



Norwegian
Business School

This file was downloaded from BI Open, the institutional repository (open access) at BI Norwegian Business School <https://biopen.bi.no>.

It contains the accepted and peer reviewed manuscript to the article cited below. It may contain minor differences from the journal's pdf version.

Jütte, E., & Olson, E. L. (2022). A brand hegemony rejection explanation for digital piracy. *European Journal of Marketing*, 56(5), 1512-1531.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-04-2020-0303>

Copyright policy of *Emerald Publishing Group*, the publisher of this journal:

As soon as we've published an article, the version of the article that has been accepted for publication, the Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) can be used for a variety of non-commercial scholarly purposes, subject to full attribution. An author may deposit and use their AAM (aka post-print)

http://www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/openaccess/oa_policies.htm

A brand hegemony rejection explanation for digital piracy.

Espen Jutte
BI Norwegian Business School
0484 Oslo
Norway
e-mail: espen@jutte.no

Erik L. Olson (corresponding author)
BI Norwegian Business School
0484 Oslo
Norway
e-mail: erik.olson@bi.no

Please cite as:

Jütte, Espen and Olson, Erik.L. (2022), "A brand hegemony rejection explanation for digital piracy", *European Journal of Marketing*, 56 (5): 1512-1531. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-04-2020-0303>

A brand hegemony rejection explanation for digital piracy.

ABSTRACT

Research Paper

Purpose

To uncover the influence of copyright holder policies on digital piracy behavior using the brand hegemony rejection (BHR) theory.

Design/Methodology/Approach

Content analysis of in-depth personal interview data from active digital pirates that is analyzed using BHR theory.

Findings

BHR is found useful in understanding pirating motivations, which vary greatly across time and across digital mediums. Piracy is often motivated by profit enhancing policies of big media copyright holders, which are deemed unfair and not customer oriented, but such motivations are greatly reduced when copyright holders offer attractive legal means to obtain digital content. Pirates generally do not feel sympathy for large media companies, but some pirates feel guilt that their actions may hurt digital content creators.

Research Limitation

The relatively small sample of pirates is primarily from Norway and hence may not be representative of other media markets.

Practical Implications

A large portion of digital piracy can potentially be eliminated if copyright holders are customer focused and offer desired content with a format and price that are deemed fair. The technical skills of pirates are high, and they can resort to piracy whenever they feel rights holders are not customer oriented.

Value

To our knowledge, this is the first application of BHR theory to the digital piracy arena, and it is found to provide useful insights in explaining the rise and fall of piracy.

Keywords: brand hegemony, customer orientation, digital media, digital piracy, anti-consumption.

INTRODUCTION

Digital piracy is defined as the unauthorized copying, use, or distribution of a legally protected digital works and was popularized by the file sharing start-up Napster in 1999, which quickly gained 80 million users before being shut down by court order (Giesler, 2006; Gowan, 2002). Other sites and technologies have allowed piracy to continue, however, and estimates suggest that digital pirates cost video, music, gaming, and book rights holders billions of dollars in lost revenues (Groves, 2017; Raustiala and Sprigman, 2012). The vast size and associated costs of digital piracy have attracted a great deal of academic attention with a large number of studies focusing on why people participate in this criminal activity (Coyle et al., 2009; Hennig-Thurau et al., 2007; Sinclair and Green, 2016), and how they might be stopped (Danaher et al., 2014; Sinha and Mandel, 2008; Wang and McClung, 2012).

Yet several recent reviews of the piracy literature also reveal a number of important gaps in our knowledge about pirates. The first limitation is derived from the widespread use of studies that focus on only a single medium such as music or movies at a single point in time whose results are often generalized as applicable to all pirated mediums and time-frames, yet there is evidence that piracy motivations and activities vary a great deal across mediums and time that make such generalizations problematic (Watson et al. 2015; Fleming et al. 2017). The second limitation is the widespread focus on identifying and understanding the personal characteristics and motives of pirates, which has yielded highly inconsistent and difficult to act on findings (Williams et al., 2010), and generally ignores the potential influences of copyright holders and media companies and their responses to piracy in the form of high quality and easily accessible legal services that change piracy costs and rewards (Chavarría et al. 2016). This is particularly important, because the perspective and methods commonly utilized by existing

literature cannot explain the recent drop in digital piracy in a number of markets around the world (Ingham, 2015; Titcomb, 2016), which means the understanding of piracy motivations are incomplete and likely more complex than generally assumed. This lack of understanding has led to criticisms of the widespread use of student surveys to study piracy, and calls for greater use non-student pirate samples and qualitative methods to allow in-depth understanding of piracy motivations and the influence of external factors such as the role of different mediums, technology changes, and media industry policies (Chavarria et al., 2016; Watson et al., 2015, Kariithi, 2011; Williams et al., 2010).

The current study addresses these gaps and contributes to piracy understanding through the use of qualitative research and the application of Cromie and Ewing's (2009) brand hegemony rejection (BHR) theory to uncover underlying motivations, attitudes and behavior of actual pirates across a wide domain of digital media contexts, and explain how the ebb and flow of digital piracy activity is influenced by the actions of rights holders. The results reveal a great deal of variance in piracy activity and motivations over time and across different media contexts, but that the actions of the rights holders are often crucial in explaining piracy activity variance as customer unfriendly products and policies that unfairly utilize rights holder monopoly/brand power are found to increase piracy, while actions that make legal content more reasonably priced and easily accessible lead to less piracy.

BACKGROUND

Society typically grants and enforces the excludability of creative works by granting copyrights to creators/owners, which gives them the power to choose who, when, and how others can duplicate the work or not. Without such protection, there would be few monetary incentives to create works of entertainment and art, but such rewards are put at risk when consumers

disregard such exclusionary rights by what is colloquially known as ‘digital piracy’ (Edwards, 2019). Previous piracy research has tended to focus on pirate psychology and other personal characteristics to better understand, identify, and hopefully stop these thefts. For example, research has found that high Machiavellianism, low self-control, and anti-industry sentiments are linked with greater willingness to pirate (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2007; Sinha and Mandel, 2008; Higgins et al., 2008; Lowry et al., 2017). Yet focusing on the personal characteristics of pirates is problematic because digital theft is almost certainly one of the most common forms of criminal activity in the world, which means that personal characteristics are unlikely to explain such a widespread phenomenon, while the ‘hidden’ nature of these characteristics also make it difficult for public policy makers or copyright holders to target piracy prone individuals and market segments.

Efforts to uncover effective moral psychology based anti-piracy appeals have also been stymied by findings that respondents rarely view piracy as wrong or immoral (Chen et al., 2009; De Core and Van Kenhove, 2017; Moores and Chang, 2006). Yet even when studies do occasionally find consumers who believe piracy is ethically questionable, such feelings are not found to moderate consumer intentions to illegally download (Eisend 2019; Limayem et al., 2004). Similarly discouraging are findings that social norms can influence intentions to pirate, because pirates are typically found to believe that their peers view piracy favorably and in fact see piracy as a form of gift-giving to friends or the wider community (Giesler, 2006; Shanahan and Hyman, 2010; Sinha and Mandel, 2008). These largely unhelpful results in the quest to reduce piracy perhaps also explain the contradictory findings regarding a pirate’s willingness to pay for legally available copyrighted material, as some research finds zero willingness (Sinha and Mandel, 2008), while other studies finds those who shift to legal purchases typically

continue to pirate (Giesler, 2008; Weijters and Goedertier, 2016). Some of these contradictory results might be due to the use of different mediums for testing as several meta-analysis have found that the influence of characteristics such as personal norms, attitudes, and behavioral control on piracy behavior vary between mediums such as music, movies, and computer software, although they could not explain why these personal characteristics varied across mediums (Eisend, 2019; Fleming et al., 2019; Lowry et al., 2017).

