

The necessity of using humour in the teaching activity

Marius-Costel Eși

Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava, Romania
mariusesi@yahoo.com

Received 10.06.2017; Accepted 04.07. 2017

Abstract

The importance given to the pragmatic and functional nature of humor in the educational system expresses the existence and assumption of specific teaching strategies of the school organization. The idea we want to analyze is to see to what extent the use of humor in didactic activity becomes relevant and, at the same time, to analyze the (direct/indirect) relationship between it and the social and educational reality. Thus, we are interested in capturing the main ideas that refer to such an approach to humor in relation to the idea of education and, implicitly, to the didactic activity.

Keywords: *humor, didactic humor, educational humor, didactic activity, performance, competitiveness*

Introduction

By trying to bring into question the issue of the reconsideration and the evaluation of the concept of humor, we believe that it allows us to report our analysis on the dimension of strictly integrating humor into the didactic activity. The argumentative line developed in this regard is oriented towards the way in which humor is perceived, understood and applied in society and education. Therefore, we also draw attention to a number of arguments favorable to such an approach, which are also found in literature and practice.

In these circumstances, the research direction that we assumed involves, on the one hand, an exhaustive analysis of the identification of the main sources of humor in education and, on the other hand, their explanation in a scientific-ethical manner as they are found at the level of organizational culture (of educational nature). Moreover, considering such aspects, we believe that they can be a support in assuming a pragmatic and functional dimension of the idea of humor in the education process. Moreover, we believe that synthesizing the main ideas that express such an opinion may involve a form of valorisation of humor in the educational system. So, we will try to present in detail and develop a series of conceptual and theoretical approaches to this research topic and the theoretical analysis materializes on the relationship between educational and didactic humor.

The main *purpose* of this paper is focused, as the title suggests (*The necessity of using humour in the teaching activity*), upon the study of the idea of humor in education and implicitly in the didactic activity. To put it simply, through this research we propose to invoke some valid scientific

arguments that can confirm the idea that humor is a relevant factor in the process of teaching-learning-evaluation. In other words, we propose to argue that the assumption of quality humor in the educational/didactic process must take into account some pragmatic, social and ethical considerations.

The **proposed theme** is therefore conceived as an educational study through which the variety and the connections between the conceptual/theoretical and practical dimensions concerning the analysis of the idea of humor in education are explored. At the same time, the arguments that we will try to bring through this research are based upon a multidimensional analysis of the notion of „humor” and implicitly of the terms „source of humor” and „use of humor” in relation to the idea of education. Therefore, the assumptions related to this type of research are built upon analytical observations made on the main theories and examples of good practices, as they are found in literature and practice.

The **topic** chosen for study is, in our opinion, a topical one, even if it was also analyzed in previous years by a number of specialists from different perspectives in some specialized papers. Its choice was due to the lack of scientific systematization in the literature from an ethical-scientific perspective. This is more than obvious across the nation, where the literature related to this field is rather taken over and quoted, without being analyzed upon clear, ethical criteria.

Of course, taking into account the well-known classical notion that „there is nothing new under the sun”, we mention that through this approach we do not want to diminish the role and importance of the specialized literature existing in this field and that does refer to the idea of humor in relation to education. So, our initiative is to complement such research and with elements specific to our own analysis as they are found in international and national literature. The concern about this issue is all the more justified to the extent that, in many schools, the use of humor in class hours and in education is becoming more and more obvious, generating an educational pragmatism. In this way, the argumentative line developed in this paper is focused on the analysis of those fundamentals characteristic of the ethical and pragmatic ways in which humor is perceived, analyzed and used in the educational system, but also in the social system.

The **actuality and importance of the present paper** expresses the fact that, both educationally and socially, an important role in the analysis of some explanatory theories on the idea of humor and implicitly its use in education is played by teachers, parents/legal guardians, on the one hand, and the pupils/students, on the other. Under these circumstances, our focus is upon the formative valences of humor in education. Also, the foundation of this work aims, in this context, to attempt to understand and explain how humor, as a whole, is perceived in the Romanian educational environment.

