

This is the author-created version of the following work:

**Krause, Amanda E., and North, Adrian C. (2020) *Collaboration, cognitive effort, and self-reference in United Kingdom top 5 pop music lyrics 1960–2015*. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 14 (3) pp. 294-300.**

Access to this file is available from:

<https://researchonline.jcu.edu.au/62732/>

© 2019 American Psychological Association. In accordance with the publisher's policies, the Author Accepted Manuscript of this article is available Open Access from ResearchOnline@JCU.

Please refer to the original source for the final version of this work:

<https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000214>

**Note:**

This is an accepted manuscript (pre-print version) of an article published in *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts* online on 10 January 2019.

©American Psychological Association, 2019. This paper is not the copy of record and may not exactly replicate the authoritative document published in the APA journal. Please do not copy or cite without author's permission. The final article is available, upon publication, at doi:10.1037/aca0000214.

You may download the published version directly from the journal (homepage: <https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/aca/>).

## Published citation:

Krause, A. E., & North, A. C. (2019). Collaboration, cognitive effort, and self-reference in United Kingdom top 5 pop music lyrics 1960-2015. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, advance online publication. doi:10.1037/aca0000214

Collaboration, Cognitive Effort, and Self-Reference in United Kingdom Top 5 Pop Music  
Lyrics 1960-2015

Amanda E. Krause<sup>1,2</sup> and Adrian C. North<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Psychology, Curtin University,  
Kent Street, Bentley, WA 6102, Australia

<sup>2</sup>Melbourne Conservatorium of Music, The University of Melbourne,  
Gate 12, Royal Parade, Parkville, VIC 3010, Australia

Email: [amanda.krause@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:amanda.krause@unimelb.edu.au) / [adrian.north@curtin.edu.au](mailto:adrian.north@curtin.edu.au)

Tel: +61 (0)8 9266 7279

## Abstract

This research investigated associations between the lyrics of every song to have reached the weekly United Kingdom top 5 singles chart from 1960-2015 and the number of people responsible for recording each song. Following computerised content analysis of the lyrics of the 4,534 unique songs, the results showed that the number of musicians involved was related negatively to use of cognitive terms, consistent with previous research on social loafing; and was also related negatively to instances of self-reference and use of language concerning social interaction, arguably in reflection of the inherent constraints on such that arise from collaborating with others.

*Key words:* lyrics, music, social loafing, self-reference, social interaction

## Collaboration, Cognitive Effort, and Self-Reference in United Kingdom Top 5 Pop Music

Lyrics 1960-2015

Music lyrics are culturally important. Numerous surveys indicate that music has been the favoured leisure time activity in many western countries for several decades (Lonsdale & North, 2011; Rentfrow & Gosling, 2003), and the lyrics can be a direct way of communicating ideas within a song. We sing them in our cars, they provide succour to millions in times of hardship, and they help to shape numerous personal world-views and cultural zeitgeists. Despite this we know very little about lyrics from a psychological perspective. In particular, although there is a good-sized literature indicating the prevalence of collaboration in the production of music (e.g., Simonton, 2000), very little psychological research has considered the implications of collaboration for the products of expert musicians. The present research, in contrast, considers the role of the number of musicians involved in the lyrics of each of the songs to reach the weekly top 5 best-selling singles chart in the United Kingdom between 1960 and 2015. The lyrics were computer-analysed in terms of 13 different variables to address whether the number of musicians involved was associated with reduced individual effort, incidence of self-reference, and incidence of reference to social interactions.

**Social Loafing and Effort**

Numerous musicological works have of course considered collaborations. For example, Everett (1999) considered Lennon and McCartney's music in terms of the interpersonal relationships between the band members over time; and Whissell (1996, 1999, 2003, Whissell & Whissell 2000) found that, compared to McCartney, Lennon "used fewer pleasant words, and more nasty, soft, and sad ones", among a number of other

