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ABSTRACT

Melissa Spirek, Ph.D., Advisor

Investigations of popular music forms that have been negatively portrayed in popular media, such as heavy metal and rap, have been largely limited to analyses of lyrics (e.g., Hansen & Hansen, 1991; St. Lawrence & Joyner, 1991; Ballard & Coates, 1995; Anderson, Carnagey, & Eubanks, 2003), even though evidence of the sound being more important than the words was demonstrated as far back as 1969 (Robinson & Hirsch).

The present investigation was conducted in response to this void in the literature. To test the music, a two-part multimethodological study was employed, consisting of an experiment and surveys, to analyze how music genres are cognitively processed by listeners. The first study tested differences in people’s perceptions of different music genre labels and their impact on song lyrics. The second study tested differences in musical genres using pop original and heavy metal cover songs as stimuli. Data collection was gathered via questionnaires consisting of both open- and closed-ended items.

When rigorously assessing people’s behaviors, perceptions, and self-reports identifying media consumption preferences, the investigation’s findings refute a direct effects approach to music listening and underscore the complexity of individual difference factors. Most notably, a distinction between the concepts of music and lyric was found, providing evidence that previous research in this area has not accounted for the complex nature of music consumption. Detailed results of hypotheses testing are provided and discussed in relation to previous research. Additionally, arguments are advanced for using more complex theoretical perspectives and data collection methods. Finally, the results of both studies provide directions for future research to explore.
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INTRODUCTION

Popular music has been a target of media critics and scholars ever since its first foray into mainstream media (radio and television), negative attention becoming more prevalent with the popularization of rock ‘n’ roll. One trend that has become increasingly popular in all music genres is the covering of songs originally recorded by another artist. In fact, many early (1950s) rock ‘n’ roll hit songs were cover songs originally written and/or performed by black artists that were subsequently re-recorded by popular white artists and made available to mainstream audiences (e.g., “Hound Dog” by Elvis Presley) (Coyle, 2002; Plasketes, 2005). Not only has the tradition of cover songs persisted over time; the development of new music genres and the re-recording of songs into such genres have also continued.

Cover songs are recordings by musicians not responsible for the original recordings (Shuker, 2002). Genres are categories, types, or styles of musical performance, often used to organize music by retailers, critics, and fans (Shuker, 2002). Examples of music genres include rap, country, blues, rhythm and blues (R & B), pop, and heavy metal, to name a few. Additionally, within certain genres, several subgenre categories exist in an effort to further define specific musical qualities and differentiate between styles of performance within the genre.

For instance, the genre of heavy metal includes subgenres such as power metal, goth metal, doom metal, black metal, death metal, thrash metal, speed metal, nü metal, rap metal, progressive metal, glam metal, hair metal, and industrial metal, with more constantly developing. Each subgenre category offers a further distinction as to the properties of the music within the larger genre. This dynamic evolution is detailed on the metal website Encyclopaedia Metallum: The Metal Archives (http://www.metal-archives.com). Additionally, anthropologist Sam Dunn
developed a “family tree” visually depicting heavy metal’s history, in genre/subgenre form, in the recently released DVD version of his documentary film *Metal: A Headbanger’s Journey* (2006).

Moreover, genres and subgenres do not have strict inclusionary/exclusionary lines (sonic boundaries), but often overlap in musical characteristics. For explicit discussions and examples of the heavy metal genre and subgenres, the journalistic texts (e.g., Christe, 2003; Konow, 2002; Mudrian, 2004) presented later in the literature review are helpful.

Most music historians and heavy metal fans trace the beginnings of heavy metal to the late 1960s in the music of Black Sabbath and Led Zeppelin (e.g., Konow, 2002; Christe, 2003; Berelian, 2005). These two bands, especially Black Sabbath, often referred to by heavy metal journalists and fans (i.e., the cultural leaders and participants/consumers) as the “Godfathers of heavy metal,” developed a new sound and music structure that emphasized elements of volume, speed, guitar distortion, a driving rhythm section, and vocals (typically male) often shouted, shrieked, or screamed rather than sung in a traditional manner. Such music is typically faster, louder, and more distorted than music of other genres such as pop, R & B, and country. Also, this genre of music appeals mostly to a specific demographic, that being 13-34 year-old white lower-middle class males, although recent ethnographic accounts (e.g., Purcell, 2003; Halnon, 2004) portray greater diversity (of age, gender, socioeconomic status) in the heavy metal audience.

For the purposes of this study, a general, working definition of “heavy metal” is being used that includes the aforementioned sonic and production qualities, whether they are present throughout all the music of a particular artist or not. Many fans and artists within the heavy metal culture would not necessarily accept the broad definition being used for this study, as several
artists are now commonly considered hard rock, classic rock or hardcore. For instance, heavy metal bands, for this study, can include a wide range of performers that many would not classify as “true” metal such as Nickelback, Linkin Park, Tantric, and Audioslave. Additionally, coverage in metal-focused magazines such as *Metal Edge*, *Revolver*, and *Brave Words & Bloody Knuckles* warrants inclusion within the genre as defined here. This conceptualization of the genre also contains artists that used to be, but are no longer, classified as heavy metal, such as the pop/hair.glam/lite metal artists discussed by Weinstein (2000).

Therefore, the heavy metal genre, hereafter discussed, will include artists whose music fits within this broad definition. Along with heavy metal music came a new style of image and lyrics, characterized by features such as black leather clothing, long hair, occult references, and darker topics than previously dealt with in popular music (e.g., suicide, insanity and torture). Such images and lyrics serve to guide a general heavy metal philosophy of non-conformity to the greater society, often identified (by outsiders) as adolescent rebellion since a large portion of the fan base is composed of teenagers and young adults.

This new (relative to music’s overall history) and continually emerging genre of music brought with it a new culture/subculture(s) and consequently, increased general public and media attention, often negative in nature (Hansen & Hansen, 1991; Binder, 1993; Ballard & Coates, 1995). Indeed, Bryson (1996) statistically identifies heavy metal as the most disliked genre of music using a sample from the 1993 General Social Survey. As the genre developed in subsequent decades, reaching its height of popularity (with many artists regularly achieving multi-platinum status, certified by the Recording Industry Association of America for shipments in excess of one million records) in the mid- to late 1980s, subgenres were spawned with the addition of new musical elements.
Still, the previously mentioned tradition of the cover song continued its presence in this genre. Prominent evidence of this came with Quiet Riot’s number one album *Metal Health* (the first heavy metal album to reach such status), which was propelled to such heights by the cover song “Cum on Feel the Noize,” originally performed by Slade.

Because of this surge in popularity (besides Led Zeppelin, most heavy metal artists until the early to mid-1980s failed to achieve mainstream success and such high record sales) and mainstream media exposure through radio and especially MTV (introduced in 1981), extra focus on the music, its artists, and the overall culture became common topics of popular media coverage. Consequently, lawsuits were brought against heavy metal artists such as Ozzy Osbourne in 1986 (appealed in 1988) and 1991 and Judas Priest in 1990. Heavy metal quickly became known to mainstream America as the bastard child of the music industry, despised by parents, religious groups, and politicians across the nation largely because of its public rejection and prosecution by authority figures. Still today, heavy metal music and artists are blamed for negative behaviors (cited as common to the culture) such as violence, adolescent rebellion, drug use, and delinquency, despite the failure to document an overwhelming statistically significant causal relationship between the consumption of heavy metal music and aggressive feelings and/or violent behaviors (e.g., United States Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation (USSCCST), 1985; Arnett, 1991, 1993, 1996; Epstein, Pratto, & Skipper, 1990; Males, 1996).

There are two main issues that comprise this introductory discussion. First is the issue of the heavy metal music genre and its “harmful” characteristics and influences. Second is the prevalence of cover songs within this genre, specifically those that were originally performed by artists in more mainstream genres such as pop and rock. The first issue will be given precedence
in the following sections, with a more general discussion of cover songs to follow in later sections. A more immediate consideration of present day examples of negative media attention garnered by heavy metal is of primary concern to set the stage for later discussions of theories and research and show that this music is continually being correlated to violent acts.

The present study sought to test the musical differences between the pop/rock and heavy metal genres using cover songs. Specifically, ten pop/rock songs and their respective heavy metal covers were used as experimental stimuli to test the differences in the musical performances while lyrics remained constant. Additionally, differences in perceptions of these genre labels were tested using sets of lyrics from four of the musical stimuli. These experiments were developed in response to the lack of research conducted on the actual music instead of lyrics. Heavy metal cover songs were chosen because of the extremity in musical qualities versus more mainstream forms of music such as pop. Consequently, with lyrics constant in both versions of songs, changes in mood state could be attributed to musical performance rather than lyrical differences. Heavy metal was also chosen for this study because of its history of negative coverage in popular media.

Heavy metal has been a regular topic of negative media coverage (Hansen & Hansen, 1991; Binder, 1993; Ballard & Coates, 1995). Indeed, when violent incidents, especially those involving “impressionable” adolescents, occur in the United States, the musical preference of said offenders is oftentimes investigated in relation to the violent behaviors. For example, Wright (2000) notes that heavy metal is often the target of popular media, attracting general accusations that it fosters social pathologies among its listeners. Such claims often depend on tactics of anecdote and insinuation, using extreme examples as the norm, which become influential through negative media coverage (Walser, 1993).
Two recent examples exemplify this negative coverage. The 1999 shooting at Columbine High School quickly became the impetus for attacking the heavy metal genre when it was revealed that the shooters were fans of groups such as KMFDM and Marilyn Manson (both industrial metal bands), even though it was later revealed that they did not like Manson’s music. Manson (group Marilyn Manson’s namesake and lead singer) took the opportunity to advance his view of society’s interactions with heavy metal music in Michael Moore’s film Bowling for Columbine (2002) and in a Rolling Stone response piece (Manson, 1999).

In Bowling for Columbine, Moore documents examples of public debates blaming Manson for the school shooting and then interviews Manson for his perspective. In reply, Manson notes that when he was growing up, music was an escape, a place to go where no judgments would be made on its listener. However, the lead singer also acknowledges that his public persona and extreme images make for a convenient target: “It’s easy to throw my face on a TV because I’m, in the end, a poster boy for fear, because I represent what everyone’s afraid of; because I do and say what I want” (Moore, 2002). In this statement, Manson clearly espouses a central tenet (non-conformity) of the heavy metal philosophy.

More recently, in December of 2004, a fan attacked and killed several individuals at a heavy metal concert in Columbus, Ohio, at a club with which this author is very familiar. Brandishing a handgun, Nathan Gale charged the stage during a Damageplan performance, killing the band’s guitarist, “Dimebag” Darrell Abbott and three others in attendance. Ultimately, Gale was killed by a local police officer who arrived on the scene after a call was placed to police (Brunker & Associated Press, 2004). The crime and circumstances again left the heavy metal culture an easy target for media depictions of violence and negativity as commonplace within the culture.
In direct response to this recent incident and the subsequent negative media attention the culture received as a result, Sarkis (2005) conducted an online “poll” of heavy metal musicians and producers, asking them to respond to the questions “Can aggressive music lead people to kill others? Is there any connection between heavy music and violence/killings/crimes against humanity?” While some respondents acknowledge violent and other negative aspects of the culture, and their potential influences, the majority points to the individual as responsible, again exemplifying the argument that such incidents are the exception rather than the rule by removing blame from the heavy metal culture and placing it on the individual.

Following this line of reasoning, Berger (1999a) points out that while much metal music is aggressive, it is not only angry music, instead expressing a range of emotions by which listeners can use its potential cathartic impact to their benefit. While such a statement implies that there are “direct effects” (i.e., immediate changes in attitudes and/or behaviors that can be correlated with exposure to a particular stimulus, often mediated) of listening to such music, an array of arguments of direct influence have been advanced in both the academy and popular press. Among the most widely publicized expressions of such beliefs in the United States came at the 1985 Senate Hearings by the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation on record labeling, at which the music industry was under public and political scrutiny because of the content of some (mostly heavy metal) artists’ songs that certain powerful individuals found objectionable. These hearings, often referred to as the “Parents’ Music Resource Center (PMRC) hearings,” brought widespread attention to the heavy metal genre, its artists, and most importantly, the lyrical content of certain songs deemed to be representative of the genre (USSCCST, 1985).
The following chapter will provide a discussion of these hearings, in the context of a review of literature on heavy metal and the potential for the music’s direct effects on listeners. More specifically, the review will first cover popular press and legal cases which are indicative of the stereotype that heavy metal is “evil.” The discussion will then shift to academic scholarship on the direct effects model of communication theory, followed by research conducted on heavy metal, both culture-based and experiment-based. Given this context, the following chapter will entail a return to a consideration of cover songs and their place in popular music study, specifically within the realm of heavy metal music. Finally, a set of hypotheses will be advanced to investigate the intersection of the heavy metal genre and cover songs.

The survey and experiment conducted in response to this literature review will be discussed before the results are presented. The dissertation will conclude with a discussion of the results’ implications.
CHAPTER I: LITERATURE REVIEW

Popular Press and Legal Cases

The first area of heavy metal literature to be presented deals more with popular culture and legal issues than with academic scholarship. However, these legal issues serve as prominent examples of the music/culture’s place in society. Legal cases of this nature provide a platform for public scrutiny and scholarly attention. Additionally, such legal discussions place the artists and fans in the media spotlight and highlight the potentially negative impact attributed to the music and culture, especially regarding its adolescent audience members (e.g., Ozzy Osbourne’s public persona still has a negative connotation attached to it, even after MTV reality series The Osbournes highlighted his caring, fatherly, “normal dad” nature).

Such attention is of particular interest here, as media coverage of popular music focuses on the negative aspects of rap and heavy metal while often ignoring other genres (Christenson & Roberts, 1998; Binder, 1993). This approach to the topic by the media assumes a direct influence on listeners, ignoring variations in individuals, context, and content, and assumes people are passive consumers without the ability or desire to challenge, disagree with, or ignore messages they receive (Christenson & Roberts, 1998). While this direct effects conceptualization is mentioned in this section, a detailed overview of the framework and its application will be discussed later.

The first instance in this area of popular press is the aforementioned Senate Hearings of 1985 on the topic of record labeling – i.e., placing information (a warning) on music’s negative content on the record cover for parents who are unfamiliar with the music and wish to monitor their children’s music consumption. Brought to the attention of the U.S. Senate by a group of influential political individuals’ wives, the content of records, notably cover art and lyrics, was
the topic of these Senate hearings. Leading the testimony in favor of record labeling were members of the PMRC (namely Tipper Gore, whose husband was part of the Senate Committee and Susan Baker, whose husband was the Secretary of Treasury), a group founded the same year with the goal of providing education and information to parents about the content of popular music lyrics (Kennedy, 1990). As noted earlier, the role of Congress investigating the implications that popular media might have on America’s youth is not unique; the 1950s brought about examination of comic books and television (Lowery, DeFleur, 1988). What is unique, however, is that even without causal evidence, heavy metal music is consistently blamed for negative behaviors of adolescents and young adults, often resulting from the discovery that the offender was/is a fan of certain heavy metal bands.

Among the individuals testifying in defense of the recording industry were Frank Zappa, Dee Snider (lead singer of heavy metal group Twisted Sister), and John Denver, musicians whose music represented a variety of performance styles. Central to this testimony was that of John Denver, an adult contemporary/easy listening/soft rock performer who testified on behalf of musicians arguing for freedom of speech through artistic expression. Because Denver was appropriately attired and well respected by the Senate Committee (Senator Hollings stated, in reference to musicians in general, “They are not all clean-cut John Denvers”; Senators Gore and Exon proclaimed themselves fans of Denver’s music (USSCCST, 1985)), his testimony was the most (positively) influential of the three musicians. Also central to this side’s testimony was Stanley Gortikov, then president of the Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA) (USSCCST, 1985). The thrust of the arguments focused on the PMRC-led approach of labeling records that contained explicit content (i.e., references to sex, violence, drugs and/or alcohol, and
the occult) versus the musician-led approach of freedom of speech and individual parental responsibility (USSCCST, 1985).

The Committee’s stated focus of the hearings was to publicly discuss the issue of lyrical content of popular music, rather than to request and/or generate legislation or federal regulation to deal with the lyrics’ perceived effects (USSCCST, 1985). While the hearings were concerned with all popular music, of particular focus was the genre of heavy metal. Consequently, several album covers, lyrics, and videos used by the PMRC-led testimony were from this genre, in an effort to demonstrate the negative images and topics as characteristically common.

At the conclusion of the hearings, the recording industry agreed to “voluntarily” label its products, with individual record labels in charge of assigning labels to records containing content deemed explicit (Kennedy, 1990). Industry regulation was preferred by record labels over government intervention. Therefore, in November 1985, the label, reading “Parental Advisory – Explicit Content,” was adopted and applied thereafter by record labels and is still in existence today (Cloonan, 2003). This labeling technique, similar to but more vague than television program ratings (see Greenberg, 2001 for this discussion), serves to identify to consumers (specifically parents) music/artists that contain(s) topics or cover art that may be inappropriate for certain age groups.

Such content includes sexually or violently graphic cover art, lyrics containing explicit references to sex, drugs and/or alcohol, profanity, or violence. Music genres most often affected by the labeling of such matter are heavy metal and rap, although certainly pop, rock and country artists have been labeled as well. Labeling is not genre-specific, but heavy metal and rap include a higher proportion of labeled records than do other genres due to their often more explicit references to potentially offensive topics.
In reviewing the testimony of PMRC members and “experts” called to argue for the negative influences of lyrical content, Weinstein (2000) notes the misinterpretation of lyrics (i.e., literal instead of contextual and/or figurative or metaphorical) as an instance of ignorance regarding the topic of discussion. Additionally, the direct effects approached advanced by this testimony maintained a causal connection between the music and behaviors of individuals, particularly adolescents, in response to exposure to such content (Walser, 1993; Weinstein, 2000). This approach to heavy metal music will be illustrated further in the cases to follow.

A second case involving heavy metal music is detailed by Kennedy (1990). The author presents the 1986-1987 case of Jello Biafra (at the time, singer for punk band the Dead Kennedys) in which the singer was charged with distributing harmful material to minors for a poster enclosed in the *Frankenchrist* record. While not as popular (in terms of media coverage) as the subsequent Osbourne and Judas Priest cases, the Biafra case was significant because not only was it a precursor to other similar cases, but it was the first time that a record had charges filed against it in the United States, a direct outcome of the PMRC hearings and efforts to censor music in the U.S. (Kennedy, 1990). Ultimately, the Biafra case was dismissed due to a mistrial in which the jury became deadlocked (Kennedy, 1990), however, as can be gleaned from this discussion, such cases helped to fuel popular debate along with legal, legislative, and public interest groups’ calls for censorship (McDonald, 1988).

A second legal case dealing with heavy metal music is McCollum v. CBS, Inc. (1988), an appellate case that targeted Ozzy Osbourne’s record label (CBS Records) for producing and distributing his music. Specifically, the parents of a teen who committed suicide sued CBS Records for distributing material that would negatively influence listeners, in this case essentially inciting the suicide of the son of the plaintiffs. Hence, the focus was on Osbourne’s lyrics and
their potential negative “persuasive” impact on adolescents, again arguing for a direct effects approach to the content. Of particular interest was the song “Suicide Solution” which was blamed for encouraging the plaintiffs’ son’s suicide, as he had listened to the song several times before taking his life. The court ruled that Osbourne’s lyrics were protected by the First Amendment and that CBS, Inc. had no liability for the suicide because the music’s intent was not directed at inciting individuals to commit specific acts (McCollum v. CBS, Inc., 1988).

A similar case, Waller v. Osbourne (1991), was quickly brought directly against Ozzy Osbourne (originally filed in 1988, the same year of the McCollum v. CBS, Inc. decision). Much like the previous case involving Osbourne, a suit was brought by parents of a teen who committed suicide, claiming that the song “Suicide Solution” contained subliminal messages that encouraged suicide on the part of the listener. This case differed from the first case, however, due to the specific focus on subliminal messages embedded in the music. After expert witnesses testified on both sides regarding the presence of such messages, the court ruled that the plaintiffs showed no evidence of subliminal messages in the music. Therefore, citing the lack of evidence and First Amendment protection for Osbourne’s lyrics, it was again determined there was no liability on the part of the defendant (Waller v. Osbourne, 1991).

Between the Osbourne cases came Vance v. Judas Priest (1990), which was filed in an effort to prosecute the band for encouraging the suicide of its listeners through lyrics on the *Stained Class* album. In this case, the band was accused of causing the suicide of one young man and the attempted suicide of another (who subsequently died a few years later), the actions as part of a pact between two friends. The plaintiffs contended that a song (a cover of Spooky Tooth’s “Better By You, Better Than Me”) on the record contained lyrics that presented a hopeless world as well as subliminal messages that incited the actions of the two men
(Richardson, 1991; Soocher, 1999). However, during the trial it was shown that both men had personal and family issues that also contributed to their unhappiness. While the court agreed with the presence of certain harmless messages when the recording was played backwards (deemed “accidental”), the court was not convinced of the causal connection to the actions (Soocher, 1999). Therefore, the defendants were once again deemed not liable for the violent actions of their listeners.

In response to the numerous legal cases involving popular music (not just heavy metal), Cloonan and Garofalo (2003) produced an edited volume detailing specific issues of worldwide censorship. Within this volume, two particular chapters are of interest to the current review. First, Kahn-Harris (2003) presents an analysis of death metal band Cannibal Corpse’s lyrics, noting that their extreme nature was a cause for censorship targeting. Through this analysis, the author highlights the difficulty in analyzing a particular Cannibal Corpse song (i.e., “Fucked with a Knife”) because of its place in the extreme/death metal subgenre, a subgenre characterized by vocals that are growled, grunted, or barked rather than traditionally sung. Specifically, although the lyrics of “Fucked with a Knife” are blatantly vulgar and sexually perverse, taken in their musical and subgenre contexts, they become less malignant and targetable because of the complex meanings, music, texts, politics, and participants that compose the scene (Kahn-Harris, 2003). Some critics fail to recognize and/or understand exactly this complexity. Indeed, as noted by both Kahn-Harris and Purcell (2003), most death metal lyrics are indecipherable without lyric sheets, which makes criticism by those wishing to interpret lyrical meanings that much more complicated.

The second article in this volume that deals with a subgenre of heavy metal is that by Bowman (2003), who puts forward the case of Canadian hardcore band Dayglo Abortions. In
this case study, the author covers the extreme nature of the band’s images and lyrics, highlighting their costly legal battles which resulted in the closing of its record label, Fringe Product. In this case, Fringe was charged with possessing and distributing obscene material (in Canada). As the charges applied to several songs on one record, definitions of “obscene” and such applications to various works were at the center of the legal arguments (Bowman, 2003). However, the jury acquitted the label owner of all charges, affirming a freedom of speech and expression in Canada, just as had been decided in previous cases in the United States.

While court cases (see Sooucher, 1991 for discussions of rap group 2 Live Crew’s cases) have not focused solely on the heavy metal, the genre has been the most prominently covered and vehemently attacked, such as in the PMRC-fueled media coverage in the mid- and late-1980s (McDonald, 1988; Binder, 1993; Christenson & Roberts, 1998; Ballard, Coates, & Bazzini, 1999). The popular press and legal attention have contributed to heavy metal music emerging as a target for critical investigation by scholarly researchers.

For instance, Binder (1993) conducted an analysis of media coverage of rap and heavy metal music in the mainstream press and found that writers used different frames to address the “white” genre of heavy metal and the “black” genre of rap, hence constructing images of race and adolescence to tell separate stories of problems in both groups (p. 766). This racial distinction is important because of the artists and consumer audiences of each genre (i.e., heavy metal was dominated by white performers and fans while rap was dominated by black performers and fans) and the resulting media stereotypes fueling different public perceptions of each genre and the respective audience attitudes and behaviors. While this type of research provides analysis of media coverage, much of the research conducted on “problem” areas of popular music focuses on the influences incurred on listeners. Consequently, most prominent in
this area of investigation is research based on the direct effects model of communication, mentioned previously, and the central topic of the next section.

*Theoretical Framework*

The introduction of the direct effects model of mass communication research can be traced back to the late 1920s and early 1930s. As discussed in Rogers’s (1994) *A History of Communication Study*, systematic scholarly direct effects research began in the late 1920s with the Payne Fund Studies (1929-1932) and their focus on the effects of movies on youth. This initial series of studies reflected the growing concern of both the general public and special interest groups/government agencies with media’s impact on those exposed – namely, adolescents and young adults (the Payne Fund studies resulted in ten books: Blumer, 1933; Blumer & Hauser, 1933; Charters, 1933; Dale, 1933a, 1933b; Dysinger & Ruckmick, 1933; Holaday & Stoddard, 1933; Peters, 1933; Peterson & Thurstone, 1933; Shuttleworth & May, 1933 – all were reprinted in 1970). Because the Payne Fund Studies received so much attention (from both academics and the general public), direct effects research continued into the following decades with work such as that conducted by Lazarsfeld’s Radio Research Project in the late 1930s – 1940s (e.g., Lazarsfeld & Stanton, 1942, 1944).

Following in and extending this tradition of effects research were contemporaries of Lazarsfeld such as Lasswell and Hovland (Rogers, 1997). Lasswell was likely most known for his question “Who says what in which channel to whom with what effects?” which focused attention on the elements of the direct effects model of mass communication research. Lasswell also contributed to this area of research with his work on World War I propaganda messages, conducting content analyses of these messages to determine particular language patterns and
their likelihood of having persuasive effects on opposing forces. Again, such studies continued the research agenda on direct effects, paving the way for current studies that focus on different topics (e.g., heavy metal music) using the same theoretical model.

Appropriately, Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet (1968) also started the limited/indirect effects theoretical approach, demonstrating evolution in the effects model, with a study on media’s influence on voting behaviors in 1944 with their book *The People’s Choice*. Through this research, the scholars found that not all individuals exposed to mediated messages were influenced; rather only a few key individuals were influenced, who then influenced others through interpersonal communication (Rogers, 1994). These findings suggested a shift in mass communication research trends from immediate, direct effects to limited, indirect effects (Rogers, 1994).

Continuing the effects line of research, in the late 1940s, Hovland studied the effects of training videos (i.e., *Why We Fight* films) on World War II recruits to determine what types of messages and images they paid attention to and the impact these had on them (Rogers, 1994). This research helped to again evolve the effects research by testing hypotheses about why greater effects occurred under certain conditions (Rogers, 1994), although this work has been challenged by authors like Simpson (1994) in *Science of Coercion*.

As the tradition of media effects research continued through the 20th century, new and emerging media were tested for their respective effects as they were popularized in culture and society. The development of television brought the most attention to the pervasiveness of media and the levels of exposure the general public was experiencing. As noted by Wartella and Reeves (1985) in an article reviewing direct effects research from 1900-1960, most of this type of scholarship was fueled by public opinion and policy makers’ concern for the potential
negative impacts media could have on audiences, most notably children. This area of research (i.e., TV’s impact on youth) is highlighted by Liebert and Sprafkin (1988) in *The Early Window*, which reviews and summarizes findings of such studies, continuing the tradition of focusing on the negative impacts of media on children.

