Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations   Office of Graduate Studies

9-2017

TRACING TRAJECTORIES IN A COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE THROUGH PODCASTS

Richard W. Mansikka
California State University - San Bernardino

TRACING TRAJECTORIES IN A COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE THROUGH

PODCASTS

_____

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

in

English Composition

_____

by

Richard William Mansikka

September 2017

TRACING TRAJECTORIES IN A COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE THROUGH
PODCASTS

_____

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

_____

by

Richard William Mansikka

September 2017

Approved by:

Caroline Vickers PhD., Committee Chair, English

Parastou Feizzaringhalam PhD, Committee Member

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this project is to understand how humor works in expert-novice identity construction in podcasts. I employ a Community of Practice (Lave and Wenger, 1989) framework to examine the social hierarchy among the participants of a regular podcast. I am particularly concerned with uncovering how novice members construct themselves and are constructed by expert members through humor, as well as how expert members socialize novice members to participate in the kinds of humor practices that index membership in the Community of Practice (CoP).

Rooster Teeth is an internet-based entertainment production company. They produce a weekly podcast which they make available for free on the internet. The podcast participants represent a small CoP with expert/novice differentiation. Combining a corpus linguistic approach with an ethnographic approach, I collected, transcribed, and studied several podcasts that were recorded over a two-year period, beginning with the first few podcasts where founding members established the practices and their roles as experts. Then, I examine the performances of three novices over time. Two of them follow a periphery to core trajectory and become regular members of the podcast while one remained on the periphery. I discovered that teasing and modeling are the primary tools that the experts use to socialize novices and that within Rooster Teeth, novices have the power to negotiate practice from the periphery of the

community. This study demonstrates the power that novices may wield within

CoPs, and reveals how powerful a socializing tool humor can be.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The thesis writing process can be a great personal struggle. This project was only possible through the advice and encouragement of Professor Caroline Vickers. She provided initial support and direction for the work, and was always encouraging during times of doubt.

I am also especially grateful to Professor Parastou Feizzaringhalam for the final proofreading she provided for this project.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my wife, Alexis Gray

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

A relatively popular but little studied medium today is the podcast.

"Podcasts efficiently use today's information technologies to capture and

disseminate knowledge, and they use the natural appeal of the human voice to

deliver it effectively" (Tulley, 2011 p.269). The term, "podcast," can refer to

almost any audio recording that is uploaded to the internet. From the beginning

of the medium's history, the practice for listeners has been to download the

recording and listen to it whenever convenient, but there has been a recent trend

among podcast providers to move towards streaming services with the possibility

of downloading the file left available as a secondary option. (Streaming services,

like Netflix, YouTube, and Hulu, download a small portion of the video or audio

file and play it; while any segment of the file is playing, the next segment is being

downloaded, and any previously played segment is being erased to prevent

copying, duplicating, and/or distributing the file.) This means that listeners

generally do not download the files anymore and need to have an internet

connection in order to be able to listen to them. So the way that the audience

interacts with the format is currently in flux.

There are some podcasts that exist only as a single audio file, but the term

generally implies that a person or a group of people are doing this regularly and

building a large collection of audio files. While there are many genres of podcast,

one popular variety embraces a format that is, or appears to be, a casual conversation. Participants gather and record an unscripted conversation, telling stories, making jokes, discussing their interests, and attempting to gain popularity simply through their personalities. When a group of people publish a regular podcast, that group constitutes a Community of Practice (CoP) according to Lave and Wenger's (1991) framework. The purpose of this project is to understand how expert and novice identities are constructed in podcasts within an internet-based entertainment production company, and how interactions with, and through, humor work in moving a member of the CoP from the periphery towards the core, helping transition from a novice to an expert and master the practices of the podcast group, in the process.   It is expected that newcomers to the podcasts will adopt the same practices that the old-timers use: the most salient of which are teasing each other. However, due to their being involved in multiple projects and CoPs within production company nobody works only on the podcast. Since they rarely reflect on their participation in the podcast or refer to themselves as podcasters, evidence of socialization must be sought in interaction.

This study focuses on the internet-based Rooster Teeth Productions and the podcast that Rooster Teeth began producing in late 2008. The podcast continues to the time of this writing, and shows no signs of stopping, but the length of time required to transcribe, encode, and analyze a podcast has put constraints on the data collection for the current analysis. The analysis here

covers the podcast's somewhat rocky start, and the patterns and organization

that emerged and held through the first couple of years. What appears to be

more important than teasing or controlling the conversation is maintaining the

humorous frame or maintaining the interest of the audience.

Literature Review

<u>Community of Practice</u>

The foundation of the community of practice (CoP) framework came from

Lave and Wenger (1991) who say that their idea of legitimate peripheral

participation arose out of one interpretation of Vygotsky's idea of the zone of

proximal development. The Zone of Proximal Development is the range of ability

that a learner has; where one extreme is what he or she can accomplish on his

or her own, and the other end is what he or she can accomplish with the aid of a

more experienced teacher or mentor. Lave and Wenger describe learners in

various situations attempting to transition from novice to master by performing

simple but important tasks and moving on to more complex ones. Making the

tasks simple but important to the process is what they mean by legitimate

peripheral participation. In this way, through engaging in the process, apprentices

move from the periphery to the core of their community of practice. It is tempting

to think of a CoP as a set of concentric circles, but the concept is more nebulous

than that diagram would imply. The boundaries that separate members of the

community from non-members and the boundaries that separate novices from

experts can be well defined, or ill defined.

The term, "situated learning" refers to learning that takes place in the situation where the knowledge and skills being learned are actually being applied. It also refers to their project, which situates the process of learning in the interactions and relationships between new and old members of a CoP. This is contrasted with ideas and practices in more formal education, which situates the process of learning in the mind of the individual student, where everything is removed from its original context and taught in the classroom. Students are expected to remember their lessons and perhaps use them once they return to the outside world. Often, they are not even allowed to speak to one another in the classroom. By design, Lave and Wenger draw on the concept of CoPs and try to demonstrate it in their series of case studies, but they leave it "largely as an intuitive notion […] which will require a more rigorous treatment" (p.42). They say that, in keeping with their theoretical perspective, they avoid concise definitions and try to convey the meaning of the concept of legitimate peripheral participation "in its multiple theoretically generative interconnections with persons, activities, knowing, and world" (p.121). The main point is that learning is a social phenomenon, and they argue against using models of learning that focus solely on an individual's cognition. Three more points arise out of learning being a social phenomenon. First, as apprentices learn and move from the periphery to the core, they experience shifts in their identities that run on a continuum from novice to master. In fact, "novice" and "master" are terms that might not fit in this framework, since they carry with them connotations of more

4

formal education--they prefer "newcomer" and "old timer," but in the movement

that followed, most researchers use "novice" and "expert." In Lave's and

Wenger's words: "a newcomer becoming an old timer, whose changing

knowledge, skill, and discourse are part of a developing identity" (p.122).

Second, much of the learning takes place among the apprentices, in

interactions. This may rely partially or entirely on the third point, which is that

there is the transfer of implicit, or tacit knowledge. In a social situation, some

information is conveyed not through words, but through some kind of

interrelations in the contexts. This is the theoretical perspective that they are

referring to when they explicitly state that they will not explicitly delineate the

concept of a CoP.

In 1998, Wenger gives CoPs the "more rigorous treatment" that was

previously called for. He begins by contrasting the underlying assumptions that

formal education is built on with the assumptions that his theory is built on. "Our

institutions […] are based on the assumption that learning is an individual

process, that it has a beginning and an end, that it is best separated from the rest

of our activities, and that it is the result of teaching." But, "What if we assumed

that learning was as much a part of our human nature as eating or sleeping, that

it is both life-sustaining and inevitable, and that—given the chance—we are quite

good at it?" (p.3).

Wenger claims "communities of practice are everywhere" (p.6). He rules

nothing out, saying that any group of people engaged in the same activity can be

considered a CoP, (the example he uses is the millions of people across the country watching a television show from their homes) but he speculates that applying the framework to a group that is too broad, with a practice that is too mundane, and looking for situated learning will yield little information or insight. He also makes the other side of the scope a little clearer, explaining the idea of a constellation, which is a large organization which may contain multiple CoPs. So, when dealing with a large corporation, it is possible to study it as a CoP, but probably better to consider it a constellation and look at the relationships between and within the CoPs that it is comprised of. This will be important for the current analysis because Rooster Teeth is a large company with many ongoing production projects, and all of the members of the podcast are valuable members of other crews. Due to its history, and the period of time being examined, Rooster Teeth must be considered as a CoP with its own core/periphery dynamic, while it must also be considered a constellation wherein the podcast CoP exists among several other CoPs.

Wenger outlines three things that make a successful CoP: a shared repertoire, or a domain of knowledge; mutual engagement, members must interact in a social structure that is just formal enough to recognize experts but informal enough to allow members to ask questions and share and explore ideas; and a joint enterprise, the community must contain a practice. Here, "practice" is not just a series of tasks performed repeatedly, it is "a process by which we can experience the world and our engagement with it as meaningful" (p.51). Practice

6

can be an ideology and the ways that it is explored and expressed. It is anything that the community does that members can participate in, from building rocket ships to discussing members' personal lives. In the case of the Rooster Teeth Podcast, the practice is recording the podcast, which for the most part entails sharing information about the company, sharing personal information about their lives, and sharing information and opinions related to the video game and entertainment industries.

In a CoP, participation, and reification, produce meaning, but an important aspect of the theory is that meaning is negotiated. Participation is used in the sense that we are familiar with: taking part in an activity. Reification in other context refers to bringing something into being. As Wenger uses it, through an awareness of the practice and the community, it is the CoP that is brought into being. "Congeals" is the word Wenger uses (p.58). A group of people, engaged in a practice, through awareness of the practice and awareness of the group, becomes a Community of Practice. This creates structure. It can be as simple as noticing patterns or as strict as establishing rules. (Wenger says there is an organic sense to the reification of a CoP, so strict rules may have a stifling effect.) In simpler terms, if participation is what people do, reification is an understanding of how and why they do them the way that they do. Meaning is negotiated through participation in that patterns and rules may be followed or ignored depending on the group and depending on the rule or pattern, what it means for the group and for the individual who deviates is negotiated. Meaning is

negotiated through reification in that everybody is a member of multiple CoPs, and their identities reflect their membership in those other communities, which in turn colors their interpretation of the tasks they undertake in a given CoP. However, in discussing participation and reification, Wenger is adamant that they are not opposing or mutually exclusive concepts; they intertwine, overlap, and complement each other; and one cannot be substituted for the other.

It is important to note, as Wenger does, that not everybody in a community of practice has, needs, or wants a periphery to core trajectory. Looking from the point of view of the individual, engaged in multiple communities: we only need certain things from some communities, and so we may stay on the margins. Examples of this can be found in any community that revolves around a hobby: some members are die-hard enthusiasts, while others are more casual with no intention of becoming a core member.

But, the periphery to core trajectory, and the situated learning and shifts in identity that take place through legitimate peripheral participation are still the focus of Wenger's theory. "Our identities are rich and complex because they are produced within the rich and complex set of relations of practice" (p.162).

So, a community of practice is a group of people engaged or interested in a practice of some kind. The group can be large or small, and the practice can be just about anything, but if the group is too large, or the practice is too simple, the theory will yield little insight. What makes this an effective framework for studying learning, is that it takes the social aspect of learning and the context of where the

8

learning is taking place into account. It is also dynamic, looking at learning in action. It can be applied to just about any social situation, including online communities. When working within this framework what must be considered is, not just what is being learned, but what socialization is taking place, how identities are shifting and how meaning is being negotiated.

Identity

In The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (1959), Irving Goffman describes the performance of identity. He claims that, "All the world is not, of course, a stage, but the crucial ways in which it isn't are not easy to specify" (p.72). He argues that, in interactions, individuals may not simply do their work and convey their thoughts and feelings, there are social constraints which force individuals to "express the doing of tasks and acceptably convey feelings". These social constraints force people to orient activities toward communication rather than toward action, to offer an idealized impression by highlighting certain attributes and concealing others, to maintain a consistent impression through self-control, to present a front for a routine which may also be suitable for other routines and therefore cannot be tied completely to any one routine, and to care more about preventing minor dis-harmonies than the performance implies in order to maintain a coherent impression (p.65). All of these things turn the actions of individuals in an interaction into performances.

Goffman also points out that those involved in an interaction, "performers, audience, and outsiders all utilize techniques for saving the show, whether by

9

avoiding likely disruptions, or by correcting unavoided ones, or by making it possible for others to do so" (p.239), which may be the beginnings of the idea of co-construction. If an identity is performed through impression management, then when everybody involved works to maintain an impression, everybody is working towards building that identity. He shows that we tend to concern ourselves with our images, work towards managing other peoples' impressions, and perform our identities.

In Footing (1979), Goffman described the participant framework of interactions, breaking the rolls of speakers and hearers into constituent parts: animator, author, and principle. The animator is the person who utters the words, so a speaker is always the animator of an utterance, but may not always be the author or the principle. The author is the person who crafted the specific sequence of words, so a speaker would not be an author when quoting somebody else. The principle is the person who believes in the sentiment expressed by the word and may very often be the author, but not always.

On the other end of an interaction: hearers can either be ratified or unratified participants: ratified hearers are the speaker's intended audience, unratified hearers are either people who are nearby who cannot help but overhear or eavesdroppers who the speaker is deliberately trying to keep information from.

The title refers to alignments, one may take and project in an interaction. In Footing, Goffman claims that shifts in alignment are natural features of talk.

He also demonstrates how a conversational move may shift one's footing and either support or reject the alignments, or the projected self, of another. Participants co-construct identities by ratifying or rejecting claims to a specific identity made by other participants while simultaneously making claims to their own specific identities.

