



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *DIY Music and the Politics of Social Media*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/180142/>

Version: Published Version

Book:

Jones, E orcid.org/0000-0002-2557-9544 (2021) *DIY Music and the Politics of Social Media*. Bloomsbury Publishing , New York, NY, USA . ISBN 9781501359637

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

ELLIS JONES

DIY Music

and the Politics of
Social Media



BLOOMSBURY

DIY Music and the Politics of Social Media

Alternate Takes: Critical Responses to Popular Music is a series that aims to examine popular music from critical perspectives that challenge the accepted ways of thinking about popular music in areas such as popular music history, popular music analysis, the music industry, and the popular music canon. The series ultimately aims to have readers listen to – and think about – popular music in new ways.

Series Editors: Matt Brennan and Simon Frith

Editorial Board: Daphne Brooks, Oliver Wang, Susan Fast, Ann Powers,
Tracey

Thorn, Eric Weisbard, Sarah Hill, Marcus O'Dair

Other Volumes in the Series:

When Genres Collide by Matt Brennan

Nothing Has Been Done Before: Seeking the New in 21st-Century

American Popular Music by Robert Loss

Annoying Music in Everyday Life by Felipe Trotta

DIY Music and the Politics of Social Media by Ellis Jones

A Musical History of Digital Startup Culture by Cherie Hu (forthcoming)

*Live from the Other Side of Nowhere: Contemplating Musical Performance
in an Age of Virtual Reality* by Sam Cleeve (forthcoming)

Ranting and Raving: Dance Music as Everyday Culture

by Tami Gadir (forthcoming)

*National Phonography: Field Recording, Sound Archiving, and Producing
the Nation in Music* by Tom Western (forthcoming)

DIY Music and the Politics of Social Media

Ellis Jones

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

BLOOMSBURY ACADEMIC
Bloomsbury Publishing Inc
1385 Broadway, New York, NY 10018, USA
50 Bedford Square, London, WC1B 3DP, UK

BLOOMSBURY, BLOOMSBURY ACADEMIC and the Diana logo
are trademarks of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published in the United States of America 2021

Copyright © Ellis Jones, 2021

Cover design by Louise Dugdale
Cover image © Warmworld / iStock

For legal purposes the Acknowledgements on p. vi constitute
an extension of this copyright page.

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

Bloomsbury Publishing Inc does not have any control over, or responsibility for,
any third-party websites referred to or in this book. All internet addresses given in this
book were correct at the time of going to press. The author and publisher regret any
inconvenience caused if addresses have changed or sites have ceased to exist,
but can accept no responsibility for any such changes.

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Jones, Ellis (Ellis Nathaniel) author.

Title: DIY music and the politics of social media / Ellis Jones.

Description: New York City : Bloomsbury Academic, 2021. | Includes
bibliographical references. | Summary: "An investigation into the
contemporary practices of DIY musicians on social media and DIY's status
as "cultural resistance." – Provided by publisher.

Identifiers: LCCN 2020033589 | ISBN 9781501359644 (hardback) | ISBN
9781501359668 (pdf) | ISBN 9781501359651 (epub)

Subjects: LCSH: Popular music—Social aspects. | Music trade—Social
aspects. | Social media.

Classification: LCC ML3918.P67 J67 2021 | DDC 306.4/842—dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2020033589>

ISBN:	HB:	978-1-5013-5964-4
	PB:	978-1-5013-5963-7
	ePDF:	978-1-5013-5966-8
	eBook:	978-1-5013-5965-1

Typeset by Integra Software Services Pvt. Ltd.

Series: Alternate Takes: Critical Responses to Popular Music

To find out more about our authors and books visit www.bloomsbury.com
and sign up for our newsletters.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements vi

- 1 The problem?: Welcome to the democratic, DIY music business 1
- 2 The past: DIY, popular music and cultural resistance 23
- 3 The personal: Subjectivity and self-representation on social media 45
- 4 The players: Hierarchy, ownership and collectivism in DIY scenes 67
- 5 The public: Performing politics and elucidating difference 85
- 6 The popular: Metrics, measurements and the DIY imagination 103
- 7 The platform: Alterity and the political economy of social media 121
- 8 The plan ... : Potential futures for DIY music, new media and social justice 137

References 150

Index 166

1

The problem?

Welcome to the democratic, DIY music business

In the world of popular music, things – as always – aren't what they used to be. The once-rigid sureties of the music industries have been challenged by the disruptive potential of new technologies for making, circulating and experiencing music. We have arrived, apparently, at a radically different set of relations. As evidence, take this excerpt from the blurb of a recent book by Ari Herstand (2016), entitled *How to Make It in the New Music Business*: 'In the last decade, no industry has been through as much upheaval and turmoil as the music industry. If you're looking for quick fame and instant success, you're in the wrong field. It's now a democratic DIY business.'

The arrival of a democratic, DIY music business sounds like fantastic news, if true. It sounds like particularly fantastic news for any music practitioners who may have had an aversion to the 'old' music industries and who may have already been actively seeking and building alternative formations of popular music culture.

These alternative formations exist. Despite the above rhetoric of radical disruption, DIY music is not a new phenomenon. It is an approach to the production and distribution of music that, at a conservative estimate, dates back over forty years. It is often associated with punk, post-punk and indie, as well as electronic music genres, including rave. But more than an association with any particular genre, DIY scenes have historically often been affiliated with particular aspirations relating to the democratization of culture. They have questioned the organization and purpose of the music

industries, and have called, implicitly and explicitly, for those industries to be radically re-organized or even wholly dismantled.

DIY might mean prizing the intimacy of a small venue, and the temporary community created within it, as an end in itself, rather than seeing it as a stepping stone. It might mean acknowledging the harmful aspects of competition invoked by a music industry that celebrates stars at the expense of valorizing a wider range of creative endeavours, and opting out of that race for fame and commercial success. It might mean seeing musical training as a manifestation of elitist distinction, and therefore emphasizing an ‘anyone can do it’ aesthetic over precise technical ability. These are some of the ways in which DIY music cultures have historically made claims for the distinctiveness of their approach in relation to the ‘mainstream’.

But DIY today *is* mainstream. And when the case for the emergence of a ‘DIY democratic music business’ is made, the internet – and social media specifically – is usually offered as a major catalyst for such democratization. The internet, it is suggested, offers musicians a new, unguarded doorway to awaiting audiences. Media scholar David Croteau argues that ‘while “independent,” “alternative,” and “DIY” media have long existed in many forms [...], one key to the Internet’s unique significance is that it provides the infrastructure necessary to facilitate the distribution of all forms of self-produced media to a potentially far-flung audience’ (2006: 341). Of course, the fact that this ‘far-flung’ distribution is *possible* does not mean that engagement with a worldwide audience is guaranteed, and it by no means assures the democratization of the media landscape, but it has certainly brought about substantial change.

Whilst social media may not be a panacea, what I wish to emphasize here is the extent to which it has *realized*, in a meaningful way, some of the core aspirations of DIY music, and has impacted on the lives of far more people than, say, punk ever did. Or to put it another way, there is a substantial overlap between the aspirations of DIY music and the kinds of communicative potentials opened up by social media. DIY has historically been presented as a story of people who *ought to be consumers* rejecting the role prescribed to them, turning the tables on ‘popular culture’ and becoming producers, and finding a sense of self-realization and political subversion in this act. Jello Biafra, singer of seminal US punk band The Dead Kennedys, has offered the mantra: ‘don’t hate the media, *become* the media’ (Biafra 2000). This is, broadly, the promise of DIY, and it has also been a key promise of the internet and social media.

For better or worse, the lineage of DIY culture no longer has sole dominion over certain aspects of ‘do-it-yourself’ practice. DIY is increasingly acknowledged as an obvious choice for all sorts of musicians. Moving forward then, this book is premised on an understanding that there are two kinds of DIY music, which are at least theoretically separable. One is a broad

but ultimately coherent tradition of cultural resistance, often undertaken in the name of greater aesthetic diversity, economic equality and access to participation – and often with inherent or implicit connections to larger ideas of social justice. The other is largely a socio-economic consequence of changes in the music industries, as well as in the ICT (information and communication technologies) industries. These changes in turn articulate to an increasingly prominent neoliberal discourse which emphasizes the need for individuals to ‘take responsibility’, rather than to seek or expect support from state or corporate institutions. What follows is an investigation into how these two versions of DIY music are interacting, and what the consequences are. If social media was the key tool by which popular music activity became increasingly ‘DIY’, what might it offer for music that was *already* DIY?

In defence of the alternative

This book is part of a series called *Alternate Takes*, which encourages its authors to challenge or re-frame conventional wisdoms in the world of popular music studies. When I proposed this book, my ‘alternate take’ was that, despite the rhetoric of democratization outlined above, social media has in lots of ways been quite bad for DIY music – at least, for the kind with a long history of politicized independence from the music industries. I still think this, and it is a key argument of the book. But this position feels far less controversial now than it did when I began my research in 2014. We are increasingly aware that the current, platform-dominated internet constitutes an extremely lopsided economy that is bad for musicians of all kinds and a communicative environment that, more generally, seems to be quite bad for all kinds of people.

Critical internet and social media scholars have problematized optimistic rhetorics of user empowerment and unfettered cultural production. They have highlighted the uneven economic relationship between a handful of platforms and their billions of users (McChesney 2013, Nieborg and Helmond 2018, Srnicek 2017a); suggested that new opportunities for autonomy (i.e. the freedom to act on one’s own will, rather than following the dictates of others) might also lead to insecurity, compulsion and self-blaming (Duffy 2017, Kuehn and Corrigan 2013); and that the collection and application of data from our everyday online communication might represent the ‘capture’ of hitherto un-commodified dimensions of human activity (Andrejevic 2007, Dean 2010, Manzerolle and McGuigan 2014). As well as all this, the peak participatory ‘moment’ seems to be more or less over; platforms like YouTube increasingly play host to content produced by powerful ‘old media’ corporations (i.e. major labels, large film studios,

TV networks etc.), influenced by advertisers who ‘do not want their advertisement next to low-quality home video content’ (Kim 2012: 54).

What now feels more like the ‘alternate take’ is the idea that this politicized version of DIY music is something that is worth defending and protecting. There seems to be very little faith in ‘alternative’ music as a viable political project, and widespread scepticism that it even exists as something meaningfully distinct from other kinds of engagement with music. This scepticism is not new: the politicized distinction between ‘mainstream’ and ‘alternative’ music cultures is, in a sense, always facing an existential crisis. In the next chapter I suggest that this is a built-in consequence of DIY’s ambivalent (i.e. love–hate) relationship to popular music. But it does seem that in the last two decades in particular, alongside the rise of social media and the new ‘DIY’ music business, a number of discursive threads have cumulatively questioned the idea that such claims to alterity could reflect anything other than a kind of social posturing.

There is a pessimistic, Frankfurt School-esque bent to this relativism: the idea that cultural choice is an illusion (Horkheimer and Adorno 2002), mangled as an apolitical postmodern cynicism. But its closer academic relative is Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of cultural taste as ‘distinction’ (1984). It suggests that the only reason people are interested in ‘indie’ or ‘underground’ cultures is because it gives them a certain kind of credibility or status.

This intersects with a populist discourse – sometimes called ‘poptimism’ in music criticism circles (Rosen 2006) – which has questioned the political worth of any allegiance to alternative styles or scenes. This discourse negates a long-acknowledged tension between art and commerce by suggesting that popular music’s commercial impetus is, in a sense, the very thing that forces it to engage with and reflect the cultural and political zeitgeist. Alternative music’s relative hermeticism is consequently a source of aesthetic and political impoverishment. This in turn implies a kind of organic, frictionless inevitability to the social positioning of musical genres and traditions: alternative music is all fine and good for its own niche audience, it suggests, and mainstream popular music is good for its big, global audience.

Another discursive threat to DIY’s validity relates to what the late cultural theorist Mark Fisher termed ‘capitalist realism’, whereby we come to see the presence of competitive market dynamics in our social lives as inevitable and unchangeable (2009). This is most evident, in this context, as a depoliticizing of cultural actors’ decisions to engage with industries and practices that might once have been considered a betrayal of shared principles – the old notion of ‘selling out’ (Klein 2020; Klein, Meier and Powers 2017). These decisions are now seen as inviolably individual (‘it’s their choice’) or as structurally overdetermined (‘what else would you do?’), in such a way as to put them beyond critique. This perspective undermines any sense of collectivism in the setting of ethical norms and boundaries. The other consequence of this ‘realistic’ perspective is to see any alternative

ethical position as, ultimately, a marker of privilege: for example, rejecting the profit motive is seen as a gesture only available to those with the economic security to afford it.

An increasing focus on representational politics in contemporary society – in both left-wing and right-wing forms – has devalued DIY’s emphasis on organizational change as a mode of cultural resistance. DIY has historically valorized the building of alternative distribution networks, and these tend to come with inherent restrictions on audience size. But if the focus is on gaining representational visibility, then bigger is better. This perspective is reinforced as our understanding of the cultural industries – arriving both through academic research and through social media granting access ‘behind the scenes’ – draws new attention to the significant levels of agency operating within structures once caricatured as hegemonic monoliths (including major record labels). What makes the DIY musician so different, in terms of political potential, to the up-and-coming artist working to be heard in a fragmented and uncaring music industry? Isn’t the latter navigating the same tensions between art and commerce, and perhaps negotiating them more successfully? The recent glut of best-selling, politically conscious, critically revered works from star US-based artists (King 2019) seems to beg the question of quite what the problem with the music industries was ever supposed to be.

I have sympathy for most of these arguments. I do think that music should be something it’s possible to make a living doing, although I don’t think that means accepting a moral equivalency between different kinds of music-making, or concluding that people should do ‘whatever it takes’ to make money. It’s true that ‘alternative’ resentment towards chart music often continues a long history of misogynistic critique of young women’s engagements with popular culture (Ewens 2019). It can also be dismissive or suspicious of African-American musics, sometimes seeing its capacity for ‘technological innovation and stylistic change’ as evidence of commercialism (Bannister 2006a: 88–9). And, undoubtedly, DIY does struggle to embrace and support the participatory diversity that is so central to its rhetoric. Some of this does relate to the uncommon material advantages that DIY practitioners might take for granted, although the economic security of DIY practitioners should not be assumed, and I think it’s sometimes patronizing and wrong to suggest that not-for-profit principles inherently exclude certain social groups. (The tax-avoiding super-rich do not seem particularly interested in not-for-profit activity.)

The UK DIY scene that I have studied and been a part of seems at least as prone as other music scenes to abusive behaviour and prejudice. People I considered friends have taken advantage of their power, or of others’ vulnerability, in a scene that was (and still is) specifically presented as a safer space. The question of whether DIY (in the specifically ‘indie-punk’ incarnation that I study here) is systemically sexist or racist is not one

I answer thoroughly here. But it is certainly true that it has often failed to properly account for intersectional injustices, tending to reflect instead the often-narrow social positions of its practitioners.¹ The scene I studied showed disheartening historical continuity in this regard: during my research period there were several flashpoints at which problematic racial politics were brought to the fore. There are times when DIY has been an important space for emancipatory struggles, most notably in its capacity to give voice to feminist and queer politics. But it's important to recall that this space has generally been hard-won by marginalized groups, rather than simply offered up willingly.

