ABSTRACT
The present study was undertaken to study the sense of humour among college teachers based on their gender, age, experience, education, marital status, residence, management type and type of institutions. A sample of 91 college teachers was selected through lottery method of probability sampling technique. The data was collected with the help of Multidimensional Sense of Humour Scale by Thorson & Powell (1993)[19] The descriptive statistical techniques like Mean, Standard Deviation and the ‘t’-test were used for testing the research hypothesis. The finding of the study reported that there is no difference in the sense of humour among college teacher.
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INTRODUCTION
Sense of humour is define as a sort of terminology used for refer to habitual individual differences in all sorts of behaviours, experiences, affects, attitudes and abilities to amusement, laughter, jocularity and so on. The sense of humor is our ability to understand and enjoy amusement and to make others smile and laugh. Good sense of humour has long been imagined to be personal quality that moderates the impact of stressors in some one’s life. Humour has not been used widely in our classroom as a teaching tool. Humour can play an important role in today’s college classroom as it has a humanizing effect on the image of the teacher. Humour can be used as a powerful tool to put students at ease and make the overall learning process more enjoyable. The purpose of this current study is to determine the attitudes of College Teachers toward the Sense of Humour in Relation to Organizational Variables as a component of Effective Teaching.

CONCEPT OF SENSE OF HUMOR
Sense of Humour is the ability to experience humour, a quality which all people share, although the extent to which an individual will personality find something humourous, depend on most of absolute and relative variable including geographical location, culture, maturity, level of education, intelligence and marital status. It is the ability to create joyful moment or laughter in the situation of despair, sadness, anxiety, tension and even in all situations for shedding the clouds of sadness or for dreaming away the panic moment. If you have a good sense of humour you can make people more enjoyable to be around you and you might also do better at work. Teachers’ sense of humour is a miracle in creating effective teaching and learning environment where there is no place for stress and anxiety but instead in strict motivation in enhanced. The sense of humour is our ability to understand and enjoy amusement and to make others smile and laugh.

MEANING AND DEFINITIONS OF SENSE OF HUMOUR
‘Sense of humour’ refers to a personality trait which enable and individual to understand, produce and appreciate amusement for the purpose of enjoyment and laughter. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the meaning of humour is “quality of action, speech, or writing which excites amusement.”[9] Which is “the faculty of perceiving what is ludicrous or amusing, or of expressing it in speech, writing, or other composition; jocose imagination or treatment of a subject?” In other words Sense of Humour can be define as a personality trait which enables an individual to understand, produce and appreciate amusement for the purpose of enjoyment and laughter.

According to Ruch (2002)[17] “in contemporary psychology the term ‘sense of humour’ refers to humor as an ending personality trait.”

Cambridge Dictionary define (sense of humour) as, “your ability to understand funny things.”[18]

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE
The review of related literature pertaining to the present study has been given as under:
Darling & Civikly (1987)[6] found that a male teacher using non-tendentious humour and a female teacher using tendentious humour are perceived as more self protective than helpful. A male teacher using no humour is perceived as more forthright and truthful than the same teacher using either tendentious or non tendentious humour.
Crawford, M. & Macleod, M (1990)[4] found that male teachers use humor significantly more often than female teachers, with women in small classes being especially unlikely to use humour.
Dange & Jagannath (2012)[8] found that, there was no significant difference in mean scores of teachers’ sense of humour in relation to Gender and Type of the school. However, significance difference was found between Rural and Urban primary school teachers sense of humour.
Mikes, Walker, Parris, Mankoff & Christenfeld (2012) found that 94% of the men and 89% of women agreed to the stereotype that men are funnier than women.

Dhiman & Chandel (2014) found that married prospective teacher educator were found more prone to affiliative humour style than their unmarried counterparts. No significant differences were found among married and unmarried teacher educator with regard to their overall humour, self-enhancing, aggressive and self-defeating humour styles.

Channiotakis (2014) revealed in his study that teachers with 5-20 years of professional experience incorporate humour less often in their teaching, than their younger colleagues having experience 2-5 years.

Malik & Anju (2015) found that there exists no significant difference in occupational stress of secondary school teachers in relation to their sense of humour.

Malik & Sarita (2015) explored that significant difference was found in Sense of humor among male and female school teachers.

Chandel & Dhiman (2016) in their study found that tribal secondary school teachers were found to be more oriented towards self-enhancing humour and affiliative humour styles as compare to their non-tribal counterparts.

