

GALATASARAY UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
RADIO, TELEVISION AND CINEMA DEPARTMENT

**COMMODIFICATION OF CLUB CULTURES AND DJ'S CREATIVE
AND CULTURAL LABOUR: İSTANBUL AS TÜRKİYE'S NIGHTLIFE
CAPITAL**

MASTER'S THESIS

Şevval DOLANBAY

Thesis Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ceren SÖZERİ ÖZDAL

MAY 2023

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The years I have spent as a student of this esteemed and beautiful university has coincided with both the lowest and highest points of my life. I will always remember and cherish this time, no matter what the future brings.

I am forever grateful to everyone who has contributed to this process through facts, feelings or both. Thanks to all the DJ's I have had the chance to speak with, the resilience and compassion you show in your art has given me hope.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ceren SÖZERİ ÖZDAL, thank you for your patience and support, I have learned more from you during this difficult process than I could ever let on. I will forever be grateful and in awe. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ece VİTRİNEL, thank you for your support and unwavering kindness. Dr. Eser LEVİ; thank you for believing in me ever since I first walked into your class.

I know I am lucky to have the amount of love I get from my family, friends, colleagues and furry friends; thank you all for existing.

Thanks to my mom, Ayşe. No matter what I amount to in this life, there will never be anything I am more proud of than to be your daughter.

Lastly, thanks to Can. Among all of my struggle to understand and be understood, you have been my guiding light. I am forever grateful that it's you.

This thesis, although not worthy, is dedicated to Atakan, Hande and Eren, and all the lives we have lost in the 2023 Pazarcık earthquakes. You will forever be missed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	II
TABLE OF CONTENTS	III
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	IV
LIST OF TABLES	V
RÉSUMÉ	VI
ABSTRACT	IX
ÖZET	XII
INTRODUCTION	1
1. CULTURAL AND CREATIVE INDUSTRIES	4
1.1. Production and Consumption of Culture Under Capitalism.....	4
1.2. The Shifting Discourses.....	8
1.3.Cultural and Creative Industries.....	12
2. LABOUR IN CULTURAL AND CREATIVE INDUSTRIES	18
2.1. Definitive Aspects.....	18
2.2. Exploitation of Creative Labour.....	25
2.3. Social Capital and Creative Labour.....	28
3. DJ'S CREATIVE LABOUR IN CLUB CULTURAL PRODUCTION	30
3.1. The Scope of the Study.....	30
3.2.Methodology.....	36
3.3. Findings and Discussion.....	39
3.3.1. Effects of Casualisation.....	39
3.3.2. Creativity and Self-Expression.....	51
3.3.3. Role of Social Capital and Networks.....	60
CONCLUSION	68
REFERENCES	72
APPENDICES	79
AUTOBIOGRAPHY	83

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BPM	: Beats per minute
CCI	: Cultural and creative industry
DCMS	: Department of Culture, Media, Sports
EDM	: Electronic Dance Music
DJ	: Disc Jockey
PEC	: Political Economy of Communications
TSI	: Turkish Statistics Institute
UK	: United Kingdom
US	: United States

LIST OF TABLES

	Page Number
Table 3.1. Table of interviews.....	33



RÉSUMÉ

Le domaine de la production et de la consommation culturelles a subi des changements importants ces derniers temps, en raison de changements plus larges. Cette réflexion dans la perspective de la production culturelle a ouvert le champ de la production et de la consommation culturelles à des théorisations critiques qui ont remis en question les hypothèses antérieures sur la complexité et la nature intrinsèque des processus de production.

De plus, à mesure que les débats sur la numérisation et les modes de production post-fordistes prévalaient, les discours entourant les organisations culturelles et le travail se sont élargis pour englober leur contexte plus large. Avec l'adaptation de la terminologie des "industries culturelles et créatives" et les caractérisations avec lesquelles elle a influencé le milieu universitaire, les pluralités au sein de la production et de la consommation culturelles sont devenues un sujet d'intérêt majeur.

En raison de cette nouvelle perspective, les effets de longue date du mode de production capitaliste tels que la «concentration», la «précarité» et la «marchandisation» ont affirmé leur présence dans les politiques et les études liées à l'ICC. Dans ce contexte, le « travail créatif » effectué par les créateurs culturels employés sur le terrain a pris une importance accrue. Par conséquent, les conditions de travail immatérielles de cette main-d'œuvre croissante ont commencé à être étudiées de manière critique. Les exploitations et les conditions de travail précaires de ces travailleurs ont également été soulignées. Ces travailleurs étaient généralement employés sous des formes précaires et non standardisées mais compensaient leurs pertes de revenus psychiques.

Dans ce contexte, la production culturelle du club a été jugée digne d'une recherche. Ses relations étroites avec le capital social et ses connotations sous-culturelles ont constitué un terrain significativement exemplaire pour l'étude du travail créatif. On peut logiquement en déduire qu'Istanbul abrite une partie substantielle de la culture club du pays, étant donné la concentration relativement élevée d'activités culturelles et artistiques de la ville par rapport à d'autres régions de Turquie. En conséquence, Istanbul est devenue un terrain fertile pour la commercialisation rapide des scènes de club dans le contexte plus large de la production culturelle.

L'objectif principal de cette thèse était d'examiner les conditions de travail créatif parmi les DJ basés à Istanbul dans la production de la culture de club hautement décontractée dans le cadre du contexte plus large des industries créatives et culturelles (ICC). Pour atteindre cet objectif, la recherche a utilisé une approche qualitative qui consistait à mener des entretiens semi-structurés avec 14 participants. Les résultats de l'analyse ont été discutés dans trois sections principales.

La première section des résultats s'est concentrée sur les effets de la précarité sur le travail créatif des DJ basés à Istanbul et sur la production de la culture des clubs. La nature très flexible de l'industrie a rendu la plupart des DJ dépendants de plusieurs emplois et générant des revenus grâce à différentes professions pour pouvoir faire du DJing. En outre, les DJ manquent souvent d'engagement dans les formes de travail traditionnelles, car ils ne signent pas de contrats et travaillent plutôt sur la base d'un projet individuel, ce qui rend difficile pour eux de s'assurer un revenu fiable. De plus, de nombreux DJ émergents et certains DJ relativement établis s'engagent dans un travail non rémunéré, ce qui pourrait s'expliquer par le travail de l'espoir car ils perçoivent le travail non rémunéré comme une porte d'entrée dans le secteur. Les DJ établis expriment généralement le désir de jouer dans certains clubs avec certains DJ et associent leurs noms à ces événements, ce qui est considéré comme raisonnable.

Les conditions matérielles précaires des DJ dans l'industrie hautement concurrentielle affectent également leurs conditions de vie générales, y compris leurs horaires de sommeil, leur santé et leurs relations personnelles. Le travail créatif des DJ est également flexible, car leurs temps de travail et de loisirs ont tendance à se confondre, et ils consacrent souvent une grande partie de leur temps libre à des pratiques liées au DJing. Dans une industrie aussi hautement concurrentielle, les DJ basés à Istanbul semblent être extrêmement individualisés, avec un manque de négociation collective et de syndicalisation. Les DJ se sont adaptés à différentes stratégies pour renforcer leurs subjectivités entrepreneuriales, priorisant leurs portefeuilles et s'auto-exploitant pour atteindre cet objectif, ce qui signifie souvent accepter des conditions de travail précaires. De plus, les DJ interrogés ont assumé les risques et les responsabilités liés aux conditions du marché comme s'ils étaient les leurs, certains DJ déclarant qu'ils ont dû renoncer à leur autonomie créative pour éliminer ces risques.

La deuxième section des résultats a examiné la relation entre les DJ basés à Istanbul et leur créativité et les aspects connexes de la production de main-d'œuvre créative. Le public a joué un rôle clé dans leur travail non reproductible, la plupart des DJ valorisant la relation qu'ils entretenaient avec leur public comme l'aspect le plus précieux de leur travail créatif. Cependant, les DJ sont souvent confrontés à une foule croissante et indifférente à leur production créative, qu'ils attribuent à la popularité croissante des cultures de club. La plupart des DJ ne veulent pas adapter leur production mais trouvent tout de même raisonnable que les propriétaires de clubs s'attendent à un tel comportement de leur part. Les DJ ont assumé les conditions insatisfaisantes plutôt que de blâmer le capital. Cependant, les DJ tracent la ligne lorsque les problèmes de revenus commencent à s'affirmer sur leurs productions créatives, ce qui signifie l'ingérence des propriétaires de clubs dans leurs pratiques de jeu. Bien que plusieurs aient exprimé être confrontés à de telles conditions, seuls les DJ émergents vulnérables semblent les accepter sur cette base. Les autres voient le processus de production dans son ensemble et considèrent la génération de revenus comme un aspect vital pour la survie de la scène des clubs, jugeant les restrictions raisonnables.

La troisième section des résultats a exploré les rôles importants et essentiels du capital social et des réseaux dans la production de la culture de club. Tous les DJ interrogés ont bénéficié de leur capital social dans leur travail créatif, les effets des réseaux sociaux étant plus visibles dans l'introduction à la scène, à la fois principalement et

commerciallement. En raison de la nature collective des cultures de club, les relations sociales sont devenues un mécanisme de sécurité pour les DJ sur des marchés hautement concurrentiels et individualisés. Les DJ accordent la priorité au maintien de bonnes relations sociales avec leur public, ce qu'ils considèrent comme faisant partie de leur occupation principale. Cela a conduit à une flexibilisation dans leur orchestration des relations sociales au profit ultime du maintien dans l'emploi. Les DJ ont également besoin d'une forte présence sur les réseaux sociaux, car ils répondent au même objectif et sont souvent demandés par les propriétaires de clubs.

D'autre part, la présence sur les réseaux sociaux était également importante pour les DJ en termes d'auto-promotion et de création d'une marque pour eux-mêmes. Les plateformes de médias sociaux étaient considérées comme un outil permettant aux DJ de promouvoir leurs événements et de dialoguer avec leur public.

Dans l'ensemble, les résultats de cette étude mettent en évidence les défis et les conditions auxquels les DJ basés à Istanbul sont confrontés dans l'industrie de la production culturelle de club hautement décontractée et compétitive. L'étude suggère que les DJ d'Istanbul doivent compter sur plusieurs emplois et sur l'autopromotion pour soutenir leur carrière. Ils sont confrontés à des problèmes liés au travail précaire, aux horaires de sommeil, à la santé et aux relations personnelles. De plus, ils opèrent dans une industrie qui manque de négociations collectives et de syndicalisation, ce qui les rend vulnérables à l'exploitation. Ils s'appuient également sur leur capital social et leurs réseaux pour s'établir dans l'industrie et créer leurs propres formes d'action collective. Cependant, l'étude suggère également que les collectifs dans lesquels ils s'engagent à cet effet ne réussissent pas toujours à fournir un réseau de sécurité aux DJ et peuvent reproduire les mêmes conditions de travail d'exploitation que celles présentes dans l'industrie au sens large.

En conclusion, cette étude met en lumière les conditions de travail complexes et difficiles des DJ basés à Istanbul dans l'industrie de la production culturelle des clubs. Les conclusions de cette étude peuvent éclairer les futures recherches et interventions politiques visant à améliorer les conditions du travail créatif dans les industries culturelles et créatives.

Mots-clés : Cultures de club, musique de danse électronique, industries créatives, industries culturelles, travail créatif

ABSTRACT

The realm of cultural production and consumption has undergone significant changes in recent times, as a result of the wider changes in the characteristics of production and consumption patterns under post-Fordist capitalism. Its reflections in the cultural production perspective has opened up the field of cultural production and consumption to critical theorisations that have challenged previous assumptions about the complexity and intrinsic nature of production processes.

Furthermore, as the digitalisation debates and the post-Fordist modes of production prevailed, the discourses surrounding cultural organizations and labor have broadened to encompass their wider context. With the adaptation of "Cultural and Creative Industries" terminology and the characterisations it influenced the academia with, the pluralities within cultural production and consumption became a main topic of interest.

As a result of this new perspective, the long-standing effects of capitalist mode of production such as "concentration", "casualisation", and "commodification" have asserted presence in CCI related policies and studies. In this context, "creative labour" as carried out by the cultural creative workers employed in the field were heightened in importance. Therefore, the immaterial labour conditions of this growing workforce which primarily worked in symbol making practices began to be critically studied. The exploitations and insecure working conditions of these workers were emphasized as well. These workers were usually employed in precarious and non-standardised forms but made up for their losses in psychic income.

Within this context, the club cultural production as part of the larger and profitable music industry was found worthy of research. Its close relationships with social capital and subcultural connotations have made up a significantly exemplary terrain for studying creative labour in a unique way. It can be inferred that Istanbul is home to a substantial portion of Türkiye's club culture, given the city's relatively high concentration of cultural and artistic activities compared to other regions in Turkey. As a result, Istanbul has emerged as a fertile ground for rapidly commercializing club scenes within the broader context of cultural production.

The primary goal of this thesis was to examine the conditions of creative labor among Istanbul-based DJs in the highly casualized club culture production as part of the broader creative and cultural industries (CCI) context. To achieve this objective, the research employed a qualitative approach that involved conducting semi-structured interviews with 14 participants. The findings of the analysis were discussed in three main sections.

The first section of the findings focused on the effects of casualization on the creative labor of Istanbul-based DJs and club culture production. The highly flexible nature of the industry has made most DJs reliant on multiple job holding and generating income through different professions to be able to carry out DJ'ing. Furthermore, DJs often lack engagement in traditional forms of work, as they do not sign contracts and instead work on an individual project basis, which makes it difficult for them to secure a reliable income. Additionally, many emerging DJs and some relatively established DJs engage in unpaid work, which could be explained through hope labor as they perceive unpaid labor as an entryway into the sector. Established DJs usually express the desire to play at certain clubs with certain DJs and associate their names with these events, which is considered reasonable.

The precarious material conditions of DJs in the highly competitive industry also affect their general living conditions, including their sleep schedules, health, and personal relationships. DJs' creative labor is also flexible, as their work and leisure times tend to blur, and they often spend an extensive amount of their free time on DJing-related practices. In such a highly competitive industry, Istanbul-based DJs appear to be extremely individualized, with a lack of collective bargaining and unionization. DJs have adapted to different strategies to strengthen their entrepreneurial subjectivities, prioritizing their portfolios and being self-exploitative to reach this goal, which often means accepting insecure working conditions. Additionally, the DJs interviewed have carried the risks and responsibilities related to the conditions of the market as if they were their own, with some DJs stating that they have had to give up their creative autonomy to eliminate such risks.

The second section of the findings examined the relationship between Istanbul-based DJs and their creativity and related aspects of creative labor production. The audiences played a key role in their non-reproducible labor, with most DJs valuing the relationship they had with their audiences as the most prized aspect of their creative labor. However, DJs often face a growing crowd that is indifferent to their creative production, which they blame on the growing popularity of club cultures. Most DJs do not want to adapt their production but still find it somewhat reasonable for club owners to expect such behavior from them. DJs have shouldered the dissatisfactory conditions rather than blaming capital. However, DJs draw the line when revenue concerns start to assert themselves on their creative productions, meaning the club owners' interference with their playing practices. Although several have voiced facing such conditions, only vulnerable emerging DJs appear to accept them on this basis. The rest view the production process as a whole and consider revenue generation a vital aspect for the survival of the club scene, deeming the restrictions reasonable.

The third section of the findings explored the significant and essential roles of social capital and networks in club culture production. All DJs interviewed have benefited from their social capitals in their creative labor, with the effects of social networks being more visible in the introduction to the scene, both primarily and commercially. Due to the collective nature of club cultures, social relationships have become a safety mechanism for DJs in the highly competitive and individualized markets. DJs prioritize maintaining good social relationships with their crowd, which they consider to be a part of their main occupation. This has led to a flexibilization in their orchestration of social relationships

for the ultimate benefit of job-holding. DJs also require a strong social media presence, as it caters to the same aim and is often requested by club owners.

On the other hand, as social media presences were also important for DJs in terms of self-promotion and creating a brand for themselves. Social media platforms were seen as a tool for DJs to promote their events, and engage with their audience.

Overall, the findings of this study highlight the challenges and conditions that İstanbul-based DJs face in the highly casualized and competitive club cultural production industry. The study suggests that DJs in İstanbul need to rely on multiple job-holding and self-promotion to sustain their careers. They face issues related to precarious work, sleep schedules, health, and personal relationships. In addition, they operate in an industry that lacks collective bargaining and unionization, which leaves them vulnerable to exploitation. They also rely on their social capital and networks to establish themselves in the industry and create their own forms of collective action. However, the study also suggests that the collectives they engage in for this aim are not always successful in providing a safety network for DJs, and may reproduce the same exploitative labor conditions present in the broader industry.

In conclusion, this study sheds light on the complex and challenging working conditions of İstanbul-based DJs in the club cultural production industry. The findings of this study may inform future research and policy interventions aimed at improving the conditions of creative labor in the cultural and creative industries.

Keywords: Club Cultures, Electronic Dance Music, Creative Industries, Cultural Industries, Creative Labour

ÖZET

Kültürel üretim ve tüketim alanı, post-Fordist kapitalist üretim ve tüketim anlayışının geniş çaplı bağlam değişikliklerinin bir sonucu olarak son zamanlarda önemli ölçüde farklılaşmıştır. Kültürel üretim perspektifini etkileyen bu yansımalar, kültürel üretim ve tüketim süreçlerinin karmaşıklığı ve kendine içkin doğası hakkındaki önceki varsayımlara meydan okuyan eleştirel teorilere yol açmıştır.

Ek olarak, dijitalleşme tartışmaları ve post-Fordist üretim biçiminin yaygınlaşmasıyla, kültürel örgütlenmeleri ve emeği çevreleyen söylemler, bu genişleyen bağlamlarını kapsayacak şekilde evrimleşmiştir. "Kültürel ve Yaratıcı Endüstriler" terminolojisinin adaptasyonu ve akademiye etkisi altına alan nitelendirmeleriyle, kültürel üretim ve tüketimdeki çoğulluklar alandaki akademisyenler için temel ilgi alanlarından biri haline geldi.

Bu yeni bakış açısının bir sonucu olarak, kapitalist üretim tarzının "yoğunlaşma", "geçicileştirme" ve "metalaştırma" gibi uzun süredir devam eden etkileri KYİler ile ilgili politika ve çalışmalarda varlığını sürdürmektedir. Bu bağlamda, sahada istihdam edilen ve öncelikli olarak sembolik değer üretimiyle ilgilenen kültürel yaratıcı işçiler tarafından yürütülen "yaratıcı emeğin" önemi artmıştır. Bu nedenle, büyüyen bu işgücünün çalışma koşulları eleştirel bir şekilde incelenmeye başlanmıştır, sömürü ve güvencesiz çalışma koşulları vurgulanmıştır. Bahsi geçen işçiler genellikle güvencesiz ve standardize edilmemiş biçimlerde çalıştırılıp, emeklerinin maddi karşılıklarını alamamışlardır.

Bu bağlamda, içinde bulunduğu geniş ve karlı müzik endüstrisinin parçası olarak kulüp kültürel üretimler de araştırmaya değer bulunmuştur. Sosyal sermaye ve alt kültürel çağrışımlarla olan yakın ilişkileri, bu kültürlerle yaratıcı emeği incelemek için önemli ölçüde örnek teşkil eden bir alan oluşturmuştur. Türkiye'nin diğer bölgelerine kıyasla yüksek kültürel ve sanatsal faaliyet yoğunluğu göz önüne alındığında, İstanbul'un ülkenin kulüp kültürünün önemli bir bölümüne ev sahipliği yaptığı çıkarımına varılabilir. Sonuç olarak İstanbul, hızla ticarileşen kültürel üretim bağlamında verimli bir araştırma alanı olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır.

Bu tezin birincil amacı, yaratıcı ve kültürel endüstriler (KYİ) bağlamının bir parçası olarak, oldukça geçicileştirilen kulüp kültürü üretiminde İstanbul merkezli DJ'ler arasındaki yaratıcı emeğin koşullarını incelemektir. Bu amaca ulaşmak için araştırma, 14 katılımcıyla yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler yapmayı içeren nitel bir yaklaşım kullanmıştır. Analiz bulguları üç ana bölümde tartışılmıştır.

