How Collaboration affects Productivity, Creativity and Motivation

-

The Comparison of Solo vs Collaborative work

-

Ciara Adamson

N00191297

Creative Music Production

Professional Project

IADT

28/04/2023

Supervisor: Pete Meighan / Ruth Moran

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT

This Project, How Collaboration affects Productivity, Creativity and Motivation, is based on the curiosity behind the workflow that comes from collaboration, in relation to music.

By comparing work that's done in an individual setting to the work that's done within a collaborative setting, this project allows for an analysis of which method was more effective, how it influenced decisions and what were the differences in outcomes once finished.

The work of the project has resulted in the conclusion that collaboration has an intrinsic effect on the productivity, creativity and motivation of musicians; with proof of two full and two half solo songs and five collaborative song.

The importance of this project is understandably momentous for the future of music production and its link to the writer's block.

INTRODUCTION

This Project, How Collaboration affects Productivity / Creativity / Motivation, is based on the curiosity behind the motivation that comes from project collaboration, in relation to music in this case. Understanding that different work types lead to varying product outcomes and that these outcomes are established depending on what mode of work is being used; this is the same principle for solo or collaborative work. This is a strong project to pursue as it will give a relevant insight into which work style is better to take advantage of when attempting to get specific work finished to the best ability possible.

By comparing the work that has been done in an individual setting to the work that's done within a collaborative setting, it will allow for an analysis of which method of work was more effective and how and what were the difference in outcome once finished. This Project has aimed to combine production with practice and merges them with the mental and physical of the music world. Not only is it working on music and the production of that music in an individual environment but it's also doing this within a collaborative environment simultaneously, while also researching into what and how that work was done and in what way did it differ within those different environments. The project consists of three sections; Research, Experimentation and Analysis.

The research stage contained most of the information gathered, the experimentation stage was a way of putting the research to the test and the analysis was a way of examining how the solo and collaborative work both differed and resembled one another and why they differed from one another.

This project requires time to get the experiments done in good time for the analysis stage, space to execute the experiments in a controlled environment and the means to carry out the project as successfully as possible; such as, music equipment, recording space, studio time and creative space.

For this project to have been carried out successfully, the time and space that was needed had to be used efficiently and there had to be a clear and concise awareness of what had to be done and when it had to be done by.

In conclusion, this project is on the case of a monumental concept and has tremendous potential to be a huge success. It's an extremely intriguing project that is definitely unique in its own way and hopefully the end results that are to follow will display that.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Carr, Priyanka B., and Gregory M. Walton. "Cues of Working Together Fuel Intrinsic Motivation." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 53, Elsevier BV, July 2014, pp. 169–84.

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0022103114000420?via%3Dihub

This journal discusses different motivation mechanisms and how they affect people in varied working situations. A conclusion of each five separate experiments are drawn and compared. This experiment shows results that indicate higher motivation in salutations where other people are involved in the same task or are aware that other people are doing work towards the same things.

This article is a helpful resource for this project because it helps understand the basis of collaboration styles and which styles works best for problem solving. This will prove profitable on the project's behalf as there are similar collaboration styles being used in motivation of collaboration as there was the article.

Howley, Iris & Chaudhuri, Sourish & Kumar, Rohit & Rosé, Carolyn. (2009). Motivation and collaborative behavior. 2. 59-61. 10.3115/1599503.1599523.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269031811_Motivation_and_collaborative_behavior

This journal investigates three different motivation orientations; Extrinsic, Instrinsic and unknow. Examinations were run to see how motivation is effected while collaboratively learning. Howley discusses how their findings were that the perception of behaviour was affected the most within the tests that were run rather than the behaviour itself. Meaning, *"students who were Extrinsically motivated perceived themselves as knowing significantly less"* and yet *"rated themselves highest out of four groups at the extent to which they offered help to their peers".*

This reference will be a great form of knowledge on understanding different motivation orientations and how each work within certain environments.

Shteynberg, Garriy, and Adam D. Galinsky. "Implicit Coordination: Sharing Goals With Similar Others Intensifies Goal Pursuit." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 47, no. 6, Elsevier BV, Nov. 2011, pp. 1291–94.

