وزارة التعليم العالي والبحث العلمي
الجامعة العراقية
كلية التربية للبنات
AL IRAQIA UNIVERSITY
الجامعة العراقية

مجلة كلية التربية للبنات

مجلة دورية فصلية محكمة

تصدر عن كلية التربية للبنات

FONT USED : THAMANT ENNAR KUFNA LIGHT2

٣٤/ج١
العدد الرابع والثلاثون
١٥ ايلول
١٤٤٨هـ ٢٠٢٦ م

ISSN (print): 2708 - 1354 ISSN (online): 2708 - 1362

الرؤية والرسالة والهدف

الرؤية (Vision) :

الريادة في مجال نشر البحوث العلمية ، والسعي للوصول لتصنيف عالٍ متقدم بين المجلات العلمية المحكمة ، وأن تكون مجلتنا نبراساً للعلم والمعرفة ، وواجهة علمية وثقافية مشرقة لكليتنا الموقرة ورمزاً خلاقاً يجمع بين الأصالة والحداثة.

الرسالة (Mission) :

إثراء الحركة العلمية بأجود أنواع البحوث والدراسات المتخصصة والتربوية ، التي تربط بين الأصالة والحداثة ضمن اطار حضاري بناء ، باستثارة همم الباحثين وتنمية قدراتهم في النشر العلمي الأصيل وباللغتين العربية والإنكليزية ، وبما يُسهم حتماً في إيصال الفكر الوطني / التربوي لكل شعوب العالم . وإتاحة الفرصة للباحثين لتقديم الصورة الحقيقية الناصعة لدور المرأة في المجتمع الإنساني ككل وفي بلدنا العراق بشكل خاص.

الأهداف (Aims) :

تسعى مجلتنا إلى تحقيق الأهداف الآتية :

١.تنشيط البحث العلمي التخصصي في العلوم الإنسانية والمجالات التربوية وقضايا المرأة .

٢.تشجيع البحوث والدراسات والأنشطة العلمية التي تربط الأصالة بالحداثة وصولاً إلى تنمية الاعتزاز بماضينا الجميل والاختيار الواعي لما في الحداثة من توجيهات ينتفع منها الجيل الجديد .

٣. التواصل العلمي والبحثي الهادف مع المراكز العلمية ، والعلماء والباحثين لإبراز دور المرأة في المجتمع علمياً وتربوياً ، وإبراز نشاطاتها البناءة في مجال التخصص والتعليم .

٤.تسليط الضوء والاهتمام عما وصلت إليه المرأة لعراقية من رقي ومساهمة فاعلة في التنمية المستدامة لمجتمعنا الطيب .

٥.تنمية الوعي التربوي لدى الجيل الجديد من خلال استعراض الأفكار والأنشطة التربوية والتعليمية التي تساهم في انماء روح الاحترام للأصالة والانتقاء الواعي للحداثة.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

﴿ الرَّحْمَٰنُ ﴿١﴾ عَلَّمَ الْقُرْآنَ ﴿٢﴾ خَلَقَ
الْإِنسَانَ ﴿٣﴾ عَلَّمَهُ الْبَيَانَ ﴾

سورة الرحمن: الآيات ١ - ٤

مجلة كلية التربية للبنات

مجلة علمية محكمة

دورية فصلية

تصدر عن كلية التربية للبنات

Iraqia University

Journal of the College of Education for Women: A Peer-Reviewed Academic Journal

جـهة الإصدار: كلية التربية للبنات / الجامعة العراقية اختصاص الـمجلة: العلوم الإنسانية والتربوية

ISSN 2708-1354 (Print)

ISSN 2708-1362 (Electronic)

رقم الاعتـماد في دار الكتب والوثائق العراقية 2138 لسنة 2016م نوع الإصدار: (فصلي) كل ثلاثة أشهر.

نطاق التوزيع: داخل العراق البريد الإلكتروني:-

wom.mag.uni@aliraqia.edu.iq

هاتف سكرتارية التحرير: 07747936814 (الهاتف الأرضي) داخلي: (2028)

مجلة كلية التربية للبنات – الجامعة العراقية ، المجلات الأكاديمية المحكمة:

https://www.iasj.net/iasj/journal/349/issues

- **حقوق النشر محفوظة.**
- **الحقوق محفوظة للمجلة.**
- **الحقوق محفوظة للباحث من تاريخ تسليم البحث إلا في حالة تنازله الخطي.**

ما ينشر في المجلة من بحوث ووجهات نظر تعبر عن أصحابها

ولا تعبر بالضرورة عن آراء هيئة التحرير أو وجهة نظر الكلية.

التعريف:

مجلة علمية دورية محكمة فصلية تصدر عن كلية التربية للبنات الجامعة العراقية تعنى بنشر البحوث في المجالات الإنسانية والتربوية

تحمل الرقم الدولي:

ISSN (print): 2708 - 1354 ISSN (online): 2708 - 1362

مجلة معتمدة في دار الكتب والوثائق العراقية بالرقم: (2138) لسنة 2016م

وتقوم بنشر البحوث العلمية القيمة والأصيلة

في مجالات العلوم الإنسانية المختلفة باللغتين العربية والإنجليزية.

دعـــوة:

ترحب هيئة تحرير المجلة بإســـهامات الباحثين، وأصـــحاب الأقلام من الكتاب والمثقفين في أقســـام الفكر الإســـلامي، والعلوم الإنســـانية، والاجتماعية، والتعليمية والتربوية، وكل ما لـه صـــلة بشـــؤون المرأة والمجتمع، وقضـــايا الإنماء التربوي والتعليمي، والبرامج التطويرية المعاصـــرة على وجه العموم ، على وفق قواعد النشـر المعتمدة من هيئة تحرير المجلة ، على وفق تعليمات وضـوابط النشـر في الـــمجلات العلمية الصادرة من دائرة البحث والتطوير في وزارة التعليم والبحث العلمي الموقرة.

أولاً : رئيس هيئة التحرير:

الأستاذ الدكتور

ورقاء مقداد حيدر / قسم الشريعة / الفقه المقارن

ثانياً : مدير التحرير:

الأستاذ الدكتور

أحمد عبد الجبار فاضل/ اللغة العربية / البلاغة والنقد/ قسم اللغة العربية

ثالثاً : أعضاء هيئة التحرير:

١.	أ.د. مولود عويمر: تخصص: التاريخ / جامعة الجزائر / كلية العلوم الإنسانية	عضواً خارجياً.
٢.	أ.د. إبراهيم عبد الرحيم أحمد ربابعة: تخصص: أصول فقه / جامعة الوصل / كلية الدراسات الإسلامية/ الإمارات العربية .	عضواً خارجياً
٣.	أ.د. عبد الملك بو منجل: تخصص: اللغة العربية/ النقد الأدبي/جامعة سطيف ٢ ، الجزائر/ كلية الآداب واللغات .	عضواً خارجياً.
٤.	أ..م.د نجاة موسى الفيتوري : تخصص: تربية وعلم نفس/علم نفس تعليمي/ الجامعة الأسمرية الإسلامية / كلية التربية / ليبيا .	عضواً خارجياً
٥.	أ.م.د نجاح عبدالله احمد البياع : تخصص: الدراسات الإسلامية / الدعوة والثقافة الإسلامية/ جامعة الأزهر / كلية أصول الدين / مصر .	عضواً خارجياً
٦.	أ.د. سوسن صالح عبدالله سرية : تخصص: اللغة الإنكليزية/الترجمة.	عضواً ومدققاً للغة الإنكليزية

٧.	أ.د. بشرى غازي علوان : تخصص: اللغة العربية /اللغة .	عضواً
٨.	أ.د نهلة عاشور منسي : تخصص: فلسفة إسلامية / الفقه الإسلامي .	عضواً
٩.	أ.د. محمود دهام نايف : تخصص: أصول الدين / الحديث النبوي .	عضواً
١٠.	أ.د. ليث خليل خلف :تخصص: تاريخ / التاريخ القديم .	عضواً
١١.	أ.م.د وصال كاظم حسين : تخصص: اللغة العربية / البلاغة والأدب.	عضواً
١٢.	أ.م.د أسيل عبد الحميد عبد الجبار : تخصص: علم النفس التربوي.	عضواً
١٣.	أ.م.د جنان عبدالله شفيق : تخصص: اللغة الإنكليزية / الأدب .	عضوا
١٤.	أ.م.د ذكرى فاضل محل : تخصص: طرائق التدريس / التاريخ .	عضواً
١٥.	م.د سماح ثائر خيري : تخصص: رياض أطفال .	عضواً
١٦.	أ.د يونس يحيى عبدالله : تخصص: اللغة العربية / اللسانيات النصية.	عضواً ومدققاً لغوياً.
١٧.	أ.م.د. سيناء أحمد جار الله : تخصص: دراسات مالية / إدارة مالية .	عضواً ومحاسباً مالياً

رابعاً : موظفو المجلة

١. م.م. مروة مرزة حمزة / تخصص : تاريخ / مسؤولة وحدة المجلة .

٢. براء إبراهيم سالم / سكرتيرة المجلة .

ضوابط النشر في المجلة

١. تتخصص المجلة بنشر الحوث العلمية القيمة والأصيلة في المجالات الإنسانية، والتي لم يسبق نشرها أو تقديمها إلى أي جهة أخرى (بتعهد خطي من صاحب البحث) ضمن المحاور المشار إليها في التعريف أعلاه ،شرط الالتزام بمنهجية البحث العلمي وخطوات المتعارف عليها محلياً وعالمياً، وتقبل البحوث بإحدى اللغتين العربية أو الإنجليزية بنسبة محددة.

