

## Identifying The Relationship Of Teacher Candidates' Humor Styles With Anxiety And Self-Compassion Levels

Aydan AYDIN\*

### Suggested Citation:

Aydan, A. (2015). Identifying the relationship of teacher candidates' humor styles with anxiety and self-compassion levels. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 59, 1-16  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2015.59.1>

### Abstract

*Problem Statement:* Teacher candidates who will soon be responsible for educating the future generations should possess certain characteristics. Specific teacher candidates should have specific characteristics taken into consideration: pre-school and primary teacher candidates should be seen as role models by younger students; psychological counseling and guidance teacher candidates should guide students in terms of choice of profession and provide counseling in case of problems; and special education teacher candidates should be fully equipped with the skills to handle students with special needs and characteristics.

*Purpose of Study:* This study aims to identify the relationship between teacher candidates' humor styles, anxiety, and self-compassion levels, and to investigate these levels from the perspective of gender and grade variables.

*Method:* In this research study, a multiple regression analysis was applied in order to explore the relationship between candidate teachers' humor styles and their anxiety as well as self-compassion levels. The sample of the study is comprised of a total of 1008 students studying in the following departments of the Atatürk Education Faculty at Marmara University: early childhood education, primary school teaching, psychological counseling and guidance, and special education. As data collection instruments, the Self-Compassion Scale, the Humor Styles Questionnaire, and the State and Trait Anxiety Scale were used.

*Findings and Results:* According to the findings of the study, the t values calculated to find the significance of the regression coefficients indicate that isolation and self-judgment sub-dimensions have significant

---

\* Dr, Marmara University, Atatürk Faculty of Education, Special Education Department, e-mail: [aydanaydin@marmara.edu.tr](mailto:aydanaydin@marmara.edu.tr)

predictiveness for affiliated humor. Self-kindness, common humanity, isolation, and over-identification sub-dimensions have significant predictiveness for self-enhancing humor. Self-kindness, self-judgment, mindfulness, and over-identification subdimensions have significant predictiveness for aggressive humor. Self-judgment and common humanity sub-dimensions have significant predictiveness for self-defeating humor. Other sub-dimensions do not have significant influence on the dependent variable. Finally, the sub-dimensions of the State and Trait Anxiety Scale have significant predictiveness for all the sub-dimensions of the Humor Style Scale.

*Recommendations:* There is a need for experimental studies aiming to boost teacher candidates' self-compassion by developing programs indented to reduce their anxiety levels. It is also suggested that if some aspects of such programs are found to be positive in such studies, they should be incorporated into the optional courses or practice-based applications in the programs of education faculties.

*Key words:* Teacher candidates, humor style, self-compassion, anxiety

## Introduction

Teacher candidates who will soon be responsible for educating future generations should possess certain characteristics. Especially the following characteristics should be taken into consideration: pre-school and primary teacher candidates should be role models for younger students; psychological counseling and guidance teacher candidates should guide students in terms of choice of profession and provide counseling in case of problems; and special education teacher candidates should be fully equipped with the skills to handle students with special needs and characteristics.

It is important for teacher candidates to be sensitive and understanding to themselves and to the people in their surroundings. It is essential for them to have self-compassion. Self-compassion provides individuals with the skills needed to establish good relationships with themselves, develop empathy, be sympathetic and sensitive, and be tolerant of problems (Gilbert & Procter, 2006). Self-compassion also encourages individuals to feel satisfied with themselves in case of difficulties and when they feel inadequate (Neff & Beretvas, 2012), and it is one of the ways to cope with negative life experiences (Allen & Leary, 2010). Moreover, self-compassion facilitates flexibility in individuals' behaviors (Germer & Neff, 2013), and refers to the self-acceptance of the individuals and their ability to be able to make compassionate evaluations of themselves (Werner et al., 2012). Aside from this, some researchers found a negative relationship between self-compassion and depression, the fear of failure, and anxiety (Neff, Hsieh, & Dejitterat, 2005; Ying, 2009; Raes, 2010). It was also revealed that high levels of self-compassion help individuals to be

psychologically healthy (Neff, 2009; Van Dam, Sheppard, Forsyth & Earleywine, 2011).

Several factors in life might cause individuals to feel good-bad, sufficient-insufficient, happy-sad or anxious. Especially during the period of transition to the a profession, which is one of the most important transition periods in life, it is natural for teacher candidates to feel anxious. As stated by Cüceloğlu (1991), the most significant source of anxiety is a lack of knowledge about what will happen in the future. Some precautions related to the teacher candidates' appointments and placements can be taken to reduce their initial anxiety and to make them feel more secure. However, these precautions are considered to serve little purpose in the long run. Additionally, not only the challenges arising from their work experiences but also the difficulties resulting from the responsibilities of adulthood come into play in this transition period to professional life. Considering all these factors, it is essential for individuals to protect themselves and to learn how to calm down in challenging circumstances.

In addition to having self-compassion, which leads individuals to establish good relationships both with themselves and with the people in their surroundings, teacher candidates must have humor. By means of humor, individuals can be flexible, tolerant, and accepting by discovering the amusing sides of events. Humor also paves the way for the development of interpersonal relationships and a decrease in the number of conflicts (Semrud-Clikeman & Glass, 2010), the expression of emotions through positive thinking (Smith, Harrington, & Neck, 2000), and the emergence of a positive and optimistic approach (Chinery, 2007). Sense of humor has many adaptive functions (Dowling & Fain, 1999; Martin, 2002; Mireault et al., 2012) and is important in terms of the individuals' interpersonal relationships (Zeigler-Hill, Besser, & Jett, 2013). Some studies reported that as teacher candidates use more self-enhancing and affiliate humor styles, their approaches to problem solving become more positive (Traş, Arslan, & Mentiş-Taş, 2011), and they grow more self-confident in overcoming problems (Sarı & Aslan, 2005). Furthermore, it was emphasized that students with high senses of humor are more optimistic (Durmuş & Tezer, 2001). In another study, it was revealed that students using self-enhancing and affiliate humor styles have lower levels of anxiety (Bilge & Saltuk, 2007).

From the findings of the reviewed studies, it is clear that individuals have more positive approaches when they use humor, and they feel better when they have higher levels of self-compassion. Thus, it is likely that there is a positive relationship between humor and self-compassion, and they have both been proven to reduce individuals' anxiety levels. It can be maintained that teacher candidates' sense of humor will encourage them to feel satisfied both during their daily lives and in educational processes. It is also likely that satisfied teachers will exhibit more positive attitudes towards their students and deal with problems calmly and appropriately. Although no study exploring the relationship among these variables has been encountered in the reviewed literature, it is thought that teacher candidates' self-compassion and anxiety levels while establishing relationships with themselves and with their students might be related to their humor styles. Thus, this study aims

to investigate the relationship of teacher candidates' humor styles, which are important to satisfaction and healthy interpersonal relationships, with anxiety and self-compassion levels.

## Method

### *Research Design*

Multiple regression was applied in this study to explore the relationship of teacher candidates' humor styles with their anxiety and self-compassion levels. Multiple regression analysis is used to predict the dependent variable based on two or more predictors (independent variables) that are related to the dependent variable (Büyüköztürk, 2005).

### *Research Sample*

The sample of the study is comprised of a total of 1008 students studying in the departments of early childhood education (N=295), primary school teaching (N=208), psychological counseling and guidance (301), and special education (204) in the Atatürk Education Faculty at Marmara University. Out of 1008 participants, 824 were female while the remaining 184 were male. Also, 230 of the participants were in the first year while 300 of them were in the fourth year in their departments.

