EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, HUMOR STYLES AND PERSONALITY TRAITS AS DETERMINANTS OF COPING BEHAVIOR, DYSFUNCTIONAL ATTITUDE AND PERCEIVED STRESS

A Thesis submitted in the partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN PSYCHOLOGY (CLINICAL)

Submitted by:

Tavleen Kaur

(861702017)

UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF

Dr. Santha Kumari

Professor

School of Humanities & Social Sciences

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled "**Emotional intelligence, humor styles and personality traits as determinants of coping behavior, dysfunctional attitude and perceived stress**" being submitted in partial fulfillment of requirement for the award of degree of **Master of Arts** in **Psychology**, submitted in the **School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology, Patiala** is a bonafide work carried out under the supervision of **Dr.. Santha Kumari**, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology, Patiala and that no part of this thesis has been submitted for the award of any other degree.

Tavleen

(TAVLEEN KAUR)

This is to certify that above statement made by the student concerned is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

(Dr. Santha Kumari)

Professor, SHSS

Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology, Patiala "**Emotional intelligence, humor styles and personality traits as determinants of coping behavior, dysfunctional attitude and perceived stress**" in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of Degree of Master of Arts in Psychology, submitted in the **School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology, Patiala.**

CANDIDATE'S DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the work presented in this thesis entitled, "**Emotional intelligence, humor styles and personality traits as determinants of coping behavior, dysfunctional attitude and perceived stress**" being submitted in partial fulfillment of requirement for the award of Degree of **Master of Arts in Psychology**, submitted in the **School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology, Patiala**, is an authentic record of my own work carried out under the supervision and guidance of Prof. Santha Kumari, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology, Patiala and refers other researcher's work which are duly listed in the reference section.

The content written in this thesis has not formed the basis for the award of any other degree of this or any other university.

Date: May 28, 2019

Place: Patiala

(TAVLEEN KAUR)

This is to certify that the above declaration made by the student concerned is correct and true to the best of my knowledge.

(Dr. Santha Kumari)

Professor,

School of Humanities and Social Sciences,

Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology, Patiala

Acknowledgement

At the offset I would like to thank my project guide Dr. Santha Kumari for assisting me throughout and for incessantly motivating me. She has always been a great source of inspiration for me. I will forever remain grateful for her tremendous generosity in providing me direction, motivation and most especially for sparing time for me from her busy schedule. She always made it point to make me understand each and every detail. I reckon working under her guidance as a great experience to learn the techniques of research expertise.

The contribution of many people made this project possible and their efforts instill me with the utmost sense of gratitude. A huge thanks is required for all those who helped me complete my work of thesis. I consider myself fortunate and privileged for getting an opportunity to undergo my project in School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology, Patiala.

I would also like to thank the participants of this study, who made this research possible, for taking out time and filling out questionnaires with sincerity. Lastly, I would like to thank my parents for their consistent support.

ABSTRACT

Humans put enormous efforts to keep stress at a distance and the foremost tool put to use is humor. Researchers have sufficiently emphasized on the importance of coping in demanding life circumstances. Individuals who are emotionally intelligent are better at coping, and therefore have lesser tendency to have dysfunctional attitude. Personality like a mother of all has a role in shaping an individual's life and in some way dictates as to how an individual copes, how he faces stress and whether or not has dysfunctional attitude. The aforementioned variables have been studied individually by many researchers. However, it is interesting how these variables are interlinked. The present study aims to analyze the relationship between emotional intelligence, humor styles, personality traits and coping behavior, dysfunctional attitude and perceived stress. The study included 120 participants (N=120) of the age range, 18-25 years, from which sixty were males (N=60) and sixty females (N=60). The present study is a humble effort to analyze the relationship between the above mentioned variables with the help of correlation and regression.

Keywords: Emotional intelligence, humor styles, personality traits, coping behavior, dysfunctional attitude and perceived stress.

CONTENTS

List of Tables

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The world full of hurly-burly is causing enough stress in human life. People have partly, or rather largely become centered around and about their work or education. It is probable that an emotionally intelligent individual would know that socializing and surviving in these institutions is difficult without humor, though not impossible. Emotional intelligence has gained enormous amount of importance in the past decennium, while study of humor has been of interest even before that and the study personality as well has occupied the space of brilliant minds for quite some time. Coping is an everyday phenomenon, with the help of which humans combat and confront stressful situations. Humans strive to live stress-free lives and keep dysfunctional attitude at a distance. An individual's personality makes an individual susceptible to possess certain kind of coping behaviors, and the impact of personality traits also seems quite obvious on how an individual copes and what kind of attitude he possesses. These variables have been studied and well understood by researchers in their singularity. What more can be done is, to understand them in relation with each other. The variables studied in this study are enlisted and discussed below.

1.1. Emotional intelligence

In the contemporary times, the concept of emotional intelligence has secured attention and the need for it has been emphasized sufficiently. Emotional intelligence is the ability of a person to understand his own feelings as well as those of the others, and also to express his own emotions in a productive manner. Mayer and Salovey (1990), purported that assessment of emotions entailed abilities that are different from those required to assess verbal, visuo-spatial or mathematical information that conventional intelligence tests assess. People who score high on emotional intelligence can well-comprehend other people's emotions and manage their own emotions in an adaptive manner than those with low emotional intelligence (Mayer & Salovey, 1993). The construct of emotional intelligence argues that the conventional intelligence or intelligence quotient (IQ) cannot be seen as solely the basis on which an individual is called intelligent. One may have come across many individuals who are deemed to be intelligent but are socially inept and success does not automatically follow them. The reason behind social

cumbersomeness that one stays oblivious to in such scenarios is emotional intelligence. Emotional quotient (EQ) may be equal and sometimes even more coercive in determining a person's success. Emotional intelligence does not pertain to academics or anything that is tangible; rather it is related to emotions and feelings. Emotional intelligence affects how one deals with people and situations, how one makes decisions and how one navigates one's way through her life with self-efficacy in order to obtain positive results in one's efforts. The trait emotional intelligence is concerned with perception of an individual's own emotional world. The four key components of emotional intelligence are:

1. Perceiving emotions – This implies identifying and expressing feelings as well as discerning between accurate and inaccurate feelings.
2. Using emotions – This implies generating emotions that facilitate decision making and redirecting attention to significant issues.
3. Understanding emotions – This implies comprehending complex emotions and their causes as well. This involves transition from one emotion to another.
4. Managing emotions – This implies being aware of positive as well as negative emotions that one experiences. This involves reflectively monitoring emotions and solving emotionally driven problems.

1.2. Humor Styles

"Humor research is seen as a non-serious topic," writes Rod Martin (2007), in his book "The Psychology of Humor: An Integrative Approach". However, the need for humor in this fast pacing and stressful era calls for some research about humor and its relation to other variables. It is essential for people to possess some sense of humor to sashay their way in social setups and to be a champion in personal relations. As a defense mechanism, humor is indispensible for humans. However, the style and use of humor may vary among individuals. A person with humorous attitude would be tolerant of the insufficiencies and shortcomings of others and life in general, whereas, a humorless person may lead a stressful existence. Humor styles are concerned with how humor is evinced, both positively and negatively. Martin et al. (2003) distinguished between positive and negative humor styles, they are as follows:

1. Affiliative – Affiliative humor style implies the use of wit and harmless use of humor to delight others and to alleviate interpersonal and social relationships. This benevolent use of humor involves spontaneous joke telling and involvement in witty banter.
2. Self-enhancing – Self-enhancing humor typically implies humorous standpoint in life, even during hardships, adversities and idiosyncrasies. Individuals using self-defeating humor style make others laugh by making fun of them self. They ridicule their own selves to attain the approval of others. However, this act of ridiculing is not self-detrimental in nature.
3. Aggressive – Aggressive humor involves ridiculing others, sarcasm and mocking of others with an intention to affront them and to put them down. The deed of teasing can connote prejudices and often disregard the impact of humor on the other person.
4. Self-defeating – This humor styles involves the use of potentially prejudicial use of humor in order to seek approval from others. Individuals utilize self-derogatory humor to make others laugh. In other words, they themselves act as stooge to gain approval of others.

The positive humor styles, namely – affiliative and self-enhancing are beneficial for relationships and emotional well being, while the negative humor styles, namely – aggressive and self-defeating are considered to be detrimental to relationships and emotional well being of an individual. Lefcourt, 2001; Long & Graaesser, 1988, suggest that humor is crucial for interpersonal relationships, as it facilitates positive interactions and helps to diffuse tension and conflict among other things. Negative type of humor involving aggression, teasing and sarcasm impact relationships negatively (Martin, Puhlick-Doris, Larsen, Gray, & Weir, 2003).

1.3 Personality traits

The study of personality traits attracts many researchers and participants as it is something that everyone owns and everyone tries to understand. Personality study has come a long way, from Hippocrates talking about four humors to Freud's psychodynamic perspective to Alfred Adler and Carl Jung trying to differentiate between 'character' and 'personality'. Personality research has seen it all, from Eyesenck's biological perspective, B. F. Skinner's and John B. Watson's behavioral theories, Carl Rogers and Abraham Maslow's humanist theories, Gordon Allport's

trait theory and Raymond Cattell's sixteen personality factors. The later researchers propose that there are five broad attributes that constitute an individual's personality, they are:

1. Extraversion – Individuals scoring high on extraversion enjoy being with people and are typically called extroverts. They are action-oriented people who love to be in the external world. They are friendly gregarious, assertive, cheerful and seek excitement. They are outgoing and have an active social life. Individuals who score low on this scale prefer solitude and a social encounter can be pretty exhausting for them. The individuals who score low on extraversion are called introverts.
2. Agreeableness – This dimension involves characteristics such as kindness, altruism, warm-heartedness and prosocial behaviors. The individuals scoring high on this dimension are empathetic and are fond of helping others. Individuals scoring low on agreeableness are manipulative and unbothered about another person's problems. They have a tendency to be insulting in nature and they often disparage others.
3. Conscientiousness – The individuals scoring high on conscientiousness are thoughtful, painstaking and are in accord with the principles of conscience. These individuals have good impulse control and they like to have predefined schedule. Individuals who are low on conscientiousness neglect assigned tasks and often procrastinate. These individuals frequently make messes and fail to return things.
4. Neuroticism – The individuals who are neurotic are characterized as being moody, sad, anxious and irritable. They often experience mood swings and experience a good deal of tenseness. They worry about an array of various things and have difficulty in rebounding from stressful experiences. Individuals with low levels of neuroticism are emotionally stable and deal with tension in a better way. These individuals remain relaxed and do not often feel sad or depressed.
5. Openness – Individuals high on openness are imaginative and have a wide range of interests. These are queer minds and would not mind embarking upon an adventure. They are curious about the world and are delighted at the idea of thinking about abstract concepts. Individuals low on this trait disfavor change and resist new ideas. They do not like theoretical or abstract constructs and do not enjoy things that are novel to them.

1.4. Coping behavior

Coping implies dealing with a stressful situation by using some cognitive or behavioral strategy. The strategies used are most likely to reduce stress or at least will help in tolerating it. Coping is a conscious effort that helps an individual to deal with stressors that maybe internal or external. Since coping strategies are conveyed by an individual's conscious mind, they consequences can sometimes be positive and at other times be negative. If a person decides to deal with a family conflict by addressing the issues and by resolving problems then it is a positive way of coping and if the individual decides to get drunk when faced with such a problem then that is negative coping behavior. All kinds of emotional survival skills are not healthy, even though they help an individual cope with the stressor. Coping behaviors should be necessarily positive if one wants good mental health. Folkman and Lazarus (1980, 1985) proposed two styles of coping, namely – *problem focused* and *emotion focused.* The former construes contending with the origin of stress, while the latter addressing the feelings and thoughts connected with the stressor. Carver et al. (1989) along with the aforementioned dimensions, further differentiation was needed. Carver et al. (1989) devised COPE inventory in which problem-focused, emotion-focused, seeking social support and avoiding addressing, either the problematic issue or associated emotions were studied. It was later established by many researchers that COPE scales distinguished between socially-supported, self-sufficient, and avoidant coping factors and the former two were more highly associated with each other than with avoidant coping (Litman, 2006). The self-sufficient and socially-supported coping are viewed as positive means of coping while avoidant coping is viewed as a negative mode of coping. The coping strategies identified by Carver are:

1. Positive reinterpretation and growth – It is an emotion-focused coping method, in which individuals deal with their emotions and not directly with the stressor. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) termed this as *positive reappraisal.*
2. Mental disengagement – This is a variant of behavioral disengagement, which implies distracting oneself from thinking about a stressor. One may take off one's mind off from a problem by absorbing oneself in his reverie, sleeping or watching TV.
3. Focus on and venting of emotions – This involves focusing and ventilating whatever distress one is experiencing.
4. Use of instrumental social support – A problem-focused coping strategy; which involves seeking information, counsel and assistance from others.

5. Active coping – This involves putting efforts get rid of the stressor, to sidestep it or improve its effects. This is an attempt to cope by maximizing one's efforts and by taking direct action.
6. Denial – An individual refuses to deal with the cause as well as effects of a stressor and does not acknowledge the stressful realities.
7. Religious coping – This is reliance on faith to boost adjustment to stressful situations.
8. Humor – Helps to change the cognitive appraisal of a stressor.
9. Behavioral disengagement – This involves reducing the efforts to deal with a stressor, even forsaking the remaining task that the stressor is meddling with.
10. Restraint – This is somewhat a passive strategy, as one does not act on the stressor prematurely. Instead one waits until the opportunity shows up to deal with the stressor effectively.
11. Use of emotional social support – This coping strategy focuses on emotions. It involves seeking moral support and understanding from others.
12. Substance use – Taking drugs and alcohol to handle the stressor.
13. Acceptance – This involves embracing change and letting go off what cannot be controlled. Individual gains control over his situation and lets his mind to unwind from the trauma.
14. Suppression of competing activities – This involves setting aside the tasks and even skipping them, if necessary, that are distracting and focusing on dealing with the stressor.
15. Planning – This involves intellection around the ways and coming up with a strategy, with which to deal with the stressor.

From the abovementioned coping strategies are categorized into three groups, namely – self-sufficient, socially supported and avoidant. The former two categories are considered to be adaptive while the latter is considered to be maladaptive.

1.5. Dysfunctional attitude

Dysfunctional attitude is considered to be a hallmark feature of depression. According to Beck's perspective on depression (Beck, 1972), individuals predisposed to depression have dysfunctional schemas, which more or less continue to stay inactive until trying situations arise. Cognitive theories of psychopathology postulate that negative thinking predisposes individuals, when triggered with stress, to manifest, maintain and in some cases leads to reoccurrence of psychiatric and behavioral problems that result in considerable amount of distress (Alloy et al., 2006, Abramson et al., 1989; Beck 1967, 1983; Ingram et al., 1998). Dysfunctional attitude measured by Dysfunctional Attitude Scale (DAS-24) distinguishes between dependency achievement and self control subscales. Achievement subscale measures an individual's undue need for achievement. Dependency subscales measures an individual's reliance on others for approval or appreciation. Self control subscale measures an individual's excessive need to control himself and his circumstances. A number of studies endorsed Beck's supposal that dysfunctional attitudes are discerners of cognitive susceptibility to depression (e.g., Brosse, Craighead, & Craighead, 1999; Fresco et al., 2006; Meites et al., 2008; Vazqijez & Ring, 1993).

1.6. Perceived stress

Perceived stress implies the appraisal of stress and stressful situations in one's life at some specific point in time or spacing over a given period of time. Perceived stress integrates the notions about unmanageable and unpredictable life circumstances as well as how frequently one is bothered by irksome events. Perceived stress also incorporates the feelings that to what extent changes are taking place in one's life and whether or not the person is confident of his ability to address the stress and stressors. Perceived stress does not measure the frequency of stressful events, rather it measures how one feels about them and their ability to address those events. Different individuals may experience similar stressors but the way they appraise them is different. These differences in appraisal can be due to different personalities, coping behaviors employed, emotional intelligence, support from environment etc.

Chapter 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Tremendous amount of research is going on in the field of psychology to study emotional intelligence, humor styles, personality traits, coping behavior, dysfunctional attitude and perceived stress. Most of the variables aforesaid are mainly studied individually and sometimes together in groups that show how they are related to one another.