differences. The psychological phenomenon of greatest potential relevance to this is social loafing (see Karau & Williams, 1993, 2001). This states that each individual concerned exerts less effort or performs less effectively when working collaboratively than in isolation. Karau and Williams (1995) summarise a number of the theoretical explanations for social loafing that have been proposed including social impact theory (in which the demands made of individuals by an outside source (e.g., a manager) are diffused across the individuals concerned); arousal reduction (in which the presence of co-workers reduces arousal and therefore reduces performance on simple tasks but increases performance on complex tasks); an evaluation-based approach (such that collaboration makes it more difficult to identify and evaluate the performance of a given individual); and dispensability of effort (such that the individual working in a group context perceives their unique input as inessential to success). Other research has considered the possibility of a number of mediating and moderating variables such as the attainability of, and value placed upon, the goal in question (e.g., Karau & Williams, 1993); feeling less well-qualified to undertake the work in question than are others in the group (e.g., Kerr & Bruun, 1983); the perception that colleagues may take the opportunity to contribute a lower degree of effort in a collaborative context (e.g., Jackson & Williams, 1985); or the perception that a submaximal level of effort is all that is required in order to meet the goal in question (e.g., Latané, Williams, & Harkins, 1979). Several studies have demonstrated these phenomena in various domains and countries in recent years (e.g., Anshel, 1995; Czyż, Szmajke, Kruger, & Kübler, 2016; De Backer, Boen, De Cuyper, Høigaard, & Vande Broek, 2014; Gabrenya Jr., Latane, & Wang, 1983; Karau & Williams, 1993; Liden, Wayne, Jaworski, & Bennett, 2004; Martin & North, 2015; Meyer, Schermuly, & Kauffeld, 2016; Pratarelli & McIntyre, 1994; Tan & Tan, 2008).

However, there have been only three attempts to account for collaboration between successful musicians from an overtly psychological perspective. Outside the context of social loafing, Simonton (2000) considered 911 operas by 59 composers, showing that aesthetic success was predicted better by the identity of the composer than by the identity of the librettist. Jackson and Padgett (1982) showed that from 1967 onwards, the songs produced by Lennon and McCartney working predominantly as individuals were of higher quality than were their true collaborations, consistent with the social loafing hypothesis. However, in another attempt to apply social loafing to collaborations between commercially-successful musicians, Pettijohn and Ahmed's (2010) analysis of number 1 singles on the Billboard charts from 1955-2009 showed that individual songwriters were no more likely to enjoy commercial success than were collaborative teams, although they also report that solo and paired collaborations accounted for 78% of number 1 singles.

In addition to the limited range of the existing evidence concerning music, these three studies are limited in two other important ways. First, with the exception of Simonton's (2000) research, they consider only a limited range of music, and there has been no attempt to consider a larger sample of commercially-successful pieces. This is particularly unfortunate, given the high level of collaboration evident in the typical production methods associated with pop music, the prevalence of the genre, and the large amount of commercial data (such as sales) that are available: research addressing these would provide an evidence base that better reflects the mundane listening of the general public. Second, the three existing studies consider musical collaboration in terms of commercial or artistic success: for example, Jackson and Padgett focussed upon artistic quality (defined as those songs selected for release as 45 rpm singles and on the basis of sales data), Simonton focussed on aesthetic success (defined through frequency of recording and performance in addition to other archival indicators), and Pettijohn and

Ahmed focussed on music that had enjoyed considerable commercial success; and this distinction may explain the differing findings. North and Hargreaves (1998), for instance, showed that liking for music and perceptions of artistic quality are not synonymous. In contrast, the key dependant variable in social loafing may instead be the amount of effort that each individual contributes to the final product. The present research operationalises this degree of effort in the production of a large sample of commercially-successful pop music lyrics via three indices, namely complexity (i.e., mean number of characters per word), variety (i.e., number of different words divided by the number of words), and cognitive terms (i.e., reference to cerebral processes such as modes of discovery, mental challenges, learning practices, intuition, rationalism, and calculation). Social loafing leads us to expect that each of these should be related negatively to the number of musicians who produced the recording in question.

In addition to these factors, however, more detailed consideration of the literature on social loafing suggests that the phenomenon may be much more difficult to identify in the context of specifically co-production of pop music lyrics than in those other productive contexts addressed by previous research. Karau and Williams's (1993) meta-analysis, most notably, argues that an individual's propensity to engage in social loafing will be reduced in a number of circumstances that typically arise in the co-production of pop music. Specifically, they argue that propensity to engage in social loafing is reduced when the individual believes that the performance of the group will be evaluated by other people (which clearly occurs in the case of pop music); when individuals collaborate in smaller rather than larger groups (and note that the numbers of musicians involved in producing a pop song is typically smaller than the group sizes employed in research on social loafing); when the individuals concerned are provided with a standard against which to judge their performance (which is provided by the prevalence of music that is commercially- and



artistically-successful); when the task in question is intrinsically meaningful or interesting to the individuals concerned (such as, arguably at least, co-production of commercial music); and when the individuals concerned are collaborating with a highly-valued group (such as other successful musicians).

