



The judicious use and management of humor in the workplace

Jim Lyttle

School of Business, Public Administration and Information Sciences, Long Island University, One University Plaza, Brooklyn, NY 11201, USA

KEYWORDS

Humor;
Humor theory;
Ethics;
Offense;
Credibility

Abstract Everybody loves humor. In the workplace, it can provide such benefits as stress relief, team unification, employee motivation, idea generation, and frustration diffusion through venting. Despite these positives, it should be stressed that humor in this context has downsides, as well. For example, humor can distract us from the job at hand, hurt our credibility, or cause offense in increasingly diverse work settings. In the midst of this complicated situation stand managers, who occupy a position of responsibility for both the good *and* bad effects of humor in the workplace. It is the intention of this article to use existing humor theory and a simple model to generate a more analytical understanding of humorous interaction. Suggestions are then offered as to how to use humor and manage the use of humor in such a way as to maximize its benefits, while minimizing its dangers.

© 2006 Kelley School of Business, Indiana University. All rights reserved.

1. A closer look at humor

This article focuses on the judicious use and management of humor in the workplace. Generally, humor is thought of as a good thing. It helps us break bad news gently to our workers and to motivate them. Yet, anyone who has been teased in school will understand that humor is, indeed, a double-edged sword. Humor can hurt, as well as help. Ultimately, as managers, we will be held responsible if any serious harm does happen to occur under our watch.

Careful discussions of humor are hindered by lack of an agreed definition of the word. If no one laughs at our joke because they are preoccupied worrying about layoffs, does that mean that it

wasn't humorous? If people do laugh at our joke out of deference to our management position, does that make it humorous? How will we decide what we mean by humor?

We can begin by looking at the word itself. The word *humor* originally meant fluid, and is still used this way in reference to bodily fluids such as aqueous or vitreous humor. In the Middle Ages, it was believed that four different types of these fluids or humors existed, and that people whose humors were in good balance would be healthy, or "in good humor." Today, we use the term "humoring someone" to refer to anything that makes them feel good. Humor thus involves enjoyment.

We can also hope to define the term by considering humor theories, of which there are three main types: incongruity theories, superiority

E-mail address: jim.lyttle@liu.edu

theories, and relief theories. The first of these, incongruity theories (e.g., [Kant, 1951](#)), suggest that we tend to laugh at things that don't really go together but that have been put together, by accident or on purpose, to get a laugh. These theories try to explain what it is about certain things that make them funny. The second type, superiority theories (e.g., [Hobbes, 1968](#)), suggest that we laugh at people, things, or situations over which we feel some sense of superiority. (Otherwise, these incongruities would scare us instead of amusing us.) These theories try to explain when it is that we will find things funny. Finally, relief theories (e.g., [Freud, 1960a](#)) suggest that we laugh at highly charged topics like sex and aggression because our feelings in those areas are usually bottled up. These theories try to explain why humor exists at all, or why it has survived natural selection.

It is likely that all of these theories have merit. As incongruity theories suggest, we laugh at things that we find surprising and tend to ignore things that seem routine. As superiority theories suggest, we laugh at incongruity only when it is not threatening to us (when we are not in a dark alley, for example). As relief theories suggest, normally repressed topics, such as sexual and aggressive themes, tend to generate bigger laughs than commonly discussed topics. The simplest way to combine these ideas is to define humor as "the enjoyment of incongruity" ([Morreall, 1989](#)).

When something surprising and incongruous happens and we enjoy it, then that is humor. If something suddenly falls over at work and no one is hurt, we will experience it as humor. If someone misleads us with a setup and surprises us with a punch line, and if that does not embarrass or offend us, then we will experience it as humor. Now that we have established a loose definition and concept of humor, we will have to consider its assets and liabilities to try and maximize net mirth.

2. The benefits of using humor

What are the claimed benefits of humor? These can be classified into four categories. First, there are physical benefits of laughter. Laughter is different from humor. Some laughter comes from pure ridicule, nervousness, or embarrassment, not to mention tickling, nitrous oxide, and certain forms of epilepsy ([Giles & Oxford, 1970](#)). In fact, it turns out that only a small percentage of social laughter really has anything to do with humor ([Provine, 2000](#)). Nonetheless, laughter from any source provides much the same experience as jogging

and, for most people, that is a health benefit. When humor generates laughter, whether on the job or after hours, our workers gain physical benefits.

