social support for students’ resilience”.

Roslan (2015) “examined relation between, optimism and social support in resilience among students internationally and concluded that optimism and social support is one of the major features of resilience”. A study conducted by Kanak Mirchandani (2021) “on the relationship among Social Support, Self-Efficacy and Resilience” in 140 adults of age 20-50 years from Indian

population selected randomly found “positive correlation between social support & self- efficacy and self- efficacy and resilience”.

➤ *Subjective Life Satisfaction- A Conceptual Framework*

Well-being is an important value for human lives, and is considered as an indicator of social progress. The objective and subjective well-being approaches are the two primary methods that researchers have suggested for measuring overall well-being. Subjective well-being is the scientific term denoting happiness, is a crucial value in human lives, and reflection on its content have been done since ancient times. Many studies have examined “demographic variables that can predict well-being such as age, sex, socioeconomic status, marital status, educational level, income” (Vera-Villarroel, et al., 2012). “Other studies have also looked into the association between subjective well-being and internal factors and human strengths like gratitude, self-esteem, self-efficacy, optimism, forgiveness, hope, meaning in life, social self- efficacy, loneliness and shyness” (Hombrados-Mendieta et al., (2013), Li et al., (2014), Snyder & Lopez, (2007). “Happiness in particular can be defined as satisfaction with life in general”, or as sociologist Veenhoven (1984) suggested it as the length to which a person value the overall life quality favourably. Therefore, resilience can be considered an important determinant of improved subjective wellbeing. An article presented by Elżbieta Kasprzak (2010) Regarding the “relationship between life satisfaction, interpersonal relationships, and social support, it was found that the most significant factor influencing life satisfaction were practical support and the satisfaction along relationships with friends”. Following social skill training the factors which were relevant before the training appeared to be insignificant later, emotional support, satisfaction with family relationships and the number of friends gained its importance. According to Diener et al. and Schimmack (2008), “life satisfaction refers to a person's overall cognitive assessment of their level of contentment with their own life as a whole”. It is an important indicator of many aspects of “positive personal quality including psychological, social, interpersonal, and intrapersonal outcomes” (Proctor et. al., 2009). Another study investigated the resilience as a subjective indicator of well-being among 327 university students in India and showed that “resilience partially mediated the relationship between intelligence and life satisfaction” (Badri Bajaj, Pande, 2015)).

The mediating influence of psychological health in the relationship between resiliency and life satisfaction also shows that resiliency is very effective in the boosting of psychological health and life satisfaction (Poorsardar, Abbaspoor, Zarrin & Sangari, 2012). A study examining the dynamics of a set of variables contributing to life satisfaction among 1,188 teenagers shows direct predictors of family support, emotional regulation, and resilience of life satisfaction. “Emotion regulation and social support indirectly affect adolescent life satisfaction through resilience” (Azpiazu L., et al, 2021). “Depression is not a significant predictor of resilience, although perceived social support and life satisfaction are” (Sahin & Karatas, 2015). “Research has also found that life satisfaction is directly related to perceived social support and self- esteem” (Wang & Kong (2013)).

Earlier research has looked into and investigated how resilience affects high-risk populations, particularly adolescents, young adults, and the elderly. Since resilience is a crucial element in individuals to improve everyday performance and engagement, an empirical examination into its impact on the whole adult population is required. With a background of the environment, family and social support, individual can maintain a higher level of psychological well-being. However, studying individual who have resisted the challenges and problems of stressful life and have better mental health can be an effective step. In this regard, the present study aimed at responding to this question that whether individuals’ psychological resilience can be predicted by taking into consideration the structures these factors or not. By investigating association among sense of humor, social support, subjective life satisfaction and resilience, new insights into the structure of constructs and their relationship can be obtained. Thus, the study may generate important insights into the concepts of investigation and by generating, hypotheses about directed, causal or predictive relationships among these constraints.

Considering the aforementioned studies, this solidarity study aims to investigate the role of humor, perceived social support, and subjective life satisfaction. Although earlier research has examined the connections between these elements and their impact on mental health outcomes, there has been insufficient focus on their complex interactions and the collective influence they have on promoting resilience. Consequently, this research aims to fill this gap by exploring the roles of subjective life satisfaction, social support, and humor in their combined effect on resilience.

CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY

In any area, research is a scientific way of finding out information. This part talks about the group of people studied, how they were chosen, how many were included, how the information was gathered, the tools used to collect the data, and the methods used to analyze it. This study examines how a sense of humor, feeling socially connected, and personal happiness affect resilience in adults.

A. Research Design

In light of the present study a descriptive research design was utilized. For the purpose of gathering information regarding the variables of the study, survey approach utilizing questionnaires was used.

B. Sample

A total sample of 150 adult population within age range of 18-40 years belonging to different socioeconomic status were collected by using the convenience sampling method. The respective sample consists of 72 male and 78 female participants belonging to various districts of Kerala.

➤ Inclusion Criteria

The participant between age group of 18-40 years involving male and female from different sociodemographic background, in Kerala were included in the study.

➤ Exclusion Criteria

People who were mentally challenged, have learning disabilities and those who are below 18 years and above 40 years of age were excluded.

➤ Ethical Consideration

Informed Consent Form: An informed consent form which includes the terms of confidentiality and the purpose of the study was given to the participants to ensure their voluntary participation in the study.

➤ Procedure For Data Collection

For the purpose of data collection, responses were collected from individuals by providing questionnaires directly and also by sharing google forms. The participants were chosen according to convenience. Consent from participants was taken and built a healthy rapport with them. In both forms of data collection, individuals' voluntary participation was ensured. The consent form and the personal data sheet used for data collection have been enclosed in the appendix. After establishing rapport, the questionnaires were provided, and participants were informed about all the required details for filling up the questionnaires and were asked to carefully read the instructions given in the questionnaires. The participants were also requested to give honest responses and to give responses to every item of the questionnaires. 10-20 minutes were given for completing the questionnaires. After data was collected, scoring was done and subjected to statistical analysis.

C. Tools used for Data Collection

The tools used for collecting data from the sample are:

➤ Multi-Dimensional Sense Of Humor Scale (MSHS) (Thorson, J. A., Powell, F. C, Sarmany-Shuller, I., and Hampes, W. P. (1997)).

The MSPSS is a 12-item questionnaire created to assess how much support individuals feel they receive from friends, family, and partner. The MSPSS evaluates how strongly respondents believe that each of these sources contributes to their sense of social support. A Likert scale (5-point) is used to measure the MSHS, with higher scores suggesting a stronger sense of humour. The score for any blanks is 2, and the scores for the following items are reversed: 4, 8, 11, 13, 17, and 20. The MSPSS is extremely reliable, with alphas ranging from .90 to .95 for the subscales and .91 for the entire scale. The MSHS has established good construct validity.