The underlying **objectives** of this paper can be synthesized in the following formulations:

(O1) The identification in literature and practice of the main concepts and theories that prove to be relevant in the process of defining the idea of humor in education;

(O2) Explaining the main peculiarities of humor in education and society (considering the educational humor and the didactic humor), on the one hand, the role and importance of humor in the teaching-learning-evaluation process (in this regard, we consider the main social and psychological valences of humor in education in relation to some forms of humor as they are found in the educational activity), on the other.

(O3) The assessment of the context in which humor is defined.

The *content* of the paper is designed to highlight a series of examples (good practices) and models of integration of humor in the didactic activity. We also look at illustrating the dimension of ethics in relation to the educational idea of humor. So, the coordinates of this paper fall into the theoretical and practically an area of sequential exemplars of ethical and value nature. Thus, our focus has been mainly on aspects related to the conceptual and theoretical framing of the idea of humor. Our approach to this first part of the paper is rather a re-evaluation and a theoretical and practical recontextualization, as it is also found in literature and practice. At the same time, we are considering an analysis of how humor is perceived, understood and accepted in education as well as in society.

Our focus is on the very question of how to understand such an idea in relation to what is happening at the level of the current society, considering the idea of education. In this context, we are also taking into account an analytical approach to the relationship between educational humor and didactic humor, as it is found in examples of good practice. Therefore, the issue in question allows us to consider a third aspect that we have dealt with in this first chapter, namely the one related to the integration of humor in the didactic activity.

Regarding the realization of this work, we make it clear that by this approach we do not want to find out whether humor is beneficial or not, more or less permissive at the level of the didactic activity. We are rather interested in the way it is perceived in the national and international literature, as well as in the Romanian educational environment. Therefore, our focus is mainly upon the main aspects that can highlight and explain a possible conditionality between humor and its integration into a didactic activity, but also the success of such activity in relation to the actors involved at the level of the school organization (pupils, teachers, parents, legal guardians).

1. The humor in education and society. What is humor?

Let's talk about an education of excellence, competitiveness and performance from the perspective of humor, as perceived at the educational and social level! This could be the basic idea of what we have proposed in an approach such as this. Many times, humor is disregarded, because there is a saying stating that "learning at school must be a serious thing." Thus a class of students wearing a smile on their faces at the hours can be associated with the idea of frivolity or superficiality. However, if we look beyond what lies behind these smiles, we must look beyond the classical approach to learning, and why not, we must look beyond the more or less rigid expectations of the socio-educational actors. To that end, Sigmund Freud states that "the humorous process can be achieved in two ways, either to one person, who adopts the humoristic attitude itself, while the

second person has the role of a beneficiary spectator, or between two persons, among which one is in no way part of the humorous process, and the other turns the second person into the subject to her humorous considerations.” (Freud, 2002).

In fact, some specialists in the field emphasize that: “Humor is an interpersonal experience used to increase the patient's self-awareness (that is, to improve his/her ability to see himself/herself and others objectively) and to developing the state of preparedness for complete and free emotional reactivity” (Rosenheim, E., 1974). We note that the psychoanalytic approach expresses a picture of humor that can be correlated with the inner states of the being. Therefore, such a psychoanalytic approach emphasizes that humor is explained as an emotional stress relief.

Although challenged by some specialists (Kubie, 1971), the integration of humor into psychotherapy (Dinu, 2014) reflects two paradigms explaining it in relation to what it expresses. Thus, on the one hand, we find a cognitivist paradigm, in which humor is seen as an important indicator/factor in the process of changing people's thoughts and perceptions. (Ellis, 1973). On the other hand, we encounter the behavioral paradigm, according to which humor is explained as a means of facilitating the learning process. (Ziv, 1988).

We could say that the humor itself, perceived as an essential part of our life (Stieger, Formann, Burger, 2011), but also as a form of intelligence (Maxim, 2002), also has as a source the curiosity combined with some pleasure to go to classes. In other words, beyond the educational "academic" seriousness, we must admit that sometimes humor, as a social state, proves to be more than relevant in the process of teaching-learning-evaluation.

Thus, humor is nothing but what is known in the everyday social language as a “to put a smile on the face.” Identified and analyzed from a scientific point of view (Martin, Puhlik-Doris, Larsen, Gray & Weir, 2003; Cann & Chantal 2014), the multiple and different meanings of humor all send to that state of mind that can maintain good relationships or reduce anxiety (Yovetich, Dale & Hudak, 1990), and thus some diseases can even be fought.

