LEAH ARMSTRONG AND FELICE McDOWELL

# fashioning professionals

## Identity and Representation at Work in the Creative Industries

BLOOMSBURY

# FASHIONING PROFESSIONALS

9781350001848_txt_rev.indd 1 11/29/2017 8:57:42 PM

# FASHIONING PROFESSIONALS

## Identity and Representation at Work in the Creative Industries

EDITED BY
LEAH ARMSTRONG
AND FELICE MCDOWELL

Bloomsbury Academic
An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

BLOOMSBURY
LONDON • OXFORD • NEW YORK • NEW DELHI • SYDNEY

9781350001848_txt_rev.indd 3 11/29/2017 8:57:43 PM

**Bloomsbury Academic**
An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

50 Bedford Square
London
WC1B 3DP
UK

1385 Broadway
New York
NY 10018
USA

**www.bloomsbury.com**

**BLOOMSBURY and the Diana logo are trademarks of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc**

First published 2018

© Leah Armstrong and Felice McDowell, 2018
Individual chapters © the contributors, 2018

Leah Armstrong and Felice McDowell have asserted their right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as Editors of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

No responsibility for loss caused to any individual or organization acting on or refraining from action as a result of the material in this publication can be accepted by Bloomsbury or the authors.

**British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data**
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN: HB: 978-1-350-00184-8
ePDF: 978-1-350-00186-2
eBook: 978-1-350-00185-5

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**
A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Cover design by Anna Berzovan
Cover image: Three lifelike female fashion mannequins arranged in a soiree scene as their creator/mannequin designer Adel Rootstein poses in their midst in her apt
(© Terry Smith/The LIFE Images Collection/Getty Images)

Typeset by Integra Software Services Pvt. Ltd.
Printed and bound in Great Britain

To find out more about our authors and books visit www.bloomsbury.com. Here you will find extracts, author interviews, details of forthcoming events and the option to sign up for our newsletters.

# CONTENTS

List of Illustrations vii
List of Contributors ix
Acknowledgements xi
Foreword xii
*Elizabeth Wissinger*

Introduction: Fashioning Professionals: History, Theory and Method 1
*Leah Armstrong and Felice McDowell*

**PART ONE INVENTING** 27

**1** Media in the Museum: Fashioning the Design Curator at the Boilerhouse Gallery, Victoria and Albert Museum, London 29
*Liz Farrelly*

**2** Fashioning Pop: Stylists, Fashion Work and Popular Music Imagery 51
*Rachel Lifter*

**3** The Labour of Fashion Blogging 65
*Agnès Rocamora*

**PART TWO NEGOTIATING** 83

**4** Fashioning Professional Identity in the British Advertising Industry: The Women's Advertising Club of London, 1923–1939 85

*Philippa Haughton*

**5** Satirical Representations of the Bauhaus Architect in *Simplicissimus* Magazine 103

*Isabel Rousset*

**6** The Self as an Art-Work: Performative Self-Representation in the Life and Work of Leonor Fini 121

*Andrea Kollnitz*

**PART THREE MAKING** 143

**7** Designer Unknown: Documenting the Mannequin Maker 145

*June Rowe*

**8** Fashioning the Contemporary Artist: The Spatial Biography of Sue Tompkins 163

*Caroline Stevenson*

**9** The Maker 2.0: A Craft-Based Approach to Understanding a New Creative Identity 181

*Catharine Rossi*

Index 202

# LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

**1.1** Boilerhouse Press Cuttings, albums one to six (1981–1989), Blythe House, Victoria and Albert Museum. Photographed by the author 31

**1.2** British curator, journalist and critic Stephen Bayley pictured with robot exhibits in the Boilerhouse space at the Victoria and Albert Museum in London on 23 July 1984. Photo by United News/Popperfoto/Getty Images 41

**4.1** 'What is the typical Advertising Face?' (1933) *Advertisers' Weekly*, 21 December: 406 89

**5.1** Thomas Theodor Heine, *Simplicissimus* (1927), 8 August: 250 © Thomas Theodor Heine/VG Bild-Kunst. Licensed by Viscopy, 2016 111

**5.2** Thomas Theodor Heine, 'Kleine Bilder' (1928), *Simplicissimus*, 21 May: 103 © Thomas Theodor Heine/VG Bild-Kunst. Licensed by Viscopy, 2016 113

**5.3** Thomas Theodor Heine, 'Sachlichkeit!' (1928), *Simplicissimus*, 10 September: 303 © Thomas Theodor Heine/VG Bild-Kunst. Licensed by Viscopy, 2016 114

**6.1** Fini, Leonor (1975) avec la collaboration de José Alvarez, *Le Livre de Leonor Fini*, Paris: Editions Mermoud-Clairefontaine Vilo Paris, page 33. © Richard Overstreet, Estate of Leonor Fini 125

**6.2** André Ostier, *Leonor Fini wearing a costume for the Bal de Violette*, Paris 1948. © Richard Overstreet, Estate of Leonor Fini 127

**6.3** Leonor Fini, *Portrait of Manolo Borromeo*, oil on canvas, 1944. © Richard Overstreet, Estate of Leonor Fini 133

**6.4** André Ostier, photograph of Leonor Fini, Sforzino Sforza and Stanislao Lepri, Palazzo Labia, Venice 1951. © Richard Overstreet, Estate of Leonor Fini 135

**6.5** Eddie Brofferio, *Leonor Fini*, Nonza, Corsica *c*. 1965. © Richard Overstreet, Estate of Leonor Fini 137

**6.6** Horst P. Horst, *Leonor Fini in her studio*, Paris 1946. © Richard Overstreet, Estate of Leonor Fini 139

**7.1** ‘Adel Rootstein in her London Studio,’ *Life*, 15 May 1970, photo by Terence Spencer. Courtesy of Cara Spencer, Terence Spencer Photo Archive © http://www.terencespencerphotoarchive.net 157

**7.2** Adel Rootstein with bespoke fashion display mannequins, 1989, photo by Terry Smith © http://www.gettyimages.co.uk/license/50419586 159

**8.1** Sue Tompkins, ‘Your Pocket Magic’ (detail), Typewritten text on paper, card, black felt, glass table, 2007. Commissioned by The Showroom, London. Courtesy the artist, The Showroom, London and The Modern Institute, Glasgow 175

**8.2** Sue Tompkins, ‘For my Dataday’, 2010, typewritten text on coloured paper. Courtesy of the artist and The Modern Institute/Toby Webster Ltd, Glasgow 177

**9.1** Exhibition entrance, ‘Power of Making,’ V&A Museum (6 September 2011 to 2 January 2012), Photo © Oscar Bauer 182

**9.2** Makerspace, iMAL, Center for Digital Cultures and Technology, http://www.nesta.org.uk/blog/open-dataset-uk-makerspaces, Courtesy of iMAL/Fab Lab.iMAL 183

**9.3** Shanghai Maker Carnival 2015. Photo by the author 188

**9.4** Issue 1 of *Make* © Make: Magazine 189

**9.5** Issue 1 of *Craft* © Make: Magazine 192

# LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

**Leah Armstrong** is a senior lecturer in Design History at the University of Applied Arts Vienna and also Head of Archive at the Papanek Foundation, University of Applied Arts Vienna. She has previously held research and teaching positions at the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Glasgow School of Art and University of Brighton. She completed her PhD at the University of Brighton in 2014, a Collaborative Doctoral Award with the Chartered Society of Designers funded by the AHRC, on the professionalization of design in Britain (1930–2010).