So, I will not at any point make the claim that DIY is an ideal kind of music culture. I don't think it constitutes anything so grand as a revolutionary political practice or a comprehensive social movement, and it also isn't unique in being a musical culture that shows marked differences to mainstream popular music, aesthetically, organizationally or economically. But I will claim that DIY, for all its imperfections, has the capacity to mitigate one problem in particular: the distance that popular music culture has from the lives of most people. Therefore, I offer a critical defence not of the entirety of DIY music as we find it now, but of the broader notion of the alternative – the idea that musical activity outside of the commercial popular music industries might bring us closer to experiences of culture that work towards and sometimes embody social justice. I suggest that DIY music has characteristics that can make it a valuable form of 'cultural resistance'. That's a term that has fallen out of favour somewhat in academic literature, and I attempt to justify my use of it in Chapter 2.

All of this doesn't say much about whether the music produced in DIY scenes is, in itself, at all superior or preferable to other kinds of music. That isn't really the focus of this book, which is more concerned with how DIY is organized, and how it communicates political values within and outside of its borders. DIY can sometimes be a space for music that seems to be commercially unviable, as in the kind of 'abrasive sonic tinkering' that Stephen Graham locates in his study of 'underground' music (2016:3); sometimes it is home to music that sounds quite similar to pop music found elsewhere. But regardless of the aesthetics that are favoured, I think the particular value of DIY is that it presents opportunities for a particularly close kind of 'articulation' (i.e. connection) between music and social life, which can (and sometimes does) have empowering, democratizing effects.

¹Riot grrrl, a feminist, women-led DIY scene which began in the 1990s, is the DIY music lineage with the largest body of literature on experiences of exclusion in relation to race and ethnicity (see Bess 2015, Dawes 2013, Nguyen 2012). This is not to say that other scenes have not had comparable dynamics, but fewer accounts addressing them have been published.

DIY as the new default

So, DIY music is a cultural form with a long history of distinguishing itself from ‘mainstream’ music by means of specific ethical precepts. I’ve suggested that these might be valuable, and worth retaining and building upon. But social media and the internet have clouded some of the central ethical precepts of DIY music. These technologies intersect with, and often exacerbate, the existential crises I’ve listed above – of relativism, populism and pragmatism – as well as blurring distinctions between DIY and the music and ICT industries in other ways.

Take the ‘not-for-profit’ ethos as an example. DIY practitioners have historically tended to see a broad rejection of profiting from music, or variants on this theme (e.g. paying musicians but not promoters), as central to a vision of fair and ethical musical activity. But the internet has massively complicated notions of how much music costs, how much it *ought* to cost and even precisely what the music commodity is (Morris 2015). Automated surveillance of online activity is an important new site of profit which serves to underwrite ‘free’ access to culture in new ways (Andrejevic 2007), especially via targeted advertising, and many musicians today seek a similar kind of ‘free lunch’ model to that employed by tech companies. Street and Phillips, writing on music and copyright, quote one musician outlining such an approach: ‘My attitude is like a start-up [...] – you build up a community and then you monetize it [...], give it away free, remove all the obstacles that would normally be there’ (2016: 423). Clearly, this kind of approach to ‘freeing’ music is something quite distinct from a not-for-profit ethic. And there are concerns that the aspirational equation underpinning this activity – that free work now equals paid work later – might be economically infeasible and therefore subjectively harmful (Duffy 2017; Kuehn and Corrigan 2013).

Another key tenet of DIY has been independence or ‘self-sufficiency’. This has been understood as important not only in terms of artistic autonomy, but also in order to have control over economic and organizational decisions that might otherwise exploit others (e.g. avoiding extortionate ticket prices). As noted above, the internet has been seen as a substantial boon for independent artists; even the internet itself has at times felt ‘independent’, insofar as its disruption of old music industry business models was sometimes presented as a grassroots, people-powered phenomenon. But the music industries being a more ‘DIY business’ means new expectations of ‘self-management’ – a form of independence that does not hold the same political potential. Record labels have become more risk-averse, and increasingly seek to shift the costs of production onto artists. Music industry scholars Mazierska, Gillon and Rigg suggest that major record labels now offer contracts ‘only to those musicians who can prove their potential by having a significant following on social

media or winning amateur competitions' (2018: 7). Part of DIY's approach, at least historically, has been to critique this notion of non-professional music as primarily a 'talent pool' for industry to draw from. That sense of DIY and mainstream music as 'separate worlds' can be hard to maintain today, when musicians of all kinds and all levels are using the same platforms.

DIY has often aimed to blur, or eradicate, distinctions between artists and audiences, aiming to increase participation by demystifying the practice of 'doing' popular music (either as a music performer or in other roles). To this end, they have used formats such as zines (i.e. small, hand-made or photocopied magazine-style publications) to encourage participation and have sought to build social and physical spaces that put musicians and audiences in close proximity. Social media does blur artist-audience boundaries; Nancy Baym has shown that 'getting closer' to audiences is a new requirement even for established, well-known musicians (2018). But this is a commercial imperative that relates to the commodification of our everyday communication (Dean 2010). Rather than demystifying cultural production, it can instead insert a new kind of mystification into the apparently 'direct' connection between fans and artists. Today, supposedly 'intimate' communications on social media can be very difficult to disentangle from the marketing and branding efforts that are part of so many popular musicians' diversified careers (Meier 2017). DIY practitioners consequently struggle to find an appropriately 'authentic' communicative mode by which they might avoid seeming (or feeling) grubbily self-promotional.

What I'm suggesting is that some of the ethical precepts that have long been central to DIY are also at least partly compatible with an emerging form of 'platform capitalism' (Srnicek 2017a). This could be an unhappy accident. But it is important to recognize that the capitalist class who, amongst other things, oversees the activity of the biggest music and ICT corporations, has a specific ability to absorb cultural critique and to work this critique into an augmented and thus re-legitimated economic system.

Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello's book *The New Spirit of Capitalism* (2005) represents an important attempt to theorize this relationship between capitalism and critique and, along with Hesmondhalgh and Meier's application of this material to the subject of independent music (2015), it is a key influence on the research I present here. Boltanski and Chiapello engage with Max Weber's concept of the 'spirit of capitalism' – that is, 'the ideology that justifies engagement in capitalism' (2005: 8) – in order to posit that this 'spirit' is often first presented, in a sense, by anti-capitalist critique. They show how the French radical politics of the 1960s offered up both an 'artistic critique' and a 'social critique' of labour conditions, and then outline how employers were able, in focusing on the artistic critique (which was about 'disenchantment' with a perceived spiritual paucity in

everyday life), to instil work with new meanings that effectively dissolved the social critique (which had focused on inequality and suffering). Thus, flexibility that characterizes some kinds of work today is not an external arrival that was 'willed by no one' (2005: 185), but is in fact evidence of critique as a 'motor' of capitalist development (2005: 27).

So, economic and institutional power needn't always be employed as a top-down stifling of dissent (although this does happen); it can be involved in shaping more subtle processes of elision. Boltanski and Chiapello make a useful distinction between 'physical neutralization' (where critique 'does not succeed in being heard') and 'ideological neutralization' (where 'critique no longer knows what to say') (2005: 41). Symbols, texts, even whole domains of practice, can be 'hollowed out' and co-opted, whilst still carrying strong reverberations of their previous meanings. Since I'm suggesting that DIY still has the capacity to contribute to social justice, I'm also suggesting we need to be very careful of the consequences of these subtle elisions, and of the surface-level compatibility between DIY ethics and social media logics. And hopefully the overlaps outlined above also indicate why DIY music might be a specifically germane lens through which to consider social media's impact on society and culture more broadly.

As such, this book is just as much a study of social media as it is of popular music, but one that suggests social media research might fruitfully be carried out with a thorough understanding of the specific ethical precepts that people bring to social media platforms – in this case, the precepts of DIY music – and how they attempt to carry those ideas and behaviours with them when encountering these still new technologies. That doesn't mean that the normative perspective of the research has to come from the specific user-group under investigation. I have already suggested that I do have some affinity with DIY music's politics, but that isn't quite what I'm referring to here. I think that the ways that platforms constrain and enable behaviours can be best understood through a nuanced engagement with the social, political and cultural characteristics of a specific group of actually existing users. All of us arrive on social media with our own aims and intentions, however loosely or strictly defined, and with already-formed social groups that determine, at least in part, the social and cultural norms that will attempt to take root in those environments.

Nancy Baym, in her work on musicians, audiences and social media, uses the polysemy of the term 'platform' (i.e. its capacity to carry multiple meanings) as a starting point for considering links between online and offline communication environments, and the ways that both these spaces might carry some kind of 'architectural' power. 'Like concert halls', she writes, 'social media sites are built environments, designed to foster some social practices and discourage others' (2018: 155).

In this context, it is notable that DIY scenes have often placed emphasis on re-organizing spaces of musical activity. Some of the key calls to action

in historical scenes have been broadly ‘environmental’ in this sense. Notable examples include the ‘all ages’ movement to allow under-21s into licensed venues in the United States in the 1980s, and riot grrrl’s emphasis on ‘girls to the front’, which aimed to invert gendered audience norms in which women had often literally been at the periphery. In a slightly different, but related tradition of DIY music, we might also think about the environmental re-organization involved in the UK’s outdoor rave scene of the 1990s, and how the movement of urban musics to rural settings related to desires for an anti-commercial musical space. In these ways and others, DIY scenes have highlighted the malleability of the relationship between built environments and the politics that operate in and around them. It’s also important to note the sheer variety of platforms available online today, and the range of communication modes which even a single platform can offer. If you want to send private messages to a friend, or to video-chat with a group of colleagues, or to vent lengthy diatribes into the void, you can find and use online tools and platforms that are more likely to enable those kinds of communication.

So, we should be careful about assigning too much power to environments in themselves, whether mediated or physical. The issue, perhaps, is who has the power to alter them. As Baym notes, online ‘built environments’ are changing all the time. For better and for worse, Facebook and Twitter alter their design in response to how people are using them. I have written elsewhere that social media’s ‘affordances’ – that is, the actions that they seem to enable and allow – should be considered critically as ‘sites of contestation’, where user intention and platform architecture meet (Jones 2019). In this book I try to focus on these moments and places where friction between the aims of users and platforms is evident, and to theorize outwards from there to reflect on broader tensions between DIY ethics and platform logics.

But is also important to understand that this ‘architectural’ approach to platforms only gets us so far. If we look at social media only as an environment that ‘affords’ certain things rather than others, then regardless of how we understand the power balance between users and platforms, we risk losing sight of social media as a broader societal force. Platforms have an influence on our life that goes beyond the observable decisions we make when interacting with and on the platform. Even your smarmy friend who is so quick to tell you that they’ve never had a Facebook account has nonetheless had their life substantially altered by the ways in which that platform has shaped contemporary life. Our relationships to friends and family, to local businesses, to politics, to culture and even to ourselves have all been changed, in indirect as well as direct ways. Therefore, social media’s impact on a particular area of life – in this case, DIY music – may not be fully observable through studying usage in terms of the buttons that we do or don’t press. It requires investigation into how social media practices fit,

neatly or awkwardly, with the rest of life, and a consideration of online and offline activity as mutually constitutive.

Researching the Leeds DIY scene

Most of the material for this book comes from my study of a single DIY scene, undertaken in the city of Leeds between September 2015 and January 2018. Comparisons with other scenes and music cultures are made throughout. But a key premise, in the tradition of many other such studies of local music cultures (Cohen 1991, Finnegan 1988, Shank 1994), is that paying close attention to a single area of activity can reveal the operation of social mechanisms that would not be discoverable through wider-ranging surveys. The key advantage in this context is that studying a single scene, through a range of online and offline methods, permits a thorough assessment of the multiple roles that social media platforms play across different scales and kinds of communication. The findings outlined here relate not only to the ways in which the scene is outwardly communicative, but also to the ‘everyday’ individual and group interactions that construct and maintain it.

‘Scene’ is, of course, a term in popular usage, but it has also been employed as an academic concept in cultural studies (Straw 1990, 2001). Whilst the term can mask some quite different sociological approaches (Hesmondhalgh 2005: 28), there are some useful consistencies across its uses in popular music studies. Studying ‘scenes’ tends to involve paying particular attention to their ‘overlapping’ nature, and thus to a certain mobility of membership, whilst also pointing to the existence of something more stable than the posited hyper-flexibility of postmodern identity (i.e. the notion that we can ‘make’ ourselves into whoever we want to be). It also highlights that my interest in music-making here is not only in the final ‘product’, but in the routines and rituals that maintain and re-produce a music culture. Simon Frith notes that the concept of scene might usefully emphasize ‘banality’ whilst still celebrating ‘some kind of opposition to dominant ideology’ (2004: 174); Keith Kahn-Harris’s account of extreme metal fandom similarly considers the way in which scenic ‘mundanity’ is a necessary ballast that allows for experiences of ‘transgression’ (2004). Even the most aesthetically uncompromising scenes tend to be characterized by repetition and stability: the same sets of people doing the roughly same things in roughly the same places.

Choosing Leeds was partly a matter of convenience, based on my location and my existing position in this community (outlined below). But Leeds also offered access to a wider range of people, activities and venues than in other nearby cities. Leeds also has an active and longstanding connection to DIY,

most famously in its hosting of a highly political post-punk scene in the 1970s and 1980s (O'Brien 2012).

Speaking in terms of genre, I label my research population as broadly 'indie-punk' in a concession to its two clearest ideological lineages and to distinguish it from other local and trans-local DIY scenes centred around hardcore punk, electronic music, grime, folk and so on. There is a general tendency towards guitars and away from electronic instruments, and a construction of authenticity that tends to rely on some tropes drawn from rock music but which also reflects an increasing enthusiasm for popular music. So, while 'DIY' (rather than 'indie' or 'punk') is a label which captures this scene's valorization of particular methods of production and circulation, this doesn't mean genre is negated entirely. Indeed, we might even understand the term 'DIY' as problematic insofar as it makes an excessive claim to genre-indifference, which obscures the role of aesthetic discrimination in forming scene boundaries.²

Practitioners involved in this 'indie-punk' scene were mostly white and middle class, fairly mixed in terms of gender and sex (with a strong interest in feminist and queer politics), mostly vegetarian and vegan, politically left-leaning but not necessarily vocal or radical, and were mostly aged between eighteen and forty. In terms of social and cultural capital, then, there are commonalities that bind this scene together beyond generic affiliation.