While early effects research often represented the link between government and research (e.g., Lasswell’s propaganda work and Hovland’s army film testing), its continued evolution also demonstrated an expansion not only in terms of model building, but in terms of focus (Rogers, 1994). Although later efforts began to focus on new and emerging media, they often employed similar theoretical approaches to that taken by the early research (Wartella & Reeves, 1985). From radio to movies to network television programming to cable television programming, focus became more specific in terms of medium and content. As such, and in line with the current investigation, the development of music television (MTV) in 1981 led to an explicit research focus on music video content and effects.

Accordingly, as cable television became more widespread and channels such as MTV became popular among adolescent audiences in the mid-1980s, more specific attention was given to channel and program content rather than general impacts of the medium itself. Because MTV tended to show music videos that contained explicit images of sex and violence, it received more scholarly (and public) attention than many other channels. For example, Greeson and Williams (1985) and Sun and Lull (1986) studied the effects of MTV on middle and high school students, focusing on changes in attitudes after the viewing of a series of videos. Likewise, Hansen and Hansen (1990) conducted an experiment on the appeal of music videos containing sex and violence, finding that images of sex increased appeal, images of violence decreased appeal, and a combination of both sex and violence dramatically decreased appeal.
Like the Payne Fund Studies (1929-1932) of decades prior, these music video studies sought to determine the negative impacts of media on adolescents. While the direct effects research tradition evolved (somewhat) over time with new forms of media and new factors tested, the basic premise (i.e., media had immediate, measurable impact on individuals) remained intact. Such attention by the academic community and general population continued to supply the public and policy makers with the necessary concern for fueling calls for censorship as well as monitoring of adolescent behavior for signs of influence or imitation of mass-mediated messages.

Because of this focus on media’s potential negative impact(s) on youth, increased efforts of censorship and legislation became part of the popular debate. In particular, heavy metal music was selected for attack because of its extreme (compared to other popular music genres) nature of image, lyrics, artists, and performances. For example, as discussed earlier, the Parents’ Music Resource Center (PMRC) was established in 1985 to provide concerned parents with information regarding the lyrical content of popular music (Kennedy, 1990), notably music of the heavy metal genre, since it was deemed to have the highest prevalence of artists that produced offensive lyrics and images (e.g., Twisted Sister, W.A.S.P., Judas Priest, KISS, AC/DC, Mötley Crüe – all part of popular debates). To reiterate the earlier discussion, the PMRC convinced Congress to have hearings on this issue, and as a result, record labels agreed to “voluntarily” label their products with parental advisory stickers beginning in 1985 (Cloonan, 2003).

Even though the direct effects model had varying degrees of past success, it is still presently embraced by the government and public. However, researchers have moved on to an indirect effects approach. This change in focus allowed researchers to move from a one-way approach to mass communication (assuming audiences were passive receivers of messages) to a
two-way approach to new and emerging media (allowing for audience interactions with messages and media and negotiating content received in lieu of individual characteristics).

Therefore, while direct effects research had been impacting mass communication research for the better part of a century, it is one of a multitude of theoretical approaches to studying media channels and media content (Severin & Tankard, 2000). Censorship efforts like those of the PMRC, in which a special interest group seeks to “protect” youth, helped propel offshoots of the direct effects model, essentially new theories that were closely related to and built upon its theoretical basis. Two specific examples are Davison’s (1983) third-person effect and Gerbner’s (1998) cultivation analysis. Both approaches focus on media, but in different ways.

Third-person effect contends that individuals believe that others are more affected by messages than they themselves are (Davison, 1983), such as in the case of censorship groups looking out for those (i.e., adolescents) who cannot readily identify and/or ignore potential negative messages. Essentially, efforts by groups such as the PMRC during the aforementioned 1985 Senate hearings employ not only a direct effects approach, but a third-person effect approach, as PMRC members self-identified issues that could be objectionable or offensive to others (namely adolescents) as targets for censorship. However, adolescents’ perspectives were not taken into account in this regard, with the exception of Senator Danforth’s (Chairman of the Committee) discussion during the hearings of his daughter’s belief that advisory labels would act as an additional product enticement for adolescents (USSCCST, 1985). Groups like the PMRC serve as a watchdog group, highlighting aspects of popular music and their potential negative effects (e.g., behavioral, scholastic, psychological) on young, susceptible audiences. This is the epitome of third-person effect in practice.
On the other hand, cultivation analysis asserts that the more exposure one has to a medium like television, the more one will perceive the world as similar to that represented on television rather than in reality (Gerbner, 1998). In other words, a person with high television exposure is more likely to have a worldview like that presented in programs frequently watched, impacting his/her stereotyping of others (due to stereotyped television roles) and perception of the outside world (e.g., people are more violent than they actually are because of violent characters in programs).

As an example of a study employing the theoretical perspectives of direct effects and third-person effect, Rosenbaum and Prinsky (1991) attempt to show how members of the heavy metal and punk (sub)cultures are negatively labeled by others. To do this, the researchers called hospitals with adolescent care programs and gave them a hypothetical situation to determine a recommended strategy for dealing with the identified problems. Posing as a concerned parent, the caller described an attraction to heavy metal and/or punk music and style, while being sure to identify no behaviors that could be classified as a mental illness. Of the twelve hospitals contacted, ten recommended hospitalization in their treatment programs for symptoms that were essentially characteristic of a high level of participation in a music culture. While the sample of care programs in this study was small and non-representative, the results demonstrate the impact of negative media attention on adults’ assessments of adolescents’ ability to deal with mass mediated messages. Additionally, the results support the prevalence of direct effects and third-person effect approaches to mass communication study.

While neither of these alternate theoretical perspectives is considered strictly a direct effects approach to mass communication research, it is important to recognize the influence of the direct effects model on later theoretical developments. As can be seen by the above
examples, and combined with more current examples of V-chips in television sets and television program ratings, mass media continue to be of central interest to both the general public and policy makers (Potter, 2003).

Direct effects research provides an interesting and straightforward way of studying mass media, but it is not without its shortcomings. Obviously, there are several caveats with a direct effects approach to mass communication research (Wartella & Reeves, 1985; Lowery & DeFleur, 1988), some of which have been identified above. With a brief historical overview now advanced, specific limitations of the direct effects model will now be discussed.

Despite the overall rejection of the direct effects approach as a “hypodermic needle” metaphor for understanding media use, it continues to frame the understanding of the consumption of heavy metal music in much scholarly research, particularly that of an experimental nature. Methodological problems not withstanding, the important point here is the continued use of an outdated, unsubstantiated model for conceptualizing media use, in this case the use of popular music, specifically of the heavy metal genre. With that in mind, the current investigation seeks to show the complexity of the interactions involved in heavy metal consumption, pointing out problems with the simplistic nature of the direct effects model and ultimately arguing for a more detailed approach to understanding the intricacies of the medium under study.

The first and most obvious limitation of the direct effects model is its simplicity and lack of attention to factors other than those contained within the medium and/or messages. Contending that a mass-mediated message such as a radio broadcast directly affects (often negatively, in this area of research) a number of audience members without accounting for their personal characteristics, beliefs, and prior knowledge of the topic beforehand is simplistic
research design, effectively testing participants as if they are new to the medium and/or type of message and are processing it for the first time. For example, Hansen and Hansen (1991) exhibit such an approach in testing individuals for their processing of heavy metal lyrics. Specifically, while participants’ music preferences were gathered, no efforts were made to understand familiarity with stimuli (assuming that those indicating a preference for heavy metal would be more familiar with the stimuli than those who indicated a preference for another genre of music) or to distinguish musical qualities from lyrical qualities. Consequently, a lack of understanding of the stimuli being tested and individual differences in respondents dictate simple conclusions, invite criticisms (e.g., Walser, 1993), and fail to understand the “why” (or the complexity) of the results.

 Without a “why” question (the one “w” missing from Lasswell’s famous effects question), the conclusions drawn from such research are severely limited. However, in defense of early scholars such as Lazarsfeld and Stanton (1942, 1944) and Lasswell (1927, 1948), at that time being a new area of research, most any data and findings were important and led to the development of further research. Simple beginnings are understandable, but the troubling part is that little evolution has taken place in many current research designs.

 For instance, Anderson, Carnagey, and Eubanks (2003) conducted a study with undergraduate students, exposing them to songs with violent lyrics and testing their feelings of aggressiveness afterwards. The investigators concluded that because individuals exposed to violent lyrics had higher levels of aggressiveness immediately following exposure, the increase could be attributed to the lyrical content (e.g., themes of clearly violent content such as fighting or shooting someone). However, while the researchers acknowledge the lack of aggressiveness measurements periodically after the exposure (providing no evidence for lasting effects), the
research design was problematic in several ways. Namely, the researchers a) failed to
differentiate between lyrics and music as producers of aggressive feelings; b) did not assess
participants’ prior knowledge of or familiarity with the songs they were exposed to in all
experiments; and c) did not account for participants’ comprehension (i.e., did not differentiate
between audibly understandable and cognitive comprehension) of the lyrics to which they were
exposed in all experiments. Such factors limit the impact of the findings and call into question
the research design. Essentially, therefore, the research team in this case was conducting direct
effects research while testing a few more factors (i.e., exposure to several types of music and
lyrics) than previous research (e.g., Ballard & Coates, 1995; Wester, Crown, Quatman, &
Heesacker, 1997).

No single study has the ability account for and represent an entire body of music-based
direct effects research due to the complexity involved in studying the topic. However, because
of the lack of studies being done on heavy metal music, such design and results contribute to
skewing the perceptions of other researchers due to a lack of understanding of the complexities
involved. Put simply, in this particular case some scholars contribute to the negative stereotype.
Failure to acknowledge and account for musical (genre) and listener (fan/non-fan) intricacies
continue to be an issue in this line of research that also continues the tradition of the direct
effects approach.

While the Anderson, Carnagey, and Eubanks (2003) example provides evidence of
limited impact because of the lack of periodic post-treatment measurements, this study does not
highlight other limitations of the direct effects model. As noted by Christenson and Roberts
(1998), the direct effects model often assumes a widespread impact based on the group tested,
ignores differences in individuals, time periods, and contexts, and assumes individuals are
passive receivers of messages (p. 183). In an effort to justify such limitations, they will be discussed one by one.

First, the contention that the direct effects model assumes a widespread impact based on the group tested can be applied to much of the research in this area. By testing a group of children or young adults (e.g., undergraduates), some scholars imply that a large portion of these groups is at risk of being influenced by the media and/or messages (often negative) being tested. For instance, the overview of such research as mentioned earlier by Wartella and Reeves (1985) and Liebert and Sprafkin (1988), as well as multiple Surgeon General’s Reports (e.g., Surgeon General’s Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior, 1971; Pearl, Bouthilet, & Lazar, 1982) provides ample evidence of work on media’s negative impact on children, providing the basis for public debate and policy-making relative to censoring media outlets and products. In an effort to protect the entire population of children (or as many as possible – not just “at risk” children or juvenile delinquents), policymakers and special interest groups lobby and develop legislation to monitor or censor media outlets and products that target children. This again assumes that if children are exposed to such content, they will not be able to recognize the negative, potentially harmful, elements, or if recognized, will not be able to ignore the content.

Second, the contention that the direct effects approach ignores differences in individuals, time, and contexts can also be seen in much of the research. While many studies have attempted to account for differences in gender, much of the direct effects research fails to measure participants at times other than immediately following exposure (see the discussion of Anderson, Carnagey & Eubanks, 2003, above). Some studies acknowledge the unnatural environment of experiments (e.g., St. Lawrence & Joyner, 1991; Ballard & Coates, 1995). However, many fail
to discuss the fact that those who watch violent television programs or movies or listen to violent lyrics are often not prompted (on their own or by others) to think about the impact of the exposure immediately afterwards. Nor are they likely to think about how a certain series of programs or songs impacted their attitudes or behaviors.

Events such as the 1999 Columbine school shooting in Littleton, Colorado are partially blamed, by the popular media, on the music of Marilyn Manson and KMFDM in an effort to scapegoat and fuel popular debate (Burns, 1999). Michael Moore’s *Bowling for Columbine* demonstrates this public blaming. However, no systematic academic research program has concluded that such music/lyrics cause such acts or even that there exists a significant directional correlation (Anderson, Carnagey, & Eubanks, 2003). The individual cases, times, and contexts, while sometimes addressed, are often ignored as long as possible and responsibility is then laid on the producers and mediators of these messages. As was the case with Marilyn Manson, a rise in popularity with his third record, *Antichrist Superstar*, increased media and public attention to this particular artist’s “shock” tactics. This in turn brought attention from political and religious groups in an effort to censor the artist and his messages as well as protect adolescents from them (Wright, 2000). The ramifications of such behavior point to a lack of acknowledgement to products of lesser popularity (regardless of the content) and serve the status quo with a target of blame when a relationship is identified between the artist and an offender, as was the case with the Columbine shootings.

A final point of consideration (of a list that of course is not exhaustive), the contention that the direct effects model assumes individuals are passive receivers of messages, is supported by studies that fail to assess what elements participants bring with them upon entrance into exposure. While the collection of some variables such as respondents’ familiarity with and
understanding of lyrics are attempted, they are often simplistic in nature and too few to provide salient discussions/conclusions of the topic under study (e.g., Hansen & Hansen, 1991; Anderson, Carnagey, & Eubanks, 2003). Respondents’ prior knowledge, familiarity, and attentiveness to particular parts of the message are often not measured, such as in the case of the Anderson, Carnagey, and Eubanks (2003) study on violent song lyrics. The exclusion of such measurements assumes that participants are “clean slates” regarding the messages they are to be exposed to, and essentially ignores certain individual lived experiences brought to the experiment. While one could argue that such cases balance out with the large number of participants, conclusions are often limited in discussions of the impact on the specific group tested while speculating effects to (often acknowledged through calls for future studies) different types of individuals (e.g., Wester, Crown, Quatman, & Heesacker, 1997; St. Lawrence & Joyner, 1991).

An attempt to provide a comprehensive overview of the heavy metal scholarly literature requires that culture- and experiment-based studies be included. As noted earlier, these studies assume more of an indirect effects approach to the music, offering a more complex understanding of how and why people respond to music in different ways.

**Culture-Based Heavy Metal Research**

A review of culture-based heavy metal research encompasses three main elements: 1) journalistic and historical accounts of the genre; 2) deep ethnographic and critical studies that seek to describe in detail and interpret cultural characteristics, actions, and fan participation; and 3) research dealing with fans’/cultural participants’ deviance in relation to the genre.
This first category includes works that have a more journalistic than academic approach. Consequently, these books deal with the history and development of the heavy metal genre, often using data from interviews with musicians, industry personnel, and other journalists as the main information source. As a result, documentation of people, places, times, and media exposure (popularity/coverage) are of primary interest, with secondary interest falling to fan cultures and the meanings of participation in such cultures. Essentially, these works provide a background for academic scholarship and situate the genre and subgenres within the larger global music scene.

For instance, general histories of the heavy metal genre, largely focusing on the development of the artists and music since the late 1960s, provide a good starting point for those looking to acquaint themselves with the topic. In this manner, Christe (2003) provides a detailed account of the genre, attempting to provide a history as complete as possible, often demonstrating his personal knowledge of and familiarity with the music by referencing obscure bands that had little impact on the overall culture, but represented particular facets of it. In a less detailed manner, Konow (2002) provides another historical account of heavy metal music, again focusing on artists and their establishment in the global popular music context. However, unlike Christe, the focus of this text is on popular bands that had the most impact on the music scene rather than delving into discussions of all those who contributed.

More specific cases of heavy metal genre/subgenre (black, death metal) discussion also exist. Blush (2001) traces the evolution and peak years of American hardcore music, a closely related genre (although this categorization is arguable) of heavy metal. Responses from interviews with artists and industry personnel provide the basis for the presentation, detailing the bands, scene, and influential artists. While Blush claims hardcore only existed from 1980-1986 as its own genre, he calls Black Flag’s *Damaged* record a “punk/metal fusion” (p. 62),
highlighting the close relationship between heavy metal and hardcore music (within the past five years, a new subgenre dubbed “metalcore” has even developed and become very popular within the heavy metal culture). Fifteen years ago, Breen (1991) noted that there is no clear definition of heavy metal, and the genre is now even more complex with the formation of additional subgenres and their new stylistic innovations. In this regard, Perri (2004) notes that “the metal/hardcore divide no longer makes sense, and in a manner of thought, no longer even exists” (p. 55). The breaking down of such divisions demonstrates the ever-increasing complexity in defining heavy metal and its subgenres.

Similar to Blush (2001), Moynihan and Søderlind (1998) provide an account of the development of the Scandinavian metal scene, with a particular focus on Norwegian black metal. Of particular interest are band members’ “Satanic” influences; expressed in their music and images, and often linked to violent crimes of which several band members were a part, the authors depict the darker side of a particular subgenre of heavy metal. This interest in the Satanic/occult elements of heavy metal also grounds Baddeley’s (1999) tome, which provides a similar discussion of several heavy metal bands (e.g., Slayer, Deicide, Morbid Angel). Here the focus is primarily on Satanism as a religion and philosophy, but the book also contains substantial information on bands from several different countries and their incorporation of such philosophy into music and images. The most recent work in this area of journalistic research is Mudrian’s (2004) Choosing Death: The Improbable History of Death Metal and Grindcore, which presents a history of two subgenres of heavy metal, using interviews with artists, journalists, and industry personnel as the basis. Like Blush (2001) and Moynihan and Søderlind (1998), Mudrian details one subgenre of heavy metal, highlighting the cultural development from the perspective of those who were the most influential.
As can be seen from this area of research, interviews with cultural creators/participants provide the majority of data for the books. However, largely overlooked in these works are the fans and consumers – the other participants that complete the culture. While this may not be the authors’ focus, it must be discussed to detail a more complete picture and history of the (sub)cultures. The next section will turn attention to efforts that focus more on this aspect.

Research that accounts for the culture and subcultures (culture and subcultures can be equated to the earlier discussion of genre and subgenres - in this case heavy metal music is the broad genre/culture, and within it exist subgenres/subcultures such as death and black metal) of heavy metal through ethnographic studies provides the other half of the culture overlooked by the journalistic efforts. Brown (2003) provides additional insights into the heavy metal culture and its exclusion from many scholarly texts, partially due to its complexity and negative portrayals. While some of the ethnographic investigations (e.g., Walser, 1993; Berger, 1999b; Purcell, 2003) incorporate discussions of music and artists, they also focus on the overall culture of the heavy metal scene more so than examinations discussed in previous sections. The work of this group also focuses more on meanings and experiences of cultural participation, highlighting the overall contribution of the culture to both the local and global music scenes.

For example, while Straw (1990) provides a general discussion of the earlier years of the heavy metal culture, both Gross (1990) and Gaines (1991) describe and discuss the more recent culture and the meanings of participation in it. However, Gross provides a brief account focusing more on description while Gaines seeks an analysis of heavy metal’s place within a clique of suburban New Jersey teenage adolescents and young adults. All offer interesting descriptions of cultural characteristics, but lack the detailed analyses present in the central texts in this line of research (i.e., Walser, 1993; Weinstein, 2000).
In this regard, Purcell (2003) analyzes the meanings of participation in the death metal (again, a heavy metal subgenre) culture. Through methods of interviews, questionnaires, and participant observation, Purcell gains particular insight to the death metal scene in and around New York City. Purcell is interested in the cultural experience, from both the artists’ and fans’ perspectives, as a whole. While offering interesting data and analyses, as well as an interesting female perspective (given the majority of the death metal culture is male), the study lacks the detailed descriptions present in the central texts in this particular line of research.

Along the same lines, on a local level (relative to the national/global discussions of Walser, 1993 and Weinstein, 2000) similar to that of Gaines (1991), Berger (1999b) investigates two rock/metal scenes and two jazz scenes in Northeast Ohio, using ethnography, interviews, and participant observation as his data collection methods. Berger presents a more focused study, describing and interpreting the meanings of participation in the different local scenes rather than in larger-scale music scenes. Additionally, Berger’s musical expertise allows him to present detailed, analyses of how music is experienced by performers and fans.

Within the larger international scene, Harris (2000) presents a case study of Brazilian band Sepultura’s participation in both local and global extreme metal scenes. Harris documents Sepultura’s history and movements through the Brazilian and then American metal scenes, serving as a representation of one band’s contribution to and participation in the heavy (or to use Harris’s term, “extreme”) metal scene on both local and global levels.

The final two studies included in this review of ethnographic and critical cultural research are the two central texts in the area of heavy metal research. First, Weinstein (2000, originally 1991) provides a detailed account of the heavy metal culture drawing data from interviews, questionnaires, and participant observation. This study represents the first detailed cultural
sociology of heavy metal. Essentially, this account melds together elements from all the research previously discussed in this section. General but critical analyses of the music, media, artists, and fans ground the work in a largely successful attempt to understand how the heavy metal culture functions in and of itself as well as within the larger music culture and greater society.

Sharing Weinstein’s (2000) passion for the music and interest in cultural characteristics, Walser (1993) tackles the topic from a different standpoint. Combining elements of cultural criticism, ethnography, and most importantly, musical analysis, Walser’s study of heavy metal is the first to critically discuss the music of the genre. Like Berger (1999b), Walser has a musical expertise that allows detailed, complex analyses of the musical structure and, consequently, their relation to the heavy metal culture, demonstrated by perceptual and experiential discussions of the music in both texts. Such a focus is undertaken largely because most academic studies of popular music ignore the actual music and instead focus on the lyrics (Walser, 1993). Indeed, Walser criticizes Weinstein for having nothing useful to say about the actual music under study (p. 23).

Sadly this research, however, is limited in its scope. Limited sample size results in the shared weakness of experiments in that cultural studies lack ecological validity. Rich in-depth analysis is offered of a limited number of people but no degree of impact can be generated with these studies. Policy makers need to not only have depth of knowledge about a topic, but they also need to have breadth. To what degree or how many people are impacted in what way by mediated content is a key question not addressed by cultural studies.

A second weakness of many cultural studies is that the author is vested in a particular outcome because of a predisposition in favor of or against a particular topic. Even though grounded theory places importance upon the voices of the interviewees, it is the scholar and not
the participants who select the themes of importance for inclusion and interpretation for the final analysis.

So, concluding the review of heavy metal research dealing with ethnographic and critical studies, the music is of central focus. This music continues to be the central focus of other studies, however, it is not cast in such a positive or critical light.

Accordingly, this final group of studies deals with elements of fan reception of the music and participation in the culture, specifically in relation to deviant behaviors - all too commonly attributed to heavy metal. As an introductory example of this line of research, Friesen (1990) conducted observations of and interviews with heavy metal fans to determine if their cultural participation is indeed the deviant activity it is so often labeled. Findings indicated that such participation is part of a unified subculture with shared values, but that the general activities adhere to societal norms. Friesen concludes that references to a “deviant” culture are the result of a classic labeling process of a more general society that lacks the understanding necessary to respect such cultural participation (p. 74).

Likely the most prominent author in this regard, Arnett (1991, 1993, 1996) offers a series of publications that profile heavy metal fans, relating personality characteristics to preferences for this type of music. Through his writing, Arnett makes it obvious he is not a fan of the music, and while his lack of preference for it differs in respect to other works on heavy metal (e.g., Walser, 1993, Weinstein, 2000), his fascination with cultural participants does not. Through numerous interviews with self-proclaimed heavy metal fans, Arnett offers personal accounts of the music’s impact on individuals. In addition to the interviews, surveys are also employed, and interestingly enough, data gathered through this means demonstrated a cathartic effect of the music on the individuals’ behavior. Specifically, heavy metal music served as a relaxing
mechanism, allowing listeners to release aggression and relieve stress or anxiety (Arnett, 1991). While still a direct effect, this is the opposite effect many claim the music to have, as evidenced in earlier discussions of popular press and legal cases.

This review of culture-based heavy metal research has provided several examples of studies focused on the various cultural aspects encountered within heavy metal subcultures. However, this line of research differs from work on other popular music genres (except rap) in the emphasis on negative effects and fan activities (or, as in the cases of Walser, 1993, Weinstein, 2000, and Purcell, 2003, in defending against such claims), much of which comes from the experimental-based research on heavy metal music. As will be demonstrated in the next section, the only other genre as commonly examined for such negative influences is rap/hip-hop.

Throughout this literature review, a trend of examining heavy metal music’s effects has been established. The following section will deal specifically with experiment-based effects research. Since the culture-based efforts provide detailed descriptions and explanations of artist, music, and fan interactivity, they can either serve as support for or evidence against the claims often made in experiment-based heavy metal research. Following are in-depth reviews of this methodological approach to the topic, further examining research previously mentioned as well as additional studies in the area.

**Experiment-Based Heavy Metal Research**

This section highlights experimental research that focuses on the direct effects of exposure to heavy metal music. As noted by Christenson and Roberts (1998), almost all empirical research on the effects of popular music has been done since 1980. Similarly,
Anderson, Carnagey, and Eubanks (2003) note the research on the effects of violent music lyrics remains in the beginning stage. Accordingly, work in the direct effects area of music research conducted explicitly with heavy metal music is minimal. The few studies that do address this topic provide the basis for this section. As will be shown, overall, the research in this area provides mixed, often inconclusive and inconsistent, results.

Because heavy metal music did not achieve widespread popularity (i.e., mainstream appeal, crossing genre distinctions and radio playlists, selling millions of records, achieving international recognition and fans) until the mid-1980s, and the general research agenda follows a few years behind such popularity, early notions of the music’s influence did not develop until late in the decade. Accordingly, Wanamaker and Reznikoff (1989) speculated that heavy metal music may influence listeners more than the lyrics of such songs. To test this, they exposed students to one of three conditions: nonaggressive rock song, nonaggressive words/aggressive music, and aggressive words and music. Aggressive music was defined as having a “hard, driving beat, yelling, tension, and dissonance” (p. 564). After also testing for attentiveness to lyrics and familiarity of song, the investigators found that their participants did not attend to lyrics and that lyrics do not affect aggression. Additionally, music apart from lyrics did not influence aggression (Wanamaker & Reznikoff, 1989).

Following this focus, the direct effects line of research examined connections between heavy metal music and listeners’ feelings and behaviors. As mentioned earlier, Arnett (1996) found cathartic rather than negative effects when listeners were surveyed for their responses to the music. Additionally, Epstein and Pratto (1990) found no indication that listening to heavy metal had any effect on Satanic identification or delinquent behavior. Similarly, Epstein, Pratto, and Skipper (1990) examined the relationship between musical preferences of teenagers and
behavior problems, predicting that greater commitment to heavy metal or rap music is positively related to behavioral problems (p. 383). Through surveys, participant observation, examination of school records, and music content, the researchers found no support for the hypothesis that music preference and commitment to music could predict behavioral problems.

Continuing research on music preferences, Christenson (1992) visually and aurally exposed middle school students to records (one hard rock/heavy metal, and one pop/dance) with and without the parental advisory label and had them listen to four song samples, including one song from the targeted record. Findings include lower evaluations for labeled records, preference for the pop/dance song to the hard rock/heavy metal song, and no difference in response to the heavy metal song regardless of whether or not it was labeled. From these findings, Christenson concluded that, given the age of the participants, a tainted-fruit theory applied because music with parental advisory labels was less preferred.

In a similar vein, Verden, Dunleavy, and Powers (1989) examined music preference and delinquency through survey research and found that there was no single direct determinant of musical preference in relation to delinquency. Also meaningful was that the beat and sound was of greater importance than lyrical content to study participants. Again using survey data, Purcell (2003) found that a majority of death metal fans in the sample would not respond violently in a given hypothetical situation, which the author claims “supports the hypothesis that listening to music that portrays violence does not lead to violent behavior” (p. 137).