In this respect, some authors assert that humor can facilitate the interaction among people, while ensuring their psychological evolution. (Botgros, 2016).

However, sometimes humor is perceived to be rather a sign of frivolity or even negligence over a particular object/subject of interest at the level of the class of students. In this context, we can ask ourselves whether humor, as it is found in its different forms at school, represents or does not represent, in the true sense of the word, “to have fun”.

If we were to refer to the etymology of the word “school” and to relate it to the idea of humor, we can find a series of explanations designed to give an overview of what constitutes the source of humor in the educational dimension. The term “school” comes from Greek from the word “skhola” / “schola”, a word, which in turn derives from the ancient Greek from “scholeion”, meaning “free time”. Subsequently, this word has undergone various meanings, such as “leisure time” or “reading

place” (Stati, 1964). Later on, taken by the Romans, such a term expresses the place where those philosophical debates took place.

We point out that such a place did not represent the institution as such, but the waiting space specific to the Roman public baths, known as “therme”. (Şpan, 2018). In other words, in the spirit of this paper, we can conclude that school is exactly the place where “we should all feel very well”. Therefore, a school with happy students is a school that knows how to stimulate their pleasure in going to school. (Badea, 2015).

On the other hand, starting from the idea of the applicability of the idea of humor in the field of education, we can consider the idea of some authors, according to which humor is “any message - transmitted in action, speech or writing, image or music –intended to produce a smile or laughter” (Bremmer & Rodenburg, 2006). In this regard, we can agree with some authors that, from an educational point of view, the purpose of humor is to support the teacher in his approach to building a positive atmosphere in class, and encouraging students to actively engage in classroom activities, reducing anxiety (Ford, Lappi, O'Connor & Banos, 2017) and their stress (Kavandi & Kavandi, 2016). This is the reason why the educator, whomever he or she may be, must also have a good sense of humor (Florea, 2017).

Some authors have also stated that by humor and laughter, health is preserved, reducing conditions such as depression (Ibarra-Rovillarl & Kuiper, 2011) and anxiety (Smith, Ascough, Ettinger & Nelson, 1971) increasing the ability to easily withstand conflict situations and to cope with stressful environments. (McCosker & Moran, 2012). In fact, an experiment conducted at the University of Maryland by Robert R. Provine confirmed that people looking at funny or comic images had a larger blood flow, and those who watched sad, dramatic images had a low blood flow. Thus, in this experiment, it was intended to examine whether there is a direct relationship between viewing funny or sad images and the effect they have upon blood vessels. (Provine, 1996).

Starting from the idea that the quality of the educational communication depends on the “quality of the relations between the actors of communication”(Săucan, 1999), some authors assert that humor, along with attitudes, habits, the degree of openness and the affective burden are essential aspects for a teaching day to be successful for both students and teachers. (Ianculescu, 2018) In other words, the jokes made by a teacher in a classroom, as stated by Allen Klein, may be techniques to catch the attention (Klein, 1998). Through humor and laughter, it is possible to reorganize the behavior of socio-educational actors at classroom classes (Dent, 2001), and even, in some authors' opinion, the learning speed is obviously increased. (Gorham and Christophel, 1990).

Perhaps not by accident, the humor in the school is the one that relaxes the atmosphere in the classroom and brings a smile on the faces of both children and teachers. Moreover, the humor, by generating a state of well-being, makes it possible for time to pass more quickly. (Marcus, 2015). Most of the time, humor eliminates a potential tension at the level of the class or process of education.

Humor can also be found in the educational dimension at the level of the teaching-learning-evaluation process. Therefore, it is relevant that teachers also include in their own pedagogical / didactic strategies aspects related to the humorous, amusing dimension. In fact, a number of charming epigrams referring to such an approach are known in the humorous education literature. A good humor in a pleasant environment in the company of teachers who know how to master such an “art” can be fundamental elements in developing and concretizing a pleasant lesson.

Moreover, admitting the existence of a valorisation process within the school organizations by supporting the role and importance of humor in didactic activity is therefore to consider the value and ethical aspects found in the dimension of the relationship between pupils and teachers on the one hand, and students, teachers and society, on the other. Thus, we can assert that the existence of customization of didactic strategies in the didactic activity (taking into account the use of the idea of humor in class hours) illustrates a pragmatic picture of the way this is performed. In our opinion, such a useful approach may be the result of a process of theorizing the idea of using humor in didactic activity, but also of actually putting it into practice.

