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Electronic music has become increasingly popular and economically profitable. Compared to the consumption of other music genres, electronic music has always been predominantly focused on its live experience at events and in the club. The involvement and active participation of the audience are considered to be major contributions to the atmosphere and overall experience of the events. However, past research has taken limited account of the contributions of the audience and the experiential aspects to the value of events. Since the roots of electronic music lie in underground club culture, its actors are assumed to be motivated by their shared passion and non-commercial aims. Additionally, the value of cultural events has been notoriously reduced to their economic contribution because of the inherent difficulty of assessing the value of cultural products. This is particularly true for electronic music as clubs are part of the nightlife, but also the cultural industry. Yet, thereby the contribution of social and cultural values to economic value is concealed. Previous findings have indicated that industry exchanges of actors in the cultural industry are characterized by personal relationships, trust, and exchange in network reputation. Yet, it is still unclear how industry actors construct the values underlying their events. Therefore, this study aims to explore how the social, cultural, and economic values of electronic music events are constructed by venue stakeholders in the context of an experience economy. For the purpose of this study, 10 expert interviews were conducted with club stakeholders in the Netherlands, Germany, and Belgium. Findings indicated that venue stakeholders predominantly construct the value of their events around their success in executing their artistic vision. The development of personal relationships and a community within the industry was conducive and necessary for success in the industry. Yet, the increasing professionalization of the industry and the increasing use of practices from the record industry among DJs presented additional barriers to becoming economically viable. In addition, the fragmentation of audiences around subgenres presented another challenge for club owners. Concerning their audience, club owners promoted inclusiveness, diversity, and freedom, whereby participants could engage in alternative social dynamics at the club. The club experience was considered to stand in contrast to a restrictive experience of the self in public space. It was concluded that actors in the electronic music industry operate within a distinct industry network marked by informality, which supports the exchange of cultural knowledge and the execution of their artistic vision. Further research is needed to verify the exchanges and diversity of audiences at electronic music events. In addition, the impact of professionalization, commercialization, and genre fragmentation on the social and cultural value of electronic music events deserves further attention.
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1. Introduction

Cultural industries have commonly been reduced to their economic profitability in public policies; however, the different organizations involved in the cultural industries create various social and cultural values, which may not reflect in the economic value of their activities (Klamer, 2004). Here, electronic music and its performance places take in a special position because they operate in the nightlife industry, but also the cultural industry. This is substantiated by the centrality of music and dancing at electronic music events and the venues as places of diverse exchanges (Throsby, 2001). In the case of electronic music, clubs are the main performance places, which in comparison to other live music venues provide a different experiential setting and opportunities for involvement (Lawrence, 2011; Redfield & Thouin-Savard, 2017).

Furthermore, electronic dance music (EDM) enjoys increasing popularity worldwide. Its industry has been reported to account for around $7.3 billion worldwide while still expected to rise in the next years. The majority of the generated revenues comes from live consumption at festivals and clubs (Watson, 2018). In other music genres, the market also shifts away from generating its main profits through recorded music and towards live consumption (Tschmuck, Pearce, & Campbell, 2013). However, in the genre of electronic music, music production is mainly addressing other artists because of the specific industry dynamics (Lange & Bürkner, 2013), which stresses the focus of the live experience at electronic music clubs. Moreover, audiences at electronic music clubs are recognized to majorly contribute to the value of the events through their participation and feedback (Crowther & Orefice, 2014; Goulding & Shankar, 2011; Sommer, 2001). For these reasons the club is a main focus in the industry and venue stakeholders take in a powerful position because they connect audiences, DJs, and other industry actors. Yet, to the current day, there exists no overarching academic account of the underlying social, cultural, and economic values of electronic music venues in research about the cultural industries.

At this point, however, the umbrella genre of EDM needs to be more closely defined to properly contextualize the subject of this research. Countless subgenres have emerged over the years, which are mostly but not always dance-oriented. However, the musical roots lie in the emergence of Disco in America in the 1970s, where the main places of consumption of the music were clubs, warehouses and (outdoor) raves. From then on, more genres such as House and Techno developed all around the world. The connection to the club and underground culture are important to note here as it contextualizes the social and often intimate spaces, in which the music was performed (Rietveld, 2000). Here, the use of the term EDM in academic literature incites confusion of what kind of music and setting is meant, echoing the use of the genre name in the mainstream media. On the one side are the mainstream, large-scale productions represented in star DJs, mega-festivals, and concert like performances for large masses of people. They are set up like spectacles including LED, video projections, and pyrotechnics (Conner, 2015; John, 2015; Ryce, 2012). The musical sets are
characterized by big melodies and vocals making them more accessible for a wider audience (Ryce, 2012). On the other side are the underground, small-scale productions, which are characterized by a focus on the music of the DJ and genres such as Techno, House, and Disco. Those genres still have a solid base in current day clubs and are perceived as closer to the original underground notions in their organizational and performative set-up. This means that they feature a different musical direction than large-scale productions and are less focused on spectacles, or the DJ’s performance and his or her personality (Garcia, 2014; John, 2015). Therefore, to differentiate these fields, the label of electronic music is used in this study in order to be inclusive of the wide variety of Techno, House, and Disco as well as more sub-genres that circulate in current day clubs.

Further substantiating this division, Bourdieu (1984) ascribed differing levels of power, autonomy, and capital to actors in large- and small-scale productions. According to his theory, large-scale productions are oriented towards the production of ‘commercial’ cultural goods and are mostly subject to outside demand. Hence, what is assumed to be represented by EDM events in this study. The small-scale productions are focused on the production of pure artistic products operating largely autonomous from the actors involved in large-scale productions. In this study, they are considered to be represented by the electronic music club stakeholders. The central idea in this division is that small-scale productions are considered to act in a denial of the economy. The reason is the difficulty of the conversion of their creative products into economic capital Bourdieu (1984). This conception is central when interpreting the production activities of club stakeholders because it marks their position in the wider industry in terms of their power, autonomy, and potential for value creation.

In this context, the diverse experiential aspects involved at electronic music events are assumed to carry inherent value, which is why a contextualization in the framework of an experience economy suggests itself. To begin with, experiences are inherently personal because they are created within each individual on an emotional, intellectual, physical, or spiritual level. In the concept of experience economy, the experience is a way to something more desirable (Pine & Gilmore, 2011). In this regard, the music and club feature diverse experiential aspects: Firstly, music evokes strong bodily sensations (Pearce, 2013), which are commonly responded to in the movement of the body, or ultimately in dancing (Lacher, 1989). But music also has emotional impact through being bound to particular occasions and ceremonies. The emotional impact is directly related to the cognitive component of the enjoyment of the music and deals with the personal capital of people. Personal capital means knowledge about a type of music that supports its appreciation and understanding. Finally, the social context in which music is experienced as e.g. a club and the activities and behavior that are associated with its consumption add to the total experience and locate it in the field of experience economy (Pearce, 2013). Understanding electronic music events as part of the experience economy provides the opportunity to assign greater meaning to these experiential aspects and goes beyond the positioning in the cultural industry. Thereby, their contribution to the value creation of club events is acknowledged.
In light of this, value only comes into existence once it is experienced, which gives participants a more central role in the creation of it (Payne, Storbacka, & Frow, 2008). Therefore, club visitors and their participation in the electronic music industry are important contributors to its value. The concept of co-creation of value has its origins in marketing theory, where the notion of value is only vaguely defined and often implies economic gain on the part of the event organizers. Though it is suggested that the networking and interaction between participants is a key element (Crowther & Orefice, 2014), it has not been identified as a social value substantially adding to the participants’ lives. Also, specifically for the setup of electronic music events, the audience is considered to (co-) create the atmosphere with the DJ through interacting and dancing (Nardi, 2012). In clubs, the proximity and interaction between DJ and audience are emphasized, which is different to the setup of other live music performances, which are marked by a one-way, rather passive way of consumption (Biehl-Missional, 2019). Because of this difference in contribution and involvement of participants in the club experience, it can be safely assumed that the value creation of electronic music clubs is distinct from other live music settings.

In this context, economic value has commonly served as a guideline for policy decisions. However, in the cultural industry economic value has been found to be inseparable of a socio-cultural dimension, which is largely characterized by informal personal relationships between industry actors. Trust and reputation are key aspects of exchanges. The cultural value is determined by the symbolic value that stakeholders assign to the music. Through the symbolic value, stakeholders set trends and shape consumption while still including audience’s feedback in their evaluations (Lange & Bürkner, 2010). Hence, the economic value cannot be clearly separated from the social and cultural components involved in the process. Interestingly enough, there appears to be no previous research covering all three types of value in the club music context. In the case of social value, past research about grassroots events - or raves - of electronic music, the subcultural characteristics and the associated PLUR (Peace-Love-Unity-Respect) ethos have been exposed to closer scrutiny, but its persistence among current-day consumers of electronic music is highly debated (e.g. Anderson, 2009; Conner, 2015; Kavanaugh & Anderson, 2008; Redfield & Thouin-Savard, 2017). Also, the emergence of a collective identity and social cohesion at these grassroots events have been a matter of discussion (Goulding & Shankar, 2011). Current research on club culture has identified a feeling of community and the opportunity for self-expression and bonding as social features (Goulding, Shankar, & Elliott, 2002; St John, 2006). However, there remains a lack of knowledge about the way that stakeholders connect to other actors in the industry and also how their events pave the way for social exchanges among their audience. This lack in understanding is even more apparent for cultural value. The cultural value entailed for stakeholders has often been framed in terms of exchange of tacit knowledge and reputation (Lange & Bürkner, 2010). Yet, it is unclear how industry actors view the cultural value of their events. This may be due to the immateriality of the creativity of the music, especially as creativity only comes into existence through the experience and subsequent exchange and
interpretation (Negus & Pickering, 2004). But regarding these exchanges and interpretations, venue stakeholders can be considered as experts in their field because of the multiple skills that are required to run a venue (McRobbie, 2002). They can be seen as tastemakers and industry guides because of the multidirectional exchanges they are engaged in (Tschmuck, 2012). Yet still, it is unclear how the cultural values are negotiated between industry actors and audiences and how they are finally expressed at electronic music clubs.

This naturally leads to the question of how venue stakeholders co-create and translate social, cultural, and economic values with their activities. Lange and Bürkner (2013) have conducted a pioneering study about the value creation of different stakeholders of electronic music clubs in Berlin. In the context of electronic club music, Berlin has become a worldwide epicenter with regard to electronic music. It is known for preserving an experimental, self-made, and innovative character (Bader & Scharenberg, 2010). There, stakeholders’ decisions and involvement in the Berlin club scene featured subcultural lifestyles expressed in non-commercial attitudes. A noncommercial mindset was seen to enable innovation, freshness, and originality in production. Concerning their practices, the investigated clubs were highly selective about the visitors who gain access to the club. This created an image of exclusivity and was assumed to be necessary to guard the atmosphere inside the venue (Lange & Bürkner, 2013). Berlin’s electronic music clubs were highly specialized in their musical style and thereby catered to the needs of small scenes of specialized audiences. Also, the different club stakeholders were found to be in strong economic competition driven by their differing artistic ambitions. However, other than Lange and Bürkner’s (2013) study, research on actors in the electronic music industry has been scarce. Kühn (2011) has added to this subject by arguing for a differentiation of electronic club music beyond being part of the cultural industry. He added that stakeholders take part in a scene-specific economy because of the distinct ways of production, consumption, and value-chains of electronic music. His study pointed to subcultural networks in the electronic music scene, but the social or cultural value exchanges were not specified further.

Thus, with regard to the academic relevance of this study, it is argued here that by using cultural industries as an umbrella term to account for the diverse creative activities and social networks in the electronic music industry, important differences specific to the nature of the music and the (social) exchanges are overlooked. Consequently, the scene-specific industry characteristics as previously proposed by Kühn (2011) and Lange and Bürkner (2013) are explored further outside of the creative ecology of Berlin. Venue stakeholders have not been an exclusive focus of research before even though they establish connections between actors the wider industry network. In previous research, they have only been jointly investigated as part of the general group of industry actors in e.g. Lange and Bürkner's (2013) and Conner's (2015) studies or they were included in the discussion of the development of the entire scene (Anderson, 2009) and the nightlife industry in general (Grazian, 2009). So, focusing on their points of view can enrich the understanding of their exclusive exchanges with diverse industry actors and their audience.
On a societal level, this research is relevant to create a beneficial ecology for electronic music clubs so that they can build sustainable businesses. Understanding the multidirectional exchanges can help the development of (local) artists, adaption to audience demands, and the cultural vibrancy of cities. But also identifying the opportunities for social exchanges, individual development, and community can contribute to an understanding of the added social value to society. Stakeholders may recognize new opportunities for value-creation within the presented frameworks. Results can further provide guidance in policy decisions for the assessment of the added value of cultural spaces to a city and the potential legislative conditions that facilitate business in the industry.

Building on this line of argumentation, this study aims to answer the following research question: How are the values of electronic music events constructed by venue stakeholders in the context of an experience economy? The study follows an in-depth interview design with stakeholders of electronic music clubs in Central Europe. The study will be structured according to three sub-questions:

Sub-question 1: How do venue stakeholders perceive the experience of their events and the role of their audience?
Sub-question 2: How do venue stakeholders perceive the underlying social, cultural, and economic values of their events?
Sub-question 3: How are the underlying values proposed in stakeholder’s decisions about their events?

This is followed by a review of the previous literature on the different ways to describe taste communities in order to contextualize the interaction of actors and audiences. Then the concept of the experience economy is applied to the context of the electronic music industry, which connects to the subsequent discussion of co-creation value and the different types of values underlying cultural events. Finally, the value-proposition of actors in the cultural industry and specifically in electronic music are discussed. Section three covers the methodological framework of the interviews. The fourth section contains the results and interpretation of the thematic analysis. In the last section, the findings are drawn together and directions for future research are provided.
2. Theoretical framework

In the following, the theoretical grounds relevant for the exploration of value-creation in the electronic music industry are laid out. At first, the assumption of a scene in electronic music will be discussed by explaining alternative concepts of community building around cultural products. This contextualization is necessary in order to understand the specificities of the network in which stakeholders and audiences interact. Then venue stakeholders and electronic music events position inside the experience economy is laid out. In that context, the multiple experiential aspects of a club event are discussed. As club events draw to a large extent on the participation and involvement of the audience, the concept of co-creation is an important aspect in understanding the sources of value within electronic music events. There are several different values assumed to be underlying the events: social, cultural, and economic values. The theoretical chapter will be closed with an elaboration of the value-proposition of actors in the cultural industry.

2.1 Defining subcultures, (neo-)tribes and scenes

There are different theoretical concepts concerning the communities built around music and other cultural goods. The theoretical assumptions of taste communities provide relevant contextual information to understand the meaning and interaction in those communities. Especially, as the value of a cultural product is interrelated with the values that individuals assign to them.

In the past, the communities around electronic music were understood as a subculture. Here, the research from the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) in the 1970s has considerably marked the understanding of youth subcultures. It is based on a Marxist, class distinction approach, which generally conceived of youth subcultures as stable, fixed, and continuous group membership (Hesmondhalgh, 2005). In more recent accounts, the term subculture has been defined by Hodkinson's (2002) research of the goth subculture. He established four criteria serving as indicators of a subculture: 1) a consistent distinctiveness of values, styles, and tastes, 2) a shared identity, 3) commitment to the group by its members and 4) an autonomy from wider social and economic relations. Yet, the concept has remained the subject of vast criticism because of its rigid lines of division around the social groups embracing non-mainstream styles and tastes (Bennett, 1999). That is why several other definitions of taste communities have been proposed such as (neo-)tribes or scenes (Hesmondhalgh, 2005). The concept of tribes was first defined by Maffesoli (1995) and redefined as neo-tribes by Bennett (1999). The definition of neo-tribes essentially plays on the temporary and fluid nature of modern group identity, whereby individuals can express a lifestyle through their consumption patterns. Then there is the notion of a scene, which comes into existence through continuous temporary identifications of its members carrying the potential for cultural transformation. Scene describes a cultural space which transcends locality, while also referring to a fluid cosmopolitanism. Thereby, the term represents the existence of a larger international music
culture (Hesmondhalgh, 2005). Similarly, in Woo, Rennie and Poyntz's (2015) consideration of scene, scenes are loosely bounded social worlds that have the meaning of cultural expressions. As a social structure, they are equally a means for identification and connection with similar others. In addition to the previous concepts the authors add that:

Scenes are set within the fabric of everyday life but also function as an imagined alternative to the ordinary, work-a-day world. They can be utopian in moments, especially when scenes allow otherwise ignored or disappeared communities and subjects to find a home, but problems of institutionalization and coordination often push back against utopian aspirations. (Woo, Rennie, & Poyntz, 2015, p. 288)

Thereby, the concept of scene captures the continuity and the constant transformation, which mark social groups formed around culture. Another important feature is that scenes are a socio-cultural product of production and consumption, without prioritizing either. Through participation and circulation, both are equal constituents (Woo et al., 2015). In studies particularly addressing the electronic music scene, scene is used to describe the diffuse, temporal, and continually shifting dynamics of the cultural groups (Kavanaugh & Anderson, 2008) but also their contribution to individual and collective identity creation (Anderson, 2009). Research focusing on scene participants, in particular, have shown that the scene was characterized by in-group characteristics such as symbolic separation according to musical taste, listening habits, dress codes, language and specific forms of communication and interaction (Lange & Bürkner, 2013).