Bulguların ilk bölümü, gündelikleştirmenin İstanbul merkezli DJ'lerin yaratıcı emeği ve kulüp kültürü üretimi üzerindeki etkilerine odaklanmıştır. Endüstrinin son derece esnek doğası, çoğu DJ'i, DJ'lik yapabilmek için birden fazla işe sahip olmaya ve farklı meslekler aracılığıyla gelir elde etmeye bağımlı hale getirmiştir. Ayrıca DJ'ler, sözleşme imzalamadıkları ve bunun yerine bireysel proje bazında çalıştıkları için güvenilir bir gelir elde etmelerini zorlaştırdığından, genellikle geleneksel çalışma biçimleriyle tanımlanamamaktadır. Ek olarak, pek çok yeni ve nispeten yerleşik bazı DJ'ler, ücretsiz emeği sektöre giriş yolu olarak algıladıkları için umut emeği kavramıyla açıklanabilecek olduğu üzere ücretsiz işlerde çalışmaktadırlar. Köklü DJ'ler ise kimi zaman aynı duruma uyum sağlamak ve buna sebep olarak belirli kulüplerde belirli DJ'lerle birlikte çalma ve isimlerini bu etkinliklerle ilişkilendirme taleplerini belirtmektedirler; bu pratikler bu alanda makul görülmektedir.

Son derece rekabetçi endüstrideki DJ'lerin istikrarsız maddi koşulları, uyku düzenleri, sağlıkları ve kişisel ilişkileri dahil olmak üzere genel yaşam koşullarını da etkilemektedir. DJ'lerin yaratıcı emeği de esnekleşmiştir, çünkü çalışma ve boş zamanları bulanıklaşmaya eğilimlidir ve boş zamanlarının büyük bir kısmını DJ'lik ile ilgili uygulamalara harcamaktadırlar. Böylesine son derece rekabetçi bir sektörde, İstanbul merkezli DJ'ler, toplu pazarlık ve sendikalaşma eksikliği ile son derece bireyselleşmiş görünmektedir. DJ'ler girişimci öznelliklerini güçlendirmek için farklı stratejilere adapte olmuş, portföylerine öncelik vermiş ve bu amaca ulaşmak için genellikle güvensiz çalışma koşullarını kabul etmişlerdir. Ayrıca, görüşülen DJ'ler piyasa koşullarına bağlı riskleri ve sorumlulukları kendilerininmiş gibi taşımakta, bazı DJ'ler bu tür riskleri ortadan kaldırmak için yaratıcı özerkliklerinden vazgeçmek zorunda kaldıklarını belirtmişlerdir.

Bulguların ikinci bölümü, İstanbul merkezli DJ'ler ile yaratıcılıkları arasındaki ilişkiyi ve yaratıcı emek üretiminin ilgili yönlerini incelemektedir. Çoğu DJ, yaratıcı çalışmalarının en değerli yönü olarak izleyicileriyle kurdukları ilişkiye değer verdiği için, seyirciler emekleriyle olan ilişkilerinde kilit bir rol oynamışlardır. Bununla birlikte, DJ'ler alandaki sorunlar için genellikle sermayeyi değil, kulüp kültürlerinin artan popülaritesini ve buna bağlı olarak karşı karşıya kaldıkları ve yaratıcı üretimlerine kayıtsız kalarak artan kitleyi suçlamaktadırlar. Çoğu DJ, yaratıcı otonomileri üzerindeki etkilere açık olmayıp, yine de kulüp sahiplerinin kendilerinden bu tür davranışlar beklemesini makul bulmaktadır. DJ'ler, sermayeyi suçlamak yerine tatmin edici olmayan koşulları üstlenmektedirler. Bununla birlikte, DJ'ler, yaratıcı emekleri üzerinde sermayenin kaygılarının rol almasına ve kulüp sahiplerinin çalma pratiklerine müdahale etmesine müsaade etmemektedirler. Birçoğu bu tür koşullarla karşılaştığını dile getirmiş olsa da, yalnızca savunmasız durumda olan yeni DJ'ler bu etkileri kabul etmektedir. Geri kalanlar, üretim sürecini bir bütün olarak görmekte ve gelir elde etmeyi kulüp kültürünün hayatta kalması için hayati bir unsur olarak görerek kısıtlamaları makul bulmaktadır.

Bulguların üçüncü bölümü, kulüp kültürü üretiminde sosyal sermayenin ve ağların önemli ve temel rollerini araştırmıştır. Görüşülen tüm DJ'ler, yaratıcı çalışmalarında sosyal sermayelerinden yararlanmışlardır ve sosyal ağların etkileri hem kültüre hem de mesleğe girişlerinde görülmektedir. Kulüp kültürlerinin kolektif doğası nedeniyle, sosyal ilişkiler, son derece rekabetçi ve bireyselleştirilmiş pazarlarda DJ'ler için bir güvenlik mekanizması haline gelmiştir. DJ'ler, asıl mesleklerinin bir parçası olarak gördükleri üzere kitleleriyle iyi sosyal ilişkiler kurmaya öncelik vermektedirler. Bu, düzenli iş kaygısı

nedeniyle sosyal ilişkilerin düzenlenmesine sebep olmaktadır. Aynı amaca hizmet ettiği ve genellikle kulüp sahipleri tarafından talep edildiği için DJ'ler aynı zamanda güçlü bir sosyal medya varlığına da gereksinim duymaktadır.

Öte yandan, DJ'ler için sosyal medya varlıkları kendilerini tanıtmaya ve kendilerine bir marka yaratma açısından da önemli görünmektedir. Sosyal medya platformları, DJ'lerin etkinliklerini tanıtmaları ve izleyicileriyle etkileşim kurmaları için bir araç olarak görülmektedir.

Genel olarak, bu çalışmanın bulguları, İstanbul merkezli DJ'lerin son derece gündelik ve rekabetçi kulüp kültürel üretim endüstrisinde karşılaştıkları zorlukları ve koşulları vurgulamaktadır. Çalışma, İstanbul'daki DJ'lerin kariyerlerini sürdürmek için birden fazla işte çalışmaları ve sosyal ağlarına yaslanmaları gerektiğini göstermektedir. Güvencesiz çalışma, uyku sorunları, sağlık ve kişisel ilişkilerle ilgili sorunlarla karşı karşıya kalmaktadırlar. Ayrıca, toplu pazarlık ve sendikalaşmadan yoksun bir sektörde faaliyet göstermektedirler ve bu da onları sömürüye karşı savunmasız bırakmaktadır. Ek olarak, kendilerini sektörde kurmak ve kendi toplu eylem biçimlerini yaratmak için sosyal sermayelerine ve ağlarına güvenmektedirler. Bununla birlikte, bu amaç için dahil oldukları kolektiflerin DJ'ler için bir güvenlik ağı sağlamada her zaman başarılı olamadığı ve daha geniş endüstride mevcut olan aynı sömürücü çalışma koşullarını yeniden üretebileceği görülmektedir.

Sonuç olarak, bu çalışma, İstanbul merkezli DJ'lerin kulüp kültürel üretim endüstrisindeki karmaşık ve zorlu çalışma koşullarına ışık tutmaktadır. Çalışmanın bulgularının, kültürel ve yaratıcı endüstrilerde yaratıcı emeğin koşullarını iyileştirmeyi amaçlayan gelecekteki araştırma ve politika müdahaleleri için bilgi sağlayıcı olması umulmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kulüp Kùltürleri, Elektronik Dans Müziği, Yaratıcı Endüstriler, Kültürel Endüstriler, Yaratıcı Emek

INTRODUCTION

Along with the broader shifts imposed by contemporary capitalism, the terrain of cultural production and consumption saw a discourse shift in which it was understood within the academia. “The Culture Industry” as it was brought into the light by The Frankfurt School of Critical Theory scholars has provided an influential pavement on the way, expressing a standardisation in cultural products and the consequent commodification of them (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1944). Thus, previously seen ‘mythical’ in the sense that it derived from complex and intrinsic production processes (Williams, 1981), the field of cultural production and consumption has opened itself to critical theorisations.

As a result of the proliferation in information and communication technologies and the growing significance of globalisation and neoliberalism, debates surrounding cultural organisations and the labour they operate on have begun to be researched within their broader context in the 1990s. Stemming from the same shifts, the “new economy” characterised by the emphasis in service and knowledge based sectors saw a simultaneous rise (Van Dijk, 2012). With the emerging labour force in related industries, a second shift of discourse has popularised the “Cultural and Creative Industries”. Capturing the pluarilities apparent within cultural production, this discourse found its way into the emerging policies and discourse. As a result, under the new light this lucrative sector has found itself, debates regarding post-Fordist forms of production have associated themselves with CCIs. The political economy of communication scholars has enriched these debates with fundamental characterisations regarding CCIs such as ‘concentration’, ‘casualisation’ and ‘commodification’ (Murdock, 2005).

Since CCIs inherently carry themselves out through the marketisation of ‘symbolic value’, these ‘symbol makers’ have gained crucial importance in their labour processes. The practices in their labour seem to differ from those employed in traditional industries

as well, in the sense that the nature of their creation is intrinsically related to aesthetic, expressive and informational symbol making (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2011b). The emphasis on creativity and self-expressivity are central to these debates, as these features are considered to be de-alienating and self-fulfilling characterisations prominent in the labour practices of this new “creative class” (Florida, 2002).

However, as Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011b) have defined, the creative labour processes within CCIs are not free from the exploitative nature of the broader capitalist relations in which they are carried out. In fact, these highly casualised industries have led to a devouring flexibilisation, restrictive individualisation and all in all; new forms of exploitation for their workforce.

Musical production, as part of CCIs, provide a compelling example to these conditions. The global music industry made a profit of approximately 57 billion dollars in 2018 (PwC, 2019).

After the developments in recording technologies were made available as part of the ICTs, this giant industry was split into two as “recorded music” and “live music”, and approximately \$27 billion of the \$57 billion of the profit globally made in 2018 came from live music industry (ibid.). The live music industry; which is woven with production companies, sponsorship networks, and online music platforms, have been a topic of interest for the political economy of communications scholars.

Live music events vary in size and form, from street musicians to million-dollar festivals. Among these structures, one of the most significant in its cultural connotations is club cultural production. The clubs that emerged in the USA in the 1850s have taken the form we know today with the emergence of electronic rhythm machines in the 1980s and their widespread use (Magana, 2018). These places have paved the way for the formation of a youth sub-culture of their own and a musical genre that contains hundreds of sub-genres. This genre, which is generally called “electronic dance music” or simply “dance music”, has gradually increased its popularity and became the 3rd most listened music genre in 2019 (Mulligan, 2019).

Club cultures, while undergoing the popularisation and commercialisation processes, appeared as a form of experimental consumption in the sense that the only possession coming out of its consumption is an experience, which is argued to be mainly interlinked with identity formation and sociality (Goffman, 1963). However, the production processes within club cultures have significance in their similarities with those of cultural industries, in their marketing strategies based on star, genre and risk mitigating strategies. Their industry structure is also a common feature in the sense that it points out a concentration of ownership for the most part, while the local and independent venues and styles are fighting for 'what is left' (Rief, 2009, p. 64).

Thus, within the commercialised club cultures and the effects it has on DJ's subjectivities, it is seen that the creative labour processes of DJ's in club cultures are worth being examined in regard to their growing significance among CCIs. As the cultural capital of Türkiye and a city prominent in its diverse nightlife which was subjected to heavy concentration through the socio-economic variables present in recent occurrences such as inflation, insecurities and policies, İstanbul is believed to provide an exemplary case.

Therefore, this thesis will try to ascertain the conditions in which İstanbul-based DJ's carry out their creative labour. For this aim, a qualitative method with semi-structured interviews will be used to explore the subjectivities of a total of 14 İstanbul-based DJ's, who were reached with snow-ball sampling method.

In conclusion, this thesis will begin by providing a theoretical background on the aforementioned concepts in cultural production and the discursive shifts it has endured in its first chapter. In the second chapter, the focus of the theoratisations and findings will be laid out on emergence and characteristics of the creative labour notion under CCIs. In the third chapter, İstanbul-based DJ's relationship with their creative labour will be discussed in detail.

1. CULTURAL AND CREATIVE INDUSTRIES

1.1. Production and Consumption of Culture Under Capitalism

In order to be able to form a coherent understanding of cultural and creative labour, a clear contextualization of the historical debates surrounding the matter of cultural production must be brought forward. As a common theme in all of these theories, cultural production and its subsequent consumption has much to do with the social organization in which this cycle operates. Therefore, within the scope of this study, this next chapter aims to epitomise the production and consumption of culture under capitalism.

The theorization of “The Culture Industry” originated as a response to the impact of the capitalist mode of production on the processes in which the production, distribution, and consumption of cultural outputs, or as the theory itself would suggest: cultural products, occurs. Deriving from the commodification and standardization of culture in the 20th century under late capitalism, it emerged as a prominent critique.

Among the founding members of The Frankfurt School of Critical Theory, Adorno and Horkheimer coined the term in their seminal work titled “Dialectic of Enlightenment” (1944), under the chapter: “The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception”. They argued that the rise of industrial capitalism resulted in the emergence of a mass culture industry that standardized the cycle of cultural production as a whole in order to solely meet the demands of the market. They have contended that the outputs of cultural and artistic fields such as film, music, theatre and writing were designed to appeal to the general masses and to perpetuate existing social relations rather than to cater to an individually driven aesthetic experience or promote critical thinking (ibid.).

The context in which these arguments were brought forward derived from the increasing role of developments in information and communication technologies on the production and distribution of cultural products, as well as the expansion of capitalist markets and the rise of consumer culture (ibid.).

The emergence of developments in the ICTs, especially radio and television as pioneers of mass communication technologies of the era, have facilitated the spread of mass culture and, subsequently, the standardization of cultural products. As a result, the importance of consumption and the acquisition of goods as a means of social status and identity formation has caused the appearance of consumer culture as a familiar debate in related fields.

Just as it is with the emergence of the culture industry theory, the debate on consumer culture was brought along with the expansion of the capitalist market through globalisation, becoming another prominent theory of the late 20th century. Veblen, in his 1899 dated influential work “The Theory of the Leisure Class,” has brought forward the concept of “conspicuous consumption” and argues that the acquisition and display of material goods are not driven by practical needs but a means of achieving social status and signifying the reputability of it. In “Mythologies,” Roland Barthes (1972) adapts this theory to the production processes of cultural outputs by analysing a variety of consumer products that are seemingly practical in nature, such as automobiles and detergent soap. Therefore, he unveils the cultural construction of a set of attributed meanings in their production and marketing processes. He suggests that these products become “mythical” by the cultural significance they gain beyond their practical use (ibid., p. 115).

While gaining much significance under market-oriented production and consumption processes, cultural products were increasingly subjected to commodification. Referring to the process in which goods or services are transformed into subjects of the market under the capitalist mode of production, Marxist theory has argued that the commodification process involves the stripping of use value and reducing everything to its exchange value. In this sense, labour itself is stripped down to its

exchange value under the capitalist mode of production, and therefore the labour power is commodified along with the members of the working class, becoming measurable, homogenous, and capable of being accumulated.

Along with the variety of scholars, some of whom has been aforementioned, in his seminal work “Culture and Society” (1958), Raymond Williams argues that culture should not be understood as merely a set of artistic and intellectual expressions but rather as a dynamic and holistic social process encompassing a wide range of practices, beliefs and ways of life. Although critical of the reductive interpretations of the “Culture Industry” theory in some ways, he has also seen the standardization of cultural production as a form of cultural hegemony, serving to maintain the power of the dominant class. Only through such an approach can culture unveil the site of struggle and negotiation between dominant and subaltern groups that it is, reflecting the broader power relations and hierarchies within. He also argues that culture is not a static entity but rather constantly evolving and shaped by the social, economic, and political forces of the era. Furthermore, he argued that it is essential to analyze cultural artifacts in their respective historical context to unveil the conditions in which the content and meaning of cultural artifacts emerge and are understood.

In his work titled “Culture,” dated 1981, Williams argued that cultural production is not only the work of an individual artist or creator, but the product of a collective and integrated process involving a range of actors made up of producers, institutions, and consumers. This process is referred to as a “structure of feeling,” which he defines as “the totality of social experience and relationships, which are at any time complexly articulated” (p. 132).

Williams went on to stress the importance of understanding and analyzing cultural production as a dynamic process that is constantly evolving in response to its context. He then provides an extensive analysis of the relationship of culture relationship within its broader historical context, detailing the main characteristics of cultural production and circulation in each era.

The first of these stages, dubbed the “cultural form” state, refers to the period before the emergence of mass media and the commercialisation of culture. It appears as a site for diverse and specified sets of cultural forms that were indigenous to their particular communities. In this stage where culture itself was localized, cultural production and therefore the artist was also directly supported by local communities or patrons. The labour process in cultural creation was seen as a form of art, or craftsmanship, and the value it had was directly measured by the skill it required. In this era, the artist was directly paid a wage, or a stipend covering the living costs by the patron, usually the church or members of the aristocracy. Such direct relationship was a source of stability for the artist but it also meant that the creative autonomy of the artist was relatively vulnerable against their patrons inducements.

The second stage, “the cultural industry”, saw cultural production becoming more commercialized and standardized to a degree, with the emergence and development in media and communications technologies in the 19th century. Artists of then became more dependent on the industries and their representatives, such as the publishing houses and film studios, for their survival and their work was valued more for its commercial potential through appealing to mass consumption. The relationship between the artist and their patrons became more impersonal and structured, mainly through copyright deals and to some degree, a salary worker and employer basis.

The third and final stage, “the cultural system” era, emerged in the mid-20th century in light of the rise of neoliberalist policies and is argued to still be the dominant system. In this era, the relationships between artists and patrons became more complex and varied. While some artists work independently, some have worked under large, multinational institutions or organisations. Therefore the relationship between artist and patron is shaped through broad social and political concerns on representation, identity and social change.

It could be argued under this light that the scholars working on the subject of cultural production in capitalist societies have brought this topic to its contemporary connotations in the mid-20th century and onwards. They argued that the processes of

capital accumulation have subjected cultural outputs, along with the production cycle and subsequently the labour through which they are circulated, to become a site for marketisation and commodification (Garnham, 1990; Harvey, 1990; Florida, 2002; McRobbie: 2009; Hesmondhalgh, 2013; Fuchs, 2017). However, the discourses in which this notion is theorised has had a shift along with the emergences that resulted in the alterations themselves. For this reason, it seems beneficial to try and develop an understanding of the reasons and developments that has caused the shift from the discourse of “The culture industry” to “The cultural and creative Industries”, which will be used in this thesis.

1.2. The Shifting Discourses

There exists a level of ambiguity around the efforts to discern the relationship between the terms “Cultural industries” and “Cultural and creative industries”. The confusion arises as a result of these terms having roots in distinct theoretical, discursive and policy contexts. Both of these refer to a crucial domain that requires attention from cultural theorists: how cultural commodities are produced and disseminated in modern economies and societies.

While widely being accepted as a milestone among the critical perspectives on mass culture, it was commonly critiqued for asserting the idea of a passive audience without agency, homogenizing any outputs of a cultural process that has become influential over masses and failing to account for the diversity and complexity of popular culture (Storey, 1993), and therefore having an elitist and deterministic understanding of a “high culture” that seems to be acceptable rather than the critiqued “mass culture.”

Miege’s (2011) critique of the culture industry concept centers around its failure to recognize the transformative impact of technological innovations on artistic practices. Moreover, the concept’s paradoxical emphasis on markets and commodities obscures the fact that cultural production is a complex process with inherent limitations. According to him, the term “culture industry” implies a unified field governed by a single process,

which fails to acknowledge the diversity and competition among the various industries vying for consumer attention, disposable income, advertising revenue, and labour.

In contrast, the cultural industries approach represents an alternative framework for understanding cultural production processes. This approach, connected to the broader political economy of culture (PEC) theories, provides a specific analysis of the conditions of cultural industries, rather than merely concentration and integration characteristics of capitalist production. The cultural industries approach by the PEC theorists, notably with the influence of Garnham, is defined by its restriction to those industries that utilize characteristic forms of industrial production and organization to produce and disseminate symbols, which was especially centered on the media (Garnham, 2005).

