

# Predictive Analysis of Music Preferences of Indian Customers based on their Personality: A Mixed Method Approach

–Sakshi Saxena\*, Namit Mehta\*\*, Komal Malik\*\*\*, Nidhi Nagar\*\*\*\*

## ABSTRACT

*The current paper examines the music preferences of Indian customers across the Bollywood music industry based on their personality. The sample size of the study was 258 music listeners within the age group of 20-28. The data was collected using a face to face survey that explored the demographics, personality traits and music preferences of the respondents. The personality traits used in the study were mapped with the Big Five (OCEAN) personality traits and the music preferences were captured on a 5 pointer likert scale for different kinds of music clips (classified using MUSIC model). The sample was divided into two sub samples train and tested randomly using Exploratory Factor Analysis on the train sample, as a result of which 5 factor model was validated in the present context. The preference for the different genres from the MUSIC model was analyzed with respect to the Big Five (OCEAN) personality traits using ANOVA technique. The study is significant for the practitioners of the Bollywood music industry as it exhibits the relationship between the personality traits and the music preferences of the Indian customers. The composers can use the knowledge in designing the appropriate music type for their targeted audiences and vice versa.*

**Keywords:** Bollywood, Music, Personality, Customer

---

\* Research Assistant, Symbiosis Centre for Management and Human Resource Development, Symbiosis Infotech Campus, Hinjewadi, Pune, Maharashtra, India.

Email: sakshi@scmhrd.edu

\*\* Analytics Consultant, Bridge2i Analytics Solutions Private Limited, India. Email: namit.sem007@gmail.com

\*\*\* Assistant Professor, Amity Business School, Amity University, Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow Campus Jaipur, Rajasthan, India. Email: kmalik@lko.amity.edu

\*\*\*\* Research Scholar, Jyoti Vidyapeeth Women's University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India. Email: nidhisaxena17@gmail.com

## INTRODUCTION

The music industry in India is facing demand akin to international music industry for producing music involving variety of genres (Rock, metal, hip-hop, Electronic dance music, Folk, Others) from its ethnically diverse population. This demand is supported by the increasing digital media penetration into the country. Music in India is currently being distributed through television, film sector, radio and internet. Social media penetration has helped users to connect and share their music preferences directly to the artists enabling them to produce popular music. The film and music industry are witnessing significant investments by international majors to procure, create and distribute popular music. This investment has also brought the Indian audience close to international music industry, bringing revenue from import of music and artists. KPMG estimates that the Indian music industry will double in revenue by 2019 bringing an annual income of USD 300 million (KPMG, FICCI-KPMG Indian Media and Entertainment Industry Report 2015, 2015)

The objective of this paper is to map the preference for different genre of music with personality by analysing the preference scores of the music listening Indian customers across the Bollywood music industry. The selection of songs used in the study is classified on the basis of 5 factor model MUSIC (Mellow, Unpretentious, Sophisticated, Intense, and Contemporary) coined by (Rentfrow, Goldberg, & Levitin, The structure of Musical Preferences: A Five-Factor Model, 2011). The personality traits characteristics used in the study is based on the Big Five personality traits model i.e. OCEAN (openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism) model derived from NEO Personality Inventory instrument coined by Costa and McCrae in 1992 (Costa, T, McCrae, & R, 1992).

This paper is categorized into six sections, Section I gives the detailed description of the existing literature on the topic of our study. Moreover, it also brings out the gaps in the existing literature. Section II talks about the research objectives, design, methodology and assumptions used. Section III describes the analysis process through Exploratory Factor Analysis, ANOVA followed by Section IV discussing results and the key findings based on the analysis done. Section V brings out the important point of discussion, the application (where it can be used), and thereby highlighting the key findings. Section VI identifies the gaps of the study and what future research work can be done on the same. The last section

lists down all the important sources from which the research work done in this paper has been referred.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

A substantial number of studies mapping the personality type and music listening preferences in the western research work have shown significant results. A study indicated the importance of music among adolescents in England as they relate music to fulfil their emotional needs (North, Hargreaves, & O'Neil, 2000). The popularity of heavy metal music grew enormously among adolescents in late 1980. Thus, a study explored the characteristics and attitude of such adolescents (Arnett, 1991).

