



2010-01-01

Not Seeing the Joke: The Overlooked Role of Humour in Media Production Research

Edward Brennan

Dublin Institute of Technology, edward.brennan@dit.ie

Follow this and additional works at: <http://arrow.dit.ie/aaschmedcon>

 Part of the [Film and Media Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Brennan, E. 2010. Not Seeing the Joke: The Overlooked Role of Humour in Media Production Research. Conference Paper: European Sociological Association, Communications and Media Research Network Conference. Athens. 30 October 2010.

This Conference Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Media at ARROW@DIT. It has been accepted for inclusion in Conference Papers by an authorized administrator of ARROW@DIT. For more information, please contact yvonne.desmond@dit.ie, arrow.admin@dit.ie, brian.widdis@dit.ie.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 3.0 License](#)



Antenna & High Frequency Research Centre

Conference Papers

Dublin Institute of Technology

Year 2010

Not Seeing the Joke: The Overlooked
Role of Humour in Media Production
Research

Edward Brennan
Dublin Institute of Technology, edward.brennan@dit.ie

— Use Licence —

Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 1.0

You are free:

- to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work
- to make derivative works

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution.
You must give the original author credit.
- Non-Commercial.
You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- Share Alike.
If you alter, transform, or build upon this work, you may distribute the resulting work only under a license identical to this one.

For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work. Any of these conditions can be waived if you get permission from the author.

Your fair use and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike License. To view a copy of this license, visit:

- URL (human-readable summary):
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/1.0/>
 - URL (legal code):
<http://creativecommons.org/worldwide/uk/translated-license>
-

Author's Draft

Please do not quote without contacting edward.brennan@dit.ie

Not Seeing the Joke: The Overlooked Role of Humour in Researching Television Production

Eddie Brennan

Abstract

This article attempts to offer a methodological contribution to media production research. By reconsidering an earlier case study, and reviewing relevant literature, it illustrates how humour can fulfill several functions in media production. Importantly, humour is a central means of performing the 'emotional labour' that increasingly precarious media work demands. Methodologically, the everyday joking and banter of media workers can provide an important and, heretofore, overlooked means of accessing culture, meaning, consensus and conflict in media organisations. The article argues that humour's organisational role should be considered when designing production research.

Making television typically involves creativity, large teams, expensive equipment, scarce time and lean budgets. Successful television work requires clear communication, discipline and the avoidance of overt conflict (see Caldwell 2008). This requires that workers suppress or falsify their emotions to maintain efficiency and a positive working atmosphere (see Hesmondhalgh and Baker 2008: 113, Grindstaff 2002: 134; Deuze 2007: 194; Breed 1955: 278—279). Media production research has overlooked workplace humour although it is a prominent means of performing such 'emotional labour'¹.

Like some other commentaries on organisational humour, this article emerged from revisiting a past study (see also Collinson 1988, Griffiths 1998, Sanders 2004). The original research explored how the production system of a popular Irish soap opera, *Fair City*, constrained the social representations that the show could offer² (Brennan 2004). Jokes and banter, on set and in the production office, proved to be revealing. They helped clarify the show's occupational culture and the way in which its pressures were experienced and dealt with. Workplace humour was never considered while designing the research. Its significance emerged through observation. With the benefit of retrospect, the organisational role of joking behaviour is considered using observations from the production of *Fair City* and former studies on workplace humour from medical, industrial

¹ Hochschild differentiates between 'emotional labour' and 'emotional management'. Emotional labour describes the control of emotions where that control itself constitutes a commodity. This is particularly relevant in service industries such as air travel. It can also be an important part of creating the required emotional tone on a set, and this in television content (see Grindstaff 2002). Emotional management, however, describes the everyday non-commodified control of emotion (see Hochschild 1983: 7).

² The show depended heavily on the soap opera formula of limited sets, emotional themes and standardised storylines that orbited around the personal rather than the social. This reliance on tried and trusted soap opera convention was due to a lack of funding and an accompanying lack of appetite for risk. Large audiences had to be attracted regularly and reliably. This was achieved through a highly rationalised model of production which produced four episodes per week but which greatly curtailed the autonomy of actors and writers (See Brennan 2004).

and clerical settings. As past research demonstrates, light hearted utterances can, unwittingly or surreptitiously, express consensus or discord (Burns 1953; Collinson 1988; Dwyer 1991; Griffiths 1998). The playful can be a window onto more 'serious' aspects of culture, hierarchy and conflict in television production. It is important that humour be considered as a part of the performance and management of media work. It may also be best considered before entering the field rather than being overlooked or left to hindsight.

Getting Ahead by Getting Along

...in brief, the size of permanent staffs with terrestrial producer-broadcasters has diminished, casualization of the labour force has increased, entry to the industry is more difficult and less well regarded or supported, average earnings have dropped, and working terms and conditions have deteriorated (Ursell 2000: 805).

