A STUDY ON THE ADOPTION AND USAGE OF DIGITAL AUDIO WORKSTATIONS

Federico Avanzini, Riccardo Della Longa, Davide Fantini, Luca A. Ludovico, Giorgio Presti Laboratory of Music Informatics (LIM) - Department of Computer Science - University of Milan

Preferred DAW

50%

50%

40%

Other

Reaper

Logic

Cubase

Ardour

Pro tools

FL studio

Studio one

Bitwig studio

Ableton Live



Corresponding author: giorgio.presti@unimi.it





64.3% of participants had received formal training in audio manipulation. A noticeable number of users of **Bitwig**, **Pro Tools** and **Studio One** were trained (72-82%), but also for other DAWs the percentage was above 50%. Only in the case of **FL Studio**, formally trained users were a minority (34%).

Age of the respondents

58%

52%

64%

80%

25%

25%

56%

69%

82%

50%



51% of FL Studio users adopted it before 18 (and 90% before 24), and 41% had less than 6 years of experience with DAWs. Conversely, only 10% of **Pro Tools** users started before 18. In general, more than 50% of the responders started using DAWs before being 30.

Ardour and Bitwig are underrepresented in Italy compared with the rest of the world, while **FL Studio** is far more adopted in Italy, especially by young amateurs.





60%

Years of audio manipulation experience of DAW users



Ableton Live emerged as the most preferred DAW among respondents, followed by Reaper and Logic Pro. Nevertheless, the study highlights a divide between professional and amateur DAW users. **Pro Tools** remains the industry standard for professional audio engineers, while Ableton Live is gaining traction among hobbyists and independent producers, and Reaper appears to be well balanced between professionals and hobbyists.

Overall adoption of DAWs per year

Adoption of DAWs per year (Amateur)

25%

42%

36%

20%

44%

31%

18%

0%

48%

75%

A historical analysis of DAW adoption revealed an

75%

Job

50%

Hobby

Adoption of DAWs per year (In Studio)





The fact that the "**Other**" category (including 44 more DAWs) ranked second in the general diagram suggests a constellation of DAWs that make the market diverse and dynamic.

increasing shift towards **Reaper** and **Ableton Live** among newer users. **Pro Tools** remains dominant among seasoned professionals.





Further analyzing the historical data dividing company workers/owners from freelance/amateurs, it emerges that, in the first case, **Pro Tools** is widely more used than Ableton Live and FL Studio is almost absent, while, in the latter case, **RX** appears in the charts (not shown here).

DAWs use cases: Contexts Other



Other Ableton Live Reaper Pro tools Logic Cubase FL studio Audacity 20% 0% 40% 60% 80% 100 Draft Tracking Editing Sequencing/Programming Mastering Mixing music production tasks Live performance Post-production Restoration Live sound engineering Scientific res./measur. Teaching Other

In terms of Task versatility, **Reaper** stands out, with an even distribution of usage across various audio tasks. **Pro Tools** is instead the most versatile in terms of Use Contexts.

Cubase's user base is primarily focused on music production, with a significant relevance across virtually all musical genres. By contrast, Audacity is adopted more widely for non-musical purposes, such as research and education.

Although **Pro Tools** is versatile in terms of Contexts, its users don't use it as much for drafting, sequencing and programming.

DAWs users base composition

		Amateur Se		Ser	emi-professional			Professional			
Other-			3	6%		28%				36%	
Live -			31%			33%				36%	
Reaper-			28%			34%				38%	
o tools-	%6		20%							70%	
Logic-		23	%			39%				39%	
Cubase -					49%			30%		21%	
studio-						62%			30	5%	3%
udacity-					51%		22%			27%	
() 2%	2	0%	4	0%	60%	/)	8	0%	10	90%

As one may expect, many **Ableton Live** users employ the software for live performances.

Ableton Live • Most preferred overall, gaining traction with

Ardour • Underrepresented in Italy; common among SMC



DAWs use cases: Tasks

Audacity • Primarily for non-musical uses like research &

Bitwig Studio • Significant portion of users with formal training.



• Primarily Windows users. Strong in music production across genres; less so for other audio tasks (likely due to Nuendo). Main Use: Amateur Music (Electronic) for Amateur Editing.



hobbyists & independent producers. Main Use: Electronic Music (Amateur) for Semi-professional Sequencing & Programming. Also one of the top two for many tasks and contexts.







 Underrepresented in Italy. • Main Use: Amateur Music (Electronic) for Amateur Drafting.



FL Studio • Highly adopted in Italy by young amateurs. • Many users start before 18 (almost all before 24); formally trained users are a minority. • Exclusion: Almost absent among company workers/owners. Main Use: Amateur Music (Electronic) for Amateur Mixing.





Pro Tools • The go-to for professional audio engineers. • High percentage with formal training; few start before 18. Small minority on Windows • Widely used "in the studio". Most versatile in use contexts. • Main Use: Professional Music (Acoustic) for Professional Mixing.



· Well-balanced between professionals and hob-

- Increasing shift among newer users.
- for Professional Editing.

Studio One • Noticeable majority of users with formal training. • Main Use: Amateur Music (Acoustic) for Amateur Editing.



Further analysis and details about the survey can be found in the paper. You can access the raw data in JSON format and the Python script used to generate the plots at https://doi.org/10.13130/RD_UNIMI/YNQHKI



See more plots, download the poster or access further details at https://www.lim.di.unimi.it/dawsurvey/results/2023/



Are you interested in studying for a degree in Sound and Music Computing in Italy? Take a look at our course! https://infomus.lim.di.unimi.it/





With only 613 responses, we risk over-generalizing findings. The fact that the majority of responses came from Italy introduces a national bias. The imbalance in the sources – like the heavy reliance on SMC mailing lists – might not represent the diversity of DAW users. These data do not reflect recommendations or quality assessments of DAWs. Instead, they report how surveyed users utilize them. We discourage interpreting DAW usage as a reflection of its strengths, as cultural and marketing factors can distort this correlation. Evaluating the features offered by each DAW is beyond the scope of this work.