

Appendix

A.1 Humor Measures

In this appendix, we provide a selection of useful scales for assessing humor at work. Contiguous to describing the content, example items, and the scale's format, we indicate internal consistencies. Only approximately half of the original sources give factor analytical reports, especially not in the last century's publications. Thus, we add a note (and the respective page number of the source) if these analyses are available.

A.1.1 Coping Humor Scales

Doosje, Landsheer, Goede, and Doornen (2012) provide an extensive overview over humorous coping scales. We will briefly describe the humorous coping measures they classify as generic (Coping Humor Scale, CHS; Multidimensional Sense of Humor Scale, MSHS-C; Brief COPE, humorous coping scale/BCOPE-H). Of the specific humorous coping measures (e.g., Relational Humor Inventory, RHI, De Koning & Weiss, 2002), only the self-enhancing subscale of the Humor Styles Questionnaire (HSQ-SE; Martin, Puhlik-Doris, Larsen, Gray, & Weir, 2003) will be introduced in a subsequent section. The Questionnaire of Occupational Humorous Coping (QOHC) is one of the few scales specific for the workplace.

Coping Humor Scale, CHS (Martin & Lefcourt, 1983). The CHS measures the degree to which respondents make use of humor as a means of coping with stressful experiences. It consists of seven self-report statements (e.g., "I usually look for something comical to say when I am in tense situations" or "It has been my experience that humor is often a very effective way of coping with problems.") that are each rated on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (4). The reported internal consistency was Cronbach's α of 0.61.

Brief COPE Inventory—subscale humor (Carver, 1997). This 2-item subscale is taken from the short version of the COPE by Carver, Scheier, and Weintraub (1989). Respondents are asked whether, when faced with stressful situations, they

usually act in ways reflecting the specific coping styles (i.e., “I’ve been making jokes about it.” and “I’ve been making fun of the situation.”) on a 4-point Likert scale from *never* (1) to *very much* (4). A Cronbach’s α of 0.73 was reported for this subscale.

Multidimensional Sense of Humor Scale, MSHS (Thorson & Powell, 1993). Measuring several elements of the personal construct of sense of humor (creativity, coping, and appreciation) with four subscales across 24 items: (1) humor production/elements of humor creativity and social uses of humor (12 items, e.g., “I can often crack people up with the things I say.”), (2) coping and uses of coping humor (5 items, e.g., “Uses of wit or humor help me master difficult situations.”), (3) attitude toward humorous people (5 reversed items, e.g., “People who tell jokes are a pain in the neck.”), (4) attitudes toward humor itself (2 items, e.g., “I appreciate those who generate humor.”). Statements have to be rated by a 5-point Likert scale from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). The reported internal consistency for the total scale was $\alpha = 0.92$. Factor analyses are reported (i.e., Thorson & Powell, 1993, p. 21).

At work:

Questionnaire of Occupational Humorous Coping, QOHC (Doosje, De Goede, Van Doornen, & Goldstein, 2010). This 23-item scale focuses on coping humor at the workplace. Being partly based on the model of emotion regulation by Gross (2001), it contains four subscales of humorous coping methods, that is, antecedent-focused/reappraisal (9 items, e.g., “When I have to work more to finish something I am able to see the humor in the situation.”), response-focused (4 items, e.g., “When my work makes me feel tense, I make jokes to avoid that feeling.”), instrumental affiliative (3 items, e.g., “When a colleague’s behavior bothers me, I let him or her know by making an appropriate joke.”) and instrumental aggressive-manipulative (7, e.g., “When a colleague gets on my nerves, I use humor to get back at him or her.”). The items have to be rated on a 5-point Likert scale from *never* (1) to *very often* (5). Cronbach’s α was 0.82 for the antecedent-focused/reappraisal subscale, $\alpha = 0.80$ for the response-focused subscale, $\alpha = 0.73$ for the instrumental affiliative subscale and $\alpha = 0.80$ for the instrumental aggressive-manipulative subscale. Results of factor analyses are provided (i.e., Doosje et al., 2010, p. 294).

A.1.2 Personality/Sense of Humor Scales

The State-Trait-Cheerfulness-Inventory (STCI) covers exhilaratability as a trait and a state, while the SHS is based on playfulness as underlying concept of sense of humor. Cann, Holt, and Calhoun (1999) report that the CHS correlates (cross-sectionally) most with other humor scales (SHQ, SHRQ, MSHS), which suggests that dealing with potentially stressful experiences is a dominant dimension of sense of humor. In contrast, the Situational Humor Response Questionnaire

(SHRQ) and the Sense of Humor Questionnaire (SHQ)-Personal Liking assess an overall humor factor regardless of whether humor is used in coping with stress.

