12-2003

Displaying group cohesiveness: Humour and laughter in the public lectures of management gurus

David GREATBATCH

Timothy Adrian Robert CLARK
Singapore Management University, timothyclark@smu.edu.sg

Human Relations
[0018-7267(200312)56:12]
Volume 56(12): 1515–1544: 042359

SAGE Publications
London, Thousand Oaks CA,
New Delhi
www.sagepublications.com

Displaying group cohesiveness: Humour and laughter in the public lectures of management gurus

David Greatbatch and Timothy Clark

ABSTRACT

As perhaps the highest profile group of management speakers in the world, so-called management gurus use their appearances on the international management lecture circuit to disseminate their ideas and to build their personal reputations with audiences of managers. This article examines the use of humour by management gurus during these public performances. Focusing on video recordings of lectures conducted by four leading management gurus (Tom Peters, Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Peter Senge and Gary Hamel), the article explicates the verbal and nonverbal practices that the gurus use when they evoke audience laughter. These practices allow the gurus to project clear message completion points, to signal their humourous intent, to 'invite' audience laughter, and to manipulate the relationship between their use of humour and their core ideas and visions. The article concludes by suggesting that the ability of management gurus to use these practices effectively is significant because audience laughter can play an important role with respect to the expression of group cohesion and solidarity during their lectures.

KEYWORDS

group cohesion ▪ humour and laughter ▪ management gurus ▪ management ideas ▪ public speaking

So-called management gurus currently dominate contemporary notions of the organizational ideal and the nature of the management role (Barley et al., 1988; Carson et al., 2000; Gerlach, 1996; Spell, 2000). In recent years, management gurus have popularized influential management ideas such as Excellence, Culture Change, Total Quality Management and Business Process Reengineering. In addition to writing best-selling management books (e.g. Hammer & Champy, 1993; Kanter, 1985; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Senge, 1990), management gurus disseminate their ideas on the international management lecture circuit. As perhaps the highest profile group of management speakers in the world, they use their lectures to build their personal reputations with audiences of managers. Many gain reputations as powerful orators and subsequently market recordings of their talks as parts of video-based management training packages. The gurus' public performances are critical to their popularity and success, and generate a significant proportion of their income (Huczynski, 1993).

Studies of management gurus' public performances have largely consisted of theoretical discussions which, using the work of Lewin (1951) and Sargant (1957/1997), have depicted the gurus as experts in persuasive communication who seek to transform the consciousness of their audiences through powerful oratory (Clark, 1995; Clark & Salaman, 1996; Huczynski, 1993; Jackson, 1996). These studies explain the gurus' oratorical power in terms of the gurus' use of rhetorical devices identified in the seminal work of Atkinson (1984a, 1984b) on political oratory (see also Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986). However, in contrast to Atkinson's research, perhaps because of the cost and difficulty of gaining access to the events, they do not involve detailed analyses of the gurus' live performances. Indeed, we are only aware of three brief descriptions of these events (Guerrier & Gilbert, 1995; Oliver, 1990; Sharpe, 1984). Consequently, many questions remain to be answered with respect to how management gurus disseminate their ideas on the international management lecture circuit. For example, what presentational techniques do they use to communicate their messages and why? What forms of speaker/audience interaction occur during the gurus' lectures? What impact do audience members' immediate reactions have on the gurus' modes of presentation? In conducting a study that was designed to gain some insight into these issues, we discovered that the audience members regularly produce displays of affiliation with the gurus by, inter alia, clapping, laughing supportively, nodding their heads and smiling. In some cases, these affiliative responses are produced by one or two individuals. In others, however, they involve numerous audience members acting in concert with each other. When audience members collectively display their affiliation with the gurus, they do so predominantly by laughing.

In this article we examine the occurrence of collective audience laughter in video recordings of public lectures conducted by four leading management gurus: Tom Peters, Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Peter Senge and Gary Hamel. In so doing, we show that audience laughter is not simply a spontaneous reaction to messages whose content is self-evidently humorous, but rather is 'invited' by the gurus through the use of a range of verbal and nonverbal practices, which have largely been overlooked in prior research into the use of humour. We also suggest that audience laughter plays an important role with respect to the expression of group cohesion and solidarity during the gurus' lectures, and that, when used effectively, it heightens audience attentiveness and makes the gurus' messages more memorable. Consequently, we argue, the gurus' use of humour can play an important role in establishing the conditions necessary to win and retain 'converts' to their management theories. Before reporting our findings, however, we review the literature on humour and laughter, describe our data, and introduce our analytical framework.

Previous research on humour and laughter

Regardless of their specific emphases, theories of humour propose that the components of humorous remarks and incidents are 'in mutual clash, conflict or contradiction' (Wilson, 1979: 10). However, they diverge in explaining the functions and impact of humour. So-called disparagement and superiority theories link humour to hostility and malice, viewing it as a means through which people enhance their self-esteem and feelings of superiority by disparaging and laughing at others (Duncan, 1983; Hobbes, 1651; Zillman, 1983). In contrast, relief theories explain humour and laughter in terms of the diffusion of tension that has been either intentionally or unintentionally built up in a situation. Humour and laughter, thus, express relief following the removal of a potential source of pain or stress (Berlyne, 1968) and/or provide socially acceptable outlets for the release of repressed emotion, including aggression (Freud, 1916). Finally, incongruity theories contend that laughter is related to surprise following the resolution of perceived incongruities, and that it may express affection as well as malice or relief (Berlyne, 1968; Cetola, 1988; Koestler, 1964; Suls, 1972).

Drawing on these theories, empirical studies of humour indicate that it serves five primary functions: (1) to create and maintain social cohesion and group solidarity (e.g. Bradney, 1957; Coser, 1959, 1960; Dwyer, 1991; Fine, 1979, 1987, 1996; LaFave & Mennell, 1976; Meyer, 1997, 2000; Roy, 1958; Sykes, 1966); (2) to attack others in socially acceptable ways and/or

to enhance self-esteem at the expense of others (e.g. Collinson, 1988; Perry, 1992; Rodrigues & Collinson, 1995); (3) to gain the approval of others (Fine, 1979, 1987, 1996; Meyer, 1997, 2000); (4) to manage embarrassment, fear or stress in threatening situations (e.g. Coser, 1960; Dandridge, 1986; Fine, 1977; Linstead, 1985; Ott, 1989; Vinton, 1989); and (5) to express opposition, resistance and dissent (e.g. Collinson, 1988, 2002; Mulkay, 1988; Rodrigues & Collinson, 1995). As Giles et al. (1976) emphasize, people may use humour to achieve any combination of these objectives in any given situation.

Humour researchers have also sought to account for the fact that humour is situationally dependent and subjective (Carrell, 1992; Raskin, 1985; Winick, 1976). People's ability to perceive humour in a given message has been shown to be dependent on their familiarity with social scripts and patterns of communication, which enable them to recognize humorous deviations from expected patterns of behaviour. The success of humour has also been shown to depend on the willingness of specific audiences to appreciate humour, and not to regard it as irrelevant, unacceptable or inane (Raskin, 1985). Thus, as Meyer (2000: 316) observes, 'attempts at humour that meet with success depend directly on the specific audience and the situation in question'.

These studies powerfully demonstrate that people use humour to accomplish important objectives. However, although they adopt a variety of theoretical and methodological perspectives, and have been conducted by researchers based within a range of disciplines, including linguistics (e.g. Raskin, 1985), they all neglect one crucial aspect of humour and laughter; they do not attend to the practices through which humour-related actions such as jokes, quips, laughter, smiles and grins are produced, interpreted and coordinated in naturally occurring encounters (Norrick, 1993). The significance of this is underlined by the findings of conversation analytic (CA) studies of jocular talk and laughter. These studies, which are based on detailed analysis of audio- and video recordings of naturally occurring interactions, reveal that people rely upon a range of tacit, seen-but-unnoticed practices and procedures in order to produce, recognize and manage humour-related actions. Thus, for example, although laughter is often depicted as a spontaneous response to 'humorous' talk, in practice it is routinely invited by prior speakers through the use of a range of techniques, which enable them to indicate that, and when it is appropriate for others to laugh. Moreover, respondents have at their disposal an array of practices through which they can produce, or decline to produce, laughter and other humour-related responses (e.g. Gavioli, 1995; Glenn, 1989, 1991/1992, 1995; Jefferson, 1979; Jefferson et al., 1987; Rutter, 1997).

