



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Littler, J. & Couldry, N. (2008). The work of work: Reality TV and the negotiation of neoliberal labour in The Apprentice'. In: T. Austin & W. de Jong (Eds.), Rethinking documentary: new perspectives and practices. (pp. 258-267). Open University Press. ISBN 9780335221912

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/6037/>

Link to published version:

Copyright and reuse: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

publications@city.ac.uk

Littler, J. & Couldry, N. (2008). The work of work: Reality TV and the negotiation of neoliberal labour in 'The Apprentice'. In: T. Austin & W. de Jong (Eds.), *Rethinking documentary: new perspectives and practices*. (pp. 258-267). Open University Press. ISBN 9780335221912



**CITY UNIVERSITY
LONDON**

[City Research Online](#)

Original citation: Littler, J. & Couldry, N. (2008). The work of work: Reality TV and the negotiation of neoliberal labour in 'The Apprentice'. In: T. Austin & W. de Jong (Eds.), *Rethinking documentary: new perspectives and practices*. (pp. 258-267). Open University Press. ISBN 9780335221912

Permanent City Research Online URL: <http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/6037/>

Copyright & reuse

Reproduced with the kind permission of Open University Press. All rights reserved.

City University London has developed City Research Online so that its users may access the research outputs of City University London's staff. All material in City Research Online is checked for eligibility for copyright before being made available in the live archive. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to from other web pages.

Versions of research

The version in City Research Online may differ from the final published version. Users are advised to check the Permanent City Research Online URL above for the status of the paper.

Enquiries

If you have any enquiries about any aspect of City Research Online, or if you wish to make contact with the author(s) of this paper, please email the team at publications@city.ac.uk.

THE WORK OF WORK: REALITY TV AND THE NEGOTIATION OF NEOLIBERAL LABOUR IN *THE APPRENTICE*

NICK COULDRY AND JO LITTLER

‘This is a battle between the individuals now, and it’s going to be an incredible second half of the series’ Mark Frith, editor of *Heat*¹

Introduction

It has been argued that we face a crisis of ‘the society of formal work’ characterized by endemic instability in the work domain (Beck 2000: 21); and that, at the same time, powerful neoliberal discourses are seeking to eliminate social and collective opposition to that crisis’s consequences (Bourdieu 1998: 95-96). In this article we are concerned with the shift in work-focussed practices, norms and values that are inscribed within neoliberalism; more specifically, we look at how lived practices of work are reproduced in the high-profile ‘reality game’ of *The Apprentice*, specifically its UK version, and in the politics of its use of a documentary format.

There has been a shift in the forms of power and the social bonds which hold the workplace together (Sennett 2006). Organisations at all levels, from boards to sales forces, are required to respond ever more quickly to short-term demands (whether of stock market investors or powerful customers) (cf Bunting 2004: 36). This tends to undermine older models of bureaucratic power and foreground charismatic leaders who can front change at the apex of one-way command structures (enhanced by instant electronic communications) that rely primarily on a surveillance-based centralization of functions and self-governance rather than the social bonds that previously sustained corporate loyalty (Sennett 2006: 47). Whilst new forms of networking, sociality and affective forms of labour have emerged, trust between employees is overwhelmingly reduced, and the successful employee must constantly adapt to new structures (Hardt and Negri 2005: 110-111; Sennett 2006: 49). As a result, power and the norms of employee performance are transformed, and ‘success’ becomes redefined in terms of ‘the magic of “being discovered”, which involves luck, self-presentation, image and finding oneself in the right place at the right time’ (Yiannis Gabriel, quoted in Bunting 2004: 154). The power-‘play’ of *The Apprentice*’s reality game offers a useful entry-point for understanding how norms of ‘playful’ performance at work are constructed and naturalized in contemporary British society.