### **References to Self and Relationships Among Several People**

The present dataset provides an opportunity to address another aspect of pop music lyrics. Several more general content analyses of pop music have highlighted the focus of this genre over time on interpersonal relationships, and in particular first-person accounts of these. The phenomenon appears to have persisted over the history of pop music. As early as 1971, Cole's review of the lyrics of the top 10 songs for each year of the 1960s concluded that, "love-sex was the predominant theme" (p.389). Christenson and Roberts (1998) reported similarly that interpersonal romantic relationships were described in at least 50% (and typically a much higher proportion) of songs from the periods 1941-2, the mid 1960s, early 1980s, and late 1980s; and Dukes, Bisel, Borega, Lobato, and Owens (2003) found that 81% of their sample of songs from 1958-1998 concerned love.

Nonetheless, it is reasonable to suspect that this focus on the self and interpersonal relationships may be an inverse function of the number of musicians associated with a given recording. There may be fewer references to the self in lyrics associated with a larger number of musicians because the number of contributors makes it inherently difficult to focus on the concerns of one given individual. Following a similar line of reasoning, the number of collaborating musicians might be related negatively to the extent to which the lyrics address social processes and interpersonal relationships because the larger number of individuals involved means that they would inherently find it more difficult to reach a consensual viewpoint concerning others. The present research operationalises these

issues by considering the frequency of reference to the first person (hereafter 'self reference'), and several different types of words that reflect the degree of concern in the lyrics with interpersonal relationships.

In the light of these arguments, the present research computer-analysed the variables outlined above in the case of the lyrics of each of the songs to have reached the top 5 of the United Kingdom weekly singles sales chart between March 1960 and December 2015. The number of people who performed on each song was derived for each given recording, and three hypotheses were tested concerning the relationships between these two sets of variables.

Hypothesis 1: The lyrics will provide evidence of social loafing, such that the degree of complexity, variety, and use of cognitive terms in the lyrics will be negatively related to the number of musicians involved in recording the song in question.

Hypothesis 2: The number of musicians involved in recording each song will be associated negatively with the amount of self-reference contained within the lyrics.

Hypothesis 3: The number of musicians involved in recording each song should also be associated negatively with aspects of the lyrics concerning relationships between several individuals.

## **Method**

**Lyrics.** The research employed all those lyrics from the period March 1960 to December 2015 that appeared on the United Kingdom top 5 weekly singles charts. Allowing for instrumentals, a total of 4534 unique sets of lyrics were employed. The chart information was derived from Gambaccini, Rice, and Rice (1996) (March 1960 to December 1995) and [www.officialcharts.com](http://www.officialcharts.com) (January 1996 onwards), as these provide

the same data as that employed by the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) in its weekly chart radio programme and in the organisation's determination of music programming playlists. BBC radio dominated audience share throughout the period in question, so that the songs had considerable exposure to the general public. From 1960-2015, 4,534 unique songs appeared on the charts. Lyrics for each were obtained predominantly via the internet (most notably [www.azlyrics.com](http://www.azlyrics.com)) and a second version was also obtained to corroborate their accuracy. In the rare event that these two versions failed to correspond, a third version was sourced as the tie-breaker. In some cases, there were multiple versions of a given song (e.g., '12" version', 'album version', and so on), and so the version employed was that intended for radio airplay (usually designated as the 'radio edit', '7" version' or similar). The lyrics were then cleaned via two processes, so that the analyses employed a verbatim copy of each that featured consistent use of language. First, redundancies were reintroduced so that, for instance, 'Chorus' was replaced with the text of the chorus, the text was repeated in instances of 'x2', and similar. Second, contractions (e.g., 'It's') were replaced with full text (e.g., 'It is') and deliberately misspelled contractions (e.g., 'Lovin"', 'Goin"', 'Wanna') and other misspellings (e.g., "Becuz") were corrected (to e.g., 'Loving', 'Going', 'Want to', 'Because').

**Coding of lyrics.** The lyrics were computer-analysed using Diction 7.0 (Hart, Carroll, & Spiars, 2013). Diction has already been used in a large number of published studies in order to analyse text (Bligh, Merolla, Schroedel, & Gonzalez, 2010; Hart, 2014; see also <http://www.dictionsoftware.com/published-studies/>), including one previous application to song lyrics (from the Great Depression - Cook & Krupar, 2010). Computerised analysis allows for the large quantity of text to be coded reliably (Amernic, Craig, & Tourish, 2010; Bligh et al., 2010; Ober, Zhao, Davis, & Alexander, 1999; Sydserff & Weetman, 2002), and in doing so Diction employs the statistically most-common words