As these different accounts indicate, a scene captures group formation that is not focused on traditional class distinctions or assumes a rigid commitment as is the case for subculture (Hesmondhalgh, 2005; Hodkinson, 2002) and it extends beyond the consumption of cultural products as in (neo-)tribes (Bennett, 1999). The fluid, dynamic, and global identification with a cultural product and the assumption of equal priority of the consumers and producers are the decisive factors for perceiving of today’s late modern communities around electronic music as a scene. Of course, this only represents a brief discussion of the rich literature on the definitions of groups built around music or taste; however, the different accounts provide relevant contextual information to grasp the exchanges between people formed around a cultural good. The terms will be used in accordance with what they are called in the original research. However, to further understand the broader economic context in which the electronic music scene is located, the concept of experience economy is introduced.

2.2 Experience Economy

The definition of scene touches on the socio-cultural material that triggers group formation and exchanges. Thus, the places of consumption such as clubs still need to be a matter of discussion
as they connect the different scene participants and define their experience. Electronic music events can naturally be located in the cultural and leisure industry; however, as pointed out in the introduction the events are characterized by various experiential aspects, which is why it is inferred that beyond this positioning, electronic music events are part of an experience economy. Therefore first, the general concept will be introduced followed by a further elaboration on the diverse experiential aspects of electronic music events.

The experience economy is seen as a progression from the services-based service economy and the former industrial and agrarian economy. What makes experiences different from the former kinds of economies is that experiences are inherently personal because they are created within each individual on an emotional, intellectual, physical, or spiritual level. That is also why they are well remembered by the individual, which at the same time implies a lack of tangibility. Nonetheless, individuals desire experiences because of the value within them (Pine & Gilmore, 2011). Pine and Gilmore (2011) suggest that the experience itself is just a means to something more desirable. Here, they draw the comparison to a fitness gym membership, where individuals are not purchasing the pain but the exercise regimes that will make them fit. Applied to this research, venue owners and their clubs are seen as the experience stagers, who enable their audiences to find a deeper level of meaning in their experience of the event. This conception stands in contrast to top-down consumption, where the endpoint was the individuals’ purchase of goods and services. Value is now seen to only be created once it is experienced, giving individuals a more central role in the creation of it (Payne et al., 2008).

Within the concept of experience economy, Pine and Gilmore (2011) also proposed four different realms of experience: Entertainment, Educational, Esthetic, and Escapist, which are allocated on a cross-axis between guest participation (passive - active) and the environmental relationship that unites customers with the event (absorb - immerse). On these dimensions, the participation at an electronic music event could be categorized as escapist experience because visitors are actively involved and immersed in their experience at a club. Their movements and social activities impact the crowd as well as the DJ because of their feedback and interaction through dance (Lawrence, 2011; Nardi, 2012). Pine and Gilmore (2011) suggest as an escapist experience for instance gambling at a casino or trekking in a theme park. The escapist realm here is noted to be on the opposite site of pure entertainment because of their immersion in the activity and their surroundings. Applying this classification to the experience at an electronic music club has to be treated with caution as reasons for attendance of individuals may differ. Socializing and strengthening bonds with friends, for instance, has been noted as a main feature of nightlife (Buettner & Debies-Carl, 2012), which may change the actual level of participation. This can shift individuals’ focus away from activities related to the music and can have an impact on venue stakeholders’ ambitions in value-creation.

Yet, electronic music events have been defined as place where dancing is actively encouraged. Because of the absence of staged spectacles, the dancefloor is a focal point of activity.
These conventions on the dancefloor bring together the collective and subjective experiences of participants through dance (Peter, 2013). Dancing here presents a way of active listening (Juslin & Sloboda, 2010). Dancing to electronic music has also been related to an experience of immersion of the dancers in the activity. This experience is interpreted as an expression of a desire for transcendence, where the limits of everyday life are examined in order to go beyond them (Peter, 2013). This phenomenon is to be explained through dancing setting off an erosion of limits between the corporeal and technological (St John, 2006). In a more summarizing term, dancing has been described as a form of escape from the mundane life (Peter, 2013). Hence, the categorization of electronic music events as escapist experience seems widely adequate.

Linked and supporting this argument is that an engaging experience can alter participants’ sense of reality by altering the perception of space, matter, and time (Pine & Gilmore, 2011). With respect to the club experience, in Lawrence (2011) literature review about the emergence of disco in the 1970s in New York, several features of the experience are described, which can be considered to still be accurate for modern-day clubs. First, staging events late at night inverses the priorities set around day-time work and the darkness and the protected space of events allows clubbers an expressiveness rarely experienced in mundane life. Also, with regards to the perception of temporality, the cyclical and repetitive beats of electronic music create an altered perception of time. This allows visitors to lose themselves in the music and align the body in a dimension of sonic reality. This is paired with the limitation in space, which brings dancers in contact with each other and stimulates interaction (Lawrence, 2011). So, situating an electronic music event in the experience economy is reasoned through the space, time, matter, and exchanges that constitute the event. It is important to remark that participation in the event is not directed at a particular need but that visitors buy into the intangible social culture when they participate (Sundbo & Darmer, 2008). Venue stakeholders just provide the stage for the visitors to explore these material and immaterial features in the event, but the final experience of individuals lays outside of their control (Orefice, 2018).

Furthermore, in light of the experience economy, Pine and Gilmore (2011) pointed to the design of a space and specifically its amenities or props. These features are meaningful for how a space is used and how the visitors are engaged in the experience (Pine & Gilmore, 2011). The aesthetic quality of the space is of particular relevance in electronic music because it encourages movements of the whole body. Accordingly, dancers permeate space differently in comparison to body movements to rock music such as headbanging (Peter, 2013). At the same time, the aesthetic qualities of the venue are also generated through moving and dancing individuals as a response to the space. So, dancers interact with the space through their dancing (Biehl-Missal, 2019). Dimitri Hegemann, who runs the world-renown techno club Berghain in Berlin since 2004, underlined that the music has to be reflected in the building and the interior in order to embrace the soul of the venue (Peter, 2014). This statement can be related back to the origins of the genre as House comes from the warehouse raves, which were held in the 80s (Conner, 2015). Techno is closely associated with the
post-Fordist wasteland of Detroit as well as the parties that started to take place in deserted areas after the fall of the Berlin Wall around 1989. Therefore, the industrial and raw aesthetics paired with the machine produced sound is often what is reflected in electronic music venues (Biehl-Missal, 2019). Hence, it is expected of venue stakeholders to be able to assess the aesthetics of the venue and match it with their musical program.

Until now, the concept of experience economy has been discussed without further consideration of the context of the events and other experiential aspects that may be present at a club event. In this regard, setting, furniture, and ambient conditions are aspects that can further influence group cohesion among visitors. It can facilitate interaction and the creation of personal relationships between participants (Nelson, 2009). Also, the use of the appropriate lighting can enhance the experience (Goulding et al., 2002). In Lawrence’s (2011) account, lighting was used sparingly because sound enters the body more forcefully than light. Sparse lighting facilitates the alignment of the body with the sound and can, in addition, be used to create disorienting effects. Likewise, in the design of electronic music venues in Berlin the use of strobe lights and the absence of other lights were common and a characteristic of underground venues (Peter, 2014). Since the dance floor is the main focus of the event (Peter, 2013), it also does not come as a surprise that the sound system is relevant for the performance. The music and the sound inform the dancing. Particularly in electronic music because it is marked by low-frequencies, the sound is experienced corporeally (Biehl-Missal, 2019). The deep-bass lines are not heard but felt as vibrations in the sternum, so that individuals embody the music (Sommer, 2001). For that reason, the sound system should be fitted to the site as well as be appropriate for the low frequency sounds (Biehl-Missal, 2019).

Another relevant aspect for the experience of the events and the resulting ethos is the use of illicit substances. In particular, the empathy-inducing, hallucinogenic drug ecstasy, has since the emergence of raves become a main feature of events and has influenced interactions at and perceptions of the experience of electronic music events (Conner, 2015; Goulding et al., 2002). Drug use has been a central component of the experience and activities at electronic music events; however, to what extent audiences consume legal or illegal substances is beyond the scope of this study as the focus is on how stakeholders define the experiences for audiences with the help of material features such as the interior, lights, and sound system.

Finally, all experiential aspects contribute to creating a wider social environment, which is described with the terminology of atmosphere or vibe (Thornton, 1995). The vibe at electronic music events has been nicely defined by Sommer (2001) as follows:

The vibe is an active communal force, a feeling, a rhythm that is created by the mix of dancers, the balance of loud music, the effects of darkness and light, the energy. Everything interlocks to produce a powerful sense of liberation. The vibe is an active, exhilarating feeling of "now-ness" that everything is coming together-that a good party is in the making. The vibe
is constructive; it is a distinctive rhythm, the groove that carries the party psychically and physically. (p. 73)

Importantly, the vibe is created by means of communication between participants as well as their individual mental processes. This emphasizes the contribution of collective and subjective experience to the creation of the vibe (Duffett, 2014).

The discussion of this interaction and the contribution of the audience to the experience will be further discussed in the next chapter. However, the key aspects of Pine and Gilmore’s (2011) experience economy conceptualization are the level of visitor participation and the environmental relationship that define the experience of participants. Pearce (2013) has previously positioned the music business in the experience economy in order to acknowledge the challenges that may occur when joining the field of music and business. Artists are assumed to strive to be expressive and creative and business operators are assumed to focus on making profits. The club business of electronic music can be assumed to be confronted with similar issues, especially because of the higher frequency of events as compared to other live music performances. Here, the experience economy framework brings these concerns together and acknowledges the unique characteristics of live music consumption. Yet, also Pearce (2013) acknowledges the contributions of the audiences to the experience, which will now be explored further with the concept of co-creation.

2.3. Co-creation

Following the above argumentation, the audience members as active participants play an important role in the creation of the experience. Therefore, their agency in value creation is discussed with the concept of co-creation. First, co-creation will be explained in a wider context of consumption and its value related to the electronic music industry. Then, more specifically for electronic music events, literature concerning the co-creation of the atmosphere will be reviewed. Special attention is paid to the role of the DJ as a performer at the events. Understanding the significance of co-creation at and beyond the events sheds light on the different sources of value underlying the events.

In the bigger picture, value co-creation in the cultural and leisure industries can be defined through the service-dominant (S-D) logic from marketing theory. S-D logic is a theoretical framework used to explain value creation through exchanges between a multitude of actors. The interaction between consumers and producers is central in co-creation. Here, actors exchange competences and benefit from each other’s exchange in services (Vargo & Lusch, 2004). More specifically in these exchanges, customers are always co-creators of value as value only comes into existence once an offering is used. Therefore, the experience and perception are essential to the determination of value (Payne et al., 2008). However, it needs to be highlighted that the consumption of music is not essential to life, which is why event stakeholders need to reinforce and market the contribution to individual’s well-being and create the opportunities for the experience (Pearce, 2013). Related to this
idea is also that the experiential consumption is not goal-directed. That is why consumers value creating processes are dynamic, non-linear, and often unconscious (Payne et al., 2008). This aspect contributes to the conception of the atmosphere as intangible.

Yet, to further substantiate the relevance of co-creation of events and its position in the experience economy, co-creation literature also puts a focus on the participation, engagement, and experience of individuals. Here, co-creation transcends passive participation and aims at a shared experience of participants (Crowther & Orefice, 2014). The venue can thereby be regarded as a ‘value-creation space’, where the different actors – venue stakeholders, artists, audience – are connected with each other (Crowther & Donlan, 2011). Within the value-creation space, venue stakeholders on the one side set up opportunities for audiences to derive their own value (Nelson, 2009) but they also provide the foundation for interaction and co-creative exchanges between the artists and other involved actors (Crowther & Orefice, 2014). This space can also move beyond the space and time of the physical event to pre- and post-event phases, as for instance in online communities (Crowther & Orefice, 2014).

However, next to generally acknowledging that audience participation and experience are relevant for value creation, also their attention, enthusiasm, and exuberance are major contributions to the experience of events (Pearce, 2013). They are therefore considered as co-creators of the atmosphere. In Lange and Bürkner’s (2013) study of Berlin’s electronic club music, clubs aimed to provide an atmosphere that allowed their visitors to create their own temporary event through being able to make use of diverse acoustic, aesthetic, and social opportunities. However, they did not elaborate further on what a temporary event of this kind could look like but their finding points to the agency of the visitors in shaping their own experience. Yet, the experience of the music remains the focus at clubs, which is why in comparison to other live music settings, the focus is put on the dancefloor instead of the stage. This also leads to a focus on the atmosphere representing the interaction of the music, DJ, and audience. Here, the audience becomes a distinct source of energy, generating moods that are irreproducible (Thornton, 1995). Thus, the performing DJ also has a powerful role in the creation of the atmosphere. Positioning the DJ behind a booth in close proximity to the audience facilitates interaction with the audience and shapes the way of their participation. It separates the DJ from the audience while also making him or her a visible focus of attention. Yet, the club environment still constructs a social space of inclusion in comparison to the large distances in height and space common in performances of other musical genres (Nardi, 2012). Interaction between the DJ and audience can be in the way of dance, so reacting to the music being played, but also vocally through clapping, cheering, or whistling (Lawrence, 2011). So, the experience of electronic music events is distinguished from the experience of other live music performances through the performative setup, which supports active participation and interaction with the performer but also through the personal contributions and collective experience of all present actors.
This discussion not only implies that actors co-create the experience but also their impact on the value that can be derived from the event. However, the kind of value that individuals extract has not been defined in the context of this research yet, which is why now three different types of values will be discussed.

2.4 Social Value

As electronic music events are a kind of cultural event involving the participation of diverse people, there is naturally a potential to create social capital from bringing people together. The created social capital promotes people’s well-being because it allows for the production of mutually beneficial norms of reciprocity, trust, and co-operation. In terms of the creation of social capital, community contributions such as volunteering and general philanthropy as well as the resulting social connections are more relevant than engulfing in these activities for instance for money (Putnam, 2000). Bourdieu (1986) also contributed to the understanding of social capital by defining it as the interpersonal relationships between individuals, which include a shared sense of identity, norms, and values. This kind of social capital is also closely connected to the formation of subculture as explained above. However, the term capital confuses the understanding of what is aimed to be denoted here in the study. The focus is put on value as it better reflects its inherent potential to be co-created through the communication and exchange of people. Therefore, in addition to the features mentioned above, social value also comprises the value of belonging, social distinction, freedom, solidarity, tolerance, responsibility, love, and friendship (Klamer, 2004).

These different potential social values can be extracted from cultural events but more specifically for electronic music, musical taste can also be a divisive marker for people to relate to each other. Here, Bourdieu (1986) pointed to the potential rise of elitism within networks of people, who relate to a collective identity and norms. Elitism can negatively impact the level of social inclusiveness or the broadening of participation of others. An example of promotion of exclusivity was found in a study of electronic music clubs in Berlin, which presented themselves as exclusive in order to maintain an underground spirit and stimulate social cohesion among participants (Lange & Bürkner, 2013).

In this regard, Putnam (2000) further conceptualized the manners of how individuals relate to each other at cultural events through bridging and bonding social capital. Here, bonding social capital looks at the people already known and the reinforcement of their in-group relationships. It reinforces exclusive identities and encourages homogeneity. In comparison, bridging social capital looks at the new relationships built between individuals previously unknown to each other. It promotes links between diverse individuals. Field research by Wilks (2011) at an opera, folk, and pop-festival showed that participant exchange only took place on an in-group and therefore bonding level. Festival attendees were similar in their demographic characteristics and therefore not demonstrating a particularly diverse audience, which is why the opportunity for bridging social capital was not given.
Wilks (2011) insights about festival attendees’ social interactions are relevant for the purpose of this study as festival attendance indicates interest in a particular genre of music, which may also lead to an identification with other attendees with the same interest regardless of their demographic; even though that was not found to be the case in Wilk’s (2011) study. With respect to the genres of the studied festivals, it seems likely that they may have been a determining factor for the social and cultural practices of attendees. Likewise, their identification with the music and each other can be considered different from listeners of alternative genres of music, which has been previously indicated in research on alternative music identities (Kruse, 1993). Similarly, in a review of diverse nightlife settings such as bars, music venues, and nightclubs in the United States, bonding social capital predominated among exclusive circles. These nightlife spaces were marked by racial and class barriers to participation, disproportionate gender differences, routine harassment of women and a lack of inclusiveness in urban neighborhoods (Grazian, 2009). This is contrary to the above-discussed potential of cultural events to support social capital in a city; however, the study’s generalizability may be limited because of its focus on the United States and thus socio-cultural and institutional differences. The potential differences between nightlife spaces and the specific audiences they attract may have further concealed potential variations. Nevertheless, Grazian’s (2009) findings provide grounds for concern and need to be taken into consideration when evaluating the audience characteristics of electronic music venues.