The emphasis on finding ways to stop piracy would suggest that scholars primarily sympathize with the rights holder and view pirates mostly as thieves, which is legally correct but also potentially problematic because the huge number of digital pirates means that most are otherwise law-abiding citizens who often don't view their thefts as actual crimes. More importantly, this narrow 'pirate as a criminal' perspective may also be responsible for the lack of research on the possible role of rights holders in fomenting pirating (Chavarria et al. 2016). The commonly held assumption that piracy is theft and motivated by personal gain also means that the literature is unable to explain recent declines in piracy volume in places where piracy channels are widely available and legal risks are relatively low (Titcomb, 2016). For example, the percentage of young people pirating music in Norway is estimated to have gone from 80% in 2008 to 4% in 2014, even though the Norwegian government never prosecuted individual piracy during that time (Ingham, 2015). The sheer magnitude of this drop means it is highly unlikely that the psychological characteristics of pirates changed drastically during this period, while also contradicting the predominant assumptions of the literature that predict more piracy under such low risk conditions. The inability of previous research approaches to explain such sudden and widespread switching from piracy to legal digital services further reinforces the idea that a

different perspective is needed, and the current research tests BHR theory as promising perspective in understanding the rise and fall of digital piracy.

Brand Hegemony Rejection and Piracy

BHR is a component of a broader 2 x 2 anti-consumption typology developed by Cromie and Ewing (2009) consisting of a 'focus of action' dimension comprised of 'personal values' (i.e. anti-consumption originating from personal values such as environmental protection, anti-materialism, etc.) or a 'particular brand' (i.e. anti-consumption focused on a particular offending brand/industry) levels, and an 'orientation of consumption' dimension comprised of 'conserve' (i.e. reduced or low consumption) or 'consume' (i.e. increased or high consumption) levels. In contrast to the brand community literature that typically focuses on the strong personal connection community members have with their favored brand and the consumption related rituals and values they often share with fellow enthusiasts (Kozinets et al. 2017; Muniz and O'Guinn 2001; McAlexander et al. 2002; Shau et al. 2009), the anti-consumption typology is based on literature that focuses on the justifications and targets for anti-consumption activities such as boycotts and protests based on a strong community dislike for a specific brand/business/industry, or more general anti-consumption personal values such as anti-capitalism, environmental protection, or social justice (Chatzidakis et al., 2012; Cromie and Ewing 2009; Kozinets and Handelman 2004). These differing anti-consumption values and targets are reflected by the typology quadrants that include 'anti consumption society' where the focus is on boycotting or otherwise reducing consumption from an offending brand or industry, a 'conservation' quadrant with a focus on personal values such as anti-materialism, veganism, or environmentalism that call for reduced consumption more generally, a 'selective consumption' quadrant where overall consumption is maintained but directed towards rewarding (e.g. buying

from) or punishing (e.g. not buying from) entities that support or conflict with the community's personal values, and the 'brand hegemony rejection' (BHR) quadrant where overall consumption also remains high, but where a brand's perceived monopoly power creates perceptions of unfairness, alienation, and frustration among brand community members that leads to active attempts at thwarting, rejecting, or escaping the brand's hegemony (Cromie and Ewing 2009).

Cromie and Ewing (2009) focused on the BHR quadrant as they studied open-source software (OSS) communities, which were found to have been developed largely in response to Microsoft's brand hegemony. In contrast to other anti-consumption contexts built around strong personal values such as anti-capitalism or pro-environmentalism (Chatzidakis et al., 2012; Kozinets and Handelman 2004), Cromie and Ewing (2009) found the OSS community to be heavy users of computer software and often worked in the industry themselves, and hence were not anti-capitalist generally, nor displayed a strong dislike for Microsoft even as they were frustrated by its near monopoly in PC operating system and office productivity software. It is these more business friendly anti-consumption values of the BHR quadrant that are the primary interest of the current research because it is the only anti-consumption quadrant offering a pathway towards explaining the recent examples of pirates returning to legal media markets.

Cromie and Ewing's research discovered three BHR explanatory categories: 1) positive personal motivations for OSS participation such as the opportunity to create something better or enjoyment of community recognition for contributions; 2) negative motivations derived from the actions of the offending brand/industry such as disappointment with Microsoft products or the inability to customize proprietary software, and 3) environmental factors that provides the opportunity to thwart brand hegemony such as the greater technical ease in creating and collaborating on software development brought about by the Internet and cheap PCs. These

BHR explanatory categories derived from Cromie and Ewing's study of OSS communities, also appear to share some characteristics with the digital pirate community. For example, Microsoft's PC software hegemony and the environment that allowed the media industry's hegemony were both historically based on the physical medium of the copyright protected product, such as a software CD, music record, movie tape, or paper book, which made it physically difficult and expensive to make and distribute unauthorized copies without significantly downgrading product quality. This legal and physical protection against unauthorized copying also frequently led to profit maximizing industry practices such as 'windowing' to restrict and delay the content release to different markets and mediums, the bundling of unwanted content with the wanted (i.e. mediocre 'filler' songs on albums), or pre-mature release of content (i.e. 'buggy' games that don't work properly) (Smith and Telang, 2016), which are similar to some of the frustrating Microsoft practices that led to the rise of the OSS community (Cromie and Ewing, 2009; Giesler, 2008). Another similarity with the OSS community is the way media digitalization drastically altered the power balance between rights holders and consumers, because eliminating physical products made it possible to reproduce and easily distribute perfect quality unauthorized copies using file sharing platforms such as Napster and Bit Torrent (Giesler, 2008).

Despite these similarities, there are four differences between digital piracy and the OSS community that merit further investigation of BHR theory. First, the activities of the OSS community did not involve stealing anything legally belonging to Microsoft, while the activities of the digital piracy community are illegal and morally questionable. Second, unlike the near absolute hegemony of Microsoft in the PC operating and office productivity software fields, the potential power basis of digital media rights holders in the entertainment and artistic fields is much more varied, as actors range in size from huge well known movie studios to small

independent music labels, and involve faceless executives and lawyers, but also celebrity actors, musicians, and writers. Third, there seems to be little evidence to suggest that OSS community members ever return to the Microsoft customer base, which contrasts to the recent evidence of mass-scale migration of pirates to the purchase of legally sourced digital media. This may be due to the fourth contrast with the Microsoft brand hegemony example, as the entertainment and artistic business community appears to display a greater willingness to modify their business model in order to woo back pirate defectors as paying customers (Giesler, 2008; Sinha and Mandel, 2008). Thus the theoretical contribution of the current research is the application and testing of BHR theory in a new context to determine if the positive, negative, and environmental elements provide a useful framework for understanding the expressed motivations and behavior of digital pirates across time and digital mediums including their decision to abandon piracy.