At the time of writing, there have been 17 different international versions of *The Apprentice*, which have garnered various degrees of popularity: in Finland and Germany, for example, it was cancelled after one series. By contrast, in the US, it reached the ranking of 7th most popular primetime programme, and in the UK *The Apprentice* has been so popular that the current series is being moved to the main BBC channel, BBC 1,

from BBC2.² It is surely significant that the programme has gained particular popularity in two countries where working hours are so high: they continue to rise in the US, and the UK remains the only country in the EU with an opt-out from the European Working Time Directive stipulating a maximum 48 hour working week. The issue here, however, is not so much levels of working hours, but the contradictory norms and values on which such an 'overwork culture' (Bunting 2004, Schor 1992) depends. The media ritual (Couldry 2003) of 'reality TV' is an important social form in this context. By presenting the 'reality' of work and business in the form of theatrical entertainment, *The Apprentice* transforms the norms of the neoliberal workplace into taken-for-granted 'common sense'.

Some background

Our article focuses on the UK version of *The Apprentice*. The rules of the format are well known: the initial contestants compete, first in groups and in later episodes directly against each other, for the prize of a job with the corporate mogul (in the UK, Sir Alan Sugar) who is also their chief interlocutor in the game's confrontations. When a group of contestants is on the losing side in a programme's task, one of them is fired at the end of that programme: the one to be fired is either the losing team leader or one of those who the losing team leader has nominated, the decision being Sir Alan's.

The US version, while identical in format, offers a different inflection of neoliberal norms, as we will note in detail below. Indeed, it can be argued that the US version displays a neoliberal 'contract' more securely embedded in norms of sociability as well as long-established entertainment values. In the US version the potential employer (Donald Trump) is presented, unambiguously, as a celebrity of fabulous wealth, access to whom is always touched by awe and mutual, if unequal, respect. By contrast, Sir Alan Sugar in the UK version rejects any idea of his celebrity as 'natural', emphasizing throughout his hard-won triumph over his working-class upbringing. The UK version of *The Apprentice* thus shows more obviously the tensions behind neoliberalism's impoverishment of the social, just as does New Labour's political translation of international neoliberal doctrine (Hall 2003: 10-24).

Not surprisingly perhaps, given these tensions, the broadcasting objective of the UK *Apprentice* was shamelessly ideological: 'to bring business to those who might not have thought it was for them' (Jane Lush, BBC Controller of Entertainment Commissioning, quoted BBC 2005). While the programme is a game, its 'point' – in this, it is similar to most reality TV – depends on a claim to 'reality': '[it is] the first entertainment show to have a real point – to show what it really takes to get ahead in business' (Daisy Goodwin, editorial director, Talkback Productions, quoted BBC 2005). Hence, the emphasis in the opening credits: 'this is the ultimate job interview'. At the end of Series Two, the BBC2 controller, Roly Keating praised the programme's 'blend of documentary skills' (quoted *Guardian* 11 May 2006). The historical roots of this particular claim to documentary reality are interesting: the inventor of *The Apprentice* and its overall producer is Mark Burnett, a UK-born ex-paratrooper, well-known previously for developing the *Survivor* format, which also claims to present reality – in that case, 'human nature' – under game

conditions. This is also the Mark Burnett who translates the lessons of his reality-games into motivational speeches at IBM and other corporate settings.³

Jane Lush's comment also indicates how *The Apprentice* provides a popular education in what it means to be a contemporary entrepreneurial worker. Indeed the BBC explicitly promotes the programme as part of its educational remit (BBC 2006/7).⁴ This is one of the more subtle ways in which the programme is imbricated within a specific historical conjuncture within which the values of the public sector and public education are being melded with those of private business. The programme fits snugly into a Blairite landscape in which a variety of state schools are, in a variety of ways, being turned over to private corporate interests, whether through the Private Finance Initiative (PFI), City Academies, the channelling of business and enterprise specialist schools, or the more general encouragement of enterprise as a core educational value (Monbiot 2000, Whitfield 2001). That *The Apprentice* participates in the normalisation of this formation was particularly apparent in a feature in *The Independent's* educational supplement detailing the UK government's decision to provide £180 million for all 14-16 year olds to undergo five days' worth of 'enterprise training'. The cover image featured a glowering Sugar, and the headline read 'You're hired: Why Gordon Brown wants children to be more like Sir Alan'. (Notably, that article did not even remotely question the ethics of the government's policy, focusing solely on the technocratic issues surrounding its implementation (Wice, 2006).)