While some of this consumer/fan-oriented research alludes to a lyrics-effect approach, such lyrics-focused research has become relatively common, often ignoring the musical context, even though decades ago Robinson and Hirsch (1969) showed evidence that the sound is more important then the lyrical meaning. Similarly, but from a rhetorical perspective, Irvine and
Kirkpatrick (1972) and Chesebro, Foulger, Nachman, and Yannelli (1985) also pointed to the importance of examining the musical sound. In response to Chesebro, Foulger, Nachman, and Yannelli, Rein and Springer (1986) ask “Where’s the Music?” in an emphatic call for communication scholars to examine the musical dimension of songs. Additionally, Friesen and Epstein (1994), Friesen and Helfrich (1998), and Williams (2003) further argue that the music is of equal importance to the lyrics, but often goes ignored. More specifically, Friesen and Epstein also point out that heavy metal’s rhythm is of central importance, serving as an explicit, rather than implicit, focus when compared to other mainstream genres (p. 4).

Continuing this criticism in the realm of heavy metal research, Weinstein (2000) and Walser (1993) note that much academic discussion focuses on lyrics, not music, and that understanding heavy metal requires understanding its sound. Furthermore, Weinstein claims analyses of heavy metal lyrics cannot be literal, but must account for figurative and contextual elements. As a final point, she notes that research on lyrics indicates that adolescents do not attend to, know, or understand the lyrics to their favorite songs (also shown by Prinsky & Rosenbaum, 1987; Desmond, 1987; Greenfield, Bruzzone, Koyamatsu, Satuloff, Nixon, Brodie, & Kingsdale, 1987).

Returning to pure experimental-based research, Ballard, Dodson, and Bazzini (1999) examined the perceptions of lyrical effects of different genres of music. In this study, participants were given two sets of lyrics (prosocial and antisocial) labeled “heavy metal,” “pop,” “rap,” or “country” to see how they would be rated. Findings indicated that lyrics labeled as “heavy metal” or “rap” were not perceived as more antisocial or more likely to inspire antisocial behaviors than the same lyrics labeled as “pop” or “country.” However, lyrics labeled as “country” were perceived more positively than other labels. Rather intuitively, antisocial
lyrics were rated as more likely to inspire antisocial behaviors than prosocial lyrics, regardless of genre.

Employing a complex research design, Hansen and Hansen (1991) developed a series of experiments where participants were put into either a high- (no lyrics provided) or low-cognitive load (lyrics provided) condition and tested for memory recall, lyric comprehension, and detailed content extraction. Seeking to test cognitive schematic processing of heavy metal lyrics, the researchers found that both groups were able to extract the main lyrical content, but the high-load condition negatively affected all three tests. Such a finding suggests that individuals often use prior schema to interpret new lyrics (pp. 405-407).

This suggestion is similar to Weinstein’s (2000) point that, for listeners, lyrics often exist as isolated words or phrases, and consequently, meaning is obtained from certain words and phrases because of repetition, distinguishability, or articulation (p. 125). Parallel to the findings of Prinsky and Rosenbaum (1987), Desmond (1987), and Wanamaker and Reznikoff (1989), Hansen and Hansen also found evidence of individuals not attending to lyrics and/or not being able to comprehend them (as noted by the authors, it could be a product of the music chosen).

In an effort to distinguish between music and lyrics effects, additional studies were conducted employing various but similar research designs. For example, St. Lawrence and Joyner (1991) tested the effects of sexually violent rock music on males’ attitudes toward women. Using three types of music (sexually violent heavy metal, Christian heavy metal, and classical), the researchers found that both heavy metal conditions increased stereotypic, negative attitudes toward women. Also interesting is that participants in the classical music condition reported greater sexual arousal than in the heavy metal conditions. However, one important
limitation of this study is the lack of testing for lyrical attentiveness/interpretation and listener familiarity, both of which may have impacted participants’ responses.

In an experiment using gangsta rap as a stimulus, Wester, Crown, Quatman, and Heesacker (1997) tested the direct effects model by exposing males with little prior exposure to one of four conditions (i.e., lyrics/music, no lyrics/music, lyrics/no music, no lyrics/no music). By these means, the research team found that gangsta rap lyrics significantly increased men’s adversarial sexual beliefs but did not influence other attitudes toward women. While the music without lyrics condition had no negative impact, the lyrics without music condition had no significant impact at all. Such findings suggest that the music itself had no negative impact on participants’ responses, attributed by the authors to the fact that participants had no prior knowledge of the gangsta rap subculture. While this study uses rap instead of heavy metal, it is important to the literature in this area for three reasons: exposure to individuals with little prior exposure/familiarity, the isolation of music and lyrics, and the finding that music alone had no negative impact on men’s attitudes toward women.

As another example of an experimental study, Ballard and Coates (1995) exposed students to one of three lyrical conditions (nonviolent/control, homicidal, suicidal) for both heavy metal and rap music to test the immediate effects of the content on their moods. They found that rap music elicited more anger than heavy metal music, and no effect of heavy metal or rap music or lyrics on suicidal ideation or state anxiety. While all songs tested as unfamiliar to participants, a lack of consistency in participants’ thematic classification of lyrics again supports the notion that lyrics are not attended to or interpreted correctly.

More recently, Anderson, Carnagey, and Eubanks (2003) conducted a series of experiments to test the effects of brief exposure to violent song lyrics on feelings of
aggressiveness. Students were exposed to a variety of songs (including heavy metal), music genres, and lyrical content. The investigators found consistently that songs with violent lyrics increased aggression-related cognition and affect, which was attributed to the violent lyrics, not the musical style, artist, or arousal.

This review of experimental-based heavy metal research has demonstrated consistency on only two points: lyrics are often not attended to or they are misinterpreted, and there is no relationship between music preference and the ability to predict deviant behaviors. However, inconsistency exists in relation to music’s effects on feelings, with findings indicating both an impact and a lack of impact of music content. However, because the sample of studies is small at this point, further research is needed to clarify these issues.

Such experimental studies seek to test the immediate effects of certain styles of music on individuals’ feelings/reactions to legitimate or refute claims that such music produces negative influences/effects. Research in this particular area is limited, although additional studies have been conducted using rap music as the treatment (e.g., Barongan & Hall, 1995). However, additional studies on heavy metal music are needed to further test the reliability and validity of these previous studies. Future studies must also begin to address the limitations of the studies noted above, as well as the general limitations of this line of research.

Another shortcoming of the effects line of research is the failure to account for differences in time, person, and context (Christenson & Roberts, 1998). The interactive nature of new and emerging media does not allow for study of simple effects when uses are complexly variable for individuals using them (Williams, Rice, & Rogers, 1988). This particular line of research focuses solely on immediate effects, and fails to make any additional post-treatment measurements over time, which limits the impact of findings to direct arousal instead of changes
in attitudes over time. Additionally, a lack of measurement of prior knowledge/preference of the music under study also hampers findings.

One final caveat that will be underscored is ignorance displayed by scholars when studying the topic of heavy metal. Across almost all of the academic studies referenced in this literature review, authors (e.g., Walser, 1993; Weinstein, 2000; Purcell, 2003; Anderson, Carnagey, & Eubanks, 2003) have consistently misspelled musicians’ names, mislabeled songs or records, and miscategorized bands or fan actions. While not a critique of research design, such mistakes represent poor scholarship and lack of attention to detail. More importantly, they demonstrate a lack of understanding or ignorance of the complexity of the culture under discussion. In the end, the credibility of many authors in this line of research is suspect because of these mistakes, which should be second-nature to them as cultural participants (i.e., for a discussion of these issues [caveats] see Appendix A).

In a similar vein, cultural studies have failed to offer insights as to the depth and breadth of the heavy metal listening experience. Although the insights of a few heavy metal listeners are studied from within groups of fans, the listening experience of those who are not fans is ignored.

With the heavy metal literature now reviewed, attention is turned to the topic of cover songs. While at first this topic may seem irrelevant in regards to the previous discussions, cover songs represent the ideal situation of genre differences: same lyrics, different genres. Therefore, cover songs present a unique area for investigation, and one that will be explicated in the next sections.
Cover Songs

A limited number of studies have been conducted on cover songs, and none in an experimental setting. Most of the existing research on cover songs is of historical, cultural, and traditional perspective, examining the phenomenon of covering songs and what such recordings mean to the larger musical community (i.e., Weinstein, 1998; Coyle, 2002; Griffiths, 2002; Bailey, 2003; Plasketes, 2005; Cusic, 2005). The following discussion will highlight important elements of this line of research, still in its initial stage.

According to Coyle (2002), the practice of covering songs dates back to the 1950s, with Elvis Presley as the first cover artist by today’s standards. As was the case of many white performers of this time, many cover songs were initially written and performed by black artists and re-recorded by popular white artists who could turn them into hit singles (Coyle, 2002). While this racial divide has diminished over time, the practice of covering songs has not. In a detailed discussion of cover songs, Plasketes (2005) claims that the number of tribute/cover records since 1994 ranges from 150-200 per year. Such a multitude of songs of this nature cannot be ignored.

To support this notion of cover songs’ importance, recall the earlier discussion of the Judas Priest trial, in which the band was sued for allegedly recording subliminal messages (i.e., “Do it”) into the song “Better By You, Better Than Me.” As mentioned previously, that Judas Priest recorded this as a cover song, written and originally recorded by Spooky Tooth, with only a handful of wording/lyrical changes is a testament to heavy metal’s musical power. Popular media attention to this legal case was widespread and Judas Priest (along with Ozzy Osbourne due to his similar cases) essentially became the spokesmen for the genre. These cases drew further negative attention to the culture, providing opportunity to attract public scrutiny about the
While this is an extreme example of a cover song’s impact, heavy metal artists have continued the cover song tradition regularly throughout the years, ranging from b-sides to entire albums (e.g., Metallica’s *Garage Inc.*, Iced Earth’s *Tribute to the Gods*, and Ozzy Osbourne’s *Under Cover*).

While some musical genres show greater propensity for cover songs, including heavy metal, others do not lend themselves well to such tributes, especially across genres. Furthermore, cover songs can represent a variety of intentions. Indeed, Weinstein (1998) writes:

> The reasons for doing covers in the postmodern moment are as varied as the ways in which they are done: the commercial advantage of familiarity, homage, introducing obscure artists to a wider audience, gaining credibility, criticizing the past, appropriating a song from one genre into another, demonstrating one’s roots, finding the original song to express the cover artists’ views or feelings as well as if not better than anything they could write, and lack of creativity. (p. 146)

To this could be added an ease of recording for inclusion on album reissues or compilation records (e.g., tributes, greatest hits packages, soundtracks). However, of central importance here is Weinstein’s (1998) notion of appropriating songs across genres. In this manner, cover songs can reach new audiences separated by taste or generation, as well as transcend genres with new recordings to allow for new interpretations (Cusic, 2005).

Also of interest in a discussion of cover songs is the form a cover song takes. Distinctions in cover songs are detailed by Griffiths (2002): “renditions” are straightforwardly faithful versions of the originals, “transformations” make a more determined claim on the originals, and “appropriations” serve to transform a song from one genre to another. From this
notion, Christenson and Roberts (1998) note that people can think of a familiar song that had a totally different meaning when covered by another artist.

These distinctions between cover songs and their impact on new audiences allow for a unique take on popular music. Consequently, they also offer a simple route for an investigation into genre differences, as music changes and lyrics remain the same. While a detailed musicological analysis in the vein of Walser (1993) or Berger (1999b) is unattainable due to a lack of expertise, general musical differences can be explored without using instrumental songs and/or less popular (especially to the largest music consumer groups of adolescents and young adults) genres of music such as classical or jazz. Accordingly, as Frith (1996) evaluates Walser’s analysis of heavy metal, he questions whether a technical understanding of what metal musicians do explains what metal audiences hear. In a more general sense, are there differences between genre performances of the same song(s) that audiences hear, attributable only to the music and style of performance? Such a question leads directly to the present study.

Current Investigation

In 1981, in one of the first scholarly investigations into popular music industry and culture, Frith (1981) noted that “most rock records make their impact musically rather than lyrically. The words, if they are noticed at all, are absorbed after the music has made its mark. The crucial variables are sound and rhythm” (p. 14). Christenson and Roberts (1998) reiterate this point in their review of research conducted on adolescents and rock ‘n’ roll. Support for such a notion is also evidenced in the findings of Verden, Dunleavy, and Powers (1989) and Arnett (1991). Likewise, Purcell (2003) points out that death metal lyrics are often unintelligible, poorly written, or written by citizens of countries whose first language is not
English. Therefore, they serve as a means to promote the aggression and extremity of the music (p. 39). In other words, death metal lyrics often function as another sound or instrument in the mix rather than a format for deciphering the content of the song.

In further support of the importance of the music, Rettig (2005), in an interview with an author of a book on music, presents the author’s claims that the power of the music itself is as much of a concern as the lyrical content (specifically referencing the genres of hard rock and heavy metal). Both Walser (1993) and Christenson and Roberts (1998) assert that musical meanings are rarely dealt with and are an important task for scholars to undertake. More specifically, Christenson and Roberts claim it is “reasonable to ask whether such things as the music’s beat, its current popularity, who performs it, and so forth, make a difference” (p. 196).

The review of literature in the area of heavy metal music, along with the contentions advanced by these scholars in regard to differences between music and lyrics, provides justification for the current investigation. Specifically, as a follow-up to Ballard, Dodson, and Bazzini’s (1999) study on the impact of perceptions of lyrical effects of different genres, the following hypotheses are advanced for one study:

H1: Lyrics labeled as “heavy metal” will produce more negative evaluations and perceptions than those labeled as “pop/Southern rock” or “pop/rock.”

H2: Lyrics containing violent content will produce more negative evaluations and perceptions than lyrics not containing violent content, regardless of genre label.

H3: Lyrics rated as higher in familiarity will produce significantly less arousal than lyrics rated as lower in familiarity, regardless of genre label.

Additionally, the review of literature, combined specifically with the discussion of cover songs and Wanamaker and Reznikoff’s (1989) hypothesis that heavy metal music may influence
listeners more than the lyrics, provides appropriate justification for a second study. The hypotheses developed for this study are:

H1: Heavy metal cover songs will produce a significant change in mood state compared to original pop or rock versions.

H2: Heavy metal cover songs will produce mood states closer to original genre performances that are stylistically similar than those that are stylistically dissimilar (i.e., punk and hard rock songs will produce more similar mood states than pop songs and heavy metal songs).

H3: Heavy metal cover songs will produce a significant change in mood state compared to original versions regardless of lyrical content.

H4: Heavy metal cover song lyrics will be less attended to and/or produce higher levels of misinterpretation than original pop, rock, or punk versions.

H5: Heavy metal cover songs will produce significantly higher levels of happiness, anger, and excitement and significantly lower levels of sadness for individuals who identify heavy metal as a favorite genre.

H6: Heavy metal cover songs will produce significantly lower levels of all emotions (i.e., happiness, sadness, anger, excitement) for individuals who do not identify heavy metal as a favorite genre.

H7: Heavy metal cover songs will produce significantly higher levels of anger regardless of individuals’ genre preference.
CHAPTER II: METHOD

This chapter will detail the methodology used for two salient studies designed to test the effects of music genre. However, the studies differ in their focus, as one is intended to test the effects of genre labels on perceptions of music lyrics and the other is planned to test the effects of musical genre/style on mood state. Specifically, both investigations employed an experimental design (Campbell & Stanley, 1966; Montgomery, 1997), creating an appropriate means of testing hypotheses and data collection instruments and procedures. A stimulus-response ordering in which exposure responses were measured via questionnaire provided comparable data across a large group of individuals in an effort to generalize to the population from which the sample was drawn (Keyton, 2001). Additionally, an informal pilot test was conducted for the music experiment with a small sample of the target population as a means to establish the validity and reliability of the stimuli and questionnaire. Following is the description of participants, materials, and procedure for each study.

Study 1

Study one was a follow-up to Ballard, Dodson, and Bazzini’s (1999) study on the impact of perceptions of lyrical effects of different genres, employing a similar design. However, instead of focusing solely on perceptions of lyrical effects on others’ prosocial/antisocial behaviors, this investigation centered on individuals’ own perceptions of lyrical content. The following hypotheses were advanced for study 1:

H1: Lyrics labeled as “heavy metal” will produce more negative evaluations and perceptions than those labeled as “pop/Southern rock” or “pop/rock.”
H2: Lyrics containing violent content will produce more negative evaluations and perceptions than lyrics not containing violent content, regardless of genre label.

H3: Lyrics rated as higher in familiarity will produce significantly less arousal than lyrics rated as lower in familiarity, regardless of genre label.

Participants

Demographics.

Participants for this study were drawn from one large and one small introductory journalism class. Introductory journalism classes provided an appropriate participant pool for this study on media effects because of the course focus on the examination of media messages. Furthermore, these classes contained students from a variety of departments, majors, undergraduate levels, serving as a representative cross-section of undergraduates at the midwestern university.

A total of 105 undergraduate students participated in the study. Participants were an average age of 19.77 years (range 18-30); 60 were female and 42 were male (3 did not provide a sex); 82 were White, 6 were Black, and each of the remaining 13 who provided an ethnicity were of another ethnic background (4 did not provide an ethnicity); 38 were sophomores, 32 were freshmen, 22 were juniors, and 8 were seniors. A total of 5 did not provide a class rank.

Because the topic of study is popular music, this group of participants is appropriate, as it includes one of the largest popular music consumer groups (often broken by marketing companies into two separate age groups that overlap with this sample) in the nation (Burnett, 1996; Christenson & Roberts, 1998). Additional factors that affected the sample include
demographic characteristics of this particular university. Specifically, females outnumber males and the majority of the student population is white, so the sample reflected this difference.

Music consumption.

The sample’s dependent variable of music consumption was calculated. The amount of time spent listening to music, the number of CDs owned and concert attendance was recorded and analyzed.

The amount of time spent listening to music was operationalized by having the respondents indicate on a typical day the number of hours spent listening to the radio, CDs, and an MP3 player. The total time spent listening to music was calculated as the sum of these three categorical responses. The average of radio hours was 1.91, of CD hours was 2.04, and of an MP3 player was 2.32. The average total time spent listening to music was 6.29 hours. The students’ CD libraries were also recorded for this study. The average number of CDs was 80.24. The genres represented in the students’ libraries are shown in Table 1.

The average number of concerts attended per year was 2.74. Favorite musical genre was country/bluegrass (16.19%), followed by rock (14.29%) and alternative (9.52%). Adjectives most commonly listed as reasons for liking a musical genre (regardless of which genre) included “fun,” “upbeat,” “relaxing,” “emotional,” “meaningful,” and “interesting.”

Materials

The materials for this study consisted of one packet of information distributed to students in class. The packet of materials consisted of an information/cover sheet detailing the (extra credit) options included in the packet, which contained a) a lyrics sheet (see Appendix B) labeled
Table 1

*Survey Participants’ CD Ownership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country/Bluegrass</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techno/Electronic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy Listening</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>14.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Metal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Rock</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rap</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>14.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CDs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>80.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* n = 104
as either “heavy metal” or the original song’s genre (i.e., “Pop/Southern Rock” and “Pop/Rock”),
a study information sheet (see Appendix C), and lyrics questionnaire (see Appendix C); and b)
an alternate activity of equal work specifically relating to course content (i.e., read an Associated
Press article and write an OP/ED response to it).

Lyrics used for this study include those of four songs used in study 2 (see Appendix B),
with text taken from websites that publish song lyrics (checked for accuracy when listening to
the song). The four sets of lyrics that served as stimuli for this study were chosen based on two
criteria: popularity of song/likelihood of familiarity, and violent content. Specifically, the four
song lyrics chosen include “In the Chapel In the Moonlight” (Hill, 1965), “Saturday Night’s
Alright for Fighting” (John & Taupin, 1973), “If You Want to Get to Heaven” (Cash & Dillon,
1973), and “Anarchy in the U.K.” (Cook, Jones, Matlock, & Rotten, 1977) (See Appendix E for
original and cover artists). Lyrics by Hill and Cash and Dillon were chosen for their expected
low level of familiarity and nonviolent lyrics. Compositions by John and Taupin and Cook,
Jones, Matlock, and Rotten were chosen for their expected high level of familiarity and violent
lyrics.

Therefore, the stimuli produced four experimental conditions for each pop/rock (original)
or heavy metal (cover) song: low familiarity/nonviolent lyrics, low familiarity/violent lyrics,
high familiarity/nonviolent lyrics, and high familiarity/violent lyrics. Following exposure to one
of the four conditions of stimuli (lyric sheets), participants completed a questionnaire to test their
perceptions relative to genre labels and criteria for selection. Given that the stimuli are naturally
occurring, and not manipulated for experimental use (other than reprinting), they were expected
to test as valid and reliable.
Procedure

The aforementioned packet of materials was distributed to students during a normal class session. Students had the length of the class session to complete either extra credit option. Regardless of whether or not the students chose to participate in the study or which extra credit option they chose to complete, all materials were placed back in the packet and returned to the researcher monitoring the class session. This ended participation in the study.

Study 2

The second study was based on a review of experimental-based heavy metal studies, specifically combined with the discussion of cover songs and Wanamaker and Reznikoff’s (1989) hypothesis that heavy metal music may influence listeners more than the lyrics of songs. Pre- and post-exposure measures of mood were of particular importance, serving as emotional gauges of stimuli effects. As detailed by Knobloch (2003), music is one of the most often used media forms to adjust mood. “Mood” was chosen over “arousal” for measurement because of the straightforward nature (less ambiguity) of mood states. The following hypotheses were advanced:

H1: Heavy metal cover songs will produce a significant change in mood state compared to original pop or rock versions.

H2: Heavy metal cover songs will produce mood states closer to original genre performances that are stylistically similar than those that are stylistically dissimilar (i.e., punk and hard rock songs will produce more similar mood states than pop songs and heavy metal songs).
H3: Heavy metal cover songs will produce a significant change in mood state compared to original versions regardless of lyrical content.

H4: Heavy metal cover song lyrics will be less attended to and/or produce higher levels of misinterpretation than original pop, rock, or punk versions.

H5: Heavy metal cover songs will produce significantly higher levels of happiness, anger, and excitement and significantly lower levels of sadness for individuals who identify heavy metal as a favorite genre or identify as a heavy metal fan.

H6: Heavy metal cover songs will produce significantly lower levels of all emotions (i.e., happiness, sadness, anger, excitement) for individuals who do not identify heavy metal as a favorite genre or do not identify as a heavy metal fan.

H7: Heavy metal cover songs will produce significantly higher levels of anger regardless of individuals’ genre preference.

Participants

Demographics.

Participants for this study were drawn from one large introductory journalism lecture class (different than that of study 1) and one small honors class. A total of 102 undergraduate students participated in the study. Participants were an average age of 19.30 years (range 18-24); 66 were female and 35 were male whereas 1 did not provide a sex; 81 were White, 8 were Black, and each of the remaining 5 who provided an ethnicity were of another ethnic background whereas 8 did not provide an ethnicity; 42 were sophomores, 40 were freshmen, 13 were juniors, and 5 were seniors while 2 did not provide a class rank.
Again, the introductory journalism class provided an appropriate participant pool for this study on media effects because of the course focus on critical examination of media messages. While similar in nature to the participant group of study 1, this target group is different in that the classes were taught by different instructors, as well as held in different classrooms. Because of these factors, as well as the different student composition, course experiences and interactions were different, providing a different participant group with similar demographic characteristics as those in study 1. Again, these classes contained students from a variety of departments, majors, undergraduate levels, serving as a representative cross-section of undergraduates at the University.

Similarly, the honors class was taught as a critical thinking class, also heightening students’ awareness to media messages. Because the courses were introductory in nature, participants largely consisted of first- and second-year students; an appropriate group of participants given the topic of study is popular music. As stated earlier, this group includes one of the largest popular music consumer groups (often broken by marketing companies into two separate age groups that overlap with this sample) in the nation (Burnett, 1996; Christenson & Roberts, 1998). Because females outnumber males and the majority of the student population is white at this particular university, the sample reflected this difference.

**Music consumption.**

The sample’s dependent variable of music consumption was calculated. The amount of time spent listening to music, the number of CDs owned and concert attendance was recorded and analyzed.
The amount of time spent listening to music was operationalized by having the respondents indicate on a typical day the number of hours spent listening to the radio, CDs, and an MP3 player. The total time spent listening to music was calculated as the sum of these three categorical responses. The average of radio hours was 2.06, of CD hours was 2.33, and of an MP3 player was 2.46. The average total time spent listening to music was 6.86 hours. The students’ CD libraries were also recorded for this study. The average number of CDs was 63.00. The genres represented in the students’ libraries are shown in Table 2.

The average number of concerts attended per year was 2.22. Favorite musical genre was country/bluegrass (20.59%), followed by R&B (10.78%) and rock (8.82%). Adjectives most commonly listed as reasons for liking a musical genre (regardless of which genre) included “fun,” “upbeat,” “relaxing,” “energetic,” and “meaningful.”

Materials

The materials for this study consisted of two sets of songs chosen as stimuli (see Appendix E) and an information sheet and the questionnaire (see Appendix F), developed specifically for this study. Specifically, ten songs were chosen for inclusion, each with two versions (i.e., original, heavy metal cover), for a total of twenty songs. Four criteria for inclusion were identified: 1) original and cover versions had the same lyrics (slight variations not affecting overall theme were common); 2) cover versions were within (±) one minute of length of the original recording; 3) cover versions exhibited a heavy metal style of music; and 4) original and cover versions were performed by singers of the same gender (see Appendix D for the full list of songs identified as possible stimuli for the study).
Table 2

*Experiment Participants’ CD Ownership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country/Bluegrass</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techno/Electronic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy Listening</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Metal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Rock</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rap</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>11.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CDs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* n = 100
Therefore, the stimuli produced two experimental conditions: pop/original and heavy metal/cover song. Before and after exposure to one of the twenty stimuli, participants completed a questionnaire to gather information about music preferences and consumption, and test their changes in mood state and perceptions of the stimulus.

Songs selected as heavy metal cover songs contained the elements of the heavy metal genre’s musical sound/structure/composition, as defined earlier. Artists chosen are commonly referred to as heavy metal and receive frequent coverage in the genre’s popular publications (e.g., Metal Edge, Revolver, BW&BK magazines). Likewise, most have been used as examples within scholarly literature on the topic (e.g., W.A.S.P., Celtic Frost, AC/DC, Megadeth – see Walser, 1993; Weinstein, 2000; Hansen and Hansen, 1991). Finally, a conscious effort was made to select artists based on public scrutiny in the popular press and legal cases (e.g., W.A.S.P., AC/DC, Marilyn Manson). Consequently, it would be hard to argue against the classification of most of these particular artists as heavy metal artists, given the popular, scholarly, legal, and musical histories. For this reason, stimuli for this study were expected to test as valid and reliable. In an effort to support this, participants were asked to classify by genre the songs to which they were exposed.

