

Long Live the Live-Stream:

The viability of concert live-streams as a business model.

Student Name: Djoeke Arianne Spiekhout

Student Number: 584304

Supervisor: dr. Erik Hitters

Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Master Thesis

June 24th, 2021

Word count: 18220

**Long Live the Live-Stream:
The viability of concert live-streams as a business model.**

ABSTRACT

During the Covid-19 pandemic, the live music industry faced a global crisis due to lockdown measurements. Mass gatherings were prohibited and travelling became nearly impossible, meaning that touring as we know it was out of the question. To cope with this loss, many artists started to live-stream their performances to maintain an audience connection and generate some income. Still, it remains to be seen what this format can provide once lockdowns are part of history.

While some authors have begun exploring the phenomenon of concert live-streams from a culture perspective or business perspective (Vandenberg et al., 2020; Rendell, 2020; Taylor et al. 2020; Breese et al. 2020), the insights about the phenomenon remain limited. This study hopes to offer more clarity about if and how concert live-streams can be utilized in the future to create a valuable business model. So, it asks the question: How can value be created for live-streaming concerts and how can these be used for a sustainable business model for the live music industry?

To answer this, the study uses three building blocks from the business model definition of Osterwalder et al. (2005), looking at value creation, distribution channels and revenue generation. The study combines both media technological and cultural perspectives with business theory to analyze the different business strategies that occur in the dataset. This includes expert-interviews, festival panels and podcasts. A thematic analysis is applied to map out the recurring patterns.

The results show that different strategies can be employed, depending on the artist's success and the goals that they hope to achieve with the live-stream. The concert live-stream format can be an entertaining art form that can add supplemental value to the existing fan experience, although it cannot replace the physical concert experience. The digital distribution format allows for players of all sizes to profit off this format and strengthen their artist brand and increase their following. Yet, the bigger players will remain one step ahead in the game as they can employ platform strategies to increase their audience reach and create a higher production value, which in turn can generate more income. So, the format can

sustainably be used as a supplemental feature to grow your audience and keep them engaged with the brand. This way, the live-streams can be used as investments in the brand for more profit in the future.

KEYWORDS: *Concert live-streams, concert experience, digitalization, revenue streams, business model*

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	4
2. Theoretical Framework	7
2.1 Experiential Value	7
2.2 Distribution Channels	9
2.3 Revenue Streams	11
3. Method	13
3.1 Choice of Method	13
3.2 Sampling	14
3.3 Operationalisation	15
3.4 Method of Analysis	17
3.5 Validity and Reliability	18
4. Results	19
4.1 Value Creation	19
Liveness	19
Social Aspects	23
Spatial Value	26
Conclusion	29
4.2 Digital Distribution	30
Democratization	30
Platform Accumulation	33
Superstar Effect	36
Conclusion	38
4.3 Revenue Streams	40
Income Streams	40
Value For the Overall Brand	45
Conclusion	47
5. Conclusion	48
Concluding Thoughts	48
Limitations and Recommendations For Further Research	52
References	54
Appendix A	60
Open coding	60
Appendix B	63
The Final Coding Frames	63
Appendix C	69
Topic List	69

1. Introduction

As Covid-19 created a global pandemic in 2020, people all over the world were instructed to stay at home. Moreover, mass gatherings were prohibited and businesses needed to adjust to the socially distant society. This put a strain on many sectors that rely on large crowds to maintain a profitable business. The music industry in particular was hit hard, as the possibility of hosting live events was eliminated. Whereas normally musicians would perform in front of a crowd of a few hundreds or thousands of people, venues were lucky if they could host up to a hundred people in 2020. This meant that the largest source of income for artists disappeared, as record sales are no longer a booming business and streaming platforms pay their artists scarcely (Breese et al. 2020). Still, the music industry would not be a creative one if it did not adapt to the developments and came up with new solutions to connect artists and audiences.

One of those new solutions is live-streaming concerts. This is a common approach amidst the pandemic, taken on by smaller independent artists on platforms like Bandcamp, as well as pop music superstars like Dua Lipa and Billie Eilish. Whereas the technology of live-streaming has been a common trend among gamers for years, it appears that the music industry is now seeing the possibilities of it as well. New companies and initiatives originated amidst the crisis, like Larger Than Live and Driift, that are especially oriented at organizing these live-streamed events. Simultaneously, gaming companies set up their own music departments, like EA Music Group and Roblox, to facilitate these live-stream initiatives.

Even though this society of social-distancing is often referred to as the new normal in the media and in press conferences, it is unlikely that the world will forever remain in lockdown. With the prospects of global vaccinations and the return of traditional live events, it is important to study the sustainability of live-streamed concerts in the post-pandemic world. As start-up initiatives have risen and major investments have been made in this technology, it is necessary to map out the possibilities and limits of concert live-streams and the place this technology would have in a normal world. Concert live-streams have the potential to solve many problems that regular touring creates, as they remove the travelling aspect at the root of physical tours. It would be more environmentally friendly and would not put such a mental and physical strain on the artist like year-long world-tours would (Thomas, 2020). However, it is still unclear to what extent this business model can continue to exist and what it can offer in a world that does not *solely* rely on this technology for concerts.

So far, the body of work about concert live-streams within academic research is limited. Earlier work is rather about experimental showcases for niche audiences and art forms, which explore the technological opportunities of virtual concerts (Vandenberg et al., 2020; Carboni, 2014). Live-streaming for theater performances has also been explored from a business perspective, with regard to ticket cannibalism and co-existence of the embodied live and virtual live (Mueser & Vlachos, 2018; Bakhshi & Throsby, 2014; Barker, 2013).

However, the area of concert live-streams for more mainstream audiences as they occur during the pandemic is still largely unexplored. There are only a few scholars discussing this phenomenon. These works rather look at the social aspects of live-streamed concerts and what this means for the experience (Vandenberg et al., 2020), or discuss the performative and aesthetic aspects of these mediated performances (Taylor et al., 2020; Wilson, 2020). Rendell (2020) studied these live-streams from a media-technological perspective, using the lens of convergence. He does some economic groundwork as well with regards to ticketing and revenue streams. Still, his study is limited as he only uses case studies to analyse the phenomenon, while the business aspects are rather overshadowed by the social, performative and technological aspects.

This study aims to offer a more comprehensive study by analysing how players within the industry regard the model. Participants differ in terms of function, from artists to management, from starters to commercially successful projects. Whereas previous studies were conducted in the beginning of the pandemic and had a rather forecasting, predictive lens, this study has the luxury to see what has been created, one year into the pandemic. These earlier studies were about a phenomenon that offered hope, but after one year of Covid-19, there are also signs of social-distancing fatigue. That is why this thesis investigates what concert live-streams can offer for when they are not a necessity. The central research question is: How can value be created for live-streaming concerts and how can these be used for a sustainable business model for the live music industry?

In this case, the definition of a business model of Osterwalder et al. (2005) will be used, who define it as a conceptual tool that explains the business logic of a firm, its elements and their relationship with each other. It specifies the value of a business, what it can offer to its customers and its partners, and how it can create profit streams (Osterwalder et al., 2005). They identify nine core building blocks to every business model. However, as this study is limited to a certain amount and type of data, this research will focus on three of these building blocks to guide the research question. The first one is the product and its value, the second is the distribution (channels) and the third one concerns the revenue model. Even

though these three elements are inseparably linked to each other and all contribute to one business model, this threefold divide helps focus the analysis and identify the different elements that make concert live-streams a (non-)viable business model. This results in the following sub-questions:

- 1) How can concert live-streams create experiential value?
- 2) What are the common distribution strategies and what consequences do they have?
- 3) How can income be generated with concert live-streams?

These questions will be answered with the use of expert interviews. These are either partaken by the researcher or hosted by other organizations in the form of festival panels or podcasts. These will be subjected to an inductive, data-driven thematic analysis with open and axial coding. The coding frame will be finalized and sensitized with the use of media performative, media technological and business and marketing theory. These codes will guide the analysis and reveal the recurring patterns in the data about the viability and utilization of the concert live-stream business model. Using this method, this study will argue that concert live-streams can add supplemental value to the existing live business model, but cannot offer a substitute for traditional live performances.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 *Experiential Value*

When drawing out the different building blocks to a business model, Osterwalder et al. (2005) regard the product and the value proposition as an equal feature. However, this is not entirely true. Despite the many definitions to the term of the value proposition, a review of the different approaches to value proposition shows that essence lies in the *experience* that customers have before, during and after the use of the product (Payne et al., 2020). With concerts, the experience is central in the literal sense. According to Behr & Cloonan, fans are drawn to live concerts because of the cultural value that they offer: the complete experience (2020). People spend money on tickets because the events take place only once and you get to be in the same space with the performer (Holt, 2010). Live concerts have the element of having to be there, or else you missed out on it because that one performance happens only once. Mulder et al. (2020) refer to this as the momentum of the event. When these are mediated through a live-stream, the artist and audience are physically separated, which calls into question how the two art-forms relate to each other.

According to Vandenberg et al. (2020), the difference between live-streamed and physical real-life performances is so significant that they offer a different type of activity, rather than substituting it. However, Rendell (2020) is more optimistic about the possibilities and regards concert live-streams as spatial convergence. He counters previous discourses that regard digital media as a threat to the authenticity of these social experiences, arguing that the convergence of digital media with live music allows for more performative opportunities to engage audiences and create an intimate, authentic experience, while audiences still get to perform certain social practices. Live-streams would create a convergence of people's social life, allowing for parasocial interaction in the comfort of their homes, mediated by social media (2020). So, to understand the position of live-streams in a post-pandemic era, where real-life concerts are possible, we need to better understand what concert live-streams can offer opposed to - or in addition to - traditional concerts.

Concerts derive their value from the momentum: the physical and temporal liveness. So how can this be understood when mediated through a screen? Auslander (2008) argues

that the recording of a performance and the original live one are equal, as they belong to the same mediatic system that compete for the same audiences. Auslander relies in this way on Bolter & Grusin's concept of 'remediation' (1996), which implies that older media is represented in newer media. He argues that the relationship between the live and the mediatized in modern media is like a simulation: the initial is not separate from the terminal, as the mediatized replaces the live and the live becomes more mediatized. Although the level of mediatization may vary, this aspect remains central to the live experience as the two are economically tied, with live performances serving to promote mass-produced products and recordings can accumulate larger incomes (Auslander, 2008).

According to Mueser & Vlachos (2018), live performance and live broadcasts have the same temporal quality due to the ability of simultaneous broadcasting. They describe live broadcast as a simultaneity of performance and transmission, the absence of a pre-recording, and the lack of preparation and editing. They argue that the liveness of performing arts should include the connection of people watching people, all together live in time, and the danger looming over the performance that there is no second take. This creates urgency and importance.

This echoes the use of liveness as a tool to highlight an event's importance and centralize media power (van Es, 2017). Van Es suggests that the live is what makes media matter and what creates a feeling of connection among the spectators, as it is associated with presence, authenticity and intimacy. These values are important for live concerts. The study of Charron (2017) shows that concert-going is often motivated by the desire to 'be there': be a part of something unique, together with likeminded people. Dearn & Price (2016) even go as far as to argue that these social aspects surpass the aesthetic motivations of concert-goers. Mulder et al. (2020) rather see a divide with the different sort of events, whereas venues create momentum through the actual, physical performance, and festivals create momentum through its scarcity and massality: namely the co-presence. Like Van Es, they note that this is of great value for the media product - in this case the festival - as it reinforces the singularity of the event and the massive crowd attending makes it critical to be there.

In addition to the temporal quality of live, there is also a spatial quality to live performances. Despite the hedonic experience concerts offer people, they can affect the city landscape negatively, with noise pollution and the boost of gentrification, according to Thomas (2020). He writes that small venues in the UK are struggling to keep their heads above water, while concert live-streams offer affordable opportunities to reach wider audiences for smaller bands. However, with digital concerts, the situatedness of live music

changes and allows for new ways of interacting with space and the role it plays in the live music experience. It could solve the problems voiced by Thomas (2020), but also miss out on important spatial qualities. As van der Hoeven & Hitters write in multiple works (2019; 2020), live music plays an important role in the cultural life and identities of cities. It brings people together and brings new life to urban spaces. Simultaneously, these spaces also influence the performances they occur in (van der Hoeven & Hitters, 2020).

However, concert live-streams can also be shaped by spaces, as argued by Taylor et al. (2020). They see that musicians are taking more control over the spatiality of their performances by livestreaming from the intimate settings of their homes during the lockdown. So, the importance of space feeding into musical performances does not have to be lost. Although living rooms in the example of Taylor et al. do not have that brick-and-mortar, spatial value of a venue, it still creates a shared experience between artist and audience (2020).

There are also the social qualities of a concert that do not necessarily have to be sacrificed when the performance goes digital. The mediated relationship between artist and audience is what Shin et al. (2019) refer to as parasocial interaction, which means that the right use of technology can also create the sense of social presence and closeness. In turn, their study shows that parasocial interaction can increase audience satisfaction and has a positive effect on financial support for the artist. Bennett (2020) also found that the internet can be utilized to create a sense of togetherness and liveness in the study of Twitter-use of U2 fans during their concerts, blurring the boundaries between being there and being spatially removed.

So, concert live-streams allow for different uses of time, space and social interactions than real-life concerts.

2.2 Distribution Channels

As Thomas (2020) notes, an internet connection and a platform are essential to livestreaming a performance. It has a distinct manner of distribution that is highly dependent on either public or private platforms. Live-streams are subject to platformization, meaning that digital services organize the interactions and affect the organizations of the culture industry, as Nieborg & Poell (2018) call it. Artists and labels have a few aspects to consider when organizing an event: Whether to go where the audience is, or stream the concert on the

label's own platforms. This sounds like a simple decision to make, but it bears many consequences in terms of ownership, visibility and power.

As Hesmondhalgh & Meier argue, the culture industry has originally always been testing ground for the implementation of new technologies (2018). According to them, the danger of the platformization of music consumption is that IT becomes the leading factor to shape music consumption, which would threaten to sacrifice privacy and power structures in return for growth and innovation. This echoes Srnicek's platform capitalization, which means that non-IT firms have to adopt platform-strategies in order to accumulate data, as that has become the new currency (2017).