Instead of tracing the study of identity through the ages, it would probably be more efficient to start with some core principles of the co-construction movement more recently laid out by Mary Bucholtz and Kira Hall (2005). The first is that identity is the product of sociocultural interaction and not the source. The second is that identity is crafted from multiple components: specific stances within interactions, the demographic categories, the accepted roles, and emergent positions are all possible components to construct an identity. Third, there are many things that can be used to index identity, but for our purposes, we only need to concentrate on linguistic structures and systems. Fourth, identities are relationally constructed, but to incorporate this principle into an examination of comedic performances, we need to include some theories about humor. And lastly, the construction and indexing of identity may be partially or entirely unintentional.

Participants can work in conjunction with each other, they can work against each other, or a situation may be created where one participant's identity claim is supported while another's is denied. Wendy Smith (2010) provides an example of this interplay between being constructed by another and attempting

to construct one's own identity outside the context of a learning situation or a CoP. She looked at how drivers attempted to resist the identity of "Law-Breaker" when being pulled over by the Highway Patrol. During a traffic stop, the Highway Patrol Officer presents himself as a law enforcement official, a representative of government authority, and someone who is entitled to assign the identity of "Law-Breaker" to another individual. In Smith's data, the drivers offer up excuses to resist that identity, often asserting other aspects of their identity which suggest an incongruity with the "Law-Breaker" identity. The officer has enough authority to coerce the driver to ultimately accept the identity that the officer has assigned. In accepting the "Law-Breaker" identity, the driver co-constructs his, or her, own identity as a law-breaker and reinforces the officer's authoritative identity.

Robb, Dunkley, Boynton, and Greenhalgh (2007) demonstrate that "academic success depends on the construction of a coherent identity" (p.749), and that psychological and social accounts of identity complement each other. They examined the socialization and personal understanding of the self of socioeconomically deprived, but high-achieving, teenagers aspiring to be doctors. They found a link between exposure to illness and a long-lasting drive to become a doctor. However, they also found a strong link between support from family, friends, and peers and academic success. Various studies have shown that low socioeconomic status is often a huge hindrance to academic performance, but these kids have been socialized as academics.

Kane (2012) examines how academic identities (and identities tied to a specific discipline) contribute to classroom performance in a fourth-grade classroom. The kids studied had strong opinions about what a good student and a good scientist should be and do. They believed that they had the attributes of good students, and scientists. These students performed well in the areas that they believed that they did. Their teacher and their peers supported their identities. This study, and the Robb et al. study, show that even though social scientists support theories that identity is not a fixed or inherent core of a human being from which all thoughts and actions originate, many of us, as individuals living our lives, feel like it is some inner part of our being, (not without some plasticity, but not particularly dynamic) from which our thoughts and actions originate. And these studies show that it benefits us to do so. Thinking of ourselves as academics at heart, helps us to stay motivated through adversity and tedium.

Politeness Theory

As mentioned above, the construction and indexing of identity may be partially or entirely unintentional. Politeness is a good example of this. In interactions, we are not always aware of the politeness strategies we are using. Even when we are aware of them, we are still not always aware of how they are being received. However, politeness has a bearing on all our interactions, and it colors other people's perceptions of us, which is how identities are co-constructed.

Goffman also introduced the concept of Face, which Brown and Levison (1987) used to build their theory on politeness. Everybody has a positive face, which is a desire to be appreciated and accepted, and a negative face, which is a desire to not be imposed upon. It is important to note that, though positive and negative face exist on two sides of a scale in this theory, negative face is not the absence of face. Interactions almost always lead to threats to the face of participants. In order to mitigate threats to face, participants employ politeness strategies. Positive politeness is that which is oriented towards positive face. Negative politeness is not the absence of politeness, or behavior which some might call "bad manners." Negative politeness is a form of politeness meant to address negative face; a strategy for dealing with the possibility that we might be imposing on someone when we interact with them.

Researchers may analyze politeness strategies to see whether they are oriented towards positive politeness or negative politeness and get an idea of how the participants in a conversation view their face-threatening acts. Often, a conversational move will threaten the face of everybody involved. A simple request may threaten the negative face of the person who the request is made of and the positive face of the person making the request.

Chen, He, and Hu (2013) point out that important factors in the application of this theory are social distance and social hierarchies. At universities in China, Japan and the U.S.A., trying to test the universality of Brown and Levinson's theory, they passed out surveys with a list of people on it, like "friend,"

"classmate," "mother," and "college professor," and a list of different constructions one might use to request to borrow a pen. They had participants rate the people on the list in terms of social distance, and rate the requests in terms of more or less polite. Then they had people match the requests to the people who they would use them with. They found that, in every country, the greater the social distance people perceived, the more polite the construction they used. This makes sense, after all, friends and family are generally thought to be more entitled to impose upon and be imposed upon by an individual than strangers or even neighbors and coworkers, and friends have the benefit of having already done a fair amount of work building positive face. It is expected that an employee will perform various specified tasks for an employer, so requests, instructions, and commands related to said tasks are far less face threatening than the same requests might be to somebody who is not an employee, while instructions and commands would likely be considered completely inappropriate.

This is important because it stresses the importance of considering social distance and social hierarchies when observing politeness in interactions. In any group of people there are likely to be varying degrees of distance between different participants, and that will have a bearing on the politeness strategies that they use. In this view, there is no such thing as an interaction without politeness involved because every choice we make in a conversation is a politeness strategy. It is like a scale with strategies for mitigating face threats on

one side and social distance and social hierarchy on the other. The scale can be off balance, but it is never not present. Even the apparent absence of politeness strategies is a politeness strategy because it demonstrates social intimacy, or possibly a rejection of the social hierarchy. Furthermore, hierarchies are present in CoP's, as Eckert and Wenger (2005) argued and Moore (2006) demonstrated, and that too will have a bearing on the politeness strategies people use. Lastly, Rooster Teeth is a company with a fairly typical corporate structure (one of the participants of the podcast is the CEO) so the hierarchy of the podcast CoP cannot be overlooked.

Jacoby and Gonzales (1991) argue that in expert/novice interactions, the transference of information flows both ways, and that the expert and novice rolls are not necessarily the result of some externally applied social status. Looking at graduate students, and professors in a physics department, they examined instances where the students took on expert rolls, casting other students, and occasionally professors in the novice, or "less expert" roll. These shifts are dynamic, Jacoby and Gonzales show that experts and novices can swap in one exchange and swap back in the next.

They bring politeness theory into their framework by pointing out that displaying knowledge and constructing oneself as an expert is simultaneously constructing someone else as "less expert" and therefore a face threat. They pose that offering advice, issuing commands, and evaluating someone else' work constructs oneself as someone who is entitled to offer advice, issue commands,

16

and evaluate the work of others. At the same time, this constructs the person one is speaking to as someone in need of advice, instruction, or evaluation. Though they are quick to point out that not every attempt to construct oneself as an expert is necessarily a simultaneous construction of another as "less knowing" or in need of guidance.

When they introduce the terms, "more knowing" and "less knowing" (p.152), in their delineation of expert and novice, as well as "less expert" and "more expert" they show that "Expert-Novice" is a spectrum instead of a binary. This allows us to talk about displaying expertise without committing to the extremes implied by the word "expert" or casting someone in the extreme roll of "novice." And as anybody who has ever learned anything knows, one does not immediately transition from novice to expert. Learning is a process which, if divided into steps, ought to be divided into more than two.

Bethan Benwell and Elizabeth Stokoe (2002) show that displaying of knowledge indexes an expert identity, and that people may avoid constructing themselves as experts in interactions order to "display a lack of entitlement" (p.446). They find that interactional power is negotiated in complex ways. "'Face' concerns of the group, category membership and orientation to broader cultural trends" (p.429) all factor into these negotiations. Things are even more complicated in the data for this project because the Rooster Teeth Podcast is a comedy podcast and humor is an important element in the practice. In fact, the group originally entered the podcast in the "Technology and Gaming" category on

iTunes, but while they often discuss playing video games and the computer industry, humor was such a salient feature that it was later moved to the "Comedy" category. Humor allows us to set some of our expectations of social behavior aside for a time rules can be bent or broken. So, politeness strategies can get a little confusing.

<u>Humor Analysis</u>

Humor research is an enormous field, spanning multiple disciplines with varied approaches, they all deal with different aspects of humor and laughter, but none of them can account for all the things that make people laugh. There are theories that attempt to explain why we laugh. Some researchers have focused on laughter as a physiological response. Biological theories focus on explaining the origins of laughter from an evolutionary perspective. They try to explain the fact that laughter seems to be innate. Babies do not need to learn to laugh, and laughter exists universally across cultures. Jennifer Gamble (2001) points out that chimpanzees, gorillas, and orangutans laugh when being tickled, and that apes that have learned sign language (Koko, the gorilla and Kanzi, the bonobo) tell jokes and make themselves laugh (p. 169). It is interesting to note that all theories that try to explain why we laugh suffer from the same problems: first, each one only covers a limited range of things that make us laugh and therefore is not a complete explanation for why we laugh; second, whatever phenomena they relate to (tickling, jokes based on incongruity, etc.) does not always make us laugh, so they are not complete within their own domain.

Incongruity theories assert that incongruity is the source of humor. According to Elliot Oring (2011), Victor Raskin tried to distance his Semantic Script Theory of Humor from incongruity theories, but it actually seems like the perfect example (p.204). The most common form is when a statement is given that has more than one meaning, circumstances are such that anyone listening would be likely to attribute a specific meaning to it, then a second statement is given that changes the interpretation of the first. However, these theories cover more than common two-statement jokes; a common comedic device used in movies and television is having a character behave in a way that is incongruous with the situation at hand. It is important to understand theories about why we laugh because attempts at humor do not always succeed. When someone tells a joke that falls flat, having an understanding of the different types of humor can help us understand what they were trying to do.

Superiority theories posit that we laugh at people or things when we feel superior to them. This idea started with Thomas Hobbs in 1840, who also used it to explain why we can laugh at embarrassing stories about ourselves. After we have grown from an embarrassing experience, we are no longer the same person. Partington (2006) points out that people in interaction, once laughed at for making a mistake, will produce more mistakes "in order to transform laughing at into laughing with," (p.94). This is another strategy one may use to reframe an incident into a joke which mitigates a threat to a speaker's positive face.

19

Gervais and Wilson (2005) propose that humor evolved out of play as our hominid ancestors learned to speak. But the idea of play frames and non-play frames (periods of time when social order is important and social rules are strictly followed versus periods of time when the social rules are relaxed) works well with verbal humor and a pragmatic sociolinguistic approach. Joan Emerson (1969), recognized that within comedy frames, jokers are not held as accountable as they otherwise would be when they speak of taboo topics and that humor is a place where one can speak the unspeakable (p. 170). Smiling and laughting are ways to signal that communication has shifted into a play frame. A speaker may indicate that what was just said was not meant seriously by laughing and a hearer may indicate that the utterance was not taken seriously by laughing. Neal Norrick (1993) explains that, if researchers view joke-telling, punning, and teasing as occurring in a context with social hierarchy and social distance and in light of politeness theory and conversational cooperation we can understand how jokes can simultaneously express aggression and build rapport. Alan Partington (2006) shows how people often use frame shifts and indicators of frame shifts as politeness strategies.

Alfred Radcliffe-Brown (1949) proposed the idea that the function of humor is to establish and reinforce social roles and maintain a "social equilibrium" and that the act of laughing at a joke is to accept the values encoded in that joke (p.135). Although, Emerson (1969) recognizes that not everybody in a group holds the same values, and she emphasizes the negotiation that takes

place within a humorous frame. So, a joke may be seen as controversial within a community, but it allows us to deal with taboo subjects and reinforce those taboos at the same time.

Anat Zajdman (1991), looking at how pre-written jokes are used in conversation has demonstrated a variety of ways to introduce a humorous frame. He offers four types of joke incorporation based on the increase in relevance of the joke to the conversation. Type A, "Supplier," is a situation where an exchange between participants is followed by a joke with no relationship to the exchange. Type B, "Sub-contractor," is an exchange, followed by a joke that has some relevance to the conversation. The joke is often preceded by a declaration that it is coming and followed by an explanation of its relevance. Type C, "Joint venture" relies on shared knowledge. The joke is alluded to, and the hearer does not need it to be finished or the relevance explained. These can also be practical jokes played on the hearer where the hearer is not aware of the humor until the end of the joke. Type D, "Merger," can take place when the conversational context overlaps with content of the joke. The merging of the joke with the conversational context allows for new jokes to maintain the humorous frame, and for the joke to be regenerated in future humorous frames.

On the other end, Jennifer Hay (2001), has demonstrated a variety of ways in which a humorous frame can be supported. As mentioned above, jokes are encoded with certain values and laughing at a joke expresses support for those values, but laughing is not the only way we support humor. We have

myriad ways to offer support, deny support, and qualify our support of humor in order to maintain our stances within an interaction and within a community. We contribute more humor to maintain the play frame, we sometimes repeat the humorous phrase, we become more involved in the conversation and engage in more conversational overlap. Hay also points out that there are some situations when explicit support is not needed and silence, or sympathy (in the case of self-deprecating humor), can be a more appropriate supportive response than laughter.

