

MUSICAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN SENEGAL: INSIGHTS FROM THE HIP HOP COMMUNITY

Jenny F. MBAYE

PhD Candidate in Human Geography

Department of Geography and Environment

London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE)

Email: j.f.mbaye@lse.ac.uk

1) INTRODUCTION

This paper highlights the significance of non-economic factors in investment decisions of hip hop entrepreneurs in Senegal. Indeed, rather than a pure rational economic decision-making that involves a calculating logic in terms of individual costs and benefits, I argue that the business organisations of these entrepreneurs rely on a particular cultural factor, namely a transcultural hip hop ethics. In turn, this principle stresses the constant tension between the individual and the collective that informs their economic practices when investing in the music market. I thus put forward a socio-cultural perspective that underlines their entrepreneurial decision-making and demonstrate how the economic behaviour of Senegalese hip hop entrepreneurs cannot easily be fitted into the generalised model of universalist, rational economic decision-making while it is influenced by the specific network of social relations in which it operates. As such, this paper participates in the appreciation of non-economic forces in the structuration of economic behaviour, distancing itself from crude notions of economic rationalism and functionalism and insisting on an empirical perspective. Based on an empirically grounded approach, I conclude that rather than individual entrepreneurs, their business behaviours reveal an entrepreneurial community.

My inquiry develops an empirically grounded perspective on specific trades and businesses in Africa – one whose scholarship is still emerging in the Global North and significantly silenced in the South –, namely those of cultural productions. As such, a first part is dedicated to the exploration of the specific economic and political conditions that frame cultural and musical trades and businesses in Senegal. Indeed, Senegalese musical entrepreneurs have developed their economic practices against a centrally organised ‘politics of culture’ marked by an instrumental thinking of cultural production and a denial of its market dynamics. In a second part, I address the consequent “socio-genesis” of the Senegalese music market by inquiring about the specific economic practices of musical entrepreneurs. These latter, I argue, illustrate a rational calculation that favours individualistic behaviour in order for this music market to be efficient. In a third part, I confront this rational behaviour of musical entrepreneurs with the economic practices of hip hop entrepreneurs. In doing so, I demonstrate how the economic decision-making of Senegalese hip hop entrepreneurs are embedded in and shaped by wider socio-cultural frames of meaning, the ‘transcultural codes’ of their ethical economy that inspire peer productive and governing entrepreneurial practices.

2) A BRIEF HISTORY OF CULTURAL PRODUCTION IN SENEGAL

In order to understand the specific economic practices of hip hop entrepreneurs, it is helpful to inquire how, in Senegal, cultural production in general and musical production in particular has developed against the background of distinctive economic and political conditions. Indeed, the economic practices of these Senegalese musical entrepreneurs are part of wider

socio-political constellations that needs to be considered. Besides, such brief a framing of cultural production in Senegal stands as an initial step in shifting perspective from generalised economic institutions of cultural production towards the “socio-genesis” (Andersson, 2006) of economic behaviour of cultural producers, such as musical entrepreneurs.

In Senegal, the generalised economic institutions of cultural production have been essentially functionalist while they aimed at creating a single political economy of this specific form of production. As in most Francophone West African countries that share a colonial history, a common legacy, as previous French colonies, there has been in Senegal a Neo-Marxist conception of cultural production as something that is framed from a centralised and productivist perspective. Indeed, an aspect of the French culture that has been absorbed by its previous colonies is its institutional imaginary of cultural production as being intrinsically linked to the national identity. While integrating the French legacy towards cultural production as a constituent of the national identity, early Senegalese authorities thus believed that this field stood as a national endeavour whose responsibility (in definition and practice) was beard solely and exclusively by the State (Mbengue, 1973; Snipe, 2003).

As such, conceiving and using culture in an ideologically instrumental way, the successive Senegalese state patronages through their ‘politics of culture’ never thought nor governed the different modes and politics of intervention of the different economic actors who invested and continue to invest in this market. Indeed, the governmental short-term perspective conceiving culture as an instrument of national identity or prestige did not take into consideration the comprehensive production process of cultural goods nor the other intermediaries involved in cultural trades. Put differently, while the state stepped in to provide cultural productions to maintain the public good (national identity and prestige), in practice, it separated arts and culture from their commercial dimension and economic potential (Pratt, 2007 p.170). As such, this instrumental perspective has been continually erected in opposition with the potential self-organisation of the actual economic participants in this field.

At the beginning of the 1980s, economic practices related to Senegalese music (as well as West African one more generally) were based in major European urban centres, mainly Paris and London, where the market engines of ‘world music’ were emerging¹. However, by the end of the 1980s and beginning of the 1990s, the realisation of the economic potential of musical productions implied new dynamics in the field of music that has become not only a way of social ascension but also a professional activity and a business (Ndour, 2008). Local economic practices of musical reproduction exploded while private infrastructures of music recording and editing² started to emerge, and with the liberalisation³, new and privately owned radio stations and written press appeared to challenge the up-to-now monopolistic

¹ It was a time when various declinations of *mbalax* managed to adapt to the sonorous imperatives of the ‘world music’ market and to follow a particular trajectory via European distribution and marketing companies. Youssou N’Dour with *Virgin London* and *Sony Music* in the United States; Baaba Maal with *Island Records* (U.K.); or Ismaël Lô with *Barclay* (France) N. A. Benga. *Dakar et ses tempos: Significations et enjeux de la musique urbaine moderne (c.1960-années 1990)* p.299 are among these musicians who were revealed through this ‘world music’ phenomenon.

² References can here be made to Youssou N’Dour’s label “Jololi” created in 1996 in Senegal. This enterprise included, in a pioneer way, a recording studio and musical edition and distribution facilities.

³ The liberalisation of papers and radios took place in 1989 in Senegal with the consequent creation of diverse musical programming on new radio stations such as Dakar FM, Sud FM or Walf FM. See for detailed information B. Herson. *Fat Beats, Dope Rhymes & Thug Lives: Youth, Politics and Hip-Hop Culture in Dakar* p.19; N. A. Benga. *Dakar et ses tempos: Significations et enjeux de la musique urbaine moderne (c.1960-années 1990)*

status of public media. In the 1990s, there was thus an unprecedented growth in cultural and musical trade embedded in changes in the organisation of Senegalese music market, namely the development of ‘world music’ market and the emergence of local musical entrepreneurs.