٢. تخضع البحوث المرسلة إلى المجلة جميعها لفحص أولي من هيئة التحرير لتقرير مناسبتها لتخصص المجلة، ثم لبيان أهليتها للتحكيم، ويحق لهيئة التحرير أن تعتذر عن قبول البحث بالكامل، أو تشترط على الباحث تعديله بما يتناسب وسياسة المجلة قبل إرسال إلى المحكمين.

٣. ضرورة تحقق السلامة اللغوية مع مراعاة علامات الترقيم، ومتانة الأسلوب ووضوح الفكرة علل أن يكون الباحث مسؤولًا عن السلامة اللغوية للبحث المقدم باللغتين العربية والإنجليزية.

٤. ترسل البحوث المقبولة للتحكيم العلمي السري إلى خبراء من ذوي الاختصاص قبل نشرها، للتأكد من الرصانة العلمية والموضوعية والجدة والتوثيق على وفق استمارة معتمدة ولا تلتزم هيئة التحرير بالكشف عن أسماء محكميها، وترفض البحوث المتضمنة في خلالها إشارات تكشف عن هوية الباحث.

٥. لضمان السرية الكاملة لعملية التحكيم تكون المعلومات الخاصة بهوية الباحث أو الباحثين في الصفحة الأولى من البحث فحسب.

٦. يلتزم الباحث بإجراء التعديلات الجوهرية المقترحة من المحكمين للبحث.

٧. يحق لهيئة تحرير المجلة رفض البحث واتخاذ القرار وعدم التعامل مع الباحث مستقبلاً عند اكتشافها ما يتنافى والأمانة العلمية المطلوبة بعد التثبت من ذلك.

٨. تنتقل حقوق طبع البحث ونشره إلى المجلة عند إخطار صاحب البحث بقبول للنشر، ولا يجوز النقل أي عن البحث إلا بالإشارة إلى مجلتنا، ولا يجوز لصاحب البحث أو لأي جهة أخرى إعادة نشره في كتاب أو صحيفة أو دورية إلا بعد أن يحصل على موافقة خطية من رئيس التحرير.

٩. لا تدفع مكافأة للباحثين عن البحوث المحكمة التي تقبل للنشر في المجلة وتقدم رئاسة هيئة التحرير مكافأة خاصة للمحكمين.

١٠. تعتمد المجلة آلية التوثيق المتنوعة فتقبل البحوث بآلية التوثيق بالهوامش سواء أكان في نفس الصحيفة ، أم في نهاية البحث، كما تقبل البحوث بآلية التوثيق في المتن بالطريقة المتعارف عليها عالمياً بـ APA.

١١. تقبل المجلة كذلك البحوث الميدانية أو المعملية ،شرط أن يورد الباحث مقدمة يبين فيها طبيعة البحث ومدى الحاجة إليه ، ومن ثم يحدد مشكلة البحث في هيئة مسائلات أو فرضيات، ويعرف المفاهيم والمصطلحات، ويقدم ،عندها قسماً خاصاً بالإجراءات يتناول فيه خطة البحث ومجتمع والعينات والأدوات ، فضلا عن قسم خاص بالنتائج ومناقشتها، ويورد أخيراً قائمة المراجع.

١٢. لا يجوز نشر أكثر من بحث للباحث في العدد الواحد من المجلة سواء أكان بحث منفرداً أم مشتركاً مع باحث آخر.

١٣. يزود صاحب البحث- عند نشره- بنسخة واحدة مستلة مختومة من البحث المنشور في العدد.

١٤. تحتفظ هيئة التحرير بحقها في أولوية النشر في كل ما يرد إليها من مطبوعات، تأخذ بنظر الاعتبار توازن المجلة، والأسبقية في تسليم البحث معدلاً بعد التقويم، واعتبارات أخرى، ويخضع ترتيب البحوث في العدد الواحد للمعايير الفنية المعتمدة في خطة التحرير.

١٥. البحوث المنشورة في المجلة تعبر عن آراء أصحابها، ولا تعبر بالضرورة عن رأي هيئة التحرير أو رأي الكلية.

١٦. جميع المراسلات المتعلقة بالمجلة كافة تكون باسم رئيس التحرير، أو مدير التحرير عبر العنوان البريدي wom.Mag.uni@aliraqia.edu.iq: ، أو رقم هاتف المجلة.

١٧. أخيرا تؤكد هيئة التحرير على ضرورة الالتزام بالبحث الموضوعي الحر والهادئ والبعيد عن كل أشكال التهجم أو المساس بالرموز والشخصيات، وتنأى عن نشر الموضوعات التي تمس المقدسات، أو تلك التي تدعو إلى العصبيات الفئوية والطائفية، وكل ما يوجب الفرقة ويهدد السلم المجتمعي.

دليل المؤلف

Author Guidelines

١. يقدم الباحث طلب خطي (استمارة رقم 1 المرفقة) مختوم بالختم الرسمي لجهة الانتساب .

٢. يقدم الباحث ثلاث نسخ ورقية مطبوعة مكبوسة على ورق(A4) وعلى وجه واحد، وتكون إعدادات حواشي الصفحة 2.5 سم من كل جانب بخط(Simplified Arabic)بحجم 14 للمتن و 12 للهامش، و16 غامق للعنوان الرئيسي و 15 غامق للعنوان الفرعي. واذا كان البحث باللغة الإنجليزية فيكون بخط(Times New Roman) .

٣. لا يزيد البحث عن خمس وعشرين صفحة ، ويكون من ضمنها المراجع والحواشي والجداول والأشكال والملاحق. ويتحمل الباحث ما قيمته ثلاثة آلاف دينار عن كل صحيفة زائدة.

٤. يوقع الباحث التعهد الخاص بكون البحث لم يسبق نشره، ولم يقدم للنشر إلى جهات أخرى، ولن يقدم للنشر في الوقت نفسه حتى انتهاء إجراءات التحكيم (استمارة رقم 2).

٥. يلتزم الباحث بتقديم نسخة من كتاب الاستلال الإلكتروني للبحث وبخلافه يتعذر النشر.

٦. يتعهد الباحث بجلب نسخة إلكترونية من البحث على قرص حاسوب (CD) بعد إجراء جميع التعديلات المطلوبة وقبول البحث للنشر في المجلة.

٧. يرفق مع البحث خلاصة دقيقة باللغتين العربية والإنجليزية على ألا تزيد على صحيفتين مع السيرة الذاتية.

٨. يسدد الباحث أجور النشر والخبراء بحسب مقدارها بكل لقب علمي على وفق المنصوص عليه في الكتب الرسمية ، ويتم تسليم الأجور إلى الجهة الرسمية في القسم المالي للكلية بوصولات رسمية تحفظ حق الباحث وإدارة المجلة ، ولا تسترد الأجور في حالة رفض رئيس التحرير أو المقيمين للبحث المقدم لأسباب علمية أو لسلامة الفكرية أو غيرها.

٩. يستلم الباحث إيصالا خطيا بتاريخ تسليم البحث. ثم يُعلم بالإجراءات التي تمت.

١٠. إذا استخدم الباحث واحدة من أدوات البحث في الاختبارات أو جمع البيانات فعليه أن يقدم نسخة كاملة من تلك الأداة اذا لم تنشر في صلب البحث أو ملاحق .

١١. تلتزم المجلة بإرسال البحث إلى مقومين بخطاب تأليف، استمارة رقم 3 المرفقة ، على أن يتم تقويم البحث في مدة أقصاها ١٠ أيام، وبخلافهِ يقدم الخبير اعتذاره في أسبوع، وعندما يكون التقويم العلمي إيجابياً باتفاق اثنين من المقومين يحال البحث إلى المقوم اللغوي لتدقيقه لغوياً.

دليل المقوم Reviewer Guidelines

أدناه الشروط والمتطلبات الواجب مراعاتها من قبل المقوم للبحوث المرسلة:

١. يقوم البحث على وفق استمارة معتمدة للتقويم (استمارة رقم 4) تتضمن الآتي:

أ- فقرة تتعلق بموضوع البحث هل سبقت دراسته من قبل بحسب علمكم؟ وهل يوجد اقتباس حرفي؟ (الإشارة إلى الاقتباس إن وجد) أو استلال مع تحديد مكان الاستلال.

ب - جدول تقويمي فني تفصيلي يعبر عنه بـ (24) فقرة محددة صيغت على وفق مقياس ليكرت الثلاثي: جيد (3)، مقبول :(2)، ضعيف(1) ويقوم الخبير بالتأشير على اختيار واحد منها تبعاً لقناعته بمحتوى الفقرة وعدم ترك أي فقرة بدون إجابة.

ت - مكان محدد لملاحظات الخبير الخاصة بتفاصيل البحث، أو بأساسيات العامة (علمية أو منهجية) كي يستفيد منها الباحث.

ث - خلاصة التقويم المتعلقة بصلاحية النشر على وفق ثلاث خيارات (صالح للنشر أو صالح بعد إجراء التعديلات، أو غير صالح للنشر) على وفق المعايير المحددة في الاستمارة.

ج - مكان محدد لتثبيت مسوغات عدم الصلاحية للنشر إذا حكم بذلك.