Bridging and bonding social capital assumingly plays a more important role for participants of cultural events compared to the stakeholders standing behind it. So, there is a dual focus in this study on the social exchanges among participants as experienced by venue stakeholders but also and foremost their own social exchanges with other actors and their visitors. As the electronic music industry is represented in scenes, which take place in social networks, it is often strongly locally situated (Grazian, 2009). The local bonds are significant for scene stakeholders as they provide the opportunity to build informal relationships, which were considered more significant as formal relationships in past research. Formal relationships appeared only relevant to an extent as for instance in the form of booking contracts (Lange & Bürkner, 2013). Informality implies a different manner of personal interaction and a potential for the creation of social value also beyond the boundaries of the venue (Bader & Scharenberg, 2010; Pratt, 2000). In cultural industries, being sociable is seen as a requirement for professional success to an extent where it can become exclusionary for individuals who do not engage in off work events (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2011). Likewise, trust has been found to be significant in the exchanges between labels, DJs, and bookers. Being known among other scene actors facilitates the generation of business opportunities (Bader & Scharenberg, 2010). Trust in personal relationships can be considered to indicate a closer relationship, while it has also shown to reduce the uncertainty surrounding competence and negotiation common between music industry actors (Törnqvist, 2004). At this point, venue owners’ decisions in their personal network represent a mediating function for the production and consumption of the music since they take on the position of
quality controllers for their audience (Lange & Bürkner, 2013). This underlines that stakeholders’ social interactions cannot be separated from the cultural value coming from the events.

In conclusion, cultural events and in particular electronic music events bear the potential for interpersonal relationships and the creation of a shared identity, norms, and values (Bourdieu, 1986). This is supported by past research that described electronic music events as inclusive environments, where diversity, acceptance, and equity are appreciated (Anderson, 2009). Additionally, trust and cooperation between participants (Putnam, 2000) as well as friendships, freedom, and solidarity (Klamer, 2004) are social values associated with activities in the cultural industry. Although at the same time, notions of exclusivity (Lange & Bürkner, 2013) and bonding social capital of homogeneous audiences have been identified as opposing the creation of social value at cultural events and in nightlife settings (Grazian, 2009; Wilks, 2011). Consequently, identifying the social values underlying electronic music events for stakeholders and participants poses a relevant subject for investigation due to these discrepancies. As the music is the linking element between the people who create and participate in the events, the performance of the music also carries value in itself, which is why the cultural value is another realm of value-creation.

2.5 Cultural Value

Music is a cultural good, which thus also entails cultural value. Klamer's (2004) discussion of the tripartite value of cultural goods broadly identifies cultural value as the ability to inspire or be inspired. This ability to recognize cultural value independent of social and economic influence is inborn, can be acquired and developed. It serves individuals to recognize the inspirational character of a good and the ability to identify its place in cultural history. This is closely related to Bourdieu's (1986) conception of cultural capital, which extends to individual’s social assets regarding their knowledge and intellectual skills. Cultural capital is important in a system of exchange within an economy, because it is transferred through all material and symbolic goods a society considers worthy. However, inherent in Bourdieu’s (1986) concept is that individuals hold cultural capital through their upbringing and their exposure in their social-and cultural environment and that its transmission occurs in an embodied, objectified, and institutionalized state. This conception goes beyond the propensity of a cultural good to inspire individuals (Bourdieu, 1986). However, in this study the more general theoretical notion is followed that cultural capital gives rise to cultural value as well as economic value, which is why cultural value cannot be considered without focusing on cultural capital as well. Here, cultural capital is then a resource that embodies, stores, or provides cultural value in addition to the economic value (Throsby, 2001).

In the context of electronic music and club culture, also Thornton's (1995) definition of the so-called subcultural capital is relevant as it acknowledges the specific features of club culture and the ways young people and other individuals find meaning and a way of identification. It is embodied through being ‘in the know’ of pioneering cultural tastes. Stakeholders shape and define subcultural
capital, which is the reason they are appreciated in the industry. Here, venue stakeholders and other artistic actors perform the role of converting (sub-)cultural capital into economic capital. Subcultural capital cannot be learned but is acquired through consumption and involvement with cultural goods and activities (Thornton, 1995). So, when talking about cultural value, the subcultural capital of the professional actors as well as the subcultural capital of the audience members needs to be part of the discussion because it is decisive over their exchanges in the scene.

Looking at the sources of cultural value in the bigger picture, the opportunities to experience live music in a city is a characterizing feature of its cultural vibrancy (van der Hoeven & Hitters, 2019). The cultural vibrancy of a city has been recognized to impact rates of innovation and economic growth (Florida, 2004). Openness and diversity in a city can stimulate creative ideas and support the cultural industries, while at the same time boosting the international profile of a city, attracting investment and creative workers. Hence, promoting the cultural vibrancy of a city helps to stimulate creativity, but it also attracts individuals who are talented and highly educated (Florida, 2002). With regard to the experience of live music, the connection of venues to local and global actors and their collaborations contributes cultural vibrancy as it allows for mixing and expansion of audiences (van der Hoeven & Hitters, 2019). Consequently, this highlights the connection between cultural value and economic value, but also the significance of providing opportunities for the experience of cultural goods for actors and citizens alike.

A closer look at venue stakeholders’ practices that contribute to cultural value has shown to be the fostering of upcoming (local) talents by using the venue as a platform. This practice supports the development of talent in a city and it can also extend to other forms of arts that can be incorporated in the experience (van der Hoeven & Hitters, 2019). When talking about local actors and development of local talent, it is important to remark that the urban context and atmosphere are relevant as specific music styles are linked to a certain city but also to a certain group of people or a lifestyle (Allington et al., 2015; Peter, 2014). Connecting a musical style or technique to a place signals authenticity because it embodies the lifestyle of the local subculture (Bader & Scharenberg, 2010). A prime example is Detroit techno or Dutch gabber. Through the explosion of the number of subgenres in electronic music, a geographical marker helps people to identify a certain sound (Peter, 2014). In the context of cultural value this plays a role because the learning and exchange of cultural knowledge occur through a diverse offer of genres and sites in a given city (Lobato, 2006), which was also just mentioned in the context of the cultural vibrancy of a city. The point here is that in the urban context a diversity in nightlife spaces are important for local artists to exchange tacit knowledge and the creation of new music styles.

On the same note, nightlife participants are stimulated and dependent on the diversity and the opportunities to acquire cultural capital. That is why the inclusion of a diversity of genres as well as the introduction of new genres or styles are relevant practices of live music venues. These practices carry the potential to spark people’s creativity, but they can also generally expand people’s
understanding of the music (van der Hoeven & Hitters, 2019). What is worth mentioning in this context is that creativity is a communicative experience between actors. Their exchange, interpretation, and understanding of the live music experience bring about the creativity (Negus & Pickering, 2004), which relates back to the idea of co-creation discussed before.

In summary, cultural value is defined in the ability to inspire or be inspired (Klamer, 2004). It is interrelated with the concept of cultural capital, which concerns people’s individual assets to recognize cultural value (Bourdieu, 1986). In the context of the cultural value underlying electronic music events, subcultural capital is represented and shaped by the industry actors (Thornton, 1995). At the same time, cultural value is associated with the stimulation of creativity and the cultural vibrancy of a city (Florida, 2002). In the live music industry, different practices can be sources for creativity such as the provision of the venue as a platform for local talent, musical experimentation in styles and genres, involvement of local and upcoming artists, talent development, and building connections between actors and different audiences (van der Hoeven & Hitters, 2019). Paying attention to the urban context and stimulating the local artistic development supports the production of differentiated cultural goods, which are thereby given a credit of authenticity and can become representative of a place or lifestyle (Bader & Scharenberg, 2010). All practices contribute to the exchange of cultural capital and the creation of cultural value. Although, only briefly mentioned in this discussion venue stakeholders are responsible to convert cultural value into economic value in order to ensure for the economic preservation of their venue. This will be further discussed below.

2.6 Economic Value

Following the tripartite division of the value of cultural goods by Klamer (2004), the third value is the economic value, which is often the most focal when discussing the value of culture and art in public debates. In this study, the cultural good is the music and the live experience at an electronic music venue. Economic value is referred to as the price that people are willing to pay for it and focuses on the moment of exchange. The demand-supply balance serves as a point of reference for the economic value implying that the price of a good represents all kinds of values. Demand is expressed in the form of preferences (Klamer, 2004).

However, as events move in the service industry, the determination of the monetary value does not follow the same principles as with material goods or products. Therefore, the value creation of electronic club music has been based in the cultural industry. Here, its market value is determined via two dimensions where one remains the economic dimension, which is bound to an input-output relation and the monetary output of the production network of the involved actors. The second dimension is the socio-cultural dimension of value creation, where value is determined through the exchange of the involved actors to produce it (Lange & Bürkner, 2010). This has been similarly proposed in Bourdieu's (1986) discourse about the conversion of economic capital. The economic output is interdependent with the social and cultural capital needed for the production, yet production
ultimately depends on the possession of economic capital in order to expend the required time to build social and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986). So, the resulting economic value cannot be detached from the aforementioned social and cultural values.

One crucial aspect that was touched upon in the introduction is the relation of actors in the electronic music industry to the mainstream cultural field. Electronic music clubs are considered to operate in the subfield of small-scale productions, which entails that they hold low economic capital and high levels of cultural capital, which can be later converted into economic or social capital. On the contrary, mainstream, or commercial actors in the dominant class hold high economic capital and lower levels of cultural capital. The actors engaged in small-scale productions are thus predestined to focus on the production of pure artistic products while operating in a denial of the economy. The reason for this is that the value of cultural goods cannot be signified by economic value as it is a product of belief, which is not produced according to the ordinary practices of the economy. Yet, essentially this denial is an expression of the challenges of conversion of the cultural value into economic value and the conflicts of power and autonomy between the different fields. Electronic music clubs are integrated into the wider economic system to which they contribute with their practices. At the same time, their practices, in terms of the events, create the need for the cultural products (Bourdieu, 1986). Operating in denial of the economy can be seen to present a system of belief about what products are believed to be valuable in a society. Bourdieu’s conceptualization is highly relevant when interpreting the economic value of cultural practices as it needs to be understood that the position of actors in the different fields characterizes their available capital and their power and autonomy for the production cultural capital.

To go more in depth concerning the socio-cultural dimension, reputation and trust are two aspects that are exchanged in the interactions of industry actors (Lange & Bürkner, 2010). Reputation plays a key role in the exchange as a positive reputation allows for the expectation of ‘return on past performance’ (Burt, 1992). Yet, reputation is suggested to be divided into network reputation and public reputation. Network reputation is based on the exclusive exchanges of information between industry actors. It is built from the positive evaluations of a performance by other relevant actors. On the contrary, public reputation is based on freely available information for audiences and scene participants. With regard to the personal relationships, the building of trust is also related to the exchange of reliable and credible information in comparison to market information that has been passed on and filtered by diverse groups of interest. Moreover, the exchange with trusted actors also holds the capacity to assign symbolic meaning to goods, thereby industry actors can set trends and influence consumption patterns. Stakeholders act as quality markers for exclusivity and innovation of the artistic activities while including their audiences in their evaluations (Lange & Bürkner, 2010). That is the reason why the production and consumption of the music at the club is important for DJs as they receive feedback from audiences and exchange network reputation with the club and other actors (Lange & Bürkner, 2010). This substantiates the significance of the social value underlying the
interaction between scene actors mentioned earlier. It is also representative of working in the cultural industries, where the exchange of (symbolic) knowledge requires connection with a trusted network through which risk can be minimized. Thereby, the economic success of actors can be ensured while fostering culturally specific production and new creative developments in the (local) network (Banks, Lovatt, O’Connor, & Raffo, 2000).

Conclusively, the economic value of cultural activities cannot be determined without looking at social and cultural values. Yet, due to the difficulty of conversion of social and cultural values, they do not necessarily reflect in economic value but are crucial for its creation (Bourdieu, 1986). In the context of actors in the electronic music industry, the personal relationships, trust, the negotiation of symbolic meaning through the exchange of symbolic knowledge and the exchange of network reputation are key features of the social-cultural dimension (Lange & Bürkner, 2010). Looking at economic value with this concept stresses the important position of venue stakeholders as mediators and negotiators of value. Therefore, their rationality when talking about their activities is an important source to understand these intertwined and difficult to assess interactions. This will be explored next through the characteristics of actors’ position in the cultural industry and ways of translating social, cultural, and economic values in their activities.

2.7 Value-Proposition

Important for understanding the practices of venue stakeholders is a contextualization in cultural industries. In cultural industries, work has increasingly become a source for self-actualization, freedom, and independence (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2011; McRobbie, 2002). The personal and social fulfillment cultural entrepreneurs find in their work is seen as the driving force of developing the cities creativity and competitive advantage (O’Connor & Wynne, 2017). But also, the creativity inherent to their work is assumed to permeate every aspect of their lives. Due to that, actors in the cultural industry are supposed to thrive on diversity and change and prioritize experiences over possession because of their desire for self-expression and individuality out balances the material gain (Baris, 2003). On the same note, cultural, creative and lifestyle considerations have found to outweigh the need to adjust to market forces in the decisions about investments, planning, and infrastructure (Banks et al., 2000). This ascription of characteristics appears to generalize the meaning of work in the cultural industries for actors. Yet, there may be more nuances among the different cultural spaces within the cultural industries depending on their position in the market.

Nevertheless, creativity can be assumed to lay the foundation for activities in the field of culture, music, and art. It is considered to evolve from a network of interactions between actors instead of being the product of individual activity. That is why face-to-face interaction with other relevant actors is a key element of the development of a creative idea because thereby stakeholders can combine their existing knowledge with the new knowledge gained from their own and others’ activities (Cohendet, Grandadam, & Simon, 2009). To describe these networks and exchanges
between actors, three different layers of a creative ecology have been identified: the underground, middleground, and the upperground. The underground looks at the creative individuals and is, therefore, most relevant for understanding venue stakeholders’ action spaces. Their activities naturally overlap and are also part of the middleground, which represents the transference of the creative ideas into economically viable products. The upperground is represented by the organizations and institutions, who use the resources available in the underground and middleground to generate profits with popular ideas (Cohendet et al., 2009).

Thus, here underground signifies the creative, artistic, and cultural activities, which happen independently of formal or institutional organization. It involves values such as authenticity, sincerity, freedom of creative expression, appreciation of art for its own sake, love in place of money, and a general inaccessibility of the underground. These values imply that actors in the underground are active in selected circles, which are characterized by individuals’ sharing the same passion for art and culture. This is important for the definition of their identity and lifestyle (Cohendet et al., 2009). The value of authenticity needs to be stressed as it denotes genuineness and credibility. When describing activities of the actors in the underground as authentic this implies that their behavior is representative of the community. Attributing importance to authenticity can be seen as a way to elevate the creative and cultural activities of the individuals above productions of the mass culture (Thornton, 1995), stressing the distinction earlier between large- and small-scale productions. Moreover, some of these characteristics of the underground have been supported by scene actors in the electronic music industry. Authenticity can be related to a predominant Do-It-Yourself (DIY) mindset and the significance of dedication to their work. Freedom of creative expression was also stressed and put in the same line with autonomy as well as an aversion towards state-regulation. Both characteristics were also expressed in the fear of losing the freedom and aesthetics of what marks the scene - or underground - when (state) actors interfered with its activities (Kühn, 2011). Since venue owners link the informal underground culture with the formal organizations, they are part of the intermediary group of the middle ground, which brings electronic music to the market (Cohendet et al., 2009). This aversion against external regulation could therefore also be interpreted in the way that stakeholders aim to protect their creative spaces and knowledge from being used to generate profit by formal corporate or governmental entities in the upperground. Positioning the electronic music scene in the underground milieu of creativity stresses the motivation of actors to be involved out of passion (Cohendet et al., 2009) and thus it also relates to their value-proposition since it underlines a focus on creativity and artistic output dominating their decision making.

When investigating the relation of activities between the three layers, it is also relevant to point out that with regard to electronic music, its production is distinct from other genres as it is produced and distributed predominantly digitally, which detaches it from cultural boundaries (Tschmuck, 2012). Nevertheless, there are still music styles and subgenres, which are characteristic of a place and mark the local identity of the scene (Peter, 2014). The reason for this is that in the
underground layer of the cultural industry, the frequent interaction and proximity between actors is a prerequisite and supports the emergence of creative products (Cohendet et al., 2009). Here, it is noteworthy that in the electronic music industry, the music market is dominated by independent labels. The establishment of labels is one form of middleground activity and; in line with the underground notion, they have been found to not operate by market-driven aims. Accordingly, this supports a distinction of the mainstream (Cohendet et al., 2009; van der Velden & Hitters, 2016). But it also shows that stakeholders’ actions concerning local and global artists play a role for the exchanges of cultural knowledge and therefore the development of the music on a global level.

Therefore, the curation of the music by the venue stakeholders plays a defining role in the possibilities for value creation. Although it needs to be remarked again that scene actors and audiences together contribute to the symbolic value of music. Nonetheless, venue stakeholders’ selection of DJs and other collaborations are a response to the production and scene activities of the DJs in the industry. Their ascription of attributes of proficiency to individuals is a critical action for determining the orientation, quality, and quantity of musical products (Lange & Bürkner, 2013). As actors in the underground, this process is based on the shared tacit norms between scene members (Cohendet et al., 2009). The result is then a hierarchy of taste, which is respected because of the stand of the members in the scene (Lange & Bürkner, 2013). In the concept of the creative milieu of the underground, the status of scene members was also dependent on their social capital in the form of the amount of contacts and respect (Cohendet et al., 2009).