Procedure

Participants visited a computer lab to participate in the experiment. Once there, they were presented with a packet containing an instruction sheet, an information sheet, the stimulus (CD), and the music questionnaire. Participants were split on gender and randomly assigned to one of two conditions (pop/original or heavy metal/cover song). Participants completed the first half of the music questionnaire and then listened to the stimulus once, though headphones at a
computer. The use of headphones allowed for exclusive input and greater focused attention to the stimulus. Personal headphones are also more realistic of current personal experiences of music, especially with this participant group, based on the ever-increasing popularity of personal MP3 players such as the iPod. Immediately following exposure, participants completed the second portion of the music questionnaire developed specifically for this study (see Appendix F). This ended participation in the study.

Both studies were submitted to the university’s Institutional Review Board for approval of the use of human participants before they were begun. Additionally, for both studies, as incentive for participation, students were offered extra credit for participation in the respective studies or completion of an equivalent alternative assignment – i.e., read an Associated Press article and write an OP/ED response to it. Because of the use of personal headphones for study 2, participants were also given the set of headphones they used as an additional sign of appreciation for participation.
CHAPTER III: RESULTS

Study 1

The first step for analyzing the data required that an internal validity check be conducted with the independent variables of lyrics and music (Singleton, Straits, Straits, & McAllister, 1988). Construct discrimination for the key concepts of lyrics and music was examined. Two-tailed paired samples t-tests were calculated to determine if the participants perceived these variables to be distinct. It was predicted that lyrics would be viewed as independent of the music. That is, music and lyrics are identified by the listeners as being distinct concepts. Measurement of the concepts was achieved by how much attention is paid to a) music in general, b) lyrics in general, c) music in favorite songs, and d) lyrics in favorite songs.

A statistically significant difference emerged in three of the four analyses when comparing the respondents’ attention to a song’s music to attention to a song’s lyrics. The four independent analyses included: a) attention to general music versus attention to general lyrics, b) attention to favorite music versus attention to favorite lyrics, c) attention to general lyrics versus attention to favorite lyrics, d) attention to general music versus attention to favorite music.

A two-tailed paired samples t-test was computed for attention to general music versus attention to general lyrics and found to be not significant (t(103) = -1.34) at p = .18. Respondents were not more likely in general to pay attention to a song’s lyrics (M = 7.50) as compared to a song’s music (M = 7.25). In contrast, a second two-tailed paired samples t-test was computed for attention to favorite music versus attention to favorite lyrics and found to be significant (t(104) = -2.57) at p = .01. Respondents were more likely to pay attention to their favorite songs’ lyrics (M = 8.68) compared to their favorite songs’ music (M = 8.45). A third two-tailed paired samples t-test was computed for attention to general lyrics versus attention to favorite lyrics and
found to be significant \(t(103) = -8.80\) at \(p = .00\). Respondents were more likely to pay attention to their favorite songs’ lyrics \((M = 8.68)\) compared to song lyrics in general \((M = 7.50)\). A fourth two-tailed paired samples t-test was computed for attention to general music versus attention to favorite music and found to be significant \(t(104) = -10.30\) at \(p = .00\). Respondents were more likely to pay attention to their favorite songs’ music \((M = 8.45)\) when compared to music in general \((M = 7.27)\).

To further queue participants as to the distinction between music and lyrics, they were asked if hearing the song lyrics (the stimuli they were provided) in their musical context would make a difference in their interpretation of the song. In response to this question, 72 (69.90%) responded affirmatively, while 31 (30.10%) responded negatively. Participants were then asked their reasoning behind this response. These open-ended answers were analyzed thematically. When those that answered affirmatively were asked why music would make a difference as to their interpretation, four themes emerged. From 70 responses, 25 (35.71%) stated music would change their feeling and/or interpretation of the song (e.g., “then I could hear the beat, maybe feel the meaning”), 17 (24.29%) claimed the music was more important to them (e.g., “because I pay more attention to the music”), 10 (14.29%) indicated music with lyrics would provide a full listening context (e.g., “the way the music and lyrics coincide is key to my listening”), and 5 (7.14%) noted genre of the music would make the difference (e.g., “because the genre is heavy metal”).

When those that answered negatively were asked why music would not make a difference as to their interpretation, three themes emerged. From 29 responses, 9 (31.03%) stated they had already made a decision of the song based on the lyrics (e.g., “the lyrics alone turn me away”), 8 (27.59%) indicated the same message was being communicated regardless of the music (e.g.,
“because it would still be saying the same thing”), and 3 (10.34%) noted the genre of the music made the difference (e.g., “heavy metal is of no interest to me musically”).

In addition to questions to distinguish between the concepts of music and lyrics, participants were asked to identify particular songs they would use to continue stimulation of four particular mood states: happy, sad, angry, and excited. Songs were coded by genre to determine genre preferences for individual mood states. To remain happy, genres of choice were country/bluegrass and pop (both 17.71%), followed by rap/hip-hop (12.50%). Genres chosen to remain sad were country/bluegrass (22.34%), followed by pop (17.02%) and pop/rock (12.77%). An angry mood was stimulated by rap/hip-hop (23.53%), heavy metal (21.18%), and hard rock/heavy metal (10.59%). Finally, to remain excited, genres of choice were rap/hip-hop (24.44%), pop (13.33%), and pop/rock (10.00%). One caveat to the excited genre was that many participants interpreted wording of the question (“excited and aroused”) sexually, which lead to an increase of rap/hip-hop, R&B, and soul songs listed for this category.

Some genres were combined during coding of particular artists and songs because of the lack of a clear musical distinction. For instance, Dave Matthews Band was a commonly listed artist, and was classified as “pop/rock” because their music covers both genres as well as both top 40 and mainstream rock radio station playlists. Artists such as Puddle of Mudd and Papa Roach were listed as hard rock/heavy metal since they also cover both genres and multiple radio formats. Therefore, some categories listed above actually cover two closely related genres, but do not capture the entirety of the identification of particular genres.

For instance, since the genre of heavy metal is the focus of this study, the frequency of this genre to enhance mood states is also of importance. Although listed exclusively as a single genre of choice for only angry mood states, songs that could be classified as heavy metal were
listed for happiness 3.13% of the time, for sadness 3.19% of the time, for anger 37.65% of the
time, and for excitement 7.78% of the time. Artists included in categories encompassing heavy
metal and other related genres include Nickelback and Coheed and Cambria, which can also be
classified as hard rock, and AC/DC, which can be classified as classic or hard rock.

Participants were also asked why particular songs would be chosen to stimulate particular
mood states. These justifications were coded to continue the distinction between music and
lyrics, so coding categories included neither music nor lyrics (neither), lyrics, music, and both
music and lyrics (both). Two coders were employed for this data and Scott’s pi was calculated
for each mood state to determine intercoder reliability. Intercoder reliability was 97.78%
agreement for happy responses, 93.18% agreement for sad responses, 96.99% agreement for
angry responses, and 95.83% agreement for excited responses. A discussion of the discrepancies
between coders resulted in agreement on all coding choices.

Of the 90 responses for happiness, 18 (20.00%) indicated neither, 22 (24.44%) indicated
lyrics, 27 (30.00%) indicated music, and 23 (25.56%) indicated both were factors. Of the 88
responses for sadness, 20 (22.73%) indicated neither, 44 (50.00%) indicated lyrics, 12 (13.64%)
indicated music, and 12 (13.64%) indicated both. Of the 82 responses for anger, 20 (24.39%)
indicated neither, 28 (34.15%) indicated lyrics, 15 (18.29%) indicated music, and 19 (23.17%)
indicated both. Of the 84 responses for excitement, 19 (22.62%) indicated neither, 12 (14.29%)
indicated lyrics, 38 (45.24%) indicated music, and 15 (17.86%) indicated both. Again, it is noted
that the responses to the excitement mood state were often interpreted sexually, causing an
increase in references to overt sexual lyrics and/or music, most common in genres of rap, hip-
hop and soul. Therefore, the results of this category should be interpreted with that in mind.
Keeping in mind these general sample characteristics and results distinguishing the concepts of lyrics and music, specific hypotheses can now be addressed.

The first hypothesis was that lyrics labeled as “heavy metal” would produce more negative evaluations and perceptions than those labeled as “pop/Southern rock” or “pop/rock” (referred to as non-heavy metal from here on). Heavy metal stimuli included song lyrics of “In the Chapel in the Moonlight” (ICIM) and “Anarchy in the U.K.” (AUK), while non-heavy metal stimuli included song lyrics of “If You Want to Get to Heaven” (IYWGH) and “Saturday Night’s Alright for Fighting” (SNAF).

First, some contextual data must be presented. Respondents indicated their familiarity on a 10-point Likert scale that ranged from not at all familiar (“0”) to very familiar (“9”). Stimulus familiarity rated very low, with means of .92 for ICIM, 1.27 for AUK, 1.85 for IYWGH, and 1.56 for SNAF. Because of such low familiarity, responses can be interpreted without accounting for prior exposure or song preference. In other words, responses to these stimuli can be read in the context of initial exposure, with little or no prior knowledge of the stimuli by which assessments were made.

Prior familiarity/preference can also be ignored as a contributing factor when accounting for stimuli recommendations. In this regard, the mean for recommending heavy metal stimuli was 2.06, with a mode of .00 (40.38%) and the mean for recommending non-heavy metal stimuli was 2.85, with a mode of .00 (30.77%). Means and modes for heavy metal fandom were 2.88, .00 (36.54%) for heavy metal stimuli and 3.19, .00 (26.92%) for non-heavy metal stimuli.

The first hypothesis was tested through analysis of several open- and closed-ended questionnaire responses, comparing heavy metal and non-heavy metal stimuli. Responses to “What do you think about the lyrics you just read?” (Stimulus Think) were analyzed for positive,
negative and neutral evaluations. These three categories of response evaluations were also used when analyzing responses to the statement “Explain how you feel after reading the lyrics.” (Stimulus Feel). Frequencies were examined for responses to “Indicate if this is different than how you felt before you read the lyrics.” (Feel Different). Post-stimulus feelings were justified (Feel Different Why and Feel Different Why Not) and these responses were also analyzed for positive, negative and neutral content. Responses to “What was the lyricist communicating?” (Stimulus Communicate) were evaluated for content beyond the main lyrical theme(s). Finally, answers to “What did the lyrics convey to you?” (Stimulus Convey) were again examined for positive, negative and neutral qualities.

Another section of the questionnaire concerned adolescent listening. Participants were asked “Should adolescents be allowed to listen to this song?” (Adolescents Listen), and frequencies of affirmative and negative responses were recorded. Reasoning behind these responses (Adolescents Listen Why and Adolescents Listen Why Not) was content analyzed for themes.

The final section of the questionnaire dealt with classification of music listeners. Responses to “When I think of the people who listen to this type of music, I would describe them as:” (Listen Type) were analyzed for positive, negative and neutral descriptions. The same analysis procedure was used for responses to “When I think of the people who would never listen to this type of music, I would describe them as:” (Never Listen Type) and “When I think of people who avoid this type of music, I would describe them as:” (Avoid Type). Participants then classified their relationship to each of the three listener groups by answering “Here is where I think I fit in relative to the group I described above:” (Listen Relationship, Never Listen
Relationship and Avoid Relationship), and these responses were categorized as fit, sometimes/somewhat fit, and do not fit (see Appendix C for the lyrics questionnaire).

In a few cases, thematic frequencies add up to more than the number of participant responses; this is due to multiple themes occurring within one response. Analyses of these open- and closed-ended responses are presented in categories of stimuli effects, perceptions of adolescent listening, and stimuli listener types.

Stimuli effects responses are summarized in Table 3. All open-ended response categories except for Stimulus Communicate were coded as negative, positive, or neutral responses. Negative responses included negative descriptions of the stimulus such as “they are very angry and even scary” and “they were dumb.” Positive responses included positive descriptions of the stimulus such as “the lyrics are pretty and romantic” and “unique; I’d like to hear them with music.” Neutral responses included descriptions that were neither positive nor negative and were often just references to the main lyrical theme, such as “they’re about marriage” and “seems like some kind of ballad.”

When asked what they thought of the stimulus (Stimulus Think), participants showed a difference in perception of the heavy metal and non-heavy metal stimuli. Lyrics labeled as “heavy metal” were more often perceived negatively (44.23%, n = 52) and less often perceived positively (17.31%, n = 52) than lyrics labeled as a genre other than “heavy metal” (26.53% and 36.73% respectively, n = 49). Additionally, heavy metal lyrics were more often described with extreme negative descriptors such as “angry,” “crazy,” “harsh,” “hate,” “evil” and “violent” – 14 (26.92%, n = 52) references compared to only 3 (6.12%, n = 49) such references for non-heavy metal stimuli. One final point of interest is that 3 of the 26 (11.53%) participants who received
Table 3

*Stimuli Effects for Hypothesis 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>Heavy Metal Stimuli</th>
<th>Non-Heavy Metal Stimuli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stimulus Think</strong></td>
<td>Negative (23)</td>
<td>Negative (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive (9)</td>
<td>Positive (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (20)</td>
<td>Neutral (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stimulus Feel</strong></td>
<td>Negative (23)</td>
<td>Negative (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive (11)</td>
<td>Positive (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (17)</td>
<td>Neutral (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feel Different</strong></td>
<td>No = 27 (54.00%)</td>
<td>No = 28 (56.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes = 23 (46.00%)</td>
<td>Yes = 22 (44.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feel Different Why</strong></td>
<td>Negative (8)</td>
<td>Negative (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive (5)</td>
<td>Positive (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (10)</td>
<td>Neutral (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feel Different Why Not</strong></td>
<td>Negative (5)</td>
<td>Negative (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive (4)</td>
<td>Positive (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (18)</td>
<td>Neutral (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stimulus Communicate</strong></td>
<td>Interpretation beyond main</td>
<td>Interpretation beyond main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lyrical theme (2)</td>
<td>lyrical theme (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(continued)*
Table 3 (continued)

*Stimuli Effects for Hypothesis 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>Heavy Metal Stimuli</th>
<th>Non-Heavy Metal Stimuli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stimulus Convey</td>
<td>Negative (15)</td>
<td>Negative (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive (9)</td>
<td>Positive (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (27)</td>
<td>Neutral (20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Third row presents response frequencies and percentages to the closed-ended question of whether participants felt different after reading the lyrics stimulus. All other rows present themes and frequencies of open-ended responses regarding stimulus effects.
ICIM lyrics stated that the lyrics do not seem like they would be heavy metal lyrics, demonstrating a common genre stereotype that it does not include songs of love.

As can be seen in rows 2-5 of Table 3, the difference in how participants felt after reading the lyrics was small. The heavy metal genre label did not have an impact in this particular case. The only clear difference in responses between heavy metal and non-heavy metal stimuli came when participants were asked why they felt different after reading the lyrics (Feel Different Why). Negative evaluations were very close, but non-heavy metal stimuli had far more positive evaluations (54.55%, n = 22) and heavy metal stimuli had far more neutral evaluations (43.48%, n = 23). While positive descriptions were consistent across conditions (most referred to being curious about the song or going from a tired to positive mental state), they were more often used to describe non-heavy metal lyrics. Neutral evaluations often referred to the lyrical theme or no specific direction of mood change, but were more common when describing heavy metal stimuli. One noteworthy finding was that the most common reason given across conditions for no change in feeling (Feel Different Why Not) was that there was no music to accompany the lyrics (22.22%, n = 27 for the heavy metal stimuli and 29.17%, n = 24 for the non-heavy metal stimuli).

When asked what the stimulus was communicating (Stimulus Communicate), participants predominantly just repeated the main lyrical theme. However, deeper interpretation did occur for some participants, especially in response to the non-heavy metal lyrics. This demonstrates that most listeners in this sample take the lyrics at face value, interpreting them literally or offering no additional thought to the meanings behind the words.

When asked what the stimulus conveyed (Stimulus Convey), participants again offered little beyond repetition of the main lyrical theme, the differences between the two conditions
existing in positive and neutral descriptions. Tellingly, these response differences between heavy metal and non-heavy metal stimuli were inherent in the lyrical themes, with positive descriptions labeling ICIM lyrics as love and SNAF lyrics as having fun. Neutral descriptions again simply stated the lyrical content (e.g., “he wants to marry a girl” and “drinking”).

Adolescent listening data are summarized in Table 4. When asked if adolescents should be allowed to listen to song lyrics provided (Adolescents Listen), there was very little difference between conditions. Participants actually felt adolescents should be allowed to listen to the heavy metal stimuli (76.92%, n = 52) more than the non-heavy metal stimuli (71.15%, n = 52). While themes varied slightly across conditions when asked why adolescents should be allowed to listen to the song lyrics (Adolescents Listen Why), most felt that there was nothing wrong with the lyrical message or that individuals should be allowed to listen to whatever they want, often directly espousing the concept of censorship. When justifying why adolescents should not be allowed to listen to the songs (Adolescents Listen Why Not), participants most often cited the negative message present in certain stimuli, although this was more prevalent in the non-heavy metal condition, mostly due to references to drinking and fighting in SNAF lyrics. While the negative message and direct effects themes are closely related, direct effects responses were classified as such because there was explicit reference to the lyrics causing behaviors rather than just the reference to a particular message.

Stimuli listener data are presented in Table 5. To test genre listener stereotypes, participants were asked to describe the types of people who would listen to the particular type of music (Listen Type), those who would never listen to the particular type of music (Never Listen Type), and those who would avoid the particular type of music (Avoid Type). Responses were
Table 4

*Adolescent Listening for Hypothesis 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>Heavy Metal Stimuli</th>
<th>Non-Heavy Metal Stimuli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents Listen</td>
<td>No = 12</td>
<td>No = 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes = 40</td>
<td>Yes = 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents Listen Why</td>
<td>Nothing Wrong (18)</td>
<td>Nothing Wrong (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom (9)</td>
<td>Freedom (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open mind (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Effects (4)</td>
<td>Direct Effects (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive message (2)</td>
<td>Positive message (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not matter (2)</td>
<td>Does not matter (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would not Understand (1)</td>
<td>Would not understand (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents Listen Why Not</td>
<td>Negative message (5)</td>
<td>Negative message (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Effects (4)</td>
<td>Direct Effects (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would not understand (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* First row presents response frequencies to the closed-ended question of whether adolescents should be allowed to listen to the song based on the lyrics. The second and third rows present themes and frequencies of open-ended responses as the reasoning behind the response to the closed-ended question.
Table 5

*Listener Responses for Hypothesis 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>Heavy Metal Stimuli</th>
<th>Non-Heavy Metal Stimuli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listen Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (22)</td>
<td>Negative (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive (9)</td>
<td>Positive (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (24)</td>
<td>Neutral (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listen Relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit (6)</td>
<td>Fit (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes/somewhat fit (16)</td>
<td>Sometimes/somewhat fit (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not fit (27)</td>
<td>Do not fit (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (2)</td>
<td>Neutral (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never Listen Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (7)</td>
<td>Negative (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive (16)</td>
<td>Positive (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (28)</td>
<td>Neutral (27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never Listen Relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit (21)</td>
<td>Fit (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes/somewhat fit (9)</td>
<td>Sometimes/somewhat fit (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not fit (15)</td>
<td>Do not fit (27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (2)</td>
<td>Neutral (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoid Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (16)</td>
<td>Negative (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive (9)</td>
<td>Positive (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (25)</td>
<td>Neutral (28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(continued)*
Table 5 (continued)

Listener Responses for Hypothesis 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>Heavy Metal Stimuli</th>
<th>Non-Heavy Metal Stimuli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoid Relationship</td>
<td>Fit (19)</td>
<td>Fit (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes/somewhat fit (12)</td>
<td>Sometimes/somewhat fit (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not fit (16)</td>
<td>Do not fit (22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Columns present themes and frequencies in parentheses. Response themes ordered consistently by theme rather than by frequency for ease of comparing columns.*
again coded as negative (e.g., “mad people that [sic] hate their world”), positive (e.g., easy-going, a relaxing person”) or neutral (e.g., “rock fans”). Then they were asked their relationship to each group of listeners described (Listen Relationship, Never Listen Relationship, Avoid Relationship). Responses were coded as fitting with the group described (e.g., “I fit well”), sometimes/somewhat fitting with the group described (e.g., “every once in a while”), and not fitting with the group described (e.g., “I don’t fit into that group at all”).

When asked to describe those who would listen to the music, heavy metal listeners were portrayed more negatively, less positively, and more neutrally than non-heavy metal listeners. Such descriptions contained more references to negative attributes like “anger,” “hate,” and “mad” (23.08%, n = 52), as well as references to “intense,” “hardcore,” and “rebellious” (19.23%, n = 52). Heavy metal listener descriptions contained only slightly more stereotypes (19.23%, n = 52) than non-heavy metal listeners (13.46%, n = 52). Preference or dislike for a particular genre was used to describe both heavy metal (15.38%, n = 52) and non-heavy metal (11.54%, n = 52) listeners. When asked to describe their relationship to the listener group, participants were more likely to state dissimilar relationship to heavy metal listeners (55.10%, n = 49) and a more similar relationship to non-heavy metal listeners (30.00%, n = 50). Genre preference or dislikes were used almost equally in both conditions (15.38%, n = 52 for heavy metal, 14.00%, n = 50 for non-heavy metal).

When asked to describe those who would never listen to the music, heavy metal stimuli elicited less negative (13.73%, n = 51) and more positive responses (31.37%, n = 51) than non-heavy metal stimuli (25.49% and 9.80% respectively, n = 51). Age (25.49%, n = 51) and genre preferences or dislikes (13.73%, n = 51) were most often used to describe those who would never listen to heavy metal, while genre preferences or dislikes and closed-mindedness (both 17.65%, n
were most often used to describe those who would never listen to non-heavy metal. Participants also described themselves as more similar to those who would never listen to heavy metal stimuli (45.65%, n = 46) and less similar to those who would never listen to non-heavy metal stimuli (52.94%, n = 51).

Finally, descriptions of those who would avoid heavy metal and non-heavy metal music were almost equal across conditions. Closed-mindedness and genre preferences or dislikes were most often used to describe those who would avoid both heavy metal (17.65% and 13.73% respectively, n = 51) and non-heavy metal music (12.00% and 22.00% respectively, n = 50). However, when asked to describe their relationship to these individuals, respondents reported more similarity to those who would avoid heavy metal (40.43%, n = 47) and more dissimilarity to those who would avoid non-heavy metal music (45.83%, n = 48).

Overall, partial support for the first hypothesis was found. Categories that supported the notion that lyrics labeled as “heavy metal” would produce more negative evaluations and perceptions than those labeled as “pop/Southern rock” or “pop/rock” included Stimulus Recommend, Stimulus Think, Listen Type, Listen Relationship, Never Listen Type, Never Listen Relationship, and Avoid Relationship.

The second hypothesis was that lyrics containing violent content would produce more negative evaluations and perceptions than those not containing violent content, regardless of genre label. Violent stimuli included song lyrics of “Anarchy in the U.K.” (AUK) and “Saturday Night’s Alright for Fighting” (SNAF), while non-violent stimuli included song lyrics of “In the Chapel in the Moonlight” (ICIM) and “If You Want to Get to Heaven” (IYWGH).

As mentioned in the results of the first hypothesis, all stimuli rated very low in familiarity, so prior exposure/preference can be ignored as a contributing factor when accounting
for stimuli recommendations. Respondents indicated their familiarity on a 10-point Likert scale that ranged from not at all familiar (“0”) to very familiar (“9”). In this regard, the mean for recommending violent stimuli was 1.46, with a mode of .00 (50.98%) and the mean for recommending non-violent stimuli was 3.40, with a mode of .00 (20.75%). Means and modes for heavy metal fandom were 2.96, .00 (37.25%) for violent stimuli and 3.11, .00 (26.42%) for non-violent stimuli.

The second hypothesis was analyzed using the same method and data as the first hypothesis, only this time comparing violent to non-violent stimuli responses. Responses to “What do you think about the lyrics you just read?” (Stimulus Think) were analyzed for positive, negative and neutral evaluations. These three categories of response evaluations were also used when analyzing responses to the statement “Explain how you feel after reading the lyrics.” (Stimulus Feel). Frequencies were examined for responses to “Indicate if this is different than how you felt before you read the lyrics.” Post-stimulus feelings were justified (Feel Different Why and Feel Different Why Not) and these responses were also analyzed for positive, negative and neutral content. Responses to “What was the lyricist communicating?” (Stimulus Communicate) were evaluated for content beyond the main lyrical theme(s). Finally, answers to “What did the lyrics convey to you?” (Stimulus Convey) were again examined for positive, negative and neutral qualities.

Another section of the questionnaire concerned adolescent listening. Participants were asked “Should adolescents be allowed to listen to this song?” (Adolescents Listen), and frequencies of affirmative and negative responses were recorded. Reasoning behind these responses (Adolescents Listen Why and Adolescents Listen Why Not) was content analyzed for themes.
The final section of the questionnaire dealt with classification of music listeners. Responses to “When I think of the people who listen to this type of music, I would describe them as:” (Listen Type) were analyzed for positive, negative and neutral descriptions. The same analysis procedure was used for responses to “When I think of the people who would never listen to this type of music, I would describe them as:” (Never Listen Type) and “When I think of people who avoid this type of music, I would describe them as:” (Avoid Type). Participants then classified their relationship to each of the three listener groups by answering “Here is where I think I fit in relative to the group I described above:” (Listen Relationship, Never Listen Relationship and Avoid Relationship), and these responses were categorized as fit, sometimes/somewhat fit, and do not fit (see Appendix C for the lyrics questionnaire). In a few cases, thematic frequencies add up to more than the number of participant responses; this is due to multiple themes occurring within one response.

Again, analyses of these open- and closed-ended responses are presented in categories of stimuli effects, perceptions of adolescent listening, and stimuli listener types.

The second hypothesis was supported in several analyses (see Table 6). When asked thoughts of the stimulus (Stimulus Think), violent lyrics were more often perceived negatively (58.00%, n = 50) and less often perceived positively (14.00%, n = 50) than the non-violent stimuli (13.73%, n = 51 and 39.22%, n = 51). Additionally, 15 of the 29 (51.72%) negative evaluations of violent stimuli contained adjectives such as “angry,” “violent,” “harsh,” “evil,” and “crazy,” whereas none of the evaluations of non-violent stimuli contained such descriptors.

When describing how they felt about the stimuli (Stimulus Feel), participants again perceived the violent stimuli negatively (62.75%, n = 51) far more often than the non-violent stimuli (22.45%, n = 49). Like responses to Stimulus Think, 20 of the 32 (62.50%) negative
Table 6

*Stimuli Effects for Hypothesis 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>Violent Stimuli</th>
<th>Non-Violent Stimuli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stimulus Think</td>
<td>Negative (29)</td>
<td>Negative (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive (7)</td>
<td>Positive (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (16)</td>
<td>Neutral (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulus Feel</td>
<td>Negative (32)</td>
<td>Negative (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive (7)</td>
<td>Positive (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (14)</td>
<td>Neutral (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel Different</td>
<td>No = 23 (45.10%)</td>
<td>No = 32 (65.31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes = 28 (54.90%)</td>
<td>Yes = 17 (34.69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel Different Why</td>
<td>Negative (15)</td>
<td>Negative (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive (5)</td>
<td>Positive (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (8)</td>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel Different Why Not</td>
<td>Negative (7)</td>
<td>Negative (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (14)</td>
<td>Neutral (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulus Communicate</td>
<td>Interpretation beyond main</td>
<td>Interpretation beyond main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lyrical theme (7)</td>
<td>lyrical theme (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(continued)*
Table 6 (continued)

*Stimuli Effects for Hypothesis 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>Violent Stimuli</th>
<th>Non-Violent Stimuli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stimulus Convey</td>
<td>Negative (26)</td>
<td>Negative (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive (6)</td>
<td>Positive (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (21)</td>
<td>Neutral (26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Third row presents response frequencies and percentages to the closed-ended question of whether participants felt different after reading the lyrics stimulus. All other rows present themes and frequencies of open-ended responses regarding stimulus effects.
responses used adjectives such as “disgusted,” “angry,” “frustrated,” “disturbed,” “annoyed,” and “upset.” Consequently, violent stimuli were perceived far less positively (13.73%, n = 51) than non-violent stimuli (34.69%, n = 49).