Another set of benefits can be cataloged as psychological. The use of humor can vent anger and frustration that might otherwise be destructive ([Baron, 1978](#)). For example, it may be better to joke about difficult clients than to confront them, or even to let aggravation fester inside. [Freud \(1927\)](#) contended that humor is a mature coping method, and research supports the idea that people with a strong sense of humor are more resilient and recover more quickly from stress ([Martin, 1984](#)). Thus, encouraging a sense of humor should be good for the psychological health of our workers and their ability to cope effectively with pressures in the workplace.

Social benefits may also arise from humor. Using humor can help us "save face" when correcting workers' mistakes and soften the blow of unpleasant messages ([Bradney, 1957](#)). Furthermore, the shared use of humor builds a sense of intimacy and community at work ([Meyer, 1997](#)). As such, humor can, when it works, act as a social lubricant among team members and other co-workers.

Finally, there are specific cognitive benefits related to problem solving. It has been argued that humor interrupts circular and other unproductive thinking patterns ([Minsky, 1984](#)). Additionally, it is widely accepted that the appreciation of humor relies on our ability to quickly adopt new perspectives. Since this is the same facility that leads to creative problem solving and innovation in the workplace ([Isen, Daubman, & Nowicki, 1987](#)), there should be clear advantages to encouraging the use of humor among our workers.

3. The dangers of using humor

Given all these benefits, one would probably expect to find humor in wide use in businesses, especially at the highest organizational levels. We are, however, more likely to see laughter on the loading dock than in the boardroom. Why is this? Are there dangers of humor that we have not yet considered? On reflection, it is apparent that this is, indeed, the case. While we all enjoy humor and want to use it as much as we reasonably can, caution is advised. Most people can remember a time when humor, at their expense, made them feel very badly. We don't want that to happen in our workplaces.

One danger of using humor is the possibility of causing offense. Sooner or later, spontaneous humor is bound to offend someone. Whether through our own use of humor or through the use of humor in a

work area for which we are responsible, we wouldn't want to upset anyone or make them uncomfortable. The chance of accidentally offending someone increases with the diversity of the workplace (Quinn, 2000). If the person we offend is a boss, customer, or member of a litigious minority group, the consequences for the firm could be disastrous. In general, when we define an in-group of people who share our views and our sense of humor, we automatically characterize others as "outsiders" (Terrion & Ashforth, 2002). Offending or excluding people is a danger of humor that we want to minimize.

Another potential pitfall involves eroding managers' air of authority. Just as humor is frequently used to "burst the bubble" of pompous people (Forester, 2004), so it can often be taken as a frivolous activity. When used too much or in a careless manner, humor can destroy a reputation for good judgment (McLynn, 1999); after all, calling a co-worker a "clown" is rarely meant as a compliment. We need to be careful to use just enough humor, and use it sensibly, in order to maximize the likelihood that it will work effectively without eroding our credibility. Interestingly, research suggests that the danger of eroding credibility with self-effacing humor is higher for female managers (Decker and Rotondo, 2001), although that is clearly unfair. Weakening our credibility is a danger of humor that we must work hard to curtail.

Humor in the workplace can also result in simple distraction. While it might seem harmless enough on a personal level, tomfoolery can lead workers to ignore quality or safety standards. Sometimes, humor is used as an alternative to getting the job done. Allowing humor to become a distraction from the task at hand is a danger that should be monitored and dealt with effectively.

4. What others have said

Many books and articles have been written about how much fun humor is, and advocating its use in the workplace. Despite the popularity of this subject, very little careful research has been done in the area. All in all, articles on humor in management are rare. More than two decades ago, Paul Malone III (1980) delved into the topic and published an article in which he challenged management researchers to answer five questions:

- (1) Can humor serve as a tool to enhance the managerial process?
- (2) Can it be used effectively by most managers, or only those who are naturally funny?

- (3) Under what conditions is humor appropriate?
- (4) What types of people respond positively or negatively to humor?
- (5) What types of humor are most effective?