It is perhaps not surprising that CA studies have had little, if any, impact on humour research. With notable exceptions (Glenn, 1989; Rutter, 1997), CA researchers have not drawn attention to the relevance of their findings for theories and issues in the field of humour research. Consequently, the empirical, conceptual and methodological implications of CA work for humour research remain unclear. In this article, we clarify this matter by showing how our analysis of the interactional organization of laughter sheds light on both the situational dependency and the functions of humour during the public performances of management gurus.

Data and methodology

Our analysis focuses on video recordings of public lectures given by Tom Peters, Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Peter Senge and Gary Hamel. These gurus are renowned for their public performances and represent a range of popular ideas that have had a major impact on organizational life in the last 15 years. The recordings are drawn from the following commercially produced training packages:

Tom Peters – *Tom Peters Experience 1 & 2*, *Thriving on Chaos 1–3* and *Service with Soul*;
Rosabeth Moss Kanter – *Managing Change and The Great Corporate Balancing Act* and *Lessons in Leadership*;
Peter Senge – *The Fifth Discipline and the Infrastructures of a Learning Organisation* and *The Knowledge-Building Process: The Important Role of Learning Communities*; and
Gary Hamel – *Lessons in Leadership*.

The videos involving Peters and Moss Kanter combine footage of the two gurus lecturing with case studies and interviews concerning organizations that are mentioned in the gurus' lectures. The videos involving Senge and Hamel include complete performances. The 19 hours of video material contain approximately 14 hours of the gurus lecturing to audiences of managers and trainers. The video recordings focus on the gurus (rather than on audience members) as they deliver all but 15 of the messages that elicit audience laughter.

The data are analysed using the approach and findings of CA research into public speaking (e.g. Atkinson, 1984a, 1984b; Clayman, 1992, 1993; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986; McIlvenny, 1996). CA involves detailed, qualitative analysis of audio- and video recordings of naturally occurring social

interactions (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Boden & Zimmerman, 1991; Heritage, 1995; Psathas, 1995; Zimmerman, 1988). CA research does not entail the formulation and empirical testing of a priori hypotheses. Rather, it uses inductive search procedures to identify regularities in verbal and/or nonverbal interaction. The objective is to describe the practices and reasoning that speakers use in producing their own behaviour and in interpreting and dealing with the behaviour of others. Analysis emerges from the orientations and understandings that parties unavoidably display to each other during their interactions.

In locating and analysing recurring patterns of action and interaction, CA researchers repeatedly replay audio- or video recordings of natural interactions, carefully transcribing the events. The transcripts capture not only what is said, but also various details of speech production, such as overlapping talk, pauses within and between utterances, stress, pitch and volume. They may also track visual conduct such as gestures and gaze direction. These transcripts facilitate the fine-grained analysis of the recordings, enabling researchers to reveal and analyse tacit, 'seen but unnoticed' (Garfinkel, 1967) aspects of human conduct that otherwise would be unavailable for systematic study. Extracts from transcripts are included in research reports as exemplars of the interactional phenomena under investigation.

Although CA began with the study of ordinary conversations, it has been applied increasingly to other forms of interaction including medical consultations, broadcast interviews, calls for emergency assistance, organizational meetings, proceedings in small claims courts, and psychiatric intake interviews (e.g. Boden, 1994; Drew & Heritage, 1992; Samra-Fredericks, 1998). A number of researchers have also extended its principles to the study of visual conduct (e.g. Goodwin, 1981; Heath, 1986; Heath & Luff, 2000). Despite its name, CA is a generic approach to the study of social interaction.

CA research on public speaking demonstrates that collective audience responses, such as applause and laughter, are not simply spontaneous reactions to the messages that evoke them (e.g. Atkinson 1984a, 1984b; Clayman, 1993; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986). As collective actions, their production is underpinned by the basic sociological principle that people prefer to act like those around them so as to avoid social isolation (Asch, 1951). Thus, for example, although individual audience members may wish to clap or laugh in response to public speakers' remarks, they will generally only do so in situations in which they are assured that other audience members will do the same.

According to Clayman (1992), collective responses may be facilitated by two methods: independent decision-making and mutual monitoring.

Independent decision-making involves audience members reacting independently of one another, but nonetheless managing to respond in concert. Mutual monitoring involves individual response decisions being 'guided, at least in part, by reference to the [aural or, less commonly, visual] behaviour of other audience members' (Clayman, 1993: 112). Thus, for example, individual audience members may decide to respond after they observe others either doing likewise or acting in ways that suggest that they are about to do so (e.g. preparing to clap, murmuring approval and nodding). As Clayman observes these two scenarios lead to different types of responses.

> Responses organised primarily by independent decision-making should begin with a 'burst' that quickly builds to maximum intensity as many audience members begin to respond in concert. Mutual monitoring, by contrast, should result in a 'staggered' onset as the initial reactions of a few audience members prompt others to respond. These scenarios are not mutually exclusive – a response episode may begin with a 'burst' involving many independent starters, which subsequently encourages others to join in. Indeed, an initial 'burst' should be most effective in prompting others because it *decisively* establishes the relevance of a response and *decisively* counteracts concerns about isolation.
>
> (Clayman, 1993: 112, emphases in original)

CA studies of political oratory demonstrate that the onset of applause is organized primarily by independent decision-making (Atkinson, 1984a, 1984b). Generally, applause begins with a 'burst' immediately after or just before message completion. Individual audience members are able to respond in concert because political speakers indicate clearly to them that and when applause is relevant. Atkinson shows that political speakers often accomplish this not only by (i) using prosodic, rhythmic and nonvocal signals to mark out messages from a background of other speech material, but also by (ii) packaging their messages in a small number of rhetorical devices which both emphasize them and provide them with clearly projectable message completion points around which individual audience members can coordinate their actions (see also Brodine, 1986; Clayman, 1993; Grady & Potter, 1985; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986; McIlvenny, 1996). The latter devices are (1) contrasts, which comprise two juxtapositioned sentences (A →, B →) that are opposed in words, or sense, or both (see Appendix for a glossary defining the transcription symbols used in the extracts):

Extract 1 [Conservative Party Conference 1999]

Hague: And it was in the nineteen eighties (.) that
A → it was the forces of conservatism (.) that stood up to the unions
And defended our country
(.)
B → while Tony Blair was voting against every trade union law and campaigning [for unilateral disarmament.
Audience: [Applause

(2) lists, especially three-part lists (1 →, 2 →, 3 →):

Extract 2 [Liberal Party Conference 1999]

Kennedy: But they should be even more ashamed of something else. (.) When they start a s- supposedly progressive government starts using the language of the need for a moral crusade.
1 → There's more to morality than curfews Mister Straw.
(.)
2 → There's more to morality than a tax on people (.) who choose to bring up their children in their own way.
(.)
3 → And there's a lot more to morality (.) than some of the most illiberal asylum and immigration laws that this country has ever seen.
Audience: Applause.