Additionally, a curation of music also implies that club owners follow an artistic ambition. Their artistic ambition can be assumed to be expressed in their choices in musical style or subgenre. In past research about electronic music clubs, it has been observed that when a club chooses to be highly specialized in musical style, this also influences the kind of audience they attract (Allington, Dueck, & Jordanous, 2015). As mentioned earlier, in Berlin’s electronic music clubs, a careful selection of the audience was applied in order to guard the atmosphere. This conveyed social exclusiveness to visitors and elitism for those visitors that were admitted to the club (Lange & Bürkner, 2013). This specialized audience was assumed to be able to provide valuable feedback for the DJ (Lange & Bürkner, 2013), which implies that they hold the necessary cultural capital for active participation. Hence, the musical focus and selection of audiences represent the artistic and implicitly the social ambition of the venue stakeholders.

In summary, the work of venue stakeholders in the cultural industries can be a source for personal fulfillment, which is beneficial for their exchanges and integration in the industry (O’Connor & Wynne, 2017). The underground creative milieu of the involved actors is crucial for collaborations and the creativity evolving from interactions there. The network represents a source for human connection between the like-minded (Cohendet et al., 2009). The international and local interaction and involvement of actors are dependent on the underground creative ecology and the exchange of network reputation (Cohendet et al., 2009; Lange & Bürkner, 2010). Choice in musical genre, desired
audience and atmosphere represent artistic and social ambitions in practice. Yet, opposing notions have been proposed concerning Berlin’s venue stakeholders. They have shown to widely differ in their artistic ambitions. Their division was marked by diverse economic and social criteria with economic criteria dominating their ambitions (Lange & Bürkner, 2013). This exemplifies that involvement in the industry must not be equated or considered to be independent of economic ambitions.
3. Methods

3.1 Choice of Methodology

For the purpose of this study, a qualitative study design is chosen because the focus of interest are the unique perceptions, values, and experiences of venue stakeholders. The sub-questions of this research entail the experiential aspects of events and the conception of a value-oriented community surrounding the genre, which asks for an approach directed at the socially constructed realities of its actors. Qualitative research, in this case, provides the opportunity to understand the sensemaking of individuals and explore the non-quantifiable values that are perceived by the stakeholders. Thereby, their lifeworlds and the interplay of the different values can be better understood. In the course of this research, a constructivist paradigm is followed assuming a negotiation of truth among participating actors (Brennen, 2012).

Expert interviews with club owners and event organizers are chosen as a methodological approach. These actors can be expected to hold institutionalized authority to construct reality, whereby Hitzler's (2013) definition of an expert is followed. This method allows acknowledging professional knowledge in the field of cultural industries. Also, venue stakeholders of electronic music clubs are considered experts because of their contextual position within the industry and the decisive power their position entails. Their power and responsibility for their employees and the economic success of the maintenance of the venue make them key figures in the industry. They are a point of contact for all other stakeholders within the organizational structures of that industry: collectives, labels, artists, and visitors. So, the interviews aim to explore the features and dimensions, on which the stakeholders emphasize cultural, social, and economic values, which are ultimately reflected in their decisions about the activities at their venue and their perception of the experience.

3.2 Sampling Criteria

Expert interviews with venue stakeholders were conducted using purposive sampling. Purposive sampling is chosen because the selected experts are expected to be information-rich cases, which help to understand the common phenomena regarding experience and value-creation in the industry (Gentles, Charles, Ploeg, & McKibbon, 2015). Given that the number of venues and clubs is limited through a given city’s infrastructure as well as the possible market share in terms of audience size, also the number of stakeholders available for recruitment is limited. Also, with respect to the fact that experts in the electronic music industry are recruited, accessibility is generally an issue because of the significant role of these stakeholders in the industry. Yet, also personified barriers such as other employees being in charge of the communication and public relations of the venue can hinder direct contact with and recruitment of stakeholders (Littig, 2009).

In the selection of the respective electronic music venues, the following criteria were applied: The selected venues are specialized in events within the musical genres of electronic music and cater to a selected audience. Venues may also organize or engage in alternative income activities such as
events focused on other genres during weekdays or third-party leases; however, the focus on electronic music can be clearly identified through the frequency and marketing of the events. All aspects are relevant to ensure an affiliation with the industry and to establish a sample, in which venue stakeholder’s range in decisions and expertise can be compared.

3.3 Recruitment and Sample Characteristics

The interview participants were inquired via email about their willingness to participate. Additionally, the personal network of the researcher was used to get referrals to or contact information from stakeholders. Recruitment mails were tailored to the venue’s activities and relevance for the study in order to show the researcher’s engagement and knowledge about the venue.

In the Netherlands 19 venues were contacted, in Belgium three venues, and in Germany, three venues were contacted concerning their willingness for participation. Finally, a total of ten venue stakeholders were recruited. Eight stakeholders were located in the Netherlands, one in Belgium, and one in Germany. Eight interviewees were male and two female. The venues’ capacity ranged from 150 to 1500 people. The research sample can be considered to represent high-quality sources of information because of the amount of time most interviewees have been involved in the industry and the inclusion of several well-established venues in the electronic music industry. The depth and quality of the information of the stakeholders justified the size of the sample. Further contextual information is displayed in Appendix A.

As electronic music is produced mostly digitally (Tschmuck, 2012), it moves in a global industry (Bader & Scharenberg, 2010). Hence, also actors producing, exchanging, and staging the experience of the music act on an international level. Therefore, researching venues from different European countries may shed light on shared values inherent to the industry and common strategies in the global industry. Diverging geographical and political conditions need to be taken into account, within the Netherlands but also in the other countries as is for instance discussed with regard to Berlin by Peter (2014). Methodologically, expert knowledge is context specific and gained through the activities the individuals engage in. Venue stakeholders need to work with the functional requirements of these contexts, which do not have to be restricted to local contexts (Meuser & Nagel, 2009).

3.4 Data Collection and Procedure

The data collection took place between March 26th, 2019 and May 3rd, 2019. The interview’s duration ranged between 60 to 90 minutes. Nine interviews were conducted face-to-face, while one interview was conducted via phone. All interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Data collection was stopped after a point of saturation was reached. This was indicated by an experience of informational redundancy in the interview process (Gentles et al., 2015). Thereby it is ensured that results are a fair representation of the phenomena present in the population. The interviews were held at locations convenient to the participants such as the offices connected to the venues, private houses, or in a public space. Prior to the start of the interview, participants were
briefed concerning the purpose of their study, asked for written or oral consent to be audio-recorded as well as provided information about the background of the researcher and her involvement with the subject matter. Thereby, interviewers should recognize the researcher as an equal conversation partner.

Prior to the interviews, the interviewer informed herself thoroughly by looking at the venue’s website, social media pages and online groups set up by the venues, as well as previous interviews or reports available online from newspapers or magazines. Further, the venues booking schemes and previous collaborations with third parties were a point of reference for the interviewer and supported the adaption of the interview questions. With regard to the method of choice, this was relevant for the execution of the interview as the expert interviews require the presentation of expertise and knowledge of the industry on the side of the interviewer as is advised by Meuser and Nagel (2009).

The interview followed a semi-structured approach in accordance with the exploratory style of the study. Hence, the interview conversation was guided by a topic list structured around the sub-questions, so the experience, values, and decisions of the stakeholders (Appendix B). The sensitizing concepts presented in the theoretical framework were used as guidance. Particularly Lange and Bürkner’s (2013) study of industry stakeholders in Berlin served as a point of orientation. So, the topic list included the owner’s perception of the experiences, audience characteristics, and selection, ways of operating with regards to the description of the collaborations, their economic rationality, and alternative sources of income. Yet, the questions were kept considerably open so to leave room for interpretation and the emergence of topics (Bogner & Menz, 2009). As remarked in Kvale (2019) and entailed in the process of interviewing experts (Abels & Behrens, 2009), the expert knowledge gained in the process was used in subsequent interviews and altered the understanding, and hence questions posed by the researcher.

Directly following the interview, the interviewer noted down her interpersonal experience of the interview, what she learned from it and the central message of the interview. This contextual information of the nonverbal aspects and meanings supported the understanding and later interpretation of the transcriptions (Kvale, 2019).

3.5 Analysis

A thematic analysis of the transcriptions of the interviews was executed with the qualitative data analysis software ATLAS.ti. Thematic analysis is deemed most appropriate to systematically identify shared meanings and experiences across interviews. The analysis was primarily executed using an inductive approach driven by what is present in the data. In later phases of analysis, this was combined with a reflection of the theoretical concepts and the data (Braun, Clarke, Hayfield, & Terry, 2019).

For the coding of the data, Saldaña's (2015) methodological guidelines were followed. Coding written data aims to uncover recurrent patterns of actions and consistencies in the interviews (Saldaña,
2015), whereby a focus was put on the interpretation and latent meaning (Braun & Clarke, 2012). The coding process was conducted in two rounds. The first round of coding was done following an initial coding and a value coding method as introduced by Saldaña (2015). Initial coding allows for an open-ended inductive emergence of codes. Value coding is particularly appropriate for the exploration of cultural values, intrapersonal, and interpersonal experiences. The text passages were coded using a split coding technique to allow for scrutiny of the social action dynamics of the stakeholders. After the first round of coding, data was recoded following a deductive approach applying the theoretical concepts to the data corpus. Subsequently, in second cycle coding, axial coding was applied (Appendix C). This involved a strategic reassembling of the split codes to conceptualize and merge them into subcategories (Saldaña, 2015). The emerging themes were iteratively reviewed with the coded extracts and the entire data set. In that way, a consistent application of codes and themes was ensured. This finally resulted in a thematic map with the main themes and subcategories (Appendix D) (Braun et al., 2019).

3.6 Operationalization

Following the previously presented theoretical framework the theoretical concepts of the experiential aspects of the electronic music events, the social value, the cultural value, the economic value, and the decision-making activities were operationalized as follows when coding the data.

3.6.1 Experiential aspects. As music being a sensual experience it includes the body movement, lighting, and the perception of space and time, which cannot be identified separately (Nardi, 2012). Also, the aesthetics created in the form of the corporeal experience of the music, meaning the way in which audience members were dancing or moving in the space were analyzed as experiential aspects (Biehl & Vom Lehn, 2016). A collective experience was understood as audience members creation of an atmosphere through a kinaesthetic interaction through dancing (Böhme, 1993). Also the use of visual stimuli as in lighting, visual art or performances were identified as experiential aspects (Nardi, 2012). The position of the DJ booth (Nardi, 2012), the DJs performance role and the sound-producing machines are elements mediating and contributing to the experience (Ferreira, 2008), which is why interview partners were asked about the spatial position and actions of the DJ in their space and the quality of the sound system.

3.6.2 Social value. Social value was conceived of as the social interactions and exchanges, which were enabled or supported by the venue. This also included a sense of belonging, a perception of a collective identity, social distinction, freedom, trust, responsibility, and friendships, which were related to the actions or the existence of the venue (Klamer, 2004).

3.6.3 Cultural value. Cultural value in this study denotes the artistic quality of the music presented at events, experimentation in music, diversity in (sub-)genres, and creativity (Klamer, 2004). This theoretical conception by Klamer (2004) was further extended through a focus on the role of the venue as point of connection among the other actors (collectives, labels, DJs), and between the actors
and the audience. Within cultural value, cultural capital was identified separately following Bourdieu (1986). Cultural capital is understood as the cultural knowledge and intellectual skills necessary to be a participant in the production or consumption of the music.

3.6.4 Economic value. Economic value is understood as the financial aspects entailed in the business regarding the economic value of the event as a cultural good, the monetary exchanges between actors and the revenue strategies of the venues. This follows the discussion of Klamer (2004) concerning the division between cultural, social, and economic value.

3.6.5 Value-proposition. The value-proposition of the owners was assumed to be expressed in their decisions about the activities at their venue. Hence, formerly identified themes by Lange and Bürkner (2013) such as the role of opportunities, their determinants for booking DJs and working with other actors, the role of reputation, and their network building activities were part of the analysis. Additionally, stakeholders’ decisions concerning their focus on local and international actors and their online engagement were analyzed (Van Heur, 2014). Value-proposition also entails the identification of the alternative strategies to generate (economic) value as is exemplified in Lange and Bürkner (2013) through third-party leases. This operationalization is guided by the conception of the electronic music venue as operating in a value-creating ecology, which also involves the co-creation of value with consumers, so stakeholder’s investments in or involvement of the community is coded for (Hearn, Roodhouse, & Blakey, 2007). Apart from these previously theorized categories, potential value-propositions were also derived from the background and motivations for stakeholders’ involvement in the industry.

3.7 Objectivity, Reliability, and Validity

Objectivity in the interviews was aimed to be achieved through dialogical intersubjectivity on the level of researcher and participant through the clarification and validation of information with participants during the interview (Kvale, 2019).

Reliability of the information provided by the interview partners was checked for consistency and basic truthfulness. The validity of the factual information provided was verified through other sources. Additionally, knowledge or issues brought up in interviews were mentioned in subsequent interviews in order to be verified and reflected by more interviewees. Findings gained were continuously reflected during data collection (Kvale, 2019).

Also, in expert interviews status relation and gender are important for the dynamics of the situation. With regard to the status relation, the interviewer experienced a paternalism effect with one of the participants due to the large age difference (Abels & Behrens, 2009). Through gaining increasing knowledge from the experts, the interviewer was able to better present herself as a competent conversational partner in later interviews, which consequently influenced the exchange and value of information (Kvale, 2019; Meuser & Nagel, 2009). The female gender of an interviewer is often remarked as disadvantageous when interviewing in male-dominated fields - as is the case for the
electronic music industry - because the perception of gender may dominate over professional role (Meuser & Nagel, 2009). The researcher did not consciously note any such impacts in the verbal or (non-) verbal behavior of the male participants. However, together the young age and gender may present a limitation of the results of this study.
4. Results

This research aimed to explore how the underlying values of electronic music events are constructed by venue stakeholders and (co-)created at their events. In the sub-questions, this was explored in terms of the experience, social, cultural, and economic value, and the resulting value-proposition. But as the experience and value-proposition are based on the value constructs, the themes surrounding social, cultural, and economic value are discussed first, followed by the experience and the value-proposition. In total seven key themes will be introduced in the following order: 1) Creation of alternative social dynamics, 2) Continuity of scene, 3) Value determination between scene and mainstream participants, 4) Actors’ embedding in (global) music ecology, 5) Conflict between artistic vision, audience characteristics, and economic sustainability, 6) Club as social-cultural refuge from public space, and 7) Translating the self in the industry.

In order to draw a better picture of how value is created at electronic music clubs, it is important to point out that the analysis revealed that several external circumstances were determining opportunities for value-creation. These aspects were not the focus of the study, but they are key determinants for the activities of stakeholders, which is why they will be introduced first.

The music ecology, in which the venue was located determined the connection to actors and audiences in different regards. On the larger scale, the geographical location of a venue was a determining factor, more precisely its location inside the city but also regional. On the local level, the venue’s location influenced the kind of audience that visits a venue. This impact is corroborated in a study of the Toronto DJ scene, where large differences were noted between what audiences perceived to be acceptable music styles in different locations within the city (Elafros, 2013). On the regional level, stakeholders indicated that their location influenced the size of the audience that was interested in their events and the level of competition they experienced from surrounding cities. This is particularly applicable for the Netherlands as the country is well connected via public transport and distances between cities are considerably small. For that reason, music aficionados can flexibly choose between their most preferred artists and events. This notion has likewise been supported by Crim (2008) in his research about nightclub location choice in New York City. His study indicated that the accessibility of venues via different modes of transport as well as the clustering of clubs in the same district had an impact on the kind of audiences they attract. Besides that, the size of the population was decisive for the size of the possible audience that owners could attract. The significance of this aspect has been previously noted by Allington et al. (2015) in his research about the London music scene. Artists that were located in or relocated to London found that they are able to attract a larger audience for experimental music there as compared to other parts of the country. Another important key aspect was the size of the venue. The size of the venue naturally determines the number of people that can be hosted but also defines the financial possibilities in DJ bookings since more reputable DJ ask higher fees. This issue will be discussed in more detail with regard to the
economic value of the events. All these features point to the relevance of the economic value; however, it will become clear in the following how these external aspects are interconnected with social and cultural values.

4.1 Social Value

4.1.1 Creation of alternative social dynamics

The first theme that emerged from the data in the context of social value was the *creation of alternative social dynamics*. It demonstrates that scene actors and audiences are provided new ways to exchange and interact through the club events. The first part of the discussion of this theme touches upon the personal relationships, community, and the aspect of freedom in relation to the social interactions of the stakeholders and other industry actors. The second part discusses inclusiveness, diversity, identity, and freedom in the relation of stakeholders and audiences. Both resonate with the social values defined by Klamer (2004).

First, personal relationships between scene actors were seen to be highly relevant in the industry. This resonates with prior research, where personal relationships were more relevant for actors in non-mainstream genres. This was associated with their shared sense of purpose that facilitated the building of friendships, collaborations and the flow of information (Hoyler & Mager, 2005). In this respect, stakeholders’ description of their relationship with other actors was particularly interesting because they wanted to make them ‘feel at home’ while striving to build a community between the like-minded. Building connections between artists and providing a platform of (social) exchange was perceived as a responsibility by venue stakeholders. This supports previous findings concerning a feeling of belonging among industry actors (Kavanaugh & Anderson, 2008). Especially, the reference to home is associated with the intimate connections found in families and resonated with prior studies of the electronic music scene (Kavanaugh & Anderson, 2008; Sommer, 2001). On the same note, the friendships that evolved from working together were frequently remarked and transcended beyond the events. For example, one interviewee said:

> I've not made so many friends as I have made in the past two years ever, you know, and it's so nice and it would be so difficult for me to step out of this industry again if I ever would. . . . But the one's that you find yourself aligned with, you know, you can do business with them, but you can also go to party with and make music with them. It's very nice. (owner, Het Magazijn)

The significance of being sociable and creating bonds with other people in the music industry has also been previously discussed by Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011) and has shown to provide great satisfaction as well as stimulate creativity. In their study, it was apparent that for actors who chose not to engage in networking or socializing to the same extent as others in the industry, it was
considered as limiting their opportunities for new projects in the field (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2011). The reason for this is that through socializing, personal ties and trust are established, which breaks down industry boundaries and thereby becomes a source for new collaborations (Banks et al., 2000). Thus, sociability and networking is not necessarily a choice but also often compulsory when working in the industry (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2011) and can become in its own a structural configuration for value-creation (Lange & Bürkner, 2013).