Ursell succinctly captures the degradation of media employment since the 1980s. Today, working in television generally means a precarious working life. Jobs are short-lived with no certainty of the next one. Freelance, project-based work offers few guarantees other than 'continual transformation and shifting uncertainties' (Deuze 2007: 173). Exploiting television's glamour, employers attract large pools of reserve labour. Ursell suggests that the 'acclaim, reward' and 'recognition' at the 'top end of the television labour market', may help 'keep the bottom end entranced and enlisted' (2000: 818). This is exacerbated by increased formal training. There are far more media graduates than there are media jobs. Thus, 'tension runs high in finding, keeping, and consolidating jobs and, ultimately, a career' (Deuze 2007: 174).

Access to media employment has long been mediated by formal and informal networks (see Gitlin 1983: 117, Turow 1982: 126, , Breed 1955). This role has been amplified by recent labour market flux. In uncertain times, according to Ursell, freelancers have taken upon themselves 'the tasks of organizing their own labour markets'. There is a 'much strengthened role for the self-referential and partially closed occupational communities which have always characterized television workforces' (Ursell 2000: 807). Through networks, one must build a reputation for 'good work' while cultivating friendships and acquaintances that will offer recognition and employment opportunities (Ursell 2000: 811-12).

Ursell describes networks as a 'gift from the workers to the broadcasters' in that they relieve the latter of the cost of more systematic and bureaucratised recruitment procedures (Ursell 2000: 811-12). Thus, production companies often recruit a combination of regular staff, whose reputation is established alongside 'the use of reputation-based networks of colleagues'. Regular staff 'function as intermediaries by recommending people from their personal networks for positions in

new project teams' (Deuze 2007: 190). Reputation and familiarity are 'conveyed in a mix of personal acquaintance, kinship, past working connections, and past achievements' (Ursell 2000: 811). For those seeking work in television, networks exert a 'particularly strong need to maintain good working relations in short-term project work'. Future employment depends on making and maintaining contacts (Hesmondhalgh and Baker 2008: 104). Building and maintaining a career in television depends on informal peer relations as much as it does on technical skill.

Despite its demanding and uncertain employment conditions, television production emphasises team work. Coordinated cooperation across several specialised teams requires an emotional atmosphere that is cordial, relaxed and efficient (see Hochschild 1983: 115). Overt conflict must be suppressed. Deuze sees controlled conflict as 'a key value in the culture of project-based work in film and television' (2007: 199). Regardless of technical skill, doing good work in television means 'avoiding behaviour which could be seen as awkward, inconvenient or confrontational' (Deuze 2007: 194). In a time-sensitive environment emotional outbursts, arguments or obstinate objections may delay and damage a production (see Grindstaff 2002: 134). Doing 'good work' and building a reputation requires 'emotional labour' (Baker and Hesmondhalgh 2008: 113—114). With few exceptions, to be successful in television work one must suppress personal views and defer to the team. Although they are pressurised and transient, project work teams often form bonds of friendship, loyalty and trust. More or less enduring informal networks may form over time. These networks act like a form of professional closure, restricting access for outsiders and maximising employment prospects for their members (Ursell 2000: 813; see Baker and Hesmondhalgh 2008: 111). Nevertheless, television workers often need to form new bonds of trust and conviviality with a changing flow of colleagues. Workplace humour can provide an emotional shortcut to bonding such precarious or transient groups.

Jokes as Social Super Glue?

Rose Laub Coser's research (1959) recounted how joking behaviour helped quickly to establish ties among hospital patients as part of a group with ever-changing members. As distinct from Freud's emphasis on humour as a form of psychic economy or release, Coser stressed humour's contribution to 'social economy'. This social contribution is particularly marked by Coser in 'groups whose membership is continuously changing'³. Such groups are exemplified by the

³ This Coser claims is particularly relevant for the 'transient little subgroups that are formed for short spans of time each day in wards and sitting-rooms (1959: 181).

‘transient little subgroups that are formed for short spans of time each day in wards and sitting-rooms’ (1959: 181). ‘In such a shifting and threatening milieu’, Coser writes, ‘a story well told, which, in a few minutes, entertains, reassures, conveys information, releases tension, and draws people more closely together’ can contribute more to the well-being of the ‘frightened sick’ than carefully planned lectures and discussions (1959: 181). The research identified ‘jocular gripes’ as a key means of establishing consensus and ‘in group’ status among patients. Unlike humourless grievances, or ‘canned jokes’, these comic complaints were ‘based on shared experience.’

In the complaint the patient admits his vulnerability; in the jocular gripe, as in humor generally, he overcomes it and allows his listeners to participate in his triumph over weakness. In addition to the humorist’s triumph over his own weakness - the peculiar quality of gallows humor - there is the added gratification in the *collective* character of the triumph. The jocular gripe is peculiarly fit as a mechanism of adaptation to the hospital for it helps patients to regain their identity through collective triumph over their weakness and at the same time to release their grudges in ‘substitute complaints’(1959: 177).