(3) puzzle–solution formats, which involve speakers establishing a puzzle (P →) in the minds of audience members before offering as a solution (S →) to the puzzle a statement which embodies the core message they wish to get across:

Extract 3 [Labour Party Conference 1999]

Blair: P → And here's one for us to put back down the Tory throats
(.)
S → fewer days lost in strikes than in any of the eighteen years of Tory government
Audience: Applause

(4) headline–punchline formats, which involve speakers indicating that they are about to make a declaration, pledge or announcement (H →) and then proceeding to make it (P →):

Extract 4 [Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986: 129]

Meadowcroft:		The other point about that as we:ll (.) and this is very very important I think. (0.3) is that passing this motion (.) can help the Alliance with the Social Democrats. (.)
	H →	and I'll tell you why:. (.)
	P →	It remo:ves the last excuse for your idealistic radicals to join the Labour Party.
Audience:		Applause (8.0 seconds)

(5) combinations of the aforementioned devices:

Extract 5 [Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986: 130–1]

(In this case a puzzle (P →) is resolved (S →) by a contrast (a → b →))

Jones:	P →		You know Mister Chairman er Margaret Thatcher and Ted Heath (0.4) both have great vision. (0.7)
	S →	a →	The difference i:s that Margaret Thatcher (0.2) has a vision that one day Britain will be great agai:n (0.4)
		b →	and Ted Heath has a vision (0.2) that one day Ted Heath will be great again.=
Audience:			Applause (19.4 seconds)

(6) position taking (PT →), which involves a speaker first describing a state of affairs and then overtly and unequivocally praising or condemning the state of affairs described:

Extract 6 [Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986: 131]

Batiste:	There is a widespread practice in this country (.) whereby companies which use closed shops (.) pass that obligation

on to small business sub-contractors (.) to use only s- sh-
er- er union labour (.) in meeting contracts in those places.
(.)
PT →That practice must stop.
Audience: Applause (6.2 seconds)

and (7) pursuits (→), which involve speakers recompleting or resummarizing a previous point:

Extract 7 [Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986: 134]

(In this case the pursuit follows a three-part list which fails to evoke applause)

Evans: And you come to selling
(0.2)
1 → We've got to sell Great Britain
(0.2)
2 → We've got to sell Margaret Thatcher
(0.2)
3 → We've got to sell her policies (.) to the people
(.)
Pursuit → Tell the people [(0.2) what the pla:n is.
Audience: [Applause

These rhetorical devices were all well known to ancient Greek scholars; the use of contrasts (antithesis), for example, was first taught by the sophists (Dobson, 1919; Kennedy, 1963). Atkinson's contribution is to examine how they are actually used in speeches to invite, and to provide for the coordination of, applause. A description of all seven devices can be found in Heritage and Greatbatch (1986: 122–37), whose analysis of political speeches delivered to the British Conservative, Labour and Liberal party conferences in 1981 revealed that just over two-thirds of the instances of full-scale applause in the speeches occurred in response to messages that were packaged in one or more of the rhetorical formats.

This article contributes to CA literature on public speaking in two main ways. First, several researchers have developed Atkinson's work by examining not only applause (e.g. Brodine, 1986; Bull, 1986; Grady & Potter, 1985; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986) but also audience laughter (Clayman, 1992) and booing and heckling (e.g. Clayman, 1993; McIlvenny, 1996). However, these researchers have focused exclusively on

various forms of political oratory, with the result that relatively little is known about whether and how the verbal and nonverbal practices deployed by political speakers are used in other types of public speaking. By contrast, this article examines the techniques used by another group of speakers, management gurus, whose professional success depends to a large extent on their ability to build personal reputations as powerful orators. Second, the article also provides insights into how collective audience responses are evoked and coordinated when speakers do *not* package their messages in one or more of the seven verbal devices discussed earlier. As Bull (2000) notes, this issue has received very little attention in previous CA research.

Audience laughter during the management gurus' lectures

As shown in Table 1, the lectures contain 88 cases of collective audience laughter, whereas applause is confined to the beginning and end of the gurus' presentations and to three incidents during Tom Peters's lectures where laughter leads to applause, one of which involves only a handful of people clapping.[1] In this respect, the gurus' lectures are akin to various forms of public speaking, including university lectures and training seminars, in which applause is usually not treated as a relevant activity *either* on its own *or* in conjunction with laughter.

In this section we first examine how audience laughter is evoked by, and coordinated with, the gurus' messages and then discuss its relationship to the gurus' core ideas and visions.

Evoking audience laughter

Independent decision-making also plays a predominant role in the genesis of audience laughter in the gurus' lectures. Thus, as shown in Table 2, 83 (94 percent) cases of laughter begin with a burst, either just before or immediately after message completion.

Table 1 Incidence of audience laughter in the gurus' lectures

	TP	*RMK*	*PS*	*GH*	*Total*
Full laughter	42	25	10	11	88

The gurus supply all of the messages that precipitate these bursts of laughter with emphasis and clearly projectable completion points around which audience members can coordinate their actions. In just over half (42) of the cases they achieve this by using one or more of the seven rhetorical formats associated with the generation of applause at political meetings. Consider Extract 8 in which Tom Peters supports his argument that organizations should adopt 'flat and fluid' structures by quoting Ross Perot. The quotation praises one company, Electronic Data Systems (EDS) for purportedly adopting a 'flat and fluid' structure, and disparages another company, General Motors (GM), for purportedly retaining a cumbersome bureaucratic structure. Both the commendation of EDS and the criticism of GM are followed by audience laughter.

Extract 8 *[TOC2 – 35.56: 'When you see a snake']*

1	Peters:	My favourite Perroism of all was his description, right before
2		leaving GM, of what he sa:w as the difference between
3		Electronic Data Systems and GM. (0.6) He said,
4		['At EDS (.) WHEN YOU SEE A SNAKE (.) YOU KILL IT'.
5		[*Leans forward, glares, uses angry tone of voice*
6	Audience: →	[LLLLLLLLLL LLLLLLLLL LLLLLL-L-L[-L
7		[*Turns and walks* [
8	Peters:	[He said, 'At GM when
9		you see a snake, [you search the world for the top
10		[*Leans forward/smile face*
11		consultant on snakes'.
12	Audience: →	LLLLLLLLL LLLLLLLLL
13	Peters:	Then you appoint a committee on snakes and you study snakes for
14		the next two years. (1.0) <Flat (.) fluid (.) and get on with it (.) that':s
15		the creature

Table 2 Immediate bursts of laughter and laughter whose onset is staggered

	TP	*RK*	*PS*	*GH*	*Totals*
Immediate bursts	41	24	8	10	83
Staggered onsets	1	1	2	1	5
Totals	42	25	10	11	88

Peters provides the messages, which evoke laughter with both emphasis and clearly projectable completion points by, inter alia, using a puzzle–solution format (Atkinson, 1984a, 1984b; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986). Thus, he begins by establishing a puzzle in the minds of the audience members (ll. 1–3): what did Ross Perot see as the difference between EDS and GM? He then offers a two-part solution which is formed as a contrast (ll. 3–4 and 8–11). In this way, he highlights the contents of the messages against a background of surrounding speech materials. He also provides the audience members with resources to anticipate the completion of the two messages, for they can match each part of the emerging solution to the puzzle in order to infer what it will take for it to be complete. In the case of the second part of the solution/contrast, they can also match it against the first part. In both instances, Peters confirms the relevance of laughter by ceding the floor until the audience's laughter ends and then, when he resumes speaking, neither asserting nor otherwise indicating that the audience's laughter was inappropriate or unexpected (ll. 13–15).

In the 41 cases in which the gurus do not use the verbal devices discussed by Atkinson, the gurus nonetheless supply messages that precipitate laughter with emphasis and clearly projectable completion points. Consider Extract 9 in which audience laughter occurs after Rosabeth Moss Kanter derides a product name, Zoo Do (although she adopts a positive stance in relation to the product per se).