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S002210311100120X

This journal delves into the topic of sharing goals with others and its effect on individual motivation and productivity. Whether having the same goals with similar others intensifies your pursuit to achieve it. Some conclusions that have been pulled from this experiment are that participants pursued goals more intensely knowing that others were experiencing the same individual goal.

This is a great reference point for Motivation of Collaboration as it relates to motivation types that are being dealt with withing the project.

Tran, Van Dat. Does Cooperative Learning Increase Students' Motivation in Learning? |Tran | International Journal of Higher Education. 31 July 2019, www.sciedupress.com/journal/index.php/ijhe/article/view/15974.

This journal examines the impact of cooperative learning on the motivation of students within the exact same learning environment with the only varied factor being that one group was working within the lecture-based learning style and the other group took part in a cooperative learning style. The conclusion from this experiment was that *"students who were instructed with the cooperative learning method will achieve better motivation on learning outcome than those who were taught through lecture-based method."*

This is an important reference for this project, Motivation of Collaboration, because it shows similar research, similar methodology and analysis - but different work forms - and similar perceived outcomes.

Loersch, Chris, et al. "The Influence of Social Groups on Goal Contagion." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 44, no. 6, Elsevier BV, Nov. 2008, pp. 1555-58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2008.07.009.

This journal article touches on how goal contagion is more likely with people who are part of the same social groups. The concept that people catch the goals of other people they are surrounded by after seeing those goals as well as reading about those goals is tested.

This relates to this project as it's a similar social experiment in which friends work together towards the same end goal. It will also benefit the comparison of collaborative and solo work, and whether or not decisions made are influenced by partnering opinions. This is a crucial reference for Motivation of Collaboration.

Bernstein, Ethan, et al. "How Intermittent Breaks in Interaction Improve Collective Intelligence." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, vol. 115, no. 35, National Academy of Sciences, Aug. 2018, pp. 8734–39. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1802407115

This article discusses how collaborative working leads to more effective problem solving in comparison to the problem solving of an individual working alone.

This article is a helpful resource for this project because it helps understand the basis of collaboration what navigation works best for problem solving. This will prove profitable on the project's behalf as there are similar collaboration styles being used in Motivation of Collaboration as there was the article.

theyouthriot. "Brandon Boyd on Working Solo Vs in a Group." YouTube, 3 July 2010,
www.youtube.com/watch?v=kxyrrbvJwzc.

This video contains Boyd discussing an opinion on solo work versus group work in relation to music production. He states that although it is much easier to finish a song while working solo it's also a *"fight with yourself"* as you are the only person that you have to *"go up against".* Although individually you have an idea of where you want your music to go, it's extremely hard to get it to the point of completion when it will consist of constant over analyzation of the work that has been done.
This video will be beneficial to the comparison of the solo work and collaborative work within this project, Motivation of Collaboration.

Ryan, Richard M., and Edward L. Deci. "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions." *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, vol. 25, no. 1, Elsevier BV, Jan. 2000, pp. 54–67.
https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020

The relations of both intrinsic and extrinsic classes of motives to basic human needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness are discussed in this journal. It goes deep into research on the differences and comparisons of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. This will prove valuable to this project as a resource to understanding why the choices being made throughout the process were made and what motivated participants to make certain decisions.

METHODOLOGY

Every project needs a starting point, and considering there needed to be in depth knowledge of the topic being approached, research is where the starting point was. Research was carried out at the beginning to gather a good base of knowledge on the topic being approached during the working and analysis stage. The research was related to the relationship between motivation and collaboration and how they complement one another. Once the research was fully completed, the information gathered was then used as a backbone for the work to be carried out in a certain manner throughout the project. This then allowed for the continuation onto the analysis stage.

Starting the actual work elements of the project was the most enticing but the understanding of workstyle and working environment needed to have been considered for this project. Establishing a decent portfolio of work in both areas of the project was definitely a necessity to allow for the continuation into the analysis stage. Understanding that the work should have been done within a particular timeframe it was beneficial to have a good estimate of when things would be done by and the order in which they would be done in.

Solo

The form of work that was done throughout the project in terms of solo work was the writing, recording and producing of two full songs and two half / unfinished songs individually. There would be an allocation of six sessions in which the work would be done in. The solo sessions wouldn't be allocated specific task structures, these were inspiration based. The work that came from the solo sessions were to be broken up into writing sessions, recording sessions and production sessions. All solo songs were kept as demos and were decided to remain as such due to factors such as workload, work space and inspiration based sessions that were to be adhered to.

