



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

HUMOUR STYLES AMONG COLLEGE TEACHERS

¹Madan Kumar, ²Dr. Jitendra Kumar Tiwari & ³Dr. Raj Kumar Dhiman

¹Research Scholar (Ph.D.-Education), ² Associate Professor & ³Principal,

¹Career Point University, Kota (Rajasthan)-INDIA, ²Career Point University, Kota (Rajasthan)-INDIA & ³Raj Rajeshwari College of Education Bhota, Hamirpur (H.P.) – INDIA.

Abstract: The present study was planned to find out the difference in the humour styles of college teachers based on their education, residence, management type and type of institution. The teachers employed in govt. and private recognized colleges of district Hamirpur of Himachal Pradesh were selected for the study. Data was collected with the help of standardized tool viz. Hindi adaptation of humour styles questionnaire of Martin et al. (2003) ^[9] by Prof. B. P. Verma. The statistical techniques of mean, standard deviation and the ‘t’- test were employed for data analysis. The finding of the study reported that there is no difference in the styles of humour among college teacher.

Keywords: Humour Styles, College Teachers, Affiliative Humour, self-enhancing Humour, Aggressive Humour, Self

INTRODUCTION

Institutions are making effort to ensure that their faculty are effective in every way in subject delivery. Humour is a way of survival which improves the content. Teachers can be skilled more effectively by injecting humour in their teaching – learning process. Teacher can use humour in teaching learning process. Maximum teachers have praised the ability of humour to aid the learning process, to help students’ understanding and to release tension of students. Humour practiced by the teachers create a learning environment that is cheerful and can help reduce stress and anxiety of pupils.

CONCEPT OF HUMOUR STYLES

Humour is the ability of a person that is able to trigger emotions like joy or being entertained. It is one of the important components for effective management of teaching-learning process. Martin et al. (2003) has given the following four styles of humour as discussed under:

(1) **Affiliative Humour:** Affiliative humour style is used to enhance one’s relationships with others in a kind and positive manner.

Teacher can use this type of humour to amuse others, reduce anxiety among others and improve relationships with their colleague and students.

(2) **Self-Enhancing Humour:** Self-enhancing is involves being able to laugh at yourself and life’s absurdities. It’s often used a way to cope with stress, anxiety and feel better as a result. It is related to healthy managing with anxiety and stress.

(3) **Aggressive humor:** This style of humour involves put-downs or insults embattled toward individuals. When it is intended to threaten and harm others.

(4) **Self-defeating humor.** This kind of humour involves activities those putting yourself down in an aggressive or “poor me” fashion is called self-defeating humor. self-defeating humour is exclusively associated with negative effects among individuals who regularly use this style of humour.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of related literature pertaining to the present study has been given as under:

Dange & Jagannath (2012)^[3] found significance difference between rural and urban primary school teachers sense of humour.

Mikes et al. (2012)^[11] found that 94% of the men and 89 % of women agreed to the stereotype that men are funnier than women.

Dhiman & Chandel (2014)^[4] 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)^[2] 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.

Chandel & Dhiman (2016)^[1] 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.

Kumar & Dhiman (2020)^[7] 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 style.

Kanwar, S. (2021)^[6] conducted a study entitled sense of humour among secondary school teachers in relation to residential background, teaching experience, type of management and demographic variables and found that residential background, teaching experience, type of management, gender and age have no significant impact on sense of humour.

Kumar & Dhiman (2021)^[8] 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 & Kumar (2021)^[5] found no significant difference 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.

Mehta, A. (2023)^[10] found that senior secondary teachers did not differed significantly towards sense of humour in respect to residence background, marital status and age. Highly experienced senior secondary teachers were found more oriented towards generation & use of humour (HP) and over all sense of humour as compared to their low experienced counterparts.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

O. To find out the difference in the Styles of Humour of College Teachers based on their Education, Residence, Management Type and Type of Institution.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

H. There will be no significant difference in the styles of humour among college teachers based on their Education (Highly Qualified & Low Qualified), Residence (Rural & Urban), Management Type (Public & Private) and Type of Institution (General & Professional).