As can be seen in row 3 of Table 6, participants were also more affected (Feel Different) by the violent stimuli than by the non-violent stimuli. When asked why they felt different (Feel Different Why), participants were more likely to list negative reasons and less likely to list positive reasons for the violent stimuli (53.57% and 17.86% respectively, n = 28) than for the non-violent stimuli (11.76% and 70.59% respectively, n = 17). Those who did not feel different (Feel Different Why Not) after reading the lyrics were most likely to respond neutrally, but violent stimuli produced no positive responses here, while non-violent stimuli produced 6 (20.00%, n = 30) positive responses. Also, even though participants reported they were unaffected by the stimuli, the violent lyrics (33.33%, n = 21) produced more negative responses than the non-violent lyrics (6.67%, n = 30). Across both conditions, participants were likely to indicate that the lack of music to accompany the lyrics was the reason they were unaffected (25.49%, n = 51).

As with the first hypothesis data, when asked what the stimulus was communicating (Stimulus Communicate), participants predominantly just repeated the main lyrical theme. However, deeper interpretation did occur for some (11.88%, n = 101), most notably for all sets of lyrics except ICIM. This demonstrates that most listeners in this sample take the lyrics at face value, interpreting them literally or offering no additional thought to the meanings behind the words.

Participants were also more likely to use negative descriptions and less likely to use positive descriptions when detailing what the stimulus conveyed (Stimulus Convey) for the
violent stimuli (50.98% and 11.76% respectively, n = 51) than for the non-violent stimuli (8.33% and 39.58% respectively, n = 48). Again, negative descriptions of the violent lyrics often contained references to “anger,” “hate,” and “violence,” indicating topics which produced the negative perceptions. The large number of neutral descriptions in both conditions often referred to the main lyrical theme (e.g., “that the person wanted to destroy things” and “his love”).

Adolescent listening data are presented in Table 7. Participants were far more likely to state that adolescents should not be allowed to listen (Adolescents Listen) to the violent stimuli than the non-violent stimuli. In fact, only 5.66% (n = 53) of participants believed that adolescents should not be allowed to listen to the non-violent stimuli. Justification for why adolescents should be allowed to listen (Adolescents Listen Why) to the violent stimuli involved several themes, the most prevalent included freedom (e.g., “because it is our First Amendment right”) and nothing wrong with the message (e.g., “it’s not bad or anything”). While many of the same themes appeared in the same justification for the non-violent stimuli, the nothing wrong with the message theme was much more frequent.

Conversely, when justifying why adolescents should not be allowed to listen to the stimuli (Adolescents Listen Why Not), participants predominantly cited the negative message (e.g., “it depicts inappropriate or illegal behaviors,” followed closely by direct effects (e.g., “this could lead young kids to doing the wrong thing”), for the violent stimuli. Justifications for why adolescents should not be allowed to listen to the non-violent stimuli included only 3 responses, 2 of which cited the negative message (e.g., “…gives the wrong idea about what you need to do to get to heaven…”).

As Table 8 shows, respondents were more likely to classify typical listeners (Listen Type) of violent stimuli more negatively (49.02%, n = 51) and less positively (9.80%, n = 51)
Table 7

*Adolescent Listening Responses for Hypothesis 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>Violent Stimuli</th>
<th>Non-Violent Stimuli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents Listen</td>
<td>No = 24 (47.06%)</td>
<td>No = 3 (5.66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes = 27 (52.94%)</td>
<td>Yes = 50 (94.34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents Listen Why</td>
<td>Nothing Wrong (6)</td>
<td>Nothing Wrong (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom (8)</td>
<td>Freedom (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open mind (5)</td>
<td>Open mind (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Effects (4)</td>
<td>Direct Effects (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not matter (3)</td>
<td>Positive message (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents Listen Why Not</td>
<td>Negative message (17)</td>
<td>Negative message (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Effects (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would not understand (1)</td>
<td>Would not understand (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* First row presents response frequencies and percentages to the closed-ended question of whether adolescents should be allowed to listen to the song based on the lyrics. The second and third rows present themes and frequencies of open-ended responses as the reasoning behind the response to the closed-ended question.
Table 8

*Listener Responses for Hypothesis 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>Violent Stimuli</th>
<th>Non-Violent Stimuli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listen Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (25)</td>
<td>Negative (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive (5)</td>
<td>Positive (23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (19)</td>
<td>Neutral (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listen Relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit (5)</td>
<td>Fit (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes/somewhat fit (19)</td>
<td>Sometimes/somewhat fit (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not fit (22)</td>
<td>Do not fit (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never Listen Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (11)</td>
<td>Negative (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive (13)</td>
<td>Positive (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (27)</td>
<td>Neutral (31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never Listen Relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit (19)</td>
<td>Fit (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes/somewhat fit (14)</td>
<td>Sometimes/somewhat fit (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not fit (14)</td>
<td>Do not fit (26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoid Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (10)</td>
<td>Negative (22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive (12)</td>
<td>Positive (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (28)</td>
<td>Neutral (26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 (continued)

**Listener Responses for Hypothesis 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>Violent Stimuli</th>
<th>Non-Violent Stimuli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoid Relationship</td>
<td>Fit (21)</td>
<td>Fit (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes/somewhat fit (10)</td>
<td>Sometimes/somewhat fit (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not fit (16)</td>
<td>Do not fit (22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Columns present themes and frequencies in parentheses. Response themes ordered consistently by theme rather than by frequency for ease of comparing columns.
than listeners of non-violent stimuli (24.53% and 43.40% respectively, n = 53). However, non-violent listener descriptions (18.87%, n = 53) more often used stereotypes (e.g., “long hair, gothic look, quiet”) than violent listener descriptions (11.76%, n = 51). Both condition descriptions used particular genre references (e.g., “people who like oldies or disco,” “heavy metal rockers”) to describe listeners almost equally. Participants’ relationships (Listen Relationship) to listeners also differed between conditions, mostly when acknowledging a fit within the typical listening group. Specifically, violent stimuli listeners were viewed as less similar (10.42%, n = 48) and only slightly more dissimilar (45.83%, n = 48) than non-violent stimuli listeners (31.37% and 39.22% respectively, n = 51). Again, references to specific genre labels were noticeable in listener relationship descriptions (15.15%, n = 99).

More consistency was present when describing those who would never listen (Never Listen Type) to the two lyrics conditions. Those who would never listen to the violent lyrics (25.49%, n = 51) were more often portrayed positively than those who would never listen to the non-violent lyrics (15.69%, n = 51), but only by a small amount. Both conditions exhibited predominantly neutral descriptions (52.94%, n = 51 for violent stimuli and 60.78%, n = 51 for non-violent stimuli). Descriptions in both conditions also employed references to age, religious beliefs, closed-mindedness, and genre labels. More difference existed in descriptions of relationships to those who would never listen to the stimuli (Never Listen Relationship). Relationships to those who would never listen to the violent stimuli were more likely to be similar (38.78%, n = 49) and sometimes/somewhat similar (28.57%, n = 49) and less likely to be dissimilar (28.57%, n = 49) than to those that would never listen to the non-violent stimuli (27.08% similar, 18.75% sometimes/somewhat similar, 54.17% dissimilar, n = 48).
Finally, when asked to describe individuals that would avoid the type of stimuli (Avoid Type), participants portrayed those that would avoid the violent stimuli less negatively (20.00%, n = 50) and more positively (24.00%, n = 50) than those who would avoid the non-violent stimuli (43.14% and 5.88% respectively, n = 51). References to preferring or disliking a particular genre, age, and closed-mindedness were prevalent in describing those who would avoid stimuli in both conditions. Relationships to those who would avoid the type of stimuli (Avoid Relationship) also differed. Individuals who would avoid the violent stimuli were described as more similar and (44.68%, n = 47) less sometimes/somewhat similar (21.28%, n = 47) and dissimilar (34.04%, n = 47) than those who would avoid non-violent stimuli (25.00% similar, 29.17% sometimes/somewhat similar, 45.83% dissimilar, n = 48).

Overall, vast support was found for the second hypothesis. Almost all categories of data provided support for the hypothesis that violent stimuli would produce more negative evaluations and perceptions than non-violent stimuli. Additionally, stimuli genre labels seemed to have very little impact on these evaluations and perceptions, as most respondents focused on the lyrical topic/message rather than on the genre label. For instance, when the “heavy metal” genre label was referenced, it was done so in a surprising and/or stereotypical manner, as when several participants stated ICIM lyrics did not seem like heavy metal lyrics. However, such statements still reflect the primary emphasis on the content of the lyrics rather than the genre of music.

The third hypothesis was that lyrics rated as higher in familiarity would produce less arousal than lyrics rated as lower in familiarity, regardless of genre label. This hypothesis could not be tested because actual conditions showed no familiar stimuli – i.e., AUK and SNAF, while expected to rate high in familiarity, actually rated low, producing no familiar stimuli condition (see Table 9). To further test familiarity conditions, participants were also asked to indicate who
### Table 9

**Survey Participants’ Stimuli Conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Song</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HM/NV/NF</td>
<td>“In the Chapel In the Moonlight”</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHM/NV/NF</td>
<td>“If You Want to Get to Heaven”</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM/V/NF</td>
<td>“Anarchy in the U.K.”</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHM/V/NF</td>
<td>“Saturday Night’s Alright for Fighting”</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* HM = Heavy Metal (Genre label); NV = Non-Violent (Lyrics); NF = Non-Familiar (Lyrics); NHM = Non-Heavy Metal (Genre label); V = Violent (Lyrics). M based on 10-point Likert scale, response options ranging from 0 (Not at all familiar) to 9 (Very familiar). Contrary to the designed stimuli conditions used to test the third hypothesis, an internal validity check failed to confirm familiarity with the lyrics.
performed the song based on the song title and lyrics they were given. Of the 105 responses, only 5 (4.76%) were correct in identifying the artist who performed the song (a response was judged to be correct it listed any artist who performed the song – original or cover artists). “Don’t know” was the response most often given.

Study 2

Consistent with the first study, a series of paired samples t-tests were generated to determine if this sample confirmed a construct distinction between the key concepts of music and lyrics. This sample’s results were slightly different than the findings of the first study, with statistical significance emerging for all comparisons of music and lyrics.

The first step for analyzing the data required that an internal validity check be conducted with the independent variables of lyrics and music (Singleton, Straits, Straits, & McAllister, 1988). Construct discrimination for the key concepts of lyrics and music was examined. Two-tailed paired samples t-tests were calculated to determine if the sample perceived these variables to be distinct. It was predicted that lyrics would be viewed as significantly independent of the music. That is, music and lyrics are identified by the listeners as being distinct concepts. Measurement of the concepts was achieved by how much attention is paid to a) music in general, b) lyrics in general, c) music in favorite songs, and d) lyrics in favorite songs.

A statistically significant difference emerged when comparing the respondents’ attention to a song’s music in general as compared to a song’s lyrics in general; “in general” being music and lyrics overall. This finding appeared with four independent analyses: a) attention to general music versus attention to general lyrics, b) attention to favorite music versus attention to favorite
lyrics, c) attention to general lyrics versus attention to favorite lyrics, d) attention to general music versus attention to favorite music.

A two-tailed paired samples t-test was computed for attention to general music versus attention to general lyrics and found to be significant (t(101) = -2.24) at p = .03. Respondents were more likely in general to pay attention to a song’s lyrics (M = 7.29) as compared to a song’s music (M = 6.86). A second two-tailed paired samples t-test was computed for attention to favorite music versus attention to favorite lyrics and found to be significant (t(101) = -3.50) at p = .00. Respondents were more likely to pay attention to their favorite songs’ lyrics (M = 8.51) compared to their favorite songs’ music (M = 8.17). A third two-tailed paired samples t-test was computed for attention to general lyrics versus attention to favorite lyrics and found to be significant (t(101) = -10.17) at p = .00. Respondents were more likely to pay attention to their favorite songs’ lyrics (M = 8.51) compared to song lyrics in general (M = 7.29). A fourth two-tailed paired samples t-test was computed for attention to general music versus attention to favorite music and found to be significant (t(101) = -10.97) at p = .00. Respondents were more likely to pay attention to their favorite songs’ music (M = 8.17) when compared to music in general (M = 6.86).

To supplement this analysis of closed-ended data, respondents’ open-ended questionnaire responses were also analyzed for references to the distinction between music and lyrics. Like study 1, in addition to questions to distinguish between the concepts of music and lyrics, participants were asked to identify particular songs they would use to continue stimulation of four particular mood states: happy, sad, angry, and excited. Songs were coded by genre to determine genre preferences for individual mood states. To remain happy, genres of choice were pop (21.51%), followed by country/bluegrass (16.13%) and rap/hip-hop (9.68%). Genres chosen
to remain sad were country/bluegrass (25.00%), followed by pop/rock (14.13%) and R&B (10.87%). An angry mood was stimulated by heavy metal (26.51%), rap/hip-hop (18.07%), and hard rock/heavy metal (12.05%). Finally, to remain excited, genres of choice were rap/hip-hop (25.00%), rhythm and blues (R&B) (9.09%), and pop (7.95%). Again, one caveat to the excited genre was that many participants interpreted wording of the question (“excited and aroused”) sexually, which lead to an increase of rap/hip-hop, R&B, and soul songs listed for this category.

As was the case with study 1, some genres were combined during coding of particular artists and songs because of the lack of a clear musical distinction. For instance, Dave Matthews Band was a commonly listed artist, and was classified as “pop/rock” because their music covers both genres as well as both top 40 and mainstream rock radio station playlists. Artists such as Linkin Park and Papa Roach were listed as hard rock/heavy metal since they also cover both genres and multiple radio formats. Therefore, some categories listed above actually cover two closely related genres, but do not capture the entirety of the identification of particular genres.

For instance, since the genre of heavy metal is the focus of this study, the frequency of this genre to enhance mood states is also of importance. Although listed exclusively as a single genre of choice for only angry mood states, songs that could be classified as heavy metal were listed for happiness 2.15% of the time, for sadness 7.60% of the time, for anger a total of 38.55%, and for excitement 9.09% of the time. Artists included in categories encompassing heavy metal and other related genres include Deftones and Coheed and Cambria, which can also be classified as hard rock, and KISS and AC/DC, which can be classified as classic or hard rock.

Participants were also asked why particular songs would be chosen to stimulate particular mood states. These justifications were coded to continue the distinction between music and lyrics, so coding categories included neither music nor lyrics (neither), lyrics, music, and both
music and lyrics (both). Two coders were employed for this data and Scott’s pi was calculated for each mood state to determine intercoder reliability. Intercoder reliability was 93.75% agreement for happy responses, 94.51% agreement for sad responses, 91.21% agreement for angry responses, and 82.35% agreement for excited responses. A discussion of the discrepancies between coders resulted in agreement on all coding choices.

Of the 96 responses for happiness, 25 (26.04%) indicated neither, 20 (20.83%) indicated lyrics, 27 (28.13%) indicated music, and 24 (25.00%) indicated both were factors. Of the 91 responses for sadness, 22 (24.18%) indicated neither, 37 (40.66%) indicated lyrics, 17 (18.68%) indicated music, and 15 (16.48%) indicated both. Of the 86 responses for anger, 28 (32.56%) indicated neither, 33 (38.37%) indicated lyrics, 15 (17.44%) indicated music, and 10 (11.63%) indicated both. Of the 85 responses for excitement, 29 (34.12%) indicated neither, 10 (11.76%) indicated lyrics, 34 (40.00%) indicated music, and 12 (14.12%) indicated both. Again, it is noted that the responses to the excitement mood state were often interpreted sexually, causing an increase in references to overt sexual lyrics and/or music, most common in genres of rap, soul, and hip-hop. Therefore, the results of this category should be interpreted with that in mind.

One final note before addressing specific hypotheses is that similar to study 1, stimuli conditions did not turn out exactly as expected. To classify familiarity levels, a median split was calculated, resulting in stimuli with a familiarity mean $\leq 4.49$ as unfamiliar and stimuli $\geq 4.50$ as familiar. When analyzing familiarity means by this rule, conditions of heavy metal/violent/familiar and non-heavy metal/violent/familiar became heavy metal/violent/non-familiar and non-heavy metal/violent/non-familiar, which impacted 8 stimuli (See Table 10).

Overall, the mean for stimulus familiarity was 3.20; for original versions it was slightly higher at 3.37, and for cover versions it was slightly lower at 3.02 (all had modes of .00). To
Table 10

*Experiment Participants’ Stimuli Conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Artist, Song</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NHM/NV/NF</td>
<td>Dean Martin, “In the Chapel In the Moonlight”</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depeche Mode, “Personal Jesus”</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fleetwood Mac, “The Chain”</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ozark Mountain Daredevils, “If You Want to Get to Heaven”</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHM/NV/F</td>
<td>Dead or Alive, “You Spin Me Round (Like a Record)”</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ted Nugent, “Cat Scratch Fever”</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soft Cell, “Tainted Love”</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AC/DC, “You Shook Me All Night Long”</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM/V/NF</td>
<td>W.A.S.P., “Saturday Night’s Alright for Fighting”</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Megadeth, “Anarchy in the U.K.”</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM/NV/F</td>
<td>Dope, “You Spin Me Round (Like a Record)”</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tantric, “The Chain”</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marilyn Manson, “Tainted Love”</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Six Feet Under, “You Shook Me All Night Long”</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHM/V/NF</td>
<td>Elton John, “Saturday Night’s Alright for Fighting”</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex Pistols, “Anarchy in the U.K.”</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 10 (continued)

*Experiment Participants’ Stimuli Conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Artist, Song</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HM/NV/NF</td>
<td>Celtic Frost, “In the Chapel In the Moonlight”</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gravity Kills, “Personal Jesus”</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pantera, “Cat Scratch Fever”</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nine Pound Hammer, “If You Want to Get to Heaven”</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* NHM = Non-Heavy Metal (Music); NV = Non-Violent (Lyrics); NF = Non-Familiar (Song); HM = Heavy Metal (Music); V = Violent (Lyrics); F = Familiar (Song). M based on 10-point Likert scale, response options ranging from 0 (Not at all familiar) to 9 (Very familiar). Contrary to the designed stimuli conditions, an internal validity check failed to confirm familiarity with several songs.
further test stimuli familiarity, participants were asked to identify the performer, song title, and song genre. For all stimuli, the performer was identified correctly 7.22% (n = 97) of the time, the title was identified correctly 45.00% (n = 100) of the time, and the genre was identified correctly 44.12% (n = 102) of the time. For original versions, the correct performer was given 12.77% (n = 47) of the time, the correct title was given 53.06% (n = 49) of the time, and the correct genre was given 39.22% (n = 51) of the time. When examining cover versions, participants correctly listed the performer 2.00% (n = 50) of the time, the title 37.25% (n = 51) of the time, and the genre 49.02% (n = 51) of the time. These results show that while all stimuli were unfamiliar, heavy metal cover versions were less familiar and/or participants were less knowledgeable about the genre. However, the results also show that, regardless of familiarity, participants were often able to identify the correct music genre.

Keeping in mind these general sample characteristics and results distinguishing the concepts of lyrics and music, specific hypotheses can now be addressed.

The first hypothesis was that heavy metal cover songs would produce a significant change in mood state compared to original pop or rock versions. A 1 X 2 analysis of variance (ANOVA) was computed for each emotional state (i.e., happy, sad, angry, excited) to test the first hypothesis. The first independent variable consisted of the heavy metal versus the original version of the song (i.e., cover versus original). The second independent variable consisted of the mood state prior to (pre) and after (post) listening to the stimulus (i.e., pre versus post). The four dependent variables were measured with 10-point Likert scales that ranged from not at all (“0”) to extremely (“9”).

Statistically significant differences did not emerge between the original and the cover songs for the four emotions. For happiness, F(1, 99) = .36, p = .55 with original (M = -.26)
versus cover ($M = -.45$); for sadness $F(1, 99) = .98$, $p = .32$ with original ($M = -.04$) versus cover ($M = -.29$); for anger $F(1, 99) = 3.20$, $p = .08$ with original ($M = .18$) versus cover ($M = .80$); and for excitement $F(1, 99) = .03$, $p = .87$ with original ($M = .36$) versus cover ($M = .29$).

The second hypothesis was that heavy metal cover songs would produce mood states closer to original genre performances that are stylistically similar than those that are stylistically dissimilar. Performance similarity between genres was determined by vocal and musical elements such as pace, instrumentation, and tone. For instance, the vocal patterns and musical pace were very similar in both versions of “The Chain.” Conversely, vocal style, instrumentation and pace were very different in the two versions of “In the Chapel in the Moonlight.” Table 11 presents the complete list of stimuli and the determination regarding performance similarity/dissimilarity.

A one-tailed independent samples t-test was computed for each emotional state (i.e., happy, sad, angry, excited) to test the second hypothesis. A statistically significant difference emerged only for the excited mood state ($t(99) = 1.87$) at $p = .03$, with similar ($M = .71$) versus dissimilar ($M = -.02$). Statistically significant differences did not emerge for happiness ($t(99) = .14$) at $p = .45$, with similar ($M = -.33$) versus dissimilar ($M = -.38$); sadness ($t(99) = .78$) at $p = .22$, with similar ($M = -.06$) versus dissimilar ($M = -.26$); or anger ($t(99) = -1.10$) at $p = .14$, with similar ($M = .29$) versus dissimilar ($M = .68$). When comparing similar and dissimilar performances, participants reported only a significant change in excitement between the two conditions. All other emotions were not significantly impacted, regardless of the similarity or dissimilarity of musical performances. Therefore, the second hypothesis was supported for only the excited mood state.
Table 11

*Experiment Performance Similarity of Stimuli*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song</th>
<th>Original Artist, Cover Artist</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“In the Chapel in the Moonlight”</td>
<td>Dean Martin, Celtic Frost</td>
<td>Dissimilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Saturday Night’s Alright for Fighting”</td>
<td>Elton John, W.A.S.P.</td>
<td>Dissimilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Personal Jesus”</td>
<td>Depeche Mode, Gravity Kills</td>
<td>Dissimilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“You Spin Me Round (Like a Record)”</td>
<td>Dead or Alive, Dope</td>
<td>Dissimilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Chain”</td>
<td>Fleetwood Mac, Tantric</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Cat Scratch Fever”</td>
<td>Ted Nugent, Pantera</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“If You Want to Get to Heaven”</td>
<td>Ozark Mountain Daredevils, Nine</td>
<td>Dissimilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pound Hammer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Tainted Love”</td>
<td>Soft Cell, Marilyn Manson</td>
<td>Dissimilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Anarchy in the U.K.”</td>
<td>Sex Pistols, Megadeth</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“You Shook Me All Night Long”</td>
<td>AC/DC, Six Feet Under</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The third hypothesis was that heavy metal cover songs would produce a significant change in mood stated compared to original versions, regardless of lyrical content. A 2 X 2 ANOVA was computed for each emotional state (i.e., happy, sad, angry, excited) to test the third hypothesis. The first independent variable consisted of the heavy metal versus the original version of the song (i.e., cover versus original). The second independent variable consisted of violent or sexual lyrical content (i.e., violent/sexual versus non-violent/non-sexual). The four dependent variables were measured with 10-point Likert scales that ranged from not at all (“0”) to extremely (“9”).

Statistically significant differences did not emerge between the original and cover songs across emotions, regardless of lyrical content. For happiness, $F(100) = .18, p = .68$ with original ($M = -.26$) versus cover ($M = -.45$); for sadness $F(100) = 2.91, p = .09$ with original ($M = -.04$) versus cover ($M = -.29$); for anger $F(100) = .01, p = .92$ with original ($M = .18$) versus cover ($M = .80$); and for excitement $F(100) = 1.65, p = .20$ with original ($M = .36$) versus cover ($M = .29$). Stimuli containing violent or sexual lyrics did not produce more change in emotions than stimuli containing non-violent or non-sexual lyrics. Therefore, the third hypothesis was not supported.

The fourth hypothesis was that heavy metal cover song lyrics will be less attended to and/or produce higher levels of misinterpretation than original pop, rock, or punk versions. Open-ended responses to three questionnaire items yielded data for testing this hypothesis. Responses to the question “What do you think about the music you just listened to?” were analyzed for positive, negative and neutral evaluations. Answers to “What was the performer of the music communicating?” were examined for correct or incorrect interpretation of the song. Participants were credited with correct interpretation for identification of lyrical themes (e.g., “his love for a woman”) and for identification of feelings communicated through the lyrics (e.g.,
“anger/frustration” was considered correct for “The Chain” because of the singer addressing hypocritical behaviors of and acquaintance/lover). Finally, replies to “What were the lyrics of the music you just listened to?” were judged for correct or incorrect identification of any lyrics. Lyrics were categorized as correct if they included multiple words from the chorus or verses (e.g., “Saturday nights are right for fighting” was correct, but “It’s Saturday!” was incorrect when identifying lyrics from “Saturday Night’s Alright for Fighting”) as demonstration of attention to the stimulus during exposure.

The fourth hypothesis was supported. Responses regarding thoughts about the music were more likely to be positive and less likely to be negative for original versions (56.86% and 19.61% respectively, n = 51) when compared to cover versions (37.25% for both, n = 51). Additionally, respondents were slightly more likely to use references to musical genres when evaluating cover versions (19.61%, n = 51) than when evaluating original versions (11.76%, n = 51). Responses detailing what the performer was communicating were more correct and less incorrect for original versions (84.00% and 16.00% respectively, n = 50) when compared to cover versions (64.00% and 36.00% respectively, n = 50). Also, respondents in the heavy metal cover condition stated they were unsure, did not know, or couldn’t understand what the performer was communicating more often (34.00%, n = 50) than those in the original pop, rock or punk condition (10.00%, n = 50). Finally, there was very little difference between conditions when identifying song lyrics. Respondents were very likely to correctly identify lyrics for both the original (94.12%, n = 51) and cover versions (90.00%, n = 50). Both groups also correctly identified wording from the chorus the majority of the time (84.31%, n = 51 for originals and 72.00%, n = 50 for covers) – an expected result for any song, given the higher repetition of the chorus in comparison to verses. Surprisingly, respondents in the cover condition identified lyrics
from both the verse(s) and chorus more often (10.00%, n = 50) than those in the original condition (3.92%, n = 51). However, as with responses detailing what the performer was communicating, lyric identification responses contained more “unsure/don’t know/couldn’t understand” references for cover versions (14.00%, n = 50) than for original versions (3.92%, n = 51).

The results of data analysis for hypothesis four demonstrate support across all three response items, but not as convincingly in the lyric identification data. Overall, heavy metal cover song lyrics were less attended to and/or produced higher levels of misinterpretation than original pop, rock or punk versions.