BHR theory and explanatory elements are derived from qualitative research, which has traditionally been utilized by scholars to gain deep understanding of the values, motivations, behaviors and influences among various online, brand, and anti-consumption community members (e.g. Kozinets and Handelman 2004; Kozinets et al. 2017; Muniz and O'Guinn 2001; McAlexander et al. 2002; Shau et al. 2009). In contrast, many of the inconsistencies and uncertainties afflicting piracy research results has been attributed to the dominance of survey based questionnaires that fail to provide in-depth understanding of this sensitive, controversial, and illegal behavior, which can create social desirability problems that have seldom been addressed by the survey designs employed, and has led to calls for more qualitative approaches in the study of piracy (Chavarria et al., 2016; Watson et al., 2015, Kariithi, 2011; Williams et al., 2010). Thus a further contribution of the current research comes from the application of the qualitative derived BHR theory to a qualitative study of pirate communities.

METHOD

Digital piracy is an illegal activity that creates recruitment challenges in ensuring that respondents have actual piracy experience and are willing to honestly discuss their motivations and criminal behaviors. The first author's experience in the media digitalization industry and familiarity with the piracy literature proved helpful in overcoming these challenges. The resulting network of contacts also provided access to people who have been actively involved in the piracy community, and were consequently asked to participate in a study on 'digital media usage and piracy', which further facilitated the recruitment of respondents via a snowball technique and led to interviews with 4 members of hidden underground pirate communities and an additional 10 respondents with an admitted history of piracy (see exhibit 1 for respondent description). Two rounds of interviews were conducted in 2015 and 2018 to observe possible changes in the market, and interview locations were chosen by the informants including at schools and in their homes and workplaces. Relevant background on digital piracy platform technologies also allowed rapport to be established with the pirates during the pre-interview phase by showing an understanding of the technology/techniques, which together with anonymity assurances put respondents at ease with regards to discussing their illegal activities. As a result all the respondents admitted to long histories of illegal piracy activity encompassing a wide variety of digital media markets including books, games, music, movies and TV shows.

EXHIBIT 1 ABOUT HERE

Twelve of the 14 respondents were from Norway, which proved helpful in getting honest answers because of Norway's lack of history in tracking or prosecuting individual pirates during or prior to the data collection periods (Waage, 2018). Norway's lack of legal enforcement, together with being a wealthy country ranking very high in technological development and near

universal Internet adoption means Norwegian pirates have easy access to the technology needed to pirate, but are unlikely to be primarily motivated by poverty (ITU, 2017; Statistics Norway, 2016). Norwegians are also heavy consumers of international media with 76% of music played coming from outside the country (Martinsen, 2019), which together with the other characteristics make the country a relevant research site for identifying the causes of the recent drop in piracy. The snowball technique also led to two U.S. respondents, which allowed comparisons to be made with a major supplier of popular culture media and provided differing perspectives on the geographic blocking of content and copyright law enforcement intensity as piracy influences.

Problem-centered interviews were used to conduct the research, which has proven to be an effective technique for understanding consumer motivations and behaviors (Witzel and Reiter, 2012). All data was collected by the first author in a narrative active-listening mode during one-on-one interviews to reduce the likelihood that respondents might be intimidated or unwilling to address the interview questions due to the illegality of piracy. Respondents were encouraged to recall and talk about specific piracy episodes, and only steered by the interviewer when the narrative strayed too far off topic, but retaining enough flexibility to allow new relevant topics to emerge. The self-narrative approach allowed for rapid discovery of cases involving changes in piracy behavior and their causes, with each interview being treated as a separate case and respondent recruitment continuing until theoretical saturation was reached on all literature and respondent derived themes.

The interview guide was derived from the piracy related literature, and addressed the following themes: ‘feeling bad about pirating’ based on moral psychology (Cesareo and Pastore, 2014; De Corte and Van Kenhove, 2017), piracy risks (Sinha and Mandel, 2008; Shanahan and Hyman, 2010; Higgins et al., 2008), differences between legal and illegal services (Sinha and

Mandel, 2008), 'price and money' as economic benefits (Cesareo and Pastore, 2014), friends' views on piracy from social norms (Al-Rafee and Cronan, 2006; Yang et al., 2015), and 'learning to pirate' (e.g. Danaher et al., 2010). The nature of the interview guide also allowed respondents to discuss piracy across different mediums and time-frames, providing a broader perspective than most previous research, which has more often focused only on a single medium or point in time (Watson et al. 2015). Each respondent used a pseudonym with no personally identifiable information collected, and interviews began by telling respondents they could refuse any question they felt uncomfortable about. Interviews averaged 45 minutes, were voice-recorded, and concluded with questions about what media they had pirated in the last 14 days with no respondent refusing to answer this or any other question.

The individual case recordings were transcribed and analyzed with vertical analysis where a biographical chronology established the impact that changes in external factors and life-situation had on piracy habits across time and mediums, and a horizontal analysis where the themes of each case were systematically contrasted and compared to other cases (Witzel and Reiter, 2012). Two judges assigned respondent statements to topics and then grouped the topics into themes, and overarching themes were then summarized to highlight changes over time and differences between digital mediums. Following the procedure utilized by the Harris and Dumas (2009), after completing the initial coding task to generate the response categories and related themes, the two judges proceeded to code the theme content into the BHR environmental, positive, and negative factor categories (Cromie and Ewing, 2009). Inter-judge reliability at .90 or above in all categories is acceptable by content analysis reliability guidelines (Kassarjian, 1977).

RESULTS

The 14 respondents reported 24 pirating episodes in the 2 weeks prior to their interviews, which included TV shows (9 incidences), movies (7 incidences) books/comics (4 incidences), and games and music (2 incidences each). The themes and categories derived from the initial coding are displayed in exhibit 2. Six topic categories from the interview transcripts formed the ‘dynamics of law and technology’ theme, which involved respondent’s discussion about how new laws and technologies influenced piracy over time. In the early days of piracy, several respondents noted that fairly sophisticated technical skills were required to find and acquire the desired digital content, but that more recent technologies had generally made pirating easier. Several respondents also mentioned how they had become more aware of pirating risks and sought ways to avoid detection during time periods when tougher international anti-piracy law enforcement efforts were publicized.

EXHIBIT 2 ABOUT HERE

Four topic categories formed the ‘value for limited money’ theme that relate to the monetary benefits of piracy, which were particularly relevant during periods when the respondents desired digital content but did not have the money to buy legal versions. Piracy was also found to be used as a risk-free product trial to eliminate the problem of wasting limited financial resources on a poor quality legal purchase. Yet all the respondents with comments under this theme indicated that as their personal finances improved their piracy motivation changed from ‘getting something for free’ to much more limited pirating activity motivated by a desire to get content not available through legal channels. The change from analog to digital media also created expectations from some respondents that the price of digital media should have become reduced due to savings from not having to manufacture and transport physical

products. The most recent batch of respondents also mentioned that the high cost of subscribing to multiple streaming services to gain access to all desired digital content meant they sometimes only subscribed to the most important services, and limited their pirating to content only available on the unsubscribed channels.

