

The impact that music streaming services such as Spotify, Tidal and Apple Music have had on consumers, artists and the music industry itself.

Aoife Coffey

A research Paper submitted to the University of Dublin,
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science Interactive Digital Media

2016

Declaration

I have read and I understand the plagiarism provisions in the General Regulations of the University Calendar for the current year, found at: <http://www.tcd.ie/calendar>

I have also completed the Online Tutorial on avoiding plagiarism 'Ready, Steady, Write', located at <http://tcdie.libguides.com/plagiarism/ready-steady-write>

I declare that the work described in this research Paper is, except where otherwise stated, entirely my own work and has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree at this or any other university.

Signed: _____

Aoife Coffey

13th May 2016

Permission to lend and/or copy

I agree that Trinity College Library may lend or copy this research Paper upon request.

Signed: _____

Acknowledgements:

I would like to thank my mum and Ian for being there for me throughout the year. I would also like to thank my boyfriend Luke, for reading all my drafts and for his support this year.

I would also like to thank my supervisor Jack Cawley for his support.

Abstract

This essay will analyse the impact that music streaming services have had on consumers, artists and the music industry. The project will aim to do this by critically analysing three of the most prominent streaming services, Spotify, Apple Music and Tidal. This essay develops three case studies in order to fully interpret the impact which the introduction of music streaming services have had on the industry. Currently, Spotify is the most popular streaming service. However, this may be due to the fact that it offers a freemium service alongside a paid service. Apple Music was launched on the world's most popular smartphone, the iPhone, as well as other Apple products. Tidal was rebranded under the management of Jay Z and thus had to build up its subscription base. After careful analysis of the streaming services, recommendations are offered in order to assist the future alignment of music streaming services with the wishes of the music industries consumers, artists and record labels.

This research paper was researched using the current literature available that has been written on the three music streaming services. The influence of piracy on the music industry will also be analysed. This will be associated with the growth of technology in the area of music distribution and will highlight the changes that have taken place in the music industry over the last twenty years. The references used in this essay consist of academic findings alongside website articles which offer insights into the music streaming services, its associated artists and the music industry surrounding them. This ensures that the facts stated in the essay are up to date. All sources have been cross referenced to ensure their authenticity.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review and Methodology.....	3
2.1 Literature Review	3
2.1.1 The Power of the Industry	5
2.2 Methodology	6
Chapter 3 Spotify	7
3.1 The Growing Popularity of Spotify	7
3.2 Freemium Controversy	8
3.3 Industry Response to Spotify	9
3.4 Conclusion	11
Chapter 4 Case Study on Taylor Swift	12
Chapter 5 The Beginning of iTunes and Apple Music	15
5.1 The Development of iTunes	15
5.2 The Launch of Apple Music.....	16
5.3 Artist Connection	18
5.4 Conclusion	19
Chapter 6 Tidal.....	20
6.1 Tidal under Jay Z's Management	20
6.2 High Cost Subscription Service.....	21
6.3 Tidal's Exclusivity Issue	22
6.3.1 Rihanna's 'Anti'	23
6.3.2 Kanye West's 'The Life of Pablo'	23
6.3.3 Beyoncé's 'Lemonade'	24
6.4 Conclusions	25
Chapter 7 Recommendations for the Future	26
7.1 Spotify	26
7.2 Apple Music	27
7.3 Tidal	27
Chapter 8 Conclusion	29
References	32

Chapter 1 Introduction

Music streaming services have become the most popular method for consumers to listen to music. Streaming services offer consumers unlimited access to large catalogues of music. These services store the music in a server that users can connect to via their laptops and mobile devices. Whilst connected to the internet users can listen to any song they wish, by selecting it on the application from which it can then be played. On many services the consumer can choose to store the music locally, by making it available offline. This means that the music is stored on the consumer's device within the memory of the streaming service app. The user does not own any of the music in the catalogue, in this way it is similar to how people rent books from a library. Users are also unable to access the individual MP3 files within the catalogue and therefore they cannot make copies for their own use. Through a monthly subscription whether paid or free, users are able to stream their favourite artists easily on their own devices. The technology of streaming services whether music or video has been growing consistently over the past ten years. Most streaming services allow users to download an application for free from which they are able to access the full service, rather than just using the services main website. Music streaming has grown in popularity due to the fact that many consumers have access to a smart phone with internet on a regular basis. Thus showing that the rise of music streaming services has been dependent on the technology which has been created alongside it. Music streaming has offered the music industry and its artists a new method of sharing and distributing music to consumers across the world.

This research paper aims to critically analyse three of the most prominent music streaming services in the industry, Spotify, Apple Music and Tidal. Spotify was chosen due to the popularity and dominance that it currently holds over the streaming market. Apple Music was chosen due its development from the existing iTunes Store, Apple brand and its associated products. Tidal was chosen due to its connection with artists and recent controversy surrounding the exclusivity of some of the music on the site. Each of these services will be examined, in relation to the effect they have on their consumers, artists and the music industry itself. Through analysing and comparing each of these services, readers

will have a greater understanding of the positive and negative features associated with a streaming service. After discussing the music streaming services, this essay will make recommendations on aspects of the services that could be changed or updated in order for each service to improve. These changes will represent benefits for consumers, artists and the industry. This paper will also include three case studies. The first case study is based on the idea of a DIY artist, and features the artist, Sandi Thom who is independent to the music industry. The second case study looks at prominent artist Taylor Swift, and her opinions on music streaming services in general, but more specifically on Spotify and Apple Music. The final case study is within the Tidal chapter, which discusses the controversy surrounding the exclusivity of music offered by Tidal. These case studies were chosen as examples of controversy surrounding music streaming services and the industry.

This paper is based on research literature which is currently available in relation to the music streaming services. There is a gap in academic research of this area, as many academics have written papers solely on Spotify. This could be due to the fact that both Apple Music and Tidal are only one year old at the time of writing. Therefore, this paper will stand out as an analysis looking to compare the three services, something that has yet to be explored thoroughly. This paper will aim to identify whether each service has had a positive or negative impact on their consumers, artists and the industry. With regards to the artist's aspect of this paper, it will look at the payment they receive from streaming services and the influence of some artists in the Tidal movement. The music industry aspect will analyse the effect streaming has had on piracy, CD sales and also the distribution of music. The impact of technology will be discussed in the literature review section, as will the different methods of piracy that have existed in the music industry over the last fifty years.

Chapter 2 Literature Review and Methodology

2.1 Literature Review

Many of the articles written about music streaming services often refer to them as the modern form of piracy. In the last twenty years, the music industry has gone through many changes due to technological innovations. Technology has had both a negative and a positive effect on the industry. The issue of piracy has existed in the music industry since the beginning, however the nature of it has changed. Piracy as defined by the Oxford English Dictionary refers to 'the unauthorized reproduction or use of an invention or work of another, as a book, recording, computer software, intellectual property, etc.' (*piracy, n.*, 2016). Before music was available on CDs, music fans would record their favourite artist's music via cassette tape while the song was being played on the radio. One of the earliest forms of music piracy occurred when people would produce recordings of songs and then sell the recorded songs on cassettes tapes. Initially when CDs became a popular format for audio files, many CDs were coded to restrict the disc from being played on computers, as this was how users could create pirate CDs. People would rip (upload) the files from the CD onto a computer and then burn (copy) the files onto an empty CD. This became the second generation of music piracy. However, due to advances in technology, it has become easier to acquire music for free online. As a result, this has led to an increase in piracy. Online music stores such as Apple's iTunes were seen as a necessary evil in the battle against piracy. Users were given the option of buying music cheaper and many in the industry believed this would offer users the option to morally purchase music rather than download it illegally. However, in more recent years many believe that streaming services such as Spotify have become the most recent case of music piracy. This is because Spotify offers its users a free subscription, thus allowing users to listen to music for free.

The way music is distributed has developed in line with technology, however the laws regarding copyright and the payments of artists and producers have not been updated to deal with the addition of music streaming services. Gardner (2015) quotes Maria Pallante, the director of the Copyright Office discussing this issue where she states, 'the structures that evolved in the previous century to facilitate the lawful exploitation of musical works

and sound recordings, while perhaps adequate for the era of discs and tapes, are under significant stress'. In a report issued by the US Copyright Office, Spotify stated that 'we are competing with piracy, it's a reality that we all face on every level of the ecosystem, we are all competing with free'. This shows that even well-established streaming services are attempting to combat music piracy on a daily basis. The idea of music piracy has been consistently changing alongside the development of new technology. It seems that initially the music industry is untrustworthy of each new technological development until it has existed for a number of years or been overtaken by the next big thing.

