The New Music Industry
- Understanding the Dynamics of the New Consumer of Music

Master Thesis in Business Administration
Authors: Markus Salmela
          Sakari Ylönen
Tutor: Erik Hunter
Jönköping    December, 2009
Acknowledgments

The authors would hereby like to thank all people that have helped us writing this Master Thesis and our families for support and understanding.

A true gratitude goes to all the respondents that contributed in the questionnaires, as well as to Richard Backteman for his help with conducting the data collections and Rickard Ström for his proof reading and language support.

Further, the authors would like to direct a thank you to Christoffer Krantz at A6 center for allowing us to put up the stand for the data collection.

Finally, the authors also want to thank their tutor Erik Hunter for valuable input and expertise in quantitative studies keeping the authors at the right track with eyes on the prize.

Thank you.

Markus Salmela

Sakari Ylönen
Abstract

The music industry today is undergoing a revolution with digital distribution of music taking over the traditional sales of physical CDs (Mewton, 2008). The peer-to-peer networking and illegal music piracy is a problem that lately has been widely discussed in forums of ethics, legal issues and economical aspects, followed by a music industry trying to solve the situation with new business models enhancing digital sales, e.g. the tip jar model (Hiatt & Serpick, 2007). The tip jar model embodies the problem the industry is facing since it allows the consumer to choose whether to pay or not. Therefore the question of what leads the consumer to pay instead of download or pirate music has been researched in many aspects. However it has been made to a lesser extent in theory of loyalty and liking and their implications on the new business models’ success and the new consumer of music.

Previous research within music piracy has mainly explored demographics, macro- and micro economical perspectives such as artist and record company loss of welfare and consumer surplus (Coyle et al., 2008). We find it of interest to instead further explore the impacts of theories about consumer liking, loyalty and attitudes (Wells & Prensky, 1996; Shiffman & Kanuk, 1987; Solomon et al., 2002) as an addition to this existing knowledge to enhance the understanding about the new consumer of music. The purpose of this thesis is to analyze artist liking, artist loyalty and attitudinal factors’ impact on consumers’ music piracy intentions. The study is an explanatory study based on quantitative data collected in the region of Jönköping where the collection of data has been conducted by using two questionnaires; one among students at the School of Education and Communication (Jönköping University) and one at the A6 shopping-center. This data has been summarized to create independent variables used in a multiple regression analysis to calculate their impacts on piracy to confirm or reject the from theory deduced hypotheses.

The results from the multiple regression analysis show that the attitudinal factors do not have a direct impact on piracy intentions; however the other two independent variables, measuring the artist loyalty and artist liking have a larger impact. Surprisingly, a higher level of loyalty increases the intentions to pirate music while, as anticipated from theory (Solomon et al., 2002; Shiffman & Kanuk, 1987), higher liking decreases intentions. The conclusion is that the artist liking variable and artist loyalty variable are resulting in a bridge over piracy where the pillars are built of liking and the bridge itself is built of loyalty, stressing the importance of maintaining high levels of liking to maintain purchasing behavior online.
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1 Introduction

In this chapter the background will be presented and the problem area of the study will be discussed consequently. The purpose of the thesis is introduced with additional research questions. The limitations of the study are presented in the end part of the chapter.

1.1 Background

Internet has not only revolutionized many businesses in general, but to a great extent the whole industry of music (Mewton, 2001). Already since the early 1990s when the music compression format MP3 (originated 1989) was introduced on a broader scale the ways of distributing music has experienced an ongoing evolution. More precisely it is referred to four phases of evolutionary periods, the first of them occurring in 1993 with music starting to be shared in chat rooms, websites and networks e.g. Internet Underground Music Archive (IUMA). The second sub-revolution occurred with the entry of the file- (music-) sharing software Napster by Shawn Fanning, which opened in spring 1999 (Mewton, 2001). The Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA) as a result to Napster's success filed a lawsuit against Napster, forcing them to install filters preventing downloading MP3s (Lam & Tan, 2001). However, Napster still being active, the Court of San Francisco in July 2000 ruled Napster to be closed and consequently in June 2001 Napster was offline. The third phase occurred when piracy started showing great steps forward allowed by larger band widths and capacities of downloading and storing MP3 music. This was also the phase of decentralization, moving towards peer-to-peer (P2P) technologies with softwares like Limewire, DirectConnect, and Kazaa. The next phase was the introduction of BitTorrent technologies, making it harder to track IP addresses, which digit combinations are working as the address from where the computer is connected to internet from. This phase is the one that is seen as the present state of the evolution, which is seeing some kind of end due to the legal issues ongoing in the case of The Pirate Bay (Carp, 2009).

The effect of these new means of distribution of digital music and the fact that they neglect correct payments to the artist - and therefore piracy and considered illegal - is of course a decline in physical record sales for the ‘Big Four’. That is referring to a group of record labels consisting of EMI, Warner Music Group, SonyBMG and Universal Music Group (prior to 2004 called the ‘Big Five’ before the merger of Sony Music and Bertelsmann Music Group, now fully owned by Sony) who are the largest record companies in the world (Wray, 2008). The decline in total revenues both in physical and digital sales is at this point of time valued to be slightly over 25 percent for the industry, but lately seeing some signs of stabilization in the generated revenue streams (Hiatt & Serpick, 2007).

There are legal internet solutions provided from the industry today, such as iTunes, which is one of the larger providers and furthermore also ‘freemium’ concepts developing as another solution that includes streaming of music, consisting of one subscription premium account and a free advertisement funded account like Imeem, Last.fm and Spotify (Andrews, 2009). These operations try to compensate for the losses in physical record sales with digital music sales but so far it is not more than compensating for a very small part of the decline (Hiatt & Serpick, 2007). The big record labels struggle with their war on piracy as in the current case of The Pirate Bay (Carp, 2009) through legal actions and high fines, but are also simultaneously exploring and developing new marketing strategies and new business models due to a shifting focus from physical records to live concerts and royalties or licensing (Hiatt & Serpick, 2007). Also when it comes to releasing albums, the labels explore new
methods, one example being the ‘Tip jar’-model. This model was for instance used when releasing Radiohead’s album ‘In Rainbows’ in 2007 (Leeds, 2007). The main objective of the model is that of giving the consumer (read the loyal fans of the artist) the option of downloading the album for free or if wanted leaving a self decided amount of money as a ‘tip’ for the artist (Leeds, 2007).

1.2 Problem Discussion

Not only do these kinds of business models mentioned embody the problem that record labels today are facing, they also enlighten the problem the whole industry is facing. That is, what could make the consumer buy the music instead of pirating it? The notion seems to be that consumers have taken control over the bargaining and exchange situation of music, in other words the power to decide whether to buy their music legally or obtain it illegally through piracy. The consequences of consumers choosing to pirate their music amounts to yearly sales of the music industry decreasing from $14 billion to $10 billion only in the United States during the time 2000-2008. During the same period global costs from piracy are calculated to closely $12.5 billion (Recording Industry Association of America, 2009).

According to Hiatt and Serpick (2007) the decline is mostly due to piracy and has resulted in a challenging downturn in generated revenues that record companies are getting increasingly desperate to solve. The revenue streams from physical CDs have in fact decreased to the point that the record labels’ business models are shifting towards a larger emphasis on publishing and licensing music including royalties and of course live performances and concerts. This was prior to the internet seen as something supporting record sales, not the other way around as in many cases today (Hiatt & Serpick, 2007). Also Lam and Tan (2001) address the internet’s impact on enabling new competitors and business models being established in the music industry, which explains the swift speed of change at the moment.

At this point the record labels’ most apparent questions to answer is how to attract consumers to instead of downloading music illegally through software such as Limewire, instead start using software in legal ways of consuming music, e.g. iTunes or tip jar solutions. The importance of demographics as income and age has previously been shown (Coyle, Gould, Gupta & Gupta, 2008), as well as the lower ethics that are taking place online on the internet compared to in “real life” (Chen, Shang & Lin, 2008).

One of the alternative ways the record industry has met the problem of piracy is through licensing music to new internet service providers (MacMillan, 2009). These changes have opened the market for smaller innovative solutions such as Spotify, Last.fm, legalized versions of Limewire as well as Napster which was re-launched fully legal in 2003 (Arthur, 2003). The vision of these new music providers’ business models is to allow consumers accessing music and playlists everywhere through their computers, mobile phones, and stereos while the providers receive payments for subscribing these music services (MacMillan, 2009). This is however still leaving out the option of downloading an offline copy.

The new business models show clear emphasis on access and availability which also relates to the incentive for piracy not being only due to economical reasons. The proof of that is that the amount of illegally downloaded music is not being proportional to the decline in record and digital sales for the record companies, inclining that there is an overlap between the two (MacMillan, 2009). The non-monetary incentives are also the much alike the suggested factors of success of the MP3 compression which are transferability, copy ability and
easiness of storage. These further emphasize the importance of consumers’ option to download music instead of a mere streaming option. In addition, Spellman (2002) claims that streaming of music needs to be advertisement funded or with subscription (premium) fees so low that the benefit from being relieved from advertisements overshadows the cost and most importantly, streaming music reduces the willingness to pay for it.

Our track of mind on narrowing down our study’s purpose can be followed in Figure 1A below where it is made clear that due the previously mentioned downturn in music sales the industries are exploring, evaluating and developing new business models and concepts of music sales, e.g. the tip jar-model. This meaning that the consumer actually chooses whether to pay or not (Spellman, 2002). Information attainable despite a tight lockdown on new ways of selling music confirms that only 1 percent of the users actually pay using the tip jar function on the new legal Napster (Ku, 2002). Hence this is a business model that embodies the problem the industry is facing since the present consumers choice of music acquisition is to pirate instead of purchase it. Previous studies conducted are more towards the general phenomena of piracy and leaves room for the more fundamental issues of success in business models as the tip jar to be explored. The thought is that the loyal fans or consumers that really like the artist will leave a financial contribution to the artist in the “tip jar” and therefore it is interesting to do studies on if really loyalty and liking are strong factors enough to make consumers choose to pay for their music acquisitions instead of pirate it.

There has however been research done close to the field of our interest of what do have an impact on the consumers’ decision of buying or pirating music. One study conducted by Chiou, Huang and Lee (2005) states the expected satisfaction, perceived prosecution risk, magnitude of consequence and social consensus as major factors. Adding to this an established model is presented by Coyle, Gould, Gupta and Gupta (2008) which categorizes attitudinal factors, purchase behavior and demographics as of importance. The more explored field of that study is demographics, therefore leaving room for further going into depth in purchase behavior aspects with consumer behavior theories of the phenomenon (Shiffman & Kanuk, 1987; Solomon et al., 2002; Evans et al., 2009). These kinds of studies are also further justified by Chiou et al. (2005) who argue that artist idolization might have an impact on piracy, a factor seen as a clear derivation of product/brand liking theories (Wells & Prensky, 1996).

Therefore we choose to explore purchase behavior of consumers and the impacts on consumers’ piracy intentions of loyalty (Schiffman & Kanuk, 1987), liking (Evans, Jamal & Foxall, 2009; Solomon et al., 2002) and conform ed attitudes (Wells & Prensky, 1996; Foxall, 1980). These are translated to artist loyalty, artist liking and attitudinal factors’ impact on piracy intentions, to see how they affect the consumers’ willingness to instead purchase music. This kind of findings contribute to the understanding of what could lead consumers to decide to instead pay or leave a contribution in business models as the tip jar model and therefore also shed light upon how such impacts could be critical (success) factors in the new emerging business models.

![Figure 1A – Our mind-track of the problem discussion.](image-url)
1.3 Purpose
The purpose of this study is to analyze the artist liking, artist loyalty and attitudinal factors impact on consumers’ music piracy intentions.

1.3.1 Research Questions
◊ What impact does artist liking have on consumers’ willingness to pay and not to pirate?
◊ What impact does artist loyalty have on consumers’ willingness to pay and not to pirate?
◊ What impact do attitudinal factors of consumers have upon the piracy intentions?

1.4 Delimitations
This master thesis is conducted with the following delimitations:
◊ The research is related to consumer theory as consumer behavior, rather than legal and socio-psychological theories on a more macro-level or in a social science field.
◊ We do not consider consumers paying for the artists’ music as charity donations to the artist, rather as normal payments for the supplied product.
◊ The sample of the data collection is limited to the Jönköping area due constraints of resources and time. We do not claim the results to be fully generalizable.

1.5 Definitions
The definitions presented are used throughout this master thesis and even not frequently used; these concepts are providing understanding of the piracy vocabulary.

**P2P** – meaning peer-to-peer (often referred to as P2P) is a type of internet network allowing groups of computer users with the same networking software to connect with each other and access files from one another’s computers and hard drives.

**BitTorrent** - BitTorrent is a content distribution protocol that enables efficient software distribution and peer-to-peer sharing of larger files, such as entire albums, movies or TV series and enabling users to serve as network redistribution points even to a greater extent.

**Streaming** - streaming, commonly seen in the forms of audio and video streaming, is when a multimedia file can be played via internet without being downloaded first.

**Digital** - Digital information is stored using a series of digits (ones and zeros, binary coding). CDs and DVDs can be used to store and play back high-quality sound and video even though they consist merely and entirely these ones and zeros.

The following **abbreviations** will also be used in the results and analysis sections, hence explained below:
◊ **ALV** = Artist Liking Variable
◊ **ALYV** = Artist Loyalty Variable
◊ **AFV** = Attitudinal Factors Variable
◊ **PIV** = Piracy Intentions Variable
2 Frame of Reference

In this section theories that are relevant for this study will be presented, such as music piracy in large as well as artist liking, artist loyalty and attitudinal factors will be defined and measured. These theories will then be used when analyzing the collected empirical data for the case and as support when making conclusions.

2.1 Music Piracy

In order to gain a basic understanding of the general theoretical area of this study, i.e. music piracy, the main concepts are introduced below and piracy’s varying forms are presented and explained to understand what piracy is and what forms it can take. It is a crucial part of theory since it is contributing to the ‘whole picture’ of piracy that this study is contributing to. The theories presented later sections, such as consumer behavior, attitudes and loyalty, are to be translated and applied in the music piracy matter.

The music piracy can be considered a new, growing phenomenon since the late 20th century as the unauthorized use of copyrighted music started to be spread to tapes and CDs for the private use among individuals (Hiatt & Serpick, 2007). Over time the conduct of piracy changed from pirating CDs to internet piracy, bringing out the present issues of downloading illegally copyrighted music. Record companies and music organizations have been trying to stop the piracy of music, but the prevention of it is very hard, close to impossible as there are many skillful ‘amateur’ programmers that can create new computer softwares working as vehicles for music piracy (Wilson, 2003). Piracy in general can be defined as “a contested and value laden label given to activities which involve the unauthorized reproduction of copyrighted material” (Marshall, 2005, p. 110). The different ways of obtaining music has made the business models of the music industry to face a downturn (Hiatt & Serpick, 2007). There are six forms of music piracy that are worth mentioning, the file sharing being the largest type today (Marshall, 2005):

- **Counterfeiting.** The copying of legitimate music that even can include the art of the cover of the album. Often the intention is to fool the customer to think this is an original album.
- **Pirating.** Songs or albums are copied without copying the cover art, thus trying to only spread the music, and not to sell the album as it would be original.
- **Bootlegging.** Reproduction and distribution of music that has not been sold or spread by record companies. A lot of these materials come from live concerts and studio records.
- **Tape trading.** Exchanging CDs, DVDs, or other form of recorded tapes for non-commercial use, usually conducted by private collectors of music.
- **CD burning/home taping.** Private people burn albums or singles on their own CDs for non-commercial use.
- **File sharing.** Sharing of digital music on Internet via various programs such as BitTorrent, Napster and such.

Paradise’s (1999) study shows that the majority of pirates are students and/or teenagers who believe the internet is different compared to traditional markets. They are quite often even unaware of committing a crime when they are pirating music. One reason for piracy is the lack of a global controlling of the internet. One of the few global actors that attempts
to fight against music piracy is the International Federation of the Phonographic Industry (IFPI) together with major record labels.

### 2.1.1 Music Piracy Intentions

Much research has been conducted to better understand piracy and its implications for the music industry in larger contexts (macro economical) with the emphasis often being on the industry and how not on the consumers (Hiatt & Serpick, 2007). One of the more consumer-directed studies is done by Coyle et al. (2008) where the purpose was to explore which variables were affecting consumers’ intentions to pirate music. The study’s (also see figure 2A presented below) resulting variables were:

- **Demographics**, including age, gender, and income
- **Music piracy behaviors and purchase behaviors**
- **Attitudinal factors**, including legal/ethical, economic perceptions (i.e. loss for manufacturer, loss for artist and gain for consumer), and piracy as a form of evaluation and diffusion.

One can see that the variable of ‘Music Piracy Behaviors and Purchase Behaviors’ did not include sub-variables or any factors with presented mediating effects, and further investigating the study such results were to a large extent missing out; the only one included was that consumers did have a higher probable intention to download already physically owned music.

![Figure 2A – Model by Coyle et al. 2008](image_url)

This theory together with the research made by Chiou et al. (2005) who investigated the attitudinal variables resulting in a confirmation of the expected satisfaction, perceived prosecution risk, magnitude of consequence and social consensus to be having a significant effect on consumers’ piracy, is mostly the frontier of confirmed factors today. Chiou et al. (2005) also added the artist idolization most probably having an impact as well, but this is not confirmed in their later studies.
The fact that these two studies mostly are looking at the attitudes, and to a certain extent music piracy behavior, does leave a window of opportunity for this study to go closer into detail looking more specifically at purchase behaviors and piracy intentions of consumers from the viewpoint of consumer behavior theories (Shiffman & Kanuk, 1987; Wells & Prensky, 1996; Evans et al., 2009; Solomon et al., 2002).