The writing sessions consisted of lyric writing and melody writing and the general composition of the songs. This allowed the participant to grasp an idea for the further development of any of the songs Worked on throughout this section of the project.

The recording sessions consisted of recording the demos of each song that had been written, to then be able to listen to them back and mentally process how to further expand on what had been previously worked on.

The production process was treated as a pre-production stage. This involved experimentation with sounds and plugins, layering of backing vocals and mixing techniques. This was approached as not crucial to the project but still important to be had as a section as part of the solo work to use as a determination of development of work.

Timeframe estimation of **solo** *work was as follows:*
- o   Write songs
- o   Record song demos   Finished by April
- o   Production of songs

Extensive and descriptive notes were taken for the duration of the project in relation to studio sessions, which were documenting what was done within these sessions, decisions that were made and why they were made, pre production notes and mood trackers for all the sessions that were carried out. These notes include a production timeline and an insight into the productivity, creativity and motivation for not only the individual songs themselves but the project as an entirety.

Collaborative

The form of work that was to be done throughout the project in terms of collaboration was the writing, recording and producing of a collection of five songs alongside a fellow musician and producer, and the in depth documentation of work done along the way. There was an allocation of six studio sessions with two extra studio sessions requested upon during later stages of the project, resulting in a total of eight studio sessions. The work that came from the collaborative sessions were to be broken up into writing sessions, recording sessions and production sessions. All collaborative songs were presented as "client listen ready mix's".

The collaborative working environment was within a space which allowed both participants to be creative. The writing process took place in a home studio space and also remotely over a discord server whenever it was deemed necessary by the participants. This consisted of song drafts, brainstorming sessions and experimenting with multiple ideas. Any ideas that were liked were recorded and kept for referencing further down the line.

The recording process was the most intensive section of the collaborative portion of the project. The studio was a very concentrated environment to work in and the urgency felt by the participants to successfully get the work that was initially set out to be done complete was critically tested under these time pressure pressures. All four collaborative songs, apart from the one song "*Aywa*" that wasn't recorded in the studio, were studio recorded to then be prepped for the production process.

The production process was the opportunity to take the songs from their original demo form and transform them into bigger and better professional projects. This consisted of the editing of the studio recorded material, including the comping, the quantizing, the automation, and the EQ of all instrument tracks in all four ProTool sessions of each song. The sound design of the finalized edited audio, including the use of plugins, FX and experimentation with different timbres. The mixing of all the edited and finalized audio sessions of all the songs.

Solo and collaboratively, extensive and descriptive notes were taken for the duration of the project in relation to studio sessions, which were documenting what was done within these sessions, decisions that were made and why they were made, pre production notes and solo mood trackers for all the pre production sessions, studio sessions, and editing sessions that were carried out by the participants. These notes include a production timeline and an insight into the productivity, creativity, and motivation for not only the individual songs themselves but the project as an entirety.

*Timeframe estimation of **collaborative** work was as follows:*

- Write songs
- Record song demos (stems)

Finished these sections by January

- Studio recording
- Production
- Mixing & Mastering

Finish these sections by April

Comparison

The analysis contains most of the answers that the project carried. The analysis of both solo and collaborative sides of the project delves into the specificity of the song writing process, the recording process and the production process while looking at the personal creative nature within both varied working environments. It compares the creative flow that each environment allowed for and which scenario felt more fluidly productive, creative and motivational. It will also compare the differences in stylistic choices from both working environments and the overall finished products that resulted from the writing processes. Some examples of comparable topics include:

- Work management
- Problem solving
- Productivity
- Creativity
- Writing styles
- Production styles
- Genres

The analysis could not have been carried out unless the writing, recording and producing had been achieved. This meant it was detrimental that the music production was established well, and enough, for the analysis to even begin at all.

ANALYSIS

Within all aspects of the project it's crucial to understand the difference between productivity, creativity and motivation for the benefit of the comparison. *Productivity* was measured by how much productive work was done by the participants during a particular time frame while working on music; *Creativity* was measured by creative decisions, creative flow and creative ideas while working on music; *Motivation* was measured by how driven, willing and excited one was while working on the music.

