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Music and Social Development in Adolescence

M Tarrant

Abstract

This thesis investigated the role of the social context in adolescents’ musical behaviour. Six studies were conducted to investigate how statements about music contribute to social relationships in adolescence. The studies assessed adolescents’ behaviour at various levels of social psychological explanation (c.f. Doise, 1986). A literature review is presented in Section A. Section B addressed behaviour at individual and interpersonal levels of explanation. Chapter 6 investigated adolescents’ individual reasons for listening to music. The study demonstrated that music has the potential to fulfil important individual motives concerning identity and mood regulation. Chapters 7 and 8 addressed the interpersonal behaviour of adolescents. Chapter 7 demonstrated that music has the potential to influence adolescents’ friendship formation and help maintain existing peer relationships, and Chapter 8 revealed how adolescents use music in the process of social comparison. The final set of studies, reported in Section C, addressed behaviour at the intergroup level of explanation. Chapters 9 and 10 investigated the behaviour of adolescents in experimentally contrived ‘minimal groups’, and Chapter 11 examined behaviour in a more socially meaningful context. It was demonstrated that music makes an important contribution to social identity in adolescence, and that adolescents’ intergroup behaviour is related to their self-esteem. Together, the studies presented in this thesis indicate that music is an intrinsic part of the adolescent process. Adolescents’ musical behaviour contributes to their social development, and as such interacts ultimately with their status as members of social groups. Future research should continue to address the impact of this wider social context in developing a more theoretically informed understanding of adolescent involvement with music.
SPECIAL NOTE

ITEM SCANNED AS SUPPLIED
PAGINATION IS AS SEEN
Chapter 1: Introduction and outline of the chapters

1.1 Introduction

This thesis investigates the consequences of musical affiliation for adolescent social development. Tajfel, Jaspars, and Fraser (1984, p. 3) contended that social psychology should account for the relationship between “human psychological functioning and the large scale social processes and the events which shape this functioning and are shaped by it”: accordingly the research presented here aims to address the social context in which adolescent musical behaviour takes place. It is argued that the social network exerts a crucial influence on musical behaviour in adolescence, and that this behaviour is ultimately affected by adolescents’ existence as members of social groups. This proposition is informed by Tajfel et al.’s (1984, p. 5) argument that:

In our judgments of other people, in forming stereotypes, in learning a second language, in our work relations, in our concern with justice, we do not act as isolated individuals but as social beings who derive an important part of our identity from the human groups and social categories we belong to; and we act in accordance with this awareness.

In the development of identity, an adolescent’s reference groups become an increasingly important source of support and guidance (Montemayor, 1982; Youniss and Haynie, 1992). A large number of studies indicate that adolescence is a period when group behaviour is very apparent (e.g. Coleman, 1974; Gavin and Furman,
1989; Steinberg and Silverberg, 1986), and adolescents increasingly turn to the group as a frame of reference for their own behaviour (Coleman, 1979; Elkin and Handel, 1978; Sebald, 1989). Indeed, an important predictor of psychological well-being during this period is adolescents’ perceptions of their position within their social network (Robinson, 1995). The observation that people’s stated opinions vary according to the social context within which they are expressed (see for example Chapter 5; Finnäs, 1989) provides one demonstration of adolescents’ awareness of the wider social group context in which their behaviour occurs. In recognising the importance of the social context, this thesis therefore adds to the growing literature which addresses the influence of social factors on musical preference (c.f. Konecni, 1982; LeBlanc, 1980).

Affiliation with popular music characterises most young people’s lives, and evidence for this can be found in the listening and purchasing behaviour of adolescents (e.g. Geter and Streisand, 1995; Lyle and Hoffman, 1972; Zillmann and Gan, 1997). Although empirical research into the consequences of such affiliation is sparse, media reports often portray popular culture as a negative feature of the adolescent process. For example, it is often argued that certain kinds of ‘defiant’ music cause adolescents to engage in deviant behaviour (e.g. Gladstone, 1984; King, 1988; see Cavicchi, 1998 for a review). Caughey (1984) suggested that music fans live in ‘artificial’ worlds and engage in ‘artificial’ social relations, which perhaps implies that they have somehow been ‘corrupted’ by popular culture (see also e.g. DesBarres, 1988; Schickel, 1985). Similarly, Burchill (1999) recently made a scathing attack on popular music performers. Claiming that pop stars merely create the illusion that they truly care
about adolescent concerns, Burchill (p. 12) advised:

See them and weep, these sultans of sulk, these pharaohs of futility, whose careers show us not artists with a burning desire to create beauty. Rather they are mewling, puking babies who never managed to have a decent relationship with their parents and are only happy screwing up the business of familial regard for everyone else.

However, might music serve a much more practical and positive function in young people’s lives? Music might be something with which adolescents affiliate, and which unites them with like-minded people. As such, music might make an important contribution to social development by aiding the formation and maintenance of a positive identity during adolescence.

1.2 Theoretical framework The research presented here addresses adolescent development from a social psychological perspective. Following the criticism that social psychology was reductionist in its account of human behaviour (e.g. Moscovici, 1972), Doise (1986) proposed four ‘levels of explanation’, or ‘analysis’, which he said should be considered in any attempt to provide a comprehensive explanation of social phenomena. Firstly, the intrapersonal (or individual) level of analysis addresses behaviour from a purely individual perspective (e.g. by investigating individual social attributions). The interpersonal/situational level addresses behaviour that occurs between individuals, but does not account for the wider social conditions in which such behaviour occurs (i.e. it is situation specific). The positional level addresses interpersonal behaviour in the context in which it occurs (e.g. by acknowledging the
social status of the individuals). Finally, the ideological level of analysis addresses interpersonal behaviour in the context of the wider social relationships in which it occurs. This level considers the behaviour of individuals in their social groups (e.g. by investigating the behaviour of one group towards another group), and as such, takes account of the large scale social processes which influence human behaviour (Doise, 1986).

Developing this approach to social psychology, Hewstone, Stroebe, Codol, and Stephenson (1988) proposed that behaviour at each level of analysis is influenced by, and influences, behaviour at other levels. For example, they suggested that interpersonal interaction can be influenced by individual perceptions of previous interactions (i.e. intrapersonal level), or expectations of the outcome of the current interaction. Alternatively, interpersonal interaction may be influenced by the status of the individuals (positional level), or by the social group membership of the perceiver and perceived (ideological level). Summarising the importance of these four levels of analysis, Hewstone et al. (p. 25) advised:

Social scientists must therefore come to terms with a series of dialectics between successive levels of social phenomena - interaction, relationships, social structure, socio-cultural structure and intergroup relationships. And at the same time they must remember that each level represents not an entity but a process of continuous creation.

Some attempts have been made to integrate Doise’s (1986) four levels of analysis (see
Most notably, social identity theory (SIT: Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel and Turner, 1986; Turner, 1975) has been regarded as particularly successful in this respect. SIT explains behaviour which at face value appears to be solely individual (e.g. prejudice and discrimination) in the context of the wider social group in which it occurs (see Chapter 3). By acknowledging the impact of the group context on an individual’s behaviour, research in the tradition of SIT has undoubtedly led the growth of European social psychology since World War II (see Abrams and Hogg, 1998).

Each level of analysis should be readily observable in the musical behaviour of young people. For example, at the intrapersonal level, individuals may use music as a means of regulating their affective states (e.g. for mood enhancement). At interpersonal and positional levels, individuals may use statements about musical preference as a means of attracting new friends, or to advertise to others the appropriateness of their own preferences. They may also use statements of musical preference in the processes of impression formation. At the ideological level, the search for a positive social identity may implicate the use of music in the intergroup behaviour of adolescents: the social connotations associated with different musical styles may help adolescents distinguish their own group from other groups, and this in turn may enable them to form positive evaluations of their own group.

1.3 Outline of the Chapters The present thesis is organised into four sections. Section A contains four chapters which review the relevant literature. Chapter 2 addresses the literature on adolescent social development. It outlines the central issues concerning
identity formation, and discusses the changing nature of the social network during adolescence. This review highlights the importance of the social group in adolescence, and group research is thus the primary focus of Chapter 3. Chapters 4 and 5 review literature directly relevant to musical behaviour: Chapter 4 considers the problems involved in assessing musical interests, and outlines the approach adopted by this thesis; Chapter 5 reviews the literature which addresses adolescent musical behaviour. The latter outlines the extent to which adolescents are involved with music, and considers research that has attempted to relate this involvement to the adolescent process. Chapter 5 also presents a series of research questions that are addressed in Chapters 6-11.

Section B contains three studies which addressed the role of music in intrapersonal (or individual) and interpersonal/positional processes. Chapter 6 reports a study which investigated adolescents’ reasons for listening to music. The study reported in Chapter 7 investigated three aspects of adolescent musical behaviour; namely (i) the extent to which adolescents participate in and enjoy leisure activities containing music; (ii) adolescents’ perceptions of the role of music in friendship selection; and (iii) the perceived relationship between adolescents’ musical preferences and those of their social network. Chapter 8 develops point (iii) above, and reports a study which investigated adolescents’ uses of music in the process of social comparison.

Section C addresses the behaviour of adolescents in an intergroup context (i.e. at Doise’s ideological level), and considers the degree to which adolescents use music to distinguish between social groups. Chapters 9 and 10 present two studies which
employed the so-called ‘minimal group paradigm’ procedure to investigate the role of music in adolescents’ discriminatory behaviour. In order to demonstrate how musical preference issues relate to social categorization in more realistic social contexts, the study presented in Chapter 11 examined the discriminatory behaviour of adolescents in pre-existing social groups. Finally, Section D discusses the findings of Chapters 6-11, the theoretical and methodological issues raised by these, and details some issues that remain unresolved.
SECTION A: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE
Chapter 2 Adolescent development

2.1 Introduction

The experience of being an adolescent is reported to be similar across different industrialised Western cultures (Cotterell, 1996; Heaven, 1994), and social psychological theory is based primarily on research conducted in Western society, particularly North America (Scott and Scott, 1998). Most of this research describes adolescence as a period of transitions from childhood to adulthood (Coles, 1995; Palmonari, Carugati, Bitti, and Sarchielli, 1984), a period of maturation and adjustment in terms of physical, emotional, and cognitive abilities (Durkin, 1995; Jackson and Bosma, 1992). Whilst individual differences in maturation rates make this period difficult to define chronologically (Durkin, 1995), adolescence broadly represents the second decade of life (Heaven, 1994).

The nature of the processes that occur during this period have been of continual interest to researchers from a variety of disciplines. Whilst there is often disagreement about many of the processes of adolescence, it is undoubtedly a period of identity development that is associated with increasing awareness of who one is and what one will become (Durkin, 1995).

2.2 Identity formation Marcia (1966) developed Erikson’s (1959) account of identity formation and identified four states of identity that are characteristic of adolescence: diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium, and achievement. The adolescent is portrayed as
experiencing an ‘identity crisis’ (although many might disagree with this term), which involves the exploration of possible identities. This crisis is subsequently resolved through a commitment to a particular identity (Newman and Newman, 1988). Identity diffusion is characterised by a lack of exploration and lack of commitment regarding a particular identity: the adolescent has not yet experienced an identity crisis. This is a state typically experienced in early adolescence. Identity foreclosure represents a commitment to a set of beliefs, or identities, without having experienced a crisis. An adolescent in a state of foreclosure may have adopted an identity imposed on him/her by others, such as the case of an adolescent following a particular vocation because his/her parents also did. Identity moratorium represents a state of identity crisis. The individual may have engaged in the tentative exploration of alternative identities, but not yet made a firm commitment to a given identity. Finally, adolescents in a state of identity achievement have experienced a crisis, have explored the alternative possibilities, and have made a commitment to a particular identity (Marcia, 1966). As such, identity achievement represents maturity, and is regarded by some to indicate the completion of adolescence (Heaven, 1994), although identity development of course continues throughout the lifespan (e.g. Damon, 1983; Waterman, 1982; see also Durkin, 1995).

Marcia’s (1966) conceptualisation of identity represents an ‘ego-psychological’ approach to adolescent development which focuses on the identity ‘status’ of the individual at any given time (Jackson and Bosma, 1992). However, a large amount of research also conceptualises identity in terms of its evaluative dimensions. Firstly, the field that has become known as the social-cognitive approach considers how
behaviour and thought processes contribute to self-concept and self-esteem (see Jackson and Bosma, 1992). Secondly, the social identity approach (Tajfel, 1978) considers those aspects of self-concept that are derived from the social groups to which individuals belong (see Chapter 3). Although these different approaches to identity inevitably lead to some confusion and lack of clarity (Jackson and Bosma, 1992), it is likely that each approach is inter-related: a positive evaluation of one’s group and oneself is likely to ultimately contribute to the formation of identity in the ‘ego-psychological’ sense of the term; it will contribute to *identity achievement*. As such, each approach has something important to say about adolescent development.

In an attempt to bring together some of the processes underlying this development, researchers have identified a series of ‘developmental tasks’ in which adolescents become engaged *en route* to maturity. Indeed, the available literature tends to broadly support the findings of one particular study by Roscoe and Peterson (1984). They investigated the extent to which a sample of university undergraduates in the USA reported themselves to be engaged in each of a selection of developmental tasks. Results showed that whilst the majority of participants classed themselves as young *adults*, they reported themselves as being engaged in mainly *adolescent* developmental tasks (including achieving mature relations with peers; emotional independence from parents; socially responsible behaviour; and acquiring a set of beliefs). These findings support the above contention that identity formation may be something that continues during adulthood.

2.3 The changing social network The popular notion of adolescence as a troublesome
period may stem from the observation that adolescents progressively become less dependent on parents as they increasingly associate with their peers. The notion is augmented by the assumption that peers are an important source of (often negative) social influence (e.g. Hagan, 1991; McAllister, Perry, and Maccoby, 1979; Warr, 1993). Indeed, a notable feature of adolescent development is the changing prominence of different members of the social network: in the development of independence from parents, adolescents spend an increasing amount of time with similarly-aged peers, and become increasingly closer to those peers (Larson and Richards, 1991).

Coleman’s (1979) focal theory of adolescence describes the changing emphasis on different social relationships throughout adolescence. Focal theory maintains that different ages give rise to different emphases in social relationships: the focus of relationships changes gradually from concerns about heterosexual relationships (around 13 years of age), through concerns about peer relations (around 15 years), to concerns about parental relations (around 17 years). The theory maintains that adolescents cope with one ‘focal issue’ at a time, and in doing so avoid the instability, or ‘storm and stress’ traditionally assumed to characterise adolescence. Coleman however stresses that there is considerable overlap between the phases: the theory is not intended to depict a stage-like process.

The relationship concerns that are salient at any given age are also reflected in the leisure activities that adolescents are involved with. Hendry’s (1983) focal theory of leisure mirrors Coleman’s (1979) theory and proposes that until around 13 years of
age, when adolescents become concerned with heterosexual relationships, leisure pursuits are organised predominantly by others. Participation in organised pursuits such as youth clubs and the like provides young people with a safe environment in which they can interact with and learn about the opposite sex. By middle adolescence, relationship concerns are with the peer group. With a growing desire to be less involved with adult-organised activities, leisure activities focus on casual pursuits, including for example ‘hanging around’ with friends, and talking. Finally, Hendry (1983) notes that by late adolescence, relationships with parents are the focal concern, as the young person is close to becoming an independent adult. There is a subsequent increased interest in adult leisure activities, such as going to nightclubs and public houses, activities which Hendry terms ‘commercial’ leisure. Coleman’s (1979) focal theory and Hendry’s (1983) focal theory of leisure have proved to be particularly influential in structuring modern adolescent research:

Terminology such as turbulence, storm and stress, and crisis has been replaced by words such as transition, pathways, continuity and discontinuity. Attention is now directed to processes of change, coping and adjustment to the varied tasks typically encountered during the adolescent years (Jackson and Bosma, 1992, p. 331).

2.4 Relationships with parents Contrary to lay opinion, the increased focus on peers that develops during adolescence does not necessarily involve a corresponding reduction in the quality of parental relations. The often referred to ‘generation gap’ that exists between children and their parents during adolescence is not as prominent as was once believed: adolescents do not wholly reject their parental values in favour
of those advocated by their peers (e.g. Coleman and Hendry, 1990). Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that adolescents are more susceptible to peer pressure in prosocial or neutral behaviours than they are to anti-social behaviours, which again suggests that adolescence does not represent a complete rejection of parental values (Youniss and Haynie, 1992; Heaven, 1994).

Youniss and Haynie’s (1992) review of the literature concluded that parents and peers can often have complementary influences on adolescents, arguing that since adolescents tend to choose friends with similar values as themselves, parental values are generally reinforced through peer interactions. However, although parents and peers tend to both push adolescents in the same general direction, they have influence in different domains. For instance, it has been shown that adolescents seek the advice of parents when faced with decisions about vocational choices, but turn to their peers for guidance in more ‘social’ matters, including lifestyle choices (Noller and Patton, 1990; Sebald, 1989; Youniss and Haynie, 1992; Montemayor, 1982). Elkin and Handel (1978) suggested that the peer group, in addition to serving a socialisation function, also conveys information on issues which are of concern to adolescents such as for example, sex, leisure trends, and clothing. It is also worth noting that the issues on which peer groups do have the most influence, such as hairstyle, music, and dress, do not seriously threaten the influence of parents (Youniss and Haynie, 1992). Supporting this notion, Steinberg and Silverberg (1986) argued that the development of independence from parents should not be regarded as a sudden rejection of parental values in favour of those of the peer group, but rather a gradual development of emotional autonomy and feelings of self-reliance.
In summary, increased affiliation with peers during adolescence is not tantamount to a rejection of parental values: “rather than a generation gap, a general attitude of tolerance seems to characterize the young person’s perspective on his or her parents” (van Wel, 1994, p. 227). Indeed, the maintenance of good relations with parents may actually be beneficial for adjustment during this major life phase, a situation that many adolescents themselves acknowledge, as Noller and Patton (1990, p. 62) note:

Adolescents are generally willing to talk things over with and listen to parents who are prepared to try and understand their position. They want to have more independence and autonomy, but within the context of a supportive family.

2.5 Relationships with friends Although the increased prominence of peers in the adolescent’s social network is not necessarily accompanied by a decrease in the quality of parental relations, relationships with friends and peers are reported to be qualitatively different to those with parents. Comparing the roles of parents and peers, Sullivan (1953) argued that friendships with age mates are important for positive personality development, something which cannot be achieved solely through the parent-child relationship. From an early age, children learn the skills of social interaction necessary for maintaining positive social relations, and friends become particularly important in this process during adolescence (Youniss and Haynie, 1992). The functions of friendships are far-reaching: “Friends are important sources of companionship and recreation, share advice and valued possessions, serve as trusted confidants and critics, act as loyal allies, and provide stability in times of stress or
transition” (Asher, 1990, p. 3). Friendship also offers ‘consensual validation’ in that friends rely on each other for information, feedback, and confirmation of behaviour and attitudes (Youniss and Haynie, 1992). It is for this reason that adolescents choose as friends those whom they perceive as similar to themselves in a variety of domains: “we like people who are similar to ourselves in background, in interests and in leisure activities, in beliefs and in values, in way of thinking, and in life-style” (Argyle and Henderson, 1985, p. 71).

However, decisions about friendship are also influenced by the social context in which they are made. Zarbatany, Ghesquiere, and Mohr (1992) demonstrated that interactions with friends can differ according to whether or not these take place in a competitive or co-operative context (see also Berndt, 1983). Zarbatany et al. compared the friendship expectations of 10-12 year old adolescents in relationship-focused activities (such as talking on the telephone, watching television, and listening to music) with expectations in competitive activities (such as basketball and soccer). The results demonstrated that, in competitive activities, friends were expected to act fairly, be ego-reinforcing, and offer preferential treatment which would allow the participants to demonstrate their self-worth and uniqueness. In relationship-focused activities, expectations differed such that inclusion and acceptance were emphasised as important behaviours. Whilst having common interests was reported as important in both contexts, these were regarded as particularly important in the co-operative activities of watching television and listening to music. The authors suggested that the type of activities in which adolescents engage together may influence the quality of friendship that results. As such, the continued success of the friendship may depend
on the friends’ ability to recognise and act in terms of context-specific behavioural expectations.

2.6 Intimacy in friendship The ability to adapt one’s behaviour according to the social context, together with the initial similarities in interests, feelings, and personalities which influence friendship selection, may encourage a degree of intimacy, emotional support, and reciprocity in adolescence which is not seen in children’s friendships (Zarbatany et al. 1992). These qualities are actually recognised as important by adolescents themselves: their beliefs about friendships “have indicated the centrality of the themes of intimate disclosure, true companionship, and caring about another’s welfare” (Lempers and Clarke-Lempers, 1993, p. 90). Adolescents regard companionship as important, and often form strong attachments with friends (Heaven, 1994). Through secure attachments with others, adolescents maintain a sense of psychological security, and a sense of trust and acceptance (Bowlby, 1974; Cotterell, 1996). Secure attachments are also implicated in the maintenance of a positive identity: Mannarino (1978) demonstrated that adolescents who reported having a close friend also reported higher levels of self-esteem than those who did not have a close friend. Indeed, such benefits appear to continue throughout the lifespan: “human beings at any age are most well-adjusted when they have confidence in the accessibility and responsiveness of a trusted other” (Armsden and Greenberg, 1987, p. 428).

Several studies indicate that same-sex rather than opposite-sex friendships are particularly important in this process of attachment formation during adolescence.
Paul and White (1990) note that same-sex friendships are important in identity role experimentation and in learning to be intimate, a view which supports the earlier ideas of Erikson (1959, 1968). Similarly, Lempers and Clark-Lempers (1993) found that both males and females regarded same-sex friendships as more important than opposite-sex friendships, particularly in terms of self-exploration and identity formation, or what they termed “affirmation of the self” (p. 102). It follows, therefore, that adolescents seem to engage typically in unisexual interactions, especially during early-to-middle adolescence: it is not until later adolescence that fully developed heterosexual cliques begin to interact (Dunphy, 1963, 1990).

Friendship bonds are reported to be equally strong in male and female friendships, and both boys and girls report having at least one significant friend (Blyth, Hill, and Theil, 1982; Crockett, Losoff, and Peterson, 1984). However, female friendships are often cited as being more intimate and characterised by greater self-disclosure than are male friendships (Blyth and Foster-Clark, 1987; see also Youniss and Haynie, 1992). Zarbatany et al. (1992) suggest that this gender difference may be a reflection of the different contexts in which boys’ and girls’ friendships operate. They suggest that girls are more likely than boys to participate in relationship-orientated activities which may promote cohesion and intimacy. This effect has been explained as a product of the differential socialisation of boys and girls, with females socialised to value interpersonal relationships to a greater extent than males (Douvan and Adelson, 1966; see also Archer, 1984). However, more recent research has reported no gender differences when other measures of intimacy are taken, including levels of spontaneity, frankness, and shared activities (Sebald, 1989; Sharabany, Gershoni, and
Hofman, 1981). Youniss and Haynie (1992) concluded that this reduction in gender differences might be attributable to the changing workforce in the late twentieth century: females are an increasingly significant aspect of the workforce, and may therefore have less opportunity for increased self-disclosure than they did previously. At the same time, males are reported as becoming more relationship-orientated as they become increasingly involved with child-rearing practices (Yogman, Cooley, and Kindlon, 1988). It is possible, therefore, that future research will increasingly highlight gender similarities in social psychological development.

2.1 Relationships with the peer group The adolescent social network, however, contains members other than just parents and close friends. Interactions with friends exist within a wider social context, an essential part of which is the adolescent peer group. The interactions between an adolescent and his or her peer group are different to those with friends because peer groups contain members who might not necessarily be close friends of the adolescent (Heaven, 1994). It is therefore important to acknowledge that peer group relationships are a potentially important feature of adolescent development. Peer groups embody the cultural norms and values to which individual members adhere, influencing attitudes and activities relevant to peer culture, including dress style, dating behaviour, drinking behaviour, social events, and even book and magazine choices (Sebald, 1989).

Newman and Newman (1986) proposed that affiliation with a peer group is itself essential for successful identity achievement. They suggested that the group is of particular importance between the ages of about 12-16 years, and this period
represents the so-called ‘group identity versus alienation’ crisis. The adolescent must first accommodate and resolve the need for peer group acceptance and approval before he or she can fully develop a sense of self as an individual distinct from the group. Indeed, susceptibility to peer pressure has been shown to peak during this period (Berndt, 1979; Coleman, 1974; Costanzo and Shaw, 1966; see also Steinberg and Silverberg 1986). The high levels of conformity at this time suggests that there are rigid norms determining behaviour: “teens conform lest they be criticized for “sticking out” or being different” (Gavin and Furman, 1989, p. 832). The reduction in conformity levels later in adolescence may reflect a subsequent desire to be seen as independent (Gavin and Furman, 1989).

Brown (1989) has distinguished between three types of adolescent peer group. These are dyads, cliques, and crowds. Dyads are normally composed of pairs of individuals who are close friends. Cliques are comprised of a small group of friends, some of whom may be close. They are typically unisexual, and members tend to be of similar age and social class (Dunphy, 1963; Heaven, 1994). Brown notes that cliques are particularly apparent in early-to-middle adolescence, and are the main basis for group behaviour (Brown, 1989). The group norms to which members are pressurised to adhere are most noticeable in the members’ appearance: Cotterell’s (1996) observations of Australian adolescents in shopping centres revealed that group members wore similar clothes, had similar hairstyles, and participated in the same activities.

Crowds are larger-scale social groupings and are an amalgamation of several cliques
They are typically comprised of older adolescents than are cliques, and may contain some people with whom the adolescent does not actually interact, but with whom he or she still identifies (Dunphy, 1963). Such groups represent psychological group formation and are sometimes referred to as ‘reputation-based’ groups, indicating that their existence does not depend upon face-to-face interaction (Brown, 1989; Cotterell, 1996). Unlike cliques, crowds are not restricted by size, but like cliques they have distinctive identifying features, including clothing and hairstyle, speech mannerisms, and behaviour. Members of crowds also share activities, including going to discos, cinemas, and participating in sport and the like (Brake, 1985; Cotterell, 1996). However, unlike cliques, crowds provide the opportunity for heterosexual interaction (Dunphy, 1963).

Such descriptions of crowd characteristics are not based solely on researchers’ observations. It appears that adolescents themselves acknowledge the existence of these reputation-based groups. Participants in Denholm, Horniblow, and Smalley’s (1992) study demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the crowd’s defining features, and this extended to the ability to distinguish between the leisure activities and types of music enjoyed by different crowds. The participants were also aware of the social status conferred upon different groups. For example, investigating high school peer crowds in the USA, Brown and Lohr (1987) distinguished three peer crowds, each with a different status: the jock-populars, the druggie-toughs, and the loners. Notably, those adolescents who categorised themselves as jock-populars (the group with the highest status) reported highest levels of self-esteem. Together, this research suggests that membership of a popular group may be beneficial for psychological well-being.
and social identity. These benefits cannot be achieved from dyadic interactions alone (see Chapter 3 for a discussion of the role of self-esteem in group processes).

2.8 Peer groups and social development Affiliation with a peer group therefore appears to be beneficial for social development. The peer group is seen as helping the adolescent in the transition from parental dependency to independence and autonomy through several processes, including socialisation, bonding or attachment, and belonging (Sebald, 1989). Summarising the importance of the peer group in the development of identity, Gavin and Furman (1989, p. 827) note: “Without being connected to the peer group, one may be left without an important source of support during a period of physical, emotional, and social upheaval”. They continue: “The sense of belonging gained by membership in a popular group may allow teens to feel secure in the social arena, bolstering their sense of identity as they seek to separate from the family unit” (p. 832).

It is therefore unsurprising that adolescents are motivated to be accepted by the group (Heaven, 1994). Gavin and Furman (1989) note that at the height of its influence, the group is perceived as relatively impermeable, a perception which serves to provide its members with status and feelings of self-worth. Indeed, rejection by the group is related to feelings of loneliness and increased aggression (Parkhurst and Asher, 1992; Heaven, 1994), and Buhrmester (1992) reported that those adolescents who had close relations with the peer group were less prone to anxiety and depression than were those who did not have close relations.
The peer group consequently plays an important role in identity development and social maturation, providing the opportunity to experiment with different roles and behaviours (Heaven, 1994; Youniss and Haynie, 1992). By late adolescence group membership is regarded as less important, and susceptibility to peer pressure reduces. Peer group ties become weaker, and peer groups are perceived as more permeable than previously, developments which encourage interactions with members from other groups (Berndt, 1979; Clasen and Brown, 1985; Costanzo and Shaw, 1966; Gavin and Furman, 1989; Heaven, 1994). These developments are consistent with Dunphy’s (1963) conceptualisation of peer group structure which proposes that in late adolescence individuals become concerned with interpersonal relationships, especially those involving members of the opposite sex. The decrease in the importance of group membership marks a particular phase of adolescent development in that the adolescent is resolving the crisis of group identity versus alienation (Newman and Newman, 1986). As such, the increased permeability of the peer group provides the opportunity for the development of interpersonal relationships to fulfil one’s needs (Cotterell, 1996; Gavin and Furman, 1989).

2.9 Social comparison The extent to which adolescents perceive their relations with their social network as positive or negative is theoretically important: as described above, beliefs about one’s standing within the social network may contribute to feelings of self-worth (see also Robinson, 1995). Approval from others who are experiencing similar developmental changes may be a particularly valued indicator of social standing: Robinson demonstrated that as a type of social support, approval from other adolescents was related more highly to feelings of self-worth than was emotional
support or instrumental support (e.g. giving helpful information). Approval may be particularly important because it “may be internalized as positive feelings toward the self” (Robinson, 1995, p. 255). Friends and peers are the primary instigators of such support (Gavin and Furman, 1989; Hays, 1988; Meeus and Dekovic, 1995), and adolescents are therefore likely to be motivated to seek positive evaluation from others.

A central feature of this validation process is engagement in social comparison: adolescents compare their own attributes with those of others. Same-age reference groups are important agents of social comparison: Festinger’s (1954) theory of social comparison proposes that the people with whom we compare ourselves tend to be those who are similar to us in opinions and abilities. Similarly, Marsh and Parker’s (1984) ‘frame of reference’ hypothesis suggests that comparisons with such reference groups enable people to form an appropriate self-concept (see also Rogers, Smith, and Coleman, 1978). These theories may explain why adolescents choose friends whom they perceive as similar to themselves, or friends who they regard as approximating their ideal self: it is possible to make realistic comparisons between the self and such people (Argyle and Henderson, 1985).

