

Comparative Analysis of Document-Level Embedding Methods for Similarity Scoring on Shakespeare Sonnets and Taylor Swift Lyrics

Klara Krämer

Abstract: This study evaluates the performance of TF-IDF weighting, averaged Word2Vec embeddings, and BERT embeddings for document similarity scoring across two contrasting textual domains. By analysing cosine similarity scores, the methods' strengths and limitations are highlighted. The findings underscore TF-IDF's reliance on lexical overlap and Word2Vec's superior semantic generalisation, particularly in cross-domain comparisons. BERT demonstrates lower performance in challenging domains, likely due to insufficient domain-specific fine-tuning.

1 Introduction

Document similarity assessment plays an important role in various natural language processing (NLP) applications, such as information retrieval, plagiarism detection, recommendation systems, and question answering [11, 19]. For instance, in recommendation systems, document similarity helps personalise suggestions by finding content that closely matches user preference. These tasks rely on accurate measurements of how similar documents are in terms of their structure, content, and meaning, which depends on the way the document is represented computationally. This representation is usually done in vector format and is obtained via document embedding methods. Various methodologies can be employed to obtain document-level embeddings, and the choice of method directly impacts the accuracy and usefulness of the similarity scores calculated [14, 19].

This study compares three methods of document-level embeddings for document similarity scoring: Averaged Word2Vec [18], TF-IDF weighting [16], and BERT embeddings [6]. Each method offers distinct advantages and limitations, and this comparative study applies these techniques to a diverse set of texts - specifically, the sonnets of William Shakespeare and the lyrics of Taylor Swift. Generating document-level embeddings for documents in these two contrasting genres and analysing their similarity scores will help evaluate how effective, reliable, robust, and adaptable different embedding techniques are for scoring document similarity.

The methodology employed in this project involves creating document-level cosine similarity matrices for each dataset and method. This is followed by a quantitative analysis, in which the average similarity scores within each matrix are calculated and compared.

2 Background and Related Work

There is a large body of research on document similarity measures, with different studies focusing on various aspects of document similarity and different applications.

Traditionally, methods such as TF-IDF (Term Frequency-Inverse Document Frequency) as proposed by Sparck Jones have been employed to compute the similarity between documents [16]. While TF-IDF captures relative term relevance within documents, the method cannot encode word meaning and contextual information, limiting its effectiveness for nuanced language like poetry or lyrics [13].

The more recent advancement Word2Vec, developed by Mikolov et al., maps words to continuous vector spaces based on their co-occurring context words [18]. This approach captures semantic relationships between words, but how to use these word-level embeddings to create whole-document embeddings remains an open research question. Proposed solutions include the Paragraph Vector model Doc2Vec [9], and simple but effective methods such as averaging word embeddings to obtain sentence- and document-level embeddings from their constituent words [20]. Addressing these limitations, Devlin et al. introduced BERT (Bidirectional Encoder Representation from Transformers), a pre-trained model that generates context-sensitive embeddings [6].

Most studies on document similarity scoring focus on specific application domains, for instance, patent-to-patent comparisons. Younge et al. showed that a TF-IDF-based vector space model outperforms traditional patent classifiers in terms of accuracy, specificity, and generality [21]. However, they did not compare this approach with other vectorisation models.

In a study building on the above, Shahmirzadi et al. analysed the performance of different vector space models in measuring semantic text similarity on patents [14]. Comparing TF-IDF weighting, topic modelling, and Doc2Vec embeddings, they found that pre-trained and highly tuned neural embeddings like Doc2Vec provided the best results. However, they also observed a trade-off between computational efficiency and accuracy, noting that a simple TF-IDF approach was more practical for their application. The authors of this paper noted a lack of studies evaluating the performance of different vectorisation methods on more challenging datasets, which this paper aims to address.

Within the domain of Shakespeare sonnets and Pop lyrics, there is only limited NLP research. Some existing papers utilised clustering approaches to attempt to answer the Shakespeare authorship question¹ [1, 2]. Koppel and Seidman applied first- and second-order document similarity measures to Shakespeare plays in a similar authorship verification task [8]. Their evaluation used 40 plays attributed to Shakespeare, leaving room for the future work this paper focuses on, as a larger corpus of shorter documents such as sonnets may yield different results for document similarity measures.