We can say in this context that humor itself entertains but, at the same time, it sanctions what is not in accordance with the pleasant traits and behaviors of the people. The two forms of humor, which are harder to bear and to digest at the level of human behavior manifest, are known in this respect. The ability to master and apply them rests, we can really say to those who are good at “making”(quality) humor and which, afterwards, can generate a certain “sympathy and appreciation for those around them”. (Ibidem)

Thus, we find that we can talk about three meanings of the idea of humor:

(a) *a social meaning*: the humor as a relevant factor in the process of communication and interaction; the social environment allows a good development of the human being; in this respect, the humor facilitates the relationship between them, having a beneficial role in the psychological evolution of the human being as a whole; the validation of the human being through humor means also assuming an “existential complicity” of all those with whom it interacts, that is, by humor, people learn to exist together, for “not laughing is a sign of weakness” (Junkins)

(b) *the psychological meaning*: the humor as a determining factor in the affirmation and manifestation of interpersonal moods; humor can change / save unusual situations / moods at the workplace, visible in relationships with those around us; in other words, humor is particularly beneficial to school before or after exams, at work, and so on; we can say, in accordance with the literature, that humor is a devoted ingredient in interpersonal therapy and relationships.

(c) *the educational meaning*: the humor as an active factor in the formation of human personality; the human behavior can also be modeled with the idea of humor;

Of course, these three meanings can be complemented by others meanings specific to different areas and disciplines. Thus, there is a communal sense and significance of a *spontaneous type of humor* that can be correlated with the idea of intentionality. This is the case of the *verbal humor* and

the *nonverbal humor* (theater plays, festivities at the beginning or at the end of the year, etc.), both used in the didactic communication. (Banas, Dunbar, Rodriguez & Liu, 2011).

2. From the educational humor to the teaching humor

When talking about educational humor we do not have to refer strictly to humorous schooling. Thus, we have in mind the parental / tutorial humor that proves to be more than necessary in educating our own children. Such an idea is explained in the literature by taking into account “the analysis of personality factors investigated together with their facets as predictors of parental competence” (Stamate, 2015).

On the other hand, in some learning situations, class humor is associated with the idea of superficiality. However, explained as a “principle of the science of permanent education of adult masses” (Dumitrescu, Manolache, Roșianu, 1972), seen and understood as a sociolinguistic and socio-cultural phenomenon, the humor can be correlated with the idea of responsibility when carrying out an activity teaching. In this case, it has the role of preserving a relaxed, free atmosphere. (Pânișoară, Sălăvăstru & Mitrofan, 2016).

Nevertheless, the most effective educators are those who activate and involve students through creative, interesting, even playful methods, as humor is an important element in this approach. During the last decades, the traditional attitudes towards the presence of humor in class have changed, especially in the academic environment, and is no longer seen as simply associated with entertainment, as a lack of seriousness and responsibility, with the loss of respect or rigor. Nowadays, the use of teaching humor is increasingly encouraged and even the evaluation process in all schooling cycles, particularly in gymnasium, high school and university education, based on studies that have shown its benefits. (Torok, McMorris, Lin, 2004).

Some authors talk about the *positive humor* (with a reinforcement role) and the *negative humor* (aggressive and self-deprecating, inefficient). (Martin, Puhlik-Doris, Larsen, Gray, Weir, 2003). In this context, we can also recall the initiative of Frymier, Wanzer and Wojtaszczy (2008), who, starting from the idea of humor, have shown that there are five categories of humorous nature: a humor that generates an altering in the image of some people, a humor that has nothing to do with the content expressed, an aggressive humor that offends, a self-deprecating humor, and a humor in direct relation to what is being discussed (opinions, ideas, concepts).

According to some specialized studies (Janes & Olson, 2000), it is shown that in the teaching-learning-evaluation process, teachers frequently use humor. Thus, the acceptance and promotion of classroom humor by teachers and pupils - within the limits of common sense - (Chauvet & Hofmeyer, 2007) can lead to a positive attitude from both pupils/students and teachers. (Chicuș, 2014). Thus, in the opinion of Ion-Ovidiu Pânișoară (2015), “the jokes made by the teacher can humanize the relationship established between him and the pupil”. In this way, the pupil/student's school performance can increase their focus and decrease their anxiety (Torok, McMorris & Lin, 2004). So, the learning process itself becomes easy.

