

Review research paper

HUMOROUS ANECDOTES AS MOTIVATIONAL TOOL IN PURPOSIVE COMMUNICATION

Cecil B. Albores, Rivika Alda

Philippine Science High School Central Visayas Campus¹, Cebu Normal University²

Abstract. *With the demands of effective pedagogy for the 21st century, teachers are in constant search for a teaching tool that is more fun, and interesting and promotes positive learning. Thus, this study ascertained the effectiveness of humorous anecdotes as a motivational tool in improving students' performance in Purposive Communication. Using a quasi-experimental design, the student's speaking and writing performances were evaluated and the humorous anecdotes as a motivational tool served as a treatment for the experimental group and other different motivational tools were employed in the control group. Focus group discussion was also used to obtain students' narratives during the implementation. The findings assert that the participants taught with humorous anecdotes as a motivational tool exemplify the description of needs improvement for writing skills and noted deficient in speaking skills but with noticeable little progress. Despite little developments observed, the mean gains of the entry and exit performance levels in both skills and groups were comparable. In a deeper sense, humor in this study promotes a heartwarming teaching-learning process and an efficient teacher-student relationship. It is recommended that initiatives to augment the relevance of using humor in motivation may be considered by language teachers.*

Key words: *humorous anecdotes, motivational tool, purposive communication, language teaching, language research*

1. INTRODUCTION

To motivate means to drive someone to get something done. A categorically unmotivated person is someone who feels no encouragement and inspiration, while someone who is activated or energized towards extremities is thought to be motivated. In the schoolroom location, student motivation signifies the context of sincerely exerted effort and focus on learning to achieve fruitful results. Regarding motivation, movements on humor have been embraced by educators and trainers. Building rapport between students and teachers and getting shy and slow students involved in activities is shown in books that promote the utilization of humor in the classroom (Morreall, 2008).

On the other hand, in the Philippines, in the aspect of English language teaching and learning, educators put much effort on themselves into enhancing students' capacity in

Submitted June 12th, 2022, accepted for publication February 14th, 2023

Corresponding author: Rivika Alda, Philippine Science High School Central Visayas Campus¹, Cebu Normal University

E-mail: aldar@cnu.edu.ph

speech, language, and communication (Sarte, 2017). With the aim of the education sector to help every Filipino interact effectively in a multicultural setting, various communication teaching strategies are born, yet still necessary to be verified and reexamined regarding their effectiveness. Moreover, when administrators impose various pedagogical changes and enhancements, the teacher is in the best position and most qualified resource person to be consulted (Bacus, et.al., 2022).

On the other hand, gaining fluency in the different macro skills is a must for learners (Didenko, et.al., 2021). However, students at the tertiary level though having already taken various communication classes in their secondary years of education, still have been observed as having a difficulty in achieving a successful communication process thus, lead to communication breakdown. Purposive Communication is one of the few English courses offered at the tertiary level, especially for non-education-related degree programs. In purposive communication class, students are immersed in various engagements, providing them with learning prospects in communication that has to be carried out effectively and appropriately in a multicultural setting and a diverse context, locally and globally (Cariga, 2014).

Various classroom strategies have been used, yet their efficiency is seen to have not been proven a great help to the student's performance. Latest inventive approaches shall have to be employed in the teaching-learning standpoint with appropriate reinforcements during classroom instruction for the students' surety of achieving a meaningful learning process. With all the above-mentioned concerns in language performance, students' motivation is substantial in this matter with instructional humor as a tool.

Hence, this study is a move to the call for academic exploration in setting the mind of the learners towards meaningful learning in the world of English Language Teaching. It is conducted to ascertain if humorous anecdotes as a motivational tool are effective in improving students' performance in purposive communication.

This study ascertained the effectiveness of humorous anecdotes as a motivational tool in improving students' performance in Purposive Communication.