in discourse (Abelman, 2014), based on 20,000 reference texts (Sydserff & Weetman, 2002). In deriving the scores for a given set of lyrics, Diction compared each to a total set of 10,000 words, which are classified into 35 discrete 'dictionaries' or variables. Table 1 details the subset of these of relevance to testing the present hypotheses. Each dictionary contains 10-745 words which do not overlap (Ober et al., 1999). The software calculates the frequency with which words from each of the dictionaries appears in each set of lyrics, resulting in a score for each set of lyrics on each variable. The variables that are based on word-counting are supplemented by a small number of others that analyse the properties of the words themselves (such as the mean number of letters per word and the number of different words). To control for variations in the length of various lyrics, scores on each variable were divided by the total number of words. The resulting values were subsequently divided by the number of people who recorded each song to represent input per individual. Inter-correlations between the Diction variables are reported in Appendix A. Note that although several of the Diction variables were correlated with one another, the analyses retained these individual variables given the strong likelihood that they nonetheless represent cognitively-different concepts and are calculated on a different basis to one another.

- Table 1 about here -

**Derivation of band size.** A number of sources (e.g., music industry websites and music biography encyclopaedias) were consulted in order to determine the number of named musicians associated with recording each song (hereafter 'band size'). This was corroborated against a second source, and in the case of irreconcilable ambiguity ( $N = 140$ ) the data was treated as a missing value and excluded from analyses. Recording

studio staff, instrument technicians, and others not associated with the actual performance of the song were excluded from the band size calculation. Similarly, session musicians were excluded from the calculation since (a) data on these proved highly unreliable and/or was difficult to obtain; and (b) the social presentation of the song was of it emanating from the named band (or solo artist, duet, or similar) so that employing only these in the calculation of band size is most appropriate in the context of the present hypotheses. For similar reasons, named solo artists were assigned a value of 1, named duets were assigned a value of 2, and so on. In the case of bands that have featured changes in membership over time, we calculated band size on the basis of the number of band members during the specific year in which the song in question appeared on the sales chart.

## Results

To test Hypothesis 1, a Generalized Linear Mixed Model (GLMM) analysis, implemented through SPSS's (Version 22) GENLIMIXED procedure, was performed in which the three Diction variables (complexity, variety, and cognitive terms) were entered as predictor variables and band size was entered as the dependent variable. The overall model was statistically significant ( $F(3, 4318) = 4.168, p = .006, \eta_p^2 = .003$ , see Table 2). Results showed that although complexity and variety were not associated with band size, there was a negative relationship between the use of cognitive terms and band size: the more members of the band there were so the fewer cognitive terms per band member were employed in the lyrics. The means in question for the number of cognitive terms per band size are displayed in Appendix B.

A separate GLMM analysis considered the relationship between band size and the total number of words in each set of lyrics. This analysis was statistically significant, ( $F(1,$

4392) = 12.740,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .003$ ;  $\beta = -0.001$ ,  $t = -3.569$ ,  $[-0.001, 0.000]$ ; see Appendix B for means by band size). The negative relationship between band size and the total number of words in the lyrics lends further support for the notion of social loafing: smaller bands produce lyrics with more words in them.

- Table 2 here -

To address Hypotheses 2 and 3, ten Diction variables (namely, self-reference, levelling, collectives, blame, communication, human interest, rapport, cooperation, diversity, and exclusion) were entered as predictor variables into a separate, second GLMM analysis. This model was also statistically significant,  $F(10, 4311) = 49.571$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .103$ ; see Table 3. The results showed that incidences of self-reference were related negatively to band size. Moreover, several other variables concerning interpersonal relationships were also related negatively to band size, namely levelling, collectives, blame, communication, rapport, cooperation, diversity, and exclusion.

- Table 3 here -

## Discussion

The results supported Hypothesis 1. Although the length of words employed (i.e., complexity) and number of different words employed (i.e., variety) were not related to band size, the latter was inversely-related to use of cognitive terms, implying a less cerebral approach among larger groups of individuals, and consistent with the notion of social loafing. In short, although band size was not related to the linguistic complexity of the words used, it was associated negatively with the degree of focus on intellectual concepts.

Although it would be purely speculative to expand on this much further, it is interesting that the findings should discriminate between the formation of the words employed (i.e., their complexity and variety) and the subject matter of those words (i.e., cognitive terms), and future research might consider why social loafing should be evident in the case of only the latter (perhaps as a consequence of processes concerning impression formation on the part of the musicians themselves).