The idea of giving music away for free on streaming services has been met with angst from many music artists such as Taylor Swift. However, as part of the artists contract/record deal with their record company they often have to give music away for free. When an album is ready to be sold in stores, record companies make deals with the individual stores to decide on how many albums the store will purchase in order for them to sell on to consumers. In an attempt to get stores to stock more of an album they give away 10% or more of the albums that are ordered for free (Passman, 2015). These albums do not accumulate any royalties for the artists. Albums which are offered to radio stations and competitions by the artist for the promotion a new album, lead to a loss of royalties received by the artist due to the distribution of music for free (Passman, 2015). Thus showing that the artist fails to make royalties in many aspects of music publishing and distributing, not just from streaming.

Advances in technology have forced the industry to reevaluate its current laws and practices. Each new technological innovation has been met with backlash initially, however it is only when the record companies invest in these new innovations themselves, that they become common use for the industry as a whole. It is clear to see that the music industry is still in control of what happens with its products and artists.

2.1.1 The Power of the Industry: Case Study on DIY Artists

Most artists do not have the power to stand up to the large record companies without losing their contracts. With regards to how their music is published and distributed many new artists signed to large record companies get very little say. Their music would be placed on any streaming site whether or not the artists wishes it to be. This leads to some new artists attempting to publish their music without the backing of a large company.

Nonetheless, there are not many successful cases of this. One artist who was said to be a do it yourself artists was, Sandi Thom. Thom was just a young artist attempting to become a star. Thom used websites such as Myspace and Soundcloud to promote her music. She was allegedly “discovered” when ‘she webcast a series of concerts from her basement’ (McLean, Oliver, and Wainwright, 2010). The audiences of these webcasts quickly grew and it was reported that she had 70,000 viewers at one point and as result of this success, she signed a £1 million contract with RCA records (McLean, Oliver, and Wainwright, 2010). When her song, ‘I wish I was a Punk Rocker’ went to number one in the charts, the media began to question the authenticity of Thom’s story. If it was true, it would mean that an artist could become popular without the support of a large record company. The media questioned how Thom had the internet bandwidth to support 70,000 fans watching her webcasts on a professional looking website (Sullivan, 2008). It seemed to both the media and fans that Thom, ‘was not the overnight success challenging the power of the music industry majors and PR machines, and redefining the relationship between artist and fans that she initially appeared to be’ (McLean, Oliver, and Wainwright, 2010). It was uncovered that a large public relations company had been working with Thom to help boost her profile for a few months (Gibson, 2006). Thus a media backlash against Thom ensued. Thom was called a manipulator and any other singles released failed to make an impact on the charts (Sullivan, 2008). Although it seemed, to many of the public at the time, that Thom had managed to gain success for herself without the help of any company, it turned out to be false. It seems that the record companies are the most powerful players in the industry and it has hard to succeed without their support.

2.2 Methodology

This paper is based on research previously undertaken in the area of music streaming. It will analyse the streaming services of Spotify, Apple Music and Tidal in relation to consumers, artists and the industry as a whole. The sources used in this essay were found using the college library website and databases also through Google Scholar. However, due to the fact that these streaming services are relatively new, many of the referenced are from reputable websites and have been cross referenced to ensure the facts presented are correct. Many of the news articles online led to other interesting topics that were discussed in this essay. As these streaming services are very much present, interesting news articles were published while this essay was being planned. For example, the case study on Tidal's exclusivity was formed due to new albums being released by prominent artists while analysing Tidal as a music streaming platform. Although it was difficult to find academic sources for this essay, the fact that many sources were used from the web meant that the information was very up to date. These web articles allowed for accurate statistics on subscribers numbers and also regarding the media's interest in the streaming services. Recommendations for the future of music streaming services were based on an analysis on how the music industry and streaming has changed through the years using the sources researched.

Chapter 3 Spotify

Spotify was founded in Sweden in 2006 and was officially launched as a music streaming platform in 2008. It has since expanded across the world, offering users the opportunity to listen to the music of their favourite artists without needing to own the music themselves. Spotify offers users based in European countries a paid subscription service of €10 a month. There is also a free subscription service which is offered across the website and tablet versions only. Paid users get added benefits of no advertisements between songs, unlimited skipping through the tracks, the ability to use the app on their mobile devices and also the option to have the music they like available offline. Although the option of a free service is welcomed by their consumers, it is not appreciated by many music artists as there is controversy over the payment they receive from Spotify against the payment they would normally receive from the sale of an album. Nonetheless, the record companies still use the service as a method to promote their artists. This chapter intends to highlight the impact which Spotify has had on the industry, its artists and also on the consumer.

3.1 The Growing Popularity of Spotify

When Spotify was launched in the UK and US during February 2009, it was seen as an alternative to music piracy by the media. Many articles report that it is difficult to find accurate statistics of the membership numbers of the music streaming sites and every report advocates for a different amount. Swanson (2013) wrote that 'Spotify is the fastest growing music streaming service in the world, with over 24 million users worldwide and nearly 6 million paying between US\$5 and \$10 a month to use the service'. At the time the service was only four years old, showing great progress for the future. Spotify initially offered users three subscription options, free, unlimited and premium. Unlimited would cost €5 while premium was €10. The unlimited subscription offer is no longer available on the site, however its main difference from the free version was that it removed advertisements. Nonetheless, it still did not allow offline content to be accessed on any device (Gilmour, 2016). The removal of unlimited may be seen as Spotify wishing for more of their users to pay for the premium service and thus not giving the middle option. Either the users pay to receive unlimited music with no distractions on any device or they must be

subjected to advertisements. In 2009, media sources stated that the public's perception was that Spotify was the 'future of music' (Lewis, 2009). In a more recent article on Spotify, Camp (2015) states that Spotify has 'more than fifty million users through the Americas, Europe and Australasia'. Therefore showing that according to media sources the amount of Spotify subscribers had doubled in two years. This could be associated with the continued growth of mobile phone technology, which means many consumers may use their mobile data and thus would be able to easily access the mobile application of Spotify. It is clear to see that Spotify is the most popular streaming service judging by the amount of users its service has attracted (Roettgers, 2015), however there is increased competition from new services such as Tidal and Apple Music. Spotify is popular with users due to its easy to use app and website which are available across many devices. It introduces users to new artists that they may like, in the 'discover weekly' playlist. This playlist is made up of songs and artists that Spotify thinks the user would like judging by the genres and artists they listen to while using the service (Luckerson, 2015a). Although the service is popular with its users, there has been controversy in the media regarding some artist's relationships with Spotify.

3.2 Freemium Controversy

In recent years Spotify has received criticism from artists who believe they are not receiving enough money from their streams on the site. They believe that this is because Spotify offers their music for free to subscribers. McLean, Oliver, and Wainwright (2010) stated that at the time of writing 'only 2 percent of the total memberships' were paid subscribers. According to Passman (2015), 'Spotify freemium users outnumber paid subscribers about three to one'. Freemium is a term used to describe the free subscription service offered by Spotify. Similarly to the problem with the available statistics relating to the amount of subscribers Spotify has, it is also difficult to understand how many of the users have subscribed for Spotify Premium. However it is clear to see that the number of paying subscribers has increased in line with the general subscriber increase. Lewis (2009) believed that the free aspect of Spotify would not be sustainable in the long term, however it seems that many early predictions for the service were incorrect. Nonetheless, the freemium aspect of Spotify has caused much controversy with artists. Similarly to other music

streaming services Spotify pays 'back seventy percent in royalties' which in most cases goes to the record label or distributor, unless the artist owns 'his or her master recordings', which averages to about \$0.0004 per stream of a song on Spotify (Swanson, 2013). This low payment which is often disputed and its accuracy questioned, has led to many artists pulling their music catalogue from Spotify.

Taylor Swift is one such case which will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter. The 'public discussion of Spotify payments first began in 2009, when it was widely reported that Lady Gaga had received payment of just \$167 for her song 'Poker Face', which has been streamed over a million times' (Marshall, 2015). This figure was misleading, however the publicity from it further damaged the reputation which Spotify had developed with artists. Passman (2015) states that 'earnings per stream come out to a much smaller number than they would on a pure subscription service (like Apple Music)'. This is why the artists in the music industry are pressuring Spotify to offer a paid only subscription service, and to remove the freemium service. Many artists do not receive large profits from music streaming because they do not own their songs. If the artists did not write the song, they receive less money as the songwriters and the record company need to receive their share before the artist does. The method of an artist getting paid does differ in Europe and America. Much of the problems with how artists get paid, lies with the deal that the record company would make with Spotify over how much money each stream would receive. This is often more difficult for newer artists who do not have enough popularity to depend on money made from streaming services alone. Whilst a prominent artist would receive more for their streams as Spotify expect more people to listen to their music. It is clear that Spotify has had a huge impact on an artist's income, nonetheless there is no discussion at the time of writing that suggests Spotify plan to cease the freemium subscription service.