This specifically answered the following:

1. students' entry and exit performance levels in speaking and writing of the control and experimental groups;
2. the significant difference between students' entry and exit performance levels in speaking and writing; and,
3. the significant difference in the mean gain of both groups.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

To be moved to do something is the characteristic of being motivated (Ryan and Deci, 2000). A person who is motivated is someone who is purposely driven and inspired; whereas an unmotivated person is an individual who senses no encouragement or impetus to act. What is essential for student learning is engagement and motivation in the teaching-learning setting. In the absence of motivation, learning is indistinct for the students. Stenberg (2005) believes that to achieve the purpose of attaining school success, motivation is very significant. The learner's diverse motivation characteristics may differ every time depending on the specified teaching-learning framework (Schlechty, 2001). Saeed and Zyngier (2012) contend about the various motivational types from the

qualitative viewpoint. In connection to this contention, it is stressed that more than its amount, the type carries some weight. This is the core idea for the embedded assertion from the statement “intrinsic and extrinsic”. Intrinsically motivated students have higher perceptions when it comes to competence and engagement, lower anxiety levels, and higher levels of achievement in obtaining enough input, compared to those not inspired intrinsically, according to numerous research studies (Wigfield and Wager, 2005).

Hence, it is established that a significant connection is present between success in education and the underlying driving force (Law, et.al., 2012). Understanding the various intrinsic motivation types is essential for every educative community. Utilization of more lively and attention-grabbing intrinsic motivation forms like digital sources, are only a few of the many substantial techniques for the attainment of success in learning (Ryan and Deci, 2000).

Humor has always been honored as instrumental and persuasive in setting up connections and even acquaintances. It is apparent to the thought that humor is associated with “telling and doing” and is marked to be hilarious reaching the point of making an individual laugh. Humor according to Mindess (1971) is described as a perception style based on life’s encounters and a frame of mind. It is somehow a strange standpoint, a kind of outlook, and something that possesses a healing dominance and capability. As explained by Raskin (1985), it covers the situation of someone who has heard or seen anything or something and then definitely giggles and falls laughing. This means that an individual finds the auditory and optical stimulus amusing. As stated by Morreall (2008), contentions that are introduced with humor cultivated open-mindedness about others’ ideas promoting a more peaceful and relaxing environment. Funny talks and lectures provide listeners with a soothing feeling and permit various concepts and successful collaboration (Ziv, 1983). It was determined by humor researchers that humor provides various advantages. This has been practiced in different disciplines and industries such as education.

One skill that may be enhanced because of humor incorporated into the teaching strategy is the “language skill”. Language is commonly imparted at the same time evaluated through these four skills, namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing. These are categorized into two main types of skills - productive and receptive skills”. Receptive skills include listening and reading, while productive skills are speaking and writing (Roberts, Jergens & Burchinal, 2005).

Various studies emphasize the impact of humor and its relationship to learning. A lot of scholars concur that various evidence on the utilization of humor provides progress to learning, yet still contains disputes at some parts. The very first question is on the employment and application of humor effectively and appropriately. As mentioned by Bryant and Zillmann (1989), the usage of humor in instruction is dependent on the correct employment of the humor type, considering the time, condition, and types of learners.

Instructional humor plays an important role in achieving good performance in teachers’ evaluation and the creation of a stress-free space conducive to learning. Robinson’s (1983) argues that “what is learned with laughter is learned well”. A superior conception and grasp of knowledge about the content of the curriculum are made visible as humor is appropriately and correctly utilized in the learning environment (Garner, 2006).

In this connection, Kaplan and Pascoe’s (1977) argument about humor states that it significantly requires being relevant and appropriate concerning its utilization as materials in classroom instruction to make learning meaningful. This claim is grounded in the study about students at the tertiary level who were recipients of a classroom lecture employing humor

significantly utilized and also another lecture without the manipulation of humor in the classroom. It is suggested in the results that humor assists and enhances students' learning intensity when appropriately implemented and designed along with the lecture material.