To define music styles in verbal preference, a research (Gosling P. , 2003) exploring different beliefs about music revealed four important music dimensions: Energetic and Rhythmic, Reflective and Complex, Upbeat and Conventional and Intense and Rebellions. The study incorporated 14 items to define each of the four dimensions of music model. A subsequent addition to this four factor model was done 2011, where it was found that the 5 factor model fits better to define music preferences (Rentfrow, Goldberg, & Levitin, The structure of Musical Preferences : A Five-Factor Model, 2011). Several studies have been found explaining important factors regarding preferences of a particular music style. The important factor includes culture, ethnicity, gender and age perspective (LeBlanc, Jin, & Crary, 1999).

Numerous personality indicators to define personality had been related to music styles in the past. In an experiment, the correlation between personality and music style was tested using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) for personality and Music Listener Response Scale (MLRS) for music style (Lewis & Schmidt, Listeners' Response to Music as a Function of Personality Type, 1991).

A study describing music preferences of Dutch adolescents (12-19 aged) based as a function of personality (Delsing, Bogt, & Meeus, 2008) examined the relation between the music preferences and the Big-Five personality instrument using confirmatory and exploratory factor analyses. The different dimensions undertaken to define music preferences in their research were Elite, Urban, Rock and Dance/Pop Genre. The results have shown the consistent relation of the personality characteristics with music preferences thereby determining that variability in music preferences could be explained by personality characteristics over a span of 3 years. It also

provided an extension in the existing model by Rentfrow and Goslings which only considered sample of students for determining important findings to generalize music preferences into four factors for adolescents in their research work. Another important result the study revealed was that Rentfrow and Gosling for music preference can be generalized across cultures and age groups for adolescents. A study in Malaysia extended the generalization of the relation of personality type and music style across cultures (Chamorro-Premuzic, Swami, Furnham, & Maakip, 2009). Another significant study supported Rentfrow and Gosling's four factor music model by using NEO PI indicator which permitted to scrutinize six aspects that structure Big Five traits (Zweigenhaft, 2008).

Moreover, undertaking the intergenerational aspect for the preferences of a particular music type (Bogt, Delsing, Zalk, & Meeus, 2011) the existing literature explains the sensitivity in music taste observed across generations. In a study (Bogt, Delsing, Zalk, & Meeus, 2011), the difference between parents and their children's music preferences was established using multi-actor design. The finding explained the interlinkages between popular music and has shown the continuity for the same from generation to generation. One major limitation of the study was that the measures which were undertaken to define the music styles were limited. To address this limitation in defining music styles a research proposed in 2011, exploring music dimensions based on music listener's reactions to various music genres was done (Rentfrow, Goldberg, & Levitin, The structure of Musical Preferences : A Five-Factor Model, 2011). The research proposed a 5-factor model MUSIC and the finding revealed that the auditory characteristics and social characteristics of the music were the prime two factors affecting music preferences. One similar group to folk dimension was found when the similar relation was tested in Turkey (Tekman, 2009).

Additionally, a study examined the personality with the use of music and preference. The findings of the study revealed the relation to age and gender being the reason of difference (Chamorro-Premuzic, Fagan, & Furnham, Personality and Uses of Music as Predictors of Preferences for Music Consensually Classified as Happy, Sad, Complex, and Social, 2010).

Moreover, the literature earlier was limited to the studies in west. Recently, the relationship between the personality and music listening preference was also tested in Indian scenario on a group of under graduate and post graduate students in an Indian city, Lucknow (Upadhyay, Shukla, & Chakraborty, 2016). The study revealed an association between

personality characteristics and the type of music young adult preferred to listen. The limitation of their work was absence of longitudinal study to verify the results. Another limitation of their study was the missing sub-categorization of the sample of people tested into the active music listeners and in-active music listeners.