Hay (2001) also talks about the ways we deny support for humor, and delineates the value in having such a wide range of interactional strategies regarding humor. Zajdman (1995) shows that joking activity is a potential face threatening act for all involved. If the joke is not appreciated, the speaker may lose face. A hearer may also lose face for missing, or failing to understand, the joke. According to Hay, we convey four messages when we offer unqualified support for a joke: recognition of the humorous frame, which demonstrates awareness of the social cues that indicate humor; understanding of the joke, which demonstrates awareness of the shared knowledge the joke-teller is making use of; appreciation of the joke, which is an alignment with the joke-teller's sense of humor; and agreement with the values encoded in the joke. A common way to demonstrate recognition and understanding while denying appreciation and agreement is to simply and dryly state "I get it." This can mitigate the face threat to the person responding to the joke, although other participants in the

conversation may continue the face threat if they appreciate the joke. However,

comedians often push things too far, and it occasionally becomes necessary to

deny agreement, even when we find jokes funny. A common way to do this is to

laugh and verbally object to the joke.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

Location

The data for this study comes from the podcast published by employees of internet-based entertainment production company, Rooster Teeth Productions LLC. Rooster Teeth Productions is a unique community of practice that grew up on the internet. In 2003 seven men launched the website, roosterteeth.com, which hosted a video series, called Red versus Blue, and a message board where viewers could comment on the videos. The core members of this community were those seven men, who also starred in the video series. They soon added an online store, where fans could purchase related merchandise. Initially, due to limited internet resources, the only ways one could legitimately participate on the periphery of the community were to purchase memberships, watch videos, comment on the message board, and purchase merchandise. This might not seem to fit a community of practice model; the core and periphery were generally engaged in different practices.

However, all were engaged in supporting Red versus Blue and in maintaining and expanding the community. Also, the Rooster Teeth founders have claimed that they have always understood that they were supported by the fan community and were interested in engaging with and supporting that community in return. To that end, they have attempted to blur the line between performers and audience in multiple ways: about 18 months after they launched

their website, they turned it into a social networking site, similar to Facebook, where they interacted with the online community on the same level as everybody else; they began visiting conventions and expos where they met fans in person (sometimes from a stage or a booth, but often on the floor with no physical boundary between conversational participants) and they started hosting their own yearly convention; they use online gaming platforms to hold tournament nights where they play video games alongside their fans; and, when looking for talent to serve and improve the company, the website, or any of the shows that they produce, they look to the fan community first. This means that, if we consider everybody engaged with roosterteeth.com a member of the CoP, with paid employees of Rooster Teeth as the core members of the CoP and the fan community as the peripheral members, not only is it possible to have a periphery to core trajectory, it happens quite often. Furthermore, many fans create artwork related to Rooster Teeth projects, when Rooster Teeth appreciates the artwork, they can and do engage the artist in several ways: they promote the artist on the website; they purchase the artwork and/or grant it an official license; they commission more pieces from the artist; and/or they simply hire the artist. While professional categories of "employed by Rooster Teeth" and "not employed by Rooster Teeth" exist, there is an appriciation of freelancers and a murkiness to the boundary between the two. This is perfectly in line with Lave's and Wenger's claim that CoPs are nebulous with organic growth and boundaries that are not exactly well defined.

Over the years, Rooster Teeth has grown into a much larger community. It has over 250 employees working at 3 locations. The website receives more than 5 million visitors per month and has over 2 million registered members. They have a YouTube channel with over 9 million subscribers. They have also split into several divisions and merged and partnered with other companies, each one producing multiple video series, as well as other media and merchandise lines. It seems most employees work on multiple video projects, and many do not seem to be constrained to one division. The main Rooster Teeth division produces more than 25 different video series but Red versus Blue is still the most popular, making it the longest running video series in the history of the internet, and the longest running Science Fiction series in the history of visual media in the United States. At this point, Rooster Teeth is clearly, what Wenger (1998) has termed, a constellation of practice with multiple CoPs operating within it (p.126).

The CoP within this constellation of practice that is the focus of this study is the group of Rooster Teeth members who run the Rooster Teeth Podcast—originally named "The Drunk Tank Podcast," but changed because the name deterred advertisers. Information about the rest of the company is important to the analysis because, in the data, when expertise is indexed in the conversation, it is often the participant's role in the company outside of the podcast that gets indexed. The data for this study covers a period of time from the end of 2008

through to 2012. Which begins shortly after the first division, Achievement Hunter, split off of Rooster Teeth.

Participants

Achievement Hunter was started by Geoff Ramsey who is one of the original founders of the company and one of the creators of the Rooster Teeth Podcast. This would make him a core member of both CoPs: Rooster Teeth Productions, and the Rooster Teeth Podcast. The other two creators of the podcast are also founding members of the company, and therefore core members of both CoPs. Micheal "Burnie" Burns was the creator, writer, and director of Red versus Blue as well as the CEO of Rooster Teeth. Gustavo "Gus" Sorola does not have an impressive official title but is also a founding member of the company, and he seems to be the one with the most knowledge of computer networking and web design which is highly appreciated in an internet based entertainment company with a heavy focus on video game culture. Also, it is unclear who had the idea to start the podcast, or who pushed the group to finally start recording or publishing them, but Gus appears to be completely responsible for them—having taken over from Burnie after the sixth episode. Gus sets up the recording equipment, schedules the recording time and participants, he also edits them, and he uploads them to the website and to various podcast distribution hubs. As soon as they began producing an "enhanced podcast" Gus also became responsible for the enhanced content as well. (Enhanced podcasts are podcasts that make use of the fact that most devices that play podcasts have the

ability to connect to the internet and the ability to play videos; they display images coordinated with the timing of the audio recording like a PowerPoint presentation, and they can include web links to anything that may be referred to in the recording—Rooster Teeth calls this "The Link Dump.")

In the beginning, two other founding members occasionally participated in the podcast, but they did not seem interested in becoming regular participants. In the second episode, Joel Heyman steps in when Burnie steps out to take a phone call, but he does not actually say much. Joel then returns in the fourth and sixth episodes and a handful of episodes after that. In the seventh episode, due to a schedule conflict, Matt Hullum acts as a replacement for Geoff. Joel and Matt are the only founding members of Rooster Teeth who previously had careers in Hollywood. This study does not focus on Joel and Matt because, as founding members of the company, already in the core of the Rooster Teeth Productions CoP, they would have more power to determine the practices of the podcast CoP, than newer members would. Their position within the company, and their inclusion right in the beginning of the endeavor, puts them on roughly equal footing with Burnie, Gus, and Geoff so any learning that took place in their interactions could not be described as a periphery to core trajectory. Due to their limited participation in the beginning of the podcast, it would be best to consider Joel and Matt as members of the outer core, while Burnie, Gus, and Geoff would be members of the inner core.

This study focuses on three members of the Rooster Teeth community who joined the company well after it was founded, all at different times, and later joined the podcast after it became an established, regular, and popular, feature of the website. All of these members joined the company in different roles, and worked there long before being invited onto the podcast.

The first is Gavin Free, who was a member of the fan community from the very beginning of Red versus Blue, and is probably the very first person to be hired by the company from the fan community, and a very clear example of a periphery to core trajectory at a time when the company was better defined as a Community of Practice than as a Constellation of Practice. Gavin is from the U.K. and Rooster Teeth is based in Austin, Texas, so his transition from periphery to core happened in spurts. He was so well known on the website that he was invited to visit one Summer. When he returned to the U.K., he and his friend Dan started their own web series, The Slo-Mo Guys. Later Gavin was invited back to actually work for Rooster Teeth on a project, and this began a cycle of moving back and forth between Austin and Oxfordshire to live and work in both locations. At present, he is living in the U.S. and working full time for Rooster Teeth, but when he first appeared on the podcast, it was during a visit while he was directing seasons of Red versus Blue, but still had not moved to the U.S. So his position as a core member of Rooster Teeth was still debatable, while his position as a newcomer to the podcast is clear. Gavin was chosen for this study because he was the first person to join the podcast after it was

established, and because the story of his relationship with Rooster Teeth is the most well documented.

Jack Pattillo was the next new member of the podcast. Jack is also an early member of the fan community who became an employee later. Jack helped Geoff launch Achievement Hunter. Jack was chosen for this study because he was the next newcomer to the podcast after Gavin and because his employment with Rooster Teeth was much more recent in relation to his first run on the podcast.

The last newcomer that this study focuses on is Monty Oum. Monty was not a key member of the fan community when he was hired by Rooster Teeth. Monty was a self-taught animator who made advertisements for video games that he enjoyed and published them on the internet—simply as a labor of love, not because he was employed by a company that would profit from the games he was promoting. Monty was chosen for this study because his case provides an interesting contrast to Jack and Gavin. In episode 56, where Monty makes his first appearance, his participation is almost nonexistent. Monty's subsequent appearances are also awkward and lacking in participation compared to the other newcomers. So, Monty's trajectory through the Rooster Teeth CoP was a relatively straight trip right to the core, while his trajectory through the podcast CoP spent much more time on the periphery.

Data Collection

First, I listened to the first 100 episodes of the podcast in order to look for patterns and salient features in the data. I also watched some of the videos that participants appear in to build familiarity with their methods of speaking through their non-verbal communication. This was specifically helpful for learning what it sounds like when each participant speaks while smiling. While it generally was possible to tell when participants were indicating humor through tone, in the podcast this made it easier to be certain. Next, following Partington's (2006) example, I transcribed and encoded the first five episodes in order to search for patterns that might indicate a group identity and practices that newcomers might need to learn.

As there is only one editor on the podcast and we have little information about that particular practice, editing is not a practice considered for this study. (Through discussions in the podcast, we know that he has occasionally attempted to train a new member, but Gus is still the editor after eight years and over 400 episodes.) Since the performance of conversation is the only practice most members are engaged in, multiple avenues of investigation were required to find clues to what sets this group apart from any other group of people who regularly hold a conversation. On the encoded transcripts, I marked topics of discussion to see how often they discuss the same subjects. I also looked at changes in topics along with reactions to those changes to see if any person or any subject received a significant amount of positive or negative attention. One

thing that became obvious from initially listening to the first 100 episodes was the importance of humor to the group. So, while encoding the transcripts, I also marked instances of humor along with reactions to them in order to see what sort of values the community might appreciate and what forms of humor the community appreciates most.

Once salient features were identified, instead of transcribing and encoding all episodes, like Partington (2006), due to time constraints, many later episodes were listened to again and instances of humor, topic changes, and teasing were tallied. I argue that this is the inverse of Partington's (and many others') corpus linguistics data collection techniques. While we tend to treat transcription as though it is a pure form of data collection, Buchholtz (2000) explains how transcribing audio data involves interpretive and representational decisions that are affected by the transcriber's conditions at the time of transcription including the transcriber's "expectations and beliefs about the speakers and the interactions being transcribed" (p.1439). Therefore, instead of taking the time to transcribe and encode every episode, and using computer software to create a tally that shows how often humor, teasing, and topic changes occur, I simply listened to the audio data and created the tallies myself. I used Apple's Quicktime audio player for this step because the controls allowed me pause, rewind, and playback the audio files more efficiently than other audio player software that I found. This helped me to double check my choices while scoring the tallies in order to maintain accuracy.

Since teasing is so prominent in the data, and according to Schnurr (2009) teasing is a prime means for identity construction, a powerful tool for people in leadership positions, and a "component of the linguistic repertoire that distinguishes different CofPs" (p.1126), instances of teasing were looked at specifically. In the transcripts that were encoded, I kept track of who teased who in each instance of teasing (for example, "Burnie teased Gus"), However, I found that the teases coming from a single person were generally distributed evenly among the group or in a pattern that reflected the overall distribution. Whenever one person received the majority of the abuse in an episode, it is because most or all of the other participants focused on that person more than anybody else, but among those other participants, there were still shots fired at each other. When collecting data for the later episodes, two tallies were kept: one for teases dispensed and one for teases received. For example:

.

Table 1. Teasing in Episode # 1

Teases Sent		Teases Received	
Burnie	56	Burnie	25
Gus	14	Gus	14
Geoff	24	Geoff	54

Keeping track of who fired the most shots and who received the most teasing was faster than, and just as informative as, keeping track of exactly who

attacked who in every instance. These multiple avenues of investigation were

pursued in order to gain an understanding of what the old-timers built so that an

understanding of what the newcomers have to live up to could be attained.

I chose Episode # 170 as the cap for the study because it was recorded

several years after the newcomers that this study focuses on began making

appearances on the podcast and it is an episode that features all three of them

along with old timers, Gus and Burnie. For each of the three newcomers traced

in this study, I examined their first few appearances on the podcast, their

interactions in the cap episode, and semi-randomly chosen episodes featuring

each newcomer in the middle of their run. In order to control for other

personalities as variables, I chose the episodes in the middle based on the

participants involved. I tried to find episodes that featured only Gus, Burnie, and

Geoff along with one of the newcomers, but this was not always possible. When

I could not find enough episodes featuring the original three and a newcomer, I

allowed for episodes that featured Matt or Joel, and even this became impossible

in the last few episodes. However, the inclusion of many new voices towards the

end of this study is an indicator of how the CoP was evolving at the time.

This quantitative data is intended to provide support for the ethnographic

analysis. As Buchholtz (1999) points out, the CoP framework is based on an

ethnographic approach. Lave and Wenger (1991) began the discussion by

compiling a series of ethnographic case studies, and Wenger continued that work

with a different case study. The ethnographic analysis is based on the audio

data and excerpts have been transcribed where pertinent to the discussion.

Data Analysis

The use of transcription along with the ethnographic approach is intended

to show how certain interactional moves, such as the introduction and support of

humor (especially instances of teasing), constitute an ongoing practice within a

CoP that newcomers must adopt to become accepted as full members.

Pushing back against using speech communities as an analytical

framework, Buchholtz (1999) explains the advantages of using CoP theory.