Two years later, Jack Duncan (1982) responded with five guidelines for the appropriate use of humor in the workplace. The author suggested that we should use humor, but only after creating an environment of trust, and that we should avoid "put-down" humor, permit people to respond freely to our humor, and always protect the dignity of the individual from the greater power of the group. Eight years after this, Duncan, Smeltzer, and Leap (1990) turned out a very thorough review of humor theories, research to that date, and the legal implications of negative humor in the workplace. Although these contributions are notable, mainstream research into the use of humor in management has been sporadic.

Many doubtful claims regarding humor's benefits have been put forth in commentaries such as that by Gunn (2002). For example, several writers believe that laughter increases endorphin flow, which it does not (Berk et al., 1989). Others seem to think that the book *Anatomy of an Illness* (Cousins, 1979) describes journalist Norman Cousins' healing of cancer via laughter. In reality, Cousins' rare (but not miraculous) recovery from an arthritis-like inflammation of the spine was made more pleasant by, but not cured through, watching slapstick comedy films. Cousins took every medication that was prescribed by his doctors, including massive doses of Vitamin C (Mahony, 2000). Some writers even go so far as to make completely untestable claims, such as "humor increases productivity." Perhaps not so coincidentally, these claims are often made by consultants who stand to earn money through promoting the use of humor. As such, it seems important to heed Malone's (1980) call for thoughtful consideration of the effective and responsible use of humor.

Doctoral dissertations on the use of humor in the workplace indicate a growing interest in the topic. These investigations, however, rarely produce significant results. For example, Linda Hefferin (1996) found no significant relationship between sense of humor and teamwork behaviors, and concluded that the topic could safely be ignored. Loretta Rahmani (1994) found no conclusive links between humor style and managerial effectiveness. Constance Reece (1998) found no significant differences between genders in the use of humor by managers, and only that women preferred situational over canned humor. Some researchers are now using EEG

(Derks, Gillikin, Bartolome-Rull, & Bogart, 1997) and fMRI (Ozawa et al., 2000) equipment to study the brain as it responds to humor. The results of these projects will update and enhance our understanding of humor.

Some solid research has used workplace humor as an indicator of something else. For example, David Collinson (1988) discussed its use to enforce working-class norms on a shop floor. Mary Jo Hatch (1997; Hatch and Ehrlich 1993) saw it as a way of negotiating ambiguity and paradox. Reva Brown (Brown & Keegan, 1999) saw humor being used as a stress reliever in a hotel kitchen. Cecily Cooper (2005) discussed its use to ingratiate ourselves to others.

In rare cases, researchers have looked directly at the use of humor in management or at managing the use of humor. Wayne Decker (1987) found that supervisors who used humor rated higher on subordinate satisfaction. Bruce Avolio, Jane Howell, and John Sosik (1999) found that the use of humor was related to better group and individual performance for laissez-faire leaders, better group but not individual performance for transformational leaders, and made almost no difference when used by contingent reward leaders.

A recent article by Romero and Cruthirds (2006) reviews the literature on the benefits of using humor and advocates that it be taken seriously (i.e., used more strategically) in the workplace. Additionally, a current collection of scholarly essays considers the ethics of humor in general and points out some of its dangers (Lockyer & Pickering, 2005). It seems that the time has come for us to look at humor more seriously, in a balanced and analytical way, and to think about how to manage its use responsibly. That is the intended contribution of this article. What is the process by which humor unfolds in the workplace?

5. Roles in humorous interaction

According to Freud (1960b), three distinct roles are played in any case of interpersonal joking:

- (1) Someone who creates or points out the humor;
- (2) Someone who agrees that the situation is funny
- (3) Whoever or whatever is being considered funny

I will refer to these, respectively, as the *initiator*, the *appreciator*, and the *object* of the humor.

For example, if Amina tells her co-workers a joke about lawyers, she serves as the initiator, her co-workers are the appreciators, and lawyers are the object of the humor. Of course, the object need not be a person; it could be an inanimate object or something as conceptual as a

language ambiguity or a pun. Whatever or whomever is being considered funny is the object of our humor.

Although all three roles must be occupied under Freud's framework, this does not necessarily mean that only three people will be involved; there may be more or less. Consider, for instance, a comedy club. In such a setting, we would expect to see one initiator and many appreciators. When we make fun of ourselves, we serve at the same time as both the initiator and the object of the humor. Likewise, when being teased by friends and co-workers, we serve as the object and the appreciator of that humor.