The 3 topic categories of the ‘supporting the creatives’ theme are related to how respondents felt about the impact of piracy on digital content providers and creators. Several respondents were concerned that piracy would hurt the small artists/creators of books, games, and music behind the digital content, and expressed a desire to provide financial support for them. Furthermore, many respondents also felt that most of the money paid for legal versions of digital content was unfairly taken by ‘middlemen’ rather than provided to the creative talent, and respondents indicated little sympathy or desire to support big digital media corporations.

Five topic categories formed the ‘supply of legal services’ theme pertaining to the availability of legal services offering the format, content, and pricing that was deemed reasonable by respondents, which has generally reduced the necessity and utility of pirating over time. In particular, the need to pirate music was perceived to be greatly reduced by new legal services such as Spotify, while movies and TV shows continued to be regularly pirated due to practices such as channel exclusivity and regional/channel windowing that limit the legal availability of desired content. Respondents with preferences for niche genres of digital content also continued piracy when legal versions were unavailable for purchase.

Brand Hegemony Rejection Results

Judges deemed all respondent interview content from the initial categorization as relevant and possible to code into the predefined BHR categories, and the resulting five categories of positive piracy motivations (e.g. attractions/benefits of pirating), 6 negative categories (e.g.

reactions to the disliked activities by the copyright holders/media industry), and 6 environmental categories (e.g. changes in the environment that inhibit or simplify piracy) are discussed in the next sub-sections.

Positive Motivations for Piracy:

The most commonly mentioned positive motivation for pirating is to get access to niche products (most often TV shows and movies) that are otherwise not available through legal channels. Respondents expressed frustration when world-wide media publicity made them aware of interesting programs from other countries that would likely never be available through legal channels due to their specialized nature, and pirating offered a way to gain access to these unavailable niche products as illustrated by the following comments:

‘Norway as really limited in terms of music and TV-series. There was little room for stuff I was interested in.’ (Kaia)

‘Most of what is on Netflix is British or American. I like Asian and French series. You can’t get those easily.’ (Sofie)

The respondents were found to be voracious consumers of digital media and spent a large portion of their disposable income on legal content, but the desire to get more content than they could afford continued to be another positive motivation for pirating, which was felt most keenly when they were restricted by parental allowances and/or school expenses from spending as much on media products as they might otherwise:

‘Piracy started as a way to experience new music, and I became more interested in music after that. I used to buy music, but I only had allowance for maybe 2 CDs per year.’ (Feather)

‘There was a time where I could not afford, even if I liked something, to purchase it, and if I wanted stuff, I had to pirate it. When it comes between eating for the week and buying a new video game, well you eat for the week and pirate the video game. But now that I have some disposable income I have no problems paying for stuff that I like and I think deserves my money.’ (Miles)

These quotes also suggest that policies that would make it more difficult to pirate would not necessarily lead to greater legal media sales when respondents are unable to afford desired content, but also illustrate the dynamic nature of piracy motivations that change over time as incomes rise and allow more legal purchases.

A further positive motivation was mentioned by 4 respondents who suggested piracy is a convenient method of obtaining media content, although many of the comments suggested that such convenience was a bigger factor in the early days of piracy when the legal alternatives required physically going to stores or having to remember when to record legal broadcasts as illustrated by the following:

‘Piracy is very convenient; I don’t need to go to the store.’ (Wendly)

‘I did not have time to record off the TV, and I could go online and download the episode I missed.’ (Kaia)

These quotes again illustrate the dynamic nature of piracy as the inconvenience of traditional distribution channels such as TV or physical stores made piracy much more convenient for those with piracy skills and Internet access in the days before legal digital services existed.

Several respondents mentioned that another positive motivation for piracy as the ability to have a ‘risk free’ pre-purchase trial to determine if the product was worth the money before making a legal purchase. Kretschmer et al. (1999) suggest that it can be difficult for consumers to evaluate the quality of cultural goods in advance of purchase, and this trial motivation for piracy was most often related to a computer games indicating that risk was not perceived the same across all mediums:

‘I downloaded Sleeping Dogs, and then bought it twice after that. I did it because I was unsure of the quality of the game, so I just pirated it first.’ (Albo)

Such media specific reasons to pirate is also the case for the least mentioned positive motivation that was limited to the music industry, and involved the use of piracy to get only the desired songs back in the days when most individual songs were legally available only as part of more expensive albums:

‘He charged for making pirate CDs at least as much as normal CD, but we thought, we can choose what songs we want, so it’s worth it.’ (Sock)

Negative Motivations for Piracy:

In many ways the positive motivations for piracy are a mirror image of the negative motivations for piracy created by media industry policies and products. For example, the most common positive motivation was a desire for unavailable media content, and the most common negative motivation for piracy are the restrictive distribution policies of media companies (most often TV shows and movies), who often try to maximize revenue by delaying distribution between markets or between channels. This was one of the key differences between the Norwegian and U.S. respondents, as only the Norwegians expressed any significant frustration regarding their inability to legally acquire content already available elsewhere as illustrated by the following:

‘It’s always that Netflix usually has the movie later, because media companies want to milk the market for TV, Cinema and DVDs first.’ (Every)

‘If movies came out the same time in USA as they did in Norway, Sweden or Germany, piracy would not be a problem anymore.’ (Samurai)

Samurai’s quote represents a common frustration amongst the Norwegian informants who felt discriminated against by foreign media company policies that staggered releases or used geographic licensing to slow by several weeks or months the release of desired content such as *Game of Thrones* in some geographic markets, which is a problem that pirates in dominant media markets such as the US rarely experience.

The positive economic motivation in the form of free pirated goods is also mirrored by the second most common negative motivation, which is the high price of legal digital content. The high prices were believed to be unfair for two main reasons; 1) legal digital versions should have substantially lower prices because they eliminate manufacturing and distribution costs of physical versions of the product (i.e. DVDs, paper books), and 2) because wanted products are only available from individual right holders and thus require expensive multiple subscriptions, which was the point brought up most often by the later (2018) sample, which again indicates an instability in piracy motivations across time. Both reasons are reflected in the following comments:

‘I think digital pricing is unfair, it cost the same in the store as it does online. I’d presume, without knowing, that it costs less to publish things in your own [online] store than to ship it out to physical stores etc. So they [the media companies] just take the profit the individual stores would have had.’ (Agent X)

‘One thing is to have Spotify, Netflix and HBO Nordic. If there suddenly comes another new service and you have to pay an additional 100-200 Kroner then it soon becomes very expensive.’ (Fredrik)

A few respondents mentioned the quality risks they associated with some media products, particularly computer games, which they believe are frequently overhyped by marketers that leads to disappointment when the actual quality fails to live up to the promises and therefore didn’t deserve their money:

‘There are many games where the manipulation through marketing is so effective that I bought it before I tried it via piracy and the product didn’t live up to what is implied and promised.’ (Spearmint)

Another negative motivation is based on pirate beliefs that most of the money spent on legal media actually went to media companies rather than the artists who create the work. This desire to support artists/creators was most often focused on small artists struggling to make a decent living, and the artists/creators in the music, gaming, and book mediums more generally,

but not the more famous actors/creators of TV shows and movies or big media companies who have the hegemony-based power, and these support related issues are illustrated by the following:

‘I don’t associate much good with media companies, and don’t really feel that they are needed. I would like it much better if I could give the money directly to those that made it.’ (Sofie)