The integration of the comic/humor in the school curriculum in some countries has been and still is proof that the humor is a source of inspiration in terms of optimizing the learning process / teaching activity. The existence of funny school books (Bafile, 2003) through which teachers are guided through specific ways (e.g. workshops, fun exercises) to integrate humor into school activities (Oldak, 1990) is a true reference point in assuming and recognizing such a didactic / pedagogical approach. Therefore, the effects of the positive humor in class imply openness and respect (Kher, Molstad & Donahue, 1999).

The class humor allows an increase in self-esteem for the subject (child, pupil, student). In other words, by humor, confidence builds in itself, in its own resources, and the motivational process itself develops. It is known in this respect, the theory of incongruence in education, according to which the motivation is correlated with “the ability to receive and process humorous elements” (coord.Pânișoară, Sălăvăstru, Mitrofan, 2016). According to this theory, it is admitted that the humorous stimulus must reflect the very existence of the surprise element generated by a contradiction (incongruence) between the message and its own expectations. Thus, the receptors (pupils/students and so on) must notice such incongruence (in the daily language we say “to understand the joke”), a situation which can be amplified by its own provisions, availability and motivation. Therefore, we can say that the humor used in the class represents a real “didactic / pedagogical tool” in the educational approach.

It is well known that in the educational process, both teachers and parents/legal guardians accumulate a series of tensions, frustrations and stress. That is why a behavioral modeling of children through the use of humorous methods and resources must, in our opinion, be an optimal way in the education process. Thus, the connection between play and humor can bring a number of advantages in successfully materializing a school activity.

At the same time, research shows that there are also forms of aggressive humor such as sarcasm, ridicule and teasing. Such forms of aggressive humor are not recommended to be used by teachers in the educational process because they can lead to a number of unwanted consequences on the part of students such as fear of affirmation, refusal to relate, certain conformism, even states of anxiety. We are dealing with such a paradox in such situations, as these consequences can also lead to negative evaluations by teachers and to a superficial or nonexistent assimilation of the content of a subject by students.

Developed and developed in the direction of promoting and supporting the role of humor in the didactic activity, such investigative research provides, from our standpoint, a series of useful, relevant references that can be correlated with the dynamics of the transformations of economic-social nature of the current society. At the same time, we believe that through this scientific approach we can offer a series of benchmarks that can determine the teachers' choice regarding the integration and use of humor in the didactic activity.

3. The use of humor in the teaching activity

Given the fact that the education system is under constant change and transformation, we can appreciate that, relative to the idea of humor, it is more than necessary that the smile should not be

lacking in the classroom. We consider the view that the school, in its entirety, must always be friendly towards the students, but also towards the teachers. Given the social, educational and political circumstances, such an approach appears to be sometimes less optimistic.

Such an educational mosaic (excessive bureaucracy, some “slips” signaled by the media, social problems faced by students, parents/tutors, teachers) expresses an image that does not always find clear and precise solutions. Therefore, it is necessary to create a pleasant atmosphere in such an environment, especially in the classroom. In other words, it is more than relevant that the teacher provides a pleasant atmosphere, thus also using elements/aspects related to the idea of humor. Seen and perceived as a “didactic” ingredient, humor plays an important role in the success of a lesson.

An example in this regard can be given by referring to a scientific research conducted by Neumann, Hood and Neumann (2009), a research in which 12 ways of implementing humor in statistical lessons were analyzed. The respondents, made up of 38 students, have shown that the use of humor in the teaching process leads to the relaxation of the working atmosphere, thus increasing motivation and reducing monotony.

Sometimes, the educational humor, as found in school textbooks, is associated with some logical errors, such as equivocacy (the use of a term with multiple meanings: “Since the TV is black and the teacher is black –as thunder–, then the TV is black as thunder”) or amphibolia (for example, the use of a vague ambiguous phrase: “Students say teachers are sleepy today in class”, where the lack of intonation offers multiple meanings). In other words, the humoral argumentation has as a didactical foundation such errors intentionally committed, known as material errors. Thus, where the manual can not intervene, it is the teacher who has to do it and have the initiative.