Notably, the cultural industries approach emphasizes the importance of control of circulation, rather than only their production processes. David Harvey henceforth brings an argument that the commodification of arts and culture produces a never ending capital of commodities that are designed to be consumed and discarded, saying that “cultural production and consumption have become integrated into the circuits of capital accumulation” (p. 28). This nexus of power appears as a crucial factor in the cultural industries, and understanding it provides insights into the recurring dynamics of cultural production. Overall, it offers a valuable lens through which the complexities and power relations within the various cultural production processes can be revealed.

Hesmondhalgh (2008) argues that while the cultural industries term, associated with the theories it derives upon, seem to carry a connotation of a critical analysis, the “creative industries” term and its integration in the discourse appears to reject such scrutiny. Therefore, a reliance on the latter of these terms may appear to have a degree of acceptance towards neoliberalist policies. However, to presume a complicity between neoliberalism and the creative industries theory on these grounds would result in an insufficient understanding. Hence, it is vital to develop a nuanced approach that considers the distinctive features of each concept and the context in which they exist.

Bell, in his influential work, “The Coming of Post Industrial Society” (1973), argued that the shift towards a post-industrial society, characterized by the rise of the service sector and the importance put on the knowledge-based activities has resulted in a fundamental shift in the structure of the economy. After the shift from an agricultural society which depended on manual labour, post-industrial societies depended on the informational labour. He identified the new class of professionals, the “knowledge workers”, who were increasingly becoming more and more essential to the growth of the new economy centered around the ICTs. Him and various other scholars have used similar theorizations with different concepts to signify a new way of social structure, such as “knowledge society” (Sassen, 2001; Florida, 2002) and “information society” (Harvey, 1989; Castells, 1996).

In the 1990s, the conceptualization of a “new economy” has emerged, characterized by its departure from traditional hierarchies in favour of a production process that was no longer decentralized, while the control and capital were increasingly centralized. This influential paradigm shift was based on the creation and exchange of information, as products increasingly became “experience goods” (Van Dijk, 2012).

The new economy was seen as a means to achieve sustained economic growth and increased labour productivity, largely due to the increasing prevalence of ICT businesses and their innovative mechanisms of control. As Castells (1996) argued, emergence of networked forms of organization allowed for the integration of both vertical and horizontal control structures in organizations led to increased efficiency in these processes.

The digital revolution, and the consequent rise of the “knowledge economy” has challenged the traditional lines between culture, creativity and technology, making way for new forms of artistic expression and cultural consumption (Castells, 2010). As argued by David Hesmondhalgh, the traditional culture industry theory, with its emphasis on mass production and consumption of standardized cultural products, were not efficient in capturing the complexity of cultural production processes in contemporary societies. The creative economy concept, however, encompasses the role of creativity and

innovation in driving economic growth and development. Jenkins (2006) have stressed that digital technologies have enabled new forms of participation and collaboration among the consumers of cultural outputs, therefore blurring the lines between them and the producers of these products. This shift has led to a growing emphasis on the importance of user-generated content and other forms of participatory cultures such as fan fiction, remix culture, social media and such.

Similarly, digital media technologies have also challenged traditional boundaries through the emergence of new forms of cultural production, blurring the lines between art, design, and technology. Enabling new forms of multimedia expression through combining elements of text, image, sound and interactivity, the advancements in digital media technologies have led to emergence of new fields that would collectively make up the “digital art” umbrella term, and challenge traditional definitions of art and cultural production itself (Manovich, 2013).

With the necessary tools and technologies being available to wider groups in societies, new forms of artistic expression and cultural consumption have emerged and challenged the one way hierarchy model expressed in the culture industry theory (Florida, 2002).

Globalisation and the neoliberal outlook brought onwards from the 1970 have had a significant impact on the emergence of the discursive shift to cultural and creative industries. Neoliberalism, as Harvey argues, “proposes that human well being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free market and free trade (2005, p. 2).

A renewed focus on the economic value of cultural and creative work have occurred, creating new opportunities for these industries to drive economic growth and development. With the emergences in digital technologies and the globalisation of the capitalist market, Hesmondhalgh (2007) argued that cultural and creative industries have found new opportunities to expand their reach and influence. Similarly, Kurunmaki &

Miller (2011) argues that “neoliberal policies such as deregulation, privatization and marketization has encouraged the growth of cultural industries, by creating a more favourable environment for entrepreneurship and innovation” (p. 129). This has led to the recognition of culture as a vital component of the global economy, and has fuelled the growth of both these industries and related discussions in economic, policy making and academic settings. As noted by Wasko (2014), governments around the world have developed policies and initiatives that would support the growth of cultural and creative industries through tax incentives, funding programs and regulations to promote entrepreneurship and innovation as a result.

Emerging as a result of globalisation, as Barker & Jane (2016) suggest, “the proliferation of new media technologies and the expansion of global communication networks have enabled cultural products to be produced, distributed and consumed across a wide range of cultural and geographic contexts” (p.3). This has led to a diversification in cultural markets, creating both new challenges and opportunities for cultural and creative industries. Hartley (2011) argues that the diversification of cultural markets has resulted in them to cater to distinct preferences of various consumer groups and consequently, a “shift from mass production to niche production” (p. 59). Pratt and Jeffcutt argue that the “recognition of cultural diversity as a resource for economic growth and social development has resulted in a renewed focus of the cultural and creative industries as a driver of innovation and entrepreneurship” (2009, p. 240).

1.3. Cultural and Creative Industries

In the 1990s, instead of the dominantly adopted revised mode of understanding that is “The Cultural Industries”, “The Cultural and Creative Industries” approach rose to popularity in both academic and policy making discourses regarding the cultural production processes. Shortened as CCIs, cultural and creative industries refer to a broad range of economic activities involved in the production, distribution and consumption of cultural outputs. These commonly include, but are not limited to; film, broadcasting, music, publishing, fashion, design, architecture, advertising, software development and gaming. (Hesmondhalgh, 2013; Pratt, 2008). According to the papers published in regard

to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development; the concept of CCIs emphasizes the economic and cultural value of creativity, innovation and intellectual property, as well as the diversity and plurality of cultural expressions (2018). As a wholistic approach to the eclectic nature of cultural production, CCI discourse also acknowledges the role of small sized enterprises, independent artists and grassroots communities and movements in shaping the cultural landscape, challenging the dominance of large corporations and cultural monopolies.

The European Commission (2020) working under the European Union has also developed a range of policies and initiatives with the aim of supporting the growth of cultural and creative industries to promote cross-cultural collaboration, in addition to the national governments' initiatives adding promoting cultural tourism, cultural heritage preservation and the development of creative clusters to their supportive policies (as cited in Barker & Jane, 2016).

Creative clusters, hubs, or cities; while differing from each other in size, are defined by Florida (2002) as a geographic concentration of firms, organizations and individuals in creative industries that share common resources and knowledge, and benefit from the synergies arising from their shared proximity. They foster an environment that encourages creativity and innovation, and invest in cultural and creative resources as a means of reaching economic growth and social development. The emergence of creative clusters, hubs or cities; such as the Silicon Valley in the US, Montpellier in France, or Shoreditch in the UK, has also been argued to bring economic benefits to its inhabitants.

Cultural products such as music, film, literature and art in general have been subjected to a standardization in which their production, distribution and consumption were affected. As Garnham notes, "culture has become an important part of contemporary capitalist economies" (2005, p. 32). The proliferation of the cultural and creative industries discourses in political economic, economic and policy making terrains have resulted in the need for a characterization of the distinctive features of these

industries. Many influential scholars from various schools of thought have debated on the subject, most notably the political economists in media and communications studies.

The UK governments Department for Culture, Media and Sports (DCMS) published under the Labour government have also played a key role in facilitating the idea that the cultural and creative sectors are pioneer contributors to economic growth, rather than a source for merely entertainment and cultural expression. In 1998, the department has published a white paper titled “Creative Industries: Mapping Document” and identified a range of industries as part of the creative sector: “advertising, architecture, art and antiques, computer games/ leisure software, crafts, design, designer fashion, film and video, music, performing arts, publishing, software and computer services, TV and radio.” (ibid.) Their definition of the cultural and creative industries was, “those which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent which have a potential for job and wealth creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property” (p. 3).

Hesmondhalgh, in his 2013 dated seminal work “The Cultural Industries”, provides a beneficial summary upon the main characteristics of CCIs. He, instead of simply listing those arguments, divides these characteristics into two groups. The first set of four main characteristics are named: “Problems”, the challenges with which the capital in cultural and creative industries face; and a second set of five characteristics, named “Responses” as they are CCIs’ survival tactics in response to these setbacks in surplus revenue. These, while not directly in response to each other, make up the definitive characteristics of the cultural and creative industries within their broader context in the contemporary capitalist societies. Therefore, the following characteristics will provide a brief but clear understanding about the effects of the capitalist mode of production have on the cultural production processes.

The first problem, “Risky Business”, refers to the risky nature of cultural production, resulting from high levels of uncertainty of whether cultural goods will meet with adequate demand in the market. Deriving from Garnham’s argument that in these industries, success depends on the constant production of novelty (2005), Hesmondhalgh

argues that cultural goods often require significant levels of investment in production, marketing and distribution. As its response, Hesmondhalgh brings forth “Building a Repertoire”, meaning that the cultural and creative industries build a large repertoire of products to combat the risk of producing individual works that have the risk of failing in the market, as argued by Caves to be a key strategy of mitigating the risk (2000). The policies to combat this risk also include concentration, horizontal, vertical and multisector and multimedia integration, and controlling the distribution and marketing processes through various strategies.

A related concept in scholars’ efforts to characterise CCIs is concentration, which refers to the consolidation of media ownership and consequently control in the hands of a small number of large media conglomerates through its subsidiaries or integration. To achieve profit maximization, elimination of competition is a key strategy for multinational media monopolies, which has a tendency in CCIs as well (Bagdikian, 2000; as cited in McRobbie, 2016). Its effects on cultural production appears undemocratic, and limiting of different viewpoints and cultural, politic, socioeconomic standings (Mosco, 2009; Garnham, 1990). Murdock et al. (2003) argues that concentration of media ownership needs to be challenged with adequate regulations in order to protect a democratic media landscape.

Very much related to the concentration of media ownership in the hands of multinational media conglomerates, in the nature of said conglomerates and of the products themselves; globalisation emerges as a prominent characteristic in CCIs (Mosco, 2009).

The second problem is a sum of the arguments around “Creativity versus Commerce” debate. Here, the tension between the commercial imperatives driving motive to create surplus value and the artistic and creative autonomy of the cultural worker is at the core. As cultural outputs are symbolic goods, their production processes are inherently those of symbol-making (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2011a). The motivation of those who take part in their production are, as opposed to those of circulating them, are not merely financial but rather intrinsic in their creative expression (Bilton & Leary,

2002). The combatting paradigm at work here is again, concentration, integration, and control over the distribution and marketing processes. At play here is also the penetration of creative values as a relief strategy on the workers, such as flexibility and creative autonomy as they will be key concepts in this thesis.

Casualisation, another prominent effect commonly emphasized, is another term to describe the trend towards the use of temporary, part-time, or contract based labour in the cultural production process (Murdock, 2005). In order to minimize labour costs and maximize profits, casualisation is an effective way for the capital in CCIs to ensure it through avoidance of the expenses implied upon them by benefits and job security that would be required through permanent employment (Mosco, 2004). The effect of casualisation upon cultural production processes is a lack of stability and security for workers in the industry, and consequently a potential for exploitation.

The third and fourth problems brought by Hesmondhalgh are “High Production Costs and Low Reproduction Costs” and “Semi-Public Goods” respectively. Hesmondhalgh here notes that cultural products often involve high costs in the making, such as those of the film sector including set, transportation, and special effects. However, the replication and distribution of an already produced cultural output can be done with much lower costs, especially with the democratization of digital technologies. Since these products lose none of their artistic or cultural value in the process, Hesmondhalgh names them as “semi-public goods” (p. 26). In response, to combat the non-scarce nature of these commodities, the cultural and creative industries create an “Artificial Scarcity” by controlling the distribution of cultural goods and limiting their availability through advertising, copyright and intellectual property policy and laws and limiting access. Additionally, cultural and creative industries make use of formats such as stars, genres, and serials to attribute them with particular uses and ensure their consumption by the audiences (Ryan, 1992). The common strategy for the capital to assert itself in the reproduction processes and protect revenues is the emphasis on intellectual property rights.

Finally, as the last response, “Loose Control of Symbol Creators, Tight Control of Distribution and Marketing” refers to the aforementioned exercise of seemingly loose control over the creative autonomies of the symbol creators. However, all of the responses mentioned make up the tight control over cultural production processes by the industries themselves, in the name of ensuring that the cultural outputs reach audiences in the most profitable way.

The commercialisation in CCIs has, in sum, resulted in the commodification of their very own production processes as well as the products; and more importantly as per the the scope of this study: the creative labour process itself (Ursell, 2000). The debate on the nature of control over the symbol creating process will be extensively discussed as a main theme of interest in the following chapters of this thesis.

2. LABOUR IN CULTURAL AND CREATIVE INDUSTRIES

2.1. Definitive Aspects

The concept of immaterial labour, as it was coined by the Autonomist Marxist thinkers¹ and developed to have a vital influence among PEC scholars, refers to labour that produces non-material goods or services such as knowledge, information or experiences (Hardt & Negri, 2000). One of the leading Italian Autonomist Marxist theorists, Lazzarato's (1996) definition is one that defines such labour as the opposite of a Taylorist mode of production, which is "labour that produces the informational and cultural content of commodity" (p. 133).

He argues that under post-Fordist mode of production which is the dominant form of production in modern capitalist societies after neoliberalism, the worker is expected to have intellectual, manual and entrepreneurial skills. Therefore, in order to create the cultural, or informational content that is the result of immaterial labour, workers find themselves involved with activities to accumulate such capital that are not merely and necessarily attributed to 'work', such as those regarding cultural and artistic standards of what is tasteful, popular, or even right (ibid.).

"This labour power is the product of a 'silent revolution' taking place within the anthropological realities of work and within the reconfiguration of its meanings" (ibid., p. 139). Here, waged labour is no longer the dominant model between the capital and the labour.

¹ Also known as Post-Operaismo.

With the digitalization and automation of many forms of immaterial labour regarding the production of knowledge and communication, such as social media activity or user generated content (Fuchs, 2014), the lengths which the new kind of working class goes varies like never before. Lazzarato argues that the most common characteristics of the labour executed by this class, which he names as the “intellectual proletariat” are: “precariousness, hyper-exploitation, mobility and hierarchy” (p. 136).

Workers are expected to be active subjects, who are in command of themselves and their own work as the worker, motivator, facilitator, team player and captain, all at the same time. So, the line between leisure time and labour time; capital and labour blurs. Through such contextual shift in the cultural production process, along with the definitive power of immaterial labour through as mentioned above, Hardt & Negri (2009) argue that the capital exerts itself as the biopower² in order to ensure control over social production as a whole. Consequently, through the means of production; immaterial labour not only creates the commodities, but the whole social context in which it is produced, distributed and consumed. Using the term, “biopolitical production”, Hardt and Negri argue: “One might still conceive of economic production as an engagement of the subject with nature, a transformation of the object through labour, but increasingly the “nature” that biopolitical labour transforms is subjectivity itself” (ibid. p. 172).

Richard Florida, in his work “Rise of the Creative Class” (2002), defines a new class of workers who specialise in “creativity” which he argues to be the driving force of the postindustrial economy. He has stressed that their “economic function is to create new ideas, new technology and/or new creative content” (p. 8). The creative class, as he understood, were not only employed in or through CCIs, but it included a group of individuals who work primarily with creative quality, however field they may work in. Existing at the core of creative class, he has exemplified: “scientists and engineers, university professors, poets and novelists, artists, entertainers, actors, designers, and architects, as well as the thought leadership of modern society: nonfiction writers, editors, cultural figures, think-tank researchers, analysts and other opinion makers” (2014, p. 38). However, more than the class and the workers employed in it, the “creative

² For a detailed discussion on biopower and biopolitics, see Foucault, 1990, p. 148.

class” notion, according to him, pointed to a change in the system that is moving its center from the corporate to the individual, that is fuelled by creativity, idea formation and innovation (2002, as cited in Flew, 2005).

Another prominent concept among the PEC scholars to define labour in CCIs is “informational work”(Mattelart, 1979; Smythe, 1981; Mosco, 1983; Menzies, 1996; as cited in Brophy & De Peuter, 2007). Deriving from the same aspect of labour under CCIs, which is to be involved in the production of knowledge related products and services, “knowledge worker” is also used to describe labour of this nature (Mosco & McKercher, 2008). While noting that the rise of CCIs are obviously connected to the rise of knowledge economy through both technical improvements and the change in discourse, Flew (2005) argues that the main difference stems from CCIs’ primary output being symbolic goods. Therefore, the value of labour in CCIs depend on both the workers’ creation and the consumers’ perception. While it is unclear whether the value of a creation may result in a financial return (Bilton & Leary, 2002, p. 58; as cited in Flew, 2005), the production and consumption processes of symbolic commodities require a specialised set of concepts than any which is under the ICTs.

As Raymond Williams notes in his essay, “Culture Is Ordinary” (1958), the word “art” originally was merely a synonym for skill, but over time it came to stand for a creative skill that requires intrinsic values and qualities from its creator, therefore transforming artist into “a special kind of person” (p. 15). Garnham (2011) argues that the industrialisation of culture has erased this utopian understanding of art. Therefore, while “artistic labour” (Ryan, 1992), has also been a term used in the effort to understand labour in CCIs, the implied sacredness of the artists’ relationship with their labour makes it harder to unveil the tension between art and commerce. Deriving from the difficulty in referring to work in CCIs as “artistic labour” in light of the sum of these views (Banks, 2007), the term does not emerge as a popular way of reference.

As per the summarisation done by Hesmondhalgh (2008), a growing majority of scholars all agree that work in CCIs have gained importance through their visible growth as an economic sector. Therefore, the cruciality of understanding labour in these industries have gained equal importance as well. Murdock et al. argues that in the

direction that contemporary capitalism is moving from Fordism to post-Fordism (Amin, 94; as cited in Murdock et al., 2003), to understand labour in CCIs becomes critical for PEC scholars to understand how the notion of labour itself is transforming. He also stresses that since cultural work is a dominant factor in defining everyday life and its activities, how it is produced must be understood (ibid.). Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011b) define “creative labour” as forms of labour with an especially strong element of aesthetic, expressive and informational symbol making. This definition seems to combine the common found characteristics of creative labour with “informational labour” and “artistic labour”, and has a strong position in the field as a common term. They have also stressed that a definitive research on CCIs have to be rooted in power, institutions and subjectivity; and outlined its key concepts as tension between creativity and commerce, agency, normativity, ethics, alienation, autonomy, exploitation (ibid.).

According to them, “cultural worker”, on the other hand, is the worker that is primarily employed through labour of producing symbolic goods with social meaning, which are generally the cultural commodities (ibid.). While the term “cultural labour” can be found among the works of PEC scholars as well (see Murdock, 2003), as a broader term, “creative cultural worker” refers to the workers in CCIs in general. These are the sum of workers that exists in the process of “the production of those symbolic commodities judged to be essential components of the transition to a “post-industrial”, “creative” or “knowledge” based economy” (Banks, 2007, p. 7).

Therefore, within the framework that is provided, the term to be used in this thesis when describing labour in “creative labour”, while the term “creative cultural worker” will be used in referring to the workers recruited in CCIs.

A famous term in any argument related to labour, “alienation” refers to a key result of the working conditions under the capitalist mode of production, which leave workers alienated from their own labour, the product of their labour, and their fellow workers and along with their worker identities.³ While making a distinction between the repetitive and routinised work, commonly dubbed as “alienating”, and its idealised

³ For a detailed discussion, see Marx, 2007.

counterpart, that can be referred to as “de-alienating”, Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011b) use the terms “bad work” and “good work”, respectively. What makes “good work” is, derived from the same Marxist notion, the nature of a work that would not result in the worker becoming a commodity in themselves through their labour processes. This, according to them, requires a set of conditions in said work; including high levels of security, safety, autonomy, interest and involvement in the work, good wages and working hours, self-esteem and self-realisation of workers, sociality, and being able to maintain a strong work-life balance (ibid.).