Complaints are as unwelcome in television production as they were among Coser’s patients. Doing ‘good work’ excludes persistent complaints that suggest that one will not surrender their personal position to the needs of the team. Hence making funny ‘substitute complaints’ is expedient. Sharing and making light of complaints can unify a team by ‘allowing it to reinterpret together an experience that previously was individual to each’ (Coser 1959: 178). A worker who ‘invites others to laugh with him’, rather than making an individual complaint, ‘creates or strengthens the feeling of equality in the participants’. For Coser, at the heart of jocular griping is the creation of social relationships through the reciprocal sharing of, and triumph over, fears, difficulties and anxieties (1959: 178; see also Griffiths 1998: 892; Zijderveld 1983: 47—48).

Fair City is Ireland’s longest running soap opera. Nevertheless, it only offered part-time employment to most of its cast. Actors playing non-core characters faced regular periods of unemployment with no guarantee of a renewed contract. Although their employment was precarious, actors saw themselves as part of a tight-knit group. A stage manager described the show’s ‘happy family’ atmosphere, which persisted despite its ever-changing family members. There was a sense of fun between the actors, floor and stage managers, and the crew. No one hesitated to recognise a job well done and cast and crew regularly praised each other for good work. However, while the cast were friendly to each other they generally were not friends. Actors did not tend to join informal groupings outside of work. The stage manager who described the show as a

'family' also mentioned that there was no real external social life. Like acquaintances that only met through a sports or social club, the cast displayed an attachment to each other that was warm and convivial but confined to a single setting.

Bonds among the cast were manifested largely through humour, which provided a unifying and affective but ultimately shallow means of relating to each other. Much of the fun, camaraderie and team spirit demonstrated among the cast was ironically manifested through a dim view of the show itself. For example, the cast frequently made fun of the show's mass produced, and often poorly written, dialogue. There were frequent jokes that I had been sent by the United Nations to report on the terrible food, pay and conditions that the cast were enduring. An actor, who had just joined the show at the time of the research, joked that he was 'new and still had some shred of integrity'. The 'jocular gripes' found on the set served multiple roles. They were a means of having fun, passing time and expressing solidarity. They were part of fabric of the *Fair City* 'family'.

Caldwell demonstrated 'trade stories' to be a source of industry knowledge and a means of induction for newcomers. They can also be a means of weathering the difficulties of economic and technological flux (Caldwell 2008: 37). Sometimes apparently insignificant yarns or anecdotes can capture a lot of what it is to live or work in a particular social setting. On the *Fair City* set an actor harked back to the show's early episodes featuring a dog called Snaffles. The dog that 'played' Snaffles had been specially trained. A dog handler would give hand signals off-camera for the dog to perform the appropriate actions. The dog cost £100 (€127) per day. This he remarked was nearly more money than some actors had been getting at the time. The dog was brought in for a day but was not recorded due to a production delay. It was decided that the dog cost too much for the show to pay for a second day in a row. This resulted in a scene the following day where Snaffles' owner entered his kitchen with the dog on a lead. The dog remained out of camera shot. The character held onto the dog lead and decided that Snaffles looked as though he did not want to come in. The character led Snaffles out into the backyard and closed the door on him. According to this actor, a crew member who tugged on the lead, crawling to keep out of shot, had replaced the dog. Whether this is true or not is irrelevant. Such comic stories can express worker's experience and their perceptions of what is typical in an organisation (see Fincham and Rhodes 1994: 410). Snaffles' low-cost replacement comically reflected the cast's view of a show that was produced on a shoe-string budget. Such yarns created solidarity while also conveying a sense of what was to be expected when working on its production.

Managing Disappointment and Contradiction

Jocular gripes and self deprecating humour can also serve as a means of managing disappointment or perceived stigma. In *Fair City's* production, it could be seen as an attempt by the the cast, most of whom aspired to artistic expression beyond soap opera, to distance themselves from their existing low-prestige positions. Goffman identified roles placing an individual in an 'occupational setting he feels is beneath him' as a source of 'role distance' (2009: 106). 'Sullenness, muttering, irony, joking and sarcasm' could all be employed in such roles to 'allow one to show that something of himself lies outside the constraints' of a role that is contrary to expectations, aspirations or self-image' (Goffman 2009: 107). Cohen and Taylor similarly saw jokes, mockery, irony and sarcasm as means of distancing ourselves from routinised, predictable and boring parts of life. Through such devices 'the world is put in its place, held apart from ourselves and inspected with varying degrees of dislike and reserve' (1976: 34). For Linstead, this humour acts as a 'simple mitigation of failure'. It is 'a redemption of unpleasant situations; a means of establishing harmony in the face of loss; and generally a means of coping with defeat' (1985: 745). Like the 'jocular gripe', self-deprecating humour can also be a potent means of developing group solidarity and cohesion. Zijderveld argues that, while it may be a product of a dominated social position, it does not signal an 'instability of identity' (Zijderveld 1983: 51). It may rather serve to consolidate, energise and embolden a group (Zijderveld 1983: 47—48). Grindstaff observed similarly self-deprecating humour among talk show producers who made fun of their genre, their guests and their quest for spectacular emotional outbursts among contributors (2002: 85). Grindstaff admits that, while she worked as a talk show intern, she laughed at potential guests in a manner that could be seen as 'callous or cruel'. At the time, however, she saw it as the 'only way to stay sane and carry on with the work' (2002: 138). Humour can bind groups while serving as a means of coping with workplace pressures. Some commentators have gone further, arguing that humour may be a potent means of resisting workplace norms, structures and regulations.