3.3 Industry Response to Spotify

Spotify has become very popular with consumers and is viewed as controversial by many artists. Although many popular artists such as Adele, have chosen to release their albums a month after the CD release, it has not affected the overall popularity of the site. This is due

to the support it receives from the music industry. Marshall (2015) cites 'Universal Music Group, Sony Entertainment and Warner Music Group' as large supporters of Spotify. It can be said that without the support of these large companies Spotify would not exist. These record companies, negotiate with Spotify in order to allow Spotify to stream their music. Some companies such as Sony negotiated a deal with streaming service 'Pandora' for an increase of 25 percent in royalties (Swanson, 2013). However for many cases Spotify had to pay large amounts in fees upfront to the companies and also many labels took the option of taking shares in Spotify (Swanson, 2013). This means that the record labels have a personal interest in the growth of Spotify as they have invested in the service.

As stated before some artists have waited a month after their album is officially released before opting to place it on Spotify for streaming. This is similar to how DVDs are sold. When a film is released on DVD, it is usually not available on television until a given time has passed in order for the company to sell as much of the product as possible. Many artists such as Adele are adopting this model where they 'would release an album for sale on CD and iTunes, but would not make it available to free streaming services until after initial sales have peaked a month or so later' (Cubbison, 2014). Many record labels are now altering their business models by doing this for their most prominent artists in order to achieve maximum sales. This ensures that any fan who wishes to hear the artist's new music must pay for the physical copy or the digital copy, on iTunes for example. It seems that although many of the larger record companies support Spotify due to their financial involvement, it is not accepted by all. Many smaller record companies have also pulled their catalogues from the site citing the payment as the main area of disagreement. It seems that the support from the industry depends on the artist and the record label themselves. Many artists on larger record labels do not have a choice on whether or not their music appears on Spotify, this leaves tension which is aimed at Spotify. It is clear that the current subscription based business model that Spotify operates is both accepted and rejected in the music industry community.

3.4 Conclusion

Since Spotify was founded in 2006, it has dominated the music streaming service market. The popularity of it has grown throughout the years, as has its catalogue. However, this rise to the top has not been without controversy. Prominent music artists speaking out against the service have led the music industry to call into question whether or not this service is the best path for the future of music distribution. It has no doubt led to a decline in CD sales. Nonetheless it has offered both users and artists alike the chance to engage with new music that they never would have embraced or purchased prior to the launch of the music streaming site. Consumers can explore the many playlists set up by Spotify in order to find a new artist or song to listen to. This gives artists the opportunity to find new fans in countries where their music may not be sold. Spotify allows record companies to showcase the artists all on one platform, which they can manage and negotiate contracts with Spotify for. For all the positives which Spotify offers to the music industry, the main negative part of the service is the effect of the freemium service on artist's album sales and royalty distribution, as a result of this, they now have new competition in the form of Apple Music and Tidal. Two streaming services which offer a paid only service. Spotify is still the most popular streaming service and it will be interesting to see if it stays this way.

Chapter 4 Case Study on Taylor Swift

In November 2014, Taylor Swift pulled her music from Spotify on the grounds that she believed that the payment system which Spotify operates was unfair to songwriters. After speaking out against the service previously in 2013 (Swanson, 2013). Although Swift is not the only artist to have done this, she led the way for other music artists to remove their music from the site. Swift believed that music streaming services such as Spotify were contributing to the decline in CD sales (Luckerson, 2014). Swift's catalogue was removed from Spotify shortly before the release of her 1989 album which was projected to sell over a million records, thus becoming a platinum record (Greenburg, 2014). It exceeded expectations and sold over 1.287 million copies in the first week, none of which included streams from music sites (Caulfield, 2014). It would seem that Swift's decision to leave Spotify which did result in backlash from fans and media alike, was a successful move for Big Machine Records, Swift's record company. The President of Big Machine, Scott Borchetta, believed that Spotify did indeed hurt album sales and stated that Spotify would simply take the music created by the artist and would 'put it everywhere [they] want to put it' (Cubbison, 2014). Swift has not returned to Spotify unlike country star Jason Aldean who left shortly after Swift. Aldean has subsequently returned his catalogue to the streaming site, however it does not look like Swift will return to the music site anytime soon (Menconi, 2015). Swift has been quite vocal about her reasons for leaving Spotify. In an interview with Time magazine, Swift references the fact that even the 'freemium' subscribers have access to her music and she believes that by Spotify offering this, the value of her work is lessened compared to other sites such as Apple music where people pay a 'premium package' to access her albums (Dickey, 2014). However, it is clear that the popularity of Spotify does not depend on the strength of one artist, but on its catalogue of over 30 million songs.

Swift's dislike of music streaming services did not end with Spotify. In 2015, days before the launch of Apple Music, Swift wrote a blog post on the social media site Tumblr entitled, 'To Apple, Love Taylor'. Apple Music was going to offer a free three month trial to any iTunes customer that signed up to the new service. Initially, at this time Apple Music was only available on Apple products but a Beta app is now available in the Android store. Swift's

grievance with Apple was that any artist's music which was made available on the streaming service during the free three month trial period, would not receive payment for when their music was streamed. She writes that 'three months is a long time to go unpaid, and it is unfair to ask anyone to work for nothing' and wishes for them to change their policy (Swift, 2015). Swift ends with the powerful line 'we don't ask you for free iPhones, please don't ask us to provide you with our music for no compensation'. Forbes praised Swift for 'standing up to a company as massive as Apple', as did many artists (McIntyre, 2015). It then came as no surprise that Apple announced they would indeed pay the artists for the contribution of their music and the number of streams they receive. Many artists welcomed the decision and were grateful to Swift. Swift announced a few days later on Twitter, that she would be indeed be featuring her back catalogue and her latest album '1989' on Apple Music. Swift believes that music should be paid for and thus, chose to stream her music on a site such as Apple Music, where after the free trial is up, users must pay for access to the music. Thus giving more value to the work but also more royalties getting paid out to songwriters, artists and producers.

This was just the beginning of the relationship that Swift would forge with Apple. In 2015, it was announced that subscribers of Apple Music would have access to a full feature length documentary of the Swift's 1989 World Tour. This concert film would be exclusive to Apple Music consumers and as of now is not available on any other site or platform. Along with the release of this documentary, Swift sat down to an in-depth interview with Zane Lowe, a Beats 1 DJ (Peoples, 2015). Swift discusses how she 'didn't have a personal relationship with apple' until the letter (Apple, 2016). From then on Swift and Apple became a partnership. In April 2016, an advertisement featuring Swift for Apple Music was released. It showed Swift picking a playlist on the music app and then rapping to song by the artist, Drake. Johnson (2016) writes that as a result of this ad, Drake's song 'Jumpman' increased iTunes sales by 431 percent globally and that the video accumulated over 20 million views on Facebook and Instagram. Thus showing that Swift has a large fan base which Apple can use to promote its products. However, it is not clear whether or not this relationship was as a result of a well calculated marketing strategy or was it formed based on from Swift's letter on Tumblr. Swift has also allowed her music to become available on music streaming site, 'Tidal'. However,

the 1989 album is not present, which makes Apple Music one of the few mainstream sites to stream it (Lynch, 2015). Swift is determined to show Spotify that they must move away from their 'freemium' service to a full paid subscription service in order to entice her and the other artists that have pulled their catalogues to come back. It is clear to see that Swift has had a huge impact as an artist on two of the largest music streaming services.

Chapter 5 The Beginning of iTunes and Apple Music

Apple Music has become one of the biggest competitors to Spotify over the last year. However, this would not have been achieved without the foundation that iTunes provided. iTunes was originally created as a music platform which allowed users of Apple Mac products to save and play their CDs on their computer. The music store on iTunes which is still present today was launched in response to growing tensions in the music industry regarding illegal downloading of songs. iTunes played a huge role in the growth of digital music, however it was only in May 2014 that Apple made its first step into music streaming following the purchase of Beats Electronics. This deal eventually led to the formation of the Apple Music streaming service. It aimed to offer the iTunes catalogue in its entirety to users for a monthly subscription. This service would receive some controversy before its launch over its payment of artists as seen by Taylor Swift's letter to Apple. However, since then Apple has developed a music streaming platform which allows users to get connected to their favourite artists, while streaming Apple's large catalogue of songs.