**Liz Farrelly** writes, edits, curates and lectures at University of Brighton. She's published more than 25 books in the field of design, the latest being *Design Objects and the Museum*, co-edited with Joanna Weddell (Bloomsbury Academic, 2016).

**Philippa Haughton** is a university teacher in Economic History at Cardiff University. She completed her PhD, 'The Formation of Professional Identity in the British Advertising Industry 1920–1954,' at Durham University, and is currently revising the manuscript for publication.

**Andrea Kollnitz** holds a PhD in Art History and is an assistant professor at the Centre for Fashion Studies at Stockholm University. Her research and publications are focused on national identity, fashion discourse and visual culture; fashion portraits and photography; the self-fashioning of avant-garde artists during modernism; art museums and gender and the reception of modernist art. She is co-editor of the anthologies *Modernism och mode* (Fashion and Modernism, 2015) and *A Cultural History of the Avant-Garde in the Nordic Countries, 1925–50* (2017).

**Rachel Lifter** teaches at Parsons School of Design and Pratt Institute. Her research and teaching explore the intersections of fashion, feminism and popular culture. Her forthcoming book – *Fashioning Indie: Popular Fashion, Music and*

9781350001848_txt_rev.indd 9 11/29/2017 8:57:43 PM

*Gender* – charts the mainstreaming of indie music and explores how gendered identities form within and throughout this cultural process.

**Felice McDowell** is an associate lecturer in Cultural and Historical Studies at the London College of Fashion, University of the Arts London. Her research interests are in methodologies of fashion history, archival research, critical theory, life writing, and the visual and textual representation of fashion 'work.' She has published in the journals *Fashion Theory*, *Photography & Culture, Clothing Cultures* and *a/b: Auto/Biography Studies*.

**Agnès Rocamora** is a reader in Social and Cultural Studies at the London College of Fashion. She is the author of *Fashioning the City*: *Paris, Fashion and the Media.* She is a co-editor of *Thinking through Fashion: A Guide to Key Theorists*, of *The Handbook of Fashion Studies,* and of *Fashion Media: Past and Present*. She is also a co-editor of the *International Journal of Fashion Studies*.

**Catharine Rossi** is a senior lecturer in Design History at Kingston University, London. Rossi's research interests include the relationship between craft and design, and her publications include *Crafting Design in Italy: from Postwar to Postmodernism* (Manchester University Press, 2015).

**Isabel Rousset** is a PhD candidate and teacher at the University of Western Australia. Her work focuses on the relationship between architecture, visual culture, and politics. Her current project explores the intersections between housing design and social and political theory in nineteenth-century Germany.

**June Rowe** is a PhD candidate and lecturer at the University of the Arts, London. June's doctoral research is a study of the fashion display mannequin and feminine silhouettes and includes a history of British mannequin design.

**Caroline Stevenson** is a curator, researcher and lecturer in Cultural and Historical Studies at London College of Fashion. She works closely with emerging and established artists to research and develop new projects that aim to make visible the social processes surrounding the production of art objects. She has programmed exhibitions and events for Glasgow International Festival of Visual Art, ICA (London), Tate Tanks and Tenderbooks (London), as well as a range of pop up spaces.

9781350001848_txt_rev.indd 10 11/29/2017 8:57:43 PM

9781350001848_txt_rev.indd 26

11/29/2017 8:57:44 PM

# 9

# THE MAKER 2.0: A CRAFT-BASED APPROACH TO UNDERSTANDING A NEW CREATIVE IDENTITY

*Catharine Rossi*

## Introduction

In September 2011 *Power of Making: The Importance of Being Skilled* opened at London's Victoria and Albert Museum (Figure 9.1). It was curated by the designer, educator and curator Daniel Charny in collaboration with the Crafts Council, the UK's contemporary craft development agency. The exhibition sought to 'celebrate the role of making in our lives' by presenting 'works by both amateurs and leading makers from around the world' (News Release n.d.). The result was an eclectic mix of over 100 artefacts from around thirty countries, ranging from a traditionally crafted British leather saddle and an ornate handmade Ghanaian coffin to a digitally programmed quilt and self-replicating 3D printer.

The exhibition didn't just display made objects but their making and makers too: projected at the gallery's rear were films about makers-in-action, while a 'Tinker Space' hosted demonstrations and workshops for visitors to watch and participate in making (Beaven 2013; News Release n.d.). This proved a winning combination. *Power of Making* attracted 315,000 visitors, making it the Museum's most popular free exhibition ever (From Now On n.d.). It confirmed an international craft revival that had been gathering momentum since the mid-noughties (Peach 2013), fuelled by a reawakening to the importance of making amid its possible demise (Charny 2011: 7). It also identified the figure positioned as the protagonist of this renaissance: the maker.

*Power of Making* revealed how the maker, an old European word (Online Etymology Dictionary n.d.) historically associated with specialist craft identities such as the cabinetmaker or the female-associated homemaker (Edwards 2006:

**Figure 9.1** Exhibition entrance, 'Power of Making', V&A Museum (6 September 2011 to 2 January 2012), Photo © Oscar Bauer.

13), has taken on new meaning and purchase in recent years. Today the maker can be broadly divided in two types. On the one hand it is a new name for the pre-existing identity of the crafts practitioner. This rebranding is explicit in the exhibition's name: *Power of Making* replaced the exhibition's initial title *Craft Traces*, following the curator's search for a more accessible and inclusive way of presenting craft (Charny 2010, 2016). This echoes a wider trend of adopting maker terminology to describe craft in the United Kingdom and the United States, the currency of its authentic and quality associations informing its appearance in marketing campaigns by brands from Burberry to Häagen Dazs (McGuirk 2013; Gibson 2014: 3).

*Power of Making* also presented another maker, one born outside of the craft world but who shares its hands-on approach and who often uses craft tools and techniques to work collaboratively in what Ele Carpenter described in the catalogue as 'digital making' (2011: 50). Calling this type of creative figure a maker is more recent. It can be traced back to the 2005 establishment of *MAKE*:[1] magazine and accompanying makezine.com by Dale Dougherty at O'Reilly Media, the publishing company owned by Internet evangelist Tim O'Reilly and based in California's hi-tech heartlands.