2.1.2 The New Business Models on the Internet

To provide deep background of the music industry and on which business models this study could have an impact, we include the most used models, though briefly presented:

The new technologies have forced the Big Four record labels, which hold roughly an 85% share of the US market, to search for new business models such as the tip jar (Dubosson-Torbay, Pigneur & Usunier, 2004). Whilst the digital market for music is young, Levin, Levin and Heath (2005) investigated 40 undergraduate students presented results that searching airline tickets preferably were done online as equally preferred to be bought online or offline but music was preferred to be bought offline (cited in Haugtvedt, Machleit & Yalch, 2005). Some of the new business models established in the industry are being called the ‘traditional internet business models’ (Dubosson-Torbay, et al., 2004) and are consisting of:

The Subscription model, where users pay for content gaining access during a certain period,

The “à la carte”-model, where consumers pay for single songs downloadable (e.g. iTunes),

The online radio model, advertisement funded models, and

The Freemium model, which is partly ad-funded, partly subscription.

2.2 Should the consumer behavior result in paying?

The different theories presented hereby are the ones of explaining the consumers final behavior (or misbehavior) and the underlying intentions and motivations behind it. The theories are also leading towards the issues of loyalty and relational consumption highly relevant for the study’s explored variables.

2.2.1 Consumer Motivation

Theories about consumers’ behavior starts with motivation which is presented primarily as background for understanding more in depth issues of consumer intentions, behavior, and misbehavior. Consumer motivation is important because it is linked with individuals’ needs, attitudes and also often their future behavior. Consumers’ motivation towards paying for music or pirating music is important for the ability of recognizing underlying dynamics of piracy behavior, i.e. the motivation to purchase or pirate music.

Solomon, Bamossy and Askegaard (1999) state motivation to explain why consumers behave the way they do whilst Hawkins and Mothersbaugh (2010) formulate it as being the basis for behavior and defined “the process by which and individual recognizes a need and takes action to satisfy it” (Wells & Prensky, 1996, p. 227). A ‘need’ refers to the difference between a consumer’s present state and an ideal state that is desired (Wells & Prensky, 1996). It could be said that fulfilling the need to reach the ideal state is the goal, and the goals are factors motivating consumers’ behavior (Hawkins & Mothersbaugh, 2010; Wells & Prensky, 1996). Some needs are inborn and others acquired; inborn are biogenetic needs that can be considered as primary needs, whereas acquired needs are physiological which can then be clas-
tified as secondary needs (Statt, 1999; Schiffman & Kanuk, 1987). Solomon et al. (1999) add that the needs can be derived to wants, e.g. that people face the need for music on a regular basis, but what people choose to listen to is often based on wants. For example, do consumers want to listen to Britney Spears or Audioslave to satisfy their need of music? Once the motivational process has been in use, other behavioral processes step in closing in at the first hypothesis. The ones stepping in are perception and learning, which enable consumers to obtain information of products and support to organize the information leading to attitude formation, which in turn is of assistance for consumers to value the benefits obtainable from a product. In this case, it would mean benefits obtainable from purchasing music comparable with benefits from pirating and the experiences of this is forming attitudes. The last action, decision making, allows a person to decide which chosen product or way to attain the product would fulfill the need in the best possible way (Wells & Prensky, 1996).

Theories also show existing motivational conflicts that the consumers face, both positive and negative, and many purchase decisions are made upon factors of two or more motivations due that consumers frequently discover themselves being positive and negative in different aspects towards a need or goal, i.e. both see the good and bad sides of music piracy, which are pirated music to be free of charge and its illegality. The most common motivational conflicts among consumer are according to Solomon et al. (1999), Hawkins & Mothersbaugh (2010) and Solomon et al. (2002):

- **Approach-approach conflict.** Here are two attractive alternatives; for example, two desirable music albums that a consumer would like to have, but that the consumer has to choose only one of them.

- **Approach-avoidance conflict.** Most of the products and services have both positive and negative attributes. This kind of conflict occurs when consumers would like to fulfill a need, but at the same time, for some reason, would like to avoid it, e.g. obtaining an album of a popular music artist free of charge is desirable, but illegal actions required like downloading from BitTorrent is a negative factor.

- **Avoidance-avoidance conflict.** Here are two undesirable alternatives to choose from. Consumers could face such a situation with two undesirable alternatives if they either had to pay for a CD album, or instead downloaded their favorite artists’ album illegally.

### 2.2.2 Consumer Attitudes

Consumers form attitudes from experiences and situations about products/brands/objects and the attainable benefits, attitudes work as an effective determent of future decisions made by consumers (Wells & Prensky, 1996). The outcome of one’s actions is based on feelings and beliefs, which shape the idea of attitudes (Wells & Prensky, 1996), more clearly defined as following: “an attitude is a predisposition to act in a consistent way toward an object” (Wells & Prensky, 1996, p. 313). Hawkins and Mothersbaugh (2010, p. 392) regard an attitude to be “an enduring organization of motivational, emotional, perceptual, and cognitive processes with respect to some aspect of our environment”.

Solomon et al. (1999) claim attitudes to be relatively constant through time and seem to be general since they are suitable for not just one – but several events. The theories by Schiff-
man and Kanuk (1987) however state attitudes not being entirely constant but subject to change during time, given certain circumstances. Despite attitudes not being fully constant, there do exist strong correlation between consumer attitudes and consumer behavior, which indicates that attitudes are somewhat consistent. East (1990) discovers attitudes to lead to action if the person’s behavior is not being constrained, hence it can be presumed a correlation between attitudes and action also exists.

Consumers mainly form attitudes in order to deal more efficiently with the environment, more closely evaluate a situation once and remember the decisions made then for future similar events. That is why they can be seen as functions for people in their everyday lives (Wells & Prensky, 1996) and the four most common functions and their explanations summarized by Solomon et al. (1999) are the following:

- **The utilitarian function** means people as an example had positive experiences with a certain way of attaining music compared to another option and therefore continue using it (e.g. pirating digital music or purchasing physical CD’s).
- **The value-expressive function** allows consumers to show their values, individuality, and lifestyle for others e.g. pirating as to represent anti-establishment values.
- **Ego-defensive function** protects consumers from outside threats or internal uncomfortable feelings, e.g. consumers continuing to pursue music piracy due to peer pressure or similar, or to pirate music for being able to brag with a large music collection despite low incomes restricting legal music acquisition.
- **The knowledge function** is an attitude formation motivated by a requirement of e.g. increasing knowledge in medicine to be able to understand products, hence one become more positive towards learning due to motivational factors with the goal.

If combining these bullet points about attitudinal theories and motivational theories one see that there is a high number of possible combinations, if not infinite due that they are non-excluding and consumers may inhabit several of the attitudes and conflicts simultaneously. The first hypothesis can be derived from these theories; that is, attitudes formed by earlier experiences should have an impact on consumers’ piracy intentions.

**Example:** Since attitudes often show a high correlation with consumers’ intentions and behavior, attitudes that consider piracy as wrong are likely to decrease intentions to pirate. For example, Lindsey thinks that piracy is stealing and that stealing is wrong. Lindsey is an honest person and always pays for her purchases. It is therefore likely that she formed a certain attitude towards stealing in general and wants to pay for the music she will acquire. Due to this we state the first hypothesis as:

**H1:** Attitudinal factors, i.e. seeing piracy as unethical and wrong decreases consumers’ intentions to pirate music.

### 2.3 Consumer Behavior and Decision to Pirate or not

When further going deeper into these theories, one is coming to the end product of motivations and attitudes – the behavior. It is also imperative before that mention consumer intentions. This is, because the consumer behavior is closely linked to the purpose of this study seen in the light of consumers’ intentions, motivations and attitudes and hence must be explained in a detailed manner for enhancing understanding. It can be said that in order
to understand future consumer behavior, the actual consumers is required to have well-formed beliefs, attitudes and intentions for the behavior they are carrying out (Peter & Olson, 2008).

Consumer behavior per se is much of a catch all term including aspects of motivation, attitudes and intentions with the aggregate outcome resulting in real consumer behavior; hence the term includes all aspects and not only the end behavior (Evans et al., 2009).

The definition of consumer behavior is cited in Shiffman and Kanuk (1987, p.6) and interpreted as “the behavior that consumers display in searching for, purchasing, using, evaluating, and disposing of products, services and ideas which they expect will satisfy their needs”. To the case of music piracy connected research done by Al-Rafee and Cronan (2006), which presents that consumers’ beliefs about the outcome of their behavior when pirating or paying has a strong influence on the intentions to pirate digital content. They also stress the differences in perceived importance of the issue, which is the impact of piracy on artist as well as on consumers or welfare. This result is further confirmed by Gopal, Sanders, Bhattacharjee, Agrawal and Wagner (2002) with the implication of their results that show a high probability of awareness of the implications of piracy to be a factor lowering the pirate behavior and also confirmed by Coyle et al. (2008), where the economic loss of the artist and label is seen as factors involved in the behavior and decision process. So this further confirms the impact of attitudes and pre-formed thoughts on piracy, and how it is related with behavior.

The conative behavioral part includes the mechanism of the consumers’ total behavior in form of the latter mentioned decision making, that is, whether to buy or not, deciding between products and outcome expectations of the product meaning probability to fulfill needs (Antonides & Fred van Raaij, 1998; Wells & Prensky, 1996; Evans & Foxall, 2009).

The concept of decision making is divided into three major levels of evaluation, and they are according to Solomon et al. (1999):

**Extensive**: this is involving effort in evaluating criteria and factors highly involved with the need, buying product/service niche magazines to enhance their knowledge to make the right decision, e.g. deciding whether to pirate or not when circumstances change, as the introduction of IPRED (Nilsson, 2008), or the very first time you download.

**Limited**: in the situation of limited decision making the consumer make use of existing criteria to a returning purchase decision, e.g. “I pirated music before, hence I could continue”.

**Routine**: consists of undeviating repetition of decision making practices, resulting in same brand choice and so forth, often used on frequent goods such as food or music, such as automatically pirating music without making any new decisions whether to pirate or not.

Later studies in the field of consumer decisions have shown an improvement of the consumers thinking in cost-benefit terms and more accurately in benefit-cost trade-off terms (Bettman, 1979; Payne, Bettman & Johnson, 1993). Consumers in this framework are more in line with making satisfying decisions rather than optimal and the basic idea stated by Mishra and Olshavsky (2005) behind the new more relaxed assumptions is that people are trying to make decisions that maximize their own utility (cited in Haugvedt, Machleit & Yalch, 2005). This is conformed with the consumers’ short term thinking on the effect of piracy rather than the long term downturn in the music industry when the consumer is deciding whether to pirate or not.
2.3.1 Consumer Misbehavior

Although consumers often behave according to their own values, it is however not always the case, but instead with other goals in mind, act differently, i.e. misbehave. Piracy could be seen as misbehaving in music markets and that is why this concept is important to explain for recognizing what consumer misbehavior is. Consumer misbehavior, according to Fullerton and Punj (2004), consists of “behavioral acts by consumers which violate the generally accepted norms of conduct in consumption situations and thus disrupt the consumption order” (cited in Evans et al., 2009, p.435). In this field there have been different studies carried out, e.g. studies of the acquisition of products, consumption and the disposal of them (Holbrook, 1987), but also different ethical considerations that led the consumers acquisition behavior (Muncy & Vitell, 1992). This term has often gone named under jaycustomer where the characteristics defining the jaycustomer is one who does not pay for products (or at least not full price), ignores rules of the consumer-firm relationship and often fails to pay because of lack of concern, not of pure criminal intentions.

Another issue raised by Holt (2002) is the cultural authority perspective that in short refers to the notion that consumers themselves try to allocate resources due to social distance like between one consumer and large, multinational organizations (cited in Evans et al., 2009). This theory is connectable with the theories by Coyle et al. (2008) where they distinguish between piracy’s economical impact on artist and record label. The larger the social distance is perceived to be, the greater the rebellion, which might lead to forms of misbehavior being seen as legitimate (Houston & Gassenheimer, 1987). Fullerton and Punj (2002, cited in Evans et al., 2009) present reasons for consumer misbehavior and those seven are:

1. If consumers are unable to fulfill their need through legal means, it is likely that they conduct misbehaviors such as thieving.
2. Some consumers might see the misbehavior as a kick or thrilling experience.
3. Consumers lacking out on normal moral constraints, which means they do not see the problem with stealing.
4. Teenagers (and other subpopulations and/or groups) might use the misbehavior as positioning themselves from others or their expressed values.
5. The consumer negative attitudes against the firm or larger organizations.
6. Situational factors, such as crowds, warmth and noise can make people misbehave when standing in line waiting for the subway or to get in to a nightclub.
7. Consumers make calculations and rationalizations of the risks and perceived rewards related to the misbehavior, with reward being larger than the risk.

The characteristics of music piracy are perceived by the researchers to be in line with consumer misbehavior theories and the reasoning thereof. The polemic of misbehavior is much related with consumer ethics theories (Evans et al., 2009) that could be a factor leading to certain consumer behavior and hence gone through in the following section.

2.3.2 Ethics behind Piracy or Purchase of Music

Ethics is a concept seen as supporting theory to the other theories of this study, as it can be seen directly linked to the consumers’ piracy behavior. Piracy is often practically and legally seen as stealing and hence connected to the values and ethics of the consumer. Therefore ethics may affect the behavior of people and is explained here shortly to understand how ethics, behavior, and piracy are interrelated. Consumer ethics is important for companies due to the losses that unethical behavior of consumers causes (Hiatt & Serpick, 2007), but eth-
ics is not important only for firms, but for individuals and society as well (Babakus, Cornwell, Mitchell & Schlegelmilch, 2004). According to Ferrell and Gresham, (1985); Ferrell et al., (1989); Hunt and Vitell, (1986), Hunt and Vitell (1992), ethics come into play when people are faced with a situation that has morally unclear content (cited in Al-Khatib, Vitell & Rawwas, 1997). This enlightens the problem of a new phenomenon as the internet still could be seen as, having a slight abstract sense of justice. This confirmed in investigations by Chen, Shang and Lin (2008), implying that internet piracy is enhanced by low levels of moral reasonability of internet users.

Solomon (1992) argues that the performance and well-being of markets depends strongly on the rules agreed by consumers and producers and their mutual interests (cited in Fullerton, Kerch & Doche, 1996). Morgan and Hunt (1994) in turn argue that in order for the relationship between buyers and sellers to be healthy and successful, one must value it; unethical behavior from either side leads to a poorer relationship, increased inefficiency and unproductiveness (cited in Fullerton, Kerch & Doche, 2004). The ongoing unethical behavior of music piracy could partly be explained by Fullerton et al. (1996) who state that the unethical issue often is regarded as less important if the negative economical impacts of such are small to its object, e.g. the impact on the industry if pirating only one song.

These theories can be seen as explanations for the complexity of simultaneously braking and enhancing piracy behavior, or the intentions for consumers to conduct music piracy. Still these issues are more connected to legal issues, e.g. penalizing music piracy harder increasing the ‘unethicalness’ to decrease piracy attitudes (Lam & Tan, 2001). This contributes to the ‘whole picture’ of consumers’ certain behavior, but more importantly also leads to exploring further variables that could predict and/or explain consumer behavior, i.e. brand loyalty and product liking.

## 2.4 Levels of Loyalty towards an Artist

The loyalty derived from brand theories, where brand has been changed to artist, i.e. the concept of artist loyalty, is of the most relevant theories in this study due that many theories interact with the factors of willingness to pay rather than pirate. Also loyalty is seen as a good predictor of future consumer behavior and a part of the consumer behavioral (conative) part of theories. Hence the concept of loyalty is explored deeper below.

Artists do in their strategies try to develop and enhance the consumer retention rate by creating dialogue between themselves and the consumers, which later hopefully would lead to a competitive advantage towards other artists. Consumers that are loyal towards an artist can be passionate to her/him, i.e. very loyal and preferring in choice of artist which leads to decreased search costs (transaction costs) and risk for the consumer (Evans et al., 2009). The risk part of the theory is though double sided – and applicable in the music piracy case due to that the risk often is associated with the experiences, meaning “one has to taste to know”-dynamics (Caves, 2000). One would for instance have the requirement of taking the risk of buying the album before being able to fully evaluate it, and hence the consumer takes a risk, and the relief of risk if pirating the music instead. Consumer loyalty is traditionally based on deterministic modeling of cognitive processes, which means probabilities of processes reoccurring as behavior (Evans et al., 2009).

The concept of artist loyalty which in this case well could be described as artist (brand-) loyalty is defined by Solomon et al. (1999, p. 231) in the following way: “a pattern of repeat product purchases accompanied by an underlying positive attitude towards the brand”. Defining what
artist loyalty really is however depends on the point of view - the concept of loyalty can be defined in terms of consumer behavior or attitudes towards the product from the artist (Schiffman & Kanuk, 1987), but are commonly referred to as consumer behavior which suits this study well.

The artist loyalty is referable to repeat purchasing behavior which is a good sign of continued purchases from that certain artist. It may arise from the consumer liking: the artist based on objective motives and if the artist has been active a longer time, it can also build on emotional affection, hence, it is seen integrated into the consumer’s character or connected with previous experiences. Due to the emotional bonds between consumers and artists, loyal consumers often too strongly respond to artist changes (Solomon et al., 1999).

Oliver (1997) claims loyalty to some extent having similar kind of components as attitudes, which are cognitive, affective and conative parts. These can be considered as different phases leading to a new developed loyalty. The parts are according to Oliver (1997):

- **Cognitive loyalty:** This is the first phase where one artist or product presents itself as better than others in the market. The loyalty exists towards the artist because of the information and feeling of the artist supremacy. The loyalty stage is however at this point still very low. If the purchase transaction is based on a non-provocative situation, the loyalty is not anything else than the consumer’s performance.