While speech communities look at how social information can explain linguistic

phenomena, CoP can go back and forth, looking at the effects linguistic

phenomena have on the social world as well as the effects the social world has

on language practices. An example of this in the Rooster Teeth Podcast is the

shift from one genre to another. The founders of the podcast intended it to be a

podcast that primarily talks about video games, so they listed it under the video

games category on iTunes and other podcast distribution hubs. But their practice

of continually teasing and joking with each other, as well as their practice of

frequently changing the topics led to them being redefined as a comedy podcast.

This was a group identity shift brought about by practices that naturally emerged

from their interactions. Also, according to Buchholtz, the CoP framework allows

us to look at language practices, and social practices, that indicate group identity,

and individual identity, and this allows us to take conflict into account. As a

theory of learning through socialization Wenger (1998) explains that we can look at both as individuals following trajectories into, through, or within CoPs. So, understanding group identities as well as individual identities is important, because we see evidence of an individual following a periphery to core trajectory as that individual adopting more group identity practices. This is something that can be seen in two of the cases from this data, by keeping track of the amount of teasing they receive and engage in.

I assumed the amount of topic changes that individuals succeed in initiating is another way to track their trajectories. Changing the topic is determining which direction the conversation will go. Since the practice of this CoP is engaging in conversation, exerting control over the conversation is an obvious indicator of progressing towards mastery of the practice. As time goes by, and they get more comfortable in the podcast, newcomers are expected to exert more control over the conversation, if they are following a periphery to core trajectory.

Yet another advantageous aspect of the CoP framework that Wenger (1998) talks about is the fact that it acknowledges the impact that newcomers or even long time peripheral members can have on the CoP. It is not likely to be tracked in quantitative data, but is demonstrated in the ethnographic analysis. This phenomenon is demonstrated in the third case, wherein one of the newcomers does not follow a periphery to core trajectory but does impact the practice of the CoP from the periphery.

CHAPTER THREE

FINDINGS

In this chapter, I first discuss my findings on the dynamics of the beginning of the CoP, and the patterns of language practices that set it apart from other CoPs and represent practices that newcomers need to be socialized into. First I address the teasing, then what appears to be a lack of politeness among the participants combined with a sense of cooperation that defies expectations, then the humor, and lastly I cover how the group handles the rare actual conflict. Along with each language practice that is covered, I discuss how it relates to either podcasting in general, video game culture, or the wider Rooster Teeth community, to offer insight on why these language practices fit this CoP. Qualitative and quantitative analysis are used to determine the existing hierarchy and dynamics within the group before anybody else joins.

After discussing the CoP's beginnings, I move on to analyzing the trajectories of the three newcomers. I begin with Gavin, but quickly include Jack because they have similar trajectories and because the beginning of Jack's first run on the show overlaps with the end of Gavin's first run. Qualitative and quantitative analysis demonstrates their periphery to core trajectory as expected. Over time, they go from being teased a lot to being teased less, from issuing few teases themselves to issuing more in later episodes. From the beginning, they both succeed in introducing topic changes fairly often though not as much as

Burnie, and that does not appear to change. I then move on to Monty who had a

very different experience than Gavin and Jack.   While he remained on the

periphery, possibly marginalized, he had a profound impact on the CoP.

Practices Established by the Founders

<u>Teasing and Humor</u>

The thing that is most salient about interactions in the Rooster Teeth

Podcast is the teasing. Participants make fun of, and hurl insults at, each other

quite a bit. Examples abound in the data and one need not transcribe a single

episode in order to notice it. Consider these examples from Episode 1 (2008):

> Geoff teases Gus over Oscar De La Hoya losing a recent boxing match,
> and Gus supports the humor but rejects the idea that it is something that
> should concern him and then goes on to insult Oscar De La Hoya:
>
> 6. GEOFF: How's it make you feel to know that Mexico's greatest hero got
>   beat up by a scrawny little Filipino dude?
>
> 7. GUS: Oh@@ eh I don't keep up with that stuff... He uh- He uh also got
>   beat up by some stripper, she put him in some fishnet stockings and
>   high heels.
>
> Burnie teases Gus about the time his friend punched him in the face and
> Gus responds with self deprecating humor:
>
> 68. BURNIE: Plus the size o' Gus' head, how do you miss? I mean-
>
> 69. GEOFF: [@@@]
> 70. GUS: [It- It's true] you- you just like put your hand out and let gravity
>   do the rest of the work @nd just kinda-
>
> Burnie makes a self deprecating joke after he tells about making some
> dangerous decisions while working with explosives on a film, Geoff teases
> him and Burnie laughs in response:
>
> 165. BURNIE: Adventures in stupidity

166. GEOFF: Like a junior Spielberg over there.

167. BURNIE: @@

Burnie makes fun of the whole group including himself because they have tried to record podcasts several times before and scrapped them, and the response is laughter all around:

169. BURNIE: Sure why not. This is actually- this is our... milestone, this is our hundredth podcast.

Burnie teases Geoff over a bet that they have made, which is the reason why they decided to record and publish the first podcast, Gus tries to continue the conversation and explain the bet, while Geoff brings the subject back to the unpublished podcasts—this could be a rare example of humor not being supported, or judging by the overlapping talk in between Gus and Geoff in lines 175 and 176, it could be an example of humor being supported through hyper involvement in the conversation characterized by and is one of the forms of humor support that Hay (2001) covers:

174. BURNIE: -NO Geoff'll explain it like it makes sense... So somebody should explain it with the objectivity that- ...- Geoff completely started talking out of his ass, and then got called on it.

175. GUS: Oay, okay then [let's-]
176. GEOFF: [Well first I'd] let's say that Burnie is right. This may not be our hundredth podcast, but this is... God I don't know, like our tenth or eleventh or something. We've been doing test podcasts now... And uh... I guess we're gonna post this one-

Gus teases Matt who is working just outside the room, which prompts a little more teasing from Burnie:

189. GUS: Yeah "working" I saw Matt was watching uh bad uh- bad Sc- bad Scorpions cov- BAD- Im sorry- Europe covers on YouTube-

190. GEOFF: -Oh, he got that from me, I apologize.

191. BURNIE: Yeah, Matt is like four years behind on every meme, on the internet.

39

These are just some examples from one episode. They were chosen for demonstration here because they were not wrapped up in a larger context that needed a lengthy explanation. Between Burnie, Gus, and Geoff, Burnie does the most teasing and Gus does the least, but there seems to be a relatively equal amount of insults and teasing among them compared to how they treat almost everyone else. (An odd phenomenon that is observable in multiple early episodes is that, without any noticeable prompting from Matt, the teasing between the people present decreases dramatically whenever Matt is a participant, and the group generally makes jokes at the expense of, and hurls insults at, various people and organizations outside of the group.)

Though there is in fact a hierarchy among the group. There seems to be a natural hierarchy to their friendship but there is also a management structure to the company. At the time of these podcasts, Burnie was the CEO of the company while Gus, Geoff, and Joel were department heads. Gus, Geoff, and Joel may exist on the same professional tier, but their natural social hierarchy is obvious from the amount of talking each member does. Out of all of the podcasts transcribed, Burnie takes the conversational floor 2,541 times, Geoff takes the floor 2,027 times, and Gus takes the floor 1,764 times. The disparity between Burnie's participation and everybody else, is even larger than these numbers imply because Burnie usually holds the floor for significantly longer amounts of time, and those numbers include part of an episode when Burnie stepped out to take a phone call. Considering an episode where Joel makes an

appearance: Burnie takes the floor 657 times, Geoff takes it 669 times, Gus takes it 525 times, and Joel takes it 180 times. In episodes where topic changes were tracked, Burnie almost always had about 40 per episode while everybody else had about 20 per episode. Geoff usually had a few more than everybody else but that is the only useful information that tracking the topic changes yielded. The newcomers had similar numbers to everybody else as soon as they started and that did not change as time went by.

Burnie generally does engage in more teasing than anyone else, Geoff engages in it more than Gus, and Gus engages in it more than Joel. As mentioned early, in Table 1:

.

Table 1. Teasing in Episode # 1

Teases Sent		Teases Received	
Burnie	56	Burnie	25
Gus	14	Gus	14
Geoff	24	Geoff	54

However, this is not always the case. Occasionally Gus and Geoff gang up on Burnie:

Table 2. Teasing in Episode # 2

Teases Sent		Teases Received	
Burnie	5	Burnie	12
Gus	6	Gus	1
Geoff	7	Geoff	4
Joel	0	Joel	3

Then, when Joel first participates in a full episode, he engages in teasing the least, Burnie engages in it the most, and the two of them receive most of the teasing. This suggests that there is a tendency among the group to shoot back at the person who is teasing the most and a tendency to pick on Joel.

Table 3. Teasing in Episode # 4

Teases Sent		Teases Received	
Burnie	9	Burnie	8
Geoff	7	Geoff	3
Gus	5	Gus	6
Joel	3	Joel	8

If we look at the overall trend across several episodes, the hierarchy is obvious:

Table 4. Who Teases the Most in Each Early Episode

Episodes	1	2	3	4	5	7	9	10	11	12	13
Burnie	1	3	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	2
Gus	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	1	3		3
Geoff	2	1	1	2	2		2	1	2	3	1
Joel		4		4			4				4
Matt						1				2	

This table ranks participants in order from, who teased the most to who teased the least in a given episode. While Burnie does get ranked second or third on occasion, he is most consistently in first place. Geoff gets second place as many times as he gets first and only gets third once. Gus gets third place most often, and Joel gets fourth place every time he appears.

Much of this may simply be related to how much time each member spends talking, however Joel seems to take the majority of the abuse when he is around. Nobody consistently gets the least amount of abuse and the rankings for who is on the receiving end of teases have many ties for various places and are more evenly distributed than the rankings for who is sending them. The tendency for members to return teases acts as something of a balancing mechanism among the original three founders, while still marking Joel as being on the bottom of the hierarchy.

Table 5. Who Gets Teased the Most in Each Early Episode

Episodes	1	2	3	4	5	7	9	10	11	12	13
Burnie	2	1	2	1	2	1	3	2	4	2	4
Gus	3	4	3	2	2	2	1	3	2		2
Geoff	1	2	1	3	1		3	1	3	2	3
Joel		3		1			2		1		1
Matt						2				1	

In an interview with Stuart Dredge (2015), for The Guardian, Burnie claims that gamers (people who play video games often enough to consider it part of their identity) are "competitive by nature." He says that it's an inextricable part of video game culture, and that, though "it can seem aggressive at times" it is simply "the way that those people communicate," and he cannot "really cast aspersions on it, because I do well the rest of the year based on that same passion." In the interview, Burnie is talking about gamers yelling racial and sexual slurs as well as threats of rape and murder during online gaming matches. This does not occur on the podcast, but it does offer some insight into how the participants can regularly hurl insults at one another without interpreting it as true aggression. The frequency and intensity of the teasing, along with Burnie's belief that it is somehow fundamental to their nature, suggest that it is one of the practices that newcomers must adopt in order to be seen and see themselves as core members of the podcast CoP.

However, since there is a hierarchy among the core members, it is not necessary to meet insults shot for shot. It is an ongoing dynamic in an evolving

community, therefore every joke is a new attempt to construct oneself as a valuable member of this CoP, and every bout of laughter is a ratification of a given attempt. It is reasonable to expect that as time goes by, as newcomers are more accepted in the CoP, they will either receive less verbal punishment, or fire back more often with insults of their own, or a combination of the two. As there is a hierarchy in existence, and most of the old-timers at the top continue to be involved in the podcast, it is not necessary for the newcomers to achieve a high rank on the teasing tallies in order to be considered core members.

Another thing that is obvious from simply listening to the podcast is the salience of humor and fun. There are several purposes behind the podcast. The Rooster Teeth Podcast is used as a tool to draw visitors to the Rooster Teeth website, drum up interest, and dispense information about upcoming appearances. This is a strategy many professional comedians use. Rooster Teeth also uses the podcast to dispense information about the general operations of their company. If there is a delay in production on one of their video series, or if there is a change to the website, they can talk about it on the podcast and they can rely on the portion of the fan community that listens to the podcast to share that information whenever anybody asks. Lastly, once a podcast has enough of a regular following, it can start to generate revenue on its own through advertising and merchandising. In order to keep people interested and entice them to pay money to attend live performances, visit the website, keep downloading the episodes, and listening to the ads every week, a podcast

needs to offer the audience something more than information about the

company. This is the obvious reason for the focus on humor and fun, but it is not

the only option a podcast has—there are many successful educational podcasts

and This American Life (a weekly radio show featuring nonfiction explorations of

interesting aspects of American culture) has consistently been among the top ten

downloaded podcasts on iTunes since it debuted as a podcast in 2015.

The fact that in 2013, Rooster Teeth created a separate podcast, called

"The Patch," to discuss video games more seriously in a more structured format

is an indicator that Rooster Teeth is aware of the value of this type of podcast.

They have also created many other regular podcasts and most of them feature a

group of friends speaking casually and making jokes. Even other podcasts, like

"Fan Service," which has a specific focus on Anime, and a structure with a few

rules about what aspects of the genre to discuss at which time, relies more

heavily on the fun had between participants than the rules set up beforehand.

This suggests that they find this type of podcast to be much more valuable. So, it

might seem obvious or natural that an entertainment production company would

choose to produce a podcast that focuses on humor and entertainment but that is

not their only option, and that choice reflects a group identity that must be

performed and negotiated just like any other group, or individual, identity. The

focus on humor and entertainment has lead them to some interesting practices of

humor support. Hay (2001) logically points out that people do not generally lend

full support to either self-deprecating humor or to teasing because fully agreeing

with either message would be a serious threat to face, but Rooster Teeth engages in both of these practices quite often. Furthermore, they also support humor by asking interesting questions, or providing interesting facts, related to the topic of the joke without closing the humorous frame.