State-Trait-Cheerfulness-Inventory, STCI (Ruch, Köhler, & Van Thriel, 1996; Ruch, Köhler, & Van Thriel, 1997). This inventory is based on a state-trait model of exhilaratability. Three concepts are captured as both, states and traits (cheerfulness, seriousness, bad mood). The trait form (Ruch et al., 1996) contains 60 items (international form with 106 items). The 30-item state form of cheerfulness (Ruch et al., 1997) represents the segment of positive affectivity related to exhilaratability, with three 10-item subscales: cheerfulness (e.g., “I am ready to have some fun.”), seriousness (e.g., “I’m prepared to do a task in earnest.”), and bad mood (e.g., “I am sad.”). A 4-point Likert scale format from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (4) was chosen. For the trait form, internal consistency ranged from $\alpha = 0.81$ for seriousness to $\alpha = 0.92$ for cheerfulness and $\alpha = 0.93$ for bad mood (Ruch et al., 1996). Factor analyses are reported (i.e., Ruch et al., 1996, p. 332). For the state form, Cronbach’s α was 0.93 and 0.94 for cheerfulness and bad mood, respectively, but only $\alpha = 0.55$ for seriousness (Ruch et al., 1997). Factor analysis was only mentioned without giving details.

Sense of Humor Scale, SHS (McGhee, 1994, 1996). This scale covers *playfulness* as the basis for *sense of humor*, which is measured with six less basic, hierarchically organized factors or humor skills: enjoyment of humor, seriousness and negative mood, playfulness and positive mood, laughter, verbal humor, finding humor in everyday life, laughing at yourself, and finding humor under stress. Proyer, Ruch, and Müller (2010) report reliabilities for the total scale from $\alpha = 0.90$ to 0.93 for five samples. However, subscale reliabilities varied between $\alpha = 0.44$ and 0.90, with lowest scores for enjoyment and laughing.

Multidimensional Sense of Humor Scale, MSHS (Thorson & Powell, 1993). This scale is described above (in the coping humor section). Herzog and Strevey (2008) combined 45 items of various sense of humor scales to a sense of humor “composite” and found all of them falling into the four categories suggested by Thorson and Powell (1993): humor production and social uses, coping humor, humor appreciation, and attitude toward humor (i.e., humor appreciation).

Situational Humor Response Questionnaire, SHRQ (Martin & Lefcourt, 1984). The SHRQ covers the degree to which subjects respond with mirth (i.e., laugh and smile) in a variety of different situations with 21 items. Eighteen descriptions of typical real-life pleasant and unpleasant situations that a person might encounter are provided (e.g., “You are eating in a restaurant with some friends and a waiter accidentally spilled a drink on you.”). Respondents indicate the degree to which they would have responded with laughter on a range from *I would not have found anything particularly amusing* (1) to *I would have laughed heartily much of the time* (5). Three items were nonsituational/ general self-report items (e.g., “How important is it for you to have friends who are easily amused?”). Cronbach’s α ranged from $\alpha = 0.70$ to $\alpha = 0.83$.

Sense of Humor Questionnaire, SHQ-6 (Svebak, 1996). The original SHQ (Svebak, 1974) assessed sense of humor with the subscales metamessage sensitivity, personal liking of humor, and emotional expressiveness, but the latter scale

showed poor psychometric properties (Kuiper & Martin, 1998). The originally 7-item subscales metamessage sensitivity and personal liking are reduced to a total of six items in the short version, the SHQ-6. While metamessage sensitivity covers an individuals' ability to recognize or notice humor in various life situations (e.g., "I can usually find something comical, witty, or humorous in most situations."), the liking of humor includes attitudes towards humor, particularly the degree to which an individual likes humor and values the humorous role (reversed, e.g., "A humorist is typically perceived by others as a person who lacks the courage of his convictions."). Respondents indicate their agreement using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (4). The inter-item correlations for the three item pairs of the SHQ-6 ranged from 0.38 to 0.62. Results of factor analyses are provided (i.e., Svebak, 1996, p. 357).

A.1.3 *Humor Types*

The Humorous Behavior Deck-Revised (HBD-R) and the Humor Styles Questionnaire (HSQ) distinguish specific types of how humor is used. The short work-related HSQ (swHSQ) covers humor styles specific for the workplace.

