Written Communication

Gig expectations: Literacy practices, events and texts in the gig economy

Journal:	<i>Written Communication</i>
Manuscript ID	WC-20-0117.R3
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Workplace Writing and Literacy, Genre Theory, Multiliteracies, Digital Writing, Accessibility, Identity
Abstract:	<p>This article explores the writing and reading requirements of the literacy practices, events and texts characteristic of work mediated by the online labor platforms of the gig economy, such as Airtasker and Freelancer, which bring together people needing a job done with those willing to do it. These emerging platform-based discourse communities and their associated literacies are a new domain of social activity. Based on an examination of seven gig economy platforms the article examines the core literacy event in the gig economy, the posting and bidding for tasks, together with the texts that enhance and support this process. While some tasks require written texts as the outcome or product, all tasks involve the creation of some form of written text as part of doing the work. These texts are both interactional and interpersonal. As well as being a part of negotiating and then getting a task done, they relate to the complexities of building the identities, knowledge and relationships required of those working in a virtual workspace rather than a traditional workplace (Farrell, 2006, 2009). While most of these texts reflect familiar text types, the core text cycle is argued to be an “emergent” genre (Miller, 2017). Implications for education are presented.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

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

Gig expectations: Literacy practices, events and texts in the gig economy

Abstract

This article explores the writing and reading requirements of the literacy practices, events and texts characteristic of work mediated by the online labor platforms of the gig economy, such as *Airtasker* and *Freelancer*, which bring together people needing a job done with those willing to do it. These emerging platform-based discourse communities and their associated literacies are a new domain of social activity. Based on an examination of seven gig economy platforms, the present article examines the core literacy event in the gig economy, the posting and bidding for tasks, together with the texts that enhance and support this process. While some tasks require written texts as the outcome or product, *all* tasks involve the creation of some form of written text as part of doing the work. These texts are both interactional and interpersonal. As well as being a part of negotiating and then getting a task done, they relate to the complexities of building the identities, knowledge and relationships required of those working in a virtual *workspace* rather than a traditional *workplace* (Farrell, 2006, 2009). While most of these texts reflect familiar text types, the core text cycle is argued to be an “emergent” genre (Miller, 2017). Implications for education are presented.

Keywords: work-related literacy, Industry 4.0, digital literacy, Literacy 4.0, new media genres

Introduction

Government responses to the global COVID-19 pandemic have particularly affected members of the “precariat” (Standing, 2011), workers in employment sectors such as services and hospitality who already have low job security. One group of workers with especially low job security are those working in the gig economy, who bid for and often complete work via online labor platforms. These

1
2
3 “platform workers” (McDonald et al., 2019) are likely to be strongly affected by pandemic lockdowns
4 and their aftermath. Yet, as the Fourth Industrial Revolution continues to transform industries, types
5 of work, and ways of working (Schwab, 2016), many workers are being forced to find new and
6 innovative ways to promote themselves, build relationships and get work done via these platforms.
7
8
9

10
11
12 The transformation of industries in Industry 4.0 is the result of the ubiquitous use of digital
13 data in all aspects of product development and distribution. At one end of the scale, the
14 identification and application of patterns in data allows artificially intelligent processes to be applied
15 in “smart” factories. At the other end of the scale, digital online labor platforms allow individual
16 workers to respond to opportunities to carry out short term tasks (or “gigs”) in rapid response to
17 customer needs in the “gig economy”. This article reports on research that is part of a broader
18 project examining the literacy practices required for work in the gig economy, in smart factories, and
19 in other work contexts marked by high technological convergence (Farrell, Newman & Corbel, 2020).
20 Our focus is on what we call *Literacy 4.0*, the literacy practices that are characteristic of the
21 emerging domain of digital *workspaces* (Farrell, 2006, 2009) of Industry 4.0. These workspaces are a
22 central feature of the Fourth Industrial Revolution and of the data-driven artificial intelligence
23 embedded in products and processes known as the Internet of Things (Wisskirchen, 2017).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Work and life are now mediated by increasingly diverse kinds of digital platforms, with the
41 result that the word *platform* can be tricky to define. The word has been most commonly used in
42 reference to social media platforms such as Facebook, Instagram, TikTok, and LinkedIn, but a
43 platform may be any digitally coded infrastructure that enables multiple users or groups, often
44 performing different roles, to both input and receive information or data (“content”) via a user
45 interface. In this way, a digital platform can provide a space where social activity, including work,
46 happens. Crucially, however, it is in the design of the specific kind of platform that the scope and
47 types of interaction among users are decided and defined, particularly in the user interface, where
48 content is displayed to the user(s) and options for inhabiting specific roles and inputting content are
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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

made available. As Srnicek (2017) reminds us, platforms are a kind of business model that is becoming ever more central to the global economy and though they may provide the infrastructure and intermediation between different groups, their primary function is the collection, storing and management of user-generated data.

The research reported here focuses specifically on the literacy practices of Industry 4.0 as they are manifested in the online collaborative labor platforms associated with the gig (also known as the “sharing” or “on-demand”) economy (State of Victoria, 2020). We focus on platforms that have been specifically designed to enable communication between short term, on-demand workers and customers – platforms such as *Airtasker*, *Uber* and *Freelancer*. These platforms all have in common a mechanism for building and maintaining a community of buyers and sellers of services. Customers are typically individuals as well as small to medium businesses. Tasks are those which are likely to be beyond the scope of a customer’s ability or core business. These can be anything from simple home repairs to preparing a report or designing a logo, depending on the focus of the platform. Importantly, the workers who use these platforms are considered to be self-employed, rather than employed by the companies who manage the platforms (and collect and store user-generated data), meaning that work insurance, superannuation and overhead costs such as maintenance of equipment and facilities must be borne by the worker (McDonald 2019; Srnicek 2017).

As a recent inquiry into the status of this on-demand workforce has observed, the practice of workers being sourced on an as-needed basis is not new but “the emergence of digital platforms that source, sort, organise or deploy workers presents a shift in the efficiency and accessibility of on-demand work over the last decade” (State of Victoria, 2020, p.10). It is these online labor platforms that enable gig work, facilitating, rapidly and on a large scale, the sourcing and matching of workers to particular work tasks. We argue that these platforms not only enable gig work, but in many ways define it, as the digital communication infrastructure that they provide sets the parameters for the

1
2
3 literacy practices that animate work in the gig economy. We ask, what are the literacy requirements,
4 the “gig expectations”, of work in this new social domain? What are the roles of writing and reading
5 in the literacy practices that characterise these new ways of working? In short, what are the literacy
6 practices that support work in Industry 4.0?
7
8
9
10

11
12 The core “literacy event” (Barton & Hamilton, 1999) in the gig economy is a collaborative
13 process of posting tasks to be done and bidding to carry them out. This core event is both
14 instrumental and social in that it involves mechanisms for building relationships, identity and
15 knowledge to ensure success within a platform community. In the absence of physical contact, this
16 work is now wholly dependent on texts. We adopt a social view of literacy in which “...literacy is best
17 understood as a set of social practices; these are observable in events which are mediated by
18 written texts” (Barton & Hamilton, 1999, p. 9). This article focuses on the literacy practices, events
19 and texts that accompany work in the gig economy because this will provide insights into the nature
20 of gig work and the communicative and literacy demands placed on workers in Industry 4.0. These
21 insights, in turn, will enable more critical interrogation of issues relating to equity of access to gig
22 economy work for individuals with diverse experiences of literacy education, and indeed to the
23 quality of literacy support offered to workers by the platforms themselves.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 We begin with a description of the gig economy and outline the social view of literacy we
41 espouse. We proceed with a review of previous research and an outline of our approach and
42 methodology. We then present the findings in the form of an examination of the core literacy event
43 on online labor platforms, followed by a discussion of the texts and genres associated with the
44 literacy event and the implications for educators.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 From workplaces to workspaces

54
55

56
57 As an employment system, the gig economy has three main features (Richardson, 2015; Martin,
58 2016). The first is the use of online labor platforms to bring together people who need a task done
59
60

