

## What is 'neo-craft' work, and why it matters

Gandini, Alessandro; Gerosa, Alessandro

DOI:

[10.1177/01708406231213963](https://doi.org/10.1177/01708406231213963)

License:

Other (please specify with Rights Statement)

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Gandini, A & Gerosa, A 2023, 'What is 'neo-craft' work, and why it matters', *Organization Studies*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/01708406231213963>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

### **Publisher Rights Statement:**

This is the accepted author manuscript of the following article: Gandini, A., & Gerosa, A. (2023). What is 'neo-craft' work, and why it matters. *Organization Studies*, 0(ja). Copyright © 2023 The Author(s). DOI: 10.1177/0170840623121396

### **General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

### **Take down policy**

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.



### What is 'neo-craft' work, and why it matters

Journal:	<i>Organization Studies</i>
Manuscript ID	OS-22-0112.R4
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue: Rediscovering and Theorizing Craft in Organization Studies
Keywords:	craft work, discursive materiality, hipster culture, marginal distinction, neo-craft work, meaningful work, new forms of work
Abstract:	Existing research has highlighted a global return into fashion of craft work in the new century. Within this context, the term 'neo-craft' work has been used to identify innovative craft work practices characterised by an aura of 'coolness', which promise a less alienated form of work; yet, the specific contours of this new form of work remain uncertain. In this article we develop a theoretical conceptualisation of neo-craft work. We define it as an emergent form of post-industrial craft work whereby work that was previously considered low-status, or performed by the working class, is: a) 'resignified' into status-producing activity through

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

	<p>the integration of craft practices and values; and, b) conferred new meaningfulness as the outcome of a specific process of discursive materiality, by which the intra-action of discursive and material practices provides meaning to work activity. Neo-craft work, we contend, finds roots in the cultural milieu of hipster culture, where extenuating cultural negotiations around authenticity and 'the particular' constitute the baseline for a quest for social status based on practices of 'marginal distinction', and sets itself as an alternative not only to industrial work but, primarily, to the precarious, low-paid or otherwise unsatisfactory 'bullshit jobs' of the knowledge and creative economy.</p>

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 Alessandro Gandini (University of Milan)  
4

5 Alessandro Gerosa (University of Birmingham)  
6  
7  
8

9 **What is ‘neo-craft’ work, and why it matters**  
10

11  
12  
13 *Abstract*  
14

15 Existing research has highlighted a global return into fashion of craft work in the new century. Within  
16 this context, the term ‘neo-craft’ work has been used to identify innovative craft work practices  
17 characterised by an aura of ‘coolness’, which promise a less alienated form of work; yet, the specific  
18 contours of this new form of work remain uncertain. In this article we develop a theoretical  
19 conceptualisation of neo-craft work. We define it as an emergent form of post-industrial craft work  
20 whereby work that was previously considered low-status, or performed by the working class, is: a)  
21 ‘resigned’ into status-producing activity through the integration of craft practices and values; and,  
22 b) conferred new meaningfulness as the outcome of a specific process of *discursive materiality*, by  
23 which the intra-action of discursive and material practices provides meaning to work activity. Neo-  
24 craft work, we contend, finds roots in the cultural milieu of hipster culture, where extenuating cultural  
25 negotiations around authenticity and ‘the particular’ constitute the baseline for a quest for social status  
26 based on practices of ‘marginal distinction’, and sets itself as an alternative not only to industrial work  
27 but, primarily, to the precarious, low-paid or otherwise unsatisfactory ‘bullshit jobs’ of the knowledge  
28 and creative economy.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 *Keywords:* craft work, discursive materiality, hipster culture, marginal distinction, meaningful work,  
49 neo-craft work, new forms of work  
50

51  
52  
53 Existing research has highlighted a global return into fashion of craft work in the new century,  
54 described as a ‘third wave of craft’ (Jakob, 2013, p. 130). This has primarily concerned the creative  
55 and cultural industries, where craft work is understood as a semi- or non-market form of creative work  
56 and a countercultural practice set to ‘pragmatically resist’ capital accumulation (Luckman 2015;  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Banks, 2014). Inspired by the work of Richard Sennett (2008), who conceives of craft as the epitome  
4 of ‘good work’, the resurgence of craft work has also been fostered in no small part by digital media.  
5  
6 On the one hand, digital platforms such as Etsy.com have allowed craft producers to sell their  
7  
8 artefacts online, enabling new ways for supply and demand to meet (Krugh, 2014). On the other hand,  
9  
10 social media have facilitated the gathering of global communities of practice around craft, who  
11  
12 engage in discussion and exchange advice (Naudin & Patel, 2019).  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 However, this revival of craft work has extended beyond the creative industries to become a relevant  
19  
20 phenomenon in the market economy at large, particularly in the food and hospitality sector. A new  
21  
22 term has been coined to describe this trend: ‘neo-craft’ industries (Land, 2018; Bell, Mangia, Taylor,  
23  
24 & Toraldo, 2018). Epitomised by craft beer brewing (Fox Miller 2019, 2017; Wallace, 2019; Land,  
25  
26 Sutherland, & Taylor, 2018; Thurnell-Read, 2014), this term identifies those sectors whereby forms of  
27  
28 craft work – that is, ‘concerned with the skilful production of high-quality products’ – combine with  
29  
30 ‘innovation in both product and process’, pointing towards ‘a post-industrial imaginary’ (Land, 2018,  
31  
32 np). Within this context, the specific cultures and practices of work are of particular interest. ‘Neo-  
33  
34 craft’ work, as it has been labelled, is characterised by an aura of ‘coolness’ and promises ‘a less  
35  
36 alienated form of work’ (Land, 2018, np; Ocejo, 2017). Akin to creative work in the late 1990s and  
37  
38 early 2000s, neo-craft work is marked by a notion of passion, which makes it appealing particularly  
39  
40 for those who have found themselves excluded from, or have explicitly rejected, traditional pathways  
41  
42 to education and work (Ocejo, 2017). Yet, research on neo-craft work remains in its infancy, and its  
43  
44 specific contours remain uncertain. What are the distinctive features of neo-craft work? What  
45  
46 differentiates neo-craft work from other forms of craft or manual work? Why does neo-craft work  
47  
48 represent a ‘less alienated’ and innovative form of work?  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 Contributing to the emergent body of research on craft in the new century, this article provides a  
55  
56 theoretical conceptualisation of neo-craft work. Using existing studies, we present neo-craft work as a  
57  
58 peculiar ‘new form of work’ of the 21st century. We define neo-craft work as an emergent form of  
59  
60 post-industrial craft work whereby work that was previously considered low-status, or performed by

1  
2  
3 the working class, is: a) ‘resignified’ into status-producing activity, through the integration of craft  
4 practices and values into forms of labour-intensive or manual production; and, b) conferred new  
5 meaningfulness as the outcome of a specific process of *discursive materiality*, in which discursive and  
6 material practices become inextricably connected, and their intra-action provides meaning to work  
7 activity. Neo-craft work, we contend, finds roots in the cultural milieu of hipster culture, whereby  
8 extenuating cultural negotiations around authenticity and ‘the particular’ (Smith Maguire, 2018)  
9 constitute the baseline of a quest for social status based on practices of ‘marginal distinction’. In neo-  
10 craft work, we show, the discourse around authenticity and ‘the particular’ provides meaning to the  
11 engagement with material practices, so that this acquires value in itself - and not conditional to its  
12 mastery - because it allows the body to set free from the usual organisational constraints (Harding,  
13 Gilmore, & Ford 2022), thus enabling the experience of embodied affectivity (Bell & Vachhani, 2020;  
14 Gherardi, Murgia, Bellè, Miele, & Carreri, 2019). This sets neo-craft work as an alternative not only  
15 to industrial work but, primarily, vis-a-vis the often precarious, low-paid or otherwise unsatisfactory  
16 ‘bullshit jobs’ (Graeber, 2019) of the knowledge and creative economy (Ross, 2009).

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35 In the pages that follow, the article unfolds focusing first on the contextualisation of neo-craft work  
36 within the larger debate on the ‘future of work’, and then on the articulation of its definition, with  
37 specific attention to its relationship with traditional forms of craft work. Subsequently, we provide  
38 reason for its grounding in hipster culture and then outline in full the notion of discursive materiality,  
39 that we argue represents its distinctive feature. In the conclusion we critically reflect on the broader  
40 implications of our proposition, suggesting that neo-craft work does not represent another kind of  
41 craft as ‘return to the past’, but rather one based upon innovation that speaks directly about present  
42 and future societal trends.