Humorous Behavior Deck-Revised, HBD-R (Kirsh & Kuiper, 2003). The HBD-R is the revision of the Humorous Behavior Q-Sort Deck, HBQD (Craik, Lampert, & Nelson, 1996), which covered five bipolar humor types (e.g., socially warm vs. cold, competent vs. inept, reflective vs. boorish, earthy vs. repressed, benign vs. mean-spirited) and consisted of 100 statements describing specific forms of everyday humorous conduct as self- or peer descriptions. The 100 statements with individual items of humor-related characteristics and behaviors, that is, positive and negative forms of everyday humorous conduct (e.g., "maintains group morale through humor" versus "smiles inappropriately"), had to be sorted into nine categories ranging from *very uncharacteristic* (1) to *neutral* (5) to *very characteristic* (9). The HBD-R consists of 32 self-report items that assess the degree to which participants engage in one positive and two negative components of sense of humor. The factors skilled and adept use of humor (positive other-focused, e.g., "I use good-natured jests to put others at ease."), rude humor (negative other-focused, e.g., "I am sarcastic.") and belabored humor (negative self-focused, e.g., "I react in an exaggerated way to mildly humorous comments.") had to be rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from *extremely uncharacteristic of me* (1) to *extremely characteristic of me* (7). Factor analyses are provided (i.e., Kirsh & Kuiper, 2003, p. 42).

Humor Styles Survey, HSS (Philbrick, 1989; see Receptoğlu, Kilinç, & Çepni, 2011). The HSS was developed on basis of the four styles from Babad (1974), who reported that 46% of 81 female undergraduates were producers, 24.9% were appreciators, 5.9% were reproducers, and the remaining were classified as non-humorous.

Humor Styles Questionnaire, HSQ (Martin et al., 2003). The 32-item HSQ (Martin et al., 2003) distinguishes two positive (i.e., affiliative, self-enhancing) from two negative styles (i.e., self-enhancing, aggressive) of the use of humor, which denote specific ways in which people use humor in their lives (Martin et al., 2003) in a general way. The four subscales consist of eight items each, with sample items like “I enjoy making people laugh.” (affiliative), “If I am feeling depressed, I can usually cheer myself up with humor.” (self-enhancing), “If someone makes a mistake, I will often tease them about it.” (aggressive) and “I will often get carried away in putting myself down if it makes my family or friends laugh.” (self-defeating). The 7-point Likert scale ranges from 1 = *totally disagree* to 7 = *totally agree*. Cronbach’s α ranged from 0.77 for aggressive humor to $\alpha = 0.80$ for self-defeating as well as affiliative humor and $\alpha = 0.81$ for the self-enhancing humor style. Factor analyses and loadings are described (i.e., Martin et al., 2003, pp. 58/59).

At work:

Short, work-related Humor Styles Questionnaire, swHSQ (Scheel, Gerdenitsch & Korunka, 2016). This 12-item version of the HSQ assesses specific ways in which people use humor at their workplace and includes items appropriate for and adapted to the work context, while avoiding negatively coded items. The expression *at work* was added where appropriate, and the terms family, friends, and so forth were replaced by *my colleagues*. The four subscales have three items each: affiliative (e.g., “I enjoy making my colleagues laugh.”), self-enhancing (e.g., “If I am feeling depressed at work, I can usually cheer myself up with humor.”), aggressive (e.g., “If someone makes a mistake at work, I will often tease them about it.”), and self-defeating (e.g., “I will often get carried away in putting myself down if it makes my colleagues laugh.”). Participants are asked to indicate the degree to which the statements applied to them on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *not at all* to 5 = *completely*. Cronbach’s alphas in two samples were $\alpha = 0.62/0.71$ for aggressive humor, $\alpha = 0.72/0.83$ for self-defeating humor, $\alpha = 0.71/0.80$ for self-enhancing humor, and $\alpha = 0.82/0.86$ for affiliative humor. Factor analyses are displayed (i.e., Scheel et al., 2016, p. 451).

A.1.4 Use of Humor in Communication

Humor Orientation Scale, HO (Booth-Butterfield & Booth-Butterfield, 1991; Wanzer, Booth-Butterfield & Booth-Butterfield, 2005). This 17-item scale measures an individual’s tendency to use humor (content) regularly in social interaction (i.e., communication). Self-reports as well as partner ratings (e.g., “I regularly tell jokes and funny stories when I am in a group.”) are assessed in a 5-point Likert-type format ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree* (Wanzer et al., 2005). The latter source reports a Cronbach’s α of 0.93.