1
2
3 with others who are willing to do it. The second is the distinctive employment relationship between
4
5 platforms, customers and workers. Workers are treated as stand-alone entities fully responsible for
6
7 all aspects of their own working lives. While this is often presented in public debate as an
8
9 empowering form of self-employment, the potentially exploitative nature of this form of
10
11 employment contract for individuals, and the financial benefits of outsourcing that accrue to
12
13 employers and firms, is extensively argued as well (Avis, 2018; Aloisi, 2016, McDonald et al., 2020).
14
15 The third distinguishing feature of the gig economy is the distribution of platform roles. There is a
16
17 vast difference in size between the small core group of contracted employees which develops and
18
19 manages the platform and the very large number of workers who carry out the tasks. These
20
21 arrangements are supported by industry (Australian Industry Group, 2016; Deloitte Development,
22
23 2017) as well as being the target of critique (Avis, 2018; Chalmers & Quigley, 2017).
24
25
26
27

28 In one sense this pattern of work is not new. It draws upon those whose work has always
29
30 had a freelance aspect, such as musicians (the source of the term *gig*) and some professionals. What
31
32 is new, however, is that it may now attract those displaced by industry disruption, such as in
33
34 manufacturing, where work has traditionally been relatively secure and has included benefits such
35
36 as sick and annual leave (Dean & Spoehr, 2018). The conditions of the gig economy may well
37
38 prefigure the increasingly precarious conditions of other sectors of the workforce, especially in
39
40 service industries dominated by low paid women and migrant workers, like hospitality, childcare,
41
42 and aged care, but also in traditionally secure sectors dominated by highly regulated trades. The
43
44 increasing precariousness, or “precarity” (Sutherland, et. al. 2020), of nearly all work has been
45
46 brought into stark relief by the COVID-19 global pandemic, as a result of which the gig workforce is
47
48 likely to grow in both gross employment numbers and in the range of employment sectors affected.
49
50
51
52

53 The literacy requirements of work have changed as well (Farrell, 2001), not just for
54
55 professional writers (Kirschenbaum, 2016) but for all professionals, and indeed, all workers (Brandt,
56
57 2015). The “informating” (Zuboff, 1988) of work processes, whereby actions are converted into
58
59 information (data) which makes them visible and measurable, is now so ubiquitous that not just
60

1
2
3 paper but screens themselves are being obscured with the emergence of the Internet of Things, in
4
5 which artificial intelligence is applied to vast amounts of data to produce industrial processes and
6
7 products based on newly appropriated areas of human behaviour in an emerging “surveillance
8
9 capitalism” (Zuboff, 2019).
10
11

12
13 A further influence on the literacy practices of workspaces, in addition to changes in work,
14
15 are the changes in texts themselves. The long-standing interdependence of reading, writing,
16
17 speaking and listening (Barton & Hamilton, 1999 p. 9) is expressed in new ways in texts that are no
18
19 longer clearly paper- or screen-based, but, rather, routinely multimedia in character (de Pourbaix,
20
21 1999; Cope & Kalantzis, 2000; Thorne, 2013). It is now common for texts to be collaboratively
22
23 created, and the number of text creators who may work together to produce a text has risen
24
25 exponentially over the past two decades. There is a “massification” of writing (Brandt, 2015) and
26
27 arguably a re-massification of reading thanks in part to the ubiquity of social media. These textual
28
29 changes are reflected in the literacy practices of the gig economy as well.
30
31
32

33
34 Although there has been a great deal of debate surrounding digital literacies in general (see
35
36 Thorne (2013) for an overview), and some general commentaries on literacy in Industry 4.0
37
38 (Coldwell-Neilson & Cooper, 2019; Farrell, Newman & Corbel, 2020; Fehring, 2020), the specific
39
40 literacy needs of those working in the gig economy are only now starting to be addressed. Carrigan
41
42 (2018) refers to “platform literacy”, which focuses on knowledge about the platform rather than on
43
44 the moment-by-moment textual production within the workspaces which these platforms provide.
45
46 Sutherland, et al. (2020) refer to “gig literacies”, by which they mean the “creative literacies” (p.
47
48 458) with which workers manage the precarity of gig work. However, there remains a need to
49
50 understand the social and textual practices required for effective participation in the gig economy
51
52 and how policymakers, educators, careers advisors and support staff can help prepare students and
53
54 workers to engage with it.
55
56
57
58
59
60

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

Our preference for a social view of literacy is based on the notion of literacy as part of a social “ecology” (Barton, 1994). Social approaches to the study of literacy typically focus on literacy as regular, text-mediated *literacy events* that are a part of social *literacy practices* involving *written texts*, shared among people in particular settings and communities (Street, 1993; Graddol, Maybin & Stierer, 1994; Hamilton, Barton & Ivanic, 1994; Baynham, 1995; Hawkins, 2013). A social view of literacy is particularly relevant in light of the focus on community formation espoused by most online labor platforms themselves. As we have argued elsewhere:

While it is certainly the case that new forms of literacy change the ways that working knowledges and working identities are understood and produced ... the distinctive demand that Industry 4.0 makes on literacy practices is the unrelenting attention that needs to be given to establishing, maintaining and repairing relationships. (Farrell, Newman & Corbel, 2020, p. 5)

Most research on literacy in online settings has focused on changing literacy practices in educational and social settings (Pigg et al., 2014; Jaworski, 2015; Messina-Dahlberg & Bagga-Gupta, 2016). Less research has addressed changing literacy practices in new online professional and vocational settings (though see Collin, 2011; Ducheneaut & Bellotti, 2010; Sutherland et al., 2020). Although recent studies have examined the cultural and legal aspects of labour practices in the gig economy (Aloisi, 2016; Healy, Nicholson & Pekarek, 2017), and there is some work on the “shared” economy (Richardson, 2015; Martin, 2016), there is none to date that examines the *literacy* practices, events and texts of the online labor platforms of the gig economy.

The workplace has long been studied as a setting for literacy practices (Gee, Lankshear & Hull, 1996; Farrell, 2006, Hull & Zacher, 2007). A particular focus has been on the effect of changes in reading and writing requirements that have accompanied changes in work practices as workplaces have become more automated and “textualised” (Zuboff, 1988; see also Baynham & Prinsloo, 2009; Farrell & Fenwick, 2007; Farrell, 2009; Brandt, 2005, 2009, 2015). Some early writers within the field

1
2
3 of information science also addressed some of the non-technical aspects of emerging online textual
4
5 practices (Barrett, 1993; Brown & Duguid, 2000). An abiding concern within workplace literacy
6
7 studies has always been with the relationship between workplace changes, literacy, and the
8
9 formation and framing of individual worker identity (Turtle, 1997; Sennett, 1998; Farrell, 2000,
10
11 2006).
12
13

14
15 The kinds of literacy practices examined in different workplaces have changed over time, but
16
17 all have increasingly involved writing. Even formerly exclusively physical work now involves a crucial
18
19 textual element (Zuboff, 1998; Farrell, 2006) which is frequently highly restrictive and externally
20
21 determined. While this may have benefits for the firm or supply chain in the form of “adaptive case
22
23 management” (Fisher, 2016), it also causes problems, for example, where reports are framed by
24
25 restrictive requirements such as templates (Sellen & Harper, 2002; Brandt, 2016; Karlsson &
26
27 Nikolaidou, 2015). At the same time, knowledge workers in informed organisations are
28
29 increasingly shaping them to their own needs, for example, using “email as habitat” (Ducheneaut &
30
31 Bellotti, 2001).
32
33

34
35 Textual and social practices come together in texts as genres, which both shape and are
36
37 shaped by literacy practices. We draw upon the rhetorically-oriented perspective of genre which is
38
39 captured in Miller’s (1984, 2014) notion of “genre as social action” to contribute to our account of
40
41 the ways that genres are emerging from the specific workspaces generated by the platforms of the
42
43 gig economy. Bawarshi and Reiff (2010) conclude their overview of studies of electronic genres in
44
45 workplace contexts with a call for “further studies (...) to examine the process of importing existing
46
47 genres and genre systems, improvising around them, and learning to take advantage of new and
48
49 emergent genres”(p. 170). This article is intended to contribute to that investigation. It builds on
50
51 Brandt’s work on literacy in the knowledge economy (2005, 2009, 2015), which examined the
52
53 changing writing practices of workers over a twenty-year period. Her work takes us up to the
54
55 beginning of the new vocational workspaces and working literacies of Industry 4.0. Her subjects still
56
57
58
59
60

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

worked within companies and called upon them internally for support. Nowadays, as companies shed workers, many people like those Brandt studied are now left to fend for themselves in the gig economy. The textual requirements of those now working online and on their own in the workspaces of the gig economy are the focus of this article.

