
Article:
Prentice, M.M. orcid.org/0000-0003-2981-7850 and Gershon, I. orcid.org/0000-0003-0447-0694 (2022) Introduction: genre work and the new economy. Journal of Cultural Economy, 15 (6). pp. 725-734. ISSN 1753-0350

https://doi.org/10.1080/17530350.2022.2087721

Introduction: genre work and the new economy

Michael M. Prentice & **Ilana Gershon**

ABSTRACT

The special issue brings together anthropologists working at the intersection of language and economy to draw attention to the dynamics of how people's experiences of social change are articulated through genre work in different institutional contexts. In recent years, many scholars working in cultural economy have turned to language as an analytic, and this has often focused on the performative dimensions of economic practice as the most significant dimension: the promulgation of financial models, statements of authority from bank leaders, and the power of numbers. While working within similar traditions, we aim to draw attention to the significant, but often overlooked, role that other kinds of genres and other kinds of genre work play for actors in and out of changing economic contexts.

INTRODUCTION

Scholars of capitalism have long known that capitalism can only function because language mediates the social relations that enable capitalist exchanges. Recognizing language's centrality at the core of capitalism allows scholars to deploy well-honed analytical categories for unpacking how people will use language to fashion shareable information and events across the many differently ordered contexts that, connected effectively, enable global capitalism. As patterned forms of language, genres of social interaction – such as job interviews, surveys, and workshops – play important roles in organizing knowledge and legitimacy to allow actors and organizations to act in recognizable ways and to convey recognizable information, essential for the many moments in which capitalism operates under conditions of stranger-sociality (Gal Citation1989, Irvine Citation1989, Heller and McElhinney Citation2017). Much of the work that genres do under capitalist conditions in practice is to generate forms of stability by structuring legible instances of social order and presupposing predictability. This makes genres a rich focal point for analyzing the interplay of stability and change. For the past forty years, there have been broader changes in the organization of capitalism: including the destabilization of labor markets, the break-up of managerial authority, the spread of participatory media, and the rise of neoliberal logics. This has inspired us to revisit the work that genres do to render interactions predictable in cultural economies that earlier scholars, such as Mary Poovey (1998) and JoAnne Yates (1982, 1989) addressed. If genres are one way that economic institutions or economic ideologies are stabilized and function to ensure some actions will be viewed as both legible and legitimate, what happens when the ground underneath such genres becomes unstable?

This special issue, 'Genre Work in the New Economy,' sheds light on how actors adapt to structural changes in capitalism, changes which inevitably unsettle legitimate or recognized genres of economic participation. The collected papers in this special issue reveal that a substantive way in which economic actors encounter these broader destabilizations is through their own practices of 'genre work.' Much scholarly attention has already been paid to how people develop competence across new genres, learning how to sell a car on the internet or to present oneself as employable on social media (Barley 2015, Duffy 2017, Gershon 2017). To help give conceptual framing around shared sets of concerns, we suggest that actors engage in genre work, which we define as practices of attuning to the way meaning is construed across genre types. The papers include ethnographic cases from the US, India, and South Korea, and attend to moments when actors must be literate in or are compelled to use different kinds of practice-level genres that shape their activities in economic spheres. The genres we are concerned with include PowerPoint reports, accounting slips, brainstorming meetings, and LinkedIn profiles. These kinds of genres are usually interactionally salient or named types. How people interact across these genres is significant

for our purposes because each genre requires a different form of literacy (interpreting an accounting slip is a different task than participating in a meeting). They also have different kinds of participatory structures (defined below), and they usually co-occur in practice in the formation of some broader institutional assemblage. The collected papers here focus on ethnographic cases that evince strong gaps between actors' awareness, familiarity, and competency in such genres and how such assemblages are envisioned to run. We suggest that genre work is itself a practice, but one that may appear as an additional labor burden for certain actors, while for others it may afford new opportunities for distinction amid change.