As a format, *The Apprentice* occupies a distinctive place in the universe of reality-based entertainment. In one direction, it can be related to the rise of business-related computer games such as ZooTycoon™ (Microsoft) and OilTycoon (Global Star Software).⁵ But in its performance format, and with its narratives of self-transformation, it is closer to 'democratic' games shows such as *American Idol* and *Pop Idol*. But while those shows, through their use of popular music and audience voting, offer a narrative of collective 'dealienation' (Stahl 2006: chapter 4), *The Apprentice* offers a narrative of unfettered individual competition regulated not by 'the people' but by a single powerful businessman.

Sir Alan's arbitrariness and aggressiveness as the programme's celebrity has excited critical commentary in the UK from business leaders. But this apparent conflict with everyday banal reality, no doubt accentuated for dramatic purposes, does not undermine the programme's normalisation, more generally, of a particular type of power - individualised and charismatic - that fits well with contemporary corporate transformations. Whatever its theatre, *The Apprentice* must be seen as part of a wider process whereby television seeks increasingly to govern the norms of everyday life (Ouellette and Hay, forthcoming, cf generally Rose 1996).

Let us now examine how this works in detail. Our commentary in what follows is based on a detailed analysis of Series 2 of the UK programme (BBC2, February- May 2006) and its follow-up programmes, *The Apprentice - You're Fired* (BBC3), drawing in places on comparisons with Series 1 and 2 of the US programme (2004). All references to UK episodes are to Series 2, unless otherwise noted.

Governing work in chaotic capitalism

The Apprentice is framed as both an entertaining spectacle and popular education concerning what it means to be a successful entrepreneurial worker in contemporary culture. The British version, in particular, with its more pronounced orientation towards the mode of aesthetically polished documentary, makes the subject very available to be viewed safely at one remove. The shots are long, letting the action unravel before us, distanced from us. As viewers we are guided into the programme from far away, up high over the London skyline, before we pan in close to observe these trainee entrepreneurs in their newly-natural habitat. A subtle distinction is created between the smoothness of the visual and narrative frame (with its urbane, *film-noir* photography, slick electronica soundtrack and calmly modulated voiceover) and the foregrounded brashness of its subject (the working-class, rough and ready abruptness of Sir Alan and his exposed, sweating and vulnerable proto-employees). The programme therefore readily lends the scene to be read as a quasi-ironic spectacle as well as an educational product which informs and instructs on contemporary business values. Such a built-in distance works to short-circuit criticism to some extent: it already appears to have slightly removed itself from what's being portrayed. There is an additional cultural resonance here too. Whilst Britain, unlike the US, is short on 'natural resources' (Lawson 2006), it attempts to make up for this through marketing itself as a knowledge-economy hub for the creative industries. It is from this context that we might understand the *aestheticisation* of the UK *Apprentice* as opposed to the more 'straightforward', fast reportage style of the US version, with its lack of any very pronounced distance from Trump's own particular pre-ironic brand of gaudy wealth. It is also in relation to this context that we might understand the emphasis in the UK version on a tougher, more aggressive variant of 'meritocracy'. More widely, this aestheticised narrative framing also works effectively to naturalise and endorse certain themes in contemporary business discourse, which it is worth considering in a little more detail.