Throughout the 1990s, new actors, non-governmental actors, thus emerged on the Senegalese music market while the embedding of cultural production and trade played as major forces in shaping economic behaviour of musical entrepreneurs involved in this globalising trade that connects different socio-cultural worlds. In this sense, in Senegal, the field of cultural production has been empirically informalised and has slowly started to lose its assumed singular functionality. While the state failed to capture the potential benefits of the ‘world music’ moment with an institutional perspective that disregarded the commercial dimension of music as a business, trade dynamics have nevertheless emerged and have been thriving since the early 1990s on the Senegalese music market. There are now varying aggregate responses of individual decision makers to these macro-economic forces that participate in the “socio-genesis” of this market (beyond an effect of economic liberalisation and other institutional dimension of Senegalese ‘politics of culture’). As such, Senegalese music market can be paralleled with other African markets⁴, while informal practices emerging from below have developed independently from centrally organised ‘politics of culture’ and were overlooked by an instrumental thinking and preoccupation with state control that reinforced a centralist perspective of cultural production.

3) **SITUATING MUSICAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP**

Entrepreneurship studies researchers who have focused on the spatiality and geography of entrepreneurship (Steyaert and Katz, 2004; Ekinsmyth, 2011; Johannisson, 2011; Steyaert and Landstrom, 2011) recognise the importance of an “organising context”. In the endeavour of contextualising entrepreneurial practices, this latter appears as the focal arena for interaction, learning and control in “entrepreneurship” (Steyaert, 2007), deeply rooted in everyday local life. Indeed, this “organising context” appears “as a refuge for reproduced local values and behavioural patterns and also as a translator of external influences into refined local knowledge and practices” (Johannisson, 2011 p.143). The recurrent cultural patronages of the Senegalese governments that favoured individual contributions over a market structure thus participate in the “organising context” of musical entrepreneurship in Senegal. As argued previously, such a politics considers culture as an instrument of ‘public good’ that is by definition distanced from any ‘private merchandise’. As such, one of the main implications of this political economic position of public authorities regarding the cultural sphere is that to be a musical entrepreneur has placed one in opposition to the state and its view of culture. Interestingly, this occurred despite the fact that in economic terms these entrepreneurs may be offering shiny examples of neo-liberalism that seeks to maximise the role of the private sector in determining the political and economic priorities of the state.

From this perspective, one of the main consequences of Senegalese ‘politics of culture’ is that the regulation of cultural work does not exist and an absence of legal visibility and clarity of musical professions⁵ as well as their respective enterprises has persisted (Soumaré, 2008

⁴ I am here making reference for instance to the migration labour market in Malawi that J. A. Andersson addressed in his article J. A. Andersson. *Informal Moves, Informal Markets: International migrants and traders from Mzimba District, Malawi* p.395

⁵ In Senegal the recognition of a profession is based on the reunion of different criteria: 1) the professionalization with a publicly authorised training centre; 2) the payment of public taxes; and 3) the existence of a career and retirement plan Y. Soumaré. *Dimension juridique de l'industrie musicale* p.144. As such, and for instance, the

p.150). Indeed, up to now, Senegal is still marked by the absence of a normalising and effective legislation that would conform and govern the type of activities musical entrepreneurs do, leaving their enterprises informal and unregulated. As such, a situation of perpetual rivalry has remained among musical entrepreneurs who continually and extensively compete for scarce resources as far as cultural production and consumption are concerned. Indeed, the restrictions on local cultural consumption are combined with the scarcity of rarity of musical producers, the sponsors⁶ and other arts patrons. Such a situation is common to any economy where resources are rare but it has been exacerbated on Senegalese music market, a field scarred by a legal invisibility of both its participants as well as their enterprises, a sector where any and everybody can and do improvise themselves ‘music professionals’.

Therefore, on the Senegalese music market that is marked by intensive deregulation, rather than getting together and uniting around the defence of their collective interests, the rational expectations that equalise based on other people being rational actors, has implied an individualistic or *gomboïst* attitude for these participants. Such a kind of deeds characterised as *gomboïst*⁷, borrows the metaphor used for easy and quick money from the *gombo*. Also called the ‘okra’ in English-speaking world, the *gombo* is this resourceful vegetable that grows everywhere and very rapidly without much human effort. An example of a *gomboïst* attitude can thus be the systematic practice of playback for a musical maker rather than hiring instrumentalists with whom (s)he would have to share the artist fees and the consequent progressive disappearing of this latter kind of musical makers⁸. Extending throughout the productive chain of musical production, a *gomboïst* attitude can also be identified among the consumers who, “until the day of a show, will think of how they can trick the system to attend the event for free⁹”. Indeed, in Senegal, the concept of presales, whereby people buy a ticket in advance for a show, does not exist, although such a practice secures some return on the initial investment beforehand.

In other words, for this market to be efficient, participants chose to be rational by privileging an individualist approach. As such, musical entrepreneurs adopt a particularly individualistic behaviour, searching for short-term profits for their own person rather than long-term benefits for the advancement of the whole sector. Such a choice is based on one hand on their knowledge of the deregulation of their market, and on another hand, on their evaluation of an individualist approach as the recognisable means-ends relationships. Rather than developing a form of collective organisation and harmonisation in order to counterbalance the official non-regulation of their sector, Senegalese musical entrepreneurs reconcile something that the public officials kept on ignoring, i.e. the duality of an economy and its market, by developing economic practices that respond to their contextualisation and in which rationality implies that individualistic approaches are preferred.

absence of a certified and appropriate musical training illustrates the fact that the professional criteria of a ‘work’ are not clearly defined in the Senegalese musical field where musical entrepreneurs are thus not recognised as ‘professional workers’, i.e. professionals who are, based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), legally entitled to social benefits (social security, retirement plan, social protection, etc.) and obligations (taxes payment, working contracts, etc.).

⁶ For a long time, the sponsors came mainly from tobacco companies; now they mostly come from telephony companies (two or three per country reducing the number of opportunity for cultural activities to be sponsored).

⁷ I am here indebted to Interviewee #5, who reminded me this expression extensively used in the music sector.

⁸ This situation can interestingly be compared to the one of 1960-80s when musical artists first got into this field by practicing an instrument.