### 53 **The bigger picture: contextualising neo-craft work as a ‘new form of work’**

54  
55  
56 A lively discussion on the ‘future of work’ has animated the academic and popular debate over the  
57 last decades, especially following the 2007-08 economic downturn. For the most part, this has been  
58 prompted by technological advancements in the digital sector: in a society transitioning out of the  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 industrial era and into a highly fragmented scenario, fresh concerns have been voiced in particular  
4  
5 against the threat of job automation and the consequences of the suppression of human labour by  
6  
7 means of technology (e.g. Servoz, 2019; Neufeind, O'Reilly, & Renft, 2018; Thompson & Briken,  
8  
9 2017). Within this context, a variety of 'new forms of work' have been identified and critically  
10  
11 discussed, including algorithmic and platform labour (Vallas, 2019), collaborative work (Aroles,  
12  
13 Mitev, & de Vaujany, 2019), together with issues concerning quantification and surveillance of work  
14  
15 (Moore, 2017), and the introduction of robotics in industrial work (West, 2018), to name a few. Much  
16  
17 less attention has instead been posed onto the emergence of new forms of work that are not directly  
18  
19 related to technological advancement, and on their perceived meaningfulness vis-a-vis existing or  
20  
21 otherwise well-established ones.  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 The affirmation of neoliberal policies aimed at flexibilising and globalising the labour market across  
28  
29 Western economies since the 1980s ignited a profound process of transformation of work cultures and  
30  
31 practices. Overall, this has been characterised by a diminishment of permanent employment and a  
32  
33 comprehensive push towards the 'entrepreneurialisation' of the workforce (Harvey, 2005; Kalleberg  
34  
35 & Vallas, 2018). This has particularly concerned the so-called knowledge economy, culminating at  
36  
37 the turn of the century in the vision of an upcoming 'creative class' of workers who would thrive on  
38  
39 individual talent and enjoy a 'cool' lifestyle (Florida, 2002). Contextually, the rapid diffusion of  
40  
41 digital technologies and their integration in work practices and organisation facilitated the  
42  
43 proliferation of 'contingent' and 'nonstandard' forms of employment, particularly freelance work,  
44  
45 which have affirmed as a 'new standard' of work (Cappelli & Keller, 2013; Gandini, 2016). These  
46  
47 'cool' creative jobs, however, largely materialised in the form of precarious, low-paid work,  
48  
49 characterised by long hours and scarce remuneration (Ross, 2009; McRobbie, 2016).  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 Somewhat paradoxically, in the middle of these advancements craft work experienced a resurgence.  
55  
56 Following the 2007-8 economic downturn, craft has enjoyed a new 'moment in the sun' (Luckman &  
57  
58 Thomas, 2018, p. 1), described as a 'third wave of craft' (Jakob, 2013, p. 130). Craft work affirmed as  
59  
60 a potential way out of the recession, enabling a renewed push towards small entrepreneurship while a

1  
2  
3 new set of actors, particularly startup investors, entered the craft scene, anchoring the revival of craft  
4 firmly in the camp of the neoliberal economy (Luckman & Thomas, 2018; Adamson, 2013). The  
5 popularity of social media and online platforms such as Etsy.com also contributed in no small part to  
6 this resurgence, enabling different stakeholders and communities of practice around craft to get in  
7 contact irrespective of their geographic location, opening up new markets and spaces of action  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13 (Naudin & Patel, 2019; Luckman, 2015; Krugh, 2014).  
14  
15  
16

17  
18 Interestingly, however, this revival of craft has not solely concerned work that has been traditionally  
19 classified as craft. Particularly within some productive sectors of the market economy that do not  
20 necessarily belong to the 'native' contexts of craft (Gibson, 2016), such as the food and hospitality  
21 industries, existing research has noted the emergence and popularisation of craft-based forms of  
22 production and an increased interest in small-scale, artisanally-produced goods (cfr. Pedeliento,  
23 Andreini, & Dalli, 2020). This has been defined by Currid-Halkett (2017) as a new form of  
24 aspirational consumption, characterised by 'conspicuous production'. It is 'the production, rather than  
25 the consumption', Currid-Halkett (2017, p. 117) argues, that 'becomes the key conspicuous signal'  
26 which confers value to the individual consumption practice as a kind of aspirational move based on  
27 cultural preference (Currid-Halkett, 2017, p. 117).  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 The term 'neo-craft' industries (Land, 2018) has been coined to grasp the artisanal turn of the market  
42 economy. This identifies those sectors whereby the recuperation of pre-industrial, small-scale or  
43 otherwise abandoned forms of production, aptly repurposed to the modern economy, has become  
44 fashionable, tapping into a consumer niche. Neo-craft industries are quintessentially epitomised by  
45 craft beer brewing (Fox Miller 2019, 2017; Wallace, 2019; Land et al., 2018; Thurnell-Read, 2014),  
46 which has grown from a semi-hobbyist activity to a lively entrepreneurial and cultural scene  
47 punctuated by global actors, and represents today an important subset of the beer economy worldwide  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56 (Kroezen & Heugens, 2019; Land et al., 2018; Land, 2018).  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Yet, besides craft beer brewing, the cultures and practices of work within the neo-craft context are of  
4 particular interest. Neo-craft work, as it has been labelled, is marked by an aura of ‘coolness’ and  
5 promises ‘a less alienated form of work’ (Land, 2018, p. np) that is deemed to subvert ‘the usual  
6 aspirations of social mobility, with middle-class, college educated kids rejecting office work and the  
7 professions in favour of butchering, barbering or bartending – all traditionally working-class jobs’  
8 (Land, 2018, np; Ocejo, 2017). Like creative work in the late 1990s and early 2000s, neo-craft work is  
9 characterised by a notion of passion, which makes it particularly appealing for those who have found  
10 themselves excluded from, or have explicitly rejected, traditional pathways to education and work  
11 (Ocejo, 2017). Yet, we still know quite little about its distinctive features, what differentiates it from  
12 other forms of craft (and non-craft) practices, and how we can make sense of its rise in the present day  
13 and age. This article aims at filling this gap.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

### 29 **Neo-craft work: a primer**

30 Landmark reference in the emergent scholarship on neo-craft work is Ocejo (2017). Through in-depth  
31 ethnographic research within 4 neo-craft industries in the US - ‘mixologist’ bartending, whole animal  
32 butchering, barbering, and gin distilling - Ocejo recounts how a variety of educated and culturally-  
33 savvy young workers have turned to traditionally working-class activity in search of meaningfulness  
34 and ‘good’ work, transforming once-undesirable jobs into ‘elite’ occupations and creating new  
35 cultural hierarchies within and around them. The food and hospitality sector - particularly, as said,  
36 craft beer brewing - is considered to be the ‘native’ context of neo-craft work (Land, 2018). Yet, as  
37 Ocejo’s work demonstrates, a variety of activities could potentially fit this framework, including other  
38 craft occupations - such as ceramicist or small jewellery producer - as well as jobs commonly  
39 performed by the working-class. It seems necessary, in other words, to develop a more accurate  
40 understanding of how these cultural hierarchies have come to be, and how they have contributed to  
41 what may be seen as a *resignification* of work activity that does not necessarily belong to the domain  
42 of craft, but where craft practices and values have become commonplace and the source of original  
43 forms of social recognition.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 We define neo-craft work as an emergent form of post-industrial craft work whereby work that was  
4 previously considered low-status, or performed by the working class, is: a) ‘resignified’ into status-  
5 producing activity, through the integration of craft practices and values into forms of labour-intensive  
6 or manual production; and, b) conferred new meaningfulness as the outcome of a specific process of  
7 *discursive materiality*, in which discursive and material practices become inextricably connected, and  
8 their intra-action provides meaning to work activity. This new breed of craft work can typically be  
9 found in the gentrified urban areas of Western global cities. Here, as Gibson (2016, p. 6) points out,  
10 new craft and maker scenes are ‘conferred a degree of industrial or working-class authenticity’, that is  
11 reflective of ‘a new phase of ‘cultural capitalism’ in which symbolic meaning and sign values infuse  
12 commodity production’. Research suggests that 3 main subjects typically participate in neo-craft  
13 work, frequently overlapping with one another in their capacity: a) the producers, who materially  
14 work on the production process; b) the entrepreneurs or business owners, and c) the salaried workers,  
15 particularly in the hospitality sector, who participate in these scenes not just for the mere necessity to  
16 work, but to fulfil their ‘passion’ and as a means for social recognition (Ocejo, 2017; Land, 2018; Bell  
17 et al., 2018).

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37 Empirical accounts of neo-craft work remain sparse; existing works, however, portray a contradictory  
38 picture. Fox Miller (2019), for instance, describes craft beer workers in Oregon as ‘glorified janitors’  
39 and ‘glamorised’ workers who have assumed celebrity-like status because of their ‘cool’ job, but that  
40 continue to experience significantly bad working conditions. Similarly, Wallace (2019) highlights  
41 how craft beer brewing in London is increasingly connoted with status-achieving features but  
42 continues to be marked by acute social inequality, and suffers from extensive precarity. Land et al.  
43 (2018) also underline that craft beer brewing in the UK is prone to forms of gender inequality, noting  
44 that, within this context, an emphasis on authenticity and retraditionalization is enmeshed within a  
45 comprehensively masculine culture of work. Other studies also underline that social media  
46 significantly contributed to the ‘coolness’ of craft and artisanal work (Bell et al., 2018), constituting  
47 an important milieu for neo-craft producers to meet their consumer base (Eckhardt & Bardhi, 2019;  
48 Currid-Halkett, 2017).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 More empirical research is certainly required to dig more in depth into this new kind of craft work and  
6  
7 the forms of organisation characterising it. Yet, to further complicate things, the existence of neo-craft  
8  
9 work is difficult to account for in official statistics, as it remains somewhat hidden among established  
10  
11 craft occupations and new small entrepreneurial activities, and no existing data source is able to  
12  
13 account for the exact size of this workforce. Furthermore, and perhaps most importantly, its ‘neo-’  
14  
15 status rests on unclear theoretical boundaries; the distinctive features of this kind of craft work have  
16  
17 so far been only sketched out, as they emerge inductively from rich but nonetheless context-specific  
18  
19 ethnographic research. Similar to creative work in the late 1990s, the alleged quality of neo-craft jobs  
20  
21 as ‘less alienated’ forms of work remains untested, and coated with a somewhat mythological status  
22  
23 that needs to be put under question. As Kroezen, Ravasi, Sasaki, Żebrowska, and Suddaby (2021)  
24  
25 point out, there is a demand for research that addresses how ‘creative’ and ‘pure’ forms of craft relate  
26  
27 with more technical and industrialised ones, and the extent to which the association with a ‘craft  
28  
29 imaginary’ (Bell, Dacin, & Toraldo, 2021) actually confers more meaningfulness to certain forms of  
30  
31 work. Neo-craft work seems to be an ideal case to observe in this endeavour.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