However, whilst social comparisons enable individuals to form accurate self-appraisals (Festinger, 1954), research also suggests that people prefer to make downward social comparisons which are likely to produce positive self-assessments. In short, people tend to display self-related biases which reflect the over-evaluation of their own attributes (e.g. illusory superiority) relative to the comparison other (see
review by Hoorens, 1993). For instance, when asked to compare themselves with another, individuals typically claim that they possess positively valued characteristics (e.g. honesty, intelligence) to a greater extent than the comparison other. In contrast, for negatively valued characteristics (e.g. hostility, credulity), they tend to report that these reflect themselves to a lesser extent than they do the other (Dunning, Meyerowitz, and Holsberg, 1989; Hoorens and Buunk, 1992). This bias is particularly marked in the case of abilities which are central to self-concept (Tesser, 1988). In the case of abilities which are not central to self-concept, individuals may engage in upward comparisons: these may also have positive effects on feelings of self-worth through the so-called ‘basking in reflected glory’ effect (Cialdini et al., 1976). This suggestion is neatly summarised by Brewer and Crano (1994, p. 221) who say that:

When an ability is important or highly self-relevant, it is threatening to self-esteem when someone close to us performs well. For important skills, individuals react more negatively to a friend’s good performance than they do to the same performance from a stranger. But on dimensions of low self-relevance, individuals react more positively to being outperformed by a friend than by a stranger.

However, the positive evaluation of the self that ensues from downward social comparisons is not necessarily achieved at the expense of devaluing the comparison object. The ‘superior conformity of the self’ hypothesis (Codol, 1975) maintains that individuals may evaluate others positively, and at the same time evaluate the self even more positively. Indeed, life-satisfaction research has identified a positive correlation between ratings of one’s own marital contentment and ratings of the comparison
other’s marital contentment (Buunk and van der Eijnden, 1997). Summarising such behaviour, Diener and Fujita (1997, p. 335) state that:

In those domains in which respondents rate themselves highly, they also rate their comparison others highly, and at the very same time report that they are better off relative to their comparison others in these domains.

2.10 Summary and conclusion Friends and peers make important contributions to identity development during adolescence. They aid social development through the promotion of self-exploration and interaction with same-sex and opposite-sex others. They also provide important support during a period of biological and psychological change. Friends offer advice and act as a ‘sounding block’ for the adolescent’s problems. They also promote companionship, intimacy and self-disclosure. Adolescents form strong attachments with their friends, and these attachments are important for psychological security and self-esteem. Peer groups offer access to shared activities, and instil in the adolescent a sense of belonging and group identification through adherence to group norms and values.

The research literature provides strong support for Weiss’ (1974) conceptualisation of the functions of peer groups namely, to encourage integration into a network of similarly aged others, and to provide reassurance of one’s own worth through social validation. The ability of the group to fulfil these functions peaks in early-to-middle adolescence, and it is at this time that the adolescent is likely to be most motivated to gain acceptance and social approval from the group (Gavin and Furman, 1989;
Robinson, 1995; Steinberg and Silverberg, 1986). Gavin and Furman (1989) suggested that peer groups offer a sense of belonging during a period of changing social relations (i.e. when the adolescent is entering high school, forging new friendships etc.). The benefits of peer group affiliation are ultimately related to identity achievement, as Cotterell (1996, p. 45) notes: “We need to accept that peer groups provide young people with room to develop an identity of their own, using the vehicle of group identity”. An essential aspect of this self-exploration and identity development is the process of social comparison: individuals can only evaluate their own behaviours and abilities through the social comparisons that they make with others in their frame of reference. Friends and peers are clearly major agents of social reference for such evaluations.

This review of the literature has considered mainly that behaviour which occurs at Doise’s (1986) intrapersonal (individual) and interpersonal/positional levels. As noted in Chapter 1, Tajfel et al. (1984) suggested that our behaviour is also influenced by the groups of which we are members (i.e. at the ideological level). This may be particularly apparent during adolescence given the increasing salience of peers during this period. It is likely therefore that the evaluations that an adolescent makes of him or herself are determined not only by social comparisons with other individuals in the frame of reference, but also by the outcome of social comparisons between different reference groups, i.e. between ingroups and outgroups. Despite the fact that a large body of literature exists which seeks to explain the behaviour of people in groups, this has rarely been applied specifically to the study of adolescent processes. Chapter 3 therefore develops a framework for the analysis and explanation of adolescent
behaviour in the context of the social group.
SPECIAL NOTE

ITEM SCANNED AS SUPPLIED
PAGINATION IS AS SEEN
Chapter 3 Intergroup processes

3.1 Introduction

Chapter 2 highlighted the importance of the social group in adolescent development. This chapter considers research into group processes which, although not specifically intended to explain adolescent behaviour, clearly has the potential to do so. A particularly influential researcher of social groups was Henri Tajfel who can be considered the instigator of modern group theory. In recognising the reality of group behaviour as distinct from individual behaviour, the social group was defined as follows:

We can conceptualize a group, in this sense, as a collection of individuals who perceive themselves to be members of the same social category, share some emotional involvement in this common definition of themselves, and achieve some degree of social consensus about the evaluation of their group and their membership of it (Tajfel and Turner, 1979, p. 40).

Following the earlier work of Sherif (1936) and Asch (1952), Turner and Giles (1981) point out that the group is both a psychological entity and a real social product: it is the former in that members define themselves as members of a shared social category; and it is a real social product to the extent that members act in terms of their group membership. It is further proposed that individuals may define themselves as a group member even in the absence of other group members (Sherif, 1967). Furthermore, an
awareness of one’s membership of a particular group - the ingroup - necessarily excludes certain other individuals - the outgroup. This distinction between the ingroup and outgroup leads inevitably to intergroup behaviour, defined by Tajfel and Turner (1979, p. 7) as follows:

Any behaviour displayed by one or more actors toward one or more others that is based on the actors’ identification of themselves and the others as belonging to different social categories.

In contrast, interpersonal behaviour is that in which individual characteristics are more salient than group boundaries. Tajfel and Turner (1979, p. 34) define interpersonal behaviour as:

The interaction between two or more individuals which is fully determined by their interpersonal relationships and individual characteristics and not at all affected by various social groups or categories to which they belong.

3.2 Early intergroup research Despite Le Bon’s (1896) early distinction between individual and group behaviour, it was not until the 1960s that this view entered the mainstream of social psychology. Turner and Giles (1981) note that Le Bon’s ideas were dismissed for many years, and researchers maintained an individualistic approach to the group, theorising about the group on the basis of dyadic interactions. Such an approach is summarised by Allport’s (1924, p. 6) view that:
There is no psychology of groups which is not essentially and entirely a psychology of individuals. Social psychology must not be placed in contradistinction to the psychology of the individual; it is part of the psychology of the individual, whose behaviour it studies in relation to that sector of his environment comprised by his fellows.

It was not until the Sherifs' pioneering studies on intergroup conflict in the 1950s and 1960s that research began to acknowledge the psychological reality of group behaviour. The Sherifs addressed the social and psychological consequences of intergroup competition in their development of a functional theory of group processes. They carried out a series of field studies in the US involving adolescent male participants attending summer camps (Sherif, 1951, 1967; Sherif and Sherif, 1953; Sherif, White, and Harvey, 1955; Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, and Sherif, 1961). The participants were firstly divided into two groups, and living arrangements and camp activities were separated. The groups then engaged in a series of competitive activities organised by the camp leaders (who were actually the researchers).

The competitive interactions led to an increased level of hostility between the two groups, and the generation of unfavourable outgroup attitudes and stereotypes. This subsequently led to the formation of group norms, within-group cohesiveness, within-group solidarity, and ingroup favouritism effects by which the ingroup was consistently evaluated positively while the outgroup was evaluated negatively. A notable feature of the research was that when the two groups were subsequently
required to work on tasks which required intergroup co-operation, the hostility and
intergroup conflict which was previously observed was reduced dramatically. The
Sherifs concluded that ‘functional interdependence’ between individuals when
striving to achieve common goals leads to co-operative within-group and competitive
intergroup behaviour. Similarly, such co-operation and competition enhances both
within-group cohesiveness and the likelihood of negative behaviour being displayed
towards the outgroup.

3.3 Self-categorization theory The reduction of intergroup discrimination through
cooperation which was observed by the Sherifs can be explained in terms of recent
approaches to social categorization. Self-categorization is the extent to which the self
is perceived as similar to one set of stimuli and different to another. Self-
categorization theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, and Wetherell, 1987) states that
the extent to which a target individual is categorized as either an ingroup or outgroup
member depends upon two concepts, namely the level of abstraction, and the meta-
contrast principle (Campbell, 1958; Rosch, 1978; Tajfel, 1969; Turner et al., 1987;
and Tversky, 1977).

Self-categorization theory defines three levels of ‘abstraction’, namely the
interpersonal level (self as an individual person); the intergroup level (self as a group
member); and the interspecies level (self as a human being). The meta-contrast ratio
determines which level of abstraction is most salient at any given time. It predicts that
“a given set of items is more likely to be categorized as a single entity to the degree
that differences within that set of items are less than the differences between that set
and others within the comparative context” (Oakes, Haslam, and Turner, 1994, p. 96).
Thus, if the difference between groups is perceived as less than the difference within
groups, then the individual members will likely be perceived to be from the same
group: they will be *re-categorized* at a more inclusive level of abstraction. Conversely,
if the difference between the groups is perceived as greater than that within the groups
then the existing categorization will remain. For example, at any given time a school
pupil might categorize herself as a pupil of Teacher A if the difference between
herself and other pupils of Teacher A is perceived to be less than the difference
between pupils of Teacher A and pupils of Teacher B. Alternatively, the same pupil
might categorize herself at a higher level of abstraction (e.g. as a pupil in the 8th
grade) if the difference between Teacher A’s pupils and Teacher B’s pupils is
perceived to be less than the difference between pupils in grade 8 and pupils in grade
9.

In terms of the Sherifs’ studies, intergroup discrimination could have reduced
following cooperation because of a re-categorization of group members. When the
group goal could only be achieved through intergroup co-operation, the participants
may have re-categorized the members at a more inclusive level of abstraction such
that members of the two groups were perceived in terms of a shared social category.
This then led to a reduction of discriminatory attitudes and the formation of new
norms and values conducive to the achievement of the shared goal.

Research conducted since that of Sherif et al. has demonstrated that ingroup favouring
responses may exist even when within-group cooperation and intergroup competition
is not anticipated by group members. Many studies indicate that intergroup discrimination is not solely an outcome of incompatible group goals. For instance, Doise et al., (1972) demonstrated ingroup favouring attitudes even prior to engagement in intergroup behaviour. These findings were subsequently replicated by Brewer and Silver (1978). This suggests, therefore, that categorization into ingroups and outgroups may be sufficient to create ingroup bias even in the absence of social interaction (Turner, 1981). Indeed, studies conducted using the well-known minimal group paradigm (MGP) procedure (e.g. Tajfel, Flament, Billig, and Bundy, 1971) have demonstrated convincingly that social categorization into ingroups and outgroups per se is sufficient for intergroup discrimination (see section 3.5). It appears that psychological group formation (the perception of belonging to a particular social category) is the minimal requirement for intergroup behaviour.

3.4 The interpersonal-intergroup continuum The notion that group behaviour comprises a psychological reality that is distinct from individual behaviour is commonly described in terms of the interpersonal-intergroup continuum (Tajfel, 1978). This distinction between interpersonal behaviour on the one hand, and intergroup behaviour on the other has obvious heuristic value, although it is unlikely that any behaviour between two or more individuals can ever be purely interpersonal. Tajfel (1978) argues that it would not be possible to engage in an encounter that is not, at least in the minimal sense, influenced by a social category membership such as sex. Conversely, Tajfel argues that behaviour of a purely intergroup nature is possible: an individual could potentially act entirely in terms of his/her group membership, particularly when there is no face-to-face interaction (e.g. such as when an air force
bombs an enemy country; see Tajfel, 1978). What is important, however, is the degree
to which individuals perceive their situation as being either interpersonal or
intergroup in nature. Furthermore, the more the situation is perceived as an intergroup
one, so the more uniform the individuals’ attitudes and behaviour will be towards the
outgroup. Members of the outgroup are increasingly regarded as more homogeneous,
or less differentiated than the ingroup, and treated in terms of their group
characteristics. This bias is referred to as the ‘outgroup homogeneity effect’ (see
Linville and Jones, 1980).

The identity which people derive at either end of the interpersonal-intergroup
continuum is also distinctly different. Turner (1982) differentiates personal identity
and social identity as subsystems of the self-concept. Personal identity refers to self-
descriptions derived from idiosyncratic attributes, including personality, physical and
intellectual traits: this identity is salient in interpersonal contexts. Social identity
represents self-descriptions derived from social category memberships, ranging from
large-scale ascribed social categories such as race, nationality, and gender, to smaller-
scale achieved social categories such as football team affiliation, fan club
membership, and so on (see Figure 3.1). As such, social identity is salient in
intergroup contexts.

![Figure 3.1: Relationship between personal and social identity as sub-systems of the self-concept (adapted from Hogg and Abrams, 1988)](image-url)
3.5 The minimal group paradigm Studies conducted using the minimal group paradigm procedure have established empirically that intergroup behaviour is distinct from interpersonal behaviour. Tajfel et al.'s (1971) pioneering study has been extensively cited in the research literature. Their study addressed the effects of social categorization on intergroup behaviour in the absence of other social criteria, such as individual interest or previous intergroup hostility. Tajfel et al. began from the assumption that there may be a ‘generic’ outgroup attitude in some societies which causes people to behave differentially towards ingroups and outgroups. The authors argued that social categorizations are present in all aspects of the social world, and these categorizations are reinforced from an early age. Whilst categorization may be based on rational or real differences such as intergroup conflict and competition (as in the Sherifs’ summer camp studies), it may also be based on purely psychological differences: the mere perception of group membership is sufficient to motivate intergroup behaviour. Tajfel et al. argued that a consequence of the pervasiveness of social categorization is that it becomes a guide for behaviour in any situation where group division is prevalent. Indeed, categorization may facilitate social functioning:

An undifferentiated social environment makes very little sense and provides no guidelines for action. Whenever alternative guidelines for action are lacking, unclear or confusing, and some form of intergroup categorization can be used, it will give order and coherence to the social situation while at the same time enabling the individual to act in a way which has been sanctioned as ‘appropriate’ in many other situations (Tajfel et al., 1971, p. 153).
A series of laboratory studies were conducted to test the hypothesis that social categorization alone was sufficient to bring about intergroup behaviour. Participants were firstly categorized into two groups on the basis of supposed performance on a dot estimation task (study 1), and on the basis of preference for the work of one of two painters (Klee and Kandinsky) (study 2). The allocation into groups was actually random, and there was no face-to-face contact between any of the participants.

Following this categorization procedure, the participants were required to allocate monetary rewards to various members of the ingroup and outgroup, using a series of matrices on which the amount given to each group was interdependent (i.e. the amount allocated to the ingroup member determined the amount received by the outgroup member, and vice versa. See Table 3.1). The matrices were designed so that a variety of behavioural strategies could be assessed. These strategies were: (1) assigning the maximum amount of money to each group (maximum joint payoff (MJP)); (2) assigning the maximum amount of money possible to the ingroup (maximum ingroup payoff (MIP)); (3) assigning the maximum amount of money to the ingroup whilst at the same time assigning the least amount possible to the outgroup (maximum difference in favour of the ingroup (MD)); and (4) assigning the same amount of money to each group (fairness (F)).
Participants are required to choose one column and state the amount of money that they wish to allocate to the member of each group. A participant choosing the first column on the left hand side of the matrix would therefore allocate 25 pence to member 10 of the Klee group and 19 pence to member 12 of the Kandinsky group.

Table 3.1: Example of a matrix used in the minimal group paradigm experiments (adapted from Tajfel et al. 1971)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member 10 of Klee group</th>
<th>25 23 21 19 17 15 13 11 13 15 17 19 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member 12 of Kandinsky group</td>
<td>19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10 9 8 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants followed a generic ‘groupness’ norm in their discriminatory behaviour. In the allocation of monetary rewards, they consistently chose the option of maximum group difference in favour of the ingroup: they assigned the greatest amount of money possible to the ingroup whilst at the same time assigning the least amount of money possible to the outgroup. In Tajfel et al.'s (1971) words (p. 172):

When the subjects have a choice between acting in terms of maximum utilitarian advantages to all (MJP) combined with maximum utilitarian advantage to members of their own group (MIP) as against having their own group win on points at the sacrifice of both these advantages, it is the winning that seems more important to them.

The discriminatory behaviour engaged in by the participants could not have been a product of perceived similarity between the ingroup members: even when the criterion for categorization was overtly random participants still discriminated in favour of the ingroup (Billig and Tajfel, 1973). Similar findings were demonstrated by
Deutsch, Chase, Garner, and Thomas (1969) and by Deutsch, Thomas, and Garner (1971), whose research revealed that participants do not tend to favour similar others unless those others have already been categorized as members of the ingroup. Furthermore, the effect of the social categorization on participants’ allocations was clearly distinct from any possible influence of interpersonal behaviour: participants were not asked to assign money to themselves. Numerous later studies have replicated Tajfel et al.’s findings and further confirmed the ability of minimal social categorization to produce intergroup behaviour (see for example Turner, Brown, and Tajfel, 1979).

The minimal group paradigm studies have helped to demonstrate the difference between interpersonal and intergroup processes. In rejecting the earlier individualistic explanations of group behaviour, this research convincingly demonstrated the psychological reality of the social group. As Turner (1982, p. 77) concluded, “there are social psychological processes intrinsic to or stimulated merely by ingroup-outgroup divisions which tend to create discriminatory social relations”.

3.6 Social identity theory The relevance of the above literature to adolescence becomes apparent when it is considered in the context of the theoretical framework proposed to explain such discriminatory behaviour. Social identity theory (SIT: Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel and Turner, 1986; Turner, 1975) begins from the assumption that individuals are motivated to evaluate their own group positively in order to achieve a positive social identity and self-esteem.
Central to this process of positive ingroup evaluation is the concept of social comparison. A positive evaluation of one’s own group is achieved through social comparisons with relevant outgroups along valued dimensions, that is, along dimensions that are central to the self-concept (Turner, Brown, and Tajfel, 1979). In terms of interpersonal relationships, such comparisons involve a consideration of individual attributes without acknowledgement of social category membership (c.f. Festinger, 1954). In intergroup contexts, however, the individual forms self-evaluations in terms of group membership: a positive self-evaluation therefore depends upon a positive evaluation of one’s own group in relation to a relevant outgroup. There is consequently a psychological and behavioural bias towards group comparisons which result in positive distinctiveness from the outgroup (Tajfel and Turner, 1979). With regard to adolescent behaviour, it is possible to imagine a situation in which members of one adolescent peer group might seek positive distinction from a rival peer group along the dimension of, for example, intelligence, by perceiving the ingroup as more intelligent than the outgroup. Such a mechanism also explains the behaviour of participants in the minimal group paradigm experiments: in choosing the option of maximum group difference during the monetary allocation task (rather than choosing the options of maximum ingroup payoff, or maximum joint payoff) the participants were seeking a positive intergroup comparison, or positive distinctiveness from the outgroup.

However, group members may occasionally be unable to make a positive comparison between the ingroup and outgroup (e.g. the outgroup might achieve consistently higher grades in school and is thus perceived as more intelligent). In such situations
group members may choose alternative attributes upon which to compare the groups, attributes that they are confident will enable the achievement of a positive intergroup distinction. This strategy is termed ‘social creativity’ (Tajfel, 1981). In the example given above, the adolescents who are unable to make a positive intergroup comparison on the basis of intelligence might choose to compare the groups along the dimension of for example fashion sense, and consequently perceive the ingroup as more fashionable than the outgroup. By changing the dimension for comparison in this way, the ingroup is still able to maintain a positive social identity and self-esteem (see Tajfel, 1981 for a description of other behavioural strategies available to group members when a positive comparison is unattainable).

3.7 The role of self-esteem in intergroup discrimination Whilst there is little doubt that the categorization of people into groups leads to intergroup discrimination, the extent to which self-esteem is actually implicated in this process is less clear. Abrams and Hogg’s (1988) two corollaries of the ‘self-esteem hypothesis’ attempt to explain the proposed relationship between discrimination and self-esteem. The first corollary suggests that successful intergroup discrimination leads to an increase in self-esteem, and the second corollary suggests that low or threatened self-esteem motivates increased intergroup discrimination. By this process, self-esteem may underlie the intergroup effects demonstrated by Tajfel and colleagues’ minimal group research.

However, support for both of Abrams and Hogg’s two corollaries has been mixed. Lemyre and Smith (1985) found support for corollary 1 when their participants showed higher self-esteem following the opportunity to discriminate in a minimal
groups setting (see also similar results reported by Oakes and Turner, 1980, and Turner and Spriggs, 1982). Hunter, Platow, Howard, and Stringer (1996) investigated the intergroup processes of adolescents from Catholic and Protestant schools in Northern Ireland. Participants evaluated characteristics of pupils from their own school and from a school of the other religious denomination, having completed a self-esteem scale three weeks earlier. In addition to a clear display of ingroup favouritism in the group evaluation, participants also showed increased scores in post-test self-esteem, thus providing support for corollary 1 of the self-esteem hypothesis. Hogg and Sunderland (1991) found support for corollary 2: participants whose identity had been threatened through false feedback on a test (which in turn led to lower self-esteem) demonstrated greater discrimination in monetary allocation than did those who had received positive feedback. Other studies, however, have failed to find a relationship between self-esteem and subsequent discrimination (see Hogg and Sunderland, 1991 for a review).

The evidence regarding the precise role of self-esteem in intergroup processes is not conclusive. Singh, Choo, and Poh (1998) provide a possible explanation for this inconsistency. They suggest that intergroup discrimination represents a compromise between the need for positive self-esteem and the need to portray an image of being fair. Indeed, this suggestion is reflected in research demonstrating that participants are not always inclined to discriminate between social groups, and the observation that direct outgroup derogation is an infrequent consequence of social categorization (Judd, Park, Ryan, Brauer, and Kraus, 1995; Mummendey and Schreiber, 1983; Mummendey and Simon, 1989; Spears and Manstead, 1989; Struch and Schwartz,
Other research literature indicates that there might be a relationship between self-esteem and the extent to which certain strategies of intergroup discrimination are employed, and this literature may go some way in explaining the lack of consistency in earlier studies. For instance, research has demonstrated a relationship between identity threat, the subsequent derogation of an outgroup, and post-test increases in self-esteem (Noel, Wann, and Branscombe, 1995; Verkuyten, 1997); and also between identity threat and the subsequent allocation of negative rewards to an outgroup (Mummendey et al., 1992). Other research has indicated a relationship between threatened identity and the subsequent use of ingroup-favouring language (Maass, Ceccarelli, and Rudin, 1996). Branscombe and Wann (1994) demonstrated that participants who were highly identified with their national group (American), and whose self-esteem had been lowered through a threat to identity, showed increased derogation of a Russian outgroup compared to those participants who were not highly identified with their national group. They also reported subsequent increases in levels of self-esteem.

Branscombe and Wann’s (1994) study may have been successful partly because they investigated the intergroup processes of real social groups (based on nationality). They suggest that outgroup derogation is greater in situations where individuals are highly identified with a group because such individuals are unable to distance themselves from that group when their group identity is threatened. Derogation of a threat-relevant outgroup therefore becomes a self-protection mechanism. It is possible that
previous research did not demonstrate a consistent relationship between intergroup discrimination and self-esteem because it did not always utilise real intergroup situations. Participants in artificial groups may not have strong ties to the group and as such, may not be highly motivated to protect their social identity. Hunter et al. (1996) agree, and suggest that the effects of social categorization on intergroup discrimination and self-esteem may only be fully determined when the social categorization is genuine and meaningful.

3.8 Social identity theory and adolescent groups

Despite its strong empirical support, SIT has rarely been applied specifically to the study of adolescent processes. This is particularly surprising given that such a large part of adolescent lifestyle revolves around peer group membership. Indeed, some research that has compared the intergroup behaviour of adolescent and adult groups has suggested that adolescents’ social identifications actually may be more extreme than those of adults (e.g. Liebkind, 1982). The application of SIT to this field may help to explain how adolescent groups interact, and how peer groups influence adolescent development, as Cotterell (1996, p. 14) notes: “Social identity may also have a self-preserving function, providing stability and certainty in the arena most important to young people - the self in social relations”.

Although Gavin and Furman (1989) did not specifically test the predictions of SIT, they did however offer a useful framework for the future investigation of adolescent group behaviour that might well employ this theory. Reviewing the existing literature, Gavin and Furman noted that adolescent groups are similar in composition to adult
groups, and are characterised by relative impermeability and, occasionally, hostile attitudes towards outgroups (see e.g. Cusick, 1973). They suggested that such characteristics serve as a means of differentiating between groups, and therefore contribute to social identity. Consistent with the findings of Sherif et al.'s summer camp studies, Gavin and Furman proposed that peer groups develop normative codes to which group members adhere. Using self-report measures to investigate 10-17 year old adolescents' perceptions of their peer groups, they found that as group cohesiveness increased, there was a subsequent increase in pressure to conform to the group. Deviation from the norm was associated with rejection from the group (shown in Chapter 2 to be detrimental to well-being). The results also identified a positive association between the extent to which individual participants identified with their peer group and the level of intergroup discrimination they exhibited: the higher the regard for the peer group, so the higher the level of conformity and adherence to group norms shown by participants, and the less positive behaviour and more negative behaviour that participants displayed towards the outgroup (c.f. Branscombe and Wann, 1994). Such effects of group membership appeared to be particularly salient in early-to-middle adolescence, the period when social relations begin to change (e.g. when the adolescent is making the transition from junior high/middle school to high school, and is beginning to distance him/herself from the family). The authors argued that as such, group membership may be valued because it offers security and a sense of belonging, and therefore something with which to identify (c.f. Cotterell, 1996).

These suggestions of course correspond with the bulk of research which has established that early-to-middle adolescence is a critical period for group behaviour (e.g. Coleman, 1979; Steinberg and Silverberg, 1986; see Chapter 2).
3.9 Summary and conclusion

It has been demonstrated here that human behaviour can be seen as occurring along an interpersonal-intergroup continuum. At certain times we interact with others within a framework of individual characteristics, and seek to maintain a positive personal identity through social comparisons with other individuals. On other occasions we behave in terms of the social categories which structure a large part of our social life, and in doing so maintain a positive social identity through intergroup comparisons. Following the large body of research that has been conducted on social identity theory since the work of the Sherifs, the social group is now accepted as a psychological reality.

In light of the research presented in this chapter, it is apparent that a complete understanding of adolescence needs to consider behaviour at both ends of the interpersonal-intergroup continuum. That is, research needs to address behaviour at various levels of explanation (Doise, 1986). Consequently, the studies presented in Section B (Chapters 6-8) examine adolescent behaviour at the interpersonal end of the interpersonal-intergroup continuum (i.e. individual, or intrapersonal, and interpersonal/positional levels of analysis). The studies presented in Section C (Chapters 9-11) examine the intergroup end of the continuum (ideological level), and provide a direct test of social identity theory’s predictions as applied to the study of adolescent groups. In doing so, adolescent behaviour is placed firmly within its social psychological context.

The next two chapters examine involvement with an activity that is valued by a
majority of adolescents. As will be shown, affiliation with music is a central feature of adolescent lifestyle: it is an important part of their self-concept. It is proposed that music makes an important contribution to social development in adolescence, and that adolescents are motivated to protect and enhance the identity that is derived from their music. Chapter 4 examines the problems surrounding the reliable measurement of musical preference. Chapter 5 discusses existing research that has related musical preference to adolescent behaviour.
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Chapter 4 The measurement of musical preference

4.1 Introduction

There are numerous means of assessing responses to music, and the type of measure used can have important implications for any conclusions that are drawn from the findings. This chapter discusses the various approaches to the measurement of musical interest, and outlines the approach taken in the studies presented in this thesis.

4.2 Defining musical behaviour  Reviewing the literature on the different ways that people may respond to music, Abeles (1980) proposed three different types of aesthetic experience. Firstly, people may have an involuntary ‘emotional’ or ‘affective’ response to a stimulus. An individual may experience a variety of emotions following exposure to music, such as excitement, sadness, and happiness. Secondly, a ‘preference’ response represents a statement of liking or disliking for the music. This type of response is under greater voluntary control than an emotional one, but does not necessarily amount to a long-term commitment to the stimulus. Thirdly, ‘taste’ responses are under a high degree of control, and reflect longer-term commitments. Taste responses may be evidenced in actual behaviour, such as in the purchase of pre-recorded music and music apparel (e.g. T-shirts), concert attendance, or radio station listening figures. Most empirical research tends to measure responses at Abeles’ level of musical preference, although in practice the terms ‘taste’ and ‘preference’ are often used interchangeably (Hargreaves, 1986). Following LeBlanc (1982), this thesis uses the term ‘musical preference’ to refer to participants’ responses to musical stimuli.
LeBlanc suggested that this term is more widely understood and avoids the value connotations associated with the term ‘musical taste’, which implies that one kind of music is somehow ‘better’ than another.

Responses to music are sometimes assessed through behavioural intentions. This approach requires individuals to state which music they would choose to listen to from a list of options, or to state which items of music they would choose to purchase given the opportunity (Kuhn, 1981). Behavioural intentions are also investigated using the uses-and-gratifications approach (Rosengren, Wenner and Palmgreen, 1985). Participants are typically provided with a list of potential motivations for their behaviour, and asked to state the extent to which each reason accounts for that behaviour. The uses-and-gratifications approach has provided important insight into people’s motivations for musical involvement, and has also generated some informative research (see Zillmann and Gan, 1997, for a review).

Price (1986) proposed a glossary for use in music research in an attempt to bring together the array of inconsistent terminology in the field. General preference was defined as “an act of choosing, esteeming, or giving advantage to one thing over another” (p. 154). Behavioural preference corresponded to Abeles’ (1980) ‘taste response’, and was defined as a “differential response for one stimulus as opposed to another. [It is] a demonstrated choice through non-verbal actions, such as concert attendance, recording purchase, [or] choosing to listen to specific music” (p. 153). A common means by which behavioural preference is assessed in empirical studies is through the use of an Operant Music Listening Recorder (OMLR: Cotter and Toombs,
1966; Cotter and Spradlin, 1971). The OMLR presents several ‘channels’ of music simultaneously, and participants are required to select the channel they wish to listen to. The time spent listening to each channel is recorded (see Hargreaves, 1986).