According to the publisher (Maker Media 2013), it was Dougherty who coined the terms 'maker' and 'maker movement' for what O'Reilly (2013) described

9781350001848_txt_rev.indd 182 11/29/2017 8:59:25 PM

as this ‘upwelling of interest in making things, embracing everything from new technologies like 3D printing and other forms of advanced manufacturing … to crafting and older hands-on technologies’ (O’Reilly 2013) This maker’s roots lie in California’s 1960s and 1970s hacker culture, in collectives such as the Homebrew Computer Club, whose members, including Apple founders Steve Jobs and Steve Wozniack, promoted computers as a DIY technology for self-liberation; an openness and alterity lost in the subsequent corporatization of this technology (Dellot 2015: 16, 17). Since the mid-noughties, this ethos has been reinvigorated by ‘the making and sharing ethos’ of Web 2.0 and its user-generated sites and social media platforms. Notably, Web 2.0 was a term popularized by O’Reilly (Gauntlett 2011: 1, 7).

This maker has been on the rise. Between 2010 and 2015 the number of makerspaces (Figure 9.2), an umbrella term to describe open-access workshops where makers gather to use and share digital design and fabrication tools, grew significantly in both the United Kingdom and China; from nine to ninety-seven in the former (Stokes, Stewart, and Sleigh 2015) and from one to over a hundred in the latter (Saunders and Kingsley 2016: 6). Personal consumption of 3D printers also increased, from sixty-six sold in 2007 to over 23,000 in 2011 (Tanenbaum and Tanenbaum 2015: 195). This new creative identity is a hybrid digital-analogue maker (Carpenter 2011: 49), an offspring of Web 2.0. To coin a phrase, this is a ‘maker 2.0’. Given the composite and often contradictory nature of these two

**Figure 9.2** Makerspace, iMAL, Center for Digital Cultures and Technology, http:// www.nesta.org.uk/blog/open-dataset-uk-makerspaces, Courtesy of iMAL/Fab Lab.iMAL.

maker identities, this chapter will focus on this second, newer, identity, a partial gaze that enables an in-depth focus on this complex figure.

Maker 2.0 has been regularly appearing on multiple digital and physical platforms, from websites to books such as Cory Doctorow's 2009 novel *Makers* and Chris Anderson's 2012 treatise *Makers: The New Industrial Revolution*, both manifestoes for the democratized digitally fuelled innovation that *MAKE*'s maker offers. The digital maker has also been embraced by the craft-based maker world, notably in the Craft Council's biannual *Make: Shift* conference and *Make: Shift: Do* festivals, whose innovation and technological-led agenda have aimed to attract this fashionable maker breed (Greenlees 2016).

These multimedia appearances have been accompanied by prominent government endorsement, premised on the maker's perceived economic importance in knowledge economies to which technological innovation and the creative industries are central (Rooney, Kern and Kastelle 2012: 12). In Britain, the then Chancellor of the Exchequer George Osborne ended his 2011 Budget speech calling for a 'march of the makers', conflating the craft and digital maker and small-scale making and large-scale production in his still-unsuccessful bid to reignite Britain's manufacturing industries (Elliot 2016). The United Kingdom isn't the only faltering economy to champion the maker: in 2014 President Obama launched Nation of Makers, an initiative to give Americans greater access to digital design and fabrication technologies, fostering a curious and problem solving 'maker mindset' 'vital to the modern innovation economy' (Kalil and Coy 2016).

Encouragement for the maker 2.0 has also appeared in China, as it looks to shift towards this economic model. In 2015 the government announced 'Made in China 2025', a policy to move China away from the diminishing returns of mass manufacture and towards high quality, technology and innovation-led production. Makers, with their technical skills and culture of free experimentation, reuse and repair, have been positioned as the authors of this new industrial revolution (Lindtner 2015: 854, 855) and government funding has informed the rapid growth of China's makerspaces. 'We have seen makers coming thick and fast' Premier Li Keqiang (2015) declared in 2015, 'and the cultural and creative industries have been developing with great vitality' (Keqiang 2015). Maker 2.0 has been one of the protagonists of China's creative industries, an identity fashioned as much by the state as by grassroots developments.

Clearly the maker 2.0 has emerged in the last decade to become a fashionable and valuable creative identity. Yet despite its international visibility, and seeming invention by a media outfit, this figure has been subject to little critical inquiry. The aim of this chapter is therefore to explore maker 2.0's identity through its media representation, and explore how this presence is implicated with its co-construction by the media and makers themselves.

Given this chapter's limited scope I will focus on the output of *MAKE*'s publishers, the media organization largely responsible for constructing and popularizing this figure in the United Kingdom and the United States. Admittedly, this restricts this chapter to the output of one media outlet, and it is important to assert the maker's heterogeneous existence outside of *MAKE* (Hertz 2012). It also presents a largely post-2005 Western focus, but I will also consider the maker in contexts such as China, where this figure has emerged in a radically different context.

The remainder of this chapter is divided into two parts. The first explores my methodology, an interpretation of 'fashioning' I term a 'crafting' approach. The second considers the maker's representation and co-construction through *MAKE*'s publisher's multiple platforms. In particular, it asks how *MAKE* has represented and selected who makers are, how it has enabled them to become makers, and what values it has placed on makers as creative practitioners in post-industrial and knowledge economies.

## Methodology: Crafting the maker

This chapter builds on research into the representation and construction of identities in the creative industries (Banks, Gill, and Taylor 2013; Hesmondalgh and Baker 2011). In particular, it looks to Joanne Entwistle and Elizabeth Wissinger (2012) and Agnès Rocamora (2009, 2016), who have explored the interplay between representation and identity construction of fashion personas, from model 'looks' to Paris's mythologized status as a fashion city. They address issues including agency in identity co-construction and the overlapping of real and represented identities, both of which have informed this research. This chapter offers an interpretation of this 'fashioning' approach suited to the particular characteristics and representative conventions of the maker 2.0; a 'crafting' approach. This frames the maker 2.0 in a craft context, offering a way to critically and historically contextualize this new figure, and deal with the paucity of critical literature on the maker.[2]

Positioning the maker 2.0 as a crafts practitioner is not unusual: the pre-eminent craft writer Tanya Harrod has described *MAKE*'s 'tinkering, technological brand of craft' ([2011] 2015: 180). It follows Richard Sennett's widely read *The Craftsman*, in which the sociologist discussed the 'technological craftsmanship' (2008: 33) involved in the open-source Linux operating system.

These technologically inclusive conceptualizations of craft align with Glenn Adamson's approach. The craft historian advocates understanding craft as 'an approach, an attitude, or a habit of action. Craft exists only in motion. It is a way of doing things, not a classification of objects, institutions or people' (Adamson 2007: 4). This loose definition allows for a breadth of activities to be considered as craft, including making printed circuit boards and programmed quilts. It also

allows us to think of craft as a process, echoing the verb-like conceptualization of fashioning that underpins this volume.