In a study on music similarity, Knees and Schedl noted that lyrics-based features can sometimes outperform advanced measures such as audio-based features in assessing song semantics and similar-

¹The Shakespeare authorship question asks whether all works commonly attributed to William Shakespeare have truly been written by him, or whether there have been ghostwriters or false attributions.

ity [7]. A more domain-specific paper examined linguistic patterns in Taylor Swift's writing, focusing on word and 3-gram co-occurrences. They conducted a quantitative study on these lyrics based on the assumption that song lyrics often originate as lyric poems [5], an assumption that this paper will help evaluate by calculating similarity scores between Shakespearean poetry and Swift lyrics.

3 Research Question

As the above body of related work indicates, document similarity scoring is an interesting area of research which so far is quite unexplored within specialised domains such as poetry and lyrics. Therefore, this paper investigates the effectiveness of different techniques in generating document similarity scores for these domains.

Research Question: How do the three embedding methods under evaluation - namely averaged Word2Vec, TF-IDF weighting, and BERT embeddings - affect the document similarity scores generated within and between these domains?

To establish this, the methods are to be applied to (1) a dataset of Taylor Swift lyrics, (2) a dataset of Shakespeare sonnets, and (3) a combination of the above two in one dataset.

Specifically, the following hypotheses are to be tested:

1. TF-IDF weighting will show higher average similarity scores within the Taylor Swift dataset than the other two datasets, reflecting the straightforward narrative style of the lyrics.
2. Averaging the Word2Vec embeddings of the words within each document will result in higher similarity scores for Taylor Swift songs than for Shakespeare sonnets. This is likely because of the more contemporary language of the Swift lyrics, which aligns better with the inherent Word2Vec training data.
3. Averaged Word2Vec embeddings will assign higher scores to Swift-Shakespeare pairs in the joint dataset than the TF-IDF method since Word2Vec can recognise similarities in meaning even when the vocabulary differs significantly.
4. BERT embeddings will perform better than the other methods at identifying similarities between the Shakespeare sonnets due to BERT's ability to capture the contextual nuances in poetic language.

These hypotheses will be evaluated by calculating document-level cosine similarity matrices using each method on each of the 3 datasets. These matrices will then be analysed quantitatively by calculating and comparing their average similarity scores. To test hypothesis 3, the average cosine similarity of Swift-Shakespeare pairs in the joint dataset will be compared across the different methods. In addition, qualitative error analysis will be performed in cases in which the results are unexpected.

The datasets on which the above analyses will be performed are taken from GitHub, utilising the repositories by Marquez [10] and Finch [4] for the Shakespeare sonnets and Swift lyrics respectively.

Since the Swift dataset contains 232 songs, but there are only 154 sonnets by William Shakespeare, 154 of the Swift songs are selected at random to ensure equal numbers across the two datasets. See Table 8 in the Appendix for a list of the Taylor Swift songs that were excluded. Some minor exploratory data analysis (EDA) was performed to get an overview of the data loaded from the two sources.

The results of this EDA can be seen in Table 1.

Dataset	Shakespeare	Swift
Total number of words	17507	56932
Vocabulary size	3027	3734
Lexical diversity ²	0.1729	0.0656
Top content words ³	'thy', 'thou', 'love', 'thee', 'doth', 'beauty', 'time', 'mine', 'shall', 'heart'	'like', 'oh', 'know', 'never', 'time', 'one', 'love', 'could', 'back', 'got'

Table 1: EDA on the two core datasets

4 Experimental Design

Based on the above general Research Question of how different embedding methods impact document similarity scores, and the concrete hypotheses stated, the experiments to test these hypotheses can be designed.

All document embedding methods will be applied to the same input data. To prepare for the experiments, all sonnets and songs will be preprocessed through lowercasing, tokenisation, and the removal of stopwords and punctuation. Two derived datasets will be created: The 'Combined Dataset' including all sonnets and songs, and the 'Distinct Dataset', which contains only sonnet-song similarity scores. The following procedure will be applied to each of the three embedding methods under evaluation:

1. Create embeddings of all documents for each dataset. The specific parameters used for each embedding method can be seen in the Appendix in Table 3. Tokens for which no embedding exists will be treated as zero-vectors.
2. Compute cosine similarity scores⁴ for all document pairs for each dataset, storing the results in similarity matrices.
3. Construct a similarity matrix for the 'Distinct Dataset', where rows correspond to Shakespeare sonnets and columns correspond to Swift songs. This matrix does thus not contain similarity scores between individual sonnets or between songs, but only between sonnet-song pairs. Table 4 in the Appendix visualises this difference by showing the layout of the similarity matrices generated from these two datasets.

