



An Experimental Study of Students' Perceptions of Classroom Humour

Rachid Elkhayma

Laboratory of Language and Society, Ibn Tofail University, Morocco.

Received: 11 Nov 2020; Received in revised form: 21 Jan 2021; Accepted: 19 Feb 2021; Available online: 28 Feb 2021
©2021 The Author(s). Published by Infogain Publication. This is an open access article under the CC BY license
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Abstract— This study examines the benefits of using humour in the language classroom. It investigates the incorporation of humour in the classroom and how it can facilitate and create pertinent conditions for learning and teaching. It probes students' attitudes towards their teachers' humour, and whether they consider it a learning aid or not. The study used a quasi-experiment that involved two tests and two groups of students: a treatment group and a control one. The pre-test and post-test results and findings revealed that humour facilitates learning and teaching by reducing anxiety, increasing motivation, encouraging participation, boosting concentration and improving retention.

Keywords— anxiety, concentration, humour, motivation, retention, participation.

I. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

1.1. Introduction

It is common knowledge that education is a process that facilitates learning, organizes and spreads information, engraves values and principles, and develops skills needed in and outside the classroom. Education follows diverse methods to help students organize knowledge, use information, develop skills and ultimately function as positive citizens in their respective social and educational environments. These methods make use of a myriad of techniques, and encourage a variety of teaching styles in order to meet those objectives. One of these techniques is undoubtedly humour or educational humour, which is a teaching style and “an instructional tool that teachers can use in the classroom to increase their effectiveness” (Wanzer, 2002, p.116). The use of humour may help students feel relaxed, develop concentration and increase their level of attention and retention. Gorham and Christopher strongly endorse the incorporation of humour in teaching by stating numerous benefits such as maximizing students' participation and motivation, and minimizing their learning anxiety (as cited in Wanzer, 2002).

In fact, a large number of students often feel, because of long study hours, that the classroom has turned into a

boring setting. Therefore, the question is how can we create lively classrooms that enhance creativity and imagination and achieve better learning outcomes as a result? Although a great collection of educational methods and techniques are used, monotony and routine may still prevail. One of the teachers' biggest challenges, then, is to find a solution to such negative attitudes that may reasonably hamper students' potential learning.

So, can humour and teachers' sense of humour be a reliable tool? The answer is definitely ‘not an unequivocal yes’ (Wanzer, 2002, p. 118). Although research about humour and its benefits in language teaching and learning are not as abundant as they are in psychology and physiology, there is a considerable set of studies (some are acknowledged in Martin, 2007 & Wanzer, 2002 like Bryant et al., 1980; Desberg et al., 1981; Gorham & Christopher, 1990; Neuliep, 1991; Wanzer & Frymier, 1999) that have delved into the possible advantages of humour and its positive effects on the learning environment. It is suggested that it can be a vital educational style that brings life to the classroom through the following:

- First, it reduces stress and anxiety (Martin, 2007) and is “thought to be a valuable mechanism for coping with stressful life events and a key skill for initiating, maintaining, and enhancing

satisfying interpersonal relationships” (Galloway & Cropley, 1999; Kuiper & Olinger, 1998; Lefcourt, 2001, as cited in Martin, 2007, p. 269);

- Second, it “enhances the learning environment and has a significantly positive impact on retention of educational materials in a real-world academic setting” (Garner, 2006, p. 179);
- Third, it “can break down the barriers to communication between professors and students so that professors may better connect and transmit their messages” (Berk, 1996, p. 74).
- Fourth, it “can improve the climate of [teachers’] teaching” (Ziv, 1988, p. 14);
- Fifth, it enhances teachers-students relationship and has “a positive impact on interpersonal relations and group cohesion” (Gorham & Christophel, 1990, p. 47);
- Last but not least, it promotes “more students’ positive evaluations” towards the instructor and the course (Wanzer & Frymier, 1999, as cited in Wanzer, 2002, p. 117).