Humor Assessment, HA (Wrench & Richmond, 2000; cf. Wrench & Richmond, 2004). This instrument covers 16 self-report items which “measure an

individual's use of humor in interpersonal communication contexts" (Wrench & Richmond, 2004, p. 307). The scale is used with a 5-point Likert format ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*. Internal consistency was $\alpha = 0.95$.

A.1.5 *Humor at Work*

Several scales aim at assessing humor at work with a broader focus, including general fun at work, hierarchical humor, and organizational issues. Two scales for the focus on workplace humor were already introduced above: the QOHC for assessing coping humor, and the swHSQ for assessing humor styles at work.

Fun at Work Scale—subscale global fun at work (McDowell, 2005; in Fluegge, 2008). This scale includes 24 items in four subscales (six items each). The first three factors (socializing with coworkers, celebrating at work, personal freedoms) were measured by the degree they occur at the workplace by a 5-point Likert scale from *never* (1) to *almost always* (5). The fourth factor, global fun at work (e.g., "this is a fun place to work") was assessed with a 5-point Likert agreement scale from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). The items are displayed in the appendix of Fluegge's (2008) dissertation (p. 82). Cronbach's α ranged from 0.74 to 0.85 for personal freedoms and socializing with coworkers, respectively, to $\alpha = 0.88$ for celebrating at work and $\alpha = 0.95$ for global fun at work.

Leader humor (Avolio, Howell, & Sosik, 1999). This scale covers leader's use of humor in terms of frequency of occurrence with five items on a 5-point Likert scale from *not at all* (0) to *frequently, if not always* (4). Sample items include "uses humor to take the edge off during stressful periods" and "makes us laugh at ourselves when we are too serious." An earlier version with six items was used by Dubinsky, Yammarino, Jolson, and Spangler (1995). Reliability was reported with $\alpha = 0.90$.

Supervisor humor (Decker & Rotondo, 2001). This questionnaire assesses respondent's perception of his/her manager's use of positive humor and negative humor on a five-point Likert scale of agreement from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). The seven items on perceived enjoyment or use of humor resemble positive humor with five items (e.g., "has good sense of humor," "tells jokes") and negative humor with two items (e.g., "uses insult humor"). The reliability reported was $\alpha = 0.86$ and $\alpha = 0.82$ for positive and negative humor, respectively. Factor analyses are reported (i.e., Decker & Rotondo, 2001, p. 463).

Short scale for evaluating affiliative and aggressive humor in groups (Curseu & Fodor, 2016). Purpose of this scale is to assess affiliative and aggressive humor with four items respectively, with the group being the referent. Items capture the perceptions of group members as initiators, targets and as receivers of humor. Scale format is not described; sample items include "...my team mates regularly told jokes and funny stories." and "... some group members disturbed the group by making ironic and inappropriate anecdotes and remarks." for the affiliative and the

aggressive humor, respectively. Reliabilities for the affiliative humor subscale were $\alpha = 0.89$ at the individual and 0.92 at the group level of analysis, and for the aggressive humor $\alpha = 0.88$ and 0.93, at the individual and group level, respectively. Results of factor analysis are reported (i.e., Curseu & Fodor, 2016, p. 12).

Humor Climate Questionnaire, HCQ (Cann, Watson & Bridgewater, 2014). The HCQ assesses positive and negative styles of humor in the workplace climate with 16 items on a 7-point Likert scale from *totally disagree* (1) to *totally agree* (7). The four factors, consisting of four items each, cover positive humor (e.g., “humor is often used to encourage or support coworkers”), negative humor (e.g., “the humor used by my coworkers can often make someone in the group feel bad”), outgroup humor (e.g., “my coworkers often make jokes about ‘management’”), and supervisor support with reversed items (e.g., “my supervisor believes that humor distracts from getting work done”). Cronbach’s α ranged from 0.81 for supervisor support and $\alpha = 0.83$ for negative humor to $\alpha = 0.87$ and 0.89 for positive and outgroup humor, respectively. Factor analyses are reported (i.e., Cann et al., 2014, p. 315).

Humor At Work, HAW (Rawlings & Findlay, 2016). The HAW assesses the humor climate within workplace settings with 13 items on a 7-point Likert scale from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (7). Two subscales cover pleasant climate (8 items; e.g., “I like to share funny things that happen to me with the men I work with.”) and unpleasant climate (5 items; e.g., “People use humour in this workplace for nasty reasons.”). Reliability was Cronbach’s α of 0.78 for both subscales. Factor loadings are displayed in a path model (i.e., Rawlings & Findlay, 2016, p. 64).