Moreover, humor is seen as the “fundamental vitamin of the psychic apparatus” (Elias, Tobias & Friedlander, 2003), as it is correlated by psychologists with positive emotions, which are fundamental, in their opinion, regarding the optimal development of adolescents. Also, humor can also be interpreted as a process of valorisation, precisely on the basis that it can be used in an ethical way, “humanizing” in a certain way the strategies and also emphasizing the ethical spirit. (Jeder, 2015). Therefore, capitalizing on such a concept as “humor” in an ethical spirit can only meet and support the optimization of the didactic activity.

Roger Dawson (2006) states that although it is not easy to master the art of humor, one can talk about five reasons that make people laugh: the *exaggeration* (for example, a teacher who tells his students: “220% of the students of this class know very well today’s lesson” can generate smiles and laughter), the *play upon words* (for example, the words of a teacher who tells a student whom he assesses “If you have learned you certainly passed the exam”, the *irony* (which must be done with a lot of finesse, subtlety, precisely in order not to be interpreted as an offense), the *nonsense* (the play of meaningless words accompanied by comic gestures), the *deception of expectations* (the didactic approach has a certain direction, and suddenly it takes another turn, another meaning in the form of a joke).

On the other hand, the little tricks used by educators and teachers in classes with young children are humorous factors, while also being relevant factors in the process of optimizing the didactic activity: the modulation/modeling of the voice (in a truncated form, like a cartoon character to spark amusement), the “sudden collapse to the ground” (through the conscious, intentional simulation of a fall to the floor), mimicking crying accompanied by face mimics and comic gestures, etc. However, it is well-known that not all humoristic approaches have a chance of success at the level of didactic activity. However, when a joke is “built” it is good to take into account the three stages that Scott Weems talks about: construction, anticipation, conclusion (in fact, these three stages correspond to those that involve solving the daily problems, says the author).

Conclusions

The *general conclusions* regarding the research results can be synthesized taking into account the issues analyzed and developed within this scientific approach:

- (1) The strengthening the didactic/educational environment of a school unit/organization may be a consequence of the mediatization and implementation of the humorous idea within the didactic activity;
- (2) By extrapolating this research, we find that it supports the hypothesis that humor *contributes to the optimization of didactic activity*.
- (3) When one relates to the whole national and international theory of humor and its role in the didactic activity, it is understood, we believe, the difficulty of new/personal opinions upon the subjects already established theoretically. However, upon the basis of a systematic study of specialized literature and comparative analyzes from a historical or scientific perspective, we believe that we have been able to formulate some personal opinions concerning the research approach.
- (4) In the course of the research we have put forward sufficient arguments to support the idea that humor must be an active mediator in the optimal development of a didactic activity. Thus words such as “responsibility”, “ethics”, “seriousness”, “success” can be related to the idea of humor, while generating an overview of the way a lesson unfolds.
- (5) Starting from the idea that the present society is based upon diversity and that the new methods of teaching prove its efficiency at the level of didactic activity, we can note that any didactic/educational approach that includes humor becomes essential, relevant concerning the understanding and the successful assimilation of content.
- (6) The present paper details the conceptual - theoretical method and the understanding of the idea of humor as it is found at the level of didactic activity. In this respect, we believe that such research proves to be a useful support for those interested in studying or deepening such a subject.

(7) The synthesis of our research remains in direct relation to the very topic of the research. From this standpoint, the arguments that we invoked (both in the theoretical part and in the applied research part) lead to an apparently discouraging conclusion for the specialized theory and practice, namely: although the importance of humor in didactic activity is recognized, not all socio-educational actors support its applicability in classes. However, it is noteworthy that such a problem remains open to deeper research.

(9) The comparative analyzes we have used in this paper can provide suggestions/recommendations for those who intend to study this issue. Of course, multiple comparisons can be made between the existing variables and this implies, in our opinion, the realization of a larger work that exceeds the maximum number of pages to which this dissertation thesis falls. We hope that we can continue such research in the future.

However, it is to be appreciated that in recent years, the interest in such a problem is increasing and as an argument in this respect we can note that from year to year there are specialized papers dedicated to such issues. That is why we believe that we are justified in arguing that through this initiated and completed approach, our research has achieved its purpose.