⁹ Interviewee #19; Music maker and worker, Dakar

Besides, they do so by using a ‘familial network’ in which the “know-who” dimension becomes essential. Indeed, and as it has often been debated in *African Studies*, relying on the social institution of kinship is here very present in the economic practices of Senegalese musical entrepreneurs. The principle of solidarity, even referred to as “communitarism” presupposes an economic manifestation of “reciprocity” that sustains the solidarity between the different members of the ‘familial group’ (Diop, 1985 p.153). In this context, the relevance of trust in determining action is a matter, not just of feasible alternative, but also of *interest* while it engages both the reputation and the commitment of participants, means by which the ‘family’ is assured of the effectiveness of its pressure. As such, Senegalese musical entrepreneurs trust their informal kin-based networks out of *choice*, as they are aware that such a practice maintains familial cooperation. To be sure, their approach is consistent with rational choice perspective of economic behaviours that builds on theory of individual decisions and choices (Becker, 1993 p.402) and has allowed them to constantly benefit, through the traditional informality of their familial network, from a flexible system of cooperation, a kin-based collaboration, for their entrepreneurial practices. In this respect, and as for other African markets, the mobilisation of kin-based networks by Senegalese musical entrepreneurs participates in the “socio-genesis” (Andersson, 2006 p.393) of their music market.

4) **THE SOCIAL WORLD OF HIP HOP ENTREPRENEURS**

In Senegal, cultural and musical trades and businesses are unregulated and imply a distinctive rational behaviour of musical entrepreneurs, one where individualistic perspective dominates. In this context, the particular social organisation of hip hop entrepreneurs offers evidence of market distortion to any free market advocate. While such a kind of scholar believe that market stand as an institution that is already set up and maintained through effective price information, hip hop entrepreneurs display trade and business practices that are not structured by price information but by an ethical economy that stands as their participatory framework. Indeed, for Senegalese hip hop entrepreneurs, investment in music market is directed by a belief in their ethical economy, i.e. an informal social infrastructure, rather than by rational choice that implies a knowledge about the market and ways of evaluating them.

⇒ **On hip hop transcultural politics**

There is a transcultural dimension of Hip Hop that first need to be addressed in order to contextualise and situate socio-culturally Senegalese hip hop entrepreneurs. Indeed, borrowing from the Cuban ethnomusicologist Ortiz, I argue that Hip Hop – rather than a subculture determined by social given such as race, class or age – stands as a ‘transculture’. By this, I imply a culture that exists in a permanent openness, a culture that surely exists by itself but can only be articulated through other cultures. One useful metaphor that exemplifies my purpose is the one of the ‘hermit crab’. Like this small marine crustacean, which does not own its habitat but creates it from empty seashells in order to survive and grow, Hip Hop requires another cultural ‘habitat’ to live and develop as a culture. Such an approach draws on a “liminal thinking” that confronts any essentialisation with a *pluri-essentialism* (Nouss, 2005 p.44) similar to Morin’s *unitas multiplex* who addresses the challenge of thinking Europe that stands in the difficulty of thinking of the multiple in the singular and the singular in the multiple (Morin, 1990 p.24; quoted in Nouss, 2002 p.111). A liminal thinking that allows a conception of Hip Hop as an ‘ensemble of specificities’, of singularities. From this perspective, Hip Hop is a ‘transculture’ insofar that it stands, each time and place, as a singular translation of a commonality.

The ontological character as well as the constitutive dynamics permitted by this transculture imply that the socio-cultural positioning of hip hop participants call for an original form of musical entrepreneurship: the ethics they developed as hip hop artists strongly influences and informs their entrepreneurial practices. Indeed, while there is not a fixed doctrine relative to Hip Hop, there are some recurrent cultural codes, ‘transcultural elements’ I should say, that get to be translated in different practices around the world and that binds together the hip hop community. In this sense, Hip Hop calls for specific material practices of its participants. It is first about learning to be the best from where you are, from what you have; in other words, it is about challenging oneself in a positive way. Second, it is about returning and dedicating the benefits of this individual challenge to the community, i.e. the hip hop community and its participants. Through their individual interpretations of this ‘hip hop text’, each and every participant thus contribute in creating what I refer to as an ‘hip hop ethical economy’.

⇒ **On hip hop ethical economy**

The “ethical economy” (Arvidsson et al., 2008) framed in the current crisis of value has been extensively developed by peer-to-peer researchers and theorists to explain situations that are mainly coordinated through non-monetary incentives. As such, hip hop economy is an “ethical economy” while it is regulated by affective affinities that go beyond simple monetary considerations. More precisely, hip hop music economy incorporates to the traditional rational capitalist economy of an individual, an affectivity that is relative to the collective, the community and that is deployed around two principles of *praxis*: ‘representing’ and ‘proving’. These two principles stand as hip hop ‘transcultural codes’ and reflect on the one hand, the notions of original as well as individual challenge (‘proving’), and on another hand, the attachment to the community (‘representing’)¹⁰.

While ‘proving’ incites to originally and autonomously create and innovate, ‘representing’ implies that Senegalese hip hop entrepreneurs develop an awareness and a consciousness of themselves as the new generation of musical entrepreneurs active in their locale. Their ‘transcultural ethics’ thus accompanies and directs the economic practices of Senegalese hip hop entrepreneurs. Indeed, the material dimension of their contribution to the local music market is mediated by their translation of Hip Hop’s ‘transcultural texts’ of ‘proving’ and ‘representing’. How hip hop entrepreneurs originally confronts the unregulated environments of musical trades and business with their distinctive economic practices that are informed by such an ethical economy is what I now turn to.

⇒ **On hip hop peer musical production**

Relying on the approach of peer production (Bauwens, 2009), this section stresses how these dimensions of hip hop ethical economy are concretised in the economic practices of Senegalese hip hop entrepreneurs both in terms of gaining autonomy through the ownership of the material conditions of production and of creating a dynamic business ecology in order to ensure the survival as well as the continuing development of their market. In the USA, hip hop culture have spawned a multibillion dollars enterprise (Brown, 2003). Contrary to

¹⁰ In this respect, Thomas draws a list of these codes (*keeping it real, speak truth to power, change the game, represent the hood, self-expression*) in A. Thomas. *The Spirit and Philosophy of Hip Hop* while Mitchell defines more generally an “ethos” that reflects an independent life style that involves both “raising the bar” and an attachment to the territory through a political and social engagement; see T. Mitchell. *The DIY Habitus of Australian Hip Hop*

previous African Americans in the entertainment world, hip hop entrepreneurs in the USA have been perceived as an ethnic enclave economic structure whose participants capitalise on their access to this creative niche for economic rewards beyond it (Basu and Werbner, 2001). Nowadays, many celebrate hip hop moguls who emerged on the USA market, however, these entrepreneurs, always have a link with majors either under pressing and distribution deals or joint ventures. Indeed, despite their networking and diversification strategies, American hip hop entrepreneurs and their labels still act as intermediaries within the production of music but without any control nor power over the distribution: in simple terms, they still need to be part of a major's label network (Basu, 2005 p.267).