References

- Avolio, B. J., Howell, J. M., & Sosik, J. J. (1999). A funny thing happened on the way to the bottom line: Humor as a moderator of leadership style effects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(2), 219–227. doi: [10.2307/257094](https://doi.org/10.2307/257094).
- Babad, E. (1974). A multi-method approach to the assessment of humor: A critical look at humor tests. *Journal of Personality*, 42(4), 618–631. doi: [10.1111/j.1467-6494.1974.tb00697.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1974.tb00697.x).
- Booth-Butterfield, S., & Booth-Butterfield, M. (1991). Individual differences in the communication of humorous messages. *Southern Journal of Communication*, 56(3), 205–218. doi: [10.1080/10417949109372831](https://doi.org/10.1080/10417949109372831).
- Cann, A., Holt, K., & Calhoun, L. G. (1999). The roles of humor and sense of humor in responses to stressors. *Humor—International Journal of Humor Research*, 12(2), 177–194. doi: [10.1515/humr.1999.12.2.177](https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.1999.12.2.177).
- Cann, A., Watson, A. J., & Bridgewater, E. A. (2014). Assessing humor at work: The humor climate questionnaire. *Humor—International Journal of Humor Research*, 27(2), 307–323. doi: [10.1515/humor-2014-0019](https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2014-0019).
- Carver, C. S. (1997). You want to measure coping but your protocol’ too long: Consider the brief cope. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 4(1), 92–100. doi: [10.1207/s15327558ijbm0401_6](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327558ijbm0401_6).

- Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., & Weintraub, J. K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *56*(2), 267–283. doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.56.2.267](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.2.267).
- Craik, K. H., Lampert, M. D., & Nelson, A. J. (1996). Sense of humor and styles of everyday humorous conduct. *Humor—International Journal of Humor Research*, *9*(3–4), 273–302. doi: [10.1515/humr.1996.9.3-4.273](https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.1996.9.3-4.273).
- Curseu, P. L., & Fodor, O. C. (2016). Humor and group atmosphere: Development of a short scale for evaluating affiliative and aggressive humor in groups. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, *22*(7/8). Retrieved from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/TPM-04-2015-0022>.
- Decker, W. H., & Rotondo, D. M. (2001). Relationships among gender, type of humor, and perceived leader effectiveness. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, *13*(4), 450–465.
- De Koning, E., & Weiss, R. L. (2002). The relational humor inventory: Functions of humor in close relationships. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, *30*(1), 1–18. doi: [10.1080/019261802753455615](https://doi.org/10.1080/019261802753455615).
- Doosje, S., De Goede, M., Van Doornen, L., & Goldstein, J. (2010). Measurement of occupational humorous coping. *Humor—International Journal of Humor Research*, *23*(3), 275–305. doi: [10.1515/humr.2010.013](https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.2010.013).
- Doosje, S., Landsheer, J. A., Goede, M. P. M., & Doornen, L. J. P. (2012). Humorous coping scales and their fit to a stress and coping framework. *Quality & Quantity*, *46*(1), 267–279. doi: [10.1007/s11135-010-9348-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-010-9348-2).
- Dubinsky, A. J., Yammarino, F. J., Jolson, M. A., & Spangler, W. D. (1995). Transformational leadership: An initial investigation in sales management. *The Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, *15*(2), 17–31. doi: [10.1080/08853134.1995.10754018](https://doi.org/10.1080/08853134.1995.10754018).
- Fluegge, E. R. (2008). *Who put the fun in functional? Fun at work and its effects on job performance* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3322919).
- Gross, J. J. (2001). Emotion regulation in adulthood: Timing is everything. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *10*(6), 214–219. doi: [10.1111/1467-8721.00152](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00152).
- Herzog, T. R., & Strevey, S. J. (2008). Contact with nature, sense of humor, and psychological well-being. *Environment and Behavior*, *40*(6), 747–776. doi: [10.1177/0013916507308524](https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916507308524).
- Kirsh, G. A., & Kuiper, N. A. (2003). Positive and negative aspects of sense of humor: Associations with the constructs of individualism and relatedness. *Humor—International Journal of Humor Research*, *16*(1), 33–62. doi: [10.1515/humr.2003.004](https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.2003.004).
- Kuiper, N. A., & Martin, R. A. (1998). Laughter and stress in daily life: Relation to positive and negative affect. *Motivation and Emotion*, *22*(2), 133–153. doi: [10.1023/A:1021392305352](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021392305352).
- Martin, R. A., & Lefcourt, H. M. (1983). Sense of humor as a moderator of the relation between stressors and moods. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *45*(6), 1313–1324. doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.45.6.1313](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.45.6.1313).
- Martin, R. A., & Lefcourt, H. M. (1984). Situational humor response questionnaire: Quantitative measure of sense of humor. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *47*(1), 145–155. doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.47.1.145](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.47.1.145).
- 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*(1), 48–75. doi: [10.1016/S0092-6566\(02\)00534-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00534-2).
- McDowell, T. (2005). Fun at work: Scale development, confirmatory factor analysis, and links to organizational outcomes. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B. Science and Engineering*, *65*(12), 6697.
- McGhee, P. (1994). *How to develop your sense of humor: An 8 step training program for learning to use humor to cope with stress*. Dubuque, IA.: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- McGhee, P. (1996). *Health, healing and the amuse system: humor as survival training*. Dubuque, IA.: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