²Lexical diversity = (Vocabulary size) / (Total number of words)

³Excluding common stopwords as defined by *nltk*

⁴To compute the similarity scores, the *sklearn.metrics.pairwise.cosine_similarity* function is used

Given this experimental design, the embedding method and dataset type are independent variables, since they determine how document embeddings are generated and compared. The similarity scores and the means derived from them are the measurable outcomes influenced by the choice of embedding method and dataset, making them the dependent variables.

5 Results

This section will be separated into four subsections, each corresponding to one of the four hypotheses. Table 2 gives an overview of the mean similarity scores for each embedding method and dataset. Notably, TF-IDF yields significantly lower similarity scores in all cases, while Word2Vec produces the highest scores.

	Shakespeare	Taylor Swift	Combined Dataset	Distinct Dataset
Averaged Word2Vec	0.9539	0.9993	0.9998	0.9997
TF-IDF	0.1157	0.1486	0.1075	0.0734
BERT	0.9207	0.9088	0.7983	0.6820

Table 2: Mean Similarity Scores for each Embedding Method and Dataset

5.1 TF-IDF Similarity Scores

The first null hypothesis, which states that the mean similarity scores derived using TF-IDF weighting are identical across the Shakespeare, Swift, and Combined datasets, is rejected based on the results of a one-way ANOVA performed on the three similarity matrices. The p-value for this analysis is less than 0.001, providing sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis and support the alternative hypothesis. Applying Tukey’s honestly significant difference (HSD) test confirms that the average similarity scores within the Taylor Swift dataset are significantly higher than those in the other two datasets, as shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Average similarity scores produced using TF-IDF

5.2 Word2Vec Similarity Scores

The second null hypothesis is that the mean similarity scores produced using Word2Vec are equivalent for the Shakespeare and Swift datasets. To evaluate this, a Mann-Whitney test is conducted. The resulting p-value is substantially greater than 0.05 ($p \approx 1$), indicating no statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis. This suggests comparable scores across both datasets, contrary to the hypothesis that averaged Word2Vec would yield higher similarity scores for Taylor Swift songs. Figure 2 highlights the minimal variance in these similarity scores.




Figure 2: Average similarity scores produced using Word2Vec

5.3 Similarity Scores of Shakespeare-Swift Pairs

The third null hypothesis, namely that the mean similarity scores within the Distinct dataset are the same for averaged Word2Vec embeddings and TF-IDF, is tested via a Wilcoxon test. The test yields a p-value of less than 0.001, meaning that the null hypothesis is rejected. As can be seen in Figure 3, the Word2Vec method yields significantly higher similarity scores than the TF-IDF method, supporting the hypothesis that Word2Vec effectively captures semantic similarity across disparate vocabularies, which TF-IDF does not.

5.4 Similarity Scores in the Shakespeare Dataset

To test the final null hypothesis, which states that the mean similarity scores within the Shakespeare dataset are the same across methods, a one-way ANOVA is used, yielding $p < 0.001$.

However, Tukey's HSD test reveals that BERT does not produce the highest scores. This contradicts the hypothesis that BERT would identify more similarities in the Shakespeare sonnets compared to the other methods. Figure 4 presents the results.




Figure 3: Average similarity scores of Shakespeare-Swift pairs in the Distinct dataset




Figure 4: Average similarity scores within the Shakespeare dataset

6 Discussion and Future Work

As presented in the above Results section, this study provides insights into the effectiveness of different document-level embedding methods in generating document similarity scores across specialised domains. Each hypothesis was statistically tested, and the findings highlight both the capabilities and limitations of the embedding methods in capturing relationships within and across datasets.

TF-IDF demonstrates strong performance in identifying lexical overlap in straightforward texts such as Taylor Swift lyrics, but is less effective with Shakespeare’s nuanced and metaphorical language, highlighting its limited contextual understanding.

Word2Vec does not yield higher similarity scores for Swift songs than for Shakespeare sonnets, contrary to expectations. Future work might build upon this by examining Word2Vec’s performance on texts from several centuries rather than just two.