Tiny Revolutions or Fantasies of Resistance?

Several researchers have identified organisational humour as a site of resistance. Collinson, for example, found it to be regularly linked to 'particular manifestations of resistance and sabotage' (1988: 183). Holmes revealed office workers' use of 'contestive humour' in attempts to subvert workplace conventions (2000: 175). Lesley Griffiths argued that 'jokes often involve a confrontation with the dominant social pattern, and can disrupt that pattern by giving voice to its inconsistencies and irrationalities' (1998: 892). Here Griffiths echoes the seminal work of Mary

Douglas who argued that joking intrinsically rebels against established power through the juxtaposition of systems of meaning (1968: 365). Thus, humour occurs where alternative, resistive or forbidden ways of framing reality are briefly given reign in a social situation. As such, joking may be used to build and consolidate cultures of resistance within organisations (see Collinson 1988: 184; Holmes 2000: 179; Sanders 2004: 283).

Humorous resistance may be most potent when it attacks dominant organisational definitions, and frames of meaning (see Holmes 2000: 177; Linstead 1985). Griffiths revealed joking to be a 'strategy used by rank-and-file team members to resist or attenuate instructions coming from powerful professionals' (1998: 874). Workers aimed to subvert power through attempts at 'frame shifting' (1998: 882). That is, they would try to subvert dominant definitions by offering an alternative framing of the situation through humour. Using such strategy, the gravity of a college exam board, for example, might be disrupted by a brief impersonation of an auctioneer. Humour can also be used to 'frame shift' by simply turning a serious discussion into an occasion for humour. As Linstead pointed out humorous content can be 'transposed and defined as serious' but equally 'real-world content' can be transposed into the 'humorous frame' where it may be defined as 'humorous in an indelible and irreversible way' (1986: 763). Thus humour may defuse and diffuse serious situations.

Joking can also offer a relatively safe means of resistance. It can be difficult for a manager to challenge a joke without a loss of face. Holmes found that 'humour permits the subordinate to embed the challenge, criticism or insult in a socially acceptable form, which make the negative communicative intent less easy to challenge' (2000: 179). An issue raised in jest makes it difficult for a superior to retaliate without appearing spiteful or unsporting (Holmes 2000: 178). Humour may offer a relatively low risk means of voicing criticism and objection in an environment like television production where a trenchant stance or angry objection is likely to damage one's work, reputation and career prospects. However, it is not risk free.

The ultimate prize in using humour as a form of resistance would be to have a lasting 'frame shift' where positions aired through humour become part of serious discourse. Such a 'transposition' however can only be achieved through negotiation with dominant definitions of the work situation. Emerson described how doctors and patients would occasionally attempt to overcome institutional conversational taboos that 'assist the staff in concentrating on technical matters and avoiding the human, emotional side of the patient'. One means of pursuing 'deviant discussions' was to 'negotiate' the suspension of institutional norms by transposing a taboo topic from a joke into serious conversation (1973: 270). Such transposition, however, was the product of

risky negotiation. It required the use of humour as a means of probing what was acceptable. In the workplace such trials have their dangers. As Griffiths observed the 'balance between humorous and serious dissent is a fine one, and humour clearly carries risks'(Griffiths 1998: 892).

Negotiations about humor, then, may be regarded as bargaining to make unofficial arrangements about taboo topics. Two main issues pervade such negotiations. How much licence may be taken under the guise of humor? While it is understood that persons have some leeway in joking about topics which they could not introduce in serious discourse, the line between acceptable and unacceptable content is ambiguous. So it must be negotiated in each particular exchange. Anyone making a joke cannot be sure that the other will find his move acceptable and anyone listening to a joke may find he is offended (Emerson 1973: 270).

Emerson argues that when parties do successfully negotiate such an agreement they 'they establish a presumption of trust'. Through the transposition from the humorous and the playful to the serious, trust can be expected in routine matters but more importantly a shared complicity for 'rule violations' may be extended to the extent that they may 'encourage the formation of subgroups where an independent culture, subversive to the general culture flourishes' (Emerson 1973: 280). As Emerson suggests that joking can be 'transposed' from the light-hearted and the ephemeral to the realm of the serious and the consequential. Following Douglas' conception of humour as a clash of meanings, spontaneous workplace jokes can be understood as moments where the meaning of a situation is left temporarily open to at least two possible readings. Moreover, the frames used to make sense of the workplace, its hierarchies and its culture are similarly temporarily put in flux. Spontaneous workplace jokes are fleeting semiotic upheavals. Transposition, and real resistance, may occur where the upheavals originating in humour persist in serious discourse and become part of a shared understanding.

