



Use of humour in language classes: an effective ‘filter’ or affective filter?

Hasan Bilokcuoglu ^{a *} , Emre Debreli ^b 

^a *European University of Lefke, English Preparatory School, Lefke, Northern Cyprus TR-10 Mersin, Turkey.*

^b *European University of Lefke, Faculty of Education, Department of ELT, Lefke, Northern Cyprus TR-10 Mersin, Turkey.*

APA Citation:

Bilokcuoglu, H., & Debreli, E. (2018). Use of humour in language classes: an effective ‘filter’ or affective filter? *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 14(3), 347-359.

Submission Date: 11/12/2017

Acceptance Date: 14/08/2018

Abstract

The role of the teacher’s personality can be placed amongst many factors that play a role in learning English as a second/foreign language. A teacher with a humorous character inevitably aids in reducing any potential fear that may be experienced by students in relation to the learning of a second language in the classroom (Bell, 2009; Chee, 2006). In this sense, humour can be seen as a valuable teaching tool particularly for establishing an effective classroom atmosphere and thus can be assumed to facilitate student learning outcomes. Since humour reflects one of the most authentic and universal speech undertakings in the human discourse, the use of humour within the context of second language pedagogy can display important advantages, not only for the language teacher, but also for the learner. For a constructive learning and teaching atmosphere in the communicative classroom, the ‘affective filter’ should be low - and one way of achieving this could be the use of humour. Additionally, it is apparent that humour can be employed to promote students’ motivation in learning the target language as well as reducing the possible tension that may occur in a language classroom. In light of the existing literature and having experienced the possible benefits of humour used in the classroom, we have sought to emphasise the significance of humour in the teaching/learning processes and stress the fact that, since it is an integral personal and interpersonal interaction, humour may be utilised as an effective tool in teaching and/or learning a second or foreign language.

© 2018 JLLS and the Authors - Published by JLLS.

Keywords: Humour; second language teaching; affective filter; SLA; second language learning

1. Introduction

Despite the fact that it is rarely discussed among educators and language researchers, humour is an undeniable element of classrooms, which in turn may influence the process of learning a language (Bell, 2009; Morrison, 2008; Pham, 2014). In this case, it is surprising that humour is seldomly used in the class, even on a conscious level, despite the knowledge that humour is an essential personal and interpersonal interaction. Humour may be utilised as a powerful instrument in language teaching and learning. It can also be considered as one of the most useful sources of motivation to study a second/foreign language since it can decrease the tension in the classroom and it can assist in encouraging learners to engage more in the activities used in the class (Pomerantz & Bell, 2011). It is

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +90392-660-2660
E-mail address: edebreli@eul.edu.tr

believed that students tend to generate productive and interesting answers when or if they are encouraged to be humorous. Furthermore, humour allows the teacher to become a facilitator as it can decrease the high level of authority of the teacher (Schmitz, 2002). From other aspects, humour can, amongst others, be used as a teaching strategy in order to manage undesired behaviours, build a positive classroom atmosphere, decrease anxiety, increase attention and interest; and it is a competent tool for relaxing shy and timid students and easing them into participation in group activities (Forman, 2011; Garner, 2006; Wagner & Eduardo, 2011). Since humour, when used effectively, can assist students in remembering essential facts and linguistic rules, the aim of this paper is to create awareness in the implications of pedagogical humour, as well as general classroom humour, as a positive teaching and/or learning tool.

2. Theoretical background

Although humour's linguistic aspects had not been given much attention by the Second Language Acquisition (SLA) researchers until the beginning of the 1980s, it has long been receiving attention from the disciplines like psychology and sociology since Plato's time. Since humour is an inevitable part of human life, it is a fundamental aspect of language. As Morrison (2008) states, humour stands as one of the few attributes universally applicable to all people and all languages in the world. Humour has only recently received importance as a fixture of classroom culture even though it has frequently been present within general education. After the introduction of humanistic approaches, on which today's contemporary methods are based, the classical educational models started to be replaced by more flexible approaches (Byrant, Comisky, & Zillman, 1979), and the use of humour in language classes has undergone nearly the same path. After the shift of the classical language classroom, based on the traditional grammar translation approach, behavioural approaches focused on conformity, repetition and cadence were substituted - for instance, the Audio-Lingual Method (ALM) - which allowed the usage of classroom humour. According to Schmitz (2002), the key feature of both language and humour is the creativity in communication. Therefore, with a new stress on veritable and productive language learning after the introduction of communicative syllabi in the early seventies and eighties, humour was ultimately introduced again. However, SLA researchers or second/foreign language educators have shown lack of undertaking to realise or discover the significant potential of humour in the language classroom. Since the 1970s, the research executed in the field of humour has led to over a hundred identified humour theories. Some of these are discussed in the following sections.