The fifth hypothesis was that heavy metal cover songs would produce higher levels of happiness, anger and excitement and lower levels of sadness for individuals who identified heavy metal as a favorite genre or identified as a heavy metal fan. Because only 2 of the 102 participants identified heavy metal as a favorite genre, the fifth hypothesis could not be tested on this element.

A 2 X 3 ANOVA was computed for each emotional state (i.e., happy, sad, angry, excited) to test the fifth hypothesis. The first independent variable consisted of the heavy metal cover version versus the original version of the song (i.e., cover versus original). The second independent variable was measured with three levels of fandom.

Identification as a heavy metal fan was operationalized as providing a response of ≥ 7 on a 10-point Likert scale in response to “I am a fan of heavy metal music,” where “0” represented “strongly disagree” and “9” represented “strongly agree.” This was chosen over splitting responses in half (those ≤ 4.49 as not fans and those ≥ 4.50 as fans) because genre fandom implies a solid commitment, rather than a more neutral middle ground. The first level of non-
fans was grouped by responses ≤ 2. The second level of non-fans (the neutral middle ground) was grouped by responses ranging from 3 – 6.

Statistically significant differences did not emerge for any of the four mood states. Both post-stimulus ratings and mood differences (pre- versus post-stimulus) were analyzed. Results of post-stimulus score analysis were: for happiness, F(2) = .05, p = .95 with original (M = 5.67) versus cover (M = 5.80); for sadness F(2) = .93, p = .40 with original (M = 1.55) versus cover (M = 1.22); for anger F(2) = .64, p = .53 with original (M = .94) versus cover (M = 1.65); and for excitement F(2) = .32, p = .73 with original (M = 3.80) versus cover (M = 4.08). Results of mood differences were: for happiness, F(2) = .28, p = .75 with original (M = -.26) versus cover (M = -.45); for sadness F(2) = .36, p = .70 with original (M = -.04) versus cover (M = -.29); for anger F(2) = 1.33, p = .27 with original (M = .18) versus cover (M = .80); and for excitement F(2) = .23, p = .80 with original (M = .36) versus cover (M = .29). Therefore, the fifth hypothesis was not supported.

The sixth hypothesis was that heavy metal cover songs would produce lower levels of all emotions for individuals who do not identify heavy metal as a favorite genre or do not identify as a heavy metal fan. Again, because only 2 of the 102 participants identified heavy metal as a favorite genre, the sixth hypothesis could not be tested on this element.

A 2 X 3 ANOVA was computed for each emotional state (i.e., happy, sad, angry, excited) to test the fifth hypothesis. The first independent variable consisted of the heavy metal versus the original version of the song (i.e., cover versus original). The second independent variable was measured with three levels of fandom.

As previously mentioned, identification as a heavy metal fan was operationalized as providing a response of ≥ 7 on a 10-point Likert scale in response to “I am a fan of heavy metal
music,” where “0” represented “strongly disagree” and “9” represented “strongly agree.” This was chosen over splitting responses in half (those ≤ 4.49 as not fans and those ≥ 4.50 as fans) because genre fandom implies a solid commitment, rather than a more neutral middle ground. The first level of non-fans was grouped by responses ≤ 2. The second level of non-fans (the neutral middle ground) was grouped by responses ranging from 3 – 6.

Statistically significant differences did not emerge for any of the four mood states. Both post-stimulus ratings and mood differences (pre- versus post-stimulus) were analyzed. Results of post-stimulus score analysis were: for happiness, F(2) = .05, p = .95 with original (M = 5.67) versus cover (M = 5.80); for sadness F(2) = .93, p = .40 with original (M = 1.55) versus cover (M = 1.22); for anger F(2) = .64, p = .53 with original (M = .94) versus cover (M = 1.65); and for excitement F(2) = .32, p = .73 with original (M = 3.80) versus cover (M = 4.08). Results of mood differences were: for happiness, F(2) = .28, p = .75 with original (M = -.26) versus cover (M = -.45); for sadness F(2) = .36, p = .70 with original (M = -.04) versus cover (M = -.29); for anger F(2) = 1.33, p = .27 with original (M = .18) versus cover (M = .80); and for excitement F(2) = .23, p = .80 with original (M = .36) versus cover (M = .29). Therefore, the sixth hypothesis was not supported.

The seventh hypothesis was that heavy metal cover songs would produce higher levels of anger regardless of individuals’ genre preference. A one-tailed independent samples t-test was computed for the angry emotional state to test the seventh hypothesis. Statistically significant differences emerged for both post-stimuli scores (t(100) = -1.94) at the p = .03 and mood difference scores (pre- versus post-stimulus) (t(99) = -1.79) at the p = .04. Participants reported higher levels of anger after listening to the heavy metal cover version (M = 1.65) than they did after listening to the original version (M = .94). Likewise, differences in anger scores were
greater for heavy metal cover versions ($M = .80$) than for original versions ($M = .18$). Therefore, the seventh hypothesis was supported.

Overall, the results of study 2 clearly distinguish that music listeners/consumers differentiate lyrics from music, and that music itself does have an impact on listening experience and emotional state. Findings also demonstrate support for the notion that heavy metal songs produce higher levels of misinterpretation and higher levels of anger than pop, rock and punk songs. Finally, the results show that on a music genre continuum, heavy metal covers performed more musically dissimilar from the originals significantly impacted participants’ excitement levels, but not their happiness, sadness, or anger levels.
CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION

This investigation was designed as the first in a series of studies that will focus on music effects and testing different musical genres. Emphasis was also placed on examining the ways in which music effects research has been conducted in the past, failing to understand the complexity involved in many facets of this line of investigation.

Additionally, this investigation attempted to answer the calls from scholars to examine the *music* in music research, particularly Rein and Springer’s (1986) question “Where’s the music?.” Considering Robinson and Hirsch (1969) provided evidence that sound is more important than lyrical messages over 35 years ago, effects research on music has been consistently ignored or overlooked. All the while, scholars continue to underscore the importance of examining musical sounds (e.g., Kirkpatrick, 1972; Frith, 1981; Chesebro, Fougler, Nachman, & Yannelli, 1985; Christenson & Roberts, 1998). Furthermore, Friesen and Epstein (1994), Friesen and Helfrich (1998), and Williams (2003) have stressed that music is of equal importance to lyrics, but often goes ignored in effects research.

Following such recommendations, this research program was undertaken to increasing the level of social scientific understanding associated with heavy metal music listening, a form that is often viewed as extreme in its qualities, artists, and fans. Because of the strong levels of commitment of heavy metal cultural participants and often negative perceptions from the general public, the heavy metal bands and their fans have become an area that is particularly suited to cultural research (e.g., Walser, 1993; Weinstein, 2000; Purcell, 2003). Through both general music effects research and heavy metal music research, the importance of studying the music has continually been acknowledged (e.g., Walser, 1993; Friesen & Epstein, 1994; Weinstein, 2000).
Based on previous research recommendations and findings (e.g., Verden, Dunleavy, & Powers, 1989), a first step was to distinguish between the concepts of music and lyrics. This was accomplished by asking participants how they attend to lyrics and music in both general song and favorite song listening. Results showed the concepts of lyrics and music to be statistically different in the minds of listeners, a first for this area of research.

As shown with the t-test results for both studies, when comparing the concepts of music and lyrics, a statistical significance emerged, indicating that the two concepts are engaged differently by listeners. While such a distinction may seem inherently obvious, the t-test results confirmed that listeners process music and lyrics separately. This has direct implications for the heavy metal genre because oftentimes music and lyrics within songs do not convey the same messages. Evidence of this point can be seen in certain open-ended responses to some of the heavy metal cover songs. Specifically, in reaction to Celtic Frost’s cover of “In the Chapel in the Moonlight,” two participants indicated that the lyrics/vocals did not match the music. As Wright (2000) indicated in reference to all music, but in the particular example of Blue Öyster Cult, the music itself can undermine lyrical content, as when soft acoustic tones accompany violent lyrics (p. 367).

In a more recent example, when discussing the mix of new record 10,000 Days, the guitarist of heavy metal band Tool refers to the lead singer’s voice as another instrument, hence the decision to not include it up front in the mix (Epstein, 2006). The lead singer substantiates this decision by stating:

…sometimes lyrics tend to take you out of the headspace of feeling [emphasis his] the song. That’s kind of why we don’t print the lyrics to begin with – reading is a thinking process, and if you’re looking at the words, you’re not really listening to what’s going on.
Also, in the song, if you’re distracted by a specific story line, then you’re listening to the story and not the song. (p. 68).

Such examples serve as specific distinctions, recognized by both producers and consumers of music, that differentiation between music and lyrics is a central issue. As previously discussed, this distinction was also apparent in respondents’ open-ended questionnaire responses. With this in mind, specific results of the two studies can be discussed.

**Findings**

The lyrics study was designed similar to that of Ballard, Dodson, and Bazzini (1999), concentrating on testing perceptions of different musical genre labels. However, instead of intentionally selecting unfamiliar song lyrics, lyrics expected to be both familiar and unfamiliar were used. As acknowledged in the results section, the familiar condition did not hold true when tested with participants. Therefore, the third hypothesis, which predicted that lyrics rated as higher in familiarity would produce less arousal than lyrics rated as lower in familiarity, regardless of genre label, could not be tested.

However, partial support was found for the first hypothesis, which predicted that lyrics labeled as “heavy metal” would produce more negative evaluations and perceptions than those labeled as “pop/Southern rock” or “pop/rock.” The results of data analysis provide evidence that the “heavy metal” label can produce negative evaluations, but often these evaluations are directed at the listeners/fans rather than on the music itself.

The results of this analysis are somewhat consistent with Ballard, Dodson, and Bazzini’s (1999) study, in which participants perceived “heavy metal” labels to be less likely to inspire prosocial behaviors than “country” and “pop” labels. However, Ballard, Dodson, and Bazzini
did not find that “heavy metal” genre labels were perceived as more likely to inspire antisocial behaviors, a reflection of negative effects on listeners. However, participants in the lyrics study used negative perceptions when describing listener groups and their relationship to these groups (i.e., Listen Type, Listen Relationship, Never Listen Type, Never Listen Relationship, Avoid Relationship); they negatively evaluated the music in only two categories of analysis (i.e., Stimulus Recommend and Stimulus Think). Interestingly, while participants often negatively perceived heavy metal listeners, they did not feel that adolescents should be prevented from listening to heavy metal music. These findings both support and contradict the third-person effect theory (Davison, 1983), which states that individuals are more likely to perceive effects (especially negative) on others than they are on themselves. This theory is especially relevant to heavy metal music and adolescent listeners, as activist groups (e.g., PMRC) and popular media often take on a role of advocacy and protection when it comes to adolescents interacting with media that has been portrayed controversially or negatively in the past. These findings also underscore Ballard, Dodson, and Bazzini’s point that bias exists against some music genres in the absence of music.

Testing of the second hypothesis, which predicted that lyrics containing violent content would produce more negative evaluations and perceptions than lyrics not containing violent content, regardless of genre label, provided strong support. Almost all categories of data analysis demonstrated evidence to support the second hypothesis. Along with results of the first hypothesis, this suggests that lyrical content is of primary importance to listeners, with genre of secondary importance. These results are similar to findings of Anderson, Carnagey, and Eubanks (2003), who found that songs with violent lyrics increased aggression-related cognition and affect. They attributed this finding to the lyrics, not to the musical style, artist, or arousal.
Consequently, it seems that listeners who can extract lyrical content (or who have the lyrics readily available) are more likely to judge it based on its message(s) rather than in the musical context it is performed.

Overall, the survey provided evidence that lyrical content is important in and of itself. Musical genre seems to be of secondary interest, and when it is of interest, affects perceptions of listeners/fans rather than of the music itself. The music experiment was designed to test these lyrics in their musical context in an effort to understand the complexity involved in cognitive processing of music.

The experiment was designed in order to test musical differences between genre performances using cover songs, important in music research, especially when testing different genres against one another as stimuli – Anderson, Carnagey, and Eubanks (2003) acknowledged musical differences could have attributed to their results, but failed to systematically test this in their series of experiments. The second study employed the lyrics used in the first study in their musical context, along with several other stimuli, differentiated by genre performance. Seven hypotheses were developed based on previous research.

The first hypothesis, which predicted that heavy metal cover songs would produce a significant change in mood state compared to original pop or rock versions, was not supported. Similarly, the third hypothesis, that heavy metal cover songs would produce a significant change in mood state compared to original versions regardless of lyrical content, was also not supported. Because these two hypotheses are closely related, they can be discussed simultaneously. The lack of support can be attributed to a few factors. First, the sample did not provide as many heavy metal fans as expected. Therefore, participants were highly unfamiliar with many of the heavy metal stimuli, and were not fans of the genre to begin with. While the first and third
hypotheses were proposed for general music listeners, heavy metal fans (or those who are more familiar with the genre) were expected to be more prevalent in the sample. Unfamiliarity seemed to have an impact on change in mood states, likely due to the novelty of a song upon initial listen. Novelty also affects judgment and participants may not have been able to evaluate the song based on first listen, and therefore feelings remained neutral or unchanged. While some of those that were unfamiliar with the stimuli exhibited a change in mood states, the change was not significant across the sample.

Also, lack of support for the third hypothesis may be explained by participants not fully attending to the lyrics of the songs, resulting in them not differentiating between violent/sexual content and non-violent/non-sexual content. This point is important because exposure to an unfamiliar song, regardless of the genre, necessitates added attention to all elements. As noted prior, listening to a song for the first time often produces a more neutral or unsure judgment, which is refined upon additional listens. Consequently, lack of support for the first and third hypotheses can be attributed to lack of familiarity, lack of attention to the stimulus, and a sample that did not provide a large number of heavy metal fans.

The second hypothesis, that heavy metal cover songs would produce mood states closer to original genre performances that are stylistically similar than those that are stylistically different, was supported only for the excited mood state. In other words, heavy metal covers performed more musically dissimilar from the originals significantly impacted participants’ excitement levels, but not their happiness, sadness, or anger levels. One possible explanation for this finding is that heavy metal music affected participants on a physical level rather than on a strictly emotional level – i.e., excitement was perceived as physical stimulation such as an increase or decrease in energy or adrenaline, which is much easier to acknowledge with an
unfamiliar stimulus than changes in other emotions. Conversely, a lack of significant changes in the other three mood states could signify the same issues as with the first and third hypotheses – a lack of familiarity, lack of attention to the stimulus, and lack of heavy metal fans in the sample.

The fourth hypothesis, which predicted that heavy metal cover songs would be less attended to and/or produce higher levels of misinterpretation than original versions, was supported. This was also the only hypothesis in the music study to involve analysis of open-ended questionnaire data. Analysis of responses to three open-ended questionnaire items demonstrated that participants had a harder time understanding or interpreting the lyrics in the context of heavy metal performances than in the context of pop, rock, or punk performances. However, responses identifying the song lyrics often were correct, although the majority of respondents were able to identify only the chorus, and even then, only partial wording was provided. As noted previously, this can be largely attributed to the repetition of the chorus as compared to the verses. Additionally, participants in the heavy metal cover condition were more likely to state that they were unsure, did not know, or could not understand the lyrics of the heavy metal songs than they were in the pop, rock or punk original condition. This can be attributed to the nature of heavy metal performances, which often have screamed, growled, or shrieked vocals and more complex guitar, bass and drum structures that can overwhelm or decrease the impact of the vocals. Indeed, Hansen and Hansen (1991) noted that it could be “argued that heavy metal lyrics are particularly unlikely to have much effect because the music often overwhelms the words” (p. 375).

The results of this hypothesis testing support the ongoing finding in music research that in general, participants do not attend to lyrics (e.g., Prinsky & Rosenbaum, 1987; Desmond, 1987; Wanamaker & Reznikoff, 1989). The results also support findings of Hansen and
Hansen’s (1991) study in which participants extracted main lyrical content, but not detailed ideas, regardless of the condition. Furthermore, the findings also underscore Weinstein’s (2000) point that lyrics often exist as isolated words or phrases and meaning is often obtained because of repetition, distinguishability, or articulation (p. 125). These points suggest some information processing occurs, but it can be attributed to typical song structure or particular performance qualities rather than a demonstrated understanding of content.

Results for the fifth and sixth hypotheses can also be discussed together since they were related predictions. The fifth hypothesis stated that heavy metal cover songs would produce higher levels of happiness, anger and excitement and lower levels of sadness for individuals who identify heavy metal as a favorite genre or identify as a heavy metal fan. The sixth hypothesis stated that heavy metal cover songs would produce lower levels of all emotions for individuals who do not identify heavy metal as a favorite genre or do not identify as a heavy metal fan. Neither hypothesis was supported. Additionally, neither hypothesis was tested for individuals who identified heavy metal as a favorite genre because only 2 of the 102 participants fit this category. Similarly, only 9 of the 102 participants identified as heavy metal fans, based on the operationalization of the concept explained earlier. Again, the sample did not provide enough heavy metal listeners/fans to fully test these hypotheses.

The seventh hypothesis, which predicted that heavy metal cover songs would produce higher levels of anger regardless of individuals’ genre preference, was supported. Although this finding sustains the stereotype that heavy metal is angry music and negatively affects listeners, it also demonstrates that the increase in anger can be attributed to the music rather than to the lyrics. This is an important point, as most criticism from popular media and advocacy groups (e.g., PMRC) has been directed at lyrics, with a secondary focus on album cover art and artist
imagery. However, these results suggest that effects are part of musical structure rather than lyrical themes. This finding is also consistent (for this particular mood state) with those of Verden, Dunleavy, and Powers (1989), who found that the sound was more important than lyrics to participants.

Overall, the second investigation found that heavy metal cover songs produced higher levels of misinterpretation and higher levels of anger than pop, rock or punk original versions. More importantly, the lack of support for hypotheses predicting a significant mood change is similar to Wester, Crown, Quatman, and Heesacker’s (1997) findings on gangsta rap. Specifically, the authors found that music without lyrics had no negative impact and lyrics without music had no significant impact at all. These results were attributed to their participants having no prior knowledge of the music form under study. As was the case with the current study, a high level of unfamiliarity may explain the lack of significant stimuli effects.

As noted in the review of direct effects literature, the complexity of music research has often been overlooked in studies not addressing issues of familiarity, stimulus attentiveness, and music listening preferences. A number of measures were included in the questionnaires for this investigation, in an effort to address these shortcomings and Christenson and Roberts’ (1998) point that effects research needs to account for differences in time, person and context. While some studies have accounted for stimulus familiarity (e.g., Wanamaker & Reznikoff, 1989; Hansen & Hansen, 1991; Ballard & Coates, 1995; Ballard, Dodson, & Bazzini, 1999; Anderson, Carnagey, & Eubanks, 2003), stimulus attentiveness (e.g., Wanamaker & Reznikoff, 1989; Hansen & Hansen, 1991), and genre preferences (e.g., St. Lawrence & Joyner, 1991; Hansen & Hansen, 1991; Ballard, Dodson, & Bazzini, 1999), measures of all factors across studies is inconsistent and remains a pitfall of this particular line of research. Oftentimes only some
individual characteristics are measured (e.g., St. Lawrence & Joyner, 1991) or reported (e.g., Anderson, Carnagey, & Eubanks, 2003) with study findings, leaving the results questionable and incomplete.

While these aspects of research design were rectified in the current study, it also experienced some of the same problems as these prior studies, particularly with stimuli familiarity and sample characteristics. Specifically, like Wanamaker and Reznikoff (1989) and Ballard and Coates (1995), this investigation encountered very low familiarity levels with both lyrics and music stimuli. As with studies by St. Lawrence and Joyner (1991) and Hansen and Hansen (1991), the sample included very low levels of heavy metal fans and/or those who identified heavy metal as a preferred genre. Sample and stimulus problems such as these greatly impact study results and implications. While no study can employ a perfect sample or range of stimuli, deficiencies in these areas limit the insight gained from otherwise complex and thoroughly designed research. The mention of these research issues provides a good starting for a more detailed discussion of contributions and limitations, provided in the following sections.

**Investigation's Contributions and Strengths**

Two strengths of the survey are noteworthy. First, the survey design gathered the students’ responses to specific heavy metal music within the context of also gathering the students’ general music listening behaviors. Perceptions of heavy metal music were collected while accounting for individual differences in behaviors, emotions and cognitions.

A second strength of the survey was the length to which steps were taken to provide integrity with the data collection process. Social desirability effects are not as likely because the
respondents’ identities were protected although the students were awarded extra credit offered as compensation for participation.

For the music experiment, a unique component was that a difference score was calculated by accounting for the pre-stimuli condition, although according to Campbell and Stanley (1966) and Montgomery (1997), this additional step was not necessary with this true experimental design. As these scholars point out, the true random assignment means that equality between the control and the experimental group can be assumed. Analyses were run with and without baseline scores and a discrepancy did not emerge.

A second strength to this experiment is that the stimuli were carefully selected and tested, and responded to the caveats noted in chapter one that have repeatedly emerged when discussing the heavy metal music.

First and foremost, these studies employed an appropriate sample for music research. Measurements of last CD purchased, last concert attended, favorite songs, and favorite artists provided data that mirrored the Billboard charts at the time -- i.e., in these responses, participants listed artists and songs that were present on various Billboard charts. Therefore, undergraduate college students, despite limited financial resources, prove to be an appropriate sample population for studying the larger demographic audience concerned with music purchasing and listening, concert attendance, and possible effects of such media.

Secondly, the research design and methodology used for these studies expanded upon past research designs and methods and showed that the study of music effects is much more complex than has been acknowledged and/or tested. Most notably, it was the first to statistically demonstrate the differentiation between the concepts of music and lyrics by listeners. Additionally, it highlighted musical genre differences using original and cover songs as stimuli.
This is no small achievement and in part is the result of the multimethodological approach utilized.

The current investigation’s multimethodological approach resulted in converged results that underscore the complexity of the heavy metal listening experience. The strengths and weaknesses of an experiment were offset by the survey and the reciprocal was true as well. Although costly in both resources and time, the converged results highlight the multiple advantages. In particular, the direction for the next set of studies is apparent with two independent studies demonstrating that individual differences will begin to provide insights to the unique causal mechanisms for understanding how heavy metal listeners are similar to and different from those who avoid this genre.

Relative to study design, the controlled experimental environment of the music study ensured that the stimuli were the focal point for participants during exposure. This allowed mood changes to be attributed to the stimuli, while accounting for individual differences and characteristics with the detailed measurements of the questionnaire. The detailed measurements of the questionnaire, especially the gathering of open-ended data, also allow for additional data analysis that will inform the design of future related studies.

Finally, this investigation serves as the first in a new research program, concentrating on media exchange rather than direct effects, which accounts for individual, direct interactions and inherently involves personal investments and interests. The importance of this notion is underscored by Williams, Rice, and Rogers (1988), who noted almost 20 years ago that the interactive nature of new and emerging media (e.g., iPods presently) does not allow for study of simple effects due to individuals’ complexly variable uses.
Investigation’s Challenges and Limitations

Two weaknesses that emerged with the survey include, but are not limited to, the limitations traditionally identified with print questionnaires. Print questionnaires do not allow for in-depth follow-up questions and the length and clarity of a questionnaire can influence participants’ responses. Face-to-face interviews allow for follow-up questions but they are both time-consuming and costly when paying professional interviewers.

A second weakness of the survey was that concerts on campus were likely to have a priming effect on the students’ answers. This is especially relevant for this study, as the rural Midwestern location provides few opportunities for public concerts, both on and off campus. Ideally, future surveys investigating heavy metal music will keep these caveats in mind.

Two limitations are unique to the experiment. Listening to a single song is not a typical behavior in that, as indicated in the survey, people tend to listen to a song as part of a broader collection. For example, one will often listen to at least three or four songs on a CD or iPod, or even on the radio. While experiments can never replicate natural listening conditions, great care was taken when designing this one, allowing students to listen to the song via headphones at a computer, a much more typical experience than in the past.

A second limitation is that the number of stimuli conditions, although an extension of an earlier study, increased the potential for an interaction effect unique to the stimuli condition.

More generally, as highlighted at several earlier points, this investigation was not void of problems encountered by past research in this area of study. Low levels of stimuli familiarity and heavy metal listeners/fans greatly impacted the results of both studies. These problems reflect the ongoing need for the sample to include heavy metal listeners and fans when this particular genre is of interest to the research. Wanamaker and Reznikoff (1989) highlighted this
notion when they indicated “people who are attracted to and influenced by heavy metal or violent music may have different personality characteristics than people who do not listen to this style of music” (p. 567).

The uniqueness of heavy metal fans (and culture, more generally) was also highlighted in open-ended responses to several questionnaire items. References used when describing heavy metal fans included several notations of “hardcore” and “intense” (as well as several negative stereotypes), language that emphasizes the knowledge of and commitment to the music and its culture. One respondent characterized heavy metal fans (also describing herself as respectful of the genre but not a hardcore fan) as “intense fans of music that can intertwine harsh music with meaningful lyrics.” Such statements show that respondents, whether part of the heavy metal culture or not, identify heavy metal fans as qualitatively different, more dedicated to the music and culture than general music or other genre listeners/fans. This point needs to be highlighted in future research, acknowledging individual differences in perceptions and relationships to heavy metal music and culture as well as personal characteristics that lead to such differences.

Heavy metal is not the only music genre to achieve a dedicated fan base, with rock artists such as the Grateful Dead, Dave Matthews, Phish, Bob Dylan and Bruce Springsteen all garnering loyal followers who often travel with the bands as they tour across the country (see Cavicchi, 1998 for an ethnographic account of Springsteen fans). While fans of these particular bands can be considered “hardcore” like heavy metal fans, the difference between the fans exists in dedication to a particular artist versus dedication to a particular genre. In other words, heavy metal fans champion the musical genre rather than individual artists (which is not to say that individual artists are not also championed).
Differences in music genres (in this case between pop, rock, or punk and heavy metal) can also be seen in this study’s assessments and recommendations of original and cover songs. When comparing means for original cover versions of stimuli, original versions (5.04 assessment and 3.43 recommend) were rated higher than cover versions (3.75 assessment and 2.53 recommend) in responses to “Circle the number that best shows your assessment of the music you just heard” and “How likely would you be to recommend this song to a friend?” (both on scales from 0 to 9 where “0” represents “did not like it at all” and “not at all likely” and “9” represents “liked it completely” and “very likely”).

A critical examination of why the heavy metal music and culture (or those that prefer genres other than heavy metal) is viewed qualitatively different than other genre fans was taken up recently by anthropologist Sam Dunn in his documentary film *Metal: A Headbanger’s Journey*. In this film, Dunn (a lifelong heavy metal fan) critically examines the heavy metal culture using interviews with academic scholars, artists and fans to determine why it is so often labeled with negative stereotypes, dismissed, condemned, and why so many individuals are attracted to it, given these negative perceptions. While he concludes that metal will always be a culture of outsiders because it confronts, celebrates and indulges negative aspects of life (e.g., death, Satan, war) (Dunn, McFadyen, & Wise, 2005). In fact, Dunn’s task is only half complete; to truly answer his research question he must also talk with those outside of the heavy metal culture who hold these negative stereotypes to see what motivations inform them.

One point highlighted in all of the culture-based heavy metal research, and of particular interest to effects research, is the investment and dedication of metal fans. The personal stake they have invested in the music and culture is the basis for suggesting that such music listening is more
complex than effects scholars have acknowledged, hence the principle of exchange rather than effects.