As a process, crafting the maker through the media includes fashioning activities such as appearing in magazines and engaging in self-maintenance activities, what Entwistle and Wissinger term 'aesthetic labour' (2012: 6). Crafting adds a material dimension to this mix, including engaging in making as a key activity in the self-construction of this identity. Crafting's hands-on nature encompasses the hybrid analogue-digital nature of the design, fabrication and media technologies available to the maker 2.0. It also lifts the maker 2.0 out of the codified skill set associated with earlier medium-specific craft identities and into the looser assemblage of skills associated with post-industrial economies, in a processing of de- and reskilling discussed later in this chapter.

Adamson also identified a series of 'core [craft] principles' in his conceptualization of craft. They include its supplementarity, amateur associations and close identification with skill, discussed above and evident in the *Power of Making* catalogue, whose subtitle is 'The Importance of Being Skilled.' In this chapter I will explore how these craft concepts and craft's feminine associations (Adamson 2007: 5; Edwards 2006: 12, 13) can inform our understanding of the maker and their mediation.

*Thinking through Craft* positions craft as a subordinate and marginalized realm. This conceptualization underpins much English language craft research in the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, as well as more popular understandings of craft in countries with similar histories of industrialization, such as the United Kingdom and the United States (Sennett 20; Risatti).[3] The term 'modern craft' (Adamson, Cooke, and Harrod 2008: 6) is used to describe craft in industrial modernity, in which it assumes an economic, political and socio-cultural marginality, an endangered existence wherein the handmade is positioned in ideological opposition to industrial capitalism. This image defined craft practice and its representation in industrializing nations throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, from William Morris's championing of the handmade in the Arts & Crafts movement, to the politically charged craft revival of the 1960s and 1970s.

*Power of Making* reminds us how much craft's condition has changed in the twenty-first century. Significantly, this new centrality is because of, rather than despite, technological advances that are once again revolutionizing manufacturing on a global scale. In 2012 the *Economist* described the arrival of the third industrial revolution, defined by a 'digitization of manufacturing' (Economist 2012) that replaces mass production with mass customization, making the craft-based scales of bespoke and batch production affordable on a much bigger scale. This is the revolution in which the maker is posited as a key player.

Despite this popularity, the unfashionable and marginal associations of the word 'craft' still linger, and contribute to use of maker terminology. While the craft world's use of the term 'maker' predates *MAKE*: magazine by over a decade, by

the mid noughties 'maker' had become the preferred term for the Crafts Council (Greenlees) and its *Crafts* magazine publication, due its apparent gender neutrality (Gibson 2016) and emphasis on more general skills and knowledge over discipline specificity (Greenlees). Interestingly, even amid craft's growing fashionability, the 'maker' has remained the Crafts Council's preferred term. In craft's move from the margins into the mainstream, it has leveraged the currency of the maker 2.0 to reposition and assert the craft maker as a key player in the creative industries, a co-option that requires further unpacking than is possible here.

Craft's changing condition also informs this chapter. While asserting the validity of 'modern craft' to understand the maker 2.0, it also offers a critical approach suited to craft's popularity today, a globalized context in which both analogue and digital making has a new prominence: in other words, a post craft condition.

## Making MAKE's maker

A 'Martha Stewart for Geeks.' This was how Dougherty pitched *MAKE* to O'Reilly in 2005 (O'Reilly 2013). Provisionally titled *Hacks*, a title Dougherty rejected in favour of one he thought offered 'a more positive framing for customizing and changing the world' (O'Reilly 2013), his idea was for a magazine as a platform for individuals to share and make DIY projects, albeit those of a more technological spin than Stewart's homemaking empire.

Dougherty's idea of catering for the then-unnamed 'maker' proved prophetic. The magazine quickly became the mouthpiece for the growing maker movement: its circulation doubled between 2005 and 2008 from 60,000 to over 125,000 and in 2012 (the most recent statistics available) the magazine had a total readership of 300,000 (Make Magazine 2016: np; Sivek 2011: 191). This growth has been fuelled by the magazine's extensions into other media: in 2005 it organized the first fair for makers in the local Bay Area, as an opportunity for readers to meet like-minded individuals to show and share their interests. The Maker Faire is now a global brand. Held in cities from Tokyo to Detroit, Oslo and Shenzhen, and in locations including the White House, in 2015 Maker Faires and children-focused mini Maker Faires attracted over a million visitors (Maker Faire n.d.). There are even spin offs unconnected to the brand, including Shanghai's Maker Carnival (Figure 9.3) and Maker Faire Africa.

Today Maker Media consists of the magazine, makezine.com and fair, as well as the Maker Shed online and pop-up store and Make: YouTube channel. These brand extensions (Lury 2004: 11) proved so successful that in 2013 Dougherty led the launch of Maker Media as a spin-off company from O'Reilly Publishing (O'Reilly 2013). Established next to its founder in Sebastopol, a city to the north of San Francisco, Maker Media aims to actively create makers. On its foundation Dougherty declared: 'The mission of Maker Media is to help more

**Figure 9.3** Shanghai Maker Carnival 2015. Photo by the author.

people become makers, and participate broadly in making a better future for themselves, their families and their communities' (Dougherty cited in O'Reilly 2013). As the following sections will explore, this highly prescriptive mediation permeates its media outputs, a direct solicitation to its readers that makes it a rich case study for understanding the media's role in identity construction.

9781350001848_txt_rev.indd 188 11/29/2017 8:59:34 PM

Since its first issue in February 2005 the magazine has retained a fairly similar appearance, and with it an equally regular representation of the maker, a consistency key to the magazine's maker mission. The front cover of the initially quarterly (now bimonthly) publication features the word *Make:* in bright red san serif typeface on the top left corner, underlined with the tagline 'technology on your own time'. Most of the cover (Figure 9.4) is dedicated to a single framed image; a self-built 'kite camera' for remote controlled aerial photography held

**Figure 9.4** Issue 1 of *Make* © Make: Magazine.

9781350001848_txt_rev.indd 189 11/29/2017 8:59:37 PM

in the hands of its designer and maker, one Charles C. Benton, an ‘inveterate tinkerer’ and architecture professor at the University of California. Cover lines proclaim the issue’s contents, including ‘BUILD YOUR OWN KITE RIG USING THE PLANS INSIDE!’ and ‘181 pages of D.I.Y Technology’.

The first issue includes articles by what would become a regular cohort of contributors. They include *Makers* author and open-source technology activist Doctorow on ‘hacking toy robots to sniff out toxic waste’; science fiction writer Bruce Sterling on makers dabbling in Stone Age flint knapping; and MIT scientist Neil Gershenfeld offering a tour of his Boston-based FabLab. These articles are joined by soon-to-be regular features, including: ‘Made on Earth: Report from the World of Backyard Technology’, a showcase of homemade endeavours including a monorail built in a Californian garden and a robotic Rubik’s Cube solver; a ‘Projects’ section of step-by-step instructions to make projects including the ‘kite camera’, and a how-to ‘Primer’ on soldering and desoldering.

## Who is a *MAKE* maker

The cover’s depiction of the maker as a white, middle-aged male is fairly typical of the magazine. Half of *MAKE*’s first ten covers depict a white middle-aged male holding a self-built gizmo. While the magazine has attempted to overcome this lack of gender and ethnic diversity in recent years, symptomatic of a broader unevenness in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) education and careers, it continues. Between 2005 and 2013, 85 percent of *MAKE’s* cover stars were male, and all were white (Britton 2015; Quattrocchi 2013).