The results also supported Hypothesis 2, since band size was related negatively to incidences of self-reference: the greater the number of people who contributed to the recording so the fewer instances there were of references to the first person. Similarly, the results support Hypothesis 3, as band size was related negatively to a number of other aspects of the lyrics concerning interpersonal relationships: the greater the number of band members, so the fewer instances there were of words that concerned plurality and wider social groups ('collectives'); appropriation of blame ('blame'); social interaction ('communication'); instances of attitudinal similarity ('rapport'); behavioural interactions leading to a group product ('cooperation'); interest in individuals or groups differing from social norms ('diversity'); the sources and effects of social isolation ('exclusion'); and which ignored individual differences ('levelling'). Indeed, it is notable that all those variables listed in Table 3, with the sole exception of human interest, gave rise to statistically significant results in the direction expected: as such, this arguably speaks to the pervasiveness of band size effects across the various ways in which coverage of interpersonal relationships might manifest itself in lyrics.

The results concerning both Hypotheses 2 and 3 can be explained in terms of band size itself inherently restricting the musicians' opportunity to address these issues: in the case of self-reference, larger band sizes mitigate inherently against opportunities to refer to oneself in the first person; and in the case of reference to social interactions, band size

mitigates inherently against the opportunity to form a consensual view concerning others that can be portrayed in the lyrics. For the sake of clarity, we should highlight that, of course, the findings concerning hypotheses 2 and 3 do not reflect social loafing per se, but rather represent a related way in which group processes and band size are related to the content of lyrics. Moreover, one interesting further possibility concerning hypotheses 2 and 3 might well benefit from further data and theorizing. Specifically, when addressing interpersonal relationships, collaborating groups of musicians might engage in some form of de-individuation process, in which they behave as a single entity and attempt to represent this single 'band viewpoint' when addressing interpersonal relationships (rather than attempting to aggregate and reconcile the differing views of the individual band members); or alternately they may (work harder than they would as individuals and) instead attempt to produce a consensual view that captures the opinions of all band members, albeit in diluted form. In short, it would be very interesting to see the results of careful unobtrusive observation that addressed the detail of the *process* undertaken by groups of musicians attempting to address interpersonal relationships.

We should also acknowledge explicitly two limitations to the current findings. First, the small beta values indicate only weak relationships between the variables. This seems tolerable in the context of the present research, however. A very large number of variables would be reasonably expected to influence the subject matter and specific content of a given set of lyrics, and so it seems more appropriate to give precedence to statistical significance in the context of the present methodology. Nonetheless, although band size alone can contribute to understanding of the content of lyrics, there is no suggestion that it is sufficient to explain a substantial proportion of the variance between lyrics (and nor should it necessarily). It would be particularly interesting if future research could identify relevant possible covariates of band size and explicitly include these in the research



design: for instance, a number of studies have highlighted the role of complexity in the appeal of particular pieces of music, and considering a sample of songs with greater range lyrical complexity than that represented by the present sample may yield interesting findings.

Second, while the Method section details the care that was taken to ensure that the number of musicians who performed a given recording was measured accurately and reliably, it is nonetheless often difficult to determine the specific nature and extent of the contributions of all those involved. Popular accounts of musicians' creative processes contain several examples of songs that are formally credited to several but which are predominantly the product of only one person, although there are unfortunately few instances in which expert musicians have quantified or otherwise detailed the nature of their individual contribution to a given collaborative recording. Similarly, there are also strong anecdotal grounds to suspect an occasional but significant contribution to the final recorded product by studio staff such as producers and session musicians, record company marketing departments, and familiars and associates of the musicians. Until a substantial body of quantitative data concerning this becomes available on a sufficient scale, we assume that any inaccuracies in the present data set would not demonstrate any systematic bias over the course of a large sample such as that employed here: this assumption remains to be tested, however.

Nonetheless, given the successful identification of social loafing in the present data set, three specific hypotheses for further research arise from consideration of the conclusions reached by previous research on social loafing. First, Karau and Williams's (1993) meta-analysis found that social loafing is less pronounced among women. As such it is possible that the proportion of females involved in production of a given song is related negatively to the incidence of social loafing. Such a hypothesis would be better-suited to

experimental research, rather than the more naturalistic data reported here, since within the present data set it is impossible to determine the actual input of each individual collaborator. Second, Karau and Williams (see also Earley, 1989) found that social loafing is less prevalent among individuals from collectivist cultures, since these place more value on outputs at the level of the group rather than the individual. Again, the present dataset does not permit a test of this hypothesis, but the possibility clearly indicates that there may be value in an attempt to replicate the present findings via corresponding data from a collectivist culture. Third, as noted earlier, Karau and Williams indicate that individuals might be more predisposed to social loafing when those with whom they are collaborating are expected to perform at a high level: this might imply that social loafing is more prevalent among very highly-successful groups of musicians, and less common among less prestigious groups of musicians. Such research might not be able to employ naturalistic data of the type employed here, given the difficulty of establishing comparisons between groups that differ solely in terms of their previous success, and might instead be accomplished more easily using laboratory tasks involving false feedback concerning the success of their compositions to groups of musicians.