This partial instrumentalization of social relationships was also expressed by interviewees in this study as they acknowledged that their personal relationships with artists were relevant for DJ bookings. The personal relationship was one aspect among others for DJs to return to a club in the future. Other aspects were the experience of the venue and audience as well as operational aspects. This was expressed by one interviewee as follows:

[T]he most important thing for us is doing the artist handling . . ., making sure that the people that play here have the best experience possible . . . we chat a little, get to know the people more behind the artist, . . . and make sure that they feel welcome and that they feel at home . . . it's important because [then] they want to come back, which is one of the most important things. (general manager, Perron)

Still, the social exchanges between venue stakeholders and other scene actors are dominated by the potential for building friendships and a community that can provide a sense of belonging. The degree to which the interactions are sincere or marked by other purposes is difficult to assess.

Moreover, freedom was another social value that was embraced by some stakeholders. As one interviewee explained: “Also freedom is . . . a very important part of our vision. Freedom of expression in arts, freedom of expression in being, freedom of expression in music” (owner, Paradigm). This framing is interesting in several respects. On the one side, this statement can be seen against the background of Bourdieu’s idea of autonomy and power, where this stakeholder’s striving to provide freedom is a resistance against the power that is exerted from the dominant class. In comparison to the large-scale productions, the small-scale productions, which the venues of this study are involved in, are characterized by a high level of autonomy, which Bourdieu acknowledged to be beneficial for cultural production (Hesmondhalgh, 2006). This stakeholder’s goal to provide an unrestricted experience of the self and the music can be considered as a desire for autonomy from external struggles. High levels of autonomy were also considered to be associated with high symbolic capital denoting prestige or honor (Hesmondhalgh, 2006), or in the case of clubs - reputation. Next to that, striving for freedom in cultural activities is also considered to be a basic freedom that is essential for development (Sen, 2004). Hence, on the larger scale next to the benefits for cultural production, freedom in culture helps the development of the ones involved.
In summary, the sources of social value for venue stakeholders and scene actors were found in the use of the venue as a platform to build personal connections and a community between the likeminded. Close personal relationships and friendships were a common occurrence when working together in the industry and consequently also influenced future collaborations and involvement in the industry.

Secondly, the interactions between venue stakeholders and their audience are an opportunity for the creation of social value - inside and outside of the events. Here, inclusiveness, diversity, sources of identity, and diversity were identified as predominant social values with regard to the theoretical framework of this study (Bourdieu, 1986; Klamer, 2004; Putnam, 2000). Inclusiveness was denoted through the fact that stakeholders preferred diversity in their audiences, meaning that they did not show any preference concerning their age, gender, sexual orientation, or clothing style and was combined with their goal to bring people together at their events. This finding differs from Grazian (2009), who found that urban nightlife spaces differentiate and segregate visitors by race, class, and gender. Yet, it is consistent with Anderson’s (2009) account for the electronic music scene, which she described as inclusive environments, where diversity, acceptance, and equity were key features. This discrepancy could be attributed to the kind of genre and the personal characteristics of the individuals visiting particular venues, which may result in a natural segregation around taste as Conner (2015) noted for the audience of EDM events being predominately white, middle-class, and heterosexual males.

To varying degrees, there was a conviction among stakeholders that audience diversity can inspire people. One interviewee described her perception of the experience for their visitors as follows: “I think people just have the ability to show themselves or to even develop themselves in like meeting other people. . . . There’s a big diversity of people here so you meet a lot of inspiring people” (owner, BAR). These encounters were considered to lead to intersocial or even intergenerational exchanges and learning and to support the breaking down of prejudices according to the interviewees. Generally, actors stressed the feature of socializing, meeting new people, and building friendships; also between the actors and audience members. Socializing was facilitated by a division of space within venues as all investigated venues featured “chill-out” areas. These findings are consistent with Klamer’s (2004) and Bourdieu’s (1986) accounts of interpersonal relationships, norm building and friendships as an outcome of the involvement in cultural events. It also implies the potential for bridging social capital because of targeting diversity in the audience (Putnam, 2000).

Furthermore, in the view of the stakeholders, participation could bring about a collective, even if only temporary, identity: “They come here and at this point, you know, they’re just one of . . . the Perron visitors and they are one of the Perron family” (general manager, Perron). Here, the notion of the venue as providing a home or community for their actors and visitors is reiterated. This demonstrates that stakeholders perceived a shared sense of belonging among their visitors, comparable to Kavanaugh and Anderson’s (2008) discussion of solidarity at electronic music raves.
Therefore, venue stakeholders were providing audiences the opportunity to connect to likeminded others and be part of a community, which are social values acknowledged by Klamer (2004).

Besides these active ways of interaction, freedom was also a social value that was represented in the vision of stakeholders. One stakeholder explained it with regard to their door policy and the experience at her venue as follows: “…we ask them if they can deal with total freedom” (owner, BAR). Creating a free atmosphere at the venue was seen as a prerequisite to stage events targeted to e.g. the queer community, who is frequently marginalized in public and nightlife. It indicates that stakeholders are concerned about the social position of these groups in society, whereby this is an issue that lays beyond their mission of electronic music programming. This concern is not surprising regarding the roots of electronic music in Disco in the 1970s. At that time the culture around Disco was queer in terms of its refusal of both straight normative and gay normative articulations (Lawrence, 2011). Nevertheless, stakeholders’ choice to provide their space for these communities can be seen as representative of an alteration of the social dynamics in mainstream society.

Of course, these reports of the exchanges of audience members and their diversity are only observational and self-experiential in nature but they tell an important story for the determination of the (potential) social value that these events carry for attendees. Even though the actual sociodemographic characteristics of the audience members cannot be verified with regard to their diversity, stakeholders’ accounts point to (the potential of) bridging and bonding social capital (Putnam, 2000). Additionally, the strong emphasis of inclusiveness stands in stark contrast to the exclusiveness promoted by stakeholders in Berlin. There stakeholders targeted a specialized carefully selected audience (Lange & Bürkner, 2013), which is rather in line with Bourdieu's (1986) discussion of the potential of elitism and social exclusivity that can be involved in the consumption of cultural goods. Notably, interviewees frequently referenced Berlin, the renowned club Berghain, and their strict door policy in order to draw a comparison between their approach and the exclusivity that is promoted at Berghain (O’Brien, 2011).

Drawing these points together with regard to the research question the social value of the electronic music clubs lies apart from socializing in the openness of these venues for people from various ages, gender, sexuality, and race and the opportunity for likeminded people to interact at the venue. Yet, also the promotion of community and freedom by the stakeholders are additional social values (Klamer, 2004). These approaches are viewed to be alternative to the experiences in modern day society as discriminating, segregated, and law-abiding. Therefore, the venue provides a space where social interactions can occur between individuals who through their different background would not come into contact otherwise. This can support well-being, trust, and cooperation between people (Putnam, 2000).
4.1.2 Continuity of scene

The second theme that emerged in the context of social value was the continuity of scene, which covers diverse ways of identification with other industry actors and audience members. Opinions of the stakeholders in this study were diverse regarding their definition and perception of belonging to a scene. Some solely acknowledged that they were connected to other actors because of working in the same industry but they did not regard themselves as part of a community outside of that context. Likewise, they did not see a communal connection among their audience members. In that way, they mirrored notions known from the corporate music industry (Negus, 1999). Still, others remarked an in-group identification with the people working at their venue and other actors, but they did not consider their audience to belong to a scene. Assumingly, those stakeholders used more narrow criteria that go beyond a shared liking of the music in their group identification. On the opposite site were those stakeholders that felt a strong community among themselves, the other actors, and their audience. This diversity in viewpoints may very well be a reflection of the continually shifting dynamics in the electronic music industry mentioned by Kavanaugh and Anderson (2008) and thus are not regarded as conflicting the continuity of a scene. Still, these distinctions are relevant for the question of social value creation because stakeholders’ identification with a larger community extending beyond their events can imply a greater potential for social and cultural value.

While there was no clear consensus among the stakeholders, some common features serving identification were remarked. Most notably was a notion of shared personal attributes among scene actors and visitors. Scene participants were described as open-minded, non-judgmental, and respectful. In this context, some actors even equated the genre of Techno implying this ethos:

“If somebody is being . . . overtly rude or anti-gay, . . . this isn't part of Techno. Techno was never made as an elitist art form or a sexual [music], for me Techno is the most asexual music there is” (owner, Fuse).

“[S]o we have the socializing part as well because this is Techno and it's very open minded” (general manager, Perron).

“Techno is like for combining people and like getting people together and like enjoying Techno music and no prejudice” (owner, BASIS).

These accounts stress the social character that stakeholders associate with the genre but also the description of music as asexual implicitly draws a comparison to other genres that have strong ethnic or cultural roots such as Hip Hop with roots in the Hispanic and African American communities in South Bronx in New York City (Rose, 1994). This again also underlines the
placelessness of electronic music in general (Tschmuck, 2012), which may contribute to the idea of a fluid cosmopolitanism in scenes according to Hesmondhalgh (2005). But more importantly, the emphasis on personal attributes is striking as personal attributes are inherent to individuals and thus persist beyond the time of the event. This is suggestive of a connection between genre and lifestyle but also points to a distinction of the lifestyle and personal attributes of those who are believed to belong to the scene (MacRae, 2004) and those who do not carry the desired traits. Those individuals could mainly be considered to be mainstream participants (Thornton, 1995).

On the same note, questions about stakeholders’ own lifestyle and common personal characteristics revealed that they judged the electronic music industry to carry with it an inherent lifestyle and a like-mindedness in terms of sharing the same taste and points of view. This finding is in accordance with Cohendet et al.’s (2009) description of the underground layer of a creative milieu. It demonstrates that shared taste and personal characteristics are features through which industry actors can identify with others beyond their local venue (Hesmondhalgh, 2005).

Moreover, group identification can also extend to the venue’s audience. One stakeholder reported that there existed a small minority of young audience members, who formed rigid groups around a specific sub-genre such as e.g. Techno. According to the interviewee, this group formation was used as a point of identification and denoted a particular lifestyle of the group members. Belonging to this group signaled strong commitment and cohesion between the aficionados of that genre. It also served the purpose to further demarcate oneself from other groups that were considered to be more commercial. This strongly expressed way of group identification demonstrates more rigid ways of identification known from the concept of subculture (Hesmondhalgh, 2005). Particularly the fact that these groups flock around a specialist genre, have young members, and are a minority supports the notion of subculture (Thornton, 1995). Additionally, this draws on past findings concerning genre fragmentation, where genre fragmentation was seen to enable the establishment of social boundaries and thereby becomes a subject for identification (Bourdieu, 1984). However, one may argue that due to the young age of these individuals, these rigid groups are only of temporary nature. The search of identity in that life stage fits a modern notion of fluid self-identities in the light of fracturing communities, blurring of class distinctions, and uncertain futures. Here, clubbing serves as a point of reference, identification, and group assimilation for those young individuals (Huq, 2007). Nevertheless, this finding stresses the property of music to serve as a point of identification, even though this might only be strongly embraced by the younger audiences. The question here thus is not whether they represent a subculture or scene, but the way their identification with a cultural good influence their social and cultural exchanges.

This thought directly connects to the significance of co-creation of the scene by the stakeholders and audience. Particularly striking in this regard were stakeholders accounts concerning the number of regulars of their club. For some venues, regulars made up about one third to half of their audience. Having a stable group of regulars that can provide valuable feedback was an important

contribution for the venues. Assumingly, regulars are better equipped in terms of their (sub-)cultural capital, which may also be the reason why stakeholders in Berlin targeted a specialized audience (Lange & Bürkner, 2013). Next to the contributions of the audience during the events, venue stakeholders engaged in online community building through social media through which audience engagement was also transferred to the digital space. On the one hand, this gave committed audience members the possibility to find and interact with like-minded others as well as to communicate their feedback concerning the events and artists. Hence, the audience members were also producing and shaping the scene with their input. On the other hand, social media also similarly provided stakeholders and audiences a platform to share music, industry-related content, and promotional material for events. This extension of music communities online is not a new phenomenon especially in the sphere of the digital production of electronic music (Tschech, 2012). The exchange of young music aficionados outside of events has also already been reported by Bloustien (2007). But besides that, this involvement emphasizes what Woo et al. (2015) noted regarding the socio-cultural production and consumption of the scene by stakeholders and audiences alike. In light of the underlying social value, stakeholders in this study stressed the importance of investing in the community and creating a platform for social and cultural exchange. Involvement in community building was claimed to be detached from commercial interests. Finally, providing a place outside of an institutionalized society - or as Woo et al. (2015) put it - ‘to find a home’ for individuals to interact and build relationships with each other can serve as a source for the development of mutually beneficial norms of reciprocity, trust, and possibilities for cooperation (Putnam, 2000).

In summary, venue stakeholders’ accounts revealed different ways, in which they identified themselves with other actors and the audience as part of a scene. In this analysis, the concept of scene was strongly argued for as it is found to be more suitable to represent the equal significance of production and consumption practices, that are culturally detached and are appropriate for modern day fluid identities (Hesmondhalgh, 2005; Woo et al., 2015). However, as hinted to before the relevant question is not if the stakeholders featured particular aspects of scene (or subculture), but what their common position with other industry actors is. So, this also involves the connection of their shared taste and characteristics and the meaning that they assign to it. As the feedback and participation of audiences were significant for venue stakeholders’ evaluation of their events, an equal emphasis on production and consumption of the music was recognizable (Woo, Rennie, & Poyntz, 2015). Hence, stakeholders acknowledged the agency of their audience and their significance for the value of their events. The fragmentation of audience members around specific subgenres provided a source for social division, especially for the younger audience members. The implications for the audience members need to be further explored in future research; however, for the club owners, this means that they are required to be in the know of these divisions and acknowledge these socio-cultural trends in their event planning. Finally, with regard to the question of the social value underlying the events, the connection with a lifestyle, the desire to exchange with the likeminded, and the opportunities to
engage with each other in- and outside of the venue were aspects contributing to the social value of the events. Building a community to which individuals can belong, exchange, and identify themselves are featured social values (Klamer, 2004; Putnam, 2000). Further research is required to confirm the values that scene participants ascribe to their participation and to explore the potential for bridging social capital in the audience (Putnam, 2000).

4.2 Cultural Value

4.2.1 Value determination between scene and mainstream participants

The first theme that emerged from the data in the context of cultural value was the value determination between scene and mainstream participants. This label denotes the challenges stakeholders face in meeting audience demands in electronic music. In this theme, the focus was put on the potential of the venue’s activities to inspire their audience but also the stakeholders’ assessment of their audience’s capacity to recognize the inspirational character (Klamer, 2004). In addition, the cultural (Bourdieu, 1986) and subcultural capital (Thornton, 1995) was considered. Regarding the former, this concerned the knowledge possessed by individuals and for the latter the familiarity with the current pioneering cultural tastes. The discussion of this theme is structured into venue stakeholders’ approaches concerning their bookings and musical focus, which is then reflected with the assessment of their audience.

Venue stakeholders’ artistic approaches were guided by a continuous consideration of how “niche” they wanted to be with their musical program. This was expressed in different priorities concerning their desire to introduce their audience to new music and to experiment in styles, which relates to the transfer of cultural knowledge to the audience. However, stakeholders’ choices in booking artists were consistently dependent on their assessment of and knowledge about their audience. At the same time, it was also dependent on the danceability and their judgments of quality. This stresses the centrality of dancing in the club experience. Concerning the assessment of the audience, venue stakeholders drew from successful experiences with past bookings, which can be considered as an application of their subcultural capital. Success was evaluated on two aspects: One was the stakeholder’s judgment of the performance of the DJ during the night and the other was the audience response to the performance of the DJ, also expressed in the atmosphere at the event. Notably, there was not one key determinant for judging the atmosphere, which highlights its intangibility. Several aspects such as way of dancing, extent of interaction and amount of money spent during the nights contributed to their assessment. Although, whether enough people attended the event to break even financially was still an important aspect for stakeholders. In the end, attendance was viewed to depend on more aspects than the musical quality alone such as successful promotion and other competing events. Stakeholders’ consideration of the financial success indicated the restrictions in autonomy that stakeholders experience in the performance of their artistic vision. This contradicts
the idea that actors within the subfield of small-scale productions have greater autonomy in their productions (Hesmondhalgh, 2006).