Extract 9 [MC:00.06.19]

1	RMK:	Now if it had been in New England (.) that person would ne(h)ver
2		ha(h)d dar(h)ed speak up, but because it was California they are:
3		(0.7) making their animals a profit centre.=Like the Toronto Zoo by
4		the way that has been packaging fertiliser that they sell which has
5		been contributed by the animals at the Toronto Zoo. (.) The Bronx
6		Zoo also has one like this on the market I hate to say this out loud
7		in front of several thousand people but they do have it on the
8		market (.) under the brand na:me (.) [Zoo Do.
9		[RMK purses lips and widens
10		eyes.
11	Audience:	LLLLLLLLL LL[LLL (1.5)
12	RMK:	[Well you'll see my point in a minute, I'm no(h)t
13		ju(h)st try(h)ing to entertain you. (.) Because one more round of the
14		elephant,=I then thought. . . ((Continues))

Although Kanter does not use any of the rhetorical devices (e.g. a contrast, list, puzzle–solution format) discussed in CA research on political oratory, a large number of the audience members independently anticipates the completion of her message. This is due, in part, to the fact that she nonetheless both emphasizes her message and provides it with a clearly projectable completion point. On the one hand, she draws attention to her message, and thereby emphasizes it, by announcing that she is going to say something that is potentially 'delicate' or undesirable (ll. 6–7: 'I hate to say this out loud in front of several thousand people . . .'). On the other hand, she provides her message with a clearly projectable completion point by (i) indicating that she is referring to a brand name and (ii) using a syntactic structure which clearly indicates that the brand name will be revealed at the end of the sentence in progress (ll. 7–8: 'they do have it on the market (.) under the brand na:me'). Consequently, as the sentence unfolds, the audience members are in a position to anticipate that message and sentence completion will coincide with Kanter's articulation of the brand name 'Zoo Do'. Notice, moreover, that Kanter pauses just prior to producing the brand name (l. 8: (.)), thereby providing the audience with a little extra time in which to gear up to respond (what Atkinson refers to as a monitor space). So, despite the absence of the rhetorical formats examined in research on political oratory, the same principles apply: the speaker both emphasizes her message and provides it with a clearly projectable completion point. Subsequently, Kanter confirms the relevance of laughter by, inter alia, remaining silent until the audience's response starts to die away (ll. 11–12).

In addition to providing messages that precipitate laughter with emphasis and clearly projectable completion points, the gurus also provide them with additional stress via a range of prosodic, rhythmic and nonvocal signals which mark out messages from a background of other speech material, and thereby indicate the relevance of audience response to them. In assessing the role of vocal and nonvocal cues in the generation of laughter, we used the scheme devised by Heritage and Greatbatch (1986) in their analysis of political speech making. This involves coding each message that evoked laughter in terms of its degree of stress:

> Stress was evaluated by taking note of (1) whether the speaker was gazing at the audience at or near the completion of a message; whether the message was (2) delivered more loudly than surrounding speech passages, or (3) with greater pitch or stress variation, or (4) with marked speeding up, slowing down, or some other rhythmic shift, or (5) accompanied by the use of gestures. In the absence of any of these features, the message was coded 'no stress'. One of these features was

> treated as sufficient for an 'intermediate stress' coding, whereas the presence of two or more features resulted in a coding of 'full stress'.
>
> (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986: 143)

As shown in Table 3, 64 messages had full stress (including those in Extracts 8 and 9 above), 20 had intermediate stress, whereas only 4 had no stress.

In summary, the 84 messages which precipitate bursts of audience laughter (i) have clearly projectable completion points around which audience members can coordinate their actions (regardless of whether they are packaged in the verbal devices identified in prior CA research on political oratory) and (ii) are stressed so that they stand out from surrounding speech materials. In these regards, they follow the same principles as messages that elicit applause. However, as we show in the next section, the gurus also routinely deploy additional techniques that are specifically associated with the generation of audience laughter.

Establishing the relevance of laughter

The gurus rarely rely on audience members to recognize that collective laughter is relevant on the basis of the content of their messages alone. Rather, they also establish the relevance of audience laughter through the use of a range of verbal and nonverbal actions during the delivery, and/or following the completion, of their messages. These include: (i) announcing that they are about to say something humorous; (ii) smiling or laughing; and/or (iii) using 'comedic' facial expressions, gestures and prosody. The latter involve, for example, displays of disgust, disbelief, anger, horror, amazement, which may index either their own reactions or the reactions of others to the actions, practices or issues that are being discussed. This is not to say that these nonverbal actions are inherently 'comedic'. Their possible status as such derives from their use with particular verbal messages and devices, whose 'comedic' status in turn derives in part from their use with such nonverbal

Table 3 Stress

	Full	*Intermediate*	*None*	*Totals*
TP	30	11	1	42
RMK	18	6	1	25
PS	8	1	1	10
GH	8	2	1	11
Totals	64	20	4	88

actions. In other words, the speakers' verbal and nonverbal actions are reflexively related – the comedic status of each resting in part on their use in conjunction with the other.

In 15 cases it was not possible to establish with certainty whether or not such cues had been used to signal humorous intent because the gurus' facial expressions and/or bodily actions were not visible (in the recordings) as they delivered their messages. However, as shown in Table 4, almost two-thirds (53) of the remaining 78 cases in which messages evoke immediate bursts of audience laughter involve the use by the gurus of 'comedic' cues during the delivery of their messages.

Thus, for example, in Extract 8 Tom Peters does not rely solely on the 'humorous' content of his remarks to establish the relevance of audience laughter; he also 'invites' audience laughter through the use of a range of nonverbal techniques. In the first case of laughter (Extract 8, l. 6), which follows Peters's depiction of Perot's commendation of EDS, Peters uses comedic gestures, facial expressions and prosody. As he quotes Perot on EDS (ll. 4–5), he suddenly leans forward, glares at a section of the audience and speaks louder as he adopts a 'mock angry' tone. Then, as he completes the quotation ('you kill it'), he bares his teeth as he 'spits' out the words. Together with Perot's incongruous metaphorical imagery – seeing and killing snakes in a corporate context – Peters' nonverbal actions establish the possible relevance of audience laughter. In the second case of audience laughter (l. 12), which follows Peters's depiction of Perot's disparagement of GM (ll. 8–11), Peters, reverting to a 'low key' form of speech delivery, establishes the possible relevance of laughter by leaning forward and smiling at the audience as he completes the quotation. Rosabeth Moss Kanter also uses nonverbal techniques to signal humorous intent, in Extract 9 above. As she utters the brand name Zoo Do her facial expression conveys her apparent distaste or discomfit at having to say the name out loud (l. 8) and, as she completes the sentence, she purses her lips and widens her eyes as she stares at the audience (l. 9). Like Peters, then, Kanter does not rely solely on the

Table 4 The use of comedic cues in the context of messages that evoke immediate bursts of audience laughter

Cues during delivery	53
Cues after delivery only	6
No cues	9
Don't know	15
Total	83

content of her message to indicate to the audience members that her message is humorous and that laughter is an appropriate response.

In the remaining 15 cases the gurus either deliver messages without using nonverbal cues that are, in the context of their other actions, recognizably 'comedic' (9 cases) or use such cues *after* completing their verbal messages (6 cases). In these cases, then, those audience members who laugh just before or immediately after message completion appear to do so on the basis of the content of the gurus' messages alone. Consider Extract 10 in which Peter Senge concedes that a concept (infrastructure) which has been central to his theory about organizational learning is inappropriate.

Extract 10 [FD: 0.48.50]

(Discussing co-edited volume: *The fifth discipline field book*)

PS: So what infrastructure meant to us .h wa:s how do you desi:gn an enterprise so learning isn't left to chance. .hh So that people have the ti::me for learning. .hh people have the resources for learning. .hh People have the occa::sion (.) .h. That learning is part of working. (1.8) Daniel I don't know if you're gonna (0.2) be surprised by this. (0.2) I shouldn't have been because I think I did this a few years ago. (.) .hhh As a matter of just kind of course uh- (.) I should have done this obviously about (0.2) three years ago. .hh I looked up the definition of the word infrastructure this morning. (0.7) *Looks at document he is holding, closes mouth, pulls* (0.8) *up lip* (0.8) *corners, shakes of head once*

PS: =Because many people have been telling m- me: I don't know for the last couple of years well this infrastructure doesn't quite kind of capture what you're talking about. .hhh My Websters dictionary said the permanent installations required for military purposes.