Smooth and Coarse Interaction

All of the teasing creates a perception of coarseness that is compounded by an apparent lack of politeness. The men involved mostly make use of direct statements and questions. They use "uh," "um," and "well" as place holders to claim and maintain the conversational floor, but they rarely use them to hedge statements to mitigate any face threats. Gus occasionally uses begins a statement with "well," when he has to disagree with somebody, but it does seem to be noticeably absent most of the time. Geoff and Burnie occasionally use a construction like "Let me ask you a question," to take the conversational floor and this is a politeness strategy. Although Geoff also uses it quite often as a comedic device playing polite before he teases somebody. As an example, in episode 28 (2009), Jack's first appearance on the podcast, Jack complains that when they spoke about the podcast in various formats during the previous week, nobody mentioned that he would be appearing. Geoff replies with "Can I ask you a question? Do you really think you're a highly touted guest?"

Aside from the occasional "let me ask ask a question," preface, this seems like a lack of politeness, but when social distance is considered, it is in itself a politeness strategy. By not making an effort to mitigate face threats, the

participants are expressing the closeness of their relationship. This is a group identity practice and it is a great strategy for a podcast to depict this kind of interaction because it has the effect of drawing the audience into that closeness and simulating a sense of camaraderie. However, it can also create a complicated environment for newcomers to navigate. If newcomers try to interact in the same way, they probably will not be received in the same way. Newcomers have not developed the close relationships that the core members have, and they are on the bottom of the social, and corporate, hierarchy. This creates an incentive to use typical politeness strategies, but using those strategies would be communicating in a way that is noticeably different from the rest of the group.

However, despite the relatively coarse behavior of the interlocutors conversation seems to flow quite smoothly. Even though there is a lot of teasing, and little use of typical politeness strategies, any attempt to participate or steer the conversation is generally supported. When someone attempts to tell a story, other members either cede the floor, or jump in to help construct the narrative. Sometimes a participant will interrupt to ask a question during the story. When this occurs the conversation may veer off in a new direction, or the question may be answered quickly and the narrative continued immediately, but both of these occurrences are generally smooth and cooperative.

Certainly, the smoothness of the conversation is aided by editing. If there is ever a point at which nothing is said for twenty seconds, those twenty seconds

can be cut out. Also, if a participant rambles on without saying anything worth

hearing, or if someone coughs, yawns, burps, or bumps the microphone, the

editor may cut those parts out as well, and this creates the illusion that the

conversation is smoother than it was. However, when someone does make a

mistake like that, it usually results in some pretty funny teasing from the rest of

the group, so there is incentive to leave it in. Consider an example from the

second episode (2009). The participants were trying to figure out how much

bandwidth is required for online gaming (that is how much data needs to be sent

back and forth between computers over a network through the phone or cable

lines in order to have multiple computers, or game consoles, interacting with

each other in the same video game at the same time). Joel tries to offer an

anecdote from ten years earlier that illustrates how little bandwidth a gaming

network needs, but he completely flubs the introduction, and hilarity ensues:

645. JOEL: I remember tryn' to play a game- like nineteen forty-five- that vid- that first video game- the first you know? On modem, like ten years ago-

646. BURNIE: -Here's what I just heard, Joel tried to play a video game in 1945

647. ALL: @@@

648. BURNIE: That was the first video ga[@me @@@]
649. <24:01>
650. JOEL: [-And the technology] DIDN'T EXIST, SO IT MADE IT RE:ALLY HARD!! But I'm old. So...

651. BURNIE: That video game was I Love Lucy-

652. ALL: @@@@@

653. GUS: He could not put the chocolates in his mouth fast enough.

654. ALL: @ @ @ @ @ @

655. BURNIE: (Smiling) He couldn't get passed the factory level

656. GEOFF: @ @ @

657. GUS: (Smiling) The- the [vitamin- a- vitaminavegimite]
658. BURNIE: [So what- you played- are you] talking about Battlefield
        1942?

659. JOEL: Thank you, that's-

The transcript does not capture the intensity of the laughter, but we can

see that, when Burnie teases Joel, in line 646, the humor is highly appreciated

and it is supported in every way. First, in line 647, everybody laughs. According

to Hay (2001), this demonstrates recognition of the switch to a humorous frame,

understanding of the humor involved, appreciation of the joke, and agreement

with the values encoded in the joke. In line 648 then Burnie delivers what

professional comedians call, a "tag joke;" these are used to increase the length,

and possibly the intensity, of the humorous frame. Then, in line 650 Joel plays

along and supports the humor frame by engaging in some self deprecating

humor. Then Burnie adds another tag joke in line 651. This joke also appears to

be entirely appreciated based on the laughter that follows and Gus' decision to

contribute to the joke in the next line. In line 653, Gus builds on Burnie's joke;

referencing an iconic episode of I Love Lucy, and this too is met with laughter

from everybody. Then, Burnie seizes on Gus' joke and conjures an image of that

episode as a video game level in line 655.

At this point, the laughter has died down a little bit. In line 656, Geoff is the only one who is still laughing. Burnie's tone makes it obvious that he is speaking through a smile in line 655. Gus is also speaking through a smile in line 657, but he's working to create a new joke instead of actually laughing at the last joke. This is still qualified as humor support according to Hay, but others might not recognize it as such. Burnie may have noticed the laughter dying down, or he may have been adhering to the comedy rule of threes, closing the frame after he made three jokes in reply to Joel's mistake. Either way, in line 658, Burnie brings the humor frame to a close and begins to cooperate with Joel, offering an interpretation of what Joel was trying to say, which turns out to be perfectly accurate, and the conversation continues smoothly from there. So, there are often good reasons to avoid cutting out simple verbal mistakes, and we can see that conversation can proceed smoothly even when they are left in.

What has been described as smoothness so far could, once editing has been removed from the equation, be described as a general agreeableness. Interlocutors generally adopt complementary stances whenever one adopts a new footing. This excerpt from Episode 3 (2009) provides a typical example:

267. BURNIE: We actually discovered another problem. Uh, with groups, as a result of tournaments, and that is, the Dupe Check for group names was busted so we coulda had multiple groups with uh the same name.

268. GEOFF: And we did.

269. BURNIE: And we did- we did- and what- Ben ran a Dupe Check and do you know what the most commonly duplicated group was?

51

270. GEOFF: I'm 'onna- I'm gonna take a guess "Blue Team-"

271. GUS: I'm gonna guess, "Hentai"

272. BURNIE: @@@@@ "Furries." It was, "Red Team"

273. GEOFF: "Red Team-" really?

274. BURNIE: With twenty-seven instances

275. GUS: Go-

276. GEOFF: -Twenty-seven Red Teams-

277. GUS: -Go Red Team-

278. BURNIE: -Yeah-

279. GUS: -Can't get it together they're all lookin' for teams

280. GEOFF: Suck it, Blue

281. BURNIE: @@@

282. GUS: Ye@ah @@ @ey couldn't figure out how to gather up.

283. GEOFF: @ @ @ ... So Fragmented.

Here Burnie introduces a slight topic change and Geoff jumps in to support it. In explaining certain technical aspects of the website, Burnie is indexing his expertise in that area. When Geoff jumps in, he is also making a claim of expertise in that area, though he is doing so without constructing Burnie as "less expert," as Jacoby and Gonzales (1991) describe. In this instance, Geoff is not claiming to know more about the technical aspects of the website than Burnie does; he is offering information about something that happened in the past. Geoff is acting as if Burnie is constructing a narrative and attempting to

help. Burnie does not continue his point with a story, but he does reiterate

Geoff's statement which ratifies Geoff's claim to expertise. Then Burnie shifts the

topic slightly again in line 269, which once again indexes his expertise, and

challenges the others to a bit of trivia. Both participants are again agreeable,

offering guesses. Geoff makes a serious guess based on knowledge of their

community, while Gus makes a humorous guess based on knowledge of the

internet in general. In response to Gus' joke, Burnie laughs and contributes more

humor before revealing the answer. The answer in line 272 is significant

because, in their popular web series, Red versus Blue, Geoff and Gus play

characters on the Red Team. Burnie plays a few characters, but the one that he

is most recognizable as is on the Blue Team. This is why the exchange is then

followed by some mild cheers and then some mild teasing of the Blue Team

which Burnie supports by laughing. The line, "Suck it, Blue," is often used in the

show; it elicits so much laughter from the group because it is funnier to those

familiar with the show, than it might be to the uninitiated.

This is not always the case though. Disputes among participants do

occur, but most of the time they are dealt with in a humorous frame with a sense

of humor. Bucholtz (1999 p.208) and Meyerhoff (2005 pp.595–596) claim that

the benefit of the CoP model is that it can account for the apparent contradiction

of consensus and conflict in a community. It acknowledges that communities

emerge through a shared enterprise, but are also made up of individuals with

their own sense of agency. In these cases, the parties involved in the dispute

have an awareness of the entertainment value of the situation. Consider this

example from episode # 42 (2009) which occurs after Burnie reads an email

which refers to him as a "man of importance" in the group and asks him to reign

in the behavior of Gus and Geoff because he feels they do not contribute

anything to the podcast except nitpicking insults about the grammar usage of

other participants:

2. GEOFF: By the way as-as-as, Mr. Skittz, as for saying Gus doesn't

contribute anything to the podcast, He contributes two days a week to putting it

up online that's a fucking monumental task.

3. GUS: He-he-it's easy to-It's easy to judge from the couch when you
    don't know [what's going on]
4. GEOFF: [Yeah]

5. GEOFF: Burnie had-Burnie had to do it while you were uh, I don't know
    where you were. You were doing a commercial or something

6. GUS: Yeah

7. GEOFF: And he-he complained, about every 30 seconds

8. GUS: It sucks

9. BURNIE: You-

10. GEOFF: It does suck

11. BURNIE: You know, part of the fucking complaining Geoff is the hope
     that you would pick up the slack too-

12. GEOFF: -I was busy!

13. BURNIE: You didn't do a fucking thing for that

14. GEOFF: I am doing the podcast like four times-

15. BURNIE: "Yeah Gus is gone! Gus didn't ask anybody to do the podcast I guess someone will do it"

16. GUS: @@@

17. BURNIE: [And you sat-] and you sat there the whole fucking time
18. GEOFF: [I had shit to do]

19. BURNIE: I have shit to do too!

20. GEOFF: No::

21. BURNIE: I have just as much shit to fill up my day as you do but then it had to be done!

22. GEOFF: I was in the middle of-

23. BURNIE: -Not even!

24. GEOFF: -I was in crunch time or something or other.

25. GUS: Hey hey hey, what would the Skittz say? Calm down everyone

26. GEOFF: I'm sorry

27. GUS: Don't be mean

28. GEOFF: Burnie I'm sorry

29. GUS: What would the Skittz do?

30. BURNIE: (Smiling) Listen, I'm a man of importance according to this email.

31. GEOFF: Let's have a pleasant nice time

32. JOEL: I like it when you guys argue, you know-

33. GUS: -The Skittz' only friend is GamerChick09

34. BURNIE: I-I-and Gus.

35. GEOFF: (Smiling) THAT'S a real account

36. GUS: He needs more friends

37. BURNIE: Yeah, you mean his other account?

38. GUS: @@@@

39. JOEL: I'll bom-I'm-im -befriending him, I am befriending him

40. BURNIE: Yeah I'll make-I'm gonna give Joel his friendship award

41. GUS: His friendship award

42. JOEL: Like the Boy Scouts or something

43. BURNIE: But Gus back me up here, who- who is the only guy that'll send you links for the link dump after the podcast is over?

44. GUS: Burnie

45. BURNIE: That's me

46. GUS: The man-

47. BURNIE: Every week

48. GUS: The man of importance

49. BURNIE: If I talk about it, and I has to be Link Dumped, I send him the link to it

50. GUS: (Whispering) I can find it anyway

51. BURNIE: I-

52. GEOFF: O:::::::

53. BURNIE: Alright

In line 2 Geoff takes a stance that is aligned with Gus and in opposition to Mr. Skittz (the writer of the email). Although Geoff is not entirely serious in his outrage, and he indicates this by choosing to focus on the technical aspects of Gus' job on the podcast rather than his role in the conversations which is what Mr. Skittz had been referring to. This is a tease directed at Gus. Then when Gus says "it's easy to judge from the couch when you don't know what's going on," he is aligning himself with Geoff and constructing Mr. Skittz as below, and inconsequential to, everybody on the podcast. In this move, Gus is supporting Geoff's humor frame without fully committing to it; resisting being constructed by Mr Skittz and by Geoff as worthless to the conversation. Geoff agrees with Gus in line 4, but then continues to emphasize the tediousness of the technical aspects of Gus' job on the podcast, and he brings Burnie in for a little teasing as well, exaggerating the amount of complaining that Burnie did. This appears to genuinely offend Burnie who begins yelling in line 11.

The exchanges that follow are between an angry Burnie and a relatively laid back Geoff with Geoff trying to first defend himself. Then in line 20, Geoff tries to construct the whole exchange as part of the humor frame. He just says "no" but his tone sounds more like he is playing with a child than actually trying to defend his choices. And this occurs shortly after Gus is heard laughing over the exchanges. Geoff tries once more to redefine the frame as a humorous one in line 24, suggesting that he does not even know what his excuse is for failing to help out. But it is Gus who successfully reframes the interaction in line 25.

When Gus poses the question "what would the Skittz say?" He mockingly puts Mr. Skittz in a position above them, constructing him as a person they do not want to disappoint. This gets Geoff to change tactics immediately and he adopts a position of fake contrition, supporting Gus' joke. Geoff apologizes to Burnie, but because the apology exists in a play frame, it can be real and not real at the same time. This allows both participants to move past the argument without having to accept whatever identity losing it would convey. Then when Burnie says "listen, I'm a man of importance according to this email," he is joining in on the joke and acknowledging that he might have been a little full of himself.