This representation tallies with the magazine’s readership. In 2012, 80 percent of *MAKE’s* readers were male and their median age was forty-four (Maker Media 2016: np). This also accurately represents the maker movement it has fostered in the United States and the United Kingdom, where 80 percent of makerspace users are male (Dellot 2015: 24). This is echoed in China, where 77 per cent of makers are male and 54 percent are university students (Saunders and Kingsley 2016: 6). This educated and middle-class demographic is also true of the United States: according to the Maker Market Study, a 2012 survey of Maker Faire exhibitors and *MAKE* magazine and newsletter subscribers, maker’s median income is $106,000, 80 percent have a post-graduate qualification and 83 percent are employed (24). This depiction also reflects the make-up of its editorial staff (Quattrocchi 2013), a homogeneity that strengthens the identification between the magazine and its readers.

This male and masculine identity is also evident in the type of making that *Make* covers. This isn’t obvious at first. All of Maker Media’s products and marketing, and the multiple talks and interviews that Dougherty gives, promote a universal

image of the maker. As he declared in his 2011 TED talk 'We are Makers', which nearly 700,000 viewers have watched: 'All of us are makers. We're born makers. We have this ability to make things, to grasp things with our hands. We use words like "grasp" metaphorically to also think about understanding things. We don't just live, but we make. We create things'. Harrod identifies a craft precedent in Dougherty's message, echoing the inclusive proclamations of the sculptor and typographer Eric Gill ([2011] 2015: 180).

However, this universalist identity is not reflected in *MAKE* itself, wherein the type of projects included enforce parameters of what is and is not part of maker culture; an activity of boundary setting characteristic of cultural production (Bourdieu 1993: 42). The first and subsequent issues are based around DIY projects in electronics, computing, cars and other vehicles, robots and software, an emphasis that continues today (Britton 2015; Maker Market Study 2012: 12). While some more low technology and traditional skills are included, *Make*'s conceptualization of making largely excludes craft-associated making such as textiles, ceramics and glassblowing.

The absence of craft in *MAKE* is highlighted by O'Reilly Media's 2006 launch of *Craft:* magazine. Much of *CRAFT*'s cover's design (Figure 9.5) is the same as *MAKE*. It has the same masthead and central image overlaid with cover lines – although here the tagline is 'transforming traditional craft' and the robots in the image are made of wool. The first issue features a programmable LED tank top made by a female PhD student, which editor Claire Sinclair uses to describe how *CRAFT* features projects considered outside of *MAKE*'s purview:

> This project definitely has the elements of a MAKE project – it involves soldering, LED technology, and programming. But there are also craft elements that don't quite jibe with MAKE's harder-edged sensibility: it requires a sewing machine, sewing skills, fabric, and a pattern. And unlike the projects in MAKE, where the end result is more about function than form, it's essential for this project to be as aesthetically attractive as it is useful. (Sinclair 2006: 7)

These materials, tools and techniques are all associated with textiles, a realm historically and pejoratively associated with the female gender (Adamson 2007: 5). Textile's female and feminine associations are confirmed by the magazine's first ten covers. Of the five that feature people, four are females – three of which are holding textile and fashion artefacts – and another four feature textiles. These projects are too crafty, and too female, to be included in *MAKE*; a story of defining a field by excluding craft played out repeatedly in the history of creative practice (Adamson 2007: 2).

*CRAFT*'s tenth issue of February 2009 proved its last. Citing rising costs and reduced advertisers' interest in print publishing more generally, Dougherty (2009) sought to assuage its readers that they had a place in *MAKE*: 'We

9781350001848_txt_rev.indd 191 11/29/2017 8:59:38 PM

**Figure 9.5** Issue 1 of *Craft* © Make: Magazine.

have always regarded crafters as we do makers, a creative vanguard who are remaking the world in ways that are especially vital today.' Nevertheless, such female-associated textiles crafts remain marginal in *MAKE*'s universe; less than

9781350001848_txt_rev.indd 192 11/29/2017 8:59:45 PM

20 percent of makers describe themselves as involved in 'sewing/weaving/knitting/e-textiles', compared to nearly 80 percent involved in hardware and software (Maker Market Study 2012: 12). Dougherty's statement reinforces a perception of crafters and makers as two different, gendered identities, a separation and exclusion reinforced by the magazine's promotion of the latter.

Maker 2.0's gendered identity also conforms to DIY's historically male associations. This was evident in magazines such as *Popular Science* and *Popular Mechanics*, which Dougherty (2014) cites as inspiration for *Make.* These predecessors connect *MAKE* to a science and technology-infused DIY first popular in the eighteenth century and which re-emerged after the Second World War in activities such as making crystal radio sets and model planes (Harrod [2011] 2015: 180). These magazines fuelled a more general DIY boom: in the mid-1950s, DIY was the largest hobby in America and the third most popular leisure activity for married men (Lichtman 2006: 42). Design historian Paul Atkinson (2006: 7) describes this male-dominated twentieth century amateur home maintenance as 'a means of asserting a masculine identity in a changing or uncertain world'. In the twenty-first century, DIY continues to serve in the self-construction of gendered, as well as class and sex identities (Moisio, Arnould, and Gentry 2013).

By representing makers as male and, as the next section explores, through enabling them to performatively assert (Butler 1990) their gendered identity by participating in its DIY projects, *MAKE* contributes to its readers' construction of their gendered and maker identities. As such, *MAKE* reproduces ideals of masculinity, evidencing a link between media representation and broader societal norms (Entwistle and Wissinger 2012: 4).

## How to be a maker

As the previous section suggests, one of the primary ways *MAKE*'s readers constitutively perform their maker identity is through making the DIY projects featured in the magazine. This making also asserts identity traits beyond that of the maker; not just in terms of gender, but also professional status. For the majority of *MAKE* readers making is a voluntary, non-commercial leisure activity that exists alongside their professional identity: most Maker Market Study (2012: 10) respondents identify their maker 'type' as hobbyist or tinkerer. Their responses assert the maker as an amateur figure, albeit one that exists in symbiotic relationship with these readers' professional identities.

The DIY articles can be split into two types: the 'Primer' feature, which would later become a 'Skillbuilders' section, provides instructions for makers to skill-up with technologies new and old, from speed squares to printed circuit boards,

9781350001848_txt_rev.indd 193 11/29/2017 8:59:45 PM

and the more elaborate 'Projects', which in 2016 include a smartphone garage door opener and DIY concrete lantern. The latter state upfront the time, money, materials and tool required, and the 'complexity level' involved. Both combine written descriptions with illustrated photographs of hands at work, paused processes, and tools, as part of the step-by-step instructions for makers to follow.