### 37 **Traditional craft work vs neo-craft work**

38  
39 As said, the existing scholarship identifies craft beer brewing and, more generally, the food and  
40  
41 hospitality sector, as quintessential examples of neo-craft work. However, the production of food and  
42  
43 drinks has generally not been considered to be craft work in its traditional meaning, nor workers  
44  
45 involved in their production have been traditionally considered craftspeople - with the exception of  
46  
47 specific contexts, such as France, where the word *artisan* historically refers to an ample range of  
48  
49 occupations including, among other things, baking. Furthermore, the boundaries of what is  
50  
51 conventionally considered ‘craft work’ have been difficult to draw from a strictly academic point of  
52  
53 view, as craft research has historically displayed, ‘if one were being generous, a plurality of meanings;  
54  
55 less charitably, the word [craft] has been the epitome of confusion’ (Dormer, 1997). However, a  
56  
57 clearer picture emerges if we adopt an ‘institutionalist’ perspective, looking at the boundaries set by  
58  
59 the professional bodies representing craft producers.  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 As of today, the UK Crafts Council classifies its more than 800 members in 29 categories, according  
6  
7 to the final goods they produce or the production process; these range from bookbinders to 3D makers  
8  
9 (UK Craft Council, 2022). The UK Heritage Craft Association goes even further, enlisting as many as  
10  
11 244 categories of craft (Heritage Crafts, 2017). The American Craft Council does not offer a similarly  
12  
13 specific categorization, but the vocabulary used and the people and businesses showcased is akin to  
14  
15 the other two here mentioned (American Craft Council, 2022), as well as for the World Crafts Council  
16  
17 Europe (2022), which enlists craft associations from all around Europe. The craft work that these  
18  
19 bodies chiefly preserve and promote is one that skillfully manipulates raw materials to produce a final  
20  
21 durable object with artistic quality. This resonates with the definition provided by Howard Risatti  
22  
23 (2009) in *A Theory of Crafts*, which is prompted by the same recognition of a general ambiguity of the  
24  
25 term ‘craft’ in the literature. Recognizing that craft work is commonly associated with a range of  
26  
27 materials (ceramics, glass, fibres, metals, wood, etc.) as well as with specific technical and working  
28  
29 procedures (weaving, quilting, turning, smithing, etc.), Risatti adopts a definition of craft work as a  
30  
31 working process aimed at producing objects with a practical physical function (Risatti, 2009). Risatti  
32  
33 does not mention explicitly that these objects must be durable, but from the premises this is implicit.  
34  
35 Clearly, none of the 4 jobs included in the seminal book by Ocejo (bartenders, barbers, butchers and  
36  
37 gin distillers) could be reasonably defined as ‘craft’ according to this definition, nor to the definitions  
38  
39 provided by traditionally-established craft associations. This ambiguity also extends to craft beer  
40  
41 brewing, which has often remained excluded by the circle of proper craft occupations (Brown, 2020)  
42  
43 albeit recent research (e.g. Kroezen & Heugens 2019, 2012; Land et al., 2018) has somewhat  
44  
45 ‘naturally’ included this among the new craft and making activities. Overall, an evident research  
46  
47 puzzle emerges here, hindering the possibility to pursue a systematic investigation of neo-craft work,  
48  
49 its practices and organisational forms. How can neo-craft work be epitomised by sectors that are  
50  
51 extraneous to what is generally understood as craft work?  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

58 Building on the ‘configurations’ of craft devised by Kroezen et al. (2021), we see neo-craft work as an  
59  
60 emergent form of ‘post-industrial’ craft work that bypasses the dichotomy between traditional and

1  
2  
3 industrial craft and, in so doing, devises an original blend between ‘creative’ craft - where craft is  
4  
5 “associated with a pursuit of creativity in making and fueled by social movements promoting  
6  
7 individual freedom and expression” (Kroezen et al. 2021, p. 521) - and ‘pure’ craft - where craft  
8  
9 represents “the radical prioritisation of human skills at the expense of all that is considered  
10  
11 mechanical” (Kroezen et al., 2021, p. 519). Like other forms of craft work, neo-craft work maintains  
12  
13 an ontologically alternative stance to industrial production, stressing how manual work - once free  
14  
15 from the alienation caused by machines - can be the source of “the craft satisfaction that arises from  
16  
17 conscious and purposeful mastery of the labour process” (Braverman 1974, p. 7). The mastery of  
18  
19 skills, an all-rounded understanding of the making process, and dedication to one’s work, are integral  
20  
21 to neo-craft occupations (Ocejo, 2017). Yet, as a post-industrial form of craft work, neo-craft work  
22  
23 extends its scope of action to the mastery of specific types of innovation and knowledge, expressed in  
24  
25 cultural negotiations around authenticity and ‘the particular’ (more on this later). In so doing, neo-  
26  
27 craft work is not necessarily antithetical to technological advancement; on the contrary, it is principled  
28  
29 on an opposition to the meaninglessness of other forms of employment and, in particular, sets itself as  
30  
31 alternative to the low-paid and precarious forms of knowledge and creative work in the neoliberal  
32  
33 economy. The making of something through manual or otherwise labour-intensive but ‘authentic’  
34  
35 practice is preferable, for participants in neo-craft industries, to the engagement in a labour market -  
36  
37 that of the knowledge and creative economy - which is comprehensively believed to be unable to  
38  
39 valorize one’s skill, characterised by marked precariousness and dissatisfaction (again, more on this  
40  
41 later). Conceived as such, neo-craft work allows workers to fruitfully marry cultural exploration with  
42  
43 the pursuit of personal interests and a strive for authenticity and self-affirmation, in the context of a  
44  
45 comprehensively romantic and nostalgic narration that glorifies the past and uses it as a future-  
46  
47 oriented source of inspiration. This finds roots in the context of a very peculiar social phenomenon:  
48  
49 hipster culture.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

### 56 **From hipster culture to neo-craft work: a question of ‘marginal distinction’**

57 Historically associated with an obsession for trendiness and being in-the-know about fashion and  
58  
59 lifestyle (Michael, 2015; Schiermer, 2014), and largely considered a byproduct of the indie subculture  
60

1  
2  
3 (Cronin, McCarthy, & Collins, 2014; Arsel & Thompson, 2011), hipster culture has affirmed in the  
4 first decades of the 21st century as a highly heterogeneous social phenomenon, typical (albeit not  
5 solely) of the hyper-gentrified, post-industrial neighbourhoods of Western global cities (Maly &  
6 Varis, 2016; Arvidsson, 2020). Theorisations of hipster culture in academic research exist mainly in  
7 the context of consumer research and cultural studies. These largely agree on the following, ideal-  
8 typical description: ‘Hipsters are young, white and middle class, typically between 20 and 35 years  
9 old (who) contribute to the ‘gentrification’ of former ‘popular’, working-class, ethnic or ‘exotic’  
10 neighbourhoods in the big Western cities’ (Schiermer, 2014, p.170). They ‘generally vote to the left,  
11 typically study at the humanities or work in the ‘creative industry’ or in cafes or bars or music or  
12 fashion stores’ (Schiermer, 2014, p.170). Accordingly, hipsters are regarded to be ‘voracious  
13 consumers’ who strive to keep up with the latest trends and are ‘deeply involved in the cultural field  
14 of the city they live in’ (Michael, 2015, p. 169).

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30 While this account looks credible, at least from a commonsensical standpoint, it must be noted that it  
31 relies more on theoretical assumptions than on empirical grounding. In fact, contrary to other social  
32 groups, participants in hipster culture tend to keep self-identification at bay. As Maly and Varis (2016,  
33 p. 638) note, “the rejection of the label ‘hipster’ as a category of self-identification seems to be part  
34 and parcel of the hipster identity discourse”. Similarly, Cronin et al. (2014, p. 8) underline that  
35 ‘(s)ignificant complications arise (...) when studying the hipster subgroup on the grounds that most  
36 members of this identity category shun the very label used to define them’. Put differently, the  
37 question of who should be considered a hipster remains a kind of epistemological conundrum, as a  
38 result of the absence of an explicit claim of ‘hipster subjectivity’. For the purposes of this article we  
39 follow Maly and Varis (2016), who describe hipster culture as a highly heterogeneous, translocal,  
40 polycentric and layered social phenomenon, participated by a variety of subjects roughly belonging to  
41 the same generational cohort – so-called Millennials – and constituted of practices marked by a  
42 dimension of normativity, which combine ‘very local’ tastes and attitudes with global consumption  
43 practices and cultures (Maly & Varis, 2016, p. 644). Accordingly, elaborating from Gerosa (2021), we  
44 define hipster culture as a constellation of diverse (micro-) social practices underpinned by a  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 distinguishing, shared discursive imaginary and aesthetic regime, characterised by: a) the hegemonic  
4 normativity of authenticity as a value logic, and b) the (to some degree, consequent) popularisation of  
5 a logic of taste based on the social recognition of ‘the particular’ and its extenuating cultural  
6 negotiation.  
7  
8  
9  
10