Once everybody is back in agreement, Gus points out that Mr. Skittz only has one friend on their social networking website. This orients them all towards Mr. Skittz, and moves from gentle mocking to making fun of him more directly and harshly. Geoff and Burnie make jokes suggesting that he does not have any friends.

However, before the argument is settled Joel asserts that he likes it when the others argue; then in line 39 he chooses a stance aligning himself with Mr. Skittz, and this begins to divide the group again. In line 40 Burnie aligns himself with Joel and Mr. Skittz then reasserts his claim that he does more work around the office than the others. (Since it is an implied statement, it is not clear if Burnie includes Gus in his estimation of his lazy coworkers, but the fact that it isn't clear may be why Gus turns on him.) First, Gus calls back the term, "man of importance," to mock Burnie with it in line 48, then he directly undermines

58

Burnie's claim by suggesting that the extra work Burnie does is not as valuable as he thinks it is in line 50 and this sets them at odds with one another once again.

Though there is an argument taking place here, with the possible exception of Burnie's eruption in line 11, all of these moves are playfully antagonistic. Even the reading of the email by Burnie was a playful jab at Gus and Geoff, and it was done in order to provoke some sort of retaliation. Gus tries to remain mostly agreeable in the beginning; resisting a fight with Geoff while also resisting being constructed as a member of the podcast who contributes nothing. After things appear to have gotten out of hand, Gus manages to bring things back into the play frame.

Regarding Burnie's angry reaction to Geoff, extenuating circumstances make it nearly impossible to tell if Burnie is actually angry when he's actually angry. Burnie is well known throughout Rooster Teeth, but he is probably most famous for his role as the voice of Church in Red versus Blue, and Church much of the humor surrounding Church involves him being angry. So Burnie has over a decade of experience exploring anger as a performance and as a comedic device, and Rooster Teeth fans have plenty of experience being entertained by angry rants in Burnie's voice. Furthermore, Burnie is the creator of Red versus Blue and for the first few seasons, he was the sole writer and director. This means he also has plenty of experience crafting angry constructions and tailoring

them to certain people or circumstances. So whether his anger is genuine or not, he is still performing it with an awareness of its entertainment value.

As a CoP, the practice for most of the members of the Rooster Teeth Podcast is to project a group identity, as well as individual identities within the group. The group and individual identities are expected to be funny and entertaining. To that end, they need to tell funny jokes, and/or behave in ways that make people laugh, and they need to provide interesting factoids or tell interesting stories. They also need to be able to exchange insults while supporting a smooth flow of conversation. And they need to walk a line between holding back on politeness strategies to demonstrate closeness and being respectful.

Trajectories of Newcomers

The scheduling of who is on the podcast is mostly dependent on who is available at the time. Joel and Matt first appeared on the show because they were the only ones available. Many of Matt's subsequent appearances were for the same reason. The podcast is usually recorded at around 5 or 6 o'clock, when most people are finishing up work for the day, but being an entertainment production company means that different divisions of Rooster Teeth have projects go into crunch time at different times of the month or year. This means that there are weeks when few people are available at the regular recording time. So having a short run on, or a long hiatus from, the podcast does not necessarily mean that a newcomer has failed in some way. The only way to trace a

newcomer's performance and trajectory is to look for changes in their behavior

that indicate shifts in their identity over time. Gavin's first appearance on the

podcast is an odd one, because everybody except Gus was busy for most of the

day. So, Gus got Geoff, Gavin, and Matt to take part of the show in shifts. This

meant that Gus first had a one on one conversation with Geoff, then he had a

conversation with Gavin where Matt was in the room but working on something

else, then he had a conversation with Matt.

One pattern that occurs when male newcomers join is that they are

treated warmly and gently at first. (The only female newcomer in the first two

years of the podcast is Geoff's wife; it is expected that that relationship would

make her experience very different than other newcomers.) The core members

directly index the expertise of the newcomer; explaining his value in the company

to the audience. They talk about his position and praise his work. Then they

give him a chance to talk about his work. They ask about how he likes his job

and how he got into the field. There is some teasing in the beginning but it is not

as intense or as frequent as the teasing that they generally aim at each other.

Here are some examples from Gavin's first appearance in episode 17 (2009):

1. GUS: Alright now that we got rid of Geoff, I went ahead and grabbed Gavino and brought him in here. How's it going Gavino?

2. GAVIN: Pretty good, how's it goin' how was Geoff's one

3. GUS: Geoff's was great you have a lot to live up to

4. GAVIN: Yeah?

5. GUS: Yeah

61

6. GAVIN: I like the flashing light on your headphones

7. GUS: Thanks-

8. GAVIN: See immediately I start talking about something that people can't see

9. GUS: @@@ The-e-e- the coolest thing about these headphones is how they're gold plated... with platinum accents

10. GAVIN: I'm not seeing any gold, or platinum

11. GUS: <Whispering> Play along dude, they can't see it

12. GAVIN: I can see, sort of, green sludge

13. GUS: @@@ That's-that's way more like it

14. GAVIN: Yeah

15. GUS: See the blinking light means I'm in charge

16. GAVIN: Yeah?

17. GUS: I'm running the show here

18. GAVIN: Do I have a blinking light?

19. GUS: No you do not have a blinking light

20. GAVIN: Hey, let's talk about something important-nobody cares

There is an introduction and some joking. Gavin immediately makes an audio format faux pas but realizes right away and calls himself out on it. This is some light self-deprecating humor which Gus supports by trying to contribute more humor. Gavin does not recognize the joke which does not deter Gus. Gus continues to try to make the headphones an object of humor until Gavin realizes that the conversation has become dull and calls for a change of topic without

actually choosing one. This is a good move for Gavin because it shows that he

can recognize when the podcast has lost its entertainment value, but he does not

take complete control of it either. He is not constructing himself as someone who

is entitled to take over the conversation. Gus moves on to asking Gavin about

his trips to the U.S., and about his role at Rooster Teeth, which has the effect of

building his credibility as a member of the Rooster Teeth CoP for the podcast

audience who may not be familiar with Gavin through the website.

31. GUS: So what-what are you doing-like what's uh, uh-I know-I know

we're- we're all real busy and doing a bunch of unusual stuff today but for people

listening what kind of stuff do you do day to day? What kind of things do you do

around the office.

32. GAVIN: Well the first time I came here I was intern, right? I just got
    stuff, helped out where people needed it. And now I'm director of Red
    versus Blue

33. GUS: That's like the- the biggest jump up the corporate ladder ever-

34. GAVIN: I think it is @@@@ That's like when you take like four steps
    at a time

35. GUS: Yeah, you went from getting me coffee to getting everyone in
    the office coffee

36. GAVIN: [Right]   @@@@
37. GUS: [Lo:t of] responsibility

However, by episode 27 (2009), the core members appear to simply be

fed up with Gavin. They might be indulging in the type of angry humor

performance mentioned earlier, or they might be stressed out from having altered

63

their schedule from recording a podcast once a week to recording a podcast

every day for a week, but they all heap insults on Gavin as if they hope he will

never return to the podcast. For almost the first 200 lines they all engage in the

usual sort of dialogue with the usual sort of teasing. There is an argument about

the office cat with Gus and Geoff on one side and Burnie and Gavin on the other,

but it plays out in the humor frame. (Burnie and Geoff raise their voices, but

there is much less anger expressed than in the example from episode # 42

discussed previously.) But then Gus teases Burnie, telling him that if cats could

be zombies he would be "infected instantly," and Gavin asks if it is true that cats

cannot become zombies. Geoff's reaction to Gavin's question and further

responses can only be described as increasingly venomous.

> 200. GEOFF: Duh have you ever seen a fuckin- or read anything about a cat being a zombie EVER?!

> 201. GAVIN: Well I- I didn't think any other- any animal could get zombified but I seen zombie dogs

> 202. GEOFF: Let me ask- let me ask you a question Gavin, have you EVER READ anything ever, in any capacity? About your history? A-a novel-have ya ever read-can you read?

> 203. ...

> 204. GAVIN: No

Here Gavin tries to contribute to the humor frame by engaging in a little

self-deprecating humor, but it only prompts further insults from the other

participants.

209. BURNIE: -the last few days cuz we traveled together to Seatle. He doesn't know shit

210. GUS: [No he doesn't]
211. GAVIN: [@@@@]
212. GEOFF: [No nothing]

213. GUS: Any time we ask him a question here on the podcast he's like (babbling sound made by flicking a finger up and down over the lips)

214. GAVIN: Alright well what didn't I know?

215. GUS: You didn't know how many feet were in a mile!

216. BURNIE: Okay I'll- I can- I got a better one for you

217. GAVIN: @@@

218. GEOFF: He's got a WAY better one for you

219. BURNIE: So, this is Gav's idea of stimulating conversation on the plane

220. GAVIN: @@@@

221. BURNIE: He says "Hey Burnie do you think that anyone has ever had the idea to take a long set of headphones-like eight feet, long, and you take the eight-foot chord and you swallow, the end of it and you wait till it comes out your bum and then you plug in the iPod into the part that comes out your but- bum- and then you listen to the headphones that are coming out your mouth?" And I said "Well you'd need a chord a lot longer than eight feet to get through your digestive system" and he goes "no you wouldn't, why would you need that?" And I said "cuz you have like thirty feet of intestines." And he said- and I- it- I'm gonna have to demonstrate to you but he points to his mouth, he goes "No it goes from here" then he points to his stomach "down to here and then straight out." And I said "Do you Really think that's how your DIGESTIVE system works?!" And he goes, "Yeah." And I go "You have one little shot of intestines and that's it?" He has no idea.

222. GUS: You're a-

223. GAVIN: That's that's completely not what I said

224. GEOFF: It's like a sink right? It's like a J-bend and then you're fuckin' out

225. GAVIN: @@@@

226. GUS: You're a fucking moron

227. GAVIN: I know-I know about the small intestine and the large intestine.

228. GUS: NOW apparently

229. GAVIN: NO I-

230. GUS: You thought it was an eight foot shot from your mouth to your asshole

231. GAVIN: I didn't know @@-

232. BURNIE: To him it's like he probly got his anatomy lessons [from like the Tums] commercial [where it's just a white] circle in {the middle} of the body and then that's it.
233. GAVIN: [I meant meters man]   [I meant meters how-]
234. GUS: {@@@}

235. GAVIN: How many- how many meters of intestines are there?

236. GUS: Meters? Uh probly close to ten.

237. GAVIN: se-well eight wasn't far off then was it?

238. GUS: Eight [feet]
239. BURNIE: [You said] eight feet!

240. GAVIN: Well I obviously didn't mean feet though did I?!

241. GUS: Obviously you did!

Through the whole stretch of conversation Gavin laughs multiple times,

fully participating in the humor frame. But by line 223, all of his turns in the

conversation become attempts to defend himself and by line 233 he no longer gives any indication that he is trying to maintain the humor frame. Similar stretches occur in each subsequent podcast episode until Gavin returns to England after they record episode 30. While the podcasts are not solely made up of teasing Gavin, he does receive a disproportionate amount of it.

A similar thing happens to Jack as well. Jacks first appearance on the podcast occurs in episode 28 (2009), while Gavin is still there. Gavin gets teased 25 times, while Jack gets teased 9 times. For some perspective, in the same episode Gus only gets teased 3 times and Geoff gets teased 12 times. They give Jack a chance to index his expertise in multiple ways. First it is explained that he makes videos with Geoff wherein they demonstrate how to collect Achievements in X-Box games ("Achievement" is Microsoft's term for digital merit badges earned for specific accomplishments in video games beyond completing the objective of the game; Sony has something similar on the Play Station consoles, but they call them "Trophies," and confusing the terms is a significant faux pas among gamers). Then Gavin asks Jack how to pick up a certain Achievement, which allows Jack time to demonstrate his knowledge and skills.

However, as soon as Gavin leaves, Jack becomes the target of abuse. In episode 31 (2009), the first after Gavin is gone, Joel admits that he brought Jack onto the podcast because he knew Gus and Geoff needed somebody to pick on. Gus and Geoff acknowledge this and have fun with it

29. JOEL: I'm really surprised it's not to the point yet where as soon as Jack walks into the office you guys just don't run up and punch him right in the balls.

30. GUS: @@@

31. GEOFF: We're getting there-

32. GUS: That's the best ide@a @ev@er

33. JACK: That's a horrible idea

34. GEOFF: @@@

35. GUS: I mean the second Jack walks in it jus- it @@@ it's unrelenting with him I don't know how he puts up with it.

36. JACK: Uh: I've lived a rough life. I've- I have a lot of uh being picked on

37. JOEL: It's like we fa-

38. GEOFF: -How old are you Jack?

39. JOEL: I'm twenty-seven

40. GEOFF: twenty-seven and living at home with your parents sounds pretty rough

41. ALL: @@@@@@@

In line 36, Jack is trying to play along and maintain the humor frame, but that just gives Geoff another thing to tease him over. In line 40, Geoff says something that constructs Jack's identity as a loser, which Jack resists, quickly moving from trying to maintain the humor frame to trying to defend himself.

46. JACK: I just moved back

47. GEOFF: When you get home at like eleven o'clock at night and you're like "M:o::m can I have some mac and cheese?"

48. JACK: This is after living away from home-

49. GEOFF: "Could you wash my clo:::thes"

50. GUS: "I-I'm sorry I'm past cerfe::::w"

51. GEOFF: "There's no [toilet pa::pe:::r.] M:o:::m."
52. GUS: [@ @ @ @]

53. JACK: *Sighs*

   However, Jack's attempts to defend himself only give Geoff more

ammunition with which to attack him. The teasing continues until Jack indicates

that he is fed up.