Workplace humour can then, in theory, lead to organisational change. Even if it cannot always achieve this it can mask dissent, allow workers to test the boundaries of a situation and build stability and solidarity among workgroups. Unfortunately, this view of humour as resistance appears to be unduly optimistic. In cultural and creative industries, workplace humour is more likely to act as a means of coping with workplace pressures and, also as a managerial tool rather than a method of challenging deteriorating working conditions. On the set of *Fair City* humour was used to symbolically resist structures and routines put in place by the programme's producer. The cast and crew, for example, objected to a weekly 'production run' where every scene for the week was read through on set, in broadcast order. The producer, editor and writers used this to oversee, control and standardise the week's production. The production run meant that the entire cast, crew and production team had to walk, in a snaking line, from set to set for an entire morning. Despite its

importance to the production team, the crew thought it to be tedious and anachronistic. A stage manager nicknamed it the ‘Benny Hill run’⁴. At one production run a sound operator made sheep-like noises as the group trailed between sets. The crew’s humour attempted to frame the production run as a valueless, repetitive waste of their time. There was, however, no ‘frame-shift’ for the programme’s management. The pace of production effectively barred procedural objections from the cast and crew. ‘Slagging’ the production run allowed the crew to announce their disagreement without damaging their standing as ‘good’ workers. Holmes described humour as a ‘powerful device for subtly signalling incipient rebellion in the ranks, or at least for encoding rebelliousness in a sufficiently indirect form to evade censure’ (2000: 175; see also Griffiths 1998: 875; Linstead 1985: 743). This may be so but such deeply encoded resistance appears to be largely inconsequential. In television production, humour appears to better serve the interests of managers rather than those of cast and crew.

Joking Down

Significantly, Holmes’ identified humour as a potential form of ‘repressive discourse’. She writes that ‘in an era when informality is valued, and there is a general trend towards democratisation, and a reduction of emphasis on power differences’ humour offers managers the opportunity to “do power” less explicitly (Holmes 2000: 165). Humour acts as a repressive discourse where its ‘intent is controlling or coercive.’

Repressive discourse disguises the coercive intent underlying an utterance, or fudges the power relationship involved. So while it is fundamentally based on a power imbalance, repressive discourse tends to distract attention from issues of power. It often functions to gain willing compliance, retain goodwill, promote social cohesion and, at least superficially, to reduce asymmetry. Humour is one means of realizing repressive discourse (Holmes 2000: 165).

While humour as a management technique can be found in all sectors it is particularly relevant to television production where informal relations, a positive emotional tone and the absence of overt conflict are paramount.

In managing media work, humour can be harnessed to decrease perceived social distance (see Coser 1959: 172). As Holmes saw it ‘in power-differentiated contexts, humour can be regarded as a discourse strategy which disguises oppression – a device to sugar the pill’ (2000: 172).

Collinson described ‘joking down’ as a ‘pacificatory’ device (1988: 182). Indeed, Dwyer found

⁴ The Benny Hill Show was a BBC comedy series (1955-68). Its end credits featured a chase scene where characters would pursue each other in single file.

managers more likely to use workplace humour than subordinates (Dwyer 1991: 5). Humour can function as a ‘kind of legitimating force, strengthening the authoritative quality of power’ acting as a ‘bridge between the powerful and the subordinate’ (Zijderveld 1983: 55). By joking among subordinates a manager may provide workers with a sense of ‘belonging to the family’ or may appear to ‘identify with the troops’ (Dwyer 1991: 5)⁵.

Holmes found that humour was used to hedge and soften managerial criticism. Critical comments were often ‘attenuated’ through humour thus reflecting ‘the speaker’s awareness of the addressee’s positive face needs—the need to have their wants acknowledged, and their values respected and shared’. Thus, humour offered a ‘very useful strategy for softening criticisms in contexts where work is being regularly evaluated and assessed’ (Holmes 2000: 172). This is central to the management of emotional labour where a perceived attack on a worker’s reputation or self-esteem would be counterproductive.

Managers often work at the intersections between hierarchically separate groups. Mixing groups that are normally held apart can be an uncomfortable experience. Since we generally perform our various social roles for particular groups, occupying multiple groups at the same time can undermine our role playing. Tom Burns, however, argued that it is the ‘characteristic double understanding of the joking relationship that permits the maintenance of two status positions through the same unit of social action, through performance in the same “role.”’ Joking behaviour can allow membership and role performance across two groups at the same time. For Burns, this is clearest in banter where people ‘play at being hostile, distant, unfriendly, while intimating friendliness’ (Burns 1953: 655). Banter occurs ‘when two roles are presented to an individual’ who ‘decides to retain the status appropriate to both, while, as he must, acting out the role of only one’. According to Burns ‘in every case, the relationship with the group dominant at the occasion of interaction is retained’. It is the less powerful relationship ‘which bears the episode of banter’ being ‘of less social significance at the time but nevertheless requiring safeguard for the future’ (1953: 655).