2.1. Emotional intelligence in relation with coping behavior

Research shows that components of emotional intelligence are evidently linked with coping. Studies show that trait emotional intelligence is linked with improved emotional regulation and adaptive coping (e.g., Downey et al., 2010; Petrides, Pe´rez-Gonza´lez, & Furnham, 2007; Petrides, Pita et al., 2007; Saklofske et al., 2007, Mikolajczak et al., 2007). It is also suggested that emotional intelligence is a fruitful and effective self regulation technique (e.g., Salovey et al., 2000). Folkman and Moskowitz (2000) expressed their view that research in coping should involve both positive and negative emotions and outcomes, thus showing the importance of the relationship of these two variables. Baron and Parleer (2000) suggest that managing stress and capability to adapt are major constituents of emotional intelligence. Engleberg & Sjoberg, 2003, in their study found that individuals not capable of understanding their own emotions have low social adjustment levels in comparison to those with a high capacity to realize their emotions. Lopes et al. 2004, suggest that individuals with less ability to handle their emotions are ineffective at acquiring social support in stressful circumstances. Consistent with these findings, Eskay, (2011) and Furnham et al., (2002) in their studies, found that people with higher emotional intelligence employ regular coping strategies while the individuals possessing high emotional intelligence utilize more avoidance-based coping strategies. Gohm et al. (2005), found that persons with high emotional intelligence employ active coping strategies and are better at adaptation.

2.2. Emotional intelligence in relation with dysfunctional attitude

There is a dearth of literature on dysfunctional attitude and especially in relation to emotional intelligence. However, Petrides et al. (2007), demonstrated that trait emotional intelligence can

predict dysfunctional attitudes. Higher emotional regulation is associated with improved quality of life, which helps to ward off depressive states and thus individuals with higher emotional intelligence have better psychological well-being and happiness (e.g., Austin et al., 2005; Furnham and Petrides, 2003). Saklofske et al., (2003), in their study found emotional intelligence and predisposition for depression to be negatively correlated with each other. Ciarrochi et al. (2002) in their study found that subjects good at managing emotions of others exhibit less depression and less suicidal ideations. In contrast, individuals with high emotional perception report higher occurrence of depression and suicidal ideation. In their study, Schmidt and Andrykowsky, (2004), showed that emotional intelligence is colligated with lower suffering among a sample of women with breast cancer. Slaski and Cartwright, (2002), in their study observed that individuals possessing high levels of emotional intelligence go through less subjective stress and also have better health and well being as well as exhibit better management performance, thus reducing the chances of having dysfunctional attitude which may lead to depression.

2.3. Emotional intelligence in relation with perceived stress

Salovey et al., (1999), suggest that emotional intelligence could be used as an effective stress regulation system. Some studies have found that individuals with good emotional regulation experience lower perceived stress levels, and have better quality of life (e.g., Austin et al., 2005; Furnham and Petrides, 2003). In a study conducted by Pau and Croucher, (2003), individuals with higher levels of emotional intelligence endured less perceived stress and had improved health and well-being. Gohm et al., (2005), postulated that emotional intelligence acts as a defender against stress. The association between emotional intelligence and stress is well proved in the academic literature (e.g., Ciarrochi, et al. 2002; Extremera et al. 2007: Gohm et al. 2005). Study by Birks et al. (2009), found 'moderate' relationship between emotional intelligence and stress. Individuals with higher trait emotional intelligence are better off at managing stress and are better able to appraise, express and manage their emotions (e.g., Greven, et al. 2008). Ciarrochi, Dean, & Anderson, (2002) demonstrated that people with higher levels of emotional intelligence deal better with the environmental demands than those who have lower levels of it, indicating lesser stress levels for the former group of individuals. People with high emotional intelligence can well comprehend other people's emotions and manage their own emotions pretty

well and in an adaptive manner, in comparison to individuals with low levels of emotional intelligence (Mayer & Salovey, 1993). Abdollahi et al. (2016) found that "depressed adolescent in-patients with high levels of perceived stress and low levels of emotional intelligence were more likely to report suicidal ideation" and "depressed in-patients high in both perceived stress and emotional intelligence had less suicidal ideation". The study of Abdollahi et al. (2016) highlights the essentiality of emotional intelligence "as a buffer in the relationship between perceived stress and suicidal ideation". Studies show that emotionally intelligent people endure and handle stress better during agonizing state of affairs, and have a belief that the outcome of an event would be bright. Naidoo & Pau (2008), in their study concluded that emotional intelligence is inversely correlated to perceive stress.

2.4. Humor styles in relation with coping behavior

Humor styles and coping are well studied concepts individually; however there is inadequate amount of literature that studies the relationship between the two. Humor and laughter are often thought of as means with the help of which people try to cope with the difficulties of life (Ziv, 1988). The slogans such as "Laughter is the best medicine" have furthermore enhanced the importance of laughter and humor. Different individuals have different humor styles and not all of them are considered as being good and healthy. Studies using the 'Humor Styles Questionnaire (HSQ)' found, self-enhancing and affiliative humor to be positively associated with interpersonal adaptation measures and emotional well-being, whereas aggressive humor was found to be associated with hostility, and self-defeating humor was found to associated with negative emotions, low social support, and low self-esteem (Kuiper et al. 2004; Martin et al., 2003). The use humor is in itself a coping behavior; nevertheless the styles in which the humor is used is worthy of studying. Research supports that, self-defeating and self-enhancing humor styles are pertinent in terms of grappling with stress (e.g., Cann et al., 2010; Oktug, 2017). Findings of this sort suggest that self-directed humor is essential when looking at factors pertaining to psychological well being and ailments of mood, such as depression.

2.5. Humor styles in relation with dysfunctional attitude

The existing pool of literature does not say a lot about the association between humor styles and dysfunctional attitude. However, some studies suggest that, self-defeating humor style is correlated with negative self-evaluation, low self esteem and overall lower psychological well-being, which is strongly correlative with depression (e.g., Kuiper & McHale, 2009; Schermer et al., 2017). Making use of self-defeating style of humor rather than affiliative style is also related to increase in depressive symptoms (Frewen et al., 2008). The susceptibility to manifestation of depression as an implication of using a particular style of humor suggests that it can also be related to dysfunctional attitude. Study by Rnic et al. (2016) demonstrated that cognitive distortions, corresponding to cognitive susceptibility to depression, are conciliated by the underemployment of adaptive style of humor. Cann et al. (2010), reasoned that styles of humor focusing on self had larger part in acting upon the interrelation of stress and health as compared to other humor styles.

2.6. Humor styles in relation with perceived stress

Research supports that good sense of humor acts to soften the impact of negative impact of nerve-racking life circumstances (e.g., Nezu, Nezu & Blissett, 1988; Martin & Lefcourt, 1983; Martin & Dobbin, 1988). Some studies suggest that highly humorous persons show less negative affect after experiencing high stress levels, when compared with less humorous individuals. Abel (2002) observed that lower levels of perceived stress were associated with high sense of humor. He reasoned that individuals with high sense of humor use advantageous coping strategies to deal with stress. Humor involves some incongruousness that can be understood in various manners, thus humor can be used to reposition views about stressful events. Yesteryear studies have pointed that certain humor styles carry out this in a manner which is positive and advantageous i.e., affiliative and self-enhancing style of humor, while other humor styles are negative or disadvantageous i.e., aggressive and self-defeating humor (e.g., Kuiper et al. 2004; Martin et al. 2003;)

2.7. Personality traits in relation with coping behavior

McCrae & Costa, 1986, presume that coping behaviors preferred by an individual can be deduced from personality traits like neuroticism and extraversion. Parkes (1986) suggests that

neuroticism is associated with less efficacious coping styles and extraversion has a positive impact on active and problem-focused coping. It is long living perspective that personality traits are substantial determinants of coping behaviors, as individuals may be predisposed to prefer a certain strategy over another (e.g., Carver et al. 1989; Byrne, 1964; ; Suls et al. 1996). Researchers like Watson and Hubbard (1996) reexamined ample literature that endorses this opinion. Some studies found that neuroticism was positively related to emotion-focused strategies of coping such as venting of emotions, and negatively associated with problem-focused coping behaviors like planning (e.g., O'Brien & DeLongis, 1996; McCrae & Costa, 1986; Hooker et al., 1994; Watson & Hubbard, 1996). Research has also found extraversion to be positively linked with problem-centered strategies of coping such as rational action (e.g., McCrae & Costa, 1986; Watson & Hubbard, 1996). As per other studies, agreeableness has been found to be positively associated with emotion focused strategies of coping, such as seeking social support and problem focused coping like planning (O'Brien & DeLongis, 1996; Watson & Hubbard, 1996). Studies have also found conscientiousness to be negatively associated with emotion-focused strategies of coping, in particular substance use and avoidance, have been positively associated with problem-centered strategies of coping, like planning (Watson & Hubbard, 1996; O'Brien & DeLongis, 1996). Neuroticism, conscientiousness and extraversion have been found to be linked with coping (Vollrath & Torgerson).

2.8. Personality traits in relation with dysfunctional attitude

Research has showed that Big Five personality traits are relatively unchanging, this holds true even when an individual is experiencing a depressive episode (e.g., Costa et al., 2005; McCrae and Costa, 2008; Morey et al., 2010; Steunenberg et al., 2005), or they is only marginal impact of mood disorders (e.g., Costa et al., 2005; Karsten et al., 2012). Nonetheless, other researchers argue that personality certainly is acted upon by depressed mood (Lucas & Donnellan, 2011), predicating that constancy of personality is still debatable. The relation of personality traits with dysfunctional attitude is still something that needs to be studied at a great length. There is paucity in literature about personality traits and their relation with dysfunctional attitude. Some inferences can be drawn from the literature about depression, but that would do not be justifiable. In the meta-analysis, performed by Malouff et al. (2005), found mood disorders to be linked to a distinctive pattern of personality traits. Neuroticism, extraversion and conscientiousness had

larger effect and agreeableness had lesser effect while significant link was not found with openness. Kotov et al., (2010) demonstrated a link between high neuroticism levels and depressive disorders. The same study also demonstrated a link between low levels of conscientiousness and depressive disorders. Kotov et al., (2010) also observed that both neuroticism and conscientiousness had a great impact on depressive disorders. There is an ever-increasing body of evidence that personality has significant role to play in late-life depression (depression occurring in people over sixty years of age). Current body of literature indicates that neuroticism is strongly associated with manifestation, course of maintenance and treatment outcome of late-life depression (e.g., Hayward et al., 2013; Duberstein et al., 2008; Steunenberg et al., 2006; Weber et al., 2011, Canuto et al., 2009, Kling et al., 2003, Weiss et al., 2009).

2.9. Personality traits in relation with perceived stress

Personality has been found to be associated with the likelihood of being subjected to stress (Bolger & Zuckerman, 1995) as well as to the assessment of a circumstance as nerve-racking (Guthert, Cohen, & Armeli, 1999). It has also been found that neuroticism, extraversion, and conscientiousness are associated with stress (Vollrath & Torgerson). Neurotic individuals are more likely to undergo negative emotions like anxiety and depression (Velting, 1999). Extraverts are likely to experience comparatively positive effects of a situation while neurotics endure more negative effects of the same event (Kagan & Snidman, 1991). Besser & Shackelford (2007) found conscientiousness to be negatively related to perceived stress. Evidence also suggests that openness and agreeableness are negatively correlated with perceived stress (Ebstrup et al., 2011). Grant & Langan-Fox (2007) found extraversion, agreeableness and openness to be uncorrelated to perceived stress. Ebstrup et al., (2011) noticed a positive correlation between neuroticism and perceived stress, negative correlation between extraversion, conscientiousness as well as agreeableness and perceived stress and no “statistically significant total effect was seen between openness and perceived stress score.”

2.10. Research Gap

The available studies emphasize on emotional intelligence, humor styles, personality traits, coping behavior, dysfunctional attitude and perceived stress, individually. There exist a few studies that have examined the association between aforementioned variables. However, the

relationships of dysfunctional attitude and coping behavior with other variables are not studied to a great extent. The individual groups formed in this study are not often found in the existing literature. Moreover, there is plethora of studies that pertain to the western population. There are not enough studies previously that can prove the credibility of the relationships between these variables, especially in the Indian context. Some studies like those by Grant & Langan-Fox (2007), found no relationship between agreeableness and perceived stress, whereas this study found a negative relationship. Therefore, some contradictions of this sort were found in the present study, which bespeak a rigorous study. There is particularly, dearth of literature on dysfunctional attitude, especially which concerns its relationship to humor styles. Investigation to an even greater extent is required to study the relationship of humor styles and coping behavior. Overall, the aforesaid variables and their subscales have not been studies thoroughly and also in connection to each other. This study is a humble effort to explore the direction of relationships between the aforesaid variables and also analyze individual subscales. This study also aims to reduce the insufficiency that exists in literature in Indian context.

Chapter 3: Motivation, Objectives, and Hypotheses of study

3.1. Motivation of the study

The study was aimed at minutely examining the relationship of emotional intelligence, humor styles and personality traits with coping behavior, dysfunctional attitude and perceived stress. Most of the literature focuses on studying these variables individually. There is particularly, dearth of literature on dysfunctional attitude. There is indication that dysfunctional attitude predisposes a person to depression, however, there are very few studies that pertain directly to it. Relationships of neuroticism and extraversion with other variables have particularly been studied extensively, but openness, conscientiousness and agreeableness have not yielded as many significant results. As for coping behavior, all the coping mechanisms have mostly been studied in singularity and as well as in relation to psychopathology. There are not enough studies that explore its relationship with emotional intelligence and humor styles. There is a need for more studies that intend to analyze the relationship between emotional intelligence and coping because

there is dearth of evidence that credibly shows the relationship of emotional intelligence with coping behaviors.

3.2. Objectives of the current study

1. To study the relationship between emotional intelligence and coping behavior, dysfunctional attitude and perceived stress.
2. To study the relationship between humor styles and coping behavior, dysfunctional attitude and perceived stress.
3. To study the relationship between personality traits and coping behavior, dysfunctional attitude and perceived stress.

3.3. Hypotheses for the study

H_{1a}: Emotional intelligence is correlated positively with self-sufficient and socially supported coping behaviors.

H_{1b}: Emotional intelligence is correlated negatively with avoidant coping behaviors.

H_{1c}: Emotional intelligence is correlated negatively with dysfunctional attitude.

H_{1d}: Emotional intelligence is correlated negatively with perceived stress.

H_{2a}: Positive humor styles are correlated positively with self-sufficient, socially supported and avoidant coping behavior.

H_{2b}: Negative humor styles are correlated positively with self-sufficient, socially supported and avoidant coping behaviors coping behavior.

H_{2c}: Positive humor styles are correlated negatively with dysfunctional attitude.

H_{2d}: Negative humor styles are correlated positively with dysfunctional attitude.

H_{2e}: Positive humor styles are correlated negatively with perceived stress.

H_{2f}: Negative humor styles are correlated negatively with correlated with perceived stress.

H_{3a}: Extraversion is correlated positively with self-sufficient, socially supported coping behavior.

H_{3b}: Extraversion is correlated negatively with avoidant coping behavior.

H_{3c}: Extraversion is correlated negatively with dysfunctional attitude.

H_{3d}: Extraversion is correlated negatively with perceived stress.

H_{3e}: Agreeableness is correlated positively with self-sufficient, socially supported coping behavior.

H_{3f}: Agreeableness is correlated negatively with avoidant coping behavior.

H_{3g}: Agreeableness is correlated negatively with dysfunctional attitude.

H_{3h}: Agreeableness is correlated negatively with perceived stress.

H_{3i}: Conscientiousness is correlated positively with self-sufficient, socially supported coping behavior.

H_{3j}: Conscientiousness is correlated negatively with avoidance coping behavior.

H_{3k}: Conscientiousness is correlated negatively with dysfunctional attitude.

H_{3l}: Conscientiousness is correlated negatively with perceived stress.

H_{3m}: Neuroticism is correlated negatively with self-sufficient, socially supported coping behavior.

H_{3n}: Neuroticism is correlated positively with avoidance coping behavior.

H_{3o}: Neuroticism is correlated positively with dysfunctional attitude.

H_{3p}: Neuroticism is correlated positively with perceived stress.

H_{3q}: Openness is correlated positively with self-sufficient, socially supported coping behavior.

H_{3r}: Openness is correlated negatively with avoidance coping behavior.

H_{3s}: Openness is correlated negatively with dysfunctional attitude.

H_{3t}: Openness is correlated negatively with perceived stress.

Chapter 4

METHOD

4.1. Sample

A total of 120 student volunteers (60 males and 60 females) of the age range 18-25 years participated in the study. Convenient sampling was done. The students were taken from the normal population of various colleges of Patiala, Punjab, India.

4.2. Design

The independent variables: emotional intelligence, humor styles and personality traits.

The dependent variables: coping behavior, dysfunctional attitude and perceived stress.