2.1. Arousal relief or relief theory (Berlyne, 1969)

This theory underlines the significance of the psychological aspects of humour and attempts to explain reasoning as to why something is perceived to be humorous at the mental level, that is, feelings and emotions caused by humorous circumstances. Particularly in the L2 classrooms, this theory suggests how anxiety and vexation can emerge because of the learners' shortage in the L2 rules may be eased with the employment of humour by the teacher.

2.2. The incongruity theory of humour

Berlyne (1960) points out that humorous response are brought out from exposure to stimuli that are surprising, shocking, or unexpected. This theory aims to explain the presence of humour at the intellectual level and points out the trigger for humour rather than the participating ones. In the

following joke, for example, humour is considered to be occurring due to the incongruity of the pupil's comprehension with the teacher's real aim:

Teacher: Billy, if you had two dollars in one pocket and five dollars in another, what would you have?

Billy: someone else's pants, ma'am (Deneire, 1995, p. 292).

2.3. *The incongruity-resolution theory*

Another aspect of the incongruity theory suggests that reaction occurs upon realisation that two incongruous words are used relatedly (Suls, 1983); that is, the subject who hears the joke may not make out the humour in it if he/she cannot connect two elements. For example, someone may fail in finding humour in the name 'Tiny' until he/she discovers that reference is being made to a seven feet tall volleyball player. This theory can aid the language teachers adjust their humour to their students' proficiency level.

2.4. *The superiority theory*

The other theory that puts an emphasis on instructor humour is the superiority theory, which examines humour at the social and behavioural level. This theory is grounded on the feature that people find the shortcomings, failures or inadequacies of others as humorous (Wolff, Smith, & Murray, 1934). It is suggested that when people are not threatened by incongruities, we may laugh at them (Lyttle, 2007). Nevertheless, in the classroom context, it can be argued that laughing at the weaknesses of others should not be the major generator of humour; which is the significant point that makes humour in the class differ compared to out-of-class, real world humour. As there are specific norms and ethical considerations that take place between instructors and students in the classroom, it is not expected to laugh at the failures of others. In one way, instructors are to create space for learners to err and to learn rather than to laugh at each other's failures or their inabilities. In addition to the above-mentioned social-psychological theories of humour, linguists also suggested ways to discover what makes something to be perceived as funny at the language level. These are:

2.4.1. *The General Theory of Verbal Humour (GTVH)*

A linguistics-based theory suggested by Atterdo & Raskin (1991), points out that to interpret a joke or humorous text, we need to employ semantic scripts (schemas), that is, the hearer's applying linguistic ability and real-world knowledge. Like the incongruity-resolution, GTVH examines why, at the lexical level, learners seem to find teacher's humour funny. Students can find the instructor's use of verbal humour, like wordplays, irony and puns humorous since they are compatible with two scripts which oppose each other- such as normal vs. abnormal, actual vs. non-actual, possible vs. impossible. In the following instance, the lecturer's use of the short form 'PhD' (a person who holds a doctor of philosophy degree) represents a *normal* script and is associated with being knowledgeable. On the other hand, seeing the interpretation of 'PhD' here defined as 'permanent head damage' represents the *abnormal* script and reflects a person who is mentally disabled, and ordinarily unlikely to be knowledgeable, so hereby evaluated as humorous. The following is the example:

Lecturer: do you have any idea what PhD stands for?

Student: no response

Lecturer: Permanent Head Damage (laughs)

Class: laughter

(Ziyaeemehr, Kumar, & Faiz, 2011)

2.4.2. *The Instructional Humour Processing Theory*

Another theory recently suggested by Wanzer, Frymier, & Irwin, (2009), the Instructional Humour Processing Theory, shortly IHPT, emphasises that the humorous messages that the instructors utilise should lead to increase in student motivation, rise in attention and to the creation of a positive effect. In addition to theories, some researchers have attempted to categorise the use of humour in the classroom. For instance, in 1979, Bryant, Comisky, Crane, & Zillman classified humour as puns, riddles, jokes, funny stories, humours comments, and other humorous items. Shade (1996), for example, suggests four main categories:

- (a) Figural humour (caricatures, cartoons, comic strips)
- (b) Verbal humour (puns, jokes, satire, irony, wit, riddles, etc.)
- (c) Visual humour (sight gags, impersonation, practical jokes, impressions)
- (d) Auditory humour (noises and sounds)

In addition to Shade, Hativa (2001) divides humour into three main categories: verbal humour, non-verbal humour, and a combination of the two. More recently, Chee (2006) classified humour under four major categories:

- (a) Textual: jokes, stories
- (b) Pictorial: comics, cartoons
- (c) Action/Games: video, contests, theatre, simulation, role play
- (d) Verbal: acronym, puns, word games

Özdoğan & Robert (2013) underline that humour can assist with maintaining student interest and comfort highlights how its usage allows teachers to diffuse embarrassing situations for both instructors and students; and in doing so, emphasise the direct advantageous effects of humour on learning. According to Wagner & Eduardo (2011), humour acts as an attention-getter and tension-reducer. In addition, he suggests that both student and teacher errors should be dealt with a humane manner – stating that ‘to err is to human, but also, to err is humorous’. Forman (2011) underlines that use of humour in a primary school classroom resulted in reduced tension. He also proposes that excessive or too much tension leads to negative effects on learning, but also that lack of or too little tension will also lead to similar negative effects. Thus, the frequency of humour usage in classrooms should be balanced. According to Pomerantz & Bell (2011), humorous examples, test items or test instructions may lead to the reduction of anxiety on intellectually demanding tasks. They believe that a positive atmosphere can be created by starting each class with humour which can help students to relax. Medgyes (2002) and Özdoğan & Robert (2013) emphasises that the overall learning process can become more enjoyable by the use of humour and it can be utilised as an ice-breaker. It can also be a powerful tool to moderate stress and promote creativity. This can be achieved on the condition that teachers integrate humour with content, using it both planned and spontaneously. Pham (2014) notes that although humour in the class cannot resolve all classroom management issues, it can be a perfect preventative tool for them.

It is evident that humour in classrooms can be employed not only for lowering the level of tension or anxiety, but also for the creation of conducive learning. It can also be an ideal way of presenting structural linguistic elements or units which are presented rigorously. The following examples demonstrate how playing with the linguistic elements can sometimes result in amusing meanings:

(A) Lexical level

By playing on morphemes, as in the following examples, humour can be created.

Example 1:

A: What's a baby pig called?

B: A piglet

A: What's a baby toy called?

B: A toilet

(Ravichand, 2013)

In the above joke, 'let' is a diminutive suffix that means 'small'. Hence, we see the creation of a new word meaning for a small toy intentionally created for the purpose of humour.

Example 2:

Teacher: Sally, you're pretty dirty.

Sally: Yes, and I'm even prettier when I'm clean.

(Roura, 1995)

In example 2, the dual meanings of 'pretty' (1.very, 2. beautiful) results in a humorous situation, just like the word 'crab' in example 4 (1.a crustacean, 2. a cranky person) and 'spirit' in example 5 (1.the soul regarded as separating from the body at death, 2.any distilled alcoholic liquor)

In an EFL or ESL classroom, through humorous examples as above, it can be possible to teach one of the language units, -morphemes- which are the smallest meaningful units in a linguistic system, in an indirect and humorous way. By this way, it can be assumed that learners can acquire and internalise the functions of morphemes easier. The significance of humour here is that it may make the instruction more enjoyable and may aid learners with remembering the functions of morphemes and help them become more aware of the possibility of dual meanings of a word.

(B) Phonological level

Playing on language sounds, stress, intonation, and pronunciation may result in a phonological humour, as can be seen in the following example:

Example:

A: How do you make a cat drink?

B: Easy, put it in the liquidizer.

(Ravichand, 2013)

In the above example of 'cat drink', English stress and intonation produces the ambiguity, and in terms of semantics, it results in two possible interpretations:

A drink for a cat

The way to make a cat drink

Through a humorous example as above, it can be assumed that learners can be made aware of the significance of intonation, stress, rises and falls or small pauses in our speech which can lead to different meanings. By this way, we can assume that learners may remember the importance of language sounds that the way something is uttered may sometimes lead to different meanings; thus, they can modify their speech accordingly.

(C) Syntactic+Lexicon Level

Example:

A: How do you make a horse fast?