The developments with recorded music streaming has shown so far that digital distribution tends to favor the bigger labels and keep the original superstar economy intact (Marshall, 2015; Meier & Manzerolle, 2019). Still, the study of Coelho & Mendes (2019) suggests that the long-tail effect can still exist in a streaming market, even though the superstar-effect remains prevalent. Smaller artists are mostly at a disadvantage because the bigger labels accumulate the most user-data, which are useful for targeted advertising and the introduction of other products (Meier & Manzerolle, 2019). Meanwhile, Duffy et al. (2019) highlight the power struggle between power players and the struggle for creative autonomy, as streaming platforms act as gatekeepers for the music industry, exercising "algotorial power" by influencing consumer behavior through editors and algorithms. Simultaneously, there is a divide between services that are more consumer-oriented or producer-oriented, where the latter appears to maintain more artist independence (Duffy et al., 2019). This shows that the choice of platform can have an impact on income, power and creative autonomy.

Whereas superstars can use platforms most beneficial to them and their management, with exclusivity and ticket prices, smaller artists might not have the same freedom of choice when they are still growing an audience. They would be motivated by views. Fietkiewicz et al. (2018) found already before the pandemic that concert streamers were largely motivated to gain exposure and become a star, while making money was lower on the list. The search for an audience is thus an important factor while distributing performances and this is also important for the value of the platform. Nieborg & Poell (2018) call this the phenomenon of network effects. According to them, platforms are subject to multi-sided markets, which are strongly affected by these effects. So, actors leaving or joining a platform can affect the value of that platform for other actors (Nieborg & Poell, 2018). So, many artists are heavily reliant on the channels that promise the largest audience and the widest visibility. The choice of

channels is even more rigid, as users tend to stick with their own platforms. Because platforms aggregate user data and utilize this to optimize and personalize the user environments, users are unlikely to switch platforms (Hracs & Webster, 2020). They are thus locked into place due to data optimization. So, whereas digital distribution can offer more freedom and possibilities for worldwide exposure, it also reinforces power imbalances.

2.3 Revenue Streams

According to Mulder et al. (2020), the music industry has shifted from physical record sales to a market of live performances and streaming. People are increasingly willing to pay more and more for the live experience, and less for recorded music (Behr & Cloonan, 2020). So, the income of an artist and the other parties involved relies heavily on digital distribution and concerts. With concert live-streaming as a new phenomenon that substitutes real-life concerts during the pandemic, it is important to look at the revenue streams it can produce.

Chen & Xiong (2019) mapped out several monetization strategies employed by live-streaming platforms, with specific focus at the gift versus subscription models that are employed. Although their article does not offer one clear theory, it is helpful to understand the existing models within all sectors of livestreams. Breese et al. (2020) also map out the different possibilities of monetizing concerts on the internet, with specific regard to the music industry, which can help understand and contextualize the decisions made by the cases.

The monetization and revenue generation of these online concerts can also go beyond ticketing and gift giving. The analysis of Heuguet (2016) of the Boiler Room Sessions, a DJ livestream channel, brings to light the visibility aspect of streaming, which entails an opportunity for income streams separate from ticket sales, namely marketing value and brand sponsorships. This is already a frequently occurring phenomenon at music festivals, not without a reason. The study of Rowley & Williams (2008) shows that these collaborations indeed increase brand recall, making it attractive for brands to chip in and gain exposure. Brand sponsorship needs to take shape strategically. According to Anderton (2011), brand sponsorship of music events is the most successful when it links to the "good times" (p. 146) that festival goers are looking for at such an event. It needs to enhance the whole experience and help create enjoyable memories (Anderton, 2011).

However, this section wants to look beyond simple ticket sales of a live-stream concert and also look at the overall value it can produce for the artist. This is of interest as

some artists do not have the audience to ask for high ticket prices. According to Meier (2015), musicians' positions within the industry are more reliant on their artist-brand nowadays. Whereas digitalisation was supposed to have a democratizing effect for starting artists, she argues that it's actually only the superstars and the major labels that profit from the scalability that the internet provides. Simultaneously, music in the digital era derives most of its monetary income from live performances, a business model where superstars thrive as well since they profit the most from audience maximization. So, she argues that the music industry is still a 'winner takes all'-economy, in which artists need to monetize their entire artist-brand to make an income (Meier, 2015). This means that an artist's value lies not only with record sales and concert tickets, but with the entire package like merchandising and marketing deals. This is mirrored in the study of Leenders et al. (2015), who regard the music industry from a configuration theory perspective, meaning that multiple elements combined together in the right way can create revenue overall, like radio airplay can positively influence concert revenue.

Duffy et al. (2019) also highlight these additional positive effects of digital distribution, as the network effects of platformization not only give the platform capitalists more power, but also enable other economic possibilities for horizontal connectivity and communication and organization potentials (Duffy et al., 2019). This perspective is also supported by Arbatani et al. (2018), who argue that digital platforms should be used as a new way to engage audiences to the business. This already happened traditionally with festival broadcasts that enable viewers to check out media coverage of live performances in order to discover new music and consider whether to attend the next edition of the festival (Velt et al., 2015).

With the modern technology of live-streams, the same phenomenon of using broadcasts to engage audiences was already visible within the theater industry. Bakhshi & Throsby (2014) found that live broadcasting of theater performances had a positive effect on ticket sales for the physical performances, so it complimented rather than substituted the traditional business model. This could also potentially work for concert live-streams. The study of Naveed et al. (2017), already suggests this interplay, as their research suggests that the growth of music streaming and concerts correlates with each other. However, as concert live-streaming is a hybrid between the two, it is important to explore on which side of the coin this phenomenon resides in terms of popularity and revenue.

3. Method

3.1 Choice of Method

This study takes on a qualitative approach to answer the research question. This is because it is concerned with reaching an understanding of the phenomenon of concert live-streaming. It wants to know how it takes place and why certain decisions are made. While the study is still concerned with the value creation of a live-stream product in order to monetize it, it steers away from questioning and measuring audience's responses. Instead, the focus lies on how experts, who have been dealing with the format, value concert live-streams as a business model. Qualitative research allows room for the nuances within different strategies and also unlocks why certain decisions were made. This is important because a market in real life - especially the live music industry - does not accommodate for ideal conditions. With qualitative research, real-life decisions can be understood that might not make sense in theory.

Since concert live-streaming is a new phenomenon that only became popularized during the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020, the study had to use multiple different resources to create a saturated dataset for analysis. This consists of in-depth expert interviews as performed by the researcher, as well as panels hosted by other organizations that interviewed multiple expert participants. With interviews, we get an understanding of the experiences of the participants and the meanings they assign to them (Roulston & Choi, 2018). So while they may not directly reflect the objective truth, they do reveal how the experts in the field regard the matter in question.

The amount and intensity of experience with concert live-streams varies among the participants. The dataset entails conversations with musicians, promoters, artist managers, journalists, big data researchers and managers of live-stream companies. This has the advantage of showing multiple sides of the live-stream business model, as it can reveal both the managerial, marketing and performative aspect of the streams. It also reveals the impact of concert live-streams on different actors within the music industry, and can contextualize the up-sides and down-sides that different actors experience.

This strategy of data-gathering had the disadvantage that the researcher was not able to mediate all of the interviews and interrogate the subjects. As a result, the interviews do not have the same structure across the set. In return, this dataset gives the advantage of accessing the insights of major players in the industry, who otherwise would not participate in a small-

scale study like this. In addition, these panels and interviews are administered *by* people within the music industry. So, the participants could maintain their own industry discourse when explaining certain phenomena and use industry terms. This allows the researcher to immerse herself in the industry's discursive practices, which the participants use to make sense of the live-streaming phenomena. As interviews do not reflect a direct truth but rather the discursive and cultural resources that people employ to construct their reality (Moisander & Valtonen, 2006), it is helpful to have the participants talk to people within their industry.

To fact-check these data and reach a level of saturation, two participants were interviewed by the researcher. The questions for these interviews were both based on the theoretical framework and the topics of the other panels.

Once gathered, the data was analyzed using a thematic analysis. As described by Braun & Clarke (2006), this helps to recognize, report and interpret patterns within the data. It offers a flexible and accessible frame of analysis, which is helpful to identify the patterns in such a varied data set. It can also be used with nearly any theoretical framework (Braun & Clarke, 2006). As this study researches a new and under-explored phenomenon, an adaptable approach is necessary.

3.2 Sampling

Nonprobability, purposive sampling was used to collect the data set. This was based on expert sampling (Etikan et al., 2016). Participants were selected based on expertise and their experience with the concert live-stream format. As the research area is highly specific and looks into the business model, it requires participants that are actually part of the business. Because of the mixed data set, data items were selected by their relevance to the research question.

The study primarily made use of panels, interviews and podcasts gathered online. This took place between February and April 2021. The search resulted in twelve units. Sources include the Dutch showcase festival Eurosonic Noorderslag 2021, the American arts and music festival South by Southwest 2021 and Wide Days by IQ Focus. Furthermore, data was gathered via Youtube and Vimeo, as these are common platforms to broadcast knowledge about the phenomenon. The resulting videos were found using the search term "future of concert live-streams" on both platforms. This resulted in a panel by Gigwell on Vimeo, a

panel of MusicAlly and podcasts by the Music Business Podcast on Youtube. The latter provided multiple interviews which were found by searching through their upload history.

As these interviews contain some major players in the live-stream business who can benefit from a positively painted picture of live-streams, two in-depth interviews were added to provide a fresh outlook on the matter. These were performed with Dutch musicians in different stages of their career. One was a beginning singer-songwriter, trying to set foot in the industry with a new act. The other was a guitarist of a metalcore band who already has some major festivals on his portfolio. As the online panels were mostly focused on established artists and organizations, it offered a fresh outlook on the already gathered data. Additionally, it also served as a fact-checking function as the researcher could ask more in-depth questions in relation to the study.

All fourteen units had a duration between 45 to 75 minutes. The interviews were collected by means of recordings. The interviews that were derived from Youtube were downloaded to maintain the highest audio quality. The personally conducted interviews were recorded by means of Zoom audio recordings. The rest was recorded manually, as the festival panels and Vimeo videos could not be downloaded. The interviews were transcribed using AI software by Otter.ai and then verified manually with the use of Inqscribe transcription software.

3.3 Operationalisation

How can value be created for live-streaming concerts and how can these be used for a sustainable business model for the live music industry?

As mentioned in the introduction, three building blocks of the definition of Osterwalder et al. (2005) of a business model guide the research of the sustainability of the concert live-stream model. These are the value creation of the product, the distribution channels and the revenue streams. While the definition of Osterwalder et al. consists of more building blocks, these are not fitted for qualitative research and require sensitive, inaccessible insider's information. Still, the remaining aspects should be enough to get a general idea of the sustainability of the model in this stage of the live-stream development.

The first sub-question required a look at all the aspects that would make a concert live-stream a valuable or valueless experience. The theoretical framework discusses what academic scholarship regards as the central aspects that make the concert experience special.

The analysis tests whether these same values still align with digital concerts or whether other values come into play. The central concepts for this aspect are:

1) Liveness. Is the live element still important to the live-stream experience and how does it manifest itself? This element is tested by questioning the temporal qualities of the live-stream and their effects on the product;

2) Social aspects. This element measures if and to what extent people could still derive social pleasures from the live-stream format and how this was manifested;

3) Spatiality. This element questions the role of music spaces and to what extent they still matter to a performance that transcends any physical barriers.

The second sub-question looked at the manners of distribution and what this means for the different players in the live industry market. Important concepts for this were:

1) Democratization. This refers to the extent that more players can enter the market and have a chance to flourish in it;

2) Platform accumulation. This signals the phenomenon in which music companies take on a platform-approach (Nieborg & Poell, 2018) in order to accumulate user data and gain a competitive advantage;

3) Superstar effect. This refers to the winner-takes-all economy that traditionally typifies the music industry.

For the final sub-question, the study looked at all ways that the supply-side could accumulate value for themselves with the live-streams. This was measured by:

1) Income streams. This refers to manners that generate an immediate, monetary stream of income;

2) The artist brand. This refers to all manners that would influence the position and strength of the overall value of the artist brand. As the data also concerned organizations, this branding value also applies to them.

As most of the data was retrieved from other sources, the researchers would have to search for cues that indicated these phenomena. The specific signifiers can be found in the final coding frame (Appendix B). For the interviews, a topic list was made that touched upon the topics that were discussed by the already gathered data (see Appendix C). As these interviews were used for fact-checking and fleshing out the data, they followed a similar structure to the results-section.

The interviewees did not receive the entire topic list beforehand. Still, they were given a brief introduction of the research subject, namely that it was concerned with the sustainability of concert live-streams after the pandemic. They were also notified of the sub-

topics that would be discussed: their global experiences with format, how their concert experience was, the platforms that they used and the monetization strategies they employed. This approach would presumably be the closest to the preparations that the other panellists and interviewees had, as they were invited to discuss specific topics, but were also open for spontaneous questions.

3.4 Method of Analysis

The transcripts were uploaded onto Atlas.ti, which is a software that lends itself for coding large amounts of text. The transcripts were thus analyzed using thematic analysis. This relied on coding, which is a manner to categorize themes and recognize recurring patterns within the data (Saldaña, 2013). There are different ways of coding, like open, data-driven coding, or narrow theory-driven coding (Braun & Clarke, 2006). As this study uses a mix of interviews and other externally produced data-sources, the approach of theory-driven coding would be too narrow and exclusive. On the other hand, open coding would suggest an unbiased lens, which determines the codes and patterns completely from the data. In practice, that is impossible as there are certain research questions to answer. So, this analysis used open coding in the sense that codes are not pre-established, but guided by the theory. Certain concepts were thus kept in mind while analyzing the data and provided a point of reference (Bowen, 2019). These concepts involved: liveness, interactivity, platformization, democratization and revenue and branding value. They were kept in the back of the researcher's mind while looking for themes.

The first step for this thematic analysis followed Saldaña's initial, open coding (2013). This phase was data-driven and inductive, to map out the mechanisms and give short names for the phenomena in the interviews. This resulted in around one hundred codes, which can be found in Appendix A. Some of which were very similar and most of which were rather descriptive than interpretive.