The existing research is thus an extension of the research findings proposed earlier and has combined the Big-5 model (Delsing, Bogt, & Meeus, 2008) and the 5 factor music model to test the relation between music preference and personality in Indian context. Moreover, the current research thus takes into account the music preference of Indian customers and thus tries to generalize the 5 identified music dimensions (MUSIC) for Bollywood music. The research does not incorporate different age groups for drawing conclusions as the sample surveyed was limited only to 20-28 aged people. To establish the proposed relation exploratory factor analysis and ANOVA was performed and the results supported the existing literature. The findings thus hold true for Indian customers and Bollywood music.

## **DESIGN/RESEARCH METHODOLOGY/ APPROACH**

The complete analysis done in this paper is based on the factors of the MUSIC Model proposed by Rentfrow, Goldberg, & Levitin, The structure of Musical Preferences : A Five-Factor Model (2011) and the Big 5 personality traits (OCEAN model) for personality assessment as proposed by McCrae & John (1992).

The factors in the MUSIC model Mellow, Unpretentious, Sophisticated, Intense and Contemporary are mapped with the different genres in the following way: Abbreviation M- (Mellow) - describes the relaxedness, slowness, sadness, quietness, and other non-aggressive aspects of a piece corresponding to genres Soft Rock, R &B, Adult Contemporary. Abbreviation U- (Unpretentious) - describes the lack of complexity, unaggressive, softness and acoustic nature corresponding to genres Country, Folk, Singer/Songwriter. Abbreviation S- (Sophisticated) - describes the complexity, intelligence, and dynamic nature of a piece corresponding to genres Classical, Operatic, Avant-Garde, World Beat, and Traditional Jazz. Abbreviation I- (Intensity) -describes the distortion, tenseness and aggression of a piece corresponding to genres Classic Rock, Punk, Heavy Metal, and Power Pop. Abbreviation C- (Contemporary) -

describes the percussive nature rhythmic nature, the current, and the dance ability of a piece corresponding to genres Rap, Electronica, Latin, Acid Jazz, and Euro Pop.

The factors in the Big Five personality traits model Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism were explained on the basis of the NEO inventory instrument (Costa and McCrae, 1992).

**Table 1: Big Five Personality Traits Model**

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Openness          | Artistic, Curious, Imaginative, Insightful, Original, Wide Interests |
| Conscientiousness | Efficient, Organized, Planful, reliable, Responsible, Thorough       |
| Extraversion      | Active, Assertive, Energetic, Enthusiastic, Outgoing, Talkative      |
| Agreeableness     | Appreciative, Forgiving, Generous, Kind, Sympathetic, Trusting       |
| Neuroticism       | Anxious, Self-pitying, Tense, Touching, Unstable, Worrying           |

(McCrae & John, 1992)

The research in this paper follows a mixed methods (including quantitative and qualitative both together) approach. A qualitative research was conducted during the selection of the songs and their categorization on the basis of the 5 factors music model that was a part of the observation window. The data was collected using a survey and the respondents were reached through face to face interviews. The sampling method used in the study was stratified random sampling. The sample size of the study is 258 music listeners in India within the age group of 20-28 years. The data was collected over a span of three months. The questionnaire was divided into three sections; the first section investigates the demographic profile of the target audience while the second and third part enumerates their personality traits as well as their preference of particular music genres over others respectively. Data was collected using close end questions with responses on five-point Likert scale. The major purpose of this study was to observe listener responses summaries as a purpose of 25 music variables along with 25 personality traits variables which has been undertaken from the Big Five Personality traits model.

## Participants

The final sample size of the study was around 258 music listeners within the age group of 20-28 which were bifurcated as active and non-active music listeners. The responses from the participants were recorded on the basis of their personality traits and music preferences on a likert scale.

## Materials

The questionnaire was constructed in the form of a structured survey instrument which comprised of three major sections. The first section examined the demographics of the respondents. The second and third section involved 25 questions each based on personality traits and music preferences respectively recorded on a 5 point likert scale.

## Data Screening

The data was transcribed as a .csv file in the SPSS software after imputing missing values and removing univariate outliers. The final sample size of the study was 258 in which the following analysis was performed.