Upon attaining a vast advantage in the field of education, humor has to be employed since it is considered the most influential means of teaching and learning (Cornett, 1986). He believes that it is advantageous among teachers and learners who make use of instructional humor and concentrates on its favorable results and how these results are transformed into expanded learning along with motivation. Examples of humor results according to Cornett include supervising demanding attitudes and managing the acquisition of foreign language. Conversely, Teslow (1995) focuses on the connections of humor and its use in the classroom environment. It is pointed out that humor is acknowledged as a significant strategy in uplifting the spirit of motivation and is considered a reliever of tension. To be precise, humor has been very useful in teaching and is generally considered by students as an eliminating force of apprehension and anxiety.

Moreover, instructional humor operates positively in a way that it is also a mechanism for coping with stress and anxiety and a tool for establishing a joyful and relaxed environment, and thus is influential in many favorable ways (Banas et al., 2011). The effectiveness of humor is dependent on the learner's proficiency in perceiving and sorting out the suitability of instructional humor even though it is known to assist students' learning in the classroom. Various methodologies emerge about classroom humor as researchers use them in their respective studies. Strategy for the implementation of humor is known to have relied on diverse factors and one of these is culture (Teslow, 1995). Various customs and practices originate from the different foundations of humor and humor in the logical sense are interpreted contrarily from one civilization to the other, thus a funny message in a particular context might not be funny for the other. Specifically, this circumstance needs to be taken into consideration to validate the value of instructional humor in teaching.

Based on the contentions aforementioned, motivation is expected to be playing a role in learning. Learners nowadays are observed to be requiring positive reinforcements in the classroom setting or an educative community. To go along with this need and to achieve a successful teaching-learning process, humor is said to be one of the relevant tools in motivating students and uplifting students' interest in learning. Since individuals today seem to be more attentive when the conversation is integrated with laughter and funny stories, it is anticipated that humor is also effective in the classroom setting. Highly motivated individuals are expected to gain higher learning and thus humorous anecdotes as a motivational tool are looked forward to as the answer to the academic call for students' learning.

3. METHOD

3.1. Research design

This study utilized a quasi-experimental design with pre-test, treatment, and post-test. In this study, the humorous anecdotes are the independent variable, while the students' level of speaking and writing performance in the Purposive Communication course is the dependent variable. There were two groups of respondents in this study, the experimental and control group. The experimental group was taught about the concepts of Purposive Communication utilizing humorous anecdotes as a motivational tool. On the other hand, the control group was taught with the use of other various motivational tools like simple

recapitulation, typical question and answer portion, and ordinary image observation technique, to mention some.

3.2. Participants

This study utilized the purposive sampling technique. The respondents of the study were first-year college students at a state university in Cebu. They are only a few among the many first-year college students who still struggle in communicating appropriately and successfully as a whole. Each class has 26 enrolled students and has the same degree program. A total of 52 students participated in this study assigned to the control and experimental group.

3.3. Research instruments

For the pre-test and post-test, essay writing and extemporaneous speaking were administered. These tests were validated by experts and students' tasks were rated by 3 English professors using a rubric. Compiled humorous anecdotes during the treatment were obtained in congruence with the topics stipulated in the Purposive Communication course syllabus by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED).

The rubric for the essay writing to test the writing skills of the respondents contains five criteria and scored through a 4-point scoring range.

Consequently, the rubric for the extemporaneous speaking activity to test the speaking skills of the respondents contains ten performance standards and scored through a 5-point scoring range.

3.4. Data Analysis

After all the data were gathered, the data were tabulated. Statistical formulas were used in the quantitative results of the investigation. Mean difference was used to determine the results of the pre-test and post-test entry and exit performance levels of the respondents in both speaking and writing. A T-test was used to get the significant difference in the student's entry and exit performance levels in both groups.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. The Entry and Exit Performance Levels in Writing and Speaking of the Control and Experimental Groups

Table 1 revealed that the mean scores in all criteria in the entry performance level for both the control and experimental group *needs improvement*. This indicated that the students were not able to generate wider ideas out of the question given in the essay. It can also be deduced that the students at this level have not fully developed this particular literacy skill though they were already provided with their background knowledge and competencies which they gained when they were still in high school. The pre-test must have provided them the opportunity to activate their prior knowledge and construct new meanings upon answering the essay question though it was not seen to be adequate.