5.1 The Development of iTunes

In 1999, Napster was an online platform founded and created by eighteen year old, Shawn Fanning that 'allowed people to share and swap MP3 files' (Swanson, 2013). This service was illegal, nonetheless after nine months it had over 'twenty million users' and at its peak Napster had over fifty seven million users (Swanson, 2013). As a result of this exponential growth, the music industry began to take note. This led to the Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA) suing Napster for its illegal use of MP3 files (Waldfoegel, 2010). Napster was shut down after it lost the suit. During this crisis in the music industry, Apple was planning to launch the iTunes Music Store. Many record labels at the time did not want music to be available digitally. Some record labels attempted to set up their own online music stores however they did not succeed. The creation of the iTunes Music Store coincided with the industries need to expand music sales onto an online market. It was also created to allow users of the Apple iPod to purchase music and as a result of this advancement, sales of the iPod grew from '\$344 million in 2003 to \$7.6 billion in 2006' (Leung, 2012). It is reported that by 2008, 'digital music accounted for 32 percent of

recorded music sales in the US, three quarters of which were sold at the iTunes Music Store' (Waldfoegel, 2010). Alongside the growth of popularity of the iPod, the iTunes Music catalogue expanded from 200,000 songs to over 700,000 in 2004 (Gasser, 2004).

One year after its creation, the iTunes Music Store 'had sold 125 million songs', by 2006 they had sold a billion songs and in 2008 they sold their 5 billionth song (Waldfoegel, 2010). It is clear that by this time Apple were dominating the market for digital music. However, not everyone in the industry was content with the success of iTunes. Similarly to how the media reacted to Spotify more recently, media outlets stated that iTunes had led to a drop in traditional music sales as the digital music store offered cheaper options than a record store would (Covert, 2013). iTunes gave their consumers the option of purchasing one song off an album rather than the previous method which required the consumer to purchase the complete album. This allowed consumers to be more selective in their purchasing. Covert (2013) writes that streaming services such as Spotify could improve the industry, which is the opposite of what the artists and record labels currently believe. However, Covert stated in 2013 that the effect iTunes produced on the industry over their initial ten years, meant that the way consumers listened to and accessed music would never be the same again. Apple Music would not have been able to launch without the successful foundation provided by iTunes. Similarly to Spotify, Apples digital music platform was popular with consumers without being wholeheartedly welcomed by the industries artists and record labels.

5.2 The Launch of Apple Music

In 2014, it was announced that Apple was purchasing Beats Electronic for over \$3 billion (Soloman, 2014). This signalled Apple's first step to providing a music streaming service. Apples acquisition of Beats Music provided the company with the platform of a streaming service as well a line of popular headphone products. It was from this that Apple Music developed. Soloman (2014) questioned why Apple did not simply develop its own streaming service rather than taking over the Beats service and states that this may be due to Tim Cook the CEO of Apple wanting a quick method to 'catch up with Spotify'. As stated before

Apple Music was built upon the already popular iTunes Store, which had a large number of users. Apple Music launched in June, 2015 and by August of that year, it stated that it had over 11 million trial subscribers (Della Cava, 2015). The free three month trial as discussed in the chapter on Taylor Swift, created some tension between the company and its featured music artists, however it was quickly resolved. Apple Music was launched as part of the music app available on Apple products such as iPhones, iPads and iPods, when the device was upgraded to iOS 8.4 (McGarry, 2015b). Users were then offered to sign up for the free trial which when the trial ended, the music platforms users would be charged €10 a month for the service. The Apple Music service has yet to dominate the music streaming market, however it is only a year old at time of writing. One part of its success could be put down to the fact that it was launched by 'replacing the default music player in the dock of permanent apps on the world's most popular smartphone' (Segan, 2015). This meant that users had little or no choice on whether or not they wanted to use the service. If they did not, they would have to go through their settings to remove it themselves.

Any user of the service was able to connect their own uploaded and purchased music on the iTunes Store with the new Apple Music streams. The large iTunes catalogue in its entirety was available to users for streaming. One popular feature of Apple Music was 'Beats 1', a worldwide 24 hour radio station where regular DJ's such as Zane Lowe and Ebro Darden could be heard as well as guest music artists such as Pharrell Williams (McGarry, 2015b). One aspect of the service which has proved to be negative for users and positive for artists, is that there is no free subscription option following the end of the three month trial period. After the trial ends users must choose to stay subscribed to the service for €10 a month or to leave and end their access to the music streaming service. If users do not continue to subscribe to the service they will still see the service visible on their devices and on their desktop but the streaming service will be inaccessible. In November 2015, Apple announced they would be shutting down the original Beats Music service (Tracy, 2015). Subscribers of this service were offered a migration tool which would allow them to move their music and playlists over to the Apple Music service, thus encouraging them to take up a subscription with the streaming service. Although Apple Music is still relatively new in the music streaming industry, it is clear to see that it has made an impact through attracting its

users who were already reliant on the music app on their smartphones and Apple devices. This service gave consumers the option to have their own music, held alongside the music they wished to stream rather than having it held in another app. It would be interesting to see if it has maintained the 11 million subscribers it had during the trial period and thus converted them into paying subscribers, something Spotify struggles with.

5.3 Artist Connection

Apple Music aims to connect users with the artists they love through the 'connect' area on the app. This area acts like a blog. Artists can post exclusive content such as images, posts and videos for the fans that follow them on the streaming service. McGarry (2015b) states that the Connect section of the app is 'pretty bare-bones' at the moment and suggests that the fault may exist, because of the fact that it does not allow fellow users to interact with one another 'to share songs or collaborate on playlists instead of simply following artists'. As well as the Connect section, Apple attempts to learn the users likes and dislikes. This is done initially during the set up process when users are asked to select bubbles on the screen that feature an artist's name that they like and to double tap the bubble if they love the artist (McGarry, 2015b). Apple Music will also 'automatically compare[s] every track in a user's music collection to Apple's music library' in order to understand what the user wants to hear (Weiss, 2015a).

Many users of the streaming service praise the human curated playlists provided by Apple Music. This means that there is no computer creating playlists using algorithms to detect 'songs that mention the word "summer" for a beachy playlist', for example (McGarry, 2015a). This creates a personal feel to the music provided on the app and allows users to stream playlists based on moods or activities knowing they were created by someone for that specific use. Similar to Spotify's 'discover' playlist, Apple creates a 'for you' playlist consisting of songs it thinks the user will like based on both their iTunes library and what the user has listened to on the streaming service. Apple Music initially was only available on Apple products which meant it had a limited audience, however recently it has been released on the Android store. Currently the app is still in beta. In order to use the app on

Android the user must have an Apple ID, however if the user is not a frequent user of iTunes or an Apple product they are at a disadvantage. This is because Apple knows less about their music tastes but also it most likely means that the user stores or plays music on a different device or app, thus removing the ease that Apple offers of having all the users' music in one place. However, it is clear that Apple wishes to connect users to their favourite artist through listening to their music and by interacting with them in the Connect section.

5.4 Conclusion

Although Apple was late to create an alternative streaming service to Spotify, it seems to have been a success to date. Music artists prefer Apple's service due to the fact it is paid subscription only and it paid artists during the three month free trial period for users. The use of the already existing iTunes platform to create a music streaming service meant that they would have a large consumer base to advertise their service to. Also the fact that any user of an Apple product who updated their device regularly, discovered that the music app, became the Apple Music access point. Apple Music aims to offer more than other digital streaming services by offering the users video and image content through the Connect section and as discussed in the previous chapter, it has offered users full concert documentaries and performances from stars such as Taylor swift and Drake. Many users appreciate the fact that the playlists are created by real people rather than computers, thus adding a more personal touch to the service. It is clear that Apple Music has a strong service that is well liked by fans and the industry. Apple Music streaming service could become a strong competitor for Spotify in the coming years.

Chapter 6 Tidal

Tidal was officially relaunched in March 2015 by means of a large press conference held by music artist, Jay Z, introducing the world to its new owners. These new owners consisted of some of the biggest names in the music industry such as Beyoncé, Madonna, Rihanna and Coldplay (Dredge, 2015). Although it seemed to the public that this was a new music streaming service, Tidal had already been in existence for many years under a different name. Originally founded in Norway, WiMP, as Tidal was formally known, was created by the 'largest record-store chain', Platekompaniet (Kjus, 2015). WiMP sought to offer users a higher quality of music through its streaming service and did this by offering a paid subscription service (Kjus, 2015). The service was expanded into the UK and the US in 2015, when it was then renamed Tidal and purchased by Jay Z in April 2015 for \$56 million (Ember, 2015). Jay Z promised that this service would offer better royalty payments to artists than other music streaming services. The service would also offer consumers better audio quality. However, the company has had many controversies since it rebranded under the management of Jay Z. One such controversy is over the exclusivity of certain artist's music that Tidal consistently offers its users. It promises that the artist's album will not be available on any other store or streaming service. Nonetheless, this promise has often been broken and will be further analysed in the section of Tidal's exclusivity problems.