11  
12  
13 Virtually all research agrees on the centrality of authenticity in hipster culture. Something ‘authentic’  
14 carries remarkable social value in hipster circles, as it conveys experiential meaning and constitutes a  
15 key determinant in the expression of oneself. It has been noted that authenticity in hipster culture  
16 mediates a tension between individuality and imitation (Michael, 2015). Scheirmer (2014) for  
17 instance, points out that hipsters usually refrain from imitation and reify individuality, while they  
18 thrive on being ‘quirky’ and displaying knowledge of ‘unique’ trends. Yet, as Michael (2015) also  
19 suggests, hipsters do not reify trendiness as such, but rather the narrative that is attached to it – that is,  
20 the discourse around the perceived authenticity of a practice or product. This extends onto the  
21 practices of sociality and consumption peculiar to these scenes (Gerosa, 2021; Maly & Varis, 2016).  
22 The normative, culturally hegemonic role of authenticity in hipster culture is expressed through  
23 practices that are exemplary of a logic of taste based on the social recognition of ‘the particular’, and  
24 in its extenuating cultural negotiation in given social contexts. This is particularly epitomised by an  
25 obsessive attention towards production features in consumer goods, which is reflected - and here we  
26 are - in the popularity of craft, artisanal, natural or organic products among this social group (Ocejo,  
27 2017; Currid-Halkett, 2017).  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 We understand these cultural negotiations as practices of ‘marginal distinction’. These concern the  
49 valorisation of the display of one’s capacity to grasp the ‘marginal’ differences that characterise  
50 certain products and tastes. The adjective ‘marginal’ is here intended in two different and  
51 complementary nuances. On the one hand, it concerns the social value of newness, both in absolute  
52 terms and in relation to the mainstream. In this sense, it echoes the economics notion of marginal  
53 utility, which contends that the utility (i.e., the satisfaction) of consuming a product or service  
54 decreases as the number of additional units consumed increases (Kauder, 2015). In existing research  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 and in popular discourse, this is represented through the expression ‘before it was cool’, which  
4  
5 highlights how participants in hipster culture value the newness of a fashion trend, a food habit, or a  
6  
7 technological device (Maly & Varis, 2016). Yet, the more a new taste or trend becomes incrementally  
8  
9 popular in the mainstream consumer arena, the less it carries social gain in hipster circles. A new  
10  
11 consumption practice, taste, or trend is considered socially valuable in hipster culture if it is  
12  
13 recognized as new and ‘marginally’ uncommon: its recognition brings social gain. In turn, its value  
14  
15 incrementally decreases if a growing number of consumers – the mainstream – takes an interest in this  
16  
17 same practice, taste or trend, leading to the consumption practice becoming common and thus igniting  
18  
19 the search for a new marginality.  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 At the same time, ‘marginal’ also refers to the detection of ‘the particular’ (Smith Maguire, 2018) in a  
25  
26 given consumption practice, taste, or trend. This is intended as the apparently indiscernible, discursive  
27  
28 and/or material differences that set similar products apart. In hipster culture, this commonly takes  
29  
30 place - and here we are again - on the basis of production features. Labels such as ‘craft’, ‘artisanal’,  
31  
32 ‘organic’, or ‘natural’, become value-conferring precisely because they allow to express such  
33  
34 ‘marginal’ and apparently indiscernible differences between categories of products (and inside these  
35  
36 categories too) – which recognition, again, is status-producing. For instance, a preference for craft  
37  
38 beer as opposed to its mainstream counterpart allows participants in hipster culture to present  
39  
40 themselves as refined consumers of a product that is beer, but *a tiny bit different* (cfr. Pozner,  
41  
42 DeSoucey, Verhaal, & Sikavica, 2022). Similarly, their appreciation of organic coffee allows them to  
43  
44 showcase their knowledge about a product that is coffee, but *a tiny bit different*. While an attention to  
45  
46 production features is not necessarily new as a consumer preference, in hipster culture it becomes a  
47  
48 conspicuous trait, as Currid-Halkett (2017) argues, and a device to express cultural competence. At  
49  
50 the same time, this kind of cultural competence is used as a means to social status acquisition, which  
51  
52 results from the capacity to grasp the actually existing, or otherwise perceived, ‘marginal’ differences  
53  
54 between apparently identical consumer goods.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Neo-craft work emerges within this cultural milieu. Here, craft production and products as discussed  
4 do not solely represent a market response to a consumer trend, but constitute ‘actually authentic’  
5 forms of production founded upon ‘particular’ techniques or materials, that are ‘reconverted’ to the  
6 present-day consumer economy (Scott, 2017). This constitutes the aforementioned ‘resignification’  
7 process, which is characterised by the integration of craft practices and values into forms of labour-  
8 intensive, manual production. The engagement in an eminently cultural - and therefore,  
9 quintessentially post-industrial - labour that extends the craft allure onto the subjects and practices  
10 involved in these jobs, providing them with social recognition. A vignette in Ocejo’s (2017) work  
11 perfectly describes this process, when he presents a mixologist bartender who explains that requesting  
12 a bartender to ‘do what they want’ with one’s cocktail order represents a form of social reward and a  
13 nurturing of their creative dispositions. Here, a mixologist behaves like a creative worker, in that the  
14 successful understanding of the marginal preferences of the consumer - expressed in the production of  
15 a cocktail that matches these preferences - represents a means of creative expression. This same  
16 exchange, in turn, has status acquisition potential: mixologist bartenders are bartenders, but *a tiny bit*  
17 *different* from ordinary ones. As participants in what may primarily be seen as a cultural scene, neo-  
18 craft workers thus produce a ‘culturalization’ of their working-class or otherwise manual work by way  
19 of this resignification, anchoring it in a ‘craft imaginary’ (Bell et al., 2021) and transforming it into a  
20 creative labour of sorts.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 This, as said, finds roots in the cultural negotiations that are peculiar to hipster culture. Obviously, we  
44 do not argue that all neo-craft workers are hipsters, nor that all hipsters are neo-craft workers or that  
45 hipsters solely consume neo-craft products and engage in consumption practices principled upon  
46 marginal distinction. As research on hipsters notably underlines, their consumer practices are  
47 diversified and heterogeneous; hipsters play with taste hierarchies in ways that do not always comply  
48 with a coherent cultural construction, mixing highbrow and lowbrow in clever manners, and using  
49 irony as a cultural marker (le Grand, 2020). It is for this reason that hipster culture has been taken  
50 somewhat less seriously than deserved, both in academic research and in the popular debate, often  
51 dismissed as a fad or a joke. Yet, for how incoherent, hipster culture has been argued to be exemplary  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 of emerging ‘modes of distinction’ (Friedman, Savage, Hanquinet, & Miles, 2015) that lead to new  
4 forms of social status acquisition (Eckhardt & Bardhi, 2019): the affirmation of neo-craft work, we  
5 contend, should be seen as a byproduct of this cultural and social phenomenon.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Within this context, craft, quoting Bell et al. (2021), ‘responds to the desire for authenticity through  
12 retrospective symbolic and discursive construction’ (p. 7) and, in so doing, promotes ‘a ‘forward-  
13 looking consciousness [that] does not ignore past experiences (...) but it uses its experience in order to  
14 transform it’ - in this case, into meaningful work (p. 13). This is why, as a form of ‘cultural labour  
15 with hands’ with entrepreneurial and reputational potential, as noted by Ocejo (2017) neo-craft work  
16 becomes appealing for many young workers of a middle class background, representing not only ‘the  
17 only viable alternative to the drudgery of factory labour’ (Arvidsson, 2020, p. 21) but, as said, a  
18 credible alternative to the status-inducing, but also precarious, low-paid ‘bullshit jobs’ (Graeber,  
19 2019) of the neoliberal knowledge and creative economy (Ross, 2009). See for instance how this craft  
20 beer worker, an interviewee in Fox-Miller (2019, p. 84), describes her shift to neo-craft work:  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 *“I spent my days in a cubicle staring out the window thinking about all the different things I could be*  
36 *doing with my time... [With brewing] there’s this sense of autonomy, like I have agency over*  
37 *everything I’m doing. This is my choice. I am creating a life-cycle and I’m creating a living product...*  
38 *When you are behind the computer, you are so disconnected from the end product. And there might*  
39 *not even be a product that you are working towards. But [beer] is a discernible product that I can*  
40 *consume and use and share with people.”*  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 In sum, here we extend Ocejo’s argument (2017) and contend that neo-craft work represents a new  
51 kind of ‘meaningful work’ (Schwartz, 1982; Laaser & Karlsson, 2022) through which workers  
52 experience that unity between worker, production process and object that is historically associated  
53 with the ideal of unalienated ‘good work’ in craft work (Sennett, 2008). This meaningfulness -  
54 interpreted as the combination of autonomy, dignity and reputation (Laaser & Karlsson, 2022) - is  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 determined by a peculiar combination of the discursive and the material, that we argue is the  
4  
5 distinctive trait of this new form of work.  
6  
7  
8