➤ Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS) (Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., and Farley, G. K. (1988))

The MSPSS comprises a 12-item tool crafted for evaluating an individual's perceived social support from three distinct origins: family, friends, and a significant other. This instrument gauges the degree to which respondents discern and interpret social support emanating from these specific sources. The total score is then divided by the scale's number of items. In this context, elevated scores indicate heightened levels of perceived support. Notably, the MSPSS exhibits strong internal consistency, indicated by alpha coefficients of 0.91 for the scale and ranging from 0.90 to 0.95 for its respective subscales. The authors assert the scale's favourable test-retest reliability. The MSPSS also demonstrates robust factorial validity, as well as concurrent validity.

➤ *Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) (Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., and Griffin, S. (1985).*

The 5-item Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) is part of research that examines subjective well-being, specifically focusing on cognitive-judgmental aspects of overall life satisfaction. Each item is rated on a scale from 1 to 7, ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." Higher scores reflect increased levels of life satisfaction; total scores can vary from 5 to 35, representing the sum of the individual item scores. The 5 items included in the SWLS were selected from a larger pool of 48 based on factor analysis. With a reliability alpha of .87, this instrument demonstrates very strong internal consistency. Additionally, it shows excellent test-retest reliability with a correlation of .82 over a two-month period, indicating its stability. The concurrent validity of the SWLS has been assessed using two samples of college students, with scores linked to nine indicators of an individual's subjective well-being.

➤ *Resilience Scale- 14 (RS-14) (Wagnild, 2009)*

The Resilience Scale 14 (RS-14) is a brief self-assessment tool created to evaluate an individual's resilience, which refers to their ability to adapt and recover effectively from difficult situations. As a shortened version of the original Scale (RS-25), the RS-14 seeks to provide a practical and efficient approach for measuring resilience in both research and clinical settings. The scale consists of 14 items, requiring participants to rate each item using a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (representing strong disagreement) to 7 (representing strong agreement). The internal consistency coefficient varies from .73 to .94 (Wagnild, 2009; Wagnild & Young, 1993). Cronbach's alpha falls between .89 and .96. The RS-14 has demonstrated strong construct validity, showing positive correlations with other assessments of well-being, coping abilities, and psychological adjustment, as evidenced by more than 12 published studies (Wagnild, 2009). In each of these studies, the correlations revealed consistent (positive) relationships with tools measuring similar constructs, and inverse (negative) relationships with tools measuring different constructs (Wagnild, 2009).

➤ *Personal Data Sheet*

To collect the sociodemographic details of the participants a personal data sheet was provided which included the variables such as name, age, gender, stream of study and involvement in athletic activities.

D. Statistical Techniques used for Analysis

The following statistical techniques were employed for data analysis. The data was analyzed using SPSS-22 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) version.

➤ *T-Test:*

A t-test, which is a parametric statistical test, was utilized to compare the means of two groups. This test relies on the t-distribution and is deemed suitable for assessing the significance of a sample mean or the significance of the difference between the means of two samples.

➤ *Pearson Product-Moment Correlation:*

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, commonly referred to as the Pearson correlation coefficient, quantifies the strength of the linear correlation between two variables and is denoted by the letter *r*. The Pearson correlation coefficient, *r*, indicates how closely the data points align with the line of best fit that the Pearson product-moment correlation aims to establish across the data.

➤ *One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA):*

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) is a statistical method used to compare two or more means. This parametric statistical test was developed by R.A. Fisher. ANOVA is designed to test general differences among means rather than specific ones. A one-way ANOVA analyzes the variation among group means within a sample, concentrating on a single independent variable or factor. This test is employed to evaluate hypotheses, seeking to explore various distinct explanations for the data being studied. In the context of ANOVA, the independent variable is divided into different groups, allowing for the comparison and determination of differences among three or more categorical groups. This analysis aids in establishing whether statistical differences exist between these groups. A one-way ANOVA is also referred to as one-factor ANOVA.

CHAPTER FOUR RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The research examines the impact of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction, and resilience in adults. A sample of 150 adults aged 18-40 was selected from various districts in Kerala. The variables of interest—sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction, and resilience—were assessed using standardized questionnaires. Descriptive statistical methods were employed for data analysis. Among the 150 participants, 72 (48%) were male, and 78 (52%) were female (mean=1.52, SD=0.50). Their ages ranged from 18 to 40 years (mean=1.3, SD=0.47). In terms of educational qualifications, 32 participants held diplomas, 45 were postgraduates, and 73 were undergraduates (mean=1.62, SD=0.74). Regarding employment status, 35 were unemployed, 53 were employed, and 62 were students.

The normality of the data was assessed through skewness and kurtosis values. Given that the data followed a normal distribution, appropriate parametric tests were applied. SPSS version 22.0 facilitated the analysis. The statistical techniques employed included t-tests, Pearson's Product Moment Correlation, One-way ANOVA, and the Post hoc-Duncan test. Additionally, the study explores the effect of demographic variables (age, educational qualification, employment status) on humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction, and resilience. The results for the variables of interest are presented in tables, and the findings are discussed in relation to the study's objectives and hypotheses.

➤ *The Relationship Between Sense of Humor, Perceived Social Support, Subjective Life Satisfaction and Resilience Among Adults.*

The major objective of the study was to find the relationship between sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction and resilience. Pearson's product moment correlation method was used for analysis. The findings for the correlation between resilience, subjective life satisfaction, perceived social support and sense of humor among adults are shown in table 1.

Table 1 Relationship Between Sense of Humor, Perceived Social Support, Subjective Life Satisfaction and Resilience.

Variables	r				sig
	Resilience	Subjective Life Satisfaction	Perceived Social Support	Sense of Humor	
Resilience	-	.315**	.825**	.345**	.000
Subjective Life Satisfaction	.315**	-	.445**	.361**	.000
Perceived Social Support	.825**	.445**	-	.587**	.000

* Correlation is Significant at the 0.01 Level (2-Tailed).

The results obtained from the Pearson correlation analysis, as presented in Table 4.1 unveil significant associations between various psychological dimensions among the study's adult participants.

Notably, the correlation coefficients are as follows: the relationship between resilience and subjective life satisfaction yields a value of $r = 0.315$, signifying a statistically significant moderate positive correlation at a 0.01 significance level ($p = 0.00 < 0.01$). When a person's resilience increases, their life satisfaction also increases. Conversely, when their resilience declines, their satisfaction with life tends to decrease.

Similarly, the correlation coefficient linking resilience and perceived social support stands at $r = 0.825$, demonstrating a pronounced and statistically significant strong positive correlation at the 0.01 significance level ($p = 0.00 < 0.01$). When resilience increases, their perceived social support also tends to increase. Conversely, when their resilience declines, their perceived social support tends to decrease.

