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INTRODUCTION

Various researches on the UK and US movie industries demonstrate that the labor process/industrial relations have significantly altered as Fordist accumulation regime entered the crisis in the 1970s. This transformation resulted in rising flexibility in labour markets, particularly in employment contracts. Recent researches, indeed, show that movie industry workers are working predominantly either as freelancers or employees of small subcontractor companies with short term and/or project-based contracts. While rising flexibility characterized the labour market since the 1980s, the post-war period was marked by mass production technologies, institutionalized compromise with comprehensive compulsory insurance schemes, labour protection legislations, minimum wages, and also coupled by an increase in public expenditure on welfare, education and health. The post-Fordist transition not only changed the organization of work throughout the globe, but also altered the recognition of the formal role of labour unions both in collective bargaining and the formation of public policy. Since the 1980s, Turkey has also witnessed a similar transition. This transformation aimed to overcome the limitations imposed by the import substitution accumulation strategy via transferring to the export orientation accumulation strategy, which strategically fit Turkish firms into a flexible production system and relocated them as crucial nodes within the new international division of labour. In tandem with this, public policies and labour codes were significantly altered in order to accommodate market-based solutions via shifting away from previously dominating Keynesian approach and its various forms of institutionalized compromise. An integral part of this neo-liberal restructuring was to discipline working masses by imposing new regulations that favored further flexibility in production process and industrial relations.

The Turkish Film Industry, compared to other industries in Turkey, represents an interesting case due to the historical dominance of flexible work relations. In other words, while in other industries Fordist mode of production and relations were dominant, the movie industry was strongly shaped by atypical workers and insecure work conditions even before the 1980s. The current literature on film industry is strongly dominated by the flexible specialization paradigm, since the industry involves networks of small firms,
mainly localized in certain regions and intrinsically cannot be standardized. Where few researches on labour process have been conducted on the UK and the US Film Industry (Blair, 2001), researchers in Turkey seem uninterested in the subject. Indeed, the film studies in Turkey state the lack and need of research on the cinema itself (Tore, 2010; Arslan, 2011; Scognamillo, 2010). Current researches cover the history of the cinema in Turkey and film industry as a driver of cultural economy. Our research gains importance as it puts the labour process and workers at the center of the study and interprets the employment relations from a critical realistic perspective. For this end, the paper will first discuss the parameters within which structural transformation took place in the US and UK. Later it will discuss the underlying theoretical and methodological reasons behind the labour process approach—Finally it will examine employment relations in Turkish film industry.
THE US AND UK FILM INDUSTRIES

Previous research show that transition from *Fordist* to *post-Fordist* period result in changes in mode of production, employment relations and organization of labour in the US and UK Film Industry. (Piore & Sabel, 1984; Storper, 1994; Blair, 2003; Cha, 2003) Like many other industries, film industry also passed through continuous changes after the crisis of Fordism. Followers of the flexible specialization approach investigated some of the industries that show the patterns that the theory defines and film industries serve as a very good example that seem to fit. According to Storper (1994), in the Fordist era, the United States film industry is not different from other industries in US. Together with the domination of mass production over industries, production process rationalized also in the film industry and most of the tasks are standardized. In accordance with mass-production principles, the production process was split into three different stages: pre-production (selection and preparation of the script and shooting location); production (construction of sets, filming); and postproduction (film processing, editing, sound track) (Storper, 1994). The product was moving process to process just like in the assembly line fashion in order to reach utility maximization and standardized output. This systematic was known as “studio-system” in Hollywood (Storper, 1994). Storper (1994) argues that mass production principles applied in the studio system and the only difference is the number of outputs was small compared to the mass production in other industries. Scott (2002) on the other hand, claims that film – making in the classical studio era was never standardized in any ultimate sense. The existence of efficiency gains through division of labour and production processes, the use of continuity scripts, the constant re-utilization of formulatic plot structures, and the search for regular production schedules could only mean some level of routinization but the output was never the same and standard like in automobile assembly plant. (Scott, 2002)