### 9 **The discursive materiality of neo-craft work**

10  
11  
12 Discussing craft beer, Brown (2020) identifies the low skill level required to enter the industry as the  
13  
14 main culprit which, in his view, disqualifies craft beer from being considered a 'true craft'. The  
15  
16 solution, for him, is to make the craft beer brewer a professional title, emulating the middle-age guild  
17  
18 system. In contrast, Langlands (2017) considers craft beer as a marketing ploy that misuses its  
19  
20 authentic allure for commercial purposes, and suggests that in order to recover the true meaning of  
21  
22 craft, we must instead resort to 'craft', i.e., skillfulness and wisdom. Despite standing on opposite  
23  
24 grounds, both these authors – writing for a generalist audience – ultimately agree that 'true craft'  
25  
26 equates with skill, and there is a distinction between 'new crafts', like beer brewing, and recognized  
27  
28 crafts.  
29  
30

31  
32  
33 In 'Masters of Craft', Ocejo (2017) undertakes his ethnography precisely with the aim of  
34  
35 understanding why young people with high-level education are enthusiastically choosing jobs that are  
36  
37 traditionally considered as low-skilled. The answer he finds is that, for them, these jobs turn out to be  
38  
39 more personally rewarding than any corporate job for which they might have acquired educational or  
40  
41 professional skills. Ocejo fully acknowledges these activities with the status of 'crafts', but also  
42  
43 argues that there is a tension between them and their traditional counterparts: the jobs he discusses are  
44  
45 creating a new industry rather than updating or substituting other forms of craft work. After having  
46  
47 discussed the relationship between traditional and neo-craft work and conceptualised the cultural  
48  
49 milieu wherein the latter emerges, for our argumentation to be fully outlined we now turn to argue  
50  
51 that what is distinctive of neo-craft work is a peculiar combination of the discursive and the material,  
52  
53 that we call 'discursive materiality'.  
54  
55

56  
57  
58 As said, the common denominator of craft work as traditionally intended has long been deemed to be  
59  
60 the skillful production of durable objects, being tools or goods, with raw materials such as wood,

1  
2  
3 metal (precious or otherwise), pottery, woven, glass, etc. Success – be it commercial or in terms of  
4 personal satisfaction – depends upon the production of high-quality, refined objects. To achieve this  
5 goal, the artisan needs to accumulate significant experience and mastery in a specific production  
6 technique. This focus on skillfulness, durable objects and quality represents the baseline of the  
7 fundamental connection between craft, art and design, that persists (Shiner, 2012) even after the  
8 separation between ‘fine arts’ and ‘craft arts’ (Adamson, 2013) brought to a widespread degradation  
9 of its status. Thus, in the context of craft work as traditionally conceived the mastery requires  
10 engagement with cultural and symbolic discursive practices which primarily relate to the artisan’s  
11 proficiency in the engagement with matter, that is, to create products of extraordinary quality.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 On the other hand, if we accept the conceptualisation of neo-craft work just outlined, it appears that  
25 neo-craft work primarily rests upon an engagement with the previously-illustrated cultural and  
26 symbolic discourses of marginal distinction in the performance of the working act. To put it in  
27 simpler, comparative terms: from the perspective of craft work as traditionally intended, to master the  
28 ‘craft’ of a high-quality cocktail or beer requires less expertise in manual manipulation than to master  
29 the craft of a finely decorated ceramic vase, jewel or blown glass sculpture. Thus, jobs that iconically  
30 represent neo-craft work are usually not considered to be craft work because they require a lower  
31 degree of manual engagement, and produce goods for immediate consumption that – apart from  
32 exceptional circumstances – do not possess the artistic and design qualities associated with durable  
33 craft objects. However, this does not explain why neo-craft work is now so fashionable and tightly  
34 associated with the notion, albeit in a new form, of craft. The low entry-level skill requirements may  
35 make neo-craft work an escape route for middle-class, highly-educated individuals from the ‘bad jobs’  
36 of the knowledge economy. But why does this kind of manual work remain attractive in the first  
37 place? Why do some want to become ‘craftspeople’, albeit in a different way? Put differently, if we  
38 have accounted for the ‘neo-’ prefix in the neo-craft definition, it still remains to make sense of and  
39 justify its ‘craft’ component.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In order to accomplish this task, a good starting point is to critically re-examine the renowned ‘The  
4 craftsman’ by Richard Sennett (2008). In the opening pages of the book, Sennett argues that  
5  
6 ‘craftsmanship is poorly understood when it is equated only with the manual skill of the carpenter’s  
7  
8 sort’ (Sennett, 2008, p. 20), which is a much more groundbreaking statement than what could appear  
9  
10 at first. Instead, he advances a definition of craft work that revolves around three pillars: engagement  
11  
12 and dedication to ‘good work’ for its own sake; co-presence of ‘hand and head’; and, presence of a  
13  
14 skill developed to a high level (Sennett, 2008, p. 20). But which skills? Certainly not only manual  
15  
16 ones, given the premise. Indeed, Sennett provides a very illustrative sample of who qualifies as  
17  
18 ‘craftspeople’ according to his definition: carpenters, lab technicians, conductors, even Linux  
19  
20 programmers. This is an extremely broad set of professions in which the manual component of work  
21  
22 largely fades away, becoming peripheral if not invisible. To describe his ideal of craftspeople, Sennett  
23  
24 recovers the archaic Greek ideal of the *demioergos*, who focuses on achieving quality and doing good  
25  
26 work for social recognition (Sennett, 2008, pp. 21-27). While resorting to ancient Greece, Sennett  
27  
28 actually proposes a very (post-)modern definition of craftsmanship that well captures the meaning of  
29  
30 craft in neo-craft work: neo-craft workers aspire to be *demioergoi*. However, this does not mean that  
31  
32 the craft in neo-craft work acquires a purely metaphorical dimension, becoming detached from the  
33  
34 necessity of manual work. Manual work still possesses a fundamental value in neo-craft work, only a  
35  
36 different one: it acquires value by means of an intra-agential process where the materiality of the  
37  
38 making combines with the discursive dimension (cultural negotiations around authenticity and ‘the  
39  
40 particular’), which gets tangibly incorporated in the aura of the material object serving as a semiotic  
41  
42 vehicle (Harold, 2020). It is through the combination of these dimensions that the neo-craft artisan  
43  
44 embodies, affects and perceives the achievement of ‘good work’.

45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51 Thus, informed by the performative and the affective turn in organisational studies (Bell & Vachhani,  
52  
53 2020; Gherardi, 2016; Gherardi et al., 2019; Harding et al., 2022) based on agential realism (Barad,  
54  
55 2007), we argue that neo-craft work as a productive process represents the outcome of a specific form  
56  
57 of *discursive materiality*, that is, one in which discursive and material practices become inextricably  
58  
59 connected, and their intra-action provides meaning to work activity. By applying a performative  
60

1  
2  
3 approach we interpret the working act as a situated practice (Gherardi, 2016) constituted by the intra-  
4 action (Barad, 2007) between the body of the artisan, the raw materials, the tools and the discursive  
5 practices altogether. By adding the lenses of the affective turn to this conceptualization we consider  
6 affect (in the Spinozian meaning of the ability to bodily affect and be affected) to lie in and emerge  
7 from the intra-action of embodied subjects, objects, and discourses (Gherardi et al., 2019). In line with  
8 this interpretation, the artisan should be considered as the ensemble of agentive matter and embodied  
9 discursive practices (Harding et al., 2022). The concept of discursive materiality allows enlightening  
10 the entanglement between discursive and material practices in neo-craft work, stressing how  
11 ‘materiality is in itself performed and knowing emerges from the interactions between material  
12 phenomena, the material arrangements for knowing about these phenomena, and epistemic practices’  
13 (Gherardi et al., 2019, p. 296). To read neo-craft work in this entanglement requires in other words to,  
14 on the one hand, analyse the nature of the discursive practices embodied by the artisan’s body at the  
15 moment of the working act, and on the other hand to understand the meaning and function of the  
16 relationship between the body of the artisan and the matter in the manual working act.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 An example of this entanglement between the discursive and the material is offered by Gabriele, a  
36 Lithuanian, Copenhagen-based upcycle bag maker in her late 20s. Describing her neo-craft enterprise,  
37 called Bagabù, she explains that:  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 *“Bagabù journey started back in Italy in 2015. At the time I was living there and I was looking for a*  
44 *job, but without much success. Meanwhile, to keep myself occupied, I started learning how to sew,*  
45 *and decided to try to sew some simple tote bags. One weekend, while strolling through the monthly*  
46 *vintage market in the main city square, I spotted 5 old, big leather jackets that the seller was almost*  
47 *giving away for free as they were waaay out of fashion and also a little bit damaged. At that point the*  
48 *idea kicked in: why not make leather bags by re-using the jackets? Here the whole journey started of*  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *experimenting, learning, finding cool and smart ways of upcycling leftover materials into high*  
4 *quality, handmade, and pretty unique products.”<sup>1</sup>*  
5  
6  
7  
8

9 Gabriele has a visual communication and sustainability degree. In her work, the intra-active  
10 relationship between her embodied discursive practices, the meanings associated to the manual  
11 process of production and the cultural process of marginal distinction, the raw materials such as  
12 leftovers, the direct affective relationship with the final product and consumers, all contribute to her  
13 identity as a neo-craft worker. See for example the passage below, in the same interview:  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21  
22 *“I am trying my best to be very transparent about my work, how I produce my bags, and about myself*  
23 *as an entrepreneur and craftsman. This is to show that my products are the fruit of my passion and*  
24 *hard work, and that they are built with quality and durability in mind. I also want to show my*  
25 *products not as something to show off, like some people like to do with famous brands. I want my*  
26 *products to match the personality of their owners, and be there with them when they enjoy their life*  
27 *and daily adventures like a trustworthy companion. On a more general level, I also do my best to*  
28 *show that upcycling fashion can be pretty, funky, durable, and that it can be a source of inspiration*  
29 *for our everyday life.”<sup>2</sup>*  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 Seen from the lens of discursive materiality, the focus of neo-craft work thus shifts from the nature  
42 and the properties of the final objects to the process of their formation. This means focusing on the  
43 playful and hybrid relationship between the corporeality of the artisan, the materiality of the raw  
44 materials and of the final goods, and the discursive practices informing that relationship as a whole  
45 (Gherardi, 2006). Furthermore, the entanglement between human and non-human elements has the  
46 potential to produce embodied affective resonance (Gherardi et al., 2019), but this is not an automatic  
47 outcome. Indeed, the material or discursive elements which are internalised in the bodies and the  
48 matters involved in the intra-action, can favour or at the opposite constraint the embodiment of  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58

59 <sup>1</sup> See: <https://www.lapepaboutique.com/2021/06/09/upcycled-bagabu-bags/> (Last accessed 10 November 2022)

60 <sup>2</sup> Ibid.