Moreover, the correlation between resilience and sense of humor presents a coefficient of $r = 0.345$, with statistical significance observed at the 0.01 level ($p = 0.00 < 0.01$), indicating a notable and statistically moderate positive relationship. When a person's resilience increases, their sense of humor also tends to increase. Conversely, when their resilience declines, their sense of humor tends to decrease.

Concurrently, the correlation analysis unveils that perceived social support and subjective life satisfaction manifest a moderate positive correlation with a coefficient of $r = 0.445$, reaching statistical significance at the 0.01 level ($p = 0.00 < 0.01$). As an individual's perceived social support rises, their overall life satisfaction generally improves. On the other hand, when their perceived social support declines, their life satisfaction tends to decrease.

Moreover, a notable moderate positive correlation is observed between subjective life satisfaction and sense of humor, indicated by a correlation coefficient of $r = 0.361$ ($p = 0.00 < 0.01$). As an individual's sense of humor improves, their life satisfaction generally increases. Conversely, a decrease in their sense of humor is associated with a decline in life satisfaction.

The connection between perceived social support and sense of humor also reveals a significant and moderate positive correlation, represented by a correlation coefficient of $r = 0.587$ at the 0.01 significance level ($p = 0.00 < 0.01$). When a person's perceived social support rises, their sense of humor tends to improve as well. Likewise, a reduction in perceived social support correlates with a decrease in their sense of humor.

This outcome leads to the robust conclusion that substantial positive and linear associations exist between these psychological constructs. These findings align cohesively with prior empirical research (Castella Sarriera et al., 2015; Mahanta & Aggarwal, 2013; Şahin et al., 2019; Shiyue Cao et al., 2022). Additionally, the study by Dehghani and Mehran Azadi (2018), utilizing pathway analysis, substantiates the positive interconnections between humor, social support, and life satisfaction. Furthermore, empirical evidence underscores the influential role of interpersonal relationships and a strong sense of humor in enhancing life satisfaction and resilience (Pietrzak et al., 2010; Yildirim & Arslan, 2019; Erickson & Feldstein, 2007; Kuiper et al., 1993; Kanak Mirchandani, 2021). This symbiotic relationship fosters a cycle of positivity that contributes to stress alleviation, fortification of social bonds and support networks, and the nurturing of emotional well-being.

From the above results, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction and resilience among adults is rejected. Thus, it can be concluded that there is a strong positive and linear relation between all the four factors.

➤ *Difference Between Age Group with Respect to Sense of Humor, Perceived Social Support, Subjective Life Satisfaction and Resilience.*

Table 2 Sense of Humor, Perceived Social Support, Subjective Life Satisfaction and Resilience Based on Age.

Variables	Age	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Sig
Sense of humor	18-29	99	57.99	5.44	1.34	.168
	30-40	51	55.89	4.07		
Perceived Social Support	18-29	99	25.36	1.22	1.13	.818
	30-40	51	22.42	2.43		
Subjective Life Satisfaction	18-29	99	60.83	1.28	-1.06	.141
	30-40	51	61.42	1.20		
Resilience	18-29	99	63.08	0.692	.572	.391
	30-40	51	61.78	1.21		

Correlation is Significant at the 0.05 Level.

Table 2 represents the scores of sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction and resilience with respect to age group.

The mean value of sense of humor for 18–29 year (N-99) is 57.99 (S.D. = 5.44) and for 30–40 years age group (N-51) is 55.89 (S.D. = 4.07). The obtained t-value is 1.34 and p-value is 0.168. Thus, the t- value is not significant at 0.05 level i.e., there is no significance between age and sense of humor ($p > 0.05$). The mean value of resilience for 18–29-year (N-99) is 63.08 (S.D. =15.18) and for 30-40 years age group (N-51) is 61.78 (S.D. = 14.17). The obtained t-value is 0.572 and p-value is 0.391. Thus, the t- value is not significant at 0.05 level ($p > 0.05$). The mean value of subjective life satisfaction for 18–29-year (N-99) is 63.08 (S.D. =0.69) and for 30-40 years age group (N-51) is 61.78 (S.D. = 1.21). The obtained t-value is 0.572 and p-value is 0.391. Thus, the t- value is not significant at 0.05 level ($p > 0.05$). The mean value of perceived social support for 18–29-year (N-99) is 25.36 (S.D. =1.22) and for 30-40 years age group (N-51) is 22.42 (S.D. = 2.43). The obtained t-value is 1.13 and p-value is 0.818. Thus, t- value is non-significant at 0.05 level ($p > 0.05$). The comparison of the mean from the above table shows that there is not much difference in mean among sense of humor, resilience and subjective life satisfaction between the two-age group. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted.

The impact of humor, social support, life satisfaction, and resilience is substantial across various age groups. Diverse age-related patterns of response are observed. Empirical research by Greengross (2013) demonstrates that older individuals tend to

derive greater enjoyment from humor, even when encountering difficulty in comprehending jokes. However, the frequency of laughter among older adults is comparatively lower than that observed in younger adults. This insight is substantiated by a body of literature featuring meta-analyses and prior investigations, characterized by theoretical premises and empirical findings that present a mixture of perspectives concerning the influence of age on humor. While some scholars argue for age-based distinctions (Martin et al., 2003; Bell et al., 1986; Erickson & Feldstein, 2007;; Folkman& Lazarus, 1980; Chen & Martin, 2007, Kazarian & Martin, 2006; McCrae, 1984), others maintain contrary viewpoints (Führ, 2002; Tümkaya, 2011; Liu, 2012). Certain studies yield inconclusive outcomes (Feldman et al., 1996; Erickson and Feldstein, 2007). Folkman & Lazarus (1980) and McCrae (1984) propose that individuals at all life stages experience advantageous effects from positive humor, resilience, and social support. However, consensus remains elusive regarding the role of age in shaping humor, social support, subjective life satisfaction, and resilience.

A study examining diverse age groups among older adults (45-64, 65-74, and 75 years and older) found no substantial age-related differences in resilience (Hamarat et al., 2002). Moreover, comprehensive “meta-analyses” (Feng Jiang et al., 2020, Snyder-Mackler et al., 2020, Jaime Vila, 2021, Cantril & Inglehart, 1965, 1990) elucidate the absence of a discernible age effect on resilience, sense of humor, and social support, a conclusion that aligns with the outcomes of the present investigation. According to the empirical results obtained from the current study, it can be concluded that age has a minimal impact on the levels of humor, social support, life satisfaction, and resilience. Difference between sense of humor and resilience with respect to their education qualification.

The One-way ANOVA test was carried out to compare the difference in sense of humor, and resilience with respect to their employment status in adults. Three groups (undergraduate, post graduate, diploma) were considered for analysis.