So, a second phase of axial coding was applied to deduct these codes to more interpretive signifiers of the themes and reflect a deeper understanding of the data (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006). In this phase, the codes were also categorized and linked together under umbrella-terms (Saldaña, 2013). This was approached, first by using the network-function of Atlas.ti to group them together and create relationships between the groups. Then, these relationships and merges were further refined in Word.

Naturally, the actual process of analysis did not have the clearly defined borders that scholars describe with thematic analysis. Although the process of analysis indeed began with an inductive approach and later on with a deductive lens, the actual analysis was rather cyclical. It involved a substantial amount reading the texts up-close and then putting them away so the mind could interpret them from a distance and see the larger picture. Then, the texts would have to be read again with this frame in mind to check if the emerged codes indeed added up.

The final coding frame is divided into the code label, its definition and examples that illustrate how to recognize their appearance in the data, as according to Fereday Muir-Cochrane (2006). The results of this can be found in Appendix B.

3.5 Validity and Reliability

To ensure a rigor and trustworthy result, this research made use of regular peer debriefing with the thesis supervisor, where the stage and findings of the research were continuously discussed and presented for feedback. It also made use of triangulation. Broadly speaking, this means that the subject has been studied from different perspectives (Flick, 2018). This has been achieved on a data-level as different resources and interview-formats, as described in section 3.2, are used for analysis. It has also been achieved on a theory-level, as the samples have been studied from a humanities perspective in chapter 4.1, a media technological perspective in 4.2, as well as a business perspective in 4.3.

4. Results

4.1 Value Creation

When estimating the value of concert live-streams for consumers, it is often compared to the physical concert experience. Within academic scholarship, there is disagreement about the extent that these two forms of music consumption fulfill the same needs and allow for the same practices. Rendell (2020) argues that concert live-streams expand the traditional concert experience, allowing for innovative and performative ways to audience while still maintaining an intimate experience. The social practices of fandom that take place at concerts would still find their way within these live-streams, according to him. Vandenberg et al. (2020) are rather skeptical about the possibilities of live-streaming and argue that it creates a substantially different activity - especially when compared to concerts with rather lively, dancing audiences. Whereas fans attend traditional concerts for their cultural value and immersive experience (Behr & Cloonan, 2020), Vandenberg et al. fear that live-streams run the risk of performing dead ceremonialism (2020). These differing views about a rather recent and under-explored phenomenon beg the question: How can concert live-streams create experiential value for the concert-goer?

The thematic analysis of the data reveals that certain aspects of the traditional live experience were either improved, recreated or entirely missing with the format. These concern the aspects of creating a sense of liveness, performativity, recreating the social aspects of a concert and the role of (venue) spaces to create a meaningful event.

Liveness

As expected, the interviews reflect the importance of live elements for music shows and the value that people attach to these live experiences. The respondents often use the live element as a self-evident term, referring to the overall physical concert experience of being in the venue, sharing a singular moment with the artist and other spectators. Though the term and measurements of liveness are not always as clearly or narrowly defined by the speakers, the data show that it is a crucial element to the concert experience. Adding these properties of liveness to the livestreams make them more unique and enhance their value, especially in contrast to concert documentations. Like one participant says: "Its like you're watching the

DVD of a live concert. But then you know it's still live so that adds an extra component," (Eerdenburg, ESNS #3).

As van Es (2017) describes, live has the function to create value and communicate an event's importance to the level that it should be attended now, at the moment of its occurrence. The live element, whether in its singularity or in its massality, creates a level of realness and unpredictability. It relies on a group's togetherness, making the event an important moment for society (van Es, 2017).

In the case of the interviews and panels, there were two commonly used techniques to create a sense of liveness: creating temporal singularity and creating a shared moment. In addition, the thematic analysis also revealed that the live-streams need more than just the live element to create this special moment, namely building the show around a special occasion.

Temporal singularity

Because of the spatial separation between artist and audience, the interviews show that the live-streams rely on temporal simultaneity to create a sense of live. This means that the audience can watch the performance on the streams as they occur on location. In many cases of the data, these events have to be watched as they occur since they cannot be retrieved later. This would create the same singular experience as normal concerts would. Like one participant said: "If you turn up late for one of our shows, it's the same as turning up at the Ziggo Dome at midnight. When the band is on its end, it's over," (Middleton, ESNS #2).

People want to attend a concert, because they create a temporally and spatially shared moment between the performer and their fans. That one vacuum in time is only experienced by the attendants and derives its value from its scarcity. As a fan, you have to be there, or else you miss out on this precious, shared moment (Holt, 2010). With simultaneous broadcasting, streams can create the same temporal quality as live when the performance occurs at the exact same time as transmission (Mueser and Vlachos, 2018). So, using a pre-recording is out of the question when attempting to achieve this quality, as is reflected in the data.

Where it gets tricky is with the documentation. Mueser & Vlachos (2018) also view the lack of preparation and editing as a prerequisite of creating an equal, temporal live quality with broadcasts. Yet, it is this exact example of *Driift*, that shows an extensive preparation and the use of a heavily equipped production team, switching between cameras and shots. While this required rehearsals beforehand, the director's decisions and cuts between shots happened in the moment of performance. As they performed this event at the Union Chapel twice, the director also admitted that the two performances were differently executed as the

artist reflected different energies between the performances (Testi, IQF). So while the performance was more elaborate in preparation than the prerequisites of Mueser & Vlachos (2018), it still had the suspense of performing in the moment without second takes. This real-time broadcast indeed heightened the sense of being there, as argued by Vandenberg et al. (2020).

Creating a shared moment

Liveness not only relies on the fleetingness of time, but also on creating a shared moment. The live-streams allow for an intimate closeness between the artist and the viewer, as the camera can be positioned in places where the viewer would never come. It allows for close-ups of the musicians, showing drops of sweat on their foreheads and other intimate details that the fan could never see in a physical audience. Although the live-stream prevents physical proximity and shared space, the right documentation could still mimic the sense of being there, with the artist at the venue.

But I really encourage all artists to consider this as a way of not just generating money for themselves, but also to create an incredible moment for their fans that they will really remember and really feel like an ‘I was there’ moment, just like if they would have seen the show in real life (Tannen, MA).

This element is essential to making the concert live-stream a valuable medium for fans. Mulder et al. (2020) explain this phenomenon as the momentum of a concert. The feeling of co-presence is essential to this. This can be created through scarcity - which can be amplified by temporal singularity - and massality, indicating to the viewer that they are watching together with a large crowd. This creates an even more urgent feeling among the attendants to be present and not miss out on the moment (Mulder et al., 2020). Concert-goers want to be there, be a part of a unique moment and experience it together with likeminded people (Charron, 2017).

Building around special occasions

With traditional, physical tours, an artist could create an important moment every night, in a new venue with a new audience. With concert live-streams however, the events are more vulnerable to lose importance. As anyone with an internet connection can attend the concert, fewer shows are needed to connect with the entire fanbase. Whereas restraints are

traditionally imposed by the amount of kilometers between the fan's residence and the concert hall, the geographical boundaries are now determined by time zones. As a result, the usual strategy of quantifying a show and performing it multiple times to increase the revenue is no longer applicable.

The interviewees noticed this change in viewership as well. Whereas larger audiences can be reached at once, these numbers tend to stagnate when the live-streams are repeated too quickly. The data shows that a concert live-stream should not take place without reason. It has to make sense for the audience and the artist to organize the show at that particular moment in time, in order to attract viewers.

Commonly, the live-streams took place on dates that were related to artists' tour dates or festivals' originally scheduled weekends. An example of a 'right show at the right time', is the Laura Marling show, organized by Driift. This took place on a day when the last show of her concert tour was originally scheduled (ESNS #2; IQF).

Still, it has to be taken into account that especially the festival live-streams took place in the weekends in which their physical counterparts were originally scheduled. This is due to the pandemic, which forced many events to reschedule or reform.

Nonetheless, these live-streams do not necessarily have to be hosted in connection to a concert tour. They can also be organized in relation to holidays. For example, hosting a live-stream on Valentine's day can gain more traction, especially when the event uses this as a central theme for the performance (Struijlaart, ESNS #1).

Nevertheless, most interviewees agree that live-streams should be hosted in moderate frequencies - less often rather than more often in order to keep the views coming.

Van Es (2017) notes that despite the media-centralizing function of liveness, it can only make an event seem more important when it is saved for special occasions. So, it can only create an urgency around an event when it occurs only in limited cases. This is in line with the idea of live concerts overall: that they take place only once and there are no second chances at attending the moment (Holt, 2010). As live-streams can be attended by anyone, anywhere, they need to be hosted in moderation in order to make them scarce and worth attending.

Mediation and creative ways of documentation

According to Heuguet (2016), the simpler the documentation, the more real and temporally live the live-stream event seems. That is why DJ live-streams would use static shots, with a single, steady camera, to broadcast their performance in order to stress the

simultaneity of the event being broadcasted while it is happening. This would add to the realness of the live-stream event as it has a naturalizing effect (Heuguet, 2016). However, the interviews suggest a discrepancy within this logic. Whereas the importance of the live feeling and temporal simultaneity would enhance the experience, there is also the overall agreement that the live-stream should be visually interesting. The participants that chose for static shots did this merely for practical reasons or for budgetary reasons. Those with more creative freedom and substantial production budgets opted for more intricate documentations. They actually applauded the possibility to film close-ups and other shots that would be impossible with an audience present. Like one participant said: "And he's able to not just shoot it like he would a concert, but actually to achieve angles that you never could if there was an audience in the room," (Middleton, ESNS #2). In these cases, the performance was regarded as a different medium than a traditional live show.

In the first case of static shots, there is rather a divide between the event and the camera, as the camera solely shares the event with the world as it is happening. In the latter cases, the documentation became a performative part of the show. According to Auslander's theory of liveness (2008), a documentation can be as much live as the documented performance. The broadcast of the event and the event itself are equal and inseparable as these detailed, 'theatrical' documentations broadcast a performance that was only meant to be filmed, and were never presented as stand-alone events in the presence of audiences (Auslander, 2006, p. 2). The broadcasted material was the only performance that was meant to be seen. Had the performance been in front of a physical audience, which would have been the main art piece, then the documentation could have been seen as a 'secondary, supplementary record' of the event (Auslander, 2006, p. 4). However, this primary focus on documentation and broadcasting makes the live-stream as live as can be, following Auslander's logic.

Social Aspects

A commonly recurring theme was the importance of the social elements that live music shows provide. The following shows examples of how live-streams can be used to create an audience connection in a valuable way, as well as the struggle of creating this connection with the format.

Fan Feedback

The interviewees show that even without an audience present, applause and fan feedback was still available. The findings show that most of the participants enabled a chat-function during their live-stream so fans could share their excitement and emulate fan practices like applause. While the data mainly concerns actors on the production-side and it reveals little about the experience on the consumer-side, the musicians derived a certain level of gratification from mediated interaction. Like one participant said: "The best of hearts is the closest you get to feeling applause. I think that's a nice feeling," (de Bastion, MA).

As Bennett (2012) argues, online fans can experience and reproduce responses similar to when they would be attending the concert in person. They can discuss the events as they happen on stage, share their anticipation before the event and their reactions to it afterwards. They can also share their opinions about the show, just like an audience would applaud or boo in a concert hall. As fans express their involvement with the show online, it creates a sense of togetherness and enhances the feeling of being there, according to Bennett (2012). The use of social media and mobile technology can also enhance the overall physical concert experience for the fan (Naveed et al. (2017). As these shows existed only online, there was indeed the recreation of being part of a fan community and interacting with the artist. Still, it remains doubtful to what extent this experience was as valuable as with real life concerts.

Shin et al. (2019) describe this as parasocial interaction, meaning that the right technological affordances can create a sensation of social presence and closeness for the viewer. This implementation of real-time chat-functions can thus enhance the viewing experience and create a more shared experience. While the data cannot account for the fan experience, it does show that the musicians experienced some sort of connection with and appreciation from their fans.

Live-streams as an opportunity for the audience to get to know the artist better

Despite not being in the same room together, the interviews show that the live-streams enable the possibility to interact with fans in a new way. The format can be utilized to let the fans become more acquainted with the artist. This can be in the literal sense, as the format allows for fans to ask questions directly, for which the artist now has the space and time to respond. One participant mentioned how valuable this was: "He had his laptop and he was answering questions and giving people shout-outs. Like that to me was... Like I'm never gonna get that in a real show," (Gillani, ESNS #2).

Simultaneously, the format has flexibility, allowing the artist to tailor their performance to fit their personality and artistry. The ability to broadcast from any place, in any setting, helps to show a more authentic side of the artist that the fan would not see in a traditional venue setting. This way, the viewer can see the artist in their own natural habitat, without the glitter and glamour of their stage persona.

They're doing shows where their wife or their husband is walking into the room or their kid or a dog. And one thing we've seen is, a younger consumer really wants to know that artist authentically, because we're all in this. This is the first time in history that we're all in the same condition, you know, together, whether you're Jay Z, or you just a regular guy, you know, down the street (Petrocelli, MB #2).

This reflects the repurposing of space as described by Taylor et al. (2020): whereas the lockdowns forced everyone to stay inside, the technology of video conferencing (and streaming) made public what had always been private. As live-streams do not rely on traditional musical space, they allow the artists to reveal a more authentic version of themselves to the audience by displaying intimate spaces and chatting casually in between sets.

Missing the social aspects

Despite the positive social experiences mentioned, the interviews show that the live-streams fail to completely simulate and substitute the social experience. Although neither of the participants used this type of phrasing, one had a similar, perhaps more fitting name for it, referring to their live-stream experience as if they were playing a rehearsal. This resulted in confusion and uneasiness with the performer, who had to keep reminding himself that it was actually the moment of truth. They said: "Yes, it felt more like a final rehearsal of some sorts. As in, we have to perform like this the next time. Oh wait, we are already live," (Interview #1)

From a performative standpoint, the absence of audience sounds and energy also put more pressure on the performance. One participant explained that he was actually more afraid of making a mistake, as there was no audience noise to hide behind when hitting a wrong note. "You notice your own faults especially when you watch the show back, and that makes it a bit harder. But you also have to let it go," (Interview #2).