It has to be noted that although this is an in depth analysis this is a topic that must be considered subjective to one's individual experience within the project. Taking this into consideration, no hard universal conclusion, result or proof can be drawn from the analysis of this project as no two people work the same within equivalent environments.

Solo

There were a total of six working sessions were availed of from a home environment (It's important to note that the signwriting of the participant is inspiration driven and thus could not be scheduled, therefor had to be performed within a home studio setting). Two finished songs, "*Truth in our Eyes*" and *"NICOLA"*, and two half songs, "*Shame*" and *"Lovin' to Give"*, were written. All songs were recorded as demos and both "*Truth in our Eyes*" and *"NICOLA"* were edited and mixed to a client listen ready standard.

Upon analysing, within the solo working environment the participant had a lot of creativity when it came to acoustically writing songs but would further struggle to get past the stage of vocals and acoustic guitar demos. Not in all cases was this the dilemma, the first demo of "*Truth in Our Eyes*" proves that there could be and was creativity within the solo setting while stepping out of the territory of acoustic demos.

The participants mood would begin positively while working alone, but the motivation that the start day would begin to deplete throughout the timeframe of a few hours at most. It was difficult to push through that lack of motivation and a lot of the time this would result in the end of the session.

During these sessions the participant was continually ready to be productive and was enthusiastic about getting work done. *The writing process* of the songs was near effortless and once there was a flow it felt highly constructive and that useful work was being done. The productivity of lyric writing, organising of the song structure, the proposal of vocal melodies and alternatives of those and simply getting a general grasp of the songs themselves was the main achievement from the productivity in the early on stages of the songs.

One main issue that was faced with regard to the solo writing process was once a rough draft was written the participant found it difficult to then develop the lyrics as there was a familiarity with what had already been written up until that point.

The recording process offered an engaging atmosphere to allow for the participant to hear the songs being played back, thus giving another perspective on the song. Songs sound significantly different while being sung than they sound while being listened to. Scratch demos were recorded initially, acting as a stepping stone to the understanding of the desired recording, performance and production techniques that were used in the future sessions. While working, the primary source of productivity at the beginning of sessions was stemmed from the excitement and enthusiasm to listen to the work back.

Although it was productive to record the demos, the work being done was constantly staggered and broken an it was hard for the participant to maintain a healthy workflow without distractions or frustrations. Reportedly it was difficult to remain relatively engaged for longer periods of time, resulting in mental blocks and being unable to move past those frustrations.

The production process was the editing and developing the recorded material. Although not many songs from the solo work made it to this section or got very far within this process, the production that was done was generally the most productive the participant felt while working alone. The songs "Truth in Our Eyes" and "NICOLA" were the songs that made it this far in the production process. While seeking a fresher mindset, perspective and sonic ideas / decisions helped the participant to gain creative productivity in relation to the development of these songs.

In contrast, while working on the production process alone, the participant found it continually difficult to find ways to reach the ideas being envisioned. Not fully being able to pluck the ideas from inside the mind and into the software.

<div align="center">Creativity</div>

The writing process was started from scratch with three out of the four songs written while in a solo setting. One of the songs, "Truth in Our Eyes", was written prior to starting the project sessions. The participant felt very creative during writing sessions, and was generally gaining a lot of enjoyment from the writing. This approach was steadily maintaining an open creative mind. As expressed, the creative flow that came with solo writing appeared effortless and fluid and rarely broken or disturbed.

Issues that arose during these sessions were consistent of lack of momentum in relation to getting past any mental blocks that may have been faced.

The recording process was considered the least creative setting while working alone, as there was not many engineering decisions made apart from the sole decision to record the audio into a DAW. While recording the demos, it lead to a lot of creatively thinking ahead in relation to the production, almost getting a grasp for what was envisioned for the future production process.

This process didn't allow for much creativity as it felt more strategic and mechanical. There was also less enthusiasm while recording songs in a solo setting due to being in a way immune to one's own creative process.

The production process was definitely the most creative for the participant. Although only "Truth in Our Eyes" was the only song that was creatively produced at some point, it was a definite think outside the box type of production style. While the participant was working alone it made it easier to get ideas into the DAW and find sounds that were fit for purpose, making the sessions less disjointed while considering getting ideas out and into the song itself to hear it back.