In addition to the all in one studio production system, the studio system allowed major studios to film their motion picture at their own stages, to finance with their own resources, to distribute the picture through their own distribution channels and to show its first run in the studio’s theatres (Vany, 2004). None of the transactions was outsourced and all transactions were under complete control of the studio. This complete control was
also determining factor in the box office success of the motion picture. The control exercised by the studios with the actions of block booking, customary price clauses in theatrical licenses, broad clearances of competitive exhibitions in other theatres, booking films over long-established tracks of theatres, franchise and other forms of contracting all of which aims to fix prices (Vany, 2004). These attempts of the studios led to “The Paramount Decision” – the Hollywood Antitrust Case – that triggered the institutional change in the film industry. Together with the changes in the principles of production: firms turn to subcontracting or outwork.

The period between mid-1920s and late-1940s was the golden age of the studio system; and after 1950s, the US film industry started to enter into a crisis along with other American Fordist industries. Anti-trust action by the US Supreme Court together with the entrance of television to the US family life changed all plans and structures designed by the film industry because the market became less certain with low margins because of The Paramount Decision and there was an entertainment consumer shift from box offices to the televisions; the new entertainment product designed to replace Hollywood movies (Cha, 2003). After these two setbacks, the feature film audience declined by 50% between 1946 and 1956 which led a decrease in the gross revenues of the companies and thus profits (Storper, 1994).

Like all other changes and shocks, the institutional change in the film industry that is triggered by the Hollywood Antitrust Case of 1948, increased the level of uncertainty and instability in the US film industry. The uncertainty itself is the reason of the change in the principle of production according to the followers of flexible specialization approach. Put simply, mass production best worked under long-term planning; therefore the reactions of the companies within the film industry were directly related with the changes in the principles of production: firms turn to subcontracting or outwork, so the transition from

---

1 The Paramount Decision was a landmark United States Supreme Court anti-trust case that decided the fate of movie studios owning their own theatres and holding exclusivity rights on which theatres would show their films. It would also change the way Hollywood movies were produced, distributed, and exhibited. The Court held in this case that the existing distribution scheme was in violation of the antitrust laws of the United States, which prohibit certain exclusive dealing arrangements. (Wikipedia, 2011)
Fordism to a vertically disintegrated flexible specialization began (Storper, 1994). Vertical disintegration provided control over quantitative and qualitative outputs. While number of films produced was declining, the industry was seeking for a qualitative flexibility in order to compensate the reductions in the quantitative output. The need for the flexibility in the qualitative output removed standardized films from the shelves and brought more different films with innovative ingredients such as Cinerama, Technicolor, and 3D. The aim was to position cinema film’s difference compared to television. This innovative type of film called “spectacular” (Storper, 1994). The output differentiation was not possible without specialized inputs. Through the years, one by one, the processes of production removed from the studios and started to be outsourced. This brought the end of the “term contracts” with the film industry workers; writers, actors, production technicians, directors all started to be contracted for just one film. These were all the attempts to reduce the overheads; however, the consequences were not as the firms were expecting. (Storper, 1994). While Storper (1994) names the shift from long term contracts to one-film subcontracts or freelance as vertical disintegration, Wayne (2003) approaches from a different level of abstraction and argues that it is highly misleading to apply the term vertical disintegration to the production sector alone when questions of market dominance are assessed by the vertical links across production, distribution and exchange. Another critique of Storper’s view is that while defining the studios’ strategies as “vertical disintegration”, he takes into account only “film production” and misses the film industry’s visible and viable connections with distribution, exhibition and finance (Cha, 2003). It is clear that without distribution a film cannot sell and the factor of distribution should not be underestimated. Since Storper narrowly concentrated in only film production process, he neglects the major studios that dominate the whole industry with their ventures in other related areas (Cha, 2003). Plus, contrary to what Storper claims, The Paramount Decision did not weaken the major studios compared to small “independent” firms; it only did force them to change their production strategies by removing their direct link to theaters, but not other ventures. Therefore, major studios continued to follow vertical, and as will be discussed, horizontal, cross-media and cross-industry integrations as well and continue their capital accumulation.