Malik & A Q Suhail Ahmed Choudhury (2016) found that female teachers were having less sense of humour as compare to male teachers.

Chandel (2018) conducted a study and found that male senior secondary school teachers were found to be more oriented towards self-enhancing humour as compare to their female counterparts. No significant difference in affiliative, aggressive and self defeating humour of male and female senior secondary school teachers was found.

Nur Iffah Salmi Akbar (2019) found that jokes delivered by male teachers were considered funnier than jokes delivered by female teachers.

Nur Iffah Salmi Akbar (2019) in his study found that none of the female teacher ever used narrative joke in EFL classroom interaction, meanwhile, the male teachers employed all types of jokes in EFL classroom interaction.

Kumar & Dhiman (2020) found that private secondary teachers were found to be more oriented towards self enhancing humour as compare to their government counterparts. No significance differences were found in affiliative and self-defeating humour.

Kumar & Dhiman (2021) found that the government secondary school male teachers were found to be more oriented towards affiliative, self-enhancing and aggressive humour as compared to their female counterparts. However no significant difference was found in self defeating humour of government secondary school male and female teachers.

Dhiman & Mehta (2021) conducted a study on sense of humour among science and non-science background senior secondary teacher and explore that science background senior secondary school teacher were found to be more oriented towards generation & use of humour or humour production (HP) and overall sense of humour as than their non-science background counterparts. However no significant difference were found in coping/adaptive humour (CH), attitude towards humourous people (APTH) and appreciation of humour (HA) among science and non-science background senior secondary teachers.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY
O. To find out the difference in the sense of humour of college teachers based on their Gender, Age, Experience, Education, Residence, Management Type, Type of Institution, Economic Status and Family Type.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY
H. There will be no significant difference in the sense of humour among college teachers based on their Gender (Male & Female), Age (Low Age & High Age), Experience (Low Experienced &Highly Experienced), Education (Highly Qualified & Low Qualified), Residence (Rural & Urban), Management Type (Public & Private), Type of Institution (General & Professional), Experience (Low Experienced & Highly Experienced) and Family Type (Joint Family & Nuclear Family).

METHOD
The study was conducted through descriptive survey method of research.

RESEARCH TOOL USED
In the present study Multidimensional Sense of Humour Scale by Thorson & Powell (1993) was used to collect the data from college teachers on their sense of humour.

SAMPLING
In the present study lottery method of probability sampling was used.

VARIABLES
In the present study, sense of humour was treated as dependent variable, whereas gender, age, experience, education, marital status, residence, management type and type of institution were taken as independent variables.

STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED
In the present study the statistical techniques of Mean, SD and The ‘t’–test were employed for data analysis.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA
The Table-1 presents the calculated statistics of Sense of Humour of Male and Female College Teachers.
Table 1
Significance of Mean Difference in Sense of Humour among College Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of Humour</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>‘t’-value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>87.37</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>83.70</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Age</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>85.48</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low age</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>85.40</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86.28</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>84.80</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86.97</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>84.06</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>84.88</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>86.12</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>86.63</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>84.22</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>87.12</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>84.06</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>86.52</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>84.72</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>86.43</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS = Not Significant

The table-1 indicates that the ‘t’-values of Sense of Humour were found to be 0.04, 0.96, 0.42, 0.10, 0.49, 0.18, 0.09, 0.33 and 0.14 with respect to Gender, Age, Experience, Education, Residence, Management Type, Type of Institution, Experience and Family Type Groups, which are not significant. It means that College Teachers do not differ significantly with regard to their Sense of Humour based on Gender, Age, Experience, Education, Residence, Management Type, Type of Institution, Economic Status and Family Type. In other words, we can say that more or less on the average college teachers were found to have almost similar/equal level of sense of humour with regard to their Gender, Age, Experience, Education, Residence, Management Type, Type of Institution, Economic Status and Family Type. Hence, the null hypothesis that, “there will be no significant difference in the sense of humour among college teachers based on their Gender (Male & Female), Age (Low Age & High Age), Experience (Low Experienced &Highly Experienced), Education (Highly Qualified & Low Qualified), Residence (Rural & Urban), Management Type (Public & Private), Type of Institution (General & Professional), Economic Status (Low Economic Status & High Economic Status) and Family Type (Joint Family & Nuclear Family) was accepted.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

- No significant differences were found in Sense of Humour among College Teachers based on their Gender, Age, Experience, Education, Residence, Management Type, Type of Institutions, Economic Status and Family Type.
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