In these cases, there was a chat-function available. Still, it did not give the artist the same satisfaction and energy as with a physical concert. Some participants ascribed this to the lack of dancing. However, a more commonly occurring argument was the lack of audience noise to fill the venue and the absence of a vibing, clapping crowd.

This is in line with Vandenberg et al. (2020) and Dearn & Price (2016), who point out the importance of a collective audience for a positive concert experience. The absence of sounds that indicate a crowd present, can turn a concert live-stream into a "'dead ceremonialism' of sorts" (Vandenberg et al., 2020, p. 9), performing the formal steps of a ritual without the emotional charge to it. According to them, the performance would merely be a formal execution of the steps, but would not lead to a collectively shared emotional energy. To put it plainly, the live show would not have the same emotional impact and satisfaction as we are used to with live events. This is due to the effect that a massive crowd can have. The act of communal listening and feeling a sense of collectivity during a concert can enhance the experience when the audience acts positively (Dearn & Price, 2016). While a non-present audience cannot act in a distracting or irritating way, the lack of an audience could then also be a detracting factor for the listening experience.

Spatial Value

With concert live-streams, the artist and fan are physically separated. The show can be enjoyed from every location imaginable, as long as there is a screen with internet connection. The same thing can be said about the performance itself. Theoretically, it can take place anywhere. This new manifestation of concert performances calls into question the role of venues, the connection between the artists, the fans and the local culture and the usage of space.

The showcase function of venues

Taylor et al. (2020) predicted with their early study of the pandemic and its impact on the live music industry that spaces of music consumption lost their purpose as musicians began live-streaming from domestic spaces. However, the following section will argue that venues can still maintain their purpose of connecting the audience to the artist and play a role in the market of live-streams.

Although artists can live-stream themselves from anywhere, like rooftop locations or their own bedroom, the interviews suggest that the role of concert venues has not become obsolete. With the forced closure of concert halls, venues had to adapt in order to keep in touch with their audiences, leading many to invest in live-stream equipment. As a result, they could maintain their function of connecting audiences to culture and introducing new artists.

A particular example of this was De Isolation Sessions, as hosted by De Effenaar, a local stage in Eindhoven. This series invited bands - especially local ones - to perform a live-stream concert at their venues. This was experienced as advantageous - especially for new artists as they can 'borrow' the audience of an established venue and gain exposure. "Definitely because we also made use of the social media pages of the venues themselves. So there we could reach new audiences for sure," (Interview #2).

Other artists even performed virtual theatre tours, as they hosted several live-streams in collaboration with different venues. In this format, they made use of the social platforms and digital following of the local theatres in order to reach new audiences with every show. This serial, theatre-format required more initiative from the artist-side to approach the venues and suggest a collaboration. In some cases, the performances took place at the venues themselves, while in other cases only the venues' digital presence was borrowed for the shows. "So I decided to [...] team up with different independent venues and promoters that I've worked with in the past, to jump on their channels and play a show," (de Bastion, MA).

The interviews show that even through live-streams, local venues continued their traditional role, which is concerned with talent development and showcasing upcoming artists to the public (van der Hoeven et al., 2019). This is actually easier to organize for smaller venues, as some artists have the equipment to play off-location and only need to use their social media pages to reach new audiences. It is also remarked by one artist that the virtual touring costs are so low, that she eventually earned the same amount of money live-streaming as she would with a traditional tour.

While the global reach of live-streams would presumably lead to a diminishing of the local role of live music, the data suggests otherwise.

Using venues (and their emptiness) to enrich the broadcast

Traditionally, the venue was the central meeting space for the artist and fan, with the stage being one of the most important elements of the music experience (van der Hoeven & Hitters, 2020). When concerts take place online, this element is no longer self-evident. However, as this statement shows, a virtual concert can still be influenced by its space and

vice versa. Although people can theoretically broadcast from their own homes, the interviews showed predominantly a reliance on pre-existing concert spaces. Oftentimes, the reason for this was for practical and budgetary reasons, as the venues had the proper equipment to make high quality productions. In these cases, the venues possessed the proper technicians, camera men and lighting to create a studio-quality live-stream (Endeman, ESNS #1).

In other cases, the venues were chosen for artistic and marketing purposes. This was often the case with the more commercially successful artists. In these cases, the venues had a historic and cultural value, which were thoroughly mentioned in the marketing of the show. These venues were also creatively used to make the event interesting to look at and give a new interpretation to this venue space.

If I'm filming a gig at the union chapter with an audience, I'm happy to have the artist on the stage where the stage is, but when I went there, instantly, I wanted to have the artist in a different position because the venue was as important as the artist for the feeling in a way (Testi, IQF).

As argued by van der Hoeven et al. (2019), live music contributes to the cultural ecology and vibrancy of a city. Traditionally, live music performances offer a representation of a city and a narrative to remember it by, which contributes to a city's branding (van der Hoeven et al., 2020). When the audience and the artist are separated, this function would presumably be threatened. However, the data shows that there is still a large interplay between the live-stream performances and the locations that they play at. Still, the interviews show that these relations are rather venue-related than city-related, as a venue is chosen for its aesthetic and historical qualities. This is in line with Kronenburg (2011), who argues that the locations of live music shows influence the performance in terms of character, relevance and experience of the performer and audience.

Despite the flexibility of the live-streams, the data shows a reliance on designed and adapted buildings to broadcast these performances. That refers to buildings that were either built for the purpose of being a music venue or which were later on remodelled for this purpose (Kronenburg, 2011). The latter refers to home studio's as well. The only anomaly was Pohoda festival, which took place at a deserted airport and used this space as creative inspiration for the festival (Kascak, ESNS #6).

Conclusion

To summarize the findings, the results show that many of the valued aspects of concert-going manifest themselves differently with live-streamed concerts. The live aspect is heavily reliant on temporal singularity and creating a sense of a shared moment. However, this live aspect does not have the same quality of urgency as it does with traditional live concerts. So, the events need to be hosted in moderation, on special occasions in order to communicate that it is important to 'be there', attending the event. Else, the events will lose their value due to over-saturation and cannibalize their own audiences.

Additionally, the interviews show that there were still aspects of social practices at play with the live-stream, as applause could be virtually mimicked. Still, this did not make up for the lack of audience presence in the room. So, the performances missed the energy of having a present, physical collective that responds to the music and enhances the experience. On the other hand, the live-streams still provide valuable opportunities for artist and audience to connect as the format allows for more authentic, stripped down performances and more room for Q&A's in between the songs.

While the live-streams can take place anywhere, the results show that music venues still have a big role in maintaining their showcase function online. The use of a certain concert venue can also enhance the value of the show and make it more interesting for people to watch for its cultural value and aesthetic properties.

So, the live-streams require to be approached differently than traditional concerts in order to provide a valuable experience. However, this experience has a supplemental, additional function rather than replacing how people like consuming live music as they cannot fulfill the same needs.

4.2 Digital Distribution

While traditional concerts rely on venues and the physical gathering of an audience, concert live-streams can be enjoyed and created anywhere. This section looks at how these concerts are spread and distributed and what this means for the live music industry and the viability of the business model. It asks the question: What are the common distribution strategies and what consequences do they have?

The thematic analysis revealed a dichotomy between the empowering and disempowering aspects of the live-stream format, as it relies on platforms that serve a whole different economic strategy. While this section discusses many examples that prove the experience of democratization and empowerment of artists and organizations, it also shows that a winner-takes-all economy can co-exist with that.

Democratization

This section discusses various examples of how the live-stream format is bringing back the long-tail market model and can help more players to gain exposure and participate in the market. This is because of the low entry barrier, the expansive audience reach, the ability to make money on the platforms and the possibility of broadcasting on multiple channels at once.

Low Entry Barrier

The interviews show that the participants experience a certain level of democratization with the use of live-streams to distribute their concerts. This is mainly reflected in the low entry barrier that live-streaming technology provides to host a concert. The participants in these cases applaud the little amount of equipment that is necessary to produce one of these concerts. Oftentimes, the necessary equipment is already at their home, as musicians often own a microphone and some production software. As Thomas (2020) calls it, an internet connection and a platform are all that is needed for a live-stream performance. This attitude is reflected in the data, as participants experience a low entry barrier for production.

And I discovered pretty quickly that there is free software available, like OBS, just open for download for everyone. So I started with that and I thought: 'Well, I'll just use a few microphones.' Audio was not a problem as I have a small studio at home.

So, yeah, I had it quickly on the rails, with all the free stuff that is out there (Struijlaart, ESNS #1).

It is also democratizing for the artists that are hindered from touring. This can be due to budgetary problems, homesickness or commitments to reducing CO₂ emissions. Especially as touring is responsible for a substantial amount of income for the artists, the possibility to tour online is empowering for those who experience hindrances to travelling. According to Thomas (2020), smaller artists experience psychological strains from touring as they would be a long time away from home, becoming lonely and alienated. Although the data does not suggest these types of mental burdening, it does reflect that touring is not the best way for every artist. This is especially for those artists concerned with the environment or who experience stage fright. However, this is rather a small part of the data.

[Touring] is not sustainable for the environment. So when we meet artists that can't tour, that can't afford to tour, who... We worked with an artist at ATC who was fearful of performing on a stage in front of people. There's many, many, many opportunities here for this format to flourish in grand and really bring value back to the songwriters, back to the performers (Middleton, ESNS #2).

The overall tendency rather suggests a solution for those artists with monetary concerns, as live-streaming would be cheaper than real-life touring. Although this is reflected in multiple interviews, one participant mentions: "this medium democratized everything, and everyone. And it even weighs in my mind more towards smaller artists, because some smaller artists could never afford to be on the road or be doing," (Bryant, SXSW).

It also empowers artists who live in remote areas that are not necessarily cultural centres. In these cases, it shifts the focus from these western epicentres and allows artists from other areas a stage.

"But I do think from a positive side, we African artists perhaps didn't have the opportunity to be seen in festivals or showcases globally or music conferences. They actually now have the opportunity to because everything is virtual. We don't have to now worry about flights and accommodation and visas and the like." (Ross, GW).

Making Money on the platforms

The interviews reveal that there are several platforms out there, which are chosen because they allow for transparent revenue policies and reliable and easy ways of making

money. These are the platforms like Twitch that not only enable the sustainable growth of a fanbase, but also enable easy ways for fans to support the artist through subscriptions or gifts (MB #2). The interviews also mention Veeps, which is used because of their transparent revenue system that divides the money between artist and platform service fairly (GW). In addition, a platform like Bandcamp offers easy-to-use affordances to create merch-tables during the streams (ESNS #2).

According to Fietkiewicz et al. (2018), the main motive for music live-streaming is to gain exposure, but this theme reveals something else. While there is still the motive of growing a sustainable fanbase, the emphasis is rather on fairness and long-term reliability. Like Meier (2015) argues, there is a difference between reaching an audience and building a fanbase. So, in these cases the artists pick their distribution channels mainly to create a reliable income stream for the future.

Reaching Larger Audiences

The main motivation of hosting these concert live-streams is expanding the artist's reach and connecting with larger audiences, even beyond geographical borders. The format of the live-stream helped connect festivals and artists to an audience unlike any they ever reached before. With live-streams, there is the possibility to create a global audience and share culture all around the world.

I'd say the biggest learning is recognizing that streaming puts a local show on a global platform. We've gone from selling tickets in six countries to 133. [...] We've had, like the Laura show - the two for the UK and the US - and you can't go too far the other way. So don't try and do like city-by-city live stream tours because, you know, so far they haven't been proven a success. So yeah, think about that global audience. Think about that hook and get creative, basically, (Oldham, IQF).

This is in line with Fietkiewicz et al. (2018), who found that streamers prioritize audience reach over revenue streams. In the cases of these interviews, success was measured by the amount of exposure and audience reach, rather than income. According to Meier (2015), the music industry - especially when it comes to music streaming - relies on audience maximization because it is characterized by a winner-takes-all economy. This means that wide-spread visibility might not be profitable in the beginning, but will create competitive and monetary advantages later down the line as it adds value to the artist brand. So, this wide audience reach that live-stream offer is advantageous for artists and organizations.

Broadcasting on Multiple Platforms

Still, the artists need to broadcast on the platforms that their user-base is at. This poses a problem, as Instagram is often the most popular platform in terms of reach, but very limiting when it comes to monetization and creating high value productions. In addition, audiences are often scattered across multiple social media platforms. In order to reach the most people, artists use software that streams on multiple platforms simultaneously. This way, they could reach the fans where they were at, without deciding between platforms.

As artists can broadcast on multiple channels, it questions the indirect network effects that the broadcast platforms would be subject to, as according to Nieborg & Poell (2018). These effects entail that the value of platforms is determined by actors joining and leaving the platform. Especially in these cases, the value of a platform would be determined by its user-base.

So while the interviews indeed show the importance of reaching people and broadcasting on the right channels, artists do not necessarily have to choose between one or the other. While platforms can still be left out for these broadcasts if the user-base is too small, artists are more inclined to make their decisions based on a platform's purpose and brand or just include all their platforms in the stream.

Platform Accumulation

Despite the success stories of digital events that were attended in over 100 countries, there are nooks to this development. While audience maximization is made possible due to platformization and innovating technologies, there are also other powers at play that arise with this development. The following will discuss the different aspects of platform accumulation and the crucial role of IT in the live-stream business. This is guided by the themes of user lock-ins and datafication.

User Lock-ins

The platform that is used for distribution plays a major part in reaching the audiences. The data shows that it is important to reach the fans where they are already at. The platform is a determining factor for whether people will attend the event or not. The event needs to be hosted on a platform that the audience is acquainted with and which they trust. Especially

since the mainstream audience is not yet familiar with the live-stream format, the event needs to be hosted in a way that still feels familiar and reliable (ESNS #2). This reflects what Hracs & Webster (2020) call user lock-ins, entailing that platform users tend to stick to their own platforms and are unlikely to switch.

While the lack of switching between platforms is certainly evident in the interviews, the reason behind this differs. In the interviews, the participants show that viewership is rather determined by their familiarity with the platform space and accessibility to the event. So, when a fan has to visit an unknown website or click on too many links, they are less likely to attend the performance.