...the friendly ridicule of banter is an act of overt exclusiveness which, by sharing the joke with the excluded “victim”, includes him in a special relationship with the actor. The effect is to maintain undamaged the status pattern—the nexus of memberships—pertaining to an individual (Burns 1953: 657).

⁵ Of course, management humour is not always a success and can actually create antagonism and resentment. Collinson’s study found that managerial humour which intended to ‘reduce conflict and emphasize organizational harmony, had the opposite effect of merely reinforcing the polarization between management and shop-floor’ (Collinson 1988: 187).

In television production, banter, as a particular form of ‘joking down’, can allow managers to work across status divides in an approachable and personable manner.

On the set of *Fair City*, the floor managers exemplified the use of humour as a management tool. The floor manager in charge of a week’s shoot oversaw production and relayed messages from the director to the studio floor. Beyond this, however, he had a more delicate and subtle role. It was necessary to balance efficiently shooting the show with maintaining a lighthearted and supportive atmosphere on the set. In achieving this floor managers displayed a peculiar set of interpersonal skills. Technical crew were different to actors, and actors were quite different to writers. The floor manager had to be able to communicate with, and get on personally with all of them. He had to be able to mould himself and his conversation to suit the people around him. This ability to fit in with the diverse personalities and social types involved in making the programme was an essential part of a floor manager's job. A director explained that a floor manager's job was to re-interpret the director’s orders in a manner that did not disrupt the ostensibly easy-going but very efficient working of the set. One floor manager, discussing workplace strategies, remarked that he would often share a joke with camera or sound operators. This, he said, was a routine that was often used to defuse tension and to maintain a pleasant working atmosphere.

The floor manager was central to maintaining the emotional tone necessary for efficient production. The strategies employed here mirror those mentioned by Hochschild in the maintenance of ‘emotional tone’ among flight attendants. Attendants had to work closely with others on the crew, commonly saying that ‘the work simply cannot be done well unless they work well together’. Hochschild writes that the ‘reason for this is that the job is partly an “emotional tone” road show, and the proper tone is kept up in large part by friendly conversation, banter, and joking...’.

Indeed, starting with the bus ride to the plane, by bantering back and forth the flight attendant does important relational work: she checks on people’s moods, relaxes tensions, and warms up ties so that each pair of individuals becomes a team. She also banters to keep herself in the right frame of mind” (Hochschild 1983: 115).

The floor manager was almost as much of an actor as any of the cast. He needed not only to feign good-humour but also to conceal anger and discontent to prevent the disruption of production. The use of humour to blur management power delivered efficiency while preserving a sense of autonomy and a positive emotional atmosphere among the cast and crew.

Feeble Resistance and Consensus

As discussed above, while workers may attempt to resist through humour it a weak means of challenging authority. It may be 'more a ritual statement of complaint than an indication of real opposition' (Griffiths 1998:892). Humour that is apparently resistive may unintentionally act to reinforce the structures it attacks. Ursell viewed media workers' organisation of their labour markets through networks as a gift to employers. The jocular gripes, self-deprecation, slagging and banter of media workers may also be a gift that facilitates an efficient, non-confrontational and self-regulating working environment. Ultimately, Coser saw that 'jocular gripes' helped to 'shape the behaviour of patients according to the expectations of doctors and nurses'. They were an 'integrating element' between patients and the medical establishment where 'the patients themselves, by teaching and helping each other to suppress complaints through laughter, help to enforce the norms of the hospitality community (1959: 180). Similarly, the petty resistances and coping devices of media workers may only serve as a means of adjusting to, and reinforcing, workplace norms.

Hatch and Ehrlich argued that humour could help workers to cope with contradictions. At the same time, however, it may act as a conservative force by defusing the negative consequences of such contradictions:

...humour may allow for the enjoyment of paradox and ambiguity, thus helping organizations to retain these conditions by removing them from the domain of serious discourse. If this is the case, humour offers individuals the freedom to confront contradiction, incongruity and incoherence... without feeling the need to overcome or alter it (Hatch and Ehrlich 1993: 524).

The fundamental short-coming of humour as a means of organisational change becomes apparent if we consider Douglas' distinction between the 'joke' and the 'abomination'. Dwyer commented that in Douglas' viewpoint 'humor has no "essence," it only has cultural compatibility or it does not. At one point in time, certain types of jokes may be regarded as appropriate by a milieu and at another time not so' (Dwyer 1991: 3). Douglas classifies attempted jokes, that are not only incompatible with but that are actually contrary to social structure, as abominations.