٢. على المقوم التأكد من تطابق وتوافق عنوان الخلاصتين العربية والإنجليزية لغوياً.

٣. أن يبين المقوم هل أن الجداول والأشكال التخطيطية الموجودة واضحة ومعبرة.

٤. أن يبين المقوم هل أن الباحث اتبع الأسلوب الإحصائي الصحيح.

٥. أن يوضح المقوم هل أن مناقشة النتائج كانت كافية ومنطقية.

٦. على المقوم تحديد مدى استخدام الباحث المراجع العلمية.

٧. يمكن للمقوم أن يوضح بورقة منفصلة التعديلات الأساسية لغرض قبول البحث.

٨. توقيع الخبير على الاستمارة تمثل تعهداً خطياً بأنه قام بتقويم البحث علميا على وفق المعايير الموضوعية، وان البحث يستحق التقويم الحاصل عليه ومطلوب تسجيل اسمه على وفق ما مثبت في الاستمارة.

وزارة التعليم العالي والبحث العلمي
الجامـــــعة العراقية
كلية التربية للبنات

مجلة كلية التربية للبنات

مَجلَة عِلمِيّة مُحكَمَة

فصلية دورية

تَصدُرُ عَنْ كُلِيّة التَربِيّة لِلبَنَات

تعنى بنشر البحوث في المجالات الإنسانية والتربوية

العدد الرابع والثلاثـــــون (٣٤) الجزء الأول
الصادر بتاريخ: ٢٠٢٦١٩١١٥

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

افتتاحيةُ العدد...

الحمــدُ للهِ ربِّ العــالمين ، والصــلاةُ والســلامُ علــى نبينّــا محمــدٍ ، وعلــى آلــهِ وصحبهِ تسليماً كثيراً...

أما بعدُ...

يولدُ عدد جديد من مجلة (كلية التربية للبنات / الجامعة العراقية) يحمل الرقم(34) ، الرابع والثلاثين ، بتأريخ 15/9/2026، يحوي بحوثاً متنوعة بين لغوية وأدبية وتربوية ونفسية وتاريخية واجتماعية ، وبحوث اللغة الإنكليزية ، ليكون العدد منهلاً للباحثين والدارسين والقراء عموماً ، يروي عطش المعرفة وحب العلم والتميز.

وفي هذا الإطار تؤكد إدارة المجلة حرصها على أن تكون البحوث المنتخبة في المجلة مثمرة للمجتمع والإنسان العراقيين ، وأن تلتزم بمبادئ وزارة التعليم العالي والبحث العلمي وتعليماتها ، في نوعية الموضوعات التي تعالجها ، وإسهامها المباشر في تنمية المجتمع العراقي والارتقاء به في سلم العلم والمعرفة .

نسأل الله السداد والتوفيق للباحثين والقراء ، ونسأله تعالى السداد لنا في عمل تحرير المجلة ، وأن يكون العمل خالصاً لوجهه الكريم ، ويكون لبنة في البناء المعرفي والعلمي لكليتنا الرصينة ، وخطوة نحو التقدم والازدهار العلمي لعراقنا الحبيب ، ومن الله التوفيق ، وصلى الله على سيدنا محمد وآله وصحبه وسلم تسليماً كثيراً.

هيئة تحرير المجلة

صيف 2026/9/15

قائمة المحتويات – العدد (٣٤) : ايلول/2026- البحوث المحكمة

(ج ١)

ت	اسم البحث	المؤلف	الصفحة
١.	الخطاب النقدي العربي بين التأصيل والتجريب قراءة في النظرية النقدية المعاصرة وتقبلها عربيا	أ. د. أنسام محمد راشد	١-٢١
٢.	النسق والسياق رؤية في الخارطة الصوتية لقصيدة ألا في سبيل المجد لأبي العلاء المعري	أ.د . يوسف طارق السامرائي د. ميثاق عاشور حسين	٢٢-٤٣
٣.	An Investigation of the Perceptions of Iraqi Instructors Teaching English as a Foreign Language Regarding the Use of Humour in College Level classrooms	ا .م .د هدى فالح حسن الخفاجي م.م. ضمياء فالح حسن الخفاجي	٤٤-٦٨
٤.	انكسارات الأنا للمعتمد بن عباد	أ. م. د. أفراح علي عثمان	٦٩-٨٣
٥.	أثر القناعات الإيجابية في قصة إبراهيم عليه السلام	أ.م. د. أحمد رشيد مجبل العيساوي	٨٤-٩٤
٦.	لا النافية للجنس – معموليها بين التنكير والتعريف	أ.م. د. شيماء عبد الزهرة نعمان	٩٥-١١٦
٧.	مَشْرُوعِيَّةُ عِلْمِ الكَلَامِ فِي ضَوءِ النُّصُوصِ الشَّرْعِيَّةِ مِنَ القُرْآنِ الحَكيم – دِرَاسَةٌ عَقَدِيَّةٌ مَوضُوعِيَّةٌ.	أ.م.د سمير هاشم خضير العبيدي	١١٧-١٣٩
٨.	التوثيق الأثري لمصر القديمة في كتابات أميليا آن بلاندفورد إدواردز	أ.م.د. بشرى عناد محمد أ.م.د. احمد ناظم عباس	١٤٠-١٦٠
٩.	بحيرة ŝ-ĥpt في النصوص الجنائزية "دراسة في الوظيفة الرمزية ودورها في رحلة المتوفى إلى العالم الآخر"	أ.م.د. بشرى عناد محمد	١٦١-١٩٣
١٠.	بلاغةُ الحركة وأثرُها في توجيه الدلالة – دراسة صوتية دلالية نقدية لأوجه القراءات في قوله تعالى : ﴿ إِنْ هَذَانِ لَسَاحِرَانِ ﴾	أ.م.د. حامد فرحان جاسم أ.د. محمد توفيق عبد المحسن	١٩٤-٢١١
١١.	ميكروفيزياء السلطة في رسائل عصر ما قبل الإسلام	أ.م.د. ربى عبد الرضا عبد الرزاق البنا	٢١٢-٢٣١
١٢.	مفهوم الحياة وأثرها في التشريع الجنائي الإسلامي	أ.م.د. شيماء ياسين طه الرفاعي	٢٣٢-٢٦٧

١٣.	الحركة النسوية في البحرين : تحديات والفرص	أ.م.د. صبا حسين موله	٢٦٨-٢٨٨
١٤.	أثر الشرط في العقد في تحديد نوعه وبعض أحكامه – دراسة فقهية تحليلية–	أ.م.د. محسن عباس حيال	٢٨٩-٣١٥
١٥.	حكم تجاوز مقاطع الفيديو التي تحتوي على تلاوة القرآن الكريم أو الأذان دراسة فقهية تأصيلية	م. د . أحمد إبراهيم حسن علي	٣١٦-٣٤٢
١٦.	ال منعة وأثرهم العلمي في الموصل واربل خلال العصر العباسي	م. د : مروه غازي محمد	٣٤٣-٣٧٠
١٧.	دلالة الاقتضاء بين القصد الشرعي والضرورة العقلية دراسة أصولية مقارنة	م. د. دعاء سامي رشيد	٣٧١-٤٠٧
١٨.	الأسطرة في رواية فرانكشتاين في بغداد	م. د. مروة شاكر منصور	٤٠٨-٤٢٢
١٩.	النقد الواقعي في الرواية العراقية رواية (ساعة بغداد) أنموذجا	م.د أفراح جاسم محمد	٤٢٣-٤٣٩
٢٠.	أسس الحضارة الإسلامية وتحدياتها الفكرية المعاصرة	م.د حيدر لؤي جبار حيدر	٤٤٠-٤٦٧
٢١.	The Bestowment of Wisdom In the Selected Poems of Ernest Hemingway	م.د اياد عبد الامير حسن	٤٦٨-٤٧٩
٢٢.	أثر الاستعمال اللغوي في تشكيل التمثلات الإدراكية (مقاربة معرفية لثنائية الشائع والمتحول أنموذجًا)	م.د تحرير قاسم سعدون	٤٨٠-٤٩٦
٢٣.	الجوانب الاجتماعية للطفيليين في كتاب التطفيل للخطيب البغدادي (ت٤٦٣هـ /١٠٧١م)	م.د ندى محمد عزيز	٤٩٧-٥١٢
٢٤.	الحافظ علي بن الحسين بن الجنيد الرازي وأقواله في الجرح والتعديل دراسة نقدية في كتاب الجرح والتعديل لابن أبي حاتم	م.د. أثير عماد نوري	٥١٣-٥٤٦
٢٥.	((المَعْنَى بَينَ اللِّسانيَّاتِ العَربيَّة والفَلسفةِ الإسلاميَّة))	م.د. أنسام قتيبة يحيى	٥٤٧-٥٦٤
٢٦.	الوظيفة التساؤلية في الأنماط البيانية لقصيدة (أُنشودة المطر للسياب) – مُقاربة في ضوء نظرية المُساءَلة والبلاغة لميشال مايير –	م.د. أنمار ابراهيم أحمد	٥٦٥-٥٨٦
٢٧.	الحسين عقيدة وفداء (شعراء عباسيون يخلدون رياحين أهل بيت النبوة عليهم السلام)	م.د. بتول احمد سليم	٥٨٧-٦٠٣
٢٨.	الدور الأمريكي في العلاقات الخليجية – اليابانية خلال النصف الثاني من القرن العشرين	م.د. ذو الفقار جميل جاسم	٦٠٤-٦٢٨
٢٩.	الزَّمَنُ عِنْدَ الأُصُولِّيِينّ – دراسة أصولية تطبيقية	م.د. ريّا مظفر خليل	٦٢٩-٦٧٨

٣٠.	المقاصد القرآنية الكبرى وأثرها في فهم الإسلام (سورة الفاتحة إنموذجًا)	م.د. سرى اسماعيل داود عبد	٦٧٩-٦٩٧
٣١.	Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research / University of Iraq / College of Education for Girls	م.د. شاكر حامد رشيد	٦٩٨-٧٢٢

ss

An Investigation of the Perceptions of Iraqi Instructors Teaching English as a Foreign Language Regarding the Use of Humour in College Level classrooms

بحث مدركات المدرسين العراقيين الذين يدرسون اللغة الإنكليزية كلغة اجنبية بخصوص استخدام الفكاهة في صفوف الدراسة على مستوى الكلية

humour in teaching, Iraqi EFL instructors, teacher attributes, benefits and drawbacks of humour, frequency of humour use, classroom humour preferences.