Despite having a sample that should have provided a substantive number of heavy metal fans, participants, when asked to report genre preference and heavy metal fandom, did not emerge in the data (i.e., no participants in the lyrics study and only 2 participants in the music study reported heavy metal as their favorite genre). Therefore, these study samples are skewed against heavy metal fans, providing no ecological validity. Even though these studies accounted for factors of familiarity and fandom, the sample did not allow for the testing of the impact of stimuli on those who are most often exposed to and/or familiar with heavy metal.

Additionally, the low familiarity levels of the stimuli for this study appeared to be a result of a generation gap between the researcher and the participants. While it was thought that songs like “Saturday Night’s Alright for Fighting” and “Anarchy in the U.K.” would be highly familiar to this sample, they were highly unfamiliar when rated by participants. One other interesting note is that several participants related particular songs to movies (as part of soundtracks, video tie-ins or certain scenes), resulting in increased familiarity. This point is important because it demonstrates the increasing cross-marketing of media and its impact on perceptions and familiarity. For instance, the song “You Spin Me Round (Like a Record)” (both the original and cover versions) was described by general and specific references to a movie (i.e., *The Wedding Singer*). Even though familiarity of the original version should have been affected by the generation gap, it rated relatively high (6.6 out of 9) partially due to its inclusion in the movie. However, this was not the case with the majority of stimuli, and this unfamiliarity ultimately resulted in the elimination of certain experimental conditions, further detracting from the research results.
A second problem involved certain questionnaire items. When asked about CD listening and purchasing, participants often indicated they did not listen to CDs; rather, they listened to digital MP3 files. While MP3 listening was also measured, the questionnaire item which asked “What was the last CD you purchased?” should have included reference to digital songs or albums in the MP3 form from retailers such as iTunes. Another problematic questionnaire item that was incorrectly interpreted asked participants to list a song they would use to stimulate the feelings of excitement and arousal. Several participants interpreted this question sexually because of the wording. Hence, the question should have eliminated the reference to “aroused” or included wording indicating it was not to be interpreted sexually. One final problem with the questionnaire involved items asking participants to list their favorite genres of music. These items were open-ended so that participants could be as specific or detailed as they wished, but ultimately proved troublesome when trying to collapse the data into workable categories. The items should have allowed for only closed-ended responses, using a list of several genre categories (some combined) that allowed for easier data analysis.

Genre classification was a problem throughout data entry. Participants were asked for their last concert attended, favorite song, and specific songs they would choose for mood stabilization (see Appendices C & F for specific questionnaire items). These artists and/or songs were then classified by genre to establish patterns among music preferences and choices for mood manipulation or stimulation. Oftentimes, participants responded to such items with incomplete answers (only song or artist, rather than both) or artists unfamiliar to the researcher.

In cases where unfamiliar artists were listed, it was necessary to search websites to determine the correct genre classification. Specifically, Amazon.com was the most frequently consulted website, with Google being the backup for cases in which no clear classification could
be made from information on Amazon’s site. These two websites were selected for external validity, since they are generally available to the public, creating a socialized standard and allowing for user feedback, essentially serving as an open forum for music discussions.

For instance, when an unfamiliar artist was listed, a two-step process was employed. The unfamiliar artist was searched for using Amazon’s toolbar and if results were obtained, information on listed albums was browsed for product descriptions, user comments and reviews, and listings of similar artists. This strategy allowed for relatively easy genre classification, as the information detailed for albums tended to be specific in terms of musical style, similar artists, and overall sound. Most helpful were the user comments and reviews, which allowed for comparison among several consumer viewpoints rather than relying solely on sometimes vague or incorrect information listed on the website itself. Additionally, Amazon typically had audio samples available, which were listened to for further justification as to genre classification.

For example, when artist “Damien Rice” was listed, a search on Amazon yields several of his albums. Selecting one of the albums (in this case O) displays the album information, including a song list with audio samples, a product description, and user comments. In this particular case, the audio sample of the song “Cannonball” was listened to for genre classification, which was “Singer-songwriter/Folk.” This classification was then compared to user comments for consistency purposes. If consistency was present, the selected category was used; if there were discrepancies, additional song samples were listened to and user comments read. In the case of Damien Rice, consistency was found in the “Singer-songwriter/Folk” classification, so it was used as the label in data entry and analysis.

This strategy of genre classification, while time-consuming, allowed for validation when dealing with unfamiliar artists and their music. Furthermore, relying on user (fan) comments
provided additional insight into how the actual consumers viewed the music, which was
oftentimes more specific, detailed, and exclusive than the information provided by the retailer.
This process also validated the combination of certain similar genres into one category for
analysis. For example, categories such as “Pop/Rock,” “Rap/Hip-Hop,” “Country/Bluegrass,”
and “R&B/Soul” were used to reduce the overall number of genre categories and allow for
meaningful analysis. For instance, Eminem is both a rap and hip-hop artists, as are many of his
contemporaries, so the genre combination in this case made sense. Similarly, Dave Matthews
Band can be classified as pop due to album sales alone; however, the music crosses into other
genres such as rock. Therefore, the combination of “Pop/Rock” is appropriate here for both genre
inclusiveness and ease of categorization.

As stated previously, insight gleaned during this process of genre classification included
appropriateness of the participant pool, as students’ musical consumption closely mirrored album
sales charts, as identified by Billboard. This verified that that age group under study is the target
consumer for much of the popular music released, and attending to its musical consumption
patterns evidences how popular music trends are developed and maintained.

Finally, when determining genre classification for artists and songs, it became clear that
music genres are becoming increasingly overlapping, sub-divided, and unclear. While new sub-
genres are constantly being created, their further sub-divisions seek to serve as musical
distinctions, but also end up complicating the classification in the process. Furthermore, artists
are becoming more diversified in their musical productions, often crossing genres and allowing
for multiple classifications – popular country currently exemplifies this trend. Artists such as
Shania Twain and Trace Adkins have infused elements of pop, rock, and hip-hop into their
songs, allowing them to cross over into these music markets. Similarly, artists such as Kid Rock
and Bon Jovi, while traditionally rock, have crossed over to country playlists with widely popular singles.

In cases such as these, where genre crossover exists, the history of the artist was taken into consideration and genre classification was determined by the artist’s full career, rather than a current single. Specifically, if a participant listed a Shania Twain song, it was classified as “country” rather than “pop” or “rock,” even if the particular song referenced exhibited such qualities more so than traditional country qualities.

Additionally, in cases where an artist is usually classified by a sub-genre, the broader genre was used for ease of grouping and analysis. For instance, if a participant classified a song as “speed metal” (a sub-genre of heavy metal), “heavy metal” was used for genre classification during data entry. Again, such a process significantly reduced the overall number of genres present in the data and allowed for meaningful analysis.

Finally, artists that were considered heavy metal during their musical output but are now considered largely classic rock (e.g., Led Zeppelin, AC/DC, Van Halen, KISS) were classified as “Heavy metal/Hard rock” to encompass both categories. The inclusion of heavy metal in this classification serves as an acknowledgement of how fans and popular media thought of the artists at the time of their popularity and/or that those within the heavy metal culture view them as genre originators and primary musical influences.

One final problem with this study involves the heavy metal stimuli. As noted previously, a workable definition of heavy metal was employed – one that heavy metal fans may disagree with, arguing that some artists categorized as heavy metal (e.g., Tantric, Nine Pound Hammer) are not “true” heavy metal, thus not allowing for enough contrast between conditions. This point is not under contention. When this project was being developed, heavy metal cover songs were
gathered from the author’s personal collection and additional possibilities gathered from internet sources and colleagues. However, when defining criteria for inclusion (see Appendix E), several selections were eliminated. Therefore, the list of usable songs for the heavy metal cover condition of the second study was greatly reduced and additional songs had either not yet been discovered or not yet been released. However, since the study began, a number of “true” heavy metal cover songs have been released and discovered, including those more likely to be familiar to undergraduate students (e.g., Disturbed’s cover of “Land of Confusion” by Genesis and Children of Bodom’s cover of “Oops, I Did It Again” by Britney Spears).

With these challenges in mind, a discussion of future research can now be advanced.

Future Research Implications

The first issue to be addressed for future studies in this area of research is that of sample selection. As previously indicated, future studies should make a conscious effort to recruit the underrepresented group of heavy metal fans. Both Wanamaker and Reznikoff (1989) and St. Lawrence and Joyner (1991) also called for experimental research on heavy metal fans as a unique group. This can be accomplished by targeted recruiting and/or the use of a screening questionnaire about genre preferences. Sample problems are also less likely at universities centered in larger cities (e.g., New York, Los Angeles, Chicago) where cultural diversity is greater and the heavy metal music scene is more abundant through radio stations and concerts. Additionally, such sites would provide greater ethnic diversity instead of a very homogeneous sample, as that for this investigation.

A second point to be addressed in future research is stimuli familiarity. Future studies should adequately pretest stimuli for familiarity and appropriateness with the sample to ensure
that conditions turn out as expected. While stimuli for this study were very informally pretested, the lack of systematic pilot testing caused conditions to be eliminated and prevented hypotheses from being tested.

Also relative to research design, future studies examining lyrics only and genre label effects could refine the first investigation by incorporating additional stimuli (both familiar and unfamiliar) and additional conditions. While the first study used four sets of lyrics with two sets of genre labels, future studies could use the same sets of lyrics with different genre labels (i.e., four lyrics sets with four different genre labels each). This would be particularly interesting if labels for genres most popular with the targeted populations (e.g., country, hip-hop, developing genres such as reggaeton for undergraduates) were used.

A third implication for future research on media exchange/music effects is an increased attention on testing differences between music and lyrics as separate concepts as well as on genre differences. The use of cover songs provides a well-suited means of accomplishing this. Research that employs cover songs can also go in several different directions, such as focusing on music with female vocalists (mostly absent from this study) and additional genre performances (e.g., country, rap, lounge).

Finally, in light of the errors detailed in Appendix A by scholars who have conducted research on heavy metal music, future studies should be sure to employ investigators who have legitimate expertise in heavy metal music and culture. Research on the topic that includes such errors is detrimental to the acknowledgement and advancement of an already maligned subject.

The division that currently exists between culture-based and experimental-based research on heavy metal music must be united. The culture-based scholars must bring their expertise of the music and culture together with those whose expertise is in experimental design and effects
research. Together, these two areas of investigation can bring about research that is free of the errors (see Appendix A) that undermine investigators’ credibility and achieve an interplay between the inductive and deductive research processes, providing a substantial contribution to this line of study.

In conclusion, the area of media exchange/music effects research provides ample opportunity for further study, especially in the experimental realm. This study highlights the complexity involved in individual music listening experiences and demonstrates additional means of addressing this complexity. Furthermore, with the recent public release of the Columbine killers’ diaries, public attention has again centered on forms of media entertainment such as music and videogames, as particular artists, songs and games were referenced in the entries (Associated Press, 2006). This example again shows that public scrutiny of mediated entertainment arises consistently, placing blame on the creators of such entertainment as purveyors of violence who influence adolescents with their messages. Academic research in this area will never be at a loss for material to study.
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# APPENDIX A

Errors in Scholarly Texts on Heavy Metal Music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Error(s)</th>
<th>Correction(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strasburger &amp; Wilson (2002)</td>
<td>Incorrect picture of cover art of Marilyn Manson’s <em>Mechanical Animals</em> record</td>
<td>Correct cover art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnett (1996)</td>
<td>Consistently misspells Ozzy “Ozbourne”</td>
<td>“Osbourne”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purcell (2003)</td>
<td>Incorrect title of Celtic Frost record <em>Into Pandemonium</em></td>
<td><em>Into the Pandemonium</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinds (1992)</td>
<td>Misspells “Ozzie Osborn”; adds comma to Bon Jovi song “Wanted, Dead or Alive”</td>
<td>“Ozzy Osbourne”; “Wanted Dead or Alive”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christenson &amp; Roberts (1998)</td>
<td>Incorrect presentation of band name “Green Day”; no Metallica member named “Snow” (when citing another author)</td>
<td>“Green Day”; no Metallica member named “Snow”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soocher (1999)</td>
<td>Incorrect title of Ozzy Osbourne record <em>Speaking of the Devil</em></td>
<td><em>Speak of the Devil</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(continued)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Error(s)</th>
<th>Correction(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males (1996)</td>
<td>Incorrect spelling of band name “Megadeath”; missing “…” in Metallica record <em>And Justice for All</em></td>
<td>“Megadeth”; <em>...And Justice for All</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen &amp; Hansen (1991)</td>
<td>Refer to Tipper Gore-led organization as “Parents’ Music Research Center”</td>
<td>“Parents Music Resource Center”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeson &amp; Williams (1986)</td>
<td>Incorrect title for Twisted Sister song “We’re Not Gonna Take It Anymore!”</td>
<td>“We’re Not Gonna Take It”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanamaker &amp; Reznikoff (1989); Desmond (1987)</td>
<td>Misspell “Ozzie” Osbourne</td>
<td>“Ozzy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Error(s)</td>
<td>Correction(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnett (1991)</td>
<td>Incorrect presentation of band name</td>
<td>“Guns N’ Roses”; “Revelation Mother Earth”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Guns-N-Roses,” missing parentheses in Ozzy Osbourne song title “Revelation Mother Earth”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prinsky &amp; Rosenbaum (1987)</td>
<td>Consistent incorrect presentation of band name “ACDC”</td>
<td>“AC/DC”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright (2000)</td>
<td>Incorrect title of Ozzy Osbourne record <em>Blizzard of Oz</em>; “Wormboy”;</td>
<td><em>Blizzard of Ozz</em>; “Wormboy”; “Mister Superstar”; “Minute of Mr. The Downward Spiral Decay”; <em>The Downward Spiral</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Blizzard of Oz</em>; incorrect presentation of Marilyn Manson songs “Worm Boy,” “Mr. Superstar,” and “The Minute of Decay”; incorrect title of Nine Inch Nails record <em>Downward Spiral</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wass, Raup, Cerullo, Martel, Mingione, &amp; Sperring (1988)</td>
<td>Incorrect title of Judas Priest record <em>Stained Glass</em></td>
<td><em>Stained Class</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX A (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Error(s)</th>
<th>Correction(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Incorrect spelling of Quiet Riot bassist Rudy “Sarro” and RATT guitarist “Robin” Crosby; incorrect presentation of MTV show <em>Head Bangers Ball</em>; incorrect presentation of band name “Guns and Roses”; incomplete title of AC/DC record <em>For Those About to Rock</em></td>
<td>“Sarzo”; “Robbin”; <em>Headbangers Ball</em>; “Guns N’ Roses”; While sometimes referred to in shorthand as Phillips refers to it, the complete title (also the title track) for the AC/DC record is <em>For Those About to Rock We Salute You</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friesen &amp; Epstein</td>
<td>Incorrect spelling of guitarist “Jimmy Hendrix”; incorrect presentation of band name “AC-DC”; incorrect spelling of band name “Merciful Fate”; incorrect presentation of Judas Priest cover of “Johnny Be Good”</td>
<td>“Jimi Hendrix”; “AC/DC”; “Mercyful Fate”; “Johnny B. Goode”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotarba</td>
<td>Incorrect spelling of band name “Kings’ X”</td>
<td>“King’s X”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denski &amp; Sholle</td>
<td>Incorrect spelling of band names “Thin Lizzy” and “Megadeath”; omit first umlaut in “Motley Crüe”; incorrect presentation of MTV show <em>Head Banger’s Ball</em></td>
<td>“Thin Lizzy”; “Megadeth”; “Mötley Crüe”; <em>Headbangers Ball</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Error(s)</th>
<th>Correction(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friesen &amp; Helfrich (1998)</td>
<td>Omit first umlaut in “Motley” Crüe; incorrect song title for Mötley Crüe’s “She’s Got the Looks That Kill”; incorrect presentation of Motörhead song title “I’m So Bad (Baby I Don’t Care)”; misspell band name “Alcatraz”; incorrect presentation of Alcatraz record title</td>
<td>“Mötley Crüe”; “Looks That Kill”; “I’m So Bad, Baby I Don’t Care”; “Alcatraz”; No Parole from Rock ‘N’ Roll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breen (1991)</td>
<td>Incorrect presentation of band name “Guns ‘n’ Roses”; incorrect year (1989) of release of Guns N’ Roses song “Welcome to the Jungle” from Appetite for Destruction record; misspells band name “Led Zeppelin”; incorrect title of Judas Priest record Stained Glass; indicates Metallica is from New York</td>
<td>“Guns N’ Roses”; 1987; “Led Zeppelin”; Stained Class; while Metallica started in Los Angeles, the band strategically moved to and made San Francisco its home city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wass, Miller, &amp; Stevenson (1989)</td>
<td>Incorrect title of Ozzy Osbourne record Blizzard of Oz</td>
<td>Blizzard of Ozz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Error(s)</th>
<th>Correction(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrell (1994)</td>
<td>Missing “…” in Metallica record <em>And Justice for All</em>;</td>
<td>...And Justice for All;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>All</em>; incorrect presentation of lyrics from Slayer song “Temptation” as:</td>
<td>(First verse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can interest you in lies</td>
<td>Can I interest you in lies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sell your soul for all it buys!</td>
<td>Sell your soul for all it buys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have you ever wondered why</td>
<td>Have you ever wondered why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It’s evil you’re attracted to?</td>
<td>It seems that evil you’re attracted to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While some of these errors may be typographic (e.g., Breen, 1991 misspells “Led Zeppelin” only once) or due to publisher reprinting, what makes them noteworthy is that most are regarding seminal bands in the heavy metal genre. Bands like Metallica, Megadeth, Mötley Crüe, and Guns N’ Roses were/are the most popular and representative artists of the genre. Furthermore, many of these bands are listed as seminal subgenre bands that helped develop and define a new style of metal – e.g., Metallica and Megadeth are considered two of the four bands that started and popularized thrash metal; Judas Priest is a classic band that was a forerunner in the heavy metal sound (oftentimes referred to in the group of New Wave of British Heavy Metal); Judas Priest and Ozzy Osbourne gained widespread [negative] notoriety for their previously mentioned court cases. In all, errors of this nature, with such definitive heavy metal bands, are inexcusable for a metal expert and call into question authors’ credibility in this particular area of research.
APPENDIX B

Study 1 – Lyrics Stimuli

Song Title: “In the Chapel in the Moonlight”
Genre: Heavy Metal

How I'd love to hear the organ
In the chapel in the moonlight
While we're strolling down the aisle
Where roses entwine

How I'd love to hear you whisper
In the chapel in the moonlight
That the love light in your eyes
Forever will shine

Till the roses turn to ashes
Till the organ turns to rust
If you never come I'll still be there
Till the moonlight turns to dust

How I'd love to hear the choir
In the chapel in the moonlight
As they sing "Oh Promise Me"
Forever be mine
**Song Title:** “If You Want to Get to Heaven”  
**Genre:** Pop/Southern Rock

I never read it in a book  
I never saw it on a show  
But I heard it in the alley  
On a weird radio  
If you want a drink of water  
You got to get it from a well  
If you want to get to heaven  
You got to raise a little hell

I never felt it in my feet  
I never felt it in my soul  
But I heard it the alley  
Now it's in my rock and roll  
If you want to know a secret  
You got to promise not to tell  
If you want to get to heaven  
You got to raise a little hell

I never thought it'd be so easy  
I never thought it'd be so fun  
But I heard it in the alley  
Now I got it on the run  
If you want to see an angel  
You got to find it where it fell  
If you want to get to heaven  
You got to raise a little hell

If you want to get to heaven  
If you want to get to heaven  
If you want to get to heaven  
If you want to get to heaven
**Song Title:** “Anarchy in the U.K.”  
**Genre:** Heavy Metal

Right now! ha, ha, ha, ha  
I am an antichrist  
I am an anarchist  
Don't know what I want  
But I know how to get it  
I wanna destroy passerby

'Cause I wanna be Anarchy  
No dog’s body  
Anarchy for the U.K.  
It's coming sometime and maybe  
I give a wrong time stop a traffic line  
Your future dream is a shopping scheme

'Cause I, I wanna be Anarchy  
In the city

How many ways to get what you want  
I use the best  
I use the rest  
I use the enemy  
I use Anarchy

'Cause I wanna be Anarchy  
It's the only way to be

Is this the M.P.L.A or  
Is this the U.D.A or  
Is this the I.R.A  
I thought it was the U.K.  
Or just another country  
Another council tenancy

I wanna be Anarchy  
And I wanna be Anarchy  
Know what I mean?

And I wanna be an anarchist  
Get pissed  
Destroy!
Song Title: “Saturday Night’s Alright For Fighting”  
Genre: Pop/Rock

It's getting late have you seen my mates  
Ma tell me when the boys get here  
It's seven o'clock and I want to rock  
Want to get a belly full of beer

My old man's drunker than a barrel full of monkeys  
And my old lady she don't care  
My sister looks cute in her braces and boots  
A handful of grease in her hair

Don't give us none of your aggravation  
We had it with your discipline  
Saturday night's alright for fighting  
Get a little action in

Get about as oiled as a diesel train  
Gonna set this dance alight  
'Cause Saturday night's the night I like  
Saturday night's alright, alright, alright

Well they're packed pretty tight in here tonight  
I'm looking for a dolly who'll see me right  
I may use a little muscle to get what I need  
I may sink a little drink and shout out "She's with me!"

A couple of the sound that I really like  
Are the sounds of a switchblade and a motorbike  
I'm a juvenile product of the working class  
Whose best friend floats in the bottom of a glass
APPENDIX C

Study 1 – Lyrics Information Sheet & Questionnaire

You are being invited to participate in a study as part of a dissertation project by Ike Brunner, Doctoral student in the Communication Studies Department. The purpose of this study is to find out how people think about music lyrics. Participation in the study will include reading one set of lyrics and responding to a survey, which should take about 20-30 minutes. While there are no direct benefits to you for participating, the data gathered for this study will add to the field of music research. Specifically, this study is aimed at filling a void in academic music studies by looking at how people think about lyrics, which has been largely ignored to this point. This contribution to the field will benefit the area of music research by presenting new data in the form of articles and/or presentations.

You must be at least 18 years old to participate in this study. There are no risks to participation greater than would be encountered in normal daily life. Participation is entirely voluntary, and you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time by notifying the Principal Investigator (PI) or project advisor at the contact information provided below. Additionally, if you decide to participate, you may skip any questions you do not want to answer. Your decision to participate or not participate in this research project will have no impact on your grades, class standing, or relationship to BGSU in any way.

You will be compensated with 10 extra credit points for your participation. You must print your name on the tear-off sheet attached to the questionnaire in order for these points to be awarded. Once you hand in the completed questionnaire, the tear-off sheet containing your name will be removed, and then your name will be recorded on another sheet of paper and given to the course instructor or teaching assistant so that they can assign your extra credit points. No one outside of the research team will know if you participated in the project. Additionally, no one outside of the research team will see your responses. Your confidentiality as a participant in this research project will be protected by destroying the tear-off sheet once your name has been recorded on another sheet. Additionally, all data will be stored in a locked office accessible to only the PI and will be kept indefinitely for use in other studies.

If you have any questions about this research project, you may ask the PI, who is attending this class. Additionally, if you have questions at a later time or wish to withdraw from the study, you may contact Ike Brunner (PI) at (419) 354-7848 (ibrunn@bgsu.edu) or the project advisor, Dr. Melissa Spirek at (419) 372-8641 (mspirek@bgsu.edu). Finally, if you have any questions about the conduct of the study or your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair
of Bowling Green State University’s Human Subjects Review Board at (419) 372-7716 (hsrb@bgsu.edu).

Once again, you are making a voluntary decision to participate in this research study on music lyrics. Please be sure that all your questions have been answered before beginning. If you agree to the terms of participation explained in this information sheet, please continue to the instruction sheet provided in this packet. Please keep this information sheet for your records. By completing and returning the Journalism 201 Lyrics Questionnaire, you are indicating your consent to participate in the study. In order to further protect your confidentiality as a participant, please do not put any identifying information on the questionnaire itself. Please also remember to print your name on the tear-off sheet so that you will receive the 10 extra credit points. Thank you for your time and participation in this project.
JOURNALISM 201 LYRICS QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION 1
Please answer the following:

Age: _______  Sex: Male  Female  Ethnicity: ___________________

Class Rank:  Freshman  Sophomore  Junior  Senior

On a typical day, circle how many hours you listen to a radio (e.g., terrestrial, Internet, satellite).

0   ½   1   1½   2   2½   3   3½   4   4½   5   5½   6   6½   7   7½   8   8½   9   9½   10   10½   11   11½   12
12½  13  13½  14  14½  15  15½  16  16½  17  17½  18  18½  19  19½  20  20½  21  21½  22  22½  23  23½  24

What radio station do you listen to the most?  ______________

On a typical day, circle how many hours you listen to CDs.

0   ½   1   1½   2   2½   3   3½   4   4½   5   5½   6   6½   7   7½   8   8½   9   9½   10   10½   11   11½   12
12½  13  13½  14  14½  15  15½  16  16½  17  17½  18  18½  19  19½  20  20½  21  21½  22  22½  23  23½  24

What was the last CD you purchased?

Artist: ____________________________  Title: _______________________________

On a typical day, circle how many hours you listen to an MP3 player (e.g., computer, iPod, etc.).

0   ½   1   1½   2   2½   3   3½   4   4½   5   5½   6   6½   7   7½   8   8½   9   9½   10   10½   11   11½   12
12½  13  13½  14  14½  15  15½  16  16½  17  17½  18  18½  19  19½  20  20½  21  21½  22  22½  23  23½  24

How many concerts do you attend per year? _______

Name the last concert you attended (e.g., tour name, performer name(s)).
What is your favorite genre of music? _________________________________

Provide 3-5 adjectives that you feel accurately describe this music.
__________________________________________________________________________

Rank your three favorite music genres below. Underneath each identify what you like about that genre.

1. Genre: ________________
   Like: _______________________________________________________________________

2. Genre: ________________
   Like: _______________________________________________________________________

3. Genre: ________________
   Like: _______________________________________________________________________

Rank your five favorite music artists beginning with your favorite (#1). Indicate why you like them.

1. Artist’s Name: ___________________________
   Why you like him/her/them: ___________________________________________________________________

2. Artist’s Name: ___________________________
   Why you like him/her/them: ___________________________________________________________________

3. Artist’s Name: ___________________________
   Why you like him/her/them: ___________________________________________________________________

4. Artist’s Name: ___________________________
   Why you like him/her/them: ___________________________________________________________________

5. Artist’s Name: ___________________________
   Why you like him/her/them: ___________________________________________________________________
For the following four questions, circle the number that best represents you.

_In general_, how much attention do you pay to a song’s music?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>FULL ATTENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO Attention At All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_In general_, how much attention do you pay to a song’s lyrics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>FULL ATTENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO Attention At All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much attention do you pay to your favorite songs’ music?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>FULL ATTENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO Attention At All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much attention do you pay to your favorite songs’ lyrics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>FULL ATTENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO Attention At All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explain when you are likely, if at all, to sing along with your favorite songs.

What do you like more about your favorite genre of music as compared to another genre? Be sure to indicate which one is your favorite genre.

Name your favorite song and list any of its lyrics below.