Method

Previous methodologies of research into online literacy practices have involved ethnography (Garcia et al., 2009), “netnography” (Kozinets, 2009; Sindhvani & Ahuja, 2014) and discourse analysis (see Collin, 2011, for a discourse analysis of a popular guide to composing career portfolios). Our focus in this article is on how key texts shape and are shaped by their associated literacy events and practices. To achieve this aim we examined the publicly-available texts generated by the platforms’ participants themselves, based on Template Analysis (King, 2012). As explained below, the texts were examined for patterns of commonality in the actions carried out by participants in the core gig work literacy event. On this basis, three categories of action and their associated texts were named. Each of the data texts were subsequently identified as being of a text type and in a text category, as shown in the Appendix.

The data were gathered from a desktop audit of the texts generated within a group of online labor platforms. Platforms and texts were selected for their range of text types and analysed using, as far as possible, their own terminology. The audit was framed by a literature review of vocational education and literacy journals and government and business reports based on key terms such as *gig economy*, *sharing economy*, *microwork*, *microtasking*, and *digital labour*. Platforms encountered in the literature review were examined for examples of the types of texts that were involved in negotiating and carrying out a task as well as the texts that were produced by platform workers as outcomes of a task. The examination involved visiting the platforms’ home pages and clicking through the pages available to a visitor. Links from each platform’s home page were cross-checked for content coverage against the site map found at the bottom of most home pages.

From the twenty platforms examined, seven were chosen as representing a range of complexity across two dimensions – the textual outcomes produced by participants and the knowledge and skills involved in their production. These inputs and outputs are summarised in Table 1. The phrases in brackets indicate the kinds of tasks that broadly exemplify the complexity involved.

Table 1

The complexity of platform textual outcomes

As with all gig tasks, those that involve writing as an outcome increase in complexity from the lower left to the upper right of the table. What the seven selected platforms also have in common is the use of writing to bring together buyers and sellers of a practical service or services, more of which are written texts as we move further to the top right. This difference in complexity

1
2
3 aligns broadly with the differences between “microtasks” (Rolandsson et al., 2020) and “macrotasks”
4
5 (Gegenhuber & Schussler, 2020). This sample of seven platforms thus represents a range of
6
7 complexity in terms of the literacy required in the task of creating written texts as a work product. In
8
9 Table 1 the texts produced on the seven platforms are arranged according to their increasingly
10
11 complex writing requirements. *Airtasker* focuses on everyday tasks, which have the lowest apparent
12
13 requirements for writing. *Freelancer* offers more complex tasks and more text-oriented tasks than
14
15 *Airtasker*, being aimed at a general and increasingly specialised audience of small businesses as well
16
17 as individuals. *CrowdFlower/Appen* focuses on the relationship between humans and Artificial
18
19 Intelligence, with a focus on reading rather than writing tasks which require reasonably educated
20
21 generalists as workers. *Local Motors* focuses on generating ideas for new manufacturing and taking
22
23 them to development, with an assumed reading and writing component. *99designs* focuses on the
24
25 existing (visual) literacy skills of its community. It is similar to *Freelancer* but more design focused. It
26
27 is also similar to *Scripted*, but for graphic instead of written texts. *Scripted* is the most alphanumeric,
28
29 print-oriented platform: print-based texts are its product as well as being part of the task process.
30
31 *Skillshare* offers training in skills. This requires the preparation, delivery and promotion of
32
33 multimedia texts. Crucially, whatever the nature of the textual products, the process involved in
34
35 their production on the platform always involves writing. Our attention was drawn, however, to the
36
37 consistency across this range in terms of these writing demands – the gig expectations - involved in
38
39 negotiating as well as producing work. As a result, our research came to focus on the literacy
40
41 practices involved in negotiating work of various kinds via these platforms, rather than on the
42
43 textual demands of the work tasks themselves.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 One of the authors joined each of the seven selected platforms as a member, which
52
53 provided access to more of the texts involved in the online labor processes than was available on
54
55 their public web pages. There was no active participation by the researcher in any of the platform
56
57 communities, though there was significant engagement with the platform infrastructure and
58
59 content, such as a prospective gig worker may encounter. The text selection was restricted to freely
60

1
2
3 available textual material on the platform, with no direct contact with individual community
4
5 members. While lack of such contact may have precluded direct participant observation in
6
7 community activities, it nonetheless provided enough data for this initial framing of gig work literacy
8
9 events. The author was (and remains) a legitimate but inactive member of the seven platform
10
11 communities.
12
13

14
15 To identify patterns and make comparisons, a second examination of the seven selected
16
17 platforms was undertaken, based on a standardised template which used the five headings below to
18
19 focus on details of the platform, how it operates, the roles of its participants and the textual
20
21 resources available to support them. These topics were chosen based on the issues raised in the
22
23 literature review and the impressions gained during the initial visits to the platforms. The completed
24
25 templates provided notes on each platform under the following headings:
26
27

- 28
29 1. The company: Reason for choosing this company, Tagline, Point of difference,
30
31 Purpose/Beliefs/Values, Statistics
32
- 33 2. How it works: Joining, Participating, Projects, Contests
34
- 35 3. People: Team, Customers, Workers, Other
36
- 37 4. Resources: Blog, Guides, Experts, Other, Literacy tasks
38
- 39 5. Literacy audit: Tasks, Texts, Types, Links/Ligatures/Typology
40
41

42
43 In addition to the completed templates, actual texts were collected from the platforms. Of the many
44
45 pages and texts encountered, 28 were selected for further examination based on their range,
46
47 content and relevance to the breadth of the study's goal. These texts made specific reference to
48
49 existing text types, such as blogs or position descriptions, or to aspects of literacy events, like
50
51 engaging with customers. The collection of 28 texts comprised: job descriptions (8), blog entries (6),
52
53 job advertisements (2), guides (2), media reports (2), task instructions (1), task descriptions (1),
54
55 media releases (1), application forms (1), FAQ (1), academic journal articles (1), resumes (1), quizzes
56
57
58
59
60

(1). The number of overall occurrences of these text types within the selected platforms was not recorded. Details of these 28 documents appear in the Appendix.

Where the chosen texts comprised long pages of items, such as blogs, the first page was saved, and the items on that page were viewed. Texts appearing as complete entities, such as position descriptions, were saved in full. The texts ranged in size and scope from a few lines to an academic journal article. The period of data collection, interpretation, review, and analysis ranged from 2017 to 2020.

Findings

A literacy event is a culturally recognised activity that involves literacy (Barton & Hamilton, 1999). The activities within most literacy events involve participants, actions and texts. This section presents the findings relating to the participants, actions and text types of what we call *a gig work literacy event*. In setting out the findings our focus is on identifying commonalities across the platforms that would provide a starting point for educators and researchers to engage further with literacy events in the gig economy.

All platforms have three participant roles which we have called Workers, Customers and Team Members, based on the labels used by the platforms themselves. The actual labels vary according to the platforms’ own self-images as captured in their branding, reflecting the platforms’ role in constructing the participants’ identities, and the Workers’ identities in particular. These are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Names of participants on the online labor platforms

Platform	Worker	Customer	Team Member
Airtasker	Tasker	Poster	Team Member

CrowdFlower/Appen	Contributor	Customer	Team Member
Freelancer	Freelancer	Employer	Team Member
Local Motors	Thinker, Tinkerer, Solver	Customer	Employee
Scripted	Writer	Customer	Team Member
99designs	Designer	Customer	Team Member
SkillShare	Teacher	Student	Team Member

Becoming a member of a platform community involves registering as a worker or as a customer. Registration is usually simple, though it may require additional actions such as taking a proficiency quiz on a platform such as *Scripted*, which focuses on specialised written texts. Potential workers describe themselves in as much detail as they wish. They may be able to attach samples of their work (*99Designs*). Such creation and curation of a personal brand is similar to a career portfolio, “... an increasingly common, yet under-examined feature of employment scenes in advanced capitalist economies” (Collin, 2011, p. 615). Unlike career portfolios, these profiles, like the platforms themselves, focus more on personal qualities than formal credentials. Potential customers begin by describing their need and may be guided through this process with a template (*Freelancer*). The third group of platform participants, after Workers and Customers, is Team Members. Unlike the workers, who are freelance, these are contracted employees of the platform in technical and customer service roles. Also unlike the workers, they are often depicted in the platform website imagery as working co-located in attractive, well-equipped offices. The team members still appear to inhabit physical workplaces, while the workers inhabit digital *workspaces*. Of course, workers may be physically located in a range of physical ‘places’ – homes, coffee shops, co-working spaces – but it is the digital space that is shaped by the platform infrastructure where work actually gets done and professional communities are built and maintained.