Audience: LL[LLLLLLLLLLLLLLLLLLLL-L-L-L-L-L-L-L

[*PS purses his lips/smiles as looks at document from which he has read*

PS: We have organised a few conferences around this subject of learning infrastructures. .hh I don't think we've ever included a dictionary definition (.) which was probably a bit of a shortcoming on our parts. (0.5) .hhh So: .h you may have to suspend this wor(h)d. .We may have to find a better word. I do not mean the permanent installations required for military operations.=

After summarizing 'what infrastructure meant to us' (ll. 1–5), Senge indicates that there may be a problem with his use of this concept (ll. 5–15). Initially, addressing a colleague, and fellow speaker at the meeting (l. 5: 'Daniel'), he says that he has looked up a dictionary definition of the term because he has been told that the term does not 'quite kind of capture what (he's) talking about' (ll. 5–15). Having established a puzzle in the minds of the audience (what *is* the dictionary definition?), he then offers a solution by reading out a dictionary definition which is clearly inconsistent with his use of the term (ll. 15–17). This evokes collective laughter by audience members (l. 18), the relevance of which Senge confirms by, inter alia, falling silent until the laughter ends (l. 21). Although he suggests that the dictionary definition may be a source of surprise, Senge does not either announce that the dictionary definition is humorous or smile, laugh, and/or use other recognizably 'comedic' nonverbal techniques as he delivers his message. In contrast to the speakers in Extracts 8 and 9, Senge initially relies on the content of his message to establish the relevance of audience laughter. He does not use additional cues (pursing his lips and smiling) to signal his humorous intent until after he has completed his message, and a substantial number of audience members have already started to laugh (ll. 18–20).

Interestingly, in all but one of the five cases in which the onset of audience laughter is staggered (see Table 2), the gurus rely on audience members to recognize on the basis of the content of their messages alone that laughter is a relevant, if not an expected, response. Consider Extract 11 in which Rosabeth Moss Kanter evokes audience laughter (l. 15) after she describes the purported reactions of a number of giant American corporations to a new packaging technology. After Kanter's description one or two audience members start to laugh.

Extract 11 [GCBA1: 00.21.15]

1	RMK:	They were the first producer of fruit and vegetable juice in the
2		United State (.) to put their product in the cute little paper
3		bottle.=The ( ) packaging. (0.7) A Well known packaging
4		technology all over Europe not used in the United States. I mean
5		again it just shows we're scouting the world (0.5) for technology
6		including things like packaging can make a huge difference. (.)
7		Anyhow they were not known in the United States. In the early
8		eighties the European manufacturers came over (.) to make
9		presentations to (0.2) to all the food companies to see if they could
10		interest them in the packaging. (.) So they make presentations to

11 all of the giants, Coca Cola, (.) Proctor and Gamble etcetera and
12 one of the gia:nts (0.5) was sufficiently interested in this that they
13 immediately set up a committee to study it.
14 (.)
15 Audience: L-L[-L-L -L- L- L- L [LLLLLL–L-L-L-L-[L
16 [*Expansive smile* [[
17 RMK: [Right (.) uhm [
18 RMK: [Ocean Spra::y heard
19 the same presentation (0.8) committed the next da:y, (0.5) signed a
20 deal by the end of the week, (0.4) and got an eighteen month
21 exclusive license.

The absence of an immediate burst of laughter may index, in part, uncertainty on the part of audience members as to whether collective laughter is relevant at this particular juncture. Kanter presents her message in a relatively straightforward way, with the result that the potential relevance of laughter rests largely, if not solely, on the content of her remarks. Subsequently, Kanter confirms that laughter is relevant by not only falling silent, but also smiling (l. 16). However, the audience members' audible response remains limited to isolated laughter (l. 15). In the face of this, Kanter stops smiling and, walking away from the audience, resumes speaking (l. 17: 'Right'). As she does so, however, additional audience members, start to laugh – possibly in response not only to the preceding isolated laughter, but also to Kanter's expansive smile. Kanter hesitates momentarily and then, as the laughter dissolves, goes on to praise the actions of a smaller company called Ocean Spray which, she claims, is not weighed down by bureaucracy (ll. 18–21). Examples like this perhaps underline the importance of the cues that gurus routinely use to signal their humorous intent to audience members.

In most cases (82) of collective audience laughter the gurus tacitly confirm the relevance of laughter, regardless of whether it begins with a burst or a 'staggered' onset. Specifically, as in Extracts 8–11, they cede the floor until the audience's laughter ends or starts to die away and then, when they resume speaking, they do not assert or otherwise indicate that the audience's laughter was inappropriate or unexpected. When the gurus confirm the relevance of audience laughter, they obviously confirm that their messages were designed to elicit such a response. However, in six cases the gurus do problematize the relevance of audience laughter and thereby cast doubt on the appropriateness of the audiences' treatment of their messages as 'invitations to laugh'. These cases involve the gurus continuing to speak in the face of audience laughter. Consider Extract 12 in which Gary Hamel's depiction

of construction workers lining up to buy a latte at Starbucks coffee shops elicits audience laughter.

Extract 12 [LA: 0:38:30]

1	GH:	Now this is not only in kind of high tech products and it's not
2		only things about the internet.=Let me give you some very (.)
3		mundane examples for a moment. (0.4) take something that
4		certainly in the United States we all know as a a company Star-
5		bucks.=Now beginning to go interna:tional. (0.7) Who would
6		have predicted here that you could get construction workers to
7		line up three deep to pay two and a half bucks for a latte after all.
8	Audience:	L[L L L L[L L L L L L L L L
9	GH:	[Right. [And if- and if I'm sitting there inside Nestle running you
10		know the world's largest coffee brand Nescafe how do I
11	(0.5)	feel when in less than ten years somebody can build a coffee
11		brand (0.6) that in the largest mar:ket er: coffee drinking market
12		in the world is a demonstrably more valuable bra::nd (0.5) than
13		my decades old coffee brand. (0.5) Does it matter that er Nestle
14		grabs a little bit of market share from P and G: in the (.) isles
15		of your local supermarket if most of the new wealth in the coffee
17		business is being created here.

In contrast to the speakers in Extracts 8–11 earlier, Hamel does not cede the floor whilst the audience members laugh. Having overlapped the onset of their laughter (l. 9: 'Right'), he starts a new sentence and talks across the remainder of the audience's response ('And if – and if I'm . . .'), as he initiates a spate of talk which assesses the implications of Starbucks' apparent success in the 'coffee business' for its competitor Nestle. By doing this, Hamel raises the possibility that he may not in fact have invited audience members to laugh and that their laughter was therefore a spontaneous, 'unexpected', 'unlooked for' response.

Although, the gurus sometimes cast doubt on the relevance of audience laughter, there are no examples of them suggesting that their preceding remarks were not, in fact, formulated in humorous terms. With regard to this, recall that audience laughter is not the only way in which audience members can display their understanding that the gurus have said something 'humorous'. Alternative responses include smiling or chuckling quietly, or even silently. In contrast to collective audience laughter, these responses are barely audible and thus do not embody the expectation that the speakers remain silent until they die away. When gurus continue speaking during collective laughter, then they

perhaps problematize not the purportedly humorous character of precipitative messages, but rather the *type* of audience response that is relevant and expected.

In summary, collective audience laughter is not simply a spontaneous reaction to messages whose content is self-evidently humorous. Usually, audience laughter is constituted by both gurus and audience members as having been 'invited' by the gurus: the gurus indicate clearly to audience members that and when laughter is appropriate and expectable, and then remain silent until the laughter either ends or begins to die away. Later, we examine the relationship between audience laughter and the gurus' core ideas and visions.