The workplace is unlike other venues in two main ways: there is work to be done, and there are levels of authority to delegate that work and monitor its progress. Thus, there is an element of power in the workplace that is unique. If people are offended by a comic's performance, for example, they can simply leave. If they are offended by their boss' humor, however, that is not an easy option. As managers, we occupy an intermediate power position: there are subordinates for whom we are responsible and bosses to whom we are responsible. Our workers need us to model acceptable behavior and set limits so that no one is harmed. Our employers need us to avoid disorder in the workplace and exposure to lawsuits. Thus, we must be aware of our own position when we are being humorous, and of the power balance among the participants when anyone in our area of responsibility is being humorous.

6. Advice for the workplace

Advice on how to be funny can be found in articles on creativity (Isaksen & Lauer, 2002), organizational change (Fox & Amichai-Hamburger, 2001), and related topics. There are also articles with practical advice on finding humor through such activities as watching funny programs, setting aside time for play, playing with language and puns, and carefully noting things that make us laugh (McGhee, 2000). Here we want to discuss advice on managing the use of humor, whether we are participating directly or not.

Anyone who brings a cartoon into the office, includes a joke in a speech, or makes a funny remark in the workplace serves as an initiator of humor. When we initiate humor ourselves, there is always a danger that people will laugh just to be polite (even if they don't find it funny, or if they find it offensive). Because of this deference, we cannot afford to rely on the feedback we receive regarding our use of humor; rather, we must err on

the side of caution. Humor consultants such as Steven M. Sultanoff recommend that we make fun of ourselves (Adams, 2004). This makes sense because when we make fun of ourselves, our victims are by definition consenting to it. Also, it is not enough to consider whether the “punch line” of the humor might be offensive; sometimes, the very topic that is raised might be found objectionable. For example, many consider it offensive to joke about religion or death because they feel these subjects should not be trivialized. It may be wise for us to avoid such topics and encourage our workers to do the same.

Now and again we allow ourselves to become the object of humor, or the “butt of the joke.” When we do that, we seem approachable, confident (not defensive), and open-minded. Generally, this is desirable. If our credibility or dignity is threatened, however, we need to signal with a disapproving response that we will not allow that. Although this is a judgment call that must be made by the manager on the spot, a general rule can be offered: When in doubt, speak up. We cannot allow disrespect to fester, and should model assertiveness for our employees so they can feel comfortable expressing themselves in their own peer interactions. If we witness people letting themselves be the butt of humor too often, we can explain to them in private the risks of eroding their air of authority.

When we laugh along with some humor that is occurring in the workplace, we serve as appreciators. Whoever laughs along with something will tend to be seen by observers as having condoned the sentiments expressed (de Sousa, 1987). As such, everyone needs to be conscious of what they seem to be condoning. This is particularly true for us, as managers, because of the authority that goes along with our approval.

When humor makes fun of anything or anyone, we have to think carefully about the object of that humor. When possible, it might be better to encourage people in the workplace to make fun of something that is not a person and, by definition, cannot take offense. Whenever the object of humor is a person, we must make sure that the person is either consenting to the playfulness or is an appropriate object. For example, peers might aim good-natured barbs at one another. If each person takes turns reciprocating (not if someone assumes that they could reciprocate, if they wanted to), then there is reasonable evidence that they are enjoying and consenting to the humor. And while people will differ in their judgments, appropriate objects of humor might include those who behave in ways that violate company policy or who do sloppy work, or (in a playful way, at least) our competitors.

Few people will object to humor that has any of these as its target. Using humor in this way is conventional, supporting the *status quo* and enforcing workplace expectations. Indeed, this sort of correction is a common way of teaching culture to new members of any society (Radcliffe-Brown, 1940).

7. The last laugh

Considering whether we are acting as initiator, object, or appreciator can help us stay aware of the power position that we occupy, not always comfortably. We can initiate humor cautiously, mindful that we are likely receiving inaccurate feedback. We can consider when to draw the line as objects of humor, to preserve respect for the office. We can be mindful of what we are seen to appreciate, knowing that others will assume we condone the ideas expressed. We can achieve this by developing the habit of waiting a few seconds before responding. Furthermore, we can use the same concepts to coach our employees, who may be using humor inelegantly.