6.1 Tidal under Jay Z's Management

Tidal launched in early 2015 in the US and UK, however it was not until the press conference featuring its new owners that the media and industry began to take notice. Under its new management Tidal aimed to offer artists a platform where they could place their music and attract streams from fans across the world, while getting paid higher royalties than other mainstream streaming sites. However as discussed before, the music streaming services are not responsible for how much the artists gets paid, it is down to the contract they have developed with their record company. As Dredge (2015) stated, 'Tidal cannot control the terms of those deals any more than its rivals can', as a result of this it is not clear whether or not Tidal pays its artists more than Spotify or Apple Music. Although it seems like Tidal is run by the artists for the artists, it has yet to be seen if other artists will

become public supporters of the streaming service aside from its famous owners. However, many smaller artists have their music distribution rights controlled by their record company and thus have no choice over which service they place their music catalogue on (Sisario, 2015a).

Sisario (2015b) writes that some commentators of the service and other artists have criticised 'Tidal as primarily benefiting an elite group of celebrities', thus showing it has yet to gain the respect of the music artists it supposedly created the service for. Tidal has also come under scrutiny for the amount of highly positioned executives that have left the company before it was a year old (Sisario, 2015b). In a survey interviewing 50 music executives, conducted by Billboard magazine, it was found that 71 percent believed that Tidal would last a year or less (Sisario, 2015b). It was reported by McIntyre (2015), that Tidal had 'just under 800,000 paying subscribers, though several hundred thousand of those were already paying for Tidal, before Jay-Z relaunched it'. It seems that although Tidal offered artists a viable, well-paying alternative to Spotify, its largest competitor, this has not been completely successful to date due to low subscriber rates. The less subscribers there are, the less the artists music gets streamed, the less revenue the artists generates off royalties. It is clear that the music industry and media has not yet welcomed the introduction of this elite service.

6.2 High Cost Subscription Service

Tidal can be referred to as an elite streaming service due to its cost. Tidal promises its users that they will receive high quality lossless streams. Lossless means that the audio file has not been compressed. Music files are often compressed to allow the files to be transferred over the internet quickly (Tamblyn, 2015). However, Tidal believes that by offering lossless music they are placed ahead of the competition. This function it is only available to users who are willing to pay a €20 a month subscription cost. Most users of music streaming services have grown up listening to music on their iPods or mobiles devices which have been uploaded by ripping CD's to create lower quality MP3 files. As well as this, many users access video streaming sites such as YouTube, where the quality of the audio they are

hearing cannot always be guaranteed to be high. It is this generation that are now using music streaming services such as Spotify, Apple Music and Tidal. It is also this generation who have gotten used to listening to songs at a lower bit rate. These consumers of the music industry may not be convinced that it is necessary to subscribe to the higher cost of €20 when they believe they can get the same songs for half the price, from any other streaming service (Luckerson, 2015c).

Tidal sound quality rate is 1411 kps, while its competitors Spotify and iTunes operate at 320 kps and 256 kilobits per second (Quint, 2015). It is clear that Tidal delivers on its promise of a higher quality of audio playback, however it is unclear whether the users will select this option at double the price. Users value the music as much as the artists do. D'Addario (2015) believes that music streaming subscribers 'listen to music often, on services that provide that music for free' and states that 'rather than building a better system' for its users, 'Jay Z and friends have, so far, put their energy behind a product that's more or less the same as Spotify, but more expensive'. It seems that Tidal is out of touch with what the users want. Similarly to Apple Music, Tidal offers users more than music with exclusive video content and editorial pieces regarding the artists on the site. Tidal is offered across many different mobile devices, however on desktops, it is only offered through the internet. Both Spotify and Apple Music offer an application for desktop use. Although Tidal launched onto the market with the support of some of the most prominent music artists and performers in the industry, it has failed to consider the wishes of its consumers. Tidal offers an elite service of high quality music with a similar catalogue to both Apple Music and Spotify, however the price for this service is too high for the average user. As a result of this, Tidal has yet to make a large impact in the streaming industry and as a result Spotify is still on top.

6.3 Tidal's Exclusivity Issue

One of Tidal's main marketing strategies involves the exclusivity of certain music for its subscribers. It promises fans they will hear music from mainstream artists, which will not be

available on any other platform or streaming service. However, Tidal has often broken this promise and as a result some controversies in the media have ensued.

6.3.1 Rihanna's 'Anti'

On the 27th of January 2016, Rihanna, a co-owner of the streaming service released her single 'Work' on Tidal. However, at the same time Tidal accidentally posted her new album 'Anti' to the site. It was quickly taken down, and was officially released the next day exclusively on Tidal (Spanos, 2016). It had been four years since Rihanna had released an album and as a result it was announced that Tidal had received over one 'million new subscribers in just 15 hours' (Masiolotti, 2016). This looked very impressive for a site that had been struggling to gain new subscribers since Jay Z's take over. However, it came to light that the million new subscribers had joined the service due to a promotion with the technology company Samsung. 'Samsung gave away one million free downloads on a first-come first-serve basis' each of which included a free 60 day trial of Tidal (Roettgers, 2016). However, what was interesting about this free trial was that users did not have to give credit card information to sign up for the service and thus when the trial ended they were not automatically converted into full time subscribers (Roettgers, 2016). RIAA awarded, 'Anti' platinum standard even though the one million copies sold were free for users and that only 400,000 of the 1.4 million sold were paid for (McIntyre, 2016). This album remained exclusive to Tidal for a week, after which it became available on Spotify, Apple Music and as a physical copy in stores. Although it seemed like Tidal was finally gathering the attention of music consumers and gaining members, it failed to convert many of these into full time subscribers and thus all it received was media coverage for the outrageous sales figures that it released following the exclusive release of Rihanna's latest album.

6.3.2 Kanye West's 'The Life of Pablo'

Another artist to use Tidal to launch a new album exclusively, has been Kanye West. In early 2016, West announced via twitter to his 21 million followers that his new album, 'The Life of Pablo' would only be available via Tidal and it would 'never never never be on Apple'

(Blankstein and Johnson, 2016). As a result of this Tidal increased 'its subscriber base from 1 million to 2.5 million in 10 days' (Blankstein and Johnson, 2016). This increase in subscribers led to the Tidal app becoming number one on the iTunes US app store, thus showing the influence that the co-owner of Tidal, West had over his fans (Tepper, 2016). However, the album was then pulled from the site for a period of time for changes, as a result of this fans began to download the album illegally. Nevertheless what became most controversial about this album's release was that less than two months later the full album was available on both Spotify and Apple Music. West had promised his followers that these two streaming services would not get his album to stream ever (Blankstein and Johnson, 2016). This then led West fan, Justin Baker-Rhett to sue West and Jay Z, alleging that they falsely advertised and misled the public into joining Tidal. Blankstein and Johnson (2016) report that Baker-Rhett seeks to make his case a class action 'suit to represent as many as 2 million current and former subscribers to Tidal'. This shows that clearly the fans are starting to question the exclusivity which Tidal promises to offer its fans.

6.3.3 Beyoncé's 'Lemonade'

Another Tidal exclusive came in the form of Beyoncé's new unexpected album, Lemonade. On the 23rd of April 2016, subscribers of Tidal were the only people who could hear the artist's album. It was announced that for the time being Tidal would be the only streaming service to host the album (Newman, 2016). It seemed to many fans that this would be the only place to hear the album, nevertheless just 24 hours after its initial release, Lemonade became available for purchase on the iTunes store and will also be available on Amazon's online store (Sisario, 2016). Sisario (2016) states that by only allowing her music to be streamed on the one service, which is speculated to have three million subscribers currently due to their exclusives offer, Beyoncé may be alienating the majority of consumers. Peoples (2016) discusses how 'at 6 percent brand recognition, Tidal lags far behind' competitors Apple Music with 67 percent and Spotify with 52 percent. It is clear that Tidal's exclusivity has increased its subscribers, however after the album of an artist is released elsewhere, will the subscribers opt to remain with the service. Tidal has also angered many of its consumers by making promises which it fails to keep. The law suit against West and Jay Z

has only been filed this year, so it will be interesting to see what effect it will have on the industry and other users of the service.