An action, in order to compensate the loss in the US film industry was to enter and grow
in Europe and even in Africa. The nonexistence or underexistence of television compared to US in other continents made it easier to enter the foreign markets for the US film industry, and during 1950s 50% of the revenues were accounted for foreign markets (Storper, 1994). All in all, the most important attempt was to dominate the television market. The large studios prepared to capture the television market with made for television films; however, the television networks made contracts with smaller studios in order to force major ones decrease the price (Storper, 1994).

The failure of these attempts result in profitability crisis in the 1970s. At the end; some of the studios are sold to conglomerates and became a division of them, and some other went through a new overhead reduction process. In most of the cases they sold their back-lots, lands. Therefore, instead of studio shooting, firms began location shooting that decreased the overhead costs and led to new innovations such as the Cinemobile (mobile studio) and the panaflex camera (hand held). The location shooting also served for the differentiation of the output, plus localities began to promote themselves with their differentiated services (Storper, 1994). On the other hand, location shooting helped firm owners to decrease the labour costs because they were able to avoid union rules in a certain meters away locations. Therefore, the exploitation was possible without obeying the length of working days rules of the unions, which at the end reduced the expenses (Storper, 1994).

Organizational restructuring of the US film industry started around the 1950s and continued through the late-1970s. Both studios and independent production companies turned to specialised, independent supplier firms and subcontractors to carry out the whole range of preproduction functions (Storper, 1994). These changes had happened together with a change in the division of labour. Consequently, studios and the independent production companies started to act like temporary joint ventures, sharing both investment, thus risks and profits. The subcontracted supplier firms became smaller and smaller, plus more specialized (Storper, 1994).

In sum, according to Storper (1994), from flexible specialization point of view, the studios’ response to the crisis was vertical disintegration. A series of crisis and shocks
result in more vertical disintegration and all these consecutive attempts to survive led to the emergence of a network of small independent supplier firms and a flexibly specialized system (Storper, 1994). In the new structure there are independent small firms for the processes like editing, lighting, sound and film processing, special effects etc. that once done within the studios regarded as in house processes. In order to see the change in the most explicit form and the new corporate structures in the film industry, Wayne (2003), asks us to compare the end credit titles of an old studio film with one made in the past 25 years.

However, new structure could not be explained in such a simple way. Like Piore and Sabel (1984) Storper’s use of flexible specialization approach to interpret the film industry is subject to debate. Wayne (2003) does not agree with vertical disintegration explanation of Storper and Christopher and while looking from a broader perspective, he states that at least four terms should be taken into account in order to understand current structure of the film industry: (1) Vertical integration: as discussed above, the linkages between raw materials to point of sale, (2) Horizontal integration: the ownership of different companies within the same sector of the industry still exists and should not be read like they are completely disappeared after in the post Fordist era (3) Cross-media integration refers to the tying together within one parent company of different types of media and media-related materials, thus generating synergies. (4) Cross-industry integration, where media companies are part of corporations with substantial non-media holdings. Thus US television network NBC is owned by General Electric, which is one of the biggest companies in the world. GE has interests in heavy industry, financial services, medicine and domestic electric appliances.

It is seen that, what Storper classify as autonomous decentralized small units in the film industry are not autonomous at all other than having a different brand and a separate organization. It is true that, the film industry enjoys the flexibility of the brands positioning according to changing tastes of the customers, but this does not mean that the small firms have the real autonomy. Indeed, mostly they are operating as subsidiaries of a big firm, in this case Disney, and the large cooperation has the power and authority to intervene the processes of the small profit centers in order to get them in line with its own
strategy. Therefore, we cannot say that there is not a complete decentralization but the small firms are subject to direct central control when necessary. For instance, Blair (2003) uses the term “fragmented” instead of “independent” and stresses the tendency of vertical integration also in the UK film industry.