4.3. Statistical analysis

In the present study descriptive statistics were computed. Correlation analysis was performed to see the relationship between different variables. Regression analysis was performed for the variables where significant correlations were found.

4.4. Tools used

- The Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire Short Form (TEIQue-SF), developed by Petrides (2009) was employed to assess emotional intelligence. It measures well being, self control, emotionality and sociability of a person. It provides an overall picture of an individual's emotional functioning.
- Humor styles questionnaire (HSQ), developed by Martin and Doris (2003), and was employed to assess humor styles. It measures affiliative, self-enhancing, aggressive and self-defeating humor.
- The Big Five Inventory (BFI), developed by Robert McCrae and Paul Costa was used. The 44-item inventory measures, agreeableness, extraversion, conscientiousness, openness and neuroticism.
- COPE Inventory designed by Carver (2013) was used. It has 15 scales that measure self-sufficient, avoidant and socially supported coping behavior.

- Dysfunctional attitude scale (DAS-24), developed by Power et al. (1994) was used to assess the intensity of the dysfunctional attitudes. It has three subscales, namely achievement, dependency and self-control. It measures a person's predisposition for depression in the areas of achievement, dependency and self-control.
- Perceived stress scale (PSS), developed by Cohen (1983), and was employed to assess the perception of stress. The questions in perceived stress scale are of general nature and ask about feelings and thoughts of the previous month.

4.5. Procedure

The participants were informed in detail about the study protocols and written consent was obtained from them. The subjects were informed about the procedure and were given instructions. The instructions given were – "You have to fill some questionnaires, which will measure some behavioral patterns. Do not think too hard, as there is no right or wrong answer. The first answer that comes to your mind is generally right. The information collected from you will be kept confidential. Please respond as honestly as you can". The subjects were seated comfortably. The questionnaires were made into a booklet and handed over to the subject

Chapter 5

RESULTS

The mean, standard deviation, correlation and regression were performed for all the variables being studied, i.e., emotional intelligence, humor styles, personality traits, coping behavior, dysfunctional attitude and perceived stress.

5.1. Emotional intelligence in relation with coping behavior.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for emotional intelligence and coping behavior.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
WB	120	4.81	.964
SC	120	4.29	2.444
E	120	4.41	1.000
S	120	4.21	.952
TOTAL EI	120	4.39	.652
POS RE & GR	120	12.01	2.266
MNTL DIS	120	11.10	2.277
VENT EMO	120	10.49	2.429
INST SOC SUP	120	11.08	2.419
ACT COP	120	11.19	2.224
DENIAL	119	9.24	2.804
RELG COP	120	10.99	3.050
HUMOR	120	9.49	2.759
BEH DISENG	120	9.06	2.545
RESTRAINT	120	10.91	2.000
EM SOC SUP	120	10.16	2.951
SUBS USE	120	7.53	4.685
ACCEPT	120	10.92	2.339
SUP COM ACT	120	10.98	2.043
PLANNING	120	11.65	2.255

WB- Well Being, SC-Self Control, S- Sociability, E- Emotionality, TOTAL EI –Total emotional intelligence, POS RE & GR- Positive reinterpretation and growth, INST SOC SUP- use of instrumental social support, MNTL DIS-Mental disengagement, ACT COPE-Active coping, RELG COPE-Religious coping, DENIAL-Denial, HUMOR-Humor, BEH DIS- Behavioral disengagement, VENT EMO-Venting of emotions, RESTRAINT- Restraint, EM SOC SUP- Use of emotional social support, SUBS USE- Substance use, ACCEPT-Acceptance, SUP COM ACT-Suppression of competing activities, PLANNING-Planning..

Table 2: Correlation analysis for emotional intelligence and coping behavior.

	WB	SC	E	S	TOT	POS RE & GR	MNTL DIS	VENT EMO	INST SOC SUP	ACT COP	DENIAL	RELG COP	HUMOR	BEH DISENG	REST RAINT	EM SOC SUP	SUBS USE	ACCEPT	SUP COM ACT	PLANNING
WB	1																			
SC	-.038	1																		
E	.471**	.132	1																	
S	.296**	.087	.313**	1																
TOTAL	.711**	.209*	.702**	.549**	1															
POS RE & GR	.426**	.113	.313**	.244**	.516**	1														
MNTL DIS	-.010	.064	-.099	.029	-.086	.115	1													
VENT EMO	.060	-.016	.069	.005	-.021	.066	.272**	1												
INST SOC SUP	.154	.086	.220*	.046	.172	.254**	.188*	.268**	1											
ACT COP	.318**	.048	.196*	.240**	.388**	.457**	-.004	.171	.260**	1										
DENIAL	-.310**	-.022	-.356**	-.214*	-.380**	-.164	.239**	.150	-.042	-.099	1									
RELG COP	.161	.057	-.147	-.042	-.032	.106	.283**	.132	.076	.047	.157	1								
HUMOR	-.063	.049	-.052	.008	-.084	-.001	.300**	.068	.203*	.074	.433**	.054	1							
BEH DISENG	-.287**	.025	-.300**	-.239**	-.353**	-.168	.238**	.229*	.022	-.050	.537**	.292**	.320**	1						
RESTRAINT	.053	.070	.116	-.010	.139	.308**	.094	.222*	.168	.251**	-.045	.045	.112	.145	1					
EM SOC SUP	-.043	.101	.114	-.005	-.022	.063	.238**	.417**	.414**	.071	.207*	-.051	.273**	.266**	.155	1				
SUBS USE	-.185*	.009	-.181*	-.154	-.178	-.203*	-.059	-.024	-.084	-.044	.186*	.093	.170	.164	-.036	.085	1			
ACCEPT	.054	.071	.053	.015	.101	.246**	.038	.038	.145	.315**	-.022	.088	.086	.167	.225*	.073	.075	1		
SUP COM ACT	.178	-.028	.062	.026	.117	.350**	.170	.199*	.266**	.399**	.161	.147	.050	.149	.121	.286**	.065	.112	1	
PLANNING	.339**	-.007	.129	.190*	.364**	.579**	.141	.157	.242**	.657**	-.077	.063	.001	.004	.228*	.044	-.189*	.209*	.417**	1

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

* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed level)

WB- Well Being, SC- Self Control, S- Sociability, E- Emotionality, TOTAL EI –Total emotional intelligence, POS RE & GR- Positive reinterpretation and growth, VENT EMO-Venting of emotions, INST SOC SUP- use of instrumental social support, DENIAL-Denial, ACT COPE-Active coping , MNTL DIS-Mental disengagement, RELG COPE-Religious coping, HUMOR-Humor, BEH DIS- Behavioral disengagement, RESTRAINT- Restraint, EM SOC SUP- Use of emotional social support, ACCEPT-Acceptance, SUBS USE- Substance use, SUP COM ACT-Suppression of competing activities, PLANNING-Planning.

Results indicate that well being is positively correlated with positive reinterpretation and growth (r=.426, p<.01), planning (r=.339, p<.01) and active coping (r=.318, p<.01). Well being is negatively correlated with denial (r=.310, p<.01), behavioral disengagement (r=.287, p<.01) and substance use (r=.185, p<.01). Emotionality is positively correlated with positive reinterpretation and growth (r=.313, p<.01), use of instrumental social support (r=.220, p<.05) and active coping (r=.196, p<.05). Sociability is positively correlated with positive reinterpretation and growth (r=.244, p<.01), planning (r=.190, p<.05) and active coping (r=.240, p<.01) at .01, .05 and .01 level respectively. Total emotional intelligence is positively correlated with positive reinterpretation and growth (r=.516, p<.01), planning (r=.364, p<.01) and active coping (r=.388, p<.01). Total emotional intelligence is correlated negatively with denial (r=.380, p<.01) and behavioral disengagement (r=.353, p<.01)

Table 3: Regression analysis of well being for positive reinterpretation and growth, active coping, behavioral disengagement, denial, substance use and planning.

Coping strategies (dependent variable)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Positive reinterpretation and growth	6.871	1.020	.426	6.733	.000	0.175
	1.071	0.209		5.122	.000	
Active coping	7.437	1.050	0.318	7.083	.000	.093
	0.783	.215		3.683	.000	
Denial	13.857	1.333	-.310	10.397	.000	.088
	-.964	.274		-3.521	.000	
Behavioral disengagement	12.945	1.214	-.287	10.667	.000	.075
	-.811	.249		-3.259	.000	
Substance use	12.136	2.292	-.185	5.294	.000	.026
	-.961	.470		-2.046	.000	
Planning	7.588	1.057	.339	7.182	.000	.107
	.847	.217		3.911	.000	

From the above regression table, adjusted R square for positive reinterpretation and growth is.175, for active coping is .093, for denial is .088, for behavioral disengagement is .075, for substance use is .026 and for planning is .107. Therefore, 17.5% variance in positive reinterpretation and growth can be attributed to well being, 9.3% variance in active coping can be attributed to well being, 8.8% variance in denial can be attributed to well being, 7.5% variance in behavioral disengagement can be attributed to well being, 2.6% variance in substance use can be attributed to well being and 10.7% variance in planning can be attributed to well being. The beta value obtained for positive reinterpretation and growth is 1.071, which shows that one unit increase in well being will result in 1.071 unit increase in positive reinterpretation and growth. The beta value obtained for active coping, denial, behavioral disengagement, substance use and planning are 0.783, -.964, -.811, -.961 and .847 respectively. These indicate that one unit increase in well-being will result in 0.783 unit increase in active coping, .964 unit decrease in denial, .811 unit decrease in behavioral disengagement, .961 unit decrease in substance use and .847 unit increase in planning.

Table 4: Regression analysis of emotionality for positive reinterpretation and growth, use of instrumental social support, denial, behavioral disengagement, active coping and substance use.

Coping strategies (dependent variable)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Positive reinterpretation and growth	8.814 .725	.915 .203	.313	9.627 3.574	.000 .000	.090
Use of instrumental social support	8.677 .544	1.004 .223	.220	8.645 2.447	.000 .016	.040
Active coping	9.226 .446	.928 .206	.196	9.946 2.170	.000 .032	.030
Denial	13.734 -1.019	1.116 .247	-.356	13.302 -4.119	.000 .000	.119
Behavioral disengagement	12.507 -.783	1.032 .229	-.300	12.115 -3.421	.000 .001	.083
Substance use	11.356 -.870	1.960 .434	-.181	5.795 -2.002	.000 .048	.025

From the above regression table, adjusted R square for positive reinterpretation and growth is.090, for use of instrumental social support is .040, for active coping is .030, for denial is .119, for behavioral disengagement is .083 and for substance use is .025. Therefore, 9% variance in positive reinterpretation and growth can be attributed to emotionality, 4% variance in use of instrumental social support can be attributed to emotionality, 3% variance in active coping can be attributed to emotionality, 11.9% variance in denial can be attributed to emotionality, 8.3% variance in behavioral disengagement can be attributed to emotionality and 2.5% variance in substance use can be attributed to emotionality. The beta value obtained for positive reinterpretation and growth is .725, which shows that one unit increase in emotionality will result

in .725 unit increase in positive reinterpretation and growth. The beta value obtained for use of instrumental social support is .544, active coping is .446, denial is 1.019, behavioral disengagement is 7.83 and substance use is .870. This indicates that one unit increase in emotionality will lead to .544 unit increase in use of instrumental social support, .446 unit increase in active coping, 1.019 unit decrease in denial, .783 unit decrease in behavioral disengagement and .870 unit decrease in substance use.

Table 5: Regression analysis of sociability for positive reinterpretation and growth, behavioral disengagement, active coping, denial, and planning.

Coping strategies (dependent variable)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Positive reinterpretation and growth	9.474 .598	.949 .219	.244	9.985 2.733	.000 .007	.052
Active coping	8.743 .578	.932 .215	.240	9.379 2.688	.000 .008	.050
Denial	11.981 -.647	1.185 .274	-.214	10.113 -2.365	.000 .020	.037
Behavioral disengagement	11.842 -.657	1.067 .246	-.239	11.097 -2.669	.000 .009	.049
Planning	9.689 .463	.956 .221	.190	10.133 2.099	.000 .038	.028

From the above regression table, adjusted R square for positive reinterpretation and growth is .052, for active coping is .050, for denial is .37, for behavioral disengagement is .049 and for planning is .028. Therefore, 5.2% variance in positive reinterpretation and growth can be

attributed to sociability, 5% variance in active coping can be attributed to sociability, 3.7% variance in denial can be attributed to sociability, 4.9% variance in behavioral disengagement can be attributed to sociability and 2.8% variance in planning can be attributed to sociability. The beta value obtained for positive reinterpretation and growth is .598, which shows that one unit increase in sociability will result in .598 unit increase in positive reinterpretation and growth. The beta value obtained for active coping, denial, behavioral disengagement and planning are .578, .647, .657 and .463 respectively. These indicate that one unit increase in sociability will result in .578 unit increase in active coping, .647 unit decrease in denial, .657 unit decrease in behavioral disengagement and .463 unit increase in planning.

Table 6: Regression analysis of total emotional intelligence for positive reinterpretationa nd growth, active coping, denial, behavioral disenagagement and planning.

Coping strategies (dependent variable)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Positive reinterpretation and growth	3.595 1.905	1.298 .291	.516	2.770 6.545	.007 .000	.260
Active coping	4.984 1.406	1.371 .307	.388	3.636 4.573	.000 .000	.143
Denial	16.877 -1.729	1.735 .389	-.380	9.728 -4.442	.000 .000	.137
Behavioral disengagement	15.519 -1.463	1.592 .357	-.353	9.748 -4.097	.000 .000	.117
Planning	5.752 1.336	1.405 .315	.364	4.094 4.239	.000 .000	.125

From the above regression table, adjusted R square for positive reinterpretation and growth is .260, for active coping is .143, for denial is .137, for behavioral disengagement is .117 and for planning is .125. Therefore, 26% variance in positive reinterpretation and growth can be ascribed to total emotional intelligence, 14.3% variance in active coping can be acribed to total emotional intelligence, 13.7% variance in denial can be ascribed to total emotional intelligence, 11.7% variance in behavioral disengagement can be ascribed to total emotional intelligence and 12.5% variance in planning can be attributed to total emotional intelligence. The beta value obtained for positive reinterpretation and growth 1.905, which shows that one unit increase in total emotional intelligence would result in 1.905 unit increase in positive reinterpretation and growth. The beta value obtained for active coping, denial, behavioral disengagement and planning are 1.406, 1.729, 1.463 and 1.336 respectively. These indicate that one unit increase in total emotional intelligence would result in 1.406 unit increase in active coping, .1.729 unit decrease in denial, 1.463 unit decrease in behavioral disengagement and .1.336 unit increase in planning.

5.2. Emotional intelligence in relation with dysfunctional attitude.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for emotional intelligence and dysfunctional attitude.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
WB	120	4.81	.964
SC	120	4.29	2.444
E	120	4.41	1.000
S	120	4.21	.952
TOTAL	120	4.39	.652
ACH	120	4.19	.802
DEP	120	3.45	.951
SE CNTRL	120	4.40	.844
TOTAL DS	120	96.18	12.219

WB-Well being, E- Emotionality, SC- Self Control, S- Sociability, TOTAL EI –Total emotional intelligence, ACH-Achievement, DEP-Dependency, SE CNTRL- self control, TOTAL DS- Total dysfunctional attitude.

Table 2: Correlation analysis for emotional intelligence and dysfunctional attitude.

	WB	SC	E	S	TOTAL EI	ACH	DEP	SE CNTRL	TOTAL DS
WB	1								
SC	-.038	1							
E	.471**	.132	1						
S	.296**	.087	.313**	1					
TOTAL EI	.711**	.209*	.703**	.549**	1				
ACH	-.169	.031	-.090	-.203*	-.100	1			
DEP	-.295**	.126	-.129	-.079	-.254**	.121	1		
SE CNTRL	.198*	.064	.044	.026	.194*	.422**	-.287**	1	
TOTAL DS	-.163	.124	-.110	-.111	-.103	.782**	.506**	.542**	1

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

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

WB- Well being, S- Sociability, SC- Self control, E- Emotionality, TOTAL EI –Total emotional intelligence, ACH-Achievement, DEP-Dependency, SE CNTRL- self control, TOTAL DS- Total dysfunctional attitude.

Table 3: Regression analysis of well being for dependency and self control dysfunctional attitudes.

Dysfunctional attitude (dependent variable)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Dependency	4.895	.446	-.295	10.986	.000	.080
	-.307	.091		-3.358	.001	
Self control	3.538	.404	.198	8.749	.000	.031
	.182	.083		2.196	.030	

From the above regression table, adjusted R square for dependency and self control is .080 and .031 respectively. Therefore, 8% variance in dependency can be attributed to well being and 3.1% variance in self control can be attributed to well being. The beta value obtained for dependency is .307, which shows that increase in one unit of well being will result in .307 unit

decrease in dependency and increase in one unit of well being will result in .182 unit increase in self control.