## Procedure

The major personality dimensions and the bifurcations of the respondents on the basis of their music preferences, a two-step approach was used in the present study. The original sample was split into two independent samples train and test of approximately equal size. The process of splitting was randomly done. The randomization was ensured using a computer function. The first step was to apply an Exploratory factor Analysis (EFA) on the first sample train. To test the uniformity of the results, the proposed analysis structure by Rentfrow, P.J., Gosling, & S.D. (2003) was attempted to be applied on both the sub samples. The analysis included using Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and varimax rotated results on both the sub samples. The reason for splitting a sample into two sub samples train and test was to do a comparative analysis so that the predictions from the first sample could be seen from the results of the second one or not.

## DATA ANALYSIS

Exploratory Factor Analysis was applied on the first sub sample with different control variables (demographic and nominal variables primarily).

As the results were seemingly robust and similar across the sub grouped and nominal based bifurcated results, the analysis for the complete sub sample as a whole was done. A separate approach would have been used which might have included weighted sample based approach while consolidating results if there had been a difference in the results based on control demographic results. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy test was used for ascertaining whether the partial correlations among variables were small or not. In order to proceed for a satisfactory factor analysis, the measure of sampling adequacy or the KMO value should exceed 0.5. In this case the large values for the KMO measure (0.737) indicated the appropriateness of factor analysis. In addition to this, the Bartlett's test of Sphericity test which ascertains whether the correlation matrix is an identity matrix or not needs was examined. If the test is significant it indicates that the variables in the population correlation matrix are correlated and hence factor model is appropriate. In this case, the Bartlett's test with observed significance level of .000 leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis and it is concluded that the relationship among variables is strong. Hence, it would be a good idea to execute a factor analysis for the data.

**Table 2: KMO and Bartlett's Test**

|   |                    |              |
|---|--------------------|--------------|
| <b>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.</b> |                    | <b>0.737</b> |
| <b>Bartlett's Test of Sphericity</b>                    | Approx. Chi-Square | 1346.25      |
|   | df                 | 300          |
|   | Sig.               | <b>0</b>     |

The results, from the scree tests proposed by Cattell (1966) and Kaiser test where the test results are figured out for Eigen values of greater than or equal to 1, yielded a five factor model which explained more than 70 percent of the total variance. While doing an Exploratory Factor Analysis, ratings of people on the songs were also calculated from websites and listeners. The reason was to understand that the likeliness of song by a person now versus the general likeliness of people when the song was released. This would help us understand that does the present audience understand music in the same manner as the audience when the music was launched, or is there a significant difference in the overall understanding of the genres over the years. Those ratings were also used as a part of the analysis in Exploratory Factor Analysis and exploring of factors.



Before applying the ANOVA for analyzing the difference between the music preference scores the assumptions such as measurement of the dependent variable being continuous, it being approximately normally distributed for each category of the independent variable as well as the equality of variances between the independent groups (homogeneity of variances) were validated. Levene’s test was used to confirm homogeneity of variances whereas the normality of music preference scores was gauged using the Shaipro-Wilks statistic. The personality scores for each of the five dimensions (using OCEAN model) are classified as high, average and low on the basis of the three quartiles; the ones scoring below first quartile score are classified as being low on that specific personality dimension, the ones who scored higher than the third quartile score were classified as being high on that specific personality dimension whereas the middle fifty percent cases are classified as average with respect to that specific personality dimension.

**Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Personality Dimension Scores**

| Mean        |    | Open-ness | Conscien-tiousness | Extra-version | Agree-ableness | Neurot-icism |
|-------------|----|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
|             |    | 13.52     | 19.09              | 15.37         | 19.30          | 16.87        |
| Percentiles | 25 | 11.75     | 17                 | 13            | 17             | 15           |
|             | 50 | 13        | 19                 | 15.5          | 20             | 17           |
|             | 75 | 15        | 22                 | 18            | 22             | 19.25        |
|             | 85 | 17        | 23                 | 19            | 23             | 20           |
|             | 90 | 18        | 24                 | 19            | 23             | 21           |

The music preference scores were then tested for significant differences across these three categories for each of the five kind of music as per the MUSIC model.