Work in CCIs, with its self-regulatory and autonomous characteristics that adopts both conceptualisation and execution, therefore overseeing the whole cultural production process in itself is seen as a way of working that would not alienate the worker. Thrift (2005) argues that the cultural and creative work of post-Fordism is almost a re-branding of labour as we know it: “self-regulatory, self-fulfilling individual actors’ enterprise seeks to re-enchant organized work by restoring to it that which bureaucracy is held to have crassly repressed: emotion, personal responsibility, the possibility of pleasure, etc.” (p. 34).

However, as the following parts of this thesis will try to illuminate the ways in which it happens, “What is presented initially as freedom, flexibility and autonomy actually becomes a form of alienation” (Bilton & 2007, p. 84).

The notion of creativity with all of its historical contextualisations and connotations is central to any debate around creative labour and CCIs.

It is argued that any output that was produced within the capitalist mode of production and is offered to the consumer society have socio-symbolic significance and therefore all industries are cultural (Mato, 2009). While offering a point of view worthy of debate, since CCIs primarily deal with cultural production, and creative labour primarily deals with symbol making practices, creativity appears at a focal point in this discussion.

Wolff, in “The Social Production of Art” (1993), begins by saying that Marx himself and the Marxist literature in general has seen any kind of production to be creative in its essence. However, the difference between “art” and “regular work” derives from the alienation which the latter of these two produces.

Braverman has also argued that the alienation in this so called regular work stems from the division between conceptualisation and execution (as cited in McGuigan, 2010). Since the cultural worker seems to be present in the decision making aspects of their own creation as a whole, creative labour is seen as non-alienating work. However, McGuigan argues that this understanding of a presence in their labour as a whole, turns a blind eye to the broader social connotations all labour must face and creates a completely intrinsic understanding of the labour process (ibid.). Wolff also argues that even artistic production itself is not irrelevant to the dynamics and discourses present in the wider society (Wolff, 1993).

The romantic notion of creativity lies within the understanding that creative work and arts are seen divine, genius, intrinsic and even sacred (Ross, 2009). Consequently, creative labour appears to have an inherent value that is exceptional and extraordinary. For instance, in the Creative Economy Report published by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (2010), has defined cultural creativity in the following way: “It involves imagination and a capacity to generate original ideas and novel ways of interpreting the world, expressed in text, sound and image” (p. 3).

The emphasis on imagination and originality shows itself in the centrality of copyright and intellectual property debates among various policy papers while stressing it as the main source of revenue for CCIs.⁴ Howkins, in his book “The Creative Economy” (2001) also argues intellectual property to be the key point of differentiation for CCIs and even defines these sectors as “copyright industries.”

⁴ See UNCTAD, 2008; DCMS, 1998

This understanding of an original and intrinsic cultural work is argued to stem from the division between “art” and “industry” which occurred as a response to industrial capitalism, popularised with the Romanticist “art for art’s sake” movement. (Banks, 2010) This rejection, together with the rise of CCIs, has resulted in what Banks elsewhere (2007) calls a “creative fetish.” So much so, that within CCIs and the wider creative economy in general, “creativity” emerged as the trademark; defining the industry, the labour, and the worker all at the same time as the one true quality that goes beyond the work. Then head of the DCMS, Chris Smith has confirmingly argued in a speech that “creativity after all, is about adding the deepest value to human life” (1998, p. 1, as cited in Neelands & Choe, 2010, p. 1).

Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011b) define creative autonomy as “the degree to which art, knowledge, symbol making and so on can or should operate independently of the influence of other determinants” (p. 29). One of the main terrains in creative and cultural work related research centers around the creativity versus commerce debate. Creativity, as discussed above, with its historical roots laying in the “art for art’s sake” debate, emphasises the autonomy of the artist in their artistic work as its cornerstone. The notion that it is autonomous of, then, are the relations and connotations of industrial capitalism.

The cultural creative workers of the post-industrial era are often described through notions such as authenticity, individualism, freedom of choice and autonomy (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999; Florida, 2002; Banks, 2010). These self-expressive qualities are, seemingly, not only found in cultural creative workers, but are essential to their artistic subjectivity and very being. However, through the romanticisation of self-expression, cultural and creative workers become the subjects of a duality in their labour. On one side of this duality is the perceived freedom from alienation and bureaucratic traditional forms of labour, and on the other side lies the exploitation brought by the individuality and market-led identity formation.

2.2. Exploitation of Creative Labour

Hesmondhalgh, in “Cultural and Creative Industries” (2008), summarises the common features of labour practices among cultural creative workers according to Ruth Towse (1992), which she refers as “artistic labour.” She has argued that in relation to individuals recruited in different areas of production, artists tend to hold multiple jobs and have contracts which are covering a shorter term, there is a predominance of freelancers and self-employed workers and there is little job protection, their work is irregular and career prospects are uncertain, the earnings among them are unequally distributed and they are younger (ibid.)

This categorisation seems to be very efficient in denominating the common characteristics of artistic labour under post-Fordism, and can successfully provide a base for any study related to creative labour in CCIs as it will in the following chapters under various terms.

In line with the romanticisation of creative labour, as mentioned, has resulted in an understanding that this type of labour is “a way of life” in opposition to the production processes under Fordism (Gill & Pratt, 2008). However exciting, this perspective which sees labour as a means of self-realisation and self-expression puts creative labour in a “non-work” position that is free of, even above any exploitation and alienation endemic to production as we know it (Fleming, 2009).

Hesmondhalgh & Baker argue that Marxism, for the most part, while providing the necessary tools and concepts, does not look into creative labour as a field of struggle often. They stress that Marxism regards workers’ self-exploitation as a result of developing a deep emotional connection with one’s own work (2011a), and agree that the infatuation with above mentioned qualities of creative labour paves the way for the acceptance and even romanticisation of poor working conditions. However, apart from their desire to escape the exhausting reality of alienation through a deep connection with both the conceptualisation and execution stages of their own symbol making practices, cultural creative workers are often faced with no other choice.

As it was briefly discussed in the previous chapters while summarising the main characteristics of CCIs under capitalism, casualisation appears as a prominent structural feature which heavily influences creative labour. Under post-Fordism, there has been a shift from the traditional wage labour to more fluctuating and unclear agreements that usually present themselves as freelancing, short term contracts or project based deals (Murdock, 2005). Since the practices of creative labour seem to have connotations that are associated with self fulfilment and self actualising traits, the lines between work and leisure time blur. In a study conducted with cultural creative workers in the Netherlands, Gill has found that their main attraction towards CCIs derive from the casualisation itself: “the pleasures of working autonomously with no managerial control, flexible working hours, and the intrinsically challenging and fulfilling nature of the work” (2002, p. 80).

Therefore, it can be said that this de-alienating perception of creative labour as what Hesmondhalgh & Baker call “good work” (2011b) and the creative autonomy cultural creative workers’ believe to have over their symbol making practices, are both direct results of the casualisation in the labour market (Gill, 2007). On the other hand, perhaps the same, casualisation leads to the key features that define cultural labour in CCIs. The debates on the dynamics, characteristics and liabilities of this exploitation are commonly gathered under the following terms that are highly interlinked with each other.

Flexibilisation refers to two realities persistent regarding creative labour practices of cultural creative workers. First among them is the flexibilisation in creative labourers position with the capital, and consequently cultural creative workers’ relationship with their employers and employment practices in the broader sense. The traditional forms of this relationship where the worker is to be found in a contractual and wage based subjugation are not common in creative labour, being replaced by contract based and temporal agreements. The proportion of workers engaging in these forms of self-employed regulations was found to be 30% in the UK in 2014 (Skillset), while the global percentage was estimated to be 33% in 2021 (UNESCO & The World Bank).

Another aspect of flexibilisation is visible in the working conditions of cultural creative workers. Those employed in CCIs usually embark on an understanding where being addicted to overwork themselves is perceived to be an essential feature of creative labour (Ross, 2003; as cited in Ross, 2009). Commonly argued to be deriving from the passion they have for their work (Ursell, 2000), this phenomenon in turn forces workers to adapt their whole lives according to the needs of the market. The informality in their agreements lead to additional responses and irregular workings hours and patterns.

The insecure working conditions brought by these transient conditions and consequently the income has led cultural creative workers to exist in a state where they seek multiple jobs, express low levels of quality in their lives, and find informal ways to ensure steadiness mostly through their social networks (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2011b).

Individualisation in work occurs as a result of the high levels of concentration visible in CCIs and the flexible working conditions that blur the lines between the work and the rest. Cultural creative workers are subjected to a reality where the individual is required to take on the responsibilities and risks associated with work. McGuigan (2010) argues that the creativity discourse surrounding this type of work leads to an abiding characterisation that prioritise indivuality and self-expression for the cultural creative worker. Therefore, the intrinsic quality associated with creativity results in an entrepreneurial subjectivity where the worker is the sole denominator in their working conditions, and is at fault if they prove to be dissatisfactory (Gill, 2007).

In these individualised forms of labour where each worker is self-reliant, the discourse usually centers around the 'refusal of work' (McRobbie, 2007), through its breaking of the traditional, industrial and bureaucratic conditions of work (Beck, 2000). However this also results in the lack of collective bargaining and unionisation mechanisms and alienates the worker in their imposed struggles (Ursell, 1998).

Cultural and creative workers are, although not uniquely, persistently compelled to engage in insecure and casualised forms of labour. The unreagulated forms of relationship between the capital and the labour and the deregulation of labour markets

oblige them to precarious working conditions; which are directly connected to the individualisation and flexibilisation as mentioned above.

The precariousness they experience is characterised mainly with unstable and low payments (Fantone, 2007, as cited in Gill & Pratt, 2008), unpaid labour as an entryway into the highly competitive job markets (Siebert & Wilson, 2013), long and irregular working hours (Pratt, 2002) and consequently the need to transfuse life with work (Flew, 2005).

Brophy & De Peuter (2007) argue that while these conditions were always found in the working patterns of disadvantaged groups, under post-Fordism; the precarious forms of labour became the norm. All in all, however exploitative, cultural creative workers make up for these conditions in account of the ‘psychic income’ they believe to generate from the self-realising effects of creative labour (Jarvis & Pratt, 2006).

2.3. Social Capital and Creative Labour

Social capital is one of the three kinds of capitals one can acquire through class, according to Bourdieu’s influential theorisation. It refers to the power generating resources acquired by and through social relationships and is interlinked with both economic and cultural capital as one capital is transferable into another and can be accumulated through another (1986).

In CCIs, social capital appears as a vital resource that is present in all stages and processes related to creative labour. Its influence lies first within the recruitment process, since networking is central in entrance to cultural production (Murdock, 2003). Skillset’s “The Creative Media Workforce Survey Report” with 5000 participants working in the creative sector has found that the 56% of the workers in CCIs has found their current job through informal methods; which are all through social relationships such as being approached by an employer in a social setting, word of mouth, or directly from a formal colleague, friend, relative or a former employer (2014).

Social capital is also crucial in accumulating information and know-how regarding both the work itself and the dynamics of it as part of the wider industry. Through a research among UK's cultural creative workers on unpaid labour, Siebert and Wilson (2013) have argued with reference to Daskalaki (2010), that social capital is "crucial in recruitment and selection in the creative industries, but also important in career development and knowledge sharing for individuals already in the sector" (p. 2). Especially in the preparation and development stages of cultural creative work, the skills that are passed on through working together is crucial for the wellbeing of a project (Pratt, 2005). On another note, deriving from the same reasons but also the flexibility required in its working conditions, CCIs are highly socialised industries. Even with the apparent entrepreneurial subjectivity present as discussed above, these industries create a terrain on which entrepreneurs have to work in clusters, partnerships and networks not only to accumulate resources but also for mutual support (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999).

Therefore, through the "who you know" attitude present in CCIs as Eikhof & Warhurst (2013) define it (as cited in Siebert & Wilson, 2013), cultural creative workers are faced with a necessity to play active roles in social capital accumulation in order to survive in these industries.

3. DJ'S CREATIVE LABOUR IN CLUB CULTURAL PRODUCTION

3.1. The Scope of The Study

As Hesmondhalgh and Baker summarised (2011), there are three main approaches adopted in the efforts to contextualise creative labour in CCIs: Critical theory approach, governmentality approach, and the liberal-democratic approach. The 'critical theory approaches founded on Marxist notions such as alienation and commodification. This approach analyses the labour conditions through the exploitation faced by the cultural creative workers in CCIs. The 'governmentality approach', also known as the 'Neo-Foucauldian approach', is based on the subjective experiences of cultural creative workers in order to unveil the dynamics of the exploitation in CCIs, as they agree to exist as well. The third approach which is the 'liberal-democratic approach' differs from the first two in that sense, emphasising the autonomy of cultural creative workers in the highly varied job markets in which they choose to be employed.

In the 1940s, especially with the reaction of the musician unions in the USA and the UK to the popularization of recorded music, the phenomenon of 'live music' began to be discussed separately within the music industry. Now, the market share of live music among the whole industry is larger than recorded music (Holt, 2010).

As mentioned before, among the live music genres; electronic dance music⁵ or club music has an important place. As a result of the research conducted by the IMS Industry Report with 18 countries and 19,000 participants in 2019, electronic dance music, which was revealed to be the third most listened music genre, has a great place in the industry in this sense. This type of music, which developed in direct proportion to

⁵ EDM, while it is an abbreviation of electronic dance music, is usually used for the most successfully commercial sub-genre of electronic dance music and therefore the both names will be used accordingly in this study.

technological developments, emerged in the USA in the 1980s and quickly spread to the world (Fritz, 1999).

Differentiating club cultures among live music alternatives such as festivals and concerts; its identification with a subculture. Both the disco, which is the ancestor of this genre; and the 'rave' culture that it evolved in the 1990s; have been very popular among disadvantaged and marginalized groups. Although often associated with drug use, African-American culture and the working class, this phenomenon could not resist the commercialization wave of the 2000s (Brown, 1997).

In the face of such commodification process, which is not surprising due to the nature of what pop music suggests; it will be valuable in this context to examine the production relations of this music genre, which creates itself through its 'alternative' (Taylor, 2015).

In this sense, the existing literature on club cultural production have its roots mainly in Britain and are known as 'post-subculturalist' or 'club cultural studies' (McRobbie, 1993a, 1994b; Miles, 2000; Muggleton, 1997, 1999; Redhead, 1990, 1997; Redhead et. al., 1997; Stanley, 1997; Thornton, 1995; as cited in Wilson, 2002). Therefore, they mainly concentrated around the governmentality approach within cultural studies, where the subjectivities and subjective experiences of DJ's have been studied on the account of their creativities and self-expressions.

As briefly mentioned above, there exists an influential and valuable literature on creative labour in the context of Türkiye as well. Together with comprehensive works that provide literature reviews, critical theories regarding the emergence of a terminology for the forthcoming studies (Kaya, 2016), suggestion papers on the academic implications and governance approaches regarding the rapidly-growing field are present (Yardımcı, 2016; Kaymas, 2019; Kaymas, 2022). Also, policy papers from cultural heritage perspective have appeared as well (Özdemir, 2009; Gülüm, 2015).

Studies aiming to depict the size and internal dynamics of CCIS in Türkiye creates an influential and fertile area of study as well. A study made by Seçilmiş in 2011

has found that the ratio of workforce in CCIs is %2 in Türkiye (p. 13). While it appears to be relatively low, a 2015 dated policy report by UNCTAD has shown that Türkiye is 14th globally in production among creative economy. Şen's study dated the same year has found that the workforce ratio has then increased to %6.4 (as cited in Demir, 2022, p. 235). According to Lazzeretti et. al. (2014); there have been three distinctive studies on CCIs in the three biggest cities of Türkiye: İstanbul (Aksoy & Enlil, 2011), Ankara (Güran & Seçilmiş, 2013) and İzmir (İZKA, 2013). These studies have shown that for the year 2009, especially İstanbul and Ankara provide a valuable potential for CCIs, and their own study has found that the workforce employed in CCIS in the last three years have grown by %38 (ibid., p. 204). The same study has also found a growth of %51 in the music and related industries (ibid., p. 205).

The biggest percentage among CCIS according to these studies are in information technologies, software and computing services; advertising and marketing; and film, TV, video, radio and photography (Yardımcı, 2016, p. 73). Therefore, there seems to be a concentration on related academic studies among the limited studies on CCIs in Türkiye as well (Bulut, 2016; Yörük, 2018), while there are influential studies regarding cultural creative work in digital game industry (Sezgin, 2019), advertising and public relations (Demir, 2018) and more. All of these studies, with the inevitable effect of globalisation and neoliberalism, show that the features of creative labour in CCIs are seen in their Turkish context as well. Just like their global counterparts, Turkish cultural creative workers also adapt to incredibly flexible working conditions (Bulut, 2016; Sezgin, 2019), lack the tools for collective bargaining and action (Yörük, 2018), and are highly individualised (Demir, 2018; Sezgin, 2019). Yörük's study on Turkish scriptwriters also show that a dependence on social networks in both the beginning and following stages of entering these industries are also prevalent and that their rewards in these highly casualised industries are often psychic (2018).

Club cultures and creative labour within them, however, is a fairly under-represented area in its Turkish context. Although there has recently been a growing interest, the existing literature mainly focuses on the audience within the main themes of youth culture, subculture, leisure studies and consumer culture. Additionally, there are

studies in which the DJ is under the lens as the main actor of this culture; however these do not portray the DJ as part of the wider network but examine their musical subjectivities with an ethnographical approach.

Through an extensive research and attempts to consult the officials in Ministry of Treasury and Finance and Ministry of Culture and Tourism, there is unfortunately no recent data on the size of İstanbul's club cultures. However, the data published by the Ministry of Trade in 2016 states that at the time, the number of night clubs in Türkiye was 4.889. Although this data is not specific to İstanbul; in 2012, it was estimated that %50 of the revenue generated in the entertainment sector came from İstanbul (Eder & Öz, 2015). It would be reasonable to assume that this situation persists, if not became even more significant, considering the ratio of cultural and artistic activities in İstanbul to the total of the country as the site of densest concentration of CCIs and related production in Türkiye (Lazzeretti et. al., 2014). Also, Therefore, within its broader context of club-cultural production; İstanbul appears to be fruitful in its rapidly commercialising club scene.

To make up for the lack of data unveiling this situation, an estimation on the subject of venues could be attempted elsewhere. Resident Advisor⁶, a London based electronic music database, has been a source for information since its foundation in 2001. In their website and online application which is commonly used in Türkiye as well; a regional database is provided with information on the upcoming events. When İstanbul is selected, as of April 2023, the number of venues found in the city is 283. While this does not provide a definitive source since not all venues in İstanbul has to be on this database, what it provides us with relative information. In the same database, İzmir and Ankara follow İstanbul with 32 and 15 respectively. In this sense, İstanbul seems to have a similar amount of venues with other European cities such as Prague, Budapest and Manchester; which even in sum do not make up for a third of İstanbul in terms of population. In addition, the amount of “upcoming events” shown for each of the cities mentioned is roughly three times more than of İstanbul.

⁶ See, <https://ra.co>

In the mid 1980s, Türkiye's then prime minister Özal and his government have adopted neoliberal and deregulated economic policies along with a strong conservatism regarding social and educational matters (Arıcan, 2014). This duality, much like the Thatcherite Britain, has resulted in the visibility of youth subcultures and consequently engaged interest from the rapidly growing capital. This era has also saw a boom in tourism, and therefore club cultures were easily and swiftly imported from Europe; especially Germany, Netherlands, and of course United Kingdom (Eder & Öz, 2015). In 2000's, especially in Beyoğlu region and almost exclusively in İstanbul, rave culture has risen to popularity. Bars were replaced with underground clubs and the Turkish middle-class youth has adopted the raver identity (Arıcan, 2003). The beginning of 2000s were the years many international DJ's would play in these clubs which were rapidly increasing and festivals were being held in Türkiye (Demren, 2009, as cited in Özbek & Can, 2020).