Table 4: Regression analysis of sociability for achievement dysfunctional attitude.

Dysfunctional attitude (dependent variable)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Achievement	4.918 -.171	.327 .076	-.203	15.024 -2.258	.000 .026	.033

As seen in the above regression table, adjusted R square for achievement is .033, which means that 3.3% variance in achievement can be attributed to sociability. The beta value obtained for achievement is .171, which shows that increase in one unit of sociability will result in .171 unit decrease in achievement.

Table 5: Regression analysis of total emotional intelligence for dependency and self control dysfunctional attitude.

Dysfunctional attitude (dependent variable)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coeffcients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Dependency	5.138 -.388	.606 .136	-.254	8.482 -2.856	.000 .005	.057
Self control	3.252 .262	.543 .122	.194	5.984 2.152	.000 .033	.030

As seen in the above table, adjusted R square for dependency and self control is .057 and .030 respectively. This means that 5.7% variance in dependency can be ascribed to total emotional

intelligence and 3% variance in self control can be attributed to total emotional intelligence. The beta value for dependency and self control is 3.88 and .262 respectively. This indicates that increase in total emotional intelligence by one unit will result in .388 unit decrease in dependency and increase in self control dysfunctional attitudes by .262 units.

5.3. Emotional intelligence in relation with perceived stress.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for emotional intelligence and perceived stress.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
WB	120	4.81	.964
SC	120	4.29	2.444
E	120	4.41	1.000
S	120	4.21	.952
TOTAL	120	4.39	.652
P STRESS	120	20.80	5.984

WB- Well Being, S- Sociability, SC- Self Control, E- Emotionality, TOTAL EI –Total emotional intelligence, P STRESS- Perceived stress.

Table 2: Correlation analysis for emotional intelligence and perceived stress.

	WB	SC	E	S	TOTAL	P STRESS
WB	1					
SC	-.038	1				
E	.471**	.132	1			
S	.296**	.087	.313**	1		
TOTAL	.711**	.209*	.702**	.549**	1	
P STRESS	-.267**	-.231*	-.198*	-.370**	-.456**	1

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

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

WB- Well Being, S- Sociability, SC- Self Control, E- Emotionality, TOTAL EI –Total emotional intelligence, P STRESS- Perceived stress.

The results indicate that well being (r=.267, p<.01), emotionality (r=.198, p<.05), self-control (r=.231, p<.05), sociability (r=.370, p<.01), and total emotional intelligence (r=.456, p<.01), are correlated negatively with perceived stress.

Table 3: Regression analysis of emotional intelligence for perceived stress.

(Constant)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coeffcients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Well Being	29.279 -1.768	.2.872 .589	-.267	10.196 -3.004	.000 .003	.063
Self Control	23.246 -.568	1.089 .220	-.231	21.344 -2.577	.000 .011	.045
Emotionality	26.137 -1.212	2.495 .553	-.198	10.476 -2.191	.000 .030	.031
Sociability	30.961 -2.399	2.400 .554	-.370	12.900 -4.332	.000 .000	.130
Total Emotional Intelligence	40.411 -4.441	3.562 .799	-.456	11.346 -5.558	.000 .000	.201

Dependent variable: Perceived stress

The adjusted R square for well being is .063, self control is .045, emotionality is .031, sociability is .130 and total emotional intelligence is .201. Therefore, 6.3% variance in well being can be attributed to perceived stress, 4.5% variance in self control can be attributed to perceived stress, 3.1% variance in emotionality can be attributed to perceived stress, 13% variance in sociability can be attributed to perceived stress and 20.1% variance in total emotional intelligence can be attributed to perceived stress. The beta value obtained from well being is 1.768, self control is .568, emotionality is 1.212, sociability is 2.399 and total emotional intelligence is 4.441. This shows that increase in perceived stress by one unit will result in 1.768 unit decrease in well being, .568 unit decrease in self control, 1.212 unit decrease in emotionality, 2.399 unit decrease in sociability and 4.441 unit decrease in total emotional intelligence.

5.4. Humor styles in relation with coping behavior.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for humor styles coping behavior.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
POS RE & GR	120	12.01	2.266
MNTL DIS	120	11.10	2.277
VENT EMO	120	10.49	2.429
INST SOC SUP	120	11.08	2.419
ACT COP	120	11.19	2.224
DENIAL	119	9.24	2.804
RELG COP	120	10.99	3.050
HUMOR	120	9.49	2.759
BEH DISENG	120	9.06	2.545
RESTRAINT	120	10.91	2.000
EM SOC SUP	120	10.16	2.951
SUBS USE	120	7.53	4.685
ACCEPT	120	10.92	2.339
SUP COM ACT	120	10.98	2.043
PLANNING	120	11.65	2.255
ACH	120	4.19	.802
DEP	120	3.45	.951
SE CNTRL	120	4.40	.844
TOTAL DS	120	96.18	12.219
AFF	120	31.87	6.517
SEL ENH	120	32.07	5.427
AGG	120	32.20	5.183
SEL DEF	120	34.25	6.151

POS RE & GR- Positive reinterpretation and growth, , VENT EMO-Venting of emotions, MNTL DIS-Mental disengagement , INST SOC SUP- use of instrumental social support, ACT COPE-Active coping, DENIAL-Denial, , HUMOR-Humor, BEH DIS- Behavioral disengagement, RESTRAINT- Restraint, , SUBS USE- Substance use, EM SOC SUP- use of emotional support, ACCEPT-Acceptance, SUP COM ACT-Suppression of competing activities, RELG COPE-Religious coping,, PLANNING-Planning, ACH-Achievement, DEP-Dependency, SE CNTRL- self control, TOTAL DS- Total dysfunctional attitude, AFF-Affiliative, AGG- Aggressive, SE ENH-Self-enhancing, SEL DEF- Self-defeating.

Table 2: Correlation analysis for humor styles and coping behavior.

	AFF	SEL ENH	AGG	SEL DEF	POS RE & GR	MNTL DIS	VENT EMO	INST SOC SUP	ACT COP	DENIAL	RELG COP	HUMOR	BEH DISENG	RESTRAINT	EM SOC SUP	SUBS USE	ACCEPT	SUP COM ACT	PLANNING
AFF	1																		
SEL ENH	-.053	1																	
AGG	-.076	-.287**	1																
SEL DEF	-.237**	.066	.156	1															
POS RE & GR	.010	.234*	-.022	.292**	1														
MNTL DIS	-.078	-.105	-.005	.178	.115	1													
VENT EMO	.094	-.057	.240**	.169	.066	.272**	1												
INST SOC SUP	.169	-.053	.060	.067	.254**	.188*	.268**	1											
ACT COP	.034	.041	.016	.102	.457**	-.004	.171	.260**	1										
DENIAL	-.279**	.048	.037	.219*	-.164	.239**	.150	-.042	-.099	1									
RELG COP	.011	-.014	-.080	.069	.106	.283**	.132	.076	.047	.157	1								
HUMOR	-.208*	.167	-.014	.191*	-.001	.300**	.068	.203*	.074	.433**	.054	1							
BEH DISENG	-.196*	.098	-.061	.105	-.168	.238**	.229*	.022	-.050	.537**	.292**	.320**	1						
RESTRAINT	-.091	.037	.050	.162	.308**	.094	.222*	.168	.251**	-.045	.045	.112	.145	1					
EM SOC SUP	.016	-.002	.151	.161	.063	.238**	.417**	.414**	.071	.207*	-.051	.273**	.266**	.155	1				
SUBS USE	.000	-.023	.114	.005	-.203*	-.059	-.024	-.084	-.044	.186*	.093	.170	.164	-.036	.085	1			
ACCEPT	.024	.152	-.082	.125	.246**	.038	.038	.145	.315**	-.022	.088	.086	.167	.225*	.073	.075	1		
SUP COM ACT	.103	.043	.114	.169	.350**	.170	.199*	.266**	.399**	.161	.147	.050	.149	.121	.286**	.065	.112	1	
PLANNING	-.034	.161	-.016	.229*	.579**	.141	.157	.242**	.657**	-.077	.063	.001	.004	.228*	.044	-.189*	.209*	.417**	1

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

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

AFF-Affiliative, , AGG- Aggressive, SE ENH-Self-enhancing, SEL DEF- Self-defeating, POS RE & GR- Positive reinterpretation and growth, VENT EMO-Venting of emotions, MNTL DIS-Mental disengagement, INST SOC SUP- use of instrumental social support, DENIAL-Denial, RELG COPE-Religious coping, ACT COPE-Active coping, HUMOR-Humor, RESTRAINT- Restraint, EM SOC SUP- Use of emotional support, BEH DIS- Behavioral Disengagement, SUBS USE- Substance use, ACCEPT-Acceptance, SUP COM ACT-Suppression of competing activities, PLANNING-Planning.

The results indicate the affiliative humor style is correlated negatively to denial (r=.279, p<.01), humor (r=.208, p<.05) and behavioral disengagement (r=.196, p<.05). Self-enhancing humor is correlated positively to positive reinterpretation and growth (r=.234, p<.05). Aggressive humor style is positively correlated to focus on and venting of emotion (r=.240, p<.01).Self-defeating humor is correlated positively to positive reinterpretation and growth (r=.292, p<.01) denial (r=.219, p<.01), humor (r=.191, p<.05) and planning (r=.229, p<.05).

Table 3: Regression analysis of affiliative humor style for coping behavior.

Coping strategies (dependent variable)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Denial	13.060 -.120	1.239 .038	-.279	10.539 -3.143	.000 .002	.070
Humor	12.305 -.088	1.240 .038	-.208	9.925 -2.316	.000 .022	.035
Behavioral disengagement	11.499 -.077	1.146 .035	-.196	10.031 -2.173	.000 .032	.030

As seen from above regression table, adjusted R square for denial is .070, for humor is .035 and for behavioral disengagement is .030. Therefore, 7% variance in denial, 3.5% variance in humor and 3% variance in behavioral disengagement can be attributed to affiliative humor style. The beta value obtained for denial is .120, for humor is .088 and for behavioral disengagement is .077. This shows that increase in affiliative humor style by one unit will result in .120 unit decrease in denial, .088 unit decrease in humor and .077 unit decrease in behavioral disengagement.

Table 4: Regression analysis of self-enhancing humor style for coping behavior.

Coping strategies (dependent variable)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Positive reinterpretation and growth	8.880 .098	1.215 .037	-.234	7.308 2.610	.000 .010	.047

The adjusted R square for positive reinterpretation and growth is .047, which means that 4.7% variance in positive reinterpretation and growth can be attributed to self-enhancing humor style. The beta value for positive reinterpretation and growth is .098, which indicates that one unit increase in self-enhancing humor style would lead to .098 unit increase in positive reinterpretation and growth.

Table 5: Regression analysis of aggressive humor style for coping behavior.

Coping strategies (dependent variable)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Focus on venting of emotions	6.864 .113	1.365 .042	.240	5.027 2.691	.000 .008	.050

The adjusted R square for focus on and venting of emotions is .050. This indicates that 5% variance in focus on and venting of emotions can be attributed to aggressive humor style. The beta value for focus on and venting of emotions indicates that increase in aggressive humor style by one unit will result in .113 unit increase in focus on and venting of emotions.

Table 6: Regression analysis of self-defeating humor style for coping behavior.

Coping strategies (dependent variable)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Positive reinterpretation and growth	8.321 .108	1.128 .032	.292	7.374 3.320	.000 .001	.078
Denial	5.783 .101	1.451 .042	.219	3.987 2.422	.000 .017	.040
Humor	6.561 .086	1.410 .041	.191	4.652 2.111	.000 .037	.028
Planning	8.778 .084	1.143 .033	.229	7.678 2.552	.000 .012	.044

The adjusted R square for positive reinterpretation and growth is .078, humor is .028, denial is .040 and planning is .044. This indicates that 7.8% variance in positive reinterpretation and growth, 4% variance in denial, 2.8% variance in humor and 4.4% variance in planning can be attributed to self-defeating humor style. The beta values for positive reinterpretation and growth is .108, humor is .086, denial is .101 and planning is .084. This means that one unit increase in self-defeating humor style would lead to .108 unit increase in positive reinterpretation and growth, .101 unit increase in denial, .086 unit increase in humor and .084 unit increase in planning.

5.5. Humor styles in relation with dysfunctional attitude.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for humor styles and dysfunctional attitude.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
ACH	120	4.19	.802
DEP	120	3.45	.951
SE CNTRL	120	4.40	.844
TOTAL DS	120	96.18	12.219
AFF	120	31.87	6.517
SEL ENH	120	32.07	5.427
AGG	120	32.20	5.183
SEL DEF	120	34.25	6.151

AFF- Affiliative, AGG-Aggressive, SE ENH- Self-enhancing, SEL DEF- Self-defeating, ACH-Achievement, DEP-Dependency, SE CNTRL- self control, TOTAL DS- Total dysfunctional attitude.

Table 2: Correlation analysis for humor styles and dysfunctional attitude.

	AFF	SEL ENH	AGG	SEL DEF	ACH	DEP	SE CNTRL	TOTAL
AFF	1							
SEL ENH	-.053	1						
AGG	-.076	-.287**	1					
SEL DEF	-.237**	.066	.156	1				
ACH	-.238**	-.010	-.017	.006	1			
DEP	-.061	-.019	.099	-.017	.121	1		
SE CNTRL	.061	-.072	-.067	-.059	.422**	-.287**	1	
TOTAL DS	-.127	-.047	.008	-.061	.782**	.506**	.542**	1

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

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

AFF-Affiliative, AGG- Aggressive, SE ENH-Self-enhancing , SEL DEF- Self-defeating, ACH-Achievement, DEP-Dependency, SE CNTRL- self control, TOTAL DS- Total dysfunctional attitude.

The results indicate that affiliative style of humor is correlated negatively with achievement dysfunctional attitude ($r=.238$, $p<.01$).

Table 3: Regression analysis of affiliative humor style for achievement dysfunctional attitude.

(Constant)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Affiliative	5.096	.346	-.238	14.747	.000	.048
	-.028	.011		-2.657	.009	

Dependent variable: Achievement

The adjusted R square for achievement is .048, which indicates that 4.8% variance in achievement, can be attributed to affiliative humor style. The beta value for achievement indicates that increase in affiliative humor style by one unit will result in .048 unit decrease in achievement dysfunctional attitude.

5.6. Humor styles in relation with perceived stress.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for humor styles and perceive stress.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
P STRESS	120	20.80	5.984
AFF	120	31.87	6.517
SEL ENH	120	32.07	5.427
AGG	120	32.20	5.183
SEL DEF	120	34.25	6.151

AFF-Affiliative, AGG- aggressive, SE ENH-Self-enhancing, SEL DEF- Self-defeating, P STRESS- Perceived stress,

Table 2: Correlation analysis for humor styles and perceived stress.

	AFF	SEL ENH	AGG	SEL DEF	P STRESS
AFF	1				
SEL ENH	-.053	1			
AGG	-.076	-.287**	1		
SEL DEF	-.237**	.066	.156	1	
P STRESS	-.212*	-.105	.159	.073	1

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

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

AFF-Affiliative, AGG-Aggressive, SE ENH-Self-enhancing, SEL DEF- Self-defeating, P STRESS- Perceived stress

Results indicate that affiliative humor style is correlated negatively with perceived stress ($r=212$, $p<.05$).

Table 3: Regression analysis of affiliative humor for perceived stress.

(Constant)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Affiliative	27.006	2.686	-.212	10.053	.000	.037
	-.195	.083		-2.357	.020	

Dependent variable: Perceived stress

The adjusted R square for perceived stress is .037. This indicates that 3.7% variance in perceived stress can be ascribed to affiliative humor style. The beta value for perceived stress indicates that one unit increase in affiliative humor style would lead to .037 unit decrease in perceived stress.