B: Don't give it anything for a while

(Deneire, 1995, p.290)

This combined example of syntax and lexicon shows the ambiguity of the two meanings for *fast* (1.rapid movement, 2.an abstinence from food, or a limiting of one's food, especially when voluntary and as a religious observance) as well as the use of *fast* as a verb or adjective.

Looking at the example above, it can be possible to make learners think critically towards the use of certain words in a statement that they may function and mean differently. By this way, learners can be made aware of the significance of parts of speech in a statement; that is, a word in a statement may sometimes function as a noun or as an adjective. By providing a humorous example, this can be taught in a more enjoyable way, rather than in a rigours way. We assume that, in this way, learners may remember, acquire or internalise those particular linguistic functions more easily.

(D) Syntactic Level

Syntactic ambiguity may be created depending on a ‘duality’ of semantic interpretations motivated by the structural patterns of the language system (Lew, 1996), as seen in the following examples:

Example 1:

A: Your dog’s been chasing a man on a bike.

B: Don’t be stupid! My dog can’t ride a bike! (Roura, 1995)

Example 2:

A lady went into a clothing store and asked: ‘May I try that dress in the window?’

‘Well, replied the sales clerk doubtfully, ‘don’t you think it would be better to use the dressing room?’ (Partinton, 2006)

The pattern of word order and the possibility of a word’s dual meaning can mean two possible meanings can be taught through a humorous example in an EFL or ESL classroom. By this way, learners can be aided with teaching those aspects of a language system in a more positive environment and help them with remembering those functions easier.

(i) Pragmatic level:

Example:

Researcher: Have you got a watch, Ali?

Student (Ali): Yes, sir, and it’s a very expensive one

Researcher: Oh cool...and the time is..?

(Laughter)

In the above example, the lack of perception by the student of the author’s real intention (to learn the time) led to this humorous situation. In an EFL or ESL classroom, in a humorous way, a teacher’s indirect teaching of the significance of ‘hidden or indirect’ meaning can sometimes be possible in any language system. By this way, it is assumed that learner may become aware of the pragmatic elements of language and may remember or consider those aspects of language when speaking or listening.

(ii) Syntactic level:

Example 1:

Researcher: Ayşe, have you ever written a book?

Ayşe (student): No, Sir. Not yet, maybe in the future. Have you ever written one?

Researcher: Yes, maybe a hundred times.

Ayşe: Wow! That's a lot.
Researcher: Why are you surprised? It's not so difficult to write a book.
Ayşe: Oh isn't it, sir?
Researcher: Sure. Just put the letters b-o-o-k together on a piece of paper!
(Laughter)

Through a humorous example as above, it can be possible to make learners think critically towards the use of certain words in a statement that they may function and mean different.

We believe that, before the actual teaching/instruction, humour can initially be provided, and then the instructor (and also the learners) can move on to examine the aspects/elements of linguistic systems. By this way, we assume that instead of having a dread, boring, authoritative, and insipid learning/teaching environment, language teachers can turn their language classrooms into a more contextualised, enjoyable, conductive, collective, and more humanistic learning and teaching settings.

3. Appropriate utilization of humour as a guideline

According to Bell (2009), humour can be considered as effective when it can reflect the personality of the teacher and when it is appropriate to the context and situation. The appropriate use of humour can become a powerful tool when it can create a sense of community, reduce conflict and produce creativity. Garner (2006) points out that humour decreases the natural unfairness of the status relationship and the situation with the students, as well as increasing the sense of ease that people may have. On the other hand, inappropriate use of humour can produce an unfriendly learning atmosphere that promptly destroys self-esteem and communication.

Wagner & Eduardo (2011) and Morrison (2008) claim that how humour is received by students depends on the manner in which humour is delivered. Instructors should be careful not to deliver humour through insult or sarcasm, since they can defeat the utility served by humour. In addition, they believe that sexually suggestive humour must not be made if it is not directly associated with content, such as sexual education. Great care should be exercised if and/or when such humour is utilised. Schmitz (2002) considers teachers as being powerful role models; and as such, teachers may utilise suitable humour in order to improve a sense of community in the classroom. He claims that humour can be integrated into classrooms in a way that can foster an openness and respect between students and teachers. It is accurate to say that when/if students feel safe in the classroom they will possibly enjoy their learning process; thus, the thoughtfully used of humour by teachers can assist in teaching more effectively.