### *Research Instrument and Procedure*

**Self-compassion Scale:** The scale developed by Neff (2003) assesses the characteristics related to the sub-dimensions of self-compassion, and it is a self-assessment instrument based on individuals' information about themselves. Containing 26 items in the form of five-point Likert scale, it includes six sub-dimensions making up the concept of self-compassion by means of the confirmatory factor analysis. These sub-dimensions are as follows: self-kindness against self-judgment, common humanity against isolation, and mindfulness against over-identification. The adaptation of the scale into Turkish and the reliability as well as the validity of the scale was carried out by Akın, Akın and Abacı (2007) who collected data from 633 students at the Education Faculty of Sakarya University. The confirmatory factor analysis in the study revealed that the scale was compatible with the original form ( $\chi^2=779.01$ ,  $sd=264$ ,  $p=0.00$ ,  $RMSEA=.056$ ,  $NFI=.95$ ,  $CFI=.97$ ,  $IFI=.97$ ,  $RFI=.94$ ,  $GFI=.91$  and  $SRMR=.059$ ). The internal consistency coefficients of the scale were found to be between .72 and .80, and the test-retest reliability coefficients were between .56 and .69. Also, the corrected item-total correlations of the scale were between .48 and .71, and it was revealed that all the differences between the 27% of the mean scores of the high-low groups were significant (Akın, Akın & Abacı, 2007).

**Humor Styles Questionnaire (Scale):** Developed by Martin, Puhlik-Doris, Larsen, Gray and Weir (2003), the scale aims to assess four different dimensions through 32 seven-likert-type items pertaining to the individual differences in the use of humor styles. The scale was adapted into Turkish by Yerlikaya (2003) whose participants were 1363 students attending Çukurova University. The piloting of the scale was done with a sample of 530 students while the construct validity of the scale

was tested with a sample of 495 students. The criterion-related validity studies were done by means of the involvement of two different sample groups including 137 and 138 students, and the test-retest reliability studies were conducted in a fifteen-day interval with the participation of a sample of 63 students. The findings of the study revealed that the scale was comprised of four factors as determined in its original form, and each factor was found to be equivalent to four sub-scales that included eight items. The percentage variance explanation of the obtained four factors is 36.88%. Core values of the factors are respectively as follows: Self-enhancing humor: 5.22, Affiliate Humor: 2.97, Aggressive Humor: 1.90, and Self-defeating Humor: 1.70. The variance description percentages are respectively as follows: 16.34, 9.28, 5.97, and 5.30. The Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficients of the sub-scales were found to be between .67 and .78, and the test-retest correlation coefficients were found to be between .83 and .88 (Yerlikaya, 2003).

**State and Trait Anxiety Scale:** The scale including 40 items was developed by Spielberger (1979) and the reliability and the validity study of the scale in Turkish was carried out by Öner and Le Compte. While the State Anxiety Scale asks individuals to describe how they feel at a certain times and under certain conditions, the Trait Anxiety Scale requires individuals to describe how they feel in general. Each of these scales is comprised of 20 items. The Alpha reliability coefficient of the State and Trait Anxiety Inventory in different applications was between 0.83 and 0.87 for the State Anxiety Scale and for the Trait Anxiety Scale, the coefficient was between 0.94 and 0.96. The test-retest reliability coefficient was found to be between 0.71 and 0.86 for the State Anxiety Scale while the coefficient for the State Anxiety Scale was between 0.26 and 0.68 (Öner & Compte, 1998).

## Results

**Table 1.**

*Results of the Multiple Regression Analysis Applied to Predict Sub-dimension Scores of Humor Styles Scale through Sub-dimension Scores of Self-compassion Scale*

<i>Affiliate humor</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE<sub>B</sub></i>	<i>β</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Binary r</i>	<i>Partial r</i>
Invariant	5,567	,262		21,244	,000		
Self-kindness	,061	,070	,041	,878	,380	,161	,028
Self-judgment	-,189	,060	-,143	-3,143	,002	-,228	-,099
Common Humanity	,115	,059	,083	1,945	,052	,171	,061
Isolation	-,201	,058	-,161	-3,463	,001	-,226	-,109
Mindfulness	-,024	,065	-,017	-,375	,708	,138	-,012
Over-identification	,105	,059	,088	1,779	,076	-,162	,056

R=,270      R<sup>2</sup>=,073  
F<sub>(6, 1001)</sub>=13,138      p=,0000

Table 1 Continue...

<i>Self-enhancing humor</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Sh<sub>B</sub></i>	<i>β</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Binary r</i>	<i>Partial r</i>
Invariant	3,140	,263		11,939	,000		
Self-kindness	,372	,070	,230	5,314	,000	,405	,166
Self-judgment	,022	,060	,015	,358	,721	-,272	,011
Common Humanity	,172	,059	,114	2,899	,004	,345	,091
Isolation	-,131	,058	-,097	-2,258	,024	-,292	-,071
Mindfulness	,067	,065	,044	1,021	,307	,349	,032
Over-identification	-,131	,059	-,101	-2,210	,027	-,311	-,070
R=,451		R <sup>2</sup> =,204					
F <sub>(6,1001)</sub> =42,690		p=,0000					
<i>Aggressive humor</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Sh<sub>B</sub></i>	<i>β</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Binary r</i>	<i>Partial r</i>
Invariant	2,684	,236		11,378	,000		
Self-kindness	,166	,063	,126	2,645	,008	-,043	,083
Self-judgment	,236	,054	,200	4,342	,000	,153	,136
Common Humanity	-,074	,053	-,060	-1,398	,163	-,103	-,044
Isolation	,048	,052	,043	,921	,357	,094	,029
Mindfulness	-,157	,059	-,126	-2,673	,008	-,111	-,084
Over-identification	-,145	,053	-,136	-2,724	,007	,052	-,086
R=,206		R <sup>2</sup> =,043					
F <sub>(6,1001)</sub> =7,429		p=,0000					
<i>Self-defeating humor</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Sh<sub>B</sub></i>	<i>β</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Binary r</i>	<i>Partial r</i>
Invariant	2,006	,268		7,492	,000		
Self-kindness	,114	,071	,075	1,599	,110	-,003	,050
Self-judgment	,342	,062	,255	5,555	,000	,201	,173
Common Humanity	,132	,060	,094	2,189	,029	,017	,069
Isolation	,069	,059	,055	1,167	,244	,137	,037
Mindfulness	-,088	,067	-,062	-1,323	,186	-,036	-,042
Over-identification	-,087	,060	-,072	-1,438	,151	,109	-,045
R=,233		R <sup>2</sup> =,054					
F <sub>(6,1001)</sub> =9,601		p=,0000					

The analysis of the multiple regression results between the sub-dimension scores of Self-Compassion scale and Humor style scale indicates that the score in the sub-dimension of affiliate humor ( $R=,270$ ;  $R^2=,073$ ;  $p<,01$ ), the aggressive humor score ( $R=,206$ ;  $R^2=,043$ ;  $p<,01$ ), and the self-defeating score ( $R=,233$ ;  $R^2=,054$ ;  $p<,01$ ) had a relationship at a low level. T-values were calculated to explore the significance of the regression coefficients, and indicate that self-kindness, common humanity, isolation, and over-identification sub-dimensions had significant positive correlations with self-enhancing humor; self-kindness, self-judgment, mindfulness, and over-identification sub-dimensions had significant predictiveness for aggressive humor; self-judgment and common humanity sub-dimensions have significant predictiveness for self-defeating humor. Other sub-dimensions had no significant influence on the dependent variable.

**Table 2.**  
Results of the Multiple Regression Analysis Applied to Predict Sub-dimension Scores of Humor Styles Scale through Sub-dimension Scores of Anxiety Scale

Affiliate Humor	B	SE <sub>B</sub>	B	T	p	Binary r	Partial r
Invariant	6,941	,169		40,959	,000		
State anxiety	-,325	,071	-,162	-4,568	,000	-,261	-,143
Trait anxiety	-,434	,083	-,185	-5,204	,000	-,271	-,162
R=,304 F(2;1005)=51,136	R <sup>2</sup> =,092 p=,0000						
<b>Self-enhancing Humor</b>							
Invariant	6,890	,174		39,622	,000		
State anxiety	-,360	,073	-,166	-4,942	,000	-,335	-,154
Trait anxiety	-,808	,086	-,318	-9,443	,000	-,406	-,285
R=,430 F(2; 1005)=113,974	R <sup>2</sup> =,185 p=,0000						
<b>Aggressive Humor</b>							
Invariant	2,180	,156		13,954	,000		
State anxiety	,132	,066	,074	2,014	,044	,113	,063
Trait anxiety	,152	,077	,073	1,981	,048	,113	,062
R=,129 F(2; 1005)=8,536	R <sup>2</sup> =,017 p=,0000						
<b>Self-defeating Humor</b>							
Invariant	2,664	,178		14,937	,000		
State anxiety	-,079	,075	-,039	-1,059	,290	,041	-,033
Trait anxiety	,359	,088	,151	4,094	,000	,130	,128
R=,134 F(2; 1005)=9,255	R <sup>2</sup> =,018 p=,0000						

The state and trait anxiety sub-dimensions of the anxiety scale have low-level correlations with the affiliate humor sub-dimension of Humor Style Scale (R=,304; R<sup>2</sup>=,092; p<,01) aggressive humor sub-dimension (R=,129; R<sup>2</sup>=,017; p<,01), and self-defeating humor scores (R=,134; R<sup>2</sup>=,018; p<,01). The t-values intended to explore the significance of the regression coefficients indicate that both state and trait anxiety sub-dimensions have significant predictiveness for all the dimensions of Humor Style Scale.