Moreover, it was found that scene participants such as the regulars of the venue were deemed to have more sophisticated knowledge of the music and the quality; however, there was a common consent that this group of people is small, often too small to cover costs. This was also due to distinction in tastes. Even though audiences from some subgenres also mixed, some subgenres were considered to have mutually exclusive audiences. In this respect, previous research on electronic music clubs indicated that venues commonly build their audience through focusing on specific genres or sub-genres appropriate for the local audience (Allington et al., 2015; Lange & Bürkner, 2013). Yet, current findings rather point to a specialization of audiences around specific subgenres rather than venues, which was demonstrated by the often-diverse subgenres that were featured at the venues. The aspect of genre fragmentation in electronic music has been previously acknowledged and related to the establishment of own cultural styles, more sophisticated preferences and tastes, and the desire to rebuild intimacy in smaller groups in an expanding scene (Anderson, 2009).

Even though views varied greatly concerning which (sub-)genres to program, stakeholders agreed that variety, within a genre or between different subgenres, is a necessity to exploit those different specialized audiences. One interviewee pointed to the fact that the size of the local audience forced him to program more ‘commercial’ artists:

So, having a club with a big local following, it's nice because your people are very loyal, and you can build up loyalty. But on the other hand, you have to make some concessions because a town, London is 10 million people you know. It's like we have only . . . one million so that's already one tenth. So, it means that automatically you have 90 percent less potential audience than you would have in a place like London or Paris or even Berlin. So yeah, we . . . do have to make some commercial concessions to make sure that we can . . . run it as . . . a real business. (owner, Fuse)

Here, a separation within the audience becomes apparent. On the one side are the loyal and knowledgeable scene participants and on the other side mainstream participants, who hold low (sub-)cultural capital. The mainstream participants are assumed to lack an understanding of the (sub-)cultural capital of lesser-known artists or of a particular subgenre. This was substantiated by the finding that renown artists function as a reference point for the less knowledgeable and distinct audience. Yet, notably the high fees of renown artists often made them unaffordable for small or medium size venues. Similar dynamics have been reported in Anderson's (2009) study of the development of the EDM scene and the professionalization that has occurred since the decline of the rave scene. One of her most important findings in this context was that seeing a renown DJ had become a primary motivation for attendance. This, however, appeared to remove it from the PLUR
ethos formerly held up by scene members. More importantly, it was remarked that the conviction that ‘superstar’ DJs were necessary to energize scenes, could be hampered by the high fees that are required for booking them (Anderson, 2009). Therefore, the inference is drawn that the cultural value of the musical program is constantly renegotiated between the scene participants and the larger group of mainstream participants. This negotiation between mainstream and scene participants can be interpreted with the earlier introduced concept of the relation between the dominant and the dominated class (Hesmondhalgh, 2006). Here, the dominant mainstream participants exercise their economic power over the cultural activities at the club, which forces the venue stakeholders to make ‘concessions’ in their artistic vision. Still, stakeholders in this study were aware that they cannot fully enforce their own vision on their audience, as stated by one interviewee: “[I]t can't totally be like my playhall” (owner, BAR). So, by making these concessions venues can be seen to open up the musical field through which they navigate their program in order to remain accessible for the mainstream audience. Thereby, those individuals receive the opportunity to access these cultural experiences and develop cultural capital.

In summary, these findings provide support for several key points relevant to the cultural value on the stakeholder – audience level. The aim to introduce and educate audiences with a distinct musical programming, variety in genres and willingness to experiment represents an important characteristic, which has also been previously identified by van der Hoeven and Hitters (2019). Especially the variety of subgenres, and therefore audience groups that were connected through the venue, demonstrated the exchange of cultural knowledge between participants. This confirmed previous findings concerning live music venues (Lobato, 2006). At the same time, this activity can stimulate creativity between a wider group of people (Negus & Pickering, 2004), which is ultimately relevant for the cultural vibrancy of a city (Florida, 2002). Nonetheless, the barriers of limited venue capacity, high artist fees, and most importantly the division between mainstream and scene participants are impeding stakeholders’ artistic vision and determine the potential for the creation of cultural value. Especially, the division between mainstream and scene participants, but also the fragmentation around the subgenres, reinforces Bourdieu’s (1984) concept of distinction. For the stakeholders, this implies that they need to have extensive cultural knowledge about diverse subgenres, aim for exchanges with diverse groups of artists, and find effective manners to assess the demands and trends of their audience groups. This again underlines their central position in defining the scene and the symbolic value attached to the different genres in electronic music.

4.2.2 Actors’ embedding in (global) music ecology

The second theme concerning the cultural value of activities at electronic music clubs was the actors’ embedding in the (global) music ecology, which covers the ways in which the stakeholders exchanged cultural knowledge with other actors (e.g. collectives, labels, DJs) and their audience.
These activities are considered to express their artistic approach. The term ecology here is used to denote the widespread social and symbolic network between different creative outlets and actors, while also taking into consideration the material aspects such as the size of the venue and the urban setting (Behr, Brennan, Cloonan, Frith, & Webster, 2016). According to van der Hoeven and Hitters (2019), one way to create cultural value is to connect to other local actors and to support upcoming artists. This resonated with the findings of this study as venue stakeholders felt responsible for the development of their local music scene. Some also phrased it in terms of making their city known for their music, showing a sense of shared identity with the other local actors in the city, as exemplified by one interviewee:

> If you're in a city and your local music scene isn't evolving then, why would you still be in that city? Because if the DJs that come from your town or the DJs that are good from your town, . . . they could come to your club and you can give them a platform, you can give them an audience and they can grow. So then, Rotterdam will become better internationally and globally and . . . they might get really big and they might draw people to your club as well. (general manager, Perron)

However, the emphasis on a shared identity varied between actors. The size of a given city and the number of venues is assumed to play a role in this variance. Still, clubs represented a platform for local artists through which artists could develop their talent. This also entailed that local artists could connect to other regional or internationally established artists. As one interviewee put it: “I know we make the connection between a lot of DJs . . . People that didn't know each other. Guys that were in the same kind of music and they connected to each other through here” (owner, BAR).

Thereby, venues contributed to their local music ecology.

The exchange with the different (local) actors was an opportunity for stakeholders to exchange cultural knowledge as well as tacit knowledge. This was facilitated through frequent face-to-face contact and personal relationships. In this context, one interviewee talked about their relationship with actors from a nearby venue: “We just talk to each other. The guys from [club name], . . . I meet up with them every week” (owner, BAR). These local knowledge exchanges have likewise been reported by Watson (2008) and were found to offer a greater scope for establishing trust. Other studies also reported that even though the affiliation with the global scene is important, local artists are often regarded as equally talented and also put less financial strain on venues (Weber, 1999), which is important for economic sustainability. Next to that, building connections between collectives was a practice that stakeholders applied to reach a wider audience among other benefits. This finding supports van der Hoeven and Hitters' (2019) research, where the expansion and mixing of audiences through collaborations was found to be relevant for the cultural vibrancy of a city and one form of cultural value.
Next, stakeholders also had to find their own position in the global music ecology. This concerned the extent to which they included international artists in their program. Their engagement had two sides, where one is the showcasing of the music quality and experience of established artists. On the other side is the general connection of actors on a global level, which supported the exchange of the locally developed styles and helped venue stakeholders to “stay exciting as a club” (owner, Schumacher Club). In terms of cultural value, this can be considered to support the exchange of cultural knowledge on three sites: DJs, owners, and audience. This has likewise been reported in past research, where the inclusion of international artists stimulated a productive two-way flow of cultural information between global and local experiences of artists (Attias, Gavanas, & Rietveld, 2013). For that reason, the concept of scene-based co-creation of value appears as a suitable description of the dynamics present in the electronic music scene. Although in comparison to the dynamic and subcultural projects of scene actors in Berlin (Lange & Bürkner, 2013), the interaction and industry dynamics in this study were perceived as more institutionalized, less spontaneous and more carefully synchronized with the activities of surrounding venues and events. One reason may be a more limited number of scene participants in the cities of this study for particular genres that then lead to economic pressure.

Furthermore, connecting artists internationally was found to carry a combination of social-cultural values. This was suggested by interviewees’ emphasis on the social connections that could be made because of their shared passion for music with others and the extension of their network on a global scale. Hence, they valued the social interactions in addition to their exchanges about music, which could subsequently support their creative activities. In those cases, the creative activities provided the possibility to build new personal relationships but also to gain more cultural knowledge. This highlights the intertwining of cultural and social values and their inherent value for the individuals, independent of the potential economic value in the future.

In conclusion, venue stakeholders’ choices to embed themselves in their local and global music ecology had the function to create a shared identity between local actors and facilitate the development of their talent. Also, the exchanges of cultural knowledge through the newly built connections between actors and other established artists were illustrative of the ways, in which actors created cultural value. In this context, the establishment of a scene-based network that is built around or followed by personal relationships found application (Lange & Bürkner, 2013). However, the responsibility venue stakeholders felt for their local artists was remarkable and stress a striving for artistic value and a tight embedding in the local ecology. This supports Bourdieu’s notion of small-scale productions, where because of the venues’ inferiority in power against the dominant class, scene actors establish closer relationships among themselves (Hesmondhalgh, 2006). Yet, a feeling of responsibility also denotes a greater significance of the relationship beyond the stimulation of creativity and exchange of knowledge. This may also be dependent on the size of the local creative ecology.
4.3 Economic Value

4.3.1 Conflict between artistic vision, audience characteristics, and economic sustainability

Venue stakeholders’ perception of the economic value of electronic music events was marked by a conflict between their artistic vision, their audience’s characteristics, and the pressure to operate in economically sustainable ways, represented in the label of this theme. Their perceptions were assessed under the assumption that the economic value was represented by the financial profits from the activities performed at the venue (Klamer, 2004).

Firstly, a remarkable finding in the analysis was that stakeholders viewed their activities to be essentially non-profitable, as one interviewee put it: “[Money] is not in the business” (general manager, RADION). Thus, the notion that electronic music events carry substantial economic value was discarded. However, in essence, this statement is representative of the denial of the economy introduced earlier (Bourdieu, 1986). Thus, implicitly the club actors express the difficulty of converting the cultural value of their events into economic value because their creative activities are socially not recognized as economic because their production does not follow ordinary market principles (Bourdieu & Nice, 1980).

Further strengthening this common conception in the cultural industry, stakeholders followed an intriguing logic when talking about commercialization. On the one side, they defined commercial as making money, but on the other side, they differentiated themselves from commercial actors in the way that they were not motivated by maximizing profits but instead by their passion. For example, one interviewee said the following:

I’m doing this because I love it, but it’s still commercial. . . . I mean I make a living out of it, . . . all the people working make a living out of it, DJs [are] making a living out of it. (owner, BASIS).

However, actors that were assumed to engage in more commercial endeavors were also equated to follow a less artistic approach (see e.g. Kühn, 2011). This again points to the relation of autonomy and power and the cultural value of large- and small-scale productions (Hesmondhalgh, 2006). A possible interpretation of this finding is that scene actors have established exclusive exchanges among themselves and the audience members, who hold the necessary (sub-)cultural capital to evaluate the cultural value.

Another interesting finding in this context was that the size of an event served as an indicator to assess its commerciality. Ironically though, mostly only larger size venues are able to afford the high fees of the renown DJs. This shows an ambiguous notion about at what size an event is considered commercial because stakeholders still highly regarded the skills and quality of those renown artists. This finding is difficult to be integrated with Bourdieu’s concept of large- and small-
scale productions as it is contradictory that the renown artists, who are assumingly high in symbolic capital are predominantly involved with larger, economically more powerful clubs. This points to an adaptation of the actors to the principles followed by the dominant class, which might imply consequences for the creation of cultural value (Hesmondhalgh, 2006).

Furthermore, booking renown artists also entailed that stakeholders exploited their network reputation as also discussed by Lange and Bürkner (2010). The transfer of network reputation was particularly relevant in order to attract the mainstream participants next to the scene participants. But then again, the mainstream participants were judged to motivate their attendance by the DJ’s reputation. This supposedly makes them less valuable for venue stakeholders because of their limited capacity to contribute in terms of feedback about the music and the quality of the event. Nevertheless, they were very relevant for the economic sustainability of the venue. To prove oneself as independent of the DJ’s reputation posed a challenge to the venues, even though stakeholders were convinced to provide an equal level of cultural value without renown artists. In this context, about the consequences of the recent omission of entrance fees, one interviewee said: “The program is not easier because we still . . . need to offer the same type of quality and look for very handy options and opportunities and it is maybe much more interesting even” (owner, Het Magazijn). However, this value was likely to only be recognized by scene participants with the necessary (sub-)cultural capital. This connects to Lange and Bürkner’s (2013) finding that clubs were targeting and relied on the feedback of specialized audiences. Even though, the specific position of Berlin and its ecology in electronic music needs to be taken into account (Bader & Scharenberg, 2010). Venues need to be able to afford this selectivity, which is ultimately dependent on the number of scene participants and the economic capital they hold.

However, next to these ambiguous views of the economic value of the events, there was a notable conflict between the cultural value for industry actors and the audience and the financial pressure of making the venue economically sustainable. To be more precise, stakeholders’ aim of executing their artistic vision through providing high quality, artistic, experimental, or unknown music was impeded by the limited number of people possessing the (sub-)cultural capital and preference for that music. As a result, venue stakeholders had to consistently balance their audiences’ characteristics to determine the economic success of their artistic vision. The realization of their artistic vision was sometimes accompanied by the objective to remain independent of profit-driven practices and therefore achieve artistic freedom to an extent. These tendencies were also recognized in Kühn’s (2011) study, where electronic music stakeholders prioritized dedication to their work, artistic freedom, and autonomy over profit making.

Conclusively, stakeholders were continuously confronted with the conflict between economic pressures, demands of the predominant audience, and their own artistic ambitions. Generally, this finding is in line with Bourdieu's (1986) conception that social and cultural values are generated from previously existing economic capital in order to invest the time that is necessary to build up relationships and reputation. Especially as financial investment in DJs precedes the event, the return
of cultural value and transfer of reputation only follows financial investment. Hence, the cultural and social values deriving from the events cannot be judged without considering the previously available economic capital (Bourdieu, 1986). The availability of economic capital inevitably impacts the range of decisions stakeholders can make. Concerning the audience characteristics, it is necessary to point out again that trends and tastes are exchanged and co-produced within the network of scene participants (Lange & Bürkner, 2013), stakeholders are reliant on the contributions of the scene participants to stay relevant and in touch with the fluctuating tastes in the electronic music industry and assess their (sub-)cultural capital. Therefore, to operate economically sustainable, socio-cultural exchanges between scene actors and participants are necessary to convert electronic music into an economically recognized cultural product.

4.4 Experience

4.4.1 Club as socio-cultural refuge from public space

The theme that emerged in relation to the perception of the experience at electronic music clubs was labeled as the *club as socio-cultural refuge from public space*. This idea originated from previous literature, where nightlife places were defined as so-called third places as an alternative to the other two most dominant spaces in life: the public and labor world and the domesticated world at home (Oldenburg, 1989). Calling the club a refuge indicates it as an alternative to public space. In past research, the electronic music club has already been acknowledged as a temporary protected space, in which alternative social behaviors can be explored without directly falling into the disgrace of surrounding visitors (Lawrence, 2011). Regarding the data of this study, the specific ways in which interactions and exchanges were perceived determined the social and cultural values of the clubs. It was suggested that the club embodied an alternative to public space because of its focus on activity and opportunities for interaction with likeminded others. Here, one can argue that visitors voluntarily decide for their participation in the event, so they also naturally have the power to leave. Their decision to stay in the venue is also a decision to involve with the other visitors that are present. This leads to a negotiation of the norms for participation between visitors. In this study, these negotiations were found to move within the explicit and implicit rules set by the venue stakeholders. These rules eventually help to realize the desired social and cultural values. Stakeholders’ reports indicated that these explicit rules were communicated via signs inside the venue, on the venue’s website, or communicated personally during the event. They included, for example, a zero tolerance for sexism or homophobia while generally promoting respectful behavior. Additionally, the use of flash of mobile phone cameras was often prohibited in order to prevent the annoyance of other visitors but also in order to create an atmosphere, where visitors are active participants. In the context of the experience economy, the level of activity was remarked as an important indicator to determine if visitors were immersed in their experience (Pine & Gilmore, 2011). Moreover, the implicit rules were a
representation of what venue stakeholders considered as the purpose of their venue. Here, creating a safe space was considered of utmost importance for the experience. Naturally, this was related to visitors adhering to the explicit rules. A safe space should facilitate visitors’ ability to self-express and explore themselves. One stakeholder phrased this in terms of playfulness:

I want people to be playful here. I want people to get out of their strict harness and just do stuff that they’d . . . maybe wouldn't normally do. Talk to a person you never talked to before, be like a child in a way. (owner, BAR)

This notion of playfulness reflects an account of the early rave and subculture of electronic music in the 90s (Conner, 2015). But it further reiterates the concept of play and fun proposed by Turner (1982), who argued that play and fun take their fullest form in the transitional state of “ludic liminality”. This transitional state is a free and experimental region of culture, which provides the opportunity for the introduction of new elements or combinatory rules supporting the argumentation for participation norms above (Turner, 1982). Apart from this description, also other stakeholders stressed their venue’s capacity to provide an out of the mundane experience, which provides a separation from the demands or conditions individuals face in modern society identified previously by Lawrence (2011). In this context, one interviewee said the following:

At our club, we clearly position ourselves against sexism and homophobia etc. I believe that is the reason for many people, who may have missed that in other clubs or more generally in society, that they feel free to self-express themselves or be themselves here. (owner, Schumacher Club)

This implies a clear separation from daily life and the club experience. This was likewise observed in Goulding et al.’s study (2002). Offering this alternative way of being in combination with the earlier stated emphasis on inclusiveness also led stakeholders to cater to and engage with marginalized groups such as the queer community. Interestingly enough, in past research, the club experience was identified as a form of escape from daily life (Goulding et al., 2002; Lawrence, 2011). However, escape denotes that the return to public space is a disenchancing and undesired necessity, whereas other studies have found that club experiences can enrich individual’s personal development outside of the venue (Redfield & Thouin-Savard, 2017). This does not negate that club experiences can and are aimed to be widely different from public spaces but that they are not as disconnected from reality as escape may imply.