Participant felt that if a creative wall was hit, it almost concluded the sessions altogether due to the frustration and true mental block that would result from it.

The writing process was a lot of fun for the participant as this was the initial inspiration for the resulted songs. This would have been the introduction into the songs that would be companioned for the foreseeable. The motivation that occurred while writing these songs was generally natural and at first easy to maintain. It was straightforward for the participant to gain motivation from writing something that had potential.

While motivation was flowing during the writing process there were a few difficulties such as, gaining mental blocks in relation to melody and lyric development resulting in the participant going in circles and struggling to look outside the box.

The recording process wasn't necessarily considered as a proper studio recording process in the same way that the collaborative recording process was but that was due to the fact that the participant was working off of an inspiration based session schedule. This meant that, as stated earlier in the analysis of the creativity of the project, rather than this process feeling more like a mechanical studio session just for recording the song it was able to feel slightly more creative and freer. This genuinely helped the participants with the motivation towards recording the demos of the songs that contained the most enthusiasm.

Contrasting this, though this style of solo working helped with motivating the participant depending on external factors it also did the opposite of motivate. Examples of this would be when frustrations and emotions were high due to being stuck on song structure or preproduction planning of the song it proved very difficult for the participant to put themselves back into what felt like a very emotionally high stake situation.

The production process gave the participant freedom to explore the songs sonically and experiment with any ideas that may have arose. Considering how creatively free the participant felt within the production process genuinely helped with the motivation to push through any writer's block that was faced and get the songs to a point of clarity and with a developing vision.

While the participant was motivated to creatively explore sounds and ideas within these songs, when that motivation came to a standstill it was genuinely difficult to enjoy the work that was being done on these songs and this is evidently seen in the development of "Truth in Our Eyes".

Collaborative

There were a total of eight working sessions availed of from a professional studio environment. Five songs, "Open Up", "Gone", "Addiction", "Dawn" and "Aywa" were written, recorded and edited to a client listen ready standard.

While working within similar conditions as to solo writing, the participant clearly found it easier to expand a creative mindset during collaborations. This was due to facts such as there being a second perspective and input into ideas and decisions, thus making it easier to get over a drought of creativity.

Alternatively, the participants mood would begin positively average while working collaboratively, but the motivation that began the day would start with increase due to the enthusiasm gained from other musicians ideas and excitement. This made working on material much easier to tackle and enjoyable to be a part of. This also lead to more work being done, more ideas to arise and exploration of different recording techniques such as vocal styles, different playing styles and production styles and techniques.

Productivity

The writing process was approached from the angle of peer critiquing. When one person wrote something, the other would offer other alternatives that may have fit better for the lyrics, melodies or arrangement. This helped the participants to obtain a steady work environment and a constant supply of work.

Although an abundance of work was done while feeding off of the energy of another, the participants were not always purely productive. One main issue that was faced while attempting to work alongside another individual was that the participants were getting distracted by one another and unable to get back into a working mindset.

The recording process was done within a studio setting allowing the productivity to almost be crucial to the sessions, otherwise time would be considered wasted in the studio according to the participants. This helped push through any distraction and follow through with any schedules and timetables that were planned prior to studio sessions.

The main issues that were encountered were, broken studio equipment and studio setup. The studio setup would always take longer than anticipated before the sessions began,

leading to timetable and schedule times meaning less recording time and causing more stress and anxiety for the participants.

In most areas collaboration helped with productivity, especially during *the production process* as the workload was split and took less time to do things and leading to things getting done twice as fast.
Issues faced were, losing momentum throughout the studio sessions as the participants would begin to get tired and hungry. This resulting in mistakes being made from an engineering point of view and also a performance point of view.

<div align="center">Creativity</div>

The writing process was unquestionably creative territory for the participants in a collaborative setting. The best example of this within the project was "Gone", as this was a song that began entirely from scratch within this due. There was a systemic equality between the two participants, allowing them to have an open communication regarding opinions and ideas. It's evident that the collaborative environment benefited these participants as it has resulted in five very high quality songs in which prove enthusiasm and progression.
One push back that was constantly faced collaboratively was the feeling of having to hit a certain mark or impress the other or getting distracted and having to pull back into a creative mindset.