However, above genre and status, I stress the role of place, and specifically venues. There are a number of venues that help constitute and maintain the scene, and one in particular serves to help define my research population. Wharf Chambers is a worker's cooperative and members' club with a bar and multi-use venue, which is open every day, and hosts several music events each week. Located in the city centre, near the so-called Freedom Quarter that denotes a cluster of LGBT-oriented venues, it emerged from a previous venue, Common Place, which was formed in the same location in 2005. Temple of Boom is another important city-centre venue (without a real 'bar' space outside of the gig room) which tends towards heavier punk and metal; Chunk is a practice space and gig venue in Meanwood operated by a collective of bands and artists, with an emphasis on art-rock and esoteric electronic music.

There are larger venues, too, which play a role in the scene's construction. Brudenell Social Club is a multi-room venue in Hyde Park which has received national recognition within the live music industry (Live Music Awards 2015), and which tends to host bigger indie, pop and rock acts in its 300 capacity main room. DIY music practitioners, however, had played a key role in its gradual transformation from working men's

²A sense of shared, politicized identity can also help practitioners to see beyond genre – in many DIY scenes it is primarily queer identity that plays this role. Pearce and Lohman's research on trans music scenes finds a similar kind of leniency towards genre in operation (2019).

club to student-facing venue, and so retained some sense of attachment, alongside some disappointment that the Brudenell had ‘outgrown’ the DIY scene. Local pubs like the Fox and Newt in Burley, and The Fenton and The Packhorse in the university area of Woodhouse, still hosted occasional shows. Belgrave Music Hall and Headrow House, two city-centre venues operated by one local company, overlapped with the DIY scene insofar as practitioners would attend (and play as opening acts at) bigger shows there but, for the most part, these two venues were seen to embody a different set of values, reflected in more self-conscious, faux-industrial interior design, as well as expensive beer and ticket prices.

Wharf Chambers in particular, though, was central. In particular, its status as a cooperatively run, queer-friendly venue, with a safer spaces policy, vegan food and relatively affordable prices, allowed it to stand in for and symbolize the values held by the scene. The understanding was, broadly: *if it happens at Wharf, it's DIY*. Even as different nights brought in overlapping but distinct crowds, the sense of a coherent scene hinged on a shared affinity with and attachment to place. This also demonstrates how local and trans-local notions of the DIY scene might relate – through similar experiences of attachment to DIY venues across the country (and beyond), members of the UK-wide scene felt as though they ‘belonged’ at Wharf, even though they may only visit once a year when touring. Indeed, Wharf often served as a model for those seeking a stable ‘home’ for DIY in their own city or town.

This broad veneration of Wharf Chambers gave way to a more complex relationship during the course of my research. A specific accusation of abuse against a Wharf staff member led to broader concerns about the venue’s accountability processes, especially in relation to racism and discrimination. This led to, amongst other things, an informal boycott of Wharf by some members, the formation of an action group (Wharf Members against Racism) and the venue drawing up an anti-racism action plan (which, as of November 2019, readily admits ‘previous failings’). During this period several members’ meetings took place which I did not attend, since I felt my presence as a researcher might well inhibit participants’ willingness to speak on these sensitive topics. So, whilst those events aren’t fully documented here, a generalized concern with regards to the ‘whiteness’ of the scene provides an important context for this research on DIY’s relationship to social media. Such concerns reinforce the need to engage seriously with the historical and contemporary dimensions of racism in DIY (as well as problematic histories regarding ableism and heterosexism), and particularly in punk rock (see Duncombe 2011). We certainly cannot take any association between DIY and social justice as inherent – it is for that reason that I attempt a critical engagement with the notion of ‘cultural resistance’ in Chapter 2.

In tracing this DIY scene online, I followed other digital culture researchers in thinking that the boundary of online study ought to reflect the usage pattern of the research population in question, where possible (Stirling 2016: 63). Nancy Baym uses the metaphor of the ‘pub crawl’ to consider how the most appropriate object of study is not one single online institution amongst many, but the meanings created by a set of actors who traverse across these spaces (2007).

The most commonly used site was Facebook and Facebook Pages (which has a standalone app but is within the Facebook ecosystem). All of my research participants had some degree of administrative control over a Facebook Page – for their band, solo music project, gig promotion, record label, venue, studio, practice space and in many cases several of the above – and the majority also maintained a personal Facebook profile. Twitter was the next most popular general-purpose social media platform, although usage here was more varied and several interviewees claimed to not really ‘get’ its purpose.

The most commonly used music-hosting site was Bandcamp. Bandcamp is a privately owned music hosting and sales platform founded in 2007, which fulfils digital music sales and mediates sales of physical goods, and almost all my participants had access to at least one artist or label page on the site. Whilst Bandcamp has links to Silicon Valley through its CEO and early investors, it has a reputation for being ‘indie’ and artist-friendly and is, unlike other comparable music streaming services, regularly turning a profit. SoundCloud offers similar services (although emphasizes streaming and embedding capabilities, rather than sales), but was used by fewer Leeds DIY practitioners, had more ‘industry’ associations and was considered primarily to be a home for electronic music genres.

Music streaming platforms, such as Spotify, iTunes (now Apple Music), Google Play and so on, were less central to the scene, since they generally do not allow the kind of free, instant account-creation and music-uploading that characterizes Bandcamp and SoundCloud. Rather, these platforms have aimed to get bigger labels and publishers on board in an attempt to create a music catalogue that will appeal to a broad consumer base (Hesmondhalgh, Jones and Rauh 2019); independent artists are required to go through third-party distributors (such as Record Union or Tunecore), most of which charge annual music registration fees, and to then wait for their music to be approved and uploaded. This is changing fast, as Spotify playlists become an increasingly powerful form of ‘exposure’, and the process of dealing with these third-party distributors becomes easier (i.e. more automated) and cheaper.

YouTube offers, like Bandcamp and SoundCloud, the ability to upload material quickly and without cost, and potentially to a far greater audience than these specialist independent music sites. It was generally used by practitioners for hosting music videos for ‘singles’ (i.e. lead tracks from

releases), or other one-off videos, and wasn't home to much intra-scene communication. The notion of being a 'YouTuber' carried connotations of brand-building and self-absorption that my interviewees sometimes saw as contradictory to DIY ethics. YouTube's parent company, Alphabet, was part of the everyday online experience for practitioners in various forms, including email, file sharing, scheduling and in the prevalence of Google Search as a means of information retrieval. Of particular importance to the scene was the understanding of urban space enabled by Google Maps, and the associated information provided by Google Places.

Photo and video-centric platforms Instagram and Snapchat do not feature heavily here, since they were used by only a few practitioners, but they are becoming central for everyday communication and also gathering audiences for circulating music. Private chat applications like Facebook Messenger and WhatsApp were widely used but difficult to observe. Ticket sales sites, merchandize ordering and fulfilment sites, and file-hosting sites are also part of the online infrastructure that supports and shapes the scene.

Whilst we seem to be in a period of relative stability, there is no guarantee that the current key online platforms will stick around – a similar research project undertaken ten or fifteen years earlier may have noted the seemingly unbreakable dominance of MySpace and the prevalence of local music forums in organizing and maintaining scenes. Those platforms that do last tend to meddle with site architecture incessantly and also adapt their business models in order to keep up with competitors. I have tried to keep this in mind when writing, with the aim of sustaining the value of this research in the longer term by focusing not on specific platform functionalities, but on the relatively stable relationships that form between platforms' textual and architectural characteristics, and practitioners' aims and perspectives (Hesmondhalgh, Jones and Rauh 2019).

Interviews and observations are the two primary sources of data utilized in this project. I conducted twenty-four semi-structured interviews with twenty-eight Leeds-based DIY music practitioners³ between August 2015 and August 2016. Material from these interviews is included throughout

³I use the term 'practitioner' throughout the book, rather than 'musician', because it is characteristic of DIY scenes that people hold more than one role. These practitioners included musicians, promoters, producers, sound engineers, visual artists and venue staff, with most holding at least two of these roles. Leeds-based music writer Rob Hayler, although writing about a slightly different, more experimental scene in the city, introduces the useful notion of the 'no-audience underground': 'There is no "audience" as such, in the sense of "passive receivers", because almost everyone with an interest in the scene is involved somehow in the scene. The roles one might have – musician, promoter, label "boss," distributor, writer, "critic," paying punter and so on – are fluid, non-hierarchical and can be exchanged or adopted as needed' (Hayler 2015).

Chapters 3–8, and all interviewees have been anonymized.⁴ I attended a large number of gigs in Leeds during my research period, and was also given access to some rehearsals, recordings and meetings (although that ‘behind the scenes’ material did not prove hugely relevant). I also observed scene members’ online practice, paying specific attention to prominent Leeds-specific Facebook Groups and Pages. This online observation fed back into offline interviews, where discussion would often turn to a specific event or interaction that had taken place online.

Alongside interviews and observations, the other key source of material has been my own involvement in DIY music. DIY has played a more formative role in my life than almost anything else I can think of. It is a place where I have learned about politics and ethics, founded and re-enforced numerous lasting friendships, and had my most profound experiences of music, provoking both personal reflection and collective exuberance. In Bristol, the city where I grew up, to discover a local musical world apart from the charmless, extortionate pubs we had been playing in as teenagers was to discover a culture that felt valuable and powerful in a way that nothing had previously, with connections to other local and national scenes that suggested a movement at once both globally visible and intimately secret. The Bristol scene had (and still has) a particularly strong identification with feminist and queer politics, as well as with veganism, and these particular integrations of political thought and action with musical culture rang true for me. They felt full and rich where previously posited connections with music and politics (in mainstream folk, punk, reggae and dance) had felt shallow. Whilst I would consider myself more open to other musical and political worlds now, and more aware of DIY’s own particular foibles and flaws, the connection has nonetheless been a lasting one. Much of the last ten years has been spent, to the detriment of any other interests, playing in bands and putting on gigs, and meeting people with similar shared passions.

When my doctoral research brought me to Leeds in 2014, I co-founded a non-profit DIY promotion collective with the few friends I already half-knew. It was a fantastic way to divide up the sometimes-formidable labour of

⁴Julia Downes, Maddie Breeze and Naomi Griffin have written thought-provokingly on the specific ethical considerations of conducting research with DIY cultures. In their work, the issue of anonymizing or pseudonymizing data is examined as a power relation between researcher and participant, particularly on those occasions where participants might *want* to be named and recognized as ‘critical agents of social change’ rather than ‘objects’ to be observed (Downes, Breeze and Griffin 2013: 106–7). However, in this book I have opted to anonymize the DIY practitioners I spoke with, since much of the material contains opinions and perspectives on other local institutions and practitioners. This material is important to the research, but also has the potential to cause ill-feeling, and therefore I consider anonymity to be the best means of ensuring that the trust placed in me by those people is not used recklessly. Participants are instead numbered randomly (P1, P2, P3 etc.).

organizing shows – booking bands to play, promoting the show online and off, cooking dinner for the performers (and baking cakes for the audience), running the zine stall, occasionally doing the sound (badly) and providing somewhere for the bands to sleep. That collective lasted for two years, and there was some other DIY music activity too, playing music in my own band as well as other people's projects, and attending countless shows. For the final ten months or so of my research I was living in Sheffield – an hour's train journey from Leeds – and becoming involved in that city's DIY music scene, although in more peripheral roles.

As well as my participation in various DIY scenes, I also had a rather different set of engagements with music culture over the same period. During the same month I started my research, I signed a recording contract with an independent label who were, unbeknownst to me at the time, in partnership with Caroline International – a subsidiary of Universal Music Group, and very much part of the 'industry'. My musical venture, which sat somewhere between indie rock band and solo recording project, released two albums through that label in 2015, supported by frequent touring and other promotional activity. We had some press coverage in the sort of publications that even my parents had heard of – *Pitchfork*, *Rolling Stone*, *NME*, *Guardian* – and got to meet and play with musicians that remain heroes and role models to me (although I have local, DIY heroes too). Whilst the band and I found this to be a level of 'success' that both surprised and, at times, perturbed us, our record sales (and assorted income streams) weren't as strong as the label had anticipated, and the option to extend my contract wasn't taken up. Our most recent albums were self-released on cassette and vinyl, and all our touring returned to being self-organized.

Running alongside this academic research on DIY, then, was a strange parallel journey through the industry. Perhaps unsurprisingly, there were numerous times when it felt like the boundaries between research and practice were hard to define (as well as boundaries between work and leisure). This project then has been informed by my own experiences in ways that would be difficult to document fully. The imposition of third parties into our working practice as a band – PR companies, booking agents, tour managers – gave me an understanding of how artists' autonomy is 'negotiated' within music industry management structures (Banks 2007: 7). Touring with musicians (as well as meeting other industry workers) from the UK and the United States who manage to make a living from music gave me insight into their positive experiences as cultural workers, as well as the sacrifices involved, and the extent to which self-management has become a defining characteristic of work in this specific corner of the cultural industries (again, Banks 2007). And during this time, I found my relationship to the DIY scene felt increasingly problematic – my band was still referred to frequently in interviews and features as a

'DIY' project and yet we were really anything but, having 'sold out' at least by the standard measure of signing a record contract and taking accompanying steps towards professionalization. At times I felt partially responsible for (or at least compatible with) some of the harmful kinds of individualist aspiration which I identify and examine in this book. So, although this book offers an 'insider' perspective on DIY music, it also reflects my experience 'outside' of DIY – as musician and researcher – and hopefully this allows for sensible consideration of the value offered by DIY's specific political project.

This book is a work of social science, and it therefore carries the peculiar reflexivity characteristic of that discipline: in attempting to study some existing social phenomenon, it can change the object of study itself. That is a sufficiently daunting notion so as to inspire a cautious, considered approach towards research and the presentation of new knowledge. But, in evaluating the relationship between social media platforms and DIY music, I do hope that my research will have some impact on the ways in which practitioners engage with platforms, with each other and with the wider world. I think that DIY music continues to offer, at its best, a strong form of resistance to some forms of social injustice. The critical examination offered here is intended to bolster that strength. I follow Rebecca Solnit in thinking that 'authentic hope requires clarity' (2006: 20), and therefore this critical examination of DIY is not intended to be a fault-finding inquisition, but rather a consideration of the ways in which it is threatened by new forms of capitalist accumulation, put forward in the belief that these threats can and should be countered.

Chapter outlines

In this opening chapter, I have shown that a certain kind of 'DIY' activity is increasingly proposed as a means of successfully operating around and within the contemporary music and ICT industries. This discourse has much in common with a longer-standing conception of DIY music, especially in the emphasis placed on autonomy, participation and independence. But it also differs in some substantial ways from this older DIY lineage, which has often emphasized its distinction from and incompatibility with the 'mainstream' music industries on ethical and economic grounds. I have suggested that social media is a key site where the differences between these discourses of DIY might be elided, and where a previously 'resistant' cultural approach might be made compatible with increasingly normalized expectations of entrepreneurial self-government.

Chapter 2 engages with the history of DIY music, in order to give context to the present-day scene in Leeds and to further elucidate how and why DIY has been differentiated from other popular musics. It outlines DIY's historical relationships both to popular music and to communication technologies, drawing on examples from notable past DIY scenes – including UK post-punk, US indie and riot grrrl. It also engages with 'cultural resistance' – an often-maligned concept that I argue retains some power to explain DIY's specific political orientation.