الفكاهة في التدريس، مدرسون اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في العراق، سمات المدرس، فوائد الفكاهة وسلبياتها، تكرار استخدام الفكاهة، تفضيلات الفكاهة في الصف الدراسي

ا .م .د هدى فالح حسن الخفاجي

Assist.Prof. Huda Falih Hasan AlKhafaji, PhD

قسم رياض الأطفال والتربية الخاصة – كلية التربية للبنات – الجامعة العراقية

Department of Kindergarten and Special Education – College of Education for Women – Al Iraqiya University

Email: huda.hasan@aliraqia.edu.iq

م .م ضمياء فالح حسن الخفاجي

Assist. Instructor, Dhamya Falih Hassan AlKhafaji, MA Al-Hind Secondary School for Girls Al-Karkh Second Education Directorate Ministry of Education

Email: falihdhamya@gmail.com

الملخص

هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى استقصاء تصوّرات مدرسي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في العراق تجاه أهمية استخدام الفكاهة في التدريس، وذلك من خلال تحليل آرائهم حول أشكال الفكاهة المفضلة، والفوائد المتوقعة، والسلبيات المحتملة، بالإضافة إلى تكرار استخدامهم للفكاهة في تدريسهم اليومي. شارك في الدراسة ستة عشر مدرساً ومدرسة من مدرسي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية بكلية التربية للبنات – الجامعة العراقية. واستخدمت الدراسة استبانة ذات منهج مختلط (كمي ونوعي)، حيث طُلب من المشاركين ترتيب قائمة من سمات المدرس (ضمنها الفقرات المتعلقة بالفكاهة)، وتقييم عبارات حول أشكال الفكاهة وفوائدها وسلبياتها باستخدام مقاييس ليكرت، والإبلاغ عن عدد المرات التي يستخدمون فيها الفكاهة في تدريسهم. وقد أسفرت الدراسة عن نتائج مهمة، من أبرزها أن الصدق، والقدوة الحسنة، والوداعة احتلت المراتب العليا كأهم سمات المدرس، بينما جاءت الفكاهة الفعالة في المرتبة الأخيرة من حيث الأهمية. كما أظهر المدرسون اتفاقاً قوياً على ضرورة الحفاظ على النبرة الجادة عند الحاجة، وتجنب الفكاهة المسيئة أو الموجهة ضد الآخرين، واستخدام النكات ذات الصلة بالدرس والتي يقودها المدرس فقط، في حين رُفضت كل من الفكاهة الذاتية الساخرة (السخرية من النفس) والفكاهة التي يبادر بها الطلاب. وتمثلت الفوائد الأكثر تأييداً في ان استخدام الفكاهة يساعد في تخفيف الضغط أثناء الدروس الصعبة، وخلق جو إيجابي في الصف، وتحسين العلاقة بين المدرس والطلاب، وجذب انتباه الطلاب والمحافظة عليه. أما أبرز المخاوف فكانت أن تؤدي الفكاهة إلى التعبير عن آراء غير لائقة أو إلى الإساءة لبعض الطلاب، بينما أعرب عدد قليل من المدرسين عن قلقهم من أن الفكاهة قد تقوض سلطة المدرس أو تسبب اضطراباً في الصف. وانقسم المدرسون بالتساوي فيما يتعلق بتكرار استخدام الفكاهة، إذ يستخدم نصفهم الفكاهة في معظم أيام التدريس بينما يستخدمها النصف الآخر بشكل عرضي فقط، وكان المعدل الأكثر شيوعاً بين مستخدمي الفكاهة يومياً هو مرة أو مرتين في كل ساعة تدريس. وفي الختام، يميل مدرسو اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في العراق إلى نظرة إيجابية لكنها حذرة تجاه الفكاهة في التدريس، إذ يضعون الجدية والاحترام وسيطرة المدرس في المقام الأول، ويرون أن الفكاهة أداة تدريسية اختيارية وليست مهارة تدريسية

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate Iraqi EFL instructors' perceptions of the importance of humour in teaching, including their views on preferred forms of humour, perceived benefits and drawbacks, and frequency of humour use in daily classroom instruction. Sixteen Iraqi EFL instructors teaching at preparatory schools participated in the study. A mixed-method questionnaire was employed. Instructors ranked a list of teacher attributes

(including humour-related items), rated statements about forms of humour, benefits, and drawbacks using Likert scales, and reported their frequency of humour use. The findings revealed that honesty, role modelling, and friendliness were ranked as the most important teacher attributes, whereas effective humour was ranked least important. Instructors strongly endorsed maintaining a serious tone, avoiding offensive or targeted humour, and using only relevant, teacher-led jokes. Self-deprecating and student-initiated humour were rejected. The most strongly agreed benefits were relieving pressure, creating a positive atmosphere, improving teacher-student relationships, and capturing attention. The greatest concerns were that humour might express inappropriate views or offend students; few worried about loss of authority or disruption. Frequency of use was evenly split: 50% used humour most days, 50% only occasionally. Among daily users, 1–2 times per hour was the most common rate. In conclusion, Iraqi EFL instructors hold a cautiously positive but bounded view of humour, prioritising seriousness, respect, and teacher control. Humour is seen as a discretionary pedagogical tool rather than a core teaching competency.

1.Introduction

Humor in language teaching is a purposeful pedagogical strategy that leverages engaging content—such as jokes, puns, stories, and playful activities—to achieve specific educational objectives. Far from being mere entertainment, it is an intentional tool designed to improve language acquisition, reduce learner anxiety, and foster a positive classroom environment.

Research documents its dual impact on both instructional efficiency and student psychology. Psychologically, humor promotes well-being by creating a secure environment for experimentation (Harris, 1989) and a positive, open classroom climate (Herbert, 1991; Korobkin, 1988). It significantly reduces academic and test-related anxiety, which can help highly anxious students achieve better results (Korobkin, 1988; Meyer, 1990; Sullivan, 1992). Furthermore, humor strengthens teacher-student rapport by making educators appear more relatable and multifaceted (Ackerman & Dummer, 1982; Bryant, 1979; Colwell & Wigle, 1984; Wilson, 1979).

Cognitively, humor enhances learning by boosting creativity, problem-solving, and critical thinking (Neuliep, 1991; Steele, 1998; Whitmer, 1986). It aids information retention (Chenfeld, 1990) and fosters higher-order, investigative thinking (Nilsen, 1993). This is especially pertinent to language learning, where humor directly supports instruction in formal

linguistic, cultural, and pragmatic components. It serves as an effective tool for raising student awareness of phonological, morphological, lexical, and syntactic distinctions, both within the target language and in contrast with their first language (Deneire, 1999, cited in Askildson, 2005), and for teaching structural components (Vizmuller, 1979). As Trachtenberg (1979) notes, joke-telling in ESL contexts provides ideal opportunities for focused grammar or semantic lessons. Consequently, scholars like Askildson (2005) strongly affirm its efficacy, arguing it lowers the affective filter and promotes the pro-social behaviors essential for communicative success.

The effective application of humor, however, depends on a nuanced understanding of its forms and social dynamics. Bryant et al. (1979) catalog primary forms such as jokes, riddles, puns, and narratives. Cohen (1999) expands this by analyzing three key "laughing situations": being laughed at (usually negative), making others laugh (positive), and laughing at oneself (an admirable trait). The impact of humor—positive or negative—hinges on which social dynamic is activated. Crucially, instructional relevance is another determining factor; as Sullivan (1992) warns, humor disconnected from the subject matter wastes instructional time and weakens classroom management.

This interplay between form, social context, and relevance highlights a central tension in classroom application. On one side, scholars such as O'Donnell-Trujillo and Adams (1983) advocate positive, structured practices—for instance, starting class with an amusing thought or using student-oriented comic materials. On the other side, researchers like Barioud (1988) caution that poorly timed, excessive, or inappropriate humor can lead to distraction, create a circus-like atmosphere, and damage students' self-esteem.

In summary, humor is a powerful but double-edged pedagogical instrument. Its benefits for language acquisition, classroom climate, and student psychology are well-established. To harness these benefits while mitigating risks, its application must be strategic, context-sensitive, and firmly tied to instructional goals.