- Philbrick, K. T. (1989). *The use of humor and effective leadership styles* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9021898).
- Proyer, R. T., Ruch, W., & Müller, L. (2010). Sense of humor among the elderly: Findings using the German version of the SHS. *Zeitschrift Für Gerontologie Und Geriatrie*, 43(1), 19–24. doi: [10.1007/s00391-009-0082-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00391-009-0082-0).
- Rawling, M., & Findlay, B. (2016). The development and validation of the Humor at Work (HAW) scale. *Humor—International Journal of Humor Research*, 249–75. doi: [10.1515/humor-2015-0097](https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2015-0097).
- Recepöglü, E., Kiliç, A. Ç., & Çepni, O. (2011). Examining teachers' motivation level according to school principals' humor styles. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 6(17), 928–934. doi: [10.5897/ERR11.178](https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR11.178).
- Ruch, W., Köhler, G., & Van Thriel, C. (1996). Assessing the “humorous temperament”: Construction of the facet and standard trait forms of the State-Trait-Cheerfulness-Inventory—STCI. *Humor—International Journal of Humor Research*, 9(3–4), 303–339. doi: [10.1515/humr.1996.9.3-4.303](https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.1996.9.3-4.303).
- Ruch, W., Köhler, G., & Van Thriel, C. (1997). To be in good or bad humor: Construction of the state form of the State-Trait-Cheerfulness-Inventory—STCI. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 22(4), 477–491. doi: [10.1016/S0191-8869\(96\)00231-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(96)00231-0).
- Scheel, T. E., Gerdenitsch, C., & Korunka, C. (2016). Humor at work: Validation of the short and work-related Humor Styles Questionnaire (swHSQ). *Humor—International Journal of Humor Research*, 29(3), 439–465. doi: [10.1515/humor-2015-0118](https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2015-0118).
- Svebak, S. (1974). Revised questionnaire on the sense of humor. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 15(1), 328–331. doi: [10.1111/j.1467-9450.1974.tb00597.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.1974.tb00597.x).
- Svebak, S. (1996). The development of the sense of humor questionnaire: From SHQ to SHQ-6. *Humor—International Journal of Humor Research*, 9(3–4), 341–362. doi: [10.1515/humr.1996.9.3-4.341](https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.1996.9.3-4.341).
- Thorson, J. A., & Powell, F. C. (1993). Development and validation of a multidimensional sense of humor scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 49(1), 13–23. doi: [10.1002/1097-4679\(199301\)49:13.0.CO:2-S](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679(199301)49:13.0.CO:2-S).
- Wanzer, M., Booth-Butterfield, M., & Booth-Butterfield, S. (2005). “If we didn’t use humor, we’d cry”: Humorous coping communication in health care settings. *Journal of Health Communication*, 10(2), 105–125. doi: [10.1080/10810730590915092](https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730590915092).
- Wrench, J. S., & Richmond, V. P. (2000, November). *The relationships between teacher humor assessment and motivation, credibility, verbal aggression, affective learning, perceived learning, and learning loss*. Paper presented at the National Communication Association’s Convention, Seattle, WA.
- Wrench, J. S., & Richmond, V. P. (2004). Understanding the psychometric properties of the humor assessment instrument through an analysis of the relationships between teacher humor assessment and instructional communication variables in the college classroom. *Communication Research Reports*, 21(1), 92–103. doi: [10.1080/08824090409359971](https://doi.org/10.1080/08824090409359971).