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

Some platforms emphasise the notion of community as central to membership and it is through literate practice that participation in the communities is made possible. *Airtasker* members, for example, are encouraged to “hang out” on the platform between gigs. Hanging out involves making use of the various textual and communication resources on the platform. Although platform participants are all considered community members, and there is a cooperative tone to much of the platform content, there remains a fundamental tension between cooperation and competition between workers who need to bid against each other to get a gig.

The four key writing activities that constitute the literacy event of negotiating a gig are posting a task, making a bid, creating and maintaining a profile, and posting a review. These interrelated activities, and their corresponding text types – *post*, *bid*, *profile*, *review* – are often explicitly outlined as part of the requirements for participating in online labour platforms. Most commonly, the customer or client is involved in writing a *post* or a *review* of a worker, while the worker is involved in writing a *bid*, writing and continually updating a *profile*, and also potentially writing a *review* of the customer. Reading in various forms is also required, as the worker must browse tasks posted by customers, search key words, and review their own (and possibly others’) profiles as they update them, while the customer must read through bids, profiles and reviews related to individual workers whom they may choose to hire. Other forms of literacy may also be called upon when engaging in the platforms.¹ However, the central focus of the literacy event through which a gig is negotiated is on the written production of two core texts, the *post* and the *bid* (or *offer*). For the worker, the articulation of these gig expectations can be seen in Figure 1, a page from the *Airtasker* website that explains to potential workers “How to start earning”² This page is accessible via a link in the main navigation bar labelled “Become a Tasker”, clearly indicating that these are the steps involved for attaining work in the gig economy via this platform. The content in Figure 1 is summarised in Table 3, highlighting in bold the four main actions and text types of the gig work literacy event.

Figure 1

Table 3
Worker actions and text types in a gig work literacy event

How to start earning			
Browse tasks	Make an offer	Do the task well and get paid	Improve your profile

Search for tasks nearby that match your skill set by using filtering for location, distance, completing in-person vs. remotely, and by searching keywords. When you find the right task, make an offer !	It's important to make sure your offer is at a fair price, taking into account how long it could take and what skills are needed. This could well be higher or lower than the task price. Just make sure you let the Poster know why in your offer .	Keep talking to the Poster regularly so that they know what's happening. When it's done, make sure you request for the payment to be released and leave an honest and true review for the Poster.	Posters will look at your profile and reviews so you've got to make a good first impression! Upload a photo, write a nice description, and list the skills you're great at. An awesome profile instantly improves your chances of your offers getting accepted.
<u>Start browsing tasks</u> [clickable link]			<u>View profile</u> [clickable link]

The literacy-intensive nature of the activities involved in negotiating a gig are illustrated in Figure 1 and Table 3, as is their social, relational character. As the instructions for “Browse tasks” make clear, the process of starting work (“starting to earn”) for the gig worker begins with reading *post* texts produced by the customer, or “Poster” as *Airtasker* identifies them. It is also clear that the worker’s production of an *offer* text (on other sites labelled a *bid* text) should be in direct response to their reading of a specific *post* text, articulating the time and skill requirements of the posted task in order to justify the *offer*. The dialogical nature of this negotiation centres on these two core texts of the *post* and the *offer*. It also extends beyond it. Indeed, “doing the task well” involves regular communication on the part of the worker to keep the customer/poster informed “so that they know what’s happening”. The importance of maintaining an “awesome” *profile* and attracting positive *reviews* as highlighted in Figure 1 further underscores the relationship-oriented character of working literacies in the gig economy. As we have discussed elsewhere, it is this focus on the building, maintenance and repair of working identities and working relationships that characterises the literate practice of work in Industry 4.0, of which the gig economy is part (Farrell, Newman & Corbel, 2020).

While our focus is on the literacy demands placed on workers by online labour platforms like *Airtasker*, some examination of the literacy demands expected of the customer enables deeper

understanding of this social, interactional nature of the literacy event that is the negotiation of gig work. These can be seen in Figure 2 and Table 4, another page from the *Airtasker* website that explains to potential customers “How it works”³. The content in Figure 2 is summarised in Table 4, highlighting in bold the four main actions and text types of the gig work literacy event.

Figure 2

Table 4

Customer actions and text types in a gig work literacy event

How it works		
What do you need done?	Choose the best person for you	Task completed
Start by telling us about your task. Mention when and where (in person or online) you need it done, then suggest a fair budget for the task. Post any task you need from cleaning to web design in only	Take a look at profiles and reviews to pick the best Tasker for your task. When you accept an offer , your payment is held securely with Airtasker Pay until the task is complete. Now you can message and call	With your task complete, you just need to release the payment held with Airtasker Pay. Then you're free to leave a review for the Tasker so everyone can know what a great job they've done!

two minutes – for free! There's no obligation to hire.	the Tasker to sort out the details.	
--	-------------------------------------	--

Airtasker's description of the literate practices required of the gig participants is typical of all sites reviewed in our study. All the platforms articulate a continuous cycle of posting and bidding for tasks and the platform architecture itself is geared towards providing for this social exchange, the core gig work literacy event. Notwithstanding the range of tasks to be done, there are strong similarities across all seven platforms in the types of texts involved in this process. The terminology changes only slightly: *Freelancer*, for example, calls an *offer* a *bid*, which is the term we have used in this article to capture the competitive element of the action. Overall, the terms *post*, *bid*, *profile* and *review* (as nouns and verbs) are the most frequent names for these actions and their associated texts.

In summary, the literacy event of negotiating a gig in the gig economy centres on two core writing activities, posting a task and bidding for a task. This post/bid interactive cycle is the fundamental social exchange that is facilitated by these online labour platforms that provide the digital architecture of the gig economy. The post/bid exchange is facilitated by two additional, optional activities: creating and maintaining a profile (by the worker) and posting a review (by the customer and/or the worker). The actual text types within a gig work literacy event were identified by expressing each of the actions in the event as a noun instead of a verb, giving us the text types of Post, Bid, Profile and Review. Gig work literacy events also involve giving and getting supporting texts providing Information and Instructions, and in some cases producing textual Products of varying complexity (see Table 1). Importantly, all of these actions and options are textually mediated, demanding literate social engagement.

These six text types were categorised according to their usage in the literacy event. Posts and Bids are required as an essential part of the gig negotiation process. Profiles and Reviews are advisable for the success of the gig completion process. Information and Instructions are optional

and are available for use at any stage of the process if necessary. The texts which are created are the outcome or product of the gig work itself. This categorisation of gig work literacy event text types is summarised in Table 5.

Table 5

Gig work literacy event actions and texts

Text category	<u>Process 1</u>	<u>Process 2</u>	<u>Support</u>	<u>Product</u>
Usage	Required	Recommended	Optional	Task-dependent
Text type (n)	Post	Profile	(Give/Get) Instructions	Various
= Action (v)	Bid	Review	(Give/Get) Information	

Texts are broadly categorised as Process (1 and 2), Support or Product to emphasise the nature of their role and purpose in the event. *Process* texts directly shape the nature of the work to be done and the social contract of doing it. Two of these *Process* text types, Posts and Bids, are core to the literacy event itself. The other two *Process* text types, Profiles and Reviews, are recommended by the platforms to ensure success in bidding (McDonald et al., 2000). At each stage of the gig cycle two types of *Support* texts, Informational and Instructional, are available to provide assistance and to regulate communicative behaviour and social interaction on the platforms. Finally, some gigs require the preparation of a text as the output of the task, which we refer to as *Product* texts, though these are not part of every gig work literacy event. Process and Support texts are the foundational text categories in our model of the gig work literacy event, whatever the product or outcome may be. Crucially, the model shows that some form of engagement with written texts is required in all gig work, whether or not a task actually requires the production of a written text as a product.