Table 3 Sense of Humor and Resilience Based on Educational Qualification.

Variables	Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Sense of Humor	Between Groups	2188.692	5	437.738	
	Within Groups	21839.063	194	112.572	3.889 .002
Resilience	Between Groups	6828.941	5	1365.788	
	Within Groups	78125.135	194	402.707	3.392 .006

Correlation is Significant at the 0.05 Level.

The above table 3 reveals that there is a significant difference in between group and within group of sense of humor and resilience in relation to their educational qualification.

The result of the One-way ANOVA test presented in table 4.3, shows that, sense of humor and resilience, showed statistically significant difference among the three groups. The F ratio obtained from the one-way analysis for sense of humor was 3.889 ($p=0.002$). The F ratio obtained from the one-way for resilience was 3.392 and was significant at 0.006 significance level ($p=0.006<0.05$). The F ratio clearly showed that there existed a statistical difference between the three group on sense of humor and resilience.

Hence, the hypothesis is rejected.

➤ Post Hoc Comparison

In order to find the exact mean differences among three groups on sense of humor and resilience in which the ANOVA gave significant F ratio further analysis was done with Duncan test.

Table 4 Sense of Humor with Respect to Educational Qualification.

Educational Qualification	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
Diploma	32	51.03	
undergraduate	73		56.44
Post graduate	45		57.64
Sig.		0.180	.231

The result of the Duncan test for sense of humor is given in the above table 4.

Concerning the sense of humor, the mean scores for participants categorized into the diploma, undergraduate, and postgraduate groups were 51.03, 56.44, and 57.64, respectively. These scores reveal a elevation in the mean score for the postgraduate group, suggesting a relatively heightened sense of humor compared to the other groups. Notably, the distinction in mean scores between the postgraduate and undergraduate cohorts is marginal. However, a noteworthy disparity in mean scores emerges between the postgraduate and diploma groups. Furthermore, the statistical analysis reveals a significant disparity in mean scores between the postgraduate and undergraduate groups when compared to those individuals with a diploma. This outcome implies that individuals with postgraduate and undergraduate qualifications demonstrate a notably enhanced sense of humor when contrasted with individuals possessing only a diploma. Based on the derived results, it can be concluded that the postgraduate group, followed closely by the undergraduate group, tends to exhibit a more pronounced sense of humor compared to individuals holding diplomas

Table 5 Resilience with Respect to Educational Qualification.

Educational Qualification	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
Diploma	32	61.59	
undergraduate	73		67.05
Post graduate	45		68.93
Sig.		0.083	.075

The result of the Duncan test for resilience was given in the above table 5.

In the case resilience, the mean scores were 61.59, 67.05, and 68.93 for the diploma, undergraduate, and postgraduate groups, respectively. The notably higher mean score for the postgraduate group indicates their superior resilience. A significant difference exists between the mean scores of the postgraduate and undergraduate groups in comparison to the diploma group. Thus, it can be inferred that both postgraduate and undergraduate individuals exhibit greater resilience compared to those with a diploma. Moreover, the minor disparity between the mean scores of the postgraduate and undergraduate groups suggests their similarity in the ability to effectively rebound from challenges.

When scrutinizing the literature pertaining to humor, a consensus emerges that a well- developed sense of humor contributes positively to mental well-being. This encompasses stress reduction, diminished anxiety, and enhanced psychological health (Abel, 2002; Kelly, 2002; Kuiper and Martin, 1993; Morreall, 1997; Thorson et al., 1997; Yovetich et al., 1990). The outcomes of this study align with Hampes' (2001) comparative research on Education and Humor Appreciation, establishing a positive correlation between education level and humor appreciation. Similarly, Masten's (2014) “replicates these findings, highlighting education's potential to bolster resilience through the cultivation of cognitive and socio- emotional competencies. Notably, scholarly investigations suggest that higher education fosters a more sophisticated sense of humor and a healthier capacity to confront adversity” (Masten, 2014).

Education's role in expanding cognitive flexibility and knowledge is well-established (Varga et al., 2021). By enhancing critical thinking and problem-solving skills, higher education equips individuals with the resilience necessary to navigate and rebound from challenges (Carlos et al., 2022). Scholarly discourse also suggests that higher education contributes to the cultivation of a more refined sense of humor and enhanced coping mechanisms when confronted with adversity.

On the basis of the results obtained from the present empirical investigation, it is reasonable to conclude that both sense of humor and resilience exhibit noteworthy distinctions contingent upon an individual's educational level.

➤ *Difference Between Perceived Social Support and Subjective Life Satisfaction with Respect to their Education Qualification.*

Table 6 Social Support and Subjective Life Satisfaction Based on Educational Qualification

Variables		Sum of	Mean	F	
		Squares	square		Sig.
Perceived social support	Between Groups	933.22	466.63	2.12	.78
	Within Groups	11673.76	219.97		
Subjective life satisfaction	Between Groups	98.300	49.150	1.56	.213
	Within Groups	4623.70	31.45		

Correlation is Significant at the 0.05 Level.

The above table 6 reveals that there is a no significant difference in between group and within group of perceived social support and subjective life satisfaction in relation to their educational qualification.

A One-way ANOVA analysis was executed to assess potential disparities in perceived social support and subjective life satisfaction among adults based on their employment status. The study included three distinct groups: undergraduates, postgraduates, and diploma holders. The obtained F ratio from the One-way ANOVA for perceived social support stood at 2.12, accompanied by a significance level of 0.78. Likewise, the F ratio yielded by the One-way ANOVA for subjective life satisfaction was 1.56, with a

significance level of 0.213. These F ratios underscored the absence of statistically significant discrepancies among the three groups concerning perceived social support and subjective life satisfaction ($p > 0.05$). Hence, the hypothesis that states there is no significant difference between subjective life satisfaction and perceived social support with respect to education qualification is accepted.

Consistent with the present findings, earlier research, such as that by Catherine E. (1997), has demonstrated that “educational qualification exerts minimal or negligible influence on subjective life satisfaction or perceived social support”. This could suggest that factors beyond education, such as interpersonal relationships, health, and psychological well-being, wield a more predominant role in shaping an individual's life satisfaction and perception of social support. Cultural and individual differences could further contribute to the varied impact of education on social relationships and life satisfaction. Such studies might contend that “higher educational attainment could lead to increased opportunities, improved job prospects, and elevated socioeconomic status, subsequently contributing to enhanced life satisfaction and an augmented sense of social support” (Möwisch, D., Brose, A., & Schmiedek, 2020).

From the aforementioned findings, it can be inferred that no discernible change was evident in perceived social support and subjective life satisfaction among adults across the educational qualification categories.

➤ *Difference Between Sense of Humor and Perceived Social Support with Respect to their Employment Status.*

Table 7 Sense of Humor and Perceived Social Support with Respect to their Employment Status.