Concerning other experiential aspects, stakeholders took various measures to shape their space and communicate their vision as in the form of decoration, visual art, or performances. These additional artistic features were not embraced by all stakeholders as for some their highest priority
was their musical programming. Still, there was agreement about how architecture, lights, and sound support the creation of an atmosphere. In terms of architecture, industrial and underground looks were most preferred and said to reflect the sound of specific subgenres such as Techno. For example, one interviewee said:

I think the best techno clubs are in old buildings that were not built to be a techno club. They have a soul. They already have a character. . . . [I]f you would build like a purpose-built techno club I think it would be dead. . . . I really think the building should have some industrial heritage. (owner, Fuse)

Here, the owner precisely recapitulated the opinion expressed by Berghain owner Dimitri Hegemann. This emphasis can also be interpreted as maintenance of authenticity as next to local musical styles also buildings can reflect the history and local relation (Peter, 2014). This way of denoting authenticity can be considered to contribute to the distinction from the large-scale productions of EDM events mentioned in the introduction of this study.

Furthermore, the adjustment of the lights during the night was highly important to make visitors feel comfortable. The lighting had to be adjusted to the music to create and develop an atmosphere. Red lights, strobe, smoke, switching between light and darkness are examples of those sensual aspects supporting the atmosphere, which corroborates with findings of previous research on electronic music events (Lawrence, 2011; Sommer, 2001). All aspects were intended to facilitate self-expression of the audience and give participants the opportunity to shape their individual experience through e.g. changing positions on the dancefloor through which one could separate oneself from the group or become the focus of attention. The provision of these opportunities within space can be interpreted as the kind of temporary event described by Lange and Bürkner (2013). They observed that inside of electronic music clubs in Berlin, audiences could create their own temporary event through various acoustic, aesthetic, and social opportunities.

Dancing together and sharing enjoyment was also a focal point of participation for the involved individuals. In this regard, the corporeality of dancing was seen as a way of the audience to self-express but also the way of dancing was reported to be a way of feedback and interaction with the DJ. More exuberant dancing signaled positive feedback. Body movement as feedback also went along with vocal feedback as in whistling, cheering, or shouting. This form of interaction with the DJ was also observed by Lawrence (2011) and corroborates with the concept of co-creation applied in this study.

On rare occasions, the energy of the audience was observed to fuse into a collective, where all present individuals experienced shared enjoyment and togetherness. One interviewee described this experience as follows:
I have experienced a few nights also that you can have this collective energy on the dance floor . . . this is amazing . . . as if the place can explode because everybody is enjoying the music so much and they're so open . . . and then [they] make contact with each other. (owner, Paradigm)

This is an example of the intangible aspects, which contribute to the experience while also stressing the notion of transcendence (Peter, 2013). It further underlines the audience member’s agency and contribution to the event next to the performative role of the DJ.

Conclusively, the event experience as a socio-cultural refuge from public space is constituted by multidirectional social exchanges and cultural aspects. The interactions of the audience were tripartite: with other visitors, with the music, and with the DJ. Yet importantly, stakeholders assumed a guiding role to create a safe space set around their explicit rules. So that visitors are given the opportunity to engage in social exchanges with a diverse group of people sharing the same interest. These conditions are supposed to encourage them to express themselves through dancing or otherwise, while they are also given the possibility to position themselves in a new (social) environment. Thereby, social cohesion and a sense of belonging can be established between audience members (John, 2015). The cultural aspects are generally represented through the engagement with the music through active participation and interaction with the DJ. The DJ performance can be considered to serve the exchange (sub-)cultural capital between the DJ, the stakeholders, and the audience (Thornton, 1995). Conclusively, the participation and the exchange between stakeholders, artists, and audience in a space, which follows alternative norms, and that is enhanced by diverse material and immaterial aspects represents a refuge from a more structured and impersonal public space.

4.5 Value-Proposition

4.5.1 Translating the self in the industry

Finally, the value-proposition of venue stakeholders was recognized to be a translation of their identity in the wider industry context, which is why this theme was labeled translating the self in the industry. Partially the question of how the social, cultural, and economic values are translated has been answered through the community building activities, stakeholders’ collaborations with other actors, and their explicit and implicit rules for their venue. However, another determining factor for the creation of value in these activities has been the individual characteristics of the stakeholders, their vision, and passion. As there are several different realms of activity, this theme is divided firstly into the motivation to start the venue and the way it can provide a place for self-fulfillment and self-actualization. This is particularly associated with the creation of social and cultural values. Secondly, the practical actions are covered concerning the actors’ current vision and exchanges, collaborations,
bookings, and the relevance of the venue’s network reputation within the larger industry. These aspects are associated mostly with the creation of cultural and economic values. Last is the door policy of the studied venues as a specific activity determining the inclusiveness and social value of participation.

Venue stakeholders’ motivation for starting their venue was found to be representative of the values highlighted in their present activities. The interview data indicated that dissatisfaction with or the lack of nightlife spaces was a common starting point. Usually, venue stakeholders were already involved in the scene in various ways prior to the opening of the venue. The opening of the venue was often related to connections to other scene participants and came about either through opportunities that arose from the network as in the case of this interviewee:

I started doing parties in the Techno scene about . . . six years ago . . . . and two years later, we got a possibility to take over a club . . . . we had a conversation with the owner of [club name] at that time and then it was actually quite clear . . . that we wanted to start the club BASIS. (owner, BASIS)

But also, a DIY approach was frequently found in the actions of stakeholders as explained by one interviewee: “. . .we were dissatisfied about nightlife and then like why not do it yourself then” (owner, BAR). DIY approaches can be considered to be authentic and differentiated from approaches in the regular working world (Thornton, 1995). Self-starting or DIY strategies in the electronic music industry have also been similarly discussed by Kühn (2011) with regard to scene actors in Berlin. Additionally, in this study, these activities were related to interviewees’ perception that there was a lack of electronic music or a particular subgenre in the city. Their cultural demand was often accompanied by a desire to create their own space and connect to likeminded people. These notions of passion and freedom of creative expression have been reported as typical for actors in the underground creative ecology (Cohendet et al., 2009).

These starting points already serve as points of reference for what stakeholders in this study aimed to achieve with their current activities. In past research, work in the cultural industry has also been found to carry a deeper meaning and be a source for self-fulfillment (O’Connor & Wynne, 2017). Applied to the interview data, venue stakeholders commonly experienced self-fulfillment through the opportunity to express their passion for music. Some others also highly appreciated the community within the industry and the joy that they bring their visitors. One interviewee combined both motivations when she said:

I value the community that I get out of it and the passion that you share with other people, this is so fulfilling more than anything else. It is just knowing that you are able to share a
passion with the people around you, that really believe in something, that you co-create and push each other and support each other. (event organizer, Oost)

Notably, more than half of the stakeholders were also engaging in DJing themselves and performed at their venue occasionally, which demonstrates their involvement and creativity. These findings further substantiate Cohendet et al.’s (2009) characterization of actors in the underground ecology.

In this context, also a feeling of self-actualization through setting up the venue was expressed resonating with McRobbie's (2002) characterization of workers in the cultural industry. Even though this was only voiced by a minority in this study, self-actualization is distinguished from self-fulfillment in the way that it implies a greater transference of personal propensities and values in the activities. Notions of self-actualization were identified in reports about the aesthetic of the venue, representing the self as well as the venue being an extension of self. In this context, one interviewee said:

This is actually my soul. . . . So basically if you look at the bigger picture, people are . . . dancing in my brain. Yeah this is just literally me. . . . it all comes out of my soul. (owner, BAR)

Furthermore, those stakeholders often pursued extra objectives that were not directly related to electronic music or the club. Those extra objectives included concerns with sustainability, drug awareness, or gender equality. By including them, stakeholders also made their presentation of and vision for their venue more distinct from other venues. Even though those objectives were demonstrated by a minority, they pose an interesting realm for future research.

More common perceptions within the visions of stakeholders were related to their personal characteristics and development. For example, one interviewee said the following when talking about the differences involved when moving to a new venue:

[T]he [old] location was very underground. . . . We don't really want to have this specific underground vibe anymore . . . it changed a little bit because . . . I think we were in this underground mood a lot when we started and we're not really anymore there. (owner, Paradigm)

Hence, the actor’s personal development changed the way he wanted to represent himself and the new venue. This can be partially explained through actors being active in - what Cohendet et al. (2009) have called - the underground micro level of cultural economy but it also points again to a way of self-actualization. However, passion was more prominently featured in venue owners’ vision and
occasionally also the activity of clubbing. Passion was a key determinant when judging other actors’ motivations and was also related to authenticity as expressed by one interviewee as “doing it for the right reasons” (event organizer, Oost).

Next to sharing passion, interpersonal connection informed decisions for collaborations. For stakeholders, this was expressed by interaction ‘feeling good’ or their gut feeling. This emphasis on the emotional and intuitive has been commonly acknowledged in the cultural industry due to its base in the expressiveness of tastes, which are difficult to predict (O’Connor, 2004). Also, trust was occasionally mentioned as being important in the exchanges. In this study, trust played a more prominent role for collaborations with local actors but was generally less expressed than assumed from previous literature (e.g. Banks, Lovatt, O’Connor, & Raffo, 2000). A possible explanation for the emphasis on trust among local actors could be that local actors interacted more frequently, which facilitates the building of a personal relationship and knowledge exchange (Cohendet et al., 2009). Next to these interpersonal aspects, the judgment of other actors’ artistic priorities was a determinant for collaborations. Actors were judged on the dimension of cultural or artistic value vs. economic value or commerciality, hence following Bourdieu’s distinction of the subfields (Hesmondhalgh, 2006). This was explained by one interviewee in the following way:

Some are highly commercial, they say this is my way of living, I need to pay my rent, so I need to have 15 parties in a year. And then there are the creatives. They start out really from out the music, and the love of music or friendships to start up events and parties. So, it is really different per organization how commercial they are or how artistic they are. (general manager, RADION)

Actors’ degree of commerciality was perceived to reflect in the makeup of their audiences. This led to inner conflicts for venue stakeholders, who were torn between the representation of commerciality by the other party, their demands in artistic quality, and the gain in network reputation from a collaboration. Thus, stakeholders faced similar issues as explained in the context of economic value. In the collaborations with other actors, the added factor is the exchange of network reputation, which is important for the creation of economic value according to Lange and Bürkner (2010).

This issue was also similarly recognized regarding DJ bookings. Getting access to renown artists depended upon the network reputation of the venue. Past failed attempts to reach or book them was thus also seen as a threshold for quality. However, booking artists who were judged to hold high (sub-)cultural capital (Thornton, 1995) was also a way of risk management for stakeholders because they provided a greater guarantee of selling out the event. As one interviewee said: “Sometimes [you] get a sure shot for a DJ like a very famous name that you know for instance when you hire [DJ name], . . . you will sell out within 45 minutes, sure shot, 45 minutes” (general manager, RADION). Although, in this regard, stakeholders did not miss to highlight that the economic security was a
byproduct of providing high-quality music, as one interviewee said: “A good example is [DJ name] who is . . . one of my favorite DJs but also brings in the money so that's perfect” (owner, BAR). This demonstrates an interesting industry dynamic as even though the scene actors were well connected in their (social) network, exclusivity contracts with specific artists and the network reputation of venues were determining the success of generating cultural and economic value. This development has also been previously brought up by an industry stakeholder in Conner's (2015) study about the development of EDM as a cultural industry. There, the interviewee saw the rise of star DJs and artificially created scarcity in geographic regions as affecting the ability for other DJs to gain network reputation. Additionally, the participant claimed that this would negatively impact the scene participants as they are restricted in their experience and building of cultural capital when renown artists are tied to rare major events. Particularly interesting in this study was also that network reputation was often framed by stakeholders to originate in word-of-mouth between DJs as well as the venue’s booking portfolio. This was, for instance, recognizable in the following statement by one interviewee:

They talk to each other. So, one of them . . . [says]: ‘Hey it was super cool here!’ and then you build up and build up and build up and then now there is big names here who had a great time. (owner, BAR)

Because of this dynamic, venue stakeholders were unable to permanently realize the cultural value that they envisioned. This then cannot solely be explained through the symbolic value that scene actors assign to artists as was explained by Lange and Bürkner (2013) in the context of co-creation of value. Furthermore, this dynamic also reflects the professionalization that has taken place in the electronic music industry because of their use of industry conducts that are commonly used in the record industry (Tschmuck, 2012). This is further underpinned by the circumstance that DJs mainly generate their income through their performances, which is why the protection of their reputation and the creation of scarcity are recognized market strategies (Tschmuck et al., 2013). However, with regard to venue stakeholders’ value-proposition, this development makes the generation of cultural value more difficult and dependent on initial economic capital. It indicates a shift of power and autonomy and a change in the symbolic value of the music into a commodified cultural good (Hesmondhalgh, 2006). This may also lead to the by Bourdieu (1986) described dynamics that profits in one area are necessarily paid for by costs in another.

Lastly, the door policy was a club specific matter that determines their degree of inclusiveness. As an explanatory note before going into venue owners’ positions: In the nightlife industry, it is common for venues to employ security people or ‘bouncers’ who regulate the entry of visitors, sometimes this follows particular selection criteria apart from safety aspects. As door policies have not been explicitly discussed in the context of electronic music scenes before, Thornton’s (1995)
discourse regarding club cultures is used as a reference. In her elaboration of (sub-)cultural capital, door policies signal social exclusivity and were following criteria regarding the clothing styles, language, and portrayal of trends in subcultural groups. These aspects were crucial in order to belong to the subcultural groups and their cultural spaces (Thornton, 1995). However, in this study, the goal of presenting oneself as non-discriminatory, open, and inclusive prevailed as a common approach among stakeholders. For example, one stakeholder expressed: “[W]e are an inclusive club, everybody should feel welcome and everybody here should every night have an experience that they are appreciated and [that] they are respected” (general manager, RADION). Only one stakeholder adhered to a stricter door policy as he aimed to attract more “experienced clubbers”. Thereby, he appeared to imply that he aimed for individuals with more subcultural capital that were able to enjoy the specific genre that was played at the venue. His door selection was based on information about the event, DJs, and clothing styles. Nevertheless, the majority of interviewees refuted Thornton’s (1995) idea of social exclusivity within club culture.

In summary, the venue stakeholders translated their own demands of a cultural and social space in the establishment of their venue. Because this was commonly preceded by dissatisfaction, many venue owners achieved a great sense of self-fulfillment or even self-actualization through the establishment of the venue. Possibly, this depended on their degree of identification with the music. Yet, also the identification with other actors and visitors was a significant source of value for owners. The emphasis on inclusiveness in their door policies further supported their vision to include and combine a diverse range of people in their audience. These cultural and social values were commonly combined but generally the passion for the music and thus the cultural value can be considered to dominate and lead their decisions. Therefore, in exchanges with other industry actors the level of artistic value or creativity that results from a collaboration was decisive for their decisions. In relation to the earlier discussion of the economic value, the denial of the economy was also recognizable in actors’ value-proposition because the failure to execute their artistic vision due to a lack in network reputation could be interpreted as a lack of initial economic capital or failure in conversion (Bourdieu, 1986). Combining these different arrays of stakeholders’ value-proposition, the electronic music industry is defined by a balancing act of the social and cultural values and the challenges encountered in the creation of economic value. Finally, the earlier identified genre fragmentation, professionalization, and shifts in the power and autonomy relations between the different fields of cultural production are determinants for the creation of social and cultural values in the current electronic music industry.
5. Conclusion

This research had the aim of exploring venue stakeholders’ construction of the social, cultural, and economic values of electronic music events. Electronic music clubs were positioned within the theoretical framework of the experience economy because of the distinct features of the club experience and the music. The co-creation of value was acknowledged in the analysis of their value constructs and actions. Thereby, the consumption of electronic music, its music ecology, and the unique values it contributes to those involved is better understood, which is especially relevant in the light of its rising popularity and diversifying cultural industries. The findings suggest that industry actors construct the values of their activities predominantly in terms of the social values of personal relationships, community, and inclusiveness, which enable their ultimate goal of creating cultural value with the diverse creative activities of their club. The economic value of the events played a secondary role in their value constructs and their perception of their position in the cultural and nightlife industry.