1.2. What is humour?

Humour is a state of mind and a means of expression. It helps in reshaping reality and transforming it into something funny in order to create laughter. It is closely attached to our daily life and can carry a lot of direct or indirect messages. Originally, it comes from the Latin word *umor* that refers to body fluids or humors: blood, black bile, yellow bile, and Phlegm (Morrison, 2008). These four humours were thought to gauge the person’s physical condition. The more balanced they are, the healthier the person is.

The meaning of humor evolved over time. In the middle ages, it was regarded as an odd trait. In the 18th century, the attitude towards humour ameliorated and was “considered normal behavior” (Morrison, 2008, p. 15). In his book *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious* (1960), Freud referred to jokes as verbal forms of humour and declared that it is a “defensive process” in regaining “pleasurable affect” (As cited in Christoff & Dauphin, 2017). In 1988, the psychologists Long and Graesser (as cited in Martin, 2007) defined humour as “anything done or said, purposely or inadvertently, that is found to be comical or amusing” (p. 37). In 1998, Michael Mulkey stated that humour “may be viewed as a mode of interpersonal communication that is frequently used to convey implicit messages in an indirect manner and to influence other people in various ways” (as cited in Martin, 2007, p. 17). From his part, Martin (2007) differentiated between humour and sense of humor. The latter refers to “habitual individual differences in all sorts of behaviors, experiences, affects, attitudes, and abilities

relating to amusement, laughter, jocularity, and so on,” while the former comprises “a wide range of concepts such as amusement, wit, ridicule, comedy, whimsy, and satire” (p. 17). Last but not least, Wanzer et al. (2006) believed that humour (and this is the most related definition of humour to the essence of this study as it taps on the areas relevant to the humour-education relationship) is “anything that the teacher and/or students find funny or amusing” (p.182).

By and large, humour is an implicit feeling and a spontaneous expression that can ease stress and tension of such a troubled world. People resort to forms of humour like jokes in order to relax and create moments of joy. We are inextricably attached to humour, and it is essentially present in our daily routine. We cannot be all the time serious, so we feel inclined to be humorous to amuse ourselves. However, our perception of it is not the same; what is humorous to one may turn plain to another, and that depends either on age, life experience, personality or education. Therefore, situations that are deemed humorous to some can be considered as mockery or bad taste to others. Also, what can be humorous in a particular context may adversely be offensive or extraneous in another one.

1.3. Theories of humour

The theories of humour entail the different ways that people use to practice humour. They are divided into several types and forms in order to help students and researchers understand the complexity of humour research. MacHovec (1988) classified them into classical, neo-classical and modern theories, but the most prevalent division is the superiority / derision theory, the incongruity theory, the relief / release theory, the semantic script theory, the general theory of verbal humour and instructional humour processing theory (Morreall, 1997; Raskin, 1985; MacHovec, 1988; Martin, 2007).

1.3.1. The superiority theory

The superiority theory focuses on the social function of humour that can be employed by a dominant group to show a sense of superiority. It is usually the case when we laugh at somebody because we feel we are better or, say, smarter than him or her. Plato emphasizes that “we laugh at what is ridiculous in other people, feeling delight instead of pain when we see even our friends in misfortune” (as cited in Martin, 2007, p. 44). Seventeenth century philosopher Thomas Hobbes also believes that humour stems from a feeling of superiority at the expense of disparaging other people or laughing at their dilemma. He writes that the “the passion of laughter is nothing else but sudden glory arising from some sudden conception of some eminency in ourselves, by comparison with the infirmity of others, or with our own formerly” (as cited in

Martin, 2007, p. 44). Gruner (1997) is one of the last proponents of this theory. He considered it to be resulting from a sense of superiority driven by ridiculing others on account of their inferiority or weakness (as cited in Martin, 2007).

This signifies that humour is not always innocent. It can make fun of others and turn into a scornful act. Consequently, if such an act of humour is used in the classroom, it will unquestionably be counter-productive.