**Table 3.**  
*Results of Independent Group t Test Applied to Identify whether Sub-dimension Scores of the Self-compassion, Humor and Anxiety Scales Differ Depending on the Gender Variable*

	Groups	N	$\bar{x}$	SS	Sh $\bar{x}$	t Test																																																																																																																																																																						
						t	Sd	p																																																																																																																																																																				
Self-kindness	Female	824	2,96	,706	,025	-1,818	1006	,069																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	184	3,06	,646	,048				Self-judgment	Female	824	2,54	,791	,028	-3,124	1006	,002	Male	184	2,74	,726	,053	Common Humanity	Female	824	3,04	,760	,026	,201	1006	,840	Male	184	3,02	,684	,050	Isolation	Female	824	2,71	,847	,030	-1,424	1006	,155	Male	184	2,80	,755	,056	Mindfulness	Female	824	3,09	,758	,026	-1,569	1006	,117	Male	184	3,18	,658	,049	Over-identification	Female	824	2,77	,877	,031	,219	1006	,826	Male	184	2,75	,813	,060	Total Scale Score	Female	824	3,18	,608	,021	,377	1006	,706	Male	184	3,16	,498	,037	Affiliate Humor	Female	824	5,33	1,010	,035	3,463	1006	,001	Male	184	5,04	1,131	,083	Self-enhancing Humor	Female	824	4,32	1,134	,040	,355	1006	,723	Male	184	4,28	1,084	,080	Aggressive Humor	Female	824	2,74	,916	,032	-4,892	1006	,000	Male	184	3,10	,884	,065	Self-defeating Humor	Female	824	3,26	1,045	,036	-2,958	1006	,003	Male	184	3,51	1,057	,078	State Anxiety	Female	824	2,13	,519	,018	1,422	1006	,155	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038	Trait Anxiety	Female	824	2,26	,440	,015	2,609	1006	,009	Male
Self-judgment	Female	824	2,54	,791	,028	-3,124	1006	,002																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	184	2,74	,726	,053				Common Humanity	Female	824	3,04	,760	,026	,201	1006	,840	Male	184	3,02	,684	,050	Isolation	Female	824	2,71	,847	,030	-1,424	1006	,155	Male	184	2,80	,755	,056	Mindfulness	Female	824	3,09	,758	,026	-1,569	1006	,117	Male	184	3,18	,658	,049	Over-identification	Female	824	2,77	,877	,031	,219	1006	,826	Male	184	2,75	,813	,060	Total Scale Score	Female	824	3,18	,608	,021	,377	1006	,706	Male	184	3,16	,498	,037	Affiliate Humor	Female	824	5,33	1,010	,035	3,463	1006	,001	Male	184	5,04	1,131	,083	Self-enhancing Humor	Female	824	4,32	1,134	,040	,355	1006	,723	Male	184	4,28	1,084	,080	Aggressive Humor	Female	824	2,74	,916	,032	-4,892	1006	,000	Male	184	3,10	,884	,065	Self-defeating Humor	Female	824	3,26	1,045	,036	-2,958	1006	,003	Male	184	3,51	1,057	,078	State Anxiety	Female	824	2,13	,519	,018	1,422	1006	,155	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038	Trait Anxiety	Female	824	2,26	,440	,015	2,609	1006	,009	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038										
Common Humanity	Female	824	3,04	,760	,026	,201	1006	,840																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	184	3,02	,684	,050				Isolation	Female	824	2,71	,847	,030	-1,424	1006	,155	Male	184	2,80	,755	,056	Mindfulness	Female	824	3,09	,758	,026	-1,569	1006	,117	Male	184	3,18	,658	,049	Over-identification	Female	824	2,77	,877	,031	,219	1006	,826	Male	184	2,75	,813	,060	Total Scale Score	Female	824	3,18	,608	,021	,377	1006	,706	Male	184	3,16	,498	,037	Affiliate Humor	Female	824	5,33	1,010	,035	3,463	1006	,001	Male	184	5,04	1,131	,083	Self-enhancing Humor	Female	824	4,32	1,134	,040	,355	1006	,723	Male	184	4,28	1,084	,080	Aggressive Humor	Female	824	2,74	,916	,032	-4,892	1006	,000	Male	184	3,10	,884	,065	Self-defeating Humor	Female	824	3,26	1,045	,036	-2,958	1006	,003	Male	184	3,51	1,057	,078	State Anxiety	Female	824	2,13	,519	,018	1,422	1006	,155	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038	Trait Anxiety	Female	824	2,26	,440	,015	2,609	1006	,009	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038																								
Isolation	Female	824	2,71	,847	,030	-1,424	1006	,155																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	184	2,80	,755	,056				Mindfulness	Female	824	3,09	,758	,026	-1,569	1006	,117	Male	184	3,18	,658	,049	Over-identification	Female	824	2,77	,877	,031	,219	1006	,826	Male	184	2,75	,813	,060	Total Scale Score	Female	824	3,18	,608	,021	,377	1006	,706	Male	184	3,16	,498	,037	Affiliate Humor	Female	824	5,33	1,010	,035	3,463	1006	,001	Male	184	5,04	1,131	,083	Self-enhancing Humor	Female	824	4,32	1,134	,040	,355	1006	,723	Male	184	4,28	1,084	,080	Aggressive Humor	Female	824	2,74	,916	,032	-4,892	1006	,000	Male	184	3,10	,884	,065	Self-defeating Humor	Female	824	3,26	1,045	,036	-2,958	1006	,003	Male	184	3,51	1,057	,078	State Anxiety	Female	824	2,13	,519	,018	1,422	1006	,155	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038	Trait Anxiety	Female	824	2,26	,440	,015	2,609	1006	,009	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038																																						
Mindfulness	Female	824	3,09	,758	,026	-1,569	1006	,117																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	184	3,18	,658	,049				Over-identification	Female	824	2,77	,877	,031	,219	1006	,826	Male	184	2,75	,813	,060	Total Scale Score	Female	824	3,18	,608	,021	,377	1006	,706	Male	184	3,16	,498	,037	Affiliate Humor	Female	824	5,33	1,010	,035	3,463	1006	,001	Male	184	5,04	1,131	,083	Self-enhancing Humor	Female	824	4,32	1,134	,040	,355	1006	,723	Male	184	4,28	1,084	,080	Aggressive Humor	Female	824	2,74	,916	,032	-4,892	1006	,000	Male	184	3,10	,884	,065	Self-defeating Humor	Female	824	3,26	1,045	,036	-2,958	1006	,003	Male	184	3,51	1,057	,078	State Anxiety	Female	824	2,13	,519	,018	1,422	1006	,155	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038	Trait Anxiety	Female	824	2,26	,440	,015	2,609	1006	,009	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038																																																				
Over-identification	Female	824	2,77	,877	,031	,219	1006	,826																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	184	2,75	,813	,060				Total Scale Score	Female	824	3,18	,608	,021	,377	1006	,706	Male	184	3,16	,498	,037	Affiliate Humor	Female	824	5,33	1,010	,035	3,463	1006	,001	Male	184	5,04	1,131	,083	Self-enhancing Humor	Female	824	4,32	1,134	,040	,355	1006	,723	Male	184	4,28	1,084	,080	Aggressive Humor	Female	824	2,74	,916	,032	-4,892	1006	,000	Male	184	3,10	,884	,065	Self-defeating Humor	Female	824	3,26	1,045	,036	-2,958	1006	,003	Male	184	3,51	1,057	,078	State Anxiety	Female	824	2,13	,519	,018	1,422	1006	,155	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038	Trait Anxiety	Female	824	2,26	,440	,015	2,609	1006	,009	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038																																																																		
Total Scale Score	Female	824	3,18	,608	,021	,377	1006	,706																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	184	3,16	,498	,037				Affiliate Humor	Female	824	5,33	1,010	,035	3,463	1006	,001	Male	184	5,04	1,131	,083	Self-enhancing Humor	Female	824	4,32	1,134	,040	,355	1006	,723	Male	184	4,28	1,084	,080	Aggressive Humor	Female	824	2,74	,916	,032	-4,892	1006	,000	Male	184	3,10	,884	,065	Self-defeating Humor	Female	824	3,26	1,045	,036	-2,958	1006	,003	Male	184	3,51	1,057	,078	State Anxiety	Female	824	2,13	,519	,018	1,422	1006	,155	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038	Trait Anxiety	Female	824	2,26	,440	,015	2,609	1006	,009	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038																																																																																
Affiliate Humor	Female	824	5,33	1,010	,035	3,463	1006	,001																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	184	5,04	1,131	,083				Self-enhancing Humor	Female	824	4,32	1,134	,040	,355	1006	,723	Male	184	4,28	1,084	,080	Aggressive Humor	Female	824	2,74	,916	,032	-4,892	1006	,000	Male	184	3,10	,884	,065	Self-defeating Humor	Female	824	3,26	1,045	,036	-2,958	1006	,003	Male	184	3,51	1,057	,078	State Anxiety	Female	824	2,13	,519	,018	1,422	1006	,155	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038	Trait Anxiety	Female	824	2,26	,440	,015	2,609	1006	,009	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038																																																																																														
Self-enhancing Humor	Female	824	4,32	1,134	,040	,355	1006	,723																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	184	4,28	1,084	,080				Aggressive Humor	Female	824	2,74	,916	,032	-4,892	1006	,000	Male	184	3,10	,884	,065	Self-defeating Humor	Female	824	3,26	1,045	,036	-2,958	1006	,003	Male	184	3,51	1,057	,078	State Anxiety	Female	824	2,13	,519	,018	1,422	1006	,155	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038	Trait Anxiety	Female	824	2,26	,440	,015	2,609	1006	,009	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038																																																																																																												
Aggressive Humor	Female	824	2,74	,916	,032	-4,892	1006	,000																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	184	3,10	,884	,065				Self-defeating Humor	Female	824	3,26	1,045	,036	-2,958	1006	,003	Male	184	3,51	1,057	,078	State Anxiety	Female	824	2,13	,519	,018	1,422	1006	,155	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038	Trait Anxiety	Female	824	2,26	,440	,015	2,609	1006	,009	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038																																																																																																																										
Self-defeating Humor	Female	824	3,26	1,045	,036	-2,958	1006	,003																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	184	3,51	1,057	,078				State Anxiety	Female	824	2,13	,519	,018	1,422	1006	,155	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038	Trait Anxiety	Female	824	2,26	,440	,015	2,609	1006	,009	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038																																																																																																																																								
State Anxiety	Female	824	2,13	,519	,018	1,422	1006	,155																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038				Trait Anxiety	Female	824	2,26	,440	,015	2,609	1006	,009	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038																																																																																																																																																						
Trait Anxiety	Female	824	2,26	,440	,015	2,609	1006	,009																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	184	2,07	,518	,038																																																																																																																																																																							