For scholars who wish to take a linguistic angle to understanding cultural economy, the interplay of genres on the ground offers empirical points of entry to understanding how practices come to interact with broader structural, ideological, or institutional forces. As might be clear by now, we take a wide view of what 'genre' entails empirically, a view going beyond written forms and extending to any kind of socially recognized and distinct activity that organizes participation, shapes how knowledge and utterances circulate, is viewed by all who engage with the form as a distinct version, and has conventions for expressing meaning. (Slack message board chats would fit this definition; so would corporate golf outings.) These aspects are important for understanding not only the wider ecosystem in which actors must be literate, but the challenges of coherence and alignment they face across spaces of economic participation and evaluation. In turning to genre work, we are stressing that actors negotiate in the moment how they want to participate in complex social transformations by coordinating different genres. But what exactly is being coordinated? We highlight three key components that are at stake when looking across genres: chronotopes, participant structures, and ideological or cultural associations.

From genres to genre alignment

First, as Mikhail Bakhtin argued (1986), every genre contains its own internal projection of how time and space are organized – its distinct chronotope – which also presupposes how people and objects move through time and space. In a multi-genre workplace or labor market, actors are faced with different projections of both time and space. When aligning genres with one another, people are also aligning chronotopes. That is, they are interweaving ways of ordering time and space with sometimes minimal chronotopic divergences, and sometimes maximal ones. As papers by both Ilana Gershon and Andrew Graan reveal, the labor of coordinating chronotopes across different genres can easily become a crucial component of how people actively construct legible figures of personhood and, simultaneously, legible social change (see also Graan and Rommel n.d.).

In other words, genres are not just different in form or content, but importantly construe the world in different scales. Compare, for instance, a weekly meeting genre where actors in an organization might be tasked with group activities for a project against the writing of a résumé where one must accentuate individual contributions over a longer time frame. Through mere participation in these genres, actors become literate in understanding multiple scales of space and time, while also learning to translate between or across them.

Second, genres vary in how they array people into specific roles. At a basic level, genres configure an inexhaustible range of participant roles into particular structures of action: speaker, hearer, over-hearer, author, ghost-writer, and so on (see Levinson 1988, Irvine 1996). In economic contexts, the spectrum of participatory roles is wide, especially where genres arrange actors in different roles across different forms of sites of practice. A manager might find herself to be a report-writer, advice-giver, friendly-chat maker, presentation-evaluator, or scheduling email-writer. In theory, a variety of participant roles in economic life is itself not a problem. However, as the papers describe, actors attune to the way their everyday participant roles might align or misalign with other kinds of promised or

desired roles. An office worker whose role is limited to making photocopies may feel their role is confined and reduced, in contrast to their title or the promise of what their role might be socially. In Eitan Wilf's paper, American innovation consultants fashion themselves as certifiers of innovation regardless of institutional affiliation or lack of institutional affiliation, in part by valorizing and enhancing the innovative roles of their client through the genre of workshops. In contrast, in Michael Prentice's paper, HR managers find themselves refashioning their own roles as experts within a large Korean corporation through the management of a satisfaction survey. A key part of analyzing genre work, then, is attending to the ways actors attune to how their roles, as valued subjects or economic cogs, might be reflected in how they are construed across genres.

Third, genres are ideologically or culturally linked with associations between economic categories and qualities of genre. For example, Wilf (2016) has shown how the post-it note genre has become associated with elements of fast capitalism in the West. Similarly, Alaric Bourgoin and Fabian Muniesa (2016) show that consultants see PowerPoint slides as particular zones that encapsulate their expert labor and organizational awareness. In the present issue, Adam Sargent's article describes how genres of construction management in India are firmly associated with different categories of labor which take on different aesthetics and exist in, and also help to reify, different social environments (the labor team versus the office workers) (see also Winsor 2000). These fundamental differences in associations across genres point to the way that actors confront complex topographies of genres in contexts of work or job-seeking. In classic views, like Bakhtin's or Pierre Bourdieu's, the associations accorded to different genres stems from the distribution of cultural distinctions, like high art and low art. Systematically clear stratifications may be true in some zones, but many modern economic environments present complex contexts for actors to learn and acclimate to. Caitlin Zaloom (2003) has described genres and their associations that comprised commodity-floor trading in Chicago. Where commodity-floor genres were once associated with the center of market capitalism, these associations shifted as trading began to go online; commodity-floor practices became re-signified as an older form of trade and traders refashioned themselves through genres embedded in computer trading. As larger scale economic shifts affect different industries or institutions, genres of practice might not necessarily change but rather become re-associated.