More generally, we would encourage future researchers to develop methodologies that permit testing between the various theoretical accounts for social loafing that have been proposed in the literature to date. In the context of music composition, the current amount of theorising far outstrips the availability of hypothesis-driven data. For example, it may be possible to test for differences between lyrics in terms of a number of factors identified in the more general literature on social loafing. This work might consider factors such as the attainability of, and value placed upon, the goal in question (e.g., by comparing the outputs of composers who are already successful against those who have attained limited or no commercial success); feeling less well-qualified to undertake the

work in question than are others in the group (e.g., by comparing products by bands in which there is one member who has a clear talent for producing lyrics against those bands in which there is no recognised main lyricist); the perception that colleagues may take the opportunity to contribute a lower degree of effort in a collaborative context (e.g., in the case of bands in which there are a sub-set of individuals who typically lead songwriting duties); or the perception that a submaximal level of effort is all that is required in order to meet the goal in question (e.g., in the case of bands that have already enjoyed a long-lasting period of commercial success versus bands who are only embarking on their career). Such work will require a number of methodological challenges to be overcome, most notably the identification of reliable data. Indeed, controlling for the effect of factors such as these was impossible within the scope of the current project, and this may well have suppressed the effect sizes reported here. Nonetheless, if research can achieve this then it will make a valuable theoretical contribution to understanding of the composition of music lyrics.

## References

- Abelman, R. (2014). Reviewing and revising the institutional vision of U.S. higher education. *Review of Communication Research, 2*(1), 30-67.
- Amernic, J., Craig, R., & Tourish, D. (2010). *Measuring and assessing tone at the top using annual report CEO letters*. Edinburgh, UK: The Institute of Chartered Accountants of Scotland.
- Anshel, M. H. (1995). Examining social loafing among elite female rowers as a function of task duration and mood. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 18*(1), 39-49.
- Bligh, M., Merolla, J., Schroedel, J., & Gonzalez, R. (2010). Finding her Voice: Hillary Clinton's Rhetoric in the 2008 Presidential Campaign. *Women's Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 39*, 823-850.
- Christenson, P. G., & Roberts, D. F. (1998). *It's not only rock and roll: popular music in the lives of adolescents*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.
- Cole, R. R. (1971). Top songs in the sixties: A content analysis of popular lyrics. *American Behavioral Scientist, 14*, 389-400.
- Cook, S. L., & Krupar, K. (2010). Defining the twentieth century and impacting the twenty-first: semantic habits created through radio and song. *ETC.: A Review of General Semantics, 67*(4), n.p.
- Czyż, S. H., Szmajke, A., Kruger, A., & Kübler, M. (2016). Participation in team sports can eliminate the effect of social loafing. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 123*(3), 754-768. doi:10.1177/0031512516664938
- De Backer, M., Boen, F., De Cuyper, B., Høigaard, R., & Vande Broek, G. (2014). A team fares well with a fair coach: Predictors of social loafing in interactive female sport teams. *Scand J Med Sci Sports, vol(is)*, pp. doi:10.1111/sms.12303

- Dukes, R. L., Bisel, T. M., Borega, K. N., Lobato, E. A., & Owens, M. D. (2003). Expressions of love, sex, and hurt in popular songs: a content analysis of all-time greatest hits. *The Social Science Journal, 40*, 643-650.
- Earley, P. C. (1989). Social loafing and collectivism: A comparison of the United States and the People's Republic of China. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 34*, 565–581.
- Everett, W. (1999). *The Beatles as musicians: Revolver through the Anthology*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Gabrenya Jr., W. K., Latane, B., & Wang, Y.-E. (1983). Social loafing in cross-cultural perspective: Chinese on Taiwan. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology, 14*(3), 238-384. doi: 10.1177/0022002183014003009
- Gambaccini, P., Rice, J., & Rice, T. (1996). *Guinness book of British hit singles (9th ed.)*. Enfield: Guinness.
- Hart, R. P. (2014). *Communication and language analysis in the public sphere*. Hershey, PA: IGI-Global Publishers.
- Hart, R. P., Carroll, C. E., & Spiars, S. (2013). *Diction 7.0: the text analysis program*. Austin: Digitext.
- Jackson, J. M., & Padgett, V. R. (1982). With a little help from my friend: Social loafing and the Lennon-McCartney songs. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8*(4), 672-677. doi:10.1177/0146167282084011
- Jackson, J. M., & Williams, K. D. (1985). Social loafing on difficult tasks. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*(4), 937-942.
- Karau, S. J., & Williams, K. D. (1993). Social loafing: A meta-analytic review and theoretical integration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*(4), 681-706.