In more detail, this finding stressed the inseparability of cultural and social values and the difficulty of their conversion into economic value (Bourdieu, 1986). The reason could be found in stakeholder’s embedding in the informal underground layer of the creative ecology (Cohendet et al., 2009). The informality of this milieu implied an inherent social value. In this context, the stakeholders’ position in the subfield of small-scale productions, which are distinct from the mainstream - or in Bourdieu's (1984) terms the dominant class - was a key feature. Individual’s personal relationship with other actors and their match in values secured that they could realize the desired cultural value. The characteristics of a scene in terms of identification and cooperation supported the exchanges of social and cultural value with other actors and the audience. Friendship, trust, cooperation, inclusiveness, freedom, and a sense of belonging were foundational social values for stakeholders. These social values were conducive and accompanied by the cultural values of the events in the form of talent development, the inclusion of a variety of subgenres, and experimentation in styles, which resulted in the creation of cultural capital for audiences and actors. This dynamic between the industry actors and audience was in line with Bourdieu’s notion of the inferiority in power of small-scale productions (Hesmondhalgh, 2006). Moreover, this finding was connected to the value-proposition of venue owners as they were translating their own social and cultural value demands in their venue. Those values were not equated with the resulting economic value but had a deeper meaning for their personal life. On the same note, the finding that venues represent a sociocultural refuge, where alternative social dynamics are established, substantiates the assumption that venues also serve the cultural and social needs of actors and audiences next to the ones of the stakeholder. So, the experiences at electronic music clubs appear to contribute to the well-being and development of people more generally. Combining these conclusions, the question arises if stakeholders are actually in denial of the economy since they are often painfully aware of the
symbolic value of cultural goods and their economic value. It could be argued that rather than denying their conversion of cultural value into economic value, they essentially adapt an economically functional rationality, which is appropriate to serve social and cultural value demands. This is substantiated by the finding that symbolic value is negotiated and co-created with scene participants (Lange & Bürkner, 2013), which is why their influence on the guarantee for financial return is limited. Hence, venue stakeholders balanced the economic viability and their socio-cultural goals in their decision making. This further greatly depended on their ability and possession of cultural capital to assess the activities of competitors, the different tastes of their fragmented audience, and their existing network in the industry. Additionally, even though the industry actors commonly positioned themselves outside of the dominant culture, their activities were marked by professionalization and integration into regular nightlife economy, which is contrary to Bourdieu’s assumption that small-scale productions have higher autonomy and symbolic capital than mass productions (Hesmondhalgh, 2006). This development in the modern cultural industry has been rightly pointed to by Hesmondhalgh (2006) but requires further comparison with the mass productions of EDM events.

Several theoretical frameworks have been applied, which can be usefully extended and criticized with the results of this study. Firstly, electronic music venues and events were examined with the concept of experience economy proposed by Pine and Gilmore (2011) and combined with Pearce’s (2013) account for the music industry as part of the experience economy. However, this concept has not shown to be useful in the interpretation of the findings. One reason may be that music is an inherently experiential and intangible product, which is thus not a good that requires transformation. This aspect of transformation was a starting point for Pine and Gilmore’s (2011) development of the concept. It was difficult to examine the four experience realms and the positioning of electronic music events as an escapist experience. That is due to this study’s limitation in that it did not include audience opinions. Nevertheless, the here determined description of the venue as a refuge from public place substantiates the claim that the club experience is on the opposite dimension of passive entertainment. This could be further explored in future research. Still, according to the stakeholders in this study audiences engage in a variety of activities at the venue, which is why it is questionable how useful it is for club events to be positioned in one experience realm. So, Pine and Gilmore’s (2011) concept of the experience economy does not elucidate how the experience of electronic music events move in the market. On the contrary, Pearce’s (2013) position aimed to combine the field of business and the artistically oriented music industry in an experience economy. Here, he appears to discount that these fields are not incompatible or naturally opposing. His research essentially aims to establish music as experiential good that is a distinct cultural good. Although, it seems that the subject matter of his position is actually the problem of the conversion of cultural value into economic value (Bourdieu, 1986). Yet, Pearce’s (2014) consideration of the social and behavioral contexts are additional valuable characteristics that were not specified this way in Pine and Gilmore’s (2011) framework. Yet, it is for these reasons, that the concept of experience economy was found to
be unsuitable to explore the distinctiveness of the experiences of electronic music events in the market. Future research might instead turn to the concept of scene economy (Kühn, 2011) and advance its account for the diverse experiential aspects contributing to the value dimensions.

Moreover, the concept of co-creation of value was further explored in this study (e.g. Crowther & Orefice, 2014; Vargo & Lusch, 2004). Co-creation appears to be intertwined with most activities in the electronic music industry. In this study, it was especially expressed by the community building activities and feedback requests of the stakeholders. The fact that these activities were also occurring increasingly online, poses an interesting realm of study because it represents a digital value-creation space as an extension of the values created at events. This corroborates with Crowther and Orefice's (2014) research of value-creation spaces. In the beginning of this study, it was pointed out that in the concept of co-creation by Crowther and Orefice (2014) the kind of value was not further specified apart from pointing to value resulting from interaction and networking. In this study, these activities were identified as social value and played an important role for the industry actors within and outside of their events. But in addition to these social values, it was also found that the diverse cultural values of the events are co-created between audiences, actors, and venue stakeholders. This concerned particularly the exchanges about the symbolic value and the other experiential aspects of the club events. Even though, this concept has found wide application in the marketing field (Vargo & Lusch, 2004), where economic value is commonly the subject of interest, the interpretation of the exchanges of event organizers and audiences in terms of social and cultural value can serve to classify their interactions and can also be seen as values available for conversion into economic value.

Further, the study yielded some surprising findings. Even though, the scene actors clearly positioned themselves outside of the mainstream, the mainstream participants - or supposedly participants from the other subfield of the dominated class (Bourdieu, 1984) - had substantial power over the cultural value of the events as the number of scene participants was often considerably small. As stakeholders promoted inclusiveness the inclusion of the mainstream participants was also a natural result. The priority of inclusiveness also countered Thornton's (1995) characterization of club culture and the necessity of subcultural capital for participation. In addition, the adaptation of the musical program to mainstream participants’ demands was regarded as a concession. This opposed Bourdieu’s notion of the high autonomy of the subfield of small-scale productions and their level of symbolic value (Hesmondhalgh, 2006). As Bourdieu was majorly concerned with art, literature, and journalism in his studies of the cultural industries, the impact of this power relation on the cultural value of the electronic music industry requires further research.

Another previously not acknowledged finding in this context is the inaccessibility of artists because of limitations in the social network of industry actors or the lack in network reputation of the venue. Both impeded the creation of cultural value. Lange and Bürkner (2010) have indicated network reputation as an exchange currency between industry actors but this has not been further explored in terms of its influence on cultural value production of electronic music events. Therefore, this aspect of
the electronic music industry should be investigated further; also potentially with regard to the significance of word-of-mouth between DJs.

The last remarkable finding which needs further attention is the meaningfulness that venues gained because of the social and cultural exchanges they enabled. What is meant here is that the freedom, diversity, self-expression, and playfulness that individuals can experience at the club appear to carry greater significance for their motivation to participate. At the same time, this may also point to current societal issues, which lead to difficulties for individuals to meet these needs in other places of their life. Yet, they are important for an individual’s well-being (Putnam, 2000). Redfield and Thouin-Savard (2017) have previously pointed out and referred to numerous studies where the motivation for attendance at electronic music events has been recognized as an under-explored field of study. Thus, the potential aspects identified in this study may serve as a starting point for further research.

Reflecting on the methodology used in this study several things can be remarked. The methodological choice of in-depth semi-structured expert interviews with venue stakeholders in the Netherlands, Belgium, and Germany yielded in-depth information about the value constructs and rationales of relevant venue stakeholders in the electronic music industry. However, a mixed method approach including the audience accounts would have been beneficial to substantiate the reports of venue stakeholders. Especially, individuals’ perceptions of the experience and the social exchanges between their audience members require further validation as the reports are marked by individuals’ rich experience and may thus assumingly tend to portray the activities at their venue more desirably. This is also particularly applicable for the frequently reported diversity of the audience at electronic music venues, where a quantitative investigation of audience characteristics would be desirable. In this way, more substantive claims about the potential for bonding and bridging social capital at electronic music events could be made (Putnam, 2000). Besides that, the economic value was only looked at with the information of the stakeholders. However, it would have been informative to compare their reports of financial precariousness with official financial reports in order to grasp the economic sustainability of the venues.

Several issues concerning the recruitment arose, which may have affected the quality of the findings. In terms of reflexivity regarding the recruitment of interview partners, the motivation to take part in this study needs to be paid attention to as there may have been diverse perceived barriers or benefit motivations (Obelenė, 2009). During the recruitment and interview process the researcher noted that some renown venues were consistently mentioned; however, these venues had refused to participate. It is supposed that these venues may differ in their perception of the benefits of the study, which may further indicate other differences in those venue stakeholders’ characteristics. This ‘natural’ exclusion is a subject matter important for recruitment in future studies. Moreover, in the process of recruitment, general information was gathered about the nightlife venues in the given countries. This information conveyed the idea that actors of the electronic music industry have
increasingly opened up their musical program to include other genres than electronic music. Due to this diversity in their program, they were excluded from this study. However, their point of views might have been informative with regards to their reasons to move away from an exclusive focus on electronic music.

Regarding the research design, the use of telephone interviews when talking to experts needs to be treated cautiously. Even though, the telephone interview in this study had rich informational value, the common limitations in interaction due to the lack of non-verbal cues and the coordination effort that is required for interactions were noticed in this study (Christmann, 2009). Also, the lack of spatial cues from seeing the venue was perceived as limiting the proper contextualization of activities. On this basis, it should be advised against using telephone interviews when investigating nightlife or other social spaces.

Another issue that was noted during the interviews concerned the use of words in the interview questions. The term ‘value’ is open to wide interpretation, that is because stakeholders did not commonly identify or connect their actions with a particular type of value. Even so, the different stakeholder accounts showed clear consistencies and logics when talking about their activities. However, in the conceptualization of future interviews, interviewers need to be aware of this problem of comprehension.

Next, the personal position and characteristics of the researcher may have biased results as she plays an integral role in the research. As such my personal biases, experiences, and knowledge about the industry have shaped this study. On the one side this provided me access to a hard to reach population because of my personal connection with committed audience members or other actors in the industry. This was perceived to have positively impacted the interactions as interviewees showed greater trust towards the researcher, which was thus beneficial for the informational value of the interview. This difference in interaction was noted in interviews, where the researcher had no previous link to the participants. While the majority of participants were unrelated to the researcher, this may have still impacted findings. Also, my personal knowledge from being a committed audience member, who has attended and been involved at diverse kinds of electronic music events, has on the one side contributed to my position as a quasi-expert and equal conversational partner in the expert interviews. Yet, it may also have impacted the interpretation of the interview data. I have aimed to remain as neutral and true to my interviewees’ opinions as possible in my representation of their perspectives in this study.

Concerning the analysis of the data, a crucial shortcoming was the lack of validity checks. In a further review of this study, double-coding should be applied to the interview transcripts in order to validate the findings of this study.

Lastly, it should also be noted that most research about the electronic music industry has been conducted in the United States, UK and increasingly in Germany; however, Central Europe and also especially the Netherlands are playing an increasingly important role in the global electronic music
market, which is why it remains of interest how they influence the global music ecology of the electronic music industry. In particular, this can be of interest because of the distinction between the supposedly mainstream productions of EDM with their own separate audience (Anderson, 2009) and the underground club market of electronic music.

In addition to the provision of some directions for future research, this study offers suggestive evidence for the existence of two distinctive markets of EDM events and electronic music club events. The persistence of the denial of the market is a telltale sign of the struggle of cultural organizations to remain economically viable. Their social and cultural meaning for actors and audiences; however, stresses their contribution to cities and society as a whole.

Finally, the findings of this study can provide information for venue stakeholders about the different sources of value within their activities. Findings can also inform policy makers about the sources of creativity in a city and their potential to stimulate cultural vibrancy. Findings can increase their awareness of the diverse values and functions of the cultural nighttime industry. Thus, they can in the long term inform their decisions about legislative and infrastructural issues relevant to the industry and creative ecology of cities.
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## Appendix A

### Participant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club Name</th>
<th>Name Participant</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Opening year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAR</td>
<td>Jetti Steffers</td>
<td>Schiekade 201 3013 BR Rotterdam</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIS</td>
<td>Jorn Lukaszczyk</td>
<td>BASIS Oudegracht aan de werf 97 3511 AL Utrecht</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultuurpodium Perron</td>
<td>Rishi Bindraban Koen Landman</td>
<td>Schiestraat 42 3013 AH Rotterdam</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuse</td>
<td>Olivier 'Nick' Ramoudt</td>
<td>Rue Blaesstraat 208 1000 Brussels, Belgium</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Het Magazijn</td>
<td>Arend Lakke</td>
<td>Grote Markt 10 2511BG The Hague</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOST</td>
<td>Jenny Schellenberg</td>
<td>Oosterstraat 13a 9711 NN Groningen</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm</td>
<td>Paul Grimmius</td>
<td>Energieweg 10 9743 AN Groningen</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADION Amsterdam</td>
<td>Wouter Stock</td>
<td>Louwesweg 1 1066 EA Amsterdam</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumacher Club</td>
<td>Lukas Stalter</td>
<td>Kurt-Schumacher-Platz 1 44787 Bochum, Germany</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDRGRND</td>
<td>Alex Sharp</td>
<td>Rembrandplein 31 1017 CT Amsterdam</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Interview schedule

Briefing
- Purpose of the interview
- All information is confidential
- No right or wrong answers, ask when you do not understand the questions
- Consent form and tape recording
- Any questions

Beginning:
NAME…. you have been running this venue …. since…..and your current role is …..Could you briefly explain how you came to run/work here and what your position entails?

Topics:
- Perception and description of own events and music
  - What happens during your club nights?
    - What activities do people engage in here? How are they important?
    - Reaction and interaction of the audience?
    - With the DJ?
    - What do people do?
    - Do you think your visitors come here searching for a particular experience? (Community, Equality, Escapism, hedonism, spirituality/rituality)
    - What do you think you provide to the audience apart from quality music and entertainment?
  - What is the music genre that is played at most of your events?
    - Are you aiming to serve particular niches within the EDM genre?
    - What makes EDM distinct from other genres for you?
    - Performance: Interaction between DJ and audience?
    - (Music made for dancing?)
  - What else contributes to the experience of the event?
    - E.g Aesthetics
    - Lights
    - Sound system
- Audience and their experience
Who comes to your club? (age, gender, lifestyle)

Do you select the audience of your club?

- If so, how?
- What is/does an ideal visitor (look) like? / What do you expect from your visitors??

Do you think you carry a particular responsibility with regard to the music and during the event? (Tastemaker, Guarding atmosphere)

What does the audience give to you as a club? What do they mean for you and the DJ?

What do you think someone who has never been here would say about his/her experience?

How is that different from the experience of a regular visitor?

Do you see your EDM events extending beyond this space and time?  
- E.g. scene, online, record stores, festivals

- Scene attributes and interaction between actors

  How do you relate to other actors in the industry?
  - Communication, Trust
  - Promoters, DJs, labels
  - Competition?
  - Local vs. international booking

  Can you describe how you work or collaborate with DJs, collectives, labels?

  Do you think there are any shared values between you and the DJs or other involved actors?

- Way of operating

  In these collaborations and your own decision making: Do you have any elementary principles that you follow? With regard to ….
  - The club (no racism, sexism, homophobia)

  What do you value about your work? What do you get back from it apart from money?

  Social and cultural value?
  - What are your thoughts on receiving public funding?

- Distinctiveness of club

  What makes your club different from other clubs? Can you name particular actions/characteristics where this is visible?
- Economic rationality
  o What are the main sources of income for your venue?
  o How do you prioritize the spendings on e.g. DJs, light effects, drinks, performances?
  o OPTIONAL: What do you see as the main obstacle in becoming an economically successful venue?

- Alternative sources of income
  o Next to the club events, is your space also used for other purposes? What is the reason behind that?
  o Are there any other sources of income that you make use of?
  o OPTIONAL: Venues such as your’s often also create their own festivals or host stages at other festivals. What role do opportunities like these play in your business?

END

Debriefing
- Is there anything you would like to mention or that I should know about?
- After end the interview: How was the interview experienced by the interviewee?
- Alternative: summary of points mentioned by the interviewee; I have no further questions…Is there anything else you would like to bring up?..
- Do you know anyone else that I should talk to you can refer me to?
# Appendix C

## Kodes nach Gruppe Decisions - Community within/outside/both of club thrm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gruppen</th>
<th>Kommentar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>artist care</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaboration benefits for each other's success</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaboration for expansion of network/each certain artist</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaboration - transfer of reputation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combining different collectives/organizing them together</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committed employees</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community building</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connection to local scene actors</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feedback</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclusion of third parties</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement international actors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivation for collaboration</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>network between venues and collectives</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>network of artists</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal relationships venue - Q2s</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resistance culture</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ergebnis: 48 von 222 Kodes

## Kodes nach Gruppe Decisions - Intuition/feeling right thrm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gruppen</th>
<th>Kommentar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>authenticity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>judgment in opposition with intuition/feeling</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>match in co-operation between actors</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal preferences in decision making</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trust</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ergebnis: 6 von 222 Kodes

## Kodes nach Gruppe Decisions - Self actualization thrm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gruppen</th>
<th>Kommentar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIY</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-expression</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-reflection</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-constitution</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>versus owner vision</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vision for the future</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What experience does the owner want to create?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ergebnis: 7 von 222 Kodes

## Kodes nach Gruppe Experience - Club different from reality thrm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gruppen</th>
<th>Kommentar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>audience motivation - dance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audience motivation - listen to music</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audience motivation - music</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audience motivation - want to party merge...</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audience motivation - want to party merge...</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>club different from reality</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freedom</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reasons for involvement actions - sexual/boyfriend</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safe space</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-expression - audience</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ergebnis: 8 von 222 Kodes