We now turn to an examination of each of these text types in more detail. *Process texts* comprise Posts and Bids (Process 1) and Profiles and Reviews (Process 2), of which Posts and Bids are core to a gig work literacy event. Posts can be a few words (*Airtasker, Freelancer*) or quite lengthy

1
2
3 (*CrowdFlower/Appen*). Some involve templates provided by the platform (*CrowdFlower/Appen*,
4
5
6 *Scripted*). Workers browse lists of tasks and select tasks to bid for. Tasks may be displayed to
7
8 potential workers according to each worker's status on the platform (McDonald et al., 2020). Several
9
10 platforms allow the customer to present the job as either a project or a contest. The use of
11
12 competitive contests as well as collaborative projects introduces a "gamification" element (Fuchs et
13
14 al., 2014) that blends other genres of online activity into a mixture of work and play, but also
15
16 complicates relationships within the espoused community. The Bid is a written text which requires
17
18 workers to distinguish themselves from the many other bidders. Other bids may be displayed to
19
20 potential bidders and workers may be allowed to interact with customers to clarify the task (see
21
22 Figures 1 and 2 and Tables 3 and 4). The result of this interaction is a jointly constructed text that
23
24 takes the form of a chat, which have features of spoken and written language. They can occur in real
25
26 time, though lags between responses are common, and may contain spelling or grammar errors.
27
28 Some bidders emphasise their language ability as a point of difference, particularly when the task
29
30 involves producing a written product text (*Scripted*). Most platforms provide advice on successful
31
32 bidding in their Support texts.
33
34
35

36
37 Although a basic Profile is a requirement for becoming a member of the platform
38
39 community as a worker, Profile updates and Reviews are merely recommended. Profiles range from
40
41 a few words to detailed documents including samples of work and can be readily accessed by visitors
42
43 and customers as well as other workers. Workers are encouraged to continually modify their
44
45 Profiles, just as they would in other areas of social media. In so doing they develop both their
46
47 working identities and their potential continuing relationships with customers. Profiles can be
48
49 enhanced by contributing to the community in the form of feedback and responses to blogs and
50
51 articles (Information texts). As in computer game play, moving up levels helps to evolve and
52
53 promote a worker's profile. Levelling up can be achieved through improving metrics on job
54
55 completion, or by undertaking internal training courses, for which the worker may have to pay
56
57 (*Freelancer*). Reviews are optional, but customers and workers are encouraged to review each other
58
59
60

1
2
3 and give feedback. Giving and receiving feedback is seen as a way to build profiles and trust within
4
5 the community. Since feedback can have an effect on identity and status, some platforms provide
6
7 guidance on how to provide it in the Support texts.
8
9

10 *Support texts*, unlike *Process texts*, are not integral to the gig work literacy event but provide
11
12 a framework of support for the participants. These texts are mainly Informational but can also be
13
14 Instructional. Included in these are the on-boarding texts required for new members (customers and
15
16 workers) to join the community. Other resources include a range of texts which support, frame and
17
18 develop the work of the community. Informational texts tend to focus on communication and news,
19
20 serving to instantiate the community as they reflect back to the community the identity of the
21
22 platform and what it means to be a member. They include guides, press releases, press reports,
23
24 position descriptions and articles. All platforms provide written guides concerning how to get the
25
26 best out of membership. These are usually written by team members and may also be
27
28 supplemented by workers in blogs, or by multimodal texts distributed via social media (e.g.
29
30 *Airtasker's* YouTube channel). *Freelancer*, for example, provides explanations of how the site works
31
32 provided by both team members and workers, suggesting that in some cases workers should seek
33
34 guidance from the crowd (other workers) rather than the elite (team members). Blogs may be
35
36 managed by team members or expert members of the community. They cover technical and social
37
38 elements likely to be of interest to the community. Some are for members only while others are
39
40 accessible to any visitor to the platform. Most have opportunities for posting comments. Externally
41
42 authored texts may also be provided. *CrowdFlower/Appen*, for example, provides a link to an
43
44 academic paper that shows how the services of the platform work for customers.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Instructional texts include documents, FAQs, and templates. All platforms have a document
52
53 or section called something like *How it works* (See Figure 2/Table 3), which sets out the basics of the
54
55 gig process. Instructions are usually written by team members, though some worker contributions to
56
57 blogs also serve this function. This is an example of what was previously the work of professional
58
59
60

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

technical writers (Barrett, 1993) becoming shared with non-specialists. Guides of various types, other than in relation to the Process texts, are written by team members and workers. These are often in the form of FAQs and other relatively unstructured texts, rather than in the form of a hierarchically structured text such as those traditionally associated with hardware and software support. Some form of structure may be provided in the form of templates to assist customers and workers to complete the Process texts.

A social view of literacy in the gig economy reveals the importance of both Process and Support texts in negotiating, maintaining and reproducing working relationships, identities and knowledge among participants in a platform community. While Process texts are essential for negotiating and completing the work itself, Support texts are necessary for the establishment of norms of participation within a platform community and, indeed, of the identity of the community itself. Worker engagement in the production of both kinds of texts is particularly apparent in relation to the negotiation of norms for chats which occur between customers and workers during the bidding process, usually to clarify a task. As the excerpt from an *Airtasker* “Community Summit Q&A Session” below illustrates, workers may provide feedback to team members on the platform’s efficacy in supporting the creation of Post and Bid texts. In this example, workers express the need for “more accurate task descriptions” from customers, leading to a change in the platform’s communication infrastructure towards more efficient negotiation of the gig. In other words, customers are required to conform their Post texts to new literacy standards as a direct result of workers’ contribution to this Support text.

16. What is Airtasker doing to make sure that Job Posters provide a more accurate task description, instead of basic “move furniture”?

We’ll be building more customised task templates that make it easier and clearer to Job Posters the type of information that needs to be included. (Airtasker 2017)

1
2
3 Because chats lack the visual feedback that face-to-face communication provides, jointly creating
4 such texts in real time is a complex task, particularly since the relationships between community
5 members may not be well-developed. The platform's response to "build more customised task
6 templates" is a direct result of worker participation in the production of the Support text that is the
7
8
9
10
11
12 *Airtasker* Community Summit Q&A Session (Airtasker 2017).
13
14

15 Product texts are those which are the typical outcomes of tasks, rather than being part of
16 the gig work literacy event itself like Process and Support texts. As discussed above, the extent to
17 which texts are outcomes of a task rather than part of the gig work process varies across the
18 platforms, broadly according to how generalised or specialised their services are. Generalist
19 platforms like *Airtasker* and *Freelancer* offer text preparation as one of a wide range of task
20 offerings. These platforms may not highly concerned with all aspects of these texts since they are
21 relatively well-framed by the task, as in editing for example. However, there are also requests for
22 texts such as essays to be written, which is a matter of concern for educators concerned with
23 cheating on assessments. The number and nature of Product texts vary greatly between platforms,
24 from very low (*Airtasker*) to very high (*Scripted*). They range from blog entries to complex written
25 reports and multimedia teaching materials. Although all platforms require a basic level of facility
26 with written language for navigation of the platform and negotiation of the gig, the seven platforms
27 vary in complexity broadly in line with the complexity of the product texts and worker specialisation
28 required. Specialist platforms exert higher levels of control, whether in the forms of restrictions on
29 entry (*Scripted*), or highly visible outputs (*99designs* and *Skillshare*). Each of the three specialist
30 writing platforms focuses on a particular textual mode, from alphabetic texts (*Scripted*) through
31 graphic texts (*99designs*) to multimedia texts (*Skillshare*). Consistent across all of the platforms are
32 the more hidden minimum literacy demands involved in negotiating the gig, which, as we have
33 shown, may involve some rather sophisticated and socially intensive communication practices.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Discussion

5 This article has examined the literacy practices, events and texts of one of the emerging workspaces
6
7 of Industry 4.0, the online labor platforms of the gig economy. It has presented a model of a gig work
8
9 literacy event, focusing on the actions and text types used by members of a platform community.
10
11 Our analysis has revealed the inherently social nature of the work roles and working relationships
12
13 that are mediated by gig texts, themselves both enabled and constrained by the communication
14
15 infrastructure provided by the platforms. The analysis also revealed the social framing of the texts
16
17 themselves. The purpose of the model is to provide a heuristic for the continuing examination of the
18
19 implications of the gig economy and Industry 4.0 for literacy educators and researchers. In this initial
20
21 analysis we have highlighted commonalities in the literacy required rather than examining
22
23 theoretical issues in detail. Our purpose has thus been to provide a way of talking about the
24
25 elements of a gig literacy event that will contribute to further discussion and debate.
26
27
28
29
30