‘I think it’s terrible when people pirate from small companies or small programmers who can hardly live off what they create.’ (Samurai)

Social elements are often found to be a powerful motivation to continue participation in various brand and online communities (Cromie and Ewing, 2009; Kozinets et al. 2017; McAlexander et al. 2002) and in early Napster era pirating (Giesler, 2008), but social elements generated only one comment in the current sample, which was based on the perceived necessity of pirating by those in later release markets in order to see digital content before story line spoilers by online fan conversations or media coverage from earlier release markets ruined their enjoyment:

‘There is a social aspect in that we are a bit behind [on media releases]. We want to know things at the same time as everyone else knows it. Not read it somewhere, which spoils everything. Especially since Norwegian websites have started telling what is happening in American TV-series.’ (Kaia)

Environmental Facilitators and Inhibitors of Piracy:

Environmental factors are the aspects of the marketplace that facilitate or inhibit brand hegemony, and in the piracy context these factors tend to revolve around technology, risks, and the quality of legal product offerings. A major focus of the media industry has been the enactment and enforcement of laws that strengthen copyright protections and penalize copyright violations (Danaher et al., 2014), and the most common environmental factor mentioned by nearly all the respondents was legal risks. Respondents were aware of the potential legal risks of piracy, with U.S. respondents showing the most concern because pirates have been prosecuted in

the U.S. (unlike Norway), but unlike early Napster era research findings (e.g. Giesler, 2008) the current sample perceived such risks as small because they only pirated a very limited amount or because countermeasures could be used to avoid detection, and consequently none of sample had stopped pirating as evidenced by the following:

‘It’s like this with piracy: Some people have the knowledge, and you will never catch them, because they know how to hide.’ (Samurai)

‘You do hear that people get caught for piracy, but I feel like I download so little that they would not go after me first. I feel like there are bigger sinners than me, but that is probably naive since you only have to get caught once for it all to go to hell.’ (Sock)

On the other hand, the risk of viruses or malware infecting their computers from disreputable pirate sites seemed to be a bigger real concern than legal risks for many respondents, which is an environmental factor seldom mentioned in the piracy literature (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2007; Higgens et al., 2008). This threat led several respondents to take precautions by ‘verifying’ the file sharing user, which are reflected by the following comments:

‘So you have to ask yourself, is the person who has seeded [provided the download] trustworthy? Is he a ‘trusted user’, has he uploaded before or is he from a group that is established?’ (Spearmint)

‘There has been piracy software like Kazaa which was known for spreading spyware and viruses. So it’s never been easy, there is always a certain risk involved in piracy.’ (Feather)

Another environmental factor that has changed over time is the improved technology that has made piracy easier. Older respondents recalled the time and effort required to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to pirate desired media content and hide their piracy activity to avoid possible legal risks, but the comments of younger respondents indicate that piracy is now far easier as reflected in the following comments:

‘Yes, piracy did take some learning. Those early [bittorrent] clients were rough, and you had to know about port forwarding and all kind of things, which is hard to learn but that was the times, the Internet was much different than it is now.’ (Miles)

‘Many people in my generation have a very intuitive way to do things online. So I don’t really feel like I had to learn anything, I only had to learn the idea that piracy was possible.’ (Sofie)

With the exception of the gaming market, which has relied on effective copy-protection systems that has proven difficult to circumvent, the most widespread market development has been new legal services that several respondents suggested were the most effective means of countering piracy because they made legal media purchases more convenient and safer than piracy even with their vast piracy experience and the improvements in piracy technology noted previously. Several respondents indicated it was now easier to use Spotify or Netflix than finding pirated versions of desired products, which is similar to the reduction in piracy noted by others after new legal channels were introduced (e.g. Giesler, 2008; Wlomet and Papies, 2019). Thus a key explanation for recent reductions in piracy activity is provided by comments that suggest piracy has now evolved into something that is mostly done when a legal version of the product is unavailable in their market:

‘But now I don’t pirate anymore. The only thing I do that can be classified as illegal is that I sometimes watch Popcorn Time. I only do that if I can’t find it on any legal services.’ (Samurai)

‘It’s almost easier to find music on Spotify than to start looking for downloading-pages.’ (Fredrik)

‘I actually prefer to watch things on Netflix and Amazon, the convenience offered by them is greater than I can offer myself. So I went there, and they have my attention.’ (Clay)

These three quotes all reference streaming services as a replacement for piracy, and thus technological change in the form of new legal product offerings again demonstrates how piracy changes over time and explains why piracy in some markets has been greatly reduced to cases when desired content is not legally available. Thus technological improvements are perhaps the biggest facilitator of both piracy and legal media purchases, as widespread broadband Internet has made it possible to quickly access digitalized media products via downloads and streaming

channels. The Internet has also globalized the media market, which allows high involvement consumers anywhere in the world to quickly and easily find out about new movies, music, games, or books that are already released in other markets, and respondents didn't see why media companies often make customers wait for legal versions of desired digital products when technological possibilities were available to make access easier, cheaper, and more equal:

'They don't give you a choice; take for example Netflix series that come out weekly. It's not that people are not willing to wait a week, but if there are spoilers out a few hours after airing, then it's all ruined. They should realize that everything is shared all over the world at the same time.'
(Kaia)

This quote highlights the complex interplay between the globalization of media demand and the issues with market-based licensing and windowing. Even if media companies fail to acknowledge it, their hegemony doesn't prevent pirates in more remote places such as Norway from seeing the world as a single market where the first supplier of desired content gets their attention whether legal or not.

DISCUSSION

The content analysis of digital pirate interview transcripts indicates that piracy is partly dependent on personal characteristics, as a temporary lack of monetary resources or a special personal interest in niche/specialized digital offerings occasionally make piracy the only means of gaining access to desired digital content. Respondents also noted that piracy has become easier over time due to technological improvements such as more sophisticated search engines. Changing technology is also found to influence piracy motivations, as early pirating was seen as a solution to the inconvenience of physical shopping for physical mediums such as CDs and DVDs, but has evolved into a means of gaining access to desired digital content that is unavailable from legal channels due to common digital media practices such as regional windowing and channel exclusive contracts. Change is therefore the key finding as piracy

motivations and ability continually evolve over time due to changing personal resources and interests, changing digital technologies, and changing industry practices that vary across digital mediums. This finding contrasts sharply with much previous work where findings from one medium or time-frame have frequently been extrapolated across mediums and times without any empirical verification (Watson et al. 2015, Fleming et al. 2017).

The application of BHR theory to the themes and categories derived from the digital piracy context was also expected to provide a deeper understanding of piracy activity and perhaps offer an explanation for recent reductions in piracy behavior in some markets and media channels. The results support the relevance of BHR, and suggest that piracy is motivated by several positive and negative factors and is facilitated or curtailed by important environmental factors, which offer a number of similarities and contrasts to the results found in the OSS application of BHR and by earlier longitudinal research on Napster era digital piracy (Cromie and Ewing, 2009; Giesler, 2006, 2008). Perhaps the biggest similarity is the finding that members of both communities are not anti-consumption or anti-capitalist. The comments of the pirate respondents suggest they are big consumers of digital media and will buy legally sourced media when they have the income, and if the product they desire is available in attractive formats and with reasonable pricing. Neither the OSS or pirate communities appear to have a strong dislike for the brand/industry hegemony they circumvent with their behaviors, but both communities are also very proficient and knowledgeable about technology that allows them to break free of hegemony power when they believe the brand/industry is not customer focused. In contrast, some anti-capitalist indications were found among early Napster era pirates as they reacted in anger to the ‘capitalist oppression’ of major music labels using the courts to shut-down

Napster and other file sharing piracy sites prior to the advent of legal digital services (Giesler, 2008).