Such articles are part of a broader culture of manuals, 'how to' guidance and advice literature long central to amateur craft practice (Knott 2015: xvi). They are part of what Ann Sophie Lehmann terms 'showing making', a 'genre' characterized by depictions of craft processes that has particular currency in our image-saturated digital age (2012: 12–13). Lehmann argues that such imagery serves four key 'functions': 'archival'; 'instructional'; 'participatory' and 'display'.

In *MAKE* the primary purpose of such imagery is their 'instructional function' as they 'enable the acquisition of skills and material knowledge' (Lehmann 2012: 9). They speak to an uneven distribution of expertise among its readers, many of whom are interested in making but lack the necessary skills. They embody a widespread deskilling in Western nations such as the United States, a result of the outsourcing of production and shift towards service economies (Charny 2011: 7; Lindtner 2015: 871). *MAKE* shows this has affected the skill level not only in the workplace, but at home too. As Dougherty lamented in 2012:

> There once was a time when most Americans commonly thought of themselves as tinkerers. Tinkering used to be a basic skill, and you could get a little bit more out of life than the average person if you had good tinkering skills – if you could fix your own car, for example, or improve your home or make your own clothes. I think we lost some of that over the decades, but I also think it is coming back. (Dougherty 2012: 11)

*MAKE*'s readers might lack these making and repair skills, but they seek to re-gain lost skills and add new ones through the magazine; a process of de- and re-skilling that accompanies each new technological advance. The magazine's middle class readers have sufficient means and time to engage in making in their free time (Knott 2015: xiii) and they choose to use this time to learn and apply skills to make a variety of domestic-scale projects, such as rigging for kite aerial photography.

*MAKE*'s readers' making is informed by their professional background. Like the cover star architecture professor Benton, many combine their leisure interest in making with a profession in an allied area: a third of Maker Market Study respondents work 'in technical areas such as scientific or engineering' (Maker Market Study 2012: 24). This is not uncommon. Knott describes the high incidence of creative practitioners spending 'holiday or 'free time' engaged in a similar activity' to their work (2015: 98). As Knott argues, the elision of work and

leisure interests shows how individuals do not 'switch off' their work interests in their free time, but instead continue 'to engage with the skills, tools and mentalities' of their profession (2015: 98). To see qualified architects, engineers and scientists as amateur makers makes clear how leisure time identities reflect professional ones, and how reading *MAKE*, and realizing its DIY projects, is not about escaping a professional identity, but entrenching it.

Reading and making *MAKE's* DIY projects offers a way to assert both an individual and community maker identity. This co-construction of the maker's identity chiefly occurs through readers' participation in Maker Media's other platforms. Makers can meet, show and take part in making activities at Maker Faires, and upload photographs and self-made films of their attempts to realize the magazine's DIY projects, as well as their own making projects, to the publisher's multiple social media channels, using the #makeshowtell hashtag. As Susan Currie Sivek has shown, user-generated content 'intensifies readers' buy-in to the ideologies presented' (2011: 188) in *MAKE*, a close relationship between magazine and reader that enhances the sense of community, and also engenders consumer loyalty. Sharing making videos also exemplifies the 'display' function of 'showing making' that Lehmann identifies. This showcasing is part of a wider phenomenon of posting and sharing self-produced 'how-to' films on sites such as YouTube, many of which share their 'unshowy, rough-and-ready' appearance (Gauntlett 2011: 85).

Such online sharing corresponds to Web 2.0's participatory and user-generated nature (Gauntlett 2011: 85) that enables individuals united by their interests but geographically separated to virtually come together and create their own communities. This digital connecting has been key to building local and international maker communities. According to the *Economist* (2012) 'The ease with which designs for physical things can be shared digitally goes a long way towards explaining why the maker movement has already developed a strong culture.' It also shows how the 'maker 2.0' may have been born in California, but makers can be located anywhere in the world, and the ability to be a member of the maker community is defined by the ability to access the Internet rather than being in any specific geographic location.

## Why be a maker

While the first two sections addressed who *MAKE*'s makers are and how to become one, this final section briefly considers some of the maker's values, as posited by *MAKE*. While the maker's gendering occurs through boundary setting, and becoming a maker is energized by making and sharing the DIY projects published in *MAKE*, the maker's worth is communicated through the magazine's voice. The magazine repeatedly features articles that proselytize the

9781350001848_txt_rev.indd 195 11/29/2017 8:59:45 PM

values of the maker, using 'you' or 'we' to engender empathy and identification between the author and reader.

In the opening lines of *MAKE*'s first-ever editorial Dougherty declares: 'more than mere consumers of technology, we are makers, adapting technology to our needs and integrating it into our lives' (Dougherty 2005: 7). He posits the maker as an individual with agency, someone who does not passively accept technologies and products produced in some remote location; a passive and alienated relationship that defines contemporary consumer society (Dellot 2015). Instead the maker is a 'craft consumer' or 'producing consumer' (Knott 2015: xv), who exploits the accessibility of digital design and fabrication tools to make, adapt and fix their surroundings. Accordingly, the maker 2.0 is a response to the rapid technological changes of the third industrial revolution (Dellot 2015: 5); a response based on the embrace of emerging new technologies rather than their rejection.

The idea of the maker as a backlash to the passivity of consumer technology is most explicit in the 'Maker's Bill of Rights' that first appeared in the magazine's fourth issue in 2006 (157). It was authored by one Mister Jalopy, a regular *MAKE* voice. Prefaced with the tagline 'If you can't open it, you don't own it' the manifesto consists of seventeen commandments for manufacturers to make their products more maker friendly. They include: 'Cases shall be easy to open'; 'Profiting by selling expensive special tools is wrong and not making special tools available is even worse' and 'Ease of repair shall be a design ideal, not an afterthought' (Jalopy 2006: 157).

The manifesto exemplifies the magazine's broader rejection of consumer technology's closed ethos. This widespread corporate ideology is seen to have a detrimental environmental impact and to limit the country's innovation capacity. Early articles in the magazine's often have nationalist, nostalgic undertones about America's former industrial and economic prowess, in which the maker is invested with the power to (re)claim the nation's global might. As Fraudenfeld argues in the second issue:

> Yankee Ingenuity – that is, improvising with technology, taking ownership of it, and being self-reliant and creative with it, is a proud American tradition that has spread to every corner of the free world. Hollywood's efforts to impose Soviet-style centralized control on technology are a huge step backwards for innovation. (Fraudenfeld 2005: 7)

While such nationalist attitudes have since toned down, this idea of the maker as an economic figure has been central to other depictions of the maker. These include Anderson's popular book *Makers* (2012), which positions the maker as the protagonist of the third industrial revolution, and so the key to America's manufacturing future, and Obama's 2013 State of the Union address, in which

he argued that maker-friendly innovations such as 3D printing were the key to ensuring 'that the next revolution in manufacturing is made in America' (Lindtner 2015: 858). The maker is championed as the solution to America's economic woes as it struggles to shift from a post-industrial to a knowledge economy.