Table 3 demonstrates that the difference in the mean scores of the groups in the self-judgment sub-dimension is significant in favor of the male participants ( $t=3,124$ ;  $p<,01$ ) while the differences in the other sub-dimensions and the total score are not significant ( $p>,05$ ). The difference in the mean scores of the groups' affiliate humor sub-dimension is significantly in favor of female candidates ( $t=3,463$ ;  $p<,01$ ) while the differences in the mean scores of the groups' aggressive humor sub-dimension ( $t=-4,892$ ;  $p<,001$ ) and self-defeating humor sub-dimension ( $t=-2,463958$   $p<,01$ ) are significantly in favor of male candidates. The differences in the self-enhancing humor are not significant ( $p>,05$ ). The difference in the groups' mean scores of the trait anxiety sub-dimension is in favor of female students ( $t=2,609$ ;  $p<,01$ ) while the differences in the state anxiety sub-dimension are not significant ( $p>,05$ ).



**Table 4.**  
**Results of Independent Group *t* Test Applied to Identify whether Sub-dimension Scores of the Self-compassion, Humor, and Anxiety Scales Differ Depending on the Grade Variable**

Score	Groups	N	$\bar{x}$	ss	Sh $\bar{x}$	t Test																																																																																																																																																																						
						t	Sd	p																																																																																																																																																																				
Self-kindness	Grade 1	230	2,97	,734	,048	,758	528	,449																																																																																																																																																																				
	Grade 4	300	2,92	,647	,037				Self-judgment		230	2,68	,766	,050	1,195	528	,233		300	2,60	,800	,046	Common Humanity		230	3,01	,777	,051	-,346	528	,729		300	3,03	,757	,044	Isolation		230	2,80	,847	,056	,110	528	,913		300	2,79	,851	,049	Mindfulness		230	3,09	,736	,048	,803	528	,422		300	3,04	,742	,043	Over-identification		230	2,80	,899	,059	,207	528	,836		300	2,79	,820	,047	Total Scale Score		230	3,13	,593	,039	-,123	528	,902		300	3,14	,568	,033	Affiliate Humor		230	5,36	1,024	,067	2,325	528	,020		300	5,15	1,039	,060	Self-enhancing Humor		230	4,40	1,248	,082	2,625	528	,009		300	4,14	1,012	,058	Aggressive Humor		230	2,79	,999	,066	-,510	528	,610		300	2,84	,947	,055	Self-defeating humor		230	3,40	1,082	,071	1,367	528	,172		300	3,28	1,005	,058	State Anxiety		230	2,12	,474	,031	-3,163	528	,002		300	2,26	,562	,032	Trait Anxiety		230	2,26	,453	,030	-,338	528	,735	
Self-judgment		230	2,68	,766	,050	1,195	528	,233																																																																																																																																																																				
		300	2,60	,800	,046				Common Humanity		230	3,01	,777	,051	-,346	528	,729		300	3,03	,757	,044	Isolation		230	2,80	,847	,056	,110	528	,913		300	2,79	,851	,049	Mindfulness		230	3,09	,736	,048	,803	528	,422		300	3,04	,742	,043	Over-identification		230	2,80	,899	,059	,207	528	,836		300	2,79	,820	,047	Total Scale Score		230	3,13	,593	,039	-,123	528	,902		300	3,14	,568	,033	Affiliate Humor		230	5,36	1,024	,067	2,325	528	,020		300	5,15	1,039	,060	Self-enhancing Humor		230	4,40	1,248	,082	2,625	528	,009		300	4,14	1,012	,058	Aggressive Humor		230	2,79	,999	,066	-,510	528	,610		300	2,84	,947	,055	Self-defeating humor		230	3,40	1,082	,071	1,367	528	,172		300	3,28	1,005	,058	State Anxiety		230	2,12	,474	,031	-3,163	528	,002		300	2,26	,562	,032	Trait Anxiety		230	2,26	,453	,030	-,338	528	,735		300	2,27	,454	,026										
Common Humanity		230	3,01	,777	,051	-,346	528	,729																																																																																																																																																																				
		300	3,03	,757	,044				Isolation		230	2,80	,847	,056	,110	528	,913		300	2,79	,851	,049	Mindfulness		230	3,09	,736	,048	,803	528	,422		300	3,04	,742	,043	Over-identification		230	2,80	,899	,059	,207	528	,836		300	2,79	,820	,047	Total Scale Score		230	3,13	,593	,039	-,123	528	,902		300	3,14	,568	,033	Affiliate Humor		230	5,36	1,024	,067	2,325	528	,020		300	5,15	1,039	,060	Self-enhancing Humor		230	4,40	1,248	,082	2,625	528	,009		300	4,14	1,012	,058	Aggressive Humor		230	2,79	,999	,066	-,510	528	,610		300	2,84	,947	,055	Self-defeating humor		230	3,40	1,082	,071	1,367	528	,172		300	3,28	1,005	,058	State Anxiety		230	2,12	,474	,031	-3,163	528	,002		300	2,26	,562	,032	Trait Anxiety		230	2,26	,453	,030	-,338	528	,735		300	2,27	,454	,026																								
Isolation		230	2,80	,847	,056	,110	528	,913																																																																																																																																																																				
		300	2,79	,851	,049				Mindfulness		230	3,09	,736	,048	,803	528	,422		300	3,04	,742	,043	Over-identification		230	2,80	,899	,059	,207	528	,836		300	2,79	,820	,047	Total Scale Score		230	3,13	,593	,039	-,123	528	,902		300	3,14	,568	,033	Affiliate Humor		230	5,36	1,024	,067	2,325	528	,020		300	5,15	1,039	,060	Self-enhancing Humor		230	4,40	1,248	,082	2,625	528	,009		300	4,14	1,012	,058	Aggressive Humor		230	2,79	,999	,066	-,510	528	,610		300	2,84	,947	,055	Self-defeating humor		230	3,40	1,082	,071	1,367	528	,172		300	3,28	1,005	,058	State Anxiety		230	2,12	,474	,031	-3,163	528	,002		300	2,26	,562	,032	Trait Anxiety		230	2,26	,453	,030	-,338	528	,735		300	2,27	,454	,026																																						
Mindfulness		230	3,09	,736	,048	,803	528	,422																																																																																																																																																																				
		300	3,04	,742	,043				Over-identification		230	2,80	,899	,059	,207	528	,836		300	2,79	,820	,047	Total Scale Score		230	3,13	,593	,039	-,123	528	,902		300	3,14	,568	,033	Affiliate Humor		230	5,36	1,024	,067	2,325	528	,020		300	5,15	1,039	,060	Self-enhancing Humor		230	4,40	1,248	,082	2,625	528	,009		300	4,14	1,012	,058	Aggressive Humor		230	2,79	,999	,066	-,510	528	,610		300	2,84	,947	,055	Self-defeating humor		230	3,40	1,082	,071	1,367	528	,172		300	3,28	1,005	,058	State Anxiety		230	2,12	,474	,031	-3,163	528	,002		300	2,26	,562	,032	Trait Anxiety		230	2,26	,453	,030	-,338	528	,735		300	2,27	,454	,026																																																				