1.1 Research Gap and Rationale for the Present Study

Despite this robust theoretical and empirical foundation, practical uptake among educators is not assured. For instance, a study by Chaniotakis (2014) on Greek primary school teachers revealed a significant undervaluation of humor's role. Teachers prioritized other professional qualities—such as fairness, curriculum expertise, and clear rule-setting—

over humor, citing fears of losing classroom control, skepticism about its pedagogical benefits, and a perception of teaching as an inherently serious endeavor.

This disconnect is also evident among instructors who acknowledge humor's value. Ağçamii and Imam (2017) study of Turkish university EFL instructors found strong agreement that humor increases motivation and reduces classroom anxiety. However, participants expressed significant hesitation and remained undecided about its direct impact on learning outcomes, self-esteem, and retention, citing similar concerns about control and appropriateness.

Collectively, these findings reveal a significant gap: while educators recognize humor's psychological advantages, persistent concerns about classroom control and instructional efficacy prevent them from integrating it as a core teaching strategy. This divide between empirical support and contextual apprehension necessitates further localized research.

To address this specific gap, and to fill the research void within Iraqi higher education, the present study investigates how instructors of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) at the Department of English, College of Education for Women, Al Iraqia University, perceive the use of humor.

Accordingly, this study is guided by the following research questions:

1. Which teacher attributes do Iraqi instructors teaching English as a Foreign Language prioritize in their teaching practice?
2. How do Iraqi instructors teaching English as a Foreign Language perceive both the benefits and risks associated with integrating humor in their teaching practice?
3. To what extent, and in what ways do Iraqi instructors teaching English as a Foreign Language incorporate humor into their instructional practices?

The following section presents the methodological design of the study, including information on participant demographics, the data collection tool, and the analytical approach.

2. Methodology

The study was conducted for one academic year commencing in November 2025. The participants are 16 instructors who teach English as a foreign language at the Department of English, College of Education for Women, Al Iraqia University. The participants completed a teacher questionnaire (see Appendix A) on how they perceive the use of humor their teaching practices The questionnaire is constructed and based on Chaniotakis (2014).

This questionnaire is structured into four distinct sections, each designed to capture a different dimension of the relationship between teachers and humor. The structure moves from broad, foundational attributes to specific perceptions, then to pedagogical impact, and finally to behavioral frequency. This creates a logical flow that first establishes a baseline for the teacher's overall profile before drilling down into the specifics of humor.

Section one of the questionnaire, entitled "Teacher's Attributes," is a ranking task. It asks respondents to order the twelve qualities from most to least important, producing ordinal data (rank 1 through 12). The purpose of this section is to find out what respondents value most in a teacher before the later questions focus specifically on humor. By forcing respondents to rank attributes—placing "be able to use humor effectively" alongside traditional virtues such as "be patient" and "master the teaching subject"—the researcher can determine the relative importance of humor compared to other pedagogical qualities. This approach is more rigorous than simply asking "Is humor important?" because it reveals the trade-offs respondents make when prioritizing different teacher attributes.

Section two of the questionnaire, entitled "Teacher Perceptions of Classroom Humor," uses a closed-ended attitudinal scale (a five-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree) to produce ordinal data. It consists of nine items that break the concept of "humor" down into actionable behaviors; rather than simply asking whether a teacher likes humor, the section asks about specific practices such as welcoming appropriate jokes from students, integrating cartoons into lessons, and laughing at oneself. The aim is to measure the teacher's acceptance of particular humorous techniques and to elicit participants' overall perceptions about which forms of humorous behavior they consider appropriate for teaching.

Section three of the questionnaire, entitled "The Benefits and Drawbacks of Using Humor," employs a closed-ended attitudinal scale—a five-point

Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree—to generate ordinal data. It comprises 14 items designed to measure teachers' beliefs about the outcomes of humor in the classroom. This section is structured as a balanced matrix, deliberately split into two clusters: items 1 through 9 focus on pedagogical benefits such as classroom atmosphere, knowledge retention, student creativity, and teacher-student relationships; items 10 through 14 address potential drawbacks, including loss of authority, offending students, slowing the pace of instruction, and provoking disruption. Including both benefits and drawbacks helps counter social desirability bias, as respondents are not simply led to endorse humor as uniformly positive. Moreover, this structure allows the researcher to gauge teachers' perceptions of risk associated with humor—a key factor that influences whether they choose to incorporate it into their practice.

Section four, titled "Frequency of Humor Use," uses a contingency question structure. It begins with a yes/no filter: teachers are asked whether they incorporate humor on a typical day. Only those who answer "Yes" proceed to state how many times per hour they use humor (1–2, 3–4, or 5+ times). This design produces categorical data (yes/no) and ratio-like frequency data (times per hour). The purpose is to measure actual self-reported behavior, which contrasts with the attitudes captured in earlier sections. The initial filter with skip logic prevents teachers who rarely use humor from guessing a frequency, avoiding skewed results. Asking for "times per hour" also provides a more objective measure than vague terms like "sometimes" or "often."

To ensure the content validity of the questionnaire used in this study, two steps were taken. First, the questionnaire was reviewed by experts in applied linguistics. Second, a pilot study was conducted from January 1 to January 30, 2026. The data collected from the teacher questionnaire were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 14.0. The questionnaire statements were coded and entered into SPSS. After data entry, descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) were calculated for the statements addressing participants' perceptions and practices of humour. Reliability analysis yielded a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.71 for the questionnaire items.

3. Data Analysis and Results

3.1. Importance of humour to teachers

The first research question sought to explore how Iraqi EFL instructors perceive various teacher attributes. Analysis of the rankings provided by 16

respondents (see Table 1) reveals clear priorities, with honesty emerging as the most valued quality (mean rank = 2.56). In fact, nine out of sixteen instructors ranked honesty first, indicating strong consensus that trust and integrity are foundational in Iraqi EFL classrooms.

Table 1 . Attributes of the teachers

Rank	Attribute	MeanRank	Interpretation
1	honest	2.56	Most Important - Clear consensus
2	good_model	5.31	Highly Important
3	friendly	5.44	Highly Important
4	patient	6.5	Moderately Important
5	fair	6.62	Moderately Important
6	clear_rules	6.94	Moderately Important
7	good- grades	7.44	Lower Importance
8	subject_mastery	7.56	Lower Importance
9	occasional_jokes	7.94	Lower Importance
10	appearance	8.12	Least Important
11	stirct	8.62	Least Important
12	humor_effective	8.94	Least Important

Beyond honesty, two other relational attributes—being a good role model (rank 2) and being friendly (rank 3)—form a top tier of highly important qualities. This suggests that instructors prioritize character and approachability over control. Notably, strictness ranked near the bottom (rank 11), reinforcing a preference for kind, fair guidance rather than harsh discipline.

Subject mastery, while appearing low at rank 8, is likely not considered unimportant. Instead, instructors probably view it as a baseline expectation—something every teacher should already possess, not a distinguishing trait. Similarly, telling an occasional joke (rank 9) was seen as more desirable than having a consistently effective sense of humor (rank 12), indicating that light, natural humor is welcome while forced or constant comedy is not.

The least valued attributes—appearance (rank 10), strictness (rank 11), and effective humor (rank 12)—suggest that physical presentation and authoritarian discipline matter far less than relational integrity. Agreement among respondents was strong at both the top and bottom of the ranking, but moderate variability appeared for middle-ranked traits (patience, fairness, clear rules, and grading). This indicates that while instructors broadly agree on core virtues, they hold more diverse opinions about secondary classroom behaviors.

In summary, Iraqi EFL instructors perceive an effective teacher as honest, friendly, and a good example—not strict, appearance-focused, or overly concerned with humor. Subject knowledge is assumed. This profile points to a teaching philosophy grounded in mutual respect and relationship-building rather than control or external polish.

3.2. Forms of humour

The second research question was intended to scrutinize Iraqi EFL instructors' perceptions on the use of humour in higher education. Table 2 , 3 and 4 show the results

Table 2. Forms of humorous behaviour in the classroom

Statement	Mean	Std Dev
Q1: Welcome jokes	3.69	0.98
Q2: Incorporate jokes	4.06	1.18
Q3: Joke positively	4	0.79
Q4: Invite sharing	2.94	0.97
Q5: Use cartoons	3.31	1.04
Q6: Serious tone	4.5	0.61
Q7: Laugh at self	2.81	1.38
Q8: Natural humor	3.94	0.83
Q9: avoid targeting	4.44	1.17

Table 3. Highest Rated (Most Agreement)

Rank	Statement	Mean	Interpretation
1	Q6: Maintain serious tone when needed	4.5	Between Agree and Strongly Agree
2	Q9: Avoid targeting/embarrassing humor	4.44	Between Agree and Strongly Agree
3	Q2: Incorporate relevant jokes	4.06	Agree
4	Q3: Joke positively/inoffensively	4	Agree

Table 4. Lowest Rated (Most Disagreement/Neutral)

Rank	Statement	Mean	Interpretation
9	Q7: Teacher should laugh at self	2.81	Between Disagree and Neutral
8	Q:4 Invite students to share jokes	2.94	Neutral
7	Q5: Integrate cartoons/comics	3.31	Neutral to Agree

The data on Iraqi EFL instructors' perceptions of humour in higher education reveal three clear patterns: strong agreement on core principles, sharp division on certain humour types, and general uncertainty on others. Each pattern has practical implications for teaching and training.