1  
2  
3 affectivity. Thus, a process of discursive materiality takes place when the working act resulting from  
4 the intra-action of these elements enables the achievement of affective resonance. The discursive  
5 materiality of neo-craft work is pivotal in connecting it with the ideal of the ‘good work’ as theorised  
6 by Sennett or Ocejo. As a means to achieve affective resonance, neo-craft work sets out as a response  
7 to the ‘cruel optimism’ (Berlant, 2011) of creative work and a response to the general crisis of work,  
8 pursued by means of an adjustment in the way one’s discursive and material, manual and cultural  
9 dispositions are put at value.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 Arguably, discursive materiality is not an exclusive feature of neo-craft work. Yet, neo-craft work  
21 represents a specific engagement in material and discursive practices: the engagement of the worker in  
22 a direct relationship with matter and its manipulation and alteration - i.e. the act of crafting - brings  
23 with itself a fundamental value. It allows what Bell and Vachhani (2020) define as the sensual,  
24 experiential and being-centred quality of craft. Indeed, building on the notion that global capitalism  
25 and consumerism depend on preventing humans to have sensory engagements with matter (Bennett,  
26 2010), Bell and Vachhani (2020, p. 695) argue that craft work ‘can be understood as a site where  
27 feeling and desire for crafted objects intersects with the bodies of others and is transformed into a  
28 source of affect’, producing interactions of desire. This embodied experiential pleasure is essential to  
29 the discursive materiality of neo-craft work. On the other hand, discursive practices embodied by the  
30 worker and expressed through the material engagement are equally fundamental in the process of  
31 discursive materiality of neo-craft work. Through the symbolic practice of marginal distinction, the  
32 worker operates a resignification of the craftsperson as a profession and, consequently, of their social  
33 status based on the cultural negotiation around the values of authenticity and the particular (Gasparin  
34 & Neyland, 2022).  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53


54 Also, both neo-craft work and work that has been as traditionally classified as craft might represent,  
55 potentially, processes of discursive materiality. Yet, what distinguishes them are the specific forms of  
56 engagement with the material and discursive practices in the process. In the latter, the discursive  
57 component embodied by the worker responds mainly to the ‘pure craft’ logic described by Kroezen et  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 al. (2021), which emphasises mastery in the knowledge of the history and skills associated with the  
4 production techniques. The achievement of embodied affective resonance between the artisan and the  
5 matter in the working process derives from a manual manipulation consistent with this discursive  
6 mastery, i.e. a skillful working act capable of producing an object of high artistic quality and coherent  
7 with tradition. Compared to neo-craft work, the discursive engagement remains more reflexively  
8 oriented toward the manual manipulation of the matter. Also creative work might perpetuate the  
9 constraint of the workers' bodies. As material and discursive practices are not independent but are  
10 intra-acting components, the lack of engagement with material practices in 'classic' creative work also  
11 influences the kind of engagement with discursive practices this can enact, undermining its potential  
12 to the achievements in terms of status and good work involved in neo-craft work.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 Comprehensively taken, work that has been as traditionally classified as craft and neo-craft work as  
27 here conceived might be seen as two pure ideal types at the ends of a broad spectrum (Fig. 1, below),  
28 rather than clear-cut categories. Neo-craft work may well engage in discursive practices based upon  
29 gaining mastery in the production process of an object with high artistic quality, altering their  
30 engagement with matter accordingly. Craft work as traditionally intended may as well engage in  
31 discursive practices of marginal distinction, achieving conspicuous production. Yet, in line with the  
32 focus of discursive materiality on the process, the critical assumption is that neo-craft work *may*  
33 engage in discursive practices distinctive of craft work as conventionally conceived and in the  
34 production of objects of exquisite artistic and design quality, but it *must* engage in the discursive  
35 practice of marginal distinction. The same, reversed, is valid for traditional craft work. Accordingly,  
36 jobs such as food truck operator, craft brewer, cocktail mixologist or the hairdressers described by  
37 Ocejo (2017) tend to align very closely with the neo-craft work ideal type. Others, such as potter or  
38 weaver, tend to align very closely to the traditional craft end of the spectrum. Still, these may also be  
39 considered to be neo-craft work: it is not the occupation that determines the closeness to a category,  
40 but the configuration of discursive materiality enacted through the work process. Ultimately, where a  
41 particular practitioner falls on the spectrum depends on how they practice their craft.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Fig. 1 - Discursive materiality - Spectrum of differentiation (including prototypical examples)



This becomes particularly evident in the example of the new generation of bootmakers in El Paso, Texas, described by Gibson (2016). These have embraced craft production for its relationship with the logics of creative work and authenticity but also have the will to acquire and bequeath the traditional production technique of cowboy boots from the previous generations of bootmakers. As seen earlier with Gabriele's example, also for Gibson's (p. 76) bootmakers 'in the new craft era workshops are run by people who view themselves as "creative" people with artisanal values, seeking to carve a living from a personal "passion" [...] The product's material shape and dimensions have provided a template for new and "retro" artistic expressions'. In other occasions, instead, it may even be the adoption of technological developments to enable the neo-craft nature of one's craft work, as in the case of Laura Quinn, a glassblower who integrated prototyping with 3D printing and social media work. In her auto-ethnographic reflections, she points out that her use of digital technology is to 'expand my audience's understanding of my identity, of the entire glass making process'. Put differently, for Laura her craft work is not only about mastering glass blowing, 'and I want them to know that' (Quinn, 2022).

## Conclusion

1  
2  
3 This article presented a theoretical conceptualisation of neo-craft work, with the goal of better  
4 understanding its growing significance. We have argued that neo-craft work should be seen among the  
5 ‘new forms of work’ of the 21st century, as it represents an emergent form of post-industrial craft  
6 work whereby jobs that were previously considered low-status, or performed by the working class, are  
7 ‘resignified’ into status-producing occupations through the integration of craft practices and values,  
8 and conferred new meaningfulness as the outcome of a specific form of *discursive materiality*, in  
9 which discursive and material practices become inextricably connected. We have shown how this  
10 finds roots in the cultural negotiations and the practices of marginal distinction that dominate  
11 hipster culture, taken here as the cultural milieu within which neo-craft work emerges, and outlined  
12 the notion of ‘discursive materiality’ as an interpretative framework to analyse and define neo-craft  
13 work in its intra-acting components. The discursive materiality framework also contributes to the  
14 recent but rich practice and affective turns in organisational studies, advancing a model that allows to  
15 interpret the working act, taking into full account human and non-human factors in organisations.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 It derives from this interpretation that neo-craft work should not be seen as another kind of craft as  
34 simple ‘return to the past’ (Bell et al., 2021), but rather one based upon what may be defined as a form  
35 of ‘progressive nostalgia’ (Gandini, 2020), which binds together the past and the future in a dialectical  
36 relationship, using the past as a future-oriented horizon that is not merely about preservation or  
37 conservation, but chiefly about innovation and change. The achievement of ‘good work’ is exemplary  
38 of this dynamic: after the demise of Fordism, this has been a long-standing promise of creative work  
39 (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2010; McRobbie, 2016), based on the fulfilment of autonomy and self-  
40 expression in contrast to the impoverishment of working conditions caused by industrialization  
41 (Boltanski and Chiapello, 2007). However, the reality of creative industries’ working conditions,  
42 made of precariousness, alienation, exploitation and stressfulness (Hesmondalgh & Baker, 2010;  
43 Ross, 2009), undermined the credibility of this promise. Neo-craft work is taking over from creative  
44 work in this endeavour, renewing it on the basis of a resignification of manual work that looks back at  
45 the past with a future-oriented mindset. Traditional working-class occupations that involved  
46 (allegedly) low-skilled and manual work, as shown elaborating upon Ocejo (2017), are conferred an  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 ‘elite’ status on the basis of cultural negotiations around authenticity and ‘the particular’, which  
4 narration and detection confers value and meaning to these new craft practices. A return to a direct  
5 relationship with matter (and nature), the celebration of the embodied pleasure of manual labour and  
6 the idealisation of the allure of a meaningful work dedicated to ethical rather than purely economic  
7 goals (Gerosa, 2021; Ocejo, 2017), are the building blocks of this promise.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15  
16 Yet, our effort remains an initial step: more work is required both theoretically and empirically to  
17 provide an in-depth understanding of neo-craft work. Future research will need to provide detailed  
18 accounts of work organisation, labour processes, job quality and conceptions of status across different  
19 neo-craft industries. This would also contribute to further delineating the actual boundary conditions  
20 of neo-craft work. Indeed, while neo-craft work challenges traditional notions of craft and ‘menial’  
21 manual labour through their symbolic upscaling, not all forms of manual work seem able to equally  
22 sustain discursive materiality based on marginal distinction. Emerging evidence suggests that objects  
23 for everyday experiential consumption (food and drinks, but also bikes and clothing, furniture and  
24 houseware, etc.) seem to be more prone to hold symbolic value for identity projects or  
25 (in)conspicuous consumption display thanks to the taste dealing of neo-craft workers (Gerosa,  
26 forthcoming). Other manual occupations (e.g., house cleaning, plumbing, construction work) might  
27 ultimately remain extraneous to such processes. Further research must thus work to refine the  
28 understanding of the boundaries of neo-craft work and analyse if and how it contributes to the  
29 creation of new hierarchies of symbolic inequality in manual work.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 This also highlights the need to conduct research on the potentially critical aspects of neo-craft work,  
49 for both workers and society. Indeed, despite neo-craft work taking over the promise of achieving  
50 ‘good work’ from creative work, the first empirical explorations suggest it is not without issues of  
51 social and gender inequality, and work precariousness (Delgaty & Wilson, 2023). Additionally, neo-  
52 craft businesses are increasingly under the spotlight as drivers of gentrification of urban space  
53 (Wallace, 2019; Schiermer, 2014) and of the cultural appropriation of popular consumer cultures  
54 (Gerosa, forthcoming). An in-depth critical exploration of these issues (and beyond) is essential to  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 avoid an academic glorification of neo-craft work, similar to what has occasionally happened in the  
4  
5 past with creative work.  
6  
7