This is a different reason than academic scholarship shows. According to Hracs & Webster (2020), this is due to personalisation of the virtual environment that those platforms offer. Simply put, the longer a platform has been in use, the better the system knows the user and can customize the environment to tailor to that specific user and lock them in. Users are unlikely to switch because that would make them lose the digital environment that they spent so much time building (Hracs & Webster, 2020). So, while the interviews certainly reflect that the need for familiarity plays a part in the search for audiences, the time and effort invested in a platform space does not.

Datafication

On the other hand, having audiences locked into a platform makes it easier to grow viewership if you find yourself on the right side of the coin. The data shows multiple examples in which datafication and personalisation is utilized to bring these shows to an audience. The first quote shows that utilizing your own platform is beneficial as this gives you ownership over the data, which can be used later on. This manifests itself even on a smaller scale, as using their own platforms can empower smaller venues and organizations to accumulate more capital and enforce fairer prices. One panellist notes: "Actually, we notice that increasingly more of our clients feel the need to broadcast on their own platforms. Because they, well, get more access to user data that they aggregate," (Laan, ESNS #1).

However, as previously established, it is hard to draw people to new platforms. So, it is easier to coöperate with other large platforms that already own this type of data and have the right tools to reach the people who would be interested in buying tickets. Duffy et al. (2019) call this algotorial power, referring to the influence of consumer behavior by the editorial and algorithmic power of platforms. This means that essentially, platforms act as gatekeepers for music consumption.

The data reflects this on the production side, as the interviews show targeted advertising and nudging of consumers based on their behavior. On the other hand, the data does not reveal that artists would feel like the visibility of their content is affected by these algorithms. Regardless, the data does suggest the importance of getting your hands on listener-data, in order to target your audiences. We see that the firms who rely on their own software adopt a platform-approach, as coined by Nieborg & Poell (2018) and use big data to cater to their audience. They show a manifestation of what Hracs & Webster (2020) call the advertising of events to those who show particular behavioral patterns on the platform .

Especially Dice FM, which started out as a mobile ticketing platform, is picking the fruits of this. They can market live-stream events directly to their users who have shown interest in the artists on their platform. In scholarship, this has also been referred to as ownership of user-knowledge, which can be used to push content (Meier & Manzerolle, 2019). This weaponizing of user-data not only increases the viewership of these live-stream events, but also gives the company a competitive advantage. The algorithm of Dice, which has been developing for years, makes it attractive for other artists and promoters to collaborate with them and gives them a competitive advantage.

DICE has built its whole algorithm and world around discovery. So for us, it was about finding fans that have scanned Laura in their Spotify library, previously purchased tickets, and communicating with them really thoroughly the whole way through the journey, because a lot of fans haven't experienced this before as well (Oldham, IQF).

While Dice FM is still a company specifically tailored for the music industry, the data also suggests a massive reliance on the pioneering social media platforms to spread the events. Artists often start out with streaming on Youtube and Facebook, or both at the same time. This is in line with the bias of platform accumulation, which structurally supports pre-existing capital, despite the entries of new players in the market (Meier & Manzerolle, 2019).

With platform capitalization, there is also the danger that music is merely an instrument to attract consumers and accumulate user-data (Hesmondhalgh & Meier, 2018). The developments of Twitch appear to suggest this. Although the participants are enthusiastic about Twitch and how they accommodate beginning artists, the development of their product raises some questions. As the quote shows, Twitch started out as a live-stream platform for gamers and later on also turned to music. This questions the theory of the music industry as a testing ground for IT (Hesmondhalgh & Meier, 2018), as it was rather the gaming community

to experiment with the live-stream format. Still, as Twitch is developing and changing in order to host different cultural content, it is attracting more users.

I came from the gaming community prior to joining Twitch, and I knew about Twitch just because of how they contributed back to gaming and how they're able to support not only individual pro gamers, but also tournaments and leagues and whatnot. And so we were able to kind of replicate that same format in the music community, (Andeshmand, SXSW).

Superstar Effect

When the distribution channels change, it is always the question who will benefit from it. According to Coelho & Mendes (2019), the academic discourse around digital music distribution sees two opposite outcomes that can characterize the market: the superstar effect and the long-tail. The first is dominated by a "winner-takes-all economy", in which a small percentage of the players has the largest share of income, whereas the latter has room for a marginal niche market to flourish (p. 454). With the long-tail, as introduced by Anderson (2006), the online marketplace has infinite marketspace, so it can offer niche products that physical shops would leave out. These niche products would then take over the larger percentage of the sales. While the long tail and the superstar effect seem to exclude each other, Coelho & Mendes (2019) argue that they actually co-exist in the digital music market.

Signs of Super-Star Effect

The interviews show that it depends per artist whether their live-stream attracts a large viewership and revenue stream. Especially the level of success that an artist has plays a role in this. However, this is not necessarily according to the superstar effect. The interviewees mainly show an optimism about the opportunities that the format creates for smaller, upcoming artists as a live-stream can be hosted through simple and affordable means. However, when speaking to musicians with smaller scale audiences, they do not see these opportunities for themselves. They would rather assign the benefits of live-streams to bigger, more commercially successful artists.

This would signify a winner-takes-all economy as described by Coelho & Mendes (2019), as the big players generate the most revenue with these live-streams.

Signs of Long-Tail

While this line of thinking is indeed aligned with the superstar economy, other interviews show a different view. First off, there is the problem of over-saturation. The biggest superstars have so much footage of their performances online, for free to watch, that it would not make sense to let fans pay for an online performance. However, a ticketed performance would make more sense for a smaller artist with less footage online.

Like, I think pay per view is great for those mid level bands that you don't get to see a lot, but if you can purge 5 million Katy Perry videos, it's hard to imagine someone's gonna pay for a ticket for her (DeHaven, MB #2).

When an artist has reached a certain level of commercial success, they are so omnipresent that their following would not see substantial growth after a live-stream because they are already globally visible. This is in line with the study of Montoro-Pons & Cuadrado-García (2020), who found that web-searches of famous artists do not increase after they played a festival. While their study was limited to physical events, the interviews suggest that the same phenomenon applies to live-stream events. Despite their ability to reach a global audience, which is more extensive than any venue could offer, superstars do not see a significant increase in fan growth as they already hit a ceiling.

I think the one of the big takeaways here is that Miley Cyrus's following is so huge that it's difficult to see any statistically significant growth for her, because she's just so huge already that any growth is not that - doesn't appear big from a percentage point of view. But for Charli, she was actually declining before the livestream, so she was on a downward trend and the live streaming really took her back up to, you know, positive growth numbers (Rosenborg, ESNS #4).

So, it is actually doubtful to what extent the superstars actually pick the most fruits of live-stream innovations. The interviews show that the fame-factor does not immediately promise a successful live-stream in terms of revenue and audience growth.

High Organizational Effort

Although a concert live-stream could be produced by simple means, the interviews also show a hesitance to produce low budget live-streams with a microphone in the living room, so to say. The data reflects that organizing a concert live-stream is seen as a difficult and expensive procedure, despite the technological innovations. This is due to a few reasons.

Some artists have more ambitious plans. Their performances should have a certain production quality in order to maintain their artist brand. Performing below this level with a self-made, low budget production would be harmful to their image. Likewise, there is also the issue of over-saturation, which results in high competition.

As established in the previous chapter, it is fruitful for live-streams to be aesthetically pleasing and deliver high audio quality. As Meier (2015) argues, the digital developments that make it easier to produce and distribute also lead to an over-supply of releases, making it a high-competition market. This explains why, despite the low entry barrier, an artist should still deliver a high quality performance in order to stand out. So while it might be easy to participate in the live-stream trend, it is even harder to flourish.

There is also the problem of technical difficulties. Sometimes, artists simply are not acquainted with the software and equipment needed to produce such a show. Or, they lack the budget to hire someone to produce this for them. There is also the unreliability of a wi-fi connection or software failure.

In these cases, it appears that asking beginning artists the question: 'Are you able to live-stream?' is the wrong question. It is rather about balancing losses and gains. In these cases, the participants experience a lot of effort to host these live-streams - be it in costs or manpower - while being rewarded with little gains.

As Meier (2015) argues, the music industry can only generate profit with audience maximization, as it faces high production costs but low reproduction costs. So while it is expensive to set up one performance, the costs remain the same while more people can consume the product. So when artists need to make the performance special, they are only likely to make a profit when they are assured of a paying audience or other income streams.

Conclusion

To answer the research question, the interviews showed a divide between broadcasting their streams on social media platforms and broadcasting them on their own, private channels. The decision between these two had several consequences.

These results show that the digitized spread of concerts have their advantages and disadvantages. On the one hand, the format can be empowering. Producing a live-stream essentially requires no more than a microphone, a camera and an internet connection. As a result, the entry barrier has never been lower to creating and sharing performances. This is a

positive development for the smaller (perhaps DIY-)artists who cannot afford to go on a regular tour. This way, they can tour the world without even leaving their home.

As live-streaming keeps developing, there are also more platforms that allow for fair payment systems and easy set-ups to create revenue streams.

The main advantage however is the global reach that the live-streams provide. There are no geographical boundaries anymore, as the whole planet can be reached with one performance. The main motivation of the interviewees and participants for live-streaming that comes across most of the interviews is to reach a larger, global audience. However, as discussed in the next section, it is exactly this hunt for audiences that lead to skewed power dynamics.

On the other hand, the digitization of concerts also has downsides. The interviews show that there are many manifestations of platform accumulation, which can be summarized by the increased reliance on datafication and audience lock-ins. While smaller-scale organizations are adapting to a data-based strategy, it is mainly the larger organizations that profit from the large bulks of user-data they have generated over the years. The interviews show that this data is exhausted to target advertisements and reach more audiences.

Artists are also reliant on the platforms that can offer the largest audiences, as audience reach is a more important currency than instant monetary income. This one-platform-reliance can be undermined by the use of OBS or other software that can broadcast on multiple platforms, subverting the network effects as described by Nieborg & Poell (2018).

The interviews show that while live-streams have lowered the entry barrier for artists to participate, perform and be seen, they also show that a high production value and access to user-data is needed to stand out. This is something that only the bigger artists can accomplish. However, once an artist reaches a ceiling in terms of success, the concert live-streams will not have an effect on their following.

4.3 Revenue Streams

Income Streams

The following section describes the different strategies with which artists were able to directly generate monetary income with the live-streams. This involves ticketing, pay-what-you-want models, up-selling and cross-selling and brand partnerships. It also discusses the recurring theme of struggles with generating monetary income.

Ticketing

The interviews show that ticketing is one common way of generating income with the hosting of live-streams. However, this is limited to particular types of artists. Mainly, the ones with a decent following, who are assured of a high demand for their live-streams. These artists also have the means to deliver a high quality show, which would be worth an entrance fee.

When both factors are not the case, a ticketing system is often rejected. For example, one interviewee whose band has a decent following, admitted to rejecting a ticketing model, due to being afraid that the show would not live up to this value (Interview #2).

This attitude towards ticketing is reflected as well by another participant, who voiced how important it is to clearly communicate what the product is before asking a ticket fee for it (Gillani, ESNS #2). When selling tickets for a live-streamed show, it should be made clear what the setting is, if it is indeed live or pre-recorded, whether there will be fan interaction and how much. These factors are all taken into account when deciding on a fair ticket price.

Despite the possibility of selling tickets, it should be taken into account that the ticket prices for live-stream shows are significantly lower than for physical shows at a venue. The shows that were organized by Driift, asked ticket prices between 15 to 18 euros for the performances of A-list musicians (Middleton, ESNS #2). Were these artists to host a physical show, the bottom ticket price for these shows would at least be twice or three times that price. It should also be taken into account that one ticket to the show does not equal one person, as it works with venues. Multiple people could watch through the same screen.

While creating a ticketing system is certainly possible for concert live-streams, the data shows that this system only works when certain production conditions are met. While this can create profitable revenues for artists with plenty of reach, the marginal ticket price is

lower and can accommodate more people on one ticket. So, more tickets need to be sold to create the same revenue as with physical concerts. As live music tends to account for half of an artists' income (Breese et al., 2020), this development is worrying and requires more effort from the supply-side to accumulate income.

Pay-what-you-want

A more common approach to creating income streams through live-streams is a donation system. In these cases, the concert is free for all to watch, but there is the possibility of a 'virtual tip jar', as Breese et al. (2020, p. 182) describe this function. As the description suggests, it gives audiences the option to donate some money to the artist, depending on how much they want to spend. The participants showed two reasons to opt for this payment system:

1) Live-streaming began as an exploratory adventure. The artists in question were unsure about the quality they could deliver with the technology as they were unfamiliar with the format. This is applicable for the beginning stage of live-streamers, which was rather about finding out about the possibilities of the format. Any money made along the way was just a bonus. Artists who employ this system often prioritize reach over revenue. Their first objective is to reach a large audience with their show. If it turns out that that audience is willing to pay for the concert, it is only an added bonus for the artist (See Struijlaart, ESNS #2; Interview #1). This objective of reach before revenue is in line with the findings of Fietkiewicz et al. (2018).

2) The donation-system is an option that had never been possible before for physical concerts. The digital distribution of the show simply makes it easier to create a pay-what-you-want system. With real-life shows, it would be more difficult and less profitable to set up such a system, whereas concert live-streams can simply employ such a system by creating a link or teaming up with a website (see Interview #1).

Although the revenue stream generated by such a system is unstable and unpredictable, its affordability and easy set-up makes it more advantageous for digital shows. It also makes it more attractive for hesitating viewers to sneak a peak as it requires no ticket fee.

According to Chen & Xiong (2019), gift giving or donation models are a common revenue model for streams, which turn out to be most profitable when the live-streams display high interactivity. In their study, audiences donate to streamers because they receive

social recognition as a reward, as a donation allows the viewer to talk to the host. The data of this research does not back this finding, as the participants did not report more donations in more interactive streams. The interviews rather showed some sort of obliviousness, as large donations pleasantly surprised them and were assigned to goodwill. So, this manner of making income is rather unstable as the amount and size of donations cannot be predicted. In the next section however, we see the part that interactivity plays when it comes to cross-sell and up-sell strategies.