6.4 Conclusion

Tidal, under the management of Jay Z, has attempted to create a music streaming service which is more beneficial for artists. It has done this by involving many artists in the creation of the service, through its promotion and payment of artists. However, the extra cost that this service charges for higher quality audio, is not regarded as very important for its targeted users, who have grown up listening to compressed MP3 files on portable media devices. This can be seen through the low subscriber rates in the first few months of the company. These rates have only increased with the exclusivity marketing that Tidal uses to promote certain artists music on the site. Nonetheless, it's hard to imagine why a user would pay a premium price of up to €20 a month for a service that is not much different to the rest of its competition, for one special album that may come available on a cheaper service in a month or weeks' time. Tidal has attempted to win over a user base that either receives free music from a service like Spotify or has been a user of iTunes for many years. It will take some time for Tidal to become a real threat to any other streaming service available today.

Chapter 7 Recommendations for the Future

Following an in-depth analysis of the three main music streaming services offered to users across the world, this essay will make recommendations on what should happen in the future of these services for them to improve their service. This section will look at each of the services individually, in order to ascertain the best possible outcome for the future.

7.1 Spotify

The main opposition faced by Spotify from artists and the industry, is in regards to its freemium service. It is unclear why Spotify removed their €5 subscription option for users, however I would recommend it to be reinstated. Offering users the option to remove advertisements while listening to music, may be enough to incentivise them to pay for the middle subscription rate. There is no press releases available detailing the reasons for Spotify's removal of this subscription offer and therefore it is hard to tell whether they have plans to reinstate it anytime soon. This subscription rate would assist Spotify in converting more non-paying subscribers into becoming paid subscribers. Another way in which Spotify could convert users from a freemium subscription to a premium subscription, would be if they limited the number of songs a user can stream. This could set on a basis of 100 songs a month or even 10 songs a day. Spotify could also exclude users from hearing the latest releases, which may become available for premium subscribers prior to a later release for freemium subscribers. This would mean that the free user is limited in the music that they can listen to and may entice them to become paid subscribers. However, Spotify may also face backlash from many current users of the services who have been used to a free, unlimited streaming service. Nonetheless, it would be hard to make any changes to the freemium service without causing annoyance to either the streaming services users or artists. If the popularity of other streaming services who do not offer a free service, continue growing, Spotify will have to do something to increase its numbers of paying subscribers.

7.2 Apple Music

Currently Apple Music is developing a strong presence in the music streaming industry/marketplace. It has acceptable payment options for users and still offers the free three month trial to new users, in which they can opt out of renewing the service when the trial ends, at any time. This allows users to take full advantage of Apple Music's streaming service and catalogue for three months without needing to commit to their service in the long-term. Apple Music can access a large consumer base due to that fact it is a native app on one of the world's most popular smartphones, the iPhone. After the free three month trial has ended, it has been reported that Apple managed to convert many of their subscribers into full paying subscribers (Peoples, 2016b). However, if Apple Music is to increase its popularity, it needs to expand its audience. Currently, there is only a beta app available for Android users. This prototype should be made fully operational as soon as possible. Apple should then promote the new app with a broadcast and online marketing campaign. This should be done so that consumers who do not use iTunes or do not have an iPhone are aware of the new streaming service. Another area for the improvement of Apple Music's service, is with its social Connect section. This allows users to connect and follow their favourite artists. However, it does not allow users to share music with each other. Friends are unable to share playlists or create playlists together. If Apple were to create a social area for the users of the service to interact, it would greatly enhance the Connect area of the app. Nevertheless, Apple Music offers a great service for both fans and artists alike.

7.3 Tidal

Tidal is not the newest streaming service on the market, however it is one of the least known services. Tidal having only launched last year has struggled to gain a large number of subscribers in order to compete with Spotify and Apple Music. It was relaunched by Jay Z as a new service, with a small subscriber base which needs to be increased. The main issue for users, lies with the high cost subscription price if the user wishes to receive high quality audio streaming. This high quality service is what Tidal uses to differentiate itself from its competitors. However, there is currently no free trial offered for the service, unless the user

receives a code with a purchase of an album from an artist associated with Tidal. Most users would have to pay for the more expensive subscription at €20 a month, in order to experience the service and decide on whether they wish to continue to pay for the service. However, due to that fact that many users are not concerned about the audio quality, which can also differ based on the quality of the headset they listen to the music through, many users will opt for the cheaper subscription rate of €10 a month. Therefore Tidal should reduce the subscription cost for the higher quality service and offer a free trial for users. During this free trial period, featured artists should continue to be paid. Also needing improvement is the interface design of Tidal. At the time of its release, many users of Tidal took to social media sites such as Twitter to share screenshots of the Tidal web player. This was due to the fact it was very similar in its user interface design to Spotify (Adams, 2015). In order for Tidal, to grow as a streaming service, it needs to differentiate from its competitors and design its own individual appearance that will become synonymous with its brand.

Although Spotify, is by far the most popular streaming service, its success has not occurred overnight. Having been launched in 2008, it is unfair to compare its success over the two newer services of Apple Music and Tidal. However, it is clear that both Apple Music and Tidal will need to make some changes in order to compete in a market which Spotify holds a large share of. Also the fact that Spotify offers users a free service still allows them to possess an advantage in the industry. Apple Music had the brand name of Apple to grow under and thus it will succeed due to the nature of the products it's available on. However, Tidal is only associated with a selected group of music artists and thus has to stand on its own in the music streaming industry. Nonetheless, it is clear that both Apple Music and Tidal have become large competitors for Spotify.

Chapter 8 Conclusion

The introduction of music streaming services has had a large impact on the music industry. With subscription numbers for most services reaching well over a million, it is clear that the method by which consumers listen to music has changed. The way in which music has been distributed has transitioned over time from vinyl to cassettes to CDs and currently, digital. At the beginning of this century, Apple changed the way in which music was played by introducing the digital music storage site iTunes followed a few years later by the release of the iTunes Store. Record companies across the world have adapted to this new change by making their catalogues available digitally. Some companies attempted to set up their own online music stores, however they could not compete with the size of iTunes's catalogue. iTunes allowed any record company to place their music on the store and thus created an online store which contained music from all mainstream artists. However, the rise of digital music brought about a new form of music piracy which the industry had to tackle. Initially, many CDs were not developed to be playable on computers, this had to be changed due to rise of MP3 music players setting a requirement for MP3 files to be transferred onto a computer from a CD. The industry began to monitor websites sharing MP3 files during the rise of the internet. Streaming services naturally developed as an advancement, following the required adaption of MP3 files onto computers. Streaming allowed consumers to listen to the music they wanted to whenever they wanted to. All the device user needed was a subscription to a legal streaming site, mobile data or Wi-Fi and the application of the streaming service they subscribed to. Music streaming has forever changed the industry due to ease of access to music which modern streaming sites provide to the consumers. Record companies have adapted to using these services to their advantage for example, many record companies opt to acquire shares in Spotify while negotiating contracts for their artist's music. This mutually beneficial relationship, allows Spotify to gain access to the record labels associated artists music, while also increasing record companies profits through the acquisition of shares. This relationship works to ensure that CD sales which have been declining over the past two decades do not mean the end of a record company. Music streaming services allow record companies to save money on production costs if they are unsure of whether a new artist will succeed. Initially, the decline in CD sales was credited to the growth of online music stores such as iTunes, however more recently the

media and industry have begun to view streaming sites as a cause of declining album sales. Nonetheless, it is clear to see that music streaming will continue to grow in popularity and as a result the industry must adapt to the ever changing trends in order to maintain a level of growth.

The relationship between artists and music streaming services has been fragile since the beginning. Many artists state that they do not receive as much royalties as they would from an album sale and as a result, do not wish to be involved with music streaming services. Taylor Swift was the most prominent artist to stand up to the way in which Spotify operated. Many smaller independent record companies removed their catalogues from the service, however they did not receive the media attention that Swift did. Swift believed that due to the fact that Spotify offered a freemium service, they did not value her music as much as they should and thus the artist opted to remove her entire catalogue from the service. Although this did cause controversy at the time, it is clear that it has not had a devastating effect on the subscription numbers of Spotify, which continue to grow. With the introduction of every new streaming service comes the discussion over how artists get paid. Apple Music caused controversy by initially refusing to pay artists for streams played during its free trial period. It is clear to see that there is a difficult relationship between music streaming services and artists. This led to the creation of an artist run streaming service, Tidal. However, this service has failed to make significant changes to the music site since it was relaunched by Jay Z. Tidal did offer a way for fans to gain exclusive content from their favourite artists. This exclusive content can include new music videos, concert ticket presales and editorial content. Through offering this exclusive area, artists are able to connect on a new platform which focuses on their music. Apple Music also offers this area in the connect section. Spotify, which does allow users to follow their favourite artists, does not offer the artists anywhere to post information to their fans. Music streaming services have been gaining more and more popularity due to the accessibility to their services on mobile apps. If these services gain more paid subscribers, it will in turn mean higher royalties paid out to artists. Therefore, artists wish for all streaming services to make their consumers pay for the music, this is where the main controversy currently lies between artists and music streaming services.