The neoliberal imperative of rolling back state provision and increasing corporate power is a process that is globally uneven and not uniform in its nature. The specific contemporary Anglo-American formation of neoliberal corporate capitalism is simultaneously marked by polish and chaotic extremity, combining both brutal forms of primitive accumulation and a tendency to 'activate germs of talent' in increasingly sophisticated ways (Thrift 2006). It is also characterized by 'a cancellation of the promises made to employees', as Robin Blackburn puts it, combined with 'a surge in upscale real-estate prices and the turnover of the luxury goods sector' (Blackburn 2006: 69-70). This somewhat chaotic combination of the rough and the smooth is easy enough to spot in *The Apprentice*. Luxury goods are emphasised as highly desirable, as the just deserts and the rewards of each challenge. The availability of the high-end treats such as 'pole position seats on the catwalk' at London fashion week (Series 1: Episode 5) or 'a champagne bar at Vertigo 42, one of the highest buildings in London' (Series 1: Episode 1) as the reward for the winning team at the end of every episode indicates their simultaneous status of hard-to-gain treat and ever-ready possibility. The contestants and

viewers are invited to admire objects, property and land owned by Sugar; we are, for example, reminded in Episode 1 that 'He's got his own fleet of executive jets and a Mayfair property portfolio' (and it is notable that Trump – his US opposite number - has made most of his money through real estate). The fact that there are no safety nets for contestants on the programme is constantly emphasized; indeed, the risk of being cast aside is turned into a source of dramatic excitement and tension ('You're fired!'). (In the Finnish one-off version of *The Apprentice*, by contrast the slogan was the polite phrase 'you're free to leave' which doesn't have quite the same brutally dramatic edge).⁶

Even more fundamentally, the chaotic nature of contemporary capitalism is reflected in the cultures of work incarnated in the programme which encourage people to 'govern themselves out of' precariousness (or out of the status of social loser) and into successful working agents by, as Thrift would put it, 'activat[ing their] germs of talent'. The UK *Apprentice* enshrines the individualised atomised self as the privileged or meaningful site of work. In this way, the contemporary formations of chaotic capitalism are governed not simply by top-down regulation and governance, but by the active participation of individuals, by their psychological engagement with such structures: what Foucault termed 'governmentality'. As Nikolas Rose puts it, applying this term to the individualisation of post-Fordist working cultures, 'the government of work now passes through the psychological strivings of each and every individual for fulfillment' (Rose 1999: 118).

The theatrics of *The Apprentice* provides an education in these social techniques through heightened, close-up focus on individual responses to a pressurized context. In Episode 6, for instance, after Sir Alan has told the contestants they will be selling used cars the voiceover tells us 'there's only a few hours to learn about it...So it's straight into the classroom to learn how to catch a customer'. Through such techniques, viewers are therefore presented with a mixture of psychological intrigue (in the form of how the contenders relate to their context); social drama (in terms of the interrelation between the characters); and assessment (in that they are both encouraged to participate in assessing the contestants' performance and to imbibe these lessons – whether directly or indirectly – to aid their own personal self-management). The programme therefore invites various modes of spectatorship, from the explicitly codified form of viewing as direct business education - the motivated viewer can also buy the tie-in book published alongside the series, guiding the reader learn 'how to be an apprentice' (Sugar 2005) - to a less overtly educational form of watching in which neoliberal governance is absorbed through narrative pleasure. Yet through *The Apprentice's* complex 'realist' construction as documentary, a highly particular view of contemporary capitalism is naturalized. *The Apprentice*, in other words, is documentary realism with a price attached.

How *The Apprentice* presents 'the social'

So far we have reviewed how the UK version of *The Apprentice* depicts the general business landscape, and how this translates into certain values which individuals must display if they are to succeed within the domain of the programme. In this section, we look at how the programme presents the social world of work. In these terms, the contrast with the US programme is here quite striking, as the norms of interpersonal aggression are presented with so little disguise in the UK programme. The correlations and distinctions between these different versions can partly be understood in terms of their relation to broader social and cultural contexts, as the US and UK share a number of key features but also diverge from each other.