Table 1 Entry and Exit Performance Levels in Writing Skills for Control and Experimental Group

Groups	Criteria	Entry Performance Level	Description	Exit Performance Level	Description
CONTROL	Focus and Details	2.28	Needs Improvement	2.40	Needs Improvement
	Organization	2.17	Needs Improvement	2.33	Needs Improvement
	Voice/Point of View	2.14	Needs Improvement	2.58	Excellent
	Word Choice	2.17	Needs Improvement	2.35	Needs Improvement
	Sentence Structure, Grammar, Spelling	2.01	Needs Improvement	1.94	Needs Improvement
	Totality	10.76	Needs Improvement	11.61	Needs Improvement
EXPERIMENTAL	Focus and Details	2.31	Needs Improvement	2.57	Excellent
	Organization	2.11	Needs Improvement	2.36	Needs Improvement
	Voice/Point of View	2.01	Needs Improvement	2.54	Excellent
	Word Choice	1.96	Needs Improvement	2.40	Needs Improvement
	Sentence Structure, Grammar, Spelling	1.83	Needs Improvement	2.08	Needs Improvement
	Totality	10.22	Needs Improvement	11.96	Needs Improvement

Further, it can be inferred then that in general, the students' prerequisite and fundamental skills and literary competence in writing have not been developed adequately to aid understanding of the required performance task in the pre-test which is essay writing. On the other hand, the mean scores of the exit performance level for both control and experimental groups were comparative to the mean scores of the entry performance level as shown in the table. There were noticeable little improvements in most of each criteria except for sentence structure; performance and spelling for the control group whose mean score decreased from 2.01 in the entry performance level and 1.94 in the exit performance level. Piaw (2012) revealed that the content-based humorous cartoons used as learning materials increased students' contentment from mastering complicated ideas in the reading, increased their challenge; strengthened their efficacy; increased curiosity and involvement. Similar to the entry performance level mean scores, sentence structure, grammar, mechanics, and spelling score, is observably lower than the other four for the two groups. There were only limited improvements in the writing performance of the students in both groups.

An experiment with university students explicated that while immediate recall of material was not affected, recall of the material six weeks later was significantly higher for

those who were taught with relevant humorous material (Kaplan and Pascoe, 1977). Students who receive instructions like this scored higher on standardized tests as revealed by Park and Peterson (2009). In congruence with the entry performance level in writing skills of both the control and experimental group, the exit performance level also has the description of *needs improvement*. This implied that the respondents' writing performance level after the experimentation was described still *needs improvement*.

In Table 2, the mean scores in most of the criteria in the speaking skills for both control and experimental group entry and exit performance levels were described as *minimal* and *deficient*. These results were all determined through an extemporaneous speaking activity for both groups.

At the entry level, it is obvious that the respondents have a limited idea about the given question and they were mostly overpowered by anxiety and stage fright. Students usually focus on the question by directly giving their answers without supporting materials like agreeing or contrasting to the existing body of knowledge. This is one of the factors why the respondents' writing performance is described as deficient for both groups at this level. Further, the results also showed that students may not have the time or the motivation to practice English whether spoken or written (Alda, 2018).

Meanwhile, there were also noticeable little improvements to their performance as reflected in Table 2 in the exit performance level of the control group. This signifies that students' performance in speaking for the control group still needs improvement after the implementation of humorous anecdotes as a motivational tool. One reason may be the relevance of the student's interests. Topics that can be anchored to current trends may be more engaging for them.

Consequently, the total mean score in speaking skills for the control group was described as *deficient* in the entry performance level and as *minimal* in the exit performance level. The *minimal* description means students formulate irrelevant responses to the prompts. Their speech did not flow well and was not logically organized. Overall, it has not reached the expected performance for tertiary-level students.