Up-sell Strategies

The interviews show that even for a stream, tickets can be sold for different prices as long as they have more to offer. Artists can offer regular tickets for just the stream and VIP-tickets for a more interactive experience with the artist. In some instances, the amount of VIP-tickets was also limited, as opposed to the endless offering of regular tickets (see Tannen, MA). The data suggests that fans are willing to pay more for a concert-ticket when this includes interactions with the artist, like having the ability to ask a question or request a song. Although this is in the form of an actual bundled ticket and not a donation with a flexible tariff, it does support the study of Chen & Xiong (2019). While they argued that interactivity had a positive effect on donations, the interviews show that people indeed want to pay for acknowledgement from the artist, albeit in a ticket-form.

Cross-sell Strategies

With live-streams, there is not only the possibility to sell more expensive tickets, but also to sell more products. Especially merchandise is an often mentioned aspect of this. While fans can watch the stream and buy merchandise via a link on the stream, there is also the possibility to bundle a ticket and include the merchandise in this price. It is often recommended to design limited edition merchandise specifically for that one event, whereas usual tour merchandise sticks around for the complete tour. The link to buy the merchandise should only be accessible to those watching the stream to maintain the exclusivity and offer a memorable token of the event.

It's really the idea of having a private merch store online that gets sent to all the fans that have attended the stream, who paid for a ticket just at the end of the show. And

it's like an hour window at the end and it gets sent to everyone. And it's limited edition merchandise based on that event (Tannen, MA).

These examples show a 'branding logic', as described by Meier (2015, p. 407). This entails that artists rely on more than just selling their music, and have to create their value based on their artist brand. This means that musicians have to accumulate their income from many aspects besides music making, like merchandise in this example.

Brand partnerships

Just like with regular events, live-streams allow for the possibility of brand partnerships. Study has shown that event sponsoring increases brand recall and can positively affect people's attitudes towards brands (Rowley & Williams, 2008). So, it can be very attractive for brands to connect their names to music events. With the pandemic, these physical music events disappeared and so did the marketing opportunities attached to it. Therefore, it was natural for brands to look at other ways to stay visible and collaborate with virtual events. Aside from filling a marketing gap, live-streaming also has other assets to offer for brand partnerships. The participants claim that live-streaming has a lot to offer for brand visibility, as their streams attract a lot of watch-time per viewer, which is a primary currency in the digital age.

...the average consumer attention span has dropped in recent years, from 12 seconds down to eight seconds. If you execute a live stream, particularly with music properly, we've seen watch times 10-20-30-40 minutes sometimes. We did one, you know, festival for Coca Cola, where the average watch time on desktop was 113 minutes. And that's a you know, it's a big way to monetize (Petrocelli, MB #1).

The study of Heuguet about the Boiler Room Sessions, an earlier example of live-streaming pre-pandemic, already showed that concert live-streams can display brand logo's in exchange for sponsorship (2016). This way, the streams could be distributed for free while the involved actors could still earn a living. It also allows for more income certainty for the organizers (Anderton, 2011). While the data suggests that brand partnerships are indeed a popular and fruitful way of creating revenue streams, they show different approaches to these sponsorships. The data shows creativity while weaving the brands into the live-streams. Their presence at the virtual event rather becomes a substantial part of the event, rather than just a logo that is there. This is in line with Anderton (2011), who argues that successful brand

sponsorships of music events require experiential marketing. This entails that brands need to be involved in creating memorable experiences. So, when a concert-goer recalls their positive time at the concert, they would have a positive connotation with the brand. The brand would thus have to add value to the event and fit the expectations of the event in question. This could be achieved through interaction, participation and spectacle (Anderton, 2011).

And let's see, we just did a show with Absolute, where they sponsored it, and we created floating giant Absolute bottles that people could get into and ride around on the dance floor. So the thing about virtual is, you could do anything, that any idea that you want to do in terms of finding a way besides a billboard, you know (Bryant, SXSW).

Revenue Insecurity

The interviews show that, regardless of the monetization strategy, there remains an uncertainty about how much an event will yield. This is partly due because there appears to be no recipe for a successful event. When push comes to shove, the participants admit that they have no idea which event will attract the most viewership.

It's hard. You know, it's like the old record label days back before, you know, bootlegging came in. Record labels sold a zillion records and probably didn't understand half of why they did, you know what I mean? That's kind of now (DeHaven, MB #2).

Even when an artist has enough prestige to opt for a ticketing system, the participants reveal that they have trouble predicting the revenue that will be accumulated. The participants demonstrate that buying a ticket to a virtual concert is often an impulse buy - something fans decide on within 24 hours before the show starts. Some participants experienced this while consuming concerts, as they bought tickets at the last minute, whereas others could also confirm this from the production side.

It's very, very hard to put a price on what the turn-out is going to be, especially since live-streaming is such an impulse buy. [...] I think it's very, very hard unless you've got some technology that I'm unaware of to predict how many people will show up with a hard ticket (Forman, GW).

The research of Moe & Fader (2009) shows that fans tend to postpone their purchase for mid- and low-priced concert tickets. As live-stream events, even those of the superstars, tend to be cheaper than real-life concerts, it could possibly explain why people show impulse buy behavior. More research would be needed to confirm this. It is also important to note that concert live-streams have an unlimited ticket supply, as their audience is not limited to concert seats and venue space. Whereas this affordance is often applauded by the participants for the unlimited audience reach, it could also backfire as the consumer might be less pressured to buy a ticket. An unlimited supply also loses the appeal of exclusivity, nonetheless.

Value For the Overall Brand

This section describes other ways that the participants were able to receive advantages of the concert live-streams. These are not immediately translated in monetary income, but instead create value in the long-term as these aspects reveal an investment in the brand of the organization or the artist. These aspects entail staying in the picture and promotional value.

Staying in the picture

A common argument for hosting live-streams is oftentimes not based on revenue, but rather about maintaining the overall value of your brand. This is about staying visible to your fanbase and maintaining that connection. In some instances, the live-streams were mainly used as a means to survive the lockdowns or spread a message of hope to the fans. Especially in times of lockdown, venues and artists had to make a choice between doing nothing or at least trying something to maintain a connection with the community and not to disappear from their minds.

They were really committed to it, they had no revenue source for it, they had no sponsors, they had no way to justify it. But the brand was so important that they wanted to get that out to the fans (DeHaven, MB #2).

I think it is really important to keep presenting yourself as an artist, and keep stimulating your audience. So it goes beyond just making money. When we are allowed to tour again, I bet that the triple A artists will grow their career quickly, but that massive middle segment will have to work twice as hard to earn a living. So I think you need to get ahead now by staying on top of mind with the people who always liked you (Hofstede, ESNS #1).

While this was the motivation behind many of the events in the interviews, many participants were actually pleasantly surprised by the amount of views they had gotten with the streams. The expansion of reach was beyond anything they had ever experienced. Whereas physical events are often centred locally, these events turned global. While only a few of these events were able to sell tickets, they were all able to show themselves to the world and engage with new audiences.

Just from the reach of the virtual festival like us before reached over 1 billion people. You know, we got such great feedback, you know, boosting the artists' profiles, I think of festivals, if anything will benefit from that (Raeside, GW).

This reflects the opportunities of digital music distribution as described by Arbatani et al. (2018). They regard digital distribution as a way to reach new audiences and bind them to the business, rather than just an opportunity to sell products. So even when it is not about selling tickets, the live-streams offer a great way to connect with people and keep the brand alive.

Promotional Value

While live-streams can offer a lot to enhance the artist's or organization's brand and keep it alive, the interviews also show that the live-streams have a positive effect on the artist or organization in terms of audience growth.

While the interviews and panels are performed in a time where physical concerts are out of the question, the participants show optimism about the influence the live-streams would have on physical concert sales. Some even go as far as to reflect a certainty about this stimulating effect on ticket sales. Like Petrocelli says: "It's just the opposite. The more live video I serve, the more tickets that I sell", (MB #1).

This supports the findings of Naveed et al. (2017) and Bakshi & Throsby (2014), who argue that live-stream performances would stimulate live ticket sales. So, even if a concert live-stream by itself might not be profitable, it can help boost the physical concert sales.

What is important to add, is that the streams do not stimulate other live-streams. The promotional value of these live-streams appears to have a limit as they can cannibalize each other horizontally. The participants experienced that moderation with live-streams is better than excessiveness. A successful live-stream show does not mean that the artist would attract more viewers with the next one. The data rather suggests the contrary. The increase of live-

streams would decrease the artist's viewership. As one participant puts it: "The more often you organize something like that, the more often you do that, you are actually smoking out your audience," (Struijlaart, ESNS #1).

When an artist wants to maintain a digital presence, the participants recommend to take enough time in between shows. For venues or promoters, this rule does not apply as long as there are different artists performing.

So, while live-streams can stimulate physical ticket sales as according to Naveed et al. (2017) and Bakshi & Throsby (2014), they have no promotional value in terms of viewership and ticket sales for other live-stream concerts that the artist performs.

Conclusion

There are several models that can generate direct revenue streams with a concert live-stream. The interviews show that ticketing is a popular model, especially among larger-scale artists. However, the ticket prices for live-streams are lower than for physical concerts and one ticket can also accommodate several people. For grassroots artists, a donation system is also commonly applied. This is easy to create and also lowers the participation barrier for the potential audience. It has to be taken into account that it is difficult to estimate the eventual revenue for both ticketing as donation models, as live-streams are consumed impulsively. There are also many examples of cross- and up-sell opportunities with live-streams that can effectively raise the average ticket value. This way, the existing audiences can be utilized fully.

Brand partnerships are a more stable revenue source that more and more artists and companies are starting to explore. This is especially profitable because of the watch-time that live-streams accumulate. In these cases, the partnerships have to add something to the experience in order to be effective.

However, there are also many examples that do not focus on instant revenue streams, but rather on brand building for the future. These examples prioritized audience reach over revenue and were able to grow their following and promote physical ticket sales with the live-streams. Still, physical concerts are necessary to really pick the fruits of this strategy, as the repetition of concert live-streams can cannibalize the audience of the shows.

5. Conclusion

Concluding Thoughts

To return to the main question: How can value be created for live-streaming concerts and how can these be used for a sustainable business model for the live music industry? The results show that there is no singular strategy available that can be copy-pasted for all players within the live music industry. Instead, the results show that there are many factors coming into play that determine the choices made. To summarize, especially the level of success for an artist is a deciding factor for the strategy. As the bigger stars have more resources to create an interesting, valuable experience, they can attract larger audiences and ask for higher ticket prices. In addition, they can also collaborate with platform companies, which can maximize their ticket sales through platform accumulation. However, the format would still be interesting for smaller artists as they can stream low-budget performances on social media and gradually grow an audience - generating more value for their artist brand.

For the first section, the study expanded upon Vandenberg et al. (2020) and Rendell (2020). This sub-question asked: How can concert live-streams create experiential value? This section looked at the aspects of liveness, social practices and spaces of the live-stream concerts. These aspects were the entry points for several reasons, mainly because of academic scholarship that regarded these aspects as the central value points for concert-goers (Holt, 2010; Mulder et al., 2020). These values of sharing that moment, sharing it with people and the central role of space were reflected in the interviews. However, they often have to be approached and recreated in different ways than usual, or else the event would lack those elements at all.

Whereas the sense and urgency of live is often created by being in a vacuum of shared space and time with a group of people (Behr & Cloonan, 2020; Holt, 2010; Mulder et al., 2020), the live-streams only rely on temporal singularity to create a sense of liveness. The urgency to attend can be amplified by scarcity. Whereas physical shows are naturally scarce, despite their frequency and replicability, as they take place in only one town at a time, people can attend live-streams from anywhere.

Like Vandenberg et al. (2020) argued in their studies, the data reflects that the live-streams could not provide the same sense of presence and togetherness like traditional concerts. Many participants voiced a missing of audience presence. The social aspects of live-streams rather took on the form of parasocial interaction as described by Shin et al.

(2020). This means that the live-streams could still provide a sense of closeness between viewer and artist. This manifested itself by intimate camera shots to give the audience the idea of being there. This is in contrast to Heuguet (2016) who argues that static shots emphasize presence and liveness.

The streams also provided opportunities for Q&A's, where the fans could literally get to know the artist better. So, the interviews show that live-streams can provide other opportunities of social practices and can in fact help to strengthen the bond between artist and audience. This is in line with Rendell's argument, that concert live-streams offer new and nuanced ways for artists to connect with artists. However, the analysis still shows that it is not of the same value, and should rather be seen as a valuable, *additional* art form as the experience cannot replace the feeling of actually being there.

While Taylor et al. (2020) warned of the obsolescence of traditional music spaces with the reliance on live-streams, the interviews show that venues are actually used to enhance the production value of the concert. Not only can venues employ live-streams to continue their showcase function, artists also rely on them to create interesting productions and attract new audiences. In addition, they can also increase the value when the venue is of cultural relevance or can offer aesthetic beauty to the stream. These aesthetic qualities of the venue influence the character of the show and artistic decisions, reflecting the argument of Kronenburg (2011).

So, the live-stream should be treated and approached as a different art form than the traditional concerts that we were used to pre-pandemic. They still have the possibilities to offer a meaningful experience for the fan that can function as a new, additional product.

The second part of the analysis looked at the distribution side and asked: What are the common distribution strategies and what consequences do they have? To answer it plainly, the decision was rather between broadcasting on social media platforms and on private platforms. As multiple-channel broadcasting is possible, artists do not have to decide between social media platforms.

This digital broadcasting strategy has both positive and negative consequences for the artists and the power structures within the music industry. On the one hand, it is democratizing for the artist. It has a low entry barrier and is accessible, even for the homesick artist as Thomas (2020) argues. It also allows for expanding and reaching a global audience, like Fietkewicz et al. (2018) argue. This helps even smaller artists to maximize their audiences and create a competitive advantage later down the line. So, it would help artists to navigate the winner-takes-all economy that Meier (2015) describes.

On the other hand, it also leads to more skewness within the market. As live-streams are distributed digitally, it leads to a market driven by platform accumulation. This means that it is all about keeping the audience and gathering their data. So while smaller artists can broadcast on open platforms, bigger artists can collaborate with private platforms that own their user data. As a result, they can target audiences through datafication, as warned by Hracs & Webster (2020). This shows the adoption by music companies of a platform-approach, as described by Nieborg & Poell (2018). The data shows that this gives companies, who own this data, a competitive advantage as described by Meier & Manzerolle (2019).