Humour, laughter and the gurus' core ideas and visions

The cases examined in this study confirm that incongruity is central to humour. All of the laughter episodes involve the gurus formulating a situation as surprising or unusual, and inviting audience members to laugh and thereby exhibit agreement with their values (standards of judgement) concerning some aspect of social life. In a very few cases (3), this involves the gurus inviting audience members to express (through laughter) unvarnished support for values that are embodied in their core management ideas and visions – values which characaterize familiar organizational practices as inappropriate, even absurd. Consider Extract 11 in which Kanter evokes laughter in response to her depiction of the reactions of large corporations to an innovative packaging technology. To a large extent appreciation of the humour of her remarks, which are produced 'straight-faced', derives from acceptance of her espoused view that most large organizations are too cautious when they encounter innovatory practices and products. Consequently, the audience's laughter is open to interpretation as an unvarnished expression of support for her ideas concerning organizational practice in general.

In the vast majority of cases (85), however, the gurus do *not* construct and deliver their messages so as to invite audiences to produce, through laughter, unvarnished expressions of support for values which derive from their core ideas and visions. Thus, for example, the gurus frequently invest their messages with multiple sources of humour. Consider Extract 8 in which Tom Peters quotes Ross Perot. Here Peters evokes laughter in response to his (and Perot's) praise of the supposedly rapid reaction of one organization, and criticism of the purportedly slow reactions of another. In so doing, Peters conveys a critique of big, 'bureaucratic' organizations that closely resembles

the stance taken by Kanter in Extract 11. However, in this instance there are several other potential sources of humour, including Perot's metaphorical imagery and style of speaking, and Peters's mimicry of these. Consequently, individual audience members may be displaying their appreciation of the humour in these features, as opposed to (or in addition to) Perot's evaluation of the corporations' actions and, by extension, Peters's core ideas. This means that while audience members engage in collective displays of affiliation with Peters, their laughter does not represent *unvarnished* expressions of support for the position he is using the Perot quotation to substantiate.

The gurus also frequently 'invite' audience members to laugh at the by-products of the organizational practices they are recommending or criticizing, rather than at the practices themselves. Thus, for example, in Extract 9 above the 'target' of Kanter's humour is the purportedly inappropriate name given to a product ('Zoo Do'), which she has used to illustrate her ideas; while in Extract 12, the target of Gary Hamel's humour is a purportedly 'surprising' aspect of the success of a coffee shop chain which apparently adopted his ideas concerning strategy (construction workers queuing for a latte). Consequently, although audience members exhibit that they share Kanter's perspective concerning a product name, and Hamel's perspective concerning the popularity of a product amongst a particular occupational group, their laughter clearly does not represent an unvarnished expression of support for the gurus' core management ideas.

Similar considerations apply in cases in which the gurus use humour to downplay the seriousness of potential shortcomings in their theories. Thus, while audience members in Extract 10 display a shared perspective with Peter Senge concerning the purported absurdity of a dictionary definition of the term infrastructure (in relation to his use of the term), their laughter does not represent an unequivocal expression of support for his core message, namely that his decision to discard this term, which was previously at the heart of his theory of organizational learning, is not of great significance.

In sum, although a core objective of management gurus is to persuade audiences of managers to adopt new perspectives, which involve viewing familiar organizational practices as unacceptable, the gurus rarely rely on such changes in perspective having taken place when they use humour during their lectures. Instead, as we have seen, with rare exceptions, they invest their messages with multiple sources of humour and/or invite displays of affiliation with values that do not derive directly from their core ideas and visions. The fact that the gurus routinely 'play safe' by inviting audience laughter which is *not* open to interpretation as an unvarnished expression of support for their core positions is perhaps not surprising. The gurus often recommend practices that audience members are unlikely to be using and criticize

practices that audience members are likely to be using (Greatbatch & Clark, 2002). Although managers may welcome exposure to ideas that question what they do, it does not follow that they will wish to affiliate publicly with them. By inviting audience laughter which is not open to interpretation as an unvarnished expression of support for their core ideas, the gurus may, amongst other things, increase their chances of generating affiliative exchanges with audience members, even if these conditions apply.[2]

Conclusion

Collective audience laughter during management guru lectures is not simply a spontaneous reaction to messages whose content is self-evidently humorous, but rather is evoked by the gurus through the use of a range of interactional practices. Some of these practices are also implicated in the generation of applause by political orators. Thus the gurus use the same nonverbal skills as politicians to stress their messages, and, like politicians, make extensive use of the verbal rhetorical devices discussed by Atkinson (1984a, 1984b) in his influential studies of applause and political oratory. That gurus use contrasts and the like is hardly surprising. Atkinson (1984a, 1984b) and Heritage and Greatbatch (1986) argue that these devices pervade 'persuasive' talk not only in other forms of public speaking, but also spoken interaction in general. However, our research also shows that even when the rhetorical devices discussed in CA research are not in evidence in the guru lectures, the speakers use alternative verbal formats which achieve the same ends – namely, emphasizing messages and projecting clear message completion points around which audience members can coordinate their responses. Further research is now needed to identify these formats and to determine the extent to which they feature in other forms of public speaking, such as political oratory.

In evoking laughter the gurus also deploy presentational techniques that are specifically related to the evocation of audience laughter. Rather than relying on audience members to recognize that laughter is relevant solely on the basis of the content of their messages, the gurus routinely use a range of nonverbal and, less commonly, verbal cues to signal their humorous intent. These techniques play an important role with respect to the maintenance of publicly displayed shared understandings between gurus and audience members concerning the jocular status of messages and, perhaps, the relevance of collective laughter as opposed to other forms of response (grins, smiles, etc.). The gurus also usually construct and deliver their messages in ways that disengage humour recognition from their core ideas and/or invest

their messages with multiple sources of humour. By so doing, they delineate those aspects of social life in relation to which audience laughter may express shared values and norms, and vary the extent to which audience laughter is open to interpretation as an unvarnished expression of support for their core management ideas.

These presentational techniques play an important role in the gurus' communication of their ideas and visions, especially in relation to the management of group cohesion and solidarity during their lectures. As we noted earlier, a host of studies have argued that humour can promote the emergence and maintenance of group cohesiveness by, inter alia, clarifying and reinforcing shared values and social norms; disciplining those who violate the rules of a social group, and unifying other group members against them; and dividing group members from other groups (those who would be expected to adopt a different perspective; e.g. see Meyer, 2000). It is unclear whether the gurus and their audiences can be classified or, more importantly, would classify themselves as members of distinctive social groups. Indeed, part of the management gurus' mission is to recruit managers to such groups, whose boundaries are defined by reference to their members' affiliation with the gurus' theories. Nonetheless, by evoking and producing laughter, the gurus and their audience members engage in public displays of consensus and 'like-mindedness' (Glenn, 1989) and thereby *constitute* themselves as 'in-groups' that share a common perspective in relation to the circumstances and events that the gurus describe. When gurus attack/disparage others (e.g. Extract 11), as opposed to emphasizing the positive qualities of a supposedly unusual situation (e.g. Extract 12), the gurus and those audience members who laugh also publicly differentiate themselves from individuals or groups who purportedly do not share the values or perspectives they are expressing. In these cases, then, humour and laughter delineate group boundaries by acting as both a unifier and divider (Meyer, 2000).