31 Our examination of the literacy practices of the gig economy has revealed three categories
32
33 of text, Process, Support and Product, as summarised in Table 5 above. At the centre of gig work are
34
35 the Process texts. The Process 1 Texts, the Post and the Bid, are required for *participation* in gig
36
37 work. The Process 2 texts, the Profile and Review, are recommended for *success* in gig work. Process
38
39 2 texts are recognisable general text types that occur in other contexts as well. However, the
40
41 Process 1 texts are harder to identify as existing text types, although they do display some features
42
43 of digital chats. One reason for the difficulty in identification of the Process 1 texts is that given the
44
45 nature of the data collection there were fewer of these texts accessible to a visitor or inactive
46
47 worker than Process 2 or Support texts. The actual exchanges that comprise the Posting and Bidding
48
49 are mostly hidden to non-participants. Nevertheless, the Process 1 texts examined appear to have
50
51 features of what Miller (2017) calls “vernacular genres”, found “...in situations where users have few
52
53 institutional and administrative constraints and collectively create a way of addressing a shared
54
55 exigence” (p. 24). These exigences “are not always obvious and available for inspection; they may
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 have to be inferred by the researcher..." (ibid p. 24). Such inferences underlie the model presented
4
5 here, which identifies the Post and Bid (Process 1) texts as core to the gig work literacy event.
6
7

8 Always available to users of the Process texts are the Support texts, primarily Informational
9
10 and Instructional. Their usage is optional. They provide *support* for various aspects of gig work, as
11
12 well as helping to establish the norms of behaviour required for participation in a platform
13
14 community. They accompany the Process texts, reflecting what Askehave and Nielsen (2005) call
15
16 "web-mediation", the role of the medium in the analysis of digital texts. Askehave and Nielsen
17
18 identify a process of "zoom in, zoom out" with digital texts, which captures the nature of the non-
19
20 linear, or circular, engagement with the Process and the Support texts in gig work, whereby
21
22 participants are able to access additional information or support during an event by following links
23
24 out to the Support texts and back into the Process texts.
25
26
27
28

29 Unlike the Process texts, all the Support and Product texts examined were of a recognisable
30
31 general text type, as frequently captured in their titles (See Appendix). Some of these, such as
32
33 *position description*, are well established. Others, such as *blog entry*, are newer, but nevertheless
34
35 widely used (de Pourbaix, 1999). Support texts (both Informational and Instructional) are typical of
36
37 what Miller (2017) calls "administered genres", which circulate in institutional settings where those
38
39 with power can influence processes. As we have shown, however, both team members and workers
40
41 can contribute texts to these categories, thus sharing (or at least dialogically negotiating) the power
42
43 and control to some extent. Product texts are the *outcomes* of many of the gig work tasks
44
45 undertaken. Many texts involve a mix of both screen and print-based media as part of their
46
47 development and presentation (Martin & Lambert, 2015). They utilise features of different semiotic
48
49 systems and different media. Product texts are typical of what Miller (2017) calls "commercial
50
51 genres", where there is a "strong distinction between producer and consumer" (ibid p. 23).
52
53
54
55

56 Do the central processes of gig work, the Posting, Bidding, Profiling and Reviewing, comprise
57
58 a distinctive gig work genre? As Bawarshi and Reiff (2010) point out, "Following John Swales, ESP
59
60

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

genre approaches have generally defined genres as communicative events which help members of a discourse community achieve shared communicative purposes. As such, genres are forms of communicative action” (p. 44). The members of an online labor platform community can be seen as a “discourse community” in Swalesian terms, though this suggestion would require research with community members for further validation. The gig work text types also reflect “genre as social action” (Miller 1984, 2015). In particular, the features of the Process text cycle identified in the Findings are captured in Miller’s notion of vernacular genres, in which the discourse community, and the emerging genre itself, both shape and are shaped by the ongoing actions of its members. This shaping accounts for the way in which the features of the gig literacy event have emerged:

... genres emerge not only from technological change and media transformation but also from marketing and commercial constraints, the conditions of production, antecedent genres, sociocultural and psychosocial change, influential individuals and their goals and commitments, critical appraisal and deliberate recombination, play and experimentation, and institutional and political change. (Miller, 2017, p. 26)

We suggest that the Process texts (Bid, Post, Profile and Review) may usefully be considered as an emergent vernacular genre. This also requires further investigation, particularly in relation to the constraints as well as the opportunities offered by the platforms themselves for managing shared exigences, for instance, whether *Airtasker* really did implement new task design templates and whether these new templates improved communication between the customer and the worker about the nature of the task.

A fuller understanding of the requirements of a gig work literacy event clearly requires an understanding of the social practices surrounding it. Our analysis suggests that these established and emerging text types have common features across platforms. Our argument is that these features both enable and constrain the negotiation and reproduction of working identities, working relationships and working knowledge on which the gig economy relies. We have shown that there is

an inherent tension within these platforms between the avowed cooperation and the underlying competition between workers, and between workers and team members. There have been increasing cases of workers going outside the platforms to seek legal clarification for their work status (de Ruyter et al, 2018). Building a reputation and maintaining trust are at the heart of online labour markets (Nica, Potcovaru & Mirica, 2017). It is therefore not surprising that the development and maintenance of workplace relationships, identity and knowledge underlies every aspect of the core literacy event in gig work. Although optional, active engagement in the Process 2 texts (Profiles and Reviews) contributes to building relationships and identity with other community members. Active engagement as reader and writer with the Support texts, both Instructional and Informational, builds community members' personal and shared knowledge bases. As we have emphasised throughout this article, online labor platforms are *workspaces*, not workplaces for the vast majority of participants. The capacity for face-to-face engagement and traditional forms of linguistic repair were therefore limited even before the COVID pandemic, so the literacy requirements of co-creating digital textual engagement are now magnified as more people work online and at a distance from each other. The convergence of spoken and written language and numeric and visual systems into complex real-time texts leads not just to the need for more of the established language, literacy, numeracy and digital skills, but for a greater capacity to do this textual and social work at a distance, mediated via a screen as well as by a particular app and platform infrastructure. The ways that these apps and platforms are designed and structured have direct bearing on how the social activities of textual production and engagement play out in contemporary times.

Implications

This article has examined the literacy event at the heart of work in the gig economy, and its associated practices and texts, as they are manifested in the workings of seven online labor gig

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

platforms. It has presented these in the form of a model of text types and categories. This is intended as a starting point, a heuristic to facilitate further critical investigation. We conclude with a consideration of the potential implications of this model of literacy practice for pedagogy, curriculum and for learning in the workspace domain itself.

Pedagogically the notion of the gig as a form of employment provides a potential framing for topic-based school, vocational and professional teaching. Selecting and sequencing content for teaching could begin with Process texts and move on to Support and Product texts, providing a principled means of staging learning. A gig work literacy event can provide a framework for task-based activity. The identification of gig roles can facilitate role play and group work. Profile writing is practice for resume writing (and may have already replaced it). Reviewing provides practice in interpersonal skills such as giving and receiving feedback with colleagues. Activities can be differentiated according to gig roles and learners’ preferred forms of engagement, such as those identified according to their level of participation as “passengers”, “navigators” and “drivers” (Martin & Lambert, 2015). These activities, in turn, can be extended into more critical discussion of the social nature of gig work, as well as of the affordances and limitations of different platforms in support of this social event. Finally, writing activities can focus on different mixes of paper-based and screen-based writing, with the screen used as both a step towards producing a paper-based text, and also for screen-based writing as an end product in itself.

At the simplest level, existing curriculum frameworks can benefit from an enhanced range of examples for teaching existing text types, both textual and rhetorical. Course development for accreditation and reaccreditation can draw upon the broad domains of literacy practices that frame gig work literacy events and their associated texts. National and international assessment frameworks can be guided in the same way. As well as focusing on writing skills, educators can develop students’ knowledge of the gig economy in greater depth, addressing issues such as the

1
2
3 precariousness of gig employment, the relative scarcity of secure jobs, and the power relationships
4
5 within the platforms themselves.
6
7

8 Beyond formal educational settings the focus in professional writing instruction has
9
10 traditionally been on what we have called Product texts, the *outcomes* of gig work, often done
11
12 within an organisational setting. While competency in the relevant genres of these texts remains as
13
14 important as ever, a critical understanding of how these texts are framed within gig work literacy
15
16 events, and competency in the management of Process as well as Product texts, will be of increasing
17
18 importance in all areas of work in this era of massification of writing. At the same time, the kind of
19
20 assistance once provided by Support texts generated within organisations and workplaces is
21
22 increasingly the responsibility of the platform workers themselves, as well as the platform team
23
24 members.
25
26
27
28