1.3.2. The incongruity theory

Traced back to Beattie and Schopenhauer in the eighteenth century, the incongruity theory illustrates the cognitive process of humour that in effect characterizes our understanding of its function (Martin, 2007; Dynel, 2013), and is “central to the structure and processing of humorous stimuli” (Dynel, 2013, p. 3). Morreall (1997) viewed it as the most widespread theory of humour. It centers on the notion of surprise that accrues from two conflicting elements. It is created, as Ross reports, “out of a conflict between what is expected and what actually occurs in the joke” (1998, p.6). Thus, humour accrues from an unpredictable ambiguity followed by an unexpected punch-line that can eventually cause laughter. In other words, what the audience expects to happen at the end of the joke is not what really takes place. This is usually called a pun, and is respectively exemplified in Ross (1998) and Martin (2007) by the following jokes:

- “Have you got a light, Mac?’ ‘No, but I’ve got a dark brown overcoat” (p.8).
- “O’Riley was on trial for armed robbery. The jury came out and announced, “Not guilty.” “Wonderful,” said O’Riley, “does that mean I can keep the money?”” (p. 63).

This explains why we sometimes laugh upon figuring out the punch-line of a joke, because we often do not think it may finish that way, as in the second joke where O’Riley recklessly confesses that he is guilty by asking to keep the stolen money.

In the English language classroom and education at large, according to Wanzer et al. (2010), when teachers relate humour to the content dealt with in class, students can identify the incongruity of the humour as long as it is linked to the subject matter. In this sense, students can spot the purpose of the incongruity in the current or the previously acquired information, and this will allow them to retrieve it later on from the long-term memory. So, knowing how humour is processed and how it should be conducted in the educational setting necessitates a clear understanding and formation of the humorous stimuli.

1.3.3. The relief / release theory

The release theory emphasizes the effective role of humour in decreasing personal restrained feelings. It suggests that there is a hidden energy that comes out in the form of laughter. It is often about topics that people feel somehow reluctant to talk about in public, like taboos or sexual issues. The theory maintains that laughter is set off by an accumulated power that may arise from repressed feelings whether they are emotional, intellectual or sexual. Humour emerges in such a manner in order to relieve people from several forms of tension. In the field of education, this theory can serve students by decreasing classroom anxiety through teachers’ instructional humour.

Spencer and Freud are the pioneers of this theory. Spencer (1860) asserted that “the respiratory and muscular action of laughter is a specialized way for the body to release excess nervous energy, much like a safety valve on a steam engine” (as cited in Martin, 2007, p. 58). Freud viewed humour as a defense tool for the release of stress in order to experience pleasure (as cited in Martin, 2007). In this regard, the relief theory deals with the way people see humour and its function in minimizing tension and stress, which may definitely be helpful in lowering students’ frustration and level of anxiety.

1.3.4. Wanzer’s theory

The most recent theory that accounts for the humour–learning relationship is the Instructional Humour Processing Theory (IHPT) advanced by Wanzer et al. (2010). It maintains that the use of instructional humour should help to increase students’ attention and motivation and creates a positive environment for better learning outcomes. The IHPT reports that the content of teachers’ humour can be a major mechanism in students’ affective reaction to humour. It explains “how instructors’ humorous messages are cognitively and effectively processed in the classroom to affect student retention” (2010, p.12). If the humorous content is recognized as such, it will create a positive effect on learning in case it is perceived appropriate.

This means that, on the one hand, teachers should incorporate humour and make it part of their teaching instructional techniques, and, on the other hand, they must abstain from involving extraneous humour (irony, making fun of a student, discriminatory humour) as it will seriously lead learning in an undesirable path.

The next section clarifies the social, psychological and educational roles proffered by humour in the educational context.

II. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Quasi-experiment

The objective of the experiment is to investigate the effect of classroom humour (teachers' humour in particular) on the following dependent variables: (a) students' attitudes towards EFL learning and education in general; (b) their motivation for more and better learning; (c) their level of participation in class activities; and (d) their learning anxiety.