On the other hand, the pirate community was found to differ from the OSS community in terms of social stature and other social elements that were common positive motivations for OSS and other online and brand community participation, but were barely mentioned by the pirates perhaps due to the illegal nature of piracy or the lack of collaborative efforts in building a product as required in the OSS community. The weaker social ties in the pirate community may also be a reason that many of the respondents abandoned much of their piracy activities and returned to legal media markets for a large portion of their media consumption, although Giesler (2008) found stronger social ties among early Napster era pirates did not preclude many from also returning to legal music markets when iTunes became available. In contrast, the stronger feeling of community felt among OSS members may have reduced their incentive to ‘forgive’ and return to the Microsoft customer-base.

Unlike the OSS community, there is also an expressed desire among some of the pirates to support the creative elements of the media industry hegemony. Although several pirates indicated a dislike of media company marketing and business strategies, a few also expressed guilt that their piracy might hurt the artists and creators of the media they consume, which was also found among some of the Napster era pirates interviewed by Giesler (2008). This pirate dislike for the hegemony of digital content ‘middlemen’ together with their desire to support creators whom some pirates believe are also victims of media industry hegemony may also be partly responsible for their frequent willingness to buy legal media products that meet their needs as evidenced by the relative success of new legal services such as iTunes (Giesler, 2008) and Spotify in attracting pirates (Wlomet and Papiés, 2019). Thus unlike Cromie and Ewing (2009)

who did not find members of the OSS community returning to Microsoft, pirates claimed to regularly buy many of these legal media services, and they clearly have a greater willingness to ‘forgive’ rights holders who are responsive to their needs and therefore do not display the animosity towards business or consumption often found in the anti-consumption literature (Chatzidakis et al., 2012; Kozinets and Handelman 2004). The one exception may be media products (particularly games) that pirates believe are overhyped, which leads some to pirate as a trial mechanism for determining if the product is worth their money. Such ‘trials’ with later purchase if the product proves satisfactory may also provide an explanation for findings in previous research that piracy is not generally viewed as stealing (Chen et al., 2009; Giesler, 2006; Moores and Chang, 2006).

Thus this research suggests that not all acts of piracy should be counted as lost industry sales as is typically done when calculating piracy damages, as without piracy these respondents indicate their media consumption would be reduced due to lack of funds, or lack of desired content, or worries that the product would be disappointing. Unfortunately, the media industry’s success in reducing piracy through the introduction of popular new legal streaming platforms such as Spotify and Netflix have not yet proven to be profitable, while artists are also unhappy about the low compensation they receive for their creative work from these outlets (Jahan, 2017; Morgan, 2017; Sanchez, 2017). If poor financial results tempt digital media companies to revive some of the hated industry practices in an attempt to regain profitable brand hegemony, however, the current results suggest that pirates can and will reactivate their piracy activity. This is reinforced by comments from the 2018 respondents and recent media reports, which suggest that recent upticks in piracy activity might be at least partly attributed to consumer frustrations in being forced to pay for multiple subscriptions in order to access digital content exclusive to only

a single provider (Ernesto, 2018). These findings suggest that pirates are unlikely to ever feel the brand allegiance and loyalty commonly found in the brand community literature (Muniz and O'Guinn 2001; McAlexander et al. 2002), and the only 'permanent' solution to piracy will therefore require the digital media industry to find profitable methods of delivering desired digital content at a price and in a format that is deemed reasonable by most would-be pirates. This is consistent with other recent piracy literature that suggest the media industry's best defense against piracy is to make legal purchases more rewarding rather than trying to identify and punish pirates (De Corte and Van Kenhove, 2017; Lowry et al., 2017).

These insights into why and when digital media consumers choose to pirate or stop pirating also confirms the benefits of using a qualitative approach to overcome the limitations of survey-based methods utilized in much of the piracy literature that has led to calls for more qualitative piracy research (Chavarria et al., 2016; Watson et al., 2015, Williams et al., 2010). In particular, a major advantage of the current study in gaining valid and in-depth knowledge of the digital piracy community comes from the careful attention and resources devoted to tracking down experienced pirates and ensuring their comfort and honesty in describing legally questionable behaviors. Similarly, the qualitative approach proved useful in allowing respondents to discuss how their piracy motivations and behaviors changed over time due to new technologies or legal threats, and why they differed across digital mediums. The current research also confirms that BHR theory is very amenable to qualitative data collection and analysis, and suitable for the study and understanding of 'problematic' community activities.

CONCLUSION

This application of BHR theory finds pirates are responsive to digital media marketing actions and strategies. Although much of the literature views piracy as an individual act of theft

done for pure personal gain, the application of BHR suggests that piracy can also be seen as a response to what consumers feel is the ‘unfair’ use of market power. Statements from the pirates in the current study suggest digitalization has greatly reduced the hegemony power of media companies to maximize revenues by ‘bundling’, ‘windowing’, and ‘price discriminating’ between markets and channels. While such ‘abuses’ led to widespread digital piracy, this application of BHR offers an explanation for the recent reductions in piracy activity in the form of attractive new legal products such as Netflix and Spotify, which appear to have greatly reduced the perceived need to pirate. These results suggest that the interaction between the pirate and rights holder is a far more useful and explanatory pathway towards understanding piracy behavior than traditional approaches focusing on the personal characteristics of the pirates, and that digital media companies must be mindful of piracy responses and perceptions when they engage in marketing actions that involve leveraging their brand or market power.

These findings also confirm that interpretations of past piracy research and designs for future piracy research need to account for how motivations and frequency of pirating can vary across time and mediums due to the influence of changing legal risks, pirating technology ease of use, and the quality of legal digital product offerings (Wlomet and Papies, 2019). Future research might apply BHR theory to the investigation of digital pirate communities in other parts of the world such as China where piracy has been and remains a much larger problem for the digital media industry. Although most previous piracy research has focused on only one type of media (music, or games, or movies, etc.), the current findings confirm earlier work that finds piracy motivations changing across time and mediums (Eisend, 2019; Fleming et al., 2017; Lowry et al., 2017). For example, respondents more frequently indicate a personal connection with musicians versus TV and movie creators and providers, while fears of buying an overhyped

product and the influence of copy protection is most relevant to the game market, and a desire to have niche products not available locally or get around geographic windowing was mostly seen for music, TV shows and movies. Future research might therefore quantitatively examine how these differences influence the propensity to pirate and the effectiveness of various piracy remedies over time. The ebb and flow of piracy activity noted among respondents also suggests that future research might examine other potential motivations and right's holder remedies for piracy. For example the poor artist payouts by some new legal channels such as Spotify might provide a piracy motivation to fight against the hegemony of hated middlemen and marketers. Research might also borrow the articulation and sincerity concepts from the sponsorship literature to examine whether such dislike for distributors and marketers can be mitigated by providing explanations about the services and activities they perform, and whether greater transparency in how revenues are shared with the creators/artists leads to greater perceptions of sincerity and more positive attitudes towards the industry and a lower likelihood of pirating (Cornwell et al. 2005; Olson 2010; Olson and Thjomoe 2011; Speed and Thompson 2000).