29 Addressing the perceived “literacy crisis” (Black & Yasukawa, 2011) in Industry 4.0 requires
30
31 literacy educators to think more broadly about what *Literacy 4.0* might involve. Literacy 4.0 needs to
32
33 be seen not just as readily transferrable, individual skills but as context-specific social competencies
34
35 and knowledge needed for effective and critical engagement in domains of activity such as the gig
36
37 economy. As a step towards addressing this need, we have presented a model of the literacy event
38
39 that characterises gig work and an analysis of the texts and literacy practices involved. We propose
40
41 an informed and critical engagement (what Pennycook (1997) calls “critical pragmatism”) with the
42
43 literacy practices, events and texts required for participation in the gig economy and in the
44
45 communities of practice that emerge from different platforms, a more critical form of “gig literacy”
46
47 than envisaged by Sutherland et al. (2020). This should be central to the development of pedagogy,
48
49 curriculum and policy for work-related literacy education in the current era. Further research that
50
51 engages directly with gig economy participants will help to deepen our understanding of the literacy
52
53 practices required for online labor platform work as it becomes increasingly common and as the
54
55 business model inevitably transforms (Srnicsek, 2017).
56
57
58
59
60

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

This research also bears wider implications in terms of the literacies needed for work generally in the current era, as digital platforms are increasingly being used across multiple industries and multiple types of work, as well as different kinds of work roles, to get work done. Within as well as between companies and organisations, digital platforms are being used extensively to enable teamwork and collaboration among workers, to hold meetings, to problem solve and make decisions, as well as to chat and interact socially in and around work activities – that is, to build, maintain and repair working relationships. In short, digital platforms are increasingly being used to provide the infrastructure for working literacy in contemporary times (Frith, 2020). As our discussion here of the literacy demands of gig economy platforms highlights, platforms can define the constraints as well as the possibilities for communication between users performing different roles. Indeed, by their design they define the available roles as well as the text types through which humans may interact and thus can determine what it is to *be* a worker. It is only through a critical understanding of literacy as a social practice that we will be able to adequately attend to the education and training needs of human workers and resist their commodification and exploitation in a world where online behaviour is so readily and rapidly converted to data, which in turn become texts to be collected, analysed and interpreted.

There is now added urgency. In a pandemic-induced lockdown, and in the post-lockdown world, it is not just gig workers but potentially all workers who will have to face the reality of geographically dispersed, digitally mediated workspaces replacing physically bounded workplaces. Understanding the nature of the texts and textual practices that constitute and define work in these spaces is likely to become an increasingly central concern of work-related literacy education and workforce development in the times ahead.

Appendix

Platform texts

Text Source	Text title	Text type common name	Gig text category/ Gig text type
AT1	The future of work: Airtasker research	Blog entry	Support/ Informational
AT2	Customer Experience Specialist	Position Description	Support/ Informational
AT3	Product Designer	Position Description	Support/ Informational
AT4	Job (gig) Description/Offers	Position Description	Process 1/ Post and Bid
CF1	CrowdFlower Potential Jobs	Position Description	Process 1/ Post
CF2	Hillier et al. (2016) (details below)	Academic journal article	Support/ Informational
CF3	S1 Text CrowdFlower job instructions	Task instructions	Process1 /Post
CF4	Using Crowd Flower to understand storytelling in science	Blog entry	Support/ Informational
FL1	Research writers in Australia for hire	Resume	Process 2/Profile
FL2	Research writing jobs	Advertisement	Process 1 /Post
FL3	Research paper	Advertisement	Process1 /Bid
FL4	10 tips for writing an effective bid	Guide	Support/ Instructional
FL5	How to rate an employer	Guide	Support/ Instructional
FL6	How does Freelancer.com work?	Blog entry	Support/ Informational
LM1	Local Motors introduces Forth	Media release	Support/ Informational
LM2	Junior Producer – Boulder Location	Position Description	Support/ Informational
LM3	Employee Spotlight	Blog entry	Support/ Informational
ND1	Senior copywriter	Position Description	Support/ Informational
SC1	We're hiring	Position Description	Support/ Informational
SC2	Whitepaper	Task description	Support/ Informational
SC3	Proficiency test	Quiz	Support/ Instructional
SC4	Getting what you pay for	Blog entry	Support/ Informational
SK1	Teaching FAQs	FAQ	Support/ Informational
SK2	Skillshare: Redesigning education for the masses	Media report	Support/ Informational
SK3	Skillshare raised 3.1 m to turn everyone into teachers	Media report	Support/ Informational
SK4	Associate Community Manager	Application form	Support/ Informational
SK5	Associate Community Manager	Position Description	Support/ Informational
SK6	Introducing portfolio reviews	Blog entry	Support/ Informational

Hillier et al., (2016) Narrative style influences citation frequency in climate change science PLoS ONE 11(12)

Acknowledgments

We are grateful for the detailed feedback from three anonymous reviewers.

References

Airtasker. (2017). Airtasker Community Summit: Q&A Session [Session notes]. Airtasker Blog.

<https://www.airtasker.com/blog/airtasker-community-summit-qa-session-notes/>

- Aloisi, A. (2016). Commoditized workers: Case study research on labour law issues arising from a set of "on demand/gig economy" platforms. *Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal*, 37(3), 653-690.
- Askehave, I., & Nielsen, A. E. (2005). Digital genres: A challenge to traditional genre theory. *Information Technology & People*, 18(2), 120-141.
- Australian Industry Group (AIG) (2016). *Emergence of the gig economy*: AIG Group Workforce Development. https://cdn.aigroup.com.au/Reports/2016/Gig_Economy_August_2016.pdf
- Avis, J. (2018). Socio-technical imaginary of the fourth industrial revolution and its implications for vocational education and training: a literature review. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 70(3), 337-363.
- Barrett, E. (Ed.) (1993). *The society of text: Hypertext, hypermedia and the social construction of information*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Barton, D. (1994). *Literacy studies: An introduction to the ecology of written languages*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (1999). Literacy practices. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton, & R. Ivanic (Eds.), *Situated literacies: Theorising reading and writing in context*. London: Routledge.
- Barton, D., Hamilton, M., & Ivanič, R. (1999). *Situated literacies : reading and writing in context*. London: Routledge.
- Bawarshi, A. S., & Reiff, M. J. (2010). *Genre: An introduction to history, theory, research, and pedagogy*. West Lafayette, Indiana: Parlor Press.
- Baynham, M. (1995). *Literacy practices: Investigating literacy in social contexts*. London: Longman.
- Baynham, M., & Prinsloo, M. (2009). *The future of Literacy Studies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Black, S., & Yasukawa, K. (2011). A tale of two councils: Alternative discourses on the 'literacy crisis' in Australian workplaces. *International Journal of Training Research*, 9(3), 218-233.
- Brandt, D. (2005). Writing for a living: Literacy and the knowledge economy. *Written Communication*, 22(2), 166-197.

- Brandt, D. (2009). Writing after reading. In M. Baynham & M. Prinsloo (Eds.), *The future of Literacy Studies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brandt, D. (2015). *The rise of writing: Redefining mass literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (2000). *The social life of information*. Boston, Mass: Harvard Business School Press.
- Carrigan, M. (2018). What is platform literacy? <https://markcarrigan.net/2018/05/13/what-is-platform-literacy/>
- Chalmers, J., & Quigley, M. (2017). *Changing jobs: The fair go in the new machine age*. Melbourne: Black Inc.
- Coldwell-Neilson, J., & Cooper, T. (2019). *Digital literacy meets industry 4.0* (Vol. 2), 37-50. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV.
- Collin, R. (2011). Selling the self: career portfolios and the new common-sense of immaterial capitalism. *Social Semiotics*, 21(5), 615-632.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures*. London: Routledge.
- de Pourbaix, R. (1999). Emergent literacy practices in an electronic community. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton, & R. Ivanic (Eds.). *Framing languages and literacies: Socially situated views and perspectives*: London: Routledge.
- de Ruyter, A., Brown, M., & Burgess, J. (2018). Gig work and the fourth industrial revolution; Conceptual and regulatory challenges. *Journal of International Affairs*, 72(1), 37-50.
- Dean, M., & Spoehr, J. (2018). The fourth industrial revolution and the future of manufacturing work in Australia: challenges and opportunities. *Labour & Industry: A journal of the social and economic relations of work*. 21(3), 166-181.
- Deloitte Development LLC. (2017). *Rewriting the rules for the digital age - The future of work: The augmented workforce*.