The 2010's have seen the rise of pop music, and by the middle of this decade, a sub-genre of electronic dance music known as EDM has emerged as the most popular and commercially succesful among them . Also referred to as EDM pop, this sub-genre was framed as mass culture entertainment and had technical elements and lyrics similar to those of the highest charting pop songs (Holt, 2017). This period resulted in the commercialisation of club cultures globally, and saw a boom in high-end clubs being opened in Türkiye as well. In her 2009 dated book "Club Cultures", Rief has interviewed a club manager from Istanbul who expressed that sponsorship deals with big multinational companies were made and %11 of the total revenue were acquired through these deals, which she argued to be an extremely high percentage (ibid., p. 74). However, this timeframe has abruptly coincided with a turbulent socio-economical phase in Türkiye. The terrorist attacks taking place around Beyoğlu region and the Occupy Gezi movement in 2013, along with the inflation, the decrease in the value of Turkish Lira and tourism has led to a halt in nighttime economy. The tipping point for the already struggling club cultures in Türkiye was the terrorist attack in which 39 people have lost their lives on 01.01.2017 at one of the most famous nightclubs in the country and even the region.

From this point on, most of the long standing clubs were beginning to shut down one by one, or change their concepts into bars and lounges. While there are no statistical data on the subject, the findings section of this study briefly mentions this situation which was experienced first hand by some of the participants, or is known as residents of Istanbul. From then on, a handful of venues owned by media companies or conglomerates have emerged and quickly rose to popularity as they were operating in safe zones such as gated communities, shopping malls or guarded venues outside of the city. These venues also had huge economic advantages as the foreign currencies needed to provide technical equipment, bring international DJ's and carry out marketing costs were too much for the last-remaining independent clubs to handle. With tight security and rising ticket prices, once underground club cultures were threatened to be extremely concentrated in ownership and gatekept by the upper and upper-middle class.

While the political economy of club cultures in Türkiye undergone such shifts, the popularity and commercial success of electronic dance music have increased as it was expressed above. This popularity has resulted in the phenomenon of 'superstar DJ' and along with the technological developments and their availability to larger masses which replaced the vinyl with computers, it resulted in a rapidly increasing interest in DJing (Montano, 2013, p. 113).

The romantic implications of the creativity discourse around musical production has mainly resulted in a focus on the individual artist rather than the production processes and environments of the production itself (Christopherson, 2008). Although the existence of foundational and influential studies mentioned, this phenomenon seems to be prevalent in club cultural studies as well. Therefore, this thesis will employ the critical approach in the sense that creative labour practices cannot be free from the post-Fordist capitalist context in which they operate. However, as the agency and subjectivities of cultural creative workers are often neglected in the critical approach (Garnham, 2000; Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2011), İstanbul-based DJ's subjective experiences will be prioritised as it is with the governmentality approach.

In sum, the aim of this thesis is to understand the elaborate ways in which İstanbul-based DJ's form their relationships with the conditions in which they carry out their creative labour within club cultural production from a critical perspective. While doing so; the main focus will be on their material working conditions under this highly casualised branch of CCIs, the effects of these conditions on their and creative subjectivities, and the role of social capital in the process.

3.2. Methodology

In order to fully capture the nature of its main concerns, this study will adopt a qualitative method based on semi-structured interviews as they appear strong in their ability to create a freedom in narration.

Within this framework, fourteen interviews were done in total, and the interviewees were chosen through the snow-balling method of sampling since age or gender did not play a significant role in the context of this thesis. There were no requirements for a DJ to be involved in this study, other than to mainly reside in İstanbul and to earn/have earned some degree of income through DJ'ing. By implementing these distinctions; the aim was to eliminate DJ's that were outside of the determined scope of this study in terms of space, and make sure they were all subjected to the working conditions of club cultural production.

Before moving on to the contextual questions, interviewees were asked five questions on their demographics and backgrounds that are related to this study. These included: their ages, genders; the amount of time they have been residing in İstanbul, the amount of time they have been DJ'ing in total, and the amount of time they have been getting paid to DJ. The median age of the interviewees was 27.7, with the average time in DJ'ing being 6.1 years and the average time in paid DJ'ing being 4.1 years.

According to the answers they have given to these questions, a table depicting their demographics and backgrounds is shown below.

Interviewee	Age	Gender	Residency In Istanbul	Total time in DJ'ing	Time in Paid DJ'ing
Interviewee 1	28	Man	28 years	10 years	7 years
Interviewee 2	33	Man	33 years	9 years	7.5 years
Interviewee 3	26	Man	9 years	3 years	7 months
Interviewee 4	27	Woman	9 years	5 years	2 years
Interviewee 5	27	Man	27 years	7 years	7 years
Interviewee 6	28	Man	12 years	6 years	5 years
Interviewee 7	31	Man	8 years	8 years	7 years
Interviewee 8	27	Man	8 years	4 years	1.5 years
Interviewee 9	36	Man	36 years	5 years	5 years
Interviewee 10	24	Man	5 years	4 years	10 months
Interviewee 11	29	Woman	7 years	10 years	8 years
Interviewee 12	21	Woman	15 years	5 years	4 years
Interviewee 13	26	Woman	2 years	5 years	2 years
Interviewee 14	26	Woman	3 years	5 years	2 years

Table 3.1. Table of Interviews

The interviews were all done through phone calls and simultaneously written on the computer. They were conducted between the dates of 28.04.2023 and 06.05.2023. The average duration of the interviews was 45.2 minutes, with the shortest of them lasting 25 minutes and the longest 77. The documents containing each interviewee's answers were saved under their interviewee number and therefore completely anonymous. They were all conducted in Turkish and then translated to English. Real names of the persons, clubs and organisation teams mentioned by the interviewees are numbered, such as "Club 1, Person 1, Organisation Team 1, etc." since the study does not focus on individual actors or venues, but rather the whole dynamics of club cultural production in İstanbul. However, in order to not interfere with the narrative, the numbers assigned have been kept the same for each time they were mentioned throughout the entire study.

The questionnaire consisted of twenty open-ended questions. The questions could be gathered under two main themes: Their material working conditions regarding entrance to the scene, bookings, payments and leisure time availabilities; and the subjective relationships they have with their DJ'ing practices, regarding the effects of audience and capital on their creative autonomy, social networks and their goals in the scene. By keeping the questions open-ended and general, the aim was to eliminate any bias and inducement; and therefore allowing the interviewees to narrate their own subjective experiences as freely as possible.

The answers were then read carefully, and common themes emerging were gathered under three main categories. In their depiction, the narrative analysis method was used to ensure revealing their subjectivities.

The first category to emerge among the findings almost completely corresponded to the questions regarding İstanbul based DJ's material working conditions. This section mainly explores the effects of casualisation in club cultural production on DJ's working experiences. The prominent themes under this section are flexibilisation, precarisation, and exploitation which mostly took place through unpaid labour.

The second category gathers around İstanbul based DJ's relationships with the nature of their symbolic production. In this section, the motivation they derive from the creative nature of their DJ'ing practices are explored. On the other hand, the effects of their material working conditions and the dynamics within the club cultural production on their creative autonomy constitutes the second focal point in this category.

While trying to unveil the informalities found in the way İstanbul based DJ's acquire and keep jobs, the effects of social capital and networks has significantly stood out. Therefore, the third category reflects the social networks under which DJ's creative labour practices take place. This category includes both the social networks in which they operate, and they have created for themselves while facing the individualisation they have been subjected to by the highly casualised nature of their labour as it is disclosed under the first category.

3.3. Findings and Discussion

3.3.1. Effects of Casualisation

DJing, like all types of creative labour, presents itself as a profession with self-expressive and self-fulfilling qualities (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999). Because of these qualities, in the highly casualised field of club cultural production, DJs labour practices are highly flexibilised. They do not work through contractual relationships and are not subjected to wage based recruitment styles like in Fordist working models. One of the ways in which this shows itself is that their reliance on multiple job holding in order to survive.

Among the fourteen DJ's who were interviewed as part of this study, almost none of them generated income solely from DJing. As Brophy & De Peuter (2007) argue, short-term and project based working arrangements are taken as granted in CCIs and the workers find themselves obliged to find strategies to combat the insecurities they bring. When asked if they did, Interviewee 14 has said: "There is no way I would be able to. I don't even know anyone who can. Of course⁸ I know there are people that can live by DJ'ing, but I don't have them in my circle" (06.05.2023). Most DJs have stated that what they are getting paid to DJ is usually spent on related expenses, such as license fees for tracks, DJ equipment and softwares.

"What I earn hardly covers the investment I have to do in my music. Because, I can just say candidly, there's nothing wrong with it, I used to download songs illegally up until I began booking gigs.⁷ There amount of brand new tracks I have to download for each set is twenty five to thirty, and each of them cost around 1.5 or 2 Euros. When converted (into Turkish liras), that's a lot of money, but I never wanted to download songs illegally because I have a lot of producer friends as well and that feels disrespectful. So, when I began getting paid, the only thing I can do with that money is to buy licensed tracks" (Interviewee 3, 02.05.2023).

⁷ A term used to refer to a performance by a DJ

In addition, one DJ has went further to express that he sometimes has to spend the income he generates from another job for DJ'ing related expenses. (Interviewee 10, 05.05.2023) To combat this, usually the emerging DJ's who stated to have recently began generating income from DJ'ing have pointed out that they used illegally downloaded softwares and tracks, adding that they would rather not do so. While this phenomenon was not only seen in relatively new DJ's, one of the DJ's with the longest amount of time spent in the profession has stated: "Sometimes when I am preparing for a show I really care about, I ask for the money beforehand so that I can buy tracks. That's what the money will spent on anyways, it's not like I could risk my name by not playing original songs or play something with bad quality and technical issues" (Interviewee 4, 28.04.2023).

It was seen that the multiple jobs held by DJ's varied in terms of industries as well, such as law, education, engineering and so on. However, they were mostly concentrated in CCIs and especially the music industry. The dynamics and reasons of this situation will be analysed in the following section regarding social networks in club cultural production.

The main reason why DJ's find themselves in a position where they have to hold multiple jobs lies in the highly flexibilised working conditions within club cultural production. The insecure working conditions they tend to express are very similar with those of the "freelancers" in CCIs, which make up the majority of cultural creative workers as it was stated before. Freelancing refers to the non-contractual, project based employment with no permanent income and job security. However, in club cultural production, it is hard to define DJ's creative labour under the term "freelancing", simply because the alternative is almost non-existent.

A key strategy for DJ's to combat the insecurities regarding the non-permanency of booking singular gigs and not knowing when to play next, is becoming a "Resident DJ". The term is used to describe DJ's that have apparent ties to a club/venue, or a club brand with multiple venues or festivals. Resident DJ's play in their respective clubs

frequently, usually on the same day of different weeks, or through different agreements such as twice a month. If the DJ has made a name for themselves, they can be a resident of one club and still play in different clubs and festivals. However, for the majority of emerging DJ's, residency means restrictions from playing in different clubs.

On the main features of residency, Interviewee 13 has stated that she used to work as a resident DJ, and found it to be an important experience providing a big advantage in securing a stable income. However, she broke those ties because of her dislike to the commitment and lack of options. She continued with her opinion on why clubs offer residency at the expense of these restrictions with the following words: "There are few clubs in İstanbul, and it's all 'this club versus that club', they just can't get along. When you're a resident, you could be expected to only play there. Even if it's not a direct restriction, it's not something that's welcomed." (ibid., 05.05.2023)

Although having a restricting effect on DJ's decision making processes, residency is desirable among emerging DJ's who seem to be the most vulnerable against the insecure working conditions. Interviewee 8 has voiced that he would very much like to gain a residency from what he saw from his friends who do have that title, adding some clarification on his motivation: "Not only because of the money thing, but you also become someone that can properly say you're a full time DJ" (04.05.2023). However, it's not clear what the term 'full time DJ' connotes, if not the 'money thing' which derives from securing a flow of gigs for a DJ.

One benefit of residency, although seems unique, could be a contractual relationship with the club. Interviewee 4 was the only participant to mention such traditional and Fordist form of employer-employee relationship, stating that she has a residency deal with strict date and timing, and adds: "I even have a contract with them. I know what you think, I know that generally no one has a contract, but it happens if it's such a corporate place" (ibid., 02.05.2023).

To conclude the safety net that is residency, and the cost of it from the DJ's perspective, one DJ has disclosed her own situation with a club she plays at, which she

finds ideal to maintain both the autonomy to choose where she plays and simultaneously generate job security to a degree. “(...) I still haven’t got the residency deal, but at least they can’t interfere with where I play. I still have some days guaranteed to play there though, so it’s a good situation in between” (Interviewee 12, 05.05.2023) In this example however, what is not maintainable is the situation itself.

Among the material working conditions of İstanbul based DJ’s, a very prominent and striking characteristic of creative labour is reverberated in the prevalence of unpaid labour as it considered beneficial among cultural and creative workers to generate the informational, cultural and social capital necessary to exist in these industries (Hesmondhalgh, 2010).

All of the DJ’s that were interviewed have stated that they have played without getting paid at least once, and for the majority it was not limited with once. Although not asked in terms of percentage, two different DJ’s have estimated that they have only been paid for half of the performances in their careers and it was even harder to get paid when they were in the beginning stages of their careers.

Almost all DJ’s have stated that unpaid labour is considered to be the norm for an emerging DJ, and it does not appear to be challenged at all on the account of ‘getting in’ to the creative labour market (Taylor & Luckman, 2020), which Terranova (2000) argues to be a prominent source of revenue generation for the capital. Most İstanbul-based DJ’s have stressed that in the beginning stages of their careers, getting paid seems to be a pleasant surprise.

Interviewee 11 has stated that if the venue did not make enough through ticket sales or bar turnover in a particular club night, the most vulnerable actor is the emerging DJ (05.05.2023). This reasoning seems to be prominent in almost all related responses. On the same topic, Interviewee 13 has said that if the venue has made a loss from a club night, it is the “Opening DJ”⁸ who has to pay the price (05.05.2023). Opening DJ’s, also known as warm-up DJ’s are DJ’s who play first, usually to a very small audience and

⁸ The first DJ to play in an event.

therefore they are almost always the most inexperienced ones among the line up. It's seen as a trial spot for an aspiring DJ.

Reminiscing on a time she did not get paid for a performance in the beginning stages of her career, Interviewee 12 has stated: "(...)When I got off the stage they told me that they did not earn anything. I was just starting out, so I was ready to leave empty-handed" (05.05.2023).

The reasons why an emerging DJ disregards the monetary outcomes and is confident in their unpaid labour usually stems from the expectation of acquiring the desired outcomes in the future. Ball et. al (2008) have found that 42% of newly-graduated individuals have engaged in unpaid labour as an entryway into CCIs, in hopes of securing a permanent job (as cited in Siebert & Wilson, 2013). Therefore, this shows itself in not only the acceptance DJ's show in the face of unpaid labour, but their up-front agreement with engaging in unpaid labour. This phenomenon, named as 'hope labour' refers to such engagement with unpaid labour in hopes of securing a place in the institute or the wider industry and consequently begin earning a monetary return; and is extremely vulnerable in the face of exploitation (Kuehn & Corrigan, 2013). Apart from the prospect of a payment in the future, the DJ's believe they need these 'opportunities' to gain the priceless experience of playing for a crowd. Interviewee 10 has stated that in terms of fees, he is basically playing for free alcohol, "(...) but the real outcome is to learn how to interact with a crowd" (ibid., 05.05.2023). Especially for self-taught DJ's, which appears to be the case majority of the time, being able to play in a real club setting is worth the highly precarious and insecure labour conditions.

Evidently, one of the main aims when engaging with unpaid labour is the value put in gaining experience which would hopefully lead to more stable working conditions (Eikhof & Warhurst, 2013). The emerging and relatively established DJ's alike have pointed out that they somewhat sympathise with the venues for not wanting to pay inexperienced DJ's, and therefore the aim of gaining experience almost exclusively points out to unpaid labour. Similarly, Siebert and Wilson (2013) have found that the majority of cultural creative workers found unpaid labour reasonable, for their benefits can not be acquired elsewhere.

“Some people think you have to be paid even if it’s just a symbolic amount, but most places don’t want to pay inexperienced DJ’s. I used to play without getting paid, or only earning too little. I didn’t complain though, because I preferred learning how to read people, how to play for them (...) because there is no way I could learn how to do that by myself. (...) When you reach a certain level of experience, you can demand getting paid, of course I do that now” (Interviewee 13, 05.05.2023).

As it was discussed above, the prospect of becoming a Resident DJ is also a reason in accepting the insecure labour conditions for an emerging DJ. While expressing the early stages of the relationship with the club he now has a residency, Interviewee 6 has stated: “When I was first playing there, I wouldn’t make much fuss even if they didn’t pay me, or paid too late. I knew that they paid their residents fairly” (04.05.2023).

After all, as it reflects a common phenomenon in cultural creative work, DJ’s have adapted to the insecurities in their working conditions with hopes of eliminating those very same insecurities. However, the degree to which an emerging DJ can endure this period varies, as Interviewee 7 has stated that he played for free for almost a year, but “Most DJ’s don’t make it out of those times” (ibid., 04.05.2023). In the end, the strategies and coping mechanisms adapted by DJ appears vital, as an established DJ has concededly argued. “Each job has its challenges, in the end it comes down to who can outlast that [starting out period]” (Interviewee 2, 28.04.2023).

While as discussed above, holding multiple jobs seems to be a strategy to do so, the pre-existing socio-economical capital is an invaluable lifeline for these DJ’s. The importance of these safety nets in turn, result in a the exclusion of individuals who are not equipped with such capital and consequently a lack of diversity in the field (McRobbie, 2016).

For most of the İstanbul-based DJ’s to have been interviewed within the scope of this study, the effects of flexibilised and insecure working conditions they endure are not limited to the material aspects of their labour. When asked about the features they find the most problematic within their DJ’ing experiences, almost all of them have replied with issues related with their personal lives and health conditions.

They have repeatedly stated problems with their sleep schedule, which seems to be an inevitable outcome of any worker employed in the 'night time economy'. Some DJ's have stated that the lifestyle they have to adapt to as a working DJ has taken a toll on their immune systems and consequently their physical health. As an emerging DJ with a full-time day job, Interviewee 14 has expressed that her weekdays are the calmest and when she can find the time to rest, describing the situation as: "Sometimes I DJ on both Fridays and Saturdays, and on those Sundays I mostly feel like I have caught a cold or something. If I didn't have the time to just lie down and do nothing after I come back from work [during the weekdays], I feel like I could get sick" (ibid., 06.05.2023).

Non-standard and non-routinised work, although a "poster quality" of creative labour, causes the working conditions of cultural creative workers to become their very living conditions (Gill, 2007).

"I'll begin [listing problems] with how tiring night life is, how messed up your sleep schedule becomes. Sometimes I wake up at six in the evening (...) Then there's the alcohol and stuff: no matter how hard you try to keep it under control, sometimes it just gets out of hand and it affects your health. I don't even have the concept of 'going out to have fun' anymore, because fun equals work. Since you always work on the weekends, you can't spend time with your own friends and family, you miss birthdays, special days. It can make you lonelier even though you're always socialising" (Interviewee 1, 02.05.2023).

Apart from the nature of their time spent working, almost all DJ's have also stated that a significant amount of their leisure time is filled with related activities. Most of the DJ's have stated that they allocate at least a couple of hours each day on listening and archiving songs, with one arguing the time spent on practicing equals to each time they hear something" (Interviewee 7, 04.05.2023). For some DJ's who hold multiple jobs, this time usually covered their commuting periods. Still, for the majority, the flexibilisation that presents itself in DJ's work related time usage was highly prominent. "Unfortunately I spend all of my free time [on DJ'ing related practices]. Sometimes I have four to five

sets a week and I have to play a different set each time, it's basically a full time job. People always say 'you work two hours and get paid all that money', but it's never like that. Sometimes I have back to back weeks where I don't even do anything other than playing" (Interviewee 4, 02.05.2023)

In addition to that, a few DJ's have implied that their insecure working conditions are sometimes could be understood too literally. " There was this one place I played at for a short amount of time. (...) In the one week I played there, there were three different fights. One guy was wounded even" (Interviewee 9, 05.05.2023).