Qualitative analysis provides additional insights. Word2Vec identified the highest similarity between Shakespeare’s Sonnet 60 and Sonnet 149⁵, both of which explore themes of unreciprocated love. The lowest similarity scores were assigned to Taylor Swift’s ”Out of the Woods” and ”Shake It Off”⁶, reflecting differences in tone and message, with the former song reflecting emotional struggles and the latter emphasising empowerment and joy. This outlier analysis provides insight into potential reasons for the comparatively high and low similarity scores, even though they deviate from the original hypothesis.

The results for the third hypothesis highlight the comparative strengths of Word2Vec over TF-IDF in recognising semantic similarities. The higher similarity scores for Shakespeare-Swift document pairs in the Distinct dataset confirm that Word2Vec effectively captures deeper semantic relations even when vocabulary differs.

BERT embeddings do not yield the highest similarity scores for the Shakespeare dataset, contradicting the hypothesis that BERT’s contextualised representations would prove most successful at capturing the intricate nature of Shakespeare sonnets. This suggests limitations in BERT’s performance for poetic texts, potentially due to insufficient domain-specific fine-tuning or inadequate representation of such language in its pre-training. Future research could address this by evaluating BERT on larger, more diverse poetic datasets and exploring different fine-tuning approaches.

An analysis of the most dissimilar pair of Shakespeare sonnets defined by BERT, namely Sonnet 97 and Sonnet 148⁷ shows shared themes of devotion and idolisation but differing tones: The former emphasises melancholic longing and idealised beauty, while the latter critiques love’s irrationality with an accusatory tone.

The study is not without its limitations. The above results point to correlations between the methods’ performance and the characteristics of the datasets, though causation cannot be fully established. The observed performance differences may be influenced not only by the embedding techniques themselves but also by factors such as pre-training data, hyperparameter selection, and dataset size. Additionally, the Shakespeare dataset contains fewer documents than the Taylor Swift corpus, and while random subsampling was used to balance the datasets, this approach may have introduced variability in the results. The exclusive use of cosine similarity as a metric may not fully capture the nuances of semantic similarity, especially for complex poetic language. A more in-depth qualitative evaluation of document similarity could provide a richer understanding of how the different embedding methods perform on these specialised domains.

Future work could also explore hybrid approaches that combine lexical and semantic features to build on the above results. Another interesting area of future research is performing similar evaluations using a wider range of different embedding methods such as FastText [3] and SenteceBERT [12].

⁵The sonnets are given in the Appendix in Table 5

⁶The lyrics are given in the Appendix in Table 7

⁷See Table 6 in the Appendix for the sonnets

7 Conclusion

This study explored the effectiveness of TF-IDF, averaged Word2Vec, and BERT embeddings for document similarity scoring in the domains of Taylor Swift lyrics and Shakespeare sonnets to evaluate the embedding methods' strengths and weaknesses.

The results showed that TF-IDF was most effective when applied to Swift lyrics, while it struggled with the metaphorical language of Shakespeare sonnets. Averaged Word2Vec embeddings performed better at capturing semantic similarity, particularly for Swift-Shakespeare pairs, but did not show significant differences between the Shakespeare and Swift datasets. Contrary to expectations, BERT did not identify more similarities within the Shakespeare dataset than the other methods.

There is a range of future work that could build on this research to develop a deeper and more nuanced understanding of how different embedding methods perform on diverse datasets within the context of similarity scoring.