Over-identification		230	2,80	,899	,059	,207	528	,836																																																																																																																																																																				
		300	2,79	,820	,047				Total Scale Score		230	3,13	,593	,039	-,123	528	,902		300	3,14	,568	,033	Affiliate Humor		230	5,36	1,024	,067	2,325	528	,020		300	5,15	1,039	,060	Self-enhancing Humor		230	4,40	1,248	,082	2,625	528	,009		300	4,14	1,012	,058	Aggressive Humor		230	2,79	,999	,066	-,510	528	,610		300	2,84	,947	,055	Self-defeating humor		230	3,40	1,082	,071	1,367	528	,172		300	3,28	1,005	,058	State Anxiety		230	2,12	,474	,031	-3,163	528	,002		300	2,26	,562	,032	Trait Anxiety		230	2,26	,453	,030	-,338	528	,735		300	2,27	,454	,026																																																																		
Total Scale Score		230	3,13	,593	,039	-,123	528	,902																																																																																																																																																																				
		300	3,14	,568	,033				Affiliate Humor		230	5,36	1,024	,067	2,325	528	,020		300	5,15	1,039	,060	Self-enhancing Humor		230	4,40	1,248	,082	2,625	528	,009		300	4,14	1,012	,058	Aggressive Humor		230	2,79	,999	,066	-,510	528	,610		300	2,84	,947	,055	Self-defeating humor		230	3,40	1,082	,071	1,367	528	,172		300	3,28	1,005	,058	State Anxiety		230	2,12	,474	,031	-3,163	528	,002		300	2,26	,562	,032	Trait Anxiety		230	2,26	,453	,030	-,338	528	,735		300	2,27	,454	,026																																																																																
Affiliate Humor		230	5,36	1,024	,067	2,325	528	,020																																																																																																																																																																				
		300	5,15	1,039	,060				Self-enhancing Humor		230	4,40	1,248	,082	2,625	528	,009		300	4,14	1,012	,058	Aggressive Humor		230	2,79	,999	,066	-,510	528	,610		300	2,84	,947	,055	Self-defeating humor		230	3,40	1,082	,071	1,367	528	,172		300	3,28	1,005	,058	State Anxiety		230	2,12	,474	,031	-3,163	528	,002		300	2,26	,562	,032	Trait Anxiety		230	2,26	,453	,030	-,338	528	,735		300	2,27	,454	,026																																																																																														
Self-enhancing Humor		230	4,40	1,248	,082	2,625	528	,009																																																																																																																																																																				
		300	4,14	1,012	,058				Aggressive Humor		230	2,79	,999	,066	-,510	528	,610		300	2,84	,947	,055	Self-defeating humor		230	3,40	1,082	,071	1,367	528	,172		300	3,28	1,005	,058	State Anxiety		230	2,12	,474	,031	-3,163	528	,002		300	2,26	,562	,032	Trait Anxiety		230	2,26	,453	,030	-,338	528	,735		300	2,27	,454	,026																																																																																																												
Aggressive Humor		230	2,79	,999	,066	-,510	528	,610																																																																																																																																																																				
		300	2,84	,947	,055				Self-defeating humor		230	3,40	1,082	,071	1,367	528	,172		300	3,28	1,005	,058	State Anxiety		230	2,12	,474	,031	-3,163	528	,002		300	2,26	,562	,032	Trait Anxiety		230	2,26	,453	,030	-,338	528	,735		300	2,27	,454	,026																																																																																																																										
Self-defeating humor		230	3,40	1,082	,071	1,367	528	,172																																																																																																																																																																				
		300	3,28	1,005	,058				State Anxiety		230	2,12	,474	,031	-3,163	528	,002		300	2,26	,562	,032	Trait Anxiety		230	2,26	,453	,030	-,338	528	,735		300	2,27	,454	,026																																																																																																																																								
State Anxiety		230	2,12	,474	,031	-3,163	528	,002																																																																																																																																																																				
		300	2,26	,562	,032				Trait Anxiety		230	2,26	,453	,030	-,338	528	,735		300	2,27	,454	,026																																																																																																																																																						
Trait Anxiety		230	2,26	,453	,030	-,338	528	,735																																																																																																																																																																				
		300	2,27	,454	,026																																																																																																																																																																							

Table 4 reveals that the differences in groups' self-compassion scores are not significant ( $p > ,05$ ). The differences in the mean scores of affiliate humor ( $t = 2,325$ ;  $p < ,05$ ) and self-enhancing humor sub-dimensions of Humor Style Scale ( $t = 2,625$ ;  $p < ,01$ ) are significant in favor of first year students while the differences in the mean scores of state anxiety sub-dimensions are significant in favor of fourth years ( $t = -3,163$ ;  $p < ,01$ ). On the other hand, the differences in the trait anxiety sub-dimension are not significant ( $p > ,05$ ).

## Discussion

The results summarized above indicate that self-compassion can affect humor styles. It would also be fair to state that individuals with positive humor styles evaluate and judge themselves and prefer positive humor styles by feeling precious and by being aware of the importance of sharing. On one hand, humor can be used as a means of individuals' self-acceptance and the development of their relationships with others, but on the other hand it can be used as a way of harming (e.g. humiliating) themselves or the people around them (Martin, Puhlik-Doris, Larsen,

Gray, & Weir, 2003). Furthermore, humor has an important place in interpersonal relationships, and differences in personalities influence individuals' styles of using humor (Schermer et al. 2013). A harmful use of humor might affect individuals' relationships with the people in their surroundings and may jeopardize these relationships. However, as individuals become more self-compassionate, they can evaluate themselves better and strive not to insult others. These individuals can be aware of the importance of relationships with others and can establish satisfactory relationships.