Genres are located differently vis-à-vis each other in terms of symbolic capital (Bourdieu 1991). It is precisely in moments of social change that these taken-for-granted associations can become revalued. Prentice's paper, for instance, describes how numbers on a survey are unstable without a range of other genres to legitimize and promote them as 'real' referents that can convey employee dissatisfaction. Caitrin Lynch's paper shows that high-level management techniques are no more powerful than 'old' genres, in part because they lack other forms to stabilize them in a social context. The papers collectively explore the difficulties inherent in keeping the meaning of some genres stable in an era of when many authoritative genres are no longer considered as legitimate as they were in the past, and people turn to other genres to shore up a newly vulnerable genre's efficaciousness (see also Gershon and Prentice 2021 for fuller analysis of interplay between less and more authoritative genres).

Cases of economic precarity and workplace strife can lead to a different type of genre work by exhibiting how actors attune to alignments and misalignments across genres, sometimes inspiring them to create new genre assemblages. For example, Lilly Irani (2015) has highlighted how the 'IT microwork' of Amazon's Mechanical Turk service has whittled work down to essentially one genre of work (coding tasks) on behalf of clients. In the context of work defined against this one kind of participant structure, the use of other genres of human communication, like email, were discouraged and seen as a sign of resistance. Yet in

opposition, workers themselves forged their own online communities marked by different genres of participation in which they could 'participate in an ecology of forums, employer, review sites, and job-sharing platforms' (p. 232). One can see echoes here with the kinds of genre work created in recent years on online platforms, such as Glassdoor, Blind, or Reddit where more putatively authentic evaluations of workplaces have emerged, challenging the authority of corporations themselves.

In general, these three aspects – *chronotopes, participation roles,* and *ideological or cultural associations* – suggest that genres are sites where people hold incompatible perspectives that are often experienced as misunderstandings at the level of practice. These opposing perspectives may not always be part of broader narratives, but they give shape to differentiated experiences, and provide complex zones for actors to work within and across (Bauman 2004). Part of the complexity that motivates genre work is that such differences are not always clearly distributed or predictable based on class positions. They also are not mutually exclusive, after all certain kinds of participant roles may ask actors to represent a group composed of heterogenous and incompatible perspectives. And some genres can encompass others as a way of making multiple genres legible, such as annual reports that narrate often diverging financial and managerial information into a coherent story. The broader point is that understandings of efficacy and compatible perspectives are not separate from, but intimately tied to the qualities of personhood, time, and space, and other aspects that are stipulated in and across genres (see also Bakhtin 1986 on figures of personhood).

Shifting authorities, shifting genres

This special issue has been inspired by seminal work around systems of economic genres, notably by Mary Poovey and JoAnne Yates whose work has attuned to the relations among genres in economic systems. In Poovey's historical accounts (Poovey 1998, 2008), written genres like newspapers and novels are not just sites where people are socialized to aspects of economic life as a new realm of society, but provide a constellation of forms in which economic knowledge (such as facts and figures) became legitimized in a shifting field of knowledge-power (Poovey 2008, see Knight 2013 in this journal). Genres, as recognized types of speaking, writing, or communicating, exist within spectrums of distinction which prefigure their individual content or form. In the context of producing economic knowledge or formal corporate office work, genres themselves convey legitimacy through their form, language, or presentation (things like financial statements, PowerPoint reports, or stock market charts).

In Yates' historical work on the increase of genres within American managerial corporations, emerging genre assemblages were part of building a broader reach for a new managerial corporate system structured around communication networks and ideologies of 'systematic management': objects like memos, reports, timetables (along with related phenomena like filing cabinets) were the basic building blocks for ordering new kinds of economic institutions (Yates 1982, 1989). In her contemporary work on genres (with Wanda Orlikowski), workplaces are sites where people link up different genres to 'enact' legitimated genres according to recognized rules and norms within organizational contexts; in doing so, the recognized enactment or use of genres also helps to 'reinforce and sustain the legitimacy of [genre rules] through their actions' within a community of workers (Yates and Orlikowski 1992, 302).[2]

If Poovey's work largely described the emergence and establishment of the economy as fact in the twentieth century across a broad swath of genres and Yates' work has largely shown how genres provide a structuring and stabilizing quality to organizational life, how do actors enact stable participant roles, chronotopes, and meaning in contexts where distinctions between economic fact and fiction have been questioned or where work communities are

increasingly unstable and distributed? How do scholars interrogate ideological contexts in which economic authorities and class hierarchies of old do not cleanly organize genres into legitimate and illegitimate categories? Our special issue's intervention is to explore how actors across a variety of cases face contexts where the genre rules might be unknown, unclear, or contradictory, and yet genres are still required to perform significant classificatory work. Our authors turn to cases where actors are thrust into positions where they must work to understand how to interact with genres effectively as well as what the risks might be should they make the wrong kinds of cross-genre moves.