There are currently millions of consumers of music streaming services across the world. Due to technological advances with mobile devices and internet access an increased number of people are able to access an extensive range of music. On each service, users can create their own playlists, follow and in some cases interact with their favourite artists. Playlists are also suggested for the user with the aim of introducing them to new artists or songs which they may enjoy. All this costs users very little in comparison to purchasing a CD or LP. Users can sign up to Spotify's freemium service which is subjected to advertisements, or they can pay the basic rate of €10 a month to receive access to the subsequent services catalogue. By using Tidal's service, users often gain access to exclusive music before any other digital music service or store release. However, the time frames of this exclusivity offer has shortened with Beyoncé's most recent release becoming available for purchase on iTunes the day after it was released. Nonetheless, Tidal remains the only service to stream this album at the time of writing. At the time that Apple Music launched, it was an easy transition for many users over to this service, the music they streamed would be connected with the music they owned on their iTunes library. However, it is unclear whether consumers subscribe to more than one service unless they are doing it to compare which one they wish to fully subscribe to. This is a possible area of future research surrounding the development of music and streaming sites. The offer of free trial's both from Spotify and Apple Music means that the user is in the best position to find out which service they prefer. In comparison to both the music industry and its artists, consumers have benefited the most from the introduction of music streaming services. Consumers have ample options with regards to music streaming services, all of which aim to provide the best service for their subscription base. In most cases, the same artists are available on every service, with the exception of Taylor Swift, which guarantees that the user will find their favourite artist. It is clear that the technological advances in how music is distributed across the world has had both a positive and negative impact on consumers, artists and the music industry. It seems that consumers have benefited the most from streaming services due to their easy access to large catalogues of music for relatively cheap prices in comparison to the traditional way of buying one CD at a time.

References

- 'Piracy, n.' (2016) in *Oxford English Dictionary*. Available at: <http://www.oed.com.elib.tcd.ie/view/Entry/144486?redirectedFrom=piracy#eid> (Accessed: 29 April 2016).
- Adams, C. (2015) *Tidal copies Spotify's user interface right down to a tee*. Available at: <http://www.inquisitr.com/1972994/tidal-copies-spotifys-user-interface-right-down-to-a-tee/> (Accessed: 2 May 2016).
- Blankstein, A. and Johnson, A. (2016) *Kanye west, jay Z sued over lack of exclusivity of west's new album*. Available at: <http://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/kanye-west-jay-z-sued-over-lack-exclusivity-west-s-n557986> (Accessed: 19 April 2016).
- Camp, G. (2015) 'Spotify. <https://www.spotify.com/>. Retrieved 21 January 2015', *Journal of the Society for American Music*, 9(03), pp. 375–378.
- Caulfield, K. (2014) *Official: Taylor Swift's '1989' debuts with 1.287 Million sold in First week*. Available at: <http://www.billboard.com/articles/columns/chart-beat/6304536/official-taylor-swifts-1989-debuts-with-1287-million-sold-in> (Accessed: 20 April 2016).
- della Cava, M. (2015) *Apple music hooks 11 million trial members, App store has record July*. Available at: <http://www.usatoday.com/story/tech/2015/08/05/apple-music-hooks-11-million-trial-members-app-store-has-record-july/31197721/> (Accessed: 25 April 2016).
- Covert, A. (2013) *A decade of iTunes singles killed the music industry*. Available at: <http://money.cnn.com/2013/04/25/technology/itunes-music-decline/> (Accessed: 23 April 2016).
- Cubbison, L. (2014) 'Will Taylor Swift and Spotify Ever Get Back Together?', *The CCCC-IP Annual: Top Intellectual Property Developments of 2014*. pp. 38–41.
- D'Addario, D. (2015) *How jay Z's tidal press conference showed he's out of touch*. Available at: <http://time.com/3765268/tidal-music-jay-z-beyonce/> (Accessed: 26 April 2016).

Dickey, J. (2014) *Taylor Swift talks business*. Available at: <http://time.com/3578249/taylor-swift-interview/> (Accessed: 20 April 2016).

Dredge, S. (2015) *Tidal: 10 things you need to know*. Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/music/2015/apr/05/tidal-10-things-you-need-to-know-jay-z-madonna-music-streaming> (Accessed: 8 February 2016).

Dredge, S. (2016) *Spotify vs musicians: 10 things to read to better understand the debate*. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2013/jul/29/spotify-vs-musicians-streaming-royalties> (Accessed: 21 April 2016).

Ember, S. (2015) *Jay Z's tidal service gets a new chief*. Available at: http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/03/business/media/jay-zs-tidal-service-gets-a-new-chief.html?_r=0 (Accessed: 8 February 2016).

Gardner, E. (2015) *Big shake-up to music licensing regime embraced by U.S. Copyright office*. Available at: <http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/thr-esq/big-shake-up-music-licensing-770512> (Accessed: 29 April 2016).

Gasser, U. (2004) 'iTunes: How copyright, contract, and technology shape the business of digital media - A case study', *Berkman Center for Internet & Society at Harvard Law School Research Publication*, 2004-2007

Gibson, O. (2006) *An internet superstar - or just another rock'n'roll swindle?* Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2006/may/31/news.media> (Accessed: 19 April 2016).

Gilmour, K. (2016) *Comparison of Spotify subscriptions*. Available at: <http://www.dummies.com/how-to/content/comparison-of-spotify-subscriptions.html> (Accessed: 22 April 2016).

Greenburg, Z.O. (2014) *Why Taylor Swift's '1989' could be the last platinum album ever*. Available at: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/zackomalleygreenburg/2014/10/30/why-taylor-swifts-1989-could-be-the-last-platinum-album-ever/#9031dfc2aeea> (Accessed: 20 April 2016).

Hassan, C (2016) *Spotify CEO claims the music industry would be dead without Spotify*. Available at: <http://www.digitalmusicnews.com/2016/02/17/71963/> (Accessed: 21 April 2016).

Inc, A. (2016) *Watch 'Beats 1 Interview' posted by Taylor Swift on apple music*. Available at: <https://itunes.apple.com/us/post/idsa.32246a32-a20d-11e5-ac2e-6c56662bf630> (Accessed: 20 April 2016).

Johnson, L. (2016) *Drake's iTunes sales shot up 431 percent after Taylor Swift's memorable apple music ad*. Available at: <http://www.billboard.com/articles/news/7325346/taylor-swift-apple-ad-drake-sales-itunes> (Accessed: 20 April 2016).

Kjus, Y. (2015) 'Reclaiming the music: The power of local and physical music distribution in the age of global online services', *New Media & Society*.

Leung, T.C. (2012) 'Music piracy: Bad for record sales but good for the iPod?', *Munich Personal RePEc Archive*.

Lewis, L. (2009) *The problem with Spotify*. Available at: <http://www.nme.com/blogs/nme-blogs/the-problem-with-spotify> (Accessed: 19 April 2016).

Luckerson, V. (2014) *Why only Taylor Swift could leave Spotify*. Available at: <http://time.com/3556721/taylor-swift-spotify-1989/> (Accessed: 20 April 2016).

Luckerson, V. (2015a) *Here's the story behind Spotify's coolest feature*. Available at: <http://time.com/4131520/spotify-discover-weekly-playlists/> (Accessed: 15 February 2016).

Luckerson, V. (2015b) *We fact-checked all of Jay Z's #TidalFacts*. Available at: <http://time.com/3836937/jay-z-tidal-tidalfacts/> (Accessed: 26 April 2016).

Luckerson, V. (2015c) *Why Jay-Z's new music service won't beat Spotify*. Available at: <http://time.com/3689845/jay-z-aspiro-tidal-spotify/> (Accessed: 26 April 2016).

Luckerson, V. (2016) *Tidal has more than 3 Million subscribers*. Available at: <http://time.com/4276187/tidal-3-million-subscribers/> (Accessed: 26 April 2016).