Whether these publicly displayed group affiliations actually reflect audience members' commitment to the gurus' views and thus may extend beyond the lifetime of the gurus' lectures is, of course, open to question. Nonetheless, even those cases of laughter that are not open to interpretation as unvarnished expressions of support for the gurus' core ideas indicate a shared perspective and – like affiliative interactional practices in general (Goffman, 1983; Heritage, 1984) – contribute to a sense of cohesion and intimacy, which might make audiences more receptive to the gurus' recommendations. Moreover, CA research on public speaking suggests that the effective use of humour by gurus may have a positive impact on their ability to win and retain 'converts'. Thus Atkinson's (1984a, 1984b) studies of the generation of applause during political speeches demonstrate that

certain rhetorical devices (e.g. contrasts, lists and puzzle–solution formats), when used effectively, attract and sustain audience attentiveness to what is being said and thereby contribute to the memorability of the speaker's messages. This is because the devices make messages stand out from surrounding speech materials and, in some cases, evoke audience applause, which, in turn, heightens attentiveness and contributes to the prominence of the messages. Humorous messages stand out from their surroundings irrespective of whether or not other rhetorical devices are used. Moreover, just as applause enhances the prominence of preceding messages, so do other forms of collective audience response, including laughter. Given that speakers are unlikely to persuade audiences to empathize with their positions unless they sustain the attentiveness of audience members, it seems likely that humour is one means through which gurus and other public speakers create the conditions necessary to win and retain converts.

At the outset of this article we noted that theoretical and empirical research into humour has largely overlooked the verbal and nonverbal practices that inform both the production and recognition of jocular talk and the coordination and interpretation of responses by hearers. Our study of management guru oratory shows that by analysing these practices one gains insights into both the situational dependency and the functions of humour. By directing attention to them, we certainly do not wish to deny the importance of other contextual factors such as people's emotional states and their familiarity or unfamiliarity with social scripts, cultural norms or institutional conventions. Nevertheless, as this article shows, the verbal and nonverbal practices through which jocular talk and responses are organized are critical to understanding why people laugh, when they do and what social functions their laughter performs.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Linda Putnam and three anonymous referees for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this article and Video Arts, BBC for Business and The Tom Peters Group for their invaluable support. The research on which the article is based was funded by the Economic and Social Research Council, grant number R000222860.

Notes

1. These occur in *Thriving on Chaos 1*, *Thriving on Chaos 3* and *Service with Soul*.
2. Of course, the strength of such displays of consensus, and the degrees of 'like mindedness' that they may be taken to index, can vary considerably. Most obviously,

immediate bursts of laughter (as in Extracts 1–3 and 5) comprise stronger displays of consensus than do laughter episodes whose onsets are staggered and/or delayed (as in Extract 4). When the gurus cast doubt on the relevance of laughter (as in Extract 5), laughter episodes may display a degree of descensus between the gurus and those audience members who laugh. However, in the present current data these displays of disunity are relatively innocuous because the gurus do not go on to indicate that their prior remarks were anything but humorous. More serious are those displays of disunity in which audience members decline to laugh together in response to messages which are formulated by the gurus as invitations to laugh. Even when some or all audience members engage in other forms of affiliative responses, such as smiling or chuckling inaudibly, these may appear weak in the context of messages which (at least retrospectively) appear to have been designed to evoke collective laughter. We are currently conducting research that examines such cases.

Appendix

Transcription symbols

The transcription symbols are drawn from the transcription notation developed by Gail Jefferson. For details on this notation, see Atkinson and Heritage (1984).

[	A left bracket indicates the point at which overlapping talk begins.
]	A right bracket indicates the point at which overlapping talk ends.
=	Equals signs indicate that different speakers' utterances are 'latched'. They also link continuous talk by a single speaker that has been distributed across nonadjacent lines because of another speaker's overlapping utterance.
(0.5)	Numbers in parentheses indicate the length of silences in tenths of a second.
(.)	A dot in parentheses indicates a gap of less than two-tenths of a second.
-	A dash indicates a cut-off sound like a guttural stop.
Word	Underlining indicates some form of stress via pitch and/or amplitude.
WORD	Capital letters indicate talk that is spoken louder than the surrounding talk.
Wo::rd	Colons indicate prolongation of the immediately preceding sound.
.,?	Periods, commas, and question marks are used respectively to indicate falling, non-terminal, and rising intonation.
(Word)	Parenthesized words indicate that the transcriber was not sure of what was said.
( )	Empty parentheses indicate that the transcriber could not hear what was said.

(( )) Double parentheses contain transcriber's comments and/or descriptions.
.hhh h̲s preceded by a period represent discernible inhalations.
hhhh h̲s without a preceding period represent discernible aspiration.
LLLL A string of l's are used to indicate laughter
L-L-L Spasmodic laughter is indicated by a chain punctuated by dashes.

References

Asch, S.E. Effects of group pressure on the modification and distortion of judgements. In J. Guetzhow (Ed.), *Groups, leadership, and men*. Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Press, 1951.

Atkinson, J.M. *Our masters' voices: The language and body language of politics*. London: Methuen, 1984a.

Atkinson, J.M. Public speaking and audience response: Some techniques for inviting applause. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds), *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984b.

Atkinson, J.M. & Heritage, J.C. *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Barley, S.R., Meyer, G.W. & Gash, D.C. Cultures of culture: Academics, practitioners and the pragmatics of normative control. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1988, *33*, 24–60.

Berlyne, D.E. Laughter, humor, and play. In L. Gardner (Ed.), *The handbook of social psychology,* Vol. III. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Boden, D. *The business of talk*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994.

Boden, D. & Zimmerman, D.H. (Eds). *Talk and social structure*. Oxford: Polity Press, 1991.

Bradney, P. The joking relationship in industry. *Human Relations*, 1957, *10*, 179–87.

Brodine, R. Getting the applause. In R.M.B. Bosinelli (Ed.), *U.S. presidential election 1984: An interdisciplinary approach to the analysis of political discourse*. Bologna: Pitagoria Editrice, 1986.

Bull, P. The use of hand gesture in political speeches. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 1986, *5*(2), 103–18.

Bull, P. The mistiming of applause in political speeches. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 2000, *19*(3), 275–94.

Carrell, A. The need to incorporate audience and situation into a theory of humor. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association annual convention, Chicago, IL, 1992.

Carson, P.P., Lanier, P., Carson, K.D. & Guidry, B.N. Clearing a path through the management fashion jungle: Some preliminary trailblazing. *Academy of Management Journal*, 2000, *43*, 1143–58.

Cetola, H.W. Toward a cognitive-appraisal model of humor appreciation. *Humor*, 1988, *1*, 245–8.

Clark, T. *Managing consultants*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1995.

Clark, T. & Salaman, G. The management guru as organizational witchdoctor. *Organization*, 1996, *3*(1), 85–107.

Clayman, S.E. Caveat orator: Audience disaffiliation in the 1988 presidential debates. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 1992, *78*, 33–60.

Clayman, S.E. Booing: The anatomy of a disaffiliative response. *American Sociological Review*, 1993, *58*, 110–30.