While distancing myself from any ethnical or racial affiliation in hip hop community, I still retain the “enclave logic” (Basu and Werbner, 2001) whereby a community, which shares identities and practices, organises itself internally in order to respond to its production as well as consumption needs. Such an endogenous system implies the internal organisation and coordination of the enclave as a key element in comprehending the dynamics of participants' enterprises. However, while in the USA case, a still individualistic approach to the entrepreneurial initiatives of the enclave appears to be at stake – with the success of only few moguls – in the Senegalese experience, the enclave perspective reveals a cooperative, community-based as well as community-oriented form of entrepreneurship. Indeed, while the entrepreneurial initiatives developed by American hip hop moguls aimed at increasing their respective market shares in direct competition with the music corporations, in West Africa, the motivation of hip hop entrepreneurs has been different. Rather than increasing one's shares on a given market, it is about creating and developing an alternative terrain for their own market.

- **Ownership of the means of production as condition of peer production**

Creating an alternative terrain for their own market in order to ‘prove’ themselves and ‘represent’ their community, Senegalese hip hop entrepreneurs have endeavoured to autonomously produce for the sharing benefit of their community. Such a desire is thus firstly expressed through the capacity of these participants of owning the initial recording device and instruments necessary to the musical creation. To be sure, in Senegal, in the absence of publicly owned material for musical production and insufficient privately owned material (always conditioned to affinity and “know-who”), hip hop entrepreneurs have thus autonomously invested in professional material. As one of my informants illustrates such an initiative is justified not only for their own interest but also for making it available to other participants in their community:

“I am currently saving money in order to buy this professional material in order for us not to have to order it. The objective is to have in Senegal an international quality material and to be able to make it available to artists who are willing to invest in it. [...] But the fact that there is little material, we work a lot with our imagination.” (Interview #27; Music maker and worker, Dakar)

Although this informant refers to some material required for the productive promotion, investing on one's own musical product usually starts with the ownership of the material condition of initial production, i.e. the recording studio and especially the home studio. As such, in Senegal, contrary to other popular genres such as *mbalax* whose participants were generally late in inquiring the possibility offered by digital reproduction devices, hip hop

participants have *systematised* the imperative of investing on the whole chain of production of their musical creativity. However, rather than aiming at controlling the whole chain of production in a competitive way, the ownership of the material of production by these participants has aimed at ensuring their capacity of musical production. This latter being itself dependent on falling costs, soon an ecology of entrepreneurial businesses emerged to support the productive process. Interviewee #19 explains:

“We have contributed and boosted the cultural economy. [...] The majority of studios are hip hop studios, not mbalax; and those studios are [...] managed by hip hop artists who invest not only in music but also in graphic design, in video production, etc. [...] and I cannot name ten mbalax artists who got studios!” (Interview #19; Music maker and worker, Dakar)

- **Dynamic business ecology in support to the peer production**

Since 2006, there has been a real booming of new structures created by hip hop entrepreneurs who were motivated by the desire to be locally autonomous in terms of musical production¹¹. Penetrating new areas of expertise, those entrepreneurial initiatives of hip hop participants have spread from the development of recording studios, to their specialisation in graphic design and video production but also to the creation of duplication plants¹² and fully equipped rehearsal rooms¹³. Therefore, a vertical integration and interconnectedness between different parts of the music production is here at stake. To remind, although, hip hop entrepreneurs are not the ones who initiated this standard practice of musical entrepreneurship in their locale – having been preceded by some, though rare, successful ‘world music’ artists – I argue that they are the ones who systematised this practice while aligning it with an understanding of their social responsibility as a new generation of musical entrepreneurs in their locale. Here I want to reassess the aforementioned concept of “enclave-system” (Basu and Werbner, 2001). Indeed, in practice, such logic is viable if and only if the internal organisation of the enclave, once effective, reconnects with the exterior world. Put differently, an enclave-economy, such as hip hop economy that is initially performed endogenously among participants who share identities and practices, eventually incorporates itself in the larger economy, i.e. the Senegalese music market, in order for its community to expand and grow. In this respect, the recording home studios of Senegalese hip hop entrepreneurs now stand as a viable alternative to the professional studios owned by the major producers of the 90s.

Besides, promotion stands as another example that emphasises the social sources of flexibility only enabled by the digital reproduction and its correlative technologies and where Senegalese hip hop entrepreneurs have created new social spaces of interaction. Indeed, these entrepreneurs, thanks to their ‘technological dexterity’, have now developed structures that are specialised in graphic design and video production, proposing professional provisions in a field up-to-then dominated by amateurism. Such forms of communication and information device are however essential in promoting musical products on the market. Moreover, promotional materials are not limited to video clips and hip hop strategies of promotion have

¹¹ For detailed information, see Wikipedia entry on Hip Hop Galsen:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hip_Hop_Galsen

¹² On the total units of duplication identified on the whole Senegalese territory, a quarter belongs to hip hop entrepreneurs (three out of twelve). One should note however, that in Senegal, these units mostly correspond to artisanal burning units (allowed by NICT) rather than proper industrial duplication plants.

¹³ Being an essential component for the realisation of a musical performance, fully equipped rehearsal rooms are however poorly present on the Senegalese musical scene. Throughout the country, there are only thirteen (13) of them including publicly as well as privately owned ones; and, two of them are owned by hip hop participants.

also involved alternative media, such as the merchandising still initiated through a community-spirit. Indeed, many hip hop entrepreneurs collaborate with graffiti artists to produce promotional material, unique and original, such as T-shirt with distinctive graffiti design. Also, in the absence of essential cultural intermediaries in the value chain of popular music production such as a formal network of distribution, being able to bring the recorded product to the consumers is a considerable challenge for Senegalese musical entrepreneurs who often are dependent on the good will of retailers. As such, and in order to further their autonomy, hip hop entrepreneurs have paralleled the existing informal distribution network with another informal distribution network, one that is based on their community. Three of my informants comment:

“My hip hop distribution network is hand in hand during the shows but also to my network in Ouagadougou and in France. [...] If you want to distribute some hip hop productions, you have to do it in a hip hop way!” (Interview #8; Music maker and worker, Ouagadougou)