These insecure working conditions presenting itself in both material and immaterial aspects, in turn, play a role in some DJ's not wanting to commit to the profession as a main source of income. On this topic, Interviewee 5 has stated to believe that DJ'ing in such manner would require complete devotion in terms of both the time going into finding jobs, and adapting one's lifestyle and values (03.05.2023). He has added: "That would be harder than any nine to five job because you don't have a sleep schedule, you don't have a weekend off, you have to work when everyone you know is out having fun." (ibid.)

Interviewee 3 has also expressed that he would not want to quit his main job in law, and become a full time DJ on account of the difficulties he perceives to exist within the profession. "I am a realist, I know a lot of people who earn their sole income from DJ'ing and I know really well that reaching that point is extremely hard. Even if you do reach that point, it's still extremely hard to continue. (...) When you look from the outside you think they have made a name now, and they must be earning pretty good. But the reality is not like that, even for the most professional ones" (ibid., 02.05.2023).

There is a prominent degree of individualisation in the creative labour of DJ's, as it is with all types of labour under CCIs. The emphasis put on the self-expressive cultural and creative worker results in a necessity of becoming entrepreneurial subjects for these workers (Christopherson, 2008). However, the relentless degree of competition in

İstanbul's club cultural production and informal working conditions seem to force İstanbul-based DJ's to become individualised, self-entrepreneurial subjects.

As it was stated before, the exact number of clubs and venues in İstanbul is unknown. However, the aforementioned effects of concentration and contextual challenges on the survival of İstanbul clubs have been expressed by the participants of this study as well. A majority of the DJ's interviewed have voiced that the fewness of clubs and venues in İstanbul results in a situation where too many DJ's are "fighting over spots in too few places" (Interviewee 6, 04.05.2023).

As it was shown before in this study, it could be argued that the concentration of club cultural production in Türkiye points to İstanbul by a considerable margin, especially with the picture depicted by event databases such as Resident Advisor. However, the website only shows the events promoted by established and somewhat corporate venues concerned with professional visibility, and the upcoming events are usually those with an international or established local headliner DJ with similar motivations. This star system in club cultural production, in Rief's words, create a "minority of DJ's who generate the most revenue and resource; while the majority of emerging local DJ's are bound to work under highly casualised conditions" (2009, p. 61). Therefore, the events with strict ticket prices which are usually subjected to the concentration in club cultural production appear to be few in İstanbul, and the DJ's who fail to secure spots in these events have to find work in other venues, which usually have looser policies.

These loose policies usually paint the picture that was described above, where the emerging DJ's have to work through a percentage of the revenue generated by the club, rather than a set fee. Apart from the arbitrary material conditions apparent in such policies, the situation does create a setting in which DJ is pitted against DJ, and is highly individualised in their creative labour. One of the main characteristics of this situation is the lack of collective action in club cultural production.

Ursell (1998) stresses that perhaps the most challenging aspect of the individualisation which emerged as a result of decentralisation in CCIs for the cultural creative worker, is the dismissal of collective bargaining and unionisation. While there exists several unions for workers in the music and entertainment industries, none of the DJ's interviewed within the scope of this study has stated to have a membership to any union related to their creative labour. A possible reason for the lack of interest in unionisation among İstanbul-based DJ's could be understood through the fact that the term 'musician', as it is almost exclusively used in any union related discourse and policies, has never came up in any of the interviews within the scope of this study. In fact, Interviewee 13 has mentioned a dissatisfaction in the lack of interest in collective bargaining, both through the absence of unionisation and the responsive measures that could be taken by individual DJ's themselves (05.05.2023). "We don't have a union like the DJ's in Berlin, so maybe we should ask for contracts insistently. But since no one does it, it feels really absurd to ask for it" (ibid.)

One of the prominent benefits unionisation provides for DJ's, the ability to require a written contract does work as a combatting strategy for the informalities and precarious labour conditions they engage in. However, as mentioned above, contractual relationship is a very rare phenomenon in club cultural production that is not guaranteed even in the most prestigious events. In addition, perhaps consequently, several DJ's have stated to find it 'useless'. What Interviewee 12 has voiced on the matter makes up for an abstractor of these two conditions: "I have played at Festival 1, even they did not make a contract. I guess there is no need, as long as I can get paid. If they don't want to pay you, they will find a way not to" (ibid., 05.05.2023)

However internalised the constancy in their seemingly hopeless insecurities, one relatively established DJ has voiced a bold concern which goes out to show just how low some perceive their working conditions to be in club cultural production.

"Contracts can be made with really corporate venues, (...) but it's such a vague one, and really outdated. Still, I would prefer it to be done everywhere. It's not only about the material conditions, a lot of bad things can happen to a DJ. The problems keep

increasing, you could even get killed for not playing a song someone has requested. I know it's sounds extreme but unfortunately it's not something that never happens, so I would ideally make a contract considering what my loved ones will go through.” (Interviewee 1, 28.04.2023)

Another distinct outcome of the individualisation in club cultural production is found within the DJ's commence of any risks and responsibilities related to their creative labour. As Beck (2000) argues, in post-Fordist production, the risk and responsibilities of the capital are transferred to the entrepreneurial workers themselves. As it was mentioned above, the majority of DJ's have incarnated the exploitative nature of their production at the expense of the competition in the industry. As part of her response to whether or not she has engaged in unpaid labour, Interviewee 13 has argued: “(...) It's not like they [clubs] can pay everyone, without having secured any revenue yet” (05.05.2023).

The risky nature of creative labour in CCIs is evidently high, and perhaps even higher in club cultural production. Especially in the Turkish scene, the challenges implemented on the club owners through currency rates, high taxes and rents are seen as “unfair burdens that need to be shared” by the DJ's (Interviewee 2, 28.04.2023). In this sense, the responsibilities and risks DJ's are subjected usually stem from the amount of revenue generated from a club night. Several DJ's have disclosed that some clubs asked them ‘how many people they could bring’, and they knew that this usually meant if the revenue was low, they would not get paid. Most DJ's who were relatively established saw this as a ‘red flag’ and did not continue working with these clubs if they have the chance. Some emerging DJ's have voiced that they make such efforts to a degree, and one even mentioned an incident where he was called by the club manager right before a show he was going to play. “(...) They were like, ‘do you think you can bring some more guests that would drink? It seems like we won't be able to pay if it continues like this.’ (...) Luckily I already had my friends coming for a birthday, so we had no problem with the alcohol part” (Interviewee 8, 04.05.2023).

While the role of DJ's social capitals and networks will be detailed in the following sections of this study, this situation was found significant in its ability to unveil the structural risks placed upon individuals in club cultural production. Still, at its highest, the lengths of responsibility implemented on DJ's shoulders in terms of the club's revenue generation, raises some objections.

"Just the other day, we had a serious argument with a place and they have banned us from playing there anymore. (...) To a place that is usually completely empty, we have attracted like fifty guests, just from what I know. Their bar has had turnout like never before, and they paid us a mocking amount, saying that they didn't have any in the register. (...) It's a joke" (Interviewee 12, 05.05.2023).

The most depreciable of the responsibilities DJ's have to bear however, occurs when the expectations try to interfere with their creative autonomy. "I had a place tell me they would not pay me because I did not play the genre they wanted and people have left the club because of it" (Interviewee 9, 05.05.2023).

Most DJ's stated that the insecurities and poorness of working conditions they experience, or have experienced in the beginning stages of their careers, were in the name of creating better portfolios. Sennett (1998) expresses that the new organisational forms in the new economy "aim to make entrepreneurs out of all of the workers (ibid., 252). The majority of them seem to put a significant amount of importance in curating a portfolio that would in turn help them advancing to the next stages of their careers, where they would secure a steadier gig flow and better conditions in their creative labour.

It is gathered that what seems as the most valuable asset in a DJ's portfolio is to play in the same line up as an international headliner. They believe if they associate themselves with well-known DJ's, they gain prestige and bargaining power. This is true to a degree, as we see in the statement of Interviewee 11 when describing a situation where she did not find a fee offer from a club satisfactory: "I had a mutual friend call them and say, 'do you not know that she played with International DJ 1? That [fee you offered her] is not acceptable!' They immediately called me back, apologising"

(05.05.2023). Similarly, different DJ's have expressed that after they have played with international headliner, they experienced a serious increase in gig offers.

However, as Interviewee 5 has suggested, it does not exclusively guarantee the elimination of exploitation. "I have played with the biggest names in the global scene, International DJ 2, International DJ 3, you name them... Still, I can't get paid sometimes" (03.05.2023). In order to secure agency in their own creative labour; a DJ also needs to add playing in prestigious clubs to their portfolio, and the importance put on such feature often leads them to completely disregard any monetary outcome altogether, as it was discussed above. So much so that, even the most established DJ's who were interviewed for this study have expressed to acknowledgedly engage in unpaid labour.

"I have played in Festival 2 for completely free, because I have never played in a festival before and it was bothering me at this point in my career. (...) I don't want anyone to know this, but you said you won't use my name. (...) I had friends staying near, so at least I didn't have to pay for accomodation on top of that" (Interviewee 6, 04.05.2023).

3.3.2. Creativity and Self-Expression

While seemingly trying to escape the irregularities in their work patterns and payments through enriching their portfolio with such features, almost all DJ's have voiced to perceive "making it" in the industry through non-material conditions. As it is an eminent reality of labour in CCIs, creative labour is compensative through psychic income and self-expressivity (Fleming, 2009).

Evidently, when asked about their favourite aspects related to their DJ'ing experience, all İstanbul-based DJ's interviewed have revealed concepts regarding the relationship they have with the audience. Within the scope of this study, interviewees were never asked if their DJ'ing mainly based on producing or mixing, since the main concern is whether or not they played live in front of a clubbing crowd. As the answers show, the nature of their creative production does not interfere with the relationship they create with their audience.

All DJ's have expressed that the audience plays a key role in their motivation to carry out in this occupation. Differing from a 'concert' as we know it, live electronic dance music production is not presented by the DJ to the audience, but rather is created with them. In fact, some of the DJ's have used this term themselves, voicing to believe that the audiences attend electronic dance music events as a meditation, and the DJ's role was to guide them in this process (Interviewee 13, 05.05.2023) To refer to their creative production on the stage, most use the term 'dialogue', and believe it to be the foremost aspect that makes or breaks a club night. The dialogue mentioned here is of course almost completely non-verbal, while the verbal interactions with their audiences during a club night or on social media are prized by the DJ's, the aura they share during a set is paramount.

"When I look up from the booth and see people enjoying themselves, dancing, that is the highlight. It gives you the ultimate motivation, it just gives you life" (Interviewee 3, 02.05.2023).

On the same topic, Interviewee 1 has also expressed a similar infatuation with an audience he can create a dialogue with. "While playing, you plan some moments in your head. You're like 'I'll just drop that beat there, and the crowd will go crazy.' You basically plan the emotions in a moment and when it happens exactly as you think, when you get that exact reaction, (...) that's when it's worth it. (...) Unfortunately, the youth have terrible lives in this country, even the rich ones. I think we all deserve to have fun" (28.04.2023).

While the highlight of their performance, and the sole motivation to accept the insecure conditions in which they carry out their symbol making, an audience that responds to them is the lifeline for a DJ. Their own efforts in ensuring the flow of this dialogue is also seen as a crucial aspect of their creative labour. This process is called 'crowdreading', and almost all DJ's have expressed that it is an essential feature of a 'good DJ'.

All of the DJ's who were interviewed, when asked about the measures they would take in order to please a particular crowd, have answered that it is their 'job' to do so. They have stated that the crowd can differ according to the club, the concept of the whole night, or just a particular date. They find crowdreading and reacting develops them as a DJ, sometimes even as a person.

"Sometimes it just doesn't go the way you planned, the crowd just don't want what you're doing. They want [in BPM] lower, faster, [in style] more melodic, darker; and you have to understand, make critical decisions and adapt in half a second. I even think being able to do that has an effect on my social skills in daily life as well" (Interviewee 1, 28.04.2023)

To be able to adapt so quickly, most DJ's have stated that they always bring extra tracks to a performance and the importance of a full and rich archive shows itself here. One of the interviewees have expressed that she brings five times more tracks than she can possibly play in one night, just to feel "completely in control" (Interviewee 11, 28.04.2023)

For the emerging DJ's who usually play in the opening slot of the line-up, as discussed above, crowd control is of utmost importance and consequently problematic. They usually begin playing to an empty place, as the club gets more crowded, they have to adapt and make sure no one leaves since they are generally seen as in being 'trial spots' by the club or organisation authorities. As an emerging DJ with a relatively short amount of time in the profession

Interviewee 10 has commented on the levels of responsibility he feels about crowdreading.

"When I begin, there are usually like five to ten people. We create a situation where everything goes well, but then some other people come in with a completely different vibe. (...) I have to constantly check how everyone feels, but it's really hard when they keep coming in and going out to have a smoke, or just talk. (...) If it's a

thousand people, no one notices a few people leaving. When it's fifteen and five of them leave, I just turn red" (05.05.2023).

All in all, most DJ's have spoken about considering such efforts to make sure their audiences respond to them welcomed, as long as they do not move out of their general genre. Since there are an enormous number of genres to name, it could be said that varieties in sub-genres are deemed acceptable and reasonable.

However, not all audiences and not every request by even the 'right audience' can find a compensative response from the DJ's. What makes an audience 'not right' in this sense, is described by all of the DJ's with similar concepts regarding the lack of a primary interest in the music being played.

Although most DJ's added that their aim was not to judge these crowds, their disinterest in the music is a de-motivating factor for the DJ as their sole duty there is to play it. Almost all of the DJ's who spoke of such indifference from the audience stated that it effects them poorly. "These people [in the audience] wouldn't even know the genre that's being played. They only know what drug they're on, or who they're flirting with. That really baffles me" (Interviewee 12, 05.05.2023).

When asked to elaborate on the dynamics and reasonings of this phenomenon, several points were made by İstanbul-based DJ's. The first among them, was the popularisation of club cultures on social media. Although they believe it to be a positive denominator in the increase of opportunities for themselves, as the amount of revenue generated and consequently the events are growing, most DJ's have stated to see a degeneration in the crowds. "They're just there for Instagram, taking photos and videos with their flashes on. Imagine doing that in Berlin, they would kick you right out" (Interviewee 6, 04.05.2023).

While hand in hand with the same phenomenon, another aspect of this degeneration is the excessive drug use associated with club cultures. Although not planned to be detailed within the scope of this thesis, several DJ's have stated that the

drug use, especially among the youth has been triggered by the apparent association in the media and has a deteriorating effect on the integrity of club cultures. “Whenever I see a clubbing related post on Instagram, there’s always a drug association: whether it be some beautiful women doing coke, or the lyrics themselves have ecstasy in them. When the new [to the scene] people see it, they think ‘oh, this must be what this culture means.’ That messes with the quality of the audience” (Interviewee 1, 28.04.2023).

Although being a source of de-motivation in their creative production, most DJ’s were not able to offer a quick solution for this situation, as they believed the restrictive door policies to be another problem in İstanbul’s club scene, and what they found deficient was an educated crowd who would ‘get it’. As Wilson (2002) argued with reference to Thornton’s (1995) influential work, since club cultures are often a terrain of generation and sharing of subcultural capital, ‘authenticity’ appears to be a prominent debate in the sense that a hierarchy of taste is present. While several DJ’s have expressed that the clubs knowingly cater to the likes of these degenerate crowds, they believe this attitude to stem from their obligation to generate revenue. “(...) The clubs want these people who only come for the things they have seen on social media, because they’re the ones with money to spend on tickets, on alcohol. Even the best clubs have to depend on them” (Interviewee 4, 02.05.2023). Therefore, as Christopherson (2008) argue, the problematic aspects of the environment in which they carry out their creative labour are imposed on the ‘consumer’, rather than the regulations of the market itself.

However, there have been a few who spoke of door policies they have found beneficial in this context, like asking people who they have come to see and what their favourite tracks in the genre are (Interviewee 2, 28.04.2023), but that seemed problematic as well since the clubs responsible for the door policies prioritise revenues, and most of the events work with ticket purchases anyways (Interviewee 1, 28.04.2023).

On the same topic, summarizing both the reasons and the effects of these conditions on DJ’s creative labour, Interviewee 1 has said the following: “Since it genuinely has an effect on how I play, I would really like stricter door policies to ensure they’re [audience] actually here for me, or at least another DJ in the line up. But there

are too few places and they believe they wouldn't survive if they didn't filtering like that" (28.04.2023).

Another DJ has expressed that she feels 'empty' playing to a crowd that is not there for her music, adding it could be understood even from what the members of the audience are wearing (Interviewee 4, 02.05.2023). The feeling of emptiness derived by playing for a crowd that is indifferent to the culture, is found to be rooted in the commercialisation of the scene, and the worry of 'selling out' when adapted to (Rief, 2009, p. 62).

This concern of 'selling out' was apparent in other DJ's interviewed as well, with few of them expressing that "DJ'ing with a 9 to 5 job mentality would kill the passion" (Interviewee 5, 03.05.2023). Interviewee 6 has also implied that trying to accommodate to the needs of the market both creatively and as on an employer basis would alienate him to his own symbol making practices (04.05.2023). "This is not something you do for the money, constantly trying to overwork yourself in shitty places just to stay relevant, (...) having men that know nothing about this music to tell you what to play. Or it could be, if you have like a family to feed from DJ'ing. [Laughs.]" (ibid.)

It seems apparent that İstanbul-based DJ's attribute de-alienating nature of their work to the creative autonomy in the lack of a revenue concern. Therefore it could be argued that the DJ's mostly perceive their audiences as almost an equal party in their club cultural labour, and do not consider the effects imposed by them upon their symbol making practices to be a threat to their creative autonomies. However, DJ's exist within production relations where they are not free from profit related sensitivities of the clubs they work in (Taylor, 2002). and there is another actor in club cultural production with a potential for the said threat: the club, or the organisation team which acts as the spokespeople of the club.

A considerable amount of İstanbul-based DJ's interviewed within the scope of this study has said that they have faced with such comments throughout their career, especially in the beginning stages. Interviewee 1 has stated, although he adds that he is

now beyond that point in his career: “I’m certain that every club in İstanbul interferes with what the DJ’s playing, even if it’s done in a subtle way or straight-up rudely” (ibid., 28.04.2023). Another DJ has stated that if the organization is not ticketed, and therefore considered relatively unprofessional, it is a common situation for the club authorities to try and have a say on DJ’s playing practices, “as if they know any better” (Interviewee 9, 05.05.2023).

After having faced such occurrences, most of the relatively established DJ’s interviewed have tried to adopt measures to combat any meddlings. The most common strategy by far is to associate themselves with a DJ collective, as it will be discussed in the following section extensively.

Several DJ’s have also stated that they try to make sure such interferences will not take place by speaking to the club representatives beforehand and making sure. “I always speak with the manager or whoever’s in charge before I say yes to a deal, just to make sure that there are no inducements later on. (...) Still, it happened once in Club 1. But I didn’t act defensive, because I know the owner, I know they mean well” (Interviewee 13, 05.05.2023)

Similarly, most DJ’s have expressed that if a relationship based on mutual trust exists between themselves and the club, they find some level of interference on their creative labour reasonable. However, for this to be the case, the DJ’s interviewed have to perceive the adaptations they are expected of as in the name of creating a better club night experience. This usually happens when the club is well-established and has its own distinctive audience. “Each club has a sound, a vibe they have to carry out. In order to make sure they protect whatever it is that they’re associated with, they have to interfere with the sets at some points” (Interviewee 3, 02.05.2023).

Another effect on the acceptance of such interventions on the DJ’s club cultural production occurs when the DJ is playing in a line-up outside of the headliner spot. Most DJ’s believe they have to adapt their sets accordingly, and when they are perceived to have failed, the club is somewhat relatively welcomed to comment on it. Although stating

that they usually try to take necessary precautions to make sure there is a coherency between each set, there are times when they don't know what will be played later on in the night and consider related direction beneficial. Their justification here usually lies within the coherency itself, but also the fact that playing with an established headliner DJ is considered beneficial. On this topic, Interviewee 13 has stated: "Of course it's fine [when the club interferes with what I play], it's not like I could bring such a big audience by myself. I wouldn't be able to play to them if it wasn't for the headliner" (05.05.2023).