Overview of papers

The papers in this special issue each describe and analyze cases in which economic actors, from job seekers to high-level managers, find their positions premised on becoming competent at different kinds of genre work, while simultaneously navigating the hazards inherent in such labor. Gershon's article highlights how job seekers in the US must attune to temporal alignments across professional resume and career-tracking genres competently enough not to be rejected out-of-hand by those involved in hiring. Wilf's article describes how innovation consultants use a repertoire of brainstorming genres to legitimate their status as experts in business circles, attempting to convince others that creativity can be manufactured on demand despite long-standing ideological presuppositions otherwise. Unlike Wilf's would-be experts, Lynch's fieldwork interlocutors performed contrasting forms of genre work in their struggles over the expertise required to produce standardized textiles in the shadow of deindustrialization and factory closures. Prentice describes how South Korean managers use the quality of being in 'draft' stage to mitigate potential risks to their status as experts. Sargent describes a case in India in which political demands for clean construction accounting cover up much of the messy but vital genre work done by sub-contractors, genre-work which, done poorly, leads to charges of corruption. Lastly, Graan's article reflects on the spread of the project form around the world, arguing that it has elevated ideas of individual agency while at the same time reducing human involvement to discrete time frames and specific genres, offering a framework for measuring successful social change through indicators and other metrics, and thus a framework which is context-independent and reductive.

Cross-genre work matters for actors across the economic spectrum. For economically precarious work, we find that precarity amplifies the vagaries of genre work itself: workers in the US job market require multiple skills to represent themselves; however, combining self-representation *successfully* across all the genres involved in applying for jobs is a vast task, requires active management, and is filled with ambiguities that result in widespread anxieties and hidden risks. (For more privileged job seekers, such as university graduates, we might note that new university-funded programs help them gain more familiarity with the cross-genre work needed for entry into the economy.) For other kinds of economic elites, their expertise might be premised on certain kinds of performance of expertise across genres (such as from data to analysis) that can make visible their expert knowledge. Actors often are told that there are rules, conventions, and norms that are premised on making coherent aspects or qualities that extend across genre repertoires, whether or not these rules and norms actually are enacted in practice. For some, this goal of coherence might be part of the 'art' of their jobs or necessary for their profession to distinguish from lay perspectives (Carr 2010, 20; see also Jacobs-Huey 2003). For others it might be a source of anxiety and alienation.

Genre work, in short, reveals new ways of looking at power and contention in the new economy. Lynch et al.'s account of battles over expertise in an American textile mill takes place precisely over distinctions between authoritative genres. In her case, she notes a triple distinction among handwritten forms, Excel spreadsheets, and ERP software that reifies perspectives of specific managerial styles. Internal battles over legitimacy are shaped by

other kinds of genre work. Workers draw on sensory learning and memory, playfulness and humor as a particular repertoire to reaffirm an image of the 'way things are done here' and to undercut the authority of new managers hoping to bring about organizational change (see also Lynch 2012).

Cross-genre contexts engender new kinds of problems in practice. For example, in Gershon's paper on US job seekers, different conventions for representing time across genres create competing narratives of job histories. The many genres available for representing 'work history' has complicated worker self-representations, especially with the arrival of LinkedIn. There is too much advice floating around on how job-seekers should best represent past work experiences. As a result, job-seekers are intensely aware of different genres' conventions and these conventions' mismatch with their own work contexts as they anticipate unknown and potentially rejecting evaluators. The multiple genre conventions emerge at different historical moments in capitalism, creating tensions that the job seekers must work out by coordinating the many genres in a job application. What then is performed on the job market is not just one standard of capitalist time or even two; rather, it is an awareness that job-seekers must effectively learn to switch between different representations of themselves without calling attention to the differences.