The degree of verbal aggression in the UK version of *The Apprentice* is high, whether between contestants or Sir Alan's one-way assaults on contestants in 'the Boardroom'. This aggression takes more than one form. Whereas Sir Alan appears to relish extreme directness and harshness, the multiple job interviews that make up the contest of Episode 11 intensify the mental aggression, even if the interviewers are sometimes softly spoken: as Nick Hewer, Sir Alan's adviser throughout the series, commented in the follow-up programme to Episode 11 (*The Apprentice: You're Fired*, BBC3) Sir Alan's team of interviewers acted more like 'interrogators' than interviewers. This continuous aggression, whose detailed implications we will consider shortly, incidentally contrasts sharply with how interpersonal relations are conducted in the US show. While competitive pressures are, of course intense in the US version also, there is little shouting, either among the contestants or by Donald Trump in 'the Boardroom'. Within the US contestant teams, we are shown more discussion and deliberation, and fewer obvious attempts to dominate others purely by verbal aggression. Within the social world of the US show there is therefore at least some prima facie basis for interpersonal trust. By contrast, in perhaps the 'money-shot' of UK series 2, Syed shouts down Sharon's complaints at others' duplicity: 'everyone's knifing every other fucker in the back, so what's the fucking problem?'

It is worth looking more specifically at how verbal aggression is used and made sense of in the UK show. The UK contestants are assumed – at least this is nowhere contested on camera – to accept that the price of being on the show is to face Sir Alan's verbal aggression in all its unpredictable forms. Indeed, being able to withstand verbal aggression emerges as one of the core character strengths measured and, as it were, tempered, in the UK show. In one typical incident (Episode 6), Sam is asked: 'Can I ask you a direct question?' 'Of course Sir Alan.' 'Do you think if you weren't there it would have made any difference?' Syed's outstanding ability to endure and even occasionally deflect such aggression is praised by Sir Alan (*The Apprentice: You're Fired*, following episode 10). The ability to cope with aggression is linked, as in so many other reality TV shows, to the 'learning' experience which participating provides: Ansell who came third overall comments (*The Apprentice: You're Fired*, following episode 11) on how much he learned from having Sir Alan 'carving into' him. This reference to 'learning' implies a claim about the 'reality' for which you are being educated, which was made explicit in the same discussion by a contestant from the first UK series (Saira Khan) when she justified the hyper-aggressive interviews just shown as representing 'the culture you'll be working in'. In these ways we can see the programme working to naturalise two norms:

the norm of domination by verbal aggression, and the norm of willing submission to aggression.

Ruth, the show's runner-up, who of all the contestants appeared to have the most intense identification with Sir Alan's persona, lets slip in episode 12 that 'that bloody man has had me on my knees'. There is surely anger here, but it cannot be acknowledged within the show's discourse. Why this anger cannot be acknowledged becomes clearer when we look at how Sir Alan's aggression works within the UK programme's 'documentary reality'. Sir Alan's right to exercise aggression without restraint is shown to trump any other assessment norms. At the end of Episode 11 (in effect the series' semi-final) Sir Alan confronts Paul who was distinguished for having never been on the losing team in any of the previous programmes' tasks; as a result, Paul had never appeared until this point before Sir Alan in 'the Boardroom'. From the perspective of team success, this record would seem to be evidence in Paul's favour but Sir Alan turns the tables on Paul in an interesting confrontation:

the fact that you've won all the tasks doesn't mean jack shit to me because I haven't talked with you yet. So you speak to me now, you speak to me now, because, I'm telling you, it's getting close to that door [pointing at the exit door].

As elsewhere (see above), team dynamics are seen to be inconsequential; all that matters is individual combat, and there is only one combat that ultimately counts, combat with Sir Alan.

This exclusively charismatic model of power⁷ is integrated with the editorializing of the show which emphasizes the moments when fear is generated. Such editorializing places the viewers in the position of voyeurs of fear. In these terms, it is similar to how *Big Brother* encourages the pleasure of watching contestants self-presentation crack under strain to reveal 'emotional truth', as Annette Hill describes elsewhere in this volume. In *The Apprentice*, at the end of episode 11 when Ruth's survival is in the balance, following a severe reprimand, Sir Alan keeps her waiting for a few seconds as we watch her face blush, before he tells her she's through to the final. Once again, the programme's documentary values – its implied claim to psychological 'realism' – is enmeshed with a very particular version of the norms for how power operates, through aggression and fear, in the contemporary business world.