- 1
2
3 <https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/us/Documents/human-capital/hc-2017->
4 [global-human-capital-trends-us.pdf](https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/us/Documents/human-capital/hc-2017-global-human-capital-trends-us.pdf)
5
6
7
8 Ducheneaut, N., & Bellotti, V. O. (2001). E-mail as habitat: An exploration of embedded personal
9
10 information management. *Interactions*, 8(5), 30-38.
11
12 Farrell, L. (2000). Ways of doing, ways of being: Language, education and 'working' identities.
13
14 *Language and Education*, 14(1), 18-36.
15
16 Farrell, L. (2001). The 'new word order': Workplace education and the textual practice of economic
17
18 globalization. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 9(1), 57-75.
19
20 Farrell, L. (2006). *Making knowledge common: Literacy and knowledge at work*. New York: Peter
21
22 Lang.
23
24
25 Farrell, L. (2009). Texting the future: Work, literacies and economies. In M. Baynham & M. Prinsloo
26
27 (Eds.), *The Future of Literacy Studies* (181-198). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
28
29 Farrell, L., & Fenwick, T. (Eds.). (2007). *Educating the global workforce: Knowledge, knowledge work*
30
31 *and knowledge workers*. Abingdon: Routledge.
32
33
34 Farrell, L., Newman, T., & Corbel, C. (2020). Literacy and the workplace revolution: a social view of
35
36 literate work practices in Industry 4.0. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*,
37
38 1-15.
39
40
41 Fehring, H. (2020). There is more to education than the demands of the Industrial Revolution 4.0: A
42
43 focus on literacy expectations. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 7(2), 100-108.
44
45 Fisher, L. (Ed.) (2016). *Best practice for knowledge workers: Innovation in Adaptive Case*
46
47 *Management*. Lighthouse Pt , FLA: Future Strategies Inc.
48
49
50 Frith, J. (2020). Technical standards and a theory of writing as infrastructure. *Written*
51
52 *Communication*, 37(3), 401-427.
53
54 Fuchs, M., Fizek, S., Ruffino, P., & Schrape, N. (2014). *Rethinking gamification*: Meson Press,
55
56 University of Lüneburg, Germany.
57
58
59
60

- Garcia, A. C., Standlee, A. I., Bechkoff, J., & Cui, Y. (2009). Ethnographic approaches to the internet and computer-mediated communication. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 38(1), 52-84.
- Gee, J. P., Lankshear, C., & Hull, G. (1996). *The New Work Order: Behind the language of the New Capitalism*. St. Leonards, N.S.W: Allen & Unwin.
- Gegenhuber, T., & Schlusser, E. (2020). Microphones, not megaphones: Functional crowdworkers' voice regimes on digital work platforms. *Human Relations*, 1-31 first online.
- Graddol, D., Maybin, J., & Stierer, B. (Eds.). (1994). *Researching language and literacy in social context*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Hamilton, M., Barton, D., & Ivanic, R. (Eds.). (1994). *Worlds of literacy*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hawkins, M. R. (2013). *Framing languages and literacies: Socially situated views and perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Healy, J., Nicholson, D., & Pekarek, A. (2017). Should we take the gig economy seriously? *Labour & Industry: a journal of the social and economic relations of work*, 27(3), 232-248.
- Hull, G., & Zacher, J. (2007). Identity formation and literacy development within vocational education and work. In L. Farrell & T. Fenwick (Eds.) (2007).
- Jaworski, A. (2015). Globalese: a new visual-linguistic register. *Social Semiotics*, 25(2), 217-235.
- Karlsson, A.-M., & Nikolaidou, Z. (2016). The textualization of problem handling: Lean discourses meet professional competence in eldercare and the manufacturing industry. *Written Communication*. 33(3), 275-301.
- King, N. (2012). Doing template analysis. In C. Cassell & G. Symon (Eds.), *Qualitative organizational research: Core methods and current challenges* (pp. 426-450). London: Sage.
- Kirschenbaum, M. G. (2016). *Track changes: A literary history of word processing*. Cambridge, Mass: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

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

Kozinets, R. (2010). *Netnography: Doing ethnographic research online*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Martin, C. J. (2016). The sharing economy: A pathway to sustainability or a nightmarish form of neoliberal capitalism? *Ecological Economics*, 121, 149-159.

Martin, N. M., & Lambert, C. (2015). Differentiating digital writing Instruction: The intersection of technology, writing Instruction, and digital genre knowledge. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 59(2), 217-227.

McDonald, P., Williams, P., Stewart, A., Mayes, R., & Oliver, D. (2019). *Digital platform work in Australia: Prevalence, nature and impact*. https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/6915/6081/7253/Digital_Platform_Work_in_Australia_-_Preliminary_Findings_18_June_2019.pdf

Messina-Dahlberg, G., & Bagga-Gupta, S. (2016). Mapping language in digital spaces: Literacy practices at borderlands. *Language Learning and Technology*, 20(3), 80-106.

Miller, C. R. (1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70, 151-176.

Miller, C. R. (2015). Genre as Social Action (1984), Revisited 30 Years Later (2014). *Letras & Letras*, 56-72. <https://doi:10.14393/LL63-v31n3a2015-5>

Miller, C. R. (2017). Where do genres come from? In C. R. Miller & C. Kell (Eds.), *Emerging genres in new media environments*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Nica, E., Potcovaru, A.-M., & Mirica, C.-O. D. (2017). A question of trust: cognitive capitalism, digital reputation economy, and online labor markets. *Economics, Management, and Financial Markets*, 12(3), 64-69.

Pennycook, A. (1997). Vulgar pragmatism, critical pragmatism, and EAP. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(4), 253-269.

- Pigg, S., Grabill, J. T., Brunk-Chavez, B., Moore, J. L., Rosinski, P., & Curra, P. G. (2014). Ubiquitous writing, technologies, and the social practice of literacies of coordination. *Written Communication*, 31(1), 91-117.
- Richardson, L. (2015). Performing the shared economy. *Geoforum*, 67, 121-129.
- Rolandsson, B., Saloniemi, A., & Saari, T. (2020). High-skilled platform work in Finland and Sweden - the case of technical translators. In K. Jesnes & S. Oppegaard (Eds.), *Platform work in the Nordic models: Issues, cases and responses* (pp. 47-51): TemaNord 2020:513.
- Schwab, K. (2016). *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.
- Sellen, A. J., & Harper, R. (2002). *The myth of the paperless office*. Cambridge, Mass. : MIT Press.
- Sennett, R. (1998). *The corrosion of character: the personal consequences of work in the new capitalism*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Sindhwani, P., & Ahuja, V. (2014). A study of online co-creation strategies of Starbucks using Netnography. *International Journal of Online Marketing*, 4(1).
- Srnicek, N. (2017). The challenges of platform capitalism: Understanding the logic of a new business model. *Juncture*, 23(4), 254-257.
- Standing, G. (2011). *The Precariat*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- State of Victoria (2020). *Report of the inquiry into the Victorian on-demand workforce*. Melbourne: Victorian Government. <http://engage.vic.gov.au/inquiry-on-demand-workforce>.
- Street, B. (1993). Introduction: The new literacy studies. In B. Street (Ed.), *Cross-cultural approaches to literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sutherland, W., Jarrahi, M. H., Dunn, M., & Nelson, S. B. (2020). Work precarity and gig literacies in online freelancing. *Work, Employment and Society*, 34(3), 457-475.
- Thorne, S. L. (2013). Digital literacies. In M. R. Hawkins (Ed.), *Framing languages and literacies: Socially situated views and perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Turkle, S. (1997). *Life on the screen: Identity in the age of the internet*. London: Phoenix.

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

Wisskirchen, G. (2017). *Artificial Intelligence and Robotics and their impact on the workplace*.
London: International Bar Association Global Employment Institute.

Zuboff, S. (1988). *In the age of the smart machine*. New York: Basic Books.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. London: Profile Books Ltd.

Notes

¹ For instance, speaking and listening may increasingly be involved as videos augment or even replace written texts in worker profiles and in instructional and informational texts. For instance, *Airtasker’s* “How it works” page includes an informational video linked to the company’s YouTube channel, which also features various workers or “taskers” who find regular work via the platform. See: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vRObPjevAUU>.

² “How to start earning” page from Airtasker (<https://www.airtasker.com/earn-money/>; accessed March 2021)

³ “How it works” page from Airtasker (<https://www.airtasker.com/how-it-works/>; accessed March 2021)

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Corbel, C;Newman, T;Farrell, L

Title:

Gig Expectations: Literacy Practices, Events, and Texts in the Gig Economy

Date:

2021-11-04

Citation:

Corbel, C., Newman, T. & Farrell, L. (2021). Gig Expectations: Literacy Practices, Events, and Texts in the Gig Economy. WRITTEN COMMUNICATION, 39 (1), pp.66-96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07410883211052941>.

Persistent Link:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11343/294179>