MacGuill, D. (2014) *As of today, you can split your Spotify bill five ways*. Available at: <http://www.thejournal.ie/spotify-family-how-much-1735537-Oct2014/> (Accessed: 20 April 2016).

Marshall, L. (2015) “Let’s keep music special. F—Spotify”: On-demand streaming and the controversy over artist royalties’, *Creative Industries Journal*, pp. 1–13.

Masiolotti, G. (2016) *Rihanna ‘ANTI’: Album earns TIDAL 1 Million trial subscriptions, physical copy to be released Feb. 5*. Available at:

<http://www.hngn.com/articles/174717/20160130/rihanna-anti-album-earns-tidal-1-million-trial-subscriptions-physical.htm> (Accessed: 8 February 2016).

McGarry, C. (2015a) *Apple music trials come to an end: Should you pay to stay?* Available at: <http://www.macworld.com/article/2986294/streaming-media/apple-music-trials-come-to-an-end-should-you-pay-to-stay.html> (Accessed: 23 April 2016).

McGarry, C. (2015b) *First look at apple music: Siri and beats 1 turn streaming on its ear*. Available at: <http://www.macworld.com/article/2942047/first-look-at-apple-music-siri-and-beats-1-turn-streaming-on-its-ear.html> (Accessed: 23 April 2016).

McIntyre, H. (2015) *Great business model or not, tidal’s sheer number of Exclusives is impressive*. Available at: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/hughmcintyre/2015/09/10/great-business-model-or-not-tidals-sheer-number-of-exclusives-is-impressive/#203233492c19> (Accessed: 20 April 2016).

McIntyre, H. (2016) *Tidal claims that Rihanna’s album has already sold 400, 000 copies*. Available at: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/hughmcintyre/2016/01/29/tidal-claims-that-rihannas-album-has-already-sold-400000-copies/#678fc2df2962> (Accessed: 8 February 2016).

McLean, R., Oliver, P.G. and Wainwright, D.W. (2010) ‘The myths of empowerment through information communication technologies: an exploration of the music industries and fan bases’, *Management Decision*, 48(9), pp. 1365–1377.

Menconi, D. (2015) *Jason Aldean’s music returns to Spotify*. Available at: <http://www.rollingstone.com/music/news/jason-aldeans-music-returns-to-spotify-20151106> (Accessed: 20 April 2016).

Newman, M. (2016) *Beyoncé does it again: Drops new album, ‘lemonade.’ There’s only One place you can hear it*. Available at:

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/melindanewman/2016/04/23/beyonce-does-it-again-drops-new-album-lemonade-with-no-warning/#3932a00676be> (Accessed: 28 April 2016).

Passman, D.S. (2015) *All you need to know about the music business: Ninth edition*. United States: Simon & Schuster.

Peoples, G. (2015) *Taylor Swift's partnership with apple is a landmark -- and predictable -- deal*. Available at: <http://www.billboard.com/articles/business/6806128/taylor-swift-apple-music-1989-documentary-analysis> (Accessed: 15 February 2016).

Peoples, G. (2016a) *After Beyoncé, tidal's exclusive strategy remains its best (perhaps only) weapon*. Available at: <http://www.billboard.com/articles/business/7341864/tidal-exclusive-content-strategy-beyonce-lemonade> (Accessed: 26 April 2016).

Peoples, G. (2016b) *As Spotify nears 30 Million subscribers and apple music exceeds 11 Million, is streaming turning the corner?* Available at: <http://www.billboard.com/articles/business/6875477/spotify-30-million-subscribers-apple-music-11-million-subscribers> (Accessed: 1 May 2016).

Quint, A. (2015) 'A TIDAL Wave of Music: HD Streaming Comes to the US and UK', *Fanfare: The Magazine for Serious Record Collectors*.

Reisinger, D. (2015) *Spotify's year in music 2015 reveals Drake is tops -- but there's a catch*. Available at: <http://fortune.com/2015/12/01/drake-spotify-artist/> (Accessed: 15 February 2016).

Reisinger, D. (2016) *Drake's apple music exclusivity won't last long*. Available at: <http://fortune.com/2016/04/12/drake-apple-music-exclusivity/> (Accessed: 23 April 2016).

Riley, J., Smith, R. and U.S. Copyright Office (2015) *Copyright and the music marketplace*. Available at: <http://copyright.gov/docs/musiclicensingstudy/copyright-and-the-music-marketplace.pdf> (Accessed: 29 April 2016).

Roettgers, J. (2015) *Spotify has become the world's most popular music streaming App*. Available at: <http://variety.com/2015/digital/news/spotify-has-become-the-worlds-most-popular-music-streaming-app-1201650714/> (Accessed: 15 February 2016).

Roettgers, J. (2016) *Rihanna's 'anti' release gets tidal 1 Million trial subscriptions in half a day*. Available at: <http://variety.com/2016/digital/news/rihanna-anti-tidal-trial-subscriptions-1201691313/> (Accessed: 8 February 2016).

Rys, D. (2015) 'Taylor Swift sits down with Zane Lowe, talks making Amends with apple, names Lorde "most honest" squad member'. Interview with 15 December.

Segan, S. (2015) *Apple music can win without being great*. Available at: <http://uk.pcmag.com/services-players-products/42606/opinion/apple-music-can-win-without-being-great> (Accessed: 25 April 2016).

Sisario, B. (2015a) *Jay Z reveals plans for tidal, a streaming music service*. Available at: http://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/31/business/media/jay-z-reveals-plans-for-tidal-a-streaming-music-service.html?_r=0 (Accessed: 8 February 2016).

Sisario, B. (2015b) *Jay Z's tidal loses another executive*. Available at: http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/14/business/media/jay-zs-tidal-loses-another-executive.html?_r=1 (Accessed: 8 February 2016).

Sisario, B. (2016) *Beyoncé's 'lemonade' comes to iTunes*. Available at: http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/25/arts/music/beyonce-lemonade-tidal-itunes-apple.html?_r=0 (Accessed: 26 April 2016).

Solomon, B. (2014) *It's official: Apple adds Dr. Dre with \$3 Billion beats deal*. Available at: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/briansolomon/2014/05/28/apple-brings-dr-dre-on-board-with-official-3-billion-beats-deal/#52a59d2b16d2> (Accessed: 23 April 2016).

Spanos, B. (2016) *Rihanna surprise-releases eighth album, 'anti'*. Available at: <http://www.rollingstone.com/music/news/rihanna-surprise-releases-eighth-album-anti-20160127> (Accessed: 20 April 2016).

Sullivan, C. (2008) *Can Sandi Thom recover from a PR backlash?* Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/music/musicblog/2008/may/20/cansandithomoutmanoeuvrea> (Accessed: 15 February 2016).

Swanson, K. (2013) 'A case study on Spotify: Exploring perceptions of the music streaming service', *Journal of the Music & Entertainment Industry Educators Association*, 13(1).

Swift, T. (2015) 'To apple, Love Taylor', 21 June. Available at:
<http://taylorswift.tumblr.com/post/122071902085/to-apple-love-taylor> (Accessed: 20 April 2016).

Tamblyn, T. (2015) *What is tidal?* Available at:
http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/2015/03/31/what-is-tidal_n_6974714.html (Accessed: 5 May 2016).

Team, T.S. (2014) *\$2 Billion and counting*. Available at:
<https://news.spotify.com/us/2014/11/11/2-billion-and-counting/> (Accessed: 21 April 2016).

Tepper, F. (2016) *Tidal tops U.S. App store after landing exclusive rights to Kanye west's new album*. Available at: <http://techcrunch.com/2016/02/14/tidal-tops-the-app-store-after-landing-exclusive-rights-to-kanyes-new-album/> (Accessed: 28 April 2016).

Tracy, A. (2015) *Apple is shutting down beats music on November 30*. Available at:
<http://www.forbes.com/sites/abigailtracy/2015/11/13/apple-beats-music-headphones-shutting-down-dr-dre/#2a569bd3558f> (Accessed: 23 April 2016).

Waldfoegel, J. (2010) 'Music file sharing and sales displacement in the iTunes era', *Information Economics and Policy*, 22(4), pp. 306–314.

Weiss, T.R. (2015a) *A look under the hood as apple music launches*. Available at:
<http://www.eweek.com/mobile/as-apple-music-launches-heres-what-music-fans-need-to-know.html> (Accessed: 23 April 2016).

Weiss, T.R. (2015b) *Apple music attracts 11M trial members, App store has record month*. Available at: <http://www.eweek.com/mobile/apple-music-logs-11-million-free-trial-users-so-far.html> (Accessed: 23 April 2016).