Variables		Sum of Squares	Mean square	F	Sig.
Sense of Humor	Between Groups	1632.17	816.08	2.86	.065
	Within Groups	22728.83	285.67		
Perceived social support	Between Groups	286.54	143.27	0.649	0.58
	Within Groups	32213.60	220.64		

Correlation is Significant at the 0.05 Level.

The above table 7 reveals that there is no significant difference in between group and within group of sense of humor and perceived social support in relation to their employment status.

The obtained F ratios from the one-way analyses for sense of humor and perceived social support were 2.86 and 0.649, respectively. These F ratios indicate that there were no statistically significant differences observed in sense of humor and perceived social support with regard to employment status ($p > 0.05$). Hence, the hypothesis is accepted ($p > 0.05$). The findings lead to the conclusion that perceived social support and subjective life satisfaction remained consistent among adult participants across the three educational qualification groups.

As demonstrated by Martin and Lefcourt's study in 1983, "individuals possessing a strong sense of humor often employ humor as a coping mechanism" to manage workplace pressures, potentially enhancing job satisfaction (Kuiper and Martin, 1993). Conversely, Cohen & Wills (1985) proposed that "robust social support networks equip individuals to effectively cope with job-related stressors, leading to heightened job satisfaction". Notably, Bhagat, McQuaid, and Lindholm's research in 1982 uncovered a complex relationship wherein "individuals perceiving high social support levels reported diminished job satisfaction due to work-family role conflicts" including those encountered in employment contexts. This trait's relevance may transcend employment status, as it is an intrinsic attribute rather than contingent on employment status. The link between employment status and the availability of social support networks may not be definitive. "Extensive perceived social support has been shown to mitigate stress and enhance mental well-being, regardless of employment status" (House, Umberson, and Landis, 1988). The intricate relationship between these variables and employment status is reflected in mixed research outcomes. The findings suggest that individuals in differing employment statuses students, employed, and unemployed exhibited similar levels of humor and reported comparable degrees of social support from their networks. Consequently, from the above result it is inferred that employment status may not significantly determine the presence of a social support network or the perception of humor quality. Notably, unemployed individuals might possess robust social support systems, and vice versa for employed individuals.

➤ *Difference Between Subjective Life Satisfaction and Resilience with Respect to their Employment Status.*

Table 8 Subjective Life Satisfaction and Resilience with Respect to their Employment Status.

Variables		Sum of	Mean	F	Sig.
		Squares	square		
Subjective life satisfaction	Between Groups	108.27	254.13	4.612	0.016
	Within Groups	6671.91	55.09		
Resilience	Between Groups	1174.01	587.00	3.561	.011
	Within Groups	27595.81	165.01		

Correlation is Significant at the 0.05 Level.

The one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of 4.612 for subjective life satisfaction, signifying statistical significance at a significance level of 0.016. Similarly, the F ratio obtained for resilience was 3.56, with statistical significance observed at a significance level of 0.011. These F ratios distinctly indicate the presence of statistically meaningful disparities concerning educational qualifications in relation to both subjective life satisfaction and resilience. The outcomes of this investigation underscore the significant variations in resilience and subjective life satisfaction across distinct categories such as employed individuals, the unemployed, and students ($p < 0.05$). Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

In order to find the exact differences among three groups on resilience and subjective life satisfaction further analysis was done with Post hoc Duncan test.

Table 9 Subjective Life Satisfaction with Respect to Employment Status.

Employment status	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
unemployed	35	19.636	
student	62		24.418
Employed	53		26.839
Sig.		0.104	.090

For subjective life satisfaction, the mean scores for different groups were observed: employed individuals scored 26.839, the unemployed scored 19.636, and students scored 24.418. Notably, employed individuals demonstrated a notably higher mean score, indicating elevated levels of subjective life satisfaction. The data table underscores a significant disparity in mean scores across the three groups. While the employed group exhibited marginally higher subjective life satisfaction than students, the difference in means is relatively slight.

Comparatively, the employed and student groups both showcased higher life satisfaction in contrast to the unemployed group, which displayed a notably lower satisfaction level.

Table 10 Resilience with Respect to Employment Status.

Employment status	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
unemployed	35	57.59	
student	62		64.51
Employed	53		66.45
Sig.		0.104	.090

The result of the Duncan test for resilience was given in the above table 10.

Regarding resilience, the mean score for employed individuals was 66.45, while it was 57.59 for the unemployed and 64.51 for students. The higher mean score among employed individuals indicates elevated resilience compared to the other groups. This distinction is supported by the findings presented in Table 4.10, which demonstrates a significant variance in means across the three groups. This trend aligns with the prior results, wherein employed individuals exhibited a slightly higher level of subjective life satisfaction compared to students. Furthermore, in contrast to the unemployed group, both employed individuals and students demonstrated a heightened capacity to effectively manage life challenges. “Subjective life satisfaction and resilience hold vital roles in the connected to their employment status” (Miraglia et al., 2022). Judge et al. (2010) reported greater life satisfaction than their unemployed counterparts, highlighting the positive contribution of employment life. Longitudinal research conducted by Warr (2007) indicated that transitioning into unemployment led to decreased life satisfaction, while re-employment contributed to its enhancement. This underscores the direct influence of changes in employment status on individual's life satisfaction. Complex interplay characterizes the relationship between employment status and life satisfaction, as illuminated by Clark's study (2019). Variables like job security, autonomy, and work-life balance significantly shape these outcomes. Paul and Moser (2009) suggested linkage among employment and life satisfaction is cross connected by psychological well-being, social support, and perceived control. Thus, employment status constitutes just one facet within a larger framework impacting overall life satisfaction. Luthans et al. (2006) uncovered that employed individuals tend to manifest heightened psychological resilience due to the structure and routines inherent in employment, fostering stability and purpose. Tugade and Fredrickson's research (2004) indicated a connection between resilience and positive emotions, along with the ability to glean meaning from adversity. Employment affords occasions for positive experiences, bolstering emotional resilience. Turner et al.'s study (2016) indicated that prolonged job insecurity detrimentally affects resilience, as uncertainty about job prospects elevates stress and anxiety, potentially compromising resilience in the face of challenges. Bonanno (2004) emphasized that resilience is a multifaceted process carved from diverse factors, including personality traits, social support, and cognitive appraisals. Employment status emerges as a single thread within the intricate fabric influencing resilience. From these findings, it can be inferred that employment status wields an influence on subjective life satisfaction and resilience; however, the difference might not be straightforward. Variables such as job quality, security, personal characteristics, and social support networks intersect with employment status to configure these psychological outcomes. Hence, a comprehensive perspective is vital when exploring the relationship between these constructs and employment.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The present chapter will summarize the findings and also provide the conclusion of the study. This chapter also includes the implications as well as the limitations of the study. The study aimed to examine the role sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction and resilience among adults. The results obtained by the analysis are discussed comprehensively with respect to objectives and hypotheses.