The mean scores of the entry performance level of the experimental group were relatively similar to the exit performance levels described as *below deficient*. In parallel to the control group, the experimental group respondents were also given a time limit upon delivery of ideas; however, it was evident that their speeches were very short making them unable to provide supporting materials to their answers. The highest mean score is (2.15) for formulating an introduction that orients the audience to the topic and speaker, similar to the results in the control group, described as *minimal*.

In totality, the entry and exit performance levels of the experimental group were described as *deficient*. It is evident that there were some improvements to the mean scores, however they were not able to increase much towards making the description minimal, basic, proficient, or advanced. Furthermore, most of the students spoke inaudibly, enunciated poorly, and spoke in a monotone and poor pacing tone that distracts listeners with fillers. They usually looked down and avoided eye contact, with nervous gestures and non-verbal behaviors. The message was generic or canned, and no attempt was made to establish common ground. Another factor that might have affected the results is the length of duration of the implementation. The study of Tribble (2001), revealed that a significant difference emerged between test scores measuring learning and recall on learners with longer and shorter exposure to humor in the teaching-learning process. Hence, a longer

period of implementation in this study might have shown a larger increase in performance from the pre-test to the post-test.

Table 2 Entry and Exit Performance Levels in Speaking Skills for Control and Experimental Group

Group	Criteria	Entry Performance Level	Description	Exit Performance Level	Description
CONTROL	Formulates an introduction that orients the audience to the topic and speaker	1.89	Minimal	2.50	Minimal
	Uses an effective organizational pattern	1.64	Deficient	2.01	Minimal
	Locates, synthesizes, and employs compelling supporting materials	1.25	Deficient	1.54	Deficient
	Develops a conclusion that reinforces the thesis and provides psychological insights	1.24	Deficient	1.39	Deficient
	Demonstrates a careful choice of words	1.82	Minimal	2.33	Minimal
	Effectively uses vocal expression and paralanguage to engage the audience	1.96	Minimal	2.33	Minimal
	Demonstrates non-verbal behavior that supports the verbal message	1.64	Deficient	2.03	Minimal
	Successfully adapts the presentation to the audience	1.63	Deficient	1.93	Minimal
	Constructs an effectual persuasive message with credible evidence and sound reasoning	1.94	Minimal	2.13	Minimal
	Totality	15.00	Deficient	18.15	Minimal
EXPERIMENTAL	Formulates an introduction that orients the audience to the topic and speaker	1.94	Minimal	2.15	Minimal
	Uses an effective organizational pattern	1.38	Deficient	1.53	Deficient
	Locates, synthesizes, and employs compelling supporting materials	0.78	Below Deficient	0.97	Below Deficient
	Develops a conclusion that reinforces the thesis and provides psychological insights	0.82	Below Deficient	0.96	Below Deficient
	Demonstrates a careful choice of words	1.51	Deficient	1.94	Minimal
	Effectively uses vocal expression and paralanguage to engage the audience	1.74	Deficient	1.96	Minimal
	Demonstrates non-verbal behavior that supports the verbal message	1.50	Deficient	1.72	Deficient
	Successfully adapts the presentation to the audience	1.57	Deficient	1.58	Deficient
	Constructs an effectual persuasive message with credible evidence and sound reasoning	1.56	Deficient	1.76	Deficient
	Totality	12.79	Deficient	14.58	Deficient

4.2. Significant Difference between Entry and Exit Performance Level

Even with the results above, as shown in Table 3, there is a significant difference between the entry and exit performance levels on students' writing skills for both the control and experimental group.

Table 3 Entry and Exit Performance Level Paired - Difference in Students' Writing Skills

Group	Mean	SD	T	P-Value
CONTROL				
Entry Performance Level	10.76	2.66	2.2701	0.0329
Exit Performance Level	11.61	1.95		
EXPERIMENTAL				
Entry Performance Level	10.22	2.35	3.7133	0.0011
Exit Performance Level	11.96	1.15		

Note: **Significant at 0.05

Further, results showed that there is a significant difference between the entry and exit performance levels in writing skills of the students in the control group. The means suggest that the exit performance is significantly higher than the entry performance. Students' essays, in this case, displayed improvement in the focus and details, organization of the topic given, point of view or voice of the content, the choice of words, as well as the sentence structure, grammar, mechanics, and spelling. This implies that other methods of motivation which includes simple recapitulation, typical question, and answer portion, and ordinary image observation technique can help improve writing performance. These motivational tools serve as an introductory activity to the topic of the day and have been continuously used by a lot of educators.