The complexities of cross-genre contexts are not always revealed to outsiders or researchers. Some actors spend time figuring out in private how to present or assemble different genres in service of their desired pragmatic goals without the worry of conflicting representations. Prentice's paper on drafting by South Korean HR managers demonstrates the importance of drafting as a kind of genre work. His paper describes a case of intellectual hubris in which managers expected an employee survey to deliver record amounts of employee dissatisfaction; when employees responded with higher levels of satisfaction, the managers spent months tweaking their PowerPoint report to make both the results and the managers themselves look coherent. In this sense, Prentice describes how drafting is not just a stage in the production of documents, but a strategy by experts to forestall judgments on their claims.

For some, it is important to build coherence by drawing on recognizable genres of authority outside of one's particular work domain. In Wilf's article, he describes US innovation consultants who must build their own legitimacy with corporate clients. They do so through genres like workshops which position them as knowledgeable authorities with clear roadmaps and plans, but ones that can also confer legitimacy onto those who want to become innovation experts themselves. This magical act happens precisely by suggesting that would-be consultants are also 'innovation architects' who act as a central node of communication across their organizations, elevating their participant roles to that of a central actor across many imagined genres. But what appear to be genres of workshopping are part of a broader constellation in which the innovation consultants themselves are produced as experts, part of efforts to self-anchor the broader legitimacy of outside innovation work within corporate circles.

Outsourced and other digital work (Gray and Suri 2019) suggests that certain categories of labor are premised precisely on the outsourcing of the messy side of genre work, like copyediting PowerPoint slides or fulfilling customer service. In Sargent's article, he describes the case of the construction industry in India where the putatively messy work of subcontracted laborers is carefully distinguished from the 'clean' process of construction overseen by engineers. The ambiguities of subcontracted work, along with the pivotal role of the subcontractor, are erased from the authoritative representations of the project found in engineers' reports and account books. While noting the dependence on forms of labor that are described as corrupt in India, Sargent's account shows how important the separation is

between two sets of construction accounting genres to establish specific forms of legitimacy and why their separation matters.

For some kinds of cross-genre contexts, coherence is expected to be pre-designed. Graan's contribution on the global circulation of the project as a form suggests that projects have become enormously popular around the world, from school projects to nation-building projects, in part because they configure actors (singular or plural) as having a particular kind of agency that supposedly effects social change. Yet much of what makes forms like projects so mobile is also their ability to divide labor into recognizable sub-genres, like analyzing, planning, implementing, and reporting, that allow actors to fit into relatively pre-determined and pre-formatted roles. Bringing coherence to human agency across genres can itself be traced to political economic projects that promise human freedom and collaboration, and does so in highly compartmentalized and temporally bound genres. In this sense, Graan's article attunes readers to the ways that meta-language shapes genre work, like encompassing things as 'projects' with their own participant categories and imposes certain kinds of political ideals onto institutions or sites that come under the fold of Western management ideologies. The circulation of the project form, in other words, is a kind of imposed genre work made ubiquitous.

Conclusion

As these articles reveal, there are different ways in which genre work can take place. When a social task requires composite visions of people or organizations, as in the case of hiring or evaluating a project, then the genre work entails constantly working to align different genres that might present subtly contradictory representations. Sometimes in these instances the problem is sorting which genres should be added to the mix, and which kept out – this form of genre work also sometimes involves assessing which genres should be interwoven in the first place. Other instances of genre work involve regimentation – when ideological or cultural associations are up for grabs in a given situation, people might concentrate on reinforcing the genres' qualities, trying to define how authoritative or disruptive those genres might be. In these instances, they are not changing the genres per se, as they might be when aligning genres with each other. Instead, they are altering the higher-order qualities associated with different genres. Finally, people are also creating new kinds of genre assemblages, especially in moments when they are being excluded from more established access to political or economic participation. Most recently, this means turning to digital genres, in part because digital communication has opened up the possibility for all sorts of new participant structures, which people in need of alternative forms can take imaginative advantage of. As this last form of genre work reveals, not everyone is in a position to perform certain types of genre work, and who is contributing what to a group's engagement with genre work is often another lens into how power is enacted and experienced.