References

- [1] Refat Aljumily. Hierarchical and non-hierarchical linear and non-linear clustering methods to “shakespeare authorship question”. *Social Sciences*, 4(3):758–799, 2015.
- [2] Ahmed Shamsul Arefin, Renato Vimieiro, Carlos Riveros, Hugh Craig, and Pablo Moscato. An information theoretic clustering approach for unveiling authorship affinities in shakespearean era plays and poems. *PloS one*, 9(10):e111445, 2014.
- [3] Piotr Bojanowski, Edouard Grave, Armand Joulin, and Tomas Mikolov. Enriching word vectors with subword information. *Transactions of the association for computational linguistics*, 5:135–146, 2017.
- [4] Derek Finch. Corpus-of-taylor-swift. <https://github.com/sagesolar/Corpus-of-Taylor-Swift/blob/main/>, 2024.
- [5] Faruq Ahmad Kendong, Afifah Sakinah Daud, and Aeisha Joharry. A corpus-driven analysis of taylor swift’s song lyrics. *International Journal of Modern Languages and Applied Linguistics*, 7(2):59–82, 2023.
- [6] Jacob Devlin Ming-Wei Chang Kenton and Lee Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of naacL-HLT*, volume 1, page 2. Minneapolis, Minnesota, 2019.
- [7] Peter Knees and Markus Schedl. A survey of music similarity and recommendation from music context data. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications, and Applications (TOMM)*, 10(1):1–21, 2013.
- [8] Moshe Koppel and Shachar Seidman. Detecting pseudepigraphic texts using novel similarity measures. *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities*, 33(1):72–81, 2018.
- [9] Quoc Le and Tomas Mikolov. Distributed representations of sentences and documents. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1188–1196. PMLR, 2014.
- [10] Aaron Marquez. Generate-shakespeare-sonnets. <https://github.com/enerrio/Generate-Shakespeare-Sonnets/blob/master/>, 2017.
- [11] James H Martin and Daniel Jurafsky. *Speech and Language Processing*. Pearson Prentice Hall, 2024.
- [12] N Reimers. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10084*, 2019.
- [13] Gerard Salton and Chris Buckley. Approaches to text retrieval for structured documents. Technical report, Cornell University, 1990.

-
- [14] Omid Shahmirzadi, Adam Lugowski, and Kenneth Younge. Text similarity in vector space models: a comparative study. In *2019 18th IEEE international conference on machine learning and applications (ICMLA)*, pages 659–666. IEEE, 2019.
- [15] William Shakespeare. *Complete Works of W. Shakespeare*. WP Nimmo, 1864.
- [16] Karen Sparck Jones. A statistical interpretation of term specificity and its application in retrieval. *Journal of documentation*, 28(1):11–21, 1972.
- [17] Taylor Swift. *1989 (Taylor’s Version)*. Republic Records, New York City, 2023.
- [18] Greg Corrado Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen and Jeffrey Dean. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *ICLR Workshop*, 2013.
- [19] Jiapeng Wang and Yihong Dong. Measurement of text similarity: a survey. *Information*, 11(9):421, 2020.
- [20] Zhibo Wang, Long Ma, and Yanqing Zhang. A novel method for document summarization using word2vec. In *2016 IEEE 15th International Conference on Cognitive Informatics & Cognitive Computing (ICCI* CC)*, pages 523–529. IEEE, 2016.
- [21] Kenneth A Younge and Jeffrey M Kuhn. Patent-to-patent similarity: A vector space model. *Available at SSRN 2709238*, 2016.

8 Appendix

Embedding Method	Parameters
Averaged Word2Vec	vector_size=100, window=5, min_count=1, workers=4
TFIDF	standard vectoriser.fit_transform() usage
BERT	from_pretrained('bert-base-uncased'); return_tensors='pt', truncation=True, padding=True, max_length=512

Table 3: Parameters used for each embedding method

Dataset Name	Similarity Matrix Layout																			
Combined Dataset	<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Sonnet1</td> <td>...</td> <td>Sonnet154</td> <td>Song1</td> <td>...</td> <td>Song154</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sonnet1</td> <td colspan="5" rowspan="5">Similarity Scores</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>...</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sonnet154</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Song1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>...</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Song154</td> </tr> </table>		Sonnet1	...	Sonnet154	Song1	...	Song154	Sonnet1	Similarity Scores						...	Sonnet154	Song1	...	Song154
		Sonnet1	...	Sonnet154	Song1	...	Song154													
	Sonnet1	Similarity Scores																		
	...																			
	Sonnet154																			
	Song1																			
...																				
Song154																				
Distinct Dataset	<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Song1</td> <td>...</td> <td>Song154</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sonnet1</td> <td colspan="2" rowspan="3">Similarity Scores</td> </tr> <tr> <td>...</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sonnet154</td> </tr> </table>		Song1	...	Song154	Sonnet1	Similarity Scores		...	Sonnet154										
		Song1	...	Song154																
	Sonnet1	Similarity Scores																		
	...																			
Sonnet154																				