It may be helpful to use and encourage prepared humor when possible. As we know from other aspects of managerial work, planning pays off. Through such groundwork, we are less likely to make a mistake that might look quite foolish in hindsight. What we lose in spontaneity we may gain in exploiting the “tried and true” nature of humor that has been developed and selected by experts.

As managers, we have to be especially careful of negative or sarcastic humor that seems insensitive or judgmental. Soon enough, we will be in the uncomfortable position of giving performance evaluations. It will not help if workers have reason to suspect that we take their feelings lightly.

Furthermore, credibility should not be sacrificed in the name of humor. We may have to remind workers how easily unfettered fun can erode their credibility. Anyone who uses too much humor, or humor that touches on sensitive topic areas, risks creating the sense that their judgment cannot be trusted. Moreover, those who allow themselves to be the butt of an overabundance of jokes risk being seen as weak. In effort to curb these potential threats, we might say, “Let’s be careful not to say or do anything we could regret later” to limit such behavior.

It is clear that we must check the use of humor that distracts from the efficient, safe, and high-quality completion of the task at hand. Tomfoolery and practical joking can lead to the avoidance of such standards, and therefore must be monitored

and limited. A strong message must be sent that humor, while encouraged and celebrated, will not be allowed to replace the work as an end in itself. Some managers might say, "Well, let's have fun, but make sure the job gets done." This is true whether the humor is being initiated by us or by people in our employ.

In the early 1990s, when business was booming, workplaces encouraged humor at the urging of humor consultants. By the end of the 1990s, when business was struggling, humor tended to be left aside as an unessential frill. With the experience of years and objectivity that hindsight can impart, now may be the time to find the golden mean. Armed with the tools outlined in this article, we can make an effort to take humor seriously. Managed properly, we should be able to use humor freely enough to generate benefits in terms of organizational citizenship behavior and creativity, yet responsibly enough to avoid offense, shirking, and loss of credibility.