On the other hand, based on the calculations, results in the experimental group showed that there is a significant difference between the entry and exit performance levels performance on writing skills of the students in the experimental group. The means suggest that the exit performance is significantly higher than the entry performance.

Similar to the control group, students' essays displayed improvement in the focus and details, organization of the topic given, point of view or voice of the content, the choice of words, as well as the sentence structure, grammar, mechanics, and spelling. It can be gleaned that the anecdotes provided the students with an avenue to improve students writing skills. It strengthened their will to learn more and thus, radiates to their performance. The study of Blyth and Ohyama (2011), revealed that students' achievement in vocabulary and awareness was measurable as they explored the effects of using humor in EFL classrooms. Additionally, Banas, et.al. (2011) explicated that due to less stress and anxiety, humor can increase comprehension and cognitive retention and when humor is related to course materials it can make information more memorable. Students' ability on topic recall was activated and cognitive retention increased because of humorous anecdotes used as a motivational tool, and thus helped them effectively in providing input during the writing activity.

Table 4 reflects the level paired - difference in the entry and exit performance levels in the students' speaking skills for both the control and experimental group.

Table 4 Entry and Exit Performance Level Paired - Difference
in Students' Speaking Skills

	Mean	SD	T	P-Value
CONTROL				
Entry Performance Level	15.00	5.89	3.1611	0.0044
Exit Performance Level	18.15	6.37		
EXPERIMENTAL				
Entry Performance Level	12.79	4.81	1.8255	0.0809
Exit Performance Level	14.58	6.68		

Note: **Significant at 0.05

Based on the table, the results showed that there is a significant difference between the entry and exit performance levels in the speaking skills of the students. This suggests that the exit performance is significantly higher than the entry performance. The students' speeches in the group displayed improvements in formulating an introduction that orients the audience to the topic and speaker, using an effective organizational pattern, locating, synthesizing, and employing compelling supporting materials. They also showed progress in developing a conclusion that reinforces the thesis and provides psychological closure, demonstrating careful choice of words and using vocal expression and paralanguage to engage the audience. Moreover, the students exhibited development in demonstrating non-verbal behavior that supports the verbal message, adapting the presentation to the audience, and constructing an effectual persuasive message with credible evidence and sound reasoning.

The control group who has experienced motivational methods which includes simple recapitulation, typical question, and answer portion, and ordinary image observation technique, their speaking skills were also tested through class participation during the discussion and oral recitations. This implies that these activities as inserted during classroom instruction in the aspect of motivation, in particular, served as their grounds to have enhanced their speaking skills. The lectures also provided the students with inputs as to what to say and answer during the extemporaneous speaking activity since the questions were all related to the subject, Purposive Communication.

The data showed that though the exit performance levels weighted mean score is higher than the entry performance level's weighted mean score of the experimental group, there is no significant difference between the entry and exit performance levels on the speaking skills of the students. In this part, students have received instruction through the implementation of humorous anecdotes as a motivational tool, yet their performances remained constant. Improvements were visible as shown through their mean scores, yet they did not display any significant difference after all. Prevailing factors on this result include the duration of implementation of the intervention, students' interest in the topic during evaluation, and sustainability of the student's motivation. A longer period of implementation in this study might have shown a larger increase in performance from the pre-test to the post-test. Anyhow, topics that boost students' interests like current trends on social media and gaming, might have improved their performance. Moreover, it was observed that the motivations of the students were not similar at the same time. The level of eagerness and interest they had was not directly similar during the time of the discussion and the time when they were evaluated. This might be because of personal apprehensions and obstructions that they have on their own along the way. This implies that experiential backgrounds contributed to the student's performances.