5.7. Personality traits in relation with coping behavior.

Table 1: Descriptive analysis for personality traits and coping behavior.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
POS RE & GR	120	12.01	2.266
MNTL DIS	120	11.10	2.277
VENT EMO	120	10.49	2.429
INST SOC SUP	120	11.08	2.419
ACT COP	120	11.19	2.224
DENIAL	119	9.24	2.804
RELG COP	120	10.99	3.050
HUMOR	120	9.49	2.759
BEH DISENG	120	9.06	2.545
RESTRAINT	120	10.91	2.000
EM SOC SUP	120	10.16	2.951
SUBS USE	120	7.53	4.685
ACCEPT	120	10.92	2.339
SUP COM ACT	120	10.98	2.043
PLANNING	120	11.65	2.255
EXTR	120	25.52	5.071
AGREE	120	31.82	5.001
CONS	120	28.54	4.638
NEURO	120	25.02	4.919
OPEN	120	35.17	4.937

POS RE & GR- Positive reinterpretation and growth, VENT EMO-Venting of emotions, MNTL DIS-Mental disengagement, INST SOC SUP- use of instrumental social support, DENIAL-Denial, RELG COPE-Religious coping, ACT COPE-Active coping, HUMOR-Humor, BEH DIS- Behavioral disengagement, RESTRAINT-Restraint, , SUBS USE- Substance use, ACCEPT-Acceptance, EM SOC SUP- use of emotional social support, SUP COM ACT-Suppression of competing activities, PLANNING-Planning, ACH-Achievement, DEP-Dependency, SE CNTRL- self control, TOTAL DS- Total dysfunctional attitude, P STRESS- Perceived stress, EXTR- Extraversion, AGREE- Agreeableness, NEURO-Neuroticism, CONS-Conscientiousness, OPEN- Openness.

Table 2: Correlation analysis for personality traits and coping behavior.

	EXTR	AGREE	CONS	NEURO	OPEN	POS RE & GR	MNTL DIS	VENT EMO	INST SOC SUP	ACT COP	DENIAL	RELG COP	HUMOR	BEH DISENG	RESTRAINT	EM SOC SUP	SUBS USE	ACCEPT	SUP COM ACT	PLANNING
EXTR	1																			
AGREE	.178	1																		
CONS	-.014	.273**	1																	
NEURO	-.356**	-.236**	-.246**	1																
OPEN	.363**	.393**	.243**	-.137	1															
POS RE & GR	.312**	.276**	.297**	-.218*	.424**	1														
MNTL DIS	.238**	.010	-.066	.078	.108	.115	1													
VENT EMO	.169	.108	-.149	.286**	.185*	.066	.272**	1												
INST SOC SUP	.214*	.282**	-.126	.046	.114	.254**	.188*	.268**	1											
ACT COP	.136	.185*	.279**	-.019	.413**	.457**	-.004	.171	.260**	1										
DENIAL	-.015	-.241**	-.045	.118	-.174	-.164	.239**	.150	-.042	-.099	1									
RELG COP	.101	.088	-.031	.145	-.021	.106	.283**	.132	.076	.047	.157	1								
HUMOR	.229*	-.105	-.177	-.073	-.017	-.001	.300**	.068	.203*	.074	.433**	.054	1							
BEH DISENG	-.012	-.178	-.210*	.127	-.132	-.168	.238**	.229*	.022	-.050	.537**	.292**	.320**	1						
RESTRAINT	.081	.123	.101	-.065	.166	.308**	.094	.222*	.168	.251**	-.045	.045	.112	.145	1					
EM SOC SUP	.175	-.011	-.216*	.012	.030	.063	.238**	.417**	.414**	.071	.207*	-.051	.273**	.266**	.155	1				
SUBS USE	.021	-.303**	-.205*	-.042	-.189*	-.203*	-.059	-.024	-.084	-.044	.186*	.093	.170	.164	-.036	.085	1			
ACCEPT	-.002	.069	.021	-.036	.115	.246**	.038	.038	.145	.315**	-.022	.088	.086	.167	.225*	.073	.075	1		
SSUP COM ACT	.154	.083	.016	.075	.229*	.350**	.170	.199*	.266**	.399**	.161	.147	.050	.149	.121	.286**	.065	.112	1	
PLANNING	.169	.323**	.326**	-.120	.469**	.579**	.141	.157	.242**	.657**	-.077	.063	.001	.004	.228*	.044	-.189*	.209*	.417**	1

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

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

EXTR- Extraversion, CONS-Conscientiousness, AGREE- Agreeableness, NEURO-Neuroticism, OPEN- Openness, POS RE & GR- Positive reinterpretation and growth, VENT EMO-Venting of emotions, INST SOC SUP- use of instrumental social support, MNTL DIS-Mental disengagement, ACT COPE-Active coping, DENIAL-Denial, HUMOR-Humor, BEH DIS- Behavioral disengagement, RESTRAINT- Restraint, RELG COPE-Religious coping, EM SOC SUP- use of emotional social support, SUBS USE- Substance use, ACCEPT-Acceptance, SUP COM ACT-Suppression of competing activities, PLANNING-Planning

The results show a positive correlation between extraversion and positive reinterpretation and growth (r=.312, p<.01) instrumental social support (r=.214, p<.05) mental disengagement (r=.238, p<.01) and humor (r=.229, p<.01). Agreeableness correlates positively with positive reinterpretation and growth (r=.276, p<.01), planning (r=.323, p<.01), use of instrumental social support (r=.282, p<.01) and active coping (r=.185, p<.05). Agreeableness correlates negatively with denial (r=.241, p<.01), and substance use (r=.303, p<.01). Conscientiousness correlates positively with positive reinterpretation and growth (r=.297, p<.01), active coping (r=.279, p<.01), and planning (r=.326, p<.05). Conscientiousness correlates negatively with behavioral disengagement (r=.210, p<.05), substance use (r=.189, p<.05) and use of emotional social support (r=.216, p<.05). Neuroticism correlates positively with focus on and venting of emotions (r=.286, p<.01) and negatively with positive reinterpretation and growth (r=.218, p<.05). Openness correlates positively with positive reinterpretation and growth (r=.424, p<.01), focus on and venting of emotion (r=.185, p<.05), suppression of competing activities (r=.229, p<.05), active coping (r=.413, p<.01), and planning (r=.469, p<.01). Openness is correlated negatively to substance use (r=.189, p<.05).

Table 3: Regression analysis of extraversion for positive reinterpretation and growth, use of instrumental social support, mental disengagement and humor.

Coping behaviors (Dependent variable)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Positive reinterpretation and growth	8.452 .139	1.017 .039	.312	8.314 3.566	.000 .001	.090
Mental disengagement	8.375 .107	1.044 .040	.238	8.020 2.660	.000 .009	.049
Use of instrumental social support	8.470 .102	1.116 .043	.214	7.591 2.380	.000 .019	.038
Humor	6.310 .125	1.268 .049	.229	4.975 2.557	.000 .012	.044

From the above regression table, adjusted R square is .090 for positive reinterpretation and growth, .038 for use of instrumental social support, .049 for mental disengagement, and .044 for humor. Therefore, 9% variance in positive reinterpretation and growth, 4.9% variance in mental disengagement, 4.4% variance in humor and 3.8% variance in use of instrumental social support can be attributed to extraversion. The beta value obtained for positive reinterpretation and growth is .139, mental disengagement is .107, use of instrumental social support is .102 and humor is .125 respectively. This indicates that increase in extraversion by one unit will result in .139 unit increase in positive reinterpretation and growth, .107 unit increase in mental disengagement, .102 unit increase in use of instrumental social support and .125 unit increase in humor.

Table 4: Regression analysis of agreeableness for positive reinterpretation and growth, denial, use of instrumental social support, substance use and planning.

Coping behaviors (Dependent variable)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Positive reinterpretation and growth	8.029 .125	1.291	.276	6.219 3.119	.000 .002	.068
Use of instrumental social support	6.738 .136	1.376 .043	.282	4.897 3.190	.000 .002	.072
Denial	13.525 -.135	1.614 .050	-.241	8.382 -2.686	.000 .008	.050
Substance use	16.542 -.283	2.647 .082	-.303	6.249 -3.448	.000 .001	.084
Planning	7.018 .146	1.265 .039	.323	5.546 3.705	.000 .000	.097
Active coping	8.570 0.82	1.296 .040	.185	6.615 0.048	.000 .043	.026

From the above regression table, adjusted R square for positive reinterpretation and growth is .068, for use of instrumental social support is .072, for denial is .050, for substance use is .084, planning is .097 and active coping is .26. Therefore, 6.8% variance in positive reinterpretation and growth, 7.2% variance in use of instrumental social support, 5% variance in denial, 8.4% variance in substance use, 9.7% variance in planning and 2.6% variance in active coping can be attributed to agreeableness. The beta value obtained for positive reinterpretation and growth is .125, use of instrumental social support is .136, denial is .135, substance use is .283, planning is .146 and active coping is 0.82. This indicates that increase in agreeableness by one unit will result in increase in positive reinterpretation and growth by .125 unit, increase in use of instrumental social support by .136 unit, decrease in denial by .135 unit, decrease in substance use by .283 unit, increase in planning by .146 unit and increase in active coping by .82 unit.

Table 5: Regression analysis of conscientiousness for positive reinterpretation and growth, behavioral disengagement, use of emotional social support, active coping, substance use and planning.

Coping behaviors (Dependent variable)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Positive reinterpretation and growth	7.867 .145	1.242 .043	.297	6.335 3.379	.000 .001	.080
Active coping	7.372 .134	1.226 .042	.279	6.015 3.157	.000 .002	.070
Behavioral Disengagement	12.345 -.115	1.428 .049	-.210	8.646 -2.332	.000 .021	.036
Use of emotional social support	14.075 -.137	1.653 .057	-.216	8.513 -2.400	.000 .018	.038
Substance use	13.447 -.207	2.631 .091	-.205	5.110 -2.280	.000 .024	.034
Planning	7.126 .159	1.224 .042	.326	5.824 3.745	.000 .000	.099

From the above regression table, adjusted R square for positive reinterpretation and growth is .080, for active coping is .070, for behavioral disengagement is .036, for use of emotional social support is .038, for substance use is .034 and planning is .099. Therefore, 8% variance in positive reinterpretation and growth, 7% variance in active coping, 3.6% variance in behavioral disengagement, 3.8% variance in use of emotional social support, 3.4% variance in substance use and 9.9% variance in planning can be attributed to conscientiousness. The beta value obtained for positive reinterpretation and growth is .145, for behavioral disengagement is .115, for active coping is .134, for use of emotional social support is .137, for substance use is .207 and planning is .159. This means that increase in conscientiousness by one unit will result in .145 unit increase in positive reinterpretation and growth, .134 unit increase in active coping, .115 unit decrease in behavioral disengagement, .137 unit decrease in use of emotional social support, .207 unit decrease in substance use and .159 unit increase in planning.

Table 6: Regression analysis of neuroticism for positive reinterpretation and growth and focus in and venting of emotions.

Coping behaviors (Dependent variable)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Positive reinterpretation and growth	14.519 -.100	1.055 .041	-.218	13.763 -2.425	.000 .017	.039
Focus on and venting of emotions	6.956 .141	1.110 .044	.286	6.266 3.245	.000 .002	.074

The adjusted R square for positive reinterpretation and growth is .039 and for focus on and venting of emotions is .074. This indicates that 3.9% variance in positive reinterpretation and growth can be attributed to neuroticism. 7.4% variance in focus on and venting of emotions can be attributed to neuroticism. The beta value for positive reinterpretation and growth is .100 and for focus on and venting of emotions is .141. This means that one unit increase in neuroticism

would result in .100 unit decrease in positive reinterpretation and growth and .141 unit increase in focus on and venting of emotions.

Table 7: Regression analysis of openness for positive reinterpretation and growth, active coping, focus on and venting of emotions, suppression of competing activities, substance use and planning.

Coping behaviors (Dependent variable)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Positive reinterpretation and growth	5.160 .195	1.359 .038	.424	3.799 5.090	.000 .000	.173
Focus on and venting of emotions	7.289 .091	1.580 .045	.185	4.612 2.046	.000 .043	.026
Active coping	4.655 .186	1.341 .038	.413	3.471 4.921	.001 .000	.163
Substance use	13.823 -.179	3.046 .086	-.189	4.538 -2.088	.000 .039	.027
Suppression of competing activities	7.647 .095	1.317 .037	.229	5.806 2.551	.000 .012	.044
Planning	4.121 .214	1.319 .037	.469	3.124 5.763	.002 .000	.213

The adjusted R square for positive reinterpretation and growth is .173, for focus on and venting of emotions is .026, for substance use is .027, for active coping is .163, for suppression of competing activities .044 and planning is .213. This indicates that 17.3% variance in positive reinterpretation and growth can be attributed to openness. 2.6% variance in focus on and venting of emotions, 16.3% variance in active coping, 2.7% variance in substance use, 4.4% variance in suppression of competing activities and 21.3% variance in planning can be attributed to openness. The beta value for positive reinterpretation and growth is .195, for focus on and venting of emotions is .091, for substance use is .179, for active coping is .186, for suppression of competing activities is .095 and planning is .214. This means that increase in openness by one unit will result in increase in positive reinterpretation and growth by .195 unit and increase in focus on and venting of emotions by .091 units, increase in active coping by .186 units, decrease in substance use by .179 unit, increase in suppression of competing activities by .095 unit and increase in planning by .214 units.

5.8. Personality traits in relation with dysfunctional attitude.

Table 1: Descriptive analysis for personality traits and dysfunctional attitude.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
ACH	120	4.19	.802
DEP	120	3.45	.951
SE CNTRL	120	4.40	.844
TOTAL DS	120	96.18	12.219
EXTR	120	25.52	5.071
AGREE	120	31.82	5.001
CONS	120	28.54	4.638
NEURO	120	25.02	4.919
OPEN	120	35.17	4.937

ACH-Achievement, DEP-Dependency, SE CNTRL- self control, TOTAL DS- Total dysfunctional attitude. EXTR- Extraversion, CONS- Conscientiousness, AGREE- Agreeableness, NEURO-Neuroticism, OPEN- Openness,

Table 2: Correlation analysis for personality traits and dysfunctional attitude.

	EXTR	AGREE	CONS	NEURO	OPEN	ACH	DEP	SE CNTRL	TOTAL
EXTR	1								
AGREE	.178	1							
CONS	-.014	.273**	1						
NEURO	-.356**	-.236**	-.246**	1					
OPEN	.363**	.393**	.243**	-.137	1				
ACH	-.003	.008	.064	.139	-.027	1			
DEP	.111	-.283**	-.223*	.027	-.161	.121	1		
SE CNTRL	.090	.293**	.237**	-.009	.223*	.422**	-.287**	1	
TOTAL DS	.127	-.049	.005	.065	.003	.782**	.506**	.542**	1

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

*Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

EXTR- Extraversion, CONS-Conscientiousness, AGREE- Agreeableness, NEURO-Neuroticism, OPEN- Openness, ACH-Achievement, DEP-Dependency, SE CNTRL- self control, TOTAL DS- Total dysfunctional attitude.

The results indicate that agreeableness is correlated negatively with dependency (r=.283, p<.01), and correlated positively with self control (r=.293, p<.01). Conscientiousness is negatively correlated to dependency (r=.223, p<.05), and positively correlated to self control (r=.237, p<.01). Openness is positively correlated with self control (r=.223, p<.05).

Table 3: Regression analysis of agreeableness for dependency and self control.

Dysfunctional attitude (dependent variable)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Dependency	5.112	.533	-.283	9.599	.000	.072
	-.053	.017		-3.208	.002	
Self control	2.867	.470	.293	6.104	.000	.078
	.049	.015		3.328	.001	

From the above regression table, adjusted R square for dependency and self control is .072 and .078 respectively. Therefore, 7.2% variance in dependency can be attributed to agreeableness

and 7.8% variance in self control can be attributed to agreeableness. The beta value obtained for dependency is .053, which shows that increase in agreeableness by one unit will result in .053 unit decrease in dependency and increase in agreeableness by one unit will result in .049 unit increase in self control.

Table 4: Regression analysis of conscientiousness for dependency and self control.

Dysfunctional attitude (dependent variable)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Dependency	4.708 -.045	.524 .018	-.223	8.984 -2.481	.000 .015	.042
Self control	3.204 .042	.462 .016	.237	6.934 2.647	.000 .009	.048

From the above regression table, adjusted R square for dependency and self control is .042 and .048 respectively. Therefore, 4.2% variance in dependency can be attributed to conscientiousness and 4.8% variance in self control can be attributed to conscientiousness. The beta value obtained for dependency is .045, which shows that increase in conscientiousness by one unit will result in .045 unit decrease in dependency and increase in conscientiousness by one unit will result in .042 unit increase in self control.

Table 5: Regression analysis of openness for self control.

Dysfunctional attitude (dependent variable)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Self control	3.098	.535	.223	5.792	.000	.041
	.037	.015		2.479	.015	

From the above regression table, adjusted R square for self control is .041. Therefore, 4.1% variance in self control can be attributed to openness. The beta value obtained for self control shows that one unit increase in openness would lead to .037 unit increase in self control.