3.2.1. Strong Consensus: What Most Instructors Agree On

Instructors strongly agreed on three fundamental points. First, maintaining a serious tone when needed (Q6: 88% agreement, mean 4.50) was the highest-rated item. This shows that academic seriousness is the expected classroom norm; humour, if used, must not undermine the instructor's authority or the lesson's importance. Second, avoiding humour that targets or embarrasses anyone (Q9: 82% agreement, mean 4.44) reflects a strong ethical stance. In Iraqi culture, where saving face and group harmony matter, public embarrassment is unacceptable. Third, incorporating relevant jokes (Q2: 82% agreement, mean 4.06) proves that instructors are not against humour—they simply prefer humour that is purposeful, tied to the lesson, and controlled by the teacher. Together, these items define a clear framework: seriousness as the base, respect as the limit, and teacher-led, relevant humour as an acceptable tool.

3.2.2. Divided Opinions: Where Instructors Disagree

Three items showed significant variation, indicating that instructors hold different views on specific humour practices.

Laughing at oneself (Q7) created the biggest divide among instructors (SD = 1.38). Nearly two-thirds (63%) disagreed, with some disagreeing strongly, while 19% stayed neutral and another 19% agreed. The majority feel that making fun of themselves weakens their professional authority and encourages students to be disrespectful. On the other hand, a smaller group views self-mockery as a way to connect with students and seem more relatable. The fact that similar numbers of instructors were neutral or positive suggests that opinions may be evolving—possibly due to exposure to Western teaching approaches or simply personal differences in confidence and style.

Incorporating jokes (Q2) followed a bimodal pattern: 38% agreed and 44% strongly agreed. Although overall support is high, instructors vary in how enthusiastically they use humour. Some frequently and naturally include jokes in their lessons, while others do so more carefully or sparingly. This difference likely stems from factors such as years of teaching experience, level of English fluency, or what they believe their institution expects from them.

Avoiding targeting humour (Q9) had 69% strongly agreeing, but notably 13% strongly disagreed. This small but meaningful minority challenges the consensus. Possible explanations include instructors who believe that gentle, good-natured teasing can build resilience or group bonding, or those who distinguish between targeting individuals versus targeting ideas or

behaviours. Cultural or generational differences within the sample may also play a role.

3.2.3. Areas of Neutrality: When Instructors Are Unsure

Three items fell into neutral or near-neutral territory, showing ambivalence rather than strong opposition.

Inviting students to share jokes (Q4) had a mean of 2.94 (neutral to slight disagreement) and 25% neutral. Instructors are uncomfortable giving students control over humour. They worry about losing classroom management, wasting time, or hearing inappropriate content. In teacher-centred educational cultures, student-initiated humour feels disruptive.

Natural humour opportunities (Q8) had the highest neutrality rate at 44%, despite a mean of 3.94 (leaning toward agreement). Many instructors have never thought carefully about whether their own humour feels natural. Others may distinguish between planned humour (easy to judge) and spontaneous humour (harder to evaluate).

Using cartoons or comics (Q5) had a mean of 3.31 (neutral to agreement) and 25% neutral. Uncertainty here may stem from practical issues (lack of projectors or digital tools), unfamiliarity with visual humour, or a belief that cartoons are better for children than for university students.

Overall, Iraqi EFL instructors are cautiously humour-positive. They strongly value seriousness, respect, and teacher-controlled relevance. They disagree on self-deprecation and feel mixed about student-led humour. Their neutrality on cartoons and natural humour points to opportunities for professional development. Trainers could show how visual humour can be used effectively and encourage instructors to reflect on their own humour style.

The key message for teacher trainers: do not push instructors toward self-deprecation or student-sharing activities. Instead, build on the strong consensus by modelling how to use relevant, respectful jokes while keeping a serious academic tone. Future research should explore why a small minority rejects the idea of avoiding targeting humour and whether neutrality on cartoons is due to lack of resources or lack of perceived value.

3.3. The benefits and drawbacks of using humour

For the question about the benefits of humour in teaching, table 5 sorts the benefits to show which advantages of humor are most strongly endorsed by the respondents.

Table 5. The benefits of using humour in the classroom

Rank	Benefit	Mean	Agreement %
1	5. Relieves pressure during difficult lessons	4.56	93.80%
2	1. Creates a positive classroom atmosphere	4.5	93.80%
3 (tie)	2. Improves teacher-student relationship	4.38	93.80%
3 (tie)	4. Captures and maintains student attention	4.38	93.80%
5	3. Reduces student anxiety	4.31	87.50%
6	9. Aids in knowledge retention	4.31	81.30%
7	6. Manages behavior problems	4.19	75.00%
8	7. Improves peer relations	4.06	68.80%
9	8. Promotes student creativity	3.81	56.30%

The results in Table 5 show that respondents strongly endorse humour as a teaching tool, though some benefits are seen as much more important than others. The top two benefits—relieving pressure during difficult lessons (mean 4.56) and creating a positive classroom atmosphere (mean 4.50)—received the highest agreement rates (93.8% each). This suggests that instructors primarily view humour as a way to ease tension and foster a welcoming environment, rather than just for entertainment.

Tied for third place, improving teacher-student relationships and capturing student attention both had means of 4.38 and also 93.8% agreement. These four top-rated benefits all share very strong endorsement, indicating that humour is widely seen as serving both emotional and instructional functions.

Further down the list, reducing student anxiety (mean 4.31, 87.5%) and aiding knowledge retention (mean 4.31, 81.3%) still show strong support, though slightly less unanimous. Interestingly, both have identical means, yet retention has a lower agreement percentage—suggesting that those who disagree may disagree more strongly, or that a few respondents are uncertain.

Lower-ranked benefits such as managing behavior problems (mean 4.19, 75%) and improving peer relations (mean 4.06, 68.8%) receive moderate endorsement. The lowest-ranked benefit—promoting student creativity—has the lowest mean (3.81) and only 56.3% agreement. This indicates that while humour is valued for classroom climate and rapport, instructors are less convinced that it directly fosters creativity or improves peer interactions.

Overall, the pattern suggests that humour is seen as most beneficial for affective and management purposes (reducing pressure, building positivity, maintaining attention) and least beneficial for higher-order outcomes like creativity. These rankings may reflect instructors' immediate classroom priorities rather than a rejection of humour's broader potential.

3.3.1. A discussion of the findings based on the ranked drawbacks of using humour in teaching

Table 6 sorts the drawbacks to show which risks are considered most significant by the respondents.

Table 6. The drawbacks of using humour in the classroom

Rank	Drawback	Mean	Agreement (%)
1	12. Could be used to express inappropriate views	4	68.80%
2	11. Risks offending some students	3.94	68.8%
3	13. Can slow down the pace of instruction	3.69	50.0%
4	14. Can provoke disruptive behavior	2.81	25.00%
5	10. Risks undermining teacher's authority	2.63	25.00%

The results in the drawbacks table (Table 6) reveal that instructors are selectively concerned about certain risks of humour, while dismissing others as relatively unimportant. The top two drawbacks—"Could be used to express inappropriate views" (mean 4.00, 68.8% agreement) and "Risks offending some students" (mean 3.94, also 68.8%)—stand out as the only concerns with agreement above 50%. This suggests that teachers primarily worry about humour crossing professional or cultural boundaries, such as jokes that might be seen as biased, insensitive, or unprofessional.

The third-ranked drawback, "Can slow down the pace of instruction" (mean 3.69, 50.0% agreement), receives moderate but split support. Exactly half of respondents see this as a valid concern, while the other half either disagree or are neutral. This indicates that time efficiency is a real but not universal worry—likely depending on how naturally humour fits into a teacher's style or lesson structure.

In contrast, the bottom two drawbacks show very low concern. "Can provoke disruptive behavior" (mean 2.81, 25.0% agreement) and "Risks undermining teacher's authority" (mean 2.63, 25.0%) are endorsed by only a quarter of respondents. This suggests that most instructors do not believe humour leads to loss of control or respect in the classroom. They may see humour as compatible with maintaining authority, or they may have experienced few such negative outcomes.

Overall, the pattern indicates that instructors are cautious about humour's social and ethical risks (offense, inappropriate content), somewhat concerned about pacing, but largely untroubled by discipline or authority issues. These rankings imply that teacher training on humour should focus on cultural sensitivity and boundary-setting, rather than on fear of losing classroom control.

3.4. Frequency of using humour in language teaching

Based on the responses from16 participants, the results for Question 4 (“Do you incorporate humor into your classroom instruction on a typical day?”) are evenly split. Table 7 shows a descriptive analysis of the responses to Question 4.

Table 7. A descriptive analysis of the responses to Question 4.

Response	Frequency	Percentage
No, only occasionally	8	50%
Yes, most days	8	50%
Total	16	100%

Half of the respondents (8 out of 16) report using humor in their classroom instruction most days, while the other half indicate they do so only occasionally.

The responses are evenly divided. Half of the teachers in this sample report using humor in their classroom instruction on most days, while the other half report using it only occasionally. There is no majority or dominant pattern; the distribution is perfectly split.

3.4.1. Frequency of using Humour per Hour (Among “Yes” Respondents)

Of the 8 respondents who use humor most days, all provided follow-up frequency data. Table 8 shows a descriptive analysis for the subset of respondents who answered “Yes, most days” to Q4, reporting how often they use humor per teaching hour.

Table 8. Frequency of using humour per hour

Frequency per Hour	Count	Percentage of “Yes” Group
1–2 times per hour	5	62.50%
3–4 times per hour	3	37.50%
Total	8	100%

Table 8 shows that half of the teachers in this sample do not use humor on most days; they use it only occasionally.Among the half who do use humor most days, the majority (62.5%) use it at a moderate frequency of 1–2 times per teaching hour. Only 3 out of 16 teachers (18.75%) report both using humor most days and doing so at a higher frequency of 3–4 times per hour.