The rest of the book is structured around findings drawn from fieldwork and theoretical interpretations of those findings. The chapters are ordered so as to approximate an 'outward' progression in terms of the social units considered, starting from the personal dimensions of online communication and moving towards 'larger' objects of study: the DIY scene; its relationship to local publics and other scenes; its relationship to commercial popular musics; and finally its relationship to the economic specificities of online platforms.⁵

So, Chapter 3 deals with DIY practitioners' approach to personal communication and identity construction online. It highlights that the communicative intimacy that was previously a distinctive characteristic of DIY is today increasingly compelled as part of 'doing' social media. Social media's tendency towards 'self-branding' and 'relatability' is partly mitigated by DIY's aversion to commercialization, but nonetheless means practitioners are faced with a complex set of norms to navigate. Affective engagement at this individual level is characterized by feelings of social anxiety.

Chapter 4 considers the role of social media in mediating relationships within the DIY scene. Offline, DIY scenes do have hierarchies and gatekeepers, but there also tends to be a high degree of collective ownership over various organizations. Online, a brief moment of devolved ownership (forums and stand-alone sites) was replaced with a move to Facebook and the like. Forms of collectivism demonstrated offline can prove difficult to apply within the frameworks of major platforms. In general, network structures serve to reinforce Romantic (i.e. anti-social) notions of creativity and authorship.

Chapter 5 considers 'the public' – that is, how DIY music might relate to the 'outside world' and particularly to other local music scenes. This is an area in which the DIY scene remains quite distinct. A discourse of 'safe spaces' is central to the scene's efforts to create an insular, protective environment and social media's 'echo chamber' can assist in extending this approach online. The consequences of this insularity are considered, both as

⁵This book structure owes a substantial debt to David Hesmondhalgh's *Why Music Matters* (2013).

valuable in some cases and as potentially restrictive in others. I also show, through a case study of an argument on social media, how interactions with other music scenes are shaped by platform design as well as by user intention.

Chapter 6 considers the role that online platforms play in mediating the relationship between DIY scenes and commercial popular music. Platforms place DIY musicians in the same space as global pop superstars, and metrics (the quantitative measurements of Followers, Friends and Likes that are abundant on social media) offer new capacities of direct comparison between these entities. In showing this vast gulf in scale, social media mitigates the capacity of DIY practitioners to imagine their scene as ‘alternative’ in a sense other than ‘niche’. Nonetheless, metrics do continue to provide some ambivalent value by re-presenting local, material practice in a way that offers a sense of security and self-affirmation.

Chapter 7 outlines DIY’s relationship to the platform economy and expands on the themes covered in this introductory chapter. DIY and other music scenes are increasingly making use of the same online platforms and digital tools. Whilst this brings new opportunities for self-organization and creative autonomy, these strategies of resourcefulness are also in keeping with an individualized and neoliberal ‘enterprise discourse’, wherein doing it ‘yourself’ loses much of its radical alterity. I also demonstrate, using Harry Braverman’s work in the field of labour process theory, that reliance on automated tools provided by monopolistic platforms constitutes a relative ‘deskilling’ of DIY culture. I introduce ‘optimization’ as an important platform logic: a means by which consumer autonomy is employed to justify the use of marketing strategies by producers.

Finally, in Chapter 8 I offer some thoughts on how DIY music scenes might engage with social media platforms in order to best enable cultural resistance. I suggest that this might include utilizing free and/or open-source software, building cooperative platforms and networks, and moving away from future-oriented brand-building.

SUGGESTED LISTENING

All the following chapters are interspersed with ‘suggested listening’ boxes, which act a bit like epigrams. They put forward songs that, during the writing of this book, seemed to be speaking – abstractly or concretely – about themes I was trying to engage with. They aren’t DIY songs necessarily, and they aren’t all by artists whose politics I would align with. I could have quoted the lyrics in the text, but that would defy the point, which is that music is a distinct form of communication which relates to academic research in strange ways that can feel at once tangential and vital. Paul Simon’s ‘When Numbers Get Serious’ (1983) is a goofy reggae song with an even goofier triple-time ending, and a silly, dad-joke lyric full of arithmetic wordplay. But then he sings: ‘I will love you innumerably/you can count on my word,’ and it’s heart-breaking, and suddenly I feel like I understand more about the ethical distinctions between qualitative and quantitative epistemologies. I’ve made Spotify and YouTube playlists compiling the songs mentioned here, which you can find by searching for the title of this book, but both of these are incomplete (and likely impermanent) in different ways because of rights restrictions on those platforms. It has been argued that this kind of fragmentation of the media landscape motivates users to illegally access music (Bode 2019); maybe this fragmentation could also encourage other kinds of ethical engagements with music consumption.

REFERENCES

- Abercrombie, N. and Longhurst, B. (1998) *Audiences: A Sociological Theory of Performance and Imagination*. London: Sage.
- Adorno, T. W. (2005) 'Scientific Experiences of a European Scholar in America'. In *Critical Models: Interventions and Catchwords*, edited by Pickford, H. W. New York: Columbia University Press, 215–44.
- Allen, R. (1996) *Delta 5: Interview by Mike Appelstein* [online] available from <https://www.furious.com/perfect/delta5.html> [18 February 2020].
- Anand, N. (2005) 'Charting the Music Business: Billboard Magazine and the Development of the Commercial Music Field'. In *The Business of Culture: Emerging Perspectives on Entertainment, Media, and Other Industries*, edited by Lampel, J., Shamsie, J. and Lant, T. K. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 139–54.
- Andersen, M. and Jenkins, M. (2001) *Dance of Days: Two Decade's of Punk in the Nation's Capital*. New York City: Soft Skull Press.
- Andrejevic, M. (2004) 'The Work of Watching One Another: Lateral Surveillance, Risk, and Governance'. *Surveillance & Society* [online] 2 (4): 479–97.
- Andrejevic, M. (2007) 'Surveillance in the Digital Enclosure'. *The Communication Review* 10 (4): 295–317.
- Arola, K. L. (2010) 'The Design of Web 2.0: The Rise of the Template, The Fall of Design'. *Computers and Composition* 27 (1): 4–14.
- Arnold, G. (1993) *Route 666: On the Road to Nirvana*. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Arvidsson, A. (2008) 'The Ethical Economy of Customer Coproduction'. *Journal of Macromarketing* 28 (4): 326–38.
- Azerrad, M. (2001) *Our Band Could Be Your Life: Scenes from the American Indie Underground 1981–1991*. London: Little, Brown.
- Bandcamp (nd) *What Pricing Performs Best?* [online] available from https://bandcamp.com/help/selling#pricing_performance [25 August 2017].
- Banks, M. (2007) *The Politics of Cultural Work*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Banks, M. (2010) 'Autonomy Guaranteed? Cultural Work and the "Art–Commerce Relation"'. *Journal for Cultural Research* 14 (3): 251–69.
- Bannister, M. (2006a) "'Loaded": Indie Guitar Rock, Canonism, White Masculinities'. *Popular Music* 25 (1): 77–95.
- Bannister, M. (2006b) *White Boys, White Noise: Masculinities and 1980s Indie Guitar Rock*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Barney, D. (2010) "'Excuse Us If We Don't Give a Fuck": The (Anti-) Political Career of Participation', *Jeunesse: Young People, Texts, Cultures*, 2(2): 138–46.
- Bauwens, M. (2005) 'The Political Economy of Peer Production'. *CTheory* [online] 1000 Days of Theory (26), available from <www.cttheory.net/articles.aspx?id=499>.

- Baym, N. K. (1993) 'Interpreting Soap Operas and Creating Community: Inside a Computer-Mediated Fan Culture'. *Journal of Folklore Research* 30 (2/3): 143–76.
- Baym, N. K. (2007) 'The New Shape of Online Community: The Example of Swedish Independent Music Fandom'. *First Monday* 12 (8).
- Baym, N. K. (2013) 'Data Not Seen: The Uses and Shortcomings of Social Media Metrics'. *First Monday* (10).
- Baym, N. K. (2015) *Personal Connections in the Digital Age*, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Polity.
- Baym, N. K. (2018) *Playing to the Crowd: Musicians, Audiences, and the Intimate Work of Connection*. New York: New York University Press.
- Becker, H. S. (1982) *Art Worlds*. London: University of California Press.
- Benjamin, W. (1970) 'The Author as Producer'. *New Left Review* 1 (62): 1–9.
- Benkler, Y. (2006) *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom*. London: Yale University Press.
- Berry, D. M. (2013) 'Against Remediation,' In *Unlike Us Reader*, edited by Lovink, G. and Rasch, M. Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures, 31–49.
- Bess, G. (2015) *Alternatives to Alternatives: The Black Grrrls Riot Ignored* [online]. *Vice*, available from https://broadly.vice.com/en_us/article/alternatives-to-alternatives-the-black-grrrls-riot-ignored [18 September 2016].
- Biafra, J. (2000) *Become the Media*. [CD album]. Alternative Tentacles, VIRUS260CD.
- Bikini Kill (1991) *Revolution Girl Style Now!* [Cassette album]. Self-released.
- Birch, I. (1979) 'Rough Trade Records: The Humane Sell'. *Melody Maker*, 10 February.
- Bishop, S. (2018) 'Anxiety, Panic and Self-Optimization: Inequalities and the YouTube Algorithm'. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 24 (1): 69–84.
- Blauner, R. (1964). *Alienation and Freedom: The Factory Worker and His Industry*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bode, K. (2019) 'Streaming Exclusives Could Double Piracy Rates, Study Warns'. [1 October 2019] available from https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/xwe4x7/streaming-exclusives-could-double-piracy-rates-study-warns [15 February 2020].
- Boehringer, J. (2015) 'Liberation through a Lack of Interest: The No-Audience Underground'. [17 August 2015] available from <https://multiplesystemsofevents.wordpress.com/liberation-through-a-lack-of-interest-the-no-audience-underground/> [3 January 2020].
- Bolin, G. and Andersson Schwarz, J. (2015) 'Heuristics of the Algorithm: Big Data, User Interpretation and Institutional Translation'. *Big Data & Society* 2 (2): 1–12.
- Boltanski, L. and Chiapello, É. (2005) *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Bonini, T. and Gandini, A. (2019) "'First Week Is Editorial, Second Week Is Algorithmic": Platform Gatekeepers and the Platformization of Music Curation'. *Social Media + Society* 5 (4): 1–11.
- Booth, R. (2014) *Facebook Reveals News Feed Experiment to Control Emotions* [online] available from <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2014/jun/29/facebook-users-emotions-news-feeds> [7 September 2017].

- Born, G. (1993) 'Against Negation, for a Politics of Cultural Production: Adorno, Aesthetics, the Social'. *Screen* 34 (3): 223–42.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1995) *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- boyd, d. (2011) 'Social Network Sites as Networked Publics: Affordances, Dynamics, and Implications'. In *A Networked Self: Identity, Community, and Culture on Social Network Sites*, edited by Papacharissi, Z. New York: Routledge, 39–58.
- boyd, d. (2013) *It's Complicated: The Social Lives of Networked Teens*. London: Yale University Press.
- boyd, d. (2017) 'Hacking the Attention Economy'. Data & Society [online] available from <https://points.datasociety.net/hacking-the-attention-economy-9fa1daca7a37>.
- Braverman, H. (1974) *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*. London: Monthly Review Press.
- Brown, W. (1995) *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bruns, A. (2007) *Prodosage: Towards a Broader Framework for User-Led Content Creation*. Presented at the Creativity & Cognition Conference, Washington.
- Bruns, A. (2008a) 'The Future Is User-Led: The Path towards Widespread Prodosage'. *Fibreculture* [online] (11), available from <http://eleven.fibreculturejournal.org/fcj-066-the-future-is-user-led-the-path-towards-widespread-prodosage/>.
- Bruns, A. (2008b) *Blogs, Wikipedia, Second Life, and Beyond: From Production to Prodosage*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Bucher, T. (2012) 'Want to Be on the Top? Algorithmic Power and the Threat of Invisibility on Facebook'. *New Media & Society* 14 (7): 1164–80.
- Cadwalladr, C. and Graham-Harrison, E. (2018) 'Revealed: 50 Million Facebook Profiles Harvested for Cambridge Analytica in Major Data Breach'. *The Guardian* [online] 17 March, available from <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2018/mar/17/cambridge-analytica-facebook-influence-us-election> [1 March 2020].
- Campaign Choirs Writing Collective (2018) *Singing for Our Lives: Stories from the Street Choirs*. Bristol: HammerOn Press.
- Caraway, B. (2011) 'Audience Labor in the New Media Environment: A Marxian Revisiting of the Audience Commodity'. *Media, Culture & Society* 33 (5): 693–708.
- Caraway, B. (2016) 'Crisis of Command: Theorizing Value in New Media'. *Communication Theory* 26 (1) 64–81.
- Casemajor, N., Couture, S., Delfin, M., Goerzen, M. and Delfanti, A. (2015) 'Non-Participation in Digital Media: Toward a Framework of Mediated Political Action'. *Media, Culture & Society* 37 (6): 850–66.
- Cellan-Jones, R. (2012) *Who 'Likes' My Virtual Bagels?* [online] available from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/technology-18819338> [27 February 2017].
- Chandler, D. and Munday, R. (2016a) 'Spam' [online] available from <http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780191803093.001.0001/acref-9780191803093> [1 June 2017].

- Chandler, D. and Munday, R. (2016b) 'Trolling' [online] available from <http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780191803093.001.0001/acref-9780191803093> [7 June 2017].
- Chrysagis, E. (2016) 'The Visible Evidence of DiY Ethics: Music, Publicity and Technologies of (In)Visibility in Glasgow'. *Visual Culture in Britain* 17 (3): 290–310.
- Clarke, J. (2006) 'The Skinheads and the Magical Recovery of Community'. In *Resistance through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain*, 2nd edn, edited by Hall, S. and Jefferson, T. London: Routledge, 80–8.
- Cohen, S. (1991) *Rock Culture in Liverpool: Popular Music in the Making*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Cohen, J. E. (2012) *Configuring the Networked Self: Law, Code, and the Play of Everyday Practice*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Cotter, K. (2019) 'Playing the Visibility Game: How Digital Influencers and Algorithms Negotiate Influence on Instagram'. *New Media & Society* 21 (4): 895–913.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991) 'Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color'. *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6): 1241–99.
- Croteau, D. (2006) 'The Growth of Self-Produced Media Content and the Challenge to Media Studies'. *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 23 (4): 340–4.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990) *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. London: HarperCollins.
- Culton, K. R. and Holtzman, B. (2010) 'The Growth and Disruption of a "Free Space": Examining a Suburban Do It Yourself (DIY) Punk Scene'. *Space and Culture* 13 (3): 270–84.
- Dale, P. (2012) *Anyone Can Do It: Empowerment, Tradition and the Punk Underground*. London: Routledge.
- Darms, Lisa and Fateman, J. (2013) *The Riot Grrrl Collection*, edited by Darms, L. New York: Feminist Press.
- Davyd, M. and Whitrick, B. (2015) *Understanding Small Music Venues*. London: Music Venue Trust.
- Dawes, L. (2013) *Why I Was Never a Riot Grrrl* [online] available from <https://bitchmedia.org/post/why-i-was-never-a-riot-grrrl> [18 September 2016].
- Dean, J. (2010) *Blog Theory: Feedback and Capture in the Circuits of Drive*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Deleuze, G. (1992) 'Postscript on the Societies of Control'. *October* 59: 3–7.
- Devine, K. (2019) *Decomposed: The Political Ecology of Music*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- DIY Access Guide (2017) Attitude Is Everything, available from <http://www.attitudeiseverything.org.uk/diyaccessguide> [5 February 2020].
- DIY Space for London (2016) *You Can't Be What You Can't See: DIY Performers Talk Identity, Gender and Music* [online] available from <https://diyspaceforlondon.org/event/you-cant-be-what-you-cant-see/> [19 July 2017].
- Dolan, E. I. (2010) "'... This Little Ukulele Tells the Truth": Indie Pop and Kitsch Authenticity'. *Popular Music* 29 (3): 457–69.
- Downes, J. (2009) *DIY Queer Feminist (Sub)Cultural Resistance in the UK*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Leeds.