According to Morrison (2008), if humour is utilised unsuitably it can likely harm feelings, lead to embarrassment and poor self-esteem. In consequence of this, taking into consideration the possibility that humour can be abusive, it is imperative that there are guidelines with regard to the utilisation of humour in the class. In this regard, Pomerantz & Bell (2011) highlight that humour employed by teachers in classrooms should feel natural to the students; otherwise it may backfire. Additionally, Sullivan (1992) points out that valuable class time can be demolished and the class can become unmanageable.

Humour has been viewed as a climate-creating tool in the recent years. Korobkin (1988) notes that up until the 20th century, teachers believed that teaching was a serious business, and therefore humour had no place in the classroom. As a result, the significance of humour was ignored. The same author further claims that in order to carry on with serious business, college teachers consciously chose to be

humourless. However, the seriousness in their behaviour may disregard many significant advantages that humour can present. Korobkin (1988) suggests, “Humour increases retention of material, student-teacher rapport, attentiveness and interest, motivation towards and satisfaction with learning, playfulness and positive attitude, individual and group task productivity, class discussion and animation, and creativity, idea generation and divergent thinking” (p.115). According to Korobkin, humour helps with decreasing academic stress, anxiety towards subject matter, dogmatism and class monotony. Pham (2014) highlights that sarcasm by virtue of its harsh nature, may lead to poor teacher-student relationships and poor student self-esteem. Herbert (1991) notes that it is beneficial to start the class with a joke, telling a funny anecdote, and employing visual instances of humour. Yet, he also stresses that it should have a purpose, rather than being aimless.

4. Why should humour be used in classrooms?

It is a commonly accepted fact that laughter supports us in forgetting about our problems, our fears and even ourselves for a moment in time. However, some teachers see this moment as a loss of control or poor classroom management and thus seen as something to be evaded. Nevertheless, humour in a communicative classroom should be utilised and should have a specific purpose. One reason for using humour is its effect of providing space for the introverted student in classes to take part in the group (Provine, 2000). If humour is used correctly, the student can develop a feeling that s/he is a part of the class and can possibly participate without losing face. This is particularly important in a communicative classroom where the focus is on authentic communication, participation and interaction. Since humour is a part of our lives and it plays a great role in our everyday social life, then it cannot be excluded from our everyday classroom learning. Although the fields of humour and laughter have not been closely studied in comparison to some other areas within the field of language education, their role in education and medicine were examined by Wells (1974) and more recently by Provine (2000) in ‘The Science of Laughter’, *Psychology Today*. The results of Loomax’s & Moosavi’s study (1998) revealed that humour can be an extremely useful tool in education since humour in the class can reduce tension, improve classroom climate, and can enhance enjoyment and student-teacher rapport. Similarly, Kristmanson (2000) points out the significance of the affective conditions in L2 teaching and underlines that it is salient for the instructor to maintain a ‘positive atmosphere’ for learning. Humour, in the sense of being able to reduce stress and anxiety, can enhance an affirmative classroom atmosphere.

5. The place of humour in EFL/ESL classrooms

Although some EFL/ESL teachers seemingly disregard humour in class for the reason that it is unserious for teaching aims, others employ it in order to provide a ground for entertainment, enliven the learners or to give them a break from the monotonous or tiring class work. Humour, in fact, can be used in various ways effectively and for various purposes in L2 learning. Schmitz (2002) claims that humorous discourse should be introduced in the initial stages of the teaching session, and that it should be continued throughout the language teaching program. He also believes that in order to gravitate to the linguistic competence of the learner, the humorous materials need to be selected accordingly. He maintains that the application of humour should start with universal humour towards humorous discourse. Claire (1984) points out the significance of humour, stating that: “the nature of the subject humour insures enthusiastic student involvement in class conversations. No other subject generates such lively participation, covering so many different linguistic skills” (p.5). Bell (2009) states that

existing language teaching approaches should include humour harmoniously since the advantageous side of humour is that it can be employed with any language teaching methods or approaches. He believes that humorous materials may add multifariousness to the classroom learning, providing reduction in pressure that many students may feel during the class time. While the application of humorous texts in classes ought to be planned by the teacher, it should give the learners a feeling of being spontaneous. Similarly, Watson & Emerson (1988) note that:

When humour is planned as part of the teaching strategy, a caring environment is established, there is an attitude of flexibility, and communication between student and teacher is that of freedom and openness. The tone is set allowing for human error with freedom to explore alternatives in the learning situation. This reduces the authoritarian position of the teacher, allowing the teacher to be a facilitator of the learning process. Fear and anxiety, only natural in a new and unknown situation, becomes less of a threat, as a partnership between student and instructor develops (p.89).