- Karau, S. J., & Williams, K. D. (1995). Social loafing: Research findings, implications, and future directions. *SOURCE*, 4(5), 134-140.
- Karau, S. J., & Williams, K. D. (2001). Understanding individual motivation in groups: The collective effort model. In M. E. Turner (Ed.), *Groups at work: Theory and research* (pp. 113-141). London, UK: Routledge.
- Kerr, N. L., & Bruun, S. E. (1983). Dispensability of member effort and group motivation losses: Free-rider effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(1), 78-94.
- Latané, B., Williams, K. D., & Harkins, S. (1979). Many hands make light the work: The causes and consequences of social loafing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(6), 822-832.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Jaworski, R. A., & Bennett, N. (2004). Social loafing: A field investigation. *Journal of Management*, 30(2), 285–304.  
doi:10.1016/j.jm.2003.02.002
- Lonsdale, A. J., & North, A. C. (2011). Why do we listen to music? A uses and gratifications analysis. *British Journal of Psychology*, 102(1), 108-134.  
doi:10.1348/000712610X506831
- Martin, K. K., & North, A. C. (2015). Diffusion of responsibility on social networking sites. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 44, 124-131. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2014.11.049
- Meyer, B., Schermuly, C. C., & Kauffeld, S. (2016). That's not my place: The interacting effects of faultlines, subgroup size, and social competence on social loafing behaviour in work groups. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 25(1), 31-49. doi:10.1080/1359432X.2014.996554
- North, A. C., & Hargreaves, D. J. (1998). Affective and evaluative responses to pop music. *Current Psychology*, 17, 102-108.

- Ober, S., Zhao, J. J., Davis, R., & Alexander, M. W. (1999). Telling it like it is: The use of certainty in public business discourse. *Journal of Business Communication, 36*(3), 280-296.
- Pettijohn II, T. F., & Ahmed, S. F. (2010). Songwriting loafing or creative collaboration?: A comparison of individual and team written Billboard hits in the USA. *Journal of Articles in Support of the Null Hypothesis, 7*(1), 1-5.
- Pratarelli, M. E., & McIntyre, J. A. (1994). Effects of social loafing on word recognition. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 78*(2), 455-464.
- Rentfrow, P. J., & Gosling, S. D. (2003). The do re mi's of everyday life: The structure and personality correlates of music preferences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(6), 1236-1256. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.84.6.1236
- Simonton, D. K. (2000). The music or the words? Or, how important is the libretto for an opera's aesthetic success? *Empirical Studies of The Arts, 18*, 105-118.
- Sydserrf, R., & Weetman, P. (2002). Developments in content analysis: a transitivity index and DICTION scores. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 15*(4), 523-545. doi:10.1108/09513570210440586
- Tan, H. H., & Tan, M. L. (2008). Organizational citizenship behavior and social loafing: The role of personality, motives, and contextual factors. *The Journal of Psychology, 142*(1), 89-108.
- Whissell, C. (1996). Traditional and Emotional Stylometric Analysis of the Songs of Beatles Paul McCartney and John Lennon. *Computers and the Humanities, 30*(3), 257-265.
- Whissell, C. (1999). Phonosymbolism and the emotional nature of sounds: evidence of the preferential use of particular phonemes in texts of differing emotional tone. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 89*(1), 19-48. doi:10.2466/pms.1999.89.1.19

Whissell, C. (2003). The emotional symbolism of two English e-sounds: /i/ as in “cheap” and /ɪ/ as in “chip” active. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 96(1), 149-165.

doi:10.2466/pms.2003.96.1.149

Whissell, R., & Whissell, C. (2000). The emotional importance of key: do Beatles songs written in different keys convey different emotional tones? *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 91(3), 973-980. doi:10.2466/pms.2000.91.3.973