- Downes, J. (2012) 'The Expansion of Punk Rock: Riot Grrrl Challenges to Gender Power Relations in British Indie Music Subcultures'. *Women's Studies* 41 (2): 204–37.
- Downes, J., Breeze, M. and Griffin, N. (2013) 'Researching DIY Cultures: Towards a Situated Ethical Practice for Activist-Academia'. *Graduate Journal of Social Science* 10 (3): 100–24.
- Downey, J. and Toynbee, J. (2016) 'Ideology: Towards Renewal of a Critical Concept'. *Media, Culture & Society* 38 (8): 1261–71.
- Dryhurst, M. (2015) *Saga v1.0* [online] available from <https://accessions.org/article/saga-v1-0/> [8 September 2017].
- Duffy, B. E. (2017) *(Not) Getting Paid to Do What You Love: Gender, Social Media, and Aspirational Work*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Duffy, B. E., Poell, T. and Nieborg, D. B. (2019) 'Platform Practices in the Cultural Industries: Creativity, Labor, and Citizenship'. *Social Media + Society* 5 (4): 1–8.
- Duncombe, S. (2002) *Cultural Resistance Reader*. London: Verso.
- Duncombe, S. (2008) *Notes from the Underground: Zines and the Politics of Underground Culture*, 2nd edn. Bloomington, IN: Microcosm.
- Duncombe, S. (2011) *White Riot: Punk Rock and the Politics of Race*. London: Verso.
- Duncombe, S. (2017) 'Resistance'. In *Keywords for Media Studies*, edited by Ouellette, L. and Gray, J. New York: New York University Press, 176–9.
- Dunn, K. (2016) *Global Punk: Resistance and Rebellion in Everyday Life*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Dunn, K. and Farnsworth, M. S. (2012) "'We ARE the Revolution": Riot Grrrl Press, Girl Empowerment, and DIY Self-Publishing'. *Women's Studies* 41 (2): 136–57.
- Dyer-Witheford, N. (1999) *Cyber-Marx: Cycles and Circuits of Struggle in High-Technology Capitalism*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Enzensberger, H. M. (1974) *The Consciousness Industry: On Literature, Politics and the Media*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Ewens, H. (2019) *Fangirls: Scenes from Modern Music Culture*. London: Quadrille.
- Faris, M. (2004) "'That Chicago Sound": Playing with (Local) Identity in Underground Rock'. *Popular Music and Society* 27 (4): 429–54.
- Fatsis, L. (2019) 'Policing the Beats: The Criminalisation of UK Drill and Grime Music by the London Metropolitan Police'. *The Sociological Review* 67 (6): 1300–16.
- Fife, K. (2019) 'Not For You? Ethical Implications of Archiving Zines', *Punk & Post-Punk*, 8(2): 227–42.
- Finn, E. (2017) *What Algorithms Want: Imagination in the Age of Computing*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Finnegan, R. (1988) *The Hidden Musicians: Music-Making in an English Town*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- First Timers (2017) *First Timers* [online] available from <http://www.firsttimers.org/> [19 July 2017].
- Fisher, M. (2009) *Capitalist Realism: Is There No Alternative?* Ropley: Zero Books.
- Fraser, N. (1990) 'Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy'. *Social Text* (25/26): 56–80.
- Fraser, N. (2000) 'Rethinking Recognition'. *New Left Review*, May–June (3): 107–20.

- Fraser, N. (2003) 'Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, and Participation'. In *Redistribution or Recognition?: A Political-Philosophical Exchange*, edited by Fraser, N. and Honneth, A. London: Verso, 7–109.
- Fraser, N. (2009) 'Feminism, Capitalism, and the Cunning of History'. *New Left Review* March–Apr (56): 97–117.
- Frith, S. (1996) *Performing Rites: On the Value of Popular Music*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard.
- Frith, S. (2004) 'Afterword'. In *After Subculture: Critical Studies in Contemporary Youth Culture*, edited by Bennett, A. and Kahn-Harris, K. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 173–7.
- Frith, S. (2007) 'Towards an Aesthetic of Popular Music'. In *Taking Popular Music Seriously*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 257–73.
- Fuchs, C. (2012) 'Dallas Smythe Today – The Audience Commodity, the Digital Labour Debate, Marxist Political Economy and Critical Theory. Prolegomena to a Digital Labour Theory of Value'. *TripleC* 10 (2): 692–740.
- Fuchs, C. and Dyer-Witthof, N. (2013) 'Karl Marx @ Internet Studies'. *New Media & Society* 15 (5): 782–96.
- Galloway, A. R. and Thacker, E. (2007) *The Exploit: A Theory of Networks*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gang of Four (1979) *Entertainment!* [LP]. EMI, EMC3313.
- Garnham, N. (1990) *Capitalism and Communication: Global Culture and the Economics of Information*. London: Sage.
- Garrison, E. K. (2000) 'U.S. Feminism-Grrrr! Style! Youth (Sub) Cultures and the Technologies of the Third Wave'. *Feminist Studies* 26 (1): 141–70.
- Geffen, S. (2020) 'No Shape: How Tech Helped Musicians Melt the Gender Binary'. *The Guardian* [online] 7 April, available from <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2018/mar/17/cambridge-analytica-facebook-influence-us-election> [4 May 2020].
- Gerlitz, C. and Helmond, A. (2013) 'The Like Economy: Social Buttons and the Data-Intensive Web'. *New Media & Society* 15 (8): 1348–65.
- Gerrard, Y. (2017) "'It's a Secret Thing": Digital Disembedding through Online Teen Drama Fandom'. *First Monday* [online] 22 (8). Available from <http://www.ojphi.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/7877/6514>.
- Gibson-Graham, J. K. (2006) *A Postcapitalist Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gill, A. (1978) 'Wire: Limit Club, Sheffield'. *New Musical Express*, 13 May.
- Gillespie, T. (2010) 'The Politics of "Platforms"'. *New Media & Society* 12 (3): 347–64.
- Gillespie, T. (2017) *The Platform Metaphor, Revisited* [online] available from <https://www.hiig.de/en/blog/the-platform-metaphor-revisited/> [1 September 2017].
- Gillespie, T. (2018) *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, Content Moderation, and the Hidden Decisions That Shape Social Media*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Goldhaber, M. H. (1997) *The Attention Economy and the Net* [online] available from <https://journals.uic.edu/ojs/index.php/fm/article/download/519/440?inline=1> [1 March 2020].
- Golpushnezhad, E. (2018) 'Untold Stories of DIY/Underground Iranian Rap Culture: The Legitimization of Iranian Hip-Hop and the Loss of Radical Potential'. *Cultural Sociology* 12 (2): 260–75.
- Gosden, E. (2016) *Student Accused of Violating University 'Safe Space' by Raising Her Hand* [online] available from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/04/03/student-accused-of-violating-university-safe-space-by-raising-her/> [27 February 2017].
- Gottlieb, J. and Wald, G. (1994) 'Smells Like Teen Spirit: Riot Grrrls, Revolution and Women in Independent Rock'. In *Microphone Fiends: Youth Music and Youth Culture*, edited by Ross, A. and Rose, T. New York: Routledge, 250–74.
- Gracyk, T. (2012) 'Kids're Forming Bands: Making Meaning in Post-Punk'. *Punk & Post-Punk* 1 (1): 73–85.
- Graham, S. (2016) *Sounds of the Underground: A Cultural, Political, and Aesthetic Mapping of Underground and Fringe Music*. Tracking pop. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Gray, K. L. (2012) 'Intersecting Oppressions and Online Communities'. *Information, Communication & Society* 15 (3): 411–28.
- Gross, S. A. and Musgrave, G. (2016) *Can Music Make You Sick? Music and Depression: A Study into the Incidence of Musicians' Mental Health*. London: MusicTank.
- Grosser, B. (2014) 'What Do Metrics Want? How Quantification Prescribes Social Interaction on Facebook'. *Computational Culture* 4: 1–38.
- Guerra, P. (2018) 'Raw Power: Punk, DIY and Underground Cultures as Spaces of Resistance in Contemporary Portugal'. *Cultural Sociology* 12 (2): 241–59.
- Gurak, L. J. (2001) *Cyberliteracy: Navigating the Internet with Awareness*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Gurman, D. (2009) 'Why Lakoff Still Matters: Framing the Debate on Copyright Law and Digital Publishing'. *First Monday* 14 (6).
- Hancox, D. (2019) *Inner City Pressure: The Story of Grime*. London: W. Collins.
- Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2005) *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. Penguin: London.
- Harrison, A. K. (2006) "'Cheaper than a CD, Plus We Really Mean It": Bay Area Underground Hip Hop Tapes as Subcultural Artefacts'. *Popular Music* 25 (2): 283–301.
- Harvie, D. (2004) 'Commons and Communities in the University: Some Notes and Some Examples'. *The Commoner* (8), Autumn/Winter.
- Hauben, M. (1997) 'The Computer as a Democratizer'. In *Netizens: On The History and Impact of Usenet and The Internet* [online], edited by Hauben, R. and Hauben, M. Los Alamitos: IEEE Computer Society Press, 315–20. Available from <http://www.columbia.edu/~rh120/ch106.x18> [18 February 2020].
- Hayler, R. (2015) *What I Mean by the Term 'No-Audience Underground'*. 2015 Remix [online] available from <https://radiofreemidwich.wordpress.com/2015/06/14/what-i-mean-by-the-term-no-audience-underground-2015-remix/> [12 July 2017].

- Haythornthwaite, C. (2002) 'Strong, Weak, and Latent Ties and the Impact of New Media'. *Information Society* 18 (5): 385–401.
- Haythornthwaite, C. (2005) 'Social Networks and Internet Connectivity Effects'. *Information, Communication & Society* 8 (2): 125–47.
- Hearn, A. (2017) 'Producing "Reality": Branded Content, Branded Selves, Precarious Futures'. In *A Companion to Reality Television*, edited by Ouellette, L. Wiley Blackwell, 437–55.
- Hearn, A. and Banet-Weiser, S. (2020) 'The Beguiling: Glamour in/as Platformed Cultural Production'. *Social Media + Society* 6 (1): 2056305119898779.
- Hendriks, C. M., Duus, S. and Ercan, S. A. (2016) 'Performing Politics on Social Media: The Dramaturgy of an Environmental Controversy on Facebook'. *Environmental Politics* 25 (6): 1102–25.
- Herstand, A. (2016) *How To Make It in the New Music Business*. New York: Liveright.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (1997) 'Post-Punk's Attempt to Democratise the Music Industry: The Success and Failures of Rough Trade'. *Popular Music* 16 (3): 255–74.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2005) 'Subcultures, Scenes or Tribes? None of the Above'. *Journal of Youth Studies* 8 (1): 21–40.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2010) 'User-Generated Content, Free Labour and the Cultural Industries Theory and Politics in Organization'. *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization* 10 (3/4): 267–84.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2013) *Why Music Matters*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2019) *The Cultural Industries*, 4th edn. London: Sage.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. and Baker, S. (2011) *Creative Labour: Media Work in Three Cultural Industries*. London: Routledge.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. and Meier, L. (2015) 'Popular Music, Independence and the Concept of the Alternative in Contemporary Capitalism'. In *Media Independence: Working with Freedom or Working for Free?* edited by Bennett, J. and Strange, N. New York: Routledge, 94–116.
- Hesmondhalgh, D., Jones, E. and Rauh, A. (2019) 'SoundCloud and Bandcamp as Alternative Music Platforms'. *Social Media + Society* 5: 1–13.
- Hines, S. (2019) 'The Feminist Frontier: On Trans and Feminism'. *Journal of Gender Studies* 28 (2): 145–57.
- Horkheimer, M. and Adorno, T. W. (2002) 'The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception'. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. London: Verso, 41–72.
- Hosie, R. (2017) *Millennials Are Struggling at Work Because Their Parents Gave Them Medals for Coming Last* [online] available from <http://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/millennials-struggling-work-careers-because-their-parents-gave-them-medals-for-coming-last-simon-a7537121.html> [27 February 2017].
- Howard-Spink, S. (2004) 'Grey Tuesday, Online Cultural Activism and the Mash-Up of Music and Politics'. *First Monday* 9 (10).
- Hui, Y. and Halpin, H. (2013) 'Collective Individuation: The Future of the Social'. In *Unlike Us Reader*, edited by Lovink, G. and Rasch, M. Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures, 103–16.
- Jakobsson, P. (2010) 'Cooperation and Competition in Open Production'. *Platform: Journal of Media and Communication* 2 (1): 106–19.

- Jenkins, H. (2008) *The Participation Gap* [online] available from <http://www.nea.org/home/15468.htm>.
- Jenkins, H., Clinton, K., Purushotma, R., Robison, A. J. and Weigel, M. (2006) *Confronting the Challenges of Participatory Culture: Media Education for the 21st Century* [online] Chicago, IL. Available from https://www.macfound.org/media/article_pdfs/JENKINS_WHITE_PAPER.PDF.
- Jhally, S. (1982) 'Probing the Blindspot: The Audience Commodity'. *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory* 6 (1–2): 204–10.
- John, N. (2013) 'The Social Logics of Sharing'. *The Communication Review* 16 (3): 113–31.
- John, N. (2017) 'Sharing – from Ploughshares to File Sharing and Beyond' [online]. *HIIG Digital Society Blog*, <https://www.hiig.de/en/sharing-from-ploughshares-to-file-sharing-and-beyond/> [1 February 2020].
- Jones, E. (2019) 'What Does Facebook “Afford” Do-It-Yourself Musicians? Considering Social Media Affordances as Sites of Contestation'. *Media, Culture & Society* 42 (2): 277–92.
- Jones, E. (2021) 'DIY and Popular Music: Mapping an Ambivalent Relationship across Three Historical Case Studies', *Popular Music and Society*, 44(1).
- Jouhki, J., Lauk, E., Penttinen, M., Sormanen, N., and Uskali, T. (2016) 'Facebook's Emotional Contagion Experiment as a Challenge to Research Ethics'. *Media and Communication* 4 (4): 75.
- Jurgenson, N. (2010) 'Review of Ondi Timoner's “We Live in Public”'. *Surveillance & Society* 8 (3): 377.
- Kahn-Harris, K. (2004) 'Unspectacular Subculture? Transgression and Mundanity in the Global Extreme Metal Scene'. In *After Subculture: Critical Studies in Contemporary Youth Culture*, edited by Bennett, A. and Kahn-Harris, K. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 107–18.
- Kanai, A. (2015a) 'DIY Culture'. In *The Routledge Companion to Remix Studies*, edited by Navas, E., Gallagher, O. and Burrough, X. London: Routledge, 125–34.
- Kanai, A. (2015b) 'WhatShouldWeCallMe? Self-Branding, Individuality and Belonging in Youthful Femininities on Tumblr'. *M/C Journal* [online] 18 (1). Available from <http://journal.media-culture.org.au/index.php/mcjournal/rt/printerFriendly/936/0> [1 March 2020].
- Kanai, A. (2019) *Gender and Relatability in Digital Culture: Managing Affect, Intimacy, and Value*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kang, J. (2000) 'Cyber-Race'. *Harvard Law Review* 113 (5): 1130–208.
- Kaun, A. and Stierstedt, F. (2014) 'Facebook Time: Technological and Institutional Affordances for Media Memories'. *New Media & Society* 16 (7): 1154–68.
- Keightley, K. (2001) 'Reconsidering Rock'. In *The Cambridge Companion to Pop and Rock*, edited by Frith, S. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 109–42.
- Kennedy, H. (2016) *Post, Mine, Repeat: Social Media Data Mining Becomes Ordinary*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kenney, Moira. (2001) *Mapping Gay L.A.: The Intersection of Place and Politics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kim, J. (2012) 'The Institutionalization of YouTube: From User-Generated Content to Professionally Generated Content'. *Media, Culture & Society* 34 (1): 53–67.
- Kinder, K. (2016) *DIY Detroit: Making Do in a City without Services*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- King, J. (2019) *Activism, Identity Politics, and Pop's Great Awakening* [online] available from <https://pitchfork.com/features/article/2010s-pops-great-awakening-black-lives-matter-beyonce-kendrick-lamar-solange/>.
- Klein, B. (2020) *Selling Out: Culture, Commerce and Popular Music*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Klein, B., Meier, L.M. and Powers, D. (2017) 'Selling Out: Musicians, Autonomy, and Compromise in the Digital Age'. *Popular Music and Society* 40 (2): 222–38.
- Koch, K. (2006) *Don't Need You: The Herstory of Riot Grrrl* [DVD]. Urban Cowgirl Productions.
- Kruse, H. (1993) 'Subcultural Identity in Alternative Music Culture'. *Popular Music* 12 (1): 33–41.
- Kuehn, K. and Corrigan, T. F. (2013) 'Hope Labor: The Role of Employment Prospects in Online Social Production'. *The Political Economy of Communication* 1 (1): 9–25.
- Laing, D. (1985) *One Chord Wonders: Power and Meaning in Punk Rock*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Langlois, G. (2013) 'Social Media, or Towards a Political Economy of Psychic Life'. In *Unlike Us Reader*, edited by Lovink, G. and Rasch, M. Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures, 50–61.
- Lee, M. (2011) 'Google Ads and the Blindspot Debate'. *Media Culture & Society* 33 (3): 433–47.
- Levmore, S. (2010) 'The Internet's Anonymity Problem'. In *The Offensive Internet: Speech, Privacy and Reputation*, edited by Nussbaum, M. and Levmore, S. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 51–70.
- Light, B., Burgess, J., & Duguay, S. (2018). 'The Walkthrough Method: An Approach to the Study of Apps'. *New Media & Society* 20 (3): 881–900.
- Litt, E. and Hargittai, E. (2016) 'The Imagined Audience on Social Network Sites'. *Social Media + Society* January–March, 1–12.
- Livant, B. (1978) 'The Audience Commodity: On the Blindspot Debate'. *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory* [online] 1 (1). Available from <https://mmduvic.ca/index.php/ctheory/article/view/13793>.
- Live Music Awards (2015) *Winners 2015* [online] available from <http://www.livemusicawards.co.uk/winners-2015/> [29 October 2017].
- Loten, A., Janofsky, A. and Albergotti, R. (2014) *New Facebook Rules Will Sting Entrepreneurs* [online] available from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/new-facebook-rules-will-sting-entrepreneurs-1417133694> [8 June 2017].
- Lueg, C. and Fisher, D. (2012) *From Usenet to CoWebs: Interacting with Social Information Spaces*. London: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Luxemburg, R. (2006) *Revolt or Revolution and Other Writings*. Mineola, NY: Dover.
- Mack, Z. (2019) *How Streaming Affects the Lengths of Songs* [online]. *The Verge*. Available from <https://www.theverge.com/2019/5/28/18642978/music-streaming-spotify-song-length-distribution-production-switched-on-pop-vergecast-interview> [1 March 2020].
- Manzerolle, V. (2010) 'Mobilizing the Audience Commodity: Digital Labour in a Wireless World'. *Ephemera* [online] 10 (3). Available from <http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/communicationspub>.
- Manzerolle, V. and McGuigan, L. (2014) *The Audience Commodity in a Digital Age: Revisiting a Critical Theory of Commercial Media*. New York: Peter Lang.

- Marcuse, H. (1991) *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. London: Routledge.
- Marder, B., Joinson, A., Shankar, A. and Houghton, D. (2016a) ‘The Extended “Chilling” Effect of Facebook: The Cold Reality of Ubiquitous Social Networking’. *Computers in Human Behavior* 60: 582–92.
- Marder, B., Slade, E., Houghton, D. and Archer-Brown, C. (2016b) “I Like Them, but Won’t ‘Like’ Them”: An Examination of Impression Management Associated with Visible Political Party Affiliation on Facebook’. *Computers in Human Behavior* 61: 280–7.
- Marwick, A. E. (2015) ‘Instafame: Luxury Selfies in the Attention Economy’. *Public Culture* 27 (1): 137–60.
- Marwick, A. E. and boyd, d. (2010) ‘I Tweet Honestly, I Tweet Passionately: Twitter Users, Context Collapse, and the Imagined Audience’. *New Media & Society* 13 (1): 114–33.
- Marx, K. (1976) *Capital, Vol. 1*. London: Penguin.
- Marx, K. (2000) ‘Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts’. In *Early Writings*. London: Penguin, 279–400.
- Matarasso, F. (1997) *Use or Ornament? The Social Impact of Participation in the Arts*. Stroud: Comedia.
- Mattern, M. (1994) *Acting in Concert. Music, Community And Political Action*. London: Rutgers University Press.
- Mayer-Schönberger, V. and Cukier, K. (2013) *Big Data: A Revolution That Will Transform How We Live, Work, and Think*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Mayo, C. (2010) ‘Incongruity and Provisional Safety: Thinking Through Humor’. *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 29 (6): 509–21.
- Mazierska, E., Gillon, L. and Rigg, T. (2018) ‘Introduction: The Future of and through Music’. In *Popular Music in the Post-Digital Age*, edited by Mazierska, E., Gillon, L. and Rigg, T. London: Bloomsbury, 1–31.
- McChesney, R. (2013) *Digital Disconnect: How Capitalism Is Turning the Internet against Democracy*. London: The New Press.
- McKay, G. (1998) *DiY Culture: Party and Protest in Nineties Britain*. London: Verso.
- McMillan Cottom, T. (2015) “Who Do You Think You Are?": When Marginality Meets Academic Microcelebrity’. *Ada: A Journal of Gender, New Media, and Technology* [online] 7. Available from <https://adanewmedia.org/2015/04/issue7-mcmillancottom/> [8 June 2019].
- McQuaid, I. (2015) *XTC, Functions On The Low – A Lost Grime Classic* [online] available from <https://www.redbull.com/gb-en/stormzy-shut-up-producer-xtc-interview> [18 February 2020].
- McRobbie, A. (2002) ‘Clubs To Companies: Notes on the Decline of Political Culture in Speeded Up Creative Worlds’. *Cultural Studies* 16 (4): 516–31.
- Meads, N. (2016) *Superb @scrittapolitti 1980 DIY ‘Release a Record’ Guide, Stumbled upon Researching #SmallWonderRecords Exhibition* [online] available from <https://twitter.com/musiclikedirt/status/756564212760084484?lang=en-gb> [5 May 2017].
- Meier, L. M. (2017) *Popular Music as Promotion: Music and Branding in the Digital Age*. Cambridge: Polity.

- Mendick, H. (2013) *Online Communication in the Age of Fast Academia* [online] available from http://www.celebyouth.org/the_internet_and_fast_academia/ [2 September 2017].
- Miège, B. (1989) *The Capitalization of Cultural Production*. New York: International General.
- Miller, D. (2001) *Consumption: Critical Concepts in the Social Sciences, Vol. 1*. London: Routledge.
- Moore, R. (2004) 'Postmodernism and Punk Subculture: Cultures of Authenticity and Deconstruction'. *The Communication Review* 7 (3): 305–27.
- Morris, J. W. (2015) *Selling Digital Music, Formatting Culture*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Mullaney, J. L. (2007) "'Unity Admirable but Not Necessarily Heeded": Going Rates and Gender Boundaries in the Straight Edge Hardcore Music Scene'. *Gender & Society* 21 (3): 384–408.
- Murdock, G. (1978) 'Blindspots about Western Marxism: A Reply to Dallas Smythe'. *CTheory* 2 (2): 109–15.
- Myslik, W. D. (1996) 'Renegotiating the Social Identities of Place'. In *BodySpace: Destabilising Geographies of Gender and Sexuality*, edited by Duncan, N. London: Routledge, 157–69.
- Nafus, D. (2016) 'The Domestication of Data: Why Embracing Digital Data Means Embracing Bigger Questions'. *Ethnographic Praxis in Industry Conference Proceedings* 2016 (1): 384–99.
- Needham, A. (2018) 'Neil Tennant: "Sometimes I Think, Where's the Art, the Poetry in All This?"' *Guardian* [online] available from <https://www.theguardian.com/music/2018/oct/21/neil-tennant-pet-shop-boys-collection-lyrics>.
- Nguyen, M. T. (2012) 'Riot Grrrl, Race, and Revival'. *Women & Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory* 22 (2–3): 173–96.
- Nieborg, D. B. and Helmond, A. (2018) 'The Political Economy of Facebook's Platformization in the Mobile Ecosystem: Facebook Messenger as a Platform Instance'. *Media, Culture & Society* 41 (2): 196–218.
- Nieborg, D. B. and Poell, T. (2018) 'The Platformization of Cultural Production: Theorizing the Contingent Cultural Commodity'. *New Media & Society* 20 (11): 4275–92.
- Noble, S. U. (2018) *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism*. New York: New York University Press.
- O'Brien, L. (2012) 'Can I Have a Taste of Your Ice Cream?' *Punk & Post-Punk* 1 (1): 27–40.
- Ogg, A. (2009) *Independence Days: The Story of UK Independent Record Labels*. London: Cherry Red Books.
- Packard, V. (1957) *The Hidden Persuaders*. London: Longmans.
- Papacharissi, Z. (2002) 'The Virtual Sphere: The Internet as a Public Sphere'. *New Media & Society* 4 (1): 9–27.
- Pariser, Eli. (2011) *The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You*. London: Penguin.
- Patelis, K. (2013) 'Political Economy and Monopoly Abstractions: What Social Media Demand'. In *Unlike Us Reader*, edited by Lovink, G. and Rasch, M. Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures, 117–26.

- Pearce, R. and Lohman, K (2019) 'De/constructing DIY Identities in a Trans Music Scene'. *Sexualities* 22 (1–2): 97–113.
- Pelly, L. (2019) 'The Antisocial Network'. *Logic* [online] 1 January. Available from <https://logicmag.io/play/the-antisocial-network/> [10 March 2020].
- Petre, C., Duffy, B. E. and Hund, E. (2019) "'Gaming the System": Platform Paternalism and the Politics of Algorithmic Visibility'. *Social Media + Society* 5 (4): 1–12.
- Phillips, S. (2017) 'The Bands Taking British Punk Back to Its Multicultural Roots'. Available from https://www.vice.com/en_uk/article/padjev/decolonise-fest-uk-punk-nekra-sacred-paws-fight-rosa.
- Pitcan, P., Marwick A. E., and boyd, d. (2018) 'Performing a Vanilla Self: Respectability Politics, Social Class, and the Digital World'. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 23 (3): 163–79.
- Piepmeyer, A. (2009) *Girl Zines: Making Media, Doing Feminism*. London: New York University Press.
- Prior, N. (2015) 'Beyond Napster: Popular Music and the Normal Internet'. In *The Handbook of Popular Music*, edited by Bennett, A. and Waksman, S. London: Sage, 493–507.
- Purdue, D., Dürrschmidt, J., Jowers, P. and O'Doherty, R. (1997) 'DIY Culture and Extended Milieu: LETS, Veggie Boxes and Festivals'. *Sociological Review* 45 (4): 645–67.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Quader, S. B. and Redden, G. (2015) 'Approaching the Underground: The Production of Alternatives in the Bangladeshi Metal Scene'. *Cultural Studies* 29 (3): 401–24.
- Radway, J. (2016) 'Girl Zine Networks, Underground Itineraries, and Riot Grrrl History: Making Sense of the Struggle for New Social Forms in the 1990s and beyond'. *Journal of American Studies* 50 (1): 1–31.
- Reia, J. (2014) 'Napster and beyond: How Online Music Can Transform the Dynamics of Musical Production and Consumption in DIY Subcultures'. *First Monday* [online] 19 (10). Available from <http://journals.uic.edu/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/5552> [18 February 2020].
- Rentschler, C. A. (2017) 'Bystander Intervention, Feminist Hashtag Activism, and the Anti-Carceral Politics of Care'. *Feminist Media Studies* 17 (4): 565–84.
- Resonate (2015) *Stream-to-Own* [online] available from <https://resonate.is/stream2own/> [8 September 2017].
- Resonate (n.d.) *Own the Future* [online] available from <https://resonate.is/inviting-you-to-own-the-future/> [2 September 2017].
- Rey, P. J. (2012) 'Alienation, Exploitation, and Social Media'. *American Behavioral Scientist* 56 (4): 399–420.
- Reynolds, S. (2005) *Rip It Up and Start Again: Post-Punk 1978–84*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Reynolds, S. (2012) 'DIY Conference: An Update with Simon Reynolds'. *Incubate Festival* [Film] available from <https://vimeo.com/49913417> [22 July 2017].
- Ritzer, G. and Jurgenson, N. (2010) 'Production, Consumption, Prosumption: The Nature of Capitalism in the Age of the Digital "Prosumer"'. *Journal of Consumer Culture* 10 (1): 13–36.