Finally, Price (1986) distinguished verbal preferences as spoken or written statements about the music. These include statements of liking and enjoyment, and/or statements about the qualities of the music itself, including perceived complexity. This definition reflects Abeles’ ‘preference response’ and is the type of response that is typically elicited by the large battery of psychometric tests of musical preference (see review by Hargreaves, 1986).

4.3 Empirical research into musical preference Some informative predictions about adolescent musical preferences have been generated using methodologies pioneered by Farnsworth in the 1950s (see Farnsworth, 1969). Farnsworth collected data from a variety of music archives to investigate shared consensus in taste for classical music composers. These data included measuring the amount of space allocated to different composers in encyclopaedias and official histories of music, and calculating the frequency with which each composer’s work was broadcast in radio transmissions or was featured in the performances of orchestras. He also asked musicologists to rank the composers in terms of perceived ‘eminence’. The data revealed a high degree of consensus between these different sources. Those composers whose work was featured most in the performances of orchestras were also those composers to whom most space was dedicated in official documentation, and those whom the musicologists had consistently rated as most eminent. Accordingly, Farnsworth concluded that: “we agree on the composers we call eminent” (1950, p. 7).
Using similar techniques as Farnsworth, North and Hargreaves (1995) demonstrated broad consensus in the pop artists that adolescents considered to be eminent. More interestingly, however, their study also suggested that there may be a critical period for the development of popular music preferences: participants of different ages tended to nominate as eminent those artists who had their first musical success when the participants themselves were adolescent. This finding supports those of earlier studies (e.g. Holbrook, 1995; Holbrook and Schindler, 1989), and also reflects similar findings of non-musical studies on for example the development of preference for movie stars or consumer brands (see Holbrook and Schindler, 1994).

The above suggestion that preference for popular music somehow crystallises in adolescence has received support from several sources. In a comprehensive review of the available literature, LeBlanc (1991) advanced four hypotheses to account for life-span developments in musical preference. These were: (1) younger children are more ‘open-eared’ than are older children in terms of what they are willing to listen to; (2) there is a decline in open-earedness in adolescence; (3) open-earedness increases again during early adulthood; and (4) open-earedness declines during old age (p. 2; see also LeBlanc, Sims, Siivola, and Obert, 1993).

Geringer and McManus (1979) asked adolescent participants to nominate their top ten favourite artists and rank them in order of preference. Supporting LeBlanc’s (1991) proposal that musical preferences become much narrower in adolescence, the degree of agreement between the participants increased with age (see also Rogers, 1957).
Adolescence also seems to give rise to an increased tendency to categorise music in terms of stylistic labels (Hargreaves, 1982). Popular music becomes the genre of greatest appeal in adolescence (see Chapter 5), whilst classical music appears to be the least liked style in this age group (e.g. Roe, 1983, 1985). Gernet (1940) reported a U-shaped relationship between age and preference for ‘art music’ in participants aged 10-23 years, and similar findings were reported recently by LeBlanc, Colman, McCravy, Sherrill, and Malin (1988) using traditional jazz music as stimuli. However, liking for classical music may also be related to factors such as gender, educational ambition, and level of musical training (Chapman and Williams, 1976; Frith, 1983; Hargreaves, Comber, and Colley, 1995).

4.4 Generalising between studies The variety of ways in which responses to music have been assessed in the past raises a potential problem of being unable to generalise between studies. The music that an adolescent says he/she listens to may not be the same music that he/she actually listens to, although this is not frequently examined. Most studies have tended to adopt just one measure of preference. For example, some studies have adopted archival data to examine musical interests (e.g. Farnsworth, 1950), whilst others have employed measures of verbal preference (e.g. Boyle, Hosterman, and Ramsey, 1981; LeBlanc et al., 1988; May, 1985; Schuessler, 1948). Other studies have utilised behavioural measures of preference (e.g. Geringer, 1982; Greer, Dorow, and Randall, 1974). To what extent do such behavioural preferences actually correspond to verbal statements of preference, or to behavioural intentions?
Alpert (1982) utilised a mixed methodology in an attempt to answer this question. Three measures of musical preference were employed. Firstly, adolescents’ behavioural preference was measured using a Music Selection Recorder (MSR). This is essentially the same as the OMLR (described above), and was used to present participants with six excerpts each of classical, rock, and country music. The participants were required to switch between the channels to select the music that they wished to hear (and therefore that which they did not wish to hear). Secondly, behavioural intentions were assessed by participants indicating which type of recordings they would like to receive if their name was chosen in a prize-draw. Thirdly, participants rated their liking for excerpts of classical, rock, and country music using five-point Likert scales. This was a measure of verbal preference.

The results demonstrated moderate relationships between all three measures of preference. There was a positive relationship between verbal preference and behavioural preference, and between verbal preference and behavioural intention. If the participants rated the musical excerpts favourably they also tended to listen to that music on the MSR, and indicated that they would like to receive those recordings. The relationship between the behavioural intention and behavioural preference was less strong, although this was still positive and statistically significant. These results are encouraging and suggest that studies which assess musical preference using different methodologies may be comparable (see similar findings by Geringer, 1982; Kuhn, Sims, and Shehan, 1981). However, given the distinct lack of research in this area, any conclusions about the relationship between different measures of preference need to be drawn with caution.
4.5. The use of musical excerpts and labels

The issue of generalisability is further complicated when one considers the type of musical stimuli used to elicit a response. Research that considers the effects of variations in stimulus characteristics on responses to music has generally employed musical excerpts as stimuli (e.g. experimental aesthetics). The utilisation of musical excerpts facilitates the manipulation of the relevant variables, such as for example complexity and volume (Duerksen, 1972; North and Hargreaves, 1995; Radocy, 1976). However, a potential problem of such an approach is that whilst participants may like the musical style from which the excerpt was drawn, they may dislike the particular excerpt (e.g. it is possible to like ‘dance’ music but to dislike a specific piece of music from that style - such as ‘Firestarter’ by The Prodigy). Furthermore, the number of excerpts that can be presented to participants during a single experimental session is limited. Consequently, the extent to which the excerpts are accepted by the participants as representative of a given style may also be limited (see North and Hargreaves, 1996).

In an attempt to overcome these problems some research has employed verbal stylistic labels as experimental stimuli. This approach arguably has the advantage of offering a broader measure of musical interest, and may still enable participants to rate qualities of the stimuli. Hargreaves et al. (1995) successfully used musical style labels to investigate the effects of age, gender and musical training on the musical preferences of adolescents. Discussing the relative merits of the use of excerpts and style labels, the authors suggested that the use of style labels is advantageous because participants respond “to their conception of the generic style as a whole rather than to the specific
and possibly unrepresentative features of particular examples of it” (p. 245-246). As such, the use of verbal labels potentially offers better face validity in that participants rate what they regard as for example, ‘dance’ music, rather than what an experimenter may regard as exemplars of such.

However, the accurate measurement of adolescent musical preference is further complicated by the increased variety of ‘popular’ styles of music. For instance, Skipper (1973) identified just five musical genres relevant to the study of musical preference. These were: rock and pop, hard rock/rhythm and blues, jazz, folk, and classical. In 1976, Chapman and Williams distinguished 10 genres, and by 1988 26 classes of music had been identified as relevant to the study of adolescent musical interests (Christenson and Peterson, 1988). Whilst it is likely that this diversification in part reflects the natural growth of music over time, Zillmann and Gan (1997) suggest that it is also accelerated by the music industry’s desire to label and categorise ‘new’ music. It should be noted however, that whilst Chapman and Williams, and Christenson and Peterson conducted a pilot study to confirm the meaningfulness of the styles adopted in their studies, the styles were initially selected by the researchers themselves. Therefore, the extent to which the styles reflected all styles with which the participants were familiar is unclear. A more accurate appraisal of music’s diversity is perhaps obtainable by investigating music that participants nominate themselves. The use of self-nominated styles of music also ensures that the stimuli are maximally meaningful to the participants. A recent study that applied this approach was conducted by North and Hargreaves (1995). Participants in their study nominated
up to 16 musical styles under the broad genres of rock and pop, jazz, and classical music, and similar findings are reported by Boyle, Hosterman, and Ramsey (1981).

4.6 Summary It is important to acknowledge the variety of measures of musical preference that are available to researchers who are assessing responses to music. Adolescents may increasingly categorize music in terms of stylistic labels (Hargreaves, 1982), and the use of such labels therefore may be particularly appropriate in investigating adolescent musical preferences. Indeed, the use of verbal category labels may be particularly beneficial when assessing the extra-musical consequences of expressed musical preference. Information about an individual’s broad musical interests has been shown to facilitate the process of impression formation, and it has been demonstrated that musical style labels contain social connotations which can have consequences for both interpersonal and intergroup behaviour (e.g. Frith, 1983; North and Hargreaves, 1999; Zillmann and Bhatia, 1989; see Chapter 5). It is important to be aware of the diverse styles of music to which adolescents (at least claim to) listen, and of the possibility that research participants may not always recognise and agree with experimenter-imposed musical selections. A careful selection of stimulus material is therefore essential.

The studies presented in this thesis utilised both musical excerpts and stylistic labels, and adopted verbal preference responses as the measure of preference. The nature of the specific stimuli employed in each study was determined by the nature of the issue under particular investigation. The next chapter reviews adolescent involvement with music, and presents existing literature that indicates a relationship between music and
social development. It also details the research questions that are addressed in subsequent chapters.
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Chapter 5 Adolescent musical behaviour

5.1 Introduction

The previous chapter discussed the methodological issues relevant to the study of music listening behaviour. The present chapter considers how this behaviour relates to adolescent development. The first part of the chapter outlines the degree to which adolescents are involved with music, and this is followed by a discussion of existing research that has addressed the role of music in adolescent development. In order to place this research in its social psychological context, it is considered in relation to the interpersonal-intergroup continuum which was outlined in Chapter 3. This approach illuminates the present lack of theory-driven empirical research. Following this discussion, a series of research questions are presented which are addressed in subsequent chapters of the thesis.

5.2 Involvement with music Several studies suggest that music is an important aspect of young people’s lives. Fitzgerald, Hayes, and O’Regan (1995) investigated the leisure pursuits of Irish adolescents aged 15-17 years. Their participants responded to 62 interest and activity items in terms of (i) how interested they were in each activity, and (ii) how often they participated in each activity. The range of activities included sporting and outdoor pursuits, social activities (including visiting friends and going to parties), and passive pursuits (including hobbies and listening to music). Both males and females reported that they were more interested in music than in any other activity (see also Garton and Pratt, 1987).
Adolescents’ high level of interest in music is also reflected in their listening behaviour. As early as 1972 it was reported that male and female adolescents listen to music for up to four hours per day (Lyle and Hoffman, 1972), and recent American data on music television follow a similar pattern (Brown, Campbell, and Fischer, 1986; Sun and Lull, 1986). Davis (1985) suggested that adolescents listen to an average of 10,500 hours of music between 12 and 17 years of age. Confirming its importance to adolescents, Kamptner (1995) demonstrated that American adolescents nominated music as one of their five most special, important, or treasured possessions.

As discussed in Chapter 4, adolescence is a period when musical interests are particularly marked. Whilst females are typically more drawn than males to soft or romantic music (see Frith, 1981; Zillmann and Gan, 1997), both males and females report an interest in ‘popular’ music. This interest in popular music appears to be particularly robust (e.g. Crowther and Durkin, 1982; Hargreaves et al., 1995). For example, there is a marked decrease in preference for non-popular music as people enter adolescence (LeBlanc et al., 1988). Roe (1983, 1985) even demonstrated an inverse relationship between liking for rock music and liking for classical music: individuals with an interest in rock music and related styles tended to dislike classical music and its related styles. Rogers (1957) suggested that age may predict these changing preferences more than any other variable such as sex and type of school attended. However, these other variables may still course mediate liking for any given style of music (Chapman and Williams, 1976; Hargreaves et al., 1995; Murdock and Phelps, 1973).
The popularity of adolescent music is also indicated by sales figures for pre-recorded music. By 1967 annual sales figures for rock ‘n’ roll music exceeded $1 billion, and by 1978 this figure had approached $7 billion (Frith, 1987). In 1994 sales figures for popular music had surpassed $12 billion, a large share of the US market for pre-recorded music (Geter and Streisand, 1995). In comparison, Eliot (1989) noted that sales of classical music occupied just 5% of the market share for pre-recorded music, and this represented a reduction of 20 percentage points since the 1950s. This pattern of sales is not specific to the USA: in the UK in 1996, pop and rock music albums accounted for 69% of pre-recorded music sales (Accounting Web, 1997).

Given the apparent importance of music during adolescence, and the observation that musical preferences narrow during this period, it is likely that musical behaviour contributes to social development during adolescence. A growing literature has examined the social effects of involvement with music on adolescent development.

5.3 Individual (intrapersonal) processes Research that has addressed the influence of music on adolescent development has been conducted mostly at the interpersonal end of the interpersonal-intergroup continuum. Some of this research has investigated the relationship between specific musical preferences and, often deviant, adolescent behaviour. Zillmann and Gan (1997) observed that the most notable feature of some types of adolescent music is the expression of defiance of authority. They suggested that affiliation with styles of music such as hard rock, heavy metal, and rap, serves as a statement of defiance regarding parental and institutional authority. As such, this
music may reflect a statement of independence that is important to identity development.

However, as was noted in Chapter 2, only a minority of individuals experience serious difficulties in their relationships with parents. For most individuals, adolescence does not represent a rejection of parental values in favour of those advocated by other members of the social network (e.g. Coleman and Hendry, 1990). Furthermore, parental values tend to reinforced through peer interactions (Youniss and Haynie, 1992). The ‘negative’ influence of music may therefore not be as widespread as is often assumed. In spite of this, some forms of music are often assumed to influence engagement in delinquent behaviour (Gladstone, 1984; King, 1988; Moore, Skipper, and Willis, 1979; Plopper and Ness, 1993). Zillmann and Gan (1997) propose that such pervasive assumptions are more a product of misinterpreted correlational data (assuming the existence of a causal relationship), rather than an accurate reflection of the process of social influence.

However, some research has demonstrated negative short-term effects of exposure to defiant music. Hansen and Hansen (1990) found an increased acceptance of deviant behaviours in a sample of college students following exposure to rock music videos which advocated defiance of authority. Hansen and Hansen (1988) exposed participants to a music video which either depicted a female character in a stereotypical female role, or to one which was neutral. Those participants who had observed the stereotypical video were subsequently more likely to evaluate a target female in terms of gender stereotypes than those who had seen the neutral video.
Johnson, Adams, Ashburn, and Reed (1995) reported that following exposure to videos depicting women in sexually subordinate roles, female adolescents expressed a greater acceptance of violent behaviour perpetrated by a male on a hypothetical date than did participants who had not been exposed to such videos.

Whether or not affiliation with certain musical styles promotes negative behaviour, it seems that involvement with music in adolescence may form an important part of adolescents’ identity. Given the dearth of research in this area, it is not important at present to determine whether this demonstrative function of musical preference represents expressions of specifically defiance (e.g. through affiliation with heavy metal music), or other factors such as for example, loneliness (see e.g. Gibson, Aust, Hoffman, and Zillmann, 1995). Indeed, it seems that adolescents may regard musical preference as a means of presenting the social world with an ideal or appropriate self, rather than any one specific type of identity (e.g. defiant) (see e.g. Crozier, 1997). As such, Larson (1995) argued that listening to music enables adolescents to explore their private self and define their personal identity, whatever this might be. This suggestion is also reflected in research that has been conducted using a uses-and-gratifications approach (Gantz, Gartenberg, Pearson, and Schiller, 1978; North, Hargreaves, and O’Neill, in press; Roe, 1985; Sun and Lull, 1986; see Chapters 4 and 6).

5.4 Interpersonal processes A limited amount of research has also implicated involvement with music in interpersonal processes. Given the documented importance of music during adolescence, it seems likely that shared musical preference may be an important feature of the friendship process. As with similarities in other important
domains (e.g. Argyle and Henderson, 1985; Byrne, 1971; Eiser, Morgan, Gammage, Brooks, and Kirby, 1991), a similarity in musical interests may be a crucial factor affecting the decision whether or not to become someone’s friend: a friend with very different musical interests may not be a very useful reference point for the validation of one’s own musical preferences. Adolescents may therefore use statements about musical preference to attract potential friends. Using a uses-and-gratifications approach, North et al. (in press) identified three factors that may influence adolescents’ listening behaviour. These were listening to create an external impression; listening to fulfil emotional needs; and listening for reasons related to enjoyment. The first of these factors clearly implicates music in interpersonal processes: items which loaded highest on this factor included listening in order to please others (friends, parents, teachers), listening to create a self-image, and listening to be ‘trendy/cool’.

Following Coleman’s (1979) focal theory of adolescence, the influence of musical preference on friendship development should be greatest around middle adolescence when concerns about peer relations peak. Correlational support for this proposal is provided by Larson, Kubey, and Colletti (1989). They demonstrated a positive relationship between the amount of time spent listening to music and the amount of time spent in the company of friends. This relationship was strongest in middle adolescence (around 15 years of age). Such a relationship was not found in younger adolescent participants because, the authors argued, at younger ages music does not form part of the ‘social milieu’. Interestingly, there was a negative relationship between the amount of time spent listening to music and the amount of time spent in
the company of family members. This adds support to the idea that musical behaviour is related to the peer network. It is unsurprising therefore that adolescents report most positive psychological affect when music is listened to either alone or in the presence of friends, as opposed to with the family (Thompson and Larson, 1995). Furthermore, whilst previous research has indicated that listening to music is reported as a mainly private activity (e.g. Larson and Kubey, 1983), Larson et al. (1989) noted that popular music is an important topic for discussion by adolescents.

Frith’s (1983) study of 14-18 year old adolescents supported the contention that middle adolescence is the period when interpersonal consequences of musical preference are most pronounced. As a result of a series of interviews, Frith demonstrated that adolescents aged 15-16 years tended to stress the importance of shared musical preference for friendship: “music served as the badge of individuality on which friendship choices could be based” (p. 208). This is a view supported by Zillmann and Gan (1997, p. 174) who noted that:

The declaration of allegiance to a musical culture, in whatever form, amounts to a most meaningful statement about the declarer. Among adolescents, these statements seem especially important in choosing friends and rejecting others. They are by no means socially inconsequential.

One of the few studies to test this proposal empirically was conducted by Zillmann and Bhatia (1989). They examined the effects of musical preference on American undergraduates’ romantic attraction to a target person. They found that the target’s
affiliation with particular styles of music led participants to view that person in different ways. The ‘badge’ function of music operated such that women who expressed liking for classical music were perceived by men as sophisticated, whilst those who expressed preference for heavy metal music were perceived as less sophisticated. Men were seen as less sophisticated if they confessed to enjoying country music, but were seen as more appealing if they expressed a liking for heavy metal music.

Zillmann and Bhatia discussed their findings in relation to the literature on social attraction. They noted that whilst physical characteristics have an important influence on attraction through a ‘halo effect’ (c.f. North and Hargreaves, 1997), this process is also influenced by how an individual presents and conducts him or herself. They proposed that an individual’s statements about a variety of preferences, including music “amount to statements about the displayer - statements that convey sensitivities, tastes, and behavioural dispositions [are] capable of modifying affective responses to the displayer, heterosexual attraction included” (p. 264).

These effects, of course, may be different in other cultures where the social connotations associated with certain musical styles may differ. That is, the social consequences of expressing a preference for country music may be different in certain regions of the US than they are in the UK. However, the findings clearly indicate that musical preference is an important consideration in the attraction process, and in this regard it is possible that the impact of music on social development will be similar in industrialised Western societies. This is because of the observed similarities in the
adolescent process of Western societies, and also the fact that the adolescent research
literature is based mainly upon theory developed in those societies (Cotterell, 1996;
Heaven, 1994; Scott and Scott, 1998). However, cross-cultural research in this area is
distinctly lacking.

Although not indicating causal influence, other research supports the idea that musical
interests are linked to the process of friendship development by demonstrating a
relationship between the preferences of members of existing friendship networks. Van
Wei (1994) investigated the relationship between adolescents’ own preferences for
music, reading material, film and television, and art and culture, and the perceived
preferences of various reference groups. These included their same-sex best friend,
other close friends, and parents. Six-hundred and forty-four Dutch adolescents aged
14-15 years were asked to rate how important each reference group was in
determining their own level of interest in each domain. Both male and female
participants regarded their same-sex best friend as being the most important influence
on their own preferences, particularly regarding music. The role of other close
reference groups in determining the participants’ own interests, including close friends
and boyfriend/girlfriend (who van Wel termed the ‘inner circle of friends’), were also
considered important.

Van Wel’s study did not actually demonstrate the existence of social influence since
there was no evidence that the reference groups directly influenced the adolescents’
own musical preference. Importantly, however, the study did demonstrate that
adolescents perceive their social network to be an important influence on issues of
taste. Such perceptions are important in that they may reflect a self-presentation strategy: if adolescents believe that they ‘fit in’ with their peers, these perceptions are likely to lead to increased feelings of self-worth (see Robinson, 1995). However, little research has been carried out in this area, and more studies are required to cast further light on these potentially important musical effects.

5.5 Intrgroup/intergroup processes Whilst shared musical preferences may be important for friendship development, as suggested above, they are also likely to be implicated in the group behaviour of adolescents. This behaviour is likely to be qualitatively different to behaviour at interpersonal levels, since the peer group fulfils a different function to that of friends. Most notably, the peer group provides a context for the development of normative behaviour, and is an important source of social identity. It was noted in Chapter 2 that adolescents are motivated to be accepted as part of a popular group, and that rejection from a group can be detrimental to psychological well-being (Parkhurst and Asher, 1992; Heaven, 1994). It is possible that adolescents will adopt the musical preferences of peers in order to ingratiate themselves into a group, and/or in order to avoid being ostracised by that group. In short, adolescents may adhere to the group normative standards of musical preference. Issues of musical preference may therefore be related to group processes, and ultimately, social identity.

Support for this idea comes from research suggesting that an adolescent’s knowledge and use of popular music may be related to his or her popularity within the peer group. For example, Brown and O’Leary (1971) observed a strong correlation between an
individual’s perceived knowledge about Top 10 music and the number of times that that individual was nominated as popular by classmates (see also Adoni, 1978 and Johnstone and Katz, 1957). Interestingly, however, when asked directly about influences on musical preference, Frith’s (1983) 15-16 year old participants refused to acknowledge the potential influence of peers in determining musical interests. Instead they stressed the importance of individuality in decisions about musical preference, in spite of their claim that music was an important source of group identity. These responses can be understood in terms of research on social influence which indicates that older adolescents may report less conformity to peers than younger adolescents (e.g. Gavin and Furman, 1989; Steinberg and Silverberg, 1986). As part of the desire to demonstrate their independence and self-reliance older adolescents may increasingly report that their own preferences are formed as an outcome of individual decision making processes.

There is some support for the idea that adolescents’ musical preferences are influenced by the group context in which they occur. Investigating the musical preferences of adolescents in Finland, Finnäs (1989) demonstrated that ratings of traditional and classical music differed according to whether they were stated publicly (in the presence of the peer group) or privately. Specifically, ratings were more favourable when they were stated privately than when stated publically. This behaviour may reflect a desire to be held in high esteem by one’s peers in order to maintain or achieve status within the group: an open endorsement of socially undesirable music could undermine one’s standing within the peer group, and potentially lead to rejection from it.
Finnäs’ study indicated the potential contribution of music to *intragroup* (i.e. within group) behaviour to the extent that group members may be motivated to observe the normative behaviour of the ingroup. It is plausible that an evaluation of the worth of that ingroup may occur by comparing its norms of musical preference with those of relevant outgroups. That is, the value of musical preference to social identity may also be observed in *intergroup* (i.e. between group) contexts.

Gans’ (1974) distinction between taste publics and taste cultures offers a useful framework within which to understand the role of music in intergroup processes. Gans proposed that people who have the same interest in a particular type of music represent a *taste public*, and these people share a set of beliefs concerning their preferred music; they subscribe to a particular *taste culture*. Summarising this distinction, Russell (1997, p. 142) stated:

> A music taste public is a social group comprising devotees of a particular type of music or performer (for example, opera buffs or Elvis fans) and a music taste culture is a set of aesthetic values they share (for example, ‘Elvis is King’).

Affiliation with taste publics is often demonstrated through the adoption of particular attire and hairstyles, or in actual behaviour, including the playing of pre-recorded music in public or attending music concerts (Zillmann and Gan, 1997). Such behaviour serves as a badge of identification, or a statement of affiliation with a
perceived musical ‘elite’ which facilitates intergroup differentiation. Summarising this
differentiation process, Larson (1995, p. 548) proposed that:

Music provides the security of identification with other like-minded peers. The
teenager who deeply identifies with Guns-N-Roses [a heavy metal band] gains the
solidarity of being soul mates with millions of other youth. Identification with M. C.
Hammer [a rap singer] connects you to a different group of peers.

Whilst an individual may be able to describe the characteristics of small taste publics,
such as those containing close friends and peers, larger taste publics are more difficult
to define since they may contain members that the individual does not know
(Zillmann and Gan, 1997). However, the individual nevertheless acknowledges the
existence of such publics, and may choose to identify him or herself with them. These
larger publics correspond to Brown (1989) and Cotterell’s (1996) conceptualisations
of ‘psychological’, or ‘reputation-based groups’ (see Chapter 2).

According to social identity theory, affiliation with such groups fosters positive social
identity and self-esteem, and this is achieved through positive intergroup comparisons
(see Chapter 3). To date, however, only two studies have empirically examined the
consequences of adolescent musical affiliation for social identity. Zillmann et al.,
(1995) tested the hypothesis that exposure to ‘radical rap’ music would lead to
increased self-esteem in African American adolescents. The rationale for this was the
assumption that radical rap’s assault on social institutions and “white supremacy” (p.
11) may foster the development of group cohesion and a positive self-concept.
Participants were required to watch 12 music videos, four each of radical rap, non-radical rap, and rock music. They then completed a self-esteem scale, and evaluated six fictitious student-government election candidates.

The results failed to demonstrate a relationship between exposure to the music videos and subsequent self-esteem. Whilst Zillmann et al. (1995) proposed a plausible explanation for their findings (suggesting that any potential benefits of exposure to rap music may have already been manifested prior to the experiment), a further limitation of the study concerns the social context in which the evaluations were made. Social identity theory maintains that individuals are motivated to evaluate their own group positively, and that this is achieved through positive comparisons with an outgroup. Participants in Zillmann et al.’s study were not required to make direct comparisons between an ingroup and an outgroup. It is possible that in a more overtly comparative context, the adolescents would have used affiliation with music as a means of achieving positive distinction from the outgroup. Furthermore, if exposure to the radical rap music had followed a threat to self-esteem the potential identity benefits of that exposure may have been more readily observed (c.f. Abrams and Hogg, 1988).

The above suggestion that adolescents may use music as a means of distinguishing between social groups seems all the more plausible in view of research that has demonstrated that adolescents hold different stereotypes about different musical taste publics. These stereotypes may fulfil an identity-serving function. A recent series of studies by North and Hargreaves (1999) confirmed the existence of these stereotypes. Specifically, they demonstrated that adolescents hold normative expectations about
the likely characteristics of fans of different styles of music. Participants in one study were presented with a short vignette which described a male or female target individual the same age as themselves. The target’s interest in music was manipulated such that in each condition he or she was presented as being a fan of one of the following four musical styles: British pop, country and western, heavy metal, or ballet music. The participants were required to state their degree of agreement with 12 statements about the target, six of which were positive, and six of which were negative.

The results clearly demonstrated the social consequences of preference for certain styles of music. Firstly, British pop was rated as the most prestigious style, and country and western the least prestigious. Secondly, the target who expressed a preference for British pop was evaluated most positively on the statements. The findings confirmed that musical affiliation may function as a badge upon which social judgements can be made, and thus demonstrated the utility of music in an interpersonal context. A further study demonstrated how these normative expectations can mediate group decisions, that is, behaviour in an intergroup context. Adolescents who perceived themselves as either fans of rap music or fans of pop music evaluated fans of rap and pop music on a series of statements. This was followed by completion of the Coopersmith (1967) self-esteem inventory. Consistent with previous intergroup research, the participants did not demonstrate direct outgroup derogation (e.g. Turner, 1978): they failed to differentiate between the two groups in terms of perceived dishonesty, and in the degree to which the fans were regarded as unreasonable, self-centred, or cruel to others. However, the participants did engage in behaviour which
was clearly biased towards the ingroup: fans of pop music rated other fans of pop more positively than they rated fans of rap; and fans of rap music rated other fans of rap more positively than they rated fans of pop. In addition, the study provided some support for the role of self-esteem in intergroup processes: those participants who strongly identified with either pop or rap music reported higher levels of self-esteem than those who were not highly identified.

The studies of Zillmann et al. (1995) and, particularly North and Hargreaves (1999) go some way to addressing the intergroup consequences of adolescent musical affiliation. Furthermore, North and Hargreaves’ study demonstrated that musical affiliation might influence the normal, everyday behaviour of adolescents, contributing to social evaluations in individual and group contexts. The exact role of self-esteem in this process remains to be fully determined. Given the undoubted importance of self-concept during adolescence, this is a field that requires further research attention.

5.6 Summary This chapter has demonstrated the potential contribution of music to adolescent development. It has been shown that adolescent involvement with music may be motivated by the need for a positive identity, and this can be achieved in both interpersonal and intergroup contexts. This process may be at its strongest during adolescence, a time when personal and group identity issues are especially salient. At the interpersonal end of the interpersonal-intergroup continuum, music may aid the processes of person perception and friendship development. It may also contribute to identity to the extent that it may help adolescents demonstrate their emerging
independence from adult authority. In affiliating with specific musical taste publics, the adolescent social group context is brought to the fore. As was discussed in Chapter 3, as soon as social category memberships become salient in this way, individuals act in accordance with this categorization. This is demonstrated through normative statements of musical preference (e.g. Finnås, 1989), and intergroup discrimination (e.g. North and Hargreaves, 1999). Whilst the research presented in this chapter clearly demonstrates the utilitarian role of music in adolescent social development, there is a clear lack of empirical research based on strong underlying theory.