74. JACK: I Just moved back to town and I'm not sure exactly what the
     next few months are gonna hold for me

75. GEOFF: OH Right you moved out to L.A. to make it big. How long
     were you in L.A.?

76. GUS: @ @ @ @ @ @

77. GEOFF: W@hat w@as th@at wh@at w@as th@at? You did uh- you
     gave it a good three months or so?

78. JACK: Holy shit! Jesus. I'm gonna walk out, fuck all you guys.

Geoff and Gus ease off on the teasing for a bit. They attempt to calm

Jack down but the situation has evolved into a type of meta humor, where the

humor is not necessarily in what is being said, just the fact that they are picking

on Jack is enough to carry the humor frame. The teasing is far from over and

Jack knows it.

87. GUS: No-no-no-no-no no let's-let-let-let-let's go about this a little more
     diplomatic Geoff

88. GEOFF: Okay

89. GUS: How are you doing Jack?

90. JACK: @@@ I was doing great 'til we started this podcast

91. GUS: @@@

92. GEOFF: Okay

93. JACK: Now suddenly my emotions are crushed

94. GUS: Uh I have something I want to say to you Jack

95. JACK: Oh God. You know- is this- this is- Okay what is it?

96. GUS: You're a piece of shit.

97. ALL: @@@@@@@

Jack seems to recognize the value of the humor frame, because he does not follow through on his threat to walk out. In line 90 Jack laughs, indicating support for the humor frame even though he knows he is about to be teased again. In line 95 Jack is hesitant. He is ultimately willing to play along but after having spent several minutes enduring this abuse, he does not know exactly what is coming but he knows it will be another attack. In line 96, Gus gives a name to the identity that they have been constructing for Jack. It is mean, but it is also a humorous catharsis. They have spent the last few minutes referring to aspects of Jack's life that are undeniable and indirectly index this identity that they are building for him. When Gus simply states what they have been implying there is a release of tension, and in line 97 Jack is among those laughing. In this episode, Jack is teased 39 times while everybody else is teased between 10 and 15 times.

Table 6. Teasing in Episode # 31

Teases Sent		Teases Received	
Geoff	40	Geoff	14
Gus	16	Gus	15
Joel	9	Joel	11
Jack	9	Jack	39

There are three ways to interpret this in relation to a CoP model. First, it could be that the RT Podcast is not a CoP. However, it is a group of people, mutually engaged in a common practice, that produces an artifact, and has a shared domain of knowledge. Further, Lave and Wenger (1991) claim that a CoP is just a group of people engaged in a common practice. Wenger (1998) added the other stipulations (producing an artifact, and having a shared repertoire) later, while also claiming that the lens could apply to any group of people engaged in the same practice. The artifact here is the podcast, and their shared repertoire can be seen in their use of video game culture jargon (like using "hundred percent" and "thousand point" as verbs or the very specific use of "Achievement"), their use of web design jargon (like "colo," short for "collocation facility," meaning the facility that houses servers that store the videos for their website), and their use of film industry jargon (like "squibs," the small explosives that get implanted on a set or in an actor's costume that make it look like a bullet has just hit that spot). Furthermore, the "link dump" (the list of web links to

anything important that is mentioned in the podcast that accompanies each episode of the podcast), is an example of both the shared repertoire and an artifact produced by the Rooster Teeth Podcast CoP, since they create it together and they have their own term for it.

The second possible interpretation is that it is a dysfunctional CoP. Lave and Wenger (1991) did cover a case, the butcher's union, where the CoP had a tendency to marginalize newcomers and make it very difficult for members to become masters of the trade. This is a definite possibility; at the time of this writing, eight years after its beginning, Gus Sorola is still managing and editing the podcast. Gus's control over the Podcast has led several Rooster Teeth employees to dub him "The Podcast King," and whether this is meant as a term of endearment or a term of derision is not clear.

The third possibility is that it is a functional CoP. It may be the case that when the other founding members of Rooster Teeth, Joel and Matt, appeared on the Podcast, they (intentionally or not) set up this dynamic, and that the newcomers recognized this as a humorous and entertaining formula and adopted the role, in Joel's absence. It may also be the case that it is still a professional environment, and their individual senses of politeness prevent them from teasing their bosses as often or as harshly as they are being teased, but they recognize the importance of maintaining the humor frame. There is some evidence for this because by episode 45 (2010), about 15 weeks after Jack joined and Gavin left, the teasing of Jack has decreased significantly. He is still the most teased

72

member of the group, and he only fires back one time, but the numbers are much closer to the numbers from early episodes with Joel. Consider that episode 4 is about 40 minutes long while episode 45 is about 90 minutes long:

Table 3. Teasing in Episode # 4

Teases Sent		Teases Received	
Burnie	9	Burnie	8
Geoff	7	Geoff	3
Gus	5	Gus	6
Joel	3	Joel	8

Table 7. Teasing in Episode # 45

Teases Sent		Teases Received	
Burnie	11	Burnie	3
Geoff	6	Geoff	8
Gus	11	Gus	6
Jack	1	Jack	12

It is also important to note that the politeness strategies used by the newcomers, aside from avoiding teasing the old-timers, are the same ones used by the old-timers from the very beginning. Gavin, Jack, and Monty use direct language, and curse words, in the same way Geoff, Burnie, and Gus do. They also use "um," "uh," and "well" as place holders to claim and maintain the conversational floor instead of as hedges to soften the blows when they have to

disagree with a statement that somebody else has made, exactly like Geoff, Burnie, and Gus do. (Occasionally Gavin will take the conversational floor by asking "can I ask you a question?" This might be due to his English upbringing, or he might be following the examples set by Burnie and Geoff, but it is the only obvious politeness strategy that he employs.) This is a group identity practice that demonstrates the closeness of their relationships and creates a closeness and a simulated sense of camaraderie for the audience as well.

While Gavin and Jack had similar experiences, Monty's was different. The first time he appears on the podcast, in episode 56 (2010), Burnie, Gus, and Geoff converse with each other for almost five minutes before ever acknowledging his presence. When they finally prompt him to join the conversation, his first attempt is met with immediate teasing.

3. GUS: we – despite all of the talk that we've been having so far we actually do have a silent forth sitting in the podcast I just want him to speak up-

4. BURNIE:: @@@@he's waiting for all –

5. GEOFF: say hello– Say hello silent fourth

6. MONTY: W::hat up yo

7. GEOFF: All right there you go that's Gangster Oum

8. GUS: Okay, okay y-

9. BURNIE:: –So Mont –

10. GUS: – OK @@ you can go back to sleep now Monty

11. BURNIE:: M@@- Monty's first words ever heard on-as-as a member of the company were "what up yo"

12. GEOFF: "What up yo" @@

Then Gus tries to explain what Monty does for the company, like they do for all of the other newcomers, but Burnie (probably unintentionally) hijacks the conversation and begins talking about Jack.

13. GUS: @@@ so yeah we got Monty on the podcast who is our most recent hire-I guess uh at Rooster Teeth who's helping us work with-on uh Red versus Blue season eight-

14. BURNIE: -So-you know Jack is on a Jet Blue flight today. New York to see Crysis 2. You know that's-I would imagine like that's the way you actually would play Crysis 2 is that- it's system requirements would be so intensive that you have to FLY to @a d@ifferent city

15. GUS: [@@@]
16. GEOFF: [@@@]

The conversation meanders about throughout the episode, like it often does, but Monty only fully participates when the topic is video games, or computer programming. These are his areas of expertise, and he can speak in great depth and at great length. However, keeping to these subjects (and only making an occasional comment when the conversation veers into other subjects) severely limits his participation in the podcast. This allows Monty to continually index his expertise, but it seems to backfire on him. One of two things inevitably happens when Monty gets to hold the conversational floor for an extended period. Out of what appears to be genuine interest, the old-timers ask increasingly in depth questions and eventually they ask one that he cannot answer, and then the subject is changed. The other thing that happens is that one of the old-timers will tease him or make a joke about something else, and the

subject gets changed as the rest of the old-timers will then engage with the humor frame that has been set up. Using teasing as a metric again: Gavin was teased 3 times in his first appearance on the podcast, Jack was teased 8 times in his first appearance, but Monty was teased 28 times in his first appearance.

While Gavin and Jack had a chance to go on the podcast for a run of multiple consecutive episodes, Monty first appeared on episode 56 in April of 2010 and did not appear again until episode 80 in September of the same year. Then he did not appear again until episode 152 in February of 2012. It is not clear why Monty did not participate in the podcast as much as he seemed to want to. He is the only newcomer who reported having listened to every previous episode in preparation for his first appearance, and he later reported that he continued to listen to every episode. He did get to participate in most of the episodes between 160 and 170, but many of his appearances are the result of him walking into the room during the recording session. Also, even when Monty was invited on the podcast, he did not take part in the conversation as often as other members.

When considering Monty's role in the podcast one more episode must be considered. Episode 170 was chosen as the cap for this study, but episode 309 contains Rooster Teeth members reflecting on Monty's role in the podcast and in the company. In the beginning of 2015, Monty had a severe allergic reaction to post-surgery medication that he had been prescribed and he slipped into a coma. He was in a coma for about a week before he past away. While he was in the

coma, Rooster Teeth skipped a podcast. Burnie explains, in episode 309, that they were all concerned for Monty and they did not think they could record a podcast without talking about him, but they also did not know if he would want them to discuss his medical issues and they wanted to respect his privacy. Then Monty slipped away on Sunday, February 1, 2015 and they recorded episode 309 on Monday, February 2, 2015. Burnie explains "If we missed two podcasts in a row, on Monty's behalf, I don't think Monty would've liked that very much." (By this point, the podcast was a video podcast and it was recorded and streamed live to the internet every Monday, much like a regular live television show except accessible only through the internet.) Gus then explains that Monty was around most of the time when they were recording the podcast, even though he was not featured regularly. Burnie then tells about how whenever Monty was not actually in the room during the recording, he was working on something at his desk while watching or listening to the podcast at the same time, and he was engaging Burnie from his desk through Twitter. Monty often alerted Burnie through Twitter when the conversation covered something that the podcast had already covered, and provided suggestions when the members of the podcast asked for them. Even though Monty did not, perhaps could not, participate in the podcast in the way everybody else did, it is clear that it was important to him, and he forged a new way to participate.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

Discussion

My findings indicate that the Rooster Teeth Podcast CoP is one that values humor and entertainment above all else. The founding members tease each other frequently, and often with surprising aggression. They even tease each other through conflicts. As mentioned above, this is because, as professionals in the entertainment industry, they recognize the entertainment value in conflict and the comedic value in being playfully antagonistic when dealing with conflict. The practice of the community is making jokes and having interesting conversations. I found that newcomers are introduced with glowing praise which indexes their expertise and demonstrates their value to the company. Then they are teased rather mercilessly which either socializes them into the CoP or it does not. (They are also given some explicit instruction when it comes to technical aspects like speaking into the microphone, yawning or coughing away from the microphone, being aware of the furniture and not bumping or rubbing it in a way that makes it squeak. Though this becomes an area for teasing as well when newcomers and old-timers alike make mistakes.) Old-timers model these practices by making jokes and teasing each other which indicates that this behavior is appreciated. If newcomers cannot provide enough humor and/or interesting conversation, then they become the target of the old-timers' jokes.

This is a system that works well for the old-timers, the CoP in general, and could be a powerful strategy for other podcasts with a similar conversational format. Operating in this way means that experienced podcasters don't need people to be good at performing on the podcast. This allows the podcast to take anybody who happens to be available at the time and that is important. From the first appearances of Joel, Matt, and Gavin it became clear that they are somewhat at the mercy of the availability of Rooster Teeth's other employees. Rooster Teeth Productions is large enough now that the Rooster Teeth Podcast is never short of available performers, but Gus may still find himself in a situation where all of the experienced and likable people are busy elsewhere, and other podcasts that are not associated with large companies could benefit from the same strategy as long as they have one experienced and funny person. The fact that they can fall back on teasing whoever is there, means that they just need people to be there and participate in the discussions. If the newcomer is boring or weird, or unlikable to the audience in some other way, that does not make the show less enjoyable. From the perspective of the newcomers, it means that, if they want to stay on the podcast, they need to be comfortable being berated. They will inevitably be the butt of many jokes, and that will only decrease if they develop the ability to be entertaining on the fly.

However, the one thing that the podcast needs that newcomers may not be able to provide is the one thing that any CoP needs: participation. This is an important point. It seems obvious that a community of practice needs people to

engage in the practice, but this study demonstrates that it is not always that straight forward. Monty ran into a problem because he did not speak that much. If newcomers do not contribute in any way, then the old-timers have nothing to work with. (Monty contributed in a limited way.) It seems there are people who join a CoP only to find that the practice is not as easy, or simply nothing like, what they imagined it would be from outside of the community. Because of the dynamics of this particular CoP, and because of Monry's role in the larger Rooster Teeth community, Monty was allowed to participate on his own terms, which allowed him to have a profound impact on the practice from his peripheral position. While Monty was not one of these people, there are also people who believe that just showing up is enough to become an accepted member of a community or to learn a practice. Examples of people who behave as though they believe this can be found in college classrooms across the country, but an example from CoP scholarship would probably be Kim, from Emma Moore's 2006 study. Kim hangs out with the group known as the Townies, but she does not do the work of representing herself as a Townie or engage in the Townie enterprise and she is therefore considered a "wannabe." So, the fact that CoPs require members to participate in the practice may seem obvious but it bears repeating, and it bears investigating what happens when members engage only partially.

Gavin and Jack, as well as many later newcomers, jumped into conversations and when they failed to be entertaining, they just blundered

through the gauntlet of insults that awaited them. Monty was more reserved.