Significantly, the maker is not just posited as the saviour of the West's faltering economies, but the East too. There is (at least) one key difference. As American academic Clay Shirky (2015) puts it, while in North American the maker movement occurs 'against a background of nostalgia for the old US manufacturing industry' in China 'nothing in the Maker Movement is taking place against a background of nostalgia, because 'the time when this country knew how to make things' is just a synonym for "this morning"'. However, while there has been much prominent state and commercial investment in opening makerspaces in China, many of these stand empty and have in fact closed in 2016. Clearly, the role of the state, and of the media, is ultimately limited. Despite *MAKE*'s proclamations, the magazine did not invent the maker. Instead, it created the framework to support and promote an emerging identity, one that had its roots in the alternative culture of the 1960s and 1970s, and which was reawakened in the socio-economic, political and technological vicissitudes of the early 2000s.

## Conclusion

Of course *MAKE* is not the only representation of maker 2.0. As artist, academic and early *MAKE* contributor Garnet Hertz argued in 2012 (no pagination): 'There is obviously a lot more to electronic DIY culture that what is found in the pages of Make.' Hertz (2012: no pagination) is particularly critical of its increasingly commercial nature: 'Make has done a lot of amazing work in popularizing the field, but it's been sanitized into a consumer-friendly format in the process', a criticism that reminds us that the hacker movement's subversive spirit continues today. Equally different is Maker Faire Africa's take on maker 2.0: it focuses on encouraging the maker as an entrepreneurial manufacturer, overcoming the limitation of the continent's manufacturing industries during centuries of colonial exploitation (Harrod [2011] 2015: 181).

Yet, as this chapter has argued, there is no doubt that *MAKE* and Maker Media have played a key role in constructing the maker 2.0. Using a 'crafting' interpretation of 'fashioning', it has used concepts of gender, amateurism and skill to show how Maker Media has proactively co-constructed the maker 2.0. It has shown how questions around who the maker 2.0 is, how you become a maker, and why the maker is a desirable creative identity, can be explored through considering the design and contents of the magazine and associated Maker Faire and digital platforms. This includes the importance of participatory content and platforms that allow readers to actively construct and demonstrate

9781350001848_txt_rev.indd 197 11/29/2017 8:59:45 PM

their maker identity, and exposing the boundaries that establish who is excluded and included in the maker 2.0 identity. Such demarcations are key features of the process of professionalization of creative identities (Atkinson 2010: 140), so it is interesting to see this in a currently overwhelmingly amateur identity, suggesting at least some makers' increasingly professional status.

Academics are only beginning to attend to the identity of the maker, and there are key aspects of the maker identity that necessitate further research not possible here. This includes investigating deeper the craft-based maker identity, and untangling its complex relationship with the maker 2.0. Also in question is the longevity of the maker. The maker is increasingly internationally visible, yet such fashionability also leads to an inevitable unfashionability. Future researchers may not just be looking at the fashioning of the maker through the media, but also its unfashioning.

# Notes

**1** Hereafter *Make:* will be described as *MAKE* and *Craft:* magazine as *CRAFT*, following the magazine's convention.

**2** Key exceptions include Susan Currie Sivek and Silvia Lindtner, both cited in the references.

**3** These include Richard Sennett and Howard Risatti's writings as well as *The Journal of Modern Craft,* which first appeared in 2008.

# References

Adamson, G. (2007), *Thinking through Craft*, Oxford; New York: Berg.

Adamson, G. (2013), *The Invention of Craft*, London; New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Adamson, G., N. Cooke, and T. Harrod (2008), 'Editorial Introduction', *Journal of Modern Craft*, 1 (1): 5–11.

Anderson, C. (2012), *Makers: The New Industrial Revolution*, London: Random House Business Books.

Anon (2012), 'The Third Industrial Revolution', *The Economist*, 21 April. Available online: http://www.economist.com/node/21553017 2 October 2016/ (accessed on 5 October 2016).

Anon (n.d.), *Online Etymology Dictionary*. Available online: http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=make (accessed on 5 October 2016).

Atkinson, P. (2006), 'Do It Yourself: Democracy and Design', *Journal of Design History*, 19 (1): 1–10.

Atkinson, P. (2010), 'Boundaries? What Boundaries? The Crisis of Design in a Post-Professional Era', *The Design Journal*, 13 (2): 137–155.

Banks, M, R. Gill, and S. Taylor, eds (2013), *Theorizing Cultural Work: Labour, Continuity and Change in the Cultural and Creative Industries*, London; New York: Routledge.

Beaven, K. (2013), 'Manufacture 2/Power of Making', *The Journal of Modern Craft*, 6 (1): 95–99.
Bourdieu, P. (1993), *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, trans. R. Johnson. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Britton, L. (2015), 'Power, Access, Status: The Discourse of Race, Gender, and Class in the Maker Movement', *Technology and Social Change Group*, *University of Washington*, 18 March. Available online: http://tascha.uw.edu/2015/03/power-access-status-the-discourse-of-race-gender-and-class-in-the-maker-movement/ (accessed on 3 August 2016).
Butler, J. (1990), *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, London and New York: Routledge.
Carpenter, Ele (2011), 'Social Making', in D. Charny (ed.), *The Power of Making*, 48–51, London: V&A Publishing.
'Case Study: Inspiring a Generation of Makers' (n.d), *From Now On*. Available online: http://fromnowon.co.uk/work/inspiring-a-generation-of-makers (accessed on 7 July 2016).
Charny, D. (2010), 'Craft Traces/Power of Making' (working titles), A V&A and Crafts Council Exhibition Steering Group 02 Meeting. Update and Conversation.
Charny, D., ed. (2011), *The Power of Making: The Importance of Being Skilled*, London: V&A Publishing; Crafts Council.
Charny, D. (2016), Email interview with the author, 30 July.
Craft Council (n.d.), 'Make: Shift', *Crafts Council*. Available online: http://www.craftscouncil.org.uk/what-we-do/makeshift (accessed on 4 August 2016).
Dellot, B. (2015), *Ours to Master: How Makerspaces Can Help Us Master Technology for a More Human End*, London: RSA. Available online: https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/reports/ours-to-master (accessed on 7 July 2016).
Dougherty, D. (2005), 'The Making of Make', *Make*, 1: 7.
Dougherty, D. (2009), 'CRAFT: Issue 10 Is Our Last Issue in Print', *Makezine*, 11 February. Available online: http://makezine.com/2009/02/11/craft_volume_10_is_our_last_is/ (accessed on 20 July 2016).
Dougherty, D. (2012), 'The Maker Movement', *Innovations*, 7 (3): 11–14.
Dougherty, D. (2014), 'The Blueprint Talks with Dale Dougherty', *Blueprint*. Available online: https://theblueprint.com/stories/dSale-dougherty/ (accessed on 1 August 2016).
The Editors of MAKE (2007), *The Best of MAKE*, Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly.
Edwards, C. (2006), '"Home Is Where the Art Is": Women, Handicrafts and Home Improvements 1750–1900', *Journal of Design History*, 19 (1): 11–21.
Elliot, L. (2016), 'March of the Makers Remains a Figment of Osborne's Imagination', *The Guardian*, 12 January. Available online: https://www.theguardian.com/business/2016/jan/12/march-of-the-makers-osbornes-economy-manufacturing-output (accessed on 20 October 2016).
Entwistle, J. and E. Wissinger, eds (2012), *Fashioning Models: Image, Text and Industry*, London and New York: Berg.
Fraudenfeld, M. (2005), 'When Users MAKE', *MAKE*, 2: 7.
Gauntlett, D. (2011), *Making Is Connecting: The Social Meaning of Creativity, from DIY and Knitting to YouTube and Web 2.0*, Cambridge; Malden, MA: Polity Press.
Gibson, G. (2014), 'Making a Brand's Value', *Crafts*, 246: 3.
Gibson, G. (2016), Telephone interview with the author, 8 August.
Greenlees, R. (2016), Email interview with the author, 16 September.