5.9. Personality traits in relation with perceived stress.

Table 1: Descriptive analysis for personality traits and perceived stress.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
P STRESS	120	20.80	5.984
EXTR	120	25.52	5.071
AGREE	120	31.82	5.001
CONS	120	28.54	4.638
NEURO	120	25.02	4.919
OPEN	120	35.17	4.937

P STRESS- Perceived stress, EXTR- Extraversion, AGREE- Agreeableness, CONS-Conscientiousness, NEURO-Neuroticism, OPEN- Openness

Table 2: Correlation analysis for personality traits and perceived stress.

	EXTR	AGREE	CONS	NEURO	OPEN	P STRESS
EXTR	1					
AGREE	.178	1				
CONS	-.014	.273**	1			
NEURO	-.356**	-.236**	-.246**	1		
OPEN	.363**	.393**	.243**	-.137	1	
P STRESS	-.095	-.265**	-.411**	.496**	-.077	1

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

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

EXTR- Extraversion, CONS-Conscientiousness, AGREE- Agreeableness, NEURO-Neuroticism, OPEN- Openness, P STRESS- Perceived stress.

The results indicate that agreeableness is correlated negatively (r=.265, p<.01) and conscientiousness is also negatively correlated (r=.411, p<.01) with perceived stress. Neuroticism is correlated positively (r=.496, p<.01) with perceived stress.

Table 3: Regression analysis of agreeableness for perceived stress.

(Constant)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Agreeableness	30.897	3.420	-.265	9.033	.000	.062
	-.317	.106		-2.988	.003	

Dependent variable: Perceived stress

For perceived stress, the adjusted R square is .062. this suggests that the perceived stress variance of 6.2% can be attributed to agreeableness. The beta value for perceived stress indicates that increase in agreeableness by one unit will result in perceived stress decrease by .317 units.

Table 4: Regression analysis of conscientiousness for perceived stress.

(Constant)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Conscientiousness	35.942 -.531	3.130 .108	-.411	11.482 -4.900	.000 .000	.162

Dependent variable: Perceived stress

The adjusted R square for perceived stress is .162. This indicates that 16.2% variance in perceived stress can be ascribed to conscientiousness. The beta value for perceived stress indicates that increase in conscientiousness by one unit will lead to decrease in perceived stress by .531 units.

Table 5: Regression analysis of neuroticism for perceived stress.

(Constant)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Neuroticism	5.717 .603	2.479 .097	.496	2.306 6.199	.023 .000	.239

Dependent variable: Perceived stress

The adjusted R square for perceived stress is .239. This indicates that 23.9% variance in perceived stress can be ascribed to neuroticism. The beta value for perceived stress indicates that increase in neuroticism by one unit will result in increase in perceived stress by .603 units.

Chapter 6

DISCUSSION

6.1. Emotional intelligence in relation with coping behavior

The present study focused on the question that how emotional intelligence effects coping behavior. The effect of total emotional intelligence and its components, viz. well being, self control, emotionality and sociability was studied on coping behaviors. Emotional intelligence was studied by using Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire Short Form (TEIQue-SF) and coping behavior was studied using COPE Inventory. The coping behaviors studied were self-sufficient, socially supported and avoidant. Correlation and regression analysis was done. It was found that well being, sociability, emotionality and total emotional intelligence were correlated positively with positive reinterpretation and growth. Use of instrumental social support was positively correlated with emotionality. Active coping was correlated positively with emotionality, well being, sociability and total emotional intelligence. Denial was found to be negatively correlated with emotionality, well being, sociability as well as total emotional intelligence. Behavioral disengagement correlated negatively with emotionality, sociability, well being and total emotional intelligence. Substance use correlated negatively with well being and emotionality. Planning correlated positively with sociability, well being, and total emotional intelligence.

The two hypotheses made to study this relationship were – "emotional intelligence is correlated positively with self-sufficient and socially supported coping behaviors" and "emotional intelligence is correlated negatively with avoidant coping behaviors." Both the hypotheses were confirmed, since emotional intelligence correlated positively with socially supported and self sufficient coping behaviors and correlated negatively with avoidant coping behaviors. These findings are in line with the previous studies (e.g., Downey et al. 2010; Mikolajczak et al. 2007; Petrides et al. 2007; Petrides, Pita et al. 2007; Saklofske, et al. 2007).

6.2. Emotional intelligence in relation with dysfunctional attitude

The intent of this study was to examine the relationship between emotional intelligence and dysfunctional attitude. For this purpose, the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire Short Form (TEIQue-SF) was utilized to measure emotional intelligence and Dysfunctional Attitude Scale (DAS-24) was used to measure dysfunctional attitude. Results indicated that well being scale of emotional intelligence was correlated negatively with dependency and self control. Sociability was correlated negatively with achievement subscale of dysfunctional attitude. Total emotional intelligence was negatively correlated with dependency and positively correlated with self control. The hypothesis – "Emotional intelligence is correlated negatively with dysfunctional attitude" was partially accepted because significant correlations were not found at all levels.

6.3. Emotional intelligence in relation with perceived stress

The existing study purported to analyze the relationship amongst perceived stress and emotional intelligence. Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire Short Form (TEIQue-SF) was used to gauge emotional intelligence and perceived Stress Scale (PSS) to measure perceived stress. Results indicated that well being, emotionality, self-control, sociability and total emotional intelligence were correlated negatively with perceived stress. Thus, the hypothesis – "Emotional intelligence is correlated negatively with perceived stress" was proved. These findings are consistent with the previous studies (e.g., Austin et al., 2005; Furnham and Petrides, 2003, Gohm et al. 2005, Ciarrochi, Dean, & Anderson, 2002; Singh & Sharma, 2012).

6.4. Humor styles in relation with coping behavior

The intent of the existing study was to probe the relationship amongst humor styles and coping behaviors. Humor Styles Questionnaire (HSQ) was used to measure humor styles and coping behaviors were measured using COPE Inventory. The results indicated a negative correlation between affiliative humor style and denial, humor and behavioral disengagement. Denial and behavioral disengagement are avoidant coping styles and humor is a self sufficient humor style. Self-enhancing humor was found to be positively correlated positive reinterpretation and growth. It is a self sufficient coping behavior. Aggressive humor style correlated positively with focus on and venting of emotions. It is a socially supported coping behavior. Self-defeating humor style was found to be positively correlated with positive reinterpretation and growth, denial, humor

and planning. The first hypothesis in this connection was “Positive humor styles are correlated positively with self-sufficient, socially supported and avoidant coping behavior”, this hypothesis was partially accepted because only one significant positive correlation was found i.e., between self-enhancing humor and positive reinterpretation and growth. The second hypothesis, “Negative humor styles are correlated positively with self-sufficient, socially supported and avoidant coping behaviors coping behavior” was proved. The findings correspond somewhat to previous studies (Kuiper, Grimshaw, Leite, & Kirsh, 2004; Cann et al., 2010; Martin et al., 2003; Oktug, 2017).

6.5. Humor styles in relation with dysfunctional attitude

This study purported to analyze the relationship amongst humor styles and dysfunctional attitude. Emotional intelligence was assessed using the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire Short Form (TEIQue-SF) and Dysfunctional Attitude Scale (DAS-24) was used to assess the dysfunctional attitude of individuals. It was found that affiliative humor style was negatively correlated with achievement dysfunctional attitude. The hypotheses that “Positive humor styles are correlated negatively with dysfunctional attitude” was partially accepted, because significant relationship was found only affiliative humor style and not self-enhancing humor style. The second hypothesis that “Negative humor styles are correlated positively with dysfunctional attitude” was not proved because no significant relationships were found to support this hypothesis. The insignificant results can be attributed to the small sample size, convenient sampling and group differences.

6.6. Humor styles in relation with perceived stress

The intent of this study was to probe into the relationship amongst humor styles and perceived stress. Emotional intelligence was gauged using the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire Short Form (TEIQue-SF) and Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) was used to gauge perceived stress. There was significant negative correlation between affiliative humor style and achievement dysfunctional attitude. The hypothesis “Positive humor styles are correlated negatively with perceived stress” was partially accepted because significant relationship was found only for affiliative humor style. The obtained results are consistent with previous studies (e.g., Nezu, Nezu & Blissett, 1988; Martin & Lefcourt, 1983; Martin & Dobbin, 1988). The second

hypothesis that **“**Negative humor styles are correlated negatively with perceived stress” was not supported because significant relationships were not found.

6.7. Personality traits in relation with coping behavior

This existing study purported to decipher the relationship amongst coping behavior and personality traits. Personality was measured using the Big Five Inventory and coping behavior was measured using the COPE. The results demonstrated that extraversion correlated positively with positive reinterpretation and growth, mental disengagement, humor and use of instrumental social support. There was positive correlation between agreeableness and positive reinterpretation and growth, planning, use of instrumental social support and active coping. Agreeableness was negatively correlated to denial and substance. Conscientiousness was correlated positively with positive reinterpretation and growth, substance use active coping and planning. Conscientiousness was found to be negative correlated with behavior disengagement, substance use and use of emotional social support. Neuroticism correlated negatively with positive reinterpretation and growth and correlated positively with focus on and venting of emotions. Openness was ascertained to be positively correlated with, positive reinterpretation and growth, planning, suppression of competing activities, focus on and venting of emotions and active coping. Openness correlated negatively with substance use.

The hypothesis that “Extraversion is correlated positively with self-sufficient, socially supported coping behavior” was proved. The hypothesis that “Extraversion is correlated negatively with avoidant coping behavior” was rejected because no significant correlations were found. The third hypothesis in this connection that “Agreeableness is correlated positively with self-sufficient, socially supported coping behavior” was accepted because significant positive correlations were found. The fourth hypothesis, “Agreeableness is correlated negatively with avoidant coping behavior” was also accepted. The fifth hypothesis that “Conscientiousness is correlated positively self-sufficient, socially supported coping behavior” was proved. The sixth hypothesis that “Conscientiousness is correlated negatively with avoidance coping behavior” was proved as significant negative correlations were found for behavioral disengagement and substance use. The seventh hypothesis in this connection that “Neuroticism is correlated negatively with self-sufficient, socially supported coping behavior” was partially proved because significant negative correlation was found only for positive reinterpretation and growth. On the contrary, correlation

between neuroticism and focus on and venting of emotions was found to be positive. The eighth hypothesis that "Neuroticism was correlated positively with avoidance coping behavior" was not supported because no significant negative correlation was found. The ninth hypothesis that "Openness is correlated positively with self-sufficient, socially supported coping behavior" was proved. The tenth hypothesis that "Openness is correlated negatively with avoidance coping behavior" was partially proved because significant negative correlation was found only for substance use. These findings are in line with the previous studies. Findings about extraversion, agreeableness and conscientiousness are particularly in line with the existing literature (e.g., McCrae & Costa, 1986; Watson & Hubbard, 1996; O'Brien & DeLongis, 1996;). The remaining findings also pertain to the existing literature but are not very precise. This may be due to the small sample size, convenient sampling and differences between groups.

6.8. Personality traits in relation with dysfunctional attitude

The study aimed to investigate the relationship amongst dysfunctional attitude and personality traits. For this purpose, personality traits were measures using Big Five Inventory and dysfunctional attitude was measured using Dysfunctional Attitude Scale (DAS-24). It was ascertained that agreeableness was correlated negatively with dependency and correlated positively with self control. Conscientiousness was found to be correlated negatively with dependency and correlated positively with self control. Openness correlated positively with self control. It was hypothesized that "Extraversion is correlated negatively with dysfunctional attitude", this was not proved as any significant correlations were not found in this connection. The hypothesis that "Agreeableness is correlated negatively with dysfunctional attitude" was partially accepted because significant negative correlation was only found for dependency. Contrariwise positive correlation was found for self control. The hypothesis that "Conscientiousness is correlated negatively with dysfunctional attitude" was partially proved because significant negative correlation was found only for dependency, contrarily positive correlation was found with self control. The fourth hypothesis that "Neuroticism is correlated positively with dysfunctional attitude" was not proved because insignificant correlation was found. The fifth hypothesis, "Openness is correlated negatively with dysfunctional attitude" was not proved because positive correlation was found in this connection with self control. The

insignificant results can be attributed to the small sample size, convenient sampling and gender differences.

6.9. Personality traits in relation with perceived stress

The existing study aimed at inferring the relationship amongst personality traits and perceived stress. For this purpose, Big Five Inventory was employed to assess the personality traits and perceived stress was measured by Perceived Stress Scale (PSS). Agreeableness and conscientiousness were found to be correlated negatively to perceived stress. It was also found that neuroticism was correlated positively with perceived stress. The first hypothesis that "Extraversion is correlated negatively with perceived stress" was rejected because no significant correlation was found. The second hypothesis that "Agreeableness is correlated negatively with perceived stress" was accepted. The third hypothesis that "Conscientiousness is correlated negatively with perceived stress" was proved. The fourth hypothesis that "Neuroticism is correlated positively with perceived stress" was proved. The fifth hypothesis that "Openness is correlated negatively with perceived stress" was rejected because insignificant relationship was found. The findings from the proved hypothesis appertain to the existing literature (e.g., Velting, 1999; Besser & Shackelford, 2007; Ebstrup et al., 2011).

6.10. General discussion

The majority of the results obtained are consistent with the current literature. However, some results, like those on dysfunctional attitude and personality factors need further examination. The results indicate that high emotional intelligence helps an individual to cope better. The results pertaining to emotional intelligence and dysfunctional attitude can help in understanding and determining the manifestation and maintenance of such attitudes and their characteristic of predisposing an individual to depression; as some of emotional intelligence aspects are inversely proportional to dysfunctional attitude. The negative correlation found amongst emotional intelligence and perceived stress also emphasizes the importance of emotional intelligence for an individual. This brings emotional intelligence on the high spot for a person's well being and mental health.

The results on humor styles have their own place in a person's life. Concisely, positive styles of humor have positive consequences and negative styles of humor have negative consequences for an individual. Using affiliative and self-enhancing styles of humor would be helpful for people to smoothly work through many-faced stresses of life.

Personality traits are crucial parts of an individual, and are pretty much what makes up an individual. Individuals possessing higher levels of agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion and openness are able to cope in a positive and adaptive manner, while individuals high on neuroticism are not able to utilize positive coping mechanisms. It was found that individuals who are high on agreeableness and conscientiousness sustain less dysfunctional attitude and perceived stress. Neurotic individuals also endure higher perceived stress, as per the results.

Consequently, we can accentuate the grandness of emotional intelligence, humor styles and personality traits as the determinants of coping behavior, dysfunctional attitude and perceived stress. Their role in an individual's life is all important as these are the essentials of everyday life. Haphazard alignment of any one of these variables would have far reaching consequences for an individual. Therefore, it is of utmost importance to understand and safeguard these domains of an individual's life, in order to ward off mental health issues.

Chapter 7

Conclusion, implications, limitations and future research

7.1. Conclusion

The current study put together many variables and studied their relationships. Overall, significant results were found and they were in line with the existing literature. Emotional intelligence and perceived stress have been demonstrated to be negatively correlated with each other. It has also been seen in the studies that use of humor is associated with lower perceived stress levels and dysfunctional attitudes. Emotional intelligence analysis also shows that it is correlated negatively with perceived stress and dysfunctional attitude. Analysis of coping behaviors also found its significant relationships with personality traits, emotional intelligence and humor styles. It was demonstrated that how personality traits influence coping behaviors. Results on some hypothesis did not indicate relationship between humor styles, emotional intelligence, personality traits and coping behavior and dysfunctional attitude, as seen in literature. This can be attributed to the small sample size, convenient sampling, and gender differences. However, references found in correlations between the subscales calls for an even more rigorous study of the relationship amongst these variables.

7.2. Implications

The present research shows relationships of personality traits, emotional intelligence and humor styles with coping behavior, dysfunctional attitude and perceived stress. These variables are all-important as these concepts are ceaselessly being acknowledged by people and not just researchers. Each variable has some role to play in deciding whether the person would be a fully-functioning individual or have some psychopathology. Their relationships therefore become even more crucial because if one variable undergoes change then it will have some impact on other variables as well. The study of their relationship can be of great therapeutic value as influencing one variable (e.g., emotional intelligence) maybe helpful in reducing the other variable (e.g., perceived stress). The study also adds to the existing poop of literature as, it can be seen that there is dearth of literature pertaining to coping, humor styles and dysfunctional attitude and their relationship with other variables. Another important implication of this study is that, it adds to

the Indian pool of literature. There is meager amount of research done on Indians; thence it is difficult to be amply certain as to how these variables interact among the Indian population.