Collinson, D.L. Engineering humour: Masculinity, joking and conflict in shop-floor relations. *Organisation Studies*, 1988, *9*(2), 181–99.
Collinson, D.L. Managing humour. *Journal of Management Studies*, 2002, *39*(3), 269–88.
Coser, R.L. Some social functions of laughter. *Human Relations*, 1959, *12*, 171–81.
Coser, R.L. Laughter among colleagues: A study of the social functions of humour among the staff of a mental hospital. *Psychiatry*, 1960, *23*, 81–95.
Dandridge, T.C. Ceremony as an integration of work and play. *Organizational Studies*, 1986, *7*(2), 159–70.
Dobson, J.F. *The Greek orators*. London: Methuen, 1919.
Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (Eds). *Talk at work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
Duncan, W.J. The superiority theory of humour at work: Joking relationships as indicators of formal and informal status patterns in small, task-oriented groups. *Small Group Behaviour*, 1983, *16*, 555–64.
Dwyer, T. Humour, power and change in organisations. *Human Relations*, 1991, *44*(1), 1–19.
Fine, G.A. Humour in situ: The role of humour in small group culture. In A.J. Chapman & H.C. Foot (Eds), *It's a funny thing, humour*. New York: Pergamon, 1977.
Fine, G.A. Small groups and culture creation: The idioculture of little league baseball culture. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1979, *44*, 733–45.
Fine, G.A. *With the boys: Little league baseball and preadolescent culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
Fine, G.A. *Kitchens: The culture of restaurant work*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
Freud, S. *Jokes and their relation to the unconscious*. New York: Moffat Ward, 1916.
Garfinkel, H. *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1967.
Gavioli, L. Turn-initial versus turn-final laughter: Two techniques for initiating remedy in English/Italian bookshop service encounters. *Discourse Processes*, 1995, *19*, 369–84.
Gerlach, N. The business restructuring genre: Some questions for critical organization analysis. *Organization*, 1996, *3*, 425–53.
Giles, H., Bourhis, R., Gadfield, N.J., Davies, G.J. & Davies, A.P. Cognitive aspects of humour in social interaction. In T. Chapman & H. Foot (Eds), *Humour and laughter: Theory, research and applications*. London: Wiley, 1976.
Glenn, P.J. Initiating shared laughter in multi-party conversations. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 1989, *53*, 127–49.
Glenn, P.J. Current speaker initiation of two-party shared laughter. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 1991/1992, *25*, 139–62.
Glenn, P.J. Laughing at and laughing with: Negotiating participant alignments in conversation. In G. Psathas & P. Ten Have (Eds), *Situated order*. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1995.
Goffman, E. The interaction order. *American Sociological Review*, 1983, *48*(1), 1–17.
Goodwin, C. *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. London: Academic Press, 1981.
Grady, K. & Potter, J. Speaking and clapping: A comparison of Foot and Thatcher's oratory. *Language and Communication*, 1985, *5*, 173–83.
Greatbatch, D. & Clark, T. Laughing with the gurus. *Business Strategy Review*, 2002, *13*(3), 10–18.
Guerrier, Y. & Gilbert, D. The role of presentation techniques in selling management ideas through the 'heart' not the mind. Paper presented at 12th EGOS Colloquium, Istanbul, 1995.
Hammer, M. & Champy, R. *Reengineering the corporation: A manifesto for business revolution*. London: Brealey, 1993.
Heath, C. *Body movement and speech in medical interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Heath, C. & Luff, P. *Technology in action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
Heritage, J. *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1984.
Heritage, J. Conversation analysis: Methodological aspects. In U.M. Quasthoff (Ed.), *Aspects of oral communication*. Berlin: Gruyter, 1995.
Heritage, J. & Greatbatch, D. Generating applause: A study of rhetoric and response at party political conferences. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1986, *92*, 110–57.
Hobbes, T. *Leviathan: Or, the matter, form and power of a commonwealth ecclesiastical and civil*. London: Crooke, 1651.
Huczynski, A. *Management gurus: What makes them and how to become one*. London: Routledge, 1993.
Jackson, B.G. Re-engineering the sense of self: The manager and the management guru. *Journal of Management Studies*, 1996, *33*(5), 571–90.
Jefferson, G. A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance declination. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington, 1979.
Jefferson, G., Sacks, H. & Schegloff, E.A. Notes on laughter in the pursuit of intimacy. In G. Button & J.R.E. Lee (Eds), *Talk and social organisation*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 1987.
Kanter, R.M. *The change masters: Corporate entrepreneurs at work*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1985.
Kennedy, G. *The art of persuasion in Greece*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1963.
Koestler, A. *The act of creation*. London: Hutchinson, 1964.
LaFave, L. & Mennell, R. Does ethnic humour serve prejudice? *Journal of Communication*, 1976, *26*, 116–23.
Lewin, K. *Field theory in social science*. New York: Harper, 1951.
Linstead, S. Jokers wild: The importance of humour in the maintenance of organizational culture. *The Sociological Review*, 1985, *33*(4), 741–67.
McIlvenny, P. Heckling in Hyde Park: Verbal audience participation in popular public discourse. *Language in Society*, 1996, *25*, 27–60.
Meyer, J.C. Humour in members' narratives: Uniting and dividing at work. *Western Journal of Communication*, 1997, *61*(2), 188–208.
Meyer, J.C. Humour as a double-edged sword: Four functions of humor in communication. *Communication Theory*, 2000, *10*(3), 310–31.
Mulkay, M. *On humour: Its nature and its place in modern society*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1988.
Norrick, N.R. *Conversational joking: Humor in everyday talk*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1993.
Oliver, N. Just-in-time: The new religion of western manufacturing. Paper presented to British Academy of Management conference, Glasgow, September, 1990.
Ott, J.S. *The organizational culture perspective*. Chicago: Dorsey Press, 1989.
Perry, N. Putting theory in its place: The social organization of organizational theorizing. In M. Reed & M. Hughes (Eds), *Rethinking organization*. London: Sage, 1992.
Peters, T. & Waterman, R. *In search of excellence*. New York: Harper and Row, 1982.
Psathas, G. *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction* [Qualitative Research Methods 35]. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1995.
Raskin, V. *Semantic mechanisms of humor*. Boston, MA: Reidel, 1985.
Rodrigues, S.B. & Collinson, D.L. Having fun: Humour as resistance in Brazil. *Organisation Studies*, 1995, *16*(5), 739–68.
Roy, D.F. Banana time: Job satisfaction and informal interaction. *Human Organisation*, 1958, *18*, 158–68.
Rutter, J. Stand-up as interaction: Performance and audience in comedy venues. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Salford, UK, 1997.

Samra-Fredericks, D. Conversation analysis. In G. Symon & C. Cassell (Eds), *Qualitative methods and analysis in organisational research*. London: Sage, 1998.
Sargant, W. *Battle for the mind*. Cambridge: Malor, 1997. [Originally published 1957.]
Senge, P. *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday, 1990.
Sharpe, T. The day I saw John Fenton or by the inch it's a cinch. *Management Education and Development*, 1984, *15*(1), 14–16.
Spell, C.S. Where do management fashions come from, and how long do they last? *Journal of Management History*, 2000, *5*, 334–48.
Suls, J.M. A two-stage model for the appreciation of jokes and cartoons: An information processing analysis. In J.H. Goldstein, H. Jeffrey & P.E. McGhee (Eds), *The psychology of humor*. New York: Academic Press, 1972.
Sykes, A.J.M. Joking relationships in an industrial setting. *American Anthropologist*, 1966, *68*(1), 189–93.
Vinton, K.E. Humor in the workplace: It's more than telling jokes. *Small Group Behaviour*, 1989, *20*(2), 151–66.
Wilson, C.P. *Jokes: Form, content, use and function*. London: Academic Press, 1979.
Winick, C. The social context of humor. *Journal of Communication*, 1976, *26*(3), 124–228.
Zillman, D. Disparagement humor. In P.E. McGhee & J.H. Goldstein (Eds), *Handbook of humor research*. New York: Spring, 1983.
Zimmerman, D.H. On conversation: The conversation analytic perspective. In J. Anderson (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 11*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1988.

David Greatbatch is Special Professor in the School of Education at the University of Nottingham. His research interests include competence and learning in organizations, post-compulsory education and training, and professional/client interaction. He has published in journals such as *American Journal of Sociology*, *American Sociological Review*, *Language in Society*, and *Law and Society Review*. He is currently completing two books, *Agreeing to disagree: The dynamics of third party intervention in family disputes* (Cambridge University Press, forthcoming) and *Management speak: The live oratory of management gurus* (Routledge, forthcoming, with Timothy Clark).
[E-mail: david.greatbatch@nottingham.ac.uk]

Timothy Clark is Professor of Organizational Behaviour at Durham Business School, University of Durham. His research interests are in management consultancy work, knowledge creation and diffusion, the nature of management fashion and management gurus. He is the author /editor of seven books, the most recent of which is *Critical consulting: New perspectives on the management advice industry* (with Robin Fincham). His work has also been published in *Journal of Management Studies*, *Management Communication Quarterly*, *Organization*, *Organization Studies* among others. He is currently a General Editor of *Journal of Management Studies*.
[E-mail: timothy.clark@durham.ac.uk]