Teachers' attention to themselves and to other people is especially vital for the students they will teach and for the families they will guide. Because they are the basis of sensitivity to others, self-compassion helps teachers not only establish relationships with themselves and with others, but also maintain these relationships (Neff & Beretvas, 2012). In addition, self-compassion facilitates individuals' flexibility in their behaviors by moderating their reactions against negative events (Germer & Neff, 2013). Thus, self-compassionate individuals can behave more tolerantly and become more understanding. It is reasonable to maintain that such positive behaviors and their characteristics pave the way for the effective use of humor. In other words, the higher one's self-compassion level is, the more frequent the use of positive humor is, and the more satisfying relationships are established.

In this study, the relationships of the state and trait sub-dimensions of anxiety scale with the affiliate, aggressive, and self-defeating humor dimensions of the humor scale were at a low level. Taking the t values related to the significance of the regression coefficients into consideration, both state and trait anxiety sub-dimensions have significant predictiveness for all the sub-dimensions of the humor styles scale. In other words, there is interaction between teacher candidates' humor styles and their state of anxiety. It is natural for teacher candidates to feel anxious about their future. In a study focusing on the job-related anxieties of the teacher candidates, the authors concluded that teachers' anxieties were mostly related to their professional lives (Çubukçu & Dönmez, 2011). Other researchers indicated that humor is expected to reduce the effects of negative experiences, especially in the case of feelings such as anxiety, tension, stress, and depression (Berk, 2001). Besides this, it was reported that students with healthy humor styles use coping strategies more frequently and are likely to be more optimistic (Durmuş & Tezer, 2001). Another study yielded the finding that there is a relationship between university students' aggressive as well as self-defeating humor styles and their anxieties; additionally, it was found that while students with self-enhancing and affiliate humor styles have lower anxiety scores, students with aggressive and self-defeating humor styles have higher anxiety scores (Bilge & Saltuk, 2007). Similarly, from research findings, it can be realized that the negative relationships between anxiety and positive humor styles are also true for teacher candidates. This finding implies that teacher candidates can reduce their anxieties somewhat by using positive humor.

Considering the gender variable, the difference in the mean scores of the groups' self-judgment sub-dimension was significant in favor of male participants while the differences in the sub-dimension and their total scores were not significant. Similarly, some research studies yielded the finding that self-compassion scores do not differ depending on the gender variable (Neff, Rude, & Kirkpatrick, 2007;

İskender, 2009; Soyer, 2010; Nazik & Aslan, 2011; İköz & Totan, 2012). Still, some other studies revealed that female participants were less self-compassionate than male participants (Raes, 2010; Kirkpatrick, 2005; Neff, Hsieh, & Dejitterat, 2005; Neff, 2003a; Neff & Vonk, 2009). In the present study, the difference in the groups' mean scores of the affiliate humor sub-dimension was in favor of female participants, and the difference in the aggressive humor and self-defeating humor mean scores was in favor of male ones. On the other hand, the differences in the self-enhancing humor sub-dimension were not significant. These results corroborate with other research findings, indicating that the mean scores of male participants' aggressive and self-defeating humor styles are higher than the mean scores of the female participants (Yerlikaya, 2007; Traş, Arslan & Mentiş-Taş, 2011).

Another finding of the present study is that while the difference in the groups' mean scores of trait anxiety sub-dimension was in favor of female participants, the differences in the state anxiety sub-dimension were not significant. There have been similar studies in the relevant literature that indicate the anxiety levels of female students are higher (Taşğın, 2006; Akgün, Gönen, & Aydın, 2007; Tümerdem, 2007), and that the anxiety does not differ significantly depending on the gender variable (Dogan & Coban, 2009; Tekneci, 2010). The difference in mean scores of the affiliate and self-enhancing humor sub-dimensions of the Humor Style scale was found to be in favor of the first years. On the other hand, while the difference in the mean scores of the state anxiety sub-dimension were found to be significant in favor of the fourth years, the differences in the trait anxiety sub-dimension were not found to be significant. Dereli, Angın, and Karakuş (2012) as well as Tekneci (2010) also revealed that anxiety does not differ depending on grade level. These results indicate that as teacher candidates' grades increase and as they approach the period of transition to the profession, their state anxiety increases and they start using humor styles less frequently. Especially awareness of the fact that they will have more responsibilities when they start working after graduation might cause teacher candidates' state anxiety increase. This worrisome situation might make teacher candidates less inclined to have fun and more inclined to feel anxious.

For further studies, the researchers would like to point out that there is a need for experimental studies aiming to boost teacher candidates' self-compassion by developing programs indented to reduce their anxiety levels. They also suggest that if some aspects of such programs are found to be positive in such studies, they should be incorporated into the optional courses or practice-based applications in education faculties' programs. Moreover, practical activities intended to develop teacher candidates' humor styles should be designed so that teacher candidates are encouraged to pursue their profession more enjoyably and to overcome problems they are likely to encounter in life.

### References

- Akgün, A., Gönen, S. & Aydın, M. (2007). İlköğretim fen ve matematik öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin kaygı düzeylerinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi [Investigation of primary mathematics and primary science teacher education student's anxiety levels according to some variables]. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(20), 283-299.

- Akın, Ü., Akın, A. & Abacı, R. (2007). Öz-duyarlık ölçeği: geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması [Self-compassion scale: Validity and reliability study of the Turkish version]. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33, 01-10.
- Allen, A. B. & Leary, M. R. (2010). Self-Compassion, stress and coping. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4(2), 107-118.
- Berk, R. A. (2001). The active ingredients in humor: psychophysiological benefits and risks for older adults. *Educational Gerontology*, 27, 323-339.
- Bilge, F. & Saltuk, S. (2007). Humour styles, subjective well-being, trait anger and anxiety among university students in turkey. *World Applied Science Journal*, 2 (5), 464-469.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2005). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı (5.baskı) [Data analysis handbook for social sciences (5th edition)]*. Ankara: Pegem.
- Cüceloğlu, D. (1991). *İnsan ve davranışı [Human and his behavior]*. İstanbul: Remzi.
- Chinery, W. (2007). Alleviating stress with humour: a literature review. *Journal of Perioperative Practice*, 17, 172-182.
- Çubukçu, Z. & Dönmez, A. (2011). The examination of the professional anxiety levels of teacher candidates. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 7 (1), 3-25.
- Dereli, E., Angın, E. & Karakuş, Ö. (2012). Okul öncesi öğretmen adaylarının akademik başarı ve kaygı türlerinin problem çözme becerilerine etkisi [Factors that affect the problem solving skills of preschool teacher candidates: academic achievement and types of anxiety]. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, [Online]. (9)2, 731-742.
- Doğan, T. & Çoban, A. E. (2009). Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutumları ile kaygı düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi [The Investigation of the relations between students' attitude toward teaching profession and anxiety level in faculty of education]. *Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi*.
- Dowling, J. S. & Fain, J. A. (1999). A multidimensional sense of humor scale for school-age children: issues of reliability and validity. *Journal of Pediatric Nursing*, 14 (1), 38-43
- Durmuş, Y. & Tezer, E. (2001). Mizah duygusu ve stresle başa çıkma tarzları arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between sense of humor and coping with stress]. *Türk Psikolojisi Dergisi*: 16(47), 25-32.
- Germer, C. K. & Neff, K. D. (2013). Self-Compassion in clinical practice. *Journal Clinical Psychology*, 69(8), 856-867. doi:10.1002/jclp.22021.
- Gilbert, P. & Procter, S. (2006). Compassionate mind training for people with high shame and self-criticism: overview and pilot study of a group therapy approach. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 13, 353-379.
- İkiz, E. & Totan, T. (2011). Üniversite öğrencilerinde öz-duyarlık ve duygusal zekânın incelenmesi [Investigation of self-compassion and emotional intelligence of university students]. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 14 (1), 51-71 ISSN: 1302-3284 E-ISSN: 1308-0911.
- İskender, M. (2009). The relationship between self-compassion, self-efficacy and control beliefs about learning in turkish university students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 37, 711-720.
- Kirkpatrick, K. L. (2005). *Enhancing Self-Compassion Using a Gestalt Two-Chair Intervention*. Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