The findings from Question 4 reveal a striking and perfectly balanced split among the 16 participating teachers: half report using humor "most days," while the other half use it "only occasionally." This bimodal distribution is notable because it suggests that humor integration is not a universal or even a majority practice, but rather a distinct pedagogical preference. No teachers fell in the middle (e.g., "some days"), indicating that respondents tend to identify as either regular humor users or infrequent users, with little ambiguity.

Several interpretations of this split are worth considering. First, it may reflect genuine differences in teaching philosophy or personality. Some educators may view humor as a tool for building rapport, reducing anxiety, and enhancing recall, while others may see it as a potential distraction or a risk to classroom authority. Second, contextual factors—such as grade level, subject matter, or school culture—could drive this divide. For instance, teachers of younger students or humanities subjects might employ humor more freely than those in exam-focused STEM courses, though the current data do not allow for such subgroup analysis.

The follow-up frequency data among the eight teachers who use humor most days provide additional nuance. Within this group, a clear majority (62.5%) report using humor at a moderate rate of 1–2 times per teaching hour, while a smaller portion (37.5%) do so more frequently at 3–4 times per hour. Notably, no one reported using humor more than 4 times per hour or zero times among this subsample. This suggests that even among regular humor users, there is a perceived upper bound—exceeding four instances per hour might feel excessive or counterproductive. The modal pattern of 1–2 times per hour indicates that effective humor integration may be characterized more by intentional, spaced moments than by constant comedic commentary.

When examining the full sample (n=16), only three teachers (18.75%) fall into the high-frequency humor category (most days and 3–4 times per hour). This small subset represents a distinctive teaching style that could merit further qualitative exploration—for example, investigating whether

these teachers work in particular subjects (e.g., drama, elementary education) or have unusually high classroom engagement scores.

Limitations are important to acknowledge. The sample size is very small (n=16), so these findings should not be generalized without replication. Self-report bias is also a concern: teachers may over- or under-estimate their humor use, and "humor" itself was not operationally defined (e.g., planned jokes vs. spontaneous wit vs. sarcasm). Additionally, the binary nature of Question 4 (forced choice between "only occasionally" and "most days") may have masked intermediate patterns of use.

Implications and future directions. These results suggest that humor use is not a default teaching strategy but a differentiated practice. Future research should collect qualitative interview data to understand why teachers fall into one group or the other, and explore correlates such as student outcomes, teacher burnout, or classroom climate ratings. Collecting data on grade level, subject area, and years of experience would also help determine whether the observed split is systematic or sample-specific. Finally, examining student perceptions—do students prefer humor, and at what frequency?—could inform professional development for teachers on either side of the divide.

In summary, this sample presents a teacher workforce evenly divided on the role of daily humor, with even frequent users tending to cap their use at a modest 1–2 times per hour. The findings highlight humor as a discretionary pedagogical tool rather than a universal best practice.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

Section four provides answers to the research questions of this study which were as follows:

1. Which teacher attributes do Iraqi instructors teaching English as a Foreign Language prioritize in their teaching practice?

2. How do Iraqi instructors teaching English as a Foreign Language perceive both the benefits and risks associated with integrating humor in their teaching practice?

3. To what extent, and in what ways do Iraqi instructors teaching English as a Foreign Language incorporate humor into their instructional practices?

It does so by comparing and discussing the results of the quantitative (the teacher questionnaire) research method. This section also draws a conclusion based on the findings of this study. In addition, it discusses the main findings of the present research in relation to earlier studies (see Section 1). The results of this study showed the following:

4.1. Perceived importance of humour among teacher attributes

Iraqi EFL instructors rank honesty as the most important teacher attribute, followed by being a good role model and being friendly. In contrast, humour-related attributes are consistently rated as having low to least importance. Specifically, telling occasional jokes ranks ninth out of twelve attributes and falls into the category of lower importance, while possessing an effective sense of humour ranks last and is considered the least important attribute overall. These findings indicate that instructors prioritise relational integrity and approachability over humour, which they view as a non-essential or even peripheral teaching quality.

4.2. Preferred forms of humour in the classroom

Instructors express strong agreement on three core principles regarding humour use. First, they agree that teachers should maintain a serious tone when needed, which is the highest-rated statement and demonstrates that academic seriousness is the expected classroom norm. Second, they strongly endorse avoiding humour that targets or embarrasses any individual, reflecting a clear ethical stance rooted in respect and face-saving values. Third, they agree that teachers may incorporate relevant jokes, indicating that humour is acceptable only when it is purposeful, lesson-related, and under the teacher's control. Conversely, instructors show the lowest agreement with laughing at oneself, which falls between disagree and neutral, and they remain neutral or uncertain about inviting students to share jokes or integrating cartoons and comics. These results suggest that Iraqi EFL teachers prefer teacher-led, inoffensive, and academically relevant humour while rejecting self-deprecation and student-initiated comedic contributions.

4.3. Perceived benefits of using humour in teaching

Instructors recognise several benefits of humour, but the level of endorsement varies considerably. The most strongly endorsed benefit is that humour relieves pressure during difficult lessons, followed closely by creating a positive classroom atmosphere. Both statements receive nearly

unanimous agreement at 93.8 percent. Improving teacher-student relationships and capturing and maintaining student attention tie for third place, also with 93.8 percent agreement. Reducing student anxiety and aiding knowledge retention receive strong but slightly lower support, with agreement rates of 87.5 percent and 81.3 percent, respectively. Lower-ranked benefits such as managing behaviour problems and improving peer relations show moderate endorsement, while promoting student creativity receives the weakest support, with only 56.3 percent agreement. Overall, instructors view humour as most beneficial for affective and classroom management purposes and least beneficial for fostering higher-order outcomes such as creativity.

4.4. Perceived drawbacks of using humour in teaching

Instructors express selective concern about the risks associated with humour. The two most strongly endorsed drawbacks are that humour could be used to express inappropriate views and that it risks offending some students, each with 68.8 percent agreement. The third-ranked drawback, that humour can slow down the pace of instruction, receives moderate and divided support, with exactly half of the respondents agreeing. In contrast, the risks that humour can provoke disruptive behaviour or undermine the teacher's authority are endorsed by only 25 percent of instructors, indicating that most do not see humour as a threat to classroom control or professional respect. These findings show that instructors are primarily concerned with the ethical and social boundaries of humour rather than with issues of discipline or authority.

4.5. Frequency of humour use in daily instruction

The frequency of humour use among the sampled instructors is evenly divided. Exactly half of the respondents report using humour in their classroom instruction on most days, while the other half report using it only occasionally. No instructors fall into an intermediate category such as "some days," indicating a clear binary distinction between regular users and infrequent users. Among the half who use humour most days, the majority (62.5 percent) report using it at a moderate frequency of one to two times per teaching hour, while the remaining 37.5 percent use it three to four times per hour. No instructor reports using humour more than four times per hour or zero times among the regular user subgroup. When considering the full sample, only three out of sixteen teachers (18.75 percent) qualify as high-frequency humour users, defined as using humour most days and at a rate of three to four times per hour. These results suggest that humour integration is a differentiated pedagogical preference rather than a universal

practice, and that even among regular users, humour is typically employed in modest, intentional doses.

4.6. Overall conclusion on the role of humour

Taken together, the results indicate that Iraqi EFL instructors hold a cautiously positive but clearly bounded view of humour in teaching. They do not consider humour a core teaching competency, ranking it far below honesty, role modelling, and friendliness. They strongly affirm the primacy of a serious academic tone and approve of humour only when it is teacher-led, relevant, and inoffensive. They reject self-deprecating humour and student-initiated humour. They recognise humour's benefits primarily for relieving pressure, improving classroom atmosphere, and capturing attention, while showing little concern that humour might undermine authority or cause disruption. Finally, humour use is split evenly across the sample, with half of instructors using it most days at a moderate frequency and half using it only occasionally. These findings portray humour as a discretionary, personal teaching tool that is neither universally adopted nor universally rejected, but rather deployed according to individual teaching philosophy and contextual judgment.

4.7. Comparison of Current Findings with Previous Studies

The following comparison situates the current findings within the broader body of research on humour in educational contexts. Previous studies have primarily focused on Western, and to a lesser extent Asian, educational settings. The current study offers a unique perspective from Iraqi higher education.

4.7.1. Importance of Humour Compared to Other Teacher Qualities

Current study finding: Iraqi EFL instructors ranked honesty, role modelling, and friendliness as significantly more important than humour. Humour-related attributes were positioned near the bottom of the ranking.

What previous studies found: In Western contexts such as the United States and Australia, students often rank a teacher's sense of humour as one of the most desirable characteristics (Garner, 2006; Torok, McMorris & Lin, 2004). However, a study conducted in China similarly found that teachers viewed humour as useful but not a core attribute (Zhang, 2016).

Key difference: The current Iraqi instructors assigned humour a lower overall priority than Western studies typically report, aligning more closely with the Chinese finding that humour is considered an optional rather than essential teaching quality.

4.7.2.Preferred Forms of Humour

Current study finding: Iraqi EFL instructors strongly endorsed three principles: maintaining a serious tone when needed, avoiding humour that targets or embarrasses any individual, and using humour only when it is relevant to the lesson. Self-deprecating humour and student-initiated humour were rejected.