Medgyes (2002) identifies that if laughter is included in a class, learning may become more enjoyable and less stressful, and that therefore it is the teacher's job to create an open environment. Hashem (1994) notes that plays and humour utilised in classrooms are useful when they "...relieve tension, facilitate students' understanding of materials or content, and encourage students' participation. Besides, helping to create a more pleasant classroom atmosphere, play and humour make it easier for students to work cooperatively and learn from each other as well as from the teacher"(p.16). Crump's study (1996) reveals that the most motivating behaviour (of the twelve types of behaviour) suggested by students is humour.

Maurice (1988) reports "...humour can easily be seen as a way of activating motivation and directing attention, but it can also be used in other events as well, from stimulating recall to eliciting performance and providing feedback" (p.20). On the other hand, Deneire (1995) states that humour is still 'underused' in the foreign language classroom even though numerous studies have displayed its positive effects.

6. Drawbacks of too much humour

Possible negative effects of overusing humour in the classroom may need to be given extra attention by researchers of pedagogical humour. Pomerantz & Bell (2011) underline that humour needs to be age-suitable in order to be beneficial and effective. Zillman & Bryant (1983) claim that specifically sarcastic humour may lead to confusion, particularly among the learners who are listening carelessly or reading non-verbal clues inappropriately. Downs, Javidi, & Nussbaum (1988) discovered evidence for possible unfavourable effects of overused humour. In a comparative study of humour utilisation by 'award winning' and 'ordinary' teachers, it has been displayed that award-winning teachers utilised humour less frequently than ordinary teachers. The authors have interpreted this situation as indicating that overused humour or self-disclosure is not suitable since it produces undesired effects; therefore, moderate amounts should be preferred. Similarly, Forman (2011) cautions that too much humour targeted at a particular person may result in a negative misinterpretation and perceived harassment depending on the type of humour used. Despite the fact that many researchers warn about the possibility of negative effects in using humour in learning, most are also very open in underlining its multiple beneficial effects. It is clear, however, that the negative side of pedagogical humour calls for more in-depth research.

7. Conclusions and implications

In this paper, we reviewed the literature on the use and effectiveness of humour in language classrooms. Our review suggests that humour has much potential in creating an affirmative environment and for establishing a less authoritarian way of teaching, leading to the reduction of affective filter among learners. Humour can also be viewed as a motivating factor since learners may become eager to attend their courses as a result of its utilisation in classrooms. This not only applies to language classrooms, but can also be valid for mainstream education classrooms, where humour is often noted to increase student motivation, decrease anxiety (affective factors), creates a more conducive learning environment (more humanistic), and a more authentic environment. In particular to second and foreign language learning, humour is often noted to contribute students learning in terms of understanding how words are formed through highlighting the morphemes, and such vocabulary often become easier to be recognized by the students. Furthermore, learning of specific issues through the integration of humour are said to result in new information going into students long-term memory (Bell, 2009). In light of Krashen's (1982) affective filter hypothesis and the significance of retaining low affective filter (facilitating a relaxed learning atmosphere), it is suggested that teachers should act to reduce the tension or anxiety in classrooms. One strong way of doing this is the inclusion of finely balanced humour in the classroom. It is by this way that students' psychological comfort can be established and a fruitful learning environment can be boosted. The related literature to date has demonstrated some solid theoretical and practical evidence on the significant role of humour in second and foreign language education. Yet, what appears to be lacking is the provision of more insight into classroom humour so as to gain better comprehension as to why humour can provide a better learning environment.

Such effective outcomes of the integration of humour may have important implications for foreign and second language learning and teaching in Turkish education system. First, the teaching style in language classrooms in Turkey has been noted to be traditional and teacher-centred (Ozturk, 2011), in which language teachers often employ an authoritarian way of teaching. This type of teacher role often yields to passive learner portrait in which teacher-student interaction is at the minimum. This then brings less sharing and less rapport between the teachers and the students; therefore less willingness and motivation on part of the students (Bell, 2009). On the other side, in order for learning to become more effective, it is said that students in the classroom should share more with the teacher, and that learning can become more enjoyable (Kocaoluk & Kocaoluk, 2001). This should be something Turkish EFL teachers should consider in the current education system in Turkey, in which the traditional teacher portrait still dominates the classrooms, although the way it is supposed to be is just the opposite as mentioned in the recent curricula. Second, teachers' lack of ability to establish rapport with the students is another widely encountered issue in language classrooms of Turkey (Ustunoglu, 2007). In order to overcome this tension, humour can be seen as a potential strategy to be included in language classrooms. By this way, more friendly and humanistic classroom atmospheres could be established, which would then positively affect teaching-learning process. Last but not least, ELT departments in Turkish universities may consider putting more emphasis on the affective strategies of language learning and teaching just as equal as the methodological considerations of the language teaching and learning. By this way, teacher candidates' awareness can be increased in terms of the importance of the role of affective issues in language learning.