## RESULTS

The findings from the ANOVA depict that for the music listeners who differed in terms of ‘Openness’ personality trait the music preference scores were significantly different for the three categories in case of ‘Mellow’ and ‘Unpretentious’ kind of music as indicated by significant F-ratio for these music types.

**Table 4: ANOVA-Music Preference Scores across Three Categories w.r.t. 'Openness'**

|               | F    | Sig.  |
|---------------|------|-------|
| Mellow        | 3.82 | 0.023 |
| Unpretentious | 5.08 | 0.007 |
| Sophisticated | 0.49 | 0.611 |
| Intense       | 0.66 | 0.517 |
| Contemporary  | 0.19 | 0.827 |

Further it was evident that who scored high on openness had a significantly different music preference score than those who scored low on openness dimension for Mellow music (the higher the openness in the personality, the lesser is the preference for Mellow music) and for Unpretentious music, those who scored low on openness had a significantly different music preference score than the other two categories of personalities (the more the openness quotient in the personality the lesser is the preference for the Unpretentious music).

**Table 5: Post Hoc Test (Mellow w.r.t. Openness)**

|                        | Openness | N   | Subset for alpha = 0.05 |       |
|------------------------|----------|-----|-------------------------|-------|
|                        |          |     | 1                       | 2     |
| Tukey B <sup>a,b</sup> | High     | 89  | 20.573                  |       |
|                        | Average  | 105 | 21.342                  | 21.34 |
|                        | Low      | 64  |                         | 22.06 |

**Table 6: Post Hoc Test (Unpretentious w.r.t. Openness)**

|                        | Openness | N   | Subset for alpha = 0.05 |       |
|------------------------|----------|-----|-------------------------|-------|
|                        |          |     | 1                       | 2     |
| Tukey B <sup>a,b</sup> | High     | 89  | 20.57                   |       |
|                        | Average  | 105 | 20.88                   |       |
|                        | Low      | 64  |                         | 22.18 |

Examining the disparities in the music preference scores of the music listeners for different categories of 'conscientiousness' trait it was seen that the music preference scores of the music listeners were significantly different for three categories of 'conscientiousness' trait (i.e. high, average and low) for all five kinds of music (i.e. Mellow, Unpretentious, Sophisticated, Intense and Contemporary) as indicated by significant F-ratio for all types.

**Table 7: ANOVA-Music preference scores across three categories w.r.t. 'Conscientiousness'**

| <b>Conscientiousness Mellow</b> | <b>F</b> | <b>Sig.</b> |
|---------------------------------|----------|-------------|
| Unpretentious                   | 43.14    | <b>0</b>    |
| Sophisticated                   | 24.28    | <b>0</b>    |
| Intense                         | 34.11    | <b>0</b>    |
| Contemporary                    | 38.02    | <b>0</b>    |

The post-hoc tests for multiple comparison reveal that for Mellow music, the music preference scores of all the three categories of personalities namely, with high score on conscientiousness, average score on conscientiousness as well as low score on conscientiousness differed significantly from each other (the more the conscientiousness quotient in the personality the greater is the preference for the Mellow music).

**Table 8: Post Hoc Test (Mellow w.r.t. Conscientiousness)**

|                        | <b>Conscientiousness</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Subset for alpha = 0.05</b> |          |          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|----------|----------|
|                        |                          |          | <b>1</b>                       | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b> |
| Tukey B <sup>a,b</sup> | High                     | 80       | 18.96                          |          |          |
|                        | Average                  | 102      |                                | 21.84    |          |
|                        | Low                      | 76       |                                |          | 22.88    |

The similar assertions can be drawn for the other music types as well including Unpretentious, Sophisticated, Intense and Contemporary music and in all cases it is seen that the music preference scores depict a positive trend with the increasing specific personality dimension; the higher the specific personality dimension, the greater is the music preference score.