Still, most DJ's who perceive no problem with the discussed phenomenon find it annoying when the interference happens outside of these situations. From the answers of the interviewed DJ's, it was gathered that the arrangement process of gig deals made between clubs and DJ's have two types. First of them is prevalent among established DJ's, and occurs when the club contacts the DJ, already knowing their sound and style. This kind could be taken as a minority among all types of deals taking place in club cultural production. The second and more common type occurs when the DJ sends an exemplary set to the managers or portfolios including the events they have played at before. This could happen independently of the fact that which party has reached the other first, meaning that even if the club has contacted the DJ to play, the DJ would still provide these. For most DJ's, comments made by the club at this point are welcomed, even found pleasant. "You don't always know the DJ that's playing after [you], or they don't always play in the same manner. Some places try to handle this situation and tell you the tempo beforehand. (...) I find that very professional, no one likes to go play blindly" (Interviewee 11, 05.05.2023).

Therefore, in the case where there is no headliner DJ or an established club with its own crowd; most DJ's perceive any comment on their sets unwelcomed and find it to be a hinderence on the trust established between themselves and the club. "It's weird when they ask you to turn down the BPM, or chill down, because they should've known how I play. It's obvious what each DJ plays if you just listen to their sets, so it's like, why did we come to an agreement in the first place" (Interviewee 5, 03.05.2023).

On the same topic of trust, Interviewee 1 has also stated a similar effect. “I know that it’s hard to trust any DJ now, because there are so many. (...) Just don’t let people you don’t trust play then” (28.04.2023).

While the sudden and unwelcomed interferences outside of pre-made arrangements are perceived to be threats to the DJ’s autonomy in their creative labour, established DJ’s seem to have created a situation for themselves where they can afford to raise objections.

“ If they haven’t told you anything beforehand and just send someone to the stage to tell you to slow down, that’s just disturbing. They don’t even know what they’re saying most of the time. (...) I used to really take it to heart, get upset, but now I’m at a point where no one can tell me that. Because I would tell them that I won’t change anything” (Interviewee 4, 02.05.2023).

Emerging DJ’s, however, are more vulnerable in the power relations of club cultural production as usual. Some interviewees have voiced that they have faced or are still facing various different situations in the early stages of their career; where they were asked to play the same track over and over again because it’s the favourite of the owner (Interviewee 10, 05.05.2023), comply with the audience’s song requests in completely different genres such as rap (Interviewee 9, 05.05.2023), or most strikingly, their USB stick containing the tracks they were playing were replaced by the club owners during the set (Interviewee 12, 05.05.2023). Interviewee 9, who holds a different full time job has added: “I do this as a hobby anyway, if anyone interferes with what I should play or how I should play it, I’m out of that place” (05.05.2023).

Emerging DJ’s with a motivation in advancing in this career, however, seem to accept most inducements for their usual motivations: displaying flexibility and easygoingness in order to secure a place and settle in this highly competitive scene as the capital expects from them in extreme amounts (Gill, 2007).

3.3.3. Role of Social Capital and Networks

Within the context of this research, the only question regarding the importance of the social capitals of İstanbul-based DJ's were asked on account of unveiling the informalities in DJ's processes of attaining gigs. As it is a common phenomenon among cultural creative workers' pathways into CCIs, social networks provide invaluable benefit when entering a job (Murdock, 2003). In regard to the situation in club cultural production however, it was quickly understood that social capital had a more significant and wide-reaching role.

When asked about their entryways into DJ'ing, almost all participants have stated that both their interest in club cultures and DJ'ing emerged within their social environments. Nightlife and club cultures are exceptionally social in the way that the aura in which they seem to create is a result of a collective process. While several DJ's have claimed to be self-taught, most expressed that they have learned the profession from their friends or relatives as well, and used their equipments or studios until they could afford their own. This goes out to prove the importance of social capital in the generation of 'know-how' in creative labour (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999). In addition to that, a majority of İstanbul-based DJ's interviewed within the scope of this study have started playing in parties and gatherings in their own social circles.

Following these experiences, during the advancement into playing in front of club audiences, almost all DJ's have stated to benefit from their social networks as well. To the question asking their perceptions on the importance of this notion, all DJ's without any exception have stated that for a DJ, social capital has a key significance. Evidently, Interviewee 7 has expressed the following on the topic: "The effect is major. The most important thing, period. Your first gig always comes through a friend. It goes on like this even when you've established yourself in this industry" (ibid., 04.05.2023). Discussing the process in which they have began getting paid for their creative labour in club cultural production, all the other interviewees as well have stated that it came to be through their

social networks, with one adding: “For someone who is just starting out, being social is as important as the music” (Interviewee 5, 03.05.2023).

Yet, for emerging and established DJ alike, the same interviewee has expressed that the importance is almost the same in its fundamentality. “Being a DJ is not making good music only. You can be great in the music that you do, but if you don’t know anyone you can’t expect to be booked. You’ll just play at home” (ibid.).

The reason why almost all DJ’s have to consider the accumulation of social capital as part of their creative labour has also lot to do with acquiring their own crowd. This could be argued as a reality most prevalent in CCIs that are interconnected with artistic production primarily. However, as it was discussed above, the mere product of the DJ’s creative labour; whether it be a set or a song produced, is not free from the dialogue between the DJ and the audience. Therefore, for the DJ’s interviewed within the scope of this study, engaging with the crowd socially is of utmost importance.

“This DJ’ing thing won’t work without securing a crowd that will be there for you. (...) You have to be social, you have to look them in the eye. Some people only come because they love your energy, you have to make sure they become permanent. (...) You also generate a crowd outside [at the door or smoking area], it’s very important to create good communication there, I’m all for not being a killjoy, being sincere. Because then the people will get excited for your next show, thinking that they know the DJ” (Interviewee 4, 02.05.2023).

This importance of the manners in a DJ’s social skills sometimes leads to a necessity of calculated socialising. Several DJ’s have stated that they do not leave the club after they have completed their sets even in the state of exhaustion, because “not engaging in conversation with the audience would be considered rude” (Interviewee 1, 28.04.2023).

Another aspect of this orchestrated socialisation is visible in the social media presence, of İstanbul-based DJ’s. Holt (2017) has similarly argued that the rising

popularity of electronic dance music has resulted in the appearance of the “digital realm as a new source of revenue for the live music industry” (p. 10). The only medium mentioned by name in regard to this situation was Instagram. While apparent in both established and emerging DJ’s, the importance is more vital for the latter as per usual. With no other indicator that they can attract people to a club, the clubs seem to rely on their social media followings to ensure a revenue. One DJ with a relatively long time spent in the industry has stated that “No one would book someone new with 100 followers” (Interviewee 6, 04.05.2023).

Still, for an established DJ as well, the numbers on their social media accounts are part of the job, extending the flexibilisation of their creative labour to their presence on said media. Several DJ’s have expressed that in the process of securing a deal with a club, their Instagram usernames in particular have been asked or checked. On this topic, one DJ has stated that some clubs still care about these numbers even when they’re sure that the DJ can attract an audience. “It’s not a big community, so the reaction you get [from the clubs] with a 500 followers is completely different than when you have 5000. The only reason here is the concern for revenue. Or sometimes the club knows that all 500 hundred of your followers will come, but still not let you play there just to not associate their names with a DJ who only has 500 followers” (Interviewee 1, 28.04.2023).

A few DJ’s have also voiced that the numbers are not enough, and they have to interact with their audience on social media as part of the process in which they secure their crowds, as mentioned above. “Even if you are known by your name, people still want to add you on Instagram and talk to you before the show, asking what you will play, or whatever. (...) You have to reply, they don’t like it when you try to dismiss them. It’s not like you’re International DJ 4” (Interviewee 5, 03.05.2023).

After all, most İstanbul-based DJ’s consider the management of their social media presence as part of the job, and spend an amount of energy and material resources to enhance its effect. Only few of them has stated to hire professionals to do it for them, while most did it themselves. Among these, the majority have expressed to not enjoy

doing it, but realised to be an obligation and felt inclined to go the necessary lengths. “I didn’t even have an [Instagram] account before. Now I know how to edit videos, how to post geo-targeted ads, I even got a new phone because the camera quality of the last one I had was shitty” (Interviewee 14, 06.05.2023).

While there are signs of an orchestrated or at least calculated nature in İstanbul-based DJ’s socialising practices, most of their circles have consisted of club-goers, club managers or fellow DJ’s anyways. This naturally occurring fact provides benefits for the DJ’s as well for the very same reasons. As mentioned above, several DJ’s especially in the earlier stages of their careers have disclosed stories in regard to the expectations club have of them in terms of attracting guests. It could be argued that their pre-existing social capital is also transferable into economic capital, or at least the prospect of it. “I think knowing a lot of people is really important. Especially if you’re an opening DJ as I am, you can show the club that it’s you who fills there so early in the night” (Interviewee 12, 05.05.2023).

All in all, the importance of social capital for the DJ and consequently the constancy with which they have to take it into account could be seen clearly from a quote by Interviewee 7. “Your connections are your markets, really. (...) The people in this scene are usually very young and this lifestyle gets tiring easily, so there’s a chance you won’t see the same people next year. To last [in this scene], you have to socialise constantly” (04.05.2023).

As several DJ’s have voiced, and it was tried to be expressed above, the fewness in İstanbul’s clubs and the relative numerousness in İstanbul based DJ’s and aspiring DJ’s seem to have created a highly competitive terrain. The high levels of competition in the scene accounts for a reality where the social capital which a DJ accumulates is almost always transferred into economic capital. The established DJ’s are usually the ones with the highest amount of social and economic capital, and they have a degree of autonomy over who can enter the scene by making recommendations. “If you ask me, there are not too many big names in the scene, and they always want their own contacts

to play. Which is natural, it's the same in Europe as well. It's just that there are too few of them here, so it's heightened here" (Interviewee 3, 02.05.2023).

In this highly casualised and commercialised field that is club cultural production, the working conditions of İstanbul-based DJ's are full of insecurities and highly precarious. With the individualisation brought by these high levels of competition just mentioned, DJ's seem to have been stripped of a believe and act in collective action in its traditional form. However, they have adopted a similar combatting strategy in 'Collectives.'

A collective, as it was understood in the context of interviews made within the scope of this study, refers to a group of DJ's who have ties to each other in engaging with their creative labour in club cultural production. While the arrangements and sanctions vary, their operation mechanism could be generally described as per Interviewee 3: "There is this really professional team I sometimes play with. They first plan a concept for a night, book the headliner, and make a deal with a club for that date. Then they design the poster, announce everything on social media, and just fill the empty slots with their DJ's. (...) Or if they're trusted enough by the club, they sometimes book a night just for their DJ's. That usually happens on Wednesdays or Thursdays though. (...) When the night is over, they get the money from the club, and just give our shares" (02.05.2023).

While this description appears similar to what the booking manager of a club, or an organiser does; the main difference here is that the collectives are consisted solely of DJ's themselves.

Among the participants, only several have stated to be tied to a collective, although some of them were not entirely sure about what it meant. "I guess I am. I mean, there are people that I regularly play with, and they have a brand. (...) But I'm only just friends with them, really. I don't do anything for them" (Interviewee 8, 04.05.2023). In fact, almost all the collectives claimed to be a part of by the DJ's interviewed, have shown similarity in the sense that they do not expect anything from the DJ's apart from only playing. Interviewee 7, who has his own collective, has stated that the main aim of a

collective is to “see you and your clan booked and held on to the market somehow” (04.05.2023).

Evidently, most DJ’s have stated that the main motive they have for joining a collective is being able to book more gigs. Differing from residency, collectives usually do not claim exclusivity in a sense which would deprive the DJ from options of playing elsewhere and protects their autonomy in their decision making process. In this sense, Interviewee 11 has stated that a DJ in a collective “basically just gets more gigs as an independent DJ” (05.05.2023). Interviewee 14 has also stated the reason why she would like to tie herself to a collective is being able to secure herself by a more stable schedule of gigs. “It’s hard to find a spot in a line-up, there’s just too many lobbying. (...) I would like to make sure I can play every week of course” (06.05.2023).

Another prominent benefit of a collective for the DJ is the relative guarantee in getting paid stemming from the relationships of mutual trust these collectives are usually founded on. Regarding this topic, Interviewee 3 has expressed: “In this scene everyone is so frivolous and everything is so unstable. (...) When I played with Collective 1 for one time, they were really professional throughout. They told me about the whole DJ equipment, the exact set time, and fee. When I was done with my set, they have immediately paid me. (...) That was the safest I have ever felt playing” (02.05.2023).

Deriving from the apparent issues between the capital owners and the DJ’s for the reasons which have been mentioned throughout this study, most DJ’s have stated a distaste in dealing with related matters. A collective is expressed to provide a safety net in this sense as well.

“When I first started playing, I had several bad experiences. I couldn’t get paid, I had the club owners interfering with what I played. They [friends from a collective] told me that if I worked with them, I could play whatever I wanted” (Interviewee 4, 02.05.2023).

While deemed beneficial in terms of the elimination of aforementioned risks in İstanbul-based DJ's creative labour practices, collectives are not antipodally different in the sense that they still need one or more DJ's within who concentrates the social and therefore economic capital in their hands. Through the extensivity of their social networks; these DJ's are the ones to book sought after headliners, book a club and then create the rest of the dynamics of a club night. Therefore, it is their existence that ensures any gigs and the opportunities they create for the other DJ's in the collective. This, in turn, reproduces the conditions in which DJ's knowingly engage in unpaid labour to develop their portfolios once again. "When Collective 2 called me after seeing my set in Club 2, I didn't even ask if they were going to pay me. (...) I see their names everywhere, they must be doing something right" (Interviewee 10, 05.05.2023).

On this feature, Interviewee 12 has stated that the reason why she gladly accepted the opportunity to play with a collective for free was similar in the nature that she prioritised her self-entrepreneurialism: "By that point, I've been playing in the same club for a long time, and they have never made me play with an international headliner. That won't add anything to my portfolio. (...) So it's easier to reach that position and create networks with international DJ's [in a collective]" (05.05.2023).

On top of that, it was stated that collectives that operated with a protective mentality in İstanbul are rare. "Good collectives are no more than the fingers of a hand. Most of them are just people with some money, they invest some in a club and make their irrelevant friends play. (...) Even Club 1 allows this" (Interviewee 1, 28.04.2023). On this account, it was seen that there are a few DJ's who did not get paid as they hoped even through these collectives; and had to become even more flexibilised in their creative labour.

The reason for the latter stems from the multiple jobs held within the supposed safety net itself then, forcing emerging DJ's to try and engage in different roles for the collective in order to strengthen their position inside as Banks (2007) argues: "Being flexible essentially means that one must do whatever it is required to support commercial interests" (p.56).

“I do their posters as well, because I am a visual designer. (...) Some friends do hosting, some do social media. I help with social media as well sometimes” (Interviewee 8, 04.05.2023).

Therefore, even through such associations, İstanbul-based DJ's appear to be stuck in the very conditions they are trying to escape.



CONCLUSION

The main aim of this thesis was to understand the conditions of İstanbul-based DJ's creative labour in the highly casualised club cultural production as part of the broader CCI context. In order to achieve this aim, a qualitative method of semi-structured interviews were chosen and carried out with fourteen participants. The analysis of findings were then discussed in three main sections.

The first chapter in findings broadly reflected the effects of casualisation in club cultural production on İstanbul-based DJ's creative labour and club cultural production. This highly flexibilised industry has made most DJ's reliant upon multiple job holding and generating income through different professions in order to be able to carry out DJ'ing. Another sense of their flexibilised labour has presented itself in the lack of DJ's engagement in traditional forms of work. They have been shown to not sign contracts, working on the basis of individual projects and struggle to secure a reliable income. In addition to that, most emerging DJ's and some of the relatively established DJ's have expressed to engage in unpaid work. While the emerging DJ's motivation for the phenomenon could be explained through hope labour and consequently their perception of unpaid labour as an entrway into this sector; the desired outcomes for established DJ's varied. They usually expressed wanting to be able to play at certain clubs, with certain DJ's and associate their names with these events. This was considered reasonable.

Apart from the precarious material conditions of this labour force, their general living conditions were also affected by the club cultural production process. Most of them have expressed problems in relation to their sleep schedules, healths and personal relationships. Their creative labour has also proved to be flexibilised in the sense that their work and leisure times appeared to have blurred and they have spent an extensive amount of their free time on DJing related practices.

With all these conditions at play, in such a highly competitive industry, İstanbul-based DJ's have appeared to be extremely individualised. The lack of collective bargaining and unionisation were accepted, and they have adapted to different strategies in order to strengthen their entrepreneurial subjectivities. In this sense, they have seemed to prioritise their portfolios and were self-exploitative in the aims to reach this goal. This usually meant the acceptance of insecure working conditions.

Additionally, the DJ's interviewed have carried the risks and responsibilities related to the conditions of the market as if their own. Among the measures taken to eliminate such risks, some DJ's stated having to give up their creative autonomy.

In the second chapter of findings, İstanbul-based DJ's relationships with their creativity and related aspects of creative labour production were under the lens. In their non-reproducible labour, the audiences have proved to play a key role. Most DJ's have expressed that the most prized aspect of their creative labour was the relationship they had with their audiences. The dialogue they voiced to have with their audiences was seen to have an improving effect on their profession. However, most DJ's have stated to believe an increase in a crowd that is indifferent to their creative production, naming the growing popularity of club cultures as the reason. In this sense, they did not want to adapt their production; but still found it somewhat reasonable for the club owners to expect such behaviour from them. They have, again, shouldered the dissatisfactory conditions rather than to blame the capital.

Still, the majority of İstanbul-based DJ's had drawn the line at the point where the revenue concern tries to assert itself on their creative productions, meaning the club owners interferences with their playing practices. Although several have voiced to face such conditions, only the vulnerable emerging DJ's appeared to accept these if considered on this basis. A popular approach visible in the rest was to see the production process as a whole and consider revenue generation a vital aspect for the survival of the club scene. Under such terms, the restrictions were deemed reasonable as well.

The third chapter of findings depicted the significant and essential roles of social capital and networks in club cultural production. All of the DJ's interviewed have expressed to benefit from their social capitals in their creative labour, without an exception. The role of these networks were visible in almost all of their introduction to the scene, both primarily and commercially. Because of the collective nature of club cultures, the effects have proved to be heightened than any other sector in CCIs.

In terms of establishing a crowd for themselves which would secure their place within the club cultural production scene, İstanbul-based DJ's have been found to prioritise social relations as a safety mechanism in the highly competitive and individualised markets. They have stated the importance of maintaining good social relationships with their crowd, and expressed it to be a part of DJ's main occupation. This have in turn led to a flexibilisation in their orchestration of social relationship for the ultimate benefit of job-holding. Another denominator of the same phenomenon was the requirement to have a strong social media presence, as it both catered to the same aim and was often requested by the club owners.

The informalities in their labour condition, consequent insecurities they have faced and the lack of a safety network in the industry have in turn led them to try and create their own forms of collective action. Similarly named as 'collectives', these referred to a team of DJ's loosely tied together. Most İstanbul-based DJ's interviewed have expressed to be or wish to be a part of these collectives. Their main motivation was to be able to secure more gigs and escape the monetary and autonomy-related insecurities imposed upon them by the club owners. However, only a minority of these proved to succeed; as most of them only reproduced the same exploitative labour in the benefit of the rare established names in these collectives, leaving the rest vulnerable yet again.

In conclusion, this study provides an unprecedented portrait depicting the subjective experiences of İstanbul-based DJ's. A thrivingly complicated form of creative labour with its intricate relationship with social capital, club cultural production is unique in its way of posing an example for the creativity versus commerce debate. İstanbul, on the other hand, as it is considered among the clubbing capitals of its region; lays out

unique pluralities through a rapidly growing flow into club cultures and the creative workforce within.

Therefore, it is hoped that this study could make a valuable contribution to the literature and pave way for more critical debates on club cultural production in İstanbul.



REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W., & Horkheimer, M. (1997). **Dialectic of enlightenment** (Vol. 15). Verso.
- Arıcan, T. (2003). **Metropolis, techno-culture, digitalized musical genres and clubbing in Turkey** [Yüksek lisans tezi, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi]. Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- Arıcan, T. (2012). **Dance culture in Turkey: a case study in Ankara and İstanbul**. *International review of the aesthetics and sociology of music*, 43(1), 209-225.
- Banks, M. (2010). **Autonomy guaranteed? Cultural work and the “art–commerce relation”**. *Journal for Cultural research*, 14(3), 251-269.
- Banks, M. (2007). **The politics of cultural work**. Springer.
- Barthes, R. (1972). **Mythologies: Roland Barthes**. Hill and Wang.
- Beck, U. (2000). **The brave new world of work**. Blackwell.
- Bell, D. (1973). **The coming of post-industrial society: A venture in social forecasting**.
- Bilton, C., & Leary, R. (2002). **What can managers do for creativity? Brokering creativity in the creative industries**. *International journal of cultural policy*, 8(1), 49-64.
- Bourdieu, P. (1987). **Distinction: a social critique of the judgment of taste**. Harvard University Press
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). **The forms of capital**. In: Richardson, J., *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood: 241–58.
- Brown, A. (1997). **Let’s all have a disco? Football, popular music and democratization**. In: Redhead, S., Wynne, D. and O’Connor, J. (ed.) *The clubcultures reader: readings in popular cultural studies*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 61– 83.
- Brophy, E., & De Peuter, G. (2007). **Immaterial labor, precarity, and recomposition**. *Knowledge workers in the information society, 2007*, 177-192.
- Bulut, E. (2016). **Dramın ardındaki emek: dizi sektöründe reyting sistemi, çalışma koşulları ve sendikalaşma faaliyetleri**. *Galatasaray Üniversitesi İletişim Dergisi*, (24), 79-100.

Castells, M. (1996). **The information age: Economy, society and culture** (3 volumes). Blackwell, Oxford, 1997, 1998. Chicago

Castells, M. (2010). **The information age. Media Studies: a reader**, 2(7), 152. Chicago

Caves, R. E. (2000). ***Creative industries: Contracts between art and commerce*** (No. 20). Harvard University Press.

Christopherson, S. (2008). **Beyond the self-expressive creative worker: An industry perspective on entertainment media**. *Theory, culture & society*, 25(7-8), 73-95.

Demir, E. M. (2018). **Halkla ilişkilerde profesyonellik ve yaratıcı emek**. *İletişim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 14(1).

Demir, E. M. (2022). **On the current situation of creative industries in Turkey**. *Etkileşim*, 9.

DCMS, 1998. **Creative industries mapping document**. DCMS.

Eder, M. & Öz. Ö. (2015). **Neoliberalization of İstanbul's nightlife: Beer or champagne?** *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39(2). 284-304.

Fleming, P. (2009). **Authenticity and the cultural politics of work: New forms of informal control**. OUP Oxford. Chicago

Flew, T. (2005). **Creative economy**. *Creative industries*, 344-360.

Florida, R. (2002). **The rise of the creative class: And how it's transforming work, leisure, communicate and everyday life**. Basic.

Foucault, M. (1988). **The history of sexuality (1st Vintage Books ed.)**. New York. Chicago

Fritz, J. (1999). **Rave culture: An insider's view**. Victoria, BC: Small Fry.

Fuchs, C. (2014). **Digital labour and karl marx**. Routledge.

Fuchs, C. (2014). **Social media: A critical introduction**. SAGE Publications Ltd

Garnham, N. (2011). **The political economy of communication revisited**. *The handbook of political economy of communications*, 41-61.

Garnham, N. (2005). **From cultural to creative industries: An analysis of the implications of the “creative industries” approach to arts and media policy making in the United Kingdom.** International journal of cultural policy, 11(1), 15-29.

Garnham, N. (2000). **‘Information Society’ as Theory or Ideology: A Critical Perspective in Technology, Education and Employment in the Information Age.** Information, communication & society, 3(2), 139-152.

Garnham, N. (1990). **Capitalism and Communication.** Sage.

Gill, R. (2002). **Cool, creative and egalitarian? Exploring gender in project-based new media work.** Information, communication & society, 5(1), 70-89.

Gill, R. (2007). **Postfeminist media culture: elements of a sensibility.** European journal of cultural studies, 10 (2). pp. 147-166.

Goffman, E. (1963). **Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity.** Englewood Cliffs.

Gülüm, E. (2015). **Yaratıcı turizm halk kültürü ilişkisi ve yerelin popülerleşmesi.** Milli Folklor, 27 (105), 87-98.

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2000). **Empire.** Harvard University Press.

Hartley, J. (2003). **A short history of cultural studies.** Sage.

Harvey, D. (2009). **The Limits to Capital.** Verso.

Harvey, D. (2005). **The new imperialism.** oup Oxford. Chicago.

Harvey, D. (1989). **From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism.** Geografiska Annaler: series B, human geography, 71(1), 3-17. Chicago.

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2013). **The cultural industries, 3rd edition.** Sage.

Hesmondhalgh, D., & Baker, S. (2011a). **Toward a political economy of labor in the media industries.** The handbook of political economy of communications, 381-400.

Hesmondhalgh, D., & Baker, S. (2011b). **Creative labour: Media work in three cultural industries.** Routledge.

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2010). **User-generated content, free labour and the cultural industries**. *ephemera*, 10(3/4), 267-284.

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2008). **Cultural and creative industries**. The Sage handbook of cultural analysis, 552-570

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2007). **Audiences and everyday aesthetics: Talking about good and bad music**. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 10(4), 507-527. Chicago

Holt, F. (2010). **The economy of live music in the digital age**. Sage European Journal of Cultural Studies. Vol:13-2: 243-261.

Holt, F. (2017). **EDM pop: a soft shell formation in a new festival economy**. In St. John, G. (ed) *Weekend Societies*.

Jarvis, H., & Pratt, A. C. (2006). **Bringing it all back home: The extensification and 'overflowing' of work: The case of San Francisco's new media households**. *Geoforum*, 37(3), 331-339.

Jane, E. A., & Barker, C. (2016). **Cultural studies: Theory and practice**. *Cultural Studies*, 1-760.

Jenkins, H. (2006). **Convergence culture : where old and new media collide**. New York University Press.

Kaya, E. (2016). **Kapitalist emek sürecinin öğeleri ekseninde kültürel endüstriler ve yaratıcı emek**. *İletişim araştırmaları*, 14(1), 43-74.

Kaymas, S. (2019). **Türk dünyasında kültür ve yaratıcı endüstri yönetimi üzerine bir değerlendirme**. *Türk Dünyası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 90, 215-243.

Kaymas, S. (2022). **Yaratıcı endüstriler, iletişim çalışmaları ve yükseköğretim ekosistemi: yaratıcı endüstriler ekosistemi örneğinde iletişim eğitimi yeniden düşünmek**. *Türkiye İletişim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 40, 277-301.

Kurunmaki, L. & Miller, P. (2011). **Regulatory hybrids: partnerships, budgeting and modernising government**. *Management Accounting Research*, 22(4), 220-241.

Lazzarato, M. (1996). **Immaterial labor**. *Radical thought in Italy: A potential politics*, 1996, 133-47.

Lazzeretti, L., Capone, F., & Seçilmiş, İ. E. (2014). **Türkiye'de yaratıcı ve kültürel sektörlerin yapısı**. *Maliye Dergisi*, 166(1), 195-220.

Leadbeater, C., & Oakley, K. (1999). **The independents: Britain's new cultural entrepreneurs**. Demos.

Magana, J. A. (2018). **Performance in EDM-A Study and Analysis of DJing and Live Performance Artists**. Chicago.

Manovich, L. (2013). **Media after software**. Journal of Visual Culture, 12(1), 30-37.

McGuigan, J. (2010). **Cultural analysis**. Sage.

McRobbie, A. (2016). **Towards a sociology of fashion micro-enterprises: Methods for creative economy research**. Sociology, 50(5), 934-948. Chicago

McRobbie, A. (2009). **Reflections on precarious work in the cultural sector**. *Governance der Kreativwirtschaft: Diagnosen und Handlungsoptionen*, 123, 138.

McRobbie, A. (2007). **Top girls? Young women and the post-feminist sexual contract**. *Cultural studies*, 21(4-5), 718-737.

Miege, B. (2011). **Theorizing the cultural industries: Persistent specificities and reconsiderations**. The handbook of political economy of communications, 83-108.

Montano, E. (2013). **DJ culture and the commercial club scene in Sydney**. in Attias, B. A., Gavanas, A., & Rietveld, H. C. (eds) *DJ Culture In The Mix*, 173-194.

Mosco, V. (2005). **The Digital Sublime**. MIT Press.

Mosco, V. (2009). **The Political Economy of Communication**, 2nd ed. Sage.

Mulligan, M. (2019). **IMS Music Report: Global Dance Music Industry**. MIDiA.

Murdock, G., Petts, J., & Horlick-Jones, T. (2003). **The Social Amplification of Risk: After amplification: rethinking the role of the media in risk communication**.

Murdock, G. (2005). **Back to work: Cultural labor in altered times**. In *Cultural work* (pp. 27-48). Routledge.

Özbek, C. & Can, Ü. K. (2020). **Türkiye'deki elektronik müzik bestecilerinin elektronik dans müziğine ilişkin görüşlerinin incelenmesi**. *Konservatoryum*, 7(2), 165-186.

Özdemir, N. (2009). **Kültür ekonomisi ve endüstrileri ile kültürel miras yönetimi ilişkisi**. *Milli Folklor*, 21 (84).

Pratt, A. C. (2008). **Creative cities: the cultural industries and the creative class**. *Geografiska annaler: series B, human geography*, 90(2), 107-117.

Pratt, A. (2005). **Cultural industries and cultural policy: an oxymoron**. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 11(1), 31-44.

Pratt, A. C. (2002). **Hot jobs in cool places. The material cultures of new media product spaces: the case of south of the market, San Francisco.** Information, communication & society, 5(1), 27-50. ISO 690

PwC (2019). **Outlook Insights: an Analysis of the Global Entertainment and Media Outlook 2015–2019.**

Rief, S. (2009). **Club Cultures: Boundaries, Identities and Otherness.** 1st ed. Routledge.

Ross, A. (2009). **Nice work if you can get it.** In Nice Work If You Can Get It. New York University Press.

Ryan, B. (1992). **Making Capital from Culture.** Walter de Gruyter.

Sassen S. (2001). **The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo.** 2nd ed. Princeton University Press.

Seçilmiş, E. (2015). **Türkiye’de yaratıcı endüstrilerin kümelenmesi.** Ege Akademik Bakış, 15(1), 9-18.

Sennett, R. (1998). **The corrosion of character: The personal consequences of work in the new capitalism.** WW Norton & Company.

Sezgin, S. (2019). **Türkiye’de dijital oyun endüstrisi ve yaratıcı emek** [Doktora tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi]. Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Siebert, S., & Wilson, F. (2013). **All work and no pay: consequences of unpaid work in the creative industries.** Work, employment and society, 27(4), 711-721.

Storey, J. (2006). **Cultural Theory and Popular Culture: an Introduction.** 4th ed. University of Georgia Press.

Ursell, G. (2000). **Television production: issues of exploitation, commodification and subjectivity in UK television labour markets.** Media, culture & society, 22(6), 805-825.

Ursell, G. (1998). **Labour flexibility in the UK commercial television sector.** Media, Culture & Society, 20(1), 129-153.

Van Dijk, J. A. (2012). **The network society.** *The Network Society*, 1-336.

Veblen, T. (1899). **Mr. Cummings's Strictures on "The Theory of the Leisure Class"**. Journal of Political Economy, 8(1), 106-117. Chicago

Yardımcı, A. (2016). **İçerdiği faaliyet gruplarına göre Türkiye'deki yaratıcı endüstri üzerine bir çalışma**. Finans Politik & Ekonomik Yorumlar 53(16).

Yörük, E. (2018). **Türkiye'de Televizyon Drama Yazarlarının Emek Süreçleri**. Gümüşhane Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Elektronik Dergisi, 6(1), 806-835.

Wasko, J. (2014). **The study of the political economy of the media in the twenty-first century**. International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics, 10(3), 259-271.

Williams, R. (1981). **Culture**. Fontana

Williams, R. (1959). **Culture and society**. *Essays in Criticism*, 9(4), 432-437.

Wilson, B. (2002). **The Canadian rave scene and five theses on youth resistance**. The Canadian journal of sociology, 27(3), 373-412.

Wolff, J. (1993). **The social production of art**. Bloomsbury Publishing.

APPENDIX

1- Information Text and Demographic Questions (Original In Turkish)

Sayın katılımcı,

Bu araştırma Galatasaray Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Medya ve İletişim Çalışmaları Yüksek Lisans Programı dahilinde sürdürülmekte olan “Commodification of Club Cultures and DJ’s Creative and Cultural Labour: İstanbul as Türkiye’s Nightlife Capital” başlıklı yüksek lisans tez çalışması kapsamında yürütülmektedir.

Çalışmaya katılım tamamen gönüllülük esasına dayanmaktadır. Elde edilen tüm yanıtlar yalnızca bu araştırma kapsamında ve anonim olarak kullanılacak, ve üçüncü kişiler ile hiçbir koşulda paylaşılmayacaktır.

Şevval DOLANBAY

Yaşınız nedir?:

Cinsiyetiniz nedir?:

Ne kadar süredir İstanbul’da yaşamaktasınız?:

Ne kadar süredir (amatör veya profesyonel) DJ’lik yapmaktasınız?:

Ne kadar süredir DJ’likten gelir elde etmektesiniz?:

2- Semi-structured Interview Questions (Original In Turkish)

- Kulüp kültürüyle ve elektronik dans müziğiyle nasıl tanıştınız?
- DJ’liğe nasıl başladınız? Bu süreçte en çok hangi kaynaklardan faydalandınız? Eğitim aldınız mı?
- DJ’likten gelir elde etmeye nasıl başladınız? Bu süreç nasıl ilerledi?
- DJ olarak çalmakta olduğunuz mekanlar neye göre belirleniyor? Sizin seçiminiz ise, hangi kriterleri esas alıyorsunuz? Çalacağınız mekandan beklentileriniz nelerdir?
- Bir mekanda çalarken tabi olduğunuz şartlardan genel olarak bahsedebilir misiniz? Yazılı bir anlaşma yapılıyor mu? Yapılmıyorsa, buna dair düşünceleriniz neler?
- Ödemenizi hangi esaslara göre, ne şekilde ve kimler aracılığıyla alıyorsunuz? Bu konuda genel anlayış nedir?
- DJ’likten elde ettiğiniz gelir geçinmenize yetiyor mu? Yetmiyorsa nasıl geçiniyorsunuz? DJ’lik için (ekipman, yazılım) giderlerine yaptığınız harcamanın tüm harcamalarınız arasındaki yeri nedir?
- Boş zamanlarınızın ne kadarını DJ’lik konusunda kendinizi geliştirmeye ayırıyorsunuz?

- DJ'lik deneyiminizde, işe erişme ve ücret belirlenmesinde “kitle” oluşturma'nın önemi sizce nedir?
- DJ'lik deneyiminizde, işe erişme ve ücret belirlemenizde kendi sosyal çevrenizin önemi sizce nedir?
- Çalmakta olduğunuz gece kulüplerinin kitlesini genel olarak tanımlar mısınız? Bunlar mekandan mekana değişiklik gösteriyor mu? Zaman içinde bir değişiklik gözlemlediniz mi? Sizce temel etkenler nelerdir?
- Çalmakta olduğunuz gece kulüplerinin kitlesi, veya o geceki kitlenin tepkileri ve beklentileri çalacağınız set üzerinde etkili mi? Etkiliyse ne şekilde?
- Çalmakta olduğunuz gece kulüplerinin yönetim ekibi çalacağınız set üzerinde etkili mi, etkili olma çabaları oluyor mu? Oluyorsa ne yönde bir yönlendirme veya kısıtlamayla karşı karşıya kalıyorsunuz? Buna karşı tepkiniz ne oluyor?
- Bu piyasadaki hedefiniz nedir? Sizce buna ulaşmak için önünüzdeki engeller nelerdir?
- Hem bir uğraş olarak DJ'liğe, hem de kendi DJ olarak çalışma deneyiminize dair en memnun olduğunuz ve memnun olmadığınız, değişmesi gerektiğini düşündüğünüz noktalara örnekler verir misiniz? Sizce bu değişimlerin önündeki en büyük engeller nedir?
- Bir DJ topluluğuna üye misiniz? Üye iseniz çalışma prensibi nedir? Olmadığınız duruma/olmayan meslektaşlarınızdan duyduklarınıza kıyasla bu üyeliğin artıları ve eksileri nelerdir? Üye değilseniz, olmama sebebiniz nedir? Olmak isteseydiniz, hangi konularda fayda sağlamanı beklerdiniz?
- Ekleme istedikleriniz var mı?

APPENDIX

1- Information Text and Demographic Questions (English Translation)

Dear participant,

This research is carried out within the scope of the master's thesis titled "Commodification of Club Cultures and DJ's Creative and Cultural Labor: Istanbul as Turkey's Nightlife Capital", which is being carried out within the Media and Communication Studies Master's Program of Galatasaray University Social Sciences Institute.

Participation in the study is completely voluntary. All the answers obtained will only be used within the scope of this research and anonymously, and will not be shared with third parties under any circumstances.

Şevval DOLANBAY

What is your age?:

What is your gender?

How long have you lived in Istanbul?:

How long have you been DJing (amateur or professional):

How long have you been making income from DJing?:

2- Semi-structured Interview Questions (English Translation)

- How did you meet club culture and electronic dance music?
- How did you start DJing? What resources did you benefit from the most during this process? Did you get an education?
- How did you start earning income from DJing? How did this process unfold?
- How are the venues where you play as a DJ determined? If it is your choice, what criteria do you base it on? What are your expectations from them?
- Can you talk about the general conditions you're subjected to when playing in a venue? Is there a written contract? If so, what are your thoughts on this?
- On which bases, conditions and through whom do you get paid? What is the consensus on this matter?
- Is the income you earn from DJing enough to live on? If it's not enough, how do you get by? What is the place you pay for DJing (equipment, software) expenses among your general expenses?
- How much of your free time do you spend on DJing related practices?
- On your experience as a DJ, your reach to gigs, and setting fees; how important do you think is creating your own crowd?

- On your experience as a DJ, your reach to gigs, and setting fees; how important do you think is your own social networks?
- Can you describe the audience of the nightclubs you play at? Do these vary from place to place? Have there been changes in time? If so, what do you think are the factors here?
- Does the audience of the nightclubs you are playing at, or the particular audience of a given night have an effect on how you play that night? If so, how?
- Does the management of the nightclubs you are playing at have an effect on how you play? Are there any efforts to be effective? If so, in which direction do these interferences usually occur? How do you react?
- What is your main goal regarding DJ'ing? What so you think are the main obstacles on the way?
- What are your working conditions? Can you describe a night you played at a venue?
- What is your target in this market? In your opinion, if there are obstacles/obstacles in front of you to achieve this, what are they? What are the main obstacles?
- Can you give examples to your most and least favourite aspects and things you think need to be changed regarding DJing as a profession and your own experience as a DJ? What do you think are the main obstacles in the way of this change?
- Are you a member of a DJ community? If so, how does it work? What are the pros and cons in comparison to the times you were not, or DJ's you know who are not? If you are not a member, what is the reason? If you wanted to, in which aspects would you expect it to be beneficial?
- Is there anything you would like to add?

AUTOBIOGRAPHY



TEZ ONAY SAYFASI

Üniversite : T.C. GALATASARAY ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Enstitü : SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
Hazırlayanın Adı Soyadı : Şevval DOLANBAY
Tez Başlığı : Commodification of Club Cultures and DJ's Cultural and Creative Labour: İstanbul as Türkiye's Nightlife Capital
Savunma Tarihi : 12 / 05 / 2023
Danışman : Doç. Dr. Ceren SÖZERİ ÖZDAL

JÜRİ ÜYELERİ:

Unvan, Ad-Soyadı

İmza

Doç. Dr. Ceren SÖZERİ ÖZDAL

Doç. Dr. Ece VİTRİNEL

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Eser LEVİ

Prof. Dr. Ulun AKTURAN

Enstitü Müdürü