References

- Adams, D. (2004). Exam room comedy best used with caution. *American Medical News*, 47(20), 1–2.
- Avolio, B. J., Howell, J. M., & Sosik, J. J. (1999). A funny thing happened on the way to the bottom line: Humor as a moderator of leadership style effects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(2), 219–227.
- Baron, R. A. (1978). Aggression-inhibiting influence of sexual humor. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36(2), 189–197.
- Berk, L. S., Tan, S. A., Fry, W. F., Napier, B. J., Lee, J. W., Hubbard, R. W., et al. (1989). Neuroendocrine and stress hormone changes during mirthful laughter. *American Journal of the Medical Sciences*, 298(6), 390–396.
- Bradney, P. (1957). The joking relationship in industry. *Human Relations*, 10(2), 179–187.
- Brown, R. B., & Keegan, D. (1999). Humor in the hotel kitchen. *HUMOR: International Journal of Humor Research*, 12(1), 47–70.
- Collinson, D. L. (1988). Engineering humour: Masculinity, joking, and conflict in shop-floor relations. *Organization Studies*, 9(2), 181–199.
- Cooper, C. D. (2005). Just joking around? Employee humor expression as an ingratiation behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(4), 765.
- Cousins, N. (1979). *Anatomy of an illness as perceived by the patient: Reflections on healing and regeneration*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co.
- de Sousa, R. (1987). When is it wrong to laugh? In J. Morell (Ed.), *The philosophy of laughter and humor* (pp. 226–249). Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Decker, W. H. (1987). Managerial humor and subordinate satisfaction. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 15(2), 225–232.
- Decker, W. H., & Rotondo, D. M. (2001). Relationships among gender, type of humor, and perceived leadership effectiveness. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 13(4), 450–465.
- Derks, P., Gillikin, L. S., Bartolome-Rull, D. S., & Bogart, E. H. (1997). Laughter and electroencephalographic activity. *HUMOR: International Journal of Humor Research*, 10(3), 285–300.
- Duncan, W. J. (1982). Humor in management: Prospects for administrative practice and research. *Academy of Management Review*, 7(1), 136–142.
- Duncan, W. J., Smeltzer, L. R., & Leap, T. L. (1990). Humor and work: Applications of joking behavior to management. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 255–278.
- Forester, J. (2004). Responding to critical moments with humor, recognition, and hope. *Negotiation Journal*, 20(2), 221.
- Fox, S., & Amichai-Hamburger, Y. (2001). The power of emotional appeals in promoting organizational change programs. *Academy of Management Executive*, 15(4), 84–95.
- Freud, S. (1927). Humor. *Standard edition*, Vol. 21. (pp. 161–166) London: Hogarth Press.
- Freud, S. (1960). *Jokes and their relation to the unconscious (J. Strachey, Trans.)*. New York: W.W. Norton. Original work published 1905.
- Giles, H., & Oxford, G. S. (1970). Towards a multidimensional theory of laughter causation and its social implications. *Bulletin of the British Psychological Society*, 23(79), 97–105.
- Gunn, B. (2002). Laughing matters. *Strategic Finance*, 84(4), 11–12.
- Hatch, M. J. (1997). Irony and the social construction of contradiction in the humor of a management team. *Organization Science*, 8(3), 275–288.
- Hatch, M. J., & Ehrlich, S. B. (1993). Spontaneous humor as an indicator of paradox and ambiguity in organizations. *Organizational Studies*, 14(4), 505–526.
- Hefferin, L. (1996). The relationship between sense of humor and teamwork-management styles of business managers. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57(09-A), 4025.
- Hobbes, T. (1668). *Leviathan*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Original work published 1651.
- Isaksen, S. G., & Lauer, K. J. (2002). The climate for creativity and change in teams. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 11(1), 74–86.
- Isen, A. M., Daubman, K. A., & Nowicki, G. P. (1987). Positive affect facilitates creative problem solving. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(6), 1122–1131.
- Kant, I. (1951). *Critique of judgement (J.H. Bernard, Trans.)*. New York: Hafner.
- Lockyer, S., & Pickering, M. (2005). *Beyond a joke: The limits of humour*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mahony, D. L. (2000). Is laughter the best medicine or any medicine at all? *Eye on Psi Chi (The National Honor Society in Psychology)*, 4(3), 18–21.
- Malone, P. B., III (1980). Humor: A double-edged tool for today's managers. *Academy of Management Review*, 5(3), 357–360.
- Martin, R. A. (1984). The sense of humor as a moderator of the relation between stressors and moods. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 45(5-A), 1346.
- McGhee, P. (2000). The key to stress management, retention, and profitability? More workplace fun. *HR Focus*, 77(9), 5–6.
- McLynn, F. (1999, October 2). To be a man of power and a man of humour is fundamentally incompatible. *Herald*, 13.
- Meyer, J. C. (1997). Humor in member narratives: Uniting and dividing at work. *Western Journal of Communication*, 61(2), 188–208.
- Minsky, M. (1984). Jokes and their relation to the cognitive unconscious. In L. Vaina, & J. Hintikka (Eds.), *Cognitive constraints on communication: Representations and processes*. Hingham, MA: Reidel.
- Morreall, J. (1989). Enjoying incongruity. *HUMOR: International Journal of Humor Research*, 2(1), 1–18.

- Ozawa, F., Matsuo, K., Kato, C., Nakai, T., Isoda, H., Takehara, Y., et al. (2000). The effects of listening comprehension of various genres of literature on response in the linguistic area: An fMRI study. *NeuroReport: For Rapid Communication of Neuroscience Research*, 11(6), 1141–1143.
- Provine, R. R. (2000). *Laughter: A scientific investigation*. New York: Penguin.
- Quinn, B. A. (2000). The paradox of complaining: Law, humor, and harassment in the everyday work world. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 25(4), 1151–1185.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. (1940). On joking relationships. *Africa*, 13(3), 195–210.
- Rahmani, L. H. (1994). Humor styles and managerial effectiveness. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 55(05-A), 1161.
- Reece, C. G. (1998). Male and female managers' self-reported uses of humor-oriented downward influence strategies and tactics. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59(6-A), 1835.
- Romero, E. J., & Cruthirds, K. W. (2006). The use of humor in the workplace. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20(2), 58–69.
- Terrion, J. L., & Ashforth, B. E. (2002). From 'I' to 'we': The role of putdown humor and identity in the development of a temporary group. *Human Relations*, 55(1), 55–88.