8  
9 Nonetheless, while acknowledging its inevitable limitations, we contend that this article serves the  
10  
11 key purpose of mapping the terrain on which debates over the contemporary status and significance of  
12  
13 craft work are taking place, as well as delineating an original framework for understanding the  
14  
15 specifics of ‘neo-craft’ work within that terrain. Seen from this perspective, neo-craft work emerges to  
16  
17 be more than just a fashionable trend. Paraphrasing Neff, Wissinger and Zukin (2012), it may be  
18  
19 argued that neo-craft work represents the new ‘cool job in a hot industry’, which significance is likely  
20  
21 to further increase in the post-pandemic scenario, where questions around the meaningfulness of work  
22  
23 have fully become mainstream, epitomised among other things by the emergent ‘great resignation’  
24  
25 debate (Thompson, 2021).  
26  
27  
28  
29

### 30 **Acknowledgments**

31  
32 This article is part of the CRAFTWORK project, which has received funding from the European  
33  
34 Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation  
35  
36 programme (Grant agreement No. 948982). The authors thank the anonymous reviewers and the  
37  
38 Guest Editors, particularly Jochem Kroezen, for their support and extremely insightful comments  
39  
40 throughout the review process.  
41  
42  
43  
44

### 45 **References**

46  
47  
48 Adamson, Glenn (2013). *The invention of craft*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

49  
50  
51 American Craft Council. (2022). *Home*. American Craft Council. Available at:

52  
53 <https://www.craftcouncil.org/home>, (last accessed 22/02/2022).  
54  
55

56  
57 Aroles, Jeremy, Mitev, Nathalie, & de Vaujany, François-Xavier (2019). Mapping themes in the study  
58  
59 of new work practices. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 34, 285-299.  
60

1  
2  
3 Arsel, Zeynep, & Thompson, Craig J. (2011). Demythologizing consumption practices: How  
4 consumers protect their field-dependent identity investments from devaluing marketplace myths.  
5  
6  
7 *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37, 791–806.  
8  
9

10 Arvidsson, Adam (2020). Capitalism and the commons. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 37(2), 3-30.  
11  
12

13 Banks, Mark (2014) Craft labour and creative industries. In: Chris Bilton (Ed.), *Creativity and*  
14  
15 *Cultural Policy*, London: Routledge, pp. 81-98.  
16  
17

18 Barad, Karen (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter*  
19  
20 *and meaning*. Durham: Duke University Press.  
21  
22

23 Bell, Emma, & Vachhani, Sheena J. (2020). Relational encounters and vital materiality in the practice  
24  
25 of craft work. *Organization Studies*, 41, 681–701.  
26  
27

28 Bell, Emma, Dacin, Tina M., & Toraldo, Maria Laura (2021). Craft imaginaries – Past, present and  
29  
30 future. *Organization Theory*, 2(1), 1-18.  
31  
32

33 Bell, Emma, Mangia, Gianluigi, Taylor, Scott, & Toraldo, Maria Laura (Eds.) (2018). *The*  
34  
35 *organization of craft work: Identities, meanings, and materiality*. London: Routledge.  
36  
37

38 Bennett, Jane. *Vibrant matter. A political ecology of things*. Durham: Duke University Press.  
39  
40

41 Berlant, Laurent (2011). *Cruel optimism*. Durham: Duke University Press.  
42  
43

44 Boltanski, Luc, & Chiapello, Ève (2007). *The new spirit of capitalism*. London: Verso.  
45  
46

47 Bourdieu, Pierre (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Harvard: Harvard  
48  
49 University Press.  
50  
51

52 Braverman, Harry (1974). *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth*  
53  
54 *Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press.  
55  
56

57 Brown, Pete (2020). *Craft: An argument: Why the term 'craft beer' is completely undefinable*,  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *hopelessly misunderstood and absolutely essential*. London: Storm Lantern Books.  
4  
5

6 Cappelli, Peter, & Keller, Joseph (2013). Classifying work in the new economy. *Academy of*  
7  
8 *Management Review*, 38, 575-596.  
9

10  
11 Cronin, James M., McCarthy Mary B., & Collins, Alan M. (2014). Covert distinction: How hipsters  
12  
13 practice food-based resistance strategies in the production of identity. *Consumption Markets &*  
14  
15 *Culture*, 17, 2-28.  
16

17  
18 Currid-Halkett, Elizabeth (2017). *The sum of small things: A theory of the aspirational class*.  
19  
20 Princeton: Princeton University Press.  
21

22  
23 Delgaty, Aaron, & Wilson, Eli. R. (2023). The Hidden Strains of ‘Cool’ Jobs. *Sociology*, DOI:  
24  
25 00380385231172129 [online first].  
26  
27

28  
29 Dormer, Peter (1997). *The culture of craft*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.  
30

31  
32 Eckhardt, Giana M., & Bardhi, Fleura (2019). New dynamics of social status and distinction.  
33  
34 *Marketing Theory*, 20, 85–102.  
35

36  
37 Florida, Richard (2002). *The rise of the creative class*. New York: Basic Books.  
38

39  
40 Fox Miller, Chloe (2017). The contemporary geographies of craft-based manufacturing. *Geography*  
41  
42 *Compass*, 11, 1-13.  
43

44  
45 Fox Miller, Chloe (2019). ‘Glorified Janitors’: Creativity, cachet, and everyday experiences of work  
46  
47 in Portland, Oregon’s craft brewing sector. *Geoforum*, 106, 78-86.  
48

49  
50 Friedman, Sam, Savage, Mike, Hanquinet, Laurie, & Miles, Andrew (2015). Cultural sociology and  
51  
52 new forms of distinction. *Poetics*, 53, 1-8.  
53

54  
55 Gandini, Alessandro (2020). *Zeitgeist nostalgia: On populism, work and the ‘good life’*. Winchester:  
56  
57 John Hunt Publishing.  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Gandini, Alessandro (2016). *The reputation economy. Understanding knowledge work in digital*  
4  
5 *society*. London: Palgrave Macmillan London.  
6  
7

8 Gasparin, Marta, & Neyland, Daniel (2022). Organizing Tekhnē: Configuring processes and politics  
9  
10 through craft. *Organization Studies*, 43, 1137-1160.  
11  
12

13 Gerosa, Alessandro (forthcoming). *The hipster economy: Taste and authenticity in late modern*  
14  
15 *capitalism*. London: UCL Press.  
16  
17

18 Gerosa, Alessandro (2021). Cosmopolitans of regionalism: Dealers of omnivorous taste under Italian  
19  
20 food truck economic imaginary. *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 24, 30-53.  
21  
22

23 Gherardi, Silvia (2016). To start practice theorizing anew: The contribution of the concepts of  
24  
25 agencement and formativeness. *Organization*, 23, 680–698.  
26  
27

28 Gherardi, Silvia, Murgia, Annalisa, Bellè, Elisa, Miele, Francesco, & Carreri, Anna (2019). Tracking  
29  
30 the sociomaterial traces of affect at the crossroads of affect and practice theories. *Qualitative*  
31  
32 *Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 14, 295–316.  
33  
34

35 Gibson, Christopher R. (2016). Material inheritances: How place, materiality, and labor process  
36  
37 underpin the path-dependent evolution of contemporary craft production. *Economic Geography*, 92,  
38  
39 61-86.  
40  
41

42 Graeber, David (2019). *Bullshit jobs: The rise of pointless work, and what we can do about it*.  
43  
44 London: Penguin Random House.  
45  
46

47 Harding, Nancy, Gilmore, Sarah, & Ford, Jackie (2022). Matter that embodies: Agentive flesh and  
48  
49 working bodies/selves. *Organization Studies*, 43, 649-668.  
50  
51

52 Harold, Christine (2020). *Things worth keeping: The value of attachment in a disposable world*.  
53  
54 Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.  
55  
56

57 Harvey, David (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Heritage Crafts. (2017, April 23). List of crafts. Heritage Crafts. Available at:

4  
5 <https://heritagecrafts.org.uk/crafts/> (last accessed 22/02/2022).