- **Affective loyalty:** At the second stage the liking between the consumer and artist has been created due to the satisfaction the consumer has gained from consuming the artist’s music, and the loyalty towards the artist is as strong as the liking for the music. Consumer loyalty can however been changed to another artist if the satisfaction rate changes to a lower state.

- **Conative loyalty:** The third phase is the behavioral intention point, which is affected by the frequent positive experiences of the artist and/or music. The consumers are more devoted to purchase and consume from a certain artist. This can be considered as a rational, expected action, but fully understood by the consumer.

- **Action loyalty:** Kuhl and Beckman (1985) appoint the state where the intentions are changed to actions as “action control” (cited by Oliver, 1997). The preceding state of loyalty is here transformed into a willingness to act - if the same action of consuming an artist occurs frequently, action apathy has been formed, thus making it possible to by action automatically repurchase the music from that certain artist.

The above mentioned stages of loyalty and its implications can be summarized in the following way. Cognitive loyalty concentrates on the music’s quality side, affective loyalty is based upon the likability of the artist music and conative loyalty means the willingness to repurchase music from that artist and action loyalty refers to auto-purchasing of the music. These theories about loyalty is showing that a well established loyalty towards the artist based on earlier experiences often is seen and used as a predictor of future consumer behavior, hence the second hypothesis can be derived from this.

**Example:** Since loyalty works as predictor of the consumers’ future consumption behavior, where high loyalty results in continued purchase behavior, it is likely that a consumer loyal to a certain artist would prefer to purchase the artists music instead of pirate it. For example, Lisa has all her life listened to Madonna, all the way from Madonna’s first appearance in the 1980s. Lisa instantly liked Madonna and her music and during time the liking
created a loyal bond towards Madonna. Now years and decades later, Lisa does not want to pirate Madonna’s music, but instead buy her albums, since being loyal means supporting the artist. The concept of the loyalty leads to the hypothesis, which is:

\[ H2: \text{Artist/band loyalty reduces the consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.} \]

### 2.4.1 Rating Loyalty through Liking

As mentioned in the previous section the consumer loyalty is based upon the previously established bonds of liking of either the artist or the artist’s music. Further discussing the more obvious points of loyalty, one other ingredient needs to be added for a loyalty bond to be formed between the consumer and the artist, that of time or several events. This due that loyalty is built on repeated positive (likeable) experiences, hence not a case of one single event (Foxall, 1980). The reality of emerging new artists on the market for music is stressing the importance to also see the impact of single event effects, i.e. first experiences or likeability factors and their impact on consumers purchase and piracy intentions.

 Consumers’ levels of loyalty when measured have been categorized into different levels (Evans et al., 2009) and are presented with from the different levels of loyalty different behavioral intentions and real behavior. Solomon (2002) and Kim (2008) confirm four important levels and the behavior ‘appropriate’ to the certain level of loyalty:

**Loyalists:** completely satisfied consumers claiming high levels of liking and therefore also loyalty. Some of them act as advocates’ and communicate their positive experiences to others by word of mouth, i.e. recommending songs, albums and music videos et cetera.

**Defectors:** consumers who have low to low-medium levels of perceived liking and loyalty (hence also more probable to change products or tell others about their bad experiences).

**Mercenaries:** facing high levels of perceived liking, but low to medium levels of loyalty.

**Hostages:** shows low to medium levels of liking, but high levels of loyalty. The term hostages comes due to that these consumers often are stuck because there are no substitutes or often monopolistic situations, for example badly working state owned railways.

Exploring the theories even deeper, one of the common ways to measure loyalty is by using the TNS measure (TNS being one of the world’s leading market research companies) (Percy, Hansen & Randrup, 2004; Kim, 2008; Solomon et al., 2002) which derives two main factors of loyalty useable in both long term (loyalty) or short term (liking) analysis:

**Behavioral:** frequency of purchase and/or use, monetary value spent on product/brand, purchases across range available, share of budget spent on brand/product and extent of recommending product/brand to others.

**Attitudinal:** perceived performance of product/brand, consumers declared intent to consume and the perceived competitive advantage of the product/brand compared to others.

Wells and Prensky (1996) note that the only way to attain this crucial information is simply by asking consumers about their perceived liking conducted in focus groups, interviews or surveys. The measure of liking is connecting the short term effect of liking to the long term bond of loyalty formed between the consumer and the artist enables to derive the third hypothesis, also confirmed by Fournier (1998) concluding that liking, love, passion and intimacy between the consumer and provider leads to loyalty, i.e. purchase behavior.
Example: If consumers like the artist’s music and the artist it is more likely that they would pay for the artist’s music instead of pirating it. For example, Sarah likes the emerging artist Lady Gaga (first songs heard and interviews made by Lady Gaga et cetera). The liking would therefore consequently lead to loyalty formation, hence having positive effects on Sarah’s purchase behavior. The concept of liking leads to the third hypothesis:

H3: Artist/band liking reduce the consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.

2.5 Summary of Theories and Hypothesis

The theoretical framework is built as an extension of the earlier established theories and studies made in the field of music piracy and the consumers’ behavior in music piracy situations. The main contributions with high frequency of being referred to are two studies of Coyle et al. (2008) and Chiou et al. (2005) where they explore what factors are having an impact on the consumers piracy intentions. These conclude that different category-sets of variables such as the findings of Coyle et al. (2008) where demographics (age, income) and attitudes towards piracy and the implications of piracy (consumer welfare gain, consumer utility gain and artists and music producers economic loss) have an impact. Furthermore, the findings by Chiou et al. (2005) highlight the more practical issues of probability of being prosecuted for the crime of music piracy and social consensus as main factors.

These facts lead us towards the theories to explain the behavior of consumers, hence looking closer into consumer behavior (Holt, 2002; Muncy & Vitell, 1992; Houston & Gassenheimer, 1987; Holbrook, 1987) and the prerequisites and implications of these, such as consumer motivations (Statt, 1999; Schiffman & Kanuk, 1987), consumer attitudes (Hawkins and Mothersbaugh, 2010; Wells & Prensky, 1996; East 1990) consumer intentions (Peter & Olson, 2008; Al-Rafee & Cronan, 2006) and central to this study – loyalty (Solomon, 2002; et al., 1999; Oliver, 1997) and liking (Evans et al., 2009; Fournier, 1998; Foxall, 1980; Kim, 2008).

These theories start out from the consumers forming attitudes towards both the concept of piracy and the certain artist and most importantly the motivations behind these attitudinal formations, i.e. the reasons of moving from a present state to the ideal state and why consumers chooses to pirate instead of purchase. This kind of questions is further leading towards the theories of explaining the consumers’ behavior, which is a result of a mix from attitudes, motivational factors and ethics, as well as one aspect central to this study – loyalty. From this theoretical framework, three hypotheses are formed that are connected with the sections of attitudes, loyalty and liking and are presented below:

H1: Attitudinal factors, i.e. seeing piracy as unethical and wrong decreases consumers’ intentions to pirate music.
H2: Artist/band loyalty reduces the consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.
H3: Artist/band liking reduces the consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.

These three hypotheses are derived and seen as most suitable to answer or research questions and hence the purpose, also presented below:

◊ What impact does artist liking have on consumers’ willingness to pay and not to pirate?
◊ What impact does artist loyalty have on consumers’ willingness to pay and not to pirate?
◊ What impact do attitudinal factors of consumers have upon the piracy intentions?

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to analyze the artist liking, artist loyalty and attitudinal factors impact on consumers’ music piracy intentions.
3 Method

This chapter will explain and state the research approach and strategy chosen. The data collection method will be explained as well as which techniques have been used to enable us to answer the objectives of the study. The section will be finished with a discussion of the trustworthiness of the research.

The methodology undertaken in this research is an explanatory study approach to the problem presented previously in the theoretical framework concerning artist liking, artist loyalty and attitudinal factors. The empirical data is collected through conducting two questionnaires measuring variables derived from theories earlier presented. The questionnaires enable quantitative data to be collected, gathered and encoded to describe the phenomenon of music piracy in the scope that was chosen to conduct research within. The methods used including inter alia the process, the questionnaires and collection of data are to be discussed below in the light of the purpose of the study:

3.1 Research Approach

According to Holme and Solvang (1991), it is hard to reach the goals of the research without awareness of how to use methods to answer the purpose of the study correctly. Consequently it is discussed and decided upon which methods should be used as most appropriate to reach the goals with of the study. Shortly, the approach and methods chosen make this a deductive study and through a survey explaining how a change in one variable produces a change in another, a method often referred to as an experiment (Saunders et al., 2007). This is since it exist a broad field of theory (consumer behavior, loyalty and so on) at hand to be applied on the phenomenon of music piracy and the results of the study being presented as explanatory. Clear reasoning is important due to numerous reasons; firstly with a logical approach, it is possible to choose the research design on better information, secondly it is helpful in the choice of research strategy and, finally, with knowledge of different research approaches, the authors are able to adjust to the limitations of the study (Easterby-Smith et al., 2002; cited in Saunders et al., 2007).

3.1.1 Explanatory Study

This study is made as an explanatory study which is conducted when variables and their characteristics and relationships between variables are wanted to be described closer (Saunders et al., 2007). The objective of this study is to be able to describe important features of the phenomenon of interest. Here an explanatory study helps to appreciate the attributes of consumers in a certain situation, analytically reflect about different dynamics in a certain situation as well as pave way for ideas that can be further investigated (Sekaran, 2003). This suits the purpose of this study well. Explanatory research helps to answer such questions as what impact attitudes could have on piracy, when the critical moment of building loyalty is, or if liking works as an indicator alone, where i.e. which market this is most applicable on, the online or offline market and the differences between them, and how these variables and dynamics are correlated to each other. The most important benefit of conducting an explanatory study with quantitative data is its accuracy; errors of the results are quite easy to detect and hence in extension to be narrowed down as much as possible (Zikmund, 2000). An explanatory approach was chosen before descriptive and casual research because the unsuitability to the purpose by the two latter variations where an descriptive study would focus more on categorizing and portraying the nature of music piracy and causal research would focus on identifying and clearly defining cause-and-effect associations (Zikmund, 2000). Hence the explanatory study was chosen due to the suitability and benefits it brings along for this study.
3.1.2 Deducing or Inducing the Theories?

When involved in research concerning previous theories, there are three main conducts of handling these theories. The three mainly used are deductive, inductive and abductive, where easily explained the conduct is going from theories applying it to empirical findings, or going from empirical findings creating theories or a hybrid between the two (Saunders et al., 2007). As this study has chosen the manner of a deductive study due to the large base of existing consumer behavior theories at hand to be applied on the phenomenon of music piracy, the behavior is to deduce the hypotheses from these theories to be tested in ‘the real world’. Of course all three alternatives could be seen as used since if looking more closely to the conduct of research, first hypotheses were deduced from consumer theory, then tested, and next induced as new findings into the existing theories of consumers’ piracy intentions. Though it is to be seen as the first deduction of theories that decides whether the study is to be seen as deductive or inductive (Saunders et al., 2007; Sekaran, 2003; Sekaran, 2000).

When looking closer to the nature of the deductive approach one can find there are seven steps (Sekaran, 2003; Zikmund, 2000; Sekaran, 2000) that are usually undertaken both to further confirm the right approach chosen, as well as guidance for how to carry on with the study (Bryman & Bell, 2007). These steps are discussed below:

1. Observation. When noticing differences in the phenomenon, or the need for altering theories for new fields for research. This means looking at traditional behavioral theories of for example loyalty on new market phenomenon as dampening music piracy. If these differences are considered having significant consequences the next steps can be taken.
2. Preliminary information gathering. In-depth information is obtained for the area of research, which can be done by reading previous reports, academic articles or interviewing people, i.e. the researchers grasping the ‘whole picture’ of the area to study.
3. Theory formulation. The previous theories are disintegrated and integrated in a rational way where the different variables and factors can be tested with face logic.
4. Hypothesizing. Assumptions are stated and later observed if these seem true or not.
5. Further scientific data collection. Data about the variables is collected to be able to test if the stated hypotheses are acceptable or to be rejected.
6. Data analysis. The empirical data that has been collected is decoded, measured statistically, operationalized and analyzed to see if the hypotheses were acceptable or not.
7. Deduction. This is the procedure of drawing conclusions after deducting the empirical data, where one can see if the deducted theories where applicable on the primarily observed deviation or new field of testing the theories on, e.g. if loyalty has an impact on the consumers’ music piracy intentions.

3.2 Research Design

The questions of research design refer to more hands on approaches of this study, such as if it is conducted as an experiment or survey. The research design to this study was chosen with consideration to the constraints of time and geographical mobility of the researchers, as well as the benefits different designs add to the study. Hence, due to the nature of the earlier stated mindset of this study’s conduct of being a deductive study, the most beneficial and suitable (i.e. most commonly used in these contexts) designs is conducting a survey or making a case study (Bryman & Bell, 2007). This study makes use of a survey used on consumers in the Jönköping region.
The benefits of a survey are that of its ease of collecting large amounts of data compared to methods involving in depth interviews and hence motivated both by the limited time frame this study is given as well as the type of data collected being quantitative rather than qualitative. In the process of conducting a survey, it is imperative of correct and well thought sampling strategies and methods, as well as comprehensive pilot studies to ensure a good response rate and a sample able to be considered generalizable. Since this study was conducted by using convenience sampling, the results are not seen as fully generalizable. (Saunders et al., 2007)

3.3 Research Strategy

To ensure a high quality of the conclusions drawn from a study, regardless of data collection methods such as surveys or observations, data collected to studies would be best of if triangulated, which means the study’s outcome is confirmed from multiple sources (Saunders et al., 2007). Therefore the strategy of the methodology was to collect data from two sources; first from the students of Jönköping University and then from students to the population of the Jönköping region, i.e. all consumers in the region. There are primarily two different types of data collectable; the quantitative data where data can be numerated and the qualitative data with non-numerated data. Qualitative data are opinions and more open ended questions (Saunders et al., 2007). Due to the intentions of conducting a multiple regression analysis (explained more close in later sections) the data is best suited as numerated. In addition, this type of data enabled to collect and analyze larger amounts of data in the given time frame; hence the data collected was quantitative data that measured the different variables of loyalty, liking, attitudinal factors and piracy intentions.

A quantitative study involves some key steps beginning with deducing hypotheses from theory and designing the method of the research, followed by a selection of sample, data collection and analysis of the data collected, finally ending with making conclusions and either accepting or rejecting the hypotheses (Bryman & Bell, 2007). The use of deduction of ‘real’ hypotheses was used in this study to more accurately apply the concepts of theories about liking, loyalty and attitudes on the phenomenon of music piracy and transformed into measurable variables that have been encoded to the data collecting process.

3.4 Data Collection

The process of data collection in this study is to be considered as a collection of primary data since it is required to make use of empirical findings about the impacts of the marketing concepts on music piracy chosen to be investigated. Secondary data would involve the search for answers to the research questions in for example books, academics articles or news papers, which are data collected by others (Saunders et al., 2007). The only source of secondary data operationalized in the study is that of the theoretical framework. The data collection was conducted by questionnaires and is discussed closer later, with a target of certain samples.

3.4.1 Selection of Sample

As earlier stated, two sources of data was made use of to triangulate the findings and hence ensure higher quality in the analysis. Samples of approximately 60-120 is proper for a explanatory study which is more ambitiously considered in the study’s second data collection with the whole Jönköping region as population, which also is seen as the main, primary
data collection, hence required extra attention for ensuring higher validity. The required sample can be calculated as $N > 50 + 8m$ where $m$ is the number of variables and $N$ is the number of people in the sample. Hence, $50 + 8 \times$ four variables equals $N = 82$, where 82 is the minimum size of the sample (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The population refers to the group of individuals that are wanted to be investigated and from which the sample then is drawn. If the sample is large enough, it is possible to draw conclusions about the findings extracted from the data obtained from the sample and hence be generalized to the whole population (Davies, 2007).

The population used in this study was the population of consumers in the Jönköping region, where of two sample groups were drawn; firstly the students of the Jönköping University, and secondly the broad public. These two samples, or population of consumers in the Jönköping region and sub-population of students in Jönköping were chosen with purpose of firstly in a manner of a more exploratory approach to collect data from the students and consequently see what variables are most interesting and usable, then to make use of the benefits of triangulated data continue on with a larger population and sample, the broad public.

3.4.1.1 Non Probability Sampling
Within these two sample groups chosen, non-probability sampling methods were used, which could consist of several types of non sampling, among them convenience sampling, snowball sampling and quota sampling (Bryman & Bell, 2007). Convenience sampling was to this case the most beneficial and as the name tells, convenient method to choose due to easiness, the chosen measurement instrument and difficulty to distinguish a sample that would be more representative than an other to music piracy (Sekaran, 2003). The method was carried out in the way that the authors stood in the School of Education and Communication cafeterias’ entrance and asked potential respondents that were passing by if they would like to participate. The same sampling method was be used when looking at the broad public, but located and carried out in the middle of A6 shopping center in Jönköping. The other discarded sampling methods include snowball sampling which involves an establishment of new contacts from earlier respondents and hence is seen as too time consuming (Bryman & Bell, 2007) and quota sampling which could be regarded as stratified sampling meaning choosing a certain proportion of individuals before hand from several pre-chosen groups on that represent the population (Sekaran, 2003).

Therefore due to high suitability to the research context, non-probability convenience sampling was chosen, which is further justified to use instead of probability sampling by Bryman and Bell (2007), who state that if using a probability sampling method, extensive amounts of preparation is required and hence it is frequently avoided in short time frame research. In other words, it is too difficult and costly to carry out in this context.