2.2 Participants in the experiment

There were two classes / groups of students: 24 students in the treatment group / class and 22 in the control one.

2.3 Instruments

The gathered quantitative data is based on a quasi-experiment that comprises a pre-test and a post-test. Both tests consist of the same statements, except for the post-tests wherein the researcher changes the ordering of the statements so that students cannot memorize responses from the pre-test. Before the experiment, the two tests were translated into Arabic, and were also explained to students prior to the start of the experiment.

2.4 Data collection procedure

The experiment was carried out in eight learning sessions in the form of treatment and control depending on the group selected. In the control group, students did not receive any humour activities from the teacher during the experiment. Their lessons were largely about regular, non-humorous vocabulary, communication and reading activities. I tried as I could to avoid any forms or instances of humour during the 8 sessions of the experiment. The pre-test was delivered to students at the beginning of the first class, while they sat for the post-test at the end of the eighth session.

In the treatment group, the experimental sessions / classes involved several activities (previous studies about humour such as Berk, 1996; Bryant et al., 1980; Desberg et al., 1981; Gorham & Christopher, 1990; Neuliep, 1991; Wanzer 2002; Wanzer & Frymier, 1999; Ziv, 1988 also included similar humour techniques, except for jokes which I did not use at all) which were part of the target lessons, and which consisted to a great extent of the following classroom-related humour materials:

- Funny videos
- Funny pictures
- Role plays
- Funny comments
- Funny gestures

Since humour activities were part of the lessons, and since class time was one hour, the instances and doses of classroom humour ranged between 20 and 40 per cent of class time, spread over the whole hour with different levels from a session to another, and concentrated mainly in the warm-up and the presentation stages of the lesson, and to a lesser extent in the practice and production stages. The objective was not to overwhelm students with humorous material throughout the learning session to see if it works or not, because this is not the ideal class we are looking for. The objective was, instead, about injecting doses of humour that most teachers can do in their own classes, and which may generate a natural educational environment that coexists with and encourages the use of humour.

III. RESULTS

It was found that students' most reactions and opinions on the pre-test and post-test, although there was not a statistically significant difference between the two tests, revealed agreement and strong agreement among participants about the fact that humour lessens anxiety, increases motivation, triggers participation, extends concentration and develops retention. The results also showed that teachers' humour pushes students to develop constructively positive attitudes towards their teachers and learning.

Besides, the pre-test and post-test results, though favourable for classroom humour, did not indicate a remarkable difference between their mean scores after running a paired samples t test, as shown later. There was not a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test, neither for the experimental nor for the control group, because the subjects had already had positive attitudes towards classroom humour even prior to the start of the experiment.

3.1. Experimental group

3.1.1. Comparing the pre-test and post-test results of the experimental group

A paired samples t-test was conducted to compare the mean scores of the pre-test and post-test of the treatment group. It was discovered, as shown in table 1 below, that the pre-test has a mean of 37.75 before the treatment with a standard deviation of 3.69 ($M = 37.57$, $SD = 3.69$), whereas the post-test has a mean of 38.37 after the treatment and a standard deviation of 4.91 ($M = 38.37$, $SD = 4.91$). This suggests that the means were not significantly different.

Table 1: Paired Samples Statistics in the Treatment Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pretest	37,7500	24	3,69783	,75482
	Posttest	38,3750	24	4,91504	1,00328

Table 2 : Paired Differences in the Treatment Group

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pretest – Posttest	-,625	6,219	1,269	-3,251	2,001	-,492	23	,627

In table 2, the mean paired difference between the pre-test and the post-test is -, 62 (M = -, 62) with a standard deviation of the differences of 6, 21 (SD = 6, 21). The t statistic is small and negative -, 49 with 23 degrees of freedom and a *p* value of 0,627. So, at an alpha level of .05, the analysis indicated that there was not a statistically significant difference in the scores of the pre-test (M = 37.57, SD = 3.69) and post-test [M = 38.37, SD = 4.91], $t(23) = -, 49, p = 0,627$.