Table 5 reflects the comparative analysis of the mean gain of the student's writing skills between the control and experimental group.

Table 5 Comparative Analysis of the Mean Gain of the Student's Writing Skills in Control and Experimental Groups

	Mean Gain		T	P-Value
	Mean	SD		
Control Group	0.85	1.83	-1.4859	0.1444
Experimental Group	1.74	2.29		

Note: **Significant at 0.05

As presented in the table above, there is no significant statistical difference among groups concerning writing. Thus, the results are comparable. This explains that whether instructors apply simple recapitulation, typical question and answer portion, and ordinary image observation technique, or humorous anecdotes as a motivational tool in the subject, students' performance in writing will still be relatively similar. This is supported by the claim of Radosavlevikj (2020) that because students come from varied background settings, some students may feel uncomfortable and less confident to engage in any communication involving a foreign language.

The application of other motivational tools in the control group may or may not provide any help in the students' writing performance. Sectioning which is beyond the researcher's control and exposure to language which is English of both are the underlying influences of these results. Results might vary if respondents delivered their speeches in the extemporaneous speaking activity in their language of comfort or in vernacular. One factor that affected students' performance in the experimental group, in particular, is that students' motivation during the discussion and as the anecdotes were presented may set differences by the time they were writing for their essay as evaluation.

Moreover, Ross (2005) claims that there is a time and a place for humor. It is sometimes inappropriate in certain situations and at certain times. The social and physical restrictions which are present at a given time and in a given area are different from those restrictions which are present at other times and in other areas. In addition, Rosenthal (2011) explains that the humor of the last decade might no longer be appreciated today and the humor of civilization might not be acknowledged as humor in the other. Similar to the observation above, the level of eagerness and interest of both groups is not directly similar during the time of the discussion and the time when they were evaluated. This might be because of personal apprehensions and obstructions that they have on their own along the way. This implies that psychological orientation contributed to the respondents' writing performance.

Looking into the critical lens and exploring the paradigms of this study, factors that were taken into consideration include that these students are majoring in information technology. It can be gleaned that improving their writing or speaking skills does fully benefit their field of profession after all. Facing computers and programming software do not require much of the skills tested, thus only show a little significance or improvement with the help of the motivational tools used, namely simple recapitulation, typical question and answer portion, ordinary image observation technique, and humorous anecdotes.

7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Humorous anecdotes as a motivational tool create an impact on the activation of students' interest and integration of values into the lessons. Its effectiveness is based on the interest, knowledge, skills, and values acquired by the students in the subject during classroom interaction. As the students' affective filter was removed because of the humorous anecdotes, their interest to learn was triggered, so the welcoming of new knowledge happened and this radiates to their skills and values acquired. In a deeper sense, humor in this study promotes a heartwarming teaching-learning process and an efficient teacher-student relationship. The humorous anecdotes as motivational tools encourage a healthy and effective beginning of every lesson. It carries a substantial path for willingness and motivation. Thus, educational institutions may undertake initiatives to augment the relevance of using humor in motivation, particularly in the confines of higher education institutions. They may in turn send teachers to seminars and training that promote modern strategies for motivations like the utilization of humor to assimilate suitable and effective strategies.