3.4.1.2 Non-responsiveness
According to Bryman and Bell (2007) non-responsiveness is a cause of non-sampling error which is possible to arise when collecting data from individuals. Why this non-sampling error has a risk to occur is because numerous reasons, for example people’s reluctance to assist, incapability to be reached or for various other explanations they cannot answer. The non-respondents of course are incapable of contributing to the main results, but nevertheless a good indicator of eventual problems in the methodology and therefore attention should be paid to the non-responsiveness rate (Sanders et al., 2007). The first data collection was on a goal of sample size of 120 students in Jönköping University with a time frame of two days of data collection. In that data collection 77 respondents answered the
survey, but 15 incorrectly, hence the final response were 62 students and the non-responsiveness equaling 48.3 percent. The incorrectly filled questionnaires were an important point of self-criticism and evaluation further discussed in the sections below concerning the measurement instruments. It is also worth mentioning that 10 of the 15 did not tick the box of the control question “I am a student” and hence were disregarded as incorrect for that reason. The second data collection conducted at A6 shopping-center resulted in a total of 82 responses of a possible sample of 100, resulting in a non-responsiveness of 18 percent. During this round of data collection, there were no cases of incorrectly filled in questionnaires.

3.5 Measurement Instrument

To measure the variables of loyalty, liking, attitudinal factors and piracy intentions of the consumers, this was conceptualized in encoded, numerated measurements of the variables about which collected data for using two questionnaires; one for the main population and one for the sub-population. These variables were measured by sets of three indicators, each trio measuring one variable, e.g. liking. This construction was used in the questionnaire to minimize the risk of the respondent misunderstanding the questions and similar problems and ensuring a higher accuracy and validity in the measure of the variables (Bryman & Bell, 2007). The questionnaires were used as vehicle to collect data about these variables were two self-completion questionnaires (both included in appendix), which type were chosen due to the fact that this is a quantitative study where standardized questions with scale answers are most appropriate (Bryman & Bell, 2007). Another potential technique to use in this thesis was structured interviews, which however was discarded because its nature of more open ended questions, being more time consuming as well attaining more qualitative data which this study is not aiming for (Bryman & Bell, 2007; Saunders et al., 2007).

3.6 Questionnaire Design

The self-completion questionnaire’s main concept idea is that they both measure the independent variables of artist liking, artist loyalty, attitudinal factors and piracy intentions through 18 respectively 12 questions. The first questionnaire of more exploratory nature was answered by students, the 18 questions were derived from theories as presented below (please note that all questions are presented fully in original and translated form in appendices (8.4 and 8.5) while the second questionnaire’s questions are found on next page).

Q1 Liking – Money spending (Solomon et al., 1999) Q10 Liking – Purchase intent. (Solomon et al., 1999)
Q2 Liking – Frequency of use (Solomon et al., 1999) Q11 Liking – Competitive adv. (Solomon et al., 1999)
Q3 Loyalty – Previous ownership (Evans et al., 2009) Q12 Liking – Consumer satisfaction (Evans et al., 2009)
Q4 Liking – Purchase intention (Solomon et al., 1999) Q13 Liking – Frequency of use (Solomon et al., 1999)
Q5 Liking – Competitive adv. (Solomon et al., 1999) Q14 Loyalty – Perceived likeability (Evans et al., 2009)
Q6 Liking – Consumer satisfaction (Evans et al., 2009) Q15 Loyalty – Previous experience (Oliver, 1997)
Q7 Piracy – Real consumer behavior question (fact) Q16 Loyalty – Future intention (Solomon et al., 1999)
Q8 Loyalty – Previous experiences (Oliver, 1997) Q17 Piracy – Real consumer intention (opinion)
Q9 Piracy – Real consumer behavior question (fact) Q18 Piracy – Real consumer behavior question (fact)

Each variable was measured with questions consisting of two bipolar statements that respondents had to consider and select the one which they most agreed with on a numerated
encoded scale. Rating questions and not category- or open-ended questions were used due to the purposes of the data; both these techniques are more clearly explained in upcoming sections discussing the implications and dynamics of such methods chosen.

The second self-completion questionnaire which consisted of 12 questions was also derived from the theoretical framework and with help of the most interesting usable findings from the first study. The main data collection’s purpose was to test our stated hypotheses and answer our research questions; hence the questionnaire was constructed on a less exploratory basis. The second questionnaire’s questions were derived as below:

To answer our first hypothesis (H1)…

H1: Attitudinal factors, i.e. seeing piracy as unethical and wrong decreases consumers’ intentions to pirate music.

…we wanted to measure the attitudes towards music piracy of consumers or if they spend money on music and formulated the three questions as:

Question 10 – It feels wrong to download music illegally from this artist (Det känns fel att ladda hem musik olagligt av denna artist). (Hawkins & Mothersbaugh, 2010)

Question 11 – I think it is generally wrong to download music illegally (Jag tycker det är allmänt fel att ladda hem musik olagligt). (East 1990)

Question 12 – I would leave a financial contribution if it was possible (Jag skulle lämna ett bidrag om möjligheten finns). (Wells & Prensky, 1996)

Then looking further and to answer our second hypothesis (H2)…

H2: Artist/band loyalty reduces the consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.

…we wanted to determine the consumers loyalty towards the artist and therefore measured their retention rate of listening, downloading and if they had good experiences from the artist. The three questions were formulated as:

Question 7 – I often listen to music from this artist (Jag lyssnar ofta på denna artists musik) (Solomon, 2002; et al. 1999)

Question 8 – I have earlier downloaded / purchased music from the artist (Jag har tidigare nedladdad eller köpt musik av artisten) (Evans et al., 2009)

Question 9 – I have good experiences from this artist (Jag har bra tidigare erfarenheter av denna artist) (Oliver, 1997)

Finally to answer the last hypothesis (H3)…

H3: Artist/band liking reduce the consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.

…we wanted to measure liking of the artist conceptualized by liking in general, liking of the artist’s music and the liking of the artist as person. The questions were constructed and formulated as following:

Question 1 – I like the artist (Jag gillar artisten). (Solomon et al., 1999)

Question 2 – I like the artist’s music (Jag gillar artistens musik). (Kim, 2008; Percy et al., 2004; Solomon et al., 1999)

Question 3 – I think the artist is a good person (Jag tycker artisten är en bra person). (Kim, 2008; Solomon et al., 1999)
The questions measuring the consumers piracy intentions were consequently not connected to theory but basically measuring behavior of the respondent. The three questions measuring the piracy intentions were formulated as below:

**Question 4** – I usually download music from this artist illegally (Jag brukar ladda hem musik från denna artist olagligt).

**Question 5** – I will probably download the artist’s music in the future (Jag ska förmodligen ladda hem artistens musik i framtiden).

**Question 6** – I usually do not spend money on this artist’s music (Jag spenderar sällan pengar på denna artist's musik).

The questionnaires’ overall layout was systematic and with intention of being easy to comprehend and answer. The questionnaire was with purpose made to only consist of one page and had a short explanation also further mentioning the purpose of responding as well as explaining how and where our results will be used. The order of the questions was also considered to ensure a ‘red thread’ all through the questionnaires and to further simplify the process for the respondents. Moreover, as short statements as possible were emphasized to make sure it was unproblematic for the respondents to understand the questions. Both questionnaires used are provided in the appendix (Appendix 8.1.1.8 and 8.1.19).

### 3.6.1 Scales used in questionnaires

Due to the choice to include the measuring of opinions and feelings, it is not uncommon that the questionnaires are required to be more complex than if measuring simple behavior since it is easier to answer behavioral questions due to that the respondent is able to reflect on earlier experience, while the attitudes are rather hard to describe for people. The itemized rating scales are used frequently when measuring attitudes since one can build attitude statements which help respondents to answer according to how they consider each statement using a rating scale (Brace, 2004). There are three major kinds of attitudinal rating scales where the Likert-scale is widely most known as the ‘agree-disagree’ scale, where one finds attitude statements which respondents answer how strongly they agree or disagree with, commonly on a scale of 1-5 or 1-7 (Saunders et al., 2007; Brace, 2004). Another option is the semantic differential scale, which is a bipolar scale where two opposite statements are set at opposite ends of the scale and where respondents are supposed to answer which they mostly agree with by marking along the scale. The third option, that to this study is discarded due to reasons soon to be explained, is the staple scale which has one statement in the middle with scales on both sides of the statement and the different sides of the statement often being numerated with one side negative and the other side positive (Brace, 2004).

In this study both of the firstly mentioned methods have been used, in the first round of data collection (targeted to students) the semantic differential scale was used and in the data collections second round the traditional Likert scale was used. The semantic differential scale seemed most suitable due to the slightly more exploratory nature of since the respondents are given two options to choose between, e.g. if they buy the album or not, which is also further confirmed due to that the semantic scale often is used when investigating underlying attitudes or intentions (Saunders et al., 2007) For the second round of the data collection with more distinguished and sure variables and indicators being investigated, the Likert-scale was sufficient offering the respondent one statement to agree or disagree with, hence leaving less space for guidance in the questionnaire scale (Brace, 2004).
3.6.1.1 Odd or even numbers

Another issue needed to be discussed is the question of using an odd or even number of alternatives for the respondent to choose from, since an odd number leaves a ‘neutral standpoint’ which could have implications on the ‘colorfulness’ of the results (Bryman & Bell, 2007; Brace, 2004). As mentioned in the previous sections the questionnaires’ design is consisting of rating scales and more precisely, consisting of both odd and even numbers. This is a conscious choice due the nature of the problems arising in the different questionnaires design. The first questionnaire is justifying an even number of alternatives due that the semantic differential scale is used and hence could leave the respondent as indifferent between both presented statements and therefore benefiting from enhancing respondents extent of taking sides. This mentality of enhancing colorful answers is also believed effective by Kalton, Roberts and Holt (1980) as well as Presser and Schuman (1980) both showing that often with the possibility of neutral answers, also the number of more mid-point answers increase and therefore seen beneficial to be removed inviting (forcing) the respondent to even further evaluate the options and then make a decision (cited in Brace, 2004).

In the second round of data collection, i.e. in the second questionnaire the concept of odd numbers was chosen (a Likert-scale ranging from 1 to 7) to give the respondents an opportunity to answer a middle-box answer. This was due the easiness for the respondent to answer the questionnaire since the second round questionnaires were not answered in a cafeteria rather in the middle of the A6 shopping-center. It was also not as required to use even numbers for gaining more colorful answers just due that the Likert-scale was used, hence presenting one statement for the respondent to agree or disagree with and where a mid-choice would not mean being indifferent, but not fully agreeing with the statement due to the encoded numerated scoring and therefore the odd number was chosen (Brace, 2004).

3.7 Pilot Study

To before departing on the rounds of data collection enhance and ensure clarity and usefulness of the questionnaires, a pilot study was as it should, conducted consisting of 10 people from same population - the sub-population of students of the Jönköping University. The importance of doing a pilot study is especially of importance to this study due to the full exposure of only using questionnaires with close-end questions (Bryman & Bell, 2007). The number of students involved was based on the effort already put into designing the questions from the theoretical framework as well as focusing on qualitative input rather than conducting a large amount of test runs. The 10 students did not receive any help either before or when filling in the questionnaires besides in the beginning of the questionnaires provided information about the study’s purpose and use of their answers. This was to make the pilot study more unbiased and the response mainly built on the thoughts about the questionnaires standing for themselves.

From these 10 students in the pilot study, 6 students (or 60 percent) had no problem filling in the questionnaire after reading the brief introduction, while 3 students (30 percent) thought that it was a bit confusing with an even number scale with two statements on each side and 1 student (10 percent) requested a mid-point answer possibility in the first questionnaire, however no one of the involved in the pilot study filled in the questionnaires incorrectly. The respondents needed approximately three to five minutes to fill in the questionnaire which seems reasonable due to the number of questions. To further improve the quality of the questionnaires and most importantly the second questionnaire, Erik Hunter was also consulted due to his extensive knowledge in the field of quantitative data collec-
tion with rich insights in the field (personal communication, Erik Hunter, November 2009).

3.8 Statistic Measurement

When moving to the more complex parts of the methodology in this study the statistical measurements methods used when analyzing the data are to be discussed. This issue is most easily and conveniently handled as they appear in the results and analysis sections of this study, but nevertheless the main technique is to be discussed here below.

The statistical technique that has been chosen to be used to analyze the collected quantitative data is that of conducting a multiple regression analysis where the regression shows how much of the variance in the dependent variable of ‘piracy intentions’ can be explained by the independent variables of ‘artist liking’, ‘artist loyalty’ and ‘attitudinal factors’. The difference between independent and dependent variables are that of the logic stated in the hypotheses presented; e.g. that high loyalty to the artist is decreasing the piracy intentions towards that artist, i.e. seeing loyalty as independent and piracy intentions as dependent (Saunders et al., 2007; Aczel & Sounderpandian, 2006). This is done with all the hypotheses measuring variables entering them to the calculation as independent towards the piracy intentions variable (dependent variable). First the data is needed to be decoded from the data collected, put into a data set and then calculated using the multiple regression formula:

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_k X_k + \epsilon \]

Where \( \beta_0 \) is the intercept on the Y-axis, and each \( \beta_n X_n \) is the slope of the regression of each independent variable with respect to variable X. Also the term \( \epsilon \) is included representing the normality of errors margin for the formula being mathematically correct (Aczel & Sounderpandian, 2006). This means that the data collected about each independent variable is investigated as a single case in respect to that specific independent variables’ impact on the dependent variable (‘piracy intentions’) resulting in one of the \( \beta_n X_n \) terms where X is the answer derived from the questionnaire and \( \beta_n \) is the derived slope (increase/decrease in ‘piracy intentions’ due to one unit higher level of for example ‘artist loyalty’) that X has. Together with the other \( \beta_n X_n \) terms all these different independent variables are tested and analyzed whether they are having an impact on ‘piracy intentions’ or not as well as measuring the relationship between these (Aczel & Sounderpandian, 2006), also further step-wised regression analysis could be done exploring mediating effects between the established independent variables (Rauch, Frese & Utsch, 2005; cited in Hunter, 2009).

3.9 Generalization

When discussing the level of contributions a study brings, it is imperative to discuss its generalizability of its findings (Saunders et al., 2007). The generalizability refers to the concept of being able to generalize the findings to the broader picture or the whole population, i.e. ‘external validity’, which is an issue for all researches. The issue of generalization involves several levels, e.g. if the sample can be generalized to the whole population, as well as in this case if the study population is able to be generalized to a even larger population as all consumers in Sweden. The purpose of this study is to investigate the behavioral theories’ impact on the music piracy intentions and due to time and resource constraints, the investigated region chosen was Jönköping. Therefore it is the issue of whether the sample is generalizable to the whole population of consumers in Jönköping which is the issue of concern. In this study extensive attention has been paid to the issue and will be even closer discussed in the following sections concerning validity. However due to smaller sample
sizes and convenience sampling methods, the results are not to be seen as fully generalizable (Saunders et al., 2007).

3.10 Trustworthiness

As stated in the previous section, the only way to enhance generalizability and hence also the value of contribution brought by the study is to pay close attention to the details that could put the credibility of the study and the findings at risk. To reduce the possibilities of executing the processes incorrectly or neglecting to pay attention to certain issues can be avoided by discussing two main components; reliability and validity, which both together and alone are enhancing the trustworthiness of the study and therefore are imperative to discuss (Saunders et al, 2007; Patel & Davidson, 1994; Holme & Solvang, 1991).

3.10.1 Reliability

Firstly discussing the reliability of the study, the reliability is measuring the error margin in the study itself, if a replicated study in the same population would come up with the same data and findings. Though of course as always involved with sampling issues, identical results are hard if not impossible to expect and is requiring a very large sample population that gives an even distribution along the distribution curve of the population (Bryman & Bell, 2007; Saunders et al., 2007). Though a replicated study should show similar results and if there is a distinct difference, it could indicate one of the two studies being biased, incorrectly performed or with ignorance to reliability issues at hand, i.e. the higher the correlation between the two, the better the reliability of the studies (Bryman & Bell, 2007).

There are several issues that need to be addressed as they could bias the reliability in this study and has been considered, e.g. the wording of the questionnaires. One of the issues faced is the participant error where respondents could answer as they think is most appropriate for their own ‘image’ or sake and due piracy being illegal and this study’s questions involving how consumers behave in their piracy, extra attention has been paid. Also issues like observer error concerning how the observer asks the questions to each respondent and observer bias concerning the interpretation of the respondents’ answers are easily solved due to the earlier chosen methods of encoded, numerated self-completion questionnaires where standardized questions and standardized customs of decoding and interpreting the data eliminates such risks (Bryman & Bell, 2007; Saunders et al., 2007).

3.10.2 Validity

If generalizability looks at the broadest picture of trustworthiness, reliability is more concerning the external issues and then validity to a large extent is internal issues in the study that could risk the trustworthiness (Sekaran, 2003). Discussing issues of validity raises several questions which are described as different types of validity as well. All these issues have during the research process been paid attention to, e.g. content validity, which is if the dimensions of concepts has been properly described and used, i.e. the theories have been correctly interpreted and therefore produced viable hypotheses. Also the perception of concurrent validity, where it is discussed if the methods chosen are discriminating the respondents that are prejudiced to be different, e.g. that consumers disloyal to an artist hence are seen as ones with very probable intentions to pirate (Saunders et al., 2007). Such problem is solved by the differentiation of these variables in this study’s questionnaires.

In this study it has also been paid attention to concerns regarding time since even slight news reportage about increased prosecutional implications of music piracy could affect the consumers’ point of views and hence the data collection rounds time frame of conduct has
been minimized. Also the ambiguity about causal direction is taken into account and mostly handled during the theory deduction in the theoretical framework to further clarify the relationships between attitude and behavior (Saunders et al., 2007).