3.2. Control group

3.2.1. Comparing the pre-test and post-test results of the control group

A paired samples t-test was conducted to compare the mean scores of the pre-test and post-test of the control group. It was discovered, as shown in table 3 below, that the pre-test has a mean of 34.68 with a standard deviation of 4.31 (M = 34.68, SD = 4.31), whereas the post-test has a mean of 35.59 and a standard deviation of 4.59 (M = 35.59, SD = 4.59), which reveals that the means were not significantly different.

Table 3: Paired Samples Statistics in the Control Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pretest	34,6818	22	4,31373	,91969
	Posttest	35,5909	22	4,59460	,97957

Table 4 : Paired Differences in the Control Group

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pretest - Posttest	-,909	5,681	1,211	-3,428	1,609	-,751	21	,461



In table 4, the mean paired difference between the pre-test and the post-test is -, 90 ($M = -, 90$) with a standard deviation of the differences of 5, 68 ($SD = 5, 68$). The t statistic is relatively small and negative -, 75 with 21 degrees of freedom and a p value of 0,461. So, at an alpha of .05, the analysis indicated that there was not a statistically significant difference in the scores for the pre-test ($M = 34.68, SD = 4.31$) and post-test ($M = 35.59, SD = 4.59$) conditions, $t(21) = -, 75, p = 0,461$.

3.3. Testing the hypotheses

The researcher tested the following alternative hypotheses (H_a):

- It is hypothesized that the use of humour in class increases learning motivation.
- It is hypothesized that the use of humour in class decreases learning anxiety.
- It is hypothesized that Moroccan EFL secondary school students have positive attitudes towards their teachers' humour.

The treatment group was provided with humour doses while the control class did not receive humour. The researcher gauged the differences between the two groups on the levels of anxiety, motivation and positive attitudes towards their teachers. Since there is a small difference between the groups, and a p value that is higher than the defined alpha of .05, there is a decision that there is no significant relationship between the groups' means. Therefore, the alternative / research hypothesis is rejected, and the null that states that there is no relationship between the groups is maintained. This does not entail that there is no relationship between the pre-test and the post-test. It states that there is no difference between the pre-test and the post-test. Put differently, if there is an influence of the independent variable (humour) on the dependent variables (anxiety, motivation and students' attitudes) in the pre-test, the post-test does not say the opposite. It actually corroborates the influence without any effects.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

3.4. The experimental group

It was found that humour rid students of classroom tension as they became more willing to talk and less anxious about making mistakes. They also felt more inclined to express themselves in open-pair dialogues and in individual participation. It was noticeable that they did not find it hard to communicate their answers and ideas

during the experiment. They appeared not to give too much attention to their classmates' reactions. This denotes that they were feeling well at ease with an "improved respiration and circulation [and] lower pulse and blood pressure" (Garner, 2006, p. 177). Therefore, it is worth emphasizing that they felt relaxed and content with teachers who use appropriate humour.

Since they were less anxious, they came out more motivated to learn. This was obviously reflected in the increased rate of participation and the apparent level of continuous concentration they showed in class. Besides, it was discovered that students' retention of information was developed, for they were unusually able to retain key classroom vocabulary material (related to clothes and parts of the body) on the spot and in later sessions. This finding is corroborated by other researchers, particularly Schmidt (1994) and Garner (2006).

The experiment shows that students in this group held positive attitudes towards learning. Their attitudes improved significantly in particular areas, but did not change much in others, as they had already been immensely constructive prior to the experiment, and this is exactly what the hypotheses testing proved. In this regard, many students believe that they can understand better with teachers who use humour. This is a vigorous evidence of how welcoming students' attitudes are towards humour. No doubt this is true since previous studies, like that of Garner, support this finding. He pointed that "humour can help an individual engage the learning process by creating a positive emotional and social environment in which defenses are lowered and students are better able to focus and attend to the information being presented". He added that "humour can serve as a bridge between educators and students by demonstrating a shared understanding and a common psychological bond" (2006, p. 177). This is one of the techniques that can shape more positive attitudes towards learning. But teachers need to be careful about the type of humour they incorporate as a teaching tool because if it is inapposite, it may turn counter-productive. Besides, most students think that they do not get bored in classes where humour is employed. Their attitude towards this matter did not change much from the pre-test to the post-test, and it is another proof of how humour shapes students' attitudes towards learning.