A. Summary of the Study

The major objective of the study would be to

- To comprehensively examine and elucidate the intricate nature of the relationships existing among sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction, and resilience within the adult population.
- To investigate the sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction and resilience based on age in adults,
- To understand the impact of educational qualifications on the manifestations of humor and resilience within the adult cohort.
- Analyse the effect of perceived social support and subjective life satisfaction with respect to education qualification in adults,
- To systematically analyses the humor sense in relation to the employment status of adults.
- To assess perceived social support with respect to employment status among adults,
- To assess subjective life satisfaction and resilience with respect to employment status in adults.

The hypotheses of the study were,

- There will be no significant relationship between sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction and resilience.
- There will be no significant difference between age group with respect to sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction and resilience.
- There will be no significant difference between sense of humor and resilience with respect to education qualification.
- There will be no significant difference between perceived social support and subjective life satisfaction with respect to education qualification.
- There will be no significant difference between humor and social support with respect to employment status.
- There will be no significant difference between subjective life satisfaction and resilience with respect to employment status.

A total of 150 adult, including males and females samples belonging to age group of 18-40 were selected using the convenience sampling technique from different districts of Kerala. To measure the variables of interest, existing standardized measures are used such as Multi- dimensional Sense of Humor Scale (Levenson, H. (1973)), Satisfaction with life scale (Diener et. al., (1985)), The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (Zimet et. al., (1988)) and 14-item Resilience Scale (RS-14) (Wagnild & Young). Data were collected from individuals by providing questionnaires directly and also by sharing google forms. Informed consent and personal data sheet are also collected from the selected participants. The obtained data was subjected to statistical analysis by using SPSS. Parametric tests such as the t-test, Pearson product-moment correlation, One-way ANOVA and Post hoc-Duncan procedures were used method are used for the statistical analysis of the data.

B. Major Findings and Conclusions

Based on the results of the research following findings are made:

- There exists significantly high positive correlation between perceived social support and resilience ($p = 0.00 < 0.05$).
- There exists a moderate positive relationship between resilience and life satisfaction and between resilience and humor ($p = 0.00 < 0.05$).
- There exists a moderate positive relationship between subjective life satisfaction and perceived social support and among sense of humor and perceived social support ($p = 0.00 < 0.05$).
- No significant difference was observed in the mean values of sense of humor ($p = 0.168 > 0.05$), social support ($p = 0.818 > 0.05$), subjective satisfaction with life ($p = 0.141 > 0.05$) and resilience ($p = 0.391 > 0.05$) with respect both age groups.
- There exists statistically significant difference between post graduate, undergraduate and students on sense of humor ($p = 0.002 < 0.05$) and resilience ($p = 0.006 < 0.05$).
- There is no statistically significant difference between individuals with post graduate, undergraduate and diploma on perceived social support ($p = 0.78 > 0.05$) and subjective life satisfaction ($p = 0.21 > 0.05$).
- There exists no statistically significant difference between sense of humor ($p = 0.21 > 0.065$) and perceived social support ($p = 0.58 > 0.05$) among employed, unemployed and student.
- There exists statistically significant difference between employed, unemployed and student on subjective life satisfaction ($p = 0.016 < 0.05$) and resilience ($p = 0.011 < 0.05$).

C. Tenability of Hypotheses

Table 11 The Tenability of Hypotheses Based on the Results Obtained from the Study is Discussed

No	Hypothesis	Tenability
1.	There is no significant relationship between sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction and resilience.	Rejected
2.	There is no significant difference between age group with respect to sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction and resilience.	Accepted
3.	There will be no significant difference between sense of humor and resilience with respect to education qualification.	Rejected
4.	There will be no significant difference between perceived social support and subjective life satisfaction with respect to education qualification.	Accepted
5.	There will be no significant difference between sense of humor and perceived social support with respect to employment status.	Accepted
6.	There will be no significant difference between subjective life satisfaction and resilience with respect to employment status.	Rejected

D. Implications of the Study

The present investigation, which examines the roles of sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction, and resilience within the context of adult individuals, holds promising potential to offer substantial contributions to the realm of psychology and the advancement of well-being. This study stands poised to illuminate pathways for interventions, policy formulations, and strategies for personal growth aimed at augmenting the holistic quality of life. With its substantial theoretical and empirical underpinnings, the study enriches the existing psychological literature pertaining to sense of humor, perceived social support, subjective life satisfaction, and resilience.

The study's outcomes possess the capacity to significantly deepen comprehension of the intricate interrelationships among these psychological variables, fostering an informed basis for crafting targeted intervention paradigms geared toward enhancing mental health and overall well-being. In particular, interventions could be devised that bolster individuals' sense of humor, equip them with tools for cultivating robust social support networks, and nurture their capacity for resilience. The findings manifestly establish the positive relationships among these variables, thereby furnishing a bedrock for the design of interventions targeting mental health enhancement and general well-being. Interventions oriented towards fostering sense of humor, providing tools for cultivating robust social networks, and nurturing resilience can be tailored to optimize subjective life satisfaction and psychological functioning.

The harmonization of findings from antecedent studies corroborating the current results concerning the interconnected nature of these psychological dimensions accentuates the significance of addressing multifaceted facets of an individual's life to yield more favourable outcomes. This underscores the pertinence of revitalize one's sense of humor, diligently fostering and nurturing social support systems, fostering resilience, and introspecting on personal subjective life satisfaction. The salient influence of employment status on both subjective life satisfaction and resilience underscores the intricate interplay between economic stability, individual well-being, and adaptability. This observation accentuates the necessity of factoring in employment-related determinants in the pursuit of enhancing overall contentment and fortitude against adversities. Leveraging these implications, entities such as organizations, educational institutions, and communities can harness these insights to forge policies and practices that endorse humor, social cohesion, and resilience. By doing so, these entities stand to foster improved employee welfare and communal coherence. The practical applicability of the study's findings resonates across domains including counselling, clinical settings, workplace well-being initiatives, community engagement endeavours, and personal development initiatives. Such translational implications underscore the study's potential to inform and enrich a multitude of contexts, thus resonating with both scholarly and real-world arenas.

E. Limitations of the Study

When compared to the entire general population the sample size was found relatively too small. The sample size was limited to specific geographical locations. The findings were based on self-reported data and may have been susceptible to response biases.