Wayne (2003) brings the debate on flexible specialization approach to the case of film industry and argues that the Three Cs Thesis is still valid and capitalism has the tendency towards the centralization and concentration of the capital. However, new organization forms are emerged with the dialectic of monopoly and competition. A kind of decentralized accumulation continues in these structures of subsidiary and subcontractors. These new structures allow film industry to adapt and promote to more segments and variety of global markets. Although the cultural outputs are now diffused through decentralized firms, at the very end they all serve for the centralized accumulation of the media corporate capital. As quoted at the beginning, the followers of flexible specialization approach misled with the apparent forms of relations and networks and failed to take into account the real power – control relations in between the firms. Therefore, although Storper’s analyses seem like a logical strategy from firm’s perspective, it lacks the complete information about the real relations. As Cha (2003) quotes from Aksoy and Robins, contrary to Storper’s proposition, studios in film business are “becoming more concentrated and more integrated than ever before” and a very small number of giant companies dominate the global film and entertainment industries.

The structure of the US and the UK film industries has historically differed. In both countries film companies often owned large studio facilities, employing permanent staff to manufacture a stream of films. As discussed, in the US case, studios were long-term workplaces for the employees; however, in the UK film studios, the employment has generally been less stable than US since the studios were rented to independent producers covering both facilities and labour resources available. In present day, the dominant form is project based work organization in both countries. The difference between the US and the UK is the absence of a mediating institution between labour and employers in UK, in US the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees (IATSE, the main film industry union) developed a roster system, which allocated previously studio-employed
crew to projects on the basis of seniority. In Britain, the unions are relatively weak and no formally regulated employment system exists. (Blair, 2001)

Storper (1994) introduces “star creation system” as a way of differentiation by the firms after they started to subcontract most of the processes and establish short-term contracts with the film industry workers. The commodification of the individuals with the star status did not end up as expected; the first attempt was to contract the stars under long-term agreements in order to control their access to other films and firms. He argues, from a managerialist perspective, that the long-term agreements do not fit the flexible specialization mode of production and short-term contracts with the stars, on the other hand, increased the overhead costs that the firms were trying to decrease after the crisis. Stars were asking for “enormous salaries” or profit shares from the film’s box office success. The increase in the expenses of stars resulted in more control over the other production processes’ budgets (Storper, 1994), and so standard workers’ budget.

As previously mentioned, the discussion on transformation of the labour process during transition period is very limited in film studies. (Blair, 2001) Next, we will elaborate the necessity of labour process in the film industry studies.

ON THE NECESSITY OF LABOUR PROCESS

Being aware of ongoing debate on subjectivity in labour process theory, our intention is to analyze the Turkish film industry through a perspective, which is both conscious about the dialectical nature of workplace relationships and committed to the humanist, revolutionary intent of the theory. Although we try to avoid detailed ontological discussions concerning the relations between structure, agency and subjectivity, it is useful here to clarify what we mean by hegemony, particularly before going through the examination of workplace relationships. There is an ongoing debate and a variety of related works on structure/agency duality. (Knights & Willmott, 2002; O’Doherty & Willmott, Hassard & Hogan & Rowlinson, 2001; Fleetwood, 2005; Mumby, 1997) Although the linguistic and post-structural turn can easily be pointed out as the source of weakening of critical realist ontology, in our opinion, the ongoing debate on subjectivity contributed greatly to the continuing relevance of labour process analysis by the re-
evaluation of some central concepts. Through the debate, concepts taken from grounded macro theory, such as hegemony and false consciousness, are re-read and interpreted mostly because of the need for a better interpretation vis-à-vis an important ontological challenge. As the debate inevitably produced various camps within the spectrum ranging from crude, overly structuralist realist perspective to fierce post-structuralism, the structure-agency “duality” is mostly formulated as dominance/resistance discussions based on the premises of the related ontological perspectives. In this context, the extensive reading on the concept of hegemony provides a means to confront post-structural critiques for being dualistic by embracing a dialectical, defining relationship between “hegemonic dominance” and resistance. As excellently put together by Mumby (1997), this type of understanding of hegemony as a process of struggle incorporates a rich conception of resistance, which endorses both individual level and the possibility of larger collective action, with a conception of dominance which is far away from overly structuralist reading of Marx.