In finding out about students' attitudes towards whether humour is a waste of time, I discovered that their opinions were slightly reduced in the post-test with a rate

of 8%. The reason is not about the amount of humour doses injected that they thought were excessive, but rather it might have been more about the teacher's humour-related activities that centered mainly around funny videos and pictures, and which might have not appealed much to all students (as cited in Ziv 1988, most previous studies employed humour instruments in the form of lectures, jokes and video tapes). This is because when asked about losing concentration when the teacher overuses humour, many rejected the idea claiming that even if there is an overdose of humour, they do not lose concentration. It is the first time such a situation takes place as prior research, such as that of Ziv (1988) who wrote that "the optimal dose ... in a classroom is three to four instances per hour" (p. 13), recommends a bounded amount of humour to be injected in each session.

In a stark contrast to the previous research question, students' attitudes towards their teachers' humour are substantially different. Many of their answers shifted from being strong positive attitudes to less productive ones. In responding to whether all teachers should have a sense of humour, the vigour of their stances declined in the post-test after it had been stronger before the experiment. Students commonly believe that all teachers should have a sense of humour, but this finding shows just the opposite. Some students who reacted differently did not think that way since they might believe that humour, as Ziv (1988) posited, is "not among the most important qualities of a good teacher" (p. 13). Overall, although some attitudes were less powerful, nearly all students supported the idea that teachers should have a sense of humour, and this was the overwhelming line of thoughts held by this experimental group.

Similarly, most students prefer teachers with a sense of humour and who use it for educational purposes. Nearly all of them held favourable attitudes towards the teachers who incorporate humour, but their opinions were slightly less robust after the experiment than they were prior to it. It might have been, as discussed earlier, that the types of humorous techniques adopted by the researcher during the treatment did not appeal to all students' various learning styles. So, it is advisable for teachers to diversify their humour-driven material to include a variety of verbal and non-verbal humour stimuli as contended by Wanzer et al. (2006), such as jokes, spontaneous humour, cartoons, wordplay, comments and so on and so forth. Besides, the type of humorous stimuli chosen by the teacher might have contributed to such a slight decrease, as Gorham and Christophel (1990) affirmed that students "might enjoy Joan Rivers as a teacher but put little stock in what she teaches them" (p. 59). This explains that the learning activities based on which humour was created did not

appeal much to students. Moreover, Garner (2006) contended that humour is "highly personal, subjective, and contextual and we cannot always predict the way it will be received" (p. 178).

3.5. The control group

Unlike the other group, it appears that the absence of humour stimuli affected students' learning anxiety, motivation and participation in this group. All that flourished in the experimental group did not occur here. On the contrary, the researcher did not notice a significant enhancement of students' willingness to talk and participate. Compared to the treatment group, not many students seemed to enjoy the lessons and the class as a whole in this control one, which might reasonably impact learning, because an important number of them were not really motivated to take part in the learning activities such as role plays and open-pair dialogues. It is also an indication that some group members might have had anxiety; this is why they showed less enthusiasm and involvement. It is certainly then that the students did not reasonably appreciate the routine of the classes.

Additionally, the lack of students' retention of information was obvious as not many of them, on several occasions, managed to remember some important words they saw before. Moreover, few of them revealed constant interest in the teacher's lessons, exercises and activities on account of insufficient and irregular concentration.