“Just to give an example in terms of strategy: in [name of label], we are five people and each of us has to find one hundred potential buyers for any CD released by the label [...] because people will buy if it is you who bring them the product.” (Interview #28; Music maker and worker, Dakar)

“We have good network, the best network. We are very dynamic actors having always new ideas for promotion, new marketing ideas. We are inspired a lot. For example, AURA is a network. If I want to release my album in Burkina Faso, I go to [name of Burkinabè AURA member] and he releases the product for me. Through each of the members and thanks to them, I exist in Ivory Coast, in Guinea, etc.” (Interview #20; Music maker and worker, Dakar)

Therefore, hip hop entrepreneurs, through their specifically situated productive process, have participated in changing the traditional relationships between musical producers, consumers and products on Senegalese music market while developing, through and for their community, alternative avenues for the production, promotion and distribution of their musical products. Their ownership of the means of musical production as well as their extended business ecology have permitted a peer production in accordance to the ethical economy of their community. In this sense, price information does not structure business practices of hip hop entrepreneurs while their music market is rather structured by the particular social organisation of their community. The radical innovation of hip hop entrepreneurs thus stands in their translation of an available technology by an individual imagination, itself inspired from a collective imaginary, a community ethics. As such, while sustaining the productive process inside their community, hip hop entrepreneurs have incorporated and even challenged the rest of Senegalese music market by leveraging their social spaces and making the most of the technology available. How they collectively regulate these spaces is what I now turn to.

⇒ Communal governance of hip hop productive community

This last section addresses the governance process involved in hip hop music economy and comprises the means of quality control, selection and critique central to any community. Again, alike for the productive process, I will – based upon the evidence presented – argue for a peer approach to the governing process of hip hop entrepreneurs. In doing so, I stress the

reflexive self-organisation of autonomous participants in hip hop community as an alternative to a top-down and hierarchical form of governance. Characterised by a relational paradigm, I argue that a participative process based on the principle of self-rule is applied to the productive sphere of hip hop music economy, whereby “market competition is balanced by co-operation, the invisible hand is combined with a visible handshake¹⁴”. Stemming from my understanding of hip hop ethical economy and its peer productive process previously developed, I thus highlight a peer governance based on one hand, on the voluntary engagement of participants (Bauwens, 2007 p.239) and on another hand, on the self-regulation of the productive community by affective affinity (Arvidsson et al., 2008 p.11).

- **Equipotential participatory process**

The participation of hip hop entrepreneurs is governed by a principle of equipotentiality or ‘anti-credentialism’ considering that there is no *a priori* selection to a productive participation (Bauwens, 2005). Indeed, the equipotential character of this participatory process implies that participation in hip hop economy is not pre-conditioned by an initially selective and coercive criteria. Hip hop entrepreneurs evolve in what stands as an ethical economy characterised by a passionate form of production, whereby actors participate in their community on the basis of an emotional bond. Understanding hip hop musical production as a passionate one implies a voluntary engagement of its participants with no direct reward in the form of monetary compensation (but mainly indirect rewards), and where coercion is structurally eliminated. Indeed, such participatory production distinguishes itself from traditional capitalist methods of coercion such as dependence-based wage work where productivity is based on mutual self-interest (Arvidsson et al., 2008 p.239). Rather, motivation of participation is “intrinsically positive, i.e. deriving from passion rather than from ‘extrinsic positives’ (self-interest or greed, motivated by the external monetary system)” (Bauwens, 2009 p.127).

The hip hop ethical principle of ‘proving’ oneself should thus be read as an openness of hip hop economy to any entrepreneurs provided that they have the necessary skills to contribute to the community. Put differently, there are no credentials as prerequisite to participate and the capacity to contribute is verified in the process of contribution itself (Bauwens, 2005): indeed, what counts is demonstrated ability, not prior formal proof. The popular hip hop expression “*it’s not where you’re from, but where you’re at*” acknowledges such a participatory process that is not based on a prerequisite but credited in the participation itself. “It is therefore based on the goal of inclusion rather than a mechanism of exclusion” (Bauwens, 2007 p.240). Such an equipotential process whereby an individual can fully express himself and his capabilities (Bauwens, 2007 p.242), is especially salient in the productive sphere and its promotion strategies of Senegalese hip hop music economy. To remind, media participate in the construction of both a community and a market, while they stand as a link not only between economic practices and their relative market but also between different cultural practices (Théberge, 1991).

As such, apart from their appropriation of traditional media for promotion (radio, magazines), Senegalese hip hop entrepreneurs have extensively conquered Internet by initiating websites and webzines dedicated to their community and the promotion of its members’ activities. Mostly initiated by promoters or fans, these media that promote local productions also extend well beyond their initial locale both in the content as well as in the form. In the content, webzines and websites such as Kingsize¹⁵ or Rapwolof¹⁶ mix Senegalese news and updates of

¹⁴ Retrieved from http://p2pfoundation.net/4.1.C_Peer_Governance_a_a_third_mode_of_governance

¹⁵ See www.kingsize.sn

hip hop participants and community with those of hip hop communities from other part of the world. In the form, these new media sites are developed by local members of the hip hop community with the support of members from other hip hop communities in the world. As such, Kingsize stems from a collective initiative between Senegalese and Norwegian hip hop entrepreneurs, with Kingsize Norway having preceded, inspired and supported the creation of Kingsize Senegal. Similarly, RapWolof has been developed by a hip hop entrepreneur of the Senegalese diaspora based in one of the bastions of Hip Hop, namely the Parisian *banlieue*. These virtual spheres thus offer a promotional tool both for the local hip hop community, its trans-local affiliations as well as for individual hip hop artists and their productions – with not only a magazine, but a community page as well as a forum. But most importantly, what is of interest is that on these virtual spheres, any hip hop participant, whether artists, promoters or fans, can equipotentially contribute to the community in which consumers and producers intermingle. Such a ‘producers’ dynamic is illustrated by the trajectory and comment of my informant:

“Before, a lot of people were just public, part of the audience. But now many of them have become rappers themselves. It worked for me though it does not work for everybody!” (Interview #28; Music maker and worker, Dakar)

The fact that “*it does not work for everybody*” highlights an essential aspect of the equipotential participatory process. Indeed, equipotentiality is neither synonymous of equality nor fairness and the hip hop system of participation, as any informal system, does display a co-production of new inequalities. To be sure, the self-aggregation and self-assignment of tasks is not done in an equalitarian framework: each participant contributes from his abilities. This implies that such a process is not “hierarchy-less, not structure-less, but usually characterised by flexible hierarchies and structures based on merit that are used to enable participation” (Bauwens, 2005 p.4). Indeed, authority and leadership exist and derive from the participants input into the constitution of hip hop economy and on their continued engagement in the community (Bauwens, 2005). Such authoritative and leading dimensions of hip hop peer governance are what I now turn to.