As a general conclusion, we can admit that *this research proves to be useful in that we could identify in the didactic activity the necessity of integrating the idea of humor as a point of support and as a mediating factor in assuming an educational developmental approach and both at school level and at society level as a whole.*

Humor confirms that we are human, it can lead to the elimination of boredom, it entertains, it brings smiles, generating a positive attitude towards those around us. In this regard, during this research we have sought to investigate how important it is to use humor in the didactic activity. Therefore, by synthesizing the ideas presented and analyzed in the paper, we can state that the use of humor in the didactic activity should be a landmark for teachers if they want to optimize the process of teaching-learning-evaluation process itself.

References:

Badea, E. (2015). *Părinți de succes: umorul, sprijin pentru o educație a excelenței*
https://www.dcnews.ro/parin-i-de-succes-umorul-sprijin-pentru-o-educa-ie-a-excelen-ei_465563.html. .

Bafle, C. (2003). Comedy in the classroom: just what the doctor ordered? *Education World*. Retrieved February 11, 2011
http://www.educationworld.com/a_issues/chat/chat057.shtm (accesat și consultat la 30.04.2018).

Banas, J.A., Dunbar, N., Rodriguez, D. & Liu, S.J. (2011). A review of humor in educational settings: Four decades of research. *Communication Education*, Vol. 1, 115-144.

Bremmer, J. & Roodenburg, H. (2006). O istorie culturală a umorului: din Antichitate până în zilele noastre. In Bremmer, J. & Roodenburg, H. (Eds.), *O istorie culturală a umorului: din Antichitate până în zilele noastre* (pp. 13-19). Iași: Institutul European.

Cann, A. & Chantal C. (2014). Sense of humor, stable affect and psychological wellbeing. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 10, 464-479.

Chelcea, S. (2004). *Inițiere în cercetarea sociologică*, Comunicare.ro, București.

Chauvet, S. & Hofmeyer, A. (2007), Humor as a facilitative style in problem-based learning environments for nursing students. *Nurse Education Today*, Vol. 4, 286-292.

Dawson, R. (2006). *Secretele persuasiunii*. Editura Polirom, Iași.

Dent, E. (2001). Seinfeld, professor of organizational behavior: the psychological contract and systems thinking. *Journal of Management Education*, 25 (6), 648-659.

Dinu, V. (2014). Integrarea umorului în psihoterapie. *Revista de psihologie*, București, ianuarie-martie, 60(1), 89-99.

Dumitrescu, G.T., Manolache, A., Roșianu, M. (1972). *Pedagogia socială – știința educației permanente a maselor de adulți*, Editura Politică, București, 1972.

Elias, M.J., Tobias, S.E., Friedlander, B.S. (2003). *Stimularea inteligenței emoționale a adolescenților. Cum să creștem copiii cu iubire, umor și cum să le impunem anumite limite*, Editura Curtea Veche, București.

Ellis, A. (1973). *Humanistic psychotherapy: the rational-emotive approach*, New York, Julian Press.

Florea, M.-M. (2017). Managementul educațional-comunicarea școlii cu familia și societatea. *Proceedings Volume: Managementul educațional. Legătura dintre școală, familie și societate* (Edited by: Cristian Mihail Rus, Laura Maria Carstea, Antonela Cristina Sofronia, Puiu Petrica Sofronia), Editura Lumen, Iași, 139-145.

Ford, T.E., Lappi, S. K., O'Connor, E.C. & Banos, N.C. (2016). Manipulating humor styles: Engaging in self-enhancing humor reduces state anxiety. *International Journal of Humor Research*, 1, 1-23.

Freud, S. (2002). *Comicul și umorul*, Editura Trei, București.

Frymier, A.B., Wanzer, M.B. & Wojtaszczy, A.M. (2008). Assessing student's perceptions of inappropriate and appropriate teacher humor. *Communication Education*, Vol. 2, 266-288.