REFERENCES

- Al-Rafee, S., Cronan, T. (2006), “Digital Piracy: Factors that Influence Attitude Toward Behavior”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 63 No. 3, pp. 237–259.
- Cesareo, L., Pastore, A. (2014), “Consumers’ attitude and behavior towards online music piracy and subscription-based services”, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 31 No. 6/7, pp. 515–525.
- Chatzidakis, A., Maclaran, P., Bradshaw, A. (2012), “Heterotopian space and the utopics of ethical and green consumption”, *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 28 No. 3-4, pp. 494-515.
- Chavarria, Juan A., Francis Kofi Andoh-Baidoo, Vishal Midha, and Jerald Hughes. 2016. “Software Piracy Research: A Cross-Disciplinary Systematic Review.” *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* 38 (1): 624–69. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.03831>.
- Chen, Y.-C., Shang, R.-A., Lin, A.-K. (2009), “The intention to download music files in a P2P environment: Consumption value, fashion, and ethical decision perspectives”, *Electronic Commerce Research & Applications*, Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 411–422.
- Condry, I. (2004), “Cultures of music piracy an ethnographic comparison of the US and Japan”, *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 343–363.
- Cornwell, T.B., Weeks, C.S., Roy, D.P. (2005), “Sponsorship-linked Marketing: Opening the Black Box,” *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 21-42.
- Coyle, J. R., Gould, S. J., Gupta, P., Gupta, R. (2009), “‘To buy or to pirate’: The matrix of music consumers’ acquisition-mode decision-making”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 62 No. 10, pp. 1031–1037.
- Cromie, J. G., and Ewing, M. T. (2009), “The rejection of brand hegemony,” *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 62 No. 2, pp. 218-30.
- Danaher, B., Dhanasobhon, S., Smith, M. D., Telang, R. (2010), “Converting Pirates Without Cannibalizing Purchasers: The Impact of Digital Distribution on Physical Sales and Internet Piracy,” *Marketing Science*, Vol. 29 No. 6, pp. 1138–1151.
- Danaher, B., Smith, M. D., Telang, R., Chen, S. (2014), “The Effect of Graduated Response Anti-Piracy Laws on Music Sales: Evidence from an Event Study in France,” *Journal of Industrial Economics*, Vol. 62 No. 3, pp. 541–553.

- De Corte, C.E., Van Kenhove P. (2017), “One Sail Fits All? A Psychographic Segmentation of Digital Pirates,” *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 143 No. 3, pp. 441–65.
- Edwards, L. (2019), “Copyright: a systemic marketplace icon,” *Consumption Markets & Culture*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 74-82.
- Eisend, M. (2019), “Explaining Digital Piracy: A Meta-Analysis,” *Information Systems Research* Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 636–64.
- Ernesto (2018), “BitTorrent Traffic is Not Dead, It’s Making a Comeback”, *TorrentFreak*, (Sept. 26), available at <https://torrentfreak.com/bittorrent-traffic-is-not-dead-its-making-a-comeback-180926> (accessed 14 March 2020).
- Fleming, P., Watson, S.J., Patouris, E., Bartholomew, K.J., Zizzo, D.J. (2017), “Why Do People File Share Unlawfully? A Systematic Review, Meta-Analysis and Panel Study,” *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 72 No. July, pp 535–48.
- Giesler, M. (2006), “Consumer Gift Systems”, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 283-290.
- Giesler, M. (2008), “Conflict and Compromise: Drama in Marketplace Evolution”, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 34 No. 6, pp. 739-753.
- Gowan, M. (2002). “Requiem for Napster,” *PC World*, available at: https://www.pcworld.idg.com.au/article/22380/requiem_napster/ (accessed 6 August 2018).
- Groves, J. (2018), “Online piracy losses to soar to \$52 billion”, *TVBEurope*, (October 30), available at: <https://www.tvbeurope.com/data-centre/piracy-losses-to-soar-to-52-billion> (accessed 20 March 2020).
- Harris, L. C., & Dumas, A. (2009). Online consumer misbehaviour: An application of neutralization theory. *Marketing Theory*, 9(4), 379–402.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593109346895>
- Hennig-Thurau, T., Henning, V., Sattler, H. (2007), ”Consumer File Sharing of Motion Pictures,” *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 71 No. 4, pp. 1–18.
- Higgins, G. E., Wolfe, S. E., Marcum, C. D. (2008), “Digital piracy: An examination of three measurements of self-control,” *Deviant Behavior*, Vol. 29 No. 5, pp. 440–460.
- Ingham, T. (2015), “MUSIC PIRACY HAS BEEN ‘VIRTUALLY ELIMINATED’ IN NORWAY,” *Music Business Worldwide*. (January 28), available at: <http://www.musicbusinessworldwide.com/piracy-virtually-eliminated-norway/> (accessed 20 March 2020).

- ITU. (2017), “*Measuring the Information Society Report*”, Geneva, Switzerland, available at: https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Documents/publications/misr2017/MISR2017_Volume1.pdf (accessed 20 March 2020).
- Jahan, J. (2017), “Why do so many musicians hate Spotify?”, *Spinditty*, available at: <https://spinditty.com/industry/why-so-many-artists-hate-spotify> (accessed 22 June 2019).
- Kassarjian, H. H. (1977), “Content Analysis in Consumer Research”, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 4 No.1, pp. 8–18.
- Kariithi, N.K. (2011), “Is the Devil in the Data? A Literature Review of Piracy Around the World,” *The Journal of World Intellectual Property*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 133–54. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-1796.2010.00412.x>.
- Kozinets, R.V., Handelman, J.M. (2004), “Adversaries of consumption: Consumer Movements, Activism, and Ideology”, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 691-704.
- Kozinets, R.V., Patterson, A., Ashman, R. (2017), “Networks of Desire: How Technology Increases our Passion to Consume”, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 43 No. 5, pp. 659-682.
- Kretschmer, M., Klimis, G. M., Choi, C.J. (1999), “Increasing returns and social contagion in cultural industries,” *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 10 No. 3, p. S61.
- Limayem, M., Khalifa, M., Chin, W. W. (2004), “Factors motivating software piracy: A longitudinal study”, *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, Vol. 51 No. 4, pp. 414–425.
- Lowry, P.B., Zhang, J., Wu, T. (2017), “Nature or Nurture? A Meta-Analysis of the Factors That Maximize the Prediction of Digital Piracy by Using Social Cognitive Theory as a Framework,” *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 68 No. March, pp. 104–20.
- McAlexander, J.H., Schouten, J.W., Koenig, H.F. (2002), “Building brand community”, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 66 No. 1, pp. 38-54..
- Moores, T., Chang, J. (2006), “Ethical decision making in software piracy: Initial development and test of a four-component model”, *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 167–180.
- Morgan, R. (2017), “Netflix will keep spending big despite mounting losses”, *New York Post*, (September 12), available at: <https://nypost.com/2017/09/12/netflix-will-keep-spending-big-despite-mounting-losses/> (accessed 20 March 2020).
- Muniz, A.M. Jr., O’Guinn, T.C. (2001), “Brand Community”, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp. 412-432.