Turning to genre work reveals changes in capitalist epochs as the accumulation of millions of negotiations as people take aspects of a vast reservoir of shared communicative agreements and apply what seems relevant and appropriate to the situation at hand. Social change from this perspective is no great rupture, miraculously coordinated, but a vast number of acts that in the moment presuppose and call forth a social world alongside others acting as well. Focusing in particular on the ways people produce and interpret genres illuminates how people engage explicitly with genres as pockets of order that they can fashion reactively or imaginatively. This ordering could connect to previous iterations of the genre or the genre could be assembled so as to create a break with the past, or to be made a more distinctive instance by more firmly intertwining that genre into a particular context. Yet it isn't only engaging with a single genre that leads them to see producing a genre as producing a structuring organization of knowledge, of time, of space, of people, and of sociality. Genres

have to be coordinated with each other, part of the work of producing a type of genre is also figuring out how to intertwine that genre instance into a repertoire of other genres. People are being strategic about how genres order and what that ordering could accomplish. Moreover, they openly understand themselves to be strategic in doing genre work, to be turning to an already available set of social interactions and patterned ways of presenting knowledge so that they can find a job, or be seen as more essential to a workplace, or perform valued labor.

This genre work is taking place in a moment when people's experiences of social change and instability come to a fore precisely in the moments that they try to use genres to produce pockets of order. Unemployed people typically have found jobs beforehand using good enough genre repertoires, yet faced with a new round of job searching, they go to workshops to learn how to create more neoliberal versions of the genres they used before. Whenever people try to assert control through genres, they run into problems of coordination and power because they are doing this alongside other people. For example, textile workers jostle over whether to use databases or a sense of touch to craft textiles good enough that their mill can stay afloat after decades of offshoring the US textile industry. Genre work is one of the ways in which people try to bring some measure of control as they engage with how patterned and patterning social interactions are shifting (see also Donzelli 2019). They have to develop new ways to keep more familiar and more authoritative genres efficacious, and often do so through genre work that hopes to re-iterate forms of ordering that will be to their benefit.

Acknowledgements

We want to dedicate this special issue to Richard Bauman, who has for decades shown our shared intellectual communities how analytically productive genres can be. The text of this introduction owes much to Cristina Collins, Kathryn Graber, Colin Halvorson and Sarah Osterhoudt who offered thoughtful suggestions. Ilana had an especially energizing conversation with Miyako Inoue at a crucial moment. The issue as a whole emerges from a workshop funded by Indiana University's New Frontiers in the Arts and Humanities. Conversations with many of the participants crucially influenced the special issue, we are grateful to: Purnima Bose, Keith Brown, Ron Day, Jane Goodman, Miyako Inoue, Deborah Jones, Ellen Kladky, Martha Lampland, Jean Lave, Susan Lepselter, Alex McGrath, and Ben Robinson.

Notes

1 Genre can refer to different things in different fields. While the empirical locus of genre often differs, scholars are generally concerned with the way *types* operate as structures for expectations of performance, behavior, or interpretation around which different kinds of social actions become defined. In literary studies, Wendy Sharer (2003) has used the term 'genre work' to define 'the strategic blending of typified and innovative textual elements' (p. 8), capturing the ways that actors draw on class-linked text-types to invoke authority. Within the field of cultural studies, Ana Alacovska and Dave O'Brien (2021) have focused on genres as large-scale cultural industries that surround literary or media genres like soap operas, travel writing, or crime fiction. These genres can engender their own worlds and 'shape relationships of production and genre-specific 'suffering' experiences of cultural labor by virtue of their classificatory power' (p. 648). The 'smaller' the genre, the more it may be used in accounts of creative agency; the 'larger' the genre, the more it may be seen as a determinative agent itself. In this special issue, our concern is not whether actors have more or less agency vis-à-vis genres, but how actors attune to the different affordances for participation and meaning-making *between* or *across* them.

2 For additional and related work see Yates and Orlikowski (1992); Orlikowski and Yates (1994); Bazerman (1994); and Spinuzzi (2003).