Harrod, T. (2015), *The Real Thing: Essays on Making in the Modern World*, London: Hyphen Press.

Hertz, G., ed. (2012), *Critical Making*, Hollywood, CA: Telharmonium Press.

Hesmondalgh, D. and S. Baker (2011), *Creative Labour: Media Work in Three Cultural Industries*, Oxon, New York: Routledge.

Jalopy, M. (2006), '"Own Your Own: If you Can't Open It, You Don't Own It". A Maker's Bill of Rights to Accessible, Extensible, and Repairable Hardware', *MAKE*, 4: 154–157.

Kalil, T. and A. Coy (2016), 'Announcing June 17–23 as a Week of Making', *The White House*, 9 March. Available online: https://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2016/03/09/announcing-june-17-23-week-making (accessed on 2 October 2016).

Keqiang, Li (2015), 'Full Text: Report on the Work of the Government.' Available online: http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/china/2015-03/16/c_134071473.htm (accessed on 13 September 2016).

Knott, S. (2015), *Amateur Craft: History and Theory*, London; New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Lehmann, A.S. (2012), 'Showing Making: On Visual Documentation and Creative Practice', *Journal of Modern Craft*, 5 (1): 9–24.

Lichtman, S. (2006), 'Do-It-Yourself Security: Safety, Gender, and the Home Fallout Shelter in Cold War America', *Journal of Design History*, 19 (1): 39–55.

Lindtner, Silvia (2015), 'Hacking with Chinese Characteristics: The Promises of the Maker Movement against China's Manufacturing Culture', *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 40 (5): 854–879.

Luckman, S. (2015), *Craft and the Creative Economy*, Houndmills, Basingstoke; New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

Lury, C. (2004), *Brands: The Logos of the Global Economy*, Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge.

Maker Faire (n.d.), 'Maker Faire: A Bit of History'. Available online: https://makerfaire.com/makerfairehistory/ (accessed on 28 September 2017).

Maker Media (2012), 'Maker Market Study and Media Report'.

Maker Media (2012), *Study and Media Report: An In-depth Profile of Makers at the Forefront of Hardware Innovation*. Available online: http://makerfaire.com/hardware-innovation-workshop/research/ (accessed on 1 August 2016).

Maker Media (2013), 'Fact Sheet.' Available online: http://makermedia.com/press/fact-sheet/ (accessed on 27 June 2016).

Maker Media (2016), *Make Media Kit 2016*. Available online: makermedia.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/2016-Make-Media-Kit-Final.pdf (accessed on 1 August 2016).

Margetts, M. (2011), 'Actions Not Words', in D. Charny (ed.), *The Power of Making: The Importance of Being Skilled*, 38–43, London: V&A Publishing; Crafts Council.

McGuirk, J. (2013), 'Fashion, Fetish and Craft', in *COLLECT*, 18–23, London: Crafts Council.

Miller, D. (2011), 'The Power of Making', in D. Charny (ed.), *The Power of Making: The Importance of Being Skilled*, 14–23, London: V&A Publishing; Crafts Council.

Moisio, R., E. J. Arnould, and J. W. Gentry (2013), 'Productive Consumption in the Class-Mediated Construction of Domestic Masculinity: Do-it-yourself (DIY) Home Improvement in Men's Identity Work', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40 (2): 298–316.

'News Release: Power of Making' (n.d.), *V&A*. Available online: https://www.vam.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/178663/Power_of_Making_-_Press_Release.pdf (accessed on 17 July 2016).

O'Reilly, T. (2013), 'Why We Spun Out Maker Media', *Radar*. Available online: http://radar.oreilly.com/2013/01/why-we-spun-out-maker-media.html (accessed on 27 June 2016).

Peach, A. (2013), 'What Goes Around Comes Around? Craft Revival, the 1970s and Today', *Craft Research*, 2: 161–179.

Quattrocchi, C. (2013), 'MAKE'ing More Diverse Makers', *Edsurge*, 29 October. Available online: https://www.edsurge.com/news/2013-10-29-make-ing-more-diverse-makers (accessed on 3 August 2016).

Rocamora, A. (2009), *Fashioning the City: Paris, Fashion and the Media*, London and New York: I. B. Tauris.

Rocamora, A. (2016), 'Mediatization and Digital Media in the Field of Fashion', *Fashion Theory*, 1–18. Available online: DOI: 10.1080/1362704X.2016.1173349 (accessed 29 July 2016).

Rooney, D., G. Hearn and T. Kastelle eds. (2012), 'Knowledge Is People Doing Things, Knowledge Economies Are People Doing Things with Better Outcomes for More People', in *Handbook on the Knowledge Economy*, vol. 2, 1–14, Edward Elgar Publishing. Ebook.

Saunders, T. and J. Kingsley (2016), *Made in China: Makerspaces and the Search for Mass Innovation*, London: Nesta.

Sennett, Richard (2008), *The Craftsman*, London: Penguin.

Shirky, C. (2015), 'China's Version of the 'Maker Movement' Puts the U.S. to Shame', *Fortune*, October 21. Available online: http://fortune.com/2015/10/21/chinas-version-of-the-maker-movment-puts-the-u-s-to-shame/ (accessed on 5 October 2016).

Sinclair, C. (2006), 'The Crafting of Craft: Welcome to the New Magazine for the New Craft Movement', *CRAFT*, 1: 7.

Sivek, S. C (2011), '"We Need a Showing of All Hands": Technological Utopianism in *MAKE* Magazine', *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 35 (3): 187–209.

Stokes, K., H. Stewart, and A. Sleigh (2015), 'Top Findings from the Open Dataset of UK Makerspaces', *NESTA*, 24 April. Available at: http://www.nesta.org.uk/blog/top-findings-open-dataset-uk-makerspaces (accessed on 5 October 2016).

Tanenbaum, G.J. and K. Tanenbaum (2015), 'Fabricating Futures: Envisioning Scenarios for Home Fabrication Technology', in N. Zagalo and P. Branco (eds), *Creativity in the Digital Age*, 193–221, London: Springer [online].