References

- Attardo, S., & Raskin, V. (1991). Script theory revis(it)ed: joke similarity and joke representation model. *HUMOR: International Journal of Humor Research*, 4 (3/4), 293–347.
- Bell, N. D. (2009). Learning about and through humor in the second language classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 13 (3), 241-258.
- Berlyne, D. E. (1960). *Conflict, arousal, and curiosity*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Berlyne, D. E. (1969). Laughter, humor, and play. In G. Lindzey, & E. Aronson (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (pp. 795–852). Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.
- Bryant, J., Comisky, P., & Zillman, D. (1979). Teachers' humor in the college classroom. *Communication Education*, 28, 110-118
- Chee, A. (2006). *Humor in TEYL-Reducing classroom anxiety*. Retrieved from <http://www.teyl.org/article2.html>
- Claire, E. (1984). *What's So Funny? A Foreign Student's Introduction to American Humor*. Rochelle Park, NJ: Eardley.
- Crump, C.A. (1996). *Teacher immediacy: What students consider to be effective teacher behaviours*. Retrieved 04.05.2016 from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/EJ839897.pdf>
- Deneire, M. (1995). Humor and Foreign Language Teaching. *Humor*, 8, 285-298.
- Downs, V. C., Javidi, M., & Nussbaum, J. F. (1988). An analysis of teachers' verbal communication within the college classroom: Use of humor, self-disclosure, and narratives. *Communication Education*, 37, 127-141.
- Forman, R. (2011). Humorous language play in a Thai EFL classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 32 (5), 541-565.
- Garner, R. L. (2006). Humor in pedagogy: How ha-ha can lead to aha! *College Teaching*, 54 (1), 177-180.
- Hashem, M. B. (1994). *Play and humor in the college classroom: Using play as a teaching technique in interpersonal communication classes*. Paper presented at the Central States Communication Association, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.
- Hativa, N. (2001). *Teaching for Effective Learning in Higher Education*. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Herbert, P. (1991). *Humor in the classroom: Theories, functions, and guidelines*. Chicago, IL: Central States Communication Association.
- Kocaoluk, F. & Kocaoluk, M. S. (2001). *Primary Education Curriculum 1999-2000*. Istanbul: Kocaoluk publishers.
- Korobkin, D. (1988). Humor in the classroom: Considerations and strategies. *College Teaching*, 36, 154-158.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language learning and acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Kristmanson, P. (2000). Affect: in the Second Language Classroom: How to create an emotional climate. *Reflexions*, 19, (2), 1-5.

- Lew, R. (1996). Exploitation of linguistic ambiguity in Polish and English jokes. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, 31, 127-133.
- Lyttle, J. (2007). The Judicious Use and Management of Humor In The Workplace. *Business Horizons*, 50, 239-245.
- Maurice, K. (1988). Laugh while learning another language: Techniques that are functional and funny. *English Teaching Forum*, 26 (2), 20-24.
- Medgyes, P. (2002). *Laughing Matters: Humor in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morrison, M. K. (2008). *Using humor to maximize learning: The links between positive emotions and education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Özdoğru, A. A., & Robert, F. M. (2013). Humorous cartoons in college textbooks: student perceptions and learning. *Humor*, 26(1), 135-154.
- Ozturk, H. I. (2011). Curriculum reform and teacher autonomy in Turkey: the case of the history teaching. *International Journal of Instruction*, 4 (2), 113-128.
- Partington, A.S. (2006). *The Linguistics of Laughter. A corpus-assisted study of laughter-talk*. Routledge, London.
- Pham, H. N. H. (2014). *The use of humour in EFL teaching: A case study of Vietnamese teachers' and students' perceptions and practices* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Canberra, Australia).
- Pomerantz, A., & Bell, N. D. (2011). Humor as safe house in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 148-161.
- Provine, R. (2000). *Laughter: A scientific investigation*. New York: Viking
- Ravichand, M. (2013). Humor-An Aid to Learning and Instruction. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 11(1), 18-21.
- Roura, M.T.S. (1995). Syntactic ambiguity as a device in British humour. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* (8), 209-28.
- Schmitz, J.B. (2002). Humor as a pedagogical tool in foreign language and translation courses. *Humor*, 15, 89-113.
- Shade, A. (1996). *License to laugh: Humor in the classroom*. Connecticut: Greenwood publishing.
- Sullivan, R.L. (1992). Students learn more when they're having fun. *Vocational Journal*, 67, (3), 36-38.
- Suls, J.M. (1983). Cognitive processes in humor appreciation. In P. E. McGhee, & J. H. Goldstein (Eds.), *Handbook of Humor Research*, pp. 39-57. New York: Springer.
- Ustunoglu, F. (2007). University students' perceptions of native and non-native teachers. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 13 (1), 63-79.
- Wanzer, M. B., Frymier, A. B., & Irwin, B. (2009). *An explanation of the relationship between teacher humor and student learning: Instructional humor processing theory*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association.
- Wagner, M., & Eduardo, U. A. (2011). The use of humor in the foreign language classroom: funny and effective? *Humor*, 24 (4), 399-434.