### 3.11 Artist used in Second Round Data Collection (U2)

To enable the respondents to have certain views of a specific artist, it was needed to provide the respondents one artist to presuppose, since asking about their favorite artist would result in a biased distribution of answers. The artist chosen is the Ireland originated band U2 with lead singer Bono due to several reasons; their time in the music industry and wide fan-base with a wide spectrum of age increasing the ability of different age groups to recognize the group, the group belonging to the mainstream music culture, but not being ‘too pop-culture’ like artists as Britney Spears or Michael Jackson and finally, that the group has a perceived strong brand value being involved in several charity activities et cetera enhancing the chance of people having opinions. With the band U2 as point of reference for the respondents to answer the questions about ‘artist liking’, ‘artist loyalty’, ‘attitudinal factors’ and the consumers’ overall ‘piracy intentions’ the data was be collected, decoded and sorted for analysis.

### 3.12 Summary of Methods Chosen

This study is a quantitative study of explanatory nature with purpose of explaining how and to what extent consumer theory about loyalty (Evans et al., 2009; Solomon et al., 2002); liking (Solomon et al., 2002; Schiffman & Kanuk, 1987) and attitudes (Wells & Prensky, 1996; Evans et al., 2009) affect the consumers’ intentions to pirate instead of purchase music. To test these variables (i.e. hypotheses) they are facilitated by asking three questions each, explained in section 3.6. The theories are deduced into hypotheses that are to be tested within the new phenomenon context, conducted through a set of independent variables as ‘artist loyalty’, ‘artist liking’ and ‘attitudinal factors’ and the dependent variable of ‘piracy intentions’. This is with the purpose of investigating how much of the variation in the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variables, i.e. through a multiple regression analysis (more closely explained earlier in method and in the results section)..

The data was collected through two rounds of data collection, the first (pre-study) consisting of a sub-population, students, of the main population which is the consumers in the Jönköping region. The vehicle of collecting empirical findings is through two self-completion questionnaires (one dedicated for each round of data collection) which are measuring the mentioned variables with three indicators (questions) per variable. The variables are measured by encoded rating scales consisting of a semantic differential scale with an even number of alternatives in the first round and a traditional odd number (1-7) option agree, disagree Likert-scale used in the second round. This data is after collected again decoded to be analyzed. The empirical data has been carefully considered to ensure high validity and reliability to enhance the trustworthiness and hence also the contribution of the study. This by conducting a pilot study and use of dual-source empirical input to triangulate the findings for even further ensuring accuracy. The data collections have taken place at Jönköping University and A6 shopping-center.
4 Impact on Intentions to Pirate

In this chapter the results from the questionnaires are presented. A full scale attribution of tables and figures is available in the Appendices increasing possibility for a closer investigation for the reader. The statistical technique will be explained along with the first occurrence while multiple regression analysis is explained in methods section p. 23.

In this section the data and results from the first round of data collection are presented. This was seen as a pre-study of more exploratory nature and the conclusions and outcomes from this are discussed as well. This is followed by explaining the data collected in the second (main) round of data collection and the merging and compiling of our indicators to single variables. It is these variables that are consequently used when testing the hypotheses in a standard multiple regression analysis whereof the results are presented. However we begin with discussing the results from the first data collection.

4.1 First Round of Data Collection

The first data collection was seen as a sort of pre-study for the main data collection of the research. The data that was collected from the students at Jönköping University was decoded and entered into a data set that could be used in the software SPSS. The purpose of the data was to explore high correlations and regressions in the data set, in other words relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variable. As earlier stated in the method section, the indicators in the first round were consciously seen as more diversified (on a more explorative level) than in the second questionnaire. This was due to the search of variables that were most interesting to focus on in the second round to attain rewarding results. The data collection was conducted by personally meeting the students in the cafeteria at the School of Education and Communication at the Jönköping University campus, with the researchers available if questions would arise and further assistance would be needed. The questionnaire was answered by 77 persons from the goal sample of 120, whereof 62 of the respondents were students at Jönköping University.

The indicators were supposed to be merged down to sets of indexed or factored variable (3 to 1) to attain validity in the study (Saunders et al., 2007; Bryman & Bell, 2007). The risk arising from having such diversified indicators is too low correlation between these unabling the labeling of them as measuring one variable and as in this case, it is what happened. The correlation between them should be at least 0.300 and in no cases this was fulfilled (Pallant, 2007). Therefore the different indicators are assessed on an individual level to see what areas could be interesting to focus upon in the second round of data collection. The first questionnaire handed out can be found in appendices (section 8.4) as well as the full data set is provided (8.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4A – Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on Standardized Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1 First Model and Results

To explore which indicators had the largest impact on the piracy variable in the data set the indicators from the questionnaire, were all put into a multiple regression analysis to measure the regression between the independent variables and the dependent variable (please note that a closer explanation of multiple regression analysis and its
The independent variables that had the highest regression were consequently to be chosen for further investigation to determine if they would be able to be approved in a statistically accepted model and hence yet another multiple regression analysis was to be ordered from SPSS. One of the first steps in doing this was to measure if the independent variables were reliable, measured through a Cronbach’s alpha test (Pallant, 2007). This measure shows if the used data is sufficient for the process to be continued towards stating a functional model with face validity, in other words logical reasoning. The Cronbach’s alpha measures the average correlation between the items entered into the model, which is explained as a measure of how good a fit the chosen data has to represent one variable (Pallant, 2007). The indicators used in this first hypothetical model as independent variables were ‘artist liking’, ‘frequency to listen to artist’ and ‘previous ownership of the artist’s music’. The results obtained from SPSS were not approving the model since Cronbach’s Alpha (Table 4A) was too low (0.051), whereas it should be at least over 0.5 if there are less than 10 indicators used (Pallant, 2007).

To see how much of piracy intentions could be explained by the chosen independent variables we continued to investigate all of the indicators independently; however no indicators were found in the statistically accepted qualifying range of Cronbach’s alpha being between 0.2 – 0.4 (Pallant, 2007). Despite these problems, an ANOVA-test was done to statistically test for the independent variables. This was conducted for Model One with the independent variables of ‘artist liking’, ‘frequency to listen to artist’ and ‘previous ownership’ towards ‘piracy intentions’. As Table 4B is shows, an F-statistic at 65 degrees of freedom of high 47.558 was calculated in SPSS. This F-statistic is a test measure that can be compared to a chart of normal distribution critical values to check whether the model is statistically credible, that is, likely to occur (Aczel & Sounderpandian, 2006). The F-test statistic was rejected which further confirms the model’s unsuitability (Pallant, 2007). Therefore the model was rejected and implies that the data collected with the first questionnaire cannot be used for explaining the phenomenon of music piracy with this model. Nevertheless on an exploratory basis yet another model was constructed and tested to further exploit the data collected to find additional relationships or confirm the already seen interesting indicators. This second model and its outcome are explained below.

### 4.1.2 Second Model and Results

To further make use of the first data set, the indicators were discussed and a second hypothetical model was constructed for testing. This investigated model’s purpose is to show how much of the dependent variable of piracy intentions could be explained by the chosen independent variables. The hypothetical model (Figure 4A) constructed was based on two requirements;
having good material in the data set and a perceived face validity, i.e. logic in reasoning. This is also confirmed by Pallant (2007) and Sekaran (2003) as good qualifiers for successful modeling. The indicators that were seen as most interesting from a theoretical view due to findings in the tests of the first model were: ‘likeability of the artist as person’, ‘previous experiences of the artist and artist’s music’, ‘frequency to listen to artist’ and ‘previous ownership’, all seen as independent variables. As dependent variable, the indicator measuring the consumers ‘intentions to buy latest album’ was chosen to see if these variables could predict consumers’ intentions to buy music.

When conducting the same tests as were carried out in the first model the same weak results were attained. However the results for this model were a slight improvement from Model One. Once again, the Cronbach’s alpha was measured with an outcome of 0.327 and despite receiving better results than for Model One, this is insufficient for statistical reliability (below the required 0.5) (Pallant, 2007). When conducting the ANOVA-test the F-test statistic was at a level that it could be accepted (at four degrees of freedom). This is however explained by the independent variables’ low ability to explain the variance in the dependent variable. The regression measured and in other words the percentage of the variance in the dependent variable explained by the independent variables was only about 4 percent (0.04). The adjusted R-Square is used as measure in the study because it is considered more accurate in small sample cases (Pallant, 2007). Therefore the model is accepted, but where the independent variables really did not have any relevant impact on the piracy intentions at all.

With help of the results gained in the first data collection, the indicators assessed as the most useful were helpful in constructing the second questionnaire. The data collected in the main data collection and results thereof are to be presented next.

4.2 The Main Round of Data Collection

In the main round of data collection data was to be acquired to be able to accept or reject our stated hypotheses. The data collection was based on the first round’s most useful indicators. The indicators considered most useful were the ones applied in Model Two, ‘likeability of the artist’ and ‘frequency to listen to the artist’; both well conformed to the theories of liking. Adding to this the indicators, ‘previous experiences’ and ‘previous ownership’ were well suited for measuring loyalty. Also the second questionnaire’s design was constructed with more clarified goals of what to measure due to the less explorative motives in the choice of indicators. The statistical requirements of significance, Cronbach’s alpha and correlation between the indicators measuring the same variable were given extra attention to ensure ability to compile the indicators into independent and dependent variables. The questionnaire was consisting of twelve questions where each variable was measured by three questions (indicators) which also are explained closer in method p.22. These trios were then to be merged to four variables, where three were measuring the three (hypotheses) independent variables and one measuring the dependent variable of piracy intention. The four sets of variables measured were:

- Artist liking
- Piracy Intentions
- Artist Loyalty
- Attitudinal Factors

The function of these variables is connected to the hypotheses stated in the theoretical framework section. For instance, artist liking is stated to reduce piracy intentions and therefore the three indicators measure if the respondent likes the artist or not. This is then compared with if the respondent pirates the artist’s music. This example is infused with the
other 82 responses and relationships between liking and piracy is consequently looked for. The same logic goes for the other variables as well. The connection between questions themselves and theory is more thoroughly explained in the methods section (p 22). The data acquired through the questionnaire was after the collection decoded from the Likert-scale coding and entered into the data set that was to be used (also the data coding is explained in the method section). The next step is to merge down and compile the sets of indicators into valid variables measuring each hypotheses dimension, thus trying to solve whether the hypotheses are accepted or not. The carrying out of this will be discussed next.

4.2.1 Factor Variables of our Independent Variable Indicators

The technique used to merge down each set of three indicators to one variable measuring the assigned independent variables is called factor analysis and is commonly used to describe variability in the observed indicators (Pallant, 2007). This means putting the variables into group sets that are interrelated with each other. The technique used is principal component analysis transforming the three indicators into one variable measuring e.g. liking. The information of this variability, that is, the interdependence of the indicators is consequently used when reducing the set of indicators in the data set (Pallant, 2007). In other words, this is a measure of the three indicators being sufficiently correlated and similar in the data they are presenting to accurately be reduced to only one independent. This is important since a low correlation implies that the indicators are not measuring the same dimension. To begin with, one needs to test the suitability of the data itself with measures of Bartlett’s test of sphericity and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy both explained later more explicitly (Pallant, 2007). The second step is to do the factor calculation and finally last step is to do a factor rotation analysis to see if there is more than one component measured by the three indicators. The last step in the principal component analysis resulted in only one component in all of the cases, which is seen beneficial (Pallant, 2007) and the loadings are presented in appendix 8.1. The merging and compiling of each variable is explained below.

4.2.1.1 Artist Liking Variable

The first set of indicators that are merged down to one variable is the one measuring artist liking. Before the indicators could be reduced they need to fulfill certain requirements and as mentioned, have certain levels of interdependence (Pallant, 2007). The first set of indicators tested in SPSS was consisting of questions 1 to 3 in the second questionnaire. These were checked for reliability where the results of this test revealed a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.868 with a positive correlation (above 0.3) between all three indicators and hence seen as a reliable data scale for factor analysis (Pallant, 2007). Also the statistical significance was accepted from conducting an ANOVA-test with F-test statistic of 0.597 with 2 degrees of freedom and the interdependence and correlations are seen to be statistically probable to reoccur also in replicated studies (Pallant, 2007; Aczel & Sounderpandian, 2006).

With reliability-approved indicators, this was followed by carrying out the mentioned reduction of indicators, combining the three indicators into a new variable called the Artist Liking Variable (ALV). To further confirm the validity of this new variable, an analysis of the new variable was conducted, this by investigating issues imperative for a successful reduction. These key measures firstly include the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO), which is used to evaluate the correlation between the different indicators, i.e. it is beneficial with a KMO as high as possible; not beneath 0.5 and meritorious if above 0.6 (Pallant, 2007; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The KMO extracted from SPSS was 0.656 and hence seen as sufficient. Secondly the Bartlett’s test of sphericity measuring the
statistical significance of all possible combinations of intercorrelation between the indicators was conducted with a requirement of being below 0.05 to be significant (Pallant, 2007; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) and where SPSS provided a result of 0.000. Also thirdly, before fully accepting the new variable of ALV, the initial Eigenvalues has to be considered as well which are concerning that each of the three indicators have a significant input to the variable, and where the Eigenvalues are required being larger than 1.0. (one) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The Eigenvalues calculated in SPSS regarding the indicators reduced to ALV were 79.362, 16.872 and 3.766 and hence also accepted as valid.

There is also a graphical interpretation of the Eigenvalues which is plotted into a scree-plot with a desired shape of an elbow (Pallant, 2007). This graphical interpretation has also been used to further evaluate and hence also validate the new variable of ALV, with a successful forming of the desired elbow-shape. There has also been paid attention if the indicators include several different components that are being measured. This has been investigated through a (varimax) rotated principal component analysis where only one component was extracted (loadings available in appendices 8.1). This is mainly to ensure that the indicators only measure one variable (Pallant, 2007). The fulfilled requirements therefore enable us to accept the three indicators suitable for being reduced into one variable and the new indicator variable, ALV is introduced into the data set. The same process will consequently be conducted with the other indicators as well.

### 4.2.1.2 Piracy Intentions Variable

The next set of indicators reduced to one variable was the ones measuring piracy intentions. The same methods as used when investigating and evaluating ‘artist liking’ is of course also used in the case of the indicators measuring ‘piracy intentions’. Again, the Cronbach’s alpha was checked first for looking for a value of above 0.5. The figure found from the three indicators is an alpha of 0.660, hence accepted (Pallant, 2007). Furthermore, when checking correlations between the indicators, a (close to) sufficient correlation is found, but with some deviations (see Table 4C). Since correlations above 0.3 are desired and correlation between Q6 and Q5 is a mere 0.184, as well as Q6 and Q4 is 0.245 it is important to recognize this, as it might make the piracy intentions slightly unsuitable for the reduction of indicators. It could however be applicable thanks to a high suitability of other requirements. The new variable is also accepted as credible when conducting an ANOVA-test with a test statistic of 41.969 (2 degrees) of freedom (Pallant, 2007; Aczel & Sounderpandian, 2006).

When conducting the factor analysis once combined the three indicators further implies the implication of the low correlation between Q6 and Q4, Q5 resulting in a KMO of 0.531, which is a bit lower than the one found in the artist liking indicators, however still accepted (it is required to be above 0.5) (Pallant, 2007; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The Bartlett’s sphericity is significant (0.000), well below the requirement of 0.05. However, Q6 in relation to Q5 is showing a significance of 0.054 slightly above the recommended value but not critical. Looking at the Eigenvalues all of the three indicators have results above 1 being; 62.165, 29.916 and 7.919 and therefore approving the new variable; furthermore, it is also confirmed by the scree-plot which shows an elbow shape. The principal component analysis is again resulting in only one component (loadings found in appendices 8.1. Hence, new variable of Piracy Intentions Variable (PIV) is included to the data set.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inter-Item Correlation Matrix</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4C - Correlations
4.2.1.3 Artist Loyalty Variable

The same procedure is also used when investigating the indicators measuring ‘artist loyalty’ where again a reliability test was conducted, this time obtaining a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.707 and a positive correlation between the indicators of at least 0.414 and above. This also statistically accepted with the ANOVA-test resulting in an F-test statistic of 13.475 with 2 degrees of freedom hence seen as accepted with high confidence (Aczel & Sounderpandian, 2006). Moving on to the post-reduction conducted factor analysis we extract a KMO of 0.653 as well as Bartlett’s test of sphericity showing significance of 0.000. Also, the Eigenvalues are all above 1.0 (66.255, 21.365 and 12.381) and furthermore there is a clear elbow shape in the scree-plot. When conducting the principal component analysis the results show only one component (with loadings presented in appendices 8.1) and therefore these indicators are seen to be clearly suitable for being reduced to one variable and the Artist Loyalty Variable (ALYV) was added to the data set.

4.2.1.4 Attitudinal Factors Variable

The remaining three indicators (questions 10 to 12 in the questionnaire) are the ones measuring the ‘attitudinal factors’. These three also show a high reliability with a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.741 and high correlations (ranging from 0.273 to 0.781 seen in Table 4D) except the lowest of 0.237 worth mentioning as being slightly beneath the desired level of 0.3 (Pallant, 2007). The three indicators were nevertheless merged and a factor analysis was conducted which also further validated the variable by the statistical ANOVA-test being accepted with an F-statistic of 6.240 and with 2 degrees of freedom (Aczel & Sounderpandian, 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Matrix</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Q12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4D - Correlations

From the factor analysis a KMO was extracted indicating a number above 0.5 (0.551). The Bartlett’s test shows results of being highly significant (0.000) and Eigenvalues being 67.987, 26.159 and 6.754, all clearly being above 1, therefore implying suitability of the indicators. Adding to this the scree-plot shows a clear elbow shape and the principal component analysis results in only one component (loadings are available to see in appendices 8.1). Therefore the Attitudinal Factors Variable (AFV) was added to the data set.