7.3. Limitations

The current study has some limitations. The foremost is that it did not take gender differences into account. Some of the relationships were not found to be significant which is not in line with existing literature, which can be accounted to gender differences. Convenient sampling was done. Dependence on self report measures also delimits the study, even though efforts to yield honest responses were made. The other limitation is the sample size. The results would have been better had the sample size been large.

7.4. Future Research

In view of the findings and limitations, various future study directions can be thought of. Firstly, longitudinal study can be done to understand dysfunctional attitude and how it is influenced. Assessing pre-morbid personality and case histories of depressed persons can be useful. Secondly, different coping behaviors can be studied individually. Thirdly, humor styles can be studied individually. Humor styles might also be studied in individuals with some psychopathology, their pre-morbid personality assessment may shed some light over how humor styles contributed to stress, dysfunctional attitude and coping. Probing into different coping behaviors in normal individuals and those with some psychopathology can be useful. Personality traits can be studied individually and their relation to other variables can be examined. Finally, thorough analysis can be performed for each set of variables in order to understand how they work and how they are inter-related.

REFERENCES

Abramson, L. Y., Metalsky, G.I., & Alloy, L. B. (1989). Hopelessness depression: A theory based subtype of depression. *Psychological Review*. *96*, 358–372.

Abdollahi, A., Khanbani, M., & Ghahfarokhi, S.A. (2016). Emotional intelligence moderates perceived stress and suicidal ideation among depressed adolescent inpatients. *Personality and Individual Differences, 102*, 223-228, doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.07.015.

Alloy, L.B., Abramson, L.Y., Whitehouse, W. G., Hogan, M.E., Panzarella, C., & Rose, D.T. (2006). Prospective incidence of first onsets and recurrences of depression in individuals at high and low cognitive risk for depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 115*, 145–156.

Abel, M. H. (2002). Humor, stress, and coping strategies. *Humor:International Journal of Humor Research, 15*, 365-381.doi:10.1515/humr.15.4.365.

Austin, E. J., Saklofske, D. H., Egan, V., 2005. Personality, well-being and health correlates of trait emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38*, 547-558.

Bar-on, R., & Parleer, D. (2000). The handbook of emotion intelligence. San Francesco: Jossy-Bass Books.

Beck, A.T. (1967). *Depression: Clinical, experimental, and theoretical aspects*. Harper and Row; New York.

Beck, A. T. (1972). *Depression: Causes and treatment*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania PressBeck, A. T., Clayton, P. J., &

Barrett, J. E. (1983). Treatment of depression: Old controversies and new approaches. *Cognitive therapy of depression: New perspectives*, 265-290.

Besser, A., & Shackelford, T. K. (2007). Mediation of the effects of the big five personality dimensions on negative mood and confirmed affective expectations by perceived situational stress: A quasi-field study of vacationers. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42,* 1333–1346.

Birks, Y., Mckendree, J.,& Watt, I. (2009). Emotional intelligence and perceived stress in healthcare students: a multi-institutional, multi professional survey. *BMC Medical Education*. doi.org/10.1186/1472-6920-9-61.

Bolger, N., & Zuckerman, A., (1995). A framework for studying personality in the stress process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69,* 890-902.

Brosse, A. L., Craighead, L. W., & Craighead, W. E. (1999). Testing the mood-state hypothesis among previously depressed and never-depressed individuals. *Behavior Therapy, 30,* 97 115.

Cann, A., Stilwell, K., & Taku, K. (2010). Humor styles, positive personality and health. *Europe's Journal of Psychology, 3,* 213-235. doi:10.5964/ejop.v6i3.214.

Carver, C.S., Scheier, M.F., & Weintraub, J.K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56,* 267-283.

Carver, C. S. (2013). COPE Inventory. Measurement Instrument Database for the Social Science. Retrieved from www.midss.ie.

Canuto, A., Giannakopoulos, P., Meiler-Mititelu, C., Delaloye, C., Herrmann, F.R., & Weber, K., (2009). Personality traits influence clinical outcome in day hospital-treated elderly depressed patients. *American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 17(4),* 335-343.

Costa Jr., P. T., Bagby, R. M., Herbst, J. H., & McCrae, R. R., (2005). Personality sef reports are concurrently reliable and valid during acute depressive episodes. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 89 (1-3),* 45-55.

Ciarrochi, J., Deane, F. P., & Anderson, S. (2002). Emotional intelligence moderates the relationship between stress and mental health. *Personality and Individual Differences, 32,*197-209.

C. L., Corser, G. C., & Dalsky, D. J. (2005). Emotional intelligence under stress: Useful, unnecessary, or irrelevant? *Personality and Individual Differences, 39*, 1017-1028.

Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R., "A Global Measure of Perceived Stress," in *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24* (1983), 385-396.

Downey, L. A., Johnston, P. J., Hansen, K., Birney, J., & Stough, C. (2010). Investigating the mediating effects of emotional intelligence and coping on problem behaviours in adolescents. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 62*, 20–29.

Duberstein, P. R., Palsson, S. P., Waern, M., & Skoog, I. (2008). Personality and risk for depression in a birth cohort of 70-year old followed for 15 years. *Psychological Medicine, 38 (5),* 663-671.

Ebstrup, J. F., Eplov, L. F., Pisinger, C., & Jorgensen, T. (2011). Association between the Five Factor personality traits and perceived stress: Is the effect mediated by general self-efficacy? *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping: An International Journal, 24(4),* 407–419.doi: 10.1080/10615806.2010.540012.

Engleberg, E., & Sjoberg, L. (2003). Emotional intelligence, affect intensity and Social adjustment. Personality *& Individual Differences, 37*, 533-542

Eskay, M. (2011). Harmonizing educational differences from an international perspective. *Cypriot Journal Of Educational Sciences, 6(1),* 30-36.

Extremera, N., Duran, A., & Rey, L. (2007). Perceived emotional intelligence and dispositional optimism-pessimism: Analyzing their role in predicting psychological adjustment among adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42,* 1069-1079.

Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R.S. (1980). An analysis of coping in a middle-aged community sample. *Journal of Health & Social Behavior, 21*, 219-239.

Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R.S. (1985). If it changes it must be a process: study of emotion and coping during three stages of college examination. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 48, 150-170.

Folkman, S., & Moskowitz, J.T. (2000). Positive affect and other side of coping. *American Psychologist, 55*, 647-654.

Frewen, P.A., Brinker, J., Martin, R.A., & Dozois, D.J.A. (2008). Humor Styles and personality-vulnerability to depression. *International Journal of Humor Research, 21(2)*, 179- 195. doi: 10.1515/HUMOR.2008.009.

Fresco, D. M., Heimberg, R. G., Abramowitz, A., & Bertram, T. L. (2006). The effect of a negative mood priming challenge on dysfunctional attitudes, explanatory style, and explanatory flexibility. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 45*, 167 183. doi:10.1348/014466505X35137.

Furnham, A., Pertrides, K., & Spencer-Bowdage, S. (2002). The effects of different types of social desirability on the identification of repressors. *Personality and Individual Differences, 33*, 119-130.

Furnham, A., Petrides, K. V., (2003). Trait emotional intelligence and happiness. *Spcial Behavior and Personality, 31*, 815-824.

Gohm, C. L., Corser, G. C., & Dalsky, D. J. (2005). Emotional intelligence under stress: Useful, unnecessary, or irrelevant? *Personality of Individual Differences, 39*, 1017-1028.

Greven, C., Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Arteche, A., &Furnham, A. (2008). A hierarchical integration of dispositional determinants of generalhealth in students: The Big Five, Trait Emotional Intelligence and Humour Styles. *Personality and Individual Differences, 22*, 1562-1573.

Guthert, K. C., Cohen, L. H., & Armeli, S. (1999). Role of neuroticism in daily stress and coping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 1087-1100.

Hayward, R. D., Taylor, W. D., Smoski, M. J., Steffens, D. C., & Payne, M. E. (2013). Association of five factor model personality domains and facets with presence, onset, and treatment outcomes of major depression in older adults. *American Journal of Geriatic Psychiatry, 1*, 88-96.

Hooker, K., Frazier, L. D., & Monahan, D. J. (1994). Personality and coping among caregivers of spouses with dementia. Gerontologist, 34, 386–392.

Ingram, R. E., Miranda, J., & Segal, Z. V. (1998). *Cognitive vulnerability to depression*. Guilford Press; New York.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (Vol. 2, pp. 102–138). New York: Guilford Press.

Karsten, J., Penninx, B. W., Riese, H., Ormel, J., Nolen, W.A., & Hartman, C. A., (2012). The state effect of depressive and anxiety disorders on big five personality traits. *Journal of psychiatric Research 46 (5)*, 644-650.

Kagan, J., & Snidman, N. (1991). Temperament factors in human development. *American Psychologist, 46*, 856–862.

Kling, D.N., Kotov, R., & Bufferd, S. J., (2011). Personality and depression: explanatory models and review of the evidence. *Annual review of Clinical Psychology, 7*, 269-295.

Kotov, R., Gamez, W., Schimdt, F., & Watson, D. (2010). Linking "big" personality traits to anxiety, depressive, and substance use disorders: a meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin. 136 (5)*, 768-821.

Kuiper, N. A., Grimshaw, M., Leite, C., & Kirsh, G. (2004). Humor is not always the best medicine: Specific components of sense of humor and psychological well-being. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research, 17,* 135-168.doi:10.1515/humr.2004.002.

Kuiper, N. A., & McHale, N. (2009). Humor styles as mediators between self-evaluative standards and psychological well-being. *The Journal of Psychology, 143(4)*, 359-376.

Lucas, R. E., & Donnellan, M. B. (2011). Personality development across the life span: longitudinal analyses with a national sample from Germany. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101 (4)*, 847-861.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer.

Lefcourt, H. M. (2001). *Humor: The psychology of living buoyantly*. New York: Kluwer Academic.Long, D. L., &Graesser, A. C. (1988). Wit and humor in discourse processing. *Discourse Processes, 11,* 35–60.

Litman, J. A. (2006). The COPE inventory: Dimensionality and relationships with approach-and avoidance-motives and positive and negative traits. *Personality and Individual Differences, 41, 273-284.*

Lopes, P. N., Brackett, M. A., Nezlek, J. B., Schutz, A., Sellin, I., & Salovey, P. (2004). Emotional intelligence and social interaction. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 1018-1034.

Martin, R. A. & Lefcourt, H. M. (1983). Sense of humour as a moderator of the relation between stressors and moods.*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 45,* 1313-I 324.

Martin, R. A. & Dobbin, J. P. (1988). Sense of humour, hassles, and immunoglobin A: Evidence for a stress-moderatingeffect of humour. *International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine, 18,* 93-105.

Martin, R.A. (2007). The psychology of humor: an integrative approach. Retrieved from https://archive.org/details/psychologyofhumo00martrich/page/n5.

Martin, R. A., Puhlik-Doris, P., Larsen, G., Gray, J., & Weir, K. (2003). Individual differences in uses of humor and their relation to psychological well-being: Development of the Humor Styles

Questionnaire. *Journal of Research in Personality, 37,* 48-75.doi:10.1016/S00926566(02)00534-2.

Mayer, J. D., &Salovey, P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence. *Intelligence,17* (4), 433-442.http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0160-2896(93)90010–3.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1986). Personality, coping, and coping effectiveness in an adult sample. *Journal of Personality, 54,* 385-405.
McCrae, R. R., & Costa Jr., P. T. (1986). Personality, coping, and coping effectiveness in an adult sample. Journal of Personality, 54, 385–405.

Meites T.M., Deveney C.M., Steele K.T., Holmes A.J., &Pizzagalli D.A. (2008).Implicit depression and hopelessness in remitted depressed individuals. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 46* (2008) 1078-1084. doi:10.1016/j.brat.2008.05.008.

Mikolajczak, M., Nelis, D., Hansenne, M., & Quoidbach, J. (2007). If you can regulate sadness, you can probably regulate shame: Associations between trait emotional intelligence, emotion regulation and coping efficiency across discrete emotions. *Personality and Individual Differences, 44,* 1356–1368.

Malouff, J. M., Thorsteinsson, E. B., & Schutte, N. S. (2005). The relationship between the five factor model of personality and symptoms of clinic disorders: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 27 (2),* 101-114.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., (2008). The five factor theory of personality, Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research. Guilford Pressed, New York, 159-181.

Morey, L. C., Shea, M. T., Markowitz, J. C., Stout, R. L., Hopwood, C. J., Gunderson, J. G., Grilo, C. M., McGlashan, T. H., Yen, S., Sanislow, C. A., & Skodol, A. E. (2010). State effects of major depression on the assessment of personality and personality disorder. *The American Journal of Psychiatry, 167 (5),* 528-535.

Naidoo, S., & Pau, A. (2008). Emotional intelligence and perceived stress. *SADJ: Journal of the South African Dental Association, 63*(3), 148-151.

Nezu, A. M., Nezu, C. M. &Blissett, S. E. (1988). Sense of humour as a moderator of the relation between stressful eventsand psychological distress: A prospective analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 54,* 520-525.

O'Brien, T. B., & DeLongis, A. (1996). The interactional context of problem-, emotion-, and association-focused coping: the role of the big five personality factors. Journal of Personality, 64, 775–813.

Oktug, Z. (2017). The moderating role of employee's humor styles on the relationship between job stress and emotional exhaustion. *Journal of International Business Research, 10(4),* 131. doi:10.5539/ibr.v10n4p131.

Parkes, K. P. (1986). Coping with stressful episodes: The role of individual differences, environmental factors, and situational characteristics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51,* 1277-1292.

Pau, A., & Croucher, R. (2003). Emotional intelligence and perceived stress in dental undergraduates. *Journal of dental Education, 67,* 1023-1028.

Petrides, K. V., Pe´rez-Gonza´lez, J. C., & Furnham, A. (2007). On the criterion and incremental validity of trait emotional intelligence. *Cognition and Emotion, 21,* 26–55.

Petrides, K. V., Pita, R., & Kokkinaki, F. (2007). The location of trait emotional intelligence in personality factor space. *British Journal of Psychology, 98,* 273–289.

Petrides, K. V., Perez-Gonzalez, J. C., & Furnham, A. (2007). On the criterion and incremental validity of trait emotional intelligence. *Cognition and Emotion, 21,* 26-55.

Petrides, K. V. (2009). Psychometric properties of the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire. In C. Stough, D. H. Saklofske, and J. D. Parker, *Advances in the assessment of emotional intelligence*. New York: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-0-387-88370-0_5.

Power, M. K.., Katz, R., McGuffin, P., Duggan, C. F., Lam, D. & Beck, A. T. (1994). The Dysfunctional Attitude Scale (DAS): a comparison of forms A and B and proposals for a new subscalcd version. *Journal of Research in Personality,* 28, 263-276.

Rnic, K., Dozois, J.A., & Martina, R.A. (2016). Cognitive distortions, Humor Styles, and Depression. *Europe's Journal of Psychology, 12*(3), 348-362, doi: 10.5964/ejop.v12i3.1118.

Salovey, P., Bedell, B. T., Detweiler, J., & Mayer, J. D. (1999). Coping Intelligently: Emotional intelligence and the coping process. In C. R. Sndyer (Ed), Coping: The psychology of what work. New York: Oxford University Press.

Salovey, P., Bedell, B. T., Detweiler, J., & Mayer, J.D. (2000). Current directions in emotional intelligence research. In M. Lewis & J. M. Haviland-Jones (Eds). *Handbook of emotions,* 504-520. New York: Guilford Press.

Saklofske, D. H., Austin, E. J., Galloway, J., & Davidson, K. (2007). Individual difference correlates of health-related behaviours: Preliminary evidence for links between emotional intelligence and coping. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42*, 491–502.

Saklofske, D. H., Austin, E. J., Minski, P. S., (2003). Factor structure and validity of trait emotional intelligence measure. *Personality and Individual Differences, 34*, 707-721.

Schmidt, J. E., Andrykowsky, M. A., (2004). The role of social and dispositional variables associated with emotional intelligence in adjustment to breast cancer: an internet-based study. *Health Psychology, 33*, 167-177.

Schermer, J. A., Martin, R. A., Vernon, P. A., Martin, N. G., Conde, L. C., Statham, D., & Lynskey, M. T. (2017). Lonely people tend to make fun of themselves: A Behavior Genetic Analysis of Humor Styles and Loneliness. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 117, 71-73.

Steunenberg, B., Twisk, J. W., Beekman, A. T., Deeg, D. J., Kerkhof, A. J., (2005). Stability and change neuroticism in aging. *Journals of Gerontology B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 60 (1),* 27-33.

Steunenberg, B., Twisk, J. W., Beekman, A. T., Deeg, D. J., Kerkhof, A. J., (2006). Personality and the onset of depression in late life. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 92 (2-3),* 243-251.