Our interviews with the workers of Turkish film industry show that the understanding of workplace relationships requires a reconstruction of the concept of hegemony as a continuum rather than a polarized one-way phenomenon. Although we acknowledge “common sense” in Gramscian terms in the film industry to act like a façade to disguise conflicts in the labour process, our interviews show that many workers can partially identify antagonistic capital-labour relations and its reflections in the work place. They acknowledge that lack of formal agreements and job insecurity push them to work in undesirable conditions. However, many of them also points out a basic need of avoiding a regular 8 am-5 pm job and rejecting a boring, regular life as a part of their identity. This works like a historically attributed role to film industry worker. Therefore, interestingly, their wish to avoid a regular life and rejection of conformity fits them in the reproduction of capital-labour relationship in undesirable conditions. Here, hegemony of common sense is clearly constructed through a dialectical relationship between dominance and resistance. Cultural stereotype of a film worker is constructed upon a basic dichotomy and their choice is rationalized as being a film industry worker and to work in undesirable conditions rather than being a regular worker who cannot enjoy life. This interpretation shows the importance of extensive reading of Gramsci’s concept of hegemony in order to
explain certain workplace relationships without any reduction from labor process analysis. Conceptualizing hegemony as only a top-down phenomenon can reduce explanatory power of the analysis by totally neglecting the agency. On the other hand, only focusing current actors’ resistance could be even more erroneous as it neglects the whole interaction between previous social structures and agents actually represented in discourse.

In our opinion, this dialectical relation between structure and agency, driven from Gramsci’s concept of hegemony, is a necessary correction to the reductionist readings of Marx. Although the hegemonic dominance model is generally attributed to Marxist origins where resistance is mostly presented as a departure provided by the critical review of structuralism, a simplistic conception of these notions within a dualistic context cannot fit in original Marxist ideology. As Wood (1998) points out, Marx, through his critique of political economy, diverges from Enlightenment’s understanding of progress to eliminate historical generalization of bourgeois ideology, but never retreated from the ideal of human emancipation. Therefore, Marxism provides an approach that is conscious about dominance, replacing unquestioning submission to capitalist assumptions by a critical perspective. Hence, without a reduction in its initial revolutionary aspect, Marxist approach can also provide a means for conceptualizing a possibility for a change towards a more humane society. Similar to Marxist critique of political economy, which identifies exploitation as the sole defining feature of class relations; in labor process analysis, hegemony, which consists of both dominance and resistance in our understanding, is the defining relationship of work place relations. However, this switch in the grounded theory invoke important post-structural challenges as the main concern now shifts from appropriation of surplus to power and power relations, as if the two processes can be separable.

“Control” or “dominance” is mostly used to describe this relation by labor process analysts. Nevertheless, these terms connotes a managerial approach which, in our opinion, reduces the understanding of capital-labor relations regardless of its revolutionary intent. Reductionist readings of Marx tend to define exploitation in capitalist production relations as a one-way phenomenon, while a more refined approach
defines exploitative relationship within a context where this relationship is the
determinant of class structure, and therefore of the class formation, struggle and
consciousness. In this sense, exploitation denotes the inevitable interdependence of
classes to each other, the most important dialectical relationship in capitalist mode of
production. On the other hand, a reductionist reading of hegemony may exclude its
defining aspect of being relational and engenders reduced version of a central notion such
as false consciousness while an extensive reading of hegemony provides a consistent
view with the macro theory. We can conclude that, in our understanding, domination,
control and resistance are not exogenous parameters to define modern workplace
relationships. Rather, still within labor process theory framework, these are mutually
defining components of control over labor process, which is in turn a defining element of
work place relations subjected to capitalist laws of motion.