F. Suggestions For Future Research

Longitudinal studies can be conducted. Qualitative methods can also be used. Future studies can replicate the current study in other geographical areas. Cross-cultural studies understanding the cultural influences on resilience, sense of humor, satisfaction with life and perceived social support can be beneficial.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Abel, M. H. (2002). Humor, stress, and coping strategies. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 15(4), 365–381. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.15.4.365>
- [2]. Afifi, T. O., & MacMillan, H. L. (2011). Resilience following Child Maltreatment: A Review of Protective Factors. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 56(5), 266–272. <https://doi.org/10.1177/070674371105600505>
- [3]. Angeles, M. D. (2021). A LITERATURE REVIEW OF RESILIENCY AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AMONG STUDENTS. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 9(02), 475–481. <https://doi.org/10.21474/ijar01/12471>
- [4]. Azpiazu, L., Fernández, A. R., & Palacios, E. G. (2021). Adolescent life satisfaction explained by social support, emotion regulation, and resilience. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.694183>
- [5]. Cariola, L. A. (2020). *Encyclopaedia of Personality and Individual Differences*. In Springer eBooks. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-24612-3>
- [6]. Catalano, R. F., Berglund, M., Ryan, J. a. M., Lonczak, H. S., & Hawkins, J. D. (2004). Positive Youth Development in the United States: Research findings on evaluations of positive youth development programs. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 591(1), 98–124. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716203260102>
- [7]. Cohn, M., Fredrickson, B. L., Brown, S. L., Mikels, J. A., & Conway, A. (2009a). Happiness unpacked: Positive emotions increase life satisfaction by building resilience. *Emotion*, 9(3), 361–368. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015952>
- [8]. Cohn, M., Fredrickson, B. L., Brown, S. L., Mikels, J. A., & Conway, A. (2009b). Happiness unpacked: Positive emotions increase life satisfaction by building resilience. *Emotion*, 9(3), 361–368. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015952>
- [9]. Connor, K. M., & Zhang, W. (2006). Resilience: determinants, measurement, and treatment responsiveness. *CNS Spectrums*, 11(S12), 5–12. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1092852900025797>
- [10]. Deaner, S. L., & McConatha, J. T. (1993). The relation of humor to depression and personality. *Psychological Reports*, 72(3), 755–763. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1993.72.3.755>
- [11]. Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71–75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13
- [12]. Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(2), 276–302. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.125.2.276>
- [13]. Drageset J. Social Support. 2021 Mar 12. In: Haugan G, Eriksson M, editors. *Health Promotion in Health Care – Vital Theories and Research* [Internet]. Cham (CH): Springer; 2021. Chapter 11. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK585650/> doi: 10.1007/978-3-030- 63135-2_11
- [14]. Dyer, J. G., & McGuinness, T. M. (1996). Resilience: Analysis of the concept. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 10(5), 276–282. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0883-9417\(96\)80036-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0883-9417(96)80036-7)
- [15]. Fontes, A. P., & Neri, A. L. (2015). Resilience in aging: literature review. *Ciencia & Saude Coletiva*, 20(5), 1475–1495. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-81232015205.00502014>
- [16]. Folkman, S., & Moskowitz, J. T. (2000). Stress, Positive Emotion, and Coping. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9(4), 115–118. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00073>
- [17]. Franzini, L. R., & Haggerty, S. (1994). Humor assessment of corporate managers and humor seminar and personality students. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 7(4), 341–350. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.1994.7.4.341>
- [18]. Greengross, G. (2013). Humor and Aging - A Mini-Review. *Gerontology*, 59(5), 448–453. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000351005>
- [19]. Kasprzak, E. (2010a). Perceived social support and life-satisfaction. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 41(4), 144–154. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10059-010-0019-x>
- [20]. Joyce S., Shand F., Tighe J., Laurent S. J., Bryant R. A., Harvey S. B. (2018). Road to resilience: a systematic review and meta-analysis of resilience training programmes and interventions. . doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-017858, PMID: [DOI]
- [21]. Kennison, S. M. (2022). Humor and resilience: relationships with happiness in young adults.
- [22]. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 35(4), 665–681. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2021-0079>
- [23]. Lang, J. C., & Lee, C. H. (2010). Workplace humor and organizational creativity. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(1), 46–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190903466855>
- [24]. MacLeod, S., Musich, S., Hawkins, K., Alsgaard, K., & Wicker, E. (2016). The impact of resilience among older adults. *Geriatric Nursing*, 37(4), 266–272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gerinurse.2016.02.014>
- [25]. Mouatsou, C., & Koutra, K. (2021). Emotion regulation in relation with resilience in emerging adults: The mediating role of self-esteem. *Current Psychology*, 42(1), 734– 747. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-01427-x>
- [26]. McGraw, A. P., & Warren, C. (2010). Benign Violations: Making Immoral Behavior Funny: Making Immoral Behavior Funny. *Psychological Science*, 21(8), 1141–1149. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610376073>
- [27]. Nemati, S., & Maralani, F. M. (2016). The Relationship between Life Satisfaction and Happiness: The Mediating Role of Resiliency. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 8(3), 194. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijps.v8n3p194>
- [28]. Novotny, S., & Váchová, L. (2016). The relationship between resilience and academic performance at youth placed at risk. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313602814_The_relationship_between_resilience_and_academic_performance_at_youth_placed_at_risk
- [29]. Ong, A. D., Bergeman, C. S., & Boker, S. M. (2009). Resilience comes of age: defining features in later adulthood. *Journal*