- the University of Texas at Austin in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. ABD, Texas.
- Martin, R. A. (2002). Is laughter the best medicine humor, laughter and physical health. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* December (11), 6. 216-220. doi: 10.1111/1467- 8721.00204.
- 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.
- Mireault, G., Poutre, M., Sargent-Hier, M., Dias, C., Perdue, B. & Myrick, A. (2012). Humour perception and creation between parents and 3- to 6-month-old. *Infant and Child Development*. 21 ( 4),338-347 doi: 10.1002/icd.757
- Nazik, E. & Arslan, S. (2011). Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin empatik becerileri ile öz-duyarlıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. [Investigation of the relationship between empathy skills and self compassion of nursery students]. *Anadolu Hemşirelik ve Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 14: 4
- Neff, K. D. (2003a). The development and validation of a scale to measure self -compassion. *Self and Identity*, 2(3), 223-250.
- Neff, K. D., Beretvas, S. N. (2012). The role of self-compassion in romantic relationships. *Self and Identity*, 12(1), 78-98. ISSN: 1529-8868 print/1529-8876 [Online] <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2011.63954>
- Neff, K. D., Hseih, Y. & Dejithirat, K. (2005). Self-Compassion, achievement goals and coping with academic failure. *Self and Identity*, 4, 263-287.
- Neff, K. D., Kirkpatrick, K. L., Rude, S.S. (2007). Self compassion and adaptive psychological functioning. *Journal of Research in Personality* 41, 139-154.
- Neff, K. D. & Vonk, R. (2009). Self compassion versus global self-esteem: two different ways of relating to oneself. *Journal of Personality*, 77:1, 23-50.
- Öner, N., Compte, A. (1998). *Sürekli Durumluk/ Sürekli Kaygı Envanteri El Kitabı* (2. Basım) [The State-Trait Anxiety Inventory handbook (2nd Edition)]. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi.
- Raes, P. (2010). Rumination and worry as mediators of the relationship between self-compassion and depression and anxiety. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48,757-761.
- Sarı, T. & Aslan, H. (2005). Mizah tarzları ve başa- çıkma stratejileri arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between humor style and coping strategies]. VIII. *Ulusal Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Kongresi*. İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi.
- Schermer, J. A., Martin, R. A., Martin, N. G., Lynskey, M. & Vernon, P. A. (2013). The general factor of personality and humor styles. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54(8), 890-893.
- Semrud-Clikeman M, Glass K. (2010). The relation of humor and child development: social, adaptive and emotional aspects. *Journal of Child Neurology*. 25(10):1248-60.
- Smith W. J., Harrington K V., Neck C. P. (2000). Resolving conflict with humour in a diversity context. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*; 15(6):606-625.
- Soyer, U. (2010). *Özel eğitim öğretmen adaylarının öz-duyarlık ve sürekli kaygı düzeylerinin belirlenmesi [Determination of special education teacher candidates' self compassion and constant anxiety levels]*. (Yayımlanmış yüksek lisans tezi) Marmara Üniversitesi/Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

- Taşğın, Ö., (2006). Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokulunda okuyan öğretmen adaylarının mesleki kaygı düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [Observation of concern levels teacher candidates, who enrolled physical education and sports college, according to some variables]. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 14 (2), 679-686.
- Tekneci, E. (2010). *Zihinsel engelliler öğretmenliği 1. ve 4. sınıf öğrencilerinin öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutumları ile kaygı düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması*. [Comparison of attitudes towards teaching profession and anxiety levels of first and fourth year students of instruction of mentally handicapped program]. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi/Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Taş, Z., Arslan, C. & Mentiş Taş, A. (2011). Öğretmen adaylarının mizah tarzları, problem çözme ve benlik saygısının incelenmesi [Analysis of humor styles, problem solving and self-esteem of prospective teachers]. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 8(2). <http://www.insanbilimleri.com>
- Tümerdem, R. (2007). Dicle Üniversitesi eğitim fakültesi ve fen - edebiyat fakültesi kimya son sınıf öğrencilerinin kaygılarını etkileyen etmenler [The factors affecting Dicle University education faculty and science faculty students' anxiety]. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6 (20), 32-45
- Van Dam, N. T., Sheppard, S. C., Forsyth, J. P. & Earleywine, M. (2011). Self-compassion is a better predictor than mindfulness of symptom severity and quality of life in mixed anxiety and depression. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 25, 123-130.
- Werner, K. H., Jazaieri, H., Goldin, P. R., Ziv, M., Heimberg, R. G., Gross, J. J. (2012). Self-Compassion and social anxiety disorder. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, 25 (5), 543-558.
- Yerlikaya, E. (2003). Mizah tarzı ölçeği, geçerlik güvenirlik çalışması [Humor style scale, validity-reliability study]. VII. Ulusal Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Kongresi Bildiri Özetleri Kitabı 09-11 Temmuz 2003. Malatya: İnönü Üniversitesi.
- Yerlikaya, N. (2007). Lise Öğrencilerinin mizah tarzları ile stresle başa çıkma tarzları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi [The relationship between humor styles and coping styles of high school students]. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Çukurova Üniversitesi, Adana.
- Ying, Y.W. (2009). Contribution of self compassion to competence and mental health in social work students. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 45, 309-323
- Zeigler-Hill, V., Besser, A. & Jett, S.E. (2013). Laughing at the looking glass: does humor style serve as an interpersonal signal. *Evolutionary Psychology* 11(1): 201-226

### Öğretmen Adaylarının Mizah Tarzları İle Kaygı Ve Öz-Duyarlık Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişinin Belirlenmesi

#### Özet

Aydan, A. (2015). Identifying the relationship of teacher candidates' humor styles with anxiety and self-compassion levels. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 59, 1-16  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2015.59.1>

**Problem Durumu:** Gelecek nesillerin eğitiminden sorumlu olacak aday öğretmenlerin çeşitli özelliklere sahip olması beklenir. Bu özelliklerin kimi mesleki yeterlilikle ilişkilendirilirken, kimisi adayların sahip oldukları niteliklerle ilişkilendirilebilir. Mesleki yeterlilikle ilgili eğitim fakültelerinin programları üzerine farklı zamanlarda çeşitli düzenlemeler yapılmaktadır. Ancak adayların kişisel özelliklerini belirlemeye, olumlu özelliklerini geliştirmeye ve sorunlarla baş edebilme becerilerini geliştirmeye yönelik çalışmalarında yapılması düşünülebilir. Özellikle küçük yaş çocukların model alacağı okul öncesi ve ilköğretimde çalışacak adayların, öğrencilere kariyer seçimi, olası sorunlarında rehberlik ve danışma hizmeti sunacak rehber öğretmen adaylarıyla, özel gereksinimleri ve özellikleri açısından özel bir donanıma sahip olması beklenen zihin engellilerle çalışacak aday öğretmenlerin, özelliklerinin dikkate alınması önemlidir. Başka bir deyişle; aday öğretmenlerin eğitimleri üzerinde yeniden düşünülmesi gerekliliği ve nitelikleri üzerinde yeni düzenlemeler yapılmasının yararlı olacağı söylenebilir.

**Araştırmanın amacı:** Öğretmen adaylarının mizah tarzları ile kaygı ve öz-duyarlık düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesi ve cinsiyet ile sınıf düzeyi değişkenleri açısından incelenmesidir.