When we consider capital-labor relations, our research confirms that even in film
industry where labor is claimed to be flexibly specialized, for every class or categories,
i.e. including middle layers of employment and other “contradictory” categories, the
defining exploitative relation is in place. Therefore every category, every location has its
own part of the appropriation and exploitation related to it. In the work place, the
reproduction of these relations is realized through a hegemonic relationship in which all
employers and employees engage to some extent. Thus, although it would be an issue to
be discussed in greater details, we believe that the investigation of the work place
relations should be focused on the dialectic hegemonic relationship rather than measured
by exogenous parameters detached from the production relations, which sometimes
labeled as “control” or “dominance”. Hence, in our opinion, similar to the proper
acknowledgment of the relational conception of class requiring the definition of
exploitative relations as a dialectical phenomenon, an extensive reading of Gramsci’s
concept of hegemony is vital for the relevance of labour process research in the
workplace setting in question. Through this dialectical perspective, and by its connections
to capital-labour relations, we investigate the transition period from “Fordist” to “Flexible
Specialization” in the Turkish film industry, where the dominant discourse is imprinted
so called flexible-specialization.
TURKISH FILM INDUSTRY

In comparison with the US, Turkish film industry provides an interesting case. Yesilcam’s 1960-1970 represents the “golden age” of Turkish cinema and the period itself represents the Fordist compromise in Turkey. However, our initial findings and investigation of workplace relations reveal that generalized aspects of Fordist era were hardly in place in the Turkish Film Industry during the 1960s and 70s. Therefore, although film industry was not immune from the neo-liberal shift, employment relations in the film industry affected to a smaller extent during this period, as this industry’s work organization had always carried “Flexible Specialization” characteristics more than other industries, even during 60s and 70s in Turkey. It is important to acknowledge that some particular characteristics –especially the ones related to working conditions and relations-which are generally attributed to Flexible Specialization can be traced back in earlier organizations in general. However, there is something specific, which makes Turkish film industry unique in this context: Existence of Fordist mode of production, - the trend in number of film productions during 1960s-70s (Scognamiglio, 2010) reflects a kind of mass production, though there was no “studio system” or routinization - combined with non-existent Fordist employment relations.

We think this situation might be the result of lack of regulations governing the film industry. The first Turkish law of cinema went into effect in 1986 while Yesilcam was disappearing (Arslan, 2011). The focus of the law was interests of filmmakers and importers. Therefore, before or after the law, Turkish film industry is not regulated in terms of industrial and employment relations. Basic workers’ rights, labour codes that are promoted by Keynesian Approach or insurance were simply not in place for the film industry workers. Cinema Workers Union is established in 1978, still debating with the regulators for a Cinema Work Law that regulates the working conditions of film industry. Mahir Ozerdem, quoted in Arslan’s (2011) “Cinema in Turkey”, stated that while he acted in the Turkish – Italian coproduction Safiye Sultan he saw that Italians worked with strict contracts; moreover, actors and crew were all unionized. While in Turkey actors were working on multiple contracts at the same time and went from one film set to another. Giovanni Scognamiglio, Turkish film critic, also characterize the same period
with a mass production methodology that is exported from Italians, but used in a way that allows an actor to act in multiple films within the same set with different costumes to reduce costs.

In our research, we focused on workers’ experiences in order to assess the contemporary organization of work. Here, the aim is not depicting disposition differences on the basis of actors’ positions in the organization of work, but contrarily, it is investigating the organization of work through the guidance of labour process perspective by evaluating the dispositions of various actors. Our research with the workers of Turkish film industry shows that the understanding of workplace relationships requires a concept of hegemony as a continuum rather than a polarized one-way phenomenon.

