

# Background Music and Performance on Memory-related Tasks: Preliminary Findings from a Systematic Review

Yi-Ting Cheah, Michael Spitzer, Eduardo Coutinho

*Applied Music Research Lab, Department of Music, University of Liverpool, UK*  
y.cheah2@liverpool.ac.uk, michael.spitzer@liverpool.ac.uk, e.coutinho@liverpool.ac.uk

## Background and Aims

The effects of background music (BGM) on cognitive performance have been marked by inconsistent findings. We therefore conducted a systematic review (SR) in order to clarify previous inconsistencies and identify trends that are not apparent from the results of isolated studies. The aims of this SR are: (1) to evaluate how BGM affects performance in different cognitive tasks (e.g., reading, memory recall), and (2) to identify specific listener- (e.g., personality traits, music education, etc.), music- (e.g., lyrics, arousal, etc.) and task-related factors (e.g., difficulty, cognitive domain) that could contribute to the effects of BGM on cognitive performance. In this paper we present a preliminary analysis of the SR results focused on the effects of BGM on memory-related tasks.

## Method

Empirical studies published from January 1960 until May 2020 were searched in PubMed, PsycINFO, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar databases. The searches returned 8,867 unique articles (see Cheah, Spitzer, & Coutinho, 2020 for the complete protocol). Ninety-five articles met the inclusion criteria and 29 articles (with 43 experiments) pertained to memory-related outcome measures. The memory-related experiments were further categorised into 6 task types: serial recall (n=12), immediate (n=10) and delayed (n=7) free recall, associative recall (n=4), recognition (n=8) and memory span (n=2). Analyses focused on determining (a) the effects of the presence/absence of BGM (i.e., music vs silence) on task performance; (b) the music characteristics that mediate the effects of BGM on task performance (e.g., presence of lyrics), and (c) task-specific effects of BGM within the cognitive domain. Following the recommendations in McKenzie and Brennan (2021), the findings were synthesised through vote counting based (solely) on the directions of effects, and sign tests were used to determine whether there was any evidence of the effects (Bushman & Wang, 2009).

## Results (Main Contribution)

Overall (cf. Table 1), BGM had a significant detrimental effect on memory-related task performance (Test 1: only 39 out of 108 tests— 36% successes— favouring BGM). Specifically, L-BGM was significantly more detrimental than silence (Test 2: 27% successes favouring L-BGM) and I-BGM (Test 3: 7% success favouring L-BGM; 93% successes favouring I-BGM). When analysing memory tasks independently, a task-specific effect was also observed: BGM was particularly detrimental for serial recall— performance was always impaired regardless of whether the BGM had lyrics or not (0% successes favouring L-BGM; 9% successes favouring I-BGM; cf. Test 5 and 6).

## Conclusions and Implications

Overall, the results showed that BGM significantly hindered memory-related task performance. From a wider viewpoint, the effect seemed to be mostly related to L-BGM; but when task-specific analyses were conducted, we observed that both L-BGM and I-BGM were significantly detrimental towards serial recall performance. These preliminary results suggest that it is important to consider the characteristics of BGM used and the types of tasks (even within the same cognitive domain) when evaluating the effects of BGM on cognitive performance. We will continue with our analysis of other cognitive domains, and we expect that this work will provide relevant contributions to the field of music cognition, with practical implications to everyday life (e.g., works/study habits).

**Keywords:** background music, cognitive performance, memory

## References

- Cheah, Y. T., Spitzer, M., & Coutinho, E. (2020). The impact of background music on cognitive task performance: A systematic review. *PROSPERO 2020 CRD42020207193*. Available from: [https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display\\_record.php?ID=CRD42020207193](https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42020207193)
- Bushman, B. J., & Wang, M. C. (2009). *Vote-counting procedures in meta-analysis*. In H. Cooper, L. V. Hedges, & J. C. Valentine (Eds.), *The handbook of research synthesis and meta-analysis* (p. 207–220). Russell Sage Foundation.
- McKenzie, J., & Brennan, S. (2021). Chapter 12: Synthesizing and presenting findings using other methods. In J. P. T. Higgins, J. Thomas, J. Chandler, M. Cumpston, T. Li, M. J. Page, & V. A. Welch (Eds.), *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 6.0*. Cochrane.

**Table 1**

Sign test results of proportion comparisons between interventions. BGM= background music (with and without lyrics); L-BGM= BGM with lyrics; I-BGM= instrumental BGM; S= Silence (control). Only statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ) comparisons are shown. "No. of successes" indicates the number of tests (i.e., outcome measures) reporting improved task performance in the music conditions compared to silence (for Tests 1, 2, 4, 5, 6,); for Tests 3, it indicates the number of tests reporting better performance in I-BGM compared to L-BGM. "Total tests" indicates the total number of outcome measures available for analysis within each comparison (Note: number of tests  $\neq$  number of experiments).

Test	Comparisons	No. of successes	Total tests	Proportion	p	95% Confidence	
						Lower	Upper
<i>All memory tasks</i>							
1	BGM vs S	39	108	36%	.005	.277	.455
2	L-BGM vs S	11	41	27%	.004	.157	.419
3	I-BGM vs L-BGM	13	14	93%	.002	.685	.987
<i>Serial recall</i>							
4	BGM vs S	1	20	5%	<.0001	.009	.236
5	L-BGM vs S	0	9	0%	.004	.000	.299
6	I-BGM vs S	1	11	9%	.012	.016	.377