- Olson, E.L. (2010), "Does Sponsorship Work in the Same Way in Different Sponsorship Contexts?" *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 44 No. 1-2, pp. 180-199.
- Olson, E.L., Thjomoe, H.M. (2011), "Explaining and Articulating the Fit Construct in Sponsorship", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp.57-70.
- Raustiala, K., & Sprigman, C. (2012). How Much Do Music and Movie Piracy Really Hurt the U.S. Economy?", available at: <http://freakonomics.com/2012/01/12/how-much-do-music-and-movie-piracy-really-hurt-the-u-s-economy/> (accessed 6 May 2018).
- Sanchez, D. (2017), *Digital Music News*, (June 15), available at: <https://www.digitalmusicnews.com/2017/06/15/spotify-140-million-huge-losses/> (accessed 6 May 2018).
- Schau, H.J., Muniz, A.M.Jr., Arnould, E.J. (2009), "How Brand Community Practices Create Value", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 73 No. 5, pp. 30-51.
- Shanahan, K. J., Hyman, M. R. (2010), "Motivators and enablers of SCOURing: A study of online piracy in the US and UK," *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 63 No. 9/10, pp. 1095–1102.
- Sinclair, G., Green, T. (2016), "Download or stream? Steal or buy? Developing a typology of today's music consumer", *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 3–14.
- Sinha, R. K., Mandel, N. (2008), "Preventing digital music piracy: The carrot or the stick?", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 72 No. 1, pp. 1–15.
- Smith, M. and Telang, R (2016), Windows of Opportunity: The Impact of Piracy and Delayed International Availability on DVD Sales (May 26, 2016). Available at: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2784759> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2784759>
- Speed, R., Thompson, P. (2000), "Determinants of Sport Sponsorship Response", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 226-238.
- Statistics Norway. (2016). *Medienorge*. Oslo-Kongsvinger, available at: <https://www.ssb.no/kultur-og-fritid/artikler-og-publikasjoner/attachment/303444?ts=15c1173e920> (accessed 6 May 2018).
- Titcomb, J. (2016), "Internet piracy falls to record lows amid rise of Spotify and Netflix", *The Telegraph*, (July 5), available at: <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/2016/07/04/internet-piracy-falls-to-record-lows-amid-rise-of-spotify-and-net/> (accessed 6 May 2018).
- Waage, V. (2018), "Tusenvís av norske «nettpirater» kan være avslørt – uten å vite det selv", *Hegnar*, (February 17), available at <http://www.hegnar.no/Nyheter/Personlig->

[oekonomi/2018/02/Tusenvis-av-norske-nettpirater-kan-vaere-avsloert-uten-aa-vite-det-selv](https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2875-2-10)
(accessed 6 May 2018).

- Watson, S.J., Zizzo, D.J., Fleming, P. (2015), “Determinants of Unlawful File Sharing: A Scoping Review,” *PLoS ONE*. Vol. 10 No. 6, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127921>.
- Wang, X., McClung, S. R. (2012), “The immorality of illegal downloading: The role of anticipated guilt and general emotions,” *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp 153-159.
- Weijters, B., Goedertier, F. (2016), “Understanding today’s music acquisition mix: a latent class analysis of consumers’ combined use of music platforms”, *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 27 No. 3, pp. 603–10.
- Williams, P., Nicholas, D., Rowlands, I. (2010), “The attitudes and behaviours of illegal downloaders,” *Aslib Proceedings*, Vol. 62, pp. 283–301.
- Witzel, A., Reiter, H. (2012), “The Problem-Centred Interview”, *SAGE Publications*, available at: <http://books.google.no/books?id=ERUpDwFKzRwC> (accessed 6 May 2018).
- Wolfe, S. E., Higgins, G. E., Marcum, C. D. (2016), “Role of Viruses”, *Social Science Computer Review*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 317–333.
- Wlömert, N., Papiés, D. (2019), “International Heterogeneity in the Associations of New Business Models and Broadband Internet with Music Revenue and Piracy,” *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 400–419.
- Yang, Z., Wang, J., Murali, M. (2015), “Effect of peer influence on unauthorized music downloading and sharing: The moderating role of self-construal”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 68 No. 3, pp. 516–525.

Exhibit 1: Informant Overview

<u>Psuedonym</u>	Demographics			Coding (total comments/unique categories)		
	<u>Age</u>	<u>Gender</u>	<u>Life-Situation</u>	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Environmental</u>
Fredrik	31	male	university	4 / 3	13 / 3	18 / 5
Kaia	28	female	employed	11 / 3	10 / 3	11 / 6
Samuari	34	male	employed	1 / 1	9 / 3	4 / 3
Miles (USA)	31	male	unemployed	1 / 1	3 / 3	4 / 3
Clay	28	male	employed	10 / 2	4 / 2	8 / 3
Albo (USA)	19	male	high school	4 / 3	3 / 2	4 / 2
Sofie	18	female	high school	6 / 2	4 / 2	3 / 2
Nora	33	female	employed	2 / 2	0 / 0	1 / 1
AgentX (a)	28	male	university	3 / 2	3 / 2	6 / 4
Every (a)	34	male	employed	0 / 0	5 / 2	5 / 4
Feather (a)	23	male	university	2 / 1	14 / 4	8 / 3
Sock (a)	31	female	employed	3 / 2	2 / 1	7 / 3
Spearmint (a)	39	male	unemployed	2 / 1	4 / 3	8 / 2
Wendly (a)	20	female	university	2 / 1	1 / 1	4 / 3

Notes: all respondents except those noted by (USA) are Norwegian. (a) = 2018 sample, all others are from 2015 data collection.

Exhibit 2: Overview of Themes and Topics

Theme	Topic	Description
The dynamics of law and technology	Legal risk	Perception of enforcement and ability to remain undetected
	Technological risk	Risks related to viruses, corrupt files and inaccessible downloads
	Piracy skills	Skills related piracy software operation and piracy knowledge
	Copy protection	The hassle of copy protection and the knowledge/skills needed to break them
	Piracy technology	The development of technology like broadband and storage that enables piracy
Value for limited money	Getting something for free	The desire to consume more than one can afford, for example above your allowance or software that is meant for professionals
	Purchase risk reduction	Reducing the investment risk in expensive media by trying it out before purchase
	High price of legal digital content	The belief that digital products should be cheaper and cost of multiple subscriptions
	Overhyped media	The risk that the media product is advertised as much better than it actually is
Supporting the artist/creator	Legal purchase funds do not go the artists	The belief that funds from purchases do not go to the artist
	Little desire to support Big Media	The attitude to avoid Big Media due to unfair business strategies
	Middlemen take too much revenue	The attitudes that middlemen – distributors, labels/studios take too much share of revenue from the artists
Available legal digital content services	Access to niche products	Ability to access niche products that are unlikely to be available legally
	Convenience of piracy	The convenience of illegal digital services in comparison to old physical stores
	Desire for legally unavailable content	Desire for unreleased content due to geographic windowing or slow licensing
	Ease of legal digital content services	The perceived lack of quality and ease in legal offerings
Internet has globalized demand		The increase in demand for media that is "hot" in the global mediasphere (for example Game of Thrones) regardless of local licensing