Through the examination of workplace relations within a dialectical perspective which carries capital-labour relation at the core, the control over labour can be both identified as a major motivation behind managerial activity and as a source for resistance for workers. Indeterminable nature of labour for employers has always been compensated by the lack of formal work agreements. In this way, constant “good will” and desired performance of workers are guaranteed and middle layers of employment ensures the delegation of authority which is necessary for the continuation of production. On the other hand, lack of formal work agreements provides a sense of freedom for workers, and feeds their need of staying out of boring routine. Without the delegation of responsibilities which requires technical knowledge, the making of a movie could depend on the uncontrolled collaboration of skilled workers who would have an important degree of control over their own labour. In this respect, directors’ – of light, art, photography etc.- position cannot be labeled as some location outside of the capital-labour relationship. These middle layers are not the continuation nor the revival of an artisanal work form characterized as flexible specialization and could hardly be associated with craft tradition and claimed to be reducing alienation as proposed by Piore and Sabel (1984).

During our research, a finding was that almost all film industry workers started defining the requirements of the related position by stating the necessity of creating/realizing what director wants. Although there is a complex relationship of capital-labour in the film
industry, directors’ position can be considered as a specific location in the middle layer of employment. In some cases, directors can initiate projects by acquiring sponsors or clinching deals with production companies and the directors seems to be the only “worker” who enjoys taking part from monetary success. This unique position in capital-labour relation has its translation in the hegemonic management environment. Subordinated department directors and their assistants benefit from their technical –and of course tacit- skills to realize what director wants to produce. Some department (light, art, photography etc) directors may have the privilege of counseling directors and this kind of informal relationship is dependent on the social styles and experience levels of parties. Therefore, film set is an environment in which the use of skill –especially the technical skill- is strictly controlled by management. This is a setting where subordinates may give all the control over the labor process to the representatives of capitalist. It is not surprising that wage levels are low when compared to extremely long working hours. As department and production assistant positions’ skill requirements are minimized, these positions can be considered as changeable parts which can be filled by employees with little formal training. This is especially acknowledged by young educated workers who are disturbed by the traditional uneducated worker type who enter the industry from scratch.

Part time work and subcontracting provide an environment in which this kind of replacement is possible and easy. Hence, contrarily to some arguments which promotes “flexible specialization” as a source of reskilling and private entrepreneurship, this type of subcontracting serves as encouragement for deskillling and establishment of managerial control tools in Turkish film industry. Middle layer of employment’s role in this setting is especially important: These middle layers of employment rather represent a location which carries particularities of different positions in work organization. Many of the workers acknowledged this middle layer’s technical knowledge and authority over their subordinates as well as their concerns and frustration about being disassociated from the result of their labour in a highly organized, hierarchic work setting. Again, this frustration is somehow compensated by a mythical submission in “love of cinema” which creates an aura of artistic collaboration and prevents the acknowledgement of workplace relations. This basis of workers’ consent rather than employers’ coercion in the film industry
provokes many questions about the work conditions under which such truce could be produced. This immediately reminds the concept of hegemony in Gramsci’s terms.

CONCLUSION

Labour process analysis provides a means to bridge the macro theory with experiences taken from workplace and it also creates an important prospect of defining conditions, which necessitate hegemony rather than coercive measures. Our research results underlined the existence of a large unemployed workforce, which is ready to be “flexibly employed” in the film industry, although a tradition of working under severe conditions and lack of binding contracts in micro and lack of regulation in macro are already acknowledged by the workers of the film industry. Our first results show that a more hegemonic rather than coercive style of management has evolved. However, further research should be conducted in order to analyze in depth the different crewmembers that belong to different production processes of a film.

Additional insight could be gained via investigating other creative industries like journalism and advertisement in Turkey. Furthermore, the level of flexibility before and after neo-liberal shift in Turkey should also be analyzed to understand why the industry is established in a form of project-based organizations while in other industries Fordist mode of production and relations were dominant.

Further research directions could be critique of the role of social capital in the film industry and the consequences of close network relationships based on trust since typical recruitment in the film industry in Turkey and other regions is based on an introduction of an acquaintance that already works in the industry. It is important for the workers to improve and maintain the social relationships in order to protect their role and position.
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