- Roberts, S. T. (2019) *Behind the Screen: Content Moderation in the Shadows of Social Media*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press.
- Robertson, A. (2019) *Should We Treat Incels as Terrorists?* [online] available from <https://www.theverge.com/2019/10/5/20899388/incel-movement-blueprint-toronto-attack-confession-gender-terrorism> [1 March 2020].
- Rosen, P. (1997) 'It Was Easy, It Was Cheap, Go and Do It!' Technology and Anarchy in the UK Music Industry'. In *Twenty-First Century Anarchism: Unorthodox ideas for a New Millennium*, edited by Purkis, J. & Bowen, J. New York: Cassell Press, 99–116.
- Rosen, J. (2006) *The Perils of Poptimism: Does Hating Rock Make You a Music Critic?* [online] available from http://www.slate.com/articles/arts/music_box/2006/05/the_perils_of_poptimism.html [27 February 2017].
- Ruckenstein, M. and Pantzar, M. (2017) 'Beyond the Quantified Self: Thematic Exploration of a Dataistic Paradigm'. *New Media & Society* 19 (3): 401–18.
- Ryan, C. (2015) *'Against the Rest': Fanzines and Alternative Music Cultures in Ireland*. Ireland: University of Limerick.
- Sahim, S. (2015) *The Unbearable Whiteness of Indie* [online] available from <http://pitchfork.com/thepitch/710-the-unbearable-whiteness-of-indie/>.
- Scarborough, R. C. (2017) 'Making It in a Cover Music Scene: Negotiating Artistic Identities in a "Kmart-Level Market"'. *Sociological Inquiry* 87 (1): 153–78.
- Schilt, K. (2003a) "A Little Too Ironic": The Appropriation and Packaging of Riot Grrrl Politics by Mainstream Female Musicians'. *Popular Music and Society* 26 (1): 5–16.
- Schilt, K. (2003b) "I'll Resist with Every Inch and Every Breath": Girls and Zine Making as a Form of Resistance'. *Youth Society* 35 (1): 71–97.
- Schoop, M. E. (2017) *Independent Music and Digital Technology in the Philippines*. London: Routledge.
- Scritti Politti (1985) *Cupid & Psyche* 85 [LP]. Virgin, V2350.
- Selzer, D. (2012) *Xerox Music Is Here to Stay* [online] available from http://swingsetmagazine.com/2012/06/xerox_music_is_here_to_stay/ [21 December 2016].
- Sennett, R. (2009) *The Craftsman*. London: Penguin.
- Shank, B. (1994) *Dissonant Identities: The Rock'n'roll Scene in Austin, Texas*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- Silbaugh, K. (2011) 'Testing as Commodification'. *Washington University Journal of Law & Policy* 35: 309–36.
- Simon, P. (1983) *When Numbers Get Serious*. Hearts and Bones [LP]. Warner Bros, 9 23942–1.
- Sinker, D. (ed.) (2001) *We Owe You Nothing: Punk Planet, the Collected Interviews*. New York: Akashic Books.
- Smith, M. S. and Giraud-Carrier, C. (2010) 'Bonding vs. Bridging Social Capital: A Case Study in Twitter'. In *2010 IEEE Second International Conference on Social Computing*, held August 2010. Washington DC: IEEE Computer Society, 385–92.
- Smythe, D. (1977) 'Communications: Blindspot of Western Marxism'. *CTheory* [online] available from <http://mmduvic.ca/index.php/ctheory/article/view/13715> [12 August 2017].
- Smythe, D. (1978) 'Rejoinder to Graham Murdock'. *CTheory* [online] available from <http://mmduvic.ca/index.php/ctheory/article/view/13745>.

- Smythe, D. (1981) *Dependency Road: Communications, Capitalism, Consciousness, and Canada* [online]. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Solnit, R. (2006) *Hope in the Dark: Untold Histories, Wild Possibilities*. New York: Nation Books.
- Srnicek, N. (2017a) *Platform Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Srnicek, N. (2017b) 'We Need to Nationalise Google, Facebook and Amazon. Here's Why'. *Guardian* [online] available from <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/aug/30/nationalise-google-facebook-amazon-data-monopoly-platform-public-interest> [30 August 2017].
- Stahl, M. (2003) 'To Hell with Heteronomy: Liberalism, Rule-Making, and the Pursuit of "Community" in an Urban Rock Scene'. *Journal of Popular Music Studies* 15 (2): 140–65.
- Stahl, M. (2013) *Unfree Masters: Recording Artists and the Politics of Work*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Stirling, E. (2016) "'I'm Always on Facebook!": Exploring Facebook as a Mainstream Research Tool and Ethnographic Site'. In *Digital Methods for Social Science: An Interdisciplinary Guide to Research Innovation*, edited by Roberts, S., Snee, H., Hine, C., Morey, Y. and Watson, H. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 51–66.
- Straw, W. (1990) 'Systems of Articulation, Logics of Change: Communities and Scenes in Popular Music'. *Cultural Studies* 5 (3): 368–88.
- Straw, W. (2001) 'Scenes and Sensibilities'. *Public* 22 (23): 245–57.
- Street, J. and Phillips, T. (2016) 'What Do Musicians Talk about When They Talk about Copyright?' *Popular Music and Society* 40 (4): 1–12.
- Stutzman, F., Gross, G. and Acquisti, A. (2012) 'Silent Listeners: The Evolution of Privacy and Disclosure on Facebook'. *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality* 4 (2): 7–41.
- Sunstein, C. R. (2001) 'The Daily We: "Is the Internet Really a Blessing for Democracy?"' *Boston Review* 26 (3): 4–9.
- Sunstein, C. R. (2004) 'Democracy and Filtering'. *Communications of the ACM* 47 (12): 57–59.
- Taylor, A. (2014) *The People's Platform: Taking Back Power and Culture in the Digital Age*. Toronto: Random House Canada.
- Terranova, T. (2000) 'Free Labor: Producing Culture for the Digital Economy'. *Social Text* 18 (2): 33–58.
- Thaler, R. H. and Sunstein, C. R. (2009) *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. London: Penguin Books.
- Théberge, Paul. (1997) *Any Sound You Can Imagine: Making Music/Consuming Technology*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Thompson, M. (2017) 'The Discomfort of Safety'. *Society + Space* [online]. <https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/the-discomfort-of-safety> [12 September 2018].
- Thompson, S. (2004) *Punk Productions: Unfinished Business*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Thoreau, H. D. (1986) *Walden and Civil Disobedience*, edited by Meyer, M. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Till, R. (2016) 'Singer-Songwriter Authenticity, the Unconscious and Emotions (Feat. Adele's "Someone Like You")'. In *The Cambridge Companion to the Singer-Songwriter*, edited by Williams, K. Cambridge Companions to Music. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 291–304.

- Toynbee, J. (2000) *Making Popular Music: Musicians, Creativity and Institutions*. London: Arnold.
- Toynbee, J. (2001) *Creating Problems: Social Authorship, Copyright and the Production of Culture*. Milton Keynes: The Pavis Centre for Social and Cultural Research.
- Travers, R. (2017) 'University "Safe Spaces" Are a Dangerous Fallacy – They Do Not Exist in the Real World'. *Telegraph* [online] available from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/2017/02/13/university-safe-spaces-dangerous-fallacy-do-not-exist-real/> [27 February 2017].
- Treanor, B. (2008) *Slow University: A Manifesto* [online] available from <http://faculty.lmu.edu/briantreanor/slow-university-a-manifesto/> [1 September 2017].
- Turino, T. (2008) *Music as Social Life: The Politics of Participation*. University of Chicago Press: London.
- Turkle, S. (1995) *Life on the Screen: Identity in the Age of the Internet*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Turner, F. (2010) *From Counterculture to Cyberculture: Stewart Brand, the Whole Earth Network, and the Rise of Digital Utopianism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Turner, F. (2017) *Don't Be Evil: Fred Turner on Utopias, Frontiers, and Programmers* [online] available from <https://logicmag.io/justice/fred-turner-dont-be-evil/> [18 February 2020].
- Vaidhyathan, S. (2004) 'The State of Copyright Activism'. *First Monday* 9 (4/5).
- van Alstyne, M. and Brynjolfsson, E. (2005) 'Global Village or Cyber-Balkans? Modeling and Measuring the Integration of Electronic Communities'. *Management Science* 51 (6): 851–68.
- Van Dijck, J. (2009) 'Users Like You? Theorizing Agency in User-Generated Content'. *Media Culture & Society* 31 (1): 41–58.
- van Dijck, J. (2013) *The Culture of Connectivity: A Critical History of Social Media*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Verbuč, D. (2018) 'Theory and Ethnography of Affective Participation at DIY Shows in U.S.'. *Journal of Popular Music Studies* 30 (1–2): 79–108.
- Virno, P. (2004) *A Grammar of the Multitude*. London: Semiotext(e).
- White, E. (1992) 'Revolution Girl-Style Now! : Notes from the Teenage Feminist Rock "n" Roll Underground'. *LA Weekly*, July.
- Whitson, J. R. (2013) 'Gaming the Quantified Self'. *Surveillance & Society* 11 (1–2): 163–76.
- Withers, D. (2010) 'Transgender and Feminist Alliances in Contemporary U.K. Feminist Politics'. *Feminist Studies* 36 (3): 691–7.
- X (1980) 'The Unheard Music'. *Los Angeles* [LP]. Slash, SR-104.
- XTC (1978) *Go 2* [LP]. Virgin, V2108.
- Zimmerman, A. G. and Ybarra, G. J. (2016) 'Online Aggression: The Influences of Anonymity and Social Modeling'. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture* 5 (2): 181–93.

INDEX

- Abercrombie, Nicholas, 'Incorporation/
Resistance Paradigm' 38
- Adorno, Theodor W. 104
- advertisement/advertisers 4, 7, 51,
59–60, 62, 65, 83, 101, 106,
112, 115, 125, 128, 130, 133,
135
- aesthetics 2–4, 6, 30, 34, 37, 47–8, 55,
69, 94
handmade/handwritten 49–50
intimate 51
non-professional 50
platform 50–1
- Albini, Steve 32
- alienation 37, 48 n.2, 60–1, 63, 66
- Alphabet 15
- alternative distribution network 5,
138–48
- alternative music 2–6, 23, 70, 113,
131, 137
- amateur music 8, 32, 36, 115, 123,
125, 138
- Amazon 126 n.5
- Android operating system 139
- anonymity, online 16 n.4, 68, 80–2,
135
- anti-commodification 36 n.2
- anti-consumerism 30
- anti-racism 13
- Apple Music 14, 127
- app walkthrough method 106
- Arnold, Gina 33
Route 666: The Road to Nirvana
31
- artistic critique 8
- Arvidsson, Adam 56
- Attitude Is Everything disability-led
charity 123 n.1
- audience 2, 4–5, 8–10, 15 n.3, 30–2,
35–6, 38, 55, 57–9, 73
artist–audience 8, 36, 55, 67, 70, 77
commodity 59–65
imagined/imagining 105, 108–9
online 109, 115
wrong 86–7
- audit culture 103, 119
- authenticity 12, 27–9, 32, 40, 47, 101,
114, 123 n.1
Frith on 47 n.1
intimacy/intimate 47–53
- autonomous production 54
- autonomy, artistic 3, 7, 17–18, 20, 28,
39–40, 42, 48 n.3, 66, 89, 126,
135
- avant-garde music 36 n.2
- Azerrad, Michael 33
Our Band Could be Your Life 31
- Baker, Sarah 39
- Bandcamp 14, 96, 108–9, 125, 131–2,
142
- Banet-Weiser, Sarah 51
- Bay Area hip-hop scene 26
- Baym, Nancy 8–10, 14, 108–11
- Behavioural Insights Limited
(Behavioural Insights Team) 131
n.8
- Benjamin, Walter 36 n.2, 49
- Biafra, Jello 2
- Bikini Kill zine 34, 86
- Black Flag band 31
- Blauner, Robert 60–1, 63
- Boehringer, Jorge 55
- Boltanski, Luc 9
The New Spirit of Capitalism 8
- Bourdieu, Pierre 4, 54

- Bowlie (Anorak) indie-pop forum 78.
See also music forums
- boyd, danah 74, 108, 118
- brass band movement 72
- Braverman, Harry 20, 122, 127
Labour and Monopoly Capital 124
 scientific management 124, 126
- Breeze, Maddie 16 n.4
- Bristol, research project in 26
- Brown, Wendy 42, 46
- Brudenell Social Club 12–13
- built environments, online 9–10
- Campaign Choirs Writing Collective
 (2018) 36
- capitalism 8, 41, 60–2, 66, 122,
 126, 146
 communicative 118, 144, 147
 democratic 139
 Fordist 124
 platform 8, 68, 125, 127, 131–2,
 134, 137, 140, 146
- censorship 27 n.1, 52
- Chiapello, Eve 9
The New Spirit of Capitalism 8
- Cohen, Julie E. 116 n.2
- collectivism 4, 19, 39, 68–77, 79, 82
- commercial/commercialism 2, 4–6, 8,
 19–20, 28, 32–3, 35, 133
- commodity/commodification 7–8,
 29–30, 32, 34, 36–8, 47–8, 61,
 83–4, 83 n.1, 104, 113
 audience 59–65
 cultural 127
 handmade/hand-replicated 48
 Marx on 48 n.2, 49
 self-commodification 118–19
- ‘commons’-style internet 68–9
- communication 46–7, 51, 58, 61, 95,
 97, 128, 133
 artist–audience 70
 authentic 8, 52
 intimacy/intimate 8, 48, 114
 epistolary intimacy 47, 51, 104
 mass 31, 34, 51, 115, 142
 online 3, 9–11, 19, 50, 53, 87, 98
- competition, music 2, 8, 35, 107, 112,
 128, 133, 135–7
- convivial competition 68–77
 online 81
- consumer/consumerism 20, 30, 32, 37,
 59–60, 66
 consumption 21, 24, 27, 37, 40, 60,
 65–6, 136
- contingency/contingent 127, 127 n.7
- copyright 7, 76, 82, 83 n.1, 116 n.2, 143
- creativity, musical 19, 25, 27, 76, 82,
 116 n.2, 127 n.7
- Criminal Justice and Public Order Act
 (1994) 25
- CTEA (Copyright Term Extension Act)
 143
- cultural activity 23–5, 39, 42, 125
- cultural gatekeepers 19, 68, 70–1
- cultural industries 5, 17, 41, 54, 83,
 122, 124–5, 126 n.5, 127
- cultural production 3, 8, 27, 30, 37–8,
 49, 52, 66, 122, 128, 136
- cultural resistance 6, 8, 13, 18–20, 24,
 37–43, 67, 71, 86
- datafication 104, 119
- data mining tools, social media 111
- Decolonise Fest, 2017 58
- deconstructive punk 30, 32
- democratization, cultural 1–3, 27,
 49–50, 87
- The Desperate Bicycles band 30
- digital divide 27, 87
- digital music 14, 27, 32
- digital production 122
- DistroKid music service 125
- diversity of music 23–4, 26, 28–9, 58
- DIY Access Guide* (2017) 123 n.1
- DIY Diaspora Punx 58
- DIY (do-it-yourself) scene 1, 9–10,
 28, 74
 case study 97–101
 friction 92–7
 Glasgow DIY scene 39
 historical 28–35, 49
 riot grrrl scene (1989–96) 6 n.1,
 10, 24, 29, 33–5, 40, 86–7,
 97, 104
- UK post-punk scene (1978–83)
 24, 29–31