5.7 Research questions A series of questions can be posed for investigation, and these can be categorized in terms of the interpersonal-intergroup distinction already discussed:

Individual and interpersonal processes

1) Since the early uses-and-gratifications research of the 1980s, little research has considered the reasons that adolescents themselves give for their musical behaviour. What are these reasons? Do adolescents acknowledge the importance of music in social behaviour? To what extent are findings elicited from English participants generalisable to other industrialised Western cultures, including America?

The study presented in Chapter 6 addresses these questions and directly compares English and American adolescents’ reasons for listening to music.
2a) Following the observation that adolescents regard music as a central feature of their lives, how important do adolescents regard the presence of music in the various leisure activities with which they are involved?

2b) Only a limited amount of research has examined the role of music in friendship selection. How important do adolescents perceive musical interests to be, relative to other interests, in their decisions about friendship selection? Is there a period when music is regarded as especially important in this process?

2c) Do adolescents’ musical preferences correspond with those of their social network? What is the relationship between an adolescent’s musical preferences and the perceived preferences of his or her reference groups? Is there a period when these relationships are particularly salient?

The study presented in Chapter 7 addresses these three issues. In doing so, it considers perceptions of the broad interpersonal consequences of involvement with music.

3) The literature presented in Chapter 2 demonstrated that individuals evaluate their own values and behaviour through social comparisons with relevant others. What is the nature of the relationship between adolescents’ own musical preferences and those they estimate for their reference groups in a comparative context?

In order to further examine the role of music in the social development of Western adolescents, the study presented in Chapter 8 investigated the social comparison
processes of English and American adolescents. Do English and American adolescents engage in similar social comparisons with their reference groups?

Intergroup processes

4a) The literature presented in Section 5.5 above demonstrated the potential contribution of music to adolescent social identity. The theoretical framework presented there and in detail in Chapter 3 is developed in Chapters 9, 10 and 11. Following Tajfel et al. (1971), Chapters 9 and 10 present two studies which investigate the minimal requirements for intergroup discrimination using musical preference as the comparative dimension. Are adolescents willing to discriminate between social groups using musical preference as the primary dimension for social comparison? Do they associate the ingroup more than the outgroup with positively stereotyped music, and the outgroup more than the ingroup with negatively stereotyped music?

Chapter 9 considers the intergroup behaviour of adolescents aged 18-21 years, and Chapter 10 considers the intergroup behaviour of adolescents aged 14-15 years.

4b) Following Hunter et al.'s (1996) and Branscombe and Wann's (1994) suggestion that social identity research should consider behaviour in real social contexts (see Chapter 3), Chapter 11 addresses the intergroup behaviour of pre-existing social groups. Do adolescents use musical preference as a basis for intergroup discrimination in ‘real’ social contexts? Is music a valued dimension for the development and
enhancement of social identity in such contexts, and how is this related to self-esteem?

Finally, Chapter 12 assimilates the findings of the six studies reported in the preceding chapters, and discusses the implications of these for the future development of the field.
SECTION B: INDIVIDUAL AND INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES
Chapter 6 Adolescents’ reasons for listening to music

6.1 Introduction

The review of the literature in Chapter 5 demonstrated that adolescents regard music as being very important to them. Most empirical research into adolescent musical behaviour has been conducted in the United States and in Britain, although a limited amount of research in other countries suggests that music may be similarly important in other Western adolescent cultures as well (see e.g. Bjurstrom and Wennhall, 1991). However, direct cross-cultural comparisons of involvement with music have not been conducted. The study reported here addressed the extent to which adolescents from two Western cultures, namely the US and the UK, may be involved with music for similar reasons.

Research conducted during the 1980s employed the ‘uses and gratifications’ approach (described in Chapter 4) to identify a variety of reasons given by adolescents for their musical behaviour. Conducted mainly in North America, this research indicated that adolescents report listening to music in order to help pass the time, to relieve boredom and loneliness, and to create a good mood (Gantz et al., 1978; Roe, 1985; Sun and Lull, 1986; see Zillmann and Gan, 1997). A recent investigation of British adolescents’ reasons for listening to music partially supported the findings of the earlier studies. Using a uses-and-gratifications approach, North et al. (in press) demonstrated that 13-14 year old adolescents’ reasons for listening to music clustered around identity and mood-regulation factors (see Chapter 5). North et al. discussed
their findings in terms of the ability of musical preference to help define interpersonal relations, and argued that music fulfils the social and emotional, as well as cognitive needs of young people.

The study reported in the present chapter compared English and American adolescents’ reasons for listening to music using a uses-and-gratifications approach similar to that employed by North et al. (in press). Of interest was the extent to which adolescents acknowledge the social psychological benefits of musical involvement overtly, and the degree of correspondence that would occur between the reports of adolescents from each culture. It was expected that English and American participants would report similar reasons for listening to music. This expectation was informed by the suggestion that Western adolescents experience similar patterns of social and cognitive development (see Chapter 2; Cotterell, 1996; Heaven, 1994), and by the earlier argument that music contributes to social and cognitive needs in adolescence (North et al., in press).

6.2 Method

6.2.1 Participants Two-hundred and forty-five adolescents (121 males, 124 females) aged 14-17 years took part in the study. They were selected from two schools, one in the UK and one in the USA. Each school was situated in the suburbs of a large city: the UK school was in the West Midlands region of the country; and the US school was in the Mid West region of the country. The number and age of participants from each school was as follows:
UK: \(N = 101\) (53M, 48F); mean age = 14.66 years \((SD = 0.50)\).

US: \(N = 144\) (68M, 76F); mean age = 15.88 years \((SD = 0.43)\).

6.2.2 Design, Materials, and Procedure A questionnaire addressed adolescents’ reasons for listening to music (Appendix 5a). Participants were firstly asked to provide details of their age and sex, and to indicate how much time they spent listening to music each day. The questionnaire then provided a list of eleven potential reasons for listening to music (see Table 6.1), and participants were asked to indicate the extent to which each was a reason why they listen to their favourite music. Ratings were given on an eleven-point scale on which 0 = “this is definitely not a reason why I listen to that music”, 10 = “this is definitely a reason why I listen to that music”, and 5 = “midway between the two”. These eleven potential reasons were derived from previous research that has employed a uses-and-gratifications methodology (e.g. North and Hargreaves, 1999; Sun and Lull, 1986). Once the participants had rated each reason they were asked to state the main context in which they listened to music. Three response options were provided, namely (a) “on my own” (b) “with my friends” or (c) “about the same with each”. The instructions were read by the participants and at the same time were verbally reinforced by the researcher.

A final open-ended item asked the participants to provide details of their own musical experience. They were asked to describe any formal or informal musical training they had received, and also to provide details of any experience of music that was particularly important to them (such as e.g. attending a particular music concert). They
were provided with space on the questionnaire on which to write their responses.

Three independent raters judged the participants to have the following levels of musical experience:

- **low experience**: UK $N = 51$ (50.5%); US $N = 49$ (34%).
- **medium experience**: UK $N = 42$ (41.6%); US $N = 52$ (36.1%).
- **high experience**: UK $N = 8$ (7.9%); US $N = 43$ (29.9%).

The questionnaire was administered over a four week period during designated class times, and took approximately 15 minutes to complete.

### 6.3 Results

Participants reported listening to music for a mean of 2.25 hours ($SD = 0.84$) per day. An independent t-test indicated that the US participants reported listening to more music than the UK participants: $t(242) = 2.34$, $p = .020$: US $M = 2.52$ hours ($0.84$); UK $M = 2.25$ hours ($0.95$).

68% of participants reported that they spent approximately the same amount of time listening to music in the company of friends as they did alone; 27.8% reported that they listened mainly alone; and 3.7% reported that they listened mainly with friends. The association between nationality (US or UK) and listening context was non-significant: chi-square $\chi^2(2, N = 244) = 5.40$, $p = .067$. 
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6.3.1 Reasons for listening to music The mean values assigned to the eleven reasons for listening to music are reported in Table 6.1. 22.8% of the UK participants and 34% of the US participants offered an eleventh ‘other’ reason why they listened to music. The reasons offered were similar for both UK and US participants, and the most frequently offered reasons were “to have fun” (16%) and “to help fall asleep” (10%).

A factor analysis was conducted on the participants’ responses to the reasons for listening to music. Varimax rotation of the principal components solution identified three factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. These factors together accounted for 60.3% of the total variance in responses. Factor loadings greater than 0.30 are reported in Table 6.2. Factor 1 might be interpreted as ‘self-actualising’. The items with the highest loadings on this factor were concerned with being creative/using one’s imagination, expressing feelings/emotions, creating a self-image, getting through difficult times, and relieving tension/stress. Factor 2 might be interpreted as ‘fulfilling emotional needs’. The items which loaded highest on this factor were concerned with relieving boredom, reducing loneliness, relieving tension/stress, enjoyment, and getting through difficult times. Factor 3 might be interpreted as ‘fulfilling social needs’. The items which loaded highest on this factor were concerned with pleasing friends, and achieving popularity with others.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Listening</th>
<th>Whole group mean</th>
<th>UK mean</th>
<th>US mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enjoy the music</td>
<td>9.02 (1.52)</td>
<td>8.97 (1.67)</td>
<td>9.06 (1.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be creative/use imagination</td>
<td>4.26 (3.09)</td>
<td>3.30 (2.83)</td>
<td>4.94 (3.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To relieve boredom</td>
<td>6.70 (2.80)</td>
<td>6.41 (2.80)</td>
<td>6.91 (2.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help get through difficult times</td>
<td>5.59 (3.18)</td>
<td>4.65 (2.98)</td>
<td>6.26 (3.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be popular with others</td>
<td>1.49 (2.27)</td>
<td>1.39 (2.23)</td>
<td>1.56 (2.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To relieve tension/stress</td>
<td>6.59 (2.89)</td>
<td>5.57 (2.90)</td>
<td>7.30 (2.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To create an image for self</td>
<td>2.68 (2.83)</td>
<td>2.07 (2.49)</td>
<td>3.12 (2.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To express feelings/emotions</td>
<td>4.61 (3.34)</td>
<td>2.95 (2.67)</td>
<td>5.75 (3.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To please friends</td>
<td>1.37 (2.17)</td>
<td>1.42 (2.26)</td>
<td>1.33 (2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reduce loneliness</td>
<td>3.12 (3.01)</td>
<td>2.90 (2.91)</td>
<td>3.27 (3.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9.39 (1.37)</td>
<td>8.95 (2.09)</td>
<td>9.56 (0.91)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Mean ratings assigned by UK and US participants of reasons for listening to music (and SD)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enjoy the music</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be creative/use imagination</td>
<td>+0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To relieve boredom</td>
<td>+0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help get through difficult</td>
<td>+0.64</td>
<td>+0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be popular with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To relieve tension/stress</td>
<td>+0.55</td>
<td>+0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To create an image for self</td>
<td>+0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To express feelings/emotions</td>
<td>+0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To please friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reduce loneliness</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
<td>+0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eigenvalue                       | 3.15     | 1.67     | 1.21     |
| % variance                       | 31.5     | 16.7     | 12.1     |

Table 6.2: Factor analysis of the reasons why participants listen to music
A 2 (nationality) x 2 (participant sex) x 3 (musical experience) x 3 (listening context) completely randomised MANOVA was conducted on the resulting factor scores.

There was a significant four-way multivariate interaction between nationality, sex, listening context and musical experience ($F(6, 398) = 2.51, p = .022$). Given the difficulty in interpreting such an interaction in a useful, or understandable way, further analysis of this was not undertaken. There were two further significant multivariate interactions, firstly between nationality and participant sex ($F(6, 198) = 3.29, p = .022$), and secondly between nationality and listening context ($F(6, 398) = 2.89, p = .009$).

For the interaction between nationality and participant sex there was a significant univariate effect of Factor 1 scores (self-actualising) ($F(1, 200) = 6.00, p = .015$). The interaction is plotted in Figure 6.1. For the interaction between nationality and listening context there was a significant univariate effect of Factor 2 scores (fulfilling emotional needs) ($F(2, 200) = 5.51, p = .005$). This interaction is plotted in Figure 6.2.

The above interaction between nationality and listening context is also partly reflected in the significant univariate main effect of listening context that was obtained on Factor 2 scores ($F(2, 200) = 4.72, p = .010$). A Tukey HSD test indicated that those participants who reported listening to music mainly alone, or reported spending the same amount of time listening alone as they did in the company of friends (factor scores $M = .01$ and $M = .07$ respectively), reported listening to music more to fulfil emotional needs than did those who reported listening to music mainly in the company of friends (factor score $M = -1.26$).
Figure 6.1: Interaction between nationality and participant sex on factor scores for Factor 1 (self-actualising)
Figure 6.2: Interaction between nationality and listening context on factor scores for Factor 2 (fulfilling emotional needs)
Finally, there was a significant univariate main effect of musical experience on Factor 1 scores \( (F(2, 200) = 3.92, p = .021) \) for which a Tukey HSD test indicated that those participants with a high level of musical experience (factor score \( M = .48 \)) reported listening to music more for self-actualising reasons than did participants with medium or low levels of musical experience (factor scores \( M = .01 \) and \( M = -.26 \) respectively).

6.4 Discussion

Factor analysis of the reasons for listening to music items revealed three factors which together accounted for 60.3% of the variance in participants’ responses. These factors were interpreted as ‘self-actualising’, ‘fulfilling emotional needs’, and ‘fulfilling social needs’ reasons (see Table 6.2). These three factors are similar to those reported by North et al. (in press), and similarly can be regarded as listening to music for reasons related to identity and mood-regulation.

Differences emerged between the factor scores when the variables of sex, musical experience, nationality, and listening context were taken into account. There was a significant interaction between nationality and participant sex, and between nationality and listening context. UK males reported listening to music less for self-actualising reasons than did any other group, whilst US males reported listening to music more for this reason than did any other group (see Figure 6.1). US participants who reported listening to music mostly alone, or who reported listening to the same amount of music in the company of friends as they did alone, also reported listening more to fulfil emotional needs than did those who listened mainly with others. Such an effect
was not apparent for UK participants (see Figure 6.2). It is not clear why these variables should interact in this way. However, since there were no significant multivariate or univariate main effects of participant nationality, it can be suggested that UK and US participants’ reasons for listening to music may similarly be explained by the same factors.

The analysis of the factor scores also indicated that the participants’ level of musical experience was related to their reported reasons for listening to music. Specifically, those participants with a high level of musical experience reported listening to music more for reasons of self-actualisation than did other participants. In this regard, it is noticeable that considerably more US participants reported high levels of musical experience than did UK participants (43 US participants compared with only 8 UK participants). As such, it is possible that the interaction between nationality and participant sex on Factor 1 scores (self-actualising) is in part attributable to this difference in level of musical experience. It remains to be determined however whether increased musical experience leads to increased involvement with music for self-actualising reasons, or whether those people who listen to music for those reasons seek opportunities to further actualise the self by developing their musical experience.

Finally, the MANOVA analysis revealed a univariate main effect of listening context on Factor 2 scores: those participants who listened to music either alone, or reported spending an equal amount of time listening to music in the company of friends as they did alone, also reported listening more to fulfil emotional needs than did those who listened mainly in the company of friends. This finding indicates the potential
differential benefits of listening to music in different social contexts. It suggests that solitary listening may contribute to the fulfilment of one’s emotional needs. By spending some time alone, adolescents may be able to gain the emotional benefits of listening to music. It may help them reduce feelings of loneliness, relieve tension, enjoy the music, and may also help them get through difficult periods (c.f. Table 6.2). These benefits may not be successfully gained if the listening environment mainly contains one’s friends: listening to music solely in the company of friends may not be conducive to the fulfilment of personal needs.

Previous research has indicated that adolescents report listening to music mainly in private (e.g. North et al., in press), and this finding conflicts with that of the present study: the majority of participants here reported that they spent the same amount of time listening to music alone as they did in the company of friends. This difference can possibly be explained by differences in the way that the questionnaire item was constructed in these two studies. When asked to state the context in which they listened to music, the current participants were given the options of indicating: “on my own”; “with my friends”; or “about the same with each”. North et al.’s study did not contain this third option; their participants were provided with the options of: “on my own”; “with my friends”; “with my family”; or “other”. Given the large amount of time that adolescents spend with their friends (Larson and Richards, 1991), and the importance that they place on music itself, it seems intuitively appropriate that music should feature in both private and public contexts.
6.5 Summary and conclusion This study has demonstrated the potential benefits that might be gained from listening to music. The overall similarity in responses of the UK and US participants also supports previous uses-and-gratifications research by indicating that both English and American adolescents may listen to music in an attempt to satisfy emotional and social needs. It is possible that this similarity is related to the similarity in the adolescent process of these two cultures: as noted earlier, adolescents from Western cultures are reported to undergo similar processes of cognitive and social development (e.g. Cotterell, 1996; Heaven, 1994), although research of this nature is lacking. If adolescents acknowledge the potential benefits of music, this suggests that musical factors might also influence their behaviour. The next chapter addresses these issues. It considers the role of music in adolescent leisure activities, the potential of music to influence friendship selection, and the relationship between adolescents’ musical preferences and those perceived of their reference groups.
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Chapter 7 Involvement with leisure, friendship selection, and the role of the social network in musical preference

7.1 Introduction

Chapter 6 highlighted the potential benefits of music listening in adolescence. The present chapter examines how involvement with music might influence the interpersonal behaviour of adolescents. It was noted in Chapter 6 that music’s potential to fulfil social needs may be one factor which influences adolescents’ listening behaviour. This supports the contention that musical preference may be an important basis upon which adolescents form impressions of others. Furthermore, some of the research presented in Chapter 5 suggested that musical interests act as a ‘badge’ of identification upon which friendships can be based (e.g. Frith, 1983; Zillmann and Bhatia, 1989). However, the importance of musical interests relative to other interests in this process has not been addressed systematically. Whilst some research suggests that a variety of interests can influence friendship selection (Byrne, 1971; Eiser et al., 1991), it is possible that musical interest is a particularly important predictor of friendship during adolescence: adolescents may use the ‘badge’ function of music to attract potential friends.

Part of this ‘badge’ function may involve indicating to others that the adolescent likes ‘socially approved’ music, that is, music that is approved by his or her peers. It has already been shown that musical preference is related to an adolescents’ status within the peer group (e.g. Brown and O’Leary, 1971), and van Wel (1994) demonstrated
that adolescents regard their close reference groups (friends and peers) to be particularly important influences on their musical interests. In addition, whilst van Weel’s participants reported that their parental interests were less important to their decisions about music, it was shown that they did not completely reject the values of parents in favour of those of their peers (see Chapter 2).

It is important to continue to investigate adolescents’ perceptions of their social network because beliefs about one’s social standing within this network may contribute to feelings of self-worth (Robinson, 1995; see Chapter 2). By displaying an affiliation with certain styles of music, adolescents may fulfil the need for perceived social approval. This in turn may help maintain or enhance self-esteem. Consequently, it is likely that adolescents will report their own musical interests as corresponding with those of their reference groups: to report different musical interests could be detrimental to the adolescent’s maintenance of good relations with his or her social network.

A further issue concerns the context in which musical behaviour occurs. Whilst adolescents report a primary interest in music (e.g. Fitzgerald, et al., 1995), they do of course have interests in other activities, including visiting friends, and ‘hanging around talking’ (Fitzgerald, et al., 1995). Perhaps music is also an important feature of these other activities. Some support for this suggestion comes from the findings of Chapter 6 that many adolescents spend an equal amount of time listening to music in the company of friends as they do alone. Given the value that adolescents place on music, they may be motivated to participate actively in those activities where music is
likely to be present. It is possible that those activities which are liked most and in which adolescents participate most frequently are also those activities where music is present.

The present study employed a questionnaire to address these three issues in a cross-sectional sample of adolescents aged 11-18 years. The first section addressed the degree to which adolescents considered music to be an appropriate feature of each of 24 leisure activities, and the extent to which they liked and participated in each one. The next section addressed the perceived importance of music relative to other interests in adolescents' decisions about friendship selection. The final section of the questionnaire investigated the relationship between the adolescents' musical preferences and those perceived for a variety of reference groups. In light of the observation that middle adolescence is a period when relations with friends and peers are the focal concern (Coleman, 1979; Steinberg and Silverberg, 1986; see Chapter 2), it was expected that the benefits of music in each of these contexts might be greatest during middle adolescence. The following hypotheses were tested:

1. There should be a positive relationship between the frequency of participation in a leisure activity and liking for that activity.

2. There should be a positive relationship between the degree of liking for a leisure activity and the degree to which music will be considered appropriate in that activity. This relationship will be stronger in middle adolescence (14-15 years of age) than in early adolescence (11-12 years) or late adolescence (17-18 years).
3. There should be a positive relationship between the frequency of participation in an activity and the degree to which music will be reported as appropriate in that activity. This relationship will be stronger in middle adolescence than in early or late adolescence.

4. Musical interests should be perceived as more important to friendship selection in middle adolescence than in early or late adolescence.

5. Participants’ musical preferences should be positively related to the estimated musical preferences of their best friend, group of friends, and parents. These relationships will be stronger in middle adolescence than in early or late adolescence.

7.2 Method

7.2.1 Participants One-hundred and forty-seven adolescents (70 males, 77 females) aged 11-18 years agreed to participate in the study. The number and age of participants from each age group was as follows:

11-12 years: \( N = 58 \) (30M, 28F); mean age = 11.64 (SD = 0.41).

14-15 years: \( N = 46 \) (24M, 22F); mean age = 14.80 (SD = 0.40).

17-18 years: \( N = 43 \) (16M, 27F); mean age = 17.37 (SD = 0.49).

The two older age groups were selected from the same school. The youngest age group was selected from a different school because the other school did not contain pupils of this age group. The schools were comparable in terms of SES and ethnic
composition, and were both situated in the suburbs of large cities in the Midlands region of the UK. Each age group was tested separately and during a designated class time. Class sizes determined that two testing sessions per age group were necessary.

7.2.2 Design, Materials, and Procedure The first section of the questionnaire addressed the participants’ involvement in 24 different leisure activities (see Table 7.1). These activities were adapted from recent literature that has investigated adolescents’ leisure behaviour (Fitzgerald et al., 1995; Garton and Pratt, 1987; c.f. Hendry, 1983). The participants were asked to rate each activity three times using a five-point scale. Firstly, they indicated how often they took part in each activity. On the scale, 1 = “never/hardly ever”, 2 = “once a month”, 3 = “once every two weeks”, 4 = “once a week”, and 5 = “almost every day”. Secondly, participants indicated how much they liked each activity. On the scale, 1 = “dislike very much”, 2 = “dislike”, 3 = “neither like nor dislike”, 4 = “like”, and 5 = “like very much”. Thirdly, they indicated how appropriate they believed it was that music was present in each activity. On the scale, 1 = “not at all appropriate”, 2 = “not very appropriate”, 3 = “neither appropriate nor inappropriate”, 4 = “quite appropriate”, and 5 = “very appropriate”.

The second section of the questionnaire assessed influences on friendship selection. Six everyday interests and activities were presented, and respondents were asked to rate how important each was to their decision “whether or not to become someone’s friend”. Ratings were made on a five-point scale on which 1 = “not at all important”, 2 = “not important”, 3 = “neither important nor not important”, 4 = “important”, and 5 = “very important”. The six interests and activities presented were derived from
previous research literature that has investigated leisure involvement and processes of friendship development (e.g. Fink and Wild, 1995; Fitzgerald et al., 1995), and were; sports, music, computers, TV, fashion, and attitude towards school or college.

The final section of the questionnaire presented the musical labels ‘rock/pop’ music and ‘classical’ music. Participants rated each style as follows: (a) their own liking for the style; (b) how much they thought their best friend might like the style; (c) how much they thought their group of friends might like the style; and (d) how much they thought their parents might like the style. Ratings were again made on a five-point scale on which 1 = “dislike very much”, 2 = “dislike”, 3 = “neither like nor dislike”, 4 = “like”, and 5 = “like very much”. The instructions for each section of the questionnaire were read by the participants, and at the same time reinforced verbally by the researcher (a copy of the questionnaire appears in Appendix 5b). Approximately 40 minutes were required for completion of the questionnaire.

7.3 Results

Table 7.1 displays the mean frequency of participation, liking, and music appropriateness ratings assigned to the 24 leisure activities. Hypothesis (1) stated that there should be a positive relationship between the frequency of participation in a leisure activity and liking for that activity. Hypothesis (2) stated that there should be a positive relationship between the degree of liking for a leisure activity and the degree to which music will be considered appropriate in that activity, and Hypothesis (3) stated that there should be a positive relationship between the frequency of
participation in an activity and the degree to which music will be reported as
appropriate in that activity. Since it was possible that the relationship between any two
of these variables could in part also be accounted for by responses on the third
variable, a series of parial correlations was performed to test these three hypotheses.

To test Hypothesis (1) a partial correlation was computed between the frequency of
participation and the liking scale (controlling for music appropriateness ratings). The
coefficient was significant ($r = .37, N = 144, p < .001$). Partial coefficients were also
calculated separately for each leisure interest. All but one were uniformly significant
and positive ($r$ values between .22 (going to a restaurant) and .78 (watching sport), $N$
= 144 in all cases, $p$ values between .007 and < .001). This supports the hypothesis
and indicates that the more often the respondents participated in the activities so the
more they liked those activities.

To test Hypothesis (2) a partial correlation was computed between the liking scale and
the music appropriateness scale (controlling for frequency of participation ratings).
The coefficient was significant ($r = .46, N = 144, p < .001$). Partial coefficients were
also calculated separately for each leisure interest. Twenty-one of these were
significant ($r$ values between .16 (going to a youth club) and .49 (non-sporting club),
$N = 144$ in all cases, $p$ values between .049 and < .001). This indicates that the
participants liked most those activities in which music was considered most
appropriate. To determine whether or not the relationship was stronger in middle
adolescence (14-15 years of age) than in early (11-12 years) or late adolescence (17-18
years), as hypothesised, a series of $z'$ tests were performed to compare the coefficients
obtained from ratings assigned by each age group (see Edwards, 1960). None of the
coefficients differed significantly from each other. This indicates that the strength of
the relationship between the degree of liking for the activities and the extent to which
music was considered appropriate in the activities did not differ between the three age
groups.

To test Hypothesis (3) a partial correlation was computed between the frequency of
participation scale and the music appropriateness scale (controlling for liking ratings).
The coefficient was non-significant ($r = .07, N = 144, p = .426$). Partial coefficients
were also calculated separately for each leisure interest. Five of these were significant,
namely spending time alone; going to parties; hanging around with friends at home;
attending a non-sporting club; and school or family outings ($r$ values between .17
(attending a non-sporting club) and $r = .24$ (spending time alone), $N = 144$ in all cases,
$p$ values between .050 and .004). These data indicate that the more frequently the
adolescents participated in these five activities so the more appropriate the presence of
music was considered in those activities. To determine whether or not the relationship
was stronger in middle adolescence (14-15 years of age) than in early (11-12 years) or
late adolescence (17-18 years), $z'$ tests were again performed to compare the
coefficients obtained from ratings assigned by each age group. None of the
coefficients differed significantly from each other. This indicates that the strength of
the relationship between the frequency of participation in the activities and the extent
to which music was considered appropriate in the activities did not differ between the
three age groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leisure activity</th>
<th>Mean frequency of participation in the activities</th>
<th>Mean liking for the activities</th>
<th>Mean appropriateness of music in the activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Going to pop concerts</td>
<td>1.20 (0.60)</td>
<td>3.70 (1.17)</td>
<td>4.76 (0.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scouts/guides</td>
<td>1.22 (0.77)</td>
<td>1.55 (1.06)</td>
<td>1.90 (1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to museums</td>
<td>1.24 (0.58)</td>
<td>2.22 (1.28)</td>
<td>1.95 (1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to the theatre</td>
<td>1.29 (0.57)</td>
<td>2.90 (1.52)</td>
<td>3.52 (1.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending a musical group e.g. orchestra/band</td>
<td>1.41 (0.97)</td>
<td>1.95 (1.23)</td>
<td>3.97 (1.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending a non-sporting club</td>
<td>1.45 (1.03)</td>
<td>2.33 (1.42)</td>
<td>2.31 (1.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going bowling</td>
<td>1.68 (0.86)</td>
<td>3.84 (1.16)</td>
<td>3.50 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to an amusement arcade</td>
<td>1.71 (1.05)</td>
<td>3.39 (1.18)</td>
<td>3.82 (1.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to a youth club</td>
<td>1.73 (1.23)</td>
<td>2.76 (1.26)</td>
<td>3.61 (1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to church</td>
<td>1.81 (1.26)</td>
<td>2.23 (1.25)</td>
<td>2.68 (1.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to the cinema</td>
<td>2.17 (0.87)</td>
<td>4.34 (0.74)</td>
<td>3.85 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School or family outings</td>
<td>2.20 (1.23)</td>
<td>3.50 (1.18)</td>
<td>2.85 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to a restaurant</td>
<td>2.26 (1.03)</td>
<td>4.11 (0.88)</td>
<td>3.46 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to discos or clubs</td>
<td>2.44 (1.29)</td>
<td>4.17 (1.12)</td>
<td>4.81 (0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to parties</td>
<td>2.54 (1.15)</td>
<td>4.41 (0.77)</td>
<td>4.78 (0.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school activities</td>
<td>2.57 (1.64)</td>
<td>3.29 (1.45)</td>
<td>2.75 (1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports club/team</td>
<td>2.77 (1.62)</td>
<td>3.66 (1.35)</td>
<td>2.24 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing with video or computer games</td>
<td>2.80 (1.64)</td>
<td>3.46 (1.25)</td>
<td>3.84 (1.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to a cafe or burger bar</td>
<td>2.97 (1.20)</td>
<td>3.90 (0.93)</td>
<td>3.55 (1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending time alone</td>
<td>3.21 (1.64)</td>
<td>2.92 (1.24)</td>
<td>4.08 (1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching sport</td>
<td>3.31 (1.48)</td>
<td>3.64 (1.34)</td>
<td>2.42 (1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanging around the neighbourhood with friends</td>
<td>3.34 (1.74)</td>
<td>3.69 (1.23)</td>
<td>2.58 (1.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanging around with friends at home</td>
<td>3.75 (1.29)</td>
<td>4.10 (0.95)</td>
<td>4.11 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching TV or videos</td>
<td>4.76 (0.64)</td>
<td>4.37 (0.70)</td>
<td>3.95 (1.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1: Frequency of participation, liking, and music appropriateness ratings for the twenty-four leisure activities (and SD)
Hypothesis (4) stated that musical interests should be perceived as more important to friendship selection in middle adolescence than in early and late adolescence. To test this a 3 (age group) x 2 (sex) x 6 (interest) mixed ANOVA was computed on the participants’ importance ratings, with repeated measures on the latter variable. There was a main effect of age ($F(2, 141) = 6.54, p = .002$) for which Tukey HSD tests indicated that the 11-12 year old age group rated the interests as more important for friendship than did the 17-18 year old age group. There was also a main effect of interest ($F(5, 705) = 16.88, p < .001$). Tukey HSD tests indicated that an interest in computers was rated as less important for friendship selection than any of the other five interests, and also that an interest in TV was rated as less important for friendship selection than an interest in music, fashion, and attitude towards school/college.