Abomination is an act or event which contradicts the basic categories of experience and in doing so threatens both the order of reason and the order of society. A joke does nothing of the sort. It represents a temporary suspension of the social structure, or rather it makes a little disturbance in which the particular structuring of society becomes less relevant than another. But the strength of its attack is entirely restricted by the consensus on which it depends for recognition (Douglas 1968: 372).

Humour may mock and undermine dominant norms but ultimately it depends upon, and is accepted as part of, social consensus. The person who utters an abomination cannot be tolerated while the joker on the other hand faces little danger since 'he merely expresses consensus'. He is 'safe within the permitted range of attack, he lightens for everyone the oppressiveness of social reality, demonstrates its arbitrariness by making light of formality in general, and expresses the creative possibilities of the situation' (Douglas 1968: 372).

Linstead acknowledged the shortcomings of humour as a means of resistance and organisational change. However, he was not prepared to dismiss it entirely. He commented that 'to view humour as completely subversive fails to account for its apparent incapacity to change organizations or social institutions, to dismiss it as a mere frivolity underestimates its enormous symbolic power' (1985: 762). He acknowledged that humour feeds upon consensus and the shared meanings that it ostensibly mocks. Unlike other commentators he also recognised that the transformative potential of humour is limited by material circumstances.

While transposition from the comic to the serious, from one frame of meaning to another may be possible through humour such transpositions are shaped by structures of power. Linstead made clear that humour 'may momentarily demystify the social order, but against the forces of myth and cliché promoting unreflective inertia, sustained challenge requires enormous creativity and energy to be exerted' (1985: 762). Attempted transpositions are an uphill battle because they are not negotiated from 'an equal *material basis*'.

Not only does habit and inertia favour the dominant status quo, but interests, power and capital also lend the advantage to dominant-hegemonic formulations. This does have considerable influence on what may be defined as humorous and serious, without being absolutely determining (Linstead 1985: 763).

What is seen to be a joke and what is rejected as an abomination is a product of social consensus. It is also a product of power. Humour may emerge, or fall flat, in clashes between competing definitions of the workplace. As Dwyer pointed out organisational humour is always tied to changes in organisational power (1991: 2). It is this connection to occupational culture that marks out humour as a valuable tool in production research.

Conclusion

At the heart of humour is consensus. It ‘emphasizes common ground and shared norms’ (Holmes 2000: 167). Tom Burns discusses consensus shedding any ‘connotation of empathy, of emotional rapport’ simply referring to ‘agreement on the terms of which interaction takes place’. He defines consensus as ‘the tacit delineation of mutually accepted norms of behaviour’ (Burns 1953: 654). Pointedly, he comments that ‘in all societies, the joke is the short cut to consensus’ (Burns 1953: 657). Through its connection with what may be shared, unconscious and unspoken within organisations humour blossoms as both a research site and a research tool. Workplace humour is typically spontaneous rather than consisting of ‘canned jokes’. Spontaneity offers researchers the opportunity to tap into aspects of an organisational *habitus* that may otherwise go unseen. As Burns argues, spontaneity arises from a shared and deeply ingrained cultural consensus.

Spontaneity in interaction springs from a consensus so comprehensive that the behaviour possible in the circumstances is no less than what each socialized individual would condone or approve in himself. Thus spontaneous interaction is determined by the existence of a consensus applying to all norms of social behaviour of the system into which the individuals concerned have been socialized (Burns 1953: 661).

As Fry observed ‘it is impossible to be simply spontaneous and simply thoughtful at the same time. These two states are mutually exclusive’ (2010: 5). Spontaneity signals a lack of conscious deliberation. Moreover, it suggests the presence of a strong cultural consensus. Echoing Fry, Burns distinguishes between spontaneous and ‘cliché’, or more rule-bound, behaviour. For Burns, ‘differences in the social behaviour of a person can be regarded as differences in the number as well as the kind of norms involved in the situation’. Cliché, formal or rule-bound ‘behaviour involves fewest norms and thus requires ‘little consensus’. Spontaneity, on the other hand, requires ‘maximum consensus’ (Burns 1953: 661—662)⁶. For Bourdieu, humour and spontaneity are creatively but inextricably bound up with a group’s *habitus*.

If witticisms strike as much by their unpredictability as by their retrospective necessity, the reason is that the *trouvaille* that brings to light long-buried resources presupposes a *habitus* that so perfectly possesses the objectively available means of expression that it is possessed by them, so much so that it asserts its freedom from them by realising the rarest of the possibilities that they necessarily imply (Bourdieu 1990: 57).

Humour is a window onto workplace culture. It can be a means of detecting and characterising an organisational culture, and the tensions it may contain. Jokes can express solidarity, veiled complaints, resistance, discord, as well as good-humoured resignation. This description of the

⁶ Rather than proposing a dichotomy Burns sees this as a description of ‘two extremes’ (Burns 1953: 661—662).

potential roles workplace humour is of course not exhaustive. Humour may, for example, also play a role in fostering innovation (references). The significance of humour in television production may vary with programme, genre, country and so on. Nevertheless, it can reveal aspects of workplace culture, communication and power that may be difficult to access or otherwise go unnoticed.