REFERENCES

- Alda, R. (2018). Podcasting Tasks and Students' Aural-Oral Skills. *International Journal of English and Education*, vol. 7(4), 244-251. http://ijee.org/yahoo_site_admin/assets/docs/19rivika.28065057.pdf
- Bacus, R. C., & Alda, R. C. (2022). Senior high school teaching: A phenomenological inquiry. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 19(1), 243–276. <https://doi.org/10.32890/mjli2022.19.1.9>
- Banas, J.A., Dunbar, N., Rodriguez, D., and Liu, S. (2011). A review of humor in education settings: Four decades of research. *Communication Education*, 60 (1), 115-144.
- Blyth, A., & Ohyama, T. (2011). Using humour in EFL classes. In A. Stewart (Ed.), *JALT2010 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.
- Bryant, J., & Zillmann, D. (1989). Using Humor to Promote Learning in the Classroom. In P. E. McGhee (Ed.), *Humor and children's development: A guide to practical applications* (pp. 49-78). New York: Haworth Press.
- Cariga, C., & Giongco, A. (2014, August 15). A look into CHED Memo No. 20-2013: The end of a language? Retrieved February 13, 2019, from The LaSallian website: <https://thelasallian.com/2014/08/15/a-look-into-ched-memo-no-20-2013-the-end-of-a-language/#:~:text=In%20the%20memorandum%2C%20it%20is>
- Cornett, C. E. (1986). Learning through laughter: Humor in the classroom. Bloomington, In Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Didenko, I., Zhukova, N. (2021). Teaching writing and error correction In an English for specific purposes classroom in 2014-2020 in Ukraine. *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, vol. 9 (3), 363–375. <https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP2103363D>
- Kaplan, R. M., & Pascoe, G. C. (1977). Humorous lectures and humorous examples: Some effects upon comprehension and retention. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 69, 61-65.
- Law, J., Lee, W., Roulstone E, S., Wren, Y., Zeng, B. and Lindsay, G. (2012). What Works: Interventions for Children and Young People with Speech, Language and Communication Needs. Technical Annex (London: Department for Education).

- Mindess, H. (1971). *Laughter and Liberation*. Los Angeles: Nash.
- Morreall, J. (2008). *Applications of Humor: Health, the workplace, and education*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nguyen, C. (2008). *Student Motivation and Learning*. United States Military Academy, West Point, NY
- Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2009). Character strengths: Research and practice. *Journal of College and Character*, 10(4).
- Piaw, C.Y. (2012). Using content-based humorous cartoons in learning materials to improve students' reading rate, comprehension and motivation: It is a wrong technique. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 64, 352 – 361.
- Radosavlevikj, N. (2020). Teachers' and students' perceptions and challenges in communicative language teaching. *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, vol. 8(3), 307-317. <https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP2003307R>
- Raskin, V. (1985). *Semantic Mechanisms of Humor*. Dordrecht-Boston-Lancaster: D. Reidel.
- Robinson, V.M. (1983). Humor and health. In *Handbook of Humor Research*; McGhee, P.E., Goldstein, J.H., Eds.; Springer: New York, NY, USA, 1983; Volume 2, pp. 109–128.
- Roberts, J. et.al. (2005). The role of home literacy practices in preschool childrens' language and emergent literary skills. *The University of North Carolina*. 48 (2)): 345-59.
- Rosenthal, F. (2011). *Humour in Early Islam with an introduction by Geert Jan van Gelder*. Leiden. Boston: Brill. (Brill Classics in Islam).
- Ross, A. (2005). *The Language of Humour*. London: Routledge.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000a). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54–67.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000b). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68–78.
- Saeed & Zyngier, (2012). *How Motivation Influences Student Engagement: A Qualitative Case Study*. *Journal of Education and Learning*. Monash University, Australia.
- Schlechty, Phillip C. (2011). *Engaging students*. Hoboken, NJ: Jossey – Bass.
- Sarte, M. (2017). *Lesson Exemplars for Teaching Pop-up Writing for World Literature*. Cebu, Philippines.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2005). Intelligence, competence and expertise. In E. Andrew & D. Carol (Eds.), *Hand book of competence and motivation*. New York. USA: The Guilford Press.
- Teslow, J. L. (1995). Humor me: A call for research. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 43,6-28. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02300453>.
- Tribble, M. Jr. (2001). *Humor and Mental Effort in Learning*. Ph.D. diss. The University of Georgia.
- Wigfield, A., & Wagner, A.L. (2005). Competence, Motivation, and Identity Development during Adolescence. In A. J. Elliot & C.S. Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of Competence and Motivation* (pp. 222-239). New York, NY, US: Guilford Publications.
- Ziv, A. (1983). The Influence of Humorous Atmosphere on Divergent Thinking. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 8(1), 68-75.