There was an interaction between age group and sex ($F(2, 141) = 3.86, p = 0.023$). Since this interaction does not differentiate between ratings of the six individual interests, the mean values constituting this interaction are not meaningful here and are therefore not reported. Of direct relevance are the interactions between age group and interest ($F(10, 705) = 2.03, p = .028$), and between sex and interest ($F(5, 705) = 7.19, p < .001$). These two significant interactions are plotted in Figures 7.1 and 7.2. The age group x sex x interest interaction was non-significant.

For the interaction between sex and interest, Tukey HSD tests revealed that males and females differed only on what might be considered ‘gender-stereotyped’ interests, namely computers and sport; males assigned greater importance to both as factors affecting friendship selection. For the age x interest interaction Tukey HSD tests revealed several significant differences, and these are displayed in Table 7.2.
Figure 7.1: Interaction between age and the importance of each interest/activity for friendship selection
Figure 7.2: Interaction between sex and the importance of each interest/activity for friendship selection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Computers</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Fashion</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-12 years</td>
<td>2.79 (1.27)†a</td>
<td>2.95 (1.29)†</td>
<td>3.29 (1.41)</td>
<td>3.12 (1.36)‡</td>
<td>3.36 (1.42)†</td>
<td>3.48 (1.34)‡a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15 years</td>
<td>2.39 (0.86)†abc</td>
<td>2.85 (0.84)†d</td>
<td>2.76 (1.04)e</td>
<td>3.37 (0.95)‡cde</td>
<td>3.13 (1.13)b</td>
<td>3.00 (1.05)†a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18 years</td>
<td>1.77 (0.90)†abcde</td>
<td>2.56 (0.83)†af</td>
<td>2.70 (0.89)b</td>
<td>3.05 (1.02)†cf</td>
<td>3.02 (0.94)†d</td>
<td>2.81 (0.93)†e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Similar letters mark significant differences within groups at p < .005
Similar symbols mark significant differences between groups at p < .005

Table 7.2: Mean importance of each interest for friendship selection (and SD)
The results support Hypothesis (4) that musical interests should be perceived as more important to friendship selection in middle adolescence (i.e. 14-15 years of age) than in early (i.e. 11-12 years of age) or late adolescence (i.e. 17-18 years of age). The 14-15 year old age group reported that an interest in music was more important for friendship selection than did the 11-12 and 17-18 year old age groups. Furthermore, the 14-15 year old age group reported more differences between the rated importance of music for friendship selection and the rated importance of other interests than did the 11-12 or 17-18 year old age group. For the 14-15 year old age group, music was reported as more important for friendship than interest in computers, TV, and sport, whilst for the 17-18 year old age group, an interest in music was regarded as more important for friendship than an interest in TV and computers only. For the 11-12 year old age group, an interest in music was not rated as more important for friendship selection than any other interest.

Differences between the three age groups and also between males and females on preference for rock/pop music and classical music were analysed with a 3 (age group) x 2 (sex) x 2 (musical style) mixed ANOVA, with repeated measures on the latter variable. There was one significant main effect of musical style ($F(1, 141) = 324.35, p < 0.001$). Participants reported that they liked rock/pop music more than they liked classical music ($M = 4.29$ ($SD = 0.93$) and 2.26 ($SD = 1.14$) respectively). There was a significant interaction between age group and musical style ($F(2, 141) = 9.97, p < 0.001$). Tukey HSD tests indicated that preference for rock/pop music was significantly higher in the 11-12 year old age group than in the 14-15 or 17-18 year old age group. Preference for classical music did not differ between the age groups.
The interaction is plotted in Figure 7.3. The age group x sex x musical style interaction was non-significant.

Hypothesis (5) stated that the participants’ musical preferences should be positively related to the estimated musical preferences of their best friend, group of friends, and parents. To test this, a series of Pearson product moment correlations was performed on the music preference estimates for the group of participants as a whole, and for each age group separately. Coefficients were calculated between: (a) own liking for the music and the estimate of best friend’s liking for the music (hereafter ‘self-friend’); (b) own liking for the music and the estimate of group of friends’ liking for the music (hereafter ‘self-group’); and (c) own liking for the music and the estimate of parents’ liking for the music (hereafter ‘self-parent’). These analyses were performed for ratings of rock/pop music and classical music separately, and the results are displayed in Table 7.3.

With the exception of the ‘self-group’ correlation for rock/pop music in the 11-12 year age group ($r = .22, N = 58, p = .097$), the correlations for ‘self-friend’ and ‘self-group’ were uniformly significant and positive for both rock/pop music and classical music ($r$ values between 0.41 and 0.90, $N$ between 43 and 147, $p$ values between .005 and < .001). For rock/pop music the ‘self-parent’ correlation for the group of participants as a whole was also positive and significant ($r = .24, N = 147, p = .003$). For classical music the ‘self-parent’ correlation was positive and significant in all cases ($r$ values between 0.31 and 0.49, $N$ between 43 and 147, $p$ values between .019 and < .001).
Figure 7.3: Interaction between age and preference for rock/pop and classical music
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rock/pop music</th>
<th>Classical music</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( r )</td>
<td>( p )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole group (( N=147 ))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-friend</td>
<td>0.84 (&lt;.001)</td>
<td>0.61 (&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-group</td>
<td>0.75 (&lt;.001)</td>
<td>0.58 (&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-parents</td>
<td>0.24 (.003)</td>
<td>0.40 (&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12 yrs (( N=58 ))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-friend</td>
<td>0.54 (&lt;.001)</td>
<td>0.67 (&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-group</td>
<td>0.22 (.097)</td>
<td>0.62 (&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-parents</td>
<td>0.23 (.084)</td>
<td>0.31 (.019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15 yrs (( N=46 ))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-friend</td>
<td>0.86 (&lt;.001)</td>
<td>0.47 (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-group</td>
<td>0.90 (&lt;.001)</td>
<td>0.41 (.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-parents</td>
<td>0.21 (.165)</td>
<td>0.49 (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18 yrs (( N=43 ))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-friend</td>
<td>0.86 (&lt;.001)</td>
<td>0.69 (&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-group</td>
<td>0.80 (&lt;.001)</td>
<td>0.67 (&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-parents</td>
<td>0.14 (.362)</td>
<td>0.46 (.002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3: Self-reference group correlation coefficients for liking estimates of rock/pop and classical music
To determine whether the above correlations were stronger in middle adolescence than they were in early or late adolescence, as hypothesised, a series of z’ tests was performed to compare the coefficients for each age group. This was performed for rock/pop music and classical music separately. None of the coefficients for classical music obtained within different age groups differed significantly from one another. For rock/pop music, several differences emerged. The ‘self-friend’ coefficients for the 14-15 and 17-18 year old age groups (r = 0.86 and 0.86) were both significantly higher than the ‘self-friend’ coefficient for the 11-12 year old age group (r = 0.54) (z = 3.41 and 3.35 respectively, p < 0.01). The ‘self-group’ coefficients for the 14-15 and 17-18 year old age groups (r = 0.90 and r = 0.80 respectively) were significantly higher than the ‘self-group’ coefficient for the 11-12 year old group (r = 0.22) (z = 6.15 and 4.17 respectively, p < 0.01).

This provides partial support for Hypothesis (5) in that for rock/pop music the 14-15 and 17-18 year old age groups together gave rise to significantly higher correlations than did the 11-12 year old age group for the ‘self-friend’ and ‘self-group’ relationships. These data, and those concerning the ‘self-parent’ relationship, indicate that the musical preferences of adolescents are perceived as being clearly related to those of their reference groups.

7.4 Discussion

The results indicate that a positive relationship exists between the frequency of participation in leisure activities and the degree of liking for those activities, a finding
which is consistent with previous leisure research (e.g. Fitzgerald et al., 1995; Garton and Pratt, 1987). Furthermore, there was a positive correlation between (a) the degree of liking for the activities and the degree to which music was considered appropriate in those activities, and (b) the frequency of participation in five of the activities and the degree to which music was considered appropriate in those activities. Put simply, the findings indicate that adolescents like most and, to a lesser degree, participate most frequently in those activities where music is perceived to be appropriate.

It could be suggested that adolescents simply like most those activities in which music happens to be present, such as in restaurants, at parties, and in cafes. However, the observation that music was also considered appropriate in those activities where it has to be actively initiated (such as for example hanging around with friends at home, and spending time alone; see Table 7.1) does suggest that music is an important feature of adolescent leisure activities. However, future studies should investigate this issue further, and continue to examine the extent to which music’s presence or absence in an activity influences adolescents’ orientation towards that activity.

The analysis indicated that the age of the participants did not influence their involvement with the leisure activities. However, age did appear to influence the extent to which music was thought to influence the process of impression formation (refer to Figure 7.1 and Table 7.2). Participants aged 14-15 years reported that musical interests were more important to friendship selection than did participants in the older or younger age groups. Musical interests were not reported to influence friendship selection more than any of the other interests in the youngest age group, and in the
oldest age group an interest in music was reported as more important for friendship selection than TV and computers only. The greater importance of music in friendship selection in the 14-15 year old age group could reflect Larson et al.’s (1989) argument that for younger adolescents, music does not form part of the ‘social milieu’ (see Chapter 5). Whilst young people of various ages regard music as an important aspect of their leisure time, the potential utilitarian function of music in interpersonal behaviour is not acknowledged until later in adolescence: an interest in music for the 11-12 year olds was not regarded as particularly important for the selection of friendships, whereas for the 14-15 year olds, where music is part of this social milieu, music assumed a more important role in this process.

The finding that no single interest was regarded as the most important influence on friendship selection in any age group indicates that several interests and activities are important for friendship during adolescence. Adolescents have an interest in a wide range of leisure pursuits, including music, and friends tend to respond similarly to those characteristics which are important to them (Byrne, 1971; Eiser et al., 1991). If music, fashion, and school interests are all important aspects of an individual’s life, then it follows (as has been demonstrated here) that these very aspects may help guide friendship selection. What is quite clear is that musical interests are perceived to be an important attribute upon which to base friendships in middle adolescence.

The results support van Wel’s (1994) claims that adolescents believe that their own musical preferences are closely related to those of their reference groups, and these relationships also appear to differ according to age. For the ratings assigned to
rock/pop music, the correlations between the respondents’ preferences and their estimates of their best friend and group of friends’ preferences were significantly stronger for the two older groups than those for the youngest group. This suggests that rock/pop music may be less relevant in terms of its social connotations in early adolescence (11-12 years) than it is in later adolescence (14-15 and 17-18 years). A visual comparison of the ‘self-friend’ and ‘self-group’ correlations for rock/pop music with those for classical music further supports this idea (see Table 7.3). For the 11-12 year olds, these correlations appear to be stronger for classical music than they do for rock/pop music. In the two older age groups this pattern was reversed: preference for rock/pop music appeared to be more strongly related to the reference groups than was preference for classical music.

Following Zarbatany et al.’s (1992) demonstration that feelings of inclusion and acceptance are important features of ‘relationship-focused’ activities such as listening to music, it seems plausible that adolescents may report that their own musical preferences are compatible with those of their reference groups as part of a self-presentation strategy which fosters the development of such feelings. As such, the ‘badge’ function of music may help adolescents maintain the perceived approval of important others in their social network, and this in turn may contribute to positive feelings of self-worth (c.f. Robinson, 1995).

Finally, the traditional view of adolescence that parental values are rejected in favour of those advocated by an adolescent’s peers is further contradicted by the present findings. There was a positive relationship for both rock/pop music and classical
music between the respondents’ own preference ratings and those they estimated for their parents. As suggested in Chapter 2, such findings indicate that adolescents do not completely distance themselves from parental preferences (see van Wei, 1994). The data suggest that adolescents’ musical values may be related to the musical values of their parents: whilst peer groups do take an increasingly important role in adolescence, parental values are not opposed as such.

7.5 Summary and conclusion The study reported here has shown that there are important age differences in adolescent uses of music. Whilst adolescents in each of the three age groups reported that they like most and, to a lesser degree, participate most frequently in those activities where music is believed to be appropriate, it appears that the role of music in interpersonal behaviour is more valued by middle adolescence. By 14-15 years of age, music is considered an important part of friendship selection, and musical preferences appear to be related to the perceived preferences of reference groups to a greater degree than at earlier ages. It was suggested that adolescents might perceive their own preferences as corresponding with those of their reference groups as part of a self-presentation strategy: they may have been using statements of musical preference as a means of maintaining the perceived approval of their peers, and therefore in also maintaining positive feelings of self-worth.

The process by which adolescents might maintain these positive self-evaluations deserves further examination, and this is the focus of the next chapter. It should be noted that the study reported in the present chapter employed the broad musical style
categories of ‘rock/pop’ and ‘classical music’ to which most, if not all, adolescents are able to relate. It remains to be determined how adolescents might use the more diverse and specialised styles of music with which they are involved to achieve positive self-evaluations. The next chapter considers the relationship between adolescents’ preferences for a variety of musical styles and the perceived preferences of their reference groups. It investigates the extent to which adolescents use music in the social comparison process, and considers how such comparisons may be related to self-assessment.
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Chapter 8 Social comparison and musical preference in English and American adolescents

8.1 Introduction

The previous chapter suggested that music is implicated in the interpersonal processes of young people. It was found that adolescents report that their musical preferences correspond with those of their reference groups, and it was suggested that this may reflect a self-presentation strategy. The study reported in the present chapter examined the relationship between adolescents’ musical preferences and those perceived of their reference groups in greater detail than has been attempted previously. In order to further investigate the similarities in musical involvement of adolescents from Western cultures, the study involved a comparison of English and American adolescents.

One means by which people evaluate their own abilities and opinions is through engagement in social comparisons (see Chapter 2). Festinger (1954) proposed that individuals engage in social comparisons with people whom they perceive to have similar opinions and abilities as themselves. At the same time, however, individuals are motivated to evaluate the self positively, and this is achieved through downward social comparisons (Dunning et al., 1989). In comparative situations, individuals tend to display self-related biases (e.g. illusory superiority) which enhance the evaluation of their own abilities (Hoorens, 1993; Hoorens and Buunk, 1992).
In evaluating their own musical preferences, adolescents may be motivated to display such self-biases in order to maintain or enhance their self-image: they may seek to evaluate their own musical preferences more favourably than they evaluate the preferences of others. More specifically, in an effort to feel good about themselves, adolescents in a comparative context may associate themselves with positively valued music to a greater extent than they associate others with that music. At the same time, they may associate themselves with negatively valued music to a lesser extent than they associate others with that music.

While adolescents may engage in downward comparisons in this way, they may also be motivated to demonstrate a degree of similarity between their own preferences and those of their reference groups (see Chapter 7). Codol’s (1975) ‘superior conformity of the self’ hypothesis suggests that the positive evaluation of one’s own attributes which ensues from social comparison does not necessarily lead to a corresponding devaluation of the comparison other (see e.g. Buunk and van der Eijnden, 1997; Diener and Fujita, 1997). Therefore, it is possible that whilst adolescents will say that they like positively valued music more than they say others like the music, they will report that others do still like the music as well. Indeed, to report one’s own preferences as very different to those of certain reference groups may negatively influence the extent to which the adolescent receives social approval from that group.

Although the approval of one’s closest reference groups (e.g. friends and peer group) is likely to be particularly important in this regard, the degree to which adolescents perceive their own musical preferences as related to those groups with whom they
interact less frequently (e.g. age mates) has not been researched. Do the perceived
relationships between an adolescent’s musical preference and those of his or her
reference groups become weaker as those reference groups become more inclusive or
potentially less important to the individual? Some research conducted in a non-
musical context suggests that other reference groups may influence an adolescent’s
self-evaluations. Giordano (1995) proposed that age mates (i.e. the wider circle of
friends) may be more likely than close friends to provide ‘objective’ observations of
the individual. This is because close friends offer social support and tend to avoid
making negative statements about the individual. As such, Giordano suggested that
adolescent concerns relate to both close friends and the wider circle of friends since
the wider circle provides the broader social normative context in which close
relationships exist. In a musical context, therefore, it might be expected that
adolescents will report their own preferences as related to those of various reference
groups (albeit to differing degrees), since each group may contribute to self-
evaluations.

To investigate these issues, the present study investigated English and American
adolescents’ perceptions of a variety of reference groups in their social network. These
included their best friend; their small group of friends; their wider circle of friends;
other adolescents in general; and their parents. Given the reported similarities in the
adolescent process across different western cultures (see Chapter 2), it was expected
that UK and US participants should report similar perceptions of their reference
groups. However, this prediction admittedly is somewhat speculative, since research
has not examined directly the reference group relations of UK versus US adolescents.
The following hypotheses were tested:

1. Participants’ preference for music that is liked should be greater than corresponding estimates of other reference groups’ preferences.

2. Participants’ preference for music that is disliked should be less than corresponding estimates of other reference groups’ preferences.

3. Participants should report their musical preferences as positively related to those of their reference groups.

4. Participants’ own musical preferences should be predicted more by close reference groups (best friend and small group of friends) than by other reference groups (although they should still be related to the preferences of other reference groups).

5. UK and US participants should report similar perceptions of their reference groups.

8.2 Method

8.2.1 Participants As for Chapter 6 (see Section 6.2.1)

8.2.2 Design and Materials The first section of the questionnaire asked participants to write the names of their three favourite styles of music, and to provide one or two examples of performers that played music in each style. For each style of music named, participants were asked to rate their own degree of liking and estimate the degree of liking of seven of their reference groups for these same styles. The reference groups were: (a) their best friend; (b) their small group of friends (their peer group); (c) their wider circle of friends/larger friendship group; (d) students in England in
general of the same age; (e) students in America in general of the same age; (f) their Mother; and (g) their Father. The ratings were made on eleven-point scales (0 = “dislike very much”, 10 = “like very much”, and 5 = “midway between the two”). Items (d) and (e) (English students’ and American students’ preference) were presented such that for the UK sample the participants first estimated English students’ preference and then American students’ preference; the US sample first estimated American students’ preference followed by English students’ preference.

The second section of the questionnaire addressed the styles of music that the participants disliked. They were asked to nominate their three least favourite styles of music, and to provide one or two examples of performers that played music in each style. For each style of music named they were asked to rate their own degree of liking and estimate the degree of liking of the same seven reference groups for these same styles, as before. Ratings were again made on eleven-point scales (0 = “dislike very much”, 10 = “like very much”, and 5 = “midway between the two”). A copy of the questionnaire appears in Appendix 5(c).

8.2.3 Procedure The questionnaire was administered during designated class times over a four week period. Instructions on the questionnaire were verbally reinforced by the experimenter. The participants were told that the questionnaire was about their musical interests, and was interested in the styles of music that they liked and what they thought other people liked. The questionnaire required approximately 35 minutes to complete.
8.3 Results

A mean rating of the three styles of liked music and a mean rating of the three styles of disliked music was calculated for each reference group (hereafter referred to as ‘liked’ and ‘disliked’ music respectively; see Appendix 2 for participants’ nominated styles). Hypotheses (1) stated that participants’ preference for music that is liked should be greater than corresponding estimates of other reference groups’ preferences. To test this, the mean ratings for liked music were analysed with a 2 (participant nationality) x 2 (participant sex) x 8 (reference group) mixed ANOVA (with repeated measures on the latter variable).

There was a significant interaction between participant nationality and reference group rating \( (F (7, 1498) = 4.90, p < .001) \). Tukey HSD tests indicated that the US participants reported their own preference as higher than did the UK participants \( (M = 8.68 (SD = 1.12) \) and \( M = 8.24 (SD = 1.32) \) respectively); and that UK participants reported higher ratings than did the US participants for their estimations of other English students’ preference \( (M = 6.47 (SD = 1.88) \) and \( M = 5.64 (SD = 1.69) \) respectively). No other interactions were significant. There was a significant main effect of participant sex \( (F (1, 214) = 7.59, p = .006) \) which was attributable to female participants assigning higher ratings than male participants. Given that this main effect does not distinguish between the ratings assigned for each reference group, the overall means for male and female participants would clearly lack meaningfulness and are therefore not reported.
There was also a significant main effect of reference group \( (F (7, 1498) = 190.03, p < .001) \). Tukey HSD tests indicated that the participants reported their own preference as significantly higher than that of all of their reference groups. All significant differences for the main effect of reference group are displayed in Table 8.1.

Hypothesis (1) is supported.

Hypothesis (2) stated that participants’ preference for music that is disliked should be less than corresponding estimates of other reference groups’ preferences. To test this, the mean ratings for disliked music were analysed with a 2 (participant nationality) x 2 (participant sex) x 8 (reference group) mixed ANOVA (with repeated measures on the latter variable). None of the interactions were significant. There was a significant main effect of participant nationality \( (F (1, 215) = 8.83, p = .003) \) which was attributable to the US participants assigning higher ratings than the UK participants. This main effect does not distinguish between each level of reference group, and the means are therefore not reported.

There was a significant main effect of reference group \( (F (7, 1505) = 52.63, p < .001) \). Tukey HSD tests indicated that the participants reported their own preference as significantly lower than their estimates of five of their reference groups, namely: their wider circle of friends; English students; American students; their Mother; and their Father. Own preference was not significantly different to the preference ratings assigned for their best friend and small group of friends. All significant differences for the reference group main effect are displayed in Table 8.2. Hypothesis (2) is supported partially.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference group</th>
<th>Whole group mean preference ratings</th>
<th>UK participants' mean preference ratings</th>
<th>US participants' mean preference ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>8.50a (1.22)</td>
<td>8.24 (1.32)</td>
<td>8.68 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best friend</td>
<td>7.05ab (1.80)</td>
<td>6.89 (1.78)</td>
<td>7.16 (1.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group</td>
<td>6.77ac (1.58)</td>
<td>6.69 (1.58)</td>
<td>6.82 (1.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider group</td>
<td>6.33abcd (1.54)</td>
<td>6.19 (1.71)</td>
<td>6.43 (1.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK students</td>
<td>5.97abce (1.81)</td>
<td>6.47 (1.88)</td>
<td>5.64 (1.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US students</td>
<td>5.97abc (1.65)</td>
<td>5.89 (1.73)</td>
<td>6.02 (1.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>4.11abcdef (2.36)</td>
<td>4.21 (2.39)</td>
<td>4.04 (2.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>3.88abcdef (2.46)</td>
<td>3.69 (2.37)</td>
<td>4.00 (2.52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Similar letters mark means which differ significantly from each other at $p < .05$ (for reference group main effect)

Table 8.1: Mean ratings of liked music (and SD)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference group</th>
<th>Whole group mean preference rating</th>
<th>UK participants' mean preference ratings</th>
<th>US participants' mean preference ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>0.99a (1.01)</td>
<td>0.84 (0.87)</td>
<td>1.09 (1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best friend</td>
<td>1.30b (1.39)</td>
<td>1.12 (1.16)</td>
<td>1.40 (1.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group</td>
<td>1.30c (1.31)</td>
<td>1.04 (1.02)</td>
<td>1.47 (1.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider group</td>
<td>1.79abcd (1.60)</td>
<td>1.45 (1.30)</td>
<td>2.00 (1.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK students</td>
<td>2.76abcde (1.91)</td>
<td>2.34 (1.78)</td>
<td>3.02 (1.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US students</td>
<td>3.15abcdef (2.03)</td>
<td>2.90 (2.04)</td>
<td>3.29 (2.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>2.40abcdef (2.02)</td>
<td>1.97 (1.84)</td>
<td>2.67 (2.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>2.30abcdef (2.16)</td>
<td>2.14 (2.04)</td>
<td>2.40 (2.23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Similar letters mark means which differ significantly from each other at $p < .05$ (for reference group main effect)

Table 8.2: Mean ratings of disliked music (and $SD$)
Hypothesis (3) stated that participants should report their musical preferences as positively related to those of their reference groups. To test this a series of Pearson product-moment correlations was performed between the participants’ own ratings and their estimations of liking within each of the seven reference groups. This analysis was conducted for liked and disliked music separately. The coefficients calculated were between: own preference and best-friend’s preference (hereafter referred to as ‘self-friend’); own preference and small group of friends’ preference (‘self-group’); own preference and wider circle of friends’ preference (‘self-wider’); own preference and English students’ preference (‘self-UK’); own preference and American students’ preference (‘self-US’); own preference and Mother’s preference (‘self-Mother’); and own preference and Father’s preference (‘self-Father’). The resulting coefficients are displayed in Table 8.3. Several were significant. For the whole group, the participants’ own preference for liked music was perceived as positively related to that of their best friend, their small group of friends, their wider friendship group, and to that of US students. For disliked music, across the whole group the participants’ own preference was perceived as positively related to that of each of the seven reference groups.

In order to determine whether or not the perceived relationships between the participants and their reference groups differed between the UK and US participants, the corresponding coefficients produced by these two groups were compared with a series of z’ tests (see Edwards, 1960). None of the coefficients differed between the two nationality groups. These results indicate that both English and American participants perceived their musical preferences as positively related to several of their reference groups to a similar extent, and therefore provide partial support for Hypothesis (3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Group</th>
<th>Liked music</th>
<th>Disliked music</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whole group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>r value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-friend</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-group</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>0.43***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-wider group</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-UK students</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-US students</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Mother</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Father</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05; all others n.s.

Table 8.3: Correlation coefficients for the relationship between participants' own preference and estimated preferences of their reference groups
To test hypothesis (4) that the participants' own musical preferences should be predicted more by close reference groups (best friend and small group of friends) than by other reference groups, a stepwise multiple regression analysis was performed (using the participants' own preference as the dependent variable). This was conducted for liked and disliked music separately. For liked music, the multiple R coefficient was $R = 0.51$ ($R^2 = 0.26$). The perceived preference of the respondents’ best friend regressed significantly onto the respondents’ own preference ($F(1, 216) = 75.20, p < .0001$). The perceived preferences of the remaining reference groups did not increase the predictability of the participants’ own preference over the perceived preference of their best friend. The multiple regression equation of their best friend’s preference on the participants’ own preference was: 

$$own\ preference = 0.35\ best\ friend's\ preference + 6.01.$$ 

For disliked music the multiple R coefficient was $R = 0.57$ ($R^2 = 0.32$). The estimated preferences of three reference groups significantly regressed onto the respondents’ own preference. These were the respondents’ best friend, their small group of friends, and their mother ($F(3, 215) = 33.93, p < .0001$). The multiple regression equation of the three reference groups on the respondents’ own preference was: 

$$own\ preference = 0.13\ best\ friend's\ preference + 0.30\ small\ group\ of\ friends'\ preference + 0.08\ mother's\ preference + 0.25.$$ 

The regression analysis was also performed on UK and US participants’ responses separately. For liked music, the pattern of responses was the same for each: own preference was best predicted by estimates of their best friend’s preference only. For
UK participants, the multiple R coefficient was \( R = 0.59 \) (\( R^2 = 0.35 \)), and \( F (1, 78) = 41.75, p < .0001 \). The multiple regression equation of their best friend’s preference on the participants’ own preference was: \( \text{own preference} = 0.46 \text{ best friend’s preference} + 5.00 \). For US participants, the multiple R coefficient was \( R = 0.45 \) (\( R^2 = 0.20 \)), and \( F (1, 136) = 34.43, p < .0001 \). The multiple regression equation of their best friend’s preference on the participants’ own preference was: \( \text{own preference} = 0.28 \text{ best friend’s preference} + 6.68 \).

For disliked music, the pattern of responses for UK and US participants differed. For UK participants, own preference was best predicted by their estimated best friend’s preference only \( (R = 0.58 \) (\( R^2 = 0.33 \)), and \( F (1, 77) = 38.55, p < .0001 \): \( \text{own preference} = 0.44 \text{ best friend’s preference} + 0.36 \). For US participants, own preference was best predicted by estimates of their small group of friends’ and mother’s preference \( (R = 0.53 \) (\( R^2 = 0.28 \)), and \( F (2, 137) = 27.15, p < .0001 \): \( \text{own preference} = 0.37 \text{ small group of friend’s preference} + 0.09 \text{ mother’s preference} + 0.29 \). (Full statistics for the regression analyses appear in Appendix 1.) Hypothesis (2) is partially supported.

8.4 Discussion

The patterns of data reported here further confirm that the social network is an important aspect of adolescents’ musical interests, and also that English and American adolescent networks are perceived similarly. English and American participants aligned themselves with liked music to a greater extent than they aligned their
reference groups. They also aligned themselves with disliked music to a lesser extent than they aligned their reference groups (see Tables 8.1 and 8.2). By responding in this way the participants may, by implication, have been associating themselves with the positive connotations associated with liked music to a greater extent than they were associating others with such connotations. Conversely, they may have been associating themselves with the negative connotations associated with disliked music to a lesser extent than they were associating others with those connotations (c.f. North and Hargreaves, 1999). Such self-related biases may have been motivated by the desire to evaluate the self positively. They are also consistent with the non-musical literature discussed earlier which suggests that individuals are motivated to protect and enhance their self-image through illusory superiority and downward social comparison (e.g. Hoorens, 1993; Hoorens and Buunk, 1992).