Business as entertainment

We want briefly to explore now how media's own authority within the domain of the programme is naturalized. We will leave to one side the larger question of how reality TV works to sustain its claim to reality (Couldry 2003, chapter 6) and concentrate on how in the UK show the imagined world of business is presented as in some respects continuous with the world of media and entertainment. In some ways this is hardly surprising and has already been noted: so the prize of winning the series is always associated with fabulous

wealth, suggested by the house in which the contestants live throughout the series: 'I've found you a house in the best street in the country', says Sir Alan in Episode 1, pointing out to gasps from the contestants that a neighbouring house has just sold for £45 million. The rewards each week for the successful team have been discussed earlier, as have the occasional glimpses of Sir Alan's lifestyle (for example, the fleet of luxury cars at the his London house ('now that's a house' comments one of the contestants – episode 7). More interesting is the overlap between the model of business success presented in the series and the world of entertainment: the final challenge that decides the show's winner (Episode 12) is not a conventional business task but 'putting on a show' in the Tower of London at a few day's notice.

Perhaps more surprising is the overlap between the programme's values and those of tabloid journalism which emerges particularly in the follow-up programmes shown on BBC3. On the face of it we might not expect to see the editor of the celebrity magazine *Heat* turn up as an 'expert' commentator on the show - as he did on more than one occasion - since there is no similarity between most business tasks and running a celebrity magazine. Nor would a *Sun* lifestyle journalist be an obvious choice as a business expert, but one such (Jane Moore) appeared in the follow-up to Episode 10 opposite the *Heat* editor. Her comment about Syed who had just been eliminated was striking: 'he'd make a fantastic tabloid journalist', she noted, because of his plausible charm in getting stories out of people. Given that Syed's apparent duplicity has been a running theme of the second series, this might be seen as ironic, but if so, the irony is undeveloped. At work here is the programme's construction of its own authority within the entertainment world of 'celebrity culture' that overlaps with the programme's quite particular presentation of the world of business. This foregrounds both how business culture is increasingly drawing on tabloid discourse to construct an image of itself as cool, contemporary and 'democratic' (Littler 2007, McGuigan 2006) and the sheer range of techniques *The Apprentice* draws on to stake its claim to documentary 'realism': in this case, a documentary realism which is in turn used to naturalise neoliberal working cultures.

Conclusion: 'Realism' and the Need for Ethics

Mark Andrejevic has persuasively argued that reality TV in general is a sphere in which 'the participation of consumers in the rationalization of their own consumption is sold as empowerment' (Andrejevic 2004:15). In *The Apprentice*, as we have shown, this focus is re-tooled towards labour – it becomes a site where the participation of *workers* in the rationalization of their own work is sold as empowerment (for both viewer and contestant). The programme educates its viewers (in dramatized form) in how to become 'empowered' by struggling within and reproducing the norms of a harsh, unpredictable, precarious, increasingly competitive working climate. As a result, the highly distinctive performance norms of contemporary business culture are themselves naturalized and presented as part of the 'real world out there'.

We could stop our argument here perhaps, but to do so would be to omit one key point: the ethics of the documentary format we have analysed. For we believe that important

ethical questions are raised by supposedly ‘documentary’ formats such as *The Apprentice* which are at the heart also of the potential – but surprisingly underdeveloped – debate about the ethics of reality TV generally. In fact, two rather different types of ethical question intersect here. First, there is an ethical question about whether we are happy to live in societies where reality TV formats – with their reliance on surveillance, interpersonal aggression, ritualized humiliations – have themselves become normalized, indeed legitimated as an apparent source of knowledge about today’s social ‘realities’. This is an important question (see Couldry 2006) but one not specific to *The Apprentice* and so we leave it to one side. Second, there is an ethical question about *The Apprentice* itself as a particular documentary format; it is this second question on which we would like to focus in concluding.