References

Bourdieu, P. 1990a. *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Breed, W. 1955. 'Social control in the newsroom: a functional analysis', pp. 277—282 in Boyd-Barrett, O. and C. Newbold, 1995. *Approaches to Media: A Reader*. London: Arnold.

Brennan, E. 2004. *The Fair City Production Line: An exploration of soap opera's potential contribution to the public sphere*. University College Dublin: Unpublished.

Burns, T. 1953. 'Friends, Enemies, and the Polite Fiction'. *American Sociological Review*. Vol.18, No. 6. 654 - 662.

Caldwell, J.T. 2008. *Production Culture: Industrial Reflexivity and Critical Practice in Film and Television*. London: Duke University Press.

Collinson, D.L. 1988. "'Engineering Humour": Masculinity, Joking and Conflict in Shop-floor Relations'. *Organization Studies*. Vol.9, No.2. 181-199.

Cohen, S. and L. Taylor. 1976. *Escape Attempts: The Theory and Practice of Resistance to Everyday Life*. London. Allen Lane (Penguin).

Coser, R.L. 1959. 'Some Social Functions of Laughter: A Study of Humor in a Hospital Setting'. *Human Relations*. Vol.12. 171-182.

Deuze, M. 2007. *Media Work*. Cambridge: Polity.

Douglas, M. 1968. 'The Social Control of Cognition: Some Factors in Joke Perception'. *Man*. Vol. 3, No. 3. 361-376.

Dwyer, T. 1991. 'Humor, Power, and Change in Organizations'. *Human Relations*. Vol.44, No.1. 1 - 19.

Emerson, J.P. 1973. 'Negotiating the Serious Import of Humour', pp.267-280 in Birenbaum, A and E. Sagarin (eds). 1973. *The Sociology of the Familiar*. London. Nelson.

Fincham, R. and P.S. Rhodes. 1994. *The Individual, Work and Organisation, Behavioural Studies for Business and Management*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fry, W.F. 2010. *Sweet Madness: A Study of Humor (Second Edition)*. Transaction Publishers: New Brunswick.

- Gitlin, T. 1983. *Inside Prime Time*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Goffman, E. 2009. 'Role Distance', pp.101-112 in Brissett, D and C. Edgley (eds), 2009. *Life as Theater: a Dramaturgical Sourcebook*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Griffiths, L. 1998. 'Humour as resistance to professional dominance in community mental health teams'. *Sociology of Health & Illness*. Vol.20, No.6. 874-895.
- Grindstaff, L. 2002. *The Money Shot: Trash, Class and the Making of TV Talk Shows*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. and S. Baker. 2008. 'Creative Work and Emotional Labour in the Television Industry'. *Theory, Culture and Society*. Vol.25 (7—8). 98—118.
- Hochschild, A.R. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Holmes, J. 2000. 'Politeness, Power and Provocation: How Humour Functions in the Workplace'. *Discourse Studies*. Vol. 2. No. 2. 159 - 185.
- Gitlin, T. 1983. *Inside Prime Time*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Goffman, E. 2009. 'Role Distance', pp.101-112 in Brissett, D and C. Edgley (eds), 2009. *Life as Theater: a Dramaturgical Sourcebook*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Griffiths, L. 1998. 'Humour as resistance to professional dominance in community mental health teams'. *Sociology of Health & Illness*. Vol.20, No.6. 874-895.
- Linstead, S. 1985. 'Jokers wild: the importance of humour in the maintenance of organizational culture'. *The Sociological Review*. Vol.33, No.4. 741-767.
- Hatch, J.H. and S.B Ehrlich. 1993. 'Spontaneous Humour as an Indicator of Paradox and Ambiguity in Organizations'. *Organization Studies*. Vol.14, No.4. 505 - 526.
- Holmes, J. 2000. 'Politeness, Power and Provocation: How Humour Functions in the Workplace'. *Discourse Studies*. Vol.2 159-185.
- Sanders, T. 2004. 'Controllable Laughter: Managing Sex Work through Humour'. *Sociology*. Vol.38, No.2. 273-291.
- Turow, J. 1982. 'Unconventional Programs on Commercial Television: An Organizational Perspective', pp. 107—129 in Ettema, J. and C.D. Whitney (eds), 1982. *Individuals in Mass Media Organizations*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Ursell, G. (2000) 'Television Production: Issues of Exploitation, Commodification and Subjectivity in UK Television Labour Markets', *Media, Culture & Society* Vol.22. No.6: 805–25.
- Zijderveld, Anton C. 1968. 'Jokes and their relation to social reality'. *Social Research*. 35: 286—

311.

Zijderveld, A.C. (1983) The sociology of humor and laughter, *Current Sociology*, 33, 1–103. (or 31, 1—6)