The digital distribution also leads to more supply and thus higher competition, as argued by Meier (2015). This means that artists need to enhance their production value in order to stick out in the over-supply of live-streams

So, the digitization of concerts actually does not exclude democratization nor the winner-takes-all effect. Actually, the interviews show that both can co-exist. This appears to confirm the findings of Coelhoe & Mendes (2019), who argue that both the long-tail as the superstar economy can coexist with each other in the same market. However, it is important to nuance this image. As the next section will show, it is in fact the bigger artists that can directly make a living with concert live-streams, whereas smaller artists have to use it as an investment for the long-term.

Now that the ways of creating value and distributing are established, it is important to look at monetization and creating revenue. While Breese et al. (2020) and Rendell (2020) already mapped out some monetization strategies, they were hardly interpretive or suggestive of motivations behind them. So, the third sub-question asked: How can income be generated with concert live-streams and?

The analysis showed that live-streams can either generate direct monetary income streams or indirect income streams by means of investing in the artist brand. The former happened in several ways. Ticketing was a common way for the bigger artists with higher production values. However, this is unstable because the participants noticed that live-stream tickets are impulse buys. In addition, live-stream tickets see lower ticket prices, despite their larger audience reach. As Moe & Fader (2009) found that fans postpone their ticket purchases of cheaper tickets, this phenomenon could potentially be explained by that. However, this would need more research

Pay-what-you-want models are more common for smaller artists who just want to grow their audience and see any money made along the way as a bonus. This is also hard to predict beforehand.

The data also showed many opportunities for up-sell and cross-sell strategies with exclusive merchandise and interactivity as leverage. This is in line with the branding logic, as formulated by Meier (2015), who argues that artists rely on more resources than just music income. It also reflects the findings of Chen & Xiong (2019) who found that audiences are willing to pay more for recognition. However, that was based on a gift-giving model whereas the examples in the interviews concern upgraded tickets.

A more stable form that was found is partnering up with brands. The interviews reveal creative approaches to brand partnerships that actually enhance the concert experience. This form of experiential marketing would be beneficial for brands, as according to Anderton (2011), although further research on marketing would be required to confirm this. Still, the findings suggest that live-stream performances employ more creative ways of brand partnerships than just the display of logos that Heuguet (2016) describes.

The concert live-streams also generated value that are not directly translated in revenue, but hopefully will pay off in the long run. Especially staying visible was a common argument. As concerts were impossible during the pandemic, live-streams were utilized to stay in contact with the fans. Often, these events were hosted for free. While this forgoes the opportunity to sell products, it provided an opportunity to keep the current audience and bind more people to the brand. This opportunity of finding new audiences to bind to the brand confirms the findings of Arbatani et al. (2018). It was also often mentioned that the concert live-streams stimulated live tickets sales. This confirms Naveed et al. (2017) and Bakshi & Throsby (2014). Still, it has to be seen after the pandemic whether this observation is really true for physical concerts. The thing that opposes this promotional value, is that live-stream concerts do appear to cannibalize other live-stream concerts.

What can be concluded from these different sub-questions, is that live-streams can create a viable business model as long as they are used as an additional instrument for the artist to connect with the audience. While it could stand alone in terms of profit in some rare cases, the majority sees the format as a bonus experience: a new way to engage audiences and perhaps make some money on the way. While it depends per case how many followers an artist gains or how much money they make, it is evident that there is more to gain by participating in the phenomenon than not live-streaming at all.

Limitations and Recommendations For Further Research

As concert live-streams are a fairly new phenomenon, the researcher had to be creative about creating the appropriate theoretical framework in order to answer the research questions and contextualize the findings. As the results show, there was still plenty of scholarly work to understand the individual segments and aspects that are part of the concert live-stream business model. However, when it comes to the global phenomenon of these concert live-streams, previous scholarly work is still limited.

Because the study made use of many interviews, performed by secondary parties, the researcher had less influence over the data. While this results in responses that are more true to life, it also meant that the data was less structured. As a result, the researcher needed to take on a flexible approach while studying the data and be selective about which quotes were useful for the research, and which to abandon. This meant that some transcripts were more useable than others. While some interviews were directly discussing the topics at hand, some were discussing them rather indirectly. Because of this mixed data set, a thematic analysis was definitely the right approach to study this selection, due to its flexibility. However, for future research, it is recommended to perform interviews by the researcher themselves to maintain control over and continuity throughout the dataset.

There is also the factor that the study made use of a data-driven approach when analyzing the mixed data set. While some panels were already gathered during the exploratory stages of the study, it still meant that other unaccountable factors arose in later stages of the study. These were still relevant for the research question, but could have been better accounted for if taken into account sooner.

The first sub-question was limited to the estimation of people on the production side. While they also commented on shows they had seen themselves as an audience member, their view is not the same as average audience members. This entails that we got insights on how they tried to make a show worth attending, but now what this meant to their perceived value on the audience side. To further work out the value creation, it would also be valuable to survey or interview audience members and analyze their evaluations of the live-stream concert experience.

As some of the participants were spokespersons of firms that are specialized in concert live-streams, certain personal or economic interests were also involved in the data. The inclusion of interviews by the researcher aimed to shed a critical look on this. However, it would be even more helpful to study the audience reception of the format as they are

unbiased and have no personal interests involved. This could test to what extent consumers are open for the live-stream experience and are willing to pay for it

Further research on the subject is definitely desirable and I highly recommend this to be partaken in the future, in a post-pandemic world. This is because concert live-streams are a phenomenon that saw an accelerated growth in times that the music industry faced a global crisis. The data collected by the study was created in these times of crisis and reflects this dependence on the format - whether it is the desirable format by the participants or not. By the time that this study is finalized, the world is seeing a release on lockdown measurements. It appears that concerts and festivals will continue as of this summer. If this is indeed true, concert live-streams are no longer so much a necessity as they were during the pandemic. While this study tried to find out what concert live-streams can offer in addition to concerts, it appears that this will be proven in real life over the course of 2021. So, it would be interesting to repeat this research with new data collected during a time without social distancing and find out if the music industry still uses the format and why, or abandons the format altogether.

References

- Anderson, C. (2006). *The long tail: Why the future of business is selling less of more*. Hachette Books.
- Anderton, C. (2011). Music festival sponsorship: Between commerce and carnival. *Arts Marketing: An International Journal*, 1(2), 145–158.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/20442081111180368>
- Arbatani, T. R., Asadi, H., & Omid, A. (2018). Media innovations in digital music distribution: The case of Beeptunes.com. In D. Khajeheian, M. Friedrichsen, & W. Mödinger (Eds.), *Competitiveness in emerging markets: Market dynamics in the age of disruptive technologies* (pp. 93–108). Springer International Publishing.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71722-7_6
- Auslander, P. (2006). The performativity of performance documentation. *PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art*, 28(3), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1162/pajj.2006.28.3.1>
- Auslander, P. (2008). *Liveness: Performance in a mediatized culture* (2. ed). Routledge.
- Bakhshi, H., & Throsby, D. (2014). Digital complements or substitutes? A quasi-field experiment from the Royal National Theatre. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 38(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10824-013-9201-2>
- Barker, M. (2013). *Live to your local cinema*. Palgrave Macmillan UK.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137288691>
- Behr, A., & Cloonan, M. (2020). Going spare? Concert tickets, touting and cultural value. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 26(1), 95–108.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2018.1431224>
- Bennett, L. (2012). Patterns of listening through social media: Online fan engagement with the live music experience. *Social Semiotics*, 22(5), 545–557.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2012.731897>

- Bolter, J. D., & Grusin, R. A. (1996). Remediation. *Configurations*, 4(3), 311–358.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/con.1996.0018>
- Breese, J. L., Fox, M. A., & Vaidyanathan, G. (2020). Live music performances and the internet of things. *Issues In Information Systems*.
https://doi.org/10.48009/3_iis_2020_179-188
- Carboni, M. (2014). The digitization of music and the accessibility of the artist. *Journal of Professional Communication*, 3(2), 149-164.
- Charron, J. -P. (2017). Music audiences 3.0: Concert-goers' psychological motivations at the dawn of virtual reality. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8(800).
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00800>
- Chen, Y., & Xiong, F. (2019). The business model of live streaming entertainment services in China and associated challenges for key stakeholders. *IEEE Access*, 7, 116321–116327. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2935005>
- Coelho, M. P., & Mendes, J. Z. (2019). Digital music and the “death of the long tail.” *Journal of Business Research*, 101, 454–460.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.01.015>
- Dearn, L. K., & Price, S. M. (2016). Sharing music: Social and communal aspects of concert-going. *Networking Knowledge: Journal of the MeCCSA Postgraduate Network*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.31165/nk.2016.92.428>
- Duffy, B. E., Poell, T., & Nieborg, D. B. (2019). Platform practices in the cultural industries: Creativity, labor, and citizenship. *Social Media + Society*, 5(4).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305119879672>
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American journal of theoretical and applied statistics*, 5(1), 1-4.

- Fietkiewicz, K., Dorsch, I., Scheibe, K., Zimmer, F., & Stock, W. (2018). Dreaming of stardom and money: Micro-celebrities and influencers on live streaming services. *International Conference on Social Computing and Social Media* (pp. 240–253). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91521-0_18
- Hesmondhalgh, D., & Meier, L. M. (2018). What the digitalisation of music tells us about capitalism, culture and the power of the information technology sector. *Information, Communication & Society*, 21(11), 1555–1570. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1340498>
- Heuguet, G. (2016). When club culture goes online: The case of Boiler Room. *Dancecult*, 8(1), 73–87. <https://doi.org/10.12801/1947-5403.2016.08.01.04>
- Holt, F. (2010). The economy of live music in the digital age. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 13(2), 243–261. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549409352277>
- Hracs, B. J., & Webster, J. (2020). From selling songs to engineering experiences: Exploring the competitive strategies of music streaming platforms. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17530350.2020.1819374>
- Leenders, M. A. A. M., Farrell, M. A., Zwaan, K., & ter Bogt, T. F. M. (2015). How are young music artists configuring their media and sales platforms in the digital age? *Journal of Marketing Management*, 31(17–18), 1799–1817. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2015.1034158>
- Marshall, L. (2015). ‘Let’s keep music special. F—Spotify’: On-demand streaming and the controversy over artist royalties. *Creative Industries Journal*, 8(2), 177–189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17510694.2015.1096618>
- Meier, L. M. (2015). Popular music making and promotional work inside the ‘new music industry’. *The Routledge companion to the cultural industries*, 402.

- Meier, L. M., & Manzerolle, V. R. (2019). Rising tides? Data capture, platform accumulation, and new monopolies in the digital music economy. *New Media & Society*, 21(3), 543–561. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818800998>
- Moe, W. W., & Fader, P. S. (2009). The role of price tiers in advance purchasing of event tickets. *Journal of Service Research*, 12(1), 73–86. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670508329224>
- Moisander, J., & Valtonen, A. (2006). *Qualitative marketing research: A cultural approach*. SAGE.
- Montoro-Pons, J. D., & Cuadrado-García, M. (2020). Music festivals as mediators and their influence on consumer awareness. *Poetics*, 80, 101424. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2019.101424>
- Mueser, D., & Vlachos, P. (2018). Almost like being there? A conceptualisation of live-streaming theatre. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 9(2), 183–203. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEFM-05-2018-0030>
- Mulder, M., Hitters, E., & Rutten, P. (2020). The impact of festivalization on the Dutch live music action field: A thematic analysis. *Creative Industries Journal*, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17510694.2020.1815396>
- Naveed, K., Watanabe, C., & Neittaanmäki, P. (2017). Co-evolution between streaming and live music leads a way to the sustainable growth of music industry – Lessons from the US experiences. *Technology in Society*, 50, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2017.03.005>
- Nieborg, D. B., & Poell, T. (2018). The platformization of cultural production: Theorizing the contingent cultural commodity. *New Media & Society*, 20(11), 4275–4292. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818769694>

- Osterwalder, A., Pigneur, Y., & Tucci, C. L. (2005). Clarifying Business Models: Origins, present and future of the concept. *Cais*, 15, 751–775.
- Payne, A., Frow, P., Steinhoff, L., & Eggert, A. (2020). Toward a comprehensive framework of value proposition development: From strategy to implementation. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 87, 244–255.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2020.02.015>
- Rendell, J. (2020). Staying in, rocking out: Online live music portal shows during the coronavirus pandemic. *Convergence*, 1–20.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856520976451>
- Roulston, K., & Choi, M. (2018). Qualitative interviews. In U. Flick (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data collection* (pp. 233–249). SAGE Reference.
- Rowley, J., & Williams, C. (2008). The impact of brand sponsorship of music festivals. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 26(7), 781–792.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/02634500810916717>
- Shin, M., Song, S. W., Kim, S. J., & Biocca, F. (2019). The effects of 3D sound in a 360-degree live concert video on social presence, parasocial interaction, enjoyment, and intent of financial supportive action. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 126, 81–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2019.02.001>
- Srnicek, N. (2017). The challenges of platform capitalism: Understanding the logic of a new business model. *Juncture*, 23(4), 254–257. <https://doi.org/10.1111/newe.12023>
- Taylor, I. A., Raine, S., & Hamilton, C. (2020). COVID-19 and the UK live music industry: A crisis of spatial materiality. *The Journal of Media Art Study and Theory*, 1(2), 23.