## Appendix A.

*Correlations Amongst the Diction Variables*

	Complexity	Variety	Cognitive terms	Self-reference	Levelling	Collectives	Blame	Communication	Human interest	Rapport	Cooperation	Diversity	Exclusion
Band size	-.06***	-.05**	-.23***	-.40***	-.17***	-.03*	-.19***	-.25***	-.29***	-.14***	-.11***	-.09***	-.15***
Complexity		.99***	.03*	.04**	.03*	.06***	.01	.02	.07***	.01	.01	.01	.01
Variety			.04**	.04**	.02	.01	.00	.01	.06***	.01	.01	.01	.01
Cognitive terms				.41***	.11***	.00	.09***	.14***	.34***	.09***	.06***	.04*	.12***
Self-reference					.19***	.00	.17***	.37***	.33***	.13***	.11***	.07***	.16***
Levelling						.01	.06***	.11***	.20***	.05***	.07***	.07***	.12***
Collectives							.00	-.01	.01	.01	.01	.00	.01
Blame								.10***	.10***	.05**	.03*	.07***	.03*
Communication									.19***	.10***	.07***	.08***	.09***
Human interest										.13***	.07***	.07***	.11***
Rapport											.07***	.08***	.06***
Cooperation												.03	.03
Diversity													.05***

Note. *N* ranged between 4322 and 4408.

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

## Appendix B

*Mean Cognitive Terms and Number of Words by Band Size.*

Number of band members	Cognitive terms			Total number of words		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
1	30.733	60.317	1829	319.826	178.614	1863
2	12.057	19.773	554	376.824	200.602	562
3	9.637	14.445	382	323.861	173.727	387
4	7.826	10.320	680	292.284	148.533	697
5	6.137	8.068	587	297.277	145.336	592
6	4.767	7.718	137	316.326	194.000	138
7	4.971	9.524	75	312.573	165.988	75
8	1.769	2.341	34	291.714	125.201	35
9	2.101	2.045	19	282.790	94.281	19
10	0.439	0.760	3	387.000	407.803	3
11	1.941	2.112	13	435.308	363.860	13
12	2.606	2.095	3	287.333	123.127	3
13	4.644		1	273.000		1
14	2.231	2.044	3	288.667	108.611	3
17	3.405		1	161.000		1
27	0.857		1	208.000		1

Table 1.

*Summary of the 'Diction' dictionaries (taken from Hart, 1997)*

Dictionary	Definition
Self-reference	Contains all first-person references.
Levelling	Words used to ignore individual differences and to build a sense of completeness and assurance.
Collectives	Singular nouns connoting plurality that function to decrease specificity e.g. social groupings, task groups (e.g. army), and geographical entities.
Blame	Terms designating social inappropriateness (e.g. naïve), evil, unfortunate circumstances, unplanned vicissitudes, and outright denigrations.
Communication	Terms referring to social interaction.
Cognitive terms	Contains words referring to cerebral processes, both functional and imaginative.
Human interest	Includes standard personal pronouns, family members and relations, and generic terms (e.g. friend).
Rapport	Words denoting attitudinal similarities among people.
Cooperation	Words describing behavioural interactions among people that often result in a group product.
Diversity	Words describing individuals or groups of individuals differing from the norm.
Exclusion	Describes the sources and effects of social isolation.
Variety	The number of different words divided by total words.
Complexity	Mean number of characters per word.

Table 2.

*GLMM Analysis Concerning the Social Loafing Hypothesis (N = 4322).*

Variable	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	95% CI		$\eta^2$
Complexity	3.031	.082	-0.017	-1.741	-0.036	0.002	0.001
Variety	2.630	.105	0.111	1.622	-0.023	0.245	0.001
Cognitive terms	6.259	.012	-0.011	-2.502	-0.020	-0.002	0.001

*Note.* Degrees of freedom = 1, 4318; CI = confidence interval.

Table 3.

*GLMM Analysis Results Concerning Hypothesis 2 and 3 (N = 4322).*

Variable	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	95% CI		$\eta^2$
Self-reference	46.048	< .001	-0.004	-6.786	-0.005	-0.003	0.011
Levelling	3.920	.048	-0.002	-1.980	-0.003	0.000	0.001
Collectives	10.451	.001	-0.001	-3.233	-0.001	0.000	0.002
Blame	55.107	< .001	-0.015	-7.423	-0.019	-0.011	0.013
Communication	7.967	.005	-0.005	-2.823	-0.009	-0.002	0.002
Human interest	3.380	.066	-0.001	-1.838	-0.003	0.000	0.001
Rapport	16.714	< .001	-0.010	-4.088	-0.014	-0.005	0.004
Cooperation	5.482	.019	-0.011	-2.341	-0.021	-0.002	0.001
Diversity	7.874	.005	-0.014	-2.806	-0.023	-0.004	0.002
Exclusion	10.278	.001	-0.008	-3.206	-0.013	-0.003	0.002

*Note.* Degrees of freedom = 1, 4311; CI = confidence interval.