Since no treatment was pursued in this group, their attitudes towards learning did not change much neither from positive to negative nor from negative to positive. What was different is that a lot of their attitudes towards all the areas mentioned in the treatment group changed from strong attitudes to mild ones. In responding to the statement that they can understand better and easier, their opinions greatly declined. This explains that fewer students thought that they can understand better with humour. In another example, their views that humour is just a waste of time also dropped, entailing again that fewer students rejected the statement as they were not involved in any humour activity in order to be able to judge if it was a waste of time or not. In other words, since there was no humorous stimuli, students' attitudes were mostly ordinary and less favourable towards learning as opposed to what they had been prior to the experiment. But on the whole and given the fact that there was no treatment, their perceptions were still positive towards the notion of classroom humour in particular.

In accordance with this group's previous responses, it appears that they developed less positive attitudes towards the teachers who incorporate humour, which had been stronger before the experiment, as shown in tables 46

through 50, and less encouraging after it. For instance, after the experiment, they had less favourable perceptions of the idea that all teachers should have a sense of humour. They also did not come out as robust as they had been prior to the experiment on the opinion that they prefer teachers with a sense of humour. The same applies to other attitudes such as the one that says that they prefer teachers who use humour over those who do not. These are not surprising findings because, as stated earlier, students did not encounter any form of humour during the experiment. As a result, their opinions and attitudes towards the teacher changed from more enthusiastic to less enthusiastic since his teaching style was regular, mechanical and non-humorous. If there had been some humour doses, students could have developed more encouraging attitudes and, consequently, the teacher could have become more likeable as discussed in other research (see Berk, 1996; Bryant, Crane, Comisky & Zillmann, 1980; Gorham & Christophel, 1990; Wanzer, 2002).

V. CONCLUSION

This current study showed that humour facilitates learning and teaching at the level of anxiety, motivation, participation, concentration and retention, and by creating a welcoming classroom setting that is suitable for better education. It was found out that students' most reactions and opinions, although there was not a statistically significant difference between the two tests, revealed agreement and strong agreement among participants about the fact that humour lessens anxiety, increases motivation, triggers participation, extends concentration and develops retention. The results also showed that teachers' humour pushes students to develop constructively positive attitudes towards their teachers and learning.

REFERENCES

- [1] Attardo, S. (1994). *Linguistic theories of humor*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- [2] Bell, N. D. (2009). Learning about and through humor in the second language classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(3), 241-258.
- [3] Berk, R. A. (1996). Student ratings of 10 strategies for using humor in college teaching. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 7(3), 71-92.
- [4] Billig, M. (2005). *Laughter and ridicule*. London: Sage.
- [5] Bradshaw, M. J., & Lowenstein, A. J. (2011). *Innovative teaching strategies in nursing and related health professions*. MA: Jones and Bartlett.
- [6] Bruner, R. (2002). Transforming thought: The role of humor in teaching. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=298761
- [7] Bryant, J., Crane, J. S., Comisky, P. W. & Zillmann D. (1980). Relationship between college teachers' use of humor in the classroom and students' evaluations of their teachers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 72 (4), 511-519.
- [8] Chabeli, M. (2008). Humor: A pedagogical tool to promote learning. *Curationis*, 51-59.
- [9] Christoff, M., & Dauphin, B. (2017). Freud's theory of humor. (V. Zeigler-Hill, & T. K. Shackelford, Eds.) Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317386267>
- [10] Christophel, M. D., & Gorham, J. (1990). The relationship of teachers' use of humor in the classroom to immediacy and student learning. *Communication Education*, 39, 46-62.
- [11] Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston: Pearson.
- [12] Creswell, J. (2015). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. SAGE Publications.
- [13] Deneire, M. (1995). Humor and foreign language teaching. *Humor - International Journal of Humor Research*, 286-298.
- [14] Desberg, P. H. (1981). *The effect of humour on retention of lecture material*. Paper presented at the 1981 American Psychological Association. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED223118.pdf>
- [15] Dynel, M. (2013). *Developments in linguistic humour theory*. John Benjamins.
- [16] Eastman, M. (1921). *The sense of humour*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- [17] Elkhayma, R. (2020). Affective factors in foreign language education: The role of anxiety. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 5(4), 853-860.
- [18] Feagai, H. E. (2011). Let humor lead your nursing practice. *Nurse Leader*, 9(4), 44-46.
- [19] Garner, R. L. (2006). Humor in pedagogy: How ha-ha can lead to aha! *College Teaching*, 54(1), 177-180.
- [20] MacHovec, F. J. (1988). *Humor: Theory, history, applications*. Springfield: Thomas. Retrieved from <https://books.google.co.ma/books?id=r8IUvR4jYx4C&printsec>
- [21] Martin, R. (2007). *The psychology of humor: An integrative approach*. Burlington.
- [22] Medgyes, P. (2002). *Laughing matters: Humour in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [23] Morreall, J. (1997). *Humor works*. Massachusetts: Human Resource Classroom.
- [24] Morrison, M. K. (2008). *Using humor to maximize learning: The links between positive emotions and education*. Md: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- [25] Neuliep, J. W. (1991). An examination of the content of high school teachers' humor in the classroom and the development of an inductively derived taxonomy of classroom humor. *Communication Education*, 40, 343-355.
- [26] Raskin, V. (1985). *Semantic mechanisms of humor*. Dordrecht: D: Reidel.