- Gorham, J. & Christophel, D. (1990). The relationship of teachers' use of humor in the classroom to immediacy and student learning. *Communication Education*, 39, 46-62.
- Ibarra-Rovillard, M. S. & Kuiper, N.A. (2011). The effects of humor and depression labels on reactions to social comments. *Scandinavian Journal Of Psychology*, 52(5), 448–456.
- Janes, L.M., Olson, J.M. (2000). Jeer pressures: The behavioral effects of observing ridicule of others. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 4, 474-485.
- Jeder, D. (2015). Implications of using humor in the classroom. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences (The 6th International Conference Edu World 2014 "Education Facing Contemporary World Issues", 7th - 9th November 2014)*, 180, 828 – 833.
- Kavandi, E. & Kavandi, R. (2016). The Effect of Using Humor on High School Students' Grammar Performance and Motivation. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 7, 1466-1475.
- Kehr, N., Molstad, S. & Donahue, R. (1999). Using humor in the college classroom to enhance teaching effectiveness. *Dread Courses. College Student Journal*, 33(3), 400-407.
- Klein, A. (1998). *The courage to laugh : humor, hope, and healing in the face of death and dying*, Publisher New York : J.P. Tarcher/Putnam.
- Kubie, L. S. (1971). The destructive potential of humor in psychoterapy. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 127 (7), 861-866.
- Marcus, S. (2015). Umorel dincolo de divertisment. *România literară*, XLVII, nr. 9, 27 februarie, 12-13.
- Martin, R.A., Puhlik-Doris, P., Larsen, G., Gray, J., Weir, K. (2003). Individual differences in uses of humor and their relation to psychological well-being: Development of the Humor Styles Questionnaire. *Journal of Research in Personality*, Vol. 37, 48-75.
- McCosker, B. & Moran, C.C. (2012). Differential effects of self-esteem and interpersonal competence on humor styles. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, Vol. 5, 143-150.
- Miftode, V. (1995). *Metodologia sociologică*, Editura Porto-Franco.
- Neumann, D. L., Hood, M. și Neumann, M. M. (2009). Statistics? You must be joking: The application and evaluation of humor when teaching statistics. *Journal of Statistics Education*, 17(2), 1-16.
- Oldak, E. (1990). *Comedy for Real Life: A Guide to Helping Kids Survive in an Imperfect World*. Publisher: The Comedy Prescription.

Pânișoară, G., Sălăvăstru, D., Mitrofan, L. (2016). *Copilăria și adolescența: Provocări actuale în psihologia educației și dezvoltării*, Editura Polirom. Iași.

Provine, R.R. (1996). The study of lughter provides a novel approach to the mechanisms and evolution pf vocal production, perception and social behavior. *American Scientist*, volume 84, 38-45.

Rosenheim E. (1974). Humor in psychoterapy: An interactive experience. *American Journal of Psychoterapy*, 28 (4), 584-591.

Săucan D. (1999). Specificitatea comunicării didactice în contextul comunicării interumane. În Marcus, S. (coord.), *Competența didactică* (pp.117-121). București: Editura All

Singly, F.Y., Blanchet, A., Gotman, A, Kaufmann, J.-C. (1998). *Ancheta și metodele ei*, Editura Polirom, Iași, p.21.

Smith, R. E., Ascough, J. C., Ettinger, R. F., & Nelson, D. A. (1971). Humor, anxiety, and task performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 19(2), 243-246.

Spalanzani, A., Zaiț, D. & Zaiț, Adriana (2015). *Construcția strategică a cercetării. Opțiuni metodologice între logic și euristic*, Editura Sedcom Libris, 2015, Iași.

Stamate, D. (2015). Stilurile educative ale familiilor contemporane. *Revista de Studii Psihologice*, Universitatea Hyperion, București, 3, 144-154.

Stati, S. (1964). *Cuvinte românești. O poveste a vorbelor*, Editura Științifică, București.

Stieger, S., Formann, A., Burger, C. (2011). Humor styles and their relationship to explicit and implicit self-esteem. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50(5), 747-750.

Torok, S.E., McMorris, R.F., Lin, W.C. (2004). *Is humor an appreciated teaching tool? Perceptions of professor's teaching styles and use of humor*, *College Teaching*, 1, pp. 14-20.

Yovetich, N.A., Dale A. & Hudak, M.A. (1990). Benefits of humour in reduction of threat-induced anxiety. *Psychological Reports*, 66, 51-58.

Ziv, A. (1988). Teaching and learning with humor: Experiment and replication, *Journal of Experimental Education*, 57(1), 5-15.

Weems, S. What's So Funny?: The Science of Humor
<https://www.scientificamerican.com/podcast/episode/humor-science-weems>