Although participants engaged in self-serving social comparisons with their reference groups, they also reported a degree of similarity between their own musical preferences and those of their reference groups. Both English and American participants reported that their own musical preferences were positively related to those of several of their reference groups, including close reference groups (e.g. best friend and peer group) and other reference groups such as the wider circle of friends (see Table 8.3). This finding reflects Codol’s (1975) ‘superior conformity of the self’ hypothesis, and is consistent with Buunk and van der Eijnden’s (1997) research which demonstrated a positive correlation between self-other ratings of marital satisfaction, even when those ratings clearly were biased towards the self. Furthermore, as suggested in the Introduction, such a pattern of responses may have been motivated by
a desire to maintain good relations with the social network. Responses may have represented a statement of affiliation, or a demonstration that their own interests ‘fit in’ with those of their reference groups. The present findings are therefore also consistent with the results of the study presented in Chapter 7.

The moderate correlations that were observed between the participants’ own musical preferences and those estimated for their wider circle of friends further suggests that the participants were aware of the wider social implications of affiliating with certain styles of music. Giordano (1995) demonstrated that approval from the wider circle of friends was more highly valued than approval from close reference groups because, it was argued, the wider circle of friends provide a more objective appraisal of the individual’s behaviour. Consequently, although admittedly more speculative than previous conclusions, the participants may have been motivated by the need for ‘approval’ from these more objective others. As suggested by previous research, this approval may contribute to the maintenance of positive feelings of self-worth (e.g. Robinson, 1995; see Chapter 2).

However, whilst adolescents may be aware of this wider social context, the regression analysis suggested that adolescents’ musical preferences may be best predicted by a knowledge of the preferences of their close reference groups. For liked music, own preference was best predicted by the participants’ estimates of their best friend’s preference. This pattern of responses was consistent for English and American participants. For disliked music, own preference was best predicted by estimates of their best friend’s, small group of friends’, and their Mother’s preference. When this
regression analysis was performed separately for English and American respondents, different variables predicted the participants’ own responses to disliked music. For English participants, own preference was best predicted by a knowledge of estimates of their best friend’s preference only. For American participants, own preference was best predicted by a knowledge of estimates of their small group of friends’ and Mother’s preference. This difference between the two groups is surprising and is difficult to explain. Taken together, however, the results suggest that close reference groups may be most influential in determining adolescent musical interests. This suggestion is also consistent with the literature presented in Chapter 2 which indicated that friends and peers are highly influential on matters of concern to adolescents (e.g. Elkin and Handel, 1978; Youniss and Haynie, 1992).

Finally, it is worth commenting on the findings regarding the perceived relationship between the musical preferences of the participants and those of their parents. Whilst preference for disliked music was perceived to be positively related to parental preference, this was not so for liked music (see Table 8.3). This finding does not correspond with that of Chapter 7, or previous research which suggested that adolescents’ preferences may be related to those of their parents (e.g. van Wel, 1994). However, a post hoc analysis of the participants’ nominated styles of liked and disliked music offered a potential explanation for this apparently contradictory finding. The most frequently nominated styles of disliked music were ‘classical’ and ‘country’ music. These styles have frequently been employed in previous music research, and it is likely that most people would recognise them (see for e.g. Hargreaves et al., 1995). The participants could quite realistically compare their own
preference for such styles with that of their parents, and therefore perceive their own preference to be related to that of their parents. The most frequently nominated styles of liked music, by contrast, included styles which have not been extensively employed previously by research in this field. These styles were predominantly ‘youth-orientated’, such as for example ‘rap’, ‘dance’, and ‘indie/alternative’ music. Although admittedly speculative, it is possible that the participants did not believe that their parents’ liking for such music would relate to their own, because such styles may have been perceived as the exclusive domain of young people. The label ‘rock/pop’, used in Chapter 7 and in much previous research, could be a style that is relevant to younger and older generations alike, since it encompasses a broad array of styles with which both adolescents and their parents may identify. Whilst such general musical interests may be related positively to perceptions of those of parents, preferences for specific types of rock/pop music may be more closely related to those of same-age reference groups.

8.5 Summary and conclusion This study has demonstrated that adolescents engage in downward social comparisons in their judgements of others’ musical preferences, and this is consistent with the social comparison literature. Adolescents here associated themselves with liked music to a greater extent, and with disliked music to a lesser extent, than they did their reference groups. At the same time, participants reported a degree of correspondence between their own preferences and those estimated for their reference groups (especially their closest reference groups). Such a pattern of responses may reflect a self-presentation strategy in that adolescents are motivated by the need for approval from their social network: to report very different interests in
music clearly could be damaging to one’s status within that network. By indicating that their preferences are related to those of their social network, adolescents demonstrate to others that they ‘fit in’. As such, they are able to maintain positive feelings of self-worth and, therefore, a positive identity.

Admittedly, the current findings do not actually demonstrate reference group influence, since the study addressed adolescents’ perceptions of their social network rather than the actual preferences of this network. However, perceptions of others’ preferences may be especially important during social development: beliefs about one’s position in the social network may make significant contributions to feelings of self-worth (Robinson, 1995). This issue is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 12.

Having demonstrated the potential contribution of music to individual and interpersonal processes during adolescence, the next part of the thesis addresses the importance of music in the intergroup behaviour of adolescents. Chapters 9 and 10 each present a study that addressed adolescent musical behaviour in the so-called minimal group paradigm (described in Chapter 3). This is followed in Chapter 11 by a study that investigated the role of music in adolescent group behaviour in a more naturalistic social context. The study also considered the relationship between musical preference and a phenomenon of central importance in the social identity literature, namely the maintenance of positive self-esteem.
SECTION C: INTERGROUP PROCESSES
Chapter 9 Musical behaviour in the minimal group paradigm (1)

9.1 Introduction

The studies presented in Chapters 6, 7 and 8 demonstrated the importance of music in individual and interpersonal processes. This chapter, Chapter 10 and Chapter 11 investigate the extent to which musical behaviour is implicated in the intergroup processes of adolescents.

Social category memberships are undoubtedly salient aspects of adolescence. Adolescents become increasingly involved with the peer group (Coleman, 1979), and conformity to the group’s norms and values is reported to be highest during adolescence (Steinberg and Silverberg, 1986). Consequently, membership of a group is highly valued at this time and is related to psychological well-being, and rejection from a group has been shown to be detrimental to self-esteem (Gavin and Furman, 1989; see Chapter 2). However, despite a very well-established literature on group processes represented by research on social identity theory (SIT; Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel and Turner, 1986; Turner, 1975; see Chapter 3), the predictions of this have rarely been applied to the study of adolescent groups and particularly their musical behaviour. This is surprising given the prevalence of the social group and the importance of music during adolescence. The following question therefore arises which deserves detailed investigation:

How do musical preference issues relate to social category membership and the
relations between adolescent groups, i.e. to what extent can SIT predict the musical behaviour of adolescents?

Social identity theory maintains that group members identify with their group to the extent that they define themselves in terms of their group membership (see Chapter 3). This membership subsequently motivates a self-protection strategy in that group members seek to evaluate the ingroup positively, and this is achieved through engaging in social comparisons with an outgroup. An important aspect of this comparison process is that the dimensions for comparison must be ones that are valued by the group members; they must be important for group definition (Turner et al., 1979). Factors that might fall under this definition include honesty, academic ability, and physical appearance (see Hunter et al., 1996). According to the theory, the outcome of successful intergroup comparison is the maintenance of a positive social identity and self-esteem.

The well-known minimal group paradigm experiments (described in detail in Chapter 3) established that social categorization alone was sufficient to promote intergroup discrimination. Following categorization into two groups on the supposed basis of an aesthetic preference task, participants in Tajfel et al.’s (1971) study demonstrated ingroup favouring behaviour in their allocation of monetary rewards to the ingroup and outgroup. These findings have been replicated many times (see Tajfel, 1978).

Adolescent groups may provide a useful means of testing SIT, since adolescents in particular may be highly motivated to protect their group identification (see Gavin and
Furman, 1989). More specifically, given the importance of music to adolescents, it may be a valued dimension upon which they protect their social identity. As such, in a similar way that adolescents in an interpersonal context use musical preference to form positive self-evaluations, they may also use musical preference in an intergroup context to achieve positive distinction from an outgroup, and hence positive group-evaluations.

The study reported in this chapter examined this possibility using a minimal group paradigm procedure. It was expected that the participants would associate their own group with positively stereotyped music to a greater extent, and with negatively stereotyped music to a lesser extent, than they would an outgroup. The following hypotheses were tested:

1. Participants should identify with the ingroup more than the outgroup, as indicated by higher liking ratings for the ingroup than for the outgroup.
2. The ingroup should be associated to a greater extent than the outgroup with positively stereotyped music.
3. The ingroup should be associated to a lesser extent than the outgroup with negatively stereotyped music.

**Pilot study of musical preferences and fan stereotypes**

A pilot study was conducted to establish the degree to which adolescents would stereotype two distinct styles of music.
9.2 Method

9.2.1 Participants Nineteen first year undergraduate psychology students (5 males, 14 females) aged 18-21 years participated in the pilot study (mean age = 18.37 years, \(SD = 0.50\)). They were selected from a university in the East Midlands region of the UK, and volunteered to take part in the study as partial fulfilment of an introductory psychology course.

9.2.2 Design, Materials, and Procedure Ten excerpts of music were selected to represent ‘classical’ music, and ten excerpts were selected to represent ‘rock/pop’ music (see Appendix 3). They were each 40 seconds in length, randomly ordered onto a cassette tape, and played to the participants through a portable stereo-cassette player. The participants were firstly presented with the ten classical excerpts and were asked to rate how much they liked each one on an 11-point scale (0 = “dislike very much”, 10 = “like very much”, and 5 = “midway between the two”). They were allowed ten seconds between each excerpt in which to make their rating. Following this, they were presented with ten evaluative characteristics (see Table 9.1) and were asked to rate how well each characteristic could be used to describe fans of the style of music that they had just heard. These characteristics were adapted from previous research that has addressed stereotypes in music (e.g. North and Hargreaves, 1999). Ratings were made on 11-point scales (0 = “this is very untrue of fans of this style”, 10 = “this is very true of fans of this style”, and 5 = “midway between the two”). Following this, the participants were presented with the ten excerpts of rock/pop music. They rated each one in terms of liking, and evaluated fans of the music on the same ten
characteristics, as before. A copy of the response sheet appears in Appendix 5(d). The testing session lasted approximately 25 minutes.

9.3 Results and Discussion

The mean liking ratings for the classical and rock/pop excerpts were compared by a related t-test. The rock/pop excerpts were liked significantly more than the classical excerpts \((t(18) = 2.62, p = .017)\): mean rock/pop liking = 5.63 \((SD = 0.73)\); mean classical liking = 4.75 \((SD = 1.23)\). Repeated measures MANOVA analysis of the fan characteristic ratings revealed a significant main effect of fan characteristic \((F(9, 162) = 8.28, p < .001)\). Since this main effect does not distinguish between the two musical styles, the mean values for this effect would not be informative in the current context and are therefore not reported. There was a significant interaction between musical style and fan characteristic ratings \((F(9, 162) = 14.23, p < .001)\). The means and univariate statistics for the interaction are displayed in Table 9.1. Fans of rock/pop music were regarded as more 'popular', more 'in touch with youth issues', more 'fashionable', and more 'fun' than were fans of classical music, and as less 'pro-establishment', less 'snobbish', and less 'sophisticated' than were fans of classical music. With the possible exception of the adjective 'sophisticated', the results indicate that the participants held stereotyped beliefs about fans of rock/pop and classical music, such that fans of rock/pop music were perceived more positively than fans of classical music.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean for fans of rock/pop music</th>
<th>Mean for fans of classical music</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>3.21 (1.78)</td>
<td>4.11 (2.26)</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>5.63 (1.12)</td>
<td>4.47 (1.47)</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In touch with youth issues</td>
<td>6.47 (1.43)</td>
<td>3.37 (1.71)</td>
<td>38.44</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-establishment</td>
<td>3.11 (1.82)</td>
<td>5.21 (2.28)</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snobbish</td>
<td>2.63 (1.74)</td>
<td>4.62 (2.81)</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to get along with</td>
<td>5.84 (1.21)</td>
<td>5.11 (1.60)</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not have many friends</td>
<td>2.89 (1.52)</td>
<td>3.16 (2.83)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashionable</td>
<td>6.11 (1.15)</td>
<td>3.74 (1.76)</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.95 (1.47)</td>
<td>6.11 (1.20)</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>6.68 (1.26)</td>
<td>4.58 (1.47)</td>
<td>23.04</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.1: Univariate statistics and means for the musical style x fan characteristic rating interactions (and SD)
Main study: Intergroup evaluation

9.4 Method

9.4.1 Participants Seventy-five first year undergraduate psychology students (11 males, 64 females) aged 18-21 years took part in the study (mean age = 18.57 years, $SD = 0.50$). They were from the same university as those in the pilot study, and volunteered to take part in the study as partial fulfilment of an introductory psychology course. None had participated in the pilot study.

9.4.2 Design The participants made a series of comparisons between the ingroup and the outgroup in a minimal group paradigm procedure. Three independent variables were manipulated. The first, ‘group membership’, was manipulated in a between-groups design, and had two levels. The participants were categorized into one of two groups on the basis of a supposed preference for the paintings of two contemporary European painters, Ken Kiff and Stephen Farthing (hereafter referred to as the ‘Kiff group’ and the ‘Farthing group’ respectively). The second independent variable, ‘target group’, was manipulated in a within-groups design, and also had two levels. The participants estimated how much they thought members of the ingroup and members of the outgroup would like excerpts of rock/pop and classical music. Musical style (rock/pop and classical) was therefore the third independent variable, and was manipulated in a within-groups design. The dependent variable was the estimated degree of liking for the music.
Degree of identification with the social categorization was assessed in a between-groups design. Half of the participants in each categorized group indicated how much they liked the ingroup, and the other half indicated how much they liked the outgroup.

9.4.3 Materials Six black and white A4 photocopies of paintings by the artist Ken Kiff, and six black and white A4 photocopies of paintings by the artist Stephen Farthing were used to categorize the participants into two groups (see Appendix 4 for list of paintings used). These painters are modern European painters who produce relatively abstract artwork. The participants were presented with two paintings simultaneously using two overhead projectors. They were not aware of which painting was by which artist (the pairing of the paintings was actually random). For each pair of paintings presented, the participants were required to indicate which of the two paintings they preferred. They did this by marking a box on the response sheet labelled “I prefer the painting on the left”, or the box labelled “I prefer the painting on the right” (see Appendix 5e).

Eight excerpts of rock/pop music and eight excerpts of classical music were selected from those used in the pilot study. Excerpts from four composers/artists within each style were used such that two excerpts were used from each artist (see Appendix 3). The excerpts within each style were randomly ordered onto a cassette tape and were each 40 seconds long. They were played to the participants through a portable stereo-cassette player.

Participants in the Kiff group were given a response sheet entitled ‘Kiff group
questionnaire’, and participants in the Farthing group were given a response sheet entitled ‘Farthing group questionnaire’ (see Appendix 5f). Participants were asked to estimate how much they thought the Kiff group and the Farthing group would like the excerpts. Excerpts 1, 3, 5 and 7 were rated according to how much the participants thought the Kiff group would like each excerpt, and excerpts 2, 4, 6 and 8 were rated according to how much the participants thought the Farthing group would like each excerpt.

The instructions for each excerpt differed slightly, according to the group membership of the participant. When asked to estimate how much members of the outgroup would like the music, the instructions read: “How much do members of the Kiff group (Farthing group) like this music?”. When asked to estimate how much members of the ingroup would like the music, the instructions read: “How much do other members of the Kiff group (Farthing group) like this music?”. The excerpts were rated on 11-point scales (0 = “members of the group would dislike this music very much”, 10 = “members of the group would like this music very much”, and 5 = “midway between the two”).

The next item addressed the degree of group identification. The participants were required to either state how much they would like members of the Kiff group, or state how much they would like members of the Farthing group, if the group membership of each participant was to be revealed. All participants in any one testing session rated their liking for the same group, regardless of their own group membership. Participants in four of the eight testing sessions rated how much they liked the Kiff
group, and participants in the remaining four sessions rated how much they liked the Farthing group. The ratings were given on an 11-point scale (0 = “dislike very much”, 10 = “like very much”, and 5 = “midway between the two”). The final item of the response sheet asked the participants to state how much music they listened to each day.

9.4.4 Procedure The number of participants in each group ranged from 3 to 15, and each session tested participants of a single sex. Instructions for the study were written on the response sheet and these were also verbally reinforced by the experimenter. Participants were first informed that they were taking part in a study of aesthetic appreciation. Each pair of paintings was shown for approximately three seconds during which time the participants indicated their preference. The participants’ response sheets were then ‘marked’ by an assistant at the front of the room. They were told that the assistant was marking the sheets to determine which of the two artists they had preferred. During this period they were told that the next part of the session would attempt to relate this stylistic painting preference to the appreciation of and responses to music. They were told that they would either be given a response sheet entitled ‘Kiff group questionnaire’, or one entitled ‘Farthing group questionnaire’, depending on whether they had expressed a preference for Kiff’s or Farthing’s paintings (although this allocation was actually random). Group membership remained anonymous throughout the study. The two sets of musical excerpts were presented to the participants, who were given 5 seconds at the end of each in which to make their rating. The ordering of the musical styles was counterbalanced across the testing sessions. Finally, the participants rated how much they liked either the Kiff
group, or the Farthing group, and indicated how much music they listened to each day. The testing sessions each lasted approximately 40 minutes. The participants were fully debriefed after all sessions were completed.

9.5 Results

The participants reported listening to a mean of 3.31 ($SD = 1.88$) hours of music per day. Hypothesis (1) stated that the participants should identify with the ingroup more than the outgroup. To test this, the participants’ responses to the final item (group liking) were analysed with a 2 (group membership) x 2 (target rating) completely randomised ANOVA. The two levels of group membership were (i) Kiff group participants; and (ii) Farthing group participants. The two levels of target rating were (i) liking for the Kiff group; and (ii) liking for the Farthing group. There was a significant main effect of group membership ($F (1, 71) = 5.58, p = .018$), which was attributable to members of the Kiff group assigning higher ratings than members of the Farthing group. As this main effect does not distinguish between levels of target rating, the means are not informative and are therefore not reported. There was a significant interaction between group membership and target rating ($F (1, 71) = 5.71, p = .020$), and this is plotted in Figure 9.1. Tukey HSD tests indicated that participants in the Kiff group reported liking the Kiff group more than the Farthing group reported liking the Kiff group. Although the pattern of data appears to show that the participants identified more with the ingroup than with the outgroup, this effect was not statistically significant: members of each group did not report liking their own group significantly more than they reported liking the outgroup. The hypothesis is not supported.
Figure 9.1: Interaction between group membership and liking for the target group members
Hypothesis (2) stated that the ingroup should be associated to a greater extent than the outgroup with positively stereotyped music. Hypothesis (3) stated that the ingroup should be associated to a lesser extent than the outgroup with negatively stereotyped music. To test these hypotheses a 2 (group membership) x 2 (target group) x 2 (musical style) mixed ANOVA was computed on the participants' musical preference estimates, with repeated measures on the latter two variables. The two levels of group membership were (i) Kiff group participants; and (ii) Farthing group participants. The two levels of target group were (i) estimated Kiff group liking; and (ii) estimated Farthing group liking. The two levels of musical style were (i) rock/pop music; and (ii) classical music. There was a significant main effect of target group ($F(1, 219) = 3.28, p = .022$). Tukey HSD tests indicated that participants assigned higher ratings to the target Farthing group than to the target Kiff group. However, the means for this main effect are not reported since they do not distinguish between levels of group membership or musical style. There was a marginally significant interaction between group membership and target group ($F(1, 219) = 2.62, p = .052$). Tukey HSD tests indicated that the Farthing group assigned higher ratings to the target Kiff group than the Kiff group assigned themselves. Since the means for this effect do not distinguish between the two levels of musical style, they are not reported. None of the effects involving musical style were significant. Hypotheses (2) and (3) are not supported.

9.6 Discussion

The results did not support the prediction that participants in a minimal groups context should use musical preference as a means of distinguishing between social groups,
and consequently do not provide any support for the assumptions of social identity theory.

Several factors may explain these results. Firstly, it appears that the participants did not identify with the salient categorization: the participants did not rate the ingroup significantly more favourably than they rated the outgroup. This lack of group identification may explain the lack of differentiation in estimates of group musical preferences. Since participants were not highly identified with their group, they had little reason to discriminate between it and the outgroup. In this regard it is possible that any effects of the social categorization were also reduced by the reported weakening of group ties characteristic of late adolescence (e.g. Clasen and Brown, 1985; Dunphy, 1963; see Chapter 2). As a consequence, differential group musical preference estimates cannot beneficial to social identity where that identity does not exist.

It is also possible that the participants did not feel justified in estimating the musical preferences of anonymous other people. Social judgeability theory (Yzerbyt et al., 1994) maintains that individuals follow a ‘cultural norm’ when making judgements about others. The authors proposed that individuals do not activate and act upon stereotypes unless they feel that they have enough information to warrant such activation. Even if the participants had identified with the ingroup (and were therefore motivated to evaluate that group positively), they may not have believed that they had enough information about the outgroup to justify discriminatory behaviour. As such, they may have been guided by the need to portray an image of being fair (c.f. Singh et
al., 1998). Some support for this suggestion came from one participant who, prior to the discrimination task, asked how he could possibly estimate someone else's musical preference on the basis of knowledge of their painting preference alone.

An alternative explanation follows from the predictions of social categorization theory (Turner et al., 1987). The theory suggests that the extent to which stimuli are categorized as part of the same group or not depends on the meta-contrast principle: the ratio between within-group similarities and between-group differences. Specifically, if the difference between groups is perceived to be smaller than the difference within groups, then the target stimuli will be categorized at a higher level of abstraction as part of the same group. If the difference between groups is perceived to be greater than the difference within groups, then the target stimuli will be categorized at a lower level of abstraction as part of an outgroup (see Chapter 3). Following the lack of clear identification with the ingroup it is possible that the participants re-evaluated the situation, and in failing to acknowledge any substantial differences between the group (and thus in an attempt to make sense of the situation), re-categorized all participants as members of the same group at a higher level of abstraction.

It is equally possible that the participants did not identify with the music sufficiently to use it as a means of discriminating between the groups. Some support for this suggestion comes from the pilot study which showed that the actual difference in liking for the rock/pop and classical excerpts was, although statistically significant, in fact quite small in real terms ($M = 5.63$ and $M = 4.75$ respectively). Even if they were motivated to evaluate the ingroup positively, it is possible that the participants did not
like the rock/pop excerpts enough, or dislike the classical excerpts enough, to facilitate their use in a discriminatory context. It was suggested in Chapter 3 that the criterion for group comparison must be one that is valued to the extent that it must be important for group definition (Turner et al., 1979). The excerpts of music used here, therefore, may not have fulfilled this condition. Had the dimension for comparison been one with which the participants identified, and had they actually identified with the social categorization, then perhaps the effects of categorization would have been more readily identified. The next chapter presents a replication of this study using a different sample in order to confirm whether or not these conclusions are warranted.
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Chapter 10 Musical behaviour in the minimal group paradigm (2)

10.1 Introduction

The study presented in Chapter 9 failed to support the prediction that adolescents would use music to distinguish between minimal groups. It was suggested that the weakening of group ties that is a feature of late adolescence might partly explain why participants failed to identify with the social categorization. Perhaps the effects of social categorization will be more readily observed in a sample where group membership issues are of a more focal concern. The research reported in the present chapter is therefore a replication of the study in Chapter 9 using a younger sample. The study investigated the intergroup behaviour of adolescents aged 14-15 years. The hypotheses were the same as in Chapter 9, and were as follows:

1. Participants should identify with the ingroup more than the outgroup, as indicated by higher liking ratings for the ingroup than for the outgroup.
2. The ingroup should be associated to a greater extent than the outgroup with positively stereotyped music.
3. The ingroup should be associated to a lesser extent than the outgroup with negatively stereotyped music.
Pilot study of musical preferences and fan stereotypes

10.2 Method

Twenty-four participants (14 males, 10 females) aged 14-15 years agreed to take part in the pilot study (mean age = 14.42, $SD = 0.50$). They were recruited from a school in the West Midlands region of the UK. The design, materials, and procedure were the same as those in the study reported in Chapter 9 (Section 9.2.2).

10.3 Results and Discussion

The mean liking ratings for the classical and rock/pop excerpts were compared by a related t-test. The rock/pop excerpts were liked significantly more than the classical excerpts ($t(23) = 5.24$, $p < .001$): mean rock/pop liking = 3.29 ($SD = 1.48$); mean classical liking = 1.31 ($SD = 1.05$). Repeated measures MANOVA analysis of the fan characteristic ratings revealed a significant main effect of fan characteristic ($F(9, 207) = 10.93$, $p < .001$). Since this main effect does not distinguish between musical styles, the means are not informative in the current context and are therefore not reported. There was a significant interaction between musical style and fan characteristic ratings ($F(9, 207) = 6.44$, $p < .001$). The means and univariate statistics for the interaction are displayed in Table 10.1. Fans of rock/pop music were regarded as more ‘popular’, more ‘fun’ and easier to ‘get along with’ than fans of classical music, and as less ‘snobbish’ than fans of classical music. The results indicate that the participants held stereotyped beliefs about fans of rock/pop and classical music, such that fans of rock/pop music were perceived more positively than fans of classical music.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean for fans of rock/pop music</th>
<th>Mean for fans of classical music</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>5.79 (2.65)</td>
<td>6.63 (3.45)</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>4.04 (2.29)</td>
<td>2.46 (2.15)</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In touch with youth issues</td>
<td>3.71 (2.82)</td>
<td>2.29 (2.82)</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-establishment</td>
<td>3.88 (2.47)</td>
<td>4.04 (3.29)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snobbish</td>
<td>3.42 (2.96)</td>
<td>7.50 (3.07)</td>
<td>29.48</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to get along with</td>
<td>4.21 (2.34)</td>
<td>2.67 (2.78)</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not have many friends</td>
<td>5.92 (3.28)</td>
<td>5.67 (3.23)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashionable</td>
<td>2.79 (2.55)</td>
<td>2.17 (2.44)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.92 (2.48)</td>
<td>5.46 (3.43)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>4.50 (2.74)</td>
<td>2.46 (2.38)</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.1: Univariate statistics and means for the musical style x fan characteristic rating interactions (and SD)
Main study: Intergroup evaluation

10.4 Method

Forty-seven participants (23 males, 24 females) aged 14-15 years agreed to participate in the study (mean age = 14.17, SD = 0.38). They were from the same school as those in the pilot study. None had participated in the pilot study. The number of participants in each group ranged from 5 to 9, and each session tested participants of a single sex. The design, materials, and procedure were the same as in Chapter 9 (Section 9.4).

10.5 Results

The participants reported listening to a mean of 2.75 (SD = 1.74) hours of music per day. To test Hypothesis (1) that the participants should identify with the ingroup more than the outgroup, the participants’ responses to the final item (group liking) were analysed with a 2 (group membership) x 2 (target rating) completely randomised ANOVA. The two levels of group membership were (i) Kiff group participants; and (ii) Farthing group participants. The two levels of target rating were (i) liking for the Kiff group; and (ii) liking for the Farthing group. There was a significant main effect of target rating ($F(1, 43) = 4.31, p = .044$): participants assigned higher ratings to members of the Kiff group than they did to members of the Farthing group. However, since the means for this main effect do not distinguish between levels of group membership, they are not reported. There was an interaction between group membership and target rating ($F(1, 43) = 6.65, p = .013$). Tukey HSD tests indicated
that members of the Kiff group reported liking the target Kiff group significantly more than they reported liking the target Farthing group. Members of the Farthing group did not report differential liking for the two groups. Therefore, the interaction reveals an ingroup favouritism effect for members of the Kiff group only, and is plotted in Figure 10.1. The hypothesis is supported partially.

Hypothesis (2) stated that the ingroup should be associated to a greater extent than the outgroup with positively stereotyped music. Hypothesis (3) stated that the ingroup should be associated to a lesser extent than the outgroup with negatively stereotyped music. To test these hypotheses a 2 (group membership) x 2 (target group) x 2 (musical style) mixed ANOVA was computed on the participants' musical preference estimates, with repeated measures on the latter two variables. The two levels of group membership were (i) Kiff group participants; and (ii) Farthing group participants. The two levels of target group were (i) estimated Kiff group liking; and (ii) estimated Farthing group liking. The two levels of musical style were (i) rock/pop music; and (ii) classical music. There was a single significant main effect of target group ($F(1, 135) = 8.68, p < .001$). Tukey HSD tests indicated that participants assigned higher ratings to the target Kiff group than they did to the target Farthing group. Since the means for this do not distinguish between levels of group membership or musical style, they are not reported. None of the effects involving musical style were significant. Hypotheses (2) and (3) are not supported.
Figure 10.1: Interaction between group membership and liking for the target group members
10.6 Discussion

The results failed to support the prediction of social identity theory that individuals will discriminate between groups following social categorization. The participants did not discriminate between the two groups in their comparisons of musical preference, although participants assigned to the Kiff group did demonstrate a degree of identification with their group (indicated by a higher degree of liking for the ingroup than for the outgroup). Participants in the Farthing group, however, did not show such a bias.

The factors which may explain these results are therefore the same as those discussed in Chapter 9, namely failure to identify sufficiently with the social categorization; perceived lack of justification for engaging in intergroup discrimination; recategorization of the groups at a higher level of abstraction; and lack of identification with the experimental musical stimuli. The two studies reported here and in Chapter 9 respectively have failed to establish the role of music in adolescent group behaviour. The next chapter continues to address the possible reasons for this in order to determine the extent to which SIT can actually be applied to the study of adolescent musical behaviour.
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Chapter 11 Social Categorization, Self-Esteem, and the Estimated Musical Preferences of Adolescents

11.1 Introduction

The unnaturalistic nature of the minimal group paradigm may explain why the full predictions of social identity theory have not always been supported in empirical studies (Hunter et al., 1996). As was suggested in Chapter 3, participants in artificial groups may not strongly identify with the group, and consequently may not be motivated to protect the social identity derived from that group. This is potentially a reason why the studies reported in Chapters 9 and 10 did not provide any support for SIT. Indeed, research that has utilised ‘real’ social groups in investigations of intergroup behaviour (such as studies by Hunter et al., 1996; and Branscombe and Wann 1994) has demonstrated stronger support for the theory.