As we saw earlier, BBC’s claims for *The Apprentice* as a programme turn, in large part, on claims about its status as a presentation of reality: both its educational value for contemporary living and, necessarily intertwined with that, its status as, in some sense, ‘realistic’ and ‘truthful’. *The Apprentice* is, on the other hand, also a form of entertainment which should give it, prima facie, some licence to dramatize and accentuate its presentations for the sake of being good entertainment. This ambiguity, far from being unusual, is precisely the ambiguity on which reality TV, as a form of media ritual, depends (Couldry 2002, 2003). It follows however that, where the factual claims involved in a reality TV game are themselves questionable, or in some other way require to be opened up for debate (for example, because they embed norms which are themselves highly questionable), there are some ethical issues to be discussed. And, as we have seen, *The Apprentice* makes quite particular ‘realist’ claims about contemporary capitalism, and the appropriate norms for the exercise of corporate power over employees in the workplace. There is nothing ‘factually neutral’ about the show of isolated quasi-employees (that is, stand-ins for the role of employee within the fiction of *The Apprentice* game) being humiliated by their ‘employer’ in front of their rival ‘employees’. There is nothing neutral either about the way that any values of group cooperation or even basic social respect in the workplace are, as we have argued, consistently devalued in the programme’s presentation of what is ‘really’ at stake in today’s world of work. *The Apprentice*’s presentation of ‘dog eats dog’ capitalism has, as we saw, been contested by business leaders as an inaccurate presentation of today’s workplace, but the social norms on which *The Apprentice* is based are protected by the programme’s status as ‘just a game’: this, after all, is the ideological power of ‘games’, that their premises become difficult to criticize, while being conversely easy to absorb, because they can always claim to operate within the domain of the ‘as if’.

When games, including reality TV games such as *The Apprentice*, rely for their premises on highly contestable factual claims about social reality or, just as problematic, highly contestable norms chosen from among the range of norms which might govern social reality, then those claims and those norms should, we suggest, themselves be opened up to debate in a way that the ambiguous documentary/game status of reality TV precisely prevents. Unless this is done, we are entitled to level against reality TV producers a challenge analogous to that Onora O’Neill posed in her 2002 Reith Lectures to news producers:

if powerful institutions are allowed to publish, circulate and promote material without indicating what is standard analysis and what is speculation, which sources may be knowledgeable and which are probably not, they damage our public culture and all our lives. Good public debate must not only be *accessible to* but also *assessable* by its audiences. (O'Neill 2002: 95)

The alternative for media producers is of course equally simple: to stop claiming that programmes such as *The Apprentice* exhibit 'documentary' qualities, and to acknowledge instead that they are games based on premises, and norms, that there is no reason for us as viewers to necessarily accept.

References

- Andrejevic, Mark (2004) *Reality TV: The Work of Being Watched*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.
- BBC, 'Sir Alan Sugar confirmed for BBC Two's *The Apprentice*', press release, 18 May, available from www.bbc.co.uk/print/pressoffice/pressreleases/
- Beck, U. (2000) *The Brave New World of Work*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Blackburn, R. (2006) 'Finance and the Fourth Dimension', *New Left Review* 39, 39-70
- Boltanski, L. and Chiapello, E. (2005) *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998) *Acts of Resistance: Against the Tyranny of the Market*. New York: The New Press.
- Brenner, R. (2006) *The Economics of Global Turbulence*. London: Verso.
- Bunting, M. (2004) *Willing Slaves: How the Overwork Culture is Ruling our Lives*. London: Harper Collins.
- Carlsson, M. (1990) *Bad Attitude: The Processed World Anthology*. London: Verso.
- Couldry, N. (2002) 'Playing for Celebrity: *Big Brother* as Ritual Event', *Television and New Media* 3(3): 283-294.
- Couldry, N. (2003) *Media Rituals: A Critical Approach*. London: Routledge.
- Couldry, N. (2006) 'Media and the Ethics of "Reality" Construction', *Southern Review*, 39(1): 42-54.
- Dean, M. (1993) *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage.
- Foucault, M. (1982) 'The Subject and Power' in Dreyfus and P. Rabinow (eds) *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. University of Chicago Press.
- Gibney, A. (dir) (2006) *Enron: The Smartest Guys in the Room*, Magnolia Pictures.
- Gilroy, P. (2005) *After Empire*. London: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (2005) 'New Labour's Double-shuffle', *Soundings* 24: 10-25
- Hardt, M. and A. Negri (2005) *Multitude*. London: Penguin.
- Harvey, D. (2003) *The New Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Honneth, A. (2004) 'Organized Self-Realisation: Some Paradoxes of Individualization', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 7(4): 463-478.
- Lawson, N. (2006) 'A Shameful Report Card', *The Guardian*, 14 February.
- Levi-Faur, D. and Jordana, J. (2005) 'Preface: the Making of a New Regulatory Order', *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 598: 6-9.