METHOD

The study was conducted through descriptive survey method of research. Population of the study comprised of all the college teachers teaching in Govt. and Private Colleges of Hamirpur District (H.P). Sample of the study comprised of 91 college teachers.

RESEARCH TOOL USED

In the present investigation Hindi adaptation of humour Style Questionnaire of Martin et al. (2003)^[10] by Prof. B. P. Verma was used to collect the data from college teachers.

SAMPLING

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

VARIABLES

In the present study, styles of humour were treated as dependent variable, whereas 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

Table-1 to Table-4 presents the calculated statistics of styles of humour among college teachers based on their education, residence, management type and type of institution.

The **Table-1** shows the calculated statistics of the styles of humour among teachers based on Education.

Table-1

Significance of Mean Differences in Styles of Humour Among College Teachers in Relation to their Education

Styles of Humour	Education	N	M	SD	df	't'-value	Significance
Affiliative Humour Styles	Low Qualified	48	27.93	4.52	89	0.58	NS
	High Qualified	43	28.46	4.55			
Self-Enhancing Humour Styles	Low Qualified	48	26.18	4.72	89	0.11	NS
	High Qualified	43	27.65	3.99			
Aggressive Humour Styles	Low Qualified	48	19.08	3.00	89	0.50	NS
	High Qualified	43	19.51	3.08			
Self-Defeating Humour Styles	Low Qualified	48	19.08	3.19	89	0.03	NS
	High Qualified	43	20.55	3.50			

NS=Not Significant at the Level of 0.05 Level of Significance

The **Table-1** shows that the 't'- values of Styles of Humour were found to be 0.58, 0.11, 0.50 and 0.03 with respect to affiliative humour, self-enhancing humour, aggressive humour and self-defeating humour styles, which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It means that college teachers do not differ significantly with regard to their style of humour based on their Education.

The **Table-2** present the calculated statistics of the styles of humour among teachers based on Residence.

Table-2

Significance of Mean Differences in Styles of Humour Among College Teachers in Relation to their Residence

Styles of Humour	Residence	N	M	SD	df	't'-value	Significance
Affiliative Humour Styles	Rural	50	27.68	4.80	89	0.23	NS
	Urban	41	28.80	4.11			
Self-Enhancing Humour Styles	Rural	50	26.1	4.45	89	0.06	NS
	Urban	41	27.82	4.25			
Aggressive Humour Styles	Rural	50	19.56	3.32	89	0.33	NS
	Urban	41	18.95	2.64			
Self-Defeating Humour Styles	Rural	50	20.42	3.34	89	0.04	NS
	Urban	41	19.00	3.36			

NS=Not Significant at the Level of 0.05 Level of Significance

The **Table-2** indicates that the 't'- values of Styles of Humour were found to be 0.23, 0.06, 0.33 and 0.04 with respect to affiliative humour, self-enhancing humour, aggressive humour and self-defeating humour styles, which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It means that college teachers do not differ significantly with regard to their style of humour based on their Residence.

The **Table-3** shows the calculated statistics of the styles of humour among teachers based on Management Type.

Table-3**Significance of Mean Differences in Styles of Humour Among College Teachers in Relation to their Management Type**

Styles of Humour	Management Type	N	M	SD	df	't'-value	Significance
Affiliative Humour	Public	46	28.65	4.40	89	0.32	NS
	Private	45	27.71	4.63			
Self-Enhancing Humour	Public	46	28.02	3.89	89	0.01	NS
	Private	45	25.71	4.67			
Aggressive Humour	Public	46	19.19	2.80	89	0.77	NS
	Private	45	19.37	3.28			
Self-Defeating Humour	Public	46	20.17	3.55	89	0.26	NS
	Private	45	19.37	3.28			

NS=Not Significant at the Level of 0.05 Level of Significance

It is evident from the **Table-3** that the 't'- values of styles of humour were found to be 0.32, 0.01, 0.77 and 0.26 with respect to affiliative humour, self-enhancing humour, aggressive humour and self-defeating humour styles, which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It means that college teachers do not differ significantly with regard to their style of Humour based on their Management Type.