**Table 9: Post Hoc Test (Unpretentious w.r.t. Conscientiousness)**

|                        | <b>Conscientiousness</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Subset for alpha = 0.05</b> |          |          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|----------|----------|
|                        |                          |          | <b>1</b>                       | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b> |
| Tukey B <sup>a,b</sup> | High                     | 80       | 18.83                          |          |          |
|                        | Average                  | 102      |                                | 21.47    |          |
|                        | Low                      | 76       |                                |          | 22.98    |

**Table 10: Post Hoc Test (Sophisticated w.r.t. Conscientiousness)**

|                        | Conscientiousness | N   | Subset for alpha = 0.05 |       |       |
|------------------------|-------------------|-----|-------------------------|-------|-------|
|                        |                   |     | 1                       | 2     | 3     |
| Tukey B <sup>a,b</sup> | High              | 80  | 13.95                   |       |       |
|                        | Average           | 102 |                         | 15.29 |       |
|                        | Low               | 76  |                         |       | 17.47 |

**Table 11: Post Hoc Test (Intense w.r.t. Conscientiousness)**

|                        | Conscientiousness | N   | Subset for alpha = 0.05 |       |       |
|------------------------|-------------------|-----|-------------------------|-------|-------|
|                        |                   |     | 1                       | 2     | 3     |
| Tukey B <sup>a,b</sup> | High              | 80  | 14.15                   |       |       |
|                        | Average           | 102 |                         | 16.68 |       |
|                        | Low               | 76  |                         |       | 19.01 |

**Table 12: Post Hoc Test (Contemporary w.r.t. Conscientiousness)**

|                        | Conscientiousness | N   | Subset for alpha = 0.05 |       |       |
|------------------------|-------------------|-----|-------------------------|-------|-------|
|                        |                   |     | 1                       | 2     | 3     |
| Tukey B <sup>a,b</sup> | High              | 80  | 12.48                   |       |       |
|                        | Average           | 102 |                         | 15.04 |       |
|                        | Low               | 76  |                         |       | 18.09 |

The examination of the music preference scores for the different categories of 'extraversion' trait exhibit that there are no significant differences in the music preference scores for the different categories of this personality dimension in all the five kinds of music.

**Table 13: ANOVA-Music preference scores across three categories w.r.t. 'Extraversion'**

| Extraversion  | F    | Sig. |
|---------------|------|------|
| Mellow        | 0.37 | 0.68 |
| Unpretentious | 0.65 | 0.52 |
| Sophisticated | 1.86 | 0.15 |
| Intense       | 0.96 | 0.38 |
| Contemporary  | 0.11 | 0.89 |

Examining the disparities in the music preference scores of the music listeners for different categories of 'agreeableness' trait it was seen that the music preference scores of the music listeners were significantly different

for three categories of ‘agreeableness’ trait (i.e. high, average and low) in the context of ‘Mellow’ and ‘Unpretentious’ kind of music as indicated by significant F-ratio for these music types.

**Table 14: ANOVA-Music preference scores across three categories w.r.t. ‘Agreeableness’**

| Agreeableness | F    | Sig. |
|---------------|------|------|
| Mellow        | 4.42 | 0.01 |
| Unpretentious | 5.75 | 0.00 |
| Sophisticated | 1.25 | 0.28 |
| Intense       | 0.78 | 0.45 |
| Contemporary  | 0.02 | 0.97 |

It was evident that who scored high on agreeableness had a significantly different music preference score than those who scored low on agreeableness dimension for Mellow music (the higher the agreeableness in the personality, the greater is the preference for Mellow music) and for Unpretentious music, the ones who had low score on agreeableness depicted a significantly lower preference for Unpretentious music.

**Table 15: Post Hoc Test (Mellow w.r.t. Agreeableness)**

|                        | Agreeableness | N   | Subset for alpha = 0.05 |       |
|------------------------|---------------|-----|-------------------------|-------|
|                        |               |     | 1                       | 2     |
| Tukey B <sup>a,b</sup> | High          | 72  | 20.51                   |       |
|                        | Average       | 120 | 21.19                   | 21.19 |
|                        | Low           | 66  |                         | 22.18 |

**Table 16: Post Hoc Test (Unpretentious w.r.t. Agreeableness)**

|                        | Agreeableness | N   | Subset for alpha = 0.05 |       |
|------------------------|---------------|-----|-------------------------|-------|
|                        |               |     | 1                       | 2     |
| Tukey B <sup>a,b</sup> | High          | 72  | 20.08                   |       |
|                        | Average       | 120 |                         | 21.28 |
|                        | Low           | 66  |                         | 21.87 |

With respect to the last personality dimension, ‘neuroticism’, it was seen that the different categories of this personality trait (high, average and low) the differences in the music preference scores were significant for ‘Mellow’ and ‘Unpretentious’ kind of music as indicated by significant F-ratio for these music types.