Singh, Y., & Sharma, R. (2012). Relationship between general intelligence, emotional intelligence, emotional intelligence, stress levels and stress reactivity. *Annals of Neurosciences, 19*(3), 107-111.Slaski, M. ,& Cartwright, S. (2002). Health, performance and emotional intelligence: an exploratory study of retail managers. *Stress andHealth,*18, 63-68.

Vazqijez C., & Ring J.M., (1993). Altered cognitions in depression: are dysfunctional attitudes stable? *Personality and Individual Differences, 15*(4), 415-479.

Velting, D. M. (1999). The effectiveness of coping meta-strategies: perceived efficiency, emotional correlates and cognitive performance. *Personality and Individual Differences, 26,* 923-939.

Vollrath, M., & Torgersen, S. (2000). Personality types and coping. *Personality and Individual Differences, 26,* 367-378.

Watson, D., & Hubbard, B. (1996). Adaptational style and dispositional structure: coping in the context of the Fivefactor model. Journal of Personality, 64, 735–774.

Weber, K., Giannakopoulos, P., & Canuto, A. (2011). Exploring the impact of personality dimensions in late-life depression: from group comparisons to individual trajectories. *Current opinion in Psychiatry, 24 (6),* 478-483.

Weiss, A., Sutin, A.R., Duberstein, P. R., Friedman, B., Bagby, R.M., & Costa Jr., P. T., (2009). The personality domains and styles pf the five factor model are related to incident depression in Medicare recipients aged 65 to 100. *The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 17 (7)*, 591-601.

Ziv, A. (1988). Teaching and Learning with Humor. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 57*(*1*), 4-15. doi: 10.1080/00220973.1988.10806492.

APPENDIX A: Consent Form

Dear Friends,

I, a post-graduate student of School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology Patiala, am conducting a project related to some behavioral patterns of students. In this connection I request you to kindly fill in the questionnaires attached herewith. The information collected from you would be kept strictly confidential. If you wish to know about the results of your performance you can contact me in the following address. Kindly fill up the questionnaire sincerely.

School of Humanities & Social Sciences

G Block – Room No. 121

Consent form

I, _____, student of class_____ of

_____, hereby give my consent to participate in this study.

_____ _____

(Age) (Signature)

APPENDIX B: TEIQue-SF

Instructions: Please answer each statement below by putting a circle around the number that best reflects your degree of agreement or disagreement with that statement. Do not think too long about the exact meaning of the statements. Work quickly and try to answer as accurately as possible. There are no right or wrong answers. There are seven possible responses to each statement ranging from 'Completely Disagree' (number 1) to 'Completely Agree' (number 7).

1 . . . . . 2 . . . . . 3 . . . . . 4 . . . . . 5 . . . . . 6 7

Completely Disagree **Completely Agree**

1. Expressing my emotions with words is not a problem for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I often find it difficult to see things from another person's viewpoint.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. On the whole, I'm a highly motivated person.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I usually find it difficult to regulate my emotions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I generally don't find life enjoyable.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I can deal effectively with people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I tend to change my mind frequently.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Many times, I can't figure out what emotion I'm feeling.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. I often find it difficult to stand up for my rights.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. I'm usually able to influence the way other people feel.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. On the whole, I have a gloomy perspective on most things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Those close to me often complain that I don't treat them right.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. I often find it difficult to adjust my life according to the circumstances.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. On the whole, I'm able to deal with stress.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. I often find it difficult to show my affection to those close to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. I'm normally able to "get into someone's shoes" and experience their emotions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. I normally find it difficult to keep myself motivated.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. I'm usually able to find ways to control my emotions when I want to.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. On the whole, I'm pleased with my life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. I would describe myself as a good negotiator.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. I tend to get involved in things I later wish I could get out of.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. I often pause and think about my feelings.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. I believe I'm full of personal strengths.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. I tend to "back down" even if I know I'm right.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. I don't seem to have any power at all over other people's feelings.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. I generally believe that things will work out fine in my life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. I find it difficult to bond well even with those close to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Generally, I'm able to adapt to new environments.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. Others admire me for being relaxed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX C: Humor Styles Questionnaire

People experience and express humor in many different ways. Below is a list of statements describing different ways in which humor might be experienced. Please read each statement carefully, and indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with it. Please respond as honestly and objectively as you can. Use the following scale:

Totally Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Totally Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. I usually don't laugh or joke around much with other people.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
2. If I am feeling depressed, I can usually cheer myself up with humor.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
3. If someone makes a mistake, I will often tease them about it.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
4. I let people laugh at me or make fun at my expense more than I should.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
5. I rarely make other people laugh by telling funny stories about myself.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
6. I don't often say funny things to put myself down.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
7. I usually don't like to tell jokes or amuse people.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
8. I enjoy making people laugh.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
9. If I am feeling sad or upset, I usually lose my sense of humor.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
10. I don't often joke around with my friends.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
11. Even when I'm by myself, I'm often amused by the absurdities of life.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
12. I usually can't think of witty things to say when I'm with other people.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
13. People are never offended or hurt by my sense of humor.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
14. I laugh and joke a lot with my friends.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
15. If I don't like someone, I often use humor or teasing to put them down.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
16. I don't have to work very hard at making other people laugh -- I seem to be a naturally humorous person.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
17. I will often get carried away in putting myself down if it makes my family or friends laugh.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
18. If I am feeling upset or unhappy I usually try to think of something funny about the situation to make myself feel better.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

19. When telling jokes or saying funny things, I am usually not very concerned about how other people are taking it.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
20. I often try to make people like or accept me more by saying something funny about my own weaknesses, blunders, or faults.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
21. My humorous outlook on life keeps me from getting overly upset or depressed about things.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
22. I do not like it when people use humor as a way of criticizing or putting someone down.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
23. If I'm by myself and I'm feeling unhappy, I make an effort to think of something funny to cheer myself up.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
24. Sometimes I think of something that is so funny that I can't stop myself from saying it, even if it is not appropriate for the situation.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
25. I often go overboard in putting myself down when I am making jokes or trying to be funny.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
26. I never participate in laughing at others even if all my friends are doing it.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
27. When I am with friends or family, I often seem to be the one that other people make fun of or joke about.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
28. It is my experience that thinking about some amusing aspect of a situation is often a very effective way of coping with problems.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
29. If I am having problems or am unhappy, I often cover it up by joking around, so that even my closest friends don't know how I really feel.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
30. I don't need to be with other people to feel amused -- I can usually find things to laugh about even when I'm by myself.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
31. Even if something is really funny to me, I will not laugh or joke about it if someone will be offended.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
32. Letting others laugh at me is my way of keeping my friends and family in good spirits.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

APPENDIX D: Big Five Inventory

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who likes to spend time with others? Please put a tick mark in the appropriate circle next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement.

Strongly disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly agree

1----------2----------3----------4----------5

I See Myself as Someone Who . . .	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1. Is talkative.....	O	O	O	O	O
2. Tends to find fault with others.....	O	O	O	O	O
3. Does a thorough job.....	O	O	O	O	O
4. Is depressed, blue.....	O	O	O	O	O
5. Is original, comes up with new ideas.....	O	O	O	O	O
6. Is reserved.....	O	O	O	O	O
7. Is helpful and unselfish with others.....	O	O	O	O	O
8. Can be somewhat careless.....	O	O	O	O	O
9. Is relaxed, handles stress well.....	O	O	O	O	O
10. Is curious about many different things.....	O	O	O	O	O
11. Is full of energy.....	O	O	O	O	O
12. Starts quarrels with others.....	O	O	O	O	O
13. Is a reliable worker.....	O	O	O	O	O
14. Can be tense.....	O	O	O	O	O
15. Is ingenious, a deep thinker.....	O	O	O	O	O
16. Generates a lot of enthusiasm.....	O	O	O	O	O
17. Has a forgiving nature.....	O	O	O	O	O
18. Tends to be disorganized.....	O	O	O	O	O
19. Worries a lot.....	O	O	O	O	O
20. Has an active imagination.....	O	O	O	O	O
21. Tends to be quiet.....	O	O	O	O	O

	1	2	3	4	5
22. Is generally trusting.....	O	O	O	O	O
23. Tends to be lazy.....	O	O	O	O	O
24. Is emotionally stable, not easily upset.....	O	O	O	O	O
25. Is inventive.....	O	O	O	O	O
26. Has an assertive personality.....	O	O	O	O	O
27. Can be cold and aloof.....	O	O	O	O	O
28. Perseveres until the task is finished.....	O	O	O	O	O
29. Can be moody.....	O	O	O	O	O
30. Values artistic, aesthetic experiences.....	O	O	O	O	O
31. Is sometimes shy, inhibited.....	O	O	O	O	O
32. Is considerate and kind to almost everyone.....	O	O	O	O	O
33. Does things efficiently.....	O	O	O	O	O
34. Remains calm in tense situations.....	O	O	O	O	O
35. Prefers work that is routine.....	O	O	O	O	O
36. Is outgoing, sociable.....	O	O	O	O	O
37. Is sometimes rude to others.....	O	O	O	O	O
38. Makes plans and follows through with them....	O	O	O	O	O
39. Gets nervous easily.....	O	O	O	O	O
40. Likes to reflect, play with ideas.....	O	O	O	O	O
41. Has few artistic interests.....	O	O	O	O	O
42. Likes to cooperate with others.....	O	O	O	O	O
43. Is easily distracted.....	O	O	O	O	O
44. Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature.....	O	O	O	O	O

APPENDIX E: COPE Inventory

We are interested in how people respond when they confront difficult or stressful events in their lives. There are lots of ways to try to deal with stress. This questionnaire asks you to indicate what you generally do and feel, when you experience stressful events. Obviously, different events bring out somewhat different responses, but think about what you usually do when you are under a lot of stress.

Then respond to each of the following items by circling one number on your answer sheet for each, using the response choices listed just below Choose your answers thoughtfully, and make your answers as true FOR YOU as you can. Please answer every item. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers, so choose the most accurate answer for YOU--not what you think "most people" would say or do.

Response choices:

1 = I usually don't do this at all

2 = I usually do this a little bit

3 = I usually do this a medium amount

4 = I usually do this a lot

I usually don't do this at all 1 2 3 4 Completely applicable to me

1. I try to grow as a person as a result of the experience.	1 2 3 4
2. I turn to work or other substitute activities to take my mind off things.	1 2 3 4
3. I get upset and let my emotions out.	1 2 3 4
4. I try to get advice from someone about what to do.	1 2 3 4
5. I concentrate my efforts on doing something about it.	1 2 3 4
6. I say to myself “this isn't real."	1 2 3 4
7. I put my trust in God.	1 2 3 4
8. I laugh about the situation.	1 2 3 4
9. I admit to myself that I can't deal with it, and quit trying.	1 2 3 4
10. I restrain myself from doing anything too quickly.	1 2 3 4
11. I discuss my feelings with someone.	1 2 3 4

12. I use alcohol or drugs to make myself feel better. 1 2 3 4

13. I get used to the idea that it happened. 1 2 3 4

14. I talk to someone to find out more about the situation. 1 2 3 4

15. I keep myself from getting distracted by other thoughts or activities. 1 2 3 4

16. I daydream about things other than this. 1 2 3 4

17. I get upset, and am really aware of it. 1 2 3 4

18. I seek God's help. 1 2 3 4

19. I make a plan of action. 1 2 3 4

20. I make jokes about it. 1 2 3 4

21. I accept that this has happened and that it can't be changed. 1 2 3 4

22. I hold off doing anything about it until the situation permits. 1 2 3 4

23. I try to get emotional support from friends or relatives. 1 2 3 4

24. I just give up trying to reach my goal. 1 2 3 4

25. I take additional action to try to get rid of the problem. 1 2 3 4

26. I try to lose myself for a while by drinking alcohol or taking drugs. 1 2 3 4

27. I refuse to believe that it has happened. 1 2 3 4

28. I let my feelings out. 1 2 3 4

29. I try to see it in a different light, to make it seem more positive. 1 2 3 4

30. I talk to someone who could do something concrete about the problem. 1 2 3 4

31. I sleep more than usual. 1 2 3 4

32. I try to come up with a strategy about what to do. 1 2 3 4

33. I focus on dealing with this problem,and if necessary let other things slide a little. 1 2 3 4

34. I get sympathy and understanding from someone. 1 2 3 4

35. I drink alcohol or take drugs, in order to think about it less. 1 2 3 4

36. I kid around about it. 1 2 3 4

37. I give up the attempt to get what I want. 1 2 3 4

38. I look for something good in what is happening. 1 2 3 4

39. I think about how I might best handle the problem. 1 2 3 4

40. I pretend that it hasn't really happened. 1 2 3 4

41. I make sure not to make matters worse by acting too soon. 1 2 3 4

42. I try hard to prevent other things from interfering with my efforts at dealing with this. 1 2 3 4

43. I go to movies or watch TV, to think about it less. 1 2 3 4

44. I accept the reality of the fact that it happened. 1 2 3 4

45. I ask people who have had similar experiences what they did. 1 2 3 4

46. I feel a lot of emotional distress and I find myself expressing those feelings a lot. 1 2 3 4

47. I take direct action to get around the problem. 1 2 3 4

48. I try to find comfort in my religion. 1 2 3 4

49. I force myself to wait for the right time to do something. 1 2 3 4

50. I make fun of the situation. 1 2 3 4

51. I reduce the amount of effort I'm putting into solving the problem. 1 2 3 4

52. I talk to someone about how I feel. 1 2 3 4

53. I use alcohol or drugs to help me get through it. 1 2 3 4

54. I learn to live with it. 1 2 3 4

55. I put aside other activities in order to concentrate on this. 1 2 3 4

56. I think hard about what steps to take. 1 2 3 4

57. I act as though it hasn't even happened. 1 2 3 4

58. I do what has to be done, one step at a time. 1 2 3 4

59. I learn something from the experience. 1 2 3 4

60. I pray more than usual. 1 2 3 4

APPENDIX F: Dysfunctional Attitude Scale

Attitudes	Totally Agree	Agree Very Much	Agree Slightly	Neutral	Disagree Slightly	Disagree Very Much	Totally Disagree
1. If I fail partly, it is as bad as being a complete failure.							
2. If others dislike you, you cannot be happy.							
3. I should be happy all the time.							
4. People will probably think less of me if I make a mistake.							
5. My happiness depends more on other people than it does on me.							
6. I should always have complete control over my feelings.							
7. My life is wasted unless I am a success.							
8. What other people think about me is very important.							
9. I ought to be able to solve my problems quickly and without a great deal of effort.							
10. If I don't set the highest standards for myself, I am likely to end up a second-rate person.							
11. I am nothing if a person I love doesn't love me.							
12. A person should be able to control what happens to him.							

Attitudes	Totally Agree	Agree Very Much	Agree Slightly	Neutral	Disagree Slightly	Disagree Very Much	Totally Disagree
13. If I am to be a worthwhile person, I must be truly outstanding in at least one major respect.							
14. If you don't have other people to lean on, you are bound to be sad.							
15. It is possible for a person to be scolded and not get upset.							
16. I must be a useful, productive, creative person, or life has no purpose.							
17. I can find happiness without being loved by another person.							
18. A person should do well at everything he undertakes.							
19. If I do not do well all the time, people will not respect me.							
20. I do not need the approval of other people in order to be happy.							
21. If I try hard enough, I should be able to excel at anything I attempt.							
22. People who have good ideas are more worthy than those who do not.							
23. A person doesn't need to be well liked in order to be happy.							
24. Whenever I take a chance or risk, I am only looking for trouble.							

APPENDIX G: Perceived Stress Scale

The questions in this scale ask about your feelings and thoughts during the last month. In each case, you will be asked to indicate how often you felt or thought a certain way. Although some of the questions are similar, there are differences between them and you should treat each one as a separate question. The best approach is to answer fairly quickly. That is, don't try to count up the number of times you felt a particular way; rather indicate the alternative that seems like a reasonable estimate.

For each question choose from the following alternatives:

0 – never 1 - almost never 2 – sometimes 3 - fairly often 4 - very often

____ 1. In the last month, how often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?

_____ 2. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?

_____ 3. In the last month, how often have you felt nervous and stressed

_____ 4. In the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?

_____ 5. In the last month, how often have you felt that things were going your way?

_____ 6. In the last month, how often have you found that you could not cope with all the things that you had to do?

_____ 7. In the last month, how often have you been able to control irritations in your life?

_____ 8. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were on top of things?

_____ 9. In the last month, how often have you been angered because of things that happened that were outside of your control?

_____ 10. In the last month, how often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?