**Araştırmanın Yöntemi:** Araştırmada öğretmen adaylarının mizah anlayışları ile kaygı ve öz-duyarlık düzeyleri aralarındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi için çoklu regresyon analizi kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın örneklemini: Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesinde öğrenimine devam eden; Okul Öncesi öğretmenliği (295) Sınıf öğretmenliği (208), Rehberlik- Psikolojik danışma bölümü (301) Zihin Engelliler öğretmenliği bölümünde (204) okuyan; 824'ü kız-184'ü erkek toplam 1008 öğrenciden oluşmaktadır. Araştırmada Öz-Duyarlık Ölçeği, Mizah Tarzları Ölçeği ve Durumluk-Süreklilik Kaygı Ölçeği kullanılmıştır.

**Araştırmanın Bulguları:** Öz-Duyarlılık Ölçeği alt boyut puanları ile Mizah tarzları ölçeği (MTÖ) alt boyutları arasındaki çoklu regresyon sonuçlarına bakıldığında; katılımcı mizah (KM) alt boyutu puanı ( $R=,270$ ;  $R^2=,073$ ;  $p<,01$ ), saldırgan mizah (SM) ( $R=,206$ ;  $R^2=,043$ ;  $p<,01$ ), kendini yıkıcı mizah (KYM) ( $R=,233$ ;  $R^2=,054$ ;  $p<,01$ ) ile düşük düzeyde; Kendini geliştirici mizahla (KGM) öz-yargılama ve izolasyon alt boyutları düşük düzeyde, diğer alt boyutlar orta düzeyde ilişki ( $R=,451$ ;  $R^2=,073$ ;  $p<,01$ ) vermektedir. Regresyon katsayılarının anlamlılığına ilişkin olarak hesaplanan t değerleri incelendiğinde KM üzerinde; izolasyon ve öz-yargılama alt boyutlarının anlamlı bir yordayıcılığa sahip olduğu; KGM üzerinde öz-sevecenlik, paylaşımların bilincinde olma, izolasyon ve aşırı özdeşleşme alt boyutlarının anlamlı yordayıcılığa sahip olduğu; SM üzerinde öz-sevecenlik, öz-yargılama, bilinçlilik ve aşırı özdeşleşme alt boyutlarının, YM üzerinde ise öz-yargılama ve paylaşımların bilincinde olma alt boyutlarının anlamlı yordayıcılığa sahip olduğu; diğer alt boyutların bağımlı değişken üzerinde anlamlı bir etkisinin olmadığı belirlenmiştir. Kaygı ölçeği durumluk ve sürekli kaygı alt boyutu birlikte MTÖ katılımcı mizah alt boyutu ( $R=,304$ ;  $R^2=,092$ ;  $p<,01$ ); saldırgan mizah alt boyutu ( $R=,129$ ;  $R^2=,017$ ;  $p<,01$ ) ve kendini yıkıcı mizah alt boyutu puanları ( $R=,134$ ;  $R^2=,018$ ;  $p<,01$ ) ile düşük düzeyde; kendini geliştirici mizah alt boyutu ( $R=,430$ ;  $R^2=,185$ ;  $p<,01$ ) ile orta düzeyde bir ilişki vermektedir. Regresyon katsayılarının anlamlılığına ilişkin olarak hesaplanan t değerleri incelendiğinde hem durumluk hem de sürekli kaygı alt boyutlarının; mizah tarzları ölçeği tüm alt boyutları üzerinde anlamlı yordayıcılığa sahip olduğu belirlenmiştir.

Sonuç ve Öneriler: Sonuçlara bakıldığında; olumlu mizah tarzları (KM-KGM) ile öz-duyarlık ölçeğinin negatif alt boyutları (öz-yargılama, izolasyon ve aşırı özdeşleşme) arasında düşük düzeyde de olsa negatif ilişkiler görülmektedir. Olumsuz mizah tarzları (SM-KYM) ile öz-duyarlık ölçeği öz-sevecenlik, paylaşımların bilincinde olma ve bilinçlilik alt boyutları arasında da yine düşük düzeyde negatif ilişkiler görülmektedir. Kısaca öz-duyarlık ölçeğinin negatif alt boyutları ve olumsuz mizah tarzları; olumlu alt boyutları ile olumlu mizah tarzları azda olsa etkileşim göstermektedir. Regresyon katsayılarının anlamlılığına ilişkin olarak hesaplanan t değerleri incelendiğinde KM üzerinde; izolasyon ve öz-yargılama alt boyutlarının, KGM üzerinde; öz-sevecenlik, paylaşımların bilincinde olma, izolasyon ve aşırı özdeşleşme alt boyutlarının, SM üzerinde; öz-sevecenlik, öz-yargılama, bilinçlilik ve aşırı özdeşleşme alt boyutlarının, YM üzerinde ise öz-yargılama ve paylaşımların bilincinde olma alt boyutlarının anlamlı bir yordayıcılığa sahip olduğu; diğer alt boyutların bağımlı değişken üzerinde anlamlı bir etkisinin olmadığı belirlenmiştir. Bu sonuçlar öz-duyarlığın mizah tarzlarını etkileyebileceğini göstermektedir. Olumlu mizah tarzlarını kullanan kişilerin kendilerini değerlendirdiklerini, yargılayabildiklerini ama kendilerini değerli hissederek ve paylaşımlarında bilincinde olarak olumlu mizah tarzını tercih ettikleri söylenebilir. Araştırmada; Kaygı ölçeği durumluk ve sürekli kaygı alt boyutu birlikte Mizah tarzları ölçeği KM, SM VE KYM alt boyutu puanları ile düşük düzeyde; alt boyutu ile orta düzeyde bir ilişki vermektedir. Kaygı ölçeği tüm alt boyutları birlikte MTÖ katılımcı mizah alt boyutu puanları toplam varyansının yaklaşık %9'unu, kendini geliştirici mizah %19'unu, saldırgan mizah ve kendini yıkıcı mizah alt boyutu puanları toplam varyansının yaklaşık %2'sini açıklamaktadır. Regresyon katsayılarının anlamlılığına ilişkin olarak hesaplanan t değerleri incelendiğinde hem durumluk hem de sürekli kaygı alt boyutlarının; mizah tarzları ölçeği tüm alt boyutları üzerinde anlamlı bir yordayıcılığa sahip olduğu belirlenmiştir. Başka deyişle, öğretmen adaylarının mizah tarzları ile kaygı durumları arasında etkileşim görülebilmektedir. Öğretmen adaylarının geleceklerine yönelik kaygı yaşamaları olasıdır. Cinsiyet değişkenine bakıldığında; grupların öz-yargılama alt boyutu ortalamaları arasındaki farklılık erkekler lehine anlamlı bulunurken, diğer alt boyutlar ve toplam puan için farklılıklar anlamlı bulunmamıştır. Araştırmada; grupların katılımcı mizah alt boyutu ortalamaları arasındaki farklılık kızlar lehine, saldırgan mizah ve kendini yıkıcı mizah ortalamaları arasındaki farklılık erkekler lehine anlamlı bulunurken, kendini geliştirici mizah alt boyutu için farklılıklar anlamlı bulunmamıştır. Örneklem grubunu oluşturan öğrencilerin Öz-Duyarlık, Mizah Tarzları ve Kaygı Ölçeği alt boyut ve toplam puanlarının sınıf değişkenine göre anlamlı bir farklılık gösterip göstermediğini belirlemek amacıyla yapılan bağımsız gruplar t testi sonucunda; grupların öz-duyarlık ölçeği puanları arasındaki farklılıklar anlamlı bulunmamıştır. Mizah Tarzları ölçeği katılımcı mizah alt boyutu ve kendini geliştirici mizah alt boyutu ortalamaları arasındaki farklılık 1.sınıflar lehine anlamlı bulunurken; durumluk kaygı alt boyutu ortalamaları arasındaki farklılık 4.sınıflar lehine anlamlı bulunurken sürekli kaygı alt boyutu için farklılıklar anlamlı bulunmamıştır. İleride yapılacak araştırmalarda öğretmen adaylarının kaygı düzeylerini azaltacak, öz-duyarlıklarının geliştirilmesi ve mizah tarzlarını geliştirmeye ilişkin programların hazırlanarak etkililiğini sınavacak deneysel çalışmaların yapılması önerilebilir.

Anahtar kelimeler: öğretmen adayı, mizah tarzı, öz-duyarlık, kaygı