Since he listened to every episode of the podcast before ever joining it, he may

have been trying to make more calculated moves that would put him on the same

footing as the other members of the podcast. Though he was willing to criticize

the podcast and its members, he may also have been relying on politeness

strategies that prevented him from jumping into the conversation as often as the

podcast requires. Whatever his personal reasons were, Monty did not participate

as much in conversation when he was on the podcast and this may be the

reason why he never became a regular member.

Monty contradicts one of my initial findings. Gus reported after Monty's

death that they did not consider him a regular member of the podcast but they

appreciated the fact that he was almost always nearby, watching them record

from off set. Though it is generally true that a short run or a long hiatus does not

mean that a newcomer has failed in some way, as supported by Gavin's original

short run and long hiatus, in Monty's case it could be indicative of having failed in

some way. The fact that Monty was in the room while the podcast was recording

and livestreaming, means that he was available and yet he still was not

participating. If his goal was to follow a similar trajectory to Gavin and Jack, he

was not progressing along that path. Even so, Monty actually did have a fair

amount of success with the podcast once it became a livestream video podcast.

He is an example of a person whose trajectory into a CoP reaches a comfortable

spot in the periphery and stays there. Many of Monty's later appearances on the

podcast were unplanned. They happened as a result of the conversation veering

into his area of expertise and the hosts telling him to grab a microphone and take

a seat on the couch. This allowed him to participate at the level that he was

comfortable with.

Monty is also an example of meaning and practice being negotiated by

someone on the periphery. After he died, Burnie reported that even when Monty

was not in the room, he was always listening to the livestream while it was live.

Whenever the members of the podcast began speaking about something that

they had already discussed on the podcast, Monty alerted Burnie via text

message. Burnie seems to find this annoying but also helpful and endearing.

So, as a peripheral member of the CoP, and not one with a superior rank in the

professional hierarchy, Monty managed to influence the practice of the

community.

Areas for Further Research

From an ethnographic perspective, since these innovators have always

been happy to document and share their ideas, experiences, and their thoughts

on video game culture, and the fact that Rooster Teeth has multiple platforms

from which to do so, the areas for further research are almost infinite. One could

look at any series that Rooster Teeth produces, that claims, or appears, to

include natural talk, and analyze it in the same way, and compare it to this

analysis Geoff left the podcast and started one within the Acheivement Hunter

division, called Off Topic. Geoff, Gavin, and Jack are regular members of the Off

Topic Podcast, but Gavin and Jack still appear regularly on the Rooster Teeth

Podcast. So tracing Gavin and Jack through to 2017 should be even easier than

tracking them through 2012, and they would be considered the old-timers of the

Off Topic podcast. Another option would be to look at the text posts that

members write in the Rooster Teeth forums, this would provide further insight

into these people and the identities they are concerned with projecting, and

further insight into the practices of the communities within Rooster Teeth.

Outside of Rooster Teeth, it would be interesting to know how universal the

strategy of teasing newcomers mercilessly until they improve really is. Are there

any other podcasts that operate in the same way? Are there many other

podcasts that operate the same way?

APPENDIX

DATA TABLES

Table 1. Teasing in Episode # 1

Teases Sent		Teases Received	
Burnie	56	Burnie	25
Gus	14	Gus	14
Geoff	24	Geoff	54

Table 2. Teasing in Episode # 2

Teases Sent		Teases Received	
Burnie	5	Burnie	12
Gus	6	Gus	1
Geoff	7	Geoff	4
Joel	0	Joel	3

Table 3. Teasing in Episode # 4

Teases Sent		Teases Received	
Burnie	9	Burnie	8
Geoff	7	Geoff	3
Gus	5	Gus	6
Joel	3	Joel	8

Table 4. Who Teases the Most in Each Early Episode

Episodes	1	2	3	4	5	7	9	10	11	12	13
Burnie	1	3	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	2
Gus	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	1	3		3
Geoff	2	1	1	2	2		2	1	2	3	1
Joel		4		4			4				4
Matt						1				2	

Table 5. Who Gets Teased the Most in Each Early Episode

Episodes	1	2	3	4	5	7	9	10	11	12	13
Burnie	2	1	2	1	2	1	3	2	4	2	4
Gus	3	4	3	2	2	2	1	3	2		2
Geoff	1	2	1	3	1		3	1	3	2	3
Joel		3		1			2		1		1
Matt						2				1	

Table 6. Teasing in Episode # 31

Teases Sent		Teases Received	
Geoff	40	Geoff	14
Gus	16	Gus	15
Joel	9	Joel	11
Jack	9	Jack	39

Table 7. Teasing in Episode # 45

Teases Sent		Teases Received	
Burnie	11	Burnie	3
Geoff	6	Geoff	8
Gus	11	Gus	6
Jack	1	Jack	12

REFERENCES

Benwell, Bethan and Elizabeth Stokoe. "Constructing Discussion Tasks in

University Tutorials: Shifting Dynamics and Identities." Discourse Studies,

vol. 4, no. 4, 2002: 429-453.

Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. Politeness: Some Universals in

Language Usage Vol. 4. Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Bucholtz, Mary. "'Why Be Normal?': Language and Identity Practices in a

Community of Nerd Girls." Language in Society, vol. 28, no. 2, 1999: 203-

223.

Bucholtz, Mary. "The Politics Of Transcription." Journal of Pragmatics, vol. 32,

no.10, 2000: 1439-1465.

Bucholtz, Mary and Kira Hall. "Identity and Interaction: A Sociocultural Linguistic

Approach." Discourse Studies, vol. 7, no. 4-5, 2005: 585-614.

Burns, Michael, Gustavo Sorola, and Geoff Ramsey. "Rooster Teeth Podcast #

1." Rooster Teeth Podcast. Rooster Teeth Productions. 09 Dec 2008.

http://roosterteeth.com/episode/rt-podcast-season-1-rooster-teeth-

podcast-1. 23 Mar 2017.

Burns, Michael, Gustavo Sorola and Geoff Ramsey. "Rooster Teeth Podcast #

3." Rooster Teeth Podcast. Rooster Teeth Productions. 17 Apr 2008.

http://roosterteeth.com/episode/rt-podcast-season-1-rooster-teeth-

podcast-3. 23 Mar 2017.

Burns, Michael, Gustavo Sorola, Geoff Ramsey, and Joel Heyman. "Rooster

Teeth Podcast # 2." Rooster Teeth Podcast. Rooster Teeth Productions.

10 Apr 2009. http://roosterteeth.com/episode/rt-podcast-season-1-rooster-

teeth-podcast-2. 23 Mar 2017.

Burns, Michael, Gustavo Sorola, Geoff Ramsey, and Joel Heyman. "Rooster

Teeth Podcast # 4." Rooster Teeth Podcast. Rooster Teeth Productions.

08 May 2009. http://roosterteeth.com/episode/rt-podcast-season-1-

rooster-teeth-podcast-4. 23 Mar 2017.

Chen, Rong, Lin He, and Chunmei Hu. "Chinese Requests: In Comparison to

American and Japanese Requests and with Reference to the "East-West

Divide." Journal of Pragmatics, vol. 55, 2013: 140-161.

Dredge, Stuart. "Rooster Teeth Plays the Video Game: 'We're Competing with

Netflix and HBO'." The Guardian. 16 Apr. 2015,

www.theguardian.com/technology/2015/apr/16/rooster-teeth-netflix-hbo-

youtube-lazer-team-gamergate. Accessed 17 March 2017.

Eckert, Penelope and Etienne Wenger. "What Is the Role Of Power in

Sociolinguistic Variation." Journal of Sociolinguistics, vol. 9, no. 4, 2005:

582-589.

Emerson, Joan P. "Negotiating the Serious Import of Humor." Sociometry, Vol.

32, No. 2, 1969: 169-181.

Gamble, Jennifer. "Humor in Apes." Humor – International Journal of Humor

Research, vol. 14, no. 2, 2001: 163-179.

Gervais, Mathew, David Sloan Wilson. "The Evolution and Functions of Laughter

    and Humor: A Synthetic Approach." The Quarterly Review of Biology, vol.

    80, no. 4, 2005: 395-430.

Goffman, Erving. "Footing." Semiotica, vol. 25, no. 1-2, 1979: 1-30.

Goffman, Erving. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Anchor, 1959.

Hay, Jennifer. "The Pragmatics of Humor Support." Humor – International

    Journal of Humor Research, vol. 14, no. 1, 2001: 55-82.

Jacoby, Sally, and Patrick Gonzales. "The Constitution of Expert-Novice in

    Scientific Discourse." Issues in Applied Linguistics, vol. 2, no. 2, 1991:

    149-181.

Kane, Justine M. "Young African American Children Constructing Academic and

    Disciplinary Identities in an Urban Science Classroom." Science

    Education, vol. 96, no. 3, 2012: 457-487.

Lave, Jean, and Etienne Wenger. Situated learning: Legitimate Peripheral

    Participation. Cambridge University Press. 1991.

Meyerhoff, Miriam. "Biographies, Agency and Power." Journal of Sociolinguistics,

    vol. 9, no. 4, 2005: 595-601.

Moore, Emma. "'You Tell All The Stories': Using Narrative to Explore Hierarchy

    Within a Community of Practice." Journal of Sociolinguistics, vol. 10, no. 5,

    2006: 611-640.

Norrick, Neal. "Conversational Joking: Humor in Everyday Talk." Indiana

    University Press,1993.

Oring, Elliot. "Parsing the Joke: The General Theory of Verbal Humor and

Appropriate Incongruity." Humor-International Journal of Humor Research,

vol. 24, no. 2, 2011: 203-222.

Partington, Alan. The Linguistics Of Laughter: A Corpus-Assisted Study of

Laughter-Talk. Routledge. 2006.

Radcliffe-Brown, Alfred R. "A Further Note on Joking Relationships." Africa, vol.

19 no. 2, 1949: 133-140.

Robb, Nadia, Lisa Dunkley, Petra Boynton, and Trisha Greenhalgh. "Looking for

a Better Future: Identity Construction in Socio-Economically Deprived 16-

Year Olds Considering a Career in Medicine." Social Science & Medicine,

vol. 65, no. 4, 2007: 738-754.

Schnurr, Stephanie. "Constructing Leader Identities Through Teasing at Work."

Journal of Pragmatics, vol. 41, no. 6, 2009: 1125-1138.

Smith, Wendy B. "Footing, Resistance And Control: Negotiating A Traffic

Citation." Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, vol. 7, no. 2-3, 2010: 173-

186.

Sorola, Gustavo, Michael Burns, Matt Hulum, and Gray Haddock. "Rooster Teeth

Podcast # 309." Rooster Teeth Podcast. Rooster Teeth Productions. 02

Feb 2015. http://roosterteeth.com/episode/rt-podcast-season-1-rooster-

teeth-podcast-309. 9 Jul 2017.

Sorola, Gustavo, Michael Burns, Geoff Ramsey, and Gavin Free. "Rooster Teeth

Podcast # 27." Rooster Teeth Podcast. Rooster Teeth Productions. 24

Sep 2009. http://roosterteeth.com/episode/rt-podcast-season-1-rooster-teeth-podcast-27. 14 May 2017.

Sorola, Gustavo, Geoff Ramsey, Michael Burns, and Joel Heyman. "Rooster Teeth Podcast # 42." Rooster Teeth Podcast. Rooster Teeth Productions. 30 Dec 2009. http://roosterteeth.com/episode/rt-podcast-season-1-rooster-teeth-podcast-42. 30 Jun 2017.

Sorola, Gustavo, Geoff Ramsey, Michael Burns, and Monty Oum. "Rooster Teeth Podcast # 56." Rooster Teeth Podcast. Rooster Teeth Productions. 07 Apr 2010. http://roosterteeth.com/episode/rt-podcast-season-1-rooster-teeth-podcast-56. 17 May 2017.

Sorola, Gustavo, Geoff Ramsey, Michael Burns, and Jack Pattillo. "Rooster Teeth Podcast # 45." Rooster Teeth Podcast. Rooster Teeth Productions. 20 Jan 2010. http://roosterteeth.com/episode/rt-podcast-season-1-rooster-teeth-podcast-45. 30 Jun 2017

Sorola, Gustavo, Geoff Ramsey, Gavin Free, and Jack Pattillo. "Rooster Teeth Podcast # 28." Rooster Teeth Podcast. Rooster Teeth Productions. 25 Sep 2009. http://roosterteeth.com/episode/rt-podcast-season-1-rooster-teeth-podcast-28. 18 May 2017.

Sorola, Gustavo, Geoff Ramsey, Joel Heyman, and Jack Pattillo. "Rooster Teeth Podcast # 31." Rooster Teeth Podcast. Rooster Teeth Productions. 14 Oct 2009. http://roosterteeth.com/episode/rt-podcast-season-1-rooster-teeth-podcast-31. 21 May 2017.

Sorola, Gustavo, Geoff Ramsey, Matt Hulum, and Gavin Free. "Rooster Teeth

    Podcast # 17." Rooster Teeth Podcast. Rooster Teeth Productions. 05

    Aug 2009. http://roosterteeth.com/episode/rt-podcast-season-1-rooster-

    teeth-podcast-17. 23 Mar 2017.

Tulley, Christine. "iText Reconfigured: The Rise of the Podcast." Journal of

    Business and Technical Communication, vol. 25, no. 3, 2011: 256-275.

Wenger, Etienne. Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity.

    Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Zajdman, Anat. . "Contextualization of Canned Jokes in Discourse." Humor:

    International Journal of Humor Research, vol. 4, no. 1, 1991: 23-40

Zajdman, Anat. "Humorous Face-Threatening Acts: Humor as Strategy." Journal

    of Pragmatics, vol. 23, no. 3, 1995: 325-339.