An important feature of both Hunter et al.’s (1996) and Branscombe and Wann’s (1994) studies was that the criteria for group comparison were valued by the participants; they were important for identity formation and maintenance (c.f. Turner et al., 1979). Hunter et al. examined participants’ perceptions of group honesty, academic ability, and physical appearance, and Branscombe and Wann evaluated perceptions of trustworthiness, hostility, and aggressiveness, amongst others. It is possible that musical preference is also an important criterion for intergroup comparison in adolescence, given the extent to which adolescents are involved with music, and the reasons that they cite for that involvement (see Chapter 6). The music
employed in the studies described in Chapters 9 and 10 was chosen initially by the author. Whilst the pilot study revealed differential liking for the two sets of music, rock/pop and classical music, it is possible that the participants did not identify with the music sufficiently to employ it as a means of distinguishing between groups: put simply, it was not their music. In a situation where the criteria for group comparison are valued by participants, and when the salient social categorization is real and meaningful, then SIT may well predict the behaviour of adolescent groups in a musical context. It may also reveal support for the hypothesised relationship between intergroup discrimination and self-esteem.

The study presented here further tested the idea that social identity theory is able to predict adolescent group behaviour when the social context is clearly meaningful to participants. It was expected that adolescents in an intergroup situation should seek to associate their own group with positively stereotyped music to a greater extent than they should an outgroup: they should engage in ingroup-favouring discrimination in their estimates of group musical preferences. Social identity theory predicts that the extent of this discrimination should be related to the adolescents’ self-esteem. These predictions can be summarised in the following hypotheses:

1. Participants should identify with the ingroup more than the outgroup, as indicated by higher liking ratings for the ingroup than for the outgroup.
2. The ingroup should be rated more positively than the outgroup along evaluative scales.
3. The ingroup should be associated to a greater extent than the outgroup with positively stereotyped music.

4. The ingroup should be associated to a lesser extent than the outgroup with negatively stereotyped music.

5. Pre-test self-esteem should be negatively related to the degree to which participants engage in subsequent intergroup discrimination.

6. The degree of intergroup discrimination displayed by participants should be positively related to post-test self-esteem.

Pilot study: Musical preferences, fan stereotypes, and descriptions of the outgroup

A pilot study was conducted to establish the styles of music that adolescents positively and negatively stereotype, and also to identify words in adolescent discourse which could be used to describe other adolescents their age. This information was then used as material for the experimental study.

11.2 Method

11.2.1 Participants Twenty-seven year 10 pupils aged 14-15 years ($M = 14.58$ years, $SD = 0.50$) took part in the pilot study. The participants were all male and attended a single-sex comprehensive school in the suburbs of a city in the West Midlands region of the UK.
11.2.2 Design, Materials, and Procedure Participants nominated as many styles of music as they could that they liked and disliked, and rated fans of ‘liked’ and ‘disliked’ music on ten evaluative characteristics (see Table 11.1). Ratings were made on eleven-point scales, on which 0 = “this is very untrue of fans of these styles”, 10 = “this is very true of fans of these styles”, and 5 = “midway between the two”. Participants then nominated as many adjectives as they could to describe boys their age who did not attend their school (i.e. a relevant outgroup). A copy of the questionnaire appears in Appendix 5(g).

11.3 Results and Discussion

A total of 66 styles of music were nominated by the participants. Repeated measures MANOVA analysis of the fan characteristic ratings revealed a main effect of fan characteristic \( (F(9, 198) = 7.00, p < .001) \), and an interaction between level of musical style (liked/disliked) and fan characteristic \( (F(9, 198) = 15.30, p < .001) \). The means for the main effect of fan characteristic do not distinguish between levels of musical style, and so are not reported here. The means and univariate statistics for the interaction are displayed in Table 11.1. These suggest that fans of liked music were stereotyped more positively, and less negatively, than were fans of disliked music. Fans of liked music were perceived to be significantly more ‘popular’, more ‘in touch with youth issues’, easier to ‘get along with’, more ‘fashionable’, and more ‘fun’ than were fans of disliked music. Fans of liked music were also perceived to be significantly less likely to ‘not have many friends’, less ‘boring’, and less ‘snobbish’
than were fans of disliked music. Ratings assigned to the adjectives ‘sophisticated’
and ‘nice’ did not differ between levels of musical style.

Ninety-seven words were nominated to describe members of the outgroup. No
analysis of these was conducted as the purpose was simply to generate words which
are part of adolescent discourse for the main study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean for fans of liked music</th>
<th>Mean for fans of disliked music</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>2.19 (2.34)</td>
<td>6.37 (3.02)</td>
<td>27.46</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>6.00 (2.38)</td>
<td>3.64 (2.27)</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In touch with youth issues</td>
<td>6.15 (2.73)</td>
<td>3.19 (2.22)</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snobbish</td>
<td>1.62 (1.72)</td>
<td>4.19 (3.15)</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to get along with</td>
<td>5.77 (2.30)</td>
<td>3.96 (2.52)</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not have many friends</td>
<td>1.85 (2.07)</td>
<td>4.19 (2.37)</td>
<td>16.32</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashionable</td>
<td>5.96 (2.09)</td>
<td>3.85 (2.41)</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>4.24 (2.01)</td>
<td>4.96 (3.10)</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>6.89 (1.78)</td>
<td>3.22 (1.85)</td>
<td>65.61</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice</td>
<td>5.74 (2.55)</td>
<td>4.67 (2.50)</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.1: Univariate statistics and means for the level of music liking x fan characteristic rating interactions (and SD)
Main study: Intergroup evaluation

11.4 Method

11.4.1 Participants Ninety-seven year 10 pupils aged 14-15 years ($M = 14.67$ years, $SD = 0.47$) took part in the main study. The participants were all male and attended a single-sex comprehensive school situated in the suburbs of a city in the West Midlands region of the UK. None had participated in the pilot study.

11.4.2 Design Participants made a series of comparisons between pupils attending their own school (the ingroup) and pupils who did not attend their school (the outgroup). The independent variable, ‘target group’, therefore had two levels, and was manipulated in a within-groups design. The study examined the effect of this independent variable on three classes of dependent variable. First, participants rated the extent to which twelve adjectives described both the ingroup and the outgroup; second, they indicated their liking for the ingroup and outgroup; and third, they estimated the extent to which the ingroup and outgroup liked each of six musical styles.

Participants’ self-esteem was assessed in a between-groups design in order to test Hypotheses (5) and (6). Half of the sample was chosen randomly to complete the self-esteem scale prior to the group comparisons, and the other half of the sample completed it after the group comparisons.
11.4.3 Materials The first section of the response sheet presented twelve adjectives and asked participants to indicate how well each one described boys from their school and boys who did not go to their school. The pilot study indicated that six of the adjectives had positive connotations (namely ‘nice’, ‘sporty’, ‘intelligent’, ‘fun’, ‘masculine’, and ‘popular’) and six had negative connotations (namely ‘boring’, ‘snobbish’, ‘not fashionable’, ‘weird’, ‘unfriendly’, and ‘rebellious’). Eleven-point scales were used for all ratings (0 = “this word does not describe us/them very well”, 10 = “this word describes us/them very well”, and 5 = “midway between the two”).

The second section of the response sheet asked participants to indicate how much they liked boys from their school, and boys who did not go to their school. This was rated on 11-point scales (on which 0 = “I dislike us/them very much”, 10 = “I like us/them very much”, and 5 = “midway between the two”).

The third section of the response sheet concerned participants’ estimates of ingroup and outgroup musical preferences. Six musical style labels were selected from those nominated in the pilot study, and were presented to participants. The styles had been categorized as ones which were either liked (and the fans of which had been described positively), or which were disliked (and the fans of which had been described negatively). The styles of music were presented in random order, together with two examples of bands/artists that play in each style. These examples were also selected from those nominated in the pilot study. The styles in the Liked category were ‘dance’ (The Prodigy and Sash); ‘pop’ (Hanson and All Saints); and ‘indie’ (The Verve and Oasis), and the styles in the Disliked category were ‘jazz’ (Count Basie and Duke Ellington); ‘classical’ (Beethoven and Mozart); and ‘heavy metal’ (Iron Maiden and
Metallica). Participants were required to estimate the ingroup and outgroup’s liking for each style on 11-point scales (on which 0 = “dislike very much”, 10 = “like very much”, and 5 = “midway between the two”).

Participants were then asked to state their age; how much time each day they spent listening to music; and their own level of musical experience. The latter item was open-ended and asked participants to describe any formal or informal musical training they had received, and also to provide details of any musical experience that they regarded as particularly important to them (such as e.g. attending a certain music concert). Three independent raters judged the participants to have the following levels of musical experience: low experience $N = 65$ (66.3%); moderate experience $N = 31$ (31.6%); high experience $N = 2$ (2%). A copy of the questionnaire appears in Appendix 5(h).

The self-esteem measure was identical to that employed in previous studies of social identity theory (e.g. Hogg and Sunderland, 1991; Lemyre and Smith, 1985), namely Julian, Bishop, and Fiedler’s (1966) evaluative self-description questionnaire (see Appendix 5i). This provides a measure of transitory self-esteem by asking participants to report how they feel “at the moment” on 11-point scales. Nine bipolar scales were presented in the following order: pleasant - unpleasant, warm - cold, hesitant - self-assured, efficient - inefficient, unfair - fair, good - bad, friendly - unfriendly, hardworking - lazy, and distant - close. To facilitate participants’ understanding of these terms, definitions were provided from the Oxford Advanced Learner’s
Dictionary (Fifth Edition, 1995). The scales were coded on analysis so that a low score represented low self-esteem.

11.4.4 Procedure The study took place during four timetabled classes. The participants were informed that they were taking part in a study considering issues concerning young people. The instructions informed participants that the study concerned how they compared boys from their school with boys who did not attend their school. Instructions for each section were written on the response sheet and these were verbally reinforced by the experimenter. Throughout the session participants were not permitted to begin subsequent sections until everyone else was also ready to do so. They were asked to complete the response sheet on their own, and were reminded that their responses were confidential. The participants rated the adjectives first, provided the liking ratings for the ingroup and outgroup, and then made the group musical preference estimates.

The procedure for completion of the self-esteem scales was the same for the pre-test and post-test groups. The participants were instructed that for each pair of adjectives they should circle the number which best described how they felt “at that moment”. They were told that the closer the chosen number was to either end of the scale, so the stronger that feeling. The testing sessions lasted between 45 and 50 minutes, and the participants were debriefed after all sessions were completed.
11.5 Results

Participants reported listening to a mean of 2.18 ($SD = 1.76$) hours of music per day. There were no significant effects of musical experience in any of the analyses and so this factor is not addressed further.

11.5.1 Group identification To test Hypothesis (1) that the participants should identify with the ingroup more than the outgroup, the mean liking ratings assigned to the ingroup and the outgroup were compared using a related t-test. The participants liked the ingroup more than the outgroup ($t (90) = 6.72, p < .001$): mean ingroup liking = 7.12 ($SD = 1.50$); mean outgroup liking = 5.10 ($SD = 2.26$). Hypothesis (1) was supported.

11.5.2 Group evaluation Hypothesis (2) stated that the ingroup should be rated more positively than the outgroup along evaluative characteristics. To test this, repeated measures MANOVA analysis of the adjective ratings was conducted. There was a main effect of adjective rating ($F (11, 1034) = 44.16, p < .001$). The main effect does not distinguish between levels of target group, and so the means are not reported here. There was a main effect of target group ($F (1, 94) = 19.39, p < .001$). The means for this do not distinguish between the adjective ratings and are therefore not reported. There was a significant interaction between target group and adjective rating ($F (11, 1034) = 20.64, p < .001$), and the means and univariate statistics for this are displayed in Table 11.2. There was a clear ingroup favouritism effect: all but four of the group comparisons were significant. Notably, eleven out of the twelve ratings were in the
expected direction; only ratings assigned to the adjective ‘rebellious’ were in the opposite direction to that expected, with the ingroup being rated as more rebellious than the outgroup. The ingroup was regarded as significantly more ‘sporty’, ‘fun’, ‘masculine’, and ‘popular’ than the outgroup, and as significantly less ‘boring’, ‘snobbish’, and ‘weird’ than the outgroup. Hypothesis (2) was supported.

11.5.3 Group music preference estimates Hypothesis (3) stated that the ingroup should be associated to a greater extent than the outgroup with positively stereotyped music. Hypothesis (4) stated that the ingroup should be associated to a lesser extent than the outgroup with negatively stereotyped music. To test these hypotheses the estimated ingroup and outgroup liking ratings assigned to the six musical styles were analysed with a 2 (target group) x 6 (musical style) repeated measures ANOVA. There was a significant main effect of musical style \( (F(5, 485) = 325.77, p < .001) \). Since the means for this main effect do not distinguish between levels of target group, they are not reported here. There was a significant interaction between target group and musical style \( (F(5, 485) = 19.58, p < 0.001) \). The means for the interaction are displayed in Table 11.3. Tukey HSD tests were calculated to compare the group ratings for each musical style. There was a clear ingroup favouritism effect: the ingroup was estimated to like dance and indie music (i.e. positively stereotyped music) significantly more than the outgroup, and was estimated to like jazz and classical music (i.e. negatively stereotyped music) significantly less than the outgroup \( (p < .001 \text{ in all cases}) \). These findings support Hypotheses (3) and (4). Ratings of pop music and heavy metal music were an exception to this, failing to give rise to a significant difference between estimations of the ingroup’s and the outgroup’s preferences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Ingroup mean</th>
<th>Outgroup mean</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nice</td>
<td>5.71 (1.63)</td>
<td>5.32 (1.61)</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>= 0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporty</td>
<td>8.91 (1.26)</td>
<td>6.60 (1.73)</td>
<td>166.93</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>6.93 (1.68)</td>
<td>6.58 (1.83)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>= 0.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>3.85 (2.73)</td>
<td>5.00 (2.52)</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>= 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snobbish</td>
<td>3.07 (2.77)</td>
<td>4.85 (2.68)</td>
<td>27.25</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>6.81 (2.29)</td>
<td>5.70 (1.90)</td>
<td>21.44</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not fashionable</td>
<td>4.45 (3.32)</td>
<td>4.52 (2.38)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>= 0.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weird</td>
<td>4.23 (2.72)</td>
<td>4.88 (2.53)</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>= 0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td>5.07 (2.75)</td>
<td>5.15 (2.28)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>= 0.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>7.12 (2.46)</td>
<td>5.19 (1.82)</td>
<td>60.37</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebellious</td>
<td>6.81 (2.44)</td>
<td>5.47 (2.57)</td>
<td>17.89</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>7.69 (1.85)</td>
<td>5.79 (2.35)</td>
<td>40.45</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.2: Univariate statistics and means for the target group x adjective rating interactions (and SD)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Musical style</th>
<th>Mean estimated ingroup liking</th>
<th>Mean estimated outgroup liking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>8.20 (1.62)</td>
<td>7.12 (2.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>1.30 (1.65)</td>
<td>2.47 (2.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>0.62 (1.36)</td>
<td>1.99 (2.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>7.60 (1.85)</td>
<td>7.17 (1.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indie</td>
<td>8.93 (1.45)</td>
<td>7.83 (2.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Metal</td>
<td>4.89 (2.52)</td>
<td>4.78 (2.32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.3: Mean ratings for the target group x musical style interaction (and SD)
11.5.4 Self-esteem effects The internal consistency of the self-esteem scale was assessed by computing Cronbach’s Alpha. The alpha value was 0.75, and this exceeds the minimum level of 0.70 recommended for research (Nunnally, 1978). The analysis of self-esteem was therefore conducted using the mean value of the nine scales for each participant.

For each participant, ingroup and outgroup means for each class of dependent variable were calculated. As described in Section 11.4.2 above, there were three classes of dependent variable; namely (i) group liking; (ii) group evaluation in terms of the adjectives; and (iii) estimated group musical preferences. For the measure of group liking, a single ingroup mean and a single outgroup mean were calculated (as in Section 11.5.1 above). For the group evaluation in terms of the adjectives, this consisted of calculating a single ingroup mean and a single outgroup mean for the positive adjectives (nice, sporty, intelligent, fun, masculine, and popular), and for the negative adjectives (boring, snobbish, not fashionable, weird, and unfriendly). These measures are referred to hereafter as mean of the positive adjectives and mean of the negative adjectives respectively. For the participants’ estimates of the groups’ musical preferences, this consisted of calculating a single ingroup mean and a single outgroup mean for the positively stereotyped music (pop, dance, and indie), and for the negatively stereotyped music (classical, and jazz). These measures are referred to hereafter as mean of the positively stereotyped music and mean of the negatively stereotyped music respectively. Given that responses to heavy metal music and to the adjective ‘rebellious’ were not in the expected direction, these two items were not included in the analysis of self-esteem.
Hypothesis (5) stated that pre-test self-esteem should be negatively related to the degree to which participants engage in subsequent intergroup discrimination. This was tested by calculating the Pearson product moment correlation between pre-test self-esteem scores and each of the mean values described above. Hypothesis (6) stated that the degree of intergroup discrimination displayed by the participants should be positively related to post-test self-esteem. This was tested by calculating the Pearson product moment correlation between post-test self-esteem scores and each of the same mean values.

11.5.5 Pre-test self-esteem There was a significant positive correlation between pre-test self-esteem and the evaluation of the ingroup on the positive adjectives ($r = 0.31$, $N = 45$, $p = .039$), which indicates that higher self-esteem was associated with increased ingroup favouritism. There was a significant negative correlation between pre-test self-esteem and the evaluation of the outgroup on the negative adjectives ($r = -0.29$, $N = 47$, $p = .045$). This indicates a relationship between self-esteem and subsequent intergroup discrimination, such that lower self-esteem was associated with a more negative perception of the outgroup, or increased derogation of the outgroup. In addition, there was a low but near-significant negative correlation between pre-test self-esteem and the estimated outgroup preference for negatively stereotyped music ($r = -0.28$, $N = 47$, $p = .057$). More simply, at lower levels of self-esteem, participants tended to associate the outgroup more with negatively stereotyped music. None of the other correlations reached statistical significance.
Correlations were also calculated between pre-test self-esteem and the degree to which participants differentiated the ingroup and the outgroup along each class of dependent variable. Firstly, the difference was calculated between the ratings assigned to the ingroup and the outgroup on each of the computed mean values described in Section 11.5.4. These values served as measures of intergroup differentiation. The resulting five sets of difference scores were then correlated separately with pre-test self-esteem. One correlation was significant, namely that between pre-test self-esteem and the perceived difference between the ingroup and outgroup in liking for negatively stereotyped music ($r = -0.35$, $N = 47$, $p = .016$). Put simply, at lower levels of self-esteem, the ingroup differentiated itself more from the outgroup in terms of the estimated degree of liking for negatively stereotyped music.

11.5.6 Post-test self-esteem The same correlations were calculated for post-test self-esteem that were calculated for pre-test self-esteem. None of the resulting coefficients were significant.

These analyses provide support for Hypothesis (5), and demonstrate a relationship between self-esteem and subsequent intergroup discrimination. Specifically, participants with lower levels of self-esteem engaged in increased derogation of the outgroup, and increased differentiation between the two groups. The analysis did not reveal any support for Hypothesis (6), that the degree of intergroup discrimination displayed by participants should be positively related to post-test self-esteem.
11.6 Discussion

The results demonstrate that musical preference is a valued dimension upon which to base intergroup discrimination in adolescence. These findings contrast with those of Chapter 9 and Chapter 10. The participants reported a higher degree of liking for the ingroup than for the outgroup, and made more favourable evaluations of the ingroup than the outgroup in terms of the music items and the evaluative adjectives.

Participants reported significant differences in the estimated preferences of the ingroup and outgroup for four of the six styles of music that were rated. Dance and indie music had been categorised in the pilot study as ‘liked music’, and fans of such music had been associated with positive characteristics, including popularity, good fashion sense, and a sense of fun. In contrast, classical and jazz music were categorised in the pilot study as ‘disliked music’, and their fans were associated with negative characteristics, including being boring, snobbish, and not likely to have many friends. By responding as they did it is possible that participants in the main study were, by implication, also associating their own group with the positive characteristics of fans of liked music to a greater extent than they were the outgroup. At the same time they may have been associating the ingroup with the negative characteristics of disliked music to a lesser extent than they were the outgroup. Perceptions of liking for pop music and heavy metal music did not differ significantly between the ingroup and outgroup. For heavy metal music these ratings were actually quite close to the midpoint of the scale, indicating that participants did not hold firm opinions about this style (see Table 11.3). It is therefore possible that assigning different ratings to the
ingroup and outgroup with regard to their preference for heavy metal music would not have had any consequences for the participants' social identity.

The results confirm previous findings that direct outgroup derogation is less common than is ingroup favouritism (Judd et al., 1995; Singh et al., 1998; Spears and Manstead, 1989; Struch and Schwartz, 1989; Turner, 1978; see Chapter 3). For each set of comparisons, the mean ratings assigned to the ingroup and the outgroup were both either above or both below the scale mid-point (refer to Tables 11.2 and 11.3, and data in the text). This suggests that the ingroup was not rated positively whilst the outgroup was rated negatively, but rather that the ingroup was consistently rated more favourably than the outgroup. Such a pattern of responses, particularly for the musical preference estimates, is not entirely unexpected. It would clearly lack realism if participants were to indicate that the outgroup did not like positively stereotyped music (i.e. if the outgroup ratings were below the mid-point): why would the outgroup not like positively stereotyped music? By reporting that the outgroup does like positively stereotyped music, “but not as much as us”, participants were able to maintain a positive social identity but in a credible way. In this sense, the participants can be regarded as having been influenced by the norm of fairness (Singh et al., 1998).

The results also highlight the conditions under which adolescents might engage in various forms of intergroup discrimination. In particular, it appears that at lower levels of self-esteem, participants engage in strategies of intergroup discrimination other than simple ingroup favouritism. Firstly, for the musical preference estimates there was a negative correlation between pre-test self-esteem and differentiation between
groups: the lower the adolescents’ self-esteem, so the greater the perceived differences between the ingroup’s and the outgroup’s preference for negatively stereotyped music (i.e. the outgroup was perceived to like it more and the ingroup perceived to like it less). Secondly, pre-test self-esteem was negatively related to the likelihood of participants demonstrating outgroup derogation: the lower the adolescents’ pre-test self-esteem, the more the outgroup was associated with (i) the negative characteristics of being boring, snobbish, unfashionable, weird, and unfriendly, and (ii) liking for negatively stereotyped music. In addition to this, pre-test self-esteem was also positively related to ingroup favouritism such that the higher the adolescents’ pre-test self-esteem, the more the ingroup was associated with the positive characteristics of being nice, sporty, intelligent, fun, masculine, and popular.

Whilst engagement in these various forms of discrimination may be a means of specifically restoring self-esteem, this can not be established here because the current study did not find any support for Hypothesis (6): none of the strategies of discrimination were related to post-test self-esteem. This may be a product of the experimental design rather than demonstrating a lack of support for Abrams and Hogg’s (1988) self-esteem hypothesis (outlined in Chapter 3). The present study assessed pre- and post-test self-esteem in a between-groups design in an attempt to avoid order effects. However, the outcome of this was that the potentially beneficial effects of discrimination on those participants who reported lower levels of pre-test self-esteem could not be assessed.
11.7 Summary and conclusion This study has demonstrated that social identity theory is able to predict the behaviour of adolescent groups when group comparisons are made along valued dimensions. The results contrast with those reported in Chapters 9 and 10 and appear to confirm that the factors proposed to explain the results of those two studies were indeed appropriate. Participants here identified with the salient social categorization of school membership, and they sought opportunities to protect or maintain the identity derived from that categorization. Specifically, the participants used musical preferences and other evaluative characteristics as a means of positively distinguishing themselves from the outgroup. Furthermore, this behaviour appeared to be mediated by self-esteem. The next chapter discusses the implications of these findings in greater detail, and relates these, and those of the previous studies reported in this thesis to the adolescent process.
SECTION D: GENERAL DISCUSSION
Chapter 12 General discussion

11.1 Summary and implications The social context is a crucial aspect of the adolescent process, and has been shown here to influence adolescent musical behaviour at individual, interpersonal, and intergroup levels of analysis. Previous research has demonstrated that music is an interest which assumes central importance in adolescent lifestyle (e.g. Fitzgerald et al., 1995; Geter and Streisand, 1995; Lyle and Hoffman, 1972). The studies presented in this thesis have demonstrated that this may be because music has the potential to allow adolescents to maintain successful relationships with their social network. As such, music can be seen as making an important contribution to social development.

It has been demonstrated that adolescents themselves might well recognise the potential social psychological benefits of affiliation with music, and these benefits are manifested through the uses of music for reasons of identity development and mood-regulation. Chapter 6 showed that participants’ reasons for listening to music clustered around self-actualisation (e.g. to express feelings and emotions; to be creative/to use imagination), fulfilling emotional needs (e.g. to relieve boredom; to relieve loneliness), and creating an external impression (e.g. to please friends; to be popular with others). These findings support earlier research (Larson, 1995) which suggested that music facilitates self-exploration (e.g. by stimulating creativity and the expression of internal feelings), and also correspond with Frith’s (1983) notion of music as a ‘badge’ of identification which facilitates interpersonal relations (e.g. by creating an external impression for others).
The badge function of music also has direct implications for interpersonal processes. Chapter 7 indicated that adolescents use information about others’ musical interests in the process of friendship selection. The use of music for this purpose appears to be strongest in middle-to-late adolescence. For younger adolescents, musical interests were not regarded as more important than any other interest in the friendship process. This age effect corresponds with previous research which suggests that for younger adolescents, music is not part of the ‘social milieu’ (Larson et al., 1989). It is not until middle adolescence, when concerns about affiliation and peer relations are strongest (Coleman, 1979), that the potential utilitarian function of music in social contexts comes more to the fore.

If adolescents use knowledge about others’ musical interests in their decisions about friendship selection, then it necessarily becomes important that they demonstrate the appropriateness of their own musical interests to potential friends. The data presented in Chapters 7 and 8 provided further support for this use of music to create an external impression. Of course, such statements may also convey to existing friends that they still share interests with one another: to report having musical preferences that are discrepant to those of one’s friends and peers could have negative consequences for interpersonal relationships, and could possibly even lead to ostracism. Statements about their own musical preference are amongst other things a mechanism by which adolescents maintain the perceived approval of important others (c.f. Robinson, 1995).
Whilst it is important for adolescents to demonstrate how their musical interests are compatible with those of their social network, an equally important aspect of interpersonal behaviour is the desire to enhance one’s feelings of self-worth (Hoorens and Buunk, 1992; O’Connor, 1995). This can be achieved through social comparisons with people whom a given adolescent perceives as similar to him or herself (see Chapter 2 for a review). Chapter 8 demonstrated that adolescents use musical preference as a means of forming such positive self-evaluations. For music that was liked (that is, music associated with positive social connotations), adolescents said that they liked the music more than their reference groups. In contrast, for music that was disliked (music associated with negative social connotations), they said that they liked the music less than their reference groups. These self-serving comparisons are in line with the ‘illusory superiority’ literature which relates the over-evaluation of one’s own attributes to enhanced feelings of self-worth (Hoorens, 1993). By responding in this way, the adolescents can be seen as associating themselves with the positive social connotations of liked music to a greater extent than their reference groups, and with the negative social connotations of disliked music to a lesser extent than their reference groups.

This apparent contradiction (of reporting that their own preferences are more favourable than, yet at the same time in line with, those of their reference groups) corresponds with previous research which has demonstrated that individuals often evaluate others positively and at the same time evaluate themselves even more positively (see Codol, 1975). These findings suggest that adolescents’ behaviour is motivated both by the need for approval from others (by reporting that their own
interests correspond with those of their reference groups) and by the need to enhance their own self-evaluations (by claiming that they like a given style of music more, or less, than their reference groups).

The motivation to form positive evaluations of oneself is apparent not only in interpersonal contexts, but also in contexts where social category memberships are salient. It is clear that musical preference offers a valuable comparative dimension with which group-serving evaluations can be made. Chapter 11 indicated that adolescents used the social connotations associated with certain styles of music to help distinguish between social groups, and hence to form positive evaluations of the ingroup. Furthermore, their discriminatory behaviour may have been motivated by the need for positive self-esteem, since there was an inverse relationship between self-esteem and subsequent engagement in intergroup discrimination.

The investigation of behaviour at different levels of analysis (c.f. Doise, 1986) has provided a useful means of investigating the musical behaviour of adolescents, and musical preference issues have been shown here to be implicated at various interacting levels of social psychological explanation. However, social category membership (the ideological level) may be especially pertinent during adolescence, since identity and group membership issues are so important at this time (e.g. Erikson, 1968; Gavin and Furman, 1989; c.f. Tajfel et al., 1984). It is possible that the 'psychological group' (Brown, 1989; Cotterell, 1996), is a salient feature of adolescent behaviour even when members of that group are not actually present (c.f. Larson, 1995). Social identity theory can therefore potentially be used to explain
adolescent behaviour in general, even that behaviour which at face value appears to be purely individual. Given this, it is surprising that the social identity approach to the study of adolescent behaviour is not exploited more frequently, if not motivated by the desire to further understand the adolescent process \textit{per se}, but by the desire to further develop social identity theory.

11.2 Limitations and unresolved issues Although musical preference has been shown here to be implicated in adolescent social identity, the extent to which musical preference relates to the intergroup behaviour of adults remains largely unexplored. Whilst adolescents’ social identifications are sometimes more extreme than those of adults (Liebkind, 1982), social identity theory has been shown to be an important predictor of adults’ behaviour in a variety of situations (see Tajfel, 1978). Given that social identity theory seeks to explain the relations between social groups in general, rather than specifying age differences in group behaviour, it is possible that music will make a similar contribution to the social identity of both adolescent and adult groups. For example, some studies suggest that adults of a higher social class report greater preference for classical music than do those of a lower social class (see Pegg, 1984). As Russell (1997) suggests, one reason why older age groups may affiliate with classical music is precisely because it provides access to an elite taste culture and social identity. Of course, such affiliation also serves to differentiate that culture from other taste cultures.

Whilst gender did not appear to influence the role of music in individual and interpersonal processes (see Chapters 6, 7, and 8), the extent to which gender is
important in intergroup musical contexts needs further exploration since the study presented in Chapter 11 only addressed the intergroup behaviour of male adolescents. Historically, females have occupied a lower social status than males, and differences in group status have been shown to mediate the extent of engagement in intergroup behaviour (Sachdev and Bourhis, 1987; 1991; Tajfel, 1978; Turner 1975). Consequently, it is possible that the mechanism by which musical affiliation contributes to social identity in adolescence differs between males and females.