- [27] Robinson, V. M. (1977). *Humor and the health professions*. Thorofare, New Jersey: Charles B. Slack.
- [28] Ross, A. (1998). *The language of humour*. London: Routledge.
- [29] San, B., Darrin, J. G., & Alan, K. G. (2018). Humor in the classroom: The effects of integrated humor on student learning. *Communication Education*, 144–164.
- [30] Schmidt, S. R. (1994). Effects of humour on sentence memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 20(4), 953-967. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org>
- [31] Schmitz, J. R. (2002). Humor as a pedagogical tool in foreign language and translation courses. *Humor - International Journal of Humor Research*, 15(1), 89-113.
- [32] Schwarz, J. (2010). *Linguistic aspects of verbal Humor in stand-up comedy. (Doctoral dissertation)*. Retrieved from http://scidok.sulb.unisaarland.de/volltexte/2010/3114/pdf/Linguistic_Aspects_of_Verbal_Humor_Verl_agsversion.pdf
- [33] Tamblin, D. (2003). *Laugh and learn : 95 ways to use humor for more effective teaching and training*. New York: AMACOM.
- [34] Wanzer, M., Booth-Butterfield, M., & Booth-Butterfield, S. (1995). The funny people: A source orientation to the communication of humor. *Communication Quarterly*, 142-154.
- [35] Wanzer, M. B., & Frymier, A. B. (1999). The relationship between student perceptions of instructor humour and students' reports of learning. *Communication Education*, 48-62.
- [36] Wanzer, M. (2002). Use of humor in the classroom: The good, the bad, and the not-so-funny things that teachers say and do. (C. J., & J. C. McCroskey, Eds.) *Communication for teachers*, 116-125.
- [37] Wanzer, M., Ann, F., Ann, W., & Smith, T. (2006). Appropriate and inappropriate uses of humor by teachers. *Communication Education*, 178-196.
- [38] Wanzer, M., Frymier, A. B., & Irwin, J. (2010). An explanation of the relationship between instructor humor and student learning: Instructional humor processing theory. *Communication Education*, 59(1). Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/248940257>
- [39] Wilford, W. T. (1971). *An experimental study of the effectiveness of humor used as a refutational device (Doctoral dissertation)*. Louisiana State University.
- [40] Wilkins, J., & Eisenbrannum, A. J. (2009). Humor theories and the physiological benefits of laughter. *Holistic Nursing Practice*, 349–354. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/477378/Humor_Theories_and_the_Physiological
- [41] Ziv, A. (1988). Teaching and learning with humor: Experiment and replication. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 6(1), 37-44. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/ressources.imist.ma/stable/20151750?Search=yes&resultItemClick=true&searchText=Teaching&searchText=and&searchText=learning&searchText=with&searchText=humor&searchText=Experiment&searchText=and&searchText=Replication&searchUri=%2Fact>