6  
7  
8 Hesmondhalgh, David, & Baker, Sarah (2010). 'A very complicated version of freedom': Conditions  
9 and experiences of creative labour in three cultural industries. *Poetics*, 38, 4–20.

10  
11  
12 Jakob, Doreen (2013). Crafting your way out of the recession? New craft entrepreneurs and the global  
13 economic downturn. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 6, 127-140.

14  
15  
16 Kalleberg, Arne L., & Vallas, Steven P. (2018). Probing precarious work: Theory, research, and  
17 politics. *Research in the Sociology of Work*, 31, 1-30.

18  
19  
20 Kauder, Emil (2015). *History of marginal utility theory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 Kroezen, Jochem J., & Heugens, Pursey P. M. A. R. (2019). What is dead may never die: Institutional  
27 regeneration through logic reemergence in Dutch beer brewing. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 64,  
28 976–1019.

29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34 Kroezen, Jochem J., & Heugens, Pursey P. M. A. R. (2012). Organizational identity formation:  
35 Processes of identity imprinting and enactment in the Dutch microbrewing landscape. In Majken  
36 Schultz, Steve Maguire, Ann Langley, & Haridimos Tsoukas (Eds.), *Constructing Identity in and*  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
*around Organizations* (pp. 89-127). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66 Kroezen, Jochem, Ravasi, Davide, Sasaki, Innan, Żebrowska, Monika, & Suddaby, Roy (2021).  
67 Configurations of craft: Alternative models for organizing work. *Academy of Management Annals*, 15,  
68 502-536.

69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

Laaser, Knut, & Karlsson, Jan C. (2022). Towards a sociology of meaningful work. *Work, Employment and Society*, 36, 798–815.

1  
2  
3 Land, Chris (2018). Back to the future. Re-imagining work through craft. *Futures of Work*. Available  
4 at: <https://futuresofwork.co.uk/2018/11/19/back-to-the-future-re-imagining-work-through-craft/> (last  
5  
6 accessed 25 August 2023).  
7  
8

9  
10 Land, Chris, Sutherland, Neil, & Taylor, Scott (2018). Back to the Brewster: Craft brewing, gender  
11 and the dialectical interplay of retraditionalisation and innovation. In: Emma Bell, Gianluigi Mangia,  
12 Scott Taylor, & Maria Laura Toraldo (Eds.) *The Organization of Craft Work* (pp. 150-168). London:  
13  
14 Routledge.  
15  
16  
17

18  
19  
20 Langlands, Alexander (2017). *Craeft: How traditional crafts are about more than just making*.  
21  
22 London: Faber and Faber.  
23  
24

25 le Grand, Elias, (2020). Representing the middle-class ‘hipster’: Emerging modes of distinction,  
26 generational oppositions and gentrification. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 23, 184-200.  
27  
28

29  
30 Luckman, Susan (2015). *Craft and the creative economy*. London: Springer.  
31  
32

33 Luckman, Susan, & Thomas, Nicola (Eds.) (2018). *Craft Economies*. London: Bloomsbury  
34  
35 Publishing.  
36  
37

38 Maly, Ico, & Varis, Piia (2016). The 21st-century hipster: On micro-populations in times of  
39  
40 superdiversity. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 19, 637-653.  
41  
42

43 McRobbie, Angela (2016). *Be Creative: Making a Living in the New Culture Industries*. Cambridge:  
44  
45 Polity Press.  
46  
47

48 Michael, Janna (2015). It’s really not hip to be a hipster: Negotiating trends and authenticity in the  
49  
50 cultural field. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 15, 163-182.  
51  
52

53  
54 Moore, Phoebe V. (2017). *The quantified self in precarity: Work, technology and what counts*.  
55  
56 London: Routledge.  
57  
58

59 Naudin, Annette, & Patel, Karen (2019). Entangled expertise: Women’s use of social media in  
60

1  
2  
3 entrepreneurial work. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 22, 511-527.  
4

5  
6 Neff, Gina, Wissinger, Elizabeth, & Zukin, Sharon (2005). Entrepreneurial labor among cultural  
7 producers: “Cool” jobs in “hot” industries. *Social Semiotics*, 15, 307-334.  
8  
9

10  
11 Neufeind, Max, O'Reilly, Jacqueline, & Ranft, Florian (2018). *Work in the digital age: Challenges of*  
12 *the fourth industrial revolution*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.  
13  
14

15  
16 Oejo, Richard E. (2017). *Masters of Craft: Old jobs in the new urban economy*. Princeton: Princeton  
17 University Press.  
18  
19

20  
21 Pedeliento, Giuseppe, Andreini, Daniela, & Dalli, Daniele (2020). From Mother's Ruin to  
22 Ginaiissance: Emergence, settlement and resettlement of the gin category. *Organization Studies*, 41,  
23 969-992.  
24  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 Pozner, Jo-Ellen, DeSoucey, Michaela, Verhaal, J. Cameron, & Sikavica, Katarina (2022). Watered  
30 down: Market growth, authenticity, and evaluation in craft beer. *Organization Studies*, 43, 321-345.  
31  
32

33  
34 Quinn, Laura (2022). Neo-artisanal practice and the nostalgic: Traditional makers' identities,  
35 innovation and sustainability in neo-artisanal production. In Jon Mulholland, Alessandra Ricci, &  
36 Marta Massi, *The Artisan Brand* (pp. 63–80). Edward Elgar Publishing.  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 Risatti, Howard (2009). *A theory of craft: Function and aesthetic expression*. Chapel Hill: University  
42 of North Carolina Press.  
43  
44

45  
46 Ross, Andrew (2009). *Nice work if you can get it: Life and labor in precarious times*. New York:  
47 NYU Press.  
48  
49

50  
51 Schiermer, Bjørn (2014). Late-modern hipsters: New tendencies in popular culture. *Acta Sociologica*,  
52 57, 167-181.  
53  
54  
55

56  
57 Schwartz, Adina (1982). Meaningful work. *Ethics*, 92, 634–646.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Scott, Michael (2017). ‘Hipster capitalism’ in the age of austerity? Polanyi meets Bourdieu’s new  
4 petite bourgeoisie. *Cultural Sociology*, 11, 60-76.

5  
6  
7  
8 Sennett, Richard (2008). *The craftsman*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

9  
10  
11 Servoz, Michel (2019). The future of work? Work of the future! European Commission. Available at:  
12 <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/news/future-work-work-future> (last accessed 25 August  
13 2023).

14  
15  
16  
17  
18 Shiner, Larry (2012). “Blurred boundaries”? Rethinking the concept of craft and its relation to art and  
19 design. *Philosophy Compass*, 7, 230–244.

20  
21  
22  
23  
24 Smith Maguire, Jennifer (2018). Taste as market practice: The example of “natural” wine. *Consumer*  
25 *Culture Theory*, 29, 71-90.

26  
27  
28  
29 Thompson, Derek (2021). The Great Resignation Is Accelerating. *The Atlantic*, available at:  
30 <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2021/10/great-resignation-accelerating/620382/> (last  
31 accessed 9 December 2021).

32  
33  
34  
35  
36 Thompson, Paul, & Briken, Kendra (2017). Actually existing capitalism: Some digital delusions. In:  
37 Kendra Briken, Shiona Chillas, Martin Krzywdzinski, & Abigail Marks (Eds.), *The new digital*  
38 *workplace: How new technologies revolutionise work* (pp. 241-263). Basingstoke: Palgrave  
39 Macmillan.

40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46 Thurnell-Read, Thomas (2014). Craft, tangibility and affect at work in the microbrewery. *Emotion,*  
47 *Space and Society*, 13, 46-54.

48  
49  
50  
51 UK Craft Council. (2022). UK Craft Council Directory. Available at:  
52 <https://www.craftscouncil.org.uk/directory> (last accessed 22 February 2022).

53  
54  
55  
56 Vallas, Steven P. (2019). Platform capitalism: What’s at stake for workers? *New Labor Forum*, 28(1),  
57 48-59.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Wallace, Andrew (2019). 'Brewing the Truth': Craft Beer, Class and Place in Contemporary London.  
4  
5 *Sociology*, 53, 951–966.  
6

7  
8 West, Darrell M. (2018). *The future of work: robots, AI, and automation*. Washington: Brookings  
9  
10 Institution Press.

11  
12  
13 World Craft Council Europe. (2022). What we do | World Crafts Council Europe. Available at:  
14  
15 <https://wcc-europe.org/about-us/> (last accessed 22 February 2022).  
16  
17

18  
19  
20  
21 **Alessandro Gandini** is associate professor of cultural sociology at the University of Milan,  
22  
23 Department of Social and Political Sciences. His research focuses on the critical study of work,  
24  
25 technology, digital cultures and methods. He is the Principal Investigator of the CRAFTWORK  
26  
27 project, funded by ERC Starting Grants (2020).  
28  
29

30  
31 **Alessandro Gerosa** is lecturer in marketing at the University of Birmingham. He is the author of  
32  
33 "The Hipster Economy: Taste and authenticity in late modern capitalism" (UCL Press). His research  
34  
35 focuses on the role played by authenticity in contemporary taste and urban processes, neo-craft work,  
36  
37 and digital cultures.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60