You are light-hearted and happy. You want to continue feeling this way. What song would you listen to and why would you select this particular song?
You are feeling “blue” and even sad. You want to continue feeling this way. What song would you listen to and why would you select this particular song?

You are angry and frustrated. You want to continue feeling this way. What song would you listen to and why would you select this particular song?

You are excited and aroused. You want to continue feeling this way. What song would you listen to and why would you select this particular song?

Next to the following genres of music, indicate approximately how many CDs you own in that category:

Country/Bluegrass= _____  Easy Listening= _____  Heavy Metal= _____
Pop= ______  Religious= ______  Classical= ______
Jazz= ______  Blues= ______  Hard Rock= ______
Alternative= ______  Oldies= ______  Rap= ______
Techno/Electronica= ______  Indie= ______  R&B= ______
SECTION 2

Please answer the following questions after reading the lyrics you were given.

What do you think about the lyrics you just read?

Explain how you feel after reading the lyrics.

Indicate if this is different than how you felt before you read the lyrics.

YES ➔ WHY?

NO ➔ WHY NOT?

Who performed the song you read? Guess if you do not know the artist.

What was the lyricist communicating?

What did the lyrics convey to you?

For the following two questions, circle the number that best represents you.

How familiar are these lyrics to you?

NOT AT ALL 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY FAMILIAR
How likely would you be to recommend this song to a friend, based on the lyrics you read?

NOT  0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  VERY LIKELY
AT ALL                     LIKELY

Would hearing or reading these lyrics in their music context change your interpretation?

YES  →  WHY?

NO  →  WHY NOT?

How did you imagine the sex of the singer as you read the lyrics?

Male    Female    Did not think about it

Would the singer’s sex affect your interpretation of the lyrics?

YES  →  WHY?

NO  →  WHY NOT?

Should adolescents be allowed to listen to this song?

YES  →  WHY?

NO  →  WHY NOT?
Answer this set of questions with as much detail as possible. Be sure to describe your relationship relative to each group.

When I think of the people who listen to this type of music, I would describe them as:

Here is where I think I fit in relative to the group I described above:

When I think of the people who would never listen to this type of music, I would describe them as:

Here is where I think I fit in relative to the group I described above:

When I think of the people who avoid this type of music, I would describe them as:

Here is where I think I fit in relative to the group I described above:

I am a fan of heavy metal music.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
STRONGLY DISAGREE STRONGLY AGREE

Use this space to make any additional comments about the lyrics you read:
### APPENDIX D

Prospective Experimental Stimuli – HM Cover Songs List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song</th>
<th>Original Artist</th>
<th>Original Record</th>
<th>Song Length</th>
<th>Cover Artist</th>
<th>Cover Record</th>
<th>Song Length</th>
<th>Same Lyrics?</th>
<th>Explicit Lyrics?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Everything Counts”</td>
<td>Depeche</td>
<td>People Are</td>
<td>7:20</td>
<td>In Flames</td>
<td>Whoracle</td>
<td>3:17</td>
<td>Yes; Repeat last chorus at end instead of 9x of final chorus</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“In the Chapel In the Moonlight”</td>
<td>Dean Martin</td>
<td>Dino: The Essential</td>
<td>2:32</td>
<td>Celtic</td>
<td>Into the Pandemonium</td>
<td>2:04</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*“Saturday Night’s Alright for Fighting”</td>
<td>Elton John</td>
<td>Greatest Hits</td>
<td>4:07</td>
<td>W.A.S.P. The Best of the Best 1984-2000</td>
<td>Yes; alcohol and violence</td>
<td>4:44</td>
<td>Minor word changes</td>
<td>Yes;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song</th>
<th>Original Artist</th>
<th>Original Record</th>
<th>Song Length</th>
<th>Cover</th>
<th>Cover (HM) Record</th>
<th>Song Length</th>
<th>Same Lyrics?</th>
<th>Explicit Lyrics?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Eleanor Rigby”</td>
<td>The Beatles</td>
<td><em>Beatles 1</em></td>
<td>2:06</td>
<td>Godhead</td>
<td><em>2000 Years of Human Error</em></td>
<td>4:01</td>
<td>Yes; several extra chorus repeats at end; extra ½ verse 3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Original Artist</td>
<td>Original Record</td>
<td>Song Length</td>
<td>Cover Artist</td>
<td>Cover (HM) Record</td>
<td>Song Length</td>
<td>Same Lyrics?</td>
<td>Explicit Lyrics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*“Personal Jesus”</td>
<td>Depeche</td>
<td>The Singles</td>
<td>3:46</td>
<td>Gravity</td>
<td>Superstarved</td>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>86&gt;98</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Personal Jesus”</td>
<td>Depeche</td>
<td>The Singles</td>
<td>3:46</td>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Lest We Forget:</td>
<td>4:06</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>86&gt;98</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manson</td>
<td>The Best Of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*“You Spin Me Round (Like a Record)”</td>
<td>Dead or</td>
<td>Evolution:</td>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>Dope</td>
<td>S/T single</td>
<td>2:43</td>
<td>Yes; Minor wording changes in verses</td>
<td>No; Could be some sexual innuendo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alive</td>
<td>The Hits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song</th>
<th>Original Artist</th>
<th>Original Record</th>
<th>Song Length</th>
<th>Cover Artist</th>
<th>Cover Record</th>
<th>Cover Length</th>
<th>Same Lyrics?</th>
<th>Lyrics Notes</th>
<th>Explicit Lyrics?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Blue Monday”</td>
<td>New Order</td>
<td><em>(The Best of) New Order</em></td>
<td>4:07</td>
<td>Orgy</td>
<td>Candyass</td>
<td>4:26</td>
<td>Yes; Extra phrasing at end of 1st and last verses (repeated x3 at end)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Cinnamon Girl”</td>
<td>Neil Young</td>
<td>Greatest Hits</td>
<td>2:59</td>
<td>Type O</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Yes; Minor word changes, extra repetition of last line of chorus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*“The Chain”</td>
<td>Fleetwood Mac</td>
<td>Very Best of</td>
<td>4:29</td>
<td>Tantric</td>
<td>After We</td>
<td>4:21</td>
<td>Yes; Extra chorus repeats at end</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (continued)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Song</th>
<th>Original Artist</th>
<th>Original Record</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Cover (HM) Artist</th>
<th>Cover Record</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Same Lyrics?</th>
<th>Explicit Lyrics?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The Ghost of Tom Joad”</td>
<td>Bruce Springsteen</td>
<td>The Essential</td>
<td>4:23</td>
<td>Rage Against</td>
<td>Renegades</td>
<td>5:38</td>
<td>Several wording changes (do not alter story of song); several repeats of ½ of line of final verse</td>
<td>Not in theme, but some violent lyrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Maggie’s Farm”</td>
<td>Bob Dylan</td>
<td>The Essential</td>
<td>3:54</td>
<td>Rage Against</td>
<td>Renegades</td>
<td>6:34</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No; few violent lyrics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
### APPENDIX D (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song</th>
<th>Original Artist</th>
<th>Original Record</th>
<th>Original Song Length</th>
<th>Cover Artist</th>
<th>Cover Record</th>
<th>Cover Song Length</th>
<th>Same Lyrics?</th>
<th>Explicit Lyrics?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Diamonds and Rust”</td>
<td>Joan Baez</td>
<td><em>Greatest Hits</em></td>
<td>4:47</td>
<td>Judas Priest</td>
<td><em>Sin After</em></td>
<td>3:27</td>
<td>Minor word changes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sin</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>verses of original; extra chorus x 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Green Manalishi”</td>
<td>Fleetwood Mac</td>
<td><em>Showbiz Blues: Vaudeville Years</em></td>
<td>15:15</td>
<td>Judas Priest</td>
<td><em>Hell Bent</em></td>
<td>3:23</td>
<td>Yes; Minor wording</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(With the Two-Prong Crown)”</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Vol. 2 1968-70</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>for Leather</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Johnny B. Goode”</td>
<td>Chuck Berry</td>
<td><em>His Best: Vol. 1</em></td>
<td>2:42</td>
<td>Judas Priest</td>
<td><em>Ram It</em></td>
<td>4:39</td>
<td>Yes; Minor wording</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Down</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Original Artist</td>
<td>Original Record</td>
<td>Original Song Length</td>
<td>Cover Artist</td>
<td>Cover Record</td>
<td>Cover Song Length</td>
<td>Same Lyrics?</td>
<td>Explicit Lyrics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*“Cat Scratch Fever”</td>
<td>Ted Nugent</td>
<td><em>The Ultimate</em></td>
<td>3:39</td>
<td>Pantera</td>
<td><em>Far Beyond the</em></td>
<td>3:49</td>
<td>Yes; Minor wording changes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ted Nugent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Great Southern</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual innuendo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*“If You Want to Get to Heaven”</td>
<td>Ozark Mountain Daredevils</td>
<td><em>Best Of: 20th Century Masters</em></td>
<td>3:05</td>
<td>Nine</td>
<td><em>Kentucky</em></td>
<td>2:34</td>
<td>Yes; Minor wording changes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Breakdown</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song</th>
<th>Original Artist</th>
<th>Original Record</th>
<th>Original Song Length</th>
<th>Cover Artist</th>
<th>Cover (HM) Record</th>
<th>Cover Song Length</th>
<th>Same Lyrics?</th>
<th>Explicit Lyrics?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*“Tainted Love”</td>
<td>Soft Cell</td>
<td><em>The Singles</em></td>
<td>2:42</td>
<td>Marilyn Manson</td>
<td><em>Lest We Forget: The Best Of</em></td>
<td>3:20</td>
<td>Yes; End of final verse only 1 line of original repeated (instead of 3 lines = extra phrase repeated 3 times); Extra chorus</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Original Artist</td>
<td>Original Record</td>
<td>Original Length</td>
<td>Cover Artist</td>
<td>Cover Record</td>
<td>Cover Length</td>
<td>Same Lyrics?</td>
<td>Explicit Lyrics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Sweet Dreams (Are Made of This)”</td>
<td>Eurythmics</td>
<td>Greatest</td>
<td>4:54</td>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Lest We Forget:</td>
<td>4:51</td>
<td>Mostly; all full verses instead of some 1/2 verses; modifies interlude from “Hold your head up; keep your head up” to “I wanna/I’m gonna use you; I wanna/I’m gonna abuse you; I wanna/I’m gonna know what’s inside”</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Song</th>
<th>Original Artist</th>
<th>Original Record</th>
<th>Original Song Length</th>
<th>Cover Artist</th>
<th>Cover Record</th>
<th>Cover Song Length</th>
<th>Same Lyrics?</th>
<th>Explicit Lyrics?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Word Up!”</td>
<td>Cameo</td>
<td><em>Best Of (Funk Essentials)</em></td>
<td>4:19</td>
<td>Korn</td>
<td><em>Greatest Hits Vol. 1</em></td>
<td>2:53</td>
<td>Yes; Few extra words, extra 2½ choruses at end; no final refrain of spelling out song title</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Song</td>
<td>Original Artist</td>
<td>Original Record</td>
<td>Song Length</td>
<td>Cover Artist</td>
<td>Cover Record</td>
<td>Cover (HM) Song Length</td>
<td>Same Lyrics? Description</td>
<td>Explicit Lyrics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“These Boots”</td>
<td>Nancy Sinatra</td>
<td><em>Lightning’s Girl: Greatest Hits 1965-72</em></td>
<td>2:42</td>
<td>Megadeth</td>
<td><em>Killing Is My Business...</em></td>
<td>3:44</td>
<td>Several changes to more explicit sexual terms</td>
<td>Not original; Yes for cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Army of Me”</td>
<td>Bjork</td>
<td><em>Greatest Hits</em></td>
<td>3:56</td>
<td>Powerman</td>
<td><em>The Good, the Bad and the Ugly Vol.</em></td>
<td>3:41</td>
<td>Yes; Few extra words; few minor word changes; final chorus instead of alternating lines uses</td>
<td>No; Threat of violence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song</th>
<th>Original Artist</th>
<th>Original Record</th>
<th>Song Length</th>
<th>Cover (HM) Artist</th>
<th>Cover Record</th>
<th>Song Length</th>
<th>Same Lyrics?</th>
<th>Explicit Lyrics?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Message in a Bottle”</td>
<td>Sting</td>
<td><em>The Very Best of Sting &amp; The Police</em></td>
<td>4:49</td>
<td>Machine Head</td>
<td><em>The</em></td>
<td>3:31</td>
<td>Yes; Minor wording changes; No final verses; modification of repetition of final chorus</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Shock the Monkey”</td>
<td>Peter Gabriel</td>
<td><em>Shaking the Tree: 16</em></td>
<td>3:57</td>
<td>Coal Chamber</td>
<td><em>Chamber</em></td>
<td>3:42</td>
<td>Yes; no final repetition of chorus</td>
<td>Yes, violent if taken literally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Original Artist</td>
<td>Original Record</td>
<td>Original Length</td>
<td>Cover Artist</td>
<td>Cover Record</td>
<td>Cover Length</td>
<td>Same Lyrics?</td>
<td>Explicit Lyrics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Shout”</td>
<td>Tears for Fears</td>
<td><em>Tears Roll Down: Greatest Hits 82-92</em></td>
<td>6:32</td>
<td>Disturbed</td>
<td><em>The Sickness</em></td>
<td>4:16</td>
<td>Yes; Minor wording &amp; additions;</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extra refrains near end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Anarchy in the U.K.”</td>
<td>Sex Pistols</td>
<td><em>Never Mind the Sex Pistols</em></td>
<td>3:32</td>
<td>Megadeth</td>
<td><em>So Far, So</em></td>
<td>3:01</td>
<td>Yes; Minor wording</td>
<td>Yes, violent changes (e.g., substituted USA for UK); extra expletive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Got the Time”</td>
<td>Joe Jackson</td>
<td><em>Steppin’ Out: Very Best Of</em></td>
<td>2:53</td>
<td>Anthrax</td>
<td><em>Persistence of Time</em></td>
<td>2:44</td>
<td>Yes; Minor wording</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Song</td>
<td>Original Artist</td>
<td>Original Record</td>
<td>Original Song Length</td>
<td>Cover (HM) Artist</td>
<td>Cover (HM) Record</td>
<td>Cover (HM) Song Length</td>
<td>Same Lyrics?</td>
<td>Explicit Lyrics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Faith”</td>
<td>George Michael</td>
<td><em>Faith</em></td>
<td>3:16</td>
<td>Limp Bizkit</td>
<td><em>Bill, Yall</em></td>
<td>2:26</td>
<td>Yes; Minor wording changes; Extra expletive; Change to 2nd half of chorus; No final repeat of chorus</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>“You Shook Me All Night Long”</em></td>
<td>AC/DC</td>
<td><em>Back in Black</em></td>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Six Feet Under</td>
<td><em>Classics 2</em></td>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Yes; Minor wording changes</td>
<td>Yes, sexual innuendo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * = selected for stimulus
APPENDIX E

Study 2 – Music Stimuli

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song</th>
<th>Original Artist</th>
<th>Original Record</th>
<th>Original Length</th>
<th>Cover Artist</th>
<th>Cover Record</th>
<th>Cover Length</th>
<th>Same Lyric?</th>
<th>Explicit Lyrics?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“In the Chapel In the Moonlight”</td>
<td>Dean Martin</td>
<td>Dino: The Essential</td>
<td>2:32</td>
<td>Celtic Frost</td>
<td>Pandemonium</td>
<td>2:04</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Personal Jesus”</td>
<td>Depeche Mode</td>
<td>The Singles 86&gt;98</td>
<td>3:46</td>
<td>Gravity Kills</td>
<td>Superstarved 3:15</td>
<td>Yes; only ½ of 1st chorus; minor word change – “and” to “when”</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(continued)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX E (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Song</th>
<th>Original Artist</th>
<th>Original Record</th>
<th>Original Song Length</th>
<th>Cover (HM) Artist</th>
<th>Cover (HM) Record</th>
<th>Cover Song Length</th>
<th>Same Lyrics?</th>
<th>Explicit Lyrics?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“You Spin Me Round”</td>
<td>Dead or Alive</td>
<td><em>Evolution:</em></td>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>Dope</td>
<td>Self-titled</td>
<td>2:43</td>
<td>Yes; Minor wording changes in verses</td>
<td>No; Could be some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Hits</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Like a Record)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Chain”</td>
<td>Fleetwood Mac</td>
<td><em>Very Best of Fleetwood</em></td>
<td>4:29</td>
<td>Tantric</td>
<td><em>After We Go</em></td>
<td>4:21</td>
<td>Yes; Extra chorus repeats at end</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Fleetwood</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mac</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Cat Scratch Fever”</td>
<td>Ted Nugent</td>
<td><em>The Ultimate Ted Nugent</em></td>
<td>3:39</td>
<td>Pantera</td>
<td><em>Far Beyond the Great</em></td>
<td>3:49</td>
<td>Yes; Minor wording changes</td>
<td>No; Sexual innuendo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(continued)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song</th>
<th>Original Artist</th>
<th>Original Record</th>
<th>Original Song Length</th>
<th>Cover Artist</th>
<th>Cover Record</th>
<th>Cover Song Length</th>
<th>Same Lyrics</th>
<th>Explicit Lyrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“If You Want to Get to Heaven”</td>
<td>Ozark Mountain</td>
<td>Best Of: 20th Century</td>
<td>3:05</td>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2:34</td>
<td>Yes; Minor wording</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Tainted Love”</td>
<td>Soft Cell</td>
<td>The Singles</td>
<td>2:42</td>
<td>Marilyn Manson</td>
<td>Lest We Forget: The Best Of</td>
<td>3:20</td>
<td>Yes; End of final verse</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
### APPENDIX E (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song</th>
<th>Original Artist</th>
<th>Original Record</th>
<th>Original Song Length</th>
<th>Cover Artist</th>
<th>Cover Record</th>
<th>Cover Song Length</th>
<th>Same Lyrics?</th>
<th>Explicit Lyrics?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Anarchy in the U.K.”</td>
<td>Sex Pistols</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3:32</td>
<td>Megadeth</td>
<td>So Far, So Good...So</td>
<td>3:01</td>
<td>Yes; Minor</td>
<td>Yes, wording violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mind the Bollocks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>substituted USA for UK; Extra expletive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extra expletive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“You Shook Me All Night Long”</td>
<td>AC/DC</td>
<td>Back in Black</td>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Six Feet Graveyard</td>
<td>Classics 2 Under</td>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Yes; Minor</td>
<td>Yes, wording sexual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criteria for selection:**

1) Original and cover versions had the same lyrics (slight variations not affecting overall theme were common)

2) Cover versions were within (±) one minute of length of the original recording

3) Cover versions exhibited a heavy metal style of music

4) Original and cover versions were performed by singers of the same gender
APPENDIX F

Study 2 – Music Information Sheet & Stimuli

School of Communication Studies
302 West Hall
Bowling Green, OH 43403-0237
(419) 372-8349
Fax: (419) 372-0202

JOUR 100 Music Study Information Sheet

You are being invited to participate in a study as part a dissertation project by Ike Brunner, Doctoral student in the Communication Studies Department. The purpose of this study is to find out how people think about music. Participation in the study will include listening to one song and responding to a survey, which should take about 20-30 minutes. While there are no direct benefits to you for participating, the data gathered for this study will add to the field of music research. Specifically, this study is aimed at filling a void in academic music studies by looking at how people think about music, which has been largely ignored to this point. This contribution to the field will benefit the area of music research by presenting new data in the form of articles and/or presentations.

You must be at least 18 years old to participate in this study. There are no risks to participation greater than would be encountered in normal daily life. Participation is entirely voluntary, and you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time by notifying the Principal Investigator (PI) or project advisor at the contact information provided below. Additionally, if you decide to participate, you may skip any questions you do not want to answer. Your decision to participate or not participate in this research project will have no impact on your grades, class standing, or relationship to BGSU in any way.

You will be compensated with 10 extra credit points for your participation. A check mark was placed beside your name on the sign-up sheet when you entered the lab in order for these points to be awarded. Your name will be recorded on another sheet of paper and given to the course teaching assistant to assign your extra credit points. As a “thank you” for participating, you may also keep the headphones you are given for use during the study.

No one outside of the research team will know if you participated in the project. Additionally, no one outside of the research team will see your responses. Your confidentiality as a participant in this research project will be protected by destroying the sign-up sheet once your name has been recorded on another sheet. Additionally, all data will be stored in a locked office accessible to only the PI and will be kept indefinitely for use in other studies.

If you have any questions about this research project, you may ask the experimenters. Additionally, if you have questions at a later time or wish to withdraw from the study, you may contact Ike Brunner (PI) at (419) 354-7848 (ibrunn@bgsu.edu) or the project advisor, Dr. Melissa Spirek at (419) 372-8641 (mspirek@bgsu.edu). Finally, if you have any questions about the conduct of the study or your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of Bowling Green State University’s Human Subjects Review Board at (419) 372-7716 (hsrb@bgsu.edu).
Once again, you are making a voluntary decision to participate in this research study on music. Please be sure that all your questions have been answered before beginning. If you agree to the terms of participation explained in this information sheet, please continue to the instruction sheet provided in this packet. Please keep this information sheet for your records. By completing and returning the Journalism 100 Music Questionnaire, you are indicating your consent to participate in the study. In order to further protect your confidentiality as a participant, please do not put any identifying information on the questionnaire itself. Thank you for your time and participation in this project.
JOURNALISM 100 MUSIC QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION 1
Please answer the following:

Age: _______ Sex: Male   Female Ethnicity: ___________________

Class Rank: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior

On a typical day, circle how many hours you listen to a radio (e.g., terrestrial, Internet, satellite).

0 ½ 1 1½ 2 2½ 3 3½ 4 4½ 5 5½ 6 6½ 7 7½ 8 8½ 9 9½ 10 10½ 11 11½ 12
12½ 13 13½ 14 14½ 15 15½ 16 16½ 17 17½ 18 18½ 19 19½ 20 20½ 21 21½ 22
22½ 23 23½ 24

What radio station do you listen to the most? ______________

On a typical day, circle how many hours you listen to CDs.

0 ½ 1 1½ 2 2½ 3 3½ 4 4½ 5 5½ 6 6½ 7 7½ 8 8½ 9 9½ 10 10½ 11 11½ 12
12½ 13 13½ 14 14½ 15 15½ 16 16½ 17 17½ 18 18½ 19 19½ 20 20½ 21 21½ 22
22½ 23 23½ 24

What was the last CD you purchased?

Artist: ____________________________ Title: _____________________________________

On a typical day, circle how many hours you listen to an MP3 player (e.g., computer, iPod, etc.).

0 ½ 1 1½ 2 2½ 3 3½ 4 4½ 5 5½ 6 6½ 7 7½ 8 8½ 9 9½ 10 10½ 11 11½ 12
12½ 13 13½ 14 14½ 15 15½ 16 16½ 17 17½ 18 18½ 19 19½ 20 20½ 21 21½ 22
22½ 23 23½ 24

How many concerts do you attend per year? _______

Name the last concert you attended (e.g., tour name, performer name(s)).

______________________________________________________________

What is your favorite genre of music? ______________________________

Provide 3-5 adjectives that you feel accurately describe this music.

___________________________________________________________________
Rank your three favorite music genres below. Underneath each identify what you like about that genre.

1. Genre: ________________
Like: __________________________________________________________________________

2. Genre: ________________
Like: __________________________________________________________________________

3. Genre: ________________
Like: __________________________________________________________________________

Rank your five favorite music artists beginning with your favorite (#1). Indicate why you like them.

1. Artist’s Name: ___________________________
Why you like him/her/them: ______________________________________________________________________

2. Artist’s Name: ___________________________
Why you like him/her/them: ______________________________________________________________________

3. Artist’s Name: ___________________________
Why you like him/her/them: ______________________________________________________________________

4. Artist’s Name: ___________________________
Why you like him/her/them: ______________________________________________________________________

5. Artist’s Name: ___________________________
Why you like him/her/them: ______________________________________________________________________

For the following four questions, circle the number that best represents you.

In general, how much attention do you pay to a song’s music?

| NO | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | FULL ATTENTION |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|               |
| ATTENTION AT ALL |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |               |


In general, how much attention do you pay to a song’s lyrics?

NO  0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  FULL
ATTENTION AT ALL

How much attention do you pay to your favorite songs’ music?

NO  0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  FULL
ATTENTION AT ALL

How much attention do you pay to your favorite songs’ lyrics?

NO  0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  FULL
ATTENTION AT ALL

Explain when you are likely, if at all, to sing along with your favorite songs.

What do you like more about your favorite genre of music as compared to another genre? Be sure to indicate which one is your favorite genre.

Name your favorite song and list any of its lyrics below.

You are light-hearted and happy. You want to continue feeling this way. What song would you listen to and why would you select this particular song?

You are feeling “blue” and even sad. You want to continue feeling this way. What song would you listen to and why would you select this particular song?
You are angry and frustrated. You want to continue feeling this way. What song would you listen to and why would you select this particular song?

You are excited and aroused. You want to continue feeling this way. What song would you listen to and why would you select this particular song?

Next to the following genres of music, indicate approximately how many CDs you own in that category:

Country/Bluegrass= _____  Easy Listening= _____  Heavy Metal= _____
Pop= _____  Religious= _____  Classical= _____
Jazz= _____  Blues= _____  Hard Rock= _____
Alternative= _____  Oldies= _____  Rap= _____
Techno/Electronica = _____  Indie= _____  R&B= _____

Mark on the following scales how you feel right now.

1. I feel happy.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
NOT AT ALL HAPPY
EXTREMELY HAPPY

2. I feel sad.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
NOT AT ALL SAD
EXTREMELY SAD

3. I feel angry.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
NOT AT ALL ANGRY
EXTREMELY ANGRY

4. I feel excited.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
NOT AT ALL EXCITED
EXTREMELY EXCITED
SECTION 2

Please answer the following questions after listening to the song you were given.

Mark on the following scales how you feel right now.

5. I feel happy.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
NOT AT
ALL HAPPY

6. I feel sad.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
NOT AT
ALL SAD

7. I feel angry.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
NOT AT
ALL ANGRY

8. I feel excited.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
NOT AT
ALL EXCITED

What do you think about the music you just listened to?

What was the performer of the music communicating?

What were the lyrics of the music you just listened to?
How familiar is this song to you?

NOT 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY FAMILIAR
AT ALL FAMILIAR

Circle the number that best shows your assessment of the music you just heard.

DID NOT 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 LIKED IT
LIKE IT AT ALL COMPLETELY

Why did you select the number for the music above? What did you or did you not like?

How likely would you be to recommend this song to a friend?

NOT AT 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY LIKELY
ALL LIKELY

Explain how you felt at the end of the song.

Who performed and what was the title of the song you heard? Guess if you do not know the artist and title.

What is the genre of this song?

Would you like to listen to the song again?

YES → WHY?

NO → WHY NOT?
Answer this set of questions with as much detail as possible. Be sure to describe your relationship relative to each group.

When I think of the people who listen to this type of music, I would describe them as:

Here is where I think I fit in relative to the group I described above:

When I think of the people who would never listen to this type of music, I would describe them as:

Here is where I think I fit in relative to the group I described above:

When I think of the people who *avoid this* type of music, I would describe them as:

Here is where I think I fit in relative to the group I described above:

I am a fan of heavy metal music.

| STRONGLY DISAGREE | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | STRONGLY AGREE |

Use this space to make any additional comments about the song you heard: