Being the best artist there is; what does it matter?

‘The Dutch pop music industry and the effects of winning an award onto the amount of online searches related to the artists, from 2007 to 2011.’

Being the best artist there is; what does it matter?

'The Dutch pop music industry and the effects of winning an award onto the amount of online searches related to the artists, from 2007 to 2011.'

Abstract

Within the music industry, and the cultural industries in general, awards and prizes set the tone as signals of quality and distinction. Yet, the effects and consequences of these cultural awards are lesser studied subjects. In this study about the Dutch current pop music industry, the emphasis is on music awards and their effects onto the amount of online searches for the artists involved. Through the announcements of both the win and the nomination prior to the award show, the effects of awards onto the winning artist's received attention is studied.

Keywords

Awards, popular music industry, Netherlands, Google, search traffic.

A.J. (Lydie) van Gool

Erasmus University Rotterdam

School of History, Communiation and Culture

Supervisor: Dr. Christian Handke

326056ag

July 2012

1. Summary

Although much has been written about the cultural awards and reward systems, the majority of the literature is spend on the ways in which juries are conducted, how the system sustains itself and what kind of influence this jury system has on the winners and losers of the awards. Up until now, no studies are found which revolve around the impact awards have on the winners, or losers, of those prizes. In theory, there is Superstar theory, which claims that we, in the Western world, live in a world in which a relatively small number of people, the superstars, earn enormous sums of money and dominate the activities in their field of specialty. This domination would then be present within the award system as well; for the awards form an important part of the cultural systems. But what do the artists actually get from winning? Do they benefit from their ´superstar´ status, if they indeed have one? Here, the main question: ***Does winning an award within the current Dutch popular music industry has an effect on the online attention the winner receives?*** is researched.
This is done through the use of the following hypothesizes, which are based on expectations formed out of theory and common knowledge: (1) the search traffic results will be higher in the post-period, compared to the pre-period, (2) the search traffic results are the highest within the week of the announcement itself, compared to both the pre-period and the post-period, (3a) there is a negative relation between the level of being established as an artist, and the differences in search traffic results between the pre-period and the traffic results of the week of the announcement itself, (3b) there is a positive relation between the level of being established as an artists, and the differences in search traffic results between the week of the announcement itself and the post-period search traffic results, (4a) there is a positive relation between the amount of awards won, and the difference in search traffic results between the pre-period and the week of the announcement, (4b) there is a negative relation between the amount of awards won, and the difference in search traffic results between the week of the announcement and the post-period.

In trying to answer these questions, Google Trends is used to gather information about the search traffic results regarding the award winning artists. Through statistical, quantitative analysis, a possible shift in online attention is studied. This online attention is formed out of the relative amount of times the artist's name is searched. The amount of searches is counted solely through Google, by far the most used search engine within The Netherlands. The pre-period, post-period and the period during both the winning moment and the announcement of

the nomination, are taken into account. The nominations are studied as a control measure, it could very well be that being nominated provides the same effect compared to acatually winning an award. But, following expectations, the winning moment should tick off a more intense positive effect compared to the announcement of the nomination. In total, 223 cases form the core of this study, 128 win cases and 95 nomination cases. A total of 25 weeks is covered; 12 weeks prior to the announcements, the week of the announcements itself and 12 weeks afterwards. Differences in time and the possible effect of time itself are studied with the use of these different periods.

After statistical bivariate quantitative analyzes, some of the hypothesizes can be verified and some need to be rejected. In short, the search traffic does increases right after the announcement of the nomination and the announcement of the win, so there is a positive effect for both announcements. However, the effect does not lasts very long, a couple of days at the most. Above, the traffic results are higher with regards to the nominations, compared to the announcement of the winners.
The heightening of the traffic results during the post-period for both the win and the nomination, can partly be explained by the weak/moderate positive relation between the amount of records which are released during that period and the level of search traffic results; the more records are released, the higher the traffic results. Against expectations, it does not matter if other awards are won during the period tested, how many awards are won at one time, or the artist's level of being established versus being a newcomer. There are no statistically significant correlations found regarding these mentioned independent variables and the differences over time in traffic results.
The finding that the positive effect which is found is rather short, is endorsed by the result that the course of the pre-periods, the week of the announcements and the post-periods do not show any strong trends. This accounts for both the nomination cases as well as the win cases. In short; the demonstrable effect is limited to a traffic increase of a few days and there is no long-term, sustainable positive effect which is conclusively caused by the presence of the award.

Index

2. Introduction

One of the major, most prominent assumption of prizes, medals and awards is the belief that they somehow serve as means of distinction. Distinction between good and poor quality, honorable work and more or less 'average' contributions or between talented and well, lets say 'less gifted' human beings. Certainly within the field of culture and the arts, prizes are handed out on a more than regular basis. This raft of cultural awards may come from the relatively high level of uncertainty within arts and culture, especially when compared to consumer goods. When it comes to art, everybody knows and, at the same time, nobody knows. This tension is one of the main characteristics that sets the economics and the field of arts apart from others.

Behind the general conviction that prizes serve as a mean of distinction, and the apparent need to distinct so excessively, lies the question: does the winner gain from this, supposedly positive, distinction? And while playing around with this question, the follow up: if so, is this potential gain quantifiable? In line with this train of thought, the main question of this research is defined as: ***Does winning an award within the current Dutch popular music industry has an effect on the online attention the winner receives?***
There has been thorough research about awards and distinction through criticism, both in general terms as within the cultural field in particular, but most of this research is aimed at either processes within the jury, the establishment and creation of the shows around the prizes or the level of quality of the winning artists. None of these studies has tried to quantify any impact of the prizes included, this study is aimed at precisely that.

Using the Dutch popular music industry and its awards, this study brings clarity about online attention the winning artists receive before and after winning. In doing so, the question about what it is the artists themselves gain from it is answered. Using quantitative methods, the level of attention is measured at different points in time, both before and after winning.
Every Dutch music award which deals with (a form of) pop music is considered, making this research comprehensive and thorough. The emphasis is on the current effect of awards, therefore, the music awards have been narrowed down to a limited amount of issuing years, 2006 through 2011. Once started, progression can be made and further research can potentially bring more clarity on the overall subject and in specific on the overarching

question: What is it that artists gain in attention and awareness from winning pop music awards?

3. Research question and hypothesizes

As mentioned earlier, the mean research question which shall be answered is: ***Does winning an award within the current Dutch popular music industry has an effect on the online attention the winner receives?*** Expectations are that the attention will be greater after the award is given when compared to the attention prior to the award, due to the high quality signal that an award brings. Further, the attention is expected to be at its highest point right after the announcement; namely within a couple of days after. Then, after this initial peak, the traffic will decrease again. If the award is able to give the artist more attention and overall awareness, the traffic will be higher in the post-period compared to the pre-period; even when the 'buzz' of the award is gone, traffic will be, at least slightly, higher.

If we take the level of being established as an artist into account, we would expect the newcomers benefit more from winning an award, compared to the already established winners. The established artists already have a relatively high level of attention and awareness, therefore, the differences between before the award and the week of the award should be lesser compared to the newcomers, while the expected downward trend within the post-periods will slope downward slower because the effect of the award is greater for the newcomers, i.e. the height of the differences between the week of the announcement and the post-periods traffic results should be negatively related to the level of being established. Being a newcomer makes the differences in traffic results smaller because the post-period level of attention should be higher compared to the traffic results of the more established artists.

Then, it is expected that the more awards are won, the higher the level of attention. Of course there is an upper bound, but in general, multiple winners are expected to attract more attention then single award winners. Regarding the post-periods, a higher amount of awards will cause a lesser downward slope compared to single award winners, because the relatively high amount of wins at one time will cause a greater attention effect than winning one award. Therefore, the differences between the week of the announcement and the post-period should be lesser with the multiple award winners than the differences between the same two periods regarding the single award winners.

From these expectations, the following hypothesizes are formed:

1. The search traffic results will be higher in the post-period, compared to the pre-period.
2. The search traffic results are the highest within the week of the announcement itself, compared to both the pre-period and the post-period.
3.
    a. There is a negative relation between the level of being established as an artist, and the differences in search traffic results between the pre-period and the traffic results of the week of the announcement itself.
    b. There is a positive relation between the level of being established as an artists, and the differences in search traffic results between the week of the announcement itself and the post-period search traffic results.
4.
    a. There is a positive relation between the amount of awards won, and the difference in search traffic results between the pre-period and the week of the announcement.
    b. There is a negative relation between the amount of awards won, and the difference in search traffic results between the week of the announcement and the post-period.

4. Theoretical framework

The (popular) music industry seems to struggle with the rapidly changing rules of doing business in this day and age. Questions and challenges which come to mind relate to record sales, innovations, research & development, online versus offline environments, file sharing, and so forth. On top of these changes and the accompanying required adaptability, the music industry has do deal with a growing number of leisure activities.
Distinction between good and poorer quality become even more important in deciding how to spend your (leisure) time the best way you can; the supply increases while time is scarce. The entire cultural field is, and has been, struggling with this growing tension. Time can only be spend once and the choice gets harder with all these added options around. One thing that helps people in the decision whether or not to buy or use a good or service, is the opinion of other people. Especially the opinion of people whose opinion can be trusted and serves the needs as best as possible. Within culture, in specific the cultural industries, this task is, to a great extent, left to the existence of awards and prizes; handed out to the best artists and the best works of art around.

The music industry, one of the cultural industries, relies heavily on awards and the shows revolved around the awards. Every year, a growing number of awards are handed out and there is no indication that the numbers will go down in the near future. With such a thick field of music awards, especially regarding pop music, what is the net effect of winning one or two? Do the artists gain from being on the 'winners list'?
Starting from a broad, more general idea as to why professional criticism exists, the subject is narrowed down step by step until we end up at the core of popular music awards and the potential effect of awards in specific.

Awards and success as scientific study objects

Even though awards and the accompanying shows are very prominent within the arts and cultural field, it is a relatively poor researched subject. Research is present about the rules of particular award shows or the choices and motives of the juries' voting behavior (sources needed), the amount of studies becomes rather thin when it comes to the impact an award show might have on the artists involved. Or, as James F. English has said it:*' There is no form of cultural capital so ubiquitous, so powerful, so widely talked about, and yet so little explored by scholars as the cultural prize.'* (English, 2002: 109)

A handful of researchers developed theories and empirical research. With the help of these contributions, knowledge can be gained about a possible relation between the awards and success for those artists who are in some way linked to the award show. The studies which do address this topic, or topics closely related to it, are constructed into a theoretical structure. The general premise remains: what do the artists gain from winning an award? Especially when it comes to the attention they receive, which in turn, could turn to other forms of gaining; both on a content and on financial based level. Even though it is not said that the two different levels cannot go hand in hand, they are two distinguished forms of gaining and appreciation, certainly within the field of culture and the arts. There are more other aspects that have to be taken into account as well when dealing with arts and the appreciation of it.

Demand and Superstar Theory

In a highly uncertain business such as the arts, and for the specifics of this research the music industry, questions keep popping op. Questions about how do consumers, peers and other involved parties distinguish good from poorer quality, and what constitutes as good and poor quality? Nobody knows and everybody knows.

Awarding certain artists and certain work seems to ease this highly interesting and complicated decision process. A process which is particularly hard within the cultural field, due to the heterogeneity of its products and the characteristics of artworks in general. Art sets itself apart from consumer goods; art is not just the sum of the uses and capabilities. Artworks provide something extra, something that cannot be calculated or extracted easily. This is exactly why some of the art's, and culture's, industry specifics should be treated differently. One of these characteristics is the existence of the so called Superstar. Superstars play important roles within today's modern world in general and within the arts and culture in specific. Sherwin Rosen (1981) explains this importance of superstars in the modern world through his, conveniently named, Superstar Theory. Rosen (1981) states that we, in this part of the world, live in a situation in which a relatively small number of superstars earn enormous amounts of money, and in doing so dominate the activities and fields in which they operate. For the sake of this research, lets not elaborate on the reasons why this is the current situation, but accept the idea that this indeed is the case. With this general theory, based upon the wider cultural field , there is room to test it specifically to the music industry.

William Hamlen Jr. (1991) tests two opposed views concerning the contemporary pop music industry: (1) the belief that consumers of popular music have little recognition of or appreciation for quality in singing and the opposing belief (2) which assumes that this industry is subject to the superstar phenomenon and that small differences in recognized ability are magnified into disproportionate levels of success. An important finding at the end of his study, is the indication that consumers do recognize quality but that there is no proportionate balance or unity between record sales and quality. An interesting finding. All in all, the straightforward view that the music industry is an example of Rosen's (1981) superstar theory is not supported by Hamlen (1991). On the basis of these two prominent theories, no straightforward hypothesis can be formed, yet.

Criticism as the arbitrator

Before we handle the question about what artists might gain from awards more specifically, lets explain the main reasons why awards exist in the first place, in so many forms that is. Is it indeed, as a lot of the awards shows would argue, to make a grounded distinction between good and poor artistic qualities? To start of answering this question, we begin with the more broad theme of professional criticism and the existence of it. Awards are still a form of professional criticism and therefore, how and why professional criticism exists is useful in understanding the concept.

The most prominent research concerning this subject is the study of the demand for criticism, done by S. Cameron (1995). According to this study, there are four main functions when considering the demand for criticism, including the demand for awards as a form of distinction. First of all, Cameron (1995) elaborates on criticism being an advertising source. It provides information that can be used by consumers about the quality of the work and/or the artist. Especially within the music industry, which deals with experience goods, professional and substantiated information about those experiences lowers the level of risk to buy a potential pig in a poke. In this way, critics have a comparative advantage in rating works and function as a reliable third party opinion for consumers. If this thought is followed, the differences in online search traffic prior to and after being involved within an award show, should, to some extent, react to the win by attracting more attention after the award is announced.

To kick this advertising and distinctive function up a nudge, Cameron (1995) states that the critic is consciously aware of his own advertising and information spreading function. As a consequence, the critic uses his status and influence to promote the artist, or its work, more actively. Regarding this particular research, the latter function is less important in trying to find answers to the main questions at hand. The third function entails less mutual interests between the artist and the critic, but does include the consumers interests. Criticism serves the simple utility function, it is useful as potential consumption for the item or good which is reviewed (Cameron, 1995: 323). Again, not that interesting for this particular research, but noteworthy to give a proper overview of the overall functions of criticism within this cultural field.

The last function seems more complicated than the previous ones. Cameron (1995) explains that individuals have a set of meta-preferences, preferences about preferences, which leads them to seek out utility enhanced consumption. The critic might just elaborate on a certain artist or an artists' work which fits with the image or the appearance the consumer wants or is looking for. The role of the critic is then to agent the set of tastes that may be worth cultivating, on behalf of the consumers.

Although there are differences between the four functions as explained by Cameron (1995), the differences seem rather minor. The ground on which all functions are based is called 'marketing'. If you take a step back, all functions circle around actively creating, communicating and exchanging judgments and therefore, create value for (potential) consumers. Or as Philip Kotler et al. (2008) stated quite some times,' marketing is as simple as satisfying customer needs'. In the light of this description, the critics, and award shows, within the cultural field are partly marketing the overall cultural field and in specific, marketing certain artists and ultimately careers, in order to create value. In line with this, the analysis should show that the overall attention increases after winning the awards, in comparison with the period before. If this is not the case, this marketing function, as described by Cameron (1995) is not endorsed and further research would be very interesting in order to exploit the relation between the award as the critic who endorses the winning artists. Especially because this marketing function is said to spread out to 'society', at least the media and the music lovers, and in doing so, forms an influential part of the popular music industry as a whole.

Awards, quality and success

Moving away from the more general role of cultural criticism and towards awards in specific, Victor Ginsburgh (2003) focuses specifically on awards, success and quality within the arts. Although Cameron's (1995) study is very helpful in grasping the essence of criticism and why there is demand for it, it does not cater to the specifics of the arts and cultural industries. The arts, even in its broadest sense of the word, are in many ways very different from other goods. Ultimately, art goods remain goods as well, but it is helpful to create more specified knowledge and observe the arts a little closer. Ginsburgh (2003) makes a good attempt; with the use of three cases, he studies the impact of prizes within the visual arts, books and performing arts. He distinguishes the cases on the basis of human senses. A very artistically justifiable distinction, but does it help in arranging the results?

Summarized, Ginsburgh (2003) concludes that in general, movies which win awards are reasonably often box office successes as well. But for books, the interweaving of both events was not so tight, certainly compared to the film industry and especially compared to (classical) music performances. Although cautiously, he concludes that awards, prizes and critics may have an impact on success but that for movies, award winners are often not considered the best ones as captured by other measures of quality, 20 to 50 years later (Ginsburgh, 2003: 109). At last, he poses that there is at least an association between awards, prizes or rankings and success and that there is a clear influence in the case of music. But considering the various characteristics and field structure between the music genres of Ginsburgh's study (classical music) and this one (popular music), the latter statement is not taken into consideration as ground to build a hypothesis on. Ginsburgh (2003) does shed light on awards within cultural fields and it is safe to say that, on the basis of his contributions, award are reasonably often an indicator for further success, at least in the shorter term. Following this, research should provide a third endorser for the believe that the search traffic results will be higher after the announcement of the win, compared to the period before the win.

Pop music, awards and success

Another notably contribution, aimed at cultural awards in specific, is made by James F. English (2005) and his book about the economy of prestige. Although an elaborate explanation of his book is not relevant for this particular study, it is worth mentioning some

details. Starting with one of the most astonishing one. With the use of the Grammy Awards as the award for popular music, English explains that the likelihood for a winning record or album to end up in the top-ten bestsellers is about 20 to 30 percent (English, 2005: 332). Not at all the percentage one would expect, considering the reputation of the Grammy Awards as being one of the most commercially oriented cultural prizes in the cultural field. After elaborating on the subject quite a bit, English (2005) states that awards, nowadays, form the most ubiquitous and 'awkwardly indispensable' instrument used for all forms of cultural transaction (English, 2005: 106). It then seems that every form or segment within the field of arts and culture needs awards, even if that means that the only reason for it to exist is to be taken seriously. Following his mindset, you could speak of an erosion regarding the worthiness and existence of awards.
To conclude his contribution to this discussion with, English's (2005) tendency throughout his book is that awards, their shows and the accompanying prizes serve a complex, aesthetic, but above all an economic goal. Multiple players, like the media, jury members, artists and agents, know how to play their role the best they can in order to maintain a certain reputation and reap rewards the best way possible. Following his conclusion, we should see an increase in traffic results as a result of winning the pop music award. This success will not last that long, following English (2005), but the long term effect are left to do research later on. For the sake of this study, only the relatively short term effect are measured.

The last included contribution comes from Mary Watson and N. Anand (2006). In their study regarding recorded music, they found that being nominated for, or winning a Grammy award helps increase subsequent record sales within the popular music industry. Although the study by Watson and Anand (2006) focuses on the demand for record sales and not on live music performances, it does indicate that there is a positive effect of music awards on the demand for the artist's work. This positive effect should be revealed by the online attention which is attributed to those specific award winning artist.
On the basis of their findings, Watson & Anand (2006) join Cameron and Ginsburgh (2003) in the belief that there is enough reason to be convinced that there is a direct link between winning an award and having some form of success afterwards which can be attributed to winning. English is more hesitant in this matter tends to believe that the awards are often not that good an indicator for other forms of success. English does share the believe that there is a short term uplift but regarding the pure quality of the works included, he is not convinced. Eventually, it would be highly interesting to compare both effects, both short and long term

for the Dutch music industry. Starting out with the relatively short term effect now, the long term effect could be tested later on. Then, solid contributions could be made at the discussion table.

Problems with current literature

As mentioned before, the subject of awards in combination with the artist's success, or lack of success, afterwards seems like a relatively neglected subject. On top, most of the scientific literature which do addresses cultural and music prizes, are centered around awards and shows which are American in character, like the Grammy Awards or the Oscar Awards. Apart from their American character, these award shows are aired on (international) television and serve a major market of (potential) consumer. No particularly Dutch studies regarding this particular subject are found. There is a sector institute for professional Dutch music, Muziek Centrum Nederland (further: MCN), which promotes and carries out research for all kinds of music genres including pop music and related genres. Even though MCN put out a lot of different studies and a range of subjects within music and the industry, they have never carried out research regarding awards or any other form of distinction and/or quality and its potential impact onto the involved parties. Apart from the MCN, no other studies about music awards (all genres) are found within The Netherlands or other European countries.

Is the solely U.S. based body of knowledge problematic? Compared to the United States, The Netherlands is a relatively small country with an accompanying small market for music and cultural goods. This could potentially put pressure on the stated conclusions throughout this theoretical framework. On the other hand; why would The Netherlands would be that different from the United States or the United Kingdom? The Western culture is predominantly the same and the cultural goods and markets are likely to behave in similar ways.

5. Operationalization

The cases are divided into multiple categories. This is done so there is a better understanding of what music, artists and systems we are dealing with; the two variables regarding the ranking of the artists and the voting system at hand are the ones who need further elaboration and clarification.

5.1 Ranking of the artists

First of all, all the artists included are either (largely) based within The Netherlands or have their origins within The Netherlands. Further, he or she (partially) has to serve the Dutch music market in order to be included. There are no specific limitations regarding the language used, lyrics, or other content based aspects. The division of the artists included is based on them scoring on a scale which distinguishes the two extremes; established status and unestablished status.

Unestablished versus established

The artists involved are all categorized with the use of two prominent Dutch pop music charts. The winners' highest achievement at that time, within the Dutch single top 100 or the Dutch album top 100, is used to create a continuous variable. The highest notation of the artist's top song and/or album, up until the time of the win, is deducted from 101, with 100 being the last spot in the charts and therefore the highest deductible number possible. The number that is left is the artist's score on the established/unestablished variable. Artists who have not placed within one or both charts are given a 0 score.

For example, if an artists has released a song which placed at spot 17 in the charts in 2005, he released a number one hit in 2007, and won an award both in 2006 and in 2008, his score for the 2006 award would be 101 – 17 = 84 and for the 2008 award it would be 101 – 1 = 100. In line, the higher the final score, the more the artists is seen as an established artists. Using this variable, we are able to check whether winning an award as a relatively unestablished artist shows a greater, more intense effect compared to the effect of the award onto the attention for already established artists. Following the literature, this sketched scenario would have to show up.

Within the pop music industry, the top 100 single and album charts are one of the best ways to measure whether an artist is generally accepted as such, at least within the forces of the

market. These charts are build up with the use of sales (both offline and online sales) and are the only measure, apart from the award rewards system, in which the appreciation, estimation and popularity of an artist can be measured. Therefore, it is interesting to find out whether there is any significant correlation between both ‘ rating bars’.

5.2 Voting system

There are three different voting systems at work. Most of the awards and accompanying winners are formed out of a public voting system in which the general public, if interested, is able to vote. As far as we know, the winners are chosen out of these votes. With every public based award, the nominees are announced prior to the actual finale/show. This leaves room to study the nominations as well.

Then there is the jury based system in which, logically, a jury is composed to form and judge the nominees as well as the winners of the awards. Generally, the nominations are not announced and therefore will not be studied.

At last, there is a small category of awards which are based upon other methods, including: sales figures, Dutch charts and or radio airplay. Just as with the jury based awards, there are no nominees announced, which leaves just the winning moment to be studied during this research.

With this division, knowledge is gained about the different types of voting systems at play and the way they have an effect on the attention level of the artist. If there is a significant difference between the voting systems, it might be interesting to investigate this subject further; more in depth about the effect of certain systems. Certainly the jury based system is interesting, due to the ease of the manipulation through the formation of the jury and the interests of the jury members involved. In general, it is interesting to find out if there is anything to say about the sustainability of the appreciation of both the public and of juries. Even though this research is focuses on the relatively short term after the winning of the award, it gives an indication of the influence held by both parties; the public and the juries.

6. Method & design

The main research question revolves around winning an award plus the effect it has regarding online attention. Using numerical data from Google Trends, this exploratory research studies the Dutch popular music industry, a field which has not been studied extensively in this way. As mentioned before, no comparable data is found regarding a possible relation between award winners and the amount of online attention they might get as a result.

6.1 Google Trends

All the artists involved, and their level of attention, are compared to each other via the online website Google Trends. Google Trends shows how frequently (a) certain search term(s) has been searched over time through the Google search engine. No other search engines are covered; Google is the most used search engine within Netherlands, the share of other search engines is negligible (IProspect, http://www.iprospect.nl/our-world/iprospect-onderzoek/nationale-search-engine-monitor). Therefore, solely using Google to gather data about online search traffic is a reasonably complete measure to use regarding this particular study.

6.1.1 Search terms and included artists

Due to possible multiple meanings with regard to the names of the artists (such as Typhoon, Good Things End or Racoon) solely the search results from within The Netherlands are used, results from other regions are therefore excluded. The chance of including traffic related to other subjects or concepts is greatly reduced by excluding every area but the Netherlands, the area in which the artists is successful and relatively well-known.
Notably, not all the nominated artists are included within the research, solely the nominations of the winners are. This is due to the lack of data regarding 'just' the nominated artists. There is simply not enough traffic when it comes to the majority of the nominated artists who eventually did not win the award as well.

Thus, both (a part of) the announcement of the nomination and the moment of the actual win are included. The nomination cases form a control variable for the win cases, in order to check whether being nominated provides the artist with the same level of attention compared to winning the award. The studied cases (223 in total: 128 win cases, 95 nomination cases) consist of the exclusive combinations of (1) the awarded winner and (2) the announcement

date. For example, the first ‘win case’ consists of the unique combination of the winner (1) The Opposites and the announcement date (2) 30 December 2007. Google Trends is used to calculate the amount of online searches during the studied period, which is 12/8/4 weeks prior and after the week of the announcement plus the week of the announcement itself. Therefore, the total time measured is 25 weeks.
For example, if we take the first case again, the search term would be ‘ The Opposites’ because this is the full name of the group that won the award(s). This search term is then run through Google Trends and the outcome results are imported into and adjusted in SPSS. This same process is repeated for every single case, both regarding the announcements of the win and the announcements of the nominations.

6.1.2 Scale and search traffic conditions

The data acquired from Google Trends is scaled in a fixed manner, based on the average search traffic of the term(s) used. Here, these terms generally consists of the artists/formations name. In Appendix C, the exceptions are mentioned; the ones who needed additional search terms in order to minimize the amount of searches not related to the particular artist(s).
Back to the scaling of the data, this is how Google puts it herself:
‘In fixed mode, the data is scaled to the average traffic for your term during a fixed point in time (usually January 2004). In our example, 1.0 would be the average traffic of ***dogs*** *in January 2004. If you chose 2006 as your time frame, you would be comparing data for* ***dogs*** *in 2006 to its data in January 2004. Since the scale basis (1.0) doesn’t change with time, you can look at different time periods, and relate them to each other. (Note: For keywords without a historical record, it may not be possible to establish a fixed scale).’*
(source: Google Trends, http://www.google.nl/intl/en/trends/about.html#1, consulted on April 1, 2012)

To put in other words, every traffic result included is always to be seen in the light of comparison. When a certain week turns out to have a 14.6 result, this means that the traffic within that week is 14.6 times higher than the traffic measured in the first week of January 2004. If the time frame with which Google Trends searches is set to a specific time frame, for example the year 2006, the traffic within 2006 is compared to January 2004. When collecting the data for this particular study, every term searched is set with the time frame ‘all years’, which provides the traffic of every week from 1 January 2004 up until the week in which the search is performed. Every entry is then compared to the same moment in time, namely

January 2004, which leaves us with precise results and a good enough starting point for comparing the cases mutually. The downfall could be that the artist measured had a particular 'out of the ordinary week within the first week of January 2004, for example due to a new release or other major related happening. Then, the overall traffic results could be biased. Still, this is a very small, negligible, risk that needs to be taken in order to measure every artist and every case in the same manner.

6.1.3 Traffic results periods

The best way to measure a short term effect is by setting the week in which the announcement itself is placed, apart from the other time frames. The actual announcement could be on the first day of the week, all the way through the last day of the week. This time precise bias is insurmountable at this time, due to the data being collected by Google in weekly figures. In total, a period of 25 weeks is covered (12 prior to + 1 during + 12 after), leaving us with enough data to check for any effect within a reasonable amount of time. On top, the different time frames leave room for more in depth analysis. Not only the single weeks are studied, but the 12/8/4 week period surrounding the announcements are researched as one period well. In doing so, potential differences in averages among the various time frames could be brought to the attention. This provides a more varied picture of the current situation.

6.1.4 Time frames

As mentioned earlier, the included Google Trends search results range from twelve weeks prior to the award to twelve weeks after the award show. The time frame of twelve weeks is chosen because there is reason to assume that a possible effect will be revealed within this particular time frame. Within this time, and after providing a table with the data and buildup of the traffic results' separate weeks, a total of three composed time frames are analyzed. The first timeframe is from twelve weeks before the announcement as one period and the twelve weeks after the announcement as one period as well. The following frames consist of the eight weeks and four weeks before and after. The week of the announcement itself is set apart from all the pre-periods and post-periods, because it is interesting to find out whether there is an extremely short (i.e.: a few days) effect regarding the search traffic for the artists.

Then, the different periods are compared to each other. The single weeks are put in line, first to see if there are differences between the pre-period weeks and the post-period weeks in absolute terms. Then, the pre-periods are compared with each other to see whether the

differences in weeks within periods differ from each other. Then, the different post-periods are compared with each other as well. After comparing the absolute numbers, the weekly traffic results are compared on the basis of differences. This is one step further then 'just' comparing the absolute numbers; the differences in absolute numbers between two following weeks are put in line in order to check for any possible trend.

6.2 Variables

Both the win cases and the nomination cases are being treated in the same way. Both data sets consist of (largely) the same variables and have been subjected to exactly the same data gathering. All variables included are as follows:

Table 1: Variable details regarding success through online search traffic, after being nominated for an award or winning an award

Amount	Amount of awards	Total amount of awards won at that particular moment in time	Ratio	Numeric, total amount of awards
Show	Award show	Award show, not the category but overarching show	Nominal	1. Gouden Greep 2. Urban Awards 3. State Award 4. Edison Pop 5. Buma Export 6. Buma Zilveren Harp 7. Buma Gouden Harp 8. Buma Popprijs 9. Buma Beste Nederlandse Lied

				10. 3FM Awards 11. TMF Awards
Art_rank	Ranking of artists	Ranking of artist, with the use of Dutch single and album top 100 charts. Artist' rank number consists of his/her highest scored album/single at the time of the win or at the time of nomination, deducted from 101	Ratio	1 through 100
Aw_vote	Voting system that is used to construct the winner of the award and/or category	Voting system related to the award/category	Nominal	1. jury 2. public 3. other
Week_b12 through Week_a12	Traffic results, calculated per week	Google search traffic results, in different weeks prior to, during, and after the announcement of either the award or the nomination. The traffic is calculated per week and in absolute numbers	Scale	Numeric, total amount of search traffic results in particular week
Average_b12, Average _b8, Average_b4	Average search traffic results, twelve/eight/four weeks before announcement	The average absolute search traffic results, from the twelfth/eighth/fourth week prior to the announcement, up until the week prior to the announcement.	Scale	Numeric, average absolute amount of search traffic results in particular weeks
Average_a4,	Average	The average absolute	Scale	Numeric, average

Average_a8, Average_a12	search traffic results, four/eight/twelve weeks after announcement	search traffic results, from the week after the announcement up until the fourth/eighth/twelfth week after the announcement		absolute amount of search traffic results in particular weeks
Diff_b12_win up until Diff_win_b12	Difference between (average of) twelve/eight/four weeks prior to and after week of the win.	The average absolute difference between the twelve/eight/four weeks pre-period up until the week before the win, and between the week of the win up until the twelve/eight/four week post-period.	Scale	Numeric, difference in absolute numbers between two particular periods
Diff_b12_nom up until Diff_nom_b12	Difference between (average of) twelve/eight/four weeks prior to the nomination and the week of the nomination.	The average absolute difference between the period twelve/eight/four weeks before the nomination up until the week of the nomination, and between the week of the nomination up until the twelve/eight/four week post-period.	Scale	Numeric, difference in absolute numbers between two particular periods.
Release_b12 up until Release_a12	Amount of releases within twelve/eight/four weeks prior to win or nomination week, up until the amount of releases within	The amount of record releases, either singles and/or albums, which has entered the Dutch top 100 album and/or single charts within the period studied. The week in which the record has entered the chart is taken into account.	Scale	Numeric, absolute amount of record releases.

	twelve/eight/four weeks after the win or nomination.	Therefore, if an album and/or single is not placed within the top 100, it is not included.		
Award_b12 up until Award_a12	Presence of other awards won within the period studied.	The presence of other awards which are won by the artists(s) within the period studied.	Ordinal	0. no 1. yes
First_diff_b11_b12 up until first_diff_a12_a11	Differences in absolute traffic between two single weeks	The differences, in absolute traffic results, between two single weeks. The first week, in time, is always deducted from the one who comes later in time. For example: traffic results in week_b12 are deducted from week_b11, the result forms first_diff_b11_b12	Scale	Absolute differences

6.2.1 Weekly traffic results: Week_b12 up until Week_a12

All weeks included, from the twelfth week prior to the announcement of the win or the announcement of the nomination up until the twelfth week after, have a certain level of Google Trends search traffic. These uncategorized numbers are implemented into SPSS and shown in order to see if there is any trend in absolute terms during the entire period covered.

6.2.2 Weekly average traffic results: Average_b12 up until Average_a12

Then, these week_ variables, are averaged out and transformed into other variables. For example, the Week_b12, Week_b11, Week_b10 and so forth, all the way to Week_b1, are averaged and together form the variable Average_b12. The number in the average_ variable now stands for the amount of weeks included into the calculation and of course, the period which it stands for: before, after or week of the announcement. Together, the averaged before periods now have three sub periods (Average_b12, Average_b8 and Average_b4) and the

after periods do as well (Average_a4, Average_a8 and Average_a12). The weeks of the announcements, both the win week and the nomination week, are treated as isolated weeks.

6.2.3 Differences between time periods: Diff_b12_win up until Diff_win_a12 and Diff_b12_nom until Diff_nom_a12

These calculated averages are used to calculate the differences in traffic results between the key periods: before, after and during the announcement week. For example, the Diff_b12_win variable is constructed by the difference between the Average_b12 variable and the Week_win variable. The last period in time is always deducted from the first period; here, the Week_win traffic result is conducted from the Average_b12 traffic result. The difference is now called the Diff_b12_win variable and can be compared, for example, to the Diff_win_a12 period to see if there are any major differences between the pre-periods and post-periods. Regarding the nominations, exactly the same analysis is conducted.

6.2.4 First_diff_b11_b12 up until First_diff_a12_a11

To take it one step further, we check whether there is a trend within the search traffic results between different periods in time. The differences between single week traffic results are compared by deducting the results from one particular week, from the week prior to it. In doing so, a possible upward trend may be picked up during the differences in traffic within the pre-periods, and a downward trend may be visible within the traffic of the post-periods. The week which comes later in time is always deducted from the week which is prior to that particular week. Resulting into numbers which show to what extend a week has more or less traffic compared to the week before. This analysis is conducted for both the wins and the nominations.

6.2.5 Recorded releases: Release_b12 up until Release_a12

If a record is released during the time frame studied, which is either twelve weeks (Release_b12 and Release_a12), eight weeks (Release_b8 and Release_a8), four weeks (Release_b4 and Release_a4) or one single week (Release_win and Release_nom), the amount of the releases is included as a control variable. If there are no records released in the given time frame, that particular time frame is set to 0 regarding the releases. If there are releases, the absolute number is included. The Release_ control variable is always related to a matching time period regarding the traffic results. For example, the Release_b12 is analyzed

in relation to the twelve week pre-period and the Release_a4 is analyzed in relation to the four week post-period.
The record is taken into account solely at the week of entering either the Dutch Single Top 100 or the Dutch Album Top 100. If the record did not enter one of these (most popular) Dutch charts, it is not included at all. The assumption is that the released record does not have that much impact onto the search traffic if it did not make the Single/Album Top 100. To be clear, a record could either be a single or an album; both recordings are treated the same.

5.2.6 Other awards: Award_b12 up until Award_a12

As with the recorded releases, the presence of other Dutch music award shows in which an artists is involved is taken in as a control variable as well. If the artist, or group, has been involved in another show within time frame which is studied, this involvement will be included. Both the data regarding the announcement of the win as with the announcement of the nomination will be controlled regarding other awards. As with the releases, the number of awards in which the winner is included, a part from the one under study, is taken into account. This is due to the assumption that being involved in an(other) award show brings some extra attention. If there are no records released in the given time frame, that particular time frame is set to 0 regarding the releases. If there are releases, the absolute number is included. In practice, none of the values exceeded above 1.

7. Data analysis

The data collected consists of new data formed out of secondary data; found online through multiple sources. The used data is collected specifically for the purpose of this research in order to make it as useful, complete and as fitting as possible. All data involved is gathered first hand between 1 April 2012 and 15 June 2012. All resources are online sources, put together by different organizations; private as well as public/governmental organizations. The high level of different sources, and differences in ownership of the sources, is implemented because it heightens the external validity and reliability of both the data as well as the results. The data sources, and a list of all awards and accompanying years, are found in Appendix A.

Moving on to the specific analysis which is performed with the data. First, the univariate analysis of the independent variables is given; both regarding the announcement of the win and of the nomination. Later on, a univariate analysis of the dependent variables, the (differences in) traffic results, is given in order to see if there is any effect surrounding the announcement of the awards or the nomination. After that, the analysis of how the variables relate to each other is discussed (see: analysis & results). With these different steps in univariate and bivariate analyzes, an answer to the main question is within reach.

7.1 Univariate analysis of the independent variables: wins

Table 2: Amount of awards won at one particular day in time

amount of awards won at particular time

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	100	78,1	78,1	78,1
	2	17	13,3	13,3	91,4
	3	9	7,0	7,0	98,4
	4	2	1,6	1,6	100,0
	Total	128	100,0	100,0	

Most of the cases are based on artists who won one award at a time, namely 78.1 percent or 100 out of the 128 cases. Nobody won more than four awards at one single award show. Only 8.6 percent, or 11 cases, won three or more awards during one show.

Table 3: Distribution of the awards won and their accompanying shows

award show

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Gouden Greep	5	3,9	3,9	3,9
	Urban Award	5	3,9	3,9	7,8
	State Award	10	7,8	7,8	15,6
	Edison Pop	19	14,8	14,8	30,5
	Buma Exportprijs	5	3,9	3,9	34,4
	Buma Zilveren Harp	9	7,0	7,0	41,4
	Buma Gouden Harp	10	7,8	7,8	49,2
	Buma Popprijs	5	3,9	3,9	53,1
	Buma Beste Nederlandse Lied	2	1,6	1,6	54,7
	3FM Award	36	28,1	28,1	82,8
	TMF Award	22	17,2	17,2	100,0
	Total	128	100,0	100,0	

The amount of awards included is not evenly distributed amongst the different shows. The 3FM Award is, followed the TMF Award, the most handed out award included. If the accompanying years are taken into account as well, the deviation amongst the different shows becomes less diffused. For example, the Gouden Greep and Urban Awards are handed out for 2 and 3 years within this study, while the majority of the shows are included with the full 5 years covered (the full list of awards and accompanying years can be found in Appendix A). Due to the combination of the skewed distribution of the awards and the low measurement level of the variable (nominal), this independent variable is not included within the bivariate analysis. Ultimately, the value which this analysis and the accompanying outcomes would provide is relatively little.

Table 4: Award winning artist, ranked by level of being established, uncategorized

ranking of artists

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	8	6,3	6,3	6,3
	32	1	,8	,8	7,0
	36	1	,8	,8	7,8
	73	1	,8	,8	8,6
	77	3	2,3	2,3	10,9
	78	1	,8	,8	11,7
	80	2	1,6	1,6	13,3
	88	4	3,1	3,1	16,4
	89	2	1,6	1,6	18,0
	90	1	,8	,8	18,8
	91	1	,8	,8	19,5
	93	2	1,6	1,6	21,1

	94	1	,8	,8	21,9
	95	2	1,6	1,6	23,4
	97	7	5,5	5,5	28,9
	98	6	4,7	4,7	33,6
	99	17	13,3	13,3	46,9
	100	68	53,1	53,1	100,0
	Total	128	100,0	100,0	

The uncategorized data regarding the ranking of the artists, shows that the majority of the 128 cases are cases with well established artists. 68 artists, 53.1 percent, have had a number one hit single and/or album at the time of the win and therefore score a 100 on the ranking. The second and third biggest rankings are 17 artists with a score of 99 and 8 artists with a score of 0. This means that more than half of the cases are filled with number one hit scoring artists before the artists have won (the) award(s). It could very well be that a part of those artists have won one or more awards prior to the year 2005, but that does not hold up for the majority of them.

Table 5: Award winning artists, ranked by level of being established, categorized

categorized ranking of artists

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	8	6,3	6,3	6,3
	31 through 40	2	1,6	1,6	7,8
	71 through 80	7	5,5	5,5	13,3
	81 through 90	7	5,5	5,5	18,8
	91 through 100	104	81,3	81,3	100,0
	Total	128	100,0	100,0	

When categorized, 81.3 percent of all cases is ranked within the highest possible category, namely the rankings 91 trough 100. Those 91.3 percent, or 104 cases, have all had at least one top 10 single and/or album at the time of the win. Logically, still 6.3 percent have not been placed at the top 100 single and/or album at all, they form the 0 category. The categories who are not shown, obviously do not show any cases.

Table 6: Awards won, categorized by the appointed voting system

award voting system

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	jury	23	18,0	18,0	18,0
	public	96	75,0	75,0	93,0
	sales	9	7,0	7,0	100,0
	Total	128	100,0	100,0	

At last, 96 out of the 128 win cases, or 75 percent, consist out of award winners which were chosen by a voting public. The remaining 25 percent is taken up by jury based awards, 18 percent, and awards which are given on the basis of record sales, the last 7 percent. Those sale based winners have won on the basis of record sales (including downloads), expressed in chart listings.

7.2 Univariate analysis of the independent variables: nominations

Table 7: Distribution of the awards which the artists have been nominated for and their accompanying shows

award show

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Gouden Greep	5	5,3	5,3	5,3
	Urban Award	5	5,3	5,3	10,5
	State Award	9	9,5	9,5	20,0
	Edison Pop	17	17,9	17,9	37,9
	Buma Beste Nederlandse Lied	2	2,1	2,1	40,0
	3FM Award	36	37,9	37,9	77,9
	TMF Award	21	22,1	22,1	100,0
	Total	95	100,0	100,0	

When looking at the nominations a lot less awards are included, compared to the wins. Logically, the cases that are ‘missing’ are the ones who do not issue nominations. Out of the 95 cases, 36 are linked to the 3FM award, or 37.9 percent of them. At the same time, this is the award show with the most cases included. The award with the least amount of cases is the Buma Beste Nederlandse Lied with just 2 cases. This is due to the fact that this award is being issued from 2009 onwards, only two years are included. The differences amongst the awards and the amount of nominations are relatively high, just as with the win cases. The top three awards, which feature the most cases, are still the 3FM Award, TMF award and Edison Pop award, the same as the top three regarding the wins.

Table 8: Nominated artist, ranked by level of being established, uncategorized

ranking of artists

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	6	6,3	6,3	6,3
	32	1	1,1	1,1	7,4
	36	1	1,1	1,1	8,4
	73	2	2,1	2,1	10,5
	77	2	2,1	2,1	12,6
	78	1	1,1	1,1	13,7
	80	2	2,1	2,1	15,8
	88	1	1,1	1,1	16,8
	89	1	1,1	1,1	17,9
	90	1	1,1	1,1	18,9
	91	1	1,1	1,1	20,0
	93	2	2,1	2,1	22,1
	94	1	1,1	1,1	23,2
	95	1	1,1	1,1	24,2
	97	6	6,3	6,3	30,5
	98	4	4,2	4,2	34,7
	99	13	13,7	13,7	48,4
	100	49	51,6	51,6	100,0
	Total	95	100,0	100,0	

Uncategorized, more than half of the cases, 51.6 percent to be precise, is filled by artists who have a ranking of 100. This means that they have had at least one number one single and/or album by the time they were nominated for the award(s). The remaining half is more or less equally distributed amongst the other places, with the exception of the ranking zero, artists who have not registered at either the top 100 single or album charts and the ranking 97. Both categories score 6 cases.

Table 9: Nominated artist, ranked by level of being established, categorized

categorized ranking of artists

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	6	6,3	6,3	6,3
	31 through 40	2	2,1	2,1	8,4
	71 through 80	7	7,4	7,4	15,8
	81 through 90	3	3,2	3,2	18,9
	91 through 100	77	81,1	81,1	100,0
	Total	95	100,0	100,0	

The categorized numbers show that, when it comes to the announcement of the nomination, 81.1 percent, or 77 artists, have had a top 10 single/album out at the time of the announcement. Just as with the announcement of the winners, 6.3 percent, or 6 artists, have not been placed in the top 100 single and/or album top 100 at all, up until the time they were nominated for the award.

Table 10: Awards nominated for, categorized by the appointed voting system

voting system

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	public	91	95,8	96,8	96,8
	other	3	3,2	3,2	100,0
	Total	94	98,9	100,0	
Missing	System	1	1,1		
Total		95	100,0		

Logically, the majority of the cases are public based awards. Those are the shows that issue nominations, the jury based awards hardly every do. With three cases, the awards formed out of ‘other’ (i.e. sales numbers) systems, issued nominations as well, even though the public does not have any influence on the outcome of the contest.
Due to the combination of the skewed distribution of the voting systems and the low measurement level of the variable (nominal), this independent variable is not included within the bivariate analysis. Ultimately, the value which this analysis and the accompanying outcomes would provide is relatively little.

8. Analysis and results

First, the different time frames, pre-periods, week of the announcement and post-periods, are compared to each other on the basis of their mean, the minimum, maximum, skewness and standard deviation. The different time frames are compared in order to test whether there is any kind of difference between short(er) term and long(er) term effects.
This same comparison is made with the differences between the single week traffic results. In doing so, the existence or absence of a trend comes up. The difference between the two analyzes is that the first one is build up with absolute traffic numbers, and the second is made up of the absolute difference of those absolute traffic numbers, i.e. the second analysis is a comparison of the differences in traffic results from one week to another.

After analyzing the single week results and the differences between the single weeks, the different twelve/eight/four week average time frames are analyzed because the analyzes which follow will be done with these three different period (twelve, eight and four weeks) average time frames (see:Method & design). This accounts for both the win cases and the nomination cases. Without the different pre-period and post-period twelve/eight/four weeks time frames, the data cannot be tested for the independent variables included; unless every independent variable also covers just one week. This solely weekly based analysis is not chosen because it would then be even harder to do an analysis with the already compact data. With solely one week periods to test for, almost every independent variable would be either zero, in most of the cases, or, in some cases, 1. This lowering of the data's dispersion does not benefit the study.

Moving on to the expectations we have regarding the time frames of both announcements, the logical course would be that the pre-period, in general, shows the lowest results. Followed by the week of the announcement which should have the highest and then, after the peak of the announcement, the traffic results decrease again. An upward trend should be identifiable, which peaks at the week of the announcement and afterwards, trends downward again. If there is any more or less sustainable effect, i.e. a higher level of awareness, then the post-period results will be higher compared to the pre-period traffic, even though the highest period should still be the week of the announcement itself. These expectations form the basis of the hypothesizes, which will be discussed along with the results.

8.1 Univariate analysis of the dependent variables: wins

Table 11: Descriptive statistics regarding the single week traffic results, win cases

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
week_b12	128	,00	57,00	1,6159	5,50432	8,452	,214
week_b11	128	,00	66,00	1,5427	6,13857	9,426	,214
week_b10	128	,00	74,50	1,5952	6,85610	9,742	,214
week_b9	128	,00	83,00	1,8130	7,62736	9,753	,214
week_b8	128	,00	49,50	1,6680	5,02735	7,383	,214
week_b7	128	,00	49,50	1,6378	4,98674	7,560	,214
week_b6	128	,00	37,50	1,5955	4,15911	6,008	,214
week_b5	128	,00	14,60	1,2348	2,56067	3,929	,214
week_b4	128	,00	16,40	1,1042	2,42885	4,744	,214
week_b3	128	,00	30,80	1,3265	3,47080	6,077	,214
week_b2	128	,00	27,80	1,2658	3,23967	5,856	,214
week_b1	128	,00	37,00	1,3968	3,95735	6,770	,214
week_win	128	,00	46,40	1,7222	4,82416	6,974	,214
week_a1	128	,00	25,80	1,5077	3,66371	4,804	,214
week_a2	128	,00	31,60	1,4752	4,15353	5,518	,214
week_a3	128	,00	39,20	1,4256	4,55546	6,586	,214
week_a4	128	,00	33,40	1,3134	4,00702	6,406	,214
week_a5	128	,00	14,20	,8692	1,86776	5,692	,214
week_a6	128	,00	15,60	,8883	1,96908	5,737	,214
week_a7	128	,00	17,20	,9142	2,12301	5,726	,214
week_a8	128	,00	18,80	,8607	2,08887	6,629	,214
week_a9	128	,00	20,20	,9833	2,44975	6,079	,214
week_a10	128	,00	17,00	,7898	1,84629	6,865	,214
week_a11	128	,00	14,20	,8799	2,08042	4,971	,214
week_a12	128	,00	11,20	,6549	1,15685	6,472	,214
Valid N (listwise)	128						

In accordance with the second hypothesis, the highest average search traffic result is found within the week of the win itself. Further, there is somewhat of an upward trend prior to the week of the win and a downward trend regarding the post-periods. Yet, the differences are

relatively small, certainly in absolute terms, the trend does not show a fluent line, and the distribution of the data is very skewed. Especially the high standard deviation and the skewness of the data could become problematic. Still, the upward trend, with a peak at the week of the win, can be seen, just as the (somewhat) downward trend during the post-periods. The trend is not convincing enough to state that a clear trend can be seen.

Table 12: descriptive statistics regarding the absolute averages of the 12/8/4 week time frames, win cases

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
average_before_12	128	,00	31,63	1,4830	3,50500	6,054	,214
average_before_8	128	,00	14,98	1,4037	2,72950	3,531	,214
average_before_4	128	,00	23,90	1,2733	3,06022	5,136	,214
average_after_4	128	,00	31,05	1,4305	3,98185	5,945	,214
average_after_8	128	,00	21,78	1,1568	2,74386	5,526	,214
average_after_12	128	,00	18,80	1,0469	2,24725	5,674	,214
Valid N (listwise)	128						

If we combine the single weeks and form them into in larger periods, the averages still show a trend; upward within the pre-periods and downward again within the post-periods. But the trend still is not that convincing; it slightly decreases within the pre-period. The distribution of the data is still relatively skewed and the standard deviations are relatively high, which, on top, makes the data harder to analyze later on.

8.2 Univariate analysis of the dependent variables: nominations

Table 13: Descriptive statistics regarding the single week traffic results, nomination cases

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
week_b12	95	,00	71,50	1,8865	7,62341	8,375	,247
week_b11	95	,00	65,50	1,9673	7,24839	7,598	,247
week_b10	95	,00	14,60	,9546	2,17903	5,132	,247
week_b9	95	,00	16,40	1,0389	2,42206	4,815	,247

week_b8	95	,00	12,00	,9894	2,04247	4,742	,247
week_b7	95	,00	12,00	1,0075	2,06038	4,771	,247
week_b6	95	,00	12,40	1,0039	2,08671	4,777	,247
week_b5	95	,00	55,50	1,8222	6,15751	7,444	,247
week_b4	95	,00	57,00	1,8205	6,36395	7,360	,247
week_b3	95	,00	66,00	2,2106	7,33069	7,371	,247
week_b2	95	,00	74,50	2,1651	8,00108	8,144	,247
week_b1	95	,00	83,00	2,2743	8,82018	8,407	,247
week_nom	95	,00	49,50	2,3174	6,75299	5,426	,247
week_a1	95	,00	49,50	2,0857	6,28347	5,893	,247
week_a2	95	,00	27,80	1,4996	3,73979	5,012	,247
week_a3	95	,00	37,00	1,6566	4,56420	5,864	,247
week_a4	95	,00	46,40	1,7736	5,34367	6,757	,247
week_a5	95	,00	25,80	1,6182	3,76745	4,551	,247
week_a6	95	,00	25,80	1,3334	3,24506	5,663	,247
week_a7	95	,00	39,20	1,5436	4,67944	6,465	,247
week_a8	95	,00	33,40	1,4238	4,01687	6,270	,247
week_a9	95	,00	14,40	1,0682	2,25492	4,773	,247
week_a10	95	,00	11,80	1,0440	2,07594	4,354	,247
week_a11	95	,00	11,80	1,0074	2,04307	4,447	,247
week_a12	95	,00	10,40	,7196	1,23448	5,969	,247
Valid N (listwise)	95						

Regarding the nomination cases, a general, but weak, trend is present as well. Here, the means are higher compared to the win cases, the overall trend is at a higher level while the course of the trend is in accordance with the win cases. In both the win and the nomination cases, there is no fluent line which runs from the pre-period to the post-period. Although the week of the announcement forms the highest search traffic result, the surrounding weeks form confusion because the traffic results do not follow consistent, expected, differences in results.

As mentioned, the week of the nomination has the highest level of traffic results, the results in general decrease during the post-period weeks.

The majority of the award shows (announcements of the winners) takes place within a month after the nominations are announced. Expectations would lead us to the idea that therefore, the traffic results would increase surrounding the actual announcement of the win. But, within this data, no significant upward trend is seen within a month after the nominations.

Table 14: Descriptive statistics regarding the absolute averages of the 12/8/4 week time frames, nomination cases

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
average_before_12	95	,00	28,00	1,5951	3,56753	5,170	,247
average_before_8	95	,00	42,00	1,6617	4,73528	7,056	,247
average_before_4	95	,00	70,13	2,1176	7,55631	8,048	,247
average_after_4	95	,00	35,50	1,7539	4,49347	5,412	,247
average_after_8	95	,00	33,28	1,6168	4,07748	5,803	,247
average_after_12	95	,00	22,18	1,3978	3,04081	4,784	,247
Valid N (listwise)	95						

As with the single weeks, a general trend is seen within the pre-period and post-period data. The trend is slightly evened out, due to the fact that these are averages which are formed out of the single week results. The week of the announcement still has the highest results (mean = 2.3). Logically, the standard deviation and skewness are still relatively high.

To sum up, if the absolute numbers of search traffic results are compared, an general but very weak trend is visible. The trend moves upward up to the week of the announcement, and downwards from the week of the announcement onwards. But, within the bounds of this general trend, the single variables do vary and do not form a consistent line, either moving upward or downward. This accounts for both the analysis of the win cases and the analysis of the announcements. Therefore, the trends are too weak to be considered as statistically viable trends.

Further, the means of the traffic results from the nominations are higher compared to the means of the traffic results regarding the win. This implies that being nominated could potentially bring about a greater effect than actually winning the award. Both events seem to have a positive effect, even a slight one, but thus far, the nomination seems to create a bigger positive effect compared to the win. To dig deeper into the presence or absence of a trend, the differences between the absolute traffic results from one week to another are studied.

8.1.3 Univariate analysis of the differences between the weeks: wins

Table 15: Differences in absolute traffic result between two consecutive weeks, win cases

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
first_diff_b11_b12	128	-13,60	9,00	-,0732	1,48079	-4,251	,214	66,080	,425
first_diff_b10_b11	128	-1,90	8,50	,0524	,82327	8,471	,214	89,005	,425
first_diff_b9_b10	128	-2,80	11,00	,2178	1,32989	6,310	,214	45,816	,425
first_diff_b8_b9	128	-33,50	14,20	-,1450	3,27685	-7,758	,214	88,602	,425
first_diff_b7_b8	128	-11,80	2,90	-,0302	1,15042	-8,363	,214	88,006	,425
first_diff_b6_b7	128	-49,50	37,50	-,0423	5,54321	-3,192	,214	66,612	,425
first_diff_b5_b6	128	-37,50	1,60	-,3607	3,35979	-10,815	,214	120,196	,425
first_diff_b4_b5	128	-12,40	1,80	-,1305	1,16878	-9,275	,214	97,415	,425
first_diff_b3_b4	128	-4,40	30,80	,2223	2,77058	10,714	,214	119,472	,425
first_diff_b2_b3	128	-3,00	,80	-,0607	,41835	-3,753	,214	22,578	,425
first_diff_b1_b2	128	-,47	9,20	,1310	,88366	8,869	,214	89,081	,425
first_diff_win_b1	128	-4,80	14,80	,3254	2,01077	5,584	,214	35,933	,425
first_diff_a1_win	128	-20,60	9,20	-,2145	2,42779	-5,989	,214	50,601	,425
first_diff_a2_a1	128	-12,20	9,40	-,0325	1,65121	-,709	,214	36,682	,425
first_diff_a3_a2	128	-11,80	13,40	-,0496	1,69435	1,197	,214	49,236	,425
first_diff_a4_a3	128	-5,80	,98	-,1122	,73425	-5,835	,214	39,457	,425
first_diff_a5_a4	128	-33,40	,80	-,4442	3,17043	-9,384	,214	94,715	,425
first_diff_a6_a5	128	-,95	2,10	,0191	,29782	3,240	,214	22,401	,425
first_diff_a7_a6	128	-,75	2,10	,0259	,30443	3,603	,214	22,056	,425
first_diff_a8_a7	128	-11,80	2,20	-,0535	1,10249	-9,555	,214	103,534	,425
first_diff_a9_a8	128	-4,40	15,60	,1226	1,48155	8,908	,214	96,022	,425
first_diff_a10_a9	128	-15,60	,60	-,1934	1,42094	-10,276	,214	111,191	,425
first_diff_a11_a10	128	-2,80	11,50	,0901	1,34415	7,032	,214	55,244	,425
first_diff_a12_a11	128	-14,20	2,74	-,2250	1,69771	-6,493	,214	45,891	,425
Valid N (listwise)	128								

If the means of the differences are compared, there is no real trend to be seen. The differences from week to week are ‘all over the place’. There is no clear upward or downward trend present. The somewhat questionable general trend found in the analysis of the absolute traffic

results, gets weaker by the comparison of weekly differences. The numbers on which both analyses are based are the same, but the picture gets clearer in the presence of the weekly differences.

Both the differences above and beneath zero fluctuate and do not provide a stable answer as to if the traffic results are impacted by the presence of awards. After assembling the weekly differences, and classifying them according to either a positive of negative difference in traffic results, the following image is created: -++-----+-+----++-. Although a pattern seems to be present, a convincing trend is not. There are two positive differences in the middle of the period, which lie around the week of the win itself, but the differences within the pre-period should have more positive differences in order to see a trend.

The week of the win itself does provide the biggest change in absolute traffic, compared to the other differences. If there is an effect of the award onto the search traffic, the effect is to be measured within a couple of days from the award and thus, its sustainability is rather low.

8.4 Univariate analysis of the differences between the weeks: nominations

Table 16: Differences in absolute traffic result between two consecutive weeks, nomination cases

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
first_diff_b11_b12	95	-6,00	9,60	,0807	1,36170	2,702	,247	30,220	,490
first_diff_b10_b11	95	-65,50	11,00	-1,0126	7,10223	-8,195	,247	74,267	,490
first_diff_b9_b10	95	-12,00	11,40	,0843	1,91567	,282	,247	31,978	,490
first_diff_b8_b9	95	-8,00	1,85	-,0496	,99934	-6,214	,247	46,654	,490
first_diff_b7_b8	95	-1,90	1,56	,0181	,42106	-,468	,247	8,755	,490
first_diff_b6_b7	95	-1,62	1,16	-,0036	,30635	-1,053	,247	11,077	,490
first_diff_b5_b6	95	-1,74	55,50	,8183	5,89543	8,780	,247	81,031	,490
first_diff_b4_b5	95	-1,22	1,50	-,0017	,33560	1,524	,247	8,567	,490
first_diff_b3_b4	95	-3,20	14,20	,3901	1,94657	5,354	,247	32,337	,490
first_diff_b2_b3	95	-11,80	8,50	-,0456	1,59266	-2,789	,247	40,254	,490
first_diff_b1_b2	95	-1,50	8,50	,1093	,99876	6,705	,247	54,519	,490
first_diff_nom_b1	95	-33,50	37,50	,0431	5,19979	1,144	,247	47,073	,490
first_diff_a1_nom	95	-37,50	30,80	-,2317	5,18924	-1,841	,247	41,915	,490
first_diff_a2_a1	95	-49,50	1,50	-,5861	5,09299	-9,626	,247	93,382	,490

first_diff_a3_a2	95	-1,20	9,20	,1571	1,01831	7,652	,247	67,663	,490
first_diff_a4_a3	95	-4,80	9,40	,1169	1,14666	5,018	,247	49,629	,490
first_diff_a5_a4	95	-20,60	1,94	-,1554	2,17610	-8,992	,247	85,286	,490
first_diff_a6_a5	95	-12,20	,74	-,2848	1,42157	-6,922	,247	54,486	,490
first_diff_a7_a6	95	-,76	13,40	,2102	1,64907	6,982	,247	50,913	,490
first_diff_a8_a7	95	-5,80	1,94	-,1198	,79740	-5,251	,247	34,523	,490
first_diff_a9_a8	95	-33,40	1,10	-,3556	3,44034	-9,626	,247	93,415	,490
first_diff_a10_a9	95	-4,00	2,30	-,0242	,51781	-3,896	,2. 47	41,108	,490
first_diff_a11_a10	95	-1,50	1,45	-,0366	,27339	-,440	,247	18,283	,490
first_diff_a12_a11	95	-11,80	,44	-,2878	1,71244	-6,602	,247	43,232	,490
Valid N (listwise)	95								

The means of the differences between the weekly absolute traffic results, do not show an obvious trend, just as with the differences in traffic within the analysis of the wins. After assembling the weekly differences again, and classifying them according to either a positive of negative difference in traffic results, the following image is created for the analysis of the nominations: +-+-+-+-+-+++--++--+-----. There are far more positive differences compared to the analysis of the wins. This accounts for both the pre-period and the post-period. The post-period of the weeks surrounding the nomination partly overlaps with the pre-period of the win. It might be that the relatively high level of positive differences in the nomination post-period are high due to the presence of the actual award show within that same period. On the other hand, the analysis regarding the win itself does not show these kinds of positive differences.

Moving on to the absolute numbers, the means of the differences are relatively comparable to the ones regarding the week of the win. In both analyses, the means do not go over +1 or under -1, with the exception of one difference.

To sum up, there is no clear visible trend within the period tested. The highest traffic results are found within the weeks of the announcement themselves, for both the nomination and the win, but the pre-period upward trend and post-period downward trend remain absent. Although the course of the periods hints to the possibility of a trend, the trend is not fully reflected. Then, the means of the search traffic results within the nomination time frames are generally higher than the means of the traffic results within the win. While both events bring a positive effect, it seems that being nominated has a greater (short term) positive effect.

8.5 Bivariate correlations

As can be seen in Appendix E, almost all variables needed to perform the bivariate correlations with, show too large deviations on both the skewness and the Kurtosis value (the data shows numbers which are either below -1 or over +1, while the values should be somewhere in between -1 and +1). Even if the range is loosened to -2 and +2, the data is far from being evenly distributed. This accounts for all variables; the differences in search traffic, and the variables they are tested for; record releases, other awards which are won, the level of establishment and the amount of awards which are won. And on top, this skew distribution is found in the data of the win cases as well as the nomination cases.

In other words, the data is not parametric. Therefore, Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient, which would otherwise be the most fitting here, cannot be used in the proper manner. Instead, a non-parametric test is used to analyze the data; Spearman's Rho.

Spearman's Rho

The variables and tables are fitted according to the period (variable) that is tested at the time. Of course, the dependent variable is the difference in traffic results between two periods, the rest of the included variables are the independent variables. To be statistically significant, the significance level needs to be 0.5 or less. Although the significance level should be 0.05 or below, the relations which show a significance level of 0.1 or less, will be discussed as well. The analyzes which show statistically significant correlations are shown here, the rest can be found in Appendix D . There are no statistically significant correlations found within all the tested pre-periods at all, while the post-periods do show some level of significant relations.

8.5.1 Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient: wins

Table 17: Spearmans Rho coeffiecient regarding the difference between the week of the win and the four week post-period

Correlations

			diff_win_a4	amount of awards won at particular time	ranking of artists	release_a4	dummy_award_a4
Spearman's rho	diff_win_a4	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,113	,057	,304**	,012
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,205	,524	,000	,893
		N	128	128	128	128	128

	amount of awards won at particular time	Correlation Coefficient	-,113	1,000	-,019	,055	-,035
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,205	.	,830	,540	,692
		N	128	128	128	128	128
	ranking of artists	Correlation Coefficient	,057	-,019	1,000	,221*	,018
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,524	,830	.	,012	,841
		N	128	128	128	128	128
	release_a4	Correlation Coefficient	,304**	,055	,221*	1,000	-,114
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,540	,012	.	,199
		N	128	128	128	128	128
	dummy_award_a4	Correlation Coefficient	,012	-,035	,018	-,114	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,893	,692	,841	,199	.
		N	128	128	128	128	128

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The first statistically significant and notable correlation is the one among the difference in traffic results between the week of the win and the four weeks post-period, and the amount of record releases within the same period (sig. 0.00). There is a moderately week positive relation between the two variables (Rho = 0.30), which means that there is a form of coherence between the amount of records which are released and the amount of search traffic there is. This finding is in line with the expectation that an artists which is has a record entering the top 100 single/album, has increased levels of traffic results.

Table 18: Spearmans Rho coeffiecient regarding the difference between the week of the win and the eight week post-period

Correlations

			diff_win_a8	amount of awards won at particular time	ranking of artists	release_a8	dummy_award_a8
Spearman's rho	diff_win_a8	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,075	,065	,255**	,018

	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,400	,467	,004	,844
	N	128	128	128	128	128
amount of awards won at particular time	Correlation Coefficient	-,075	1,000	-,019	,158	,036
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,400	.	,830	,075	,689
	N	128	128	128	128	128
ranking of artists	Correlation Coefficient	,065	-,019	1,000	,262**	,053
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,467	,830	.	,003	,552
	N	128	128	128	128	128
release_a8	Correlation Coefficient	,255**	,158	,262**	1,000	,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,004	,075	,003	.	,996
	N	128	128	128	128	128
dummy_award_a8	Correlation Coefficient	,018	,036	,053	,000	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,844	,689	,552	,996	.
	N	128	128	128	128	128

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

If we take a look at the difference in traffic results between the week of the win and the eight week post-period, the same variables have a statistically significant correlation (sig.= 0.04). The positive relation between the difference in traffic and the records released is slightly weaker with a value of 0.26, compared to the 0.30 correlation coefficient regarding the four week post-period. Still, the expectation that top 100 charts records, either singles or albums, are positively correlated with the difference in traffic results, holds up.

Table 19: Spearmans Rho coeffiecient regarding the difference between the week of the win and the twelve week post-period

Correlations

			diff_win_a12	amount of awards won at particular time	ranking of artists	release_a12	dummy_award_a12
Spearman's rho	diff_win_a12	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,053	,083	,172	-,020
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,551	,353	,052	,821
		N	128	128	128	128	128
	amount of awards won at particular time	Correlation Coefficient	-,053	1,000	-,019	,084	-,006
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,551	.	,830	,346	,946
		N	128	128	128	128	128
	ranking of artists	Correlation Coefficient	,083	-,019	1,000	,287**	,056
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,353	,830	.	,001	,528
		N	128	128	128	128	128
	release_a12	Correlation Coefficient	,172	,084	,287**	1,000	,076
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,052	,346	,001	.	,393
		N	128	128	128	128	128
	dummy_award_a12	Correlation Coefficient	-,020	-,006	,056	,076	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,821	,946	,528	,393	.
		N	128	128	128	128	128

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The same positive correlation is found between the difference in traffic results between the week of the win and the twelve week post-period on one hand, and the amount of records released on the other hand. Here, the correlation is less significant (sig.= 0.05), but still significant enough, and the correlation coefficient is weaker (Rho = 0.17), compared to both the eight week and the four week post-period correlations with the amount of releases.
In general, the positive relation between the record releases and the differences in traffic results weakens as time is lengthened.

8.5.2 Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient: nominations

Table 20: Spearmans Rho coeffiecient regarding the difference between the four week pre-period and the week of the nomination

Correlations

			diff_b4_nom	amount of awards nominated for at particular time	ranking of artists	release_b4	award_b4
Spearman's rho	diff_b4_nom	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,022	,009	,185	,008
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,833	,932	,075	,939
		N	95	95	95	94	95
	amount of awards nominated for at particular time	Correlation Coefficient	,022	1,000	-,115	-,170	,265**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,833	.	,268	,101	,009
		N	95	95	95	94	95
	ranking of artists	Correlation Coefficient	,009	-,115	1,000	,111	,004
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,932	,268	.	,286	,967
		N	95	95	95	94	95
	release_b4	Correlation Coefficient	,185	-,170	,111	1,000	-,069
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,075	,101	,286	.	,507
		N	94	94	94	94	94
	award_b4	Correlation Coefficient	,008	,265**	,004	-,069	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,939	,009	,967	,507	.
		N	95	95	95	94	95

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regarding the difference in search traffic between the four week pre-period and the week of the nomination, one clear significant relation is present. As with the win cases, there is a significant (sig. = 0.08) positive relation between the difference in traffic results and the records released within that time frame. The relation is weak, but present (Rho = 0.19). None of the other independent variables is positively or negatively correlated with the difference in search traffic. This time frame, the four week pre-period, is the only pre-period time frame with a significant correlation.

Table 21: Spearmans Rho coeffiecient regarding the difference between the week of the nomination and the four week post-period

Correlations

			diff_nom_a4	amount of awards nominated for at particular time	ranking of artists	release_a4	award_a4
Spearman's rho	diff_nom_a4	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,105	,162	,212*	,060
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,312	,117	,040	,562
		N	95	95	95	94	95
	amount of awards nominated for at particular time	Correlation Coefficient	-,105	1,000	-,115	-,071	,061
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,312	.	,268	,498	,559
		N	95	95	95	94	95
	ranking of artists	Correlation Coefficient	,162	-,115	1,000	,148	,004
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,117	,268	.	,154	,967
		N	95	95	95	94	95
	release_a4	Correlation Coefficient	,212*	-,071	,148	1,000	-,067
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,040	,498	,154	.	,523
		N	94	94	94	94	94
	award_a4	Correlation Coefficient	,060	,061	,004	-,067	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,562	,559	,967	,523	.
		N	95	95	95	94	95

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Moving on the to post-periods, there is a weak positive relation (Rho = 0.21) between the difference in search traffic and the amount of records released (sig.= 0.4).
There is a weaker positive relation (Rho = 0.16) between the difference in search traffic and the ranking of the artist as well, but the significance level is, with 0.12, too high to be statistically significant. The relation is worth mentioning, because it is the first 'almost' statistically significant correlation regarding this particular independent variable.

Table 22: Spearmans Rho coeffiecient regarding the difference between the week of the nomination and the eight week post-period

Correlations

			diff_nom_a8	amount of awards nominated for at particular time	ranking of artists	release_a8	award_a8
Spearman's rho	diff_nom_a8	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,114	,085	,226*	-,095
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,273	,412	,029	,358
		N	95	95	95	94	95
	amount of awards nominated for at particular time	Correlation Coefficient	-,114	1,000	-,115	-,010	-,045
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,273	.	,268	,926	,668
		N	95	95	95	94	95
	ranking of artists	Correlation Coefficient	,085	-,115	1,000	,152	-,078
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,412	,268	.	,144	,453
		N	95	95	95	94	95
	release_a8	Correlation Coefficient	,226*	-,010	,152	1,000	-,206*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,029	,926	,144	.	,046
		N	94	94	94	94	94
	award_a8	Correlation Coefficient	-,095	-,045	-,078	-,206*	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,358	,668	,453	,046	.
		N	95	95	95	94	95

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Here, the correlation between the difference in traffic and the records released is more significant (Sig. = 0.3) and has a stronger positive relation (Rho = 0.23) compared to the four week post-period. On the other hand, the relation between the difference in traffic results and the ranking of the artists has become weaker and less significant, compared to the four week post-period. Further, no relations are strong enough or significant enough to be discussed extensively.

Table 23: Spearmans Rho coeffiecient regarding the difference between the week of the nomination and the twelve week post-period

Correlations

			diff_nom_a12	amount of awards nominated for at particular time	ranking of artists	release_a12	award_a12
Spearman's rho	diff_nom_a12	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,168	,082	,274**	-,063
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,103	,431	,008	,545
		N	95	95	95	94	95
	amount of awards nominated for at particular time	Correlation Coefficient	-,168	1,000	-,115	,055	-,119
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,103	.	,268	,601	,251
		N	95	95	95	94	95
	ranking of artists	Correlation Coefficient	,082	-,115	1,000	,160	-,116
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,431	,268	.	,124	,263
		N	95	95	95	94	95
	release_a12	Correlation Coefficient	,274**	,055	,160	1,000	-,084
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,008	,601	,124	.	,421
		N	94	94	94	94	94
	award_a12	Correlation Coefficient	-,063	-,119	-,116	-,084	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,545	,251	,263	,421	.
		N	95	95	95	94	95

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation between the difference in traffic and the records released has become stronger and more statistically significant over time. The last period covered, the difference in traffic between the week of the nominations and the twelve week post-period, shows a 0.27 positive relation with a significance level of 0.08. Further, no relations are strong enough to be discussed within this analysis.

8.5.3 Bivariate analysis: conclusion

It is clear that there is one, positive, correlation which is the strongest. In fact, it is the only consistently present relation; the relation between the difference in search traffic on one hand and the amount of records released on the other hand. This finding is in line with what is

expected; namely that having a top 100 album and/or single out, increases the amount of times you, as an artist, are searched for through Google. For both announcements tested, win and nomination, this expectation hold up. Notable, the relation related to the win gets stronger and more significant as less time is covered and the relation related to the nomination gets stronger and more significant as more time is covered.
The other independent variables tested, do not show consistent, significant correlations with any of the periods involved. This goes for both the announcement of the win and the announcement of the nomination. Although there are same relations which come close (see: Appendix D) none of them are strong enough or significant enough. The expectations made earlier therefore cannot be verified on the basis of this bivariate analysis. There is no clear relation between (1) the amount of awards won at a particular time, (2) the extent to which an artist is already established, (3) the presence of other awards won on one hand, and the difference in traffic results between two periods in time on the other hand.

The bivariate analysis is the most sophisticated analysis to be done with the data involved. Due to the earlier mentioned skewness and distribution of the data (see: appendix E), a regression analysis cannot be done in the way it should be performed. The basic assumptions needed to perform the regression with (normal distribution of the data, linearity, normal variance, Durbin-Watson test, no multicollinearity) cannot all be verified.
On top, the majority of the independent variables show little variation in values, although they are continuous variables. Most of the values simply do not show more than two or three different variants. Technically, linear regression could be performed with this type of variables, in the form of transforming them into dummy variables, but having more dummy variables than continuous ones misses the whole idea and purpose of doing a linear regression analysis in the first place. Therefore, linear regression is not a part of this quantitative study, simply because the structure of the data does not allow for it.

9. Conclusion

With the use of the formed hypothesizes, the main question **does winning an award within the current Dutch popular music industry has an effect on the online attention the winner receives?** can be answered with yes, it has a positive effect on the online attention. But it is a cautious yes. In discussing the hypothesizes on which this answer is based, the reason for this caution will reveal itself.

The first hypothesis formed (1) the search traffic results will be higher in the post-period, compared to the pre-period can be verified completely. The absolute traffic results within the pre-period are, in general, lower compared to the results in the post-period. This account for the periods surrounding the nomination and the periods surrounding the actual win. The traffic results regarding the nomination are somewhat higher than the same periods regarding the win. This could mean that being nominated for an awards provides more traffic results for the artists then the actual win itself.

Moving on to the second hypothesis (2) the search traffic results are the highest within the week of the announcement itself, compared to both the pre-period and the post-period. In line with the first hypothesis, this second can be confirmed as well. In both analyzes, the week of the announcement itself provides the highest level of search results. In absolute terms, the week of the win has a traffic results score of 46.40 and the week of the nomination scores 49.50. If just the absolute numbers are taken into account, the nomination provides more traffic results then the win itself. Analyzing the means of the differences between the weeks, the nomination provides positive differences between the week prior to the week of the announcement and the week itself, while the same difference is negative regarding the win. The difference between the week of the announcement and the week afterwards show a negative difference in both analyzes, which is expected.

The hypothesis (3a) there is a negative relation between the level of being established as an artist, and the differences in search traffic results between the pre-period of the award and the results of the week of the announcement itself, cannot be verified. Just as the hypothesis (3b) there is a positive relation between the level of being established as an artists, and the differences in search traffic results between the week of the announcement itself and the post-period search traffic results. Although the analysis does show some positive and negative relations, there are not strong enough to be statistically significant. There are no statistically significant relations between the ranking of the artists on one hand and the periods tested on

the other hand (see appendix D) at all. Therefore, both hypothesizes need to be rejected. In terms of traffic results, it does not matter whether you are an established artist or a newcomer, although the expectations where pointed in the other direction.
The following pair of hypothesizes, (4a) there is a positive relation between the amount of awards won, and the difference in search traffic results between the pre-period and the week of the announcement, and (4b) there is a negative relation between the amount of awards won, and the difference in search traffic results between the week of the announcement and the post-period are both rejected as well. Just as with the ranking of the artists, no statistically significant relations are found. It therefore does not matter whether you win one award or (up to) four awards at one time; the traffic results stay unaffected by this difference.

Moving onto the control variables, a significant positive relation between the level of search traffic and the amount of records which has been released. Using Spearman's Rho coefficient, a majority of the tested periods, especially the post-periods both regarding the nomination and the win, show some level of correlation. The correlations are all located between 0.1 and 0.3, which makes them weak to moderate relations. Due to the fact that Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient is tested and not Pearson's R coefficient, we are not sure to what extend precisely, in absolute terms, the number of records which are released have an influence onto the traffic results. We can only be sure that there is a weak/moderate positive relation between the two.
The second control variable, the presence of other awards which are won, does not show any significant relation with all periods involved. In other words, the presence of awards which are won outside of the tested awards, do not show relations with the level of absolute traffic results.

Concluding, the main question **does winning an award within the current Dutch popular music industry has an effect on the online attention the winner receives?** can be answered with yes. We have seen that the search traffic results increase right after the award is won or the artist is nominated for the awards. In other words, both the nomination and the win have some sort of positive effect onto the search traffic. The effect measured is short term; a couple of days at the most. Right after the first week after the announcement of the nomination or of the win, the traffic results decrease again. The positive effect is therefore not sustainable; it is only measureable right after the announcement itself. The amount of awards which are won

and the level of being established as an artist both do not relate to the height of the traffic results.

Further, there is no upward trend within the pre-periods tested and no downward trend within the post-period as well. Apart from the already known peak right after the announcement, there is no clear trend afterwards. The average search traffic within the analysis of the nominations is, in general, higher than the analysis of the wins. This makes the positive effect of the nominations more intense than the effect of the win. Being nominated seems to be the event which attracts the most attention.
Regarding both the nomination and the win, some of the traffic results are influenced by the presence of chart listing records. Every post-period traffic result tested has a weak to moderate positive relation with the amount of records released within the same period. This correlation could partly explain the positive effect that is brought about. However, it does not interfere with the results that being nominated has a greater effect than actually winning the award. What does need to be taken into account, is the fact that the traffic results with regards to the post-periods are slightly lower if the influence of the released records is taken out of the equation.
In lesser words; yes, there is a short term, i.e. couple of days, positive effect in search traffic results right after the announcement of the nominations and the winners. The effect is not sustainable and not very intense. Being nominated will probably generate more traffic results than winning the awards itself. The traffic results from right after the announcements have positive relations with the amount of records released. On the contrary, it does not matter how many awards you are being nominated for or how many you have won, it has no significant relation with the traffic results. Just as the level of being an established artists or a newcomer.

10. Limitations and further research

Although every pop music related awards has been taken into account, not every award or category gives enough traffic results to have a solid basis to work with. For example, the 'Grote Prijs van Nederland' awards all had to be left out simply because there was not enough data. This lack of data in general is a limitation when studying this subject. In time, hopefully, the data will expand and more cases could be included into similar studies. On top, the data which is used during this study turns out to be relatively skewed; the data is not evenly distributed, which is a limitation. Due to this limitation, and the limitation that the variables have relatively compact values, a multiple regression analysis cannot be done on the basis of this data. With more data, these limitations could become a less significant part of the analysis and may even be avoided, for example by cutting out outliers and by a (natural) widening of the values.

Moreover, the analysis regarding the nomination has another limitation as well. Due to the same lack of data, all the nominees who did not eventually win the award where they have been nominated for, are excluded from the study. Simply put, the nominees who did not win showed too less data to be involved. The main reason could be that The Netherlands is a small country with a, relativity, even so small pop music sector. Although the sector is developed extensively over the last decades, it still remains a sector within a small country. Therefore, the search traffic results from Google show little results as well. With the data from the remaining nominees, more in depth research could be done regarding the potential differences between the nominations and the eventual winners. How do the two groups of artists hold up when compared to one other? Do the winners get extensively more attention? Those questions could be answered with the help of data regarding the now excluded nominated. On top, with all nominations included, winners as well as nominees, it would be easier to compare The Netherlands with other countries with regards to the same subject. The more cases, the more exact the figures and the comparison between international markets.

Further, the study misses other music genres, apart from pop related ones. On one hand, this is an advantage because this study focuses solely on pop music, all the attention goes to this subject. Needless to say, specialization could work to the benefit of the study. On the other hand is a comparison between genres interesting as well.

At the beginning stages of this particular study, a couple of different music genres were all tested for inclusion; classical music, jazz music and world music. But, again, due to a lack of data, the genres were excluded again. Just as with the comparison between countries, it would be interesting to test different music genres as well. This could still be done for pop music sectors in other countries. But in The Netherlands, there simply is not enough data to build a proper study regarding such music genres at the moment.

Literature

Ashenfelter, O. & Card, D. (1985). Using the Longitudinal Structure of Earnings to Estimate the Effect of Training Programs. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 67 (4). 648-660.

Cameron, S. (1995). On the Role of Critics in the Culture Industry. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 19. 321-331.

Cho, D., Telang, R. & Smith, M.D. (2012). Live Show Everywhere: Distribution Dynamics and Internet Influence on Concert Location. *45th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences.*

English, J.F. (2002). Winning the Culture Game: Prizes, Awards, and the Rules of Art. *New Literary History* 33 (1). 109-135.

English, J.F. (2005). *The economy of prestigpe: Prizes, Awards, and the Circulation of Cultural Value.* Harvard University Press.

Ginsburgh, V. (2003). Awards, Success and Aesthetic Quality in the Arts. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 17 (2). 99-111.

Hamlen, W.A. Jr. (1991). Superstardom in Popular Music: Empirical Evidence. *The Review Of Economics and Statistics* (73) 4. 729-733.

Kotler et al. 2008. *Principles of marketing. Fifth European Edition.* Pearson Education Limited: Essex.

Mortimer, J.H., Nosko, C. & Sorensen, A. (2012). Supply responses to digital distribution: Recorded music and live performances. *Information Economics and Policy* 24. 3-14.

Rosen, S. (1981). The economics of Superstars. *The American Economic Review* (71) 5. 845-858.

Schultz, M.F. (2009). Live Performance, Copyright, and the Future of the Music Business. *Richmond Law Review* 43 (2). 685-764.

Appendix A

All awards, and accompanying years, included are:

1. Gouden Greep Awards (up to and including 2007)
2. Urban Awards (up to and including 2007)
3. State Awards (from 2008 onwards, formed out of Gouden Greep + Urban Awards)
4. Edison Pop (2009 onwards, no awards awarded in 2007 and 2008)
5. Buma Cultuur Awards (all awards are awarded the year after, therefore the 2006 up to 2010 are included (data awarded 2007 through 2011):
    6. Gouden Harp
    7. Zilveren Harp
    8. Exportprijs
    9. Popprijs
    10. Beste Nederlandse Lied (from 2009 onwards)
11. 3FM Awards
12. TMF awards (2007/2009/2010/2011, no awards awarded in 2008)

Only the national music awards are included within the study, all regional and/or local music awards are thus excluded.

Data sources

The consulted, online sources for the awards, the artists, charts and other accompanying information are:

http://sites.bnn.nl/urban/

http://www.musicfrom.nl

http://stateawards.nl/

http://www.livexs.nl/

http://www.bumacultuur.nl/

http://www.festivalinfo.nl

http://www.podiuminfo.nl

http://3voor12.vpro.nl/

http://go.3fm.nl/3fm-awards

http://www.musicmeter.nl

http://sites.bnn.nl/urban/

http://dutchcharts.nl/index.asp

All of these websites are consulted between 1 April and 1 June 2012.

Further, the websites of the artists and their label(s) are a valuable source for data about awards, releases and other relevant background information. The data for the online search attention of the artists is gathered through the search engine Google. As explained earlier, no other search engines/websites are used for the purpose of retrieving search traffic data.

Appendix B

Table 24: Excluded combinations (both won awards and, where applicable, nominations)

Artist(s)	Award	Category	Year	Reason
All	Grote Prijs Van Nederland	All	All	Too little search traffic results
All	- Gouden Greep - Urban Awards - State Awards	Mixtape	All	More equally contributing, participating artists and/or groups who otherwise perform individually
All	Gouden Greep	International awards	All	Only national awards included
Appelsap	Gouden Greep	Best Party	2007	Organization, not artist
Keizer, Priester	State Award	101 Barz	2009	More equally contributing, participating artists and/or groups who otherwise perform individually
Partysquad, Brainpower	TMF award	Radio Hit of the Year		More equally contributing, participating artists and/or groups who otherwise perform individually
Partysquad, Adje, Reverse, Gers, Jayh	TMF award	Video	2011	More equally contributing, participating artists and/or groups who otherwise perform individually
Tony Berk	Gouden Harp		2010	Radio DJ and owner of a record company, not an (output creating) artist

Appendix C

Table 25: Artists with search terms, other than solely the name of the artist(s)/formation

Artist(s)	**Google search terms**
Typhoon	Typhoon –Philippines
Dio	Dio –Ronnie –James
Appa	Appa – Qomolangma
Hef	Hef –Playboy –Hefner
Green Gang	Green Gang –season
Kane	Kane –Blackhawks –Citizen –Chelsea
Kyteman's Hiphop Orchestra	Kyteman
Nick & Simon	Nick en Simon
Racoon	Racoon –attack –Hilton
VanVelzen	Van Velzen –Gyliano
Moke	Moke –Rupert
Nikki	Nikki –Haley –Bacharach –Blonsky
Waylon	Waylon –Jennings –Matteo
De Staat	De Staat –overheid
Ben Saunders	Ben Saunders –UFC
Keizer	Keizer –Henry -Simon

Appendix D

Bivariate correlation analyzes which show no significant correlations at the 0.01 or 0.05 level. The differences in traffic results between the twelve week pre-period and the week of the win show no significant correlations at all. The closest correlation is the negative 0.13 relation between the difference in traffic and the amount of awards won, with a significance level of 0.14. This means that there is a weak relation between the two variables.

Spearman's Rho coefficient which do not show statistically significant correlations, win cases

Table 26: Spearmans Rho coeffiecient regarding the difference between the twelve week pre-period and the week of the win

Correlations

			diff_b12_win	amount of awards won at particular time	ranking of artists	release_b12	dummy_award_b12
Spearman's rho	diff_b12_win	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,088	-,034	-,006	-,131
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,325	,707	,944	,140
		N	128	128	128	128	128
	amount of awards won at particular time	Correlation Coefficient	-,088	1,000	-,019	,065	,062
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,325	.	,830	,465	,486
		N	128	128	128	128	128
	ranking of artists	Correlation Coefficient	-,034	-,019	1,000	,162	,105
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,707	,830	.	,068	,237
		N	128	128	128	128	128
	release_b12	Correlation Coefficient	-,006	,065	,162	1,000	,052
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,944	,465	,068	.	,558
		N	128	128	128	128	128
	dummy_award_b12	Correlation Coefficient	-,131	,062	,105	,052	1,000

		Sig. (2-tailed)	,140	,486	,237	,558	.
		N	128	128	128	128	128

Regarding the eight week pre-period and the week of the win, there are no significant correlations found, or relations that come close to being statistically significant.

Table 27: Spearmans Rho coeffiecient regarding the difference between the eight week pre-period and the week of the win

Correlations

			diff_b8_win	amount of awards won at particular time	ranking of artists	release_b8	dummy_award_b8
Spearman's rho	diff_b8_win	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,036	-,019	-,035	,041
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,684	,834	,691	,647
		N	128	128	128	128	128
	amount of awards won at particular time	Correlation Coefficient	-,036	1,000	-,019	-,077	,025
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,684	.	,830	,386	,777
		N	128	128	128	128	128
	ranking of artists	Correlation Coefficient	-,019	-,019	1,000	,126	,092
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,834	,830	.	,155	,303
		N	128	128	128	128	128
	release_b8	Correlation Coefficient	-,035	-,077	,126	1,000	-,047
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,691	,386	,155	.	,598
		N	128	128	128	128	128
	dummy_award_b8	Correlation Coefficient	,041	,025	,092	-,047	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,647	,777	,303	,598	.
		N	128	128	128	128	128

As with the differences in traffic results between twelve week pre-period and the week of the win, the four week pre-period and week of the win difference shows a relation which is close to being statistically significant. Namely; when another award is won, the search traffic difference increases with 0.13 (sig. 0.15). Just the opposite compared to the twelve week pre-period regarding the same independent variable.

Table 28: Spearmans Rho coeffiecient regarding the difference between the four week pre-period and the week of the win

Correlations

			diff_b4_win	amount of awards won at particular time	ranking of artists	release_b4	dummy_award_b4
Spearman's rho	diff_b4_win	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,047	-,023	,100	,130
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,598	,794	,263	,145
		N	128	128	128	128	128
	amount of awards won at particular time	Correlation Coefficient	-,047	1,000	-,019	-,094	-,035
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,598	.	,830	,293	,692
		N	128	128	128	128	128
	ranking of artists	Correlation Coefficient	-,023	-,019	1,000	,125	,037
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,794	,830	.	,158	,674
		N	128	128	128	128	128
	release_b4	Correlation Coefficient	,100	-,094	,125	1,000	-,090
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,263	,293	,158	.	,314
		N	128	128	128	128	128
	dummy_award_b4	Correlation Coefficient	,130	-,035	,037	-,090	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,145	,692	,674	,314	.
		N	128	128	128	128	128

Spearman's Rho coefficient which do not show statistically significant correlations, nomination cases

Table 29: Spearman's Rho coefficient regarding the difference in traffic results between the twelve week pre-period and the week of the nomination

Correlations

			diff_b12_nom	amount of awards nominated for at particular time	ranking of artists	release_b12	award_b12
Spearman's rho	diff_b12_nom	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,162	,155	,062	-,003

		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,117	,134	,550	,981
		N	95	95	95	94	95
	amount of awards nominated for at particular time	Correlation Coefficient	-,162	1,000	-,115	,165	,256*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,117	.	,268	,112	,012
		N	95	95	95	94	95
	ranking of artists	Correlation Coefficient	,155	-,115	1,000	,163	-,033
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,134	,268	.	,117	,751
		N	95	95	95	94	95
	release_b12	Correlation Coefficient	,062	,165	,163	1,000	,027
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,550	,112	,117	.	,793
		N	94	94	94	94	94
	award_b12	Correlation Coefficient	-,003	,256*	-,033	,027	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,981	,012	,751	,793	.
		N	95	95	95	94	95

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 30: Spearman's Rho coefficient regarding the difference in traffic results between the eight week pre-period and the week of the nomination

Correlations

			diff_b8_nom	amount of awards nominated for at particular time	ranking of artists	release_b8	award_b8
Spearman's rho	diff_b8_nom	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,059	,124	,011	,116
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,568	,232	,918	,262
		N	95	95	95	94	95
	amount of awards nominated for at particular time	Correlation Coefficient	-,059	1,000	-,115	,056	,231*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,568	.	,268	,594	,024
		N	95	95	95	94	95
	ranking of artists	Correlation Coefficient	,124	-,115	1,000	,196	-,016
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,232	,268	.	,059	,875
		N	95	95	95	94	95
	release_b8	Correlation Coefficient	,011	,056	,196	1,000	,112

		Sig. (2-tailed)	,918	,594	,059	.	,282
		N	94	94	94	94	94
	award_b8	Correlation Coefficient	,116	,231*	-,016	,112	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,262	,024	,875	,282	.
		N	95	95	95	94	95

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Appendix E

Distribution of the independent and dependent variables regarding both the win cases and nomination cases. On the basis of the relatively wide ranging values regarding the skewness and the Kurtosis, the decision is made not to perform a multiple regression analysis. There are other assumptions which need to be met in order to perform regression, but the wide distribution of the data is enough to decide not to continue. Therefore, no other tests of assumptions are provided here.

Table 31: Distribution of the difference in traffic results between different periods, win cases

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
diff_b12_win	128	,2392	4,81024	1,993	,214	46,578	,425
diff_b8_win	128	,3185	3,79626	6,180	,214	54,799	,425
diff_b4_win	128	,4489	2,68573	6,435	,214	45,162	,425
diff_win_a4	128	-,2917	2,51779	-2,148	,214	26,999	,425
diff_win_a8	128	-,5654	3,39940	-6,436	,214	53,113	,425
diff_win_a12	128	-,6753	3,76977	-7,282	,214	63,354	,425
Valid N (listwise)	128						

Table 32: Distribution of the independent variables, win cases

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
amount of awards won at particular time	128	1,32	,675	2,163	,214	4,063	,425
ranking of artists	128	90,16	25,289	-3,043	,214	8,023	,425
release_b12	128	,51	,664	1,119	,214	,780	,425
release_b8	128	,29	,535	1,697	,214	2,020	,425
release_b4	128	,16	,405	2,608	,214	6,487	,425
release_a4	128	,25	,532	2,385	,214	6,482	,425
release_a8	128	,41	,582	1,071	,214	,172	,425
release_a12	128	,57	,660	,904	,214	,455	,425
dummy_award_b12	128	,17	,379	1,760	,214	1,115	,425

dummy_award_b8	128	,13	,332	2,295	,214	3,318	,425
dummy_award_b4	128	,05	,212	4,338	,214	17,089	,425
dummy_award_a4	128	,05	,212	4,338	,214	17,089	,425
dummy_award_a8	128	,11	,313	2,533	,214	4,485	,425
dummy_award_a12	128	,25	1,027	9,222	,214	96,006	,425
Valid N (listwise)	128						

Table 33: Distribution of the difference in traffic results between different periods, nomination cases

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
diff_b12_nom	95	,7223	3,81141	4,760	,247	30,130	,490
diff_b8_nom	95	,6557	4,19943	7,336	,247	64,607	,490
diff_b4_nom	95	,1997	4,48454	5,142	,247	56,488	,490
diff_nom_a4	95	-,5635	6,67171	-1,976	,247	27,575	,490
diff_nom_a8	95	-,7006	6,95228	-2,899	,247	28,367	,490
diff_nom_a12	95	-,9196	6,62095	-4,729	,247	32,315	,490
Valid N (listwise)	95						

Table 34: Distribution of the independent variables, nomination cases

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
amount of awards nominated for at particular time	95	1,39	,734	1,879	,247	2,790	,490
ranking of artists	95	89,47	25,823	-2,892	,247	7,220	,490
release_b12	94	,55	,650	1,242	,249	2,483	,493
release_b8	94	,38	,551	1,072	,249	,162	,493
release_b4	94	,19	,422	2,023	,249	3,286	,493
release_a4	94	,18	,414	2,140	,249	3,858	,493
release_a8	94	,47	,562	,684	,249	-,563	,493
release_a12	94	,64	,670	,574	,249	-,682	,493
award_b12	95	,11	,309	2,614	,247	4,936	,490

award_b8	95	,08	,279	3,043	,247	7,414	,490
award_b4	95	,02	,144	6,780	,247	44,913	,490
award_a4	95	,02	,144	6,780	,247	44,913	,490
award_a8	95	,05	,224	4,072	,247	14,890	,490
award_a12	95	,09	,294	2,812	,247	6,036	,490
Valid N (listwise)	94						