- US post-hardcore indie scene
 (1983–8) 24, 29, 31–3
 insularity and openness 19, 33,
 37–8, 86–8, 93, 96–7, 116
 musical activity 6–7, 9, 17, 23–8,
 46, 59, 65, 97, 118
 and COVID-19 pandemic 88 n.1
 ownership 19, 60, 68, 76–82
 promoters/promotion 15 n.3, 16–
 17, 45, 57, 59, 62, 64, 69–70,
 79, 91, 97–8, 128–9, 135
 self-promotion 8, 79, 82, 128,
 145
 research in Leeds 11–18, 23
 interviews of practitioners
 15–16, 45, 47, 52–3, 61–2, 62
 n.7, 64, 67, 73–5, 98, 100–1,
 145
 music venues 12–13
 racism 13
 research and practice 16–18
 social media platforms 14–15
 skill-sharing 50
 togetherness 67, 84
 UK DIY scene 5, 27
 DIY Space For London (DSFL), 2016
 57, 70–1, 92 n.3
 Downes, Julia 16 n.4, 33, 40
 Drake 115
 Dropbox 125
 Duncombe, Stephen 39–40
 Dyer-Witheyford, Nick 61, 68

 economy 3, 25, 56 n.5, 60, 125, 147
 attention 73, 80, 129–30
 ethical 56
 moral 146
 online 56
 platform 20, 135, 138
 political 42, 128
 electronic music, music genre 1, 12,
 14, 29
 Ello, social network 64
 emotional intimacy 34, 51
 empowerment 3, 40, 42, 46–7, 63, 66
Entertainment! (1979), Gang of
 Four 30
 environment/environmentalism 10, 148

 epistolary intimacy 47, 51, 104
 ethics, DIY 7–10, 15, 16 n.4, 26, 42–3,
 47, 57, 68, 70, 79, 83, 113, 118,
 124, 134–7, 141

 Facebook 10, 14–16, 59–65, 97–9,
 103, 116, 123, 127, 129, 131,
 137, 139, 141, 143–4
 enterprise discourse 20, 79, 105,
 107, 109, 118
 Facebook Events 91, 97–8, 125
 Facebook Group 16, 68, 78–9, 106
 Facebook Pages 14, 16, 50, 68,
 79–80, 82–3, 97, 101, 105–8,
 112, 125
 administrators of 106–7
 Likes 106–7, 109–13, 117, 134,
 146
 Sponsored Posts 112–13
 guidance 130
 Messenger 15, 98, 125
 real names policy 65
 fanzine 28, 38, 77
 feminism/feminist 6, 12, 16, 33–4,
 41–2, 58, 74
 safe spaces 89
 Finn, Ed 51
 Fisher, Mark 4, 146
 FLOSS (Free/Libre Open-Source
 Software) 139, 143
 folk music genre 12, 16, 41, 72, 148
 FOMO (fear of missing out) 146
 Fordist model 122, 124–5, 136
 framing of social media 143
 Fraser, Nancy 24, 41–3, 59, 70, 149
 misrecognition/maldistribution
 41–2
 participatory parity 71
 recognition 90
 ‘free lunch’ model 7, 60
 Frith, Simon 11
 on authenticity 47 n.1

 Geffen, Sasha 58 n.6
 Giddens, Anthony 56
 Glasgow DIY scene 39
 Golpushnezhad, Elham (study of rap
 music in Iran) 26–7

- Google 14–15, 91, 126 n.5, 137, 139
Go 2 (1978), XTC 30
 Griffin, Naomi 16 n.4
 Grosser, Benjamin 103, 110
 guitar-based music 114, 116
 Gurak, Laura 108
- Halpin, Harry 143
 hardcore punk 12, 31–2
 Harrison, Anthony Kwame 27–8, 38
 Harvie, David, convivial competition 68–76
 Hayler, Rob, ‘no-audience underground’ 15 n.3, 54–5, 54 n.4
 headline act 71
 Hearn, Alison 51
 Herstand, Ari, *How to Make It in the New Music Business* 1
 Hesmondhalgh, David 8, 39
Why Music Matters 19 n.5
 heteronomous production 54
 hierarchy 19, 68–9, 78–9, 81, 83, 90
 anti-hierarchical 67–8
 artist–audience 55, 67
 hierarchization 69
 pop 35
 Stahl on 70
 Hui, Yuk 143
- ICT (information and communication technologies) industries 3, 7–8, 18
 immaterial labour 61, 110, 147
 indie/independent music genre 1, 4, 7–8, 14, 31, 70, 72
 in Philippines 27
 US post-hardcore indie scene (1983–8) 24, 29, 31–3
 indie-punk 5, 12, 23, 35, 50, 58, 69, 138, 148
 Instagram 15, 80
 intimacy/intimate authenticity 47–53
 Iran, study of rap music in 26–7
 Irish music fanzine culture, study of 28, 38
 iTunes (Apple Music) 14
- Jurgenson, Nathan 118–19
- Kahn-Harris, Keith 11, 95
 Kanai, Akane 58–9
 Kennedy, Helen 111
 Kinder, Kimberley, *DIY Detroit* 25
- labour process 20, 122, 124
 Lamm, Nomy 34, 51
 LANDR service 126 n.3
 Langlois, Ganaele 142, 146
 liberation 55
 libertarian paternalism 130–1
 ‘lo-fi’ (bedroom) technique 49
 Lohman, Kirsty 12 n.2
 Longhurst, Brian, ‘Incorporation/Resistance Paradigm’ 38
- MacKaye, Ian 32
 ‘Guilty of being white’ 41 n.5
 mainstream music 2, 4, 6–7, 18, 26, 36, 46, 53, 79, 82, 94, 101, 105, 114
 marginality 41, 41 n.4
 marketing 112, 128, 130, 132–5
 anti-marketing 132–3, 135
 and branding 8, 122
 Facebook and 65, 125
 online 113
 Marx, Karl 48 n.2, 49, 60, 63, 113, 124–5
Capital, Vol. 1 126 n.6
 mass communication 31, 34, 51, 115, 142
 mass media 36, 60
 Mattern, Mark, *Acting in Concert. Music, Community And Political Action* 96
 McKay, George, *DiY Culture: Party and Protest in Nineties Britain* 25
 metrics, social media 103, 109–13, 115–17, 119
 accuracy/inaccuracy 109–10
 and context collapse 108–9
 failure of 109
 and platform discourse 105–8
 quantitative 109–10, 119

- Miller, Daniel 66
- The Minutemen band 32
- music criticism 4, 114
- music culture 1, 4, 6, 11, 16–17, 25–6, 28–9, 35, 37, 45, 66, 94, 138, 149
- of black youth in UK 27 n.1
- popular 1, 6, 29, 35, 148–9
- study of 28
- Music for Misfits* (television program) 41 n.4
- music forums 15, 19, 68, 77–8
- music industry 1–3, 5–7, 12, 17–18, 26, 29, 35–6, 46, 48, 48 n.3
- mental health within 64, 145–7
- music-making 5, 11, 29, 49, 76, 80, 83, 114, 145, 147
- music streaming services 14. *See also specific services*
- MySpace 15, 50, 68, 77
- networked publics approach 74–5
- non-professional music 8, 123
- not-for-profit approach 5, 7, 69–71
- nudge theory 130–3
- omniopticon model of social media 118–19
- online activity surveillance 7, 56
- Open Data, UK government's 139
- open-source software 20, 138–43
- optimization 20, 122, 139
- and social media 127–36
- Pearce, Ruth 12 n.2
- peer-production 68, 139, 143
- perzines (personal zines) 34
- Philippines, indie in 27
- physical *vs.* ideological neutralization 9
- piracy 68, 143
- platform (social media) 9, 11, 14, 18–20, 42, 47, 50–1, 53, 56–7, 58 n.6, 66, 74, 83, 111, 115, 136
- aesthetic 50–1
- affordances 10, 111, 118
- alternative distribution 138–48
- bridging/bonding 100
- DIY and 148–9
- and deskillling 123–7
- imagination 113–16
- echo chambers 19, 87–8, 97
- Facebook (*see* Facebook)
- functionalities/tools 91, 103
- glamour 51
- Instagram 15, 80
- metrics and (*see* metrics, social media)
- music streaming services 14 (*see also specific services*)
- MySpace 15, 50, 68, 77
- optimization and 127–36
- ownership on 19, 60, 68, 76–82
- photo and video-centric 15
- platform capitalism 8, 68, 125, 127, 131–2, 134, 137, 140, 146
- platform-dominated internet 3
- relatability 19, 47, 56–9
- representation 53–9, 61, 111–12, 118, 135
- self-branding 19, 57, 80, 128, 136, 146
- and social authorship 82–4
- strategies of using 144–8
- Twitter 10, 14, 52, 56, 130
- and users/consumers 3, 9–10, 59–65
- 'Web 2.0' platforms 68, 142
- YouTube 3, 14–15, 21, 87, 125, 139–41
- platformization 122–3, 127–8, 136
- politics 9–10, 16, 25, 40–1
- feminist and queer 6, 12, 16
- French radical politics of 1960s 8
- racial 6
- representational 5, 20
- pop/popular culture 2, 5, 30, 52–4, 94
- poptimism 4, 114
- popularity 71, 85, 105, 117, 119, 121
- popular music 1, 3–4, 6, 8–9, 12, 19, 28–9, 46–7, 53, 67–8, 70, 85, 103, 125, 127, 138, 148
- and community-based political action 96
- core units of 80
- and DIY imagination 113–16
- and DIY music 24, 35–8, 87, 92, 105

- post-punk music genre 1, 12, 29–31, 53, 77, 90, 101, 104
- practitioners, DIY 1, 5–8, 12 n.2, 13–15, 15 n.3, 16 n.4, 18–20, 24, 28–9, 31–2, 36–9, 41 n.5, 46, 49, 52, 91, 138
- commodities 48
- ‘firsts’ (band/show/song) 45
- friction 92–7
- hip-hop 38
- indie-punk 12
- interviews of 15–16, 26, 45, 47, 52–3, 61–2, 62 n.7, 64, 67, 73–5, 98, 100–1, 123, 140, 145
- liberation 55
- ownership 77
- participation 67, 73
- post-punk 30
- publics 85–6, 92
- punk 39
- rap 26–7
- safe/safer space 89–93, 89 n.2, 100 as social media user 59 subcultural 40
- pub rock band 98–9, 101
- punk music genre 1–2, 12–13, 18, 30–2, 49, 53–4, 58, 86
- quantification 103–4, 118
- queer 6, 12–13, 12 n.2, 16, 91, 97, 101, 135
- race/racism 2, 5–6, 6 n.1, 13, 40, 99
- Radio Free Midwich* blog 54
- rave music 1, 10
- Real Name policies 65, 115
- record labels 5, 7, 31, 48 n.3, 52, 76, 125
- reification process 25, 104, 110–11, 116, 118–19
- remix culture 27, 68
- Resonate music streaming platform 139
- Reynolds, Simon 54
- Rey, PJ, ‘ambient production’ 63
- Riot grrrl 51, 54, 76, 86–7, 97, 104
DIY Diaspora Punx 58
- scene (1989–96) 6 n.1, 10, 24, 29, 33–5, 40
- rock music 12, 29, 35, 70
rockism 114
- Rough Trade Records 30
- Ryan, Ciarán (study of Irish music fanzine culture) 28, 38
- safe/safer space policy 89–93, 89 n.2, 101
- Saga platform 141
- scepticism 4, 27, 138
- Scritti Politti band 77, 122, 124
Cupid and Psyche 85 126 n.4
on *Grapevine* show 121
‘Messthetics’ 30
musical ‘heyday’ 126, 126 n.4
- self-expression 48, 51, 54–9, 61, 63, 130, 141, 147, 149
- self-governance 42–3, 108
- self-realization 2, 39–40, 45–6, 54, 56, 59, 66, 80, 115, 144
- Sheeran, Ed 48
- signal boosting 74
- Silicon Valley 14, 75
- simulacrum 111
- Slow University movement 144–5
- Smythe, Dallas 60
- Snapchat 15
- social authorship 82–4, 83 n.1
- social critique 8–9
- social justice 3, 6, 9, 13, 24, 41–2, 52, 68, 71, 74, 136, 148–9
- social media. *See* platform (social media)
- social movement 6, 24, 26, 35, 39
- SoundCloud 14, 81, 125, 141
autoplay 74
- spam/spamming 78–9
- Spotify 14, 21, 80, 127
- Srnicke, Nick 125, 148
- Stahl, Matt 69–70
reciprocity 72
- status order 68, 70–1
- straight edge punk scene (Brazilian),
research on 28
- subcultural activity 40, 50, 54, 122
- subjectivation 146
- subjectivity/subjectivities 42, 47, 54, 60, 94, 116 n.2, 118, 143–4, 146–7
- Sunstein, Cass 130, 131 n.8

- Taylor, Frederick W. 124, 131
 Taylorism/Taylorist model 122, 124–5
 Teen Idles band 32
 Tennant, Neil 114
 Thaler, Richard 130, 131 n.8
 third-party distributors 14, 17, 62, 135
 Thompson, Marie 90
 Toynbee, Jason 82–3
 transformative process 45–6
 transgression 11, 95–6
 trans music genre 12 n.2, 58 n.6
 trigger warnings 89
 Tunecore 14, 125
 Twitter 10, 14, 52, 56, 130

 UK Conservative–Liberal Democrat coalition government 131 n.8
 UK DIY Group 79
 UK grime scene 27
 UK post-punk scene (1978–83) 24, 29–31
 underground music 4, 6
 in Iran 26

 Usenet discussion groups 87–8
 US post-hardcore indie scene (1983–8) 24, 29, 31–3

 van Dijk, Jose 59, 104
 visibility/invisibility in DIY 5, 47, 56, 80, 91, 114, 128–9

 Weber, Max, spirit of capitalism 8
 ‘Web 2.0’ platforms 68, 142
 Wharf Chambers 12–13, 90, 92 n.3, 93, 95, 97, 115
 WhatsApp application 15, 125
 Wikipedia 139
 Wire band 31
 workplace alienation 60

 YouTube/YouTuber 3, 14–15, 21, 87, 125, 139–41

 zines 8, 31, 33–4, 45, 49–51, 76, 86
 Zoombombing 88 n.1
 Zuckerberg, Mark 112