- Meritocracy and ‘benevolent dictatorships’

In the framework of peer production, “[m]ost communities seem to combine a core leadership whose forms of power do not correspond to the command and control paradigm but are nevertheless influential, and which are often termed ‘benevolent dictatorships’” (Bauwens, 2009 p.124). Here the co-existence of an ethical economy alongside the capitalist system participates in explaining such a dynamic and even points towards some limits of the participatory process as far as Senegalese hip hop entrepreneurs are concerned. Indeed, in an ethical economy, coordination is ensured through a process of “affective affinity” whereby participants aim at accumulating respect and recognition from a chosen community (Arvidsson et al., 2008 p.11), a form of ‘reputation economy’. For the most experienced hip hop entrepreneurs, such an accumulation was sometimes accompanied with a consequent credit and its privileged monetary compensation from the global music market. In this respect, the “meritocracy” governing the hip hop economy needs to be regarded in conjunction with the market economy from which some of the participants’ productions get consequent monetary recognition. Indeed, although the hip hop productive community is not

¹⁶ See www.rapwolof.com

governed by, nor is its participation conditional to, the purchasing power of its participants, it is intrinsically connected to physical products (whether recorded or live musical productions) that require systematic cost-recovery mechanisms (Bauwens, 2009 p.129). One of my informants explains this requirement of “*just getting enough back*” in order to cover his contribution and, that way, to go on producing:

“We think about it by getting together; when we form alliance we can do a lot. [...] These are small details: we need to get groups together and [...] form a committee, and auto-regulate ourselves, self-manage ourselves and organise podiums and shows. We need to get people used to quality production. It is just a question of coordination! [...] It is just about getting enough money back on one’s investment and reimburse yourself.”
(Interview #28; Music maker and worker, Dakar)

Cost-recovery mechanisms are especially salient in the organisation of festivals dedicated to Hip Hop that are active in the Sub-Saharan Francophone ensemble¹⁷. Indeed, a networking dynamic has been emerging among all these festivals that share a common thematic in terms of their productions. As such, their entrepreneurs all know each other, being part of other cooperation networks and regularly work with each other, being at the same time executive producers and/or managers of hip hop artists/groups in their respective locale. These festivals are not lucrative as they rely extensively on external funding with their organisers multiplying parallel activities in order to make a living. But the monetary dimension implied by the organisation of such spheres of live exhibition certainly calls for some systematic cost-recovery mechanisms set up by these specific hip hop entrepreneurs. Other hip hop entrepreneurs have identified these mechanisms as constraining limits relative to this regional network mostly in terms of an inclusion/exclusion and power structure dilemma. However, the entrepreneurs organising these festivals respond to an organisational dynamic whereby their investment needs to be recovered. As such they exemplify these forms of “benevolent dictatorship” (Bauwens, 2009 p.124) capable of specifying the terms of their contribution to the community, as one of my informants highlights:

“These organisers create networks: one cannot go in a specific country unless it has been recommended by the Senegalese organiser. These organisers agree on conditions such as they won’t accept an artist who has not been recommended; or they won’t pay excessive artists fees – maximum 300 000 Fcfa” **(Interview #27; Music maker and worker, Dakar)**

Therefore, the governing process of Senegalese hip hop entrepreneurs as a community is non-representational and non-hierarchical though conditioned by “meritocracy” and “benevolent dictatorships”. However, these latter are *ad hoc* in the sense that ‘forking’ – that is the creation of new independent projects (such as new hip hop festivals for instance) – is always possible (Bauwens, 2005 p.4). Besides, hip hop governance is guaranteed by an internal self-regulation by participants of this community through reputations systems that are used for communal validation (Bauwens, 2005 p.2). In other words, the self-aggregation and self-assignment of tasks is balanced by a necessary reflexivity, both from the participants

¹⁷ Gabao Hip Hop Festival (Gabon); Waga Hip Hop Festival (Burkina Faso); Hip Hop Kankpe Festival (Benin); Assallamalekoum Festival (Mauritania); Hip Hop Awards (Senegal); Festival Festa’2H (Senegal); Togo Hip Hop Awards (Togo); Guinean Africa Rap Festival (Guinea-Conakry); Hip Hop Wassa Festival (Niger); Mali Hip Hop Awards (Mali); but also in non-Francophone countries: Big Up GB - Movimento Hip Hop Festival (Guinea-Bissao); Hi-Life Festival (Ghana)

themselves and their peers, regarding their contribution to the community. As one of my informants put it, a process of “*natural selection*” is at stake whereby participants accumulate recognition based on the relative value of their contribution. And, in this context, as the same Interviewee then pursued: “*only the best will survive*”¹⁸. To be sure, this evaluation process has even reinforced the countervailing principle of ‘holoptism’ which dictates that vertical as well as horizontal information¹⁹ about other participants is made available to the rest of the community, through automatic capture of their contribution (Bauwens, 2007 p.242). Such a kind of ‘communal governance’ is thus based on its own means of organisation that is emergent, community-generated and inspired by affective affinity criteria such as respect and peer recognition, i.e. reputation. Indeed, Senegalese hip hop entrepreneurs as a productive community display a radically innovative form of governance which is community-based and community-oriented and coordinated through a distributed network of multiple autonomous participants interactively learning and contributing to their ethical economy.

5) DISCUSSING AN HIP HOP ENTREPRENEURIAL COMMUNITY

The economic practices/behaviours of hip hop entrepreneurs are based on a network of distributed autonomous producers, self-regulating themselves, whose “natural priority is to increase the sphere of free cooperation within their existing society, in the context of access to the necessary material goods” (Bauwens, 2009 p.135). Indeed, dually allying their textual and material practices, hip hop entrepreneurs have created alternative practices of musical entrepreneurship while relying on networks pertaining to their own community of practice. In doing so, they have managed to directly organise an hip hop interface with the market while following their ethical principles (Bauwens, 2007 p.246). As such, mobilising their community not only appears as a resource for the production of their musical creations but also as the very asset for the governance of their economic practices. Indeed, the community – that is, at the same time, localised, translocal and virtual²⁰ –, becomes the dynamic producer of innovative practices and illuminates the transcultural dimension of Hip Hop and its radical culturalisation of Senegalese music market from which emerges an hip hop entrepreneurial community. Indeed, the economic practices of hip hop entrepreneurs, characterised by a peer production ecology and a communal form of governance, suggests a concrete application of a radically new socio-economic approach of musical entrepreneurship, one that reconciles private (individual and economic) as well as public (collective and social) goods. In this respect, a transcultural sociality is expressed in the equipotential character of the participatory process of hip hop community that challenges the traditional “know-who” defining networks of other Senegalese musical entrepreneurs. For in the framework of this hip hop entrepreneurial community, the potential contribution of multiple trajectories is facilitated in a participatory process that does not require any “know-who” as pre-condition. As such, it reminds how hip hop entrepreneurial practices stand as a co-constitution between their cultural/political thinking and their economic doing.