What previous studies found: The preference for relevant, inoffensive humour is consistent with existing research (Neuliep, 1991; Wanzer et al., 2006). However, some Western studies have encouraged self-deprecating humour as a means of increasing instructor approachability (Cundall, 2007; Bollinger, 2011). Additionally, several studies support inviting students to share humour to build classroom community (James, 2004; Chiasson, 2009).

Key difference: The current instructors demonstrated a stronger preference for teacher-controlled humour and a clearer rejection of both self-deprecation and student-led humour compared to Western samples.

4.7.3. Perceived Benefits of Humour

Current study finding: Nearly all Iraqi instructors (93.8%) agreed that humour relieves pressure, creates a positive atmosphere, improves teacher-student relationships, and captures student attention. Fewer than 60% agreed that humour promotes student creativity.

What previous studies found: The top-ranked benefits—stress reduction, rapport building, and attention enhancement—are widely documented across multiple educational contexts (Berk, 1996, 2002; Garner, 2006). Some research has also identified a positive relationship between humour and creativity (Ziv, 1983; Lowman, 1994).

Key similarity and difference: The current findings strongly align with the international consensus on the affective and attentional benefits of humour. However, the instructors were less convinced of humour's role in fostering creativity than some previous studies suggest.

4.7.4. Perceived Drawbacks of Humour

Current study finding: The most strongly endorsed concerns were that humour could be used to express inappropriate views and that it might offend students (68.8% each). Only 25% of instructors were concerned that humour could provoke disruptive behaviour or undermine teacher authority.

What previous studies found: Concerns about offensiveness and inappropriateness are frequently reported (Wanzer et al., 2006). However, many Western teachers have also expressed fear that humour might diminish student respect for their authority (Korobkin, 1988; Torok et al., 2004).

Key difference: Unlike some Western samples, the Iraqi instructors did not perceive humour as a threat to classroom control or professional authority. Their concerns remained focused on ethical and social boundaries.

4.7.5. Frequency of Humour Use

Current study finding: Exactly half of the participating instructors reported using humour on most days, while the other half used it only occasionally. Among daily users, the majority (62.5%) reported a frequency of one to two times per teaching hour, which aligns with expert recommendations (Berk, 2002). Only three out of sixteen instructors (18.75%) qualified as high-frequency users.

What previous studies found: Considerable variation in humour orientation among teachers is well documented (Booth-Butterfield & Booth-Butterfield, 1991; Wanzer et al., 2006). Recommended frequencies typically range from one to three instances per hour (Berk, 2002).

Key similarity: The current study confirms that humour use varies substantially across individual instructors, and that even regular users tend to employ humour in moderate, intentional doses.

4.7.6. Summary of Comparisons

Table 9. Summary of Comparisons

Domain	**Current Iraqi EFL Instructors**	**Studies (Predominantly Western)**
Importance of humour	Low (optional quality)	Moderate to high (Garner, 2006; Torok et al., 2004)
Preferred	Teacher-led relevant, safe	Consistent (Neuliep, 1991; Wanzer et al.,

humour type		2006)
Rejected humour types	Self-deprecation, student-initiated	Self-deprecation sometimes accepted (Cundall, 2007)
Top benefits	Pressure relief, atmosphere, attention	Strong agreement (Berk, 2002; Garner, 2006)
Top drawbacks	Offence, inappropriate content	Similar, plus authority loss (Korobkin, 1988)
Frequency distribution	Bimodal (50% daily / 50% occasional)	Also varies by individual (Booth-Butterfield & Booth-Butterfield, 1991)

The current findings confirm that Iraqi EFL instructors and teachers in other cultural contexts largely agree on the characteristics of appropriate humour (relevant, respectful, inoffensive) and its primary benefits (stress reduction, positive atmosphere, attention). However, the Iraqi instructors assigned humour a lower overall priority, maintained a stronger insistence on a serious default tone, and rejected self-deprecating and student-led humour more firmly than many Western studies have reported. These differences suggest that cultural and institutional norms—particularly the value placed on teacher authority, seriousness, and face-saving—significantly moderate attitudes toward classroom humour.

References

Ackerman, J., & Dummer, G. (1982). Behavior management in physical education: A handbook for teachers (Report No. EC160413). Maryland Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED234546)

Ağçam, R., & Imam, S. (2017). Investigating instructors' perceptions on the use of humour in higher education. European Journal of Education Studies, 3(2), 238–248. https://www.oapub.org/edu

Akyol, C., & Çakır, A. (2020). Pre-service teachers' perceptions of teacher characteristics and their relation to humor. Journal of Pedagogical Research, 4(2), 112–125.

Askildson, L. (2005). Effects of humor in the language classroom: Humor as a pedagogical tool in theory and practice. Arizona Working Papers in SLAT, 12, 45–61.

Bariaud, F. (1988). Age differences in children's humor. Journal of Children in Contemporary Society, 20(1–2), 49–77.

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.

Berk, R. A. (2002). Humor as an instructional defibrillator: Evidence-based techniques in teaching and assessment. Stylus Publishing.

Bollinger, R. A. (2011). The use of humor in the classroom: A study of teacher perceptions. Education, 131(4), 789–797.

Booth-Butterfield, S., & Booth-Butterfield, M. (1991). Individual differences in the communication of humorous messages. Southern Communication Journal, 56(3), 205–218.

Bryant, J., Comisky, P., & Zillmann, D. (1979). Teachers' humor in the college classroom. Communication Education, 28(2), 110–118.

Chaniotakis, N. (2014). Humour in the classroom: Teachers' perceptions. Studying Humour – International Journal, 1(1), 1–15. https://ejournals.lib.auth.gr

Chenfeld, M. (1990). My loose is tooth! Kidding around with kids. Young Children, 46(1), 56–60.

Chiasson, P. E. (2009). Using humor in the college classroom: The pros and cons. Academic Exchange Quarterly, 13(1), 114–118.

Cohen, T. (1999). Jokes: Philosophical thoughts on joking matters. University of Chicago Press.

Colwell, C., & Wigle, S. (1984). Applicability of humor in the reading language arts curriculum. Reading World, 24(2), 73–80.

Cundall, M. K. (2007). Humor and the limits of incivility. The Journal of Faculty Development, 21(3), 165–172.

Deneire, M. (1995). Humor and foreign language teaching. Humor, 8(3), 285–298.

Garner, R. L. (2006). Humor in pedagogy: How ha-ha can lead to aha! College Teaching, 54(1), 177–180.

Harris, J. (1989). When jokes are not funny. Social Education, 53(5), 270.

Herbert, P. (1991). Humor in the classroom: Theories, functions, and guidelines. Central States Communication Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED336769)

James, D. (2004). A need for humor in online courses. College Teaching, 52(3), 93–96.

Korobkin, D. (1988). Humor in the classroom: Considerations and strategies. College Teaching, 36(4), 154–158.

Lowman, J. (1994). Mastering the techniques of teaching (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Martin, R. A. (2007). The psychology of humor: An integrative approach. Elsevier Academic Press.

Meyer, J. (1990). Ronald Reagan and humor: A politician's velvet weapon. Communication Studies, 41(1), 76–78.

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(4), 343–355.

Nilsen, D. L. F. (1993). Humor and psychology. In Humor scholarship: A research bibliography (pp. 5–11). Greenwood Press.

O'Donnell-Trujillo, N., & Adams, K. (1983). Heheh in conversation: Some coordinating accomplishments of laughter. The Western Journal of Speech, 47(3), 175–191.

Phan, H. P. (2014). Humour in teaching: The perspectives of Australian university students. International Journal of Educational Research, 66, 1–11.

Pollak, J. P., & Freda, P. D. (1997). Humor, learning, and socialization in middle level classrooms. The Clearing House, 70(4), 176–178.

Steele, K. E. (1998). The positive and negative effects of the use of humor in the classroom setting (Master's thesis). Salem-Teikyo University.

Sullivan, R. L. (1992). Students learn more when they're having fun. Vocational Education Journal, 67(3), 36–38.

Torok, S. E., McMorris, R. F., & Lin, W. C. (2004). Is humor an appreciated teaching tool? Perceptions of professors' teaching styles and use of humor. College Teaching, 52(1), 14–20.

Trachtenberg, S. (1979). Joke telling as a tool in ESL. TESOL Quarterly, 13(1), 89–99.

Vizmuller, J. (1980). Psychological reasons for using humor in a pedagogical setting. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 36(2), 266–271.

Wanzer, M. B., Frymier, A. B., Wojtaszczyk, A. M., & Smith, T. (2006). Appropriate and inappropriate uses of humor by teachers. Communication Education, 55(2), 178–196.

Whitmer, J. (1986). Newspaper humor: Tool for critical thinking and reading abilities. Temp. AZ: Western Humour and Irony Conference (ERIC Document Reproduction Service number No. ED 266433).

Wilson, C. (1979). Jokes: Form, content, use, and function. https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:142133150

Zhang, L. (2016). Chinese university EFL teachers' perceptions of humor in teaching. Asian EFL Journal, 18(2), 102–126.

Ziv, A. (1983). The influence of humorous atmosphere on divergent thinking. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 8(1), 68–75.

Iraqia University

Journal of the College of Education for Women: A Peer-Reviewed Academic Journal

Issue No.34
15 September
A.H 1448
A.D 2026

ISSN (print): 2708 - 1354 ISSN (online): 2708 - 1362