References

1. Alacovska, Ana, and O'Brien, Dave, 2021. Genres and inequality in the creative industries. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 24 (3), 639–657. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
2. Bakhtin, Mikhael, 1986. The problem of speech genres. In: Caryl Emerson, and Michael Holquist, eds. *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 60–102. [Google Scholar]
3. Barley, Stephen, 2015. How the internet makes buying a car less loathsome: how technologies change role relations. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 1 (1), 5–35. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
4. Bauman, Richard, 2004. *A world of other's words: cross-cultural perspectives on intertextuality*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
5. Bazerman, Charles, 1994. Systems of genres and the enactment of social intentions. In: Aviva Freedman, and Peter Medway, eds. *Genre and the new rhetoric*. Bristol, PA: Taylor & Francis, 67–85. [Google Scholar]
6. Bourgoin, Alaric, and Fabian Muniesa. 2016. Building a rock-solid slide: Management consulting, PowerPoint, and the craft of signification. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 30 (3), 390–410. [Google Scholar]
7. Bourdieu, Pierre, 1991. *Language and symbolic power*. John B. Thompson, ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [Google Scholar]
8. Carr, E. Summerson, 2010. Enactments of expertise. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 39 (1), 17–32. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
9. Donzelli, Aurora, 2019. *Methods of desire: language, morality, and affect in neoliberal Indonesia*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press. [Google Scholar]
10. Duffy, Brooke Erin, 2017. *(Not) getting paid to do what you love: gender, social media, and aspirational work*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
11. Gal, Susan, 1989. Language and political economy. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 18, 345–367. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
12. Gershon, Ilana, 2017. *Down and out in the new economy: how people find (or don't find) jobs these days*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
13. Gershon, Ilana, and Prentice, M., 2021. Genres in new economies of language. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2021 (267-268), 117–124. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
14. Graan, Andrew, and Rommel, Carl, n.d. Projects and project temporalities. Special issue of *Social Analysis*. [Google Scholar]
15. Gray, Mary L, and Suri, Siddharth, 2019. *Ghost work: how to stop silicon valley from building a new global underclass*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. [Google Scholar]
16. Heller, Monica, and McElhinney, Bonnie, 2017. *Language, capitalism, colonialism: towards a critical history*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. [Google Scholar]
17. Irani, Lilly, 2015. Difference and dependence among digital workers: the case of Amazon Mechanical Turk. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 114 (1), 225–234. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
18. Irvine, Judith, 1989. When talk isn't cheap: language and political economy. *American Ethnologist*, 16 (2), 248–267. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
19. Irvine, J. T. 1996. Shadow Conversations: the Indeterminacy of Participant Roles. In: M. Silverstein and G. Urban, eds. *Natural Histories of Discourse*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 131–159. [Google Scholar]

20. Jacobs-Huey, Lanita, 2003. Ladies are seen, not heard: language socialization in a southern, African American cosmetology school. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 34 (3), 277–299. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
21. Knight, Peter, 2013. Introduction: fictions of finance. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 6 (1), 2–12. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Google Scholar]
22. Levinson S. 1988. Putting linguistics on a proper footing: explorations in Goffman's concepts of participation. In: P Drew, AWootton, eds. *Erving Goffman: An Interdisciplinary Appreciation*. Oxford, UK: Polity Press, 161–227. [Google Scholar]
23. Lynch, C., 2012. *Retirement on the line: age, work, and value in an American factory*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
24. Orlikowski, Wanda J., and Yates, JoAnne, 1994. Genre repertoire: the structuring of communicative practices in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39 (4), 541–574. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
25. Poovey, Mary, 1998. *A history of the modern fact: problems of knowledge in the sciences of wealth and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
26. Poovey, M. 2008. *Genres of the Credit Economy: Mediating Value in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Britain.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
27. Sharer, Wendy B, 2003. Genre work: expertise and advocacy in the early bulletins of the US women's bureau. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 33 (1), 5–32. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Google Scholar]
28. Spinuzzi, Clay, 2003. *Tracing genres through organizations: a sociocultural approach to information design, acting with technology*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
29. Wilf, Eitan, 2016. The post-it note economy: understanding post-fordist business innovation through one of its key semiotic technologies. *Current Anthropology*, 57 (6), 732–760. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
30. Winsor, Dorothy, 2000. Ordering work: blue collar literacy and the political nature of genre. *Written Communication*, 17 (2), 155–184. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
31. Yates, JoAnne, 1982. From press book and pigeonhole to vertical filing: revolution in storage and access systems for correspondence. *Journal of Business Communication*, 19 (3), 5–26. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
32. Yates, JoAnne, 1989. *Control through communication: the rise of system in American management*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. [Google Scholar]
33. Yates, JoAnne, and Orlikowski, Wanda J., 1992. Genres of organizational communication: a structurational approach to studying communication and media. *The Academy of Management Review*, 17 (2), 299–326. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
34. Zaloom, Caitlin, 2003. Ambiguous numbers: trading technologies and interpretation in financial markets. *American Ethnologist*, 30 (2), 258–272. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]