- Watson, M.J., & Emerson, S. (1988). Facilitate learning with humor. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 2 (2), 89-90.
- Wells, D.A. (1974). *The relationship between the humor of elementary school teachers and the perception of students* (Doctoral Dissertation, United States International University, San Diego).
- Wolff, H.A, Smith, C.E., & Murray, H. (1934). The Psychology of Humor: A study of responses to race-disparagement jokes. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 28, 341-364
- Zillmann, D., & Bryant, J. (1983). Uses and effects of humor in educational ventures. In P. E. McGhee, & J. H. Goldstein (Eds.), *Handbook of Humor Research* (pp. 173-193). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Ziyaemehr, A., Kumar, & V., Faiz, S.A. (2011). Use and Non-use of Humor in Academic ESL Classrooms. *English Language Teaching*, (4) 3, 111-119

Esprî: Duygusal engele etkili bir szge mi? ‘Esprinin dil sınıflarındaki kullanımı’

z

Olduka aıktır ki yabancı veya ikinci dil olarak İngilizce ğrenmede rol oynayan pek ok etmen vardır, ki bunlardan bir tanesi de ğretmenin karakterinin rol olabilmektedir. Esprili bir ğretmenin, ders sırasında ğrenci zerinde oluabilecek ‘korku’nun azalmasında etken olabileceđi aıktır. Esprinin, ğretim alanında, zellikle etkili bir sınıf ortamı yaratmada, etkili bir ara olması dolayısıyla, ğrencinin ğrenim birikimine yardımcı bir ara olası beklenir. Ayrıca, esprî evrensel konuma eylemlerinin en zgn tarafını yansıttıđından, ikinci dil eđitim bilimi bađlamında, hem ğrenci hemde ğretmen zerinde nemli faydalar gstermesi gerekmektedir. ‘İletken’ bir ğretim-ğrenim ortamı iin, esprî bir ara olarak kullanılabilir. Dahası, sphesizdir ki esprî, ğrencinin motivasyonunu ykseltmede ve de sınıf iinde oluabilecek heyecanı (gerginliđi) azaltmada kullanılabilir. Araırmacı, literatr taraması ve esprinin sınıf ii kullanımının muhtemel faydalarını tecrbe etmesinin iıđında, esprinin ğretim ve ğrenim srecindeki nemine vurgu yapmaya alımı, ki esprî, bir konumada, kiinin veya kiiler arası etkileimin ayrılmaz bir parasıdır ve de yabancı veya ikinci dil ğrenim-ğretim srecinde etkili bir ara olarak kullanılabilir.

Anahtar szckler: esprî; ikinci dil ğretimi; dil sınıfları; duygusal szge; ikinci dil edinimi.

AUTHOR BIODATA

Hasan BİLOKCUOĐLU is a lecturer at European University of Lefke, Northern Cyprus. He is currently doing his doctorate in ELT. His expertise includes: applications of the schemata theory onto reading comprehension. Additionally, he is interested in the effects of cultural schemata and reading comprehension, and English for Specific Purposes.

Emre DEBRELİ is an associate professor doctor at European University of Lefke, Northern Cyprus. He received his M.A from University of Essex, UK, and his PhD from University of Reading, UK. His area of interests includes teacher education, teacher cognition, and pedagogy.