Table 4: Similarity matrix layouts for the Combined and Distinct datasets

Sonnet	Text
Sonnet 60 [15]	<p>Is it thy will, thy image should keep open My heavy eyelids to the weary night? Dost thou desire my slumbers should be broken, While shadows like to thee do mock my sight? Is it thy spirit that thou send'st from thee So far from home into my deeds to pry, To find out shames and idle hours in me, The scope and tenor of thy jealousy? O, no! thy love, though much, is not so great: It is my love that keeps mine eye awake: Mine own true love that doth my rest defeat, To play the watchman ever for thy sake: For thee watch I, whilst thou dost wake elsewhere, From me far off, with others all too near.</p>
Sonnet 149 [15]	<p>O! from what power hast thou this powerful might, With insufficiency my heart to sway? To make me give the lie to my true sight, And swear that brightness doth not grace the day? Whence hast thou this becoming of things ill, That in the very refuse of thy deeds There is such strength and warrantise of skill, That, in my mind, thy worst all best exceeds? Who taught thee how to make me love thee more, The more I hear and see just cause of hate? O! though I love what others do abhor, With others thou shouldst not abhor my state: If thy unworthiness raised love in me, More worthy I to be beloved of thee.</p>

Table 5: Selected Shakespeare sonnets for outlier analysis for hypothesis 2

Sonnet	Text
Sonnet 97 [15]	<p>From you have I been absent in the spring, When proud pied April, dressed in all his trim, Hath put a spirit of youth in every thing, That heavy Saturn laughed and leapt with him. Yet nor the lays of birds, nor the sweet smell Of different flowers in odour and in hue, Could make me any summer's story tell, Or from their proud lap pluck them where they grew: Nor did I wonder at the lily's white, Nor praise the deep vermilion in the rose; They were but sweet, but figures of delight, Drawn after you, you pattern of all those. Yet seemed it winter still, and you away, As with your shadow I with these did play.</p>
Sonnet 148 [15]	<p>Canst thou, O cruel! say I love thee not, When I against myself with thee partake? Do I not think on thee, when I forgot Am of my self, all tyrant, for thy sake? Who hateth thee that I do call my friend, On whom frown'st thou that I do fawn upon, Nay, if thou lour'st on me, do I not spend Revenge upon myself with present moan? What merit do I in my self respect, That is so proud thy service to despise, When all my best doth worship thy defect, Commanded by the motion of thine eyes? But, love, hate on, for now I know thy mind, Those that can see thou lov'st, and I am blind.</p>

Table 6: Selected Shakespeare sonnets for outlier analysis for hypothesis 4

Song	Lyrics
Out Of The Woods [17]	<p>Looking at it now, it all seems so simple We were lying on your couch, I remember You took a Polaroid of us, then discovered (Then discovered) The rest of the world was black and white, but we were in screaming color [Chorus:] And I remember thinking Are we out of the woods yet?, are we out of the woods yet?, are we out of the woods yet?, are we out of the woods? Are we in the clear yet?, are we in the clear yet?, are we in the clear yet?, in the clear yet, good Are we out of the woods yet?, are we out of the woods yet?, are we out of the woods yet?, are we out of the woods? Are we in the clear yet?, are we in the clear yet?, are we in the clear yet?, in the clear yet, good Looking at it now, last December (Last December) We were built to fall apart, then fall back together (Back together) Oh, your necklace hanging from my neck, the night we couldn't quite forget when we decided, we decided To move the furniture so we could dance Baby, like we stood a chance Two paper airplanes flying, flying, flying [Chorus] Remember when you hit the brakes too soon? Twenty stitches in a hospital room When you started crying, baby I did too But when the sun came up I was looking at you Remember when we couldn't take the heat? I walked out, I said, "I'm setting you free" But the monsters turned out to be just trees When the sun came up you were looking at me You were looking at me, oh You were looking at me [Chorus] [Chorus]</p>

Shake It Off [17]	<p>I stay out too late Got nothing in my brain That's what people say, mm-mm That's what people say, mm-mm I go on too many dates But I can't make 'em stay At least that's what people say, mm-mm That's what people say, mm-mm [Chorus:] But I keep cruisin' Can't stop, won't stop movin' It's like I got this music in my mind Sayin' it's gonna be alright 'Cause the players gonna play, play, play, play, play And the haters gonna hate, hate, hate, hate, hate Baby, I'm just gonna shake, shake, shake, shake, shake I shake it off, I shake it off (hoo-hoo-hoo) Heartbreakers gonna break, break, break, break, break And the fakers gonna fake, fake, fake, fake, fake Baby, I'm just gonna shake, shake, shake, shake, shake I shake it off, I shake it off (hoo-hoo-hoo) I never miss a beat I'm lightnin' on my feet And that's what they don't see, mm-mm That's what they don't see, mm-mm I'm dancin' on my own (dancin' on my own) I make the moves up as I go (moves up as I go) And that's what they don't know, mm-mm That's what they don't know, mm-mm [Chorus] Hey, hey, hey Just think, while you've been gettin' down and out about the liars And the dirty, dirty cheats of the world You could've been gettin' down to this sick beat My ex-man brought his new girlfriend She's like, "Oh my God!" but I'm just gonna shake And to the fella over there with the hella good hair Won't you come on over, baby? We can shake, shake, shake (yeah) [Chorus]</p>
-------------------	--