The degree to which music contributes to adolescent social identity in crossed-category memberships (e.g. groups containing both males and females) also requires investigation. There is an increased involvement with such groups during adolescence (and particularly in later adolescence), and males and females engage in joint activities more frequently than at earlier ages (Brown, 1989; Cotterell, 1996; Dunphy, 1963). The extent to which the group members actually identify with the crossed-category, or whether they remain primarily identified with the unisexual cliques which comprise the group, remains to be determined. Specifically, it is important to investigate (i) the psychological attributes of this type of group; (ii) the extent to which music helps define such groups; and thus (iii) the role of intergroup behaviour in such groups’ evaluative processes.

Future research should explore any potential cross-cultural differences in involvement with music in greater detail than has been attempted here, and should also further investigate the relationship between musical experience and identity development. Whilst two of the studies presented here suggested that adolescents in different
Western cultures may be involved with music for similar reasons (see Chapters 6 and 8), a notable difference between the two nationalities was that more American than English adolescents were classified as having a high degree of musical experience (see Chapter 6). Although the age difference between the UK and US participants in those two studies is not anticipated to have had a marked effect on these data, future research would benefit from ensuring direct comparability of ages. Similarly, future research might consider adopting a more stringent measure of musical experience than was adopted here. Nevertheless, those participants who had a high level of musical experience reported listening to music more for self-actualising reasons than did those with either a low or medium level of experience. Given the current arguments concerning the contribution of music to broader educational and intellectual development (Campaign for Music in the Curriculum, 1998), future research should continue to address individual differences in motivations for performing and listening to music.

This thesis has investigated the contribution of music to mainly white, British adolescents' social development. The findings reported here are therefore culture-specific. The extent to which they can be generalised to other Western cultures, and to non-Western cultures requires examination. For example, although there are clear differences in the musical preferences of majority and minority groups in multicultural societies such as the UK and US (e.g. Denisoff and Levine, 1972; Dixon, 1982; Peterson and DiMaggio, 1975; Zillmann et al., 1995; see also Russell, 1997), the contribution that music makes to the social development and identity of minority groups has not been fully examined. Given that minority groups are often ascribed a
lower social status than the majority group, they, like groups defined by gender, may be motivated to engage in different degrees of intergroup discrimination in order to achieve a positive social identity (see Moscovici and Paicheler, 1978). It is possible that the social function of music is even more important to the formation and maintenance of social identity in minority groups. To cite an example, the current surge in popularity of the Asian entertainment industry known as “Bollywood” may contribute to the process by which Asian groups in Western societies reaffirm their cultural identity as distinct from the majority culture.

A limitation of the studies presented here is that they relied largely on self-report data. This approach restricts inferences about adolescent identity to a discussion of adolescent perceptions of their social world, rather than actual behaviour. For example, the data presented in Chapters 7 and 8 indicated that adolescents perceived their own musical preferences to correspond with those of their reference groups. It was suggested that such a response pattern reflected a desire to be seen to have interests in music which is popular with peers. An alternative interpretation of these findings is that they may reflect a tendency towards egocentrism, characteristic of individuals of this age (see Durkin, 1995). That is, the positive correlations observed between adolescents’ own preferences and those they perceived for their reference groups may have stemmed from an inability to differentiate between their own values and those of others (see e.g. Elkind, 1967; Kruger, 1999). To resolve this issue, future research should seek to determine the accuracy of adolescents’ perceptions by questioning their reference groups directly. Similarly, Chapter 7 demonstrated that musical interests are considered important in adolescent friendship selection.
decisions. It did not establish the *actual* influence of music in this process. Whilst previous studies have investigated influences on friendship development using longitudinal methods (e.g. Fink and Wild, 1995), research has not directly examined the role of music in this process. Given the importance of music to adolescents, and the data reported here indicating that adolescents themselves say that music is important in this process, it is possible that music might well be confirmed as salient in friendship selection.

However, whilst actual behaviour is of course important, this should not detract from the continuing need to address adolescents’ *perceptions* of how they ‘fit in’ with their social network (see Zillmann and Gan, 1997). Indeed, the finding that adolescents’ self-report data change depending on the social context (e.g. Finnäs’, 1989; see Chapter 5) demonstrates adolescents’ awareness of how they are expected to respond differently under varying circumstances. The potential role of music in these processes is interesting and important in its own right. If the adolescent believes that his or her values correspond with those of important reference groups then, as has already been discussed, such perceptions are likely to contribute to positive social development and identity (e.g. Giordano, 1995; Robinson, 1995). Indeed, social identity theory itself is concerned with people’s *perceptions* of others: it is interested in how people make sense of their social world; how they construct social reality. It is these perceptions of the self and others which lead to the formation of stereotypes and engagement in intergroup behaviour. The accuracy of these perceptions is less important than the fact that they underlie social behaviour.
Moving on, the thesis has confirmed the importance of using stimuli that are relevant to adolescent identity. When participants were asked to make comparisons between real social groups using self-nominated styles of music as stimuli, it was clear that participants were prepared to discriminate between groups (Chapter 11): this was not the case when the groups and musical stimuli were less real to the participants (Chapters 9 and 10). There is always a concern that research participants will respond differently to experimenter-imposed musical stimuli than they will to music that they have chosen themselves, and this was exemplified in Chapters 7 and 8 (see also Chapter 4). Participants in Chapter 7 reported that their interest in rock/pop music (as defined by the researcher) was positively related to that of their parents. This relationship was not observed when the experimental stimuli were nominated by the participants themselves (Chapter 8). The difference in the findings of the two studies highlights the importance of using music with which adolescents identify truly, and also the importance of distinguishing between responses to ‘generic’ (e.g. ‘rock/pop’) and ‘stylistic’ (e.g. ‘drum-n-bass’) musical labels.

Finally, the thesis has confirmed that social comparison is an important means by which adolescents form self-evaluations, and it was demonstrated that they use comparisons of musical preference in this regard (Chapter 8). The methodology employed was similar to that used in much previous social comparison research (see Hoorens, 1993 for a review). However, future research should confirm the importance of music in social comparison processes using other methodologies. These may include asking participants to nominate their comparison reference groups using self-report questionnaires and diaries (e.g. Wood, 1996), and through more experimental
methods whereby participants’ behaviour following exposure to various reference
groups could be assessed more directly.

The importance of using qualitative methodologies to assess adolescents’ comparison
processes should also be acknowledged. Qualitative studies may capture the richness
of adolescent thought processes which cannot be readily assessed using more
quantitative techniques. For example, previous research utilising interview techniques
has indicated that people of various ages refer frequently to social comparisons in
evaluating their own beliefs and behaviours, even when they are not prompted to do
so (Frey and Ruble, 1985; Wood, Taylor, and Lichtman, 1985). The adoption of such
an approach would help to develop a comprehensive understanding of adolescent
reference groups and self-evaluations in a musical context.

11.3 Conclusion The studies presented here have demonstrated that music makes an
important contribution to adolescent social development. The social context in which
choices about music are made is implicated in individual, interpersonal, and
ultimately, intergroup processes during adolescence. The search for the ‘self’ leads to
an increased involvement and reliance on the social network for the validation of
one’s behaviour and attitudes, and adolescents’ musical behaviour seems geared
towards affiliation and identity concerns. Future research which aims to explain the
function of music in adolescence must continue to acknowledge the importance of the
social context in which adolescent development takes place.
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APPENDICES
Appendix 1 Multiple regression statistics for Chapter 8

**Liked Music**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whole group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best friend</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>20.44</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best friend</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>US participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best friend</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disliked music**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whole group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best friend</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best friend</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>US participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 Participants’ nominated styles of liked and disliked music for Chapter 8 (nominations > 5)

UK participants \((N = 101)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liked music</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Disliked music</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Country and western</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indie</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rap</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soul</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rap</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rave</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reggae</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heavy metal</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soul</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rave</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Folk</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blues</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

US participants \((N = 144)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liked music</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Disliked music</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rap</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Country and western</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Rap</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Heavy metal</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy metal</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;B</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>R&amp;B</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techno</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hard rock</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldies (rock)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard rock</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Techno</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hip hop</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Oldies (rock)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old rock</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Blues</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 Musical excerpts employed in Chapter 9 and 10

Pilot study

Rock/pop

1. Dave Matthews Band, ‘The best of what’s around’ (Under The Table and Dreaming, 1994)
3. Lone Justice, ‘Inspiration’ (Shelter, 1986)
5. Barenaked Ladies, ‘Life, in a nutshell’ (Maybe You Should Drive, 1994)
7. Northside, ‘Wishful thinking’ (Chicken Rhythms FACD 310, 1991)
9. Lone Justice, ‘Dreams come true’ (Shelter, 1986)
10. Northside, ‘Practise makes perfect’ (Chicken Rhythms FACD 310, 1991)

Classical

2. Shostakovich, ‘Hamlet suit’, Opus 116 (last movement) (Belgian Radio Symphony Orchestra (RTBF), 1986)
9. Ravel, ‘Daphnis et Chloe (suit 1)’, Danse guerriereCSR Syphony Orchestra (Bratislava), 1988)
Main study

Rock/pop

2. Lone Justice, ‘Belfry’ (Shelter, 1986)
3. Dave Matthews Band, ‘The best of what’s around’ (Under The Table and Dreaming, 1994)
5. Lone Justice, ‘Dreams come true’ (Shelter, 1986)
8. Northside, ‘Practise makes perfect’ (Chicken Rhythms FACD 310, 1991)

Classical

2. Shostakovich, Hamlet suit’, Opus 116 (last movement) (Belgian Radio Symphony Orchestra (RTBF), 1986)
7. Ravel, ‘Daphnis et Chloe (suit 1)’, Danse guerriere CSR Syphony Orchestra (Bratislava), 1988)
Appendix 4 Paintings employed in Chapter 9 and 10

Ken Kiff
1. The carpenter (1987)
2. Man on island with gentle cloud (1990)
5. Tree (1989-1990)


Stephen Farthing
2. Indispensable accessories to Renaissance life (1989)
5. Tribune tower (1987)
6. Carceri (1978)

Appendix 5(a) Musical Interests Questionnaire (Chapter 6)

This is a questionnaire about your musical interests. I am interested in the styles of music that you like and what you think other people like. Please complete all questions on your own, following the instructions of your teacher before completing each part. Your answers are completely confidential, and you should just answer whatever you believe.

Part 1: Please answer the following questions:

1. Your age _____ years

2. Your sex: male or female (please delete as appropriate)

3. How much music do you listen to each day, whilst doing nothing else? _____ hours

4. How much do you think each of the following reasons are reasons why you listen to your favourite music? Circle the number between 0 and 10 which best describes your opinion. On the scale, 0 = “this is definitely not a reason why I listen to that music”, 10 = “this is definitely a reason why I listen to that music”, and 5 = midway between the two.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to enjoy the music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be creative/use my imagination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to relieve boredom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to help me get through difficult times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be popular with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to relieve tension/stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to create an image for myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to express my feelings/emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to please my friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to reduce loneliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please write your main reason if not listed above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Do you listen to music mainly: (a) alone □, (b) with friends □, (c) about the same with each □ (please tick the appropriate box)

7. Please note below any musical experience that you have. (You could include things such as music lessons that you have, or have had, grade achieved, a band that you may be involved in, instruments that you can play, a particular concert attendance and so on)

Thank you for taking part in this study.
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Appendix 5(b) Youth and Leisure Questionnaire (Chapter 7)

This is a questionnaire about the leisure interests of young people. Please work through each section of the questionnaire, carefully considering your opinion to a question before answering. There are no right or wrong answers, and your answers are confidential. You should feel free to answer whatever you believe yourself. If you have any questions, please raise your hand and someone will help you.

Section A

Please give the following details:

(1) Your age ........ years

(2) Male ☐ Female ☐

Thank you very much for your help.
Section B - Participation in leisure activities

Please look at the following activities. For each activity you are requested to give 3 ratings:

1) In the FREQUENCY column please show how often you take part in the activity by giving a number between 1 and 5, where:
   1 = never/hardly ever  
   2 = once a month  
   3 = once every two weeks  
   4 = once a week  
   5 = almost every day/every day

2) In the LIKING column show how much you like the activity by giving a number between 1 and 5, where:
   1 = dislike very much  
   2 = dislike  
   3 = neither like nor dislike  
   4 = like  
   5 = like very much

3) In the APPROPRIATE THAT MUSIC IS PRESENT column show how appropriate you think it is that music is present in each activity by giving a number between 1 and 5, where:
   1 = not at all appropriate  
   2 = not very appropriate  
   3 = neither appropriate nor inappropriate  
   4 = quite appropriate  
   5 = very appropriate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>FREQUENCY (1-5)</th>
<th>LIKING (1-5)</th>
<th>APPROPRIATE THAT MUSIC IS PRESENT (1-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Going to the cinema</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to pop concerts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to a youth club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching TV/videos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to an amusement arcade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports club/team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanging around the neighbourhood with friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing with video/computer games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going bowling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-sporting club, eg drama club/chess club etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to the theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending time alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanging around with friends at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scouts/Guides etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to discos/clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to a cafe or burger restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/family outings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical group e.g. orchestra / marching band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to museums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to a restaurant for a meal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C - Friendship development

This section is about your friendships. Think about the things which make you want to become friends with someone.

Please look at the following interests that other people may have. Show how important you think each one is in deciding whether or not to become someone’s friend. Circle the number which is closest to your own opinion.

For example, the first category below is Interest in sports. If you think that somebody’s interest in sports would be important to your decision to become their friend, then circle the number 4 or 5 depending on how strong your opinion is. If their interest in sports would not be important to your decision then circle the number 1 or 2 depending on how strong your opinion is. If their interest in sports is neither important nor not important then circle number 3.

Remember there are no right or wrong answers, you should just answer whatever you believe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neither important nor not important</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Interest in sports</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Attitude towards school or college</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Interest in music</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Interest in computers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Interest in TV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Interest in fashion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Section D - Musical preferences

This section is concerned with likes and dislikes of two types of music: Rock/Pop music, and Classical music. For each type of music please give four ratings, as follows:

- (a) how much you like that type of music
- (b) how much you think your best friend likes that type of music
- (c) how much you think your group of friends like that type of music (the group of friends that you hang around with most – your peer group)
- (d) how much you think your parents like that type of music

### ROCK/POP MUSIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Like very much</th>
<th>Like nor dislike</th>
<th>Neither like nor dislike</th>
<th>Dislike</th>
<th>Dislike very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Own liking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Best friend’s liking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Group of friends’ liking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Parents’ liking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Teachers’ liking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) How much others think you like it</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CLASSICAL MUSIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Like very much</th>
<th>Like nor dislike</th>
<th>Neither like nor dislike</th>
<th>Dislike</th>
<th>Dislike very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Own liking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Best friend’s liking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Group of friends’ liking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Parents’ liking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Teachers’ liking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) How much others think you like it</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5(c) Musical Interests Questionnaire (Chapter 8)

This is a questionnaire about your musical interests. I am interested in the styles of music that you like and what you think other people like. Please complete all questions on your own, following the instructions of your teacher before completing each part. Your answers are completely confidential, and you should just answer whatever you believe.
Part 1 - Music that you like the most

This section is about your musical preferences and the preferences of other people. Think about the styles of music that you like the most. In the space below write the names of your three favourite styles of music, with your most favourite first, then your second most favourite, and then your third most favourite. Next to each style try to give the names of one or two bands/artists which play that style of music.

Music that I like the most:

1) ___________________ (e.g. ______________________________________________________)
2) ___________________ (e.g. ______________________________________________________)
3) ___________________ (e.g. ______________________________________________________)

For each style of music that you have just named, I would like you to give eight ratings for how much you think various other people like these styles. There are three boxes to complete, one for each style of music. In the first box, below, where it says “style of music: (1)”, write the name of the first style of music you stated above. In the first row, indicate on the scale how much you like that style of music. Then, for each person or people named in the next seven rows of the box, indicate how much you think they like the style of music. Circle the number which represents your best guess between 0 and 10. On the scale, 0 = “dislike very much”, 10 = “like very much”, and 5 = midway between the two. Please do not talk to anyone during this, I am interested in your own opinion only. Are there any questions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STYLE OF MUSIC: (1)</th>
<th>dislike very much</th>
<th>midway</th>
<th>like very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your own liking</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your best friend’s liking</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your small group of friends’ liking (your peer group)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your wider circle of friends/larger friendship group’s liking</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in England in general, your age</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American students in general, your age</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your mother</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your father</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now complete the next two boxes in the same way, this time for style (2) and style (3) that you named at the beginning of this section.
### STYLE OF MUSIC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>dislike very much</th>
<th>mid way</th>
<th>like very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your own liking</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your best friend’s liking</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your small group of friends’ liking (your peer group)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your wider circle of friends/larger friendship group’s liking</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in England in general, your age</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American students in general, your age</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your mother</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your father</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STYLE OF MUSIC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>dislike very much</th>
<th>mid way</th>
<th>like very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your own liking</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your best friend’s liking</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your small group of friends’ liking (your peer group)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your wider circle of friends/larger friendship group’s liking</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in England in general, your age</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American students in general, your age</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your mother</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your father</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please do not turn this page over until you are asked to do so.
Part 2 - Music that you like the least

Now think about the styles of music that you like the least. In the space below write the names of your three least favourite styles of music, with your least favourite first (your most disliked style), then your second least favourite, and then your third least favourite. Next to each style try to give the names of one or two bands/artists which play that style of music.

Music that I like the least:
1) ______________ (e.g. ______________________________)
2) ______________ (e.g. ______________________________)
3) ______________ (e.g. ______________________________)

For each style of music that you have just named, I would like you to give eight ratings for how much you think various other people like these styles. As before, there are three boxes to complete, one for each style of music. In the first box, below, where it says “style of music: (1)”, write the name of the first style of music you named above. In the first row, indicate on the scale how much you like that style of music. Then, for each person or people named in the next seven rows of the box, indicate how much you think they like the style of music. Circle the number which represents your best guess between 0 and 10. On the scale, 0 = “dislike very much”, 10 = “like very much”, and 5 = midway between the two. As before, please do not talk to anyone during this, I am interested in your opinion only. Are there any questions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STYLE OF MUSIC:</th>
<th>dislike very much</th>
<th>mid way</th>
<th>like very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your own liking</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your best friend’s liking</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your small group of friends’ liking (your peer group)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your wider circle of friends/larger friendship group’s liking</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in England in general, your age</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American students in general, your age</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your mother</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your father</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now complete the next two boxes in the same way, this time for style (2) and for style (3) that you named at the beginning of this section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STYLE OF MUSIC:</th>
<th>dislike very much</th>
<th>mid way</th>
<th>like very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your own liking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your best friend's liking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your small group of friends' liking (your peer group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your wider circle of friends/larger friendship group's liking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in England in general, your age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American students in general, your age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you very much for taking part in this study.
Appendix 5(d) Music Preference Questionnaire (Chapter 9 pre-test)

Section A

You will shortly listen to 10, 40 second excerpts of music. At the end of each excerpt please indicate how much you like each excerpt by circling the number which most closely represents your own opinion on the scale provided, where 0 = dislike very much, 10 = like very much, and 5 = midway between the two. You will have 10 seconds in which to give this rating before the next excerpt will begin. If you have heard any of the excerpts before place an X in the box on the right hand side of the response scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt</th>
<th>dislike very much</th>
<th>midway</th>
<th>like very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Think about the typical fan of the style of music that you have just heard. How true do you think each of the following characteristics are of the typical fan of that music? Circle the number which most closely represents your own opinion, where 0 = this is very untrue of fans of this style, 10 = this is very true of fans of this style, and 5 = midway between the two.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>very untrue</th>
<th>midway</th>
<th>very true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boring</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>popular</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in touch with youth issues</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro-establishment</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snobbish</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easy to get along with</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not have many friends</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fashionable</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sophisticated</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fun</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Section B**

You will now listen to 10 more, 40 second excerpts of music. As before, at the end of each excerpt please indicate how much you like each excerpt by circling the number which most closely represents your own opinion on the scale provided, where 0 = dislike very much, 10 = like very much, and 5 = midway between the two. You will have 10 seconds in which to give this rating before the next excerpt will begin. If you have heard any of the excerpts before place an X in the box on the right hand side of the response scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt</th>
<th>dislike much</th>
<th>mid way</th>
<th>like very much</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Think about the typical fan of the style of music that you have just heard. How true do you think each of the following characteristics are of the typical fan of that music? Circle the number which most closely represents your own opinion, where 0 = this is very untrue of fans of this style, 10 = this is very true of fans of this style, and 5 = midway between the two.

In general fans of this style of music tend to be:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very untrue</th>
<th>mid way</th>
<th>very true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boring</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>popular</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in touch with youth issues</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro-establishment</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snobbish</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easy to get along with</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not have many friends</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fashionable</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sophisticated</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fun</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide the following details:

Your age ______ years
Sex: male □ female □
Appendix 5(e) Preference For Paintings Response Sheet (Chapter 9)

You will be shown eight pairs of paintings by two modern painters, Stephen Farthing and Ken Kiff. Please indicate with a tick whether you prefer the painting on the right or the one on the left. Do not think about your response for too long - we are interested in your first impressions. Only place a tick in one of the boxes provided. Please make sure that no-one else can see your responses and please do not talk for the remainder of the study. Are there any questions?

Pair 1
I prefer the painting on the left I prefer the painting on the right

Pair 2
I prefer the painting on the left I prefer the painting on the right

Pair 3
I prefer the painting on the left I prefer the painting on the right

Pair 4
I prefer the painting on the left I prefer the painting on the right

Pair 5
I prefer the painting on the left I prefer the painting on the right

Pair 6
I prefer the painting on the left I prefer the painting on the right
Appendix 5(f) Intergroup Questionnaire (Chapter 9)

**KIFFGROUP QUESTIONNAIRE**

Do not let anyone else see this questionnaire.

You will now hear two sets of 8 excerpts of music each lasting approximately 40 seconds. You are required to make a series of judgements regarding the musical preferences of the two groups, the Kiff group and the Farthing group. Your task is, as accurately as possible, to estimate how much you think members of either the Kiff group or the Farthing group would like each excerpt. This estimate is to be given at the end of each excerpt. You will have 5 seconds in which to give your estimate. Each estimate should be given on the scale provided. Please circle the number which most closely represents your opinion, where 0 = 'members of the group would dislike this music very much', 10 = 'members of the group would like this music very much', and 5 = 'midway between the two'.

If you have heard any of the excerpts before place an X in the box on the right hand side of the response scale.

Make sure that no-one else can see your estimates and please do not talk for the remainder of the study. At the end of the study you will be told who else is in your group and how they responded to the music items. Are there any questions?

Please provide the following details:

Your age: _____ years
Sex: male [ ] female [ ]

Id. # [ ]
SET A

Excerpt 1

How much do other members of the Kiff group like this music?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

dislike mid like
very way very
much

Excerpt 2

How much do members of the Farthing group like this music?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

dvm mw lvm

Excerpt 3

How much do other members of the Kiff group like this music?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

dvm mw lvm

Excerpt 4

How much do members of the Farthing group like this music?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

dvm mw lvm

Excerpt 5

How much do other members of the Kiff group like this music?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

dvm mw lvm

Excerpt 6

How much do members of the Farthing group like this music?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

dvm mw lvm
Excerpt 7

How much do other members of the Kiff group like this music?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
dvm mw lvm

Excerpt 8

How much do members of the Farthing group like this music?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
dvm mw lvm

Please wait for further instructions
SET B

Excerpt 1

How much do other members of the Kiff group like this music?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Excerpt 2

How much do members of the Farthing group like this music?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Excerpt 3

How much do other members of the Kiff group like this music?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Excerpt 4

How much do members of the Farthing group like this music?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Excerpt 5

How much do other members of the Kiff group like this music?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Excerpt 6

How much do members of the Farthing group like this music?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
KIFF GROUP QUESTIONNAIRE

Excerpt 7

How much do other members of the Kiff group like this music?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Excerpt 8

How much do members of the Farthing group like this music?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Please answer the following questions:

If you were to find out which persons here preferred Kiff’s paintings, how much do you think you would find you liked them?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

On average, how much time do you spend each day listening to music? ____ hours
Appendix 5(g) Survey of Young People’s Attitudes (Chapter 11 pre-test)

This is a questionnaire about two things: (1) your musical likes and dislikes, and (2) your opinions of non-Woodlands School students.

Part 1 - Musical likes

I would like you to think carefully about the types of music that you like. In the left column below, please list all the styles of music that you like (e.g. pop, dance, jazz, classical, etc.). Next to this, in the right column, please name one or two bands which play that style of music (e.g. Prodigy, Oasis, etc.).

Music that I like

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Musical style</th>
<th>Bands which play that style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2 - Fan characteristics

Now think about the typical fans of the styles of music that you have listed above. How true do you think each of the following characteristics are of the typical fans of that music? Circle the number which most closely represents your own opinion, where 0 = ‘this is very untrue of fans of these styles’, 10 = ‘this is very true of fans of these styles’, and 5 = midway between the two.

In general fans of these styles of music tend to be:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very untrue</th>
<th>midway</th>
<th>very true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boring</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>popular</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in touch with youth issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snobbish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easy to get along with</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not have many friends</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fashionable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sophisticated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fun</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 3 - Musical dislikes

I would now like you to think about the types of music that you do not like. In the left column below, please list all the styles of music that you do not like very much. Next to this, in the right column, please name one or two bands which play that style of music.

Music that I do not like much

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Musical style</th>
<th>Bands which play that style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 4 - Fan characteristics

Now think about the typical fans of the styles of music that you have listed above. How true do you think each of the following characteristics are of the typical fans of that music? Circle the number which most closely represents your own opinion, where 0 = ‘this is very untrue of fans of these styles’, 10 = ‘this is very true of fans of these styles’, and 5 = midway between the two.

In general fans of these styles of music tend to be:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boring</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>popular</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in touch with youth issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snobbish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easy to get along with</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not have many friends</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fashionable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sophisticated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fun</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 5 - Your opinions of non-Woodlands School students

This section is about how you describe boys the same age as you who do not attend Woodlands School. Think now about boys at other schools who you might consider to be rivals, competitors etc.

I would like you to think of as many words as you can which describe boys your age who do not go to this school. Write them in the space below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive words/adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please answer the following questions:

1) How much music do you listen to each day? (when listening to music is your main activity)
   _____ hours

2) Your age _____ years

Thank you for taking part in this study.
Appendix 5(h) Survey of Pupils (Intergroup Questionnaire: Chapter 11 main study)

Part 1 - Comparison of Woodlands and non-Woodlands School pupils

This section is about how you compare boys at this school with boys who do not go to this school. Think about boys your age who do not attend this school. This might be boys at other schools who you consider to be rivals, competitors, etc.

Below is a list of words which can be used to describe the behaviour/characteristics of boys your age. For each word I would like you to give two ratings, as follows:

(a) how well you think each word describes boys from this school (us)
(b) how well you think each word describes boys who do not go to this school (them)

Each rating should be given on the 0-10 scale, where 10 = 'this word describes us/them very well', 0 = 'this word does not describe us/them very well', and 5 = midway between the two. Think carefully about your answers and take as long as you need to complete this. Please do not talk to each other during this. When you complete this page, do not turn to the next one until you are asked to do so. Are there any questions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>not a good description</th>
<th>a good description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nice</td>
<td>us: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>them: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sporty</td>
<td>us: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>them: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>us: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>them: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boring</td>
<td>us: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>them: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snobbish</td>
<td>us: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>them: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fun</td>
<td>us: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>them: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not fashionable</td>
<td>us: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>them: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weird</td>
<td>us: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>them: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfriendly</td>
<td>us: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>them: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masculine</td>
<td>us: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>them: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rebels</td>
<td>us: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>them: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>popular</td>
<td>us: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>them: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2 – liking for the two groups

1) How much do you like boys who go to this school and boys who do not go to this school?

Give your answer on the 0-10 scale, where 0 = ‘I dislike us/them very much’, 10 = ‘I like us/them very much’, and 5 = midway between the two.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>dislike very much</th>
<th>midway</th>
<th>like very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>us</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>them</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lots of research shows that music is a very important part of young people’s lives. Some pupils from this school recently said that they listen to about two and a half hours of music each day. Below is a list of styles of music, and some examples of bands/artists which play each style. These styles of music may or may not be liked by people your age.

For each style of music please give two ratings, as follows:

(a) how much you think boys at this school like the style of music (us)
(b) how much you think boys who do not go to this school like the style of music (them)

Each rating should be given on the 0-10 scale, where 10 = ‘like very much’, 0 = ‘dislike very much’, and 5 = midway between the two. Think carefully about your answers. Take as long as you need to complete this, but please do not talk to each other. When you complete this page, do not turn to the next one until you are asked to do so. Are there any questions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>us</th>
<th>them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DANCE (e.g. Prodigy, Sash)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAZZ (e.g. Count Basie, Duke Ellington)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSICAL (e.g. Beethoven, Mozart)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP (e.g. Hanson, All Saints)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIE (e.g. The Verve, Oasis)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAVY METAL (e.g. Iron Maiden, Metallica)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please answer the following questions:

1) your age _____ years

2) how much music do you listen to each day, whilst doing nothing else? _____ hours

3) Give details below of your musical experience (You could include things such as music lessons that you have, or have had, grade achieved, a band that you may be involved in, instruments that you can play, a particular concert attendance and so on)
Appendix 5(i) Self-esteem measure either completed pre- or post-intergroup comparison task  
(Chapter 11 main study)

How you feel at the moment

Below are pairs of adjectives which may describe your feelings. For each pair, circle the number which best describes how you feel at the moment. For example, for the first pair, ‘pleasant - unpleasant’, if you feel more ‘pleasant’ than ‘unpleasant’, then circle a number somewhere towards the left of the scale. If you feel more ‘unpleasant’ than ‘pleasant’, then circle a number somewhere towards the right of scale. The closer the number to the adjective, the stronger the feeling. Some of the words with which you may be unfamiliar have definitions written underneath them. The responses that you give are completely confidential and you should respond how you feel at the moment. Are there any questions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>scale (0-10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pleasant</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm (warm personality, not temperature)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hesitant (indecisive)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 self-assured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficient (effective, useful)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 inefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 unfriendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hardworking</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distant (detached, reserved)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>