Consequently all four sets of indicators have been reduced to four variables. These are added to the data set as the reduced data from the three previous indicators by using the factor analysis. Another option would have been to index them and calculate the average of the three indicators but factor analysis is providing a more accurate data reduction (Pallant, 2007). These new variables and the hypotheses can now be tested using the regression of the independent variables AFV, ALYV and ALV to the dependent variable, PIV in the multiple regression analysis handled in next section.

4.3 Regression Analysis – The Impact on Piracy Intentions

With all four variables constructed, it is time to investigate the regression between the independent and dependent variables, this through a multiple regression analysis (closer explained in the method section p. 23). This is carried out by using the hypotheses deduced from theory conceptualized into a model with face validity i.e. logical assumptions of the variables relationships with each other. It is done by setting ‘artist loyalty’ (Hypotheses 2), ‘art-
The hypothetical model (figure 4B) was tested with a standard multiple regression (where all the variables are entered simultaneously instead of hierarchically or stepwise since no order or specific distribution is assumed) with confidence intervals of 99 percent. This confidence interval means that the test is carried out at the level that the test statistic is probable to occur in 99 percent of the population (Aczel & Sounderpandian, 2006). Again as in Model One and Model Two we start off with first looking at correlations. The outcomes calculated in SPSS show good correlations, e.g. between ALV and ALYV (0.608). Further ALYV also shows a high correlation towards the dependent variable of PIV (0.529), where all are above the required level of 0.3 (Pallant, 2007). It is also important to investigate the model’s goodness of fit between the different independent variables; hence a high correlation could imply that both variables actually are measuring the same dimension (Pallant, 2007). The levels of correlation between the variables are desired to be below 0.7 which is fulfilled since the highest result is the correlation between ALV (liking) and ALYV (loyalty), at a level of 0.608 (Pallant, 2007).

### TABLE 4E – Regression of Model Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.589*</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.82764300</td>
<td>12,415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional measures of validity and model suitability are returned later on, but for the moment we concentrate closer on the models’ regression. From Table 4E can be derived how much of the variance in the dependent variable of piracy intentions could be explained by the independent variables. The ‘R square’ is the measure of regression in decimal form, here transformed to a percentage and amounts to explaining 34.7 percent of the variance in PIV (Pallant 2007; Aczel & Sounderpandian, 2006). However, in cases of small sample sizes as this one, it is much more accurate to look at the ‘adjusted R square’ which instead would lower

### TABLE 4F - Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (Constant)</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist Liking Variable</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>-1.936</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist Loyalty Variable</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>5.640</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Factors</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>-1.359</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the percentage and hence seen explaining 31.9 percent, but with a higher validity and accuracy (Pallant, 2007; Aczel & Sounderpandian, 2006). This implies that the three variables are having impact on piracy intentions. However to answer the research questions and test the hypotheses we look closer at the variables independently.

Before that the soundness of the model is to be evaluated. The statistical acceptance tests of the model was done by both looking at the significance provided in Table 4E, 0.000 which is below the required 0.05, hence stating the model as significant (Pallant, 2007) and also by again conducting earlier used methods yet again an ANOVA-test is done. This time the test outcome calculated from SPSS is an F-test statistic of 12.415 with 3 degrees of freedom, which is below the critical value of 26.125 and hence, the model is accepted as statistically credible (Pallant, 2007; Aczel & Sounderpandian, 2006).

4.3.1 Accepting or Rejecting our Hypotheses

Now the independent variables are separately examined closer. To do this the standardized beta coefficients that explain the contributions to the model from each and every variable are checked (Pallant, 2007). This is explained easily as looking at each independent variable’s impact on the dependent variable of piracy intentions. The beta coefficients are presented in Table 4F, where one also can see if the variable has a decreasing or increasing effect on piracy intentions (the coefficient being positive or negative) (Pallant, 2007). This table is the most important table to focus on when accepting or rejecting the hypotheses because it shows the independent impacts of each variable. Here can already be seen that higher artist liking as anticipated is decreasing consumers piracy intentions, hence stating Hypotheses 3 (H3) as true; artist liking decreases piracy intentions (0.0242). Furthermore, conclusions can be drawn that surprisingly artist loyalty has an increasing effect on piracy intentions, explaining 68.8% of the model (0.668). This is therefore contradicting theory that states that loyalty should increase a purchase behavior and Hypothesis 2 (H2) is to be rejected as false. Also we can derive from Table 4F that consumer attitudes towards piracy have a decreasing effect on piracy (-0.136) and therefore can accept Hypothesis 1 (H1).

Therefore these conclusions can be made about the stated hypotheses:

**H1:** Attitudinal factors, i.e. seeing piracy as unethical and wrong decreases consumers’ intentions to pirate music.

**H1:** Is accepted as true, negative attitudes towards piracy decreases consumers intentions to pirate.

**H2:** Artist/band loyalty reduces the consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.

**H2:** Is rejected as false, higher loyalty does not decrease consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.

**H3:** Artist/band liking reduce the consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.

**H3:** Is accepted as true, liking the artist does decrease consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.

However, before these conclusions can be accepted as final, another result has to be assessed as well. In Table 4F it is also included calculations on whether the contribution to the model is significant or not, where a sufficient significance would be below 0.05 (Pallant, 2007). Beginning with looking at artist liking we find a measured significance of 0.057 which is slightly over the acceptance level, but is often the case in too small samples (Pallant, 2007; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) and therefore this is recognized as a flaw, but never-
theless the contribution is accepted as being significant. Looking at artist loyalty we find a significance measurement of 0.000 and hence undoubtedly state it as making a significant contribution. The remaining variable of attitudinal factors is where it gets intriguing. The measured significance measure is 0.178 being well above the critical level of 0.05 and therefore not accepted as contributing significantly to the model. Consequently the Hypothesis 1 is unable to be answered and therefore removed from the model to ensure validity. Reasons for its insignificance are further discussed in the analysis section. However the hypothesis is regarded as unanswered:

\[ H1: \text{Attitudinal factors, i.e. seeing piracy as unethical and wrong decreases consumers’ intentions to pirate music.} \]

\[ H1: \text{Is accepted as true, negative attitudes towards piracy decreases consumers’ intentions to pirate.} \]

Therefore, due this thesis’ aspiration of the study’s outcome model that has high validity and high trustworthiness, yet another multiple regression analysis is conducted where the ‘attitudinal factors’ (H1) is excluded. This is done with purpose of enhancing the quality of the conclusions made about the two remaining variables (liking and loyalty) as well as the quality of the model itself.

### 4.3.2 A second Standard Multiple Regression Analysis

To ensure higher validity of the model, an additional multiple regression calculation is ordered in SPSS excluding the attitudinal factors variable and only including the independent variables of ‘artist loyalty’ (ALYV) and ‘artist liking’ (ALV). This is done with purpose of gaining a more statistically credible model and to investigate whether the individual impacts of the independent variables will change. The same rigorous statistical calculations as in the former case are conducted, this time instead shedding light on another issue; the correlation between the independent variable of ‘artist liking’ and the dependent variable of ‘piracy intentions’. This is not fully sufficient since the observed correlation measure of 0.144 does not reach the desired requirement of 0.3 (Pallant, 2007). The implication of this is an acknowledged flaw to the reported results which in many cases is due to a too small sample size (Bryman & Bell, 2007; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). However, such correlation issues in cases of small samples could be overseen with the condition of all other requirements being fulfilled impeccably (Pallant, 2007; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The measured correlation between ‘artist loyalty’ and ‘piracy intentions’ was on the other hand clearly fulfilled (finding a correlation measure of 0.529). As before, the correlation between the independent variables is analyzed to remove the risk of them measuring the same dimension. This is done with the requirement of correlation being below 0.7, whereas the calculated measure in SPSS is 0.608 and therefore seen as satisfactory and allowing us to continue with conducting the standard multiple regression analysis (Pallant, 2007).

Again the variables of artist liking and artist loyalty are tested against the dependent variable of piracy intentions to further confirm the earlier acceptance and rejection of hypotheses 2 and 3 (H2 and H3). The multiple regression calculation ordered from SPSS with results shown in Table 4G below derive a measured regression (adjusted R square) of 0.312 or that 31.2 percent of the variance in ‘piracy intentions’ is explained by ‘artist loyalty’ and ‘artist liking’. Again to validate the model and results, another ANOVA-test is conducted providing an F-statistic of 18.228 with two degrees of freedom, measured on a 99 percent confidence intervals. This is well below the critical value and therefore accepted (Aczel & Sounderpandian, 2006). Furthermore it is significant since the significance measure is be-
low the required 0.05 (0.000) ensuring the model as being statistically credible (Pallant, 2007; Aczel & Sounderpandian, 2006).

Next the individual independent variables and their independent contribution to the model are investigated closer. We once again look at the standardized beta coefficients (Pallant, 2007) which show a contribution of ‘artist liking’ of -0.282 and ‘artist loyalty’ contributes and explains 70% (0.700) of the model. Both these are seen as statistically significant since the significance measure is 0.021 respectively 0.000, both below the recommended 0.05. This further confirms the concluded findings from the previous model (Model Three) where high loyalty increases intentions to pirate while high liking decreases it. This confirms the stating of Hypothesis 2 (H2) as false and Hypothesis 3 (H3) as true.

The extent that the two independent variables are explaining consumers’ piracy intention has however been slightly lowered from explaining 31.9 percent in Model Three to explaining 31.2 percent in Model Four. To even further validate the derived new model, a comparison between two graphical solutions is made because their usefulness to easily see differences. These show the goodness of fit and predictability of the model (Pallant, 2007). The first used is the ‘scatter plot’ where the desired distribution is to be within the values of -3.3 and 3.3 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007; Pallant, 2007). This is shown below where Graph 4A represents Model Three, and Graph 4C consequently Model Four. Here one can see an improvement in the concentration of dots in the latter one, implying a better predictability of Model Four. The second graphical solution is the standardized residuals where the desired formation is a straight line going from lower left corner to upper right (Tabachnick & Fidell 2007; Pallant, 2007). Here one can see that in Model Three (Graph 4B) the straight line is more accurate compared to Model Four (Graph 4D). However it is important to note that the number of dots is fewer as well, again addressing the impacts of a small sample size.

TABLE 4G – Regression of Model Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.83210750</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>18,228</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Therefore since all requirements have been fulfilled it can be stated that the model is statistically credible and that the independent variables of liking and loyalty are having a clear impact on the dependent variable of piracy intentions. This is shown in the outcome model (Figure 4C). The hypothesis of attitudes (H1) is excluded due to the maintaining of high validity in the model. However reasons for and implications of this it is further discussed in analysis and conclusion sections. The hypotheses of artist liking (H3) and loyalty (H2) is accepted and rejected respectively since artist liking as anticipated is having a decreasing effect while loyalty is having an increasing effect on piracy intentions.

Summing up: the findings collected and extracted in the first round of data collection were summarized but not statistically approved, nevertheless helpful when constructing the second questionnaire. The main round of data collection resulted in statistically accepted variables, with the exception of the ‘attitudinal factors variable’ which was excluded since it did not significantly contribute to the model and hence the model above (Figure 4C) was derived as the valid, approved model and the hypotheses concluded as below:

**H1:** Attitudinal factors, i.e. seeing piracy as unethical and wrong decreases consumers’ intentions to pirate music.

H1: Is accepted as true, negative attitudes towards piracy decreases consumers intentions to pirate.

**H2:** Artist/band loyalty reduces the consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.

H2: Is rejected as false, higher loyalty does not decrease consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.

The results are to be further analyzed and discussed in the next section. Also connections will be made to theory and implications of the results will be discussed.
5 Analysis

In this chapter the findings will be related to the theories. The data empirical findings from the previous section will be discussed, reasons for certain outcomes and underlying implications of the model are interpreted.

In this section the empirical findings and the theoretical implications of these are discussed and further analyzed, i.e. reconnect the findings to our theoretical framework. The emphasis will be put on the main round of data collection while the first round will be more briefly discussed with focus on what parts were considered most noteworthy and which indicators or questions were the most rewarding. This is since these also were the ones further focused on in the second round of data collection.

5.1 Analysis of the First Round of Data Collection

The empirical findings, i.e. results attained from the questions/indicators from the first round of data collection were due a low statistical measurability instead investigated and evaluated on an individual indicator basis. The indicators that were found most interesting (due high measured impact on the dependent variable, i.e. regression) were as mentioned in the results section the ones measuring ‘likeability of the artist as person’, ‘frequency to listen to artist’, ‘previous ownership’ and ‘previous experiences of the artist and artists music’, as well as the dependent variable of ‘piracy intentions’ which was not an included variable due low statistical significance and correlations and instead measured as the single indicator ‘intention to buy latest album’.

The derived indicators are not surprising hence these are the most fundamental factors regarding both loyalty and liking theories in the field of consumer behavior (Evans et al., 2009; Solomon et al., 1999; Oliver, 1997). Also the absence of any indicators measuring ‘attitudinal factors’ could have been seen as a sign for the later confirmed contribution of low significance to piracy intentions. More accurately the indicators seen most interesting (chosen on the basis of regression to the indicator measuring the dependent variable) were showing an equal distribution of indicators measuring liking and loyalty since ‘likeability of the artist as person’ and ‘frequency to listen to artist’ are derived from the theories regarding liking (Solomon et al., 1999) and both ‘previous experiences of the artist and artist’s music’ and ‘previous ownership’ are derived from loyalty theories (Evans et al., 2009; Oliver, 1997). This would imply an assumed equal distribution of the independent variables contributions to the model, in other words the impacts of ‘artist liking’ and ‘artist loyalty’ in the second round of data collection.

5.2 The Main Data Collection

With the nature and approach of these indicators in mind, a second questionnaire was constructed as well as a second round of data collection were conducted attaining a new data set. This was through different statistically validating tests merged downed to four variables; ‘the artist liking variable’, ‘artist loyalty variable’, ‘attitudinal factors variable’ and ‘piracy intentions variable’. These are further discussed below.

5.3 The implications of the Variables (ALV, ALYV, AFV and PIV)

The four different variables gained from the reduction of indicators into variables will in this section be critically dissected and evaluated; reasons for statistical deviations will be conceptualized with the second questionnaires questions at hand. This section presents the
analysis of the variables constructed in the results part for further understanding the area and results of the study to be able to draw the final conclusions. These issues seem imperative to discuss for further measuring the validity of the empirical findings and eventually what impacts these issues have on the conclusions drawn in this study.

5.3.1 The Artist Liking Variable (ALV)

Beginning with the ‘artist liking variable’ which has the assumed and anticipated effect on piracy intentions (due to stated hypothesis (H3) “the higher the artist liking, the lower the piracy intentions towards that artist”) this can be seen as the case (hypothesis accepted). The empirical findings show the variable of liking having a lowering impact on piracy intentions (a standardized beta coefficient of -0.282 is calculated from SPSS). To further seek explanations of the results gained we explore what implications the questions measuring artist liking could have, hence again presenting the questions used (translated from Swedish to English) below.

**Question 1** – I like the artist (Jag gillar artisten).

**Question 2** – I like the artist’s music (Jag gillar artistens musik).

**Question 3** – I think the artist is a good person (Jag tycker artisten är en bra person).

The goal of having three questions measuring the same variable is as mentioned in the method section the minimization of room for misinterpretations from the respondent, i.e. that the three questions measure the same idea, asked in three different conceptual ways (Saunders et al., 2007; Bryman & Bell, 2007). The concepts behind the questions are that of the first question inquiring if a respondent likes the artist in general, including all that the concept of the ‘artist’ contains, e.g. live performances, music, given interviews et cetera. This question is highly correlated to the question inquiring if the artist is to be seen as a good person (a correlation of 0.608 is found), as well as even highly (maybe not surprisingly) correlated with the opinion about if artist’s music is good or not (correlation of 0.873). These are issues that are in line with the theories of consumer involvement presented in the theoretical framework where a high involvement with the ‘whole picture’ of the brand (in this case artist) is a foundation for establishing a liking (Solomon et al. (1999). Since ‘question 1’ was measuring the overall concept of the artist, it would also be interesting to see how much of the variance in the artist liking was explained by the two other questions, i.e. explained by how the respondent felt about the artist’s music and/or thought of the artist as person. Therefore, thanks to statistically validating criteria being fulfilled, standard multiple regression calculations were conducted to investigate the issue. The results from SPSS show a regression of adjusted R square being 0.796, i.e. that 79.6 percent of the variance in ‘artist liking’ is explained by the other two questions. This was however rejected when conducting the ANOVA-test to confirm the model, which presented an F-test statistic value of 150.847 with 2 degrees of freedom whilst it should be below 99.499 (Aczel & Sounderpandian, 2006). However, the implications of this can be further analyzed by looking closer at the coefficients table where the standardized beta coefficients show that the individual contributions of Q2 (liking the artist’s music) and Q3 (thinking the artist is a good person) are that of 0.794 and 0.161 respectively.

Returning to the core purpose asking ourselves if this really measures what it should one can see that the theoretical linkages suggests this assumption as accurate. Next steps of discussing the ‘artist liking variable’ is when integrated to the model, hence further discussion
is spared for later. However one can already conclude that the artist’ liking has a decreasing effect on consumers piracy intentions and hence Hypothesis 3 (H3) is accepted.

H3: Artist/band liking reduce the consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.

H3: Is accepted as true, liking the artist does decrease consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.