When inquiring about Senegalese hip hop entrepreneurs a parallel can be made with behavioural economics that offer a psychologically more realistic decision-maker. These approaches are essentially based on ecological and institutional theories. This literature has

¹⁸ Interviewee #20; Music maker and worker, Dakar

¹⁹ Information not in terms of privacy but in terms of the existence and contribution of other participants (horizontal) as well as in terms of the access to the aims, metrics and documentation of the hip hop economy as a whole (vertical). See M. Bauwens. *The Political Economy of Peer Production*

²⁰ Here I want to confront and deconstruct Bennett and Peterson’s trichotomic approach of the ‘music scene’ - See for an introduction A. Bennett. *Consolidating the music scenes perspective*

thus focused on the organisational forms of the firm in which the entrepreneur performs but also on the embeddedness of economic environment in social and structural relationships (Granovetter, 1985). Indeed, while in modern neo-classical economics culture stands as a residual factor that one appeals when other explanations have failed, in sociology, cultural norms pervade economic life (Fukuyama, 2001 p.3131). Behaviour is thus determined not only by rationality and preference but also by economic and social environment in which it is inscribed. As such, Granovetter stressed that economic action was embedded in structures of social relations, distancing himself from both under-socialised and over-socialised approaches of economic actions. Criticising both an utilitarian tradition (classical and neoclassical economics) which assumes a rational and self-interest behaviour as well as an “over-socialised conception” of internal behavioural patterns, Granovetter argued against the atomisation of the economic actor (Granovetter, 1985 p.485). In other words, as a genuinely (economic) human activity, musical entrepreneurship is unthinkable without (social) relating, this latter being usually absent in (economic) academic modelling, which usually lends itself to overly functional, rationalistic reasoning (Johannisson, 2011 p.141).

However, in these approaches, usually, the notion of entrepreneur has still been intermingled with the role of the capitalist, and has stemmed from a cultural rationalisation of an economic behaviour. As such, while considering historical, psychological, social, cultural and/or political determinants of entrepreneurship, in sociology as well as in psychology, the economic logic of entrepreneurship that underlines the notion of a capitalist market economy has remained predominant. As it has been argued, “while recognising the influence of non-economic factors on the determination of economic behaviour, [behavioural theory] does not include cultural factors in its analysis of economic behaviour” (Beuving, 2006 p.371). In this respect, with this paper, I stressed how the way Senegalese hip hop entrepreneurs run their business is shaped by culturally determined expectations beyond kin-based networks and beyond the rational choice made by other musical entrepreneurs participating in this deregulated market. Indeed, their economic behaviour is fuelled by expectations of ‘proving’ and ‘representing’ regarding their ethical economy rather than by economic calculation of costs and benefits. In doing so, I argue that they invent another institution of musical entrepreneurship in Senegal which outcomes remain uncertain and cannot be categories but are motivated by a belief in their ethical economy. While highlighting how hip hop entrepreneurs ally material and textual elements through its network of cultural value making, I thus suggest that solidarity stands as the ethical principle that guides their practices of musical entrepreneurship. In other words, their investment decisions in music trades and businesses is less a matter of rational calculations than of distinct concern to live up to their ideal of the community solidarity.

Therefore, the singular characteristic of hip hop entrepreneurship which is that its practices are located inside its community permitted to go beyond behavioural economics and their persistent perspective of instrumental and functional behaviour. Indeed, Senegalese hip hop entrepreneurs display a fundamentally new type of social and organisational infrastructure expressed through specific production and governance processes inscribed in an ethical economy. To insist, hip hop music economy is ethical, not in the sense that it translates some form of philosophical universal but, because it is situated and particular to the local practices of its community. Senegalese hip hop entrepreneurial practices are thus initiated by its very community of participants, i.e. in the distributed network of freely involved autonomous workers and, in this process, these entrepreneurs remain self-reflexive and are accountable to themselves as well as to their community. As such, the two ethical principles, ‘proving’ and ‘representing’, reassess the dual tensions between the individual and the collective in a field

of practice up-to-now dominated by ‘gomboïst attitudes’, individualist and short-term oriented participants. Indeed, hip hop entrepreneurs are not animated by the common entrepreneurial rationale of ‘making profit’ but rather, their peer productive and governing mechanisms mean that hip hop entrepreneurs choose to govern themselves while engaging in the production of a common resource and ‘making a living’ (i.e. finding an accommodation, feeding themselves, taking care of their family, and sustaining their principal artistic occupation). To be sure, ‘making a living’ does involve an interplay between hip hop ethical economy and capitalism as addressed through the governing processes of its community. Indeed, although hip hop participants do not aim at making profits through their entrepreneurial practices, whenever needed, they still have to address some cost-recovery mechanisms. However, based on evidence provided in this paper, I can state that thinking in terms of cost-recovery mechanisms rather than profits stands as a dynamics that still distinguishes hip hop entrepreneurial practices that are less motivated in developing a profitable enterprise than in maintaining a self-sustaining social entity that delivers value to its participants.

Hip Hop first emerged in the mid-1970s, period that stands as a “site of temporal shift in capitalist organisation” (Gill and Pratt, 2008 p.7). Since this initial emergence, I argued that an hip hop entrepreneurial community has developed in Senegal, recognising that practices of social and economic life are embedded in time and space, and embodied through practices (Pratt, 2011). To be sure, the importance of the “affect”, of the “subjective” in the whole social life has been highlighted through the productive as well as governing ethical practices of this hip hop entrepreneurial community. Indeed, through their original “form of social and political organisation that remain receptive to the local circumstances that are bound to the internal division of labour”, Senegalese hip hop entrepreneurs have succeeded in inventing “techniques of value that address the uncertainties of economic and ontological life” (Neilson and Rossiter, 2005). By focusing on the productive and economic dynamics of this specifically situated aesthetics, I certainly put myself at odd with both the traditional bodies of African Studies that focused on popular music (with either a socio-historical or an ethnomusicological perspective) and those who addressed economic practices of various trades and businesses located in this part of the world (with, up to now, little attention to markets related to cultural production). The challenge was thus double and I hope to have somehow manage to handle it while arguing for an hip hop entrepreneurial community and highlighting the socio-cultural framing of its enterprises that puts in light a novel form of musical entrepreneurship, one that stands beyond individual competitive capitalism and beyond the coercively cooperative collectivism.