The recording process was once again undoubtedly the least creative part of the songs as a whole because there wasn't much experimentation with recording techniques, the studio sessions were just used as a means of recording good quality songs. That being said it definitely was creative, when it came to microphone choices and placement. This then offered a way to sonically alter the song through the microphone choices and performance styes etc. All songs were recorded in the studio with the exception of "Aywa" which was kept at demo value.

The production process was more creative for the participants than expected. This process allowed the participants to be creative in more technical ways rather than compositionally

and lyrically. Being creative with FX and plugins and editing was considerably the most fun that was had throughout the project.

<p style="text-align:center">Motivation</p>

The writing process was filled with motivation and an eagerness to get these songs recorded and produced and this is clearly evident when the workloads between the collaborative sessions are compared to that of the solo sessions. While there is a difference in creative process that comes with working collaboratively with people, it affected the work of the participant in a positive way, which allowed for a common ground to understanding how the other communicated the ideas that were formed as a thought to then be able to mutually create an output for that idea led to an exciting source of dopamine. Being able to see a partner filled with elation and passion drove both participants to a heightened motivation in these situations.

Alternatively, the complete mirror image of this was the downfall to the sessions that lacked motivation. When one of the participants would struggle with their motivation and seemed to be upset or deflated with the work that was being done it was much harder for the other to be energetic, though not impossible for one in this instance to turn around and be able to have a positive outlook on the situation, there were times where both participants became punctured by dissatisfaction.

The recording process was the most difficult factor to the project for both participants. Due to fluctuating external factors such as good / bad performance days, certain equipment not being available within the studio to use on recording days and selected songs being prepared or not for studio sessions, this section carried the most stress and strain for the participants. Simultaneously, fun was still hard within the studio sessions and the participants were consistently excited about studio time and the recording of the songs. The motivation that came from trying to get the best take that could possibly come from the studio sessions was second to none. This was the main driving force of the motivation regarding the recording process.

Negatively when participants weren't having good performance days it knocked motivation and confidence significantly in turn making it very difficult for a bounce back.

The production process was the parish that began to glue everything together. The thought of being near to the finish line was exhilarating for the participants. This motivated them in a way that hadn't been seen in previous parts of the project, the want and the need to hear a close to finished, product was motivating enough for both parties to be able to sit down and get into gear. The enjoyment that came from the development of songs and the songs character motivated the participants enough for the result in five well written, well recorded and well produced songs with a lot of potential.

Despite the positives, there were negatives to the production process too. Some songs were better than others to work on but considering the songs that weren't so easy, this is where depreciating motivation was shown. The song "Addiction" led the participants to Many or motivated and less productive sessions then we would have liked. The uncertainty of how to develop this song and how to experiment with it was the main struggle in relation to the entire collaborative project.

DISCUSSION

The project is a source for analytical thinking within the musical working place. It has shown results and learning opportunities that have allowed for the freedom of workflow and creative thinking.

The participant was being judged on how much work was done within the writing, recording and production sessions in question. These sessions were noted throughout making it much easier to take a look back at how the participant was feeling throughout said sessions and what decisions were made for what reasons and the progression of the material itself. While creativity varies from person to person, it was comparable in this case as it is the creativity of the same individual from both solo and collaborative work that was being explored.

Considering the methodology, it is safe to assume that the project was set out to be both successful and unsuccessful, exclusive from one another. There have been a lot of findings and comparisons made and in the end it is clear that collaboration has had an intrinsic effect on many decisions made and workflow throughout the entirety of the project.

Solo

During the solo portion of the project the work that was done was that of acoustically driven writing and stripped back demos. The solo styles of writing fell into the genre category of alternative pop and indie pop. It is interesting to note that the participant felt more fluidly productive and creative within a shorter amount of time in a solo setting compared to that of a collaborative setting. It was noted that the overall general productivity and motivation that came from solo work was half of what was experienced in the collaborative settings. The participant was less enthusiastic and motivated to begin working and found this intimidating and stressful to establish a creative working rhythm. Although it is interesting to document that once the participant was in a constructive workflow this was nearly impossible to break.