- of Personality, 77(6), 1777–1804. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00600.x>
- [30]. Ozbay, F. (n.d.). Social support and resilience to stress: From neurobiology to clinical practice. PubMed Central (PMC). <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/pmc2921311/>
- [31]. Pulido, C., Mara, L. C., Ionescu, V., & T, M. (2020). Social impact of psychological Research on Well-Being shared in social media. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00135>
- [32]. Rabenu, E., & Tziner, A. (2016). Employee resilience: a faceted analytical approach. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 480–485. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2016.43>
- [33]. Rubin, K. H., Bukowski, W. M., & Laursen, B. (2011). *Handbook of Peer Interactions, Relationships, and Groups*. <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BB06424532>
- [34]. Schnur, O. (2023). What Is Well-being: A Guide On How To Measure And Improve It. *Lifhack*. <https://www.lifhack.org/908290/what-is-well-being>.
- [35]. Schwarzer, R., & Warner, L. M. (2012). Perceived Self-Efficacy and its Relationship to Resilience. In *Plenum series on human exceptionality* (pp. 139–150). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-4939-3_10
- [36]. Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.55.1.5>
- [37]. Singh, S., & Singh, A. P. (2021). RESILIENCE, EMOTION REGULATION, PEER RELATIONSHIP, HUMOR AND BODY-ESTEEM IN INDIAN COLLEGE STUDENTS. *BAU Journal. Society, Culture & Human Behavior*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.54729/2789-8296.1056>
- [38]. Sroufe, L. A. (2005). Attachment and development: A prospective, longitudinal study from birth to adulthood. *Attachment & Human Development*, 7(4), 349–367. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616730500365928>
- [39]. Singh, S., & Singh, A. P. (2021). Resilience emotion regulation peer relationship humor and body-esteem in Indian college students. *BAU Journal. Society, Culture & Human Behavior*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.54729/2789-8296.1056>
- [40]. Surzykiewicz, J., Konaszewski, K., & Wagnild, G. (2019). Polish version of the Resilience Scale (RS-14): A validity and reliability study in three samples. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02762>
- [41]. Svebak, S. (2010). The Sense of Humor Questionnaire: Conceptualization and review of 40 years of findings in empirical research. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v6i3.218>
- [42]. Van Der Hallen, R., Jongerling, J., & Godor, B. P. (2020). Coping and resilience in adults: a cross-sectional network analysis. *Anxiety Stress and Coping*, 33(5), 479–496. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2020.1772969>
- [43]. Varga, A., Vitéz, K., Orsós, I., Fodor, B., & Horváth, G. (2021). Diversity and inclusion in higher education. *Képzés És Gyakorlat*, 19(1–2), 70–81. <https://doi.org/10.17165/tp.2021.1-2.7>
- [44]. Werner, E. E. (1995). Resilience in development. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 4(3), 81–84. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.ep10772327>
- [45]. Windle, G. (2010). What is resilience? A review and concept analysis. *Reviews in Clinical Gerontology*, 21(2), 152–169. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0959259810000420>
- [46]. Zhao, J., Wang, Y., & Kong, F. (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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.02.026>
- [47]. Gedikli, C., Miraglia, M., Connolly, S., Bryan, M. L., & Watson, D. (2022). The relationship between unemployment and wellbeing: an updated meta-analysis of longitudinal evidence. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 32(1), 128–144. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432x.2022.2106855>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Informed Consent Form

Greetings Everyone, I am ****, I am conducting a study on " Sense of Humor, Perceived Social and Subjective life satisfaction and Resilience among Adults ". This study requires the completion of questionnaires, which will take roughly 10 to 15 minutes. Your response will be used only for research purpose and will be kept confidential. Please proceed with this questionnaire if your age range is between 18 - 45 years. You are requested to give your honest opinion.

For any clarifications or queries, contact through mail id: ***** Thank You in Advance.

I have read the above statements and I agree to voluntarily participate in the research study.

- Yes
- No

APPENDIX II PERSONAL DATA SHEET

Name:			
Age:			
Educational Qualification:	a. Undergraduate	b. postgraduate	c. diploma
Employment status:	a. employed	b. unemployed	c. student

APPENDIX III SENSE OF HUMOR**➤ Instruction**

Please go through these items quickly, marking the response that is appropriate for you going from left to right: "strongly disagree," "disagree," "neutral," "agree," or "strongly agree."

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1. Sometimes I think up jokes or funny stories.	—	—	—	—	—
2. Uses of wit or humor help me master difficult situations.	—	—	—	—	—
3. I'm confident that I can make other people laugh.	—	—	—	—	—
4. I dislike comics.	—	—	—	—	—
5. Other people tell me that I say funny things.	—	—	—	—	—
6. I can use wit to help adapt to many situations.	—	—	—	—	—
7. I can ease a tense situation by saying something funny.	—	—	—	—	—
8. People who tell jokes are a pain in the neck.	—	—	—	—	—
9. I can often crack people up with the things I say.	—	—	—	—	—
10. I like a good joke.	—	—	—	—	—
11. Calling somebody a "comedian" is a real insult.	—	—	—	—	—
12. I can say things in such a way as to make people laugh.	—	—	—	—	—
13. Humor is a lousy coping mechanism.	—	—	—	—	—
14. I appreciate those who generate humor.	—	—	—	—	—
15. People look to me to say amusing things.	—	—	—	—	—
16. Humor helps me cope.	—	—	—	—	—
17. I'm uncomfortable when everyone is cracking jokes.	—	—	—	—	—
18. I'm regarded as something of a wit by my friends.	—	—	—	—	—
19. Coping by using humor is an elegant way of adapting.	—	—	—	—	—
20. Trying to master situations through uses of humor is really dumb.	—	—	—	—	—
21. I can actually have some control over a group by my uses of humor.	—	—	—	—	—
22. Uses of humor help to put me at ease.	—	—	—	—	—
23. I use humor to entertain my friends.	—	—	—	—	—
24. My clever sayings amuse others.	—	—	—	—	—

APPENDIX IV PERCEIVED SOCIAL SUPPORT**➤ Instruction**

Read each statement carefully. Indicate how you feel about each statement by circling the appropriate number using the following scale:

- Very strongly disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Mildly disagree
- Neutral 5 = Mildly agree
- Strongly agree
- Very strongly agree

1. There is a special person who is around when I am in need.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. There is a special person with whom I can share joys and sorrows.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. My family really tries to help me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I get the emotional help and support I need from my family.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I have a special person who is a real source of comfort to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. My friends really try to help me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I can count on my friends when things go wrong.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I can talk about my problems with my family.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I have friends with whom I can share my joys and sorrows.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. There is a special person in my life who cares about my feelings.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. My family is willing to help me make decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. I can talk about my problems with my friends.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX V SUBJECTIVE LIFE SATISFICATION**SWLS**

Below are five statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by placing the appropriate number on the line preceding that item. Please be open and honest in your responding.

- 1 = Strongly disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Slightly disagree
- 4 = Neither agree nor disagree
- 5 = Slightly agree
- 6 = Agree
- 7 = Strongly agree

- ___ 1. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.
- ___ 2. The conditions of my life are excellent.
- ___ 3. I am satisfied with my life.
- ___ 4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.
- ___ 5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.

APPENDIX VI RESILIENCE (RS-14)

The Resilience Scale (RS)							
Please read the following statements. To the right of each you will find seven numbers, ranging from "1" (Strongly Disagree) on the left to "7" (Strongly Agree) on the right. Click the circle below the number which best indicates your feelings about that statement. For example, if you strongly disagree with a statement, click "1". If you are neutral, click "4", and if you strongly agree, click "7", etc.							
	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree		
1. When I make plans, I follow through with them.	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>
2. I usually manage one way or another.	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>
3. I am able to depend on myself more than anyone else.	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>
4. Keeping interested in things is important to me.	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>
5. I can be on my own if I have to.	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>
6. I feel proud that I have accomplished things in life.	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>
7. I usually take things in stride.	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>
8. I am friends with myself.	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>
9. I feel that I can handle many things at a time.	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>
10. I am determined.	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>
11. I seldom wonder what the point of it all is.	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>
12. I take things one day at a time.	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>
13. I can get through difficult times because I've experienced difficulty before.	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>
14. I have self-discipline.	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>
15. I keep interested in things.	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>