Bibliography

- Andersson, J. A. (2006). "Informal Moves, Informal Markets: International migrants and traders from Mzimba District, Malawi." *African Affairs* 105(420): 375-397.
- Arvidsson, A., M. Bauwens and N. Peitersen (2008). "The Crisis of Value and the Ethical Economy." *Journal of Future Studies* 12(4): 9-20.
- Basu, D. (2005). *A Critical Examination of the Political Economy of the Hip-Hop Industry. African Americans in the US Economy*. C. Conrad. Lanham, MD, Rowman & Littlefield: 258-270.
- Basu, D. and P. Werbner (2001). "Bootstrap capitalism and the culture industries: a critique of invidious comparisons in the study of ethnic entrepreneurship." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24(2): 236-262.
- Bauwens, M. (2005). "The Political Economy of Peer Production." *CTheory*.
- Bauwens, M. (2007). P2P and Human Happiness. Third International Conference on Gross National Happiness, Bangkok, The Centre for Bhutan Studies.
- Bauwens, M. (2009). "Class and capital in peer production." *Capital & Class* 33(1): 121-141.
- Becker, G. S. (1993). "Nobel Lecture: The Economic Way of Looking at Behaviour." *The Journal of Political Economy* 101(3): 385-409.
- Benga, N. A. (2002). *Dakar et ses tempos: Significations et enjeux de la musique urbaine moderne (c.1960-années 1990)*. Le Sénégal contemporain. M. C. Diop. Paris, Karthala: 289-308.
- Bennett, A. (2004). "Consolidating the music scenes perspective." *Poetics* 32(3-4): 223-234.
- Beuving, J. J. (2006). "Nigerien Second-Hand Car Traders in Cotonou: A socio-cultural analysis of economic decision-making." *African Affairs* 105(420): 353-373.
- Brown, R. D. (2003). "The Politics of Mo' Money, Mo' Money and the Strange Dialectic of Hip Hop." *Vanderbilt Journal of Entertainment Law & Practice* 5: 59-72.
- Diop, A. B. (1985). La Famille Wolof: traditions et changements. Paris, Karthala.
- Ekinsmyth, C. (2011). "Challenging the boundaries of entrepreneurship: The spatialities and practices of UK 'Mumpreneurs'." *Geoforum* 42: 104-114.
- Fukuyama, F. (2001). *Culture and Economic Development: Cultural Concerns*. International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences, Elsevier Science Ltd.: 3130-3134.
- Gill, R. and A. C. Pratt (2008). "In the Social Factory? Immaterial Labour, Precariousness and Cultural Work." *Theory, Culture & Society* 25(7-8): 1-30.
- Granovetter, M. (1985). "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness." *The American Journal of Sociology* 91(3): 481-510.

- Herson, B. (2000). *Fat Beats, Dope Rhymes & Thug Lives: Youth, Politics and Hip-Hop Culture in Dakar*, Hampshire College: 1-105.
- Johannisson, B. (2011). "Towards a practice theory of entrepreneuring." *Small Business Economics* 36: 135-150.
- Kaboret, A. F. and O. Kabore (2004). Histoire de la musique moderne du Burkina Faso. Ouagadougou, EDIPAP International.
- Mbengue, M. S. (1973). *La politique culturelle au Sénégal*. Politiques culturelles: études et documents. UNESCO. Paris, UNESCO.
- Mitchell, T. (2007). "The DIY Habitus of Australian Hip Hop." *Media International Australia, Incorporating Culture & Policy*(123): 109-122.
- Morin, E. (1990). Penser l'Europe. Paris, Gallimard.
- Ndour, S. (2008). *Approche socioéconomique de l'industrie musicale au Sénégal*. L'industrie musicale au Sénégal: essai d'analyse. S. Ndour. Dakar, CODESRIA.
- Neilson, B. and N. Rossiter (2005). "From Precarity to Precariousness and Back Again: Labour, Life and Unstable Networks." *Fibreculture Journal* 5.
- Nouss, A. (2002) "Métissage, transculture et singularité." Politique de la parole. Singularité et communauté, 99-112.
- Nouss, A. (2005). Plaidoyer pour un monde métis. Paris, Textuel.
- Pratt, A. C. (2007). *The state of the cultural economy: the rise of the cultural economy and the challenges to cultural policy making*. The urgency of theory. A. P. Ribeiro. Manchester, U.K., Carcanet Press / Gulbenkin Foundation: 166-190.
- Pratt, A. C. (2011). *An economic geography of the cultural industries*. The SAGE Compendium of Economic Geography. A. Leyshon, L. McDowell and R. Lee. London, Sage: 323-338.
- Snipe, T. D. (2003). *Cultural Politics in Post-Independence Senegal*. Afro-Optimism: Perspectives on Africa Advances. E. Onwudiwe and M. Ibelema. Westport, Praeger Publishers: 53-64.
- Soumaré, Y. (2008). *Dimension juridique de l'industrie musicale*. L'industrie musicale au Sénégal: essai d'analyse. S. Ndour. Dakar, CODESRIA: 115-165.
- Steyaert, C. (2007). "'Entrepreneuring' as a conceptual attractor? A review of process theories in 20 years of entrepreneurship studies." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development: An International Journal* 19(6): 453-477.
- Steyaert, C. and J. Katz (2004). "Reclaiming the space of entrepreneurship in society: geographical, discursive and social dimensions." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 16: 179-196.

- Steyaert, C. and H. Landstrom (2011). "Enacting entrepreneurship research in a pioneering, provocative and participative way: on the work of Bengt Johannisson." *Small Business Economics* 36: 123-134.
- Théberge, P. (1991). "Musicians' magazines in the 1980s: The creation of a community and a consumer market." *Cultural Studies* 5(3): 270-293.
- Thomas, A. (2007). *The Spirit and Philosophy of Hip Hop*. New Statesman. Blackfriars, UK.