Collaborative

During the course of the project it had to be considered that although there was work being done, this was not enough evidence to prove that it was productive work. The work being done had to be treated as a positive and beneficial type productivity for the work. This was difficult to distinguish as the productivity seen was not always clear to be either positive or negative. While studying the relationship between what type of work was done and the progress of the work itself this allowed for the analysis and comparison to follow.

The collaborative style of writing fell into the genre category of pop, pop rock and R&B / soul. The intrinsic effect of collaboration on productivity, creativity and motivation is evident when you compare the work produced within the solo section and collaborative section side by side. Two full and two half solo songs compared to five full collaborative songs, Participant finding it hard to gain momentum contrasting the participant being enthusiastic and excited to work and develop the plethora of work that had already been established in early stages of the project. Roughly recorded solo demos against a high standard of edited and mixed collaborative songs.

Despite the fact that collaboration it was evidently a positive approach for the most part there were times where the participant reported struggling to maintain a constant flow of combined productivity due to getting distracted by one another due to fatigue, hunger and other external factors. Conflict of interest sometimes resulted in significantly long disputes which in turn led to a blockage of motivation and stunned the previous productivity.

CONCLUSION

Overall, it is safe to say that a fair amount of work has been complete, put to the test and scrutinized during the course of the project. Throughout the project it has been an objective to analyse the comparative of solo and collaborative work within a musical setting. The project was entered with an open mind and finished with high hopes for the future of collaborative work.

It's fair to say that the main conclusion drawn from this project has been that in the circumstances of the participant collaboration has helped with productivity creativity and motivation within a music driven environment. Although it's evident that the productivity, creativity, and motivation seen within the collaborative setting is and was also possible in a solo setting, it is still clearly seen that collaboration provides a more consistent source of productivity, creativity, and motivation for the participant.

The learning curves of this project have been extremely insightful for the future of collaboration work and the navigation of this topic. The main learning experience to come from the project has been that of understand that creativity in relation to music is never extremely straightforward and most definitely never consistent, therefore when proving difficult to navigate it can feel disheartening; but there are definitely ways to get around it and these have been explored throughout the experiment and these solutions will be used in further endeavors.

If the project were to be approached again, some of the things that would be considered differently would be the approach to the solo work and to possibly consider a more in depth production timeline. More time and effort would be allocated to the solo aspect of the project, which includes seeking studio time for solo songs as well as collaborative studio time.

The future of this project is unknown further than personal use of certain skills learned along the way. The knowledge gained from this experience will be used in future solo and collaborative project.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bernstein, Ethan, et al. "How Intermittent Breaks in Interaction Improve Collective Intelligence." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, vol. 115, no. 35, National Academy of Sciences, Aug. 2018, pp. 8734–39. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1802407115

Carr, Priyanka B., and Gregory M. Walton. "Cues of Working Together Fuel Intrinsic Motivation." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 53, Elsevier BV, July 2014, pp. 169–84. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0022103114000420?via%3Dihub

Howley, Iris & Chaudhuri, Sourish & Kumar, Rohit & Rosé, Carolyn. (2009). Motivation and collaborative behavior. 2. 59-61. 10.3115/1599503.1599523. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269031811_Motivation_and_collaborative_behavior

Loersch, Chris, et al. "The Influence of Social Groups on Goal Contagion." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 44, no. 6, Elsevier BV, Nov. 2008, pp. 1555-58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2008.07.009.

Ryan, Richard M., and Edward L. Deci. "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions." *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, vol. 25, no. 1, Elsevier BV, Jan. 2000, pp. 54–67. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020

Shteynberg, Garriy, and Adam D. Galinsky. "Implicit Coordination: Sharing Goals With Similar Others Intensifies Goal Pursuit." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 47, no. 6, Elsevier BV, Nov. 2011, pp. 1291–94. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S002210311100120X

theyouthriot. "Brandon Boyd on Working Solo Vs in a Group." YouTube, 3 July 2010, www.youtube.com/watch?v=kxyrrbvJwzc.

Tran, Van Dat. Does Cooperative Learning Increase Students' Motivation in Learning? |Tran | International Journal of Higher Education. 31 July 2019, www.sciedupress.com/journal/index.php/ijhe/article/view/15974.