5.3.2 The Artist Loyalty Variable (ALYV)

The ‘artist loyalty variable’’s most remarkable feature is the very clearly validated statistical measures, indicating that the questions were well asked and formulated. This could also be a reason for why this variable is showing to have the largest impact on piracy intentions, thus discussed more later on in the analysis, but for now the questions and an evaluation of them are presented (again translated from Swedish to English):

Question 7 – I often listen to music from this artist (Jag lyssnar ofta på denna artists musik)

Question 8 – I have earlier downloaded / purchased music from the artist (Jag har tidigare nedladdad eller köpt musik av artisten)

Question 9 – I have good experiences from this artist (Jag har bra tidigare erfarenhet av denna artist)

These questions were as mentioned linked to the theories regarding previous experiences, i.e. the established loyalty towards the artist (Evans et al., 2009; Oliver, 1997), which had a high impact on the piracy intentions, although not in the anticipated way. The loyalty’s effect on piracy intentions is from the empirical findings showing that the higher the loyalty, the higher the intentions to pirate music from that artist (contradicting Hypothesis 2). Our suggestion would be that good previous experiences’ impact on loyalty is as from theory deducted that this would increase the purchase behavior of the consumer due to a lower risk of purchase since the consumer has been satisfied with earlier purchases of that artist music (Evans et al., 2009). Hence this could be interpreted as the loyalty is enhancing the willingness of acquisition of the artist music instead of mere purchase intentions.

Due to the importance of this finding, the questions’ formulations and their impact has to be carefully examined; since ‘question 8’ could have a biased impact to the respondents’ interpretation due to the formulation of “have earlier downloaded or purchased” which could incline a already established piracy behavior. Although investigating the correlations of the questions, ‘question 8’ is highly correlated with both questions 7 and 9 (0.420 respectively 0.414) hence seen as the question not being biased and thus valid. The resulting implications of artist loyalty is seen as clear and concluded to have an increasing effect on the consumers’ piracy intentions which is declared a surprising finding of the study. Therefore also Hypothesis 2 (H2) is rejected.

H2: Artist/band loyalty reduces the consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.

H2: Is rejected as false, higher loyalty does not decrease consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.

5.3.3 The Piracy Intentions Variable (PIV)

When moving on to the measurement of the ‘piracy intentions variable’, the first apparent issue when looking closer at the PIV data is the in the empirical findings section mentioned slightly lower correlation between ‘question 5’ and ‘question 6’ (a correlation of 0.184). The reasons for this could be a misconceptualization of piracy intentions in those two ques-
tions. Hence, again the three indicators, i.e. questions measuring the ‘piracy intentions’
variable is translated from Swedish to English and presented below:

**Question 4** – I usually download music from this artist illegally (Jag brukar ladda hem musik från denna artist olagligt).

**Question 5** – I will probably download the artist’s music in the future (Jag ska förmodligen ladda hem artistens musik i framtiden).

**Question 6** – I usually do not spend money on this artist’s music (Jag spenderar sällan pengar på denna artistens musik).

Reasons for this deviation are highly connected to the issues of ‘overlapping’ mentioned in the problem section where it is presented that the decrease in sales of physical and digital music does not proportionally cover for the amount of pirated music (MacMillan, 2009). Therefore both confirming the overlap, as well as explaining the derived results since people obviously tend to a certain degree both pirate and purchase music. From this fact we though conclude that purchase intentions and piracy intentions are not measurable together in one variable since they are two opposite intentions that also stand and work independently. This is confirmed by the Cronbach’s alpha of this variable being 0.660 and could be increased to 0.863 to further enhance the validity of the findings if ‘question 6’ would be deleted (nevertheless in this case impossible due the requirement of having three indicators measuring one variable and the lack of a substitute indicator). Any connections between theoretical framework and the ‘piracy intentions variable’ has been limited to the behavioral aspect theories (Solomon et al., 2009; Shiffman & Kanuk, 1987; Wells & Prensky, 1996) to a very small extent since this is measuring clear behavior of the consumers being derived from their real behavior rather than theories.

Usable theories could nevertheless include the theories measuring more attitudinal aspects of the consumers’ behavior regarding precisely music piracy e.g. the conflicts of being aware of music piracy being illegal versus the utility gained from acquiring music that way despite its illegality (Solomon et al., 1999; Chiou et al., 2005). Also the theories regarding the ‘routine behavior’ of the consumers’ not evaluating the options of purchasing versus pirating music rather than automatically conducting music piracy could raise certain questions about how the music industry and services/products offered could increase the perceived consumer benefit from instead purchasing music.

5.3.4 The Attitudinal Factors Variable (AFV)

The ‘attitudinal factors variable’ was from the main contributing model left out but is nevertheless a part of the data collection and still presenting usable information and findings which also will be more closely analyzed. This is done due to the fact that all statistical requirements where fulfilled except the independent contribution to the models significance being slightly lower, often a result of smaller samples (Pallant, 2007; Bryman & Bell, 2007). The questions are translated and presented below:

**Question 10** – It feels wrong to download music illegally from this artist (Det känns fel att ladda hem musik olagligt av denna artist).

**Question 11** – I think it is generally wrong to download music illegally (Jag tycker det är allmänt fel att ladda hem musik olagligt).

**Question 12** – I would leave a financial contribution if it was possible (Jag skulle lämna ett bidrag om möjligheten finns).
Also in this variable there is a case of somewhat lower correlation, this time between ‘question 10’ and ‘question 12’ implying that even it feels wrong to download music illegally from the artist and there exists an opportunity to leave a financial contribution, the consumers still would ignore to pay and download the music illegally. This is returning to the issues mentioned in the ‘piracy intentions variable’ section of motivational conflicts of what attitudes are leading to behavior (Solomon et al., 1999; Hawkings et al., 2010).

This would be most closely linked to the issue of the ‘avoidance-avoidance conflict’ where the consumer faces two undesirable alternatives to choose from instead of the ‘approach-avoidance conflict’ that one could expect (if the consumer is feeling that piracy is wrong then if one legal option would be available that one would be chosen). This is further implying that the perceived utility the consumer gains from consuming purchased music still is to low compared to price, overweighting the piracy option before buying hence making the purchase option undesirable, which is in line with our findings.

The correlation of 0.408 between ‘question 11’ and ‘question 12’ shows that most respondents think it often is unethical and wrong behavior to download music illegally from the artist at hand and artists in general. This is quite in line with the theories of ethics by Fullerton et al. (1996), but with an interesting issue left uninvestigated; if there is a small impact of unethical behavior towards a certain object, the wrongful behavior is justified compared to a larger impact (e.g. comparing piracy’s impact on small indie artists compared to larger artists e.g. U2). Although this kind of issue is not possible to draw any valid conclusions about in this study due to left out definitions of what “artists in general” means in the questionnaire. However this leaves room for further explorations of the topic in the future. The implications of consumers’ attitudes do nevertheless lead to questions of why it is having such small impact on the piracy intentions which we will return to discussing later. The low and insignificant contribution of the variable is therefore also excluded from the final model, however if statistically significant it had been rejected as false. Nevertheless Hypothesis 1 (H1) is in this case to be seen as unanswered.

**H1:** Attitudinal factors, i.e. seeing piracy as unethical and wrong decreases consumers’ intentions to pirate music.

**H1:** Is accepted as true, negative attitudes towards piracy decreases consumers intentions to pirate.

### 5.4 What could be the Motivations behind Piracy?

Returning to focus on the main questions of what is having an impact on piracy intentions, this could be because of several reasons, or as Chen et al. (2008) and Muncy and Vitell (1992) argue not necessarily due to criminal intentions, but for lack of concern and the high convenience attained. Although the convenience part of their claim is not necessarily fully defendable due the increasing ease of purchasing songs via e.g. iTunes and Spotify today, consequently further emphasizing on the monetary issues (as seen from the full-data tables in appendix where respondents have answered ‘Spotify’ and ‘flac’ as options on how they listen to music). There is also a potential relation between the stabilization of the extent of music piracy’s (Hiatt & Serpick, 2007) and the introduction of easier ways of purchasing music, where the piracy issues more becomes a question of demographics as income (Coyle et al. 2008). Besides this point, piracy could be further explained by consumer motivation theories (Statt, 1999; Shiffman & Kanuk, 1987). What is it that really leads consumers to pirating their favorite artist’s music?
The way people behave is as declared in the theoretical framework motivated by a move from their present state to their ideal state, i.e. fulfilling their needs of new music acquisition (Wells & Prensky, 1996; Hawkins & Mothersbaugh, 2010). This is raising questions about the differences of present state and ideal state such as why the consumer pirates the music instead of making use of free streaming options as ‘Spotify’. Is it because there is a notion of the ownership of an MP3 being a substitute for owning the physical album? Or is it simply a matter of time before the streaming options with increased usability and availability for end consumers is growing large enough to lower piracy significantly? The higher price sensitiveness in business models including the streaming of music is however stated by Spellman (2002) implying a wish for “physical” ownership, i.e. the downloading of MP3.

The motivational theories further claim that before the motivations (e.g. the demand for new music) is transformed to behavior, different steps are to be involved (Wells & Prensky, 1996). Perception and learning about the product (i.e. artist and artist’s music) enable consumers to obtain information about the artist and the artist’s music, as well as the arena where transactions take place. This information is then utilized by an ‘attitude formation’ which helps consumers to make calculations of how to maximize their benefit by cost-benefit calculations (Wells & Prensky, 1996; Bettman & Johnson, 1993; Bettman, 1979). This could suggest a “substitution lag” due already formed attitudes and routine behavior of pirating music which might take some time to change due new learning, and perception processes.

5.5 So do Attitudinal Factors have an impact?

In the empirical findings section the main round of data collection resulted in two different ways of interpreting the findings. One where ‘attitudinal factors’ was included due all other statistical requirements were fulfilled and one excluding it due to its failure of making a significant contribution (0.178 when desired to be below 0.05) (Pallant, 2007). Also it was measured of having only a slight impact on the model where it was included (Model Three) only explaining 13.6 percent of the piracy intentions. So why does it have such a small impact? Or does it have any impact?

The theoretical implications of this are hard to point out; instead a focus on the questions of why people’s behavior is contradicting their attitudes could be of interest. This is as earlier mentioned in line with the ‘avoidance-avoidance conflict’ which outweighs the attitude of seeing the situation as an ‘approach-avoidance conflict’, (Solomon et al., 1999; Hawkings & Mothersbaugh, 2010) thus meaning that the consumers do not think that paying the price, accepting the distribution system is a viable option of music acquisition, therefore regarding it as also an undesirable option, well aware of music piracy being both seen as wrong and declared as illegal.

Furthermore the attitudes neglected effect on piracy intentions could also be explained with the term of ‘jay customers’ arguing that due to distance between consumers and the artist (provider) is large the traditional consumer-firm relationship does not exist and therefore does not motivate any attitude formation towards any form of product relationship (Fullerton & Punji, 2002; cited in Evans et al., 2009). Subsequently consumers would not seem to care that much of the results of pirating music which could be explained by the low consumer involvement and therefore also affecting the purchasing behavior (or lack thereof) (Solomon et al., 1999; Fournier, 1998). Also, calculations and rationalizations on the risk of being prosecuted for music piracy related with the benefit gained is conducted by the consumer (Chen et al., 2008). The result in this kind of calculations is evidently that the benefit is perceived higher than the risk. This lack of consideration is therefore to some
extent explaining the low impact of attitudes on piracy intentions, thus consumers chooses to pirate music despite their formed attitudes of it being wrong and considered illegal.

### 5.6 Artist Liking versus Artist Loyalty

When leaving out the ‘attitudinal factors’ the remaining ‘artist loyalty’ and ‘artist liking’ are more interesting factors when measuring piracy intentions. This is because the level of ‘artist loyalty’ is affecting the ‘piracy intentions’ with the effect of higher loyalty resulting in higher intentions to pirate. Hence this leads to rejecting Hypothesis 2 (H2) as false. The empirical findings show that 70 percent of the ‘piracy intentions’ is explained by the ‘artist loyalty variable’. Therefore we could draw conclusions about the variable itself despite existing theory (Evans et al., 2009) as instead of enhancing future purchase behavior rather could be seen as enhancing the willingness of acquisition. The remarkable clash is found in the theories from which the hypothesis is derived explaining loyalty as a result of repeated experiences of liking. Thus one could question if liking is seen as later leading to piracy as well?

There are actually real life cases of this as Mariah Carey, Puff Daddy and Garth Brooks to mention some, who sold a large number of first albums and then slight to none among the later ones produced (Susman, 2007). However such parallels are impossible to draw due a very high number of other factors and coincidence, but the discussion of different time frames nevertheless become evident. Since ‘artist liking’ and, more accurately several events of liking, lead to ‘artist loyalty’ it becomes interesting if they have different time spells of effect on purchase enhancing behavior. Since a relational consumption with an emotional affection being established between artist and consumer (Fournier, 1998) together with high levels of liking who the artist is and the fit between the artist’s beliefs and values with the consumers (Oliver, 1997), ‘artist liking’ seems to have a shorter life length than a well established ‘artist loyalty’ towards the artist (Kuhl & Beckman, 1985). This fact is consequently having implications of the finding of artist liking as the decreasing factor of piracy.

The empirical findings present that ‘artist liking’ is the explanation of 28.2 percent of the variance in piracy intentions where the higher liking results in lower intentions to pirate. These both two variables together (due to similarities working interdependently) are to be seen as the bridge over piracy – built by pillars of liking, forming a bridge of loyalty. Consequently this stresses the importance of maintaining a high ‘artist liking’ among consumers to enhance the purchase behavior which combined with high levels of loyalty probably would gain synergies of them both. The implication of this is that the record companies should maintain and enhance a high liking towards artists so that the “establishment of new (liking) pillars” would enable a sustainable bridge of loyalty upon. Hence it can be seen as the two of artist liking and artist loyalty to have clear synergies to be exploited.
6 Conclusion

In this section the conclusion, which is drawn from the analysis and empirical data is presented. The conclusion answers the purpose of this study and its research questions.

In this section the empirical findings and analysis will again be reconnected with the starting research questions and the purpose of the study. The ‘attitudinal factors variable’ is also included since the finding of it not having an impact is considered a mentionable conclusion as well. Hence, the research questions are presented and answered below:

- What impact do attitudinal factors of consumers have upon the piracy intentions?

The empirical findings from our study about the measured ‘attitudinal factors variable’ were those of the consumers’ regarding music piracy as wrong, but nevertheless conducting it. The assumed underlying reasons for this are among other being due to low perceived prosecution risks, lack of consideration as well as other causes with reference to consumers’ attitudes (Solomon et al., 1999; Wells & Prensky, 1996; Hawkins & Mothertbaugh, 2010). The most noteworthy point is the attitude contradicting behavior carried out, which is interpreted with attitudinal factor theories of conflicting options, i.e. higher perceived utility from pirating rather than purchasing music (Solomon et al., 1999; Hawkings & Mothertbaugh, 2010). The attitude contradicting behavior was however not fully confirmable due to insignificant contribution of the ‘attitudinal factors variable’ to ‘piracy intentions’ and therefore excluded in the final model (Model Four). This also leads to our Hypothesis 1 (H1) of being seen as unanswered in this study.

**H1:** Attitudinal factors, i.e. seeing piracy as unethical and wrong decreases consumers’ intentions to pirate music.

H1: Is accepted as true, negative attitudes towards piracy decreases consumers intentions to pirate.

- What impact does artist loyalty have on consumers’ willingness to pay and not to pirate?

One of the more interesting empirical findings was regarding the variable of ‘artist loyalty’ whereas a higher level of loyalty results in increased intentions to pirate music from the artist in question. This is not in line with the theories of consumer loyalty as they are written today as “loyalty increasing future purchase behavior” (Oliver, 1997; Schiffman & Kanuk, 1987). The findings in this study rather show that loyalty merely increases the willingness of acquisition. Calculations show that 70 percent of the variance in ‘piracy intentions variable’ is explained by the level of ‘artist loyalty’ hence confirming loyalty being one of the key issues of consumer behavior (Evans et al., 2009; Solomon et al., 2002). However our second hypothesis (H2) is therefore seen as rejected as false:

**H2:** Artist/band loyalty reduces the consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.

H2: Is rejected as false, higher loyalty does not decrease consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.

- What impact does artist liking have on consumers’ willingness to pay and not to pirate?

The measured ‘artist liking variable’ is having an impact explaining 28.2 percent of the variance in the ‘piracy intentions variable’, where a higher measured liking results in lower intentions to pirate music from the liked artist. It was also explored what the respondents did
value most in the concept of artist liking, not surprisingly concluding the artist’s music as more important than how the artist is perceived as person. There were no unanticipated findings that did not match the theories from which the hypothesis to test ‘artist liking’ was deduced from (Kim, 2008; Evans et al., 2009; Solomon et al., 2002) and liking had a decreasing effect on piracy intentions of the consumers Therefore also our third hypothesis (H3) was seen as accepted:

**H3:** Artist/band liking reduce the consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.

H3: Is accepted as true, liking the artist does decrease consumers’ intentions to pirate music from that artist.

The results from this thesis are presented in the final model (Figure 4C p.34) showing the impacts on piracy intentions of ‘artist liking’ and ‘artist loyalty’, thus leaving out ‘attitudinal factors’. These remaining variables together do due similarity work together interdependently and are seen as the bridge over piracy – built by pillars of liking, forming a bridge of loyalty. Therefore pointing out the importance of maintaining a required high ‘artist liking’ among consumers to boost the purchase behavior, where a high level of synergic benefits are exploitable and therefore a factor lowering the consumers’ intentions to pirate music.

7 Discussion

In this closing discussion, reflections of issues that have been raised during the progress of writing this thesis are discussed. Suggestions on further research within the same topic and/or area are proposed.