- Thomas, M. D. (2020). Digital performances: Live-streaming music and the documentation of the creative process. In E. Mazierska, L. Gillon, & T. Rigg (Eds.), *The Future of Live Music* (pp. 83–96). Bloomsbury Academic.
- Vandenberg, F., Berghman, M., & Schaap, J. (2020). The ‘lonely raver’: Music livestreams during COVID-19 as a hotline to collective consciousness? *European Societies*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2020.1818271>
- van der Hoeven, A., & Hitters, E. (2019). The social and cultural values of live music: Sustaining urban live music ecologies. *Cities*, 90, 263–271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2019.02.015>
- van der Hoeven, A., & Hitters, E. (2020). The spatial value of live music: Performing, (re)developing and narrating urban spaces. *Geoforum*, 117, 154–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2020.09.016>
- van Es, K. (2017). Liveness redux: on media and their claim to be live. *Media, Culture & Society*, 39(8), 1245-1256.
- Velt, R., Benford, S., Reeves, S., Evans, M., Glancy, M., & Stenton, P. (2015). Towards an extended festival viewing experience. *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Interactive Experiences for TV and Online Video*, 53–62. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2745197.2745206>
- Westgate, C. J. (2020). Popular music fans and the value of concert tickets. *Popular Music and Society*, 43(1), 57–77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03007766.2019.1601152>
- Wilson, R. (2020). Aesthetic and technical strategies for networked music performance. *AI & Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-020-01099-4>

Appendix A

Open coding

acceleration due to pandemic

- adapting to a changing environment
- adventure for the artist
- autonomy for the artist
- brand identity - Staying visible
- co-existence of live streams and live shows
- creating value for the industry as a whole
- deviant
- Experiential value - affection (for music)
- experiential value - competing with real-life
- experiential value - intimacy
- Experiential value - Make it special
- experiential value - sound quality
- generale repetitie
- hybrid shows
- insecurity
- Intro / Info
- live-streaming as second best
- liveness - authenticity

Comment:

Too much authenticity / loss of mystique

- liveness - connecting with fans
- Liveness - importance of live element
- Liveness - importance of live elements
- liveness - momentum
- liveness - resemble live experience
- liveness - temporal quality
- Performative - More room for failure in a live-stream
- performative - sound quality
- performative aspect
- Performativity - difference between physical and digital
- performativity - importance of documentation
- Performativity - using space
- Performativity - Using space - stage
- platform - audio quality
- platform - autonomy
- platform - broadcasting on multiple platforms
- platform - centrality
- platform - datafication
- platform - determines audience
- platform - easy
- platform - freedom

- platform - low participation barrier
- platform - ownership
- platform - personalisation
- platform - reach
- platform - revenue
- platform - traffic between platforms
- Prioritizing reach over revenue
- production - collab with venues
- Production - collaboration
- production - flexibility
- production - high entry barrier
- production - High organizational costs
- Production - legislation
- production - low costs
- Production - Low entry barrier
- Production - stressing about tech
- production - technical difficulties
- production - technological barrier
- reaching audiences - high participation barrier
- Reaching larger audiences - low participation barrier
- revenue - brand identity - charity
- Revenue - brand partnerships
- Revenue - brand partnerships - watch time
- Revenue - Cross-sell opportunities
- Revenue - difference for different level artists
- Revenue - Grow fanbase
- Revenue - insecurity
- revenue - memberships
- revenue - merchandise
- revenue - pay-what-you want
- Revenue - payment
- revenue - promotional value
- Revenue - promotional value for artist brand
- Revenue - stimulating live ticket sales
- Revenue - supplemental income
- Revenue - Ticketing
- Revenue - ticketing difficulty
- Revenue - Upsell opportunities
- Revenue - Value for artist brand
- shifting roles for the middle man
- showcase function
- Social - Connecting with fans struggle
- Social - fan commitment
- Social - fan feedback
- Social - fan interactivity
- social - lack of social aspect
- Social value - Enhancing fan experience
- Value - Community building

- Visibility / global
- visibility / reaching larger audiences or new audiences

Appendix B

The Final Coding Frames

Value Creation	Label	Description	Example quote:
Liveness	Temporal liveness	Using temporal simultaneity to create a feeling of liveness	<i>You get to see them once. They disappear into the eco-system. If you turn up late for one of our shows, it's the same as turning up at the Ziggo Dome at midnight, when the band is on its end. It's over.</i>
	Creating a shared moment	Using a sense of massality, togetherness and co-presence to create a sense of liveness	<i>... we realized that these were moments that fans really shared around the world at the same time, in the same way that you... in a similar way to the experience you might have standing next to someone in a real-life concert hall.</i>
	Building around a special occasion	Choosing the right occasion and moment to stream.	<i>Does it actually make sense in terms of where you are, at the moment, to be doing a show?</i>
	Mediation and creative ways of documentation	Using elaborate camerawork to broadcast the performance and make the event engaging.	<i>They have the camera's, their main views and everything was straight up the camera. Instead of the registration vibe that you have with a concert. So that whole direct feel really made a difference for me in the way you...</i>
Social Aspects	Live-streams as an opportunity for the audience to get to know the artist better	Using the live-streams to show more of yourself as a performer and let the audience get to know you better.	<i>Giving a chance for fans to get to know you and see your personality. That's so compelling and I think that's open to</i>

			<i>anybody. Like, you can do that from your house with a decent internet connection and a sound card, you can do it.</i>
	Fan feedback	The ability of mimicking applause and sharing audience appreciation.	<i>The best of hearts is the closest you get to feeling applause. I think that's a nice feeling.</i>
	Missing the social aspect	Experiencing a void because there is no audience physically present.	<i>Normaal zijn er misschien toen vijf mensen die even klappen en nu was er gewoon helemaal niks, dus ja dat is wel even ongemakkelijk.</i>
Spatiality	Playing with empty spaces	Using the emptiness of venues and other places to create an interesting performance	<i>So it was playing with emptiness of the airports. And I think that we did something what was really unique and which will work also after 10 years because it was like art installation. It was not just the festival.</i>
	Showcase function	Using established organizations and venues in order to connect audiences with new artists.	<i>Especially for these venues [...] to be able to output something to keep their message going to their local communities as a local art center, whose mission is to service the local population with wonderful programming, just keeping something live and keeping something output from the venue, even if it's a virtual stage rather than from the real stage was important.</i>

Digital Distribution	Label	Description	Example:
Democratization	Low entry barrier	Indicators that it is easy and accessible for every level artist to perform live-streams.	<i>We don't need million dollar budgets. We don't need these things. And I think the people that are taking advantage of that is really important, because if your contents good, it will rise up and then you can do something with it to monetize instead of going through the whole political process of the studio system and everything else that goes on, so.</i>
	Reaching larger audiences	The possibility of reaching larger numbers of audiences on a global scale.	<i>They are streaming the services, and we see more people watching classical music than coming to our halls. For us, it's an investment to reach new audiences.</i>
	Artist autonomy	The possibility for artists to become a self-made star and execute their own artistic visions.	We're seeing with the artists that we're working with, you know, the ability to be a self thing.auto
Platform capitalism	Datafication	Indicators of using user-data to increase viewership.	<i>And DICE has built its whole algorithm and world around discovery. So for us, it was about finding fans that have scanned Laura in their Spotify library, previously purchased tickets, and communicating with them really thoroughly the whole way through the journey, because a lot of fans haven't experienced this before as well.</i>
	Audience lock-in	Indicators of audiences sticking to platforms they are familiar with.	<i>I think when we started the journey, we were very conscious that, when fans of artists buy tickets for shows, they buy them from places they are used to buying them from. When they stream music,</i>

			<i>they go to certain sites - like Youtube for example, or Vimeo - that they're familiar with.</i>
Superstar effect	High organizational efforts	Experiencing the production of a concert live-stream as expensive and labor intensive.	<i>I think we're all kind of blown away by the Laura Marling-show and all of those, you know, sort of large scale shows which are so exciting to watch as a fan. Uhm, but I think we were sort of aware that for most artists, that's just not accessible for them and there's plenty of artists that earn their living from touring, but they're not at the level where they can sell, you know, thousands or tens of thousands of tickets. Or, more than anything, even if they could, they wouldn't necessarily have the money to be able to pay for things up-front and arrange a film crew, that sort of thing.</i>
	Signs of superstar effect	Indicators of solidifying pre-existing power structures within the music industry that favors the bigger players and artists.	<i>Online, in a way that's like higher margin than streaming, because like streaming for many artists is just like, it's like batches of pennies per stream. So you, you still have to achieve a certain level of scale to like, make a living off of that.</i>
	Signs of long-tail	Indicators that smaller artists are provided with more opportunities to gain success in the music industry with live-streaming technology.	<i>And it even weighs in my mind more towards smaller artists, because some smaller artists could never afford to be on the road or be doing... Whereas, you know: Hey, you're in your house, you're in your living room, whatever it is.</i>

Revenue Streams	Label	Description	Example:
Payment systems	Ticketing	Using a ticketing system.	<i>En inmiddels ben ik dus ook op het punt aanbeland dat ik dus inderdaad kaartjes verkoop. Ik doe dat nu ook via Guts.</i>
	Pay-what-you-want	Using an adjustable entry fee or a donation model.	<i>Ja we hadden dus een linkje - volgens mij was het gewoon een Tikkie, heel simpel - waar mensen konden doneren en dat konden ze doen vanaf 1 cent tot honderden euro's.</i>
	Cross-sell opportunities	Using the format to sell multiple products.	<i>And I think we're going to continue to see more people innovate around all these add-on type options during the stream.</i>
	Up-sell opportunities	Using the format to sell tickets in different price segments.	<i>And there's people doing some interesting experience with VIP kind of options as well. So we did an event with David Guetta on the top of the Rockefeller Center. Yes, we sold the VIP tickets for that.</i>
	Brand partnerships	Generating income by collaborating with brands and advertise them in the streams.	<i>we just did a show with Absolute, where they sponsored it, and we created a floating giant Absolute bottles that people could get into and ride around on the dance floor.</i>
	Revenue insecurity	Being unable to predict how much income an event will generate.	<i>It's very, very hard to put a price on what the turnout is going to be, especially since live-streaming is such an impulse buy.</i>
Overall value	Staying in the picture	Using live-streams to keep the business alive and visible to the audience	<i>Even laten zien van: Dit is het. We zijn er. We bestaan.</i>
	Value for artist brand	Using live-streams to make the artist look cool and enhance the image.	<i>Er zijn heel veel artiesten die roepen van: 'Ja, moet ik dat wel doen? Dan bereik ik misschien maar veertig mensen? En wat moet ik daar dan mee? Kan ik daarop</i>

			<i>bouwen?' Ja, ik denk dat dat absoluut kan. Alleen ja, denk daar goed over na, en neem ook de tijd om het te vermarkten.</i>
	Promotional value	Using live-streams to gain more followers and sell more concert tickets.	<i>Just from the reach of the virtual festival like us before reached over 1 billion people. You know, we got such great feedback, you know, boosting the artists' profiles, I think of festivals, if anything will benefit from that.</i>

Appendix C

Topic List

1. Introductie

- Introduceer onderzoek
- Uitleggen general terms

Allereerst:

- Zou je wat willen vertellen over jezelf en over je band / act?
- Zou je wat kunnen vertellen over jullie live-streams?
 - Wat voor format doen jullie?
 - Wanneer doen/deden jullie dit? Hoe vaak hebben jullie dit gedaan?
 - Hoeveel views hadden jullie? Hoe verschilt dit van een fysiek evenement?
 - Organiseerden jullie het evenement helemaal zelf of in samenwerking met andere organisaties of artiesten?

Globaal:

- Hoe was je op het idee gekomen om een live-stream concert te organiseren?
- Was er dan ook een speciale reden om te gaan live-streamen? Zo ja, welke?
 - (Bijv.: Geïnspireerd door andere artiesten, album promotie, benefietconcert, band met fans onderhouden)

Beleving:

- Had je, op artistiek vlak, dezelfde aanpak als bij een normaal (fysiek) concert of pakte je de live-stream anders aan? Op wat voor manier?
- Wat deed je om het evenement speciaal te maken? Deed je bepaalde dingen om het live-gevoel na te bootsen? (Bijv. 1x uitzenden, gevoel van samen zijn creëren)
- Wat vond je van de publieksinteracties?
 - *Hoe ervaren de band met je publiek?*
 - *Wat deed je om engagement te stimuleren?*
- Wat vind je van live-streamen als middel om contact te maken met je publiek?
 - *Wat vond het publiek ervan?*
- Vanaf wat voor locatie zonden jullie uit en waarom deze?
 - *Wat voor effect had dit op jullie performance?*

Distributie/verspreiding

- Welk platform gebruikte je?
- Welke overwegingen namen jullie mee in het besluit van het distributieplatform?
Voorbeelden om mee te sturen:
 - *Keek je naar de affordances / functies van het platform?*
 - *Keek je naar het publieksbereik?*
 - *Of was de controle op bijvoorbeeld ticketing en inkomsten genereren belangrijker?*
 - *Of gebruikte je een platform die bij je label / management paste?*

- Wat was je ervaring met het platform dat gebruikt was?
 - *Zou je die opnieuw gebruiken of sta je open voor een andere? Waarom?*
 - *Vond je de online distributie empowering?*
- Had je het gevoel dat je optreden zichtbaar was? Dat je makkelijk publiek kon bereiken?
- Welke publieksgroepen bereikten jullie? Had je het idee dat je andere publieksgroepen kon bereiken buiten jullie fanbase? Bijvoorbeeld buiten Nederland?

Economische waarde

- Hoe kwamen jullie aan de equipment voor de live-stream? Hoe was dit gerealiseerd? Vond je het moeilijk om te organiseren?
- Wat vond je van het kostenplaatje om de stream te organiseren?
- Hoe genereerde je inkomsten met de live-stream?
 - *Deed je ook aan ticketing? (Zo ja, hoe werd dat georganiseerd?)*
 - *Gebruikte je andere manieren om inkomsten te genereren? Bijv. brand partnerships en merchandise?*
- Wat vond je van deze manier van opbrengsten genereren?
- Had je het idee dat de live-stream invloed had op je artiestenmerk in het algemeen?
 - *Wat voor invloed had het op je zichtbaarheid als artiest?*
 - *Wat voor invloed had het op je volgers / fanbase?*
 - *Wat voor plek heeft de live-stream in je portfolio?*

Al deze elementen meegenomen:

- Zou je het een succesvol evenement noemen? Waarom wel/niet?
- Heb je andere streaming concerten gezien waar je enthousiast van werd?
 - *Welke en waarom?*

Toekomst

- Denk je na Covid nog steeds live-stream performances uit te voeren?
 - Ja - Op wat voor manier? Waarom?
 - Nee - Waarom niet?