- Levitas, R. (2005) *The Inclusive Society? Social Exclusion and New Labour* 2nd edition. Houndsmill: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Littler, J. (2007) 'Celebrity CEOs and the cultural economy of tabloid intimacy' in S. Holmes and S. Redmond, *A Reader in Stardom and Celebrity*. London: Sage.
- McGuigan, J. (1996) 'The Politics of Cultural Studies and Cool Capitalism', *Cultural Politics* 2(2) 137-158.
- Monbiot, G. (2000) *The Captive State: The Corporate Takeover of Britain*. Macmillan
- O'Neill, O. (2002) *A Question of Trust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Opel, A. and Smith, J. (2004) 'Zootycoon™: Capitalism, Nature, and the Pursuit of Happiness', *Ethics & the Environment* 9(2): 103-120.
- Ouellette, L. and J. Hay, (forthcoming) *Better Living Through Television*, Oxford and MA: Blackwell.
- Prose, F. (2004) 'Voting Demorcacy off the Island: Reality TV and the Republican Ethos', *Harpers Magazine*, March 58-64.
- Rifkin, J. (2000) *The Age of Access*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Rose, N. (1996) 'Governing "advanced" liberal democracies' in A. Barry, T. Osborne and N. Rose (eds) *Foucault and Political Reason*. London: UCL Press, pp. 37-64.
- Rose, N. (1999) *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*. London: Free Association Books.
- Scoble, R. and S. Israel (2006) *Naked Conversations: How Blogs are Changing the Way Businesses Talk with Customers*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Schor, J. (1992) *The Overworked American*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sennett, R. (2006) *The Culture of the New Capitalism*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Stahl, M. (2006) *Reinventing Certainties: Popular Music and American Social Structure*. PhD Thesis, University of California, San Diego.
- Sugar, A. (2005) *The Apprentice: How to get hired not fired*. London: BBC Books.
- Thrift, N. (2006) 'Re-inventing invention: new tendencies in capitalist commodification' *Economy and Society*, 35:2 279-306.
- Weber, M. (1991) 'The sociology of charismatic authority' in H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds) *From Max Weber*. New edition. London: Routledge, pp. 245-250 and pp. 262-264.
- Whitfield, D. (2001) *Public Service or Corporate Welfare?* London: Pluto Press.
- Wice, H. (2006) 'The real-life business apprentices', *The Independent*, Education Supplement, 6 April pp 4-5.

¹ Speaking on *The Apprentice - You're Fired*, following episode 7 of *the Apprentice* (UK series one).

² See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Apprentice#_note-0. Accessed February 2007.

³ See (Prose 2004: 61). Thanks to Carole Stabile for alerting us to this reference.

⁴ The BBC's 2006/7 Statement of Programme Policy explicitly states that it will, as one of its future priorities, 'Continue to strengthen the range of popular factual that appeals to younger audiences, for example with factual formats in subject areas such as business (such as *The Apprentice*).' <http://www.bbc.co.uk/info/statements2006/tv/bbctwo.shtml>. Accessed February 2007.

⁵ For discussion see Opel and Smith (2004).

⁶ See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Apprentice#_note-0. Accessed February 2007.

⁷ Compare Weber's (1991) well-known division between traditional, rational and charismatic authority.