As this section of discussion leaves room for self-criticism this opportunity will be taken, mainly pointing criticism toward the first round of data collection which was conducted in a rather incoherent way concerning the choice of indicators and questions as well as the design of the questionnaire. This could have been further approved to be fully optimized, but nevertheless delivered results of very useful indicators to further use in the second questionnaire. Also the sample sizes could be discussed to be too small and with additional time the samples could have been increased and also other regions than Jönköping could have been included (e.g. Stockholm, Malmö and/or Gothenburg). This could be seen as inviting for a follow-up study to further confirm the reliability of the empirical findings if the same findings could be replicated using the same set of techniques.

Also additional deeper investigations about ‘artist liking’ would be of interest since it is this variable that is measured to have a decreasing effect on piracy. This idea more developed could refer to studies on the connections between events of liking leading to ‘artist loyalty’, which is seen to be increasing piracy intentions and the implications of this fact. Our theoretical framework of consumer liking could nevertheless also have been even deepened and explored to enhance the understanding for our measured variables. The theoretical implications, i.e. measured differences between results and theory, could be seen as significant input for the marketing strategies and development of new business models of record labels and the music industry.

The fact that there exist fully functioning and available free streaming options as ‘Spotify’ despite the ongoing piracy could also be invitational for studies researching the area of ‘digital products’, since as mentioned the downloading of an MP3 could be seen as a substitute of the ownership of a physical CD. Thus raising the question of streaming music versus the feeling and perceived utility of instead ‘owning’ the music and a deepened understanding of such dynamics.
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Appendices

8.1 Factor Analysis Results

Hereby we present the principal component analysis matrixes for each of our (reduced) variable used in our standard multiple regression analysis.

### Artist Liking Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotated Component Matrix*</th>
<th>Component Matrix*</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Only one component was extracted. The solution cannot be rotated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q1 | .944 |
| Q2 | .928 |
| Q3 | .793 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.

### Piracy Intentions Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotated Component Matrix*</th>
<th>Component Matrix*</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Only one component was extracted. The solution cannot be rotated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q4 | .920 |
| Q5 | .903 |
| Q6 | .450 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.

### Artist Loyalty Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotated Component Matrix*</th>
<th>Component Matrix*</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Only one component was extracted. The solution cannot be rotated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q7 | .853 |
| Q8 | .728 |
| Q9 | .854 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.

### Attitudinal Factors Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotated Component Matrix*</th>
<th>Component Matrix*</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Only one component was extracted. The solution cannot be rotated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q10 | .883 |
| Q11 | .928 |
| Q12 | .610 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.
8.2 Data Set, First Round of Data Collection

<p>| Respondent | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Spending on Music | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 2 |
| Liking | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| Piracy Intentions | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Frequency to Listen | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| Liking | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 |
| Previous Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Spending on Music | 4 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| Liking | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 5 |
| Artist is a good person | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 6 |
| Piracy Intentions | 4 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| Previous Experiences | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 5 |
| Loyalty | 4 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 6 |
| Download next album | 4 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 6 |
| Piracy Intentions | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| Buy latest album | 2 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| Piracy Intentions | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Uniqueness of artist | 4 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| Goodness of song | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 |
| Liking | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 4 |
| Frequency listen to song | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 |
| The artist is good | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| Liking | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Previous Experiences | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 6 |
| Intenitions to buy song | 4 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| Liking | 2 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| Piracy Intentions | 3 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| Spending on | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Likings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music Liking</strong></td>
<td>6 6 6 2 2 6 4 3 5 5 2 5 4 5 6 2 6 6 5 6 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pirate Intentions</strong></td>
<td>1 1 1 5 5 1 3 4 2 2 5 2 3 2 1 5 1 1 2 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency to Listen</strong></td>
<td>6 6 6 5 5 6 4 6 5 6 1 5 3 6 6 6 6 5 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous Ownership Liking</strong></td>
<td>5 1 5 4 2 6 1 3 3 1 4 5 3 4 1 2 6 6 3 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pirate Intentions buy next album Liking</strong></td>
<td>6 6 6 3 5 6 3 2 3 5 4 3 3 4 5 5 6 6 4 6 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pirate Intentions Uniqeness of artist Liking</strong></td>
<td>1 1 1 4 2 1 4 5 4 2 3 4 4 3 2 2 1 1 3 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artist is a good person Liking</strong></td>
<td>2 3 1 2 4 5 2 1 2 3 6 3 2 5 1 2 1 1 2 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piracy Intentions</strong></td>
<td>5 5 5 5 6 5 6 4 5 2 5 4 4 2 6 5 4 5 4 1 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous Experiences Liking</strong></td>
<td>4 5 1 4 2 4 6 6 5 6 2 3 6 2 3 2 3 6 6 6 6 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Download next album Loyalty</strong></td>
<td>3 4 5 4 5 5 4 4 5 4 3 4 6 2 2 4 3 6 4 3 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pirate Intentions Buy latest album Loyalty</strong></td>
<td>6 3 6 6 2 2 2 6 3 6 1 4 4 4 1 2 1 4 6 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pirate Intentions Uniqeness of song Liking</strong></td>
<td>2 4 6 5 4 6 6 5 5 3 4 3 3 6 6 5 2 1 4 6 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goodness of song Liking</strong></td>
<td>4 4 5 2 4 4 2 1 4 4 3 5 2 3 1 5 1 4 3 2 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency listen to song Liking</strong></td>
<td>6 6 6 5 6 5 6 6 6 6 2 5 6 2 6 6 6 6 5 6 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The artist is good Liking</strong></td>
<td>5 6 6 5 5 5 4 6 5 2 3 4 6 5 3 6 5 5 4 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous Experiences 2 Liking</strong></td>
<td>3 6 6 3 5 4 4 4 5 6 2 4 6 4 4 2 5 6 5 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intentions to buy song Liking</strong></td>
<td>4 4 6 2 1 2 4 6 5 4 3 4 4 2 5 3 6 4 2 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piracy Intentions Intentions download song</strong></td>
<td>1 1 1 4 2 1 1 3 4 4 4 3 2 1 1 3 5 3 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spending on Music 2 Pirate Intentions</strong></td>
<td>6 6 6 6 3 5 6 6 4 3 3 3 4 5 6 6 4 2 4 6 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 4 6 6 1 2 2 6 3 6 1 5 6 5 1 5 1 6 6 3 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 6 5 6 3 2 6 6 3 2 4 2 6 1 5 5 4 2 3 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spending on Music</td>
<td>Pirate Intentions</td>
<td>Frequency to Listen</td>
<td>Pirate Intentions</td>
<td>Previous Ownership</td>
<td>Pirate Intentions</td>
<td>Uniqueness of artist</td>
<td>Pirate Intentions</td>
<td>Previous Experiences</td>
<td>Download next album</td>
<td>Pirate Intentions</td>
<td>Buy latest album</td>
<td>Pirate Intentions</td>
<td>Uniqueness of song</td>
<td>Pirate Intentions</td>
<td>Goodness of song</td>
<td>Frequency listen to song</td>
<td>The artist is good</td>
<td>Previous Experiences 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62</td>
<td>1 3 6 1 4 1 3 1 1 2 1 2 1 4 3 1 1 1 4 2 5</td>
<td>6 5 1 6 1 6 5 6 5 4 6 6 2 2 6 6 5 6 6 6</td>
<td>6 4 2 5 1 4 5 6 6 1 1 6 5 5 6 6 5 6 5 6 1</td>
<td>6 3 6 4 5 1 5 6 1 6 3 1 4 2 2 3 6 6 6 1 6</td>
<td>6 4 1 3 2 6 2 1 6 1 4 6 3 5 5 4 1 1 4 6 1</td>
<td>1 4 4 5 5 3 4 4 3 4 1 1 1 3 2 1 2 5 2 3 2</td>
<td>4 2 2 4 3 3 5 4 6 3 4 5 1 3 4 5 5 1 6 5 3</td>
<td>5 1 3 1 2 6 5 4 5 3 6 3 6 3 5 5 4 6 4 6 3</td>
<td>5 3 3 5 3 4 4 6 6 3 4 2 4 4 5 5 6 2 4 6 5</td>
<td>3 1 5 1 5 4 5 1 6 1 1 3 1 1 5 4 1 6 6 3 3</td>
<td>5 3 4 3 3 3 3 1 1 1 1 5 1 4 5 6 6 6 4 6 1</td>
<td>2 4 3 4 4 4 4 6 6 6 6 2 6 3 2 1 1 1 3 1 6</td>
<td>5 4 4 1 3 1 2 1 6 2 1 6 4 3 3 4 6 5 4 4 3</td>
<td>6 6 2 5 2 6 6 2 6 6 6 6 6 4 2 6 6 6 5 5 3</td>
<td>5 5 3 5 3 2 3 4 6 5 6 3 5 6 3 2 6 6 2 5 4</td>
<td>5 5 3 4 4 5 5 6 3 3 3 6 4 2 3 5 5 4 6 4 4</td>
<td>6 6 4 4 6 3 3 4 1 1 1 6 5 4 5 6 1 1 4 4 4</td>
<td>1 5 3 3 1 4 4 3 6 6 6 1 2 3 2 1 6 6 3 3 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.3 Data Set Second Round of Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Stream</th>
<th>Youtube</th>
<th>Mp3</th>
<th>Radio</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Q12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60000</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10500</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25000</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21666</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10600</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20600</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>mobil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>tv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Youtube</td>
<td>Mp3</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>7 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 7 7 7</td>
<td>7 5 7 5</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>1 1 3 1</td>
<td>1 7 1 1</td>
<td>4 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 7 6 2</td>
<td>2 2 6 2</td>
<td>6 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>4 5 4 1</td>
<td>2 7 4 2</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>5 6 5 6</td>
<td>6 7 4 5</td>
<td>5 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 6 7 1</td>
<td>2 1 5 1</td>
<td>5 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>5 6 6 3</td>
<td>4 2 3 1</td>
<td>5 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>y y</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 5 6 4</td>
<td>5 5 2 6</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>y y</td>
<td>6 6 4 1</td>
<td>1 1 4 1</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>y y</td>
<td>6 1 4 1</td>
<td>1 1 3 3</td>
<td>4 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>3 5 2 6</td>
<td>6 6 5 6</td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21115</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>7 7 5 1</td>
<td>1 4 5 1</td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>y y</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 6 6 1</td>
<td>1 4 5 1</td>
<td>7 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22000</td>
<td>y y</td>
<td>4 4 5 1</td>
<td>2 7 2 7</td>
<td>7 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>6 6 5 6</td>
<td>6 5 4 6</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>4 5 6 1</td>
<td>1 1 7 1</td>
<td>7 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>3 3 3 3</td>
<td>3 3 2 2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>5 5 3 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>flac</td>
<td>5 4 4 7</td>
<td>7 7 5 7</td>
<td>5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>4 4 4 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>6 6 5 1</td>
<td>1 1 3 3</td>
<td>5 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>7 7 7 1</td>
<td>7 7 7 7</td>
<td>7 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 7 5 7</td>
<td>6 1 7 7</td>
<td>7 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>6 6 4 1</td>
<td>1 7 4 5</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>y y</td>
<td>5 5 6 1</td>
<td>1 7 3 1</td>
<td>3 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>do not know U2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>y y</td>
<td>3 2 6 7</td>
<td>2 7 1 1</td>
<td>5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>4 3 5 7</td>
<td>7 7 2 2</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>5 5 7 4</td>
<td>4 5 4 3</td>
<td>4 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17000</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>5 5 5 6</td>
<td>6 7 5 7</td>
<td>7 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>4 4 4 1</td>
<td>1 1 4 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29550</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>3 3 4 1</td>
<td>4 7 1 4</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 5 4 4</td>
<td>4 6 7 5</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 5 6 1</td>
<td>1 1 2 2</td>
<td>4 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33500</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>5 5 6 6</td>
<td>6 4 4 7</td>
<td>5 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>y y</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 4 5 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>y y</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 5 6 1</td>
<td>2 7 5 6</td>
<td>6 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.4 Questionnaire First Round of Data Collection

**Frågeformulär**

Vi är två studenter som studerar på Internationella Handelshögskolan i Jönköping och bedriver forskning inom 'music piracy' och skulle vilja erbjuda dig att delta i detta projekt.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jag studerar på Högskolan i Jönköping</th>
<th>JA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kan tänka mig spendera pengar på musik av artisten</th>
<th>Kan inte tänka mig spendera pengar på musik av artisten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jag lyssnar ofta på artisten</td>
<td>Jag lyssnar själv på artisten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag äger flera album från denna artist</td>
<td>Jag äger inga album från denna artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag kan inte tänka mig att köpa artistens nästa album</td>
<td>Jag kan tänka mig att köpa artistens nästa album</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det finns andra artister som jag ser som lika bra som denna artist</td>
<td>Det finns inga andra artister som jag ser som lika bra som denna artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag tycker artisten verkar vara en bra person</td>
<td>Jag tycker inte artisten verkar vara en bra person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Även om jag ändå äger flera album och köpt musik så är det inte okej att ladda hem samma musik olegligt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jag har bra tidigare erfarenheter av artisten, både när det kommer till musik och artisten som person</th>
<th>Jag har inte så bra erfarenheter av artisten, verken när det kommer till musik eller artisten som person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jag har tänkt ladda ner det senaste albumet eller låten av artisten</td>
<td>Jag har ej tänkt ladda ner det senaste albumet eller låten av artisten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag har tänkt köpa det senaste albumet eller låten av artisten</td>
<td>Jag har inte tänkt köpa det senaste albumet eller låten av artisten</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tänk nu på en riktigt bra ny låt av en annan artist och svara på resterande frågor utifrån den:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Det finns andra låtar som kan konkurrera med denna just nu</th>
<th>Det finns andra låtar som kan konkurrera med denna just nu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jag tycker att låten är bra</td>
<td>Jag tycker låten är sådär</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag lyssnar inte så mycket på den</td>
<td>Jag lyssnar mycket på den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag gillar denna artisten</td>
<td>Jag tycker denna artisten är sådär</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag har bra tidigare erfarenheter av artisten, både när det kommer till musik och artisten som person</td>
<td>Jag har inte så bra erfarenheter av artisten, verken när det kommer till musik eller artisten som person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag har tänkt köpa det senaste albumet eller låten av artisten</td>
<td>Jag har inte tänkt köpa det senaste albumet eller låten av artisten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag har eller har tänkt ladda hem låten</td>
<td>Jag har inte och tänker inte ladda hem låten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag spenderar pengar på musik</td>
<td>Jag spenderar inte pengar på musik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tack för din medverkan!
Frågeformulär

8.5 Questionnaire Second Round of Data Collection

Viär två studenter som studerar på Internationella Handelshögskolan i Jönköping och bedriver forskning inom "music piracy" och skulle bli väldigt glada om ni tog
er tid att fylla i detta formulär.

Läs påståendet och kryssa i rutan som känns rätt för dig på skalan
tämmer mycket bra till stämmer mycket dåligt.

Självklart är enkäten anonym.

Kön: □ Man □ Kvinna  Ålder: ________år  Inkomst: _______________ kronor/månad

Börja med att tänka på bandet U2 och svara på följande frågor utifrån det:

Var lyssnar du på U2's musik?
□ Laglig streaming (t ex. Spotify)  □ YouTube  □ Mp3  □ Radio  □ CD/LP/Kassett  □ Annat __________

□ Lyssnar ej på musik

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jag gillar artisten</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket bra</th>
<th>Stämmer bra</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska bra</th>
<th>Stämmer sådär</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket dåligt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jag gillar artisters musik</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket bra</th>
<th>Stämmer bra</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska bra</th>
<th>Stämmer sådär</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket dåligt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jag tycker artisten är en bra person</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket bra</th>
<th>Stämmer bra</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska bra</th>
<th>Stämmer sådär</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket dåligt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jag brukar ladda hem musik från denna artist olagligt</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket bra</th>
<th>Stämmer bra</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska bra</th>
<th>Stämmer sådär</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket dåligt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jag ska förmodligen ladda hem artisters musik i framtiden</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket bra</th>
<th>Stämmer bra</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska bra</th>
<th>Stämmer sådär</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket dåligt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jag spenderar sällan pengar på denna artists musik</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket bra</th>
<th>Stämmer bra</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska bra</th>
<th>Stämmer sådär</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket dåligt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jag lyssnar ofta på denna artists musik</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket bra</th>
<th>Stämmer bra</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska bra</th>
<th>Stämmer sådär</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket dåligt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jag har tidigare olagligt nedladdad / köpt musik av artisten</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket bra</th>
<th>Stämmer bra</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska bra</th>
<th>Stämmer sådär</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket dåligt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jag har bra tidigare erfarenheter av denna artist</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket bra</th>
<th>Stämmer bra</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska bra</th>
<th>Stämmer sådär</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket dåligt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Det känns fel att ladda hem musik olagligt av denna artist</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket bra</th>
<th>Stämmer bra</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska bra</th>
<th>Stämmer sådär</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket dåligt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jag tycker det är allmänt fel att ladda hem musik olagligt</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket bra</th>
<th>Stämmer bra</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska bra</th>
<th>Stämmer sådär</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket dåligt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I vissa fall vid nedladdning av musik (även från andra artister än U2) kan man lämna ett "bidrag" till artisten. Detta innebär att man kan betala ett varefter belopp eller ladda hem låten gratis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jag skulle lämna ett bidrag om möjligheten finns</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket bra</th>
<th>Stämmer bra</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska bra</th>
<th>Stämmer sådär</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer dåligt</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket dåligt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TACK FÖR DIN MEDVERKAN!