Table 7: Selected Swift songs for outlier analysis

Album	Title
Taylor Swift	Tim McGraw
Taylor Swift	Teardrops On My Guitar
Taylor Swift	A Place In This World
Taylor Swift	Cold As You
Taylor Swift	The Outside
Taylor Swift	Mary's Song (Oh My My My)
Taylor Swift	Our Song
Taylor Swift	Invisible
Taylor Swift	A Perfectly Good Heart
Fearless (Taylor's Version)	Fifteen
Fearless (Taylor's Version)	Tell Me Why
Fearless (Taylor's Version)	Jump Then Fall
Fearless (Taylor's Version)	Come In With The Rain
Fearless (Taylor's Version)	Superstar
Fearless (Taylor's Version)	That's When
Fearless (Taylor's Version)	Bye Bye Baby
Speak Now (Taylor's Version)	Speak Now
Speak Now (Taylor's Version)	Mean
Speak Now (Taylor's Version)	The Story Of Us
Speak Now (Taylor's Version)	Enchanted
Speak Now (Taylor's Version)	Long Live
Speak Now (Taylor's Version)	Timeless
Red (Taylor's Version)	State Of Grace
Red (Taylor's Version)	I Knew You Were Trouble
Red (Taylor's Version)	I Almost Do
Red (Taylor's Version)	The Lucky One
Red (Taylor's Version)	Everything Has Changed
Red (Taylor's Version)	Come Back...Be Here
Red (Taylor's Version)	Girl At Home
Red (Taylor's Version)	Ronan
Red (Taylor's Version)	Nothing New
Red (Taylor's Version)	I Bet You Think About Me
Red (Taylor's Version)	Forever Winter
1989 (Taylor's Version)	Welcome To New York

1989 (Taylor's Version) 1989 (Taylor's Version) 1989 (Taylor's Version) 1989 (Taylor's Version) 1989 (Taylor's Version) 1989 (Taylor's Version)	This Love You Are In Love "Slut!" Say Don't Go Is It Over Now? Sweeter Than Fiction
Reputation Reputation Reputation Reputation Reputation Reputation Reputation	...Ready For It? End Game I Did Something Bad Delicate Getaway Car Dancing With Our Hands Tied This Is Why We Can't Have Nice Things
Lover Lover Lover Lover Lover	I Forgot That You Existed Paper Rings Death By A Thousand Cuts Afterglow It's Nice To Have A Friend
Folklore Folklore Folklore Folklore Folklore Folklore Folklore	The 1 Cardigan The Last Great American Dynasty This Is Me Trying Illicit Affairs Mad Woman Hoax
Evermore Evermore Evermore	Dorothea Cowboy Like Me Long Story Short
Midnights (The Til Dawn Edition) Midnights (The Til Dawn Edition) Midnights (The Til Dawn Edition) Midnights (The Til Dawn Edition) Midnights (The Til Dawn Edition) Midnights (The Til Dawn Edition)	Midnight Rain Bejeweled Labyrinth Karma Paris Would've, Could've, Should've
The Tortured Poets Department (The Anthology) The Tortured Poets Department (The Anthology) The Tortured Poets Department (The Anthology) The Tortured Poets Department (The Anthology)	My Boy Only Breaks His Favorite Toys Fresh Out The Slammer Florida!!! Guilty As Sin?

The Tortured Poets Department (The Anthology)	Clara Bow
The Tortured Poets Department (The Anthology)	The Albatross
The Tortured Poets Department (The Anthology)	Chloe Or Sam Or Sophia Or Marcus
The Tortured Poets Department (The Anthology)	So High School
The Tortured Poets Department (The Anthology)	The Prophecy
The Tortured Poets Department (The Anthology)	Cassandra

Table 8: Swift Songs that were excluded from the dataset