The **Table-4** shows the calculated statistics of the styles of humour among teachers based on Type of Institution.

Table-4**Significance of Mean Differences in Styles of Humour Among College Teachers in Relation to their Type of Institution**

Styles of Humour	Type of Institution	N	M	SD	df	't'-value	Significance
Affiliative Humour Styles	General	41	28.63	4.64	89	0.39	NS
	Profession	50	27.82	4.42			
Self-Enhancing Humour Styles	General	41	28.02	4.10	89	0.02	NS
	Profession	50	25.94	4.51			
Aggressive Humour Styles	General	41	19.26	2.93	89	0.96	NS
	Profession	50	19.3	3.14			
Self-Defeating Humour Styles	General	41	20.31	3.64	89	0.18	NS
	Profession	50	19.34	3.16			

NS=Not Significant at the Level of 0.05 Level of Significance

The **Table-4** indicates that the 't'- values of styles of humour were found to be 0.39, 0.02, 0.96 and 0.18 with respect to affiliative humour, self-enhancing humour, aggressive humour and self-defeating humour styles, which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It means that college teachers do not differ significantly with regard to their style of humour based on their Management Type.

Hence, the null hypothesis stating that, "there will be no significant difference in the styles of humour of college teachers based on their Education (Highly Qualified & Low Qualified), Residence (Rural & Urban), Management Type (Public & Private) and Type of Institution (General & Professional)" was retained.'

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

- No significant differences were found in Styles of Humour among college teachers based on their Education, Residence, Management Type and Type of Institution.

➤ REFERENCES

- [1] Chandel, M.K., & Dhiman, R.K. (2016). A comparative study of humour styles among tribal and non-tribal secondary school teachers. *International journal, raj rajeshwari journal of psychological & educational research*. 1(2)-Oct,2016 ISSN 2455-7900
- [2] Chaniotakis, N. (2014). Humour in the Classroom: Teacher's Perceptions. *Studying Humour – International Journal*, 1, 1-12. <http://ejournals.lib.auth.gr/humour/article/view/4345>
- [3] Dange & Jagannath, K. (2012). Sense of Humour in relation to job Stress among Primary School Teachers. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Education*, 2(4), 173.
- [4] Dhiman, R.K., & Chandel, K. S. (2014). Humour style among prospective teachers' educators. *An International Journal of Education, Pedagogy of learning*, 2(1), 115-121.
- [5] Dhiman, R.K., & Kumar, M. (2021). Sense of humour of college teachers. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts (IJCRT)* 9(9), 352-354, ISSN 2320-2882.
- [6] Kanwar, S. (2020) Sense of humour among secondary school teachers in relation to residential background, teaching experience, type of management and demographic variables. [M.Phil. Thesis, Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla.]
- [7] Kumar, M., & Dhiman, R.K. (2020). Humour Styles among Government & Private Secondary Teachers. *Raj Rajeshwari Journal of Psychological & Educational Research (RRJPER)*, 4(2) & 5(1), 24-32. ISSN 2455-7900.
- [8] Kumar, M., & Dhiman, R.K. (2021). Humour styles among government secondary school teachers based on their gender. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts (IJCRT)*, 9 (1), 352-354, ISSN 2320-2882.
- [9] Martin, R. A., Doris, P. P., Larsen, G., Gray, J., & Kelly W. (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.
- [10] Mehta A. (2023) A Study of Sense of Humour Among Senior Secondary Teachers and Its Impact on their Job Satisfaction, Task Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. [Doctoral Thesis, Career Point University Kota].
- [11] Mikes, L., Walker, D, Parris, Mankoff, R, & Christenfeld, N. (2012) Who's funny: Gender stereotypes, humor production and memory bias. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 19(1), 108–112. [doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/s13423-011-0161-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/s13423-011-0161-2).