**Table 17: ANOVA-Music preference scores across three categories w.r.t. 'Neuroticism'**

| Neuroticism   | F    | Sig.        |
|---------------|------|-------------|
| Mellow        | 9.87 | <b>0</b>    |
| Unpretentious | 4.52 | <b>0.01</b> |
| Sophisticated | 0.32 | 0.72        |
| Intense       | 2.00 | 0.13        |
| Contemporary  | 0.34 | 0.71        |

Further examination indicates that for Mellow music, the ones who had low score on neuroticism depicted a significantly lower preference for Mellow music where as in the context of Unpretentious music those who scored high on neuroticism had a significantly different music preference score than those who scored low on neuroticism dimension (the higher the neuroticism in the personality, the greater is the preference for Unpretentious music).

**Table 18: Post Hoc Test (Mellow w.r.t. Neuroticism)**

|                        | Neuroticism | N   | Subset for alpha = 0.05 |         |
|------------------------|-------------|-----|-------------------------|---------|
|                        |             |     | 1                       | 2       |
| Tukey B <sup>a,b</sup> | High        | 89  | 19.9882                 |         |
|                        | Average     | 105 |                         | 21.6875 |
|                        | Low         | 64  |                         | 21.9908 |

**Table 19: Post Hoc Test (Unpretentious w.r.t. Neuroticism)**

|                        | Neuroticism | N   | Subset for alpha = 0.05 |         |
|------------------------|-------------|-----|-------------------------|---------|
|                        |             |     | 1                       | 2       |
| Tukey B <sup>a,b</sup> | High        | 89  | 20.4824                 |         |
|                        | Average     | 105 | 20.7344                 | 20.7344 |
|                        | Low         | 64  |                         | 21.7982 |

## DISCUSSION

The conceptual framework analyzes the music preferences of the Indian customers. This paper shows that music listening preferences of any individual is based on the attributes of personality which he or she possesses and it also shows the dependency of these results basis the

sample of study are active music listeners or in-active music listeners. The bifurcation of songs helped in understanding the level of likeness music listeners have towards the lyrics or music of the song. The research work is not only helpful to major distributors of Bollywood music industry such as YouTube, ErosNow, Saregama India Ltd. (HMV), Universal Music (India), Tips, Venus, Sony Music Entertainment (India), etc. but also to the individual artists or singers who would like to introduce a new song or an album of their own. These people can choose their domain of songs as per the choice of the targeted audience or vice versa. The ANOVA findings helped in discerning the important factors of Music as preferred by the Indian customers that were limited to an age group of 20-28.

## CONCLUSION

Summarising the observations of the study it was evident that who scored high on openness had less preferences for Mellow music and for Unpretentious music, the more the openness quotient in the personality the lesser is the preference for the Unpretentious music was observed. Examining the post-hoc tests for multiple comparison for conscientiousness, assertions can be drawn for all music types including Mellow, Unpretentious, Sophisticated, Intense and Contemporary music and in all cases it is seen that the music preference scores depict a positive trend with the increasing specific personality dimension; the higher the specific personality dimension, the greater is the music preference score. Surprisingly, for the different categories of 'extraversion' trait exhibit that there are no significant differences in the music preference scores for the different categories of this personality dimension in all the five kinds of music.

Also, it was evident that who scored high on agreeableness had the higher preference for Mellow music and the ones who had low score on agreeableness depicted a significantly lower preference for Unpretentious music.

With respect to 'neuroticism', examination indicates that for Mellow music, the ones who had low score on neuroticism depicted a significantly lower preference for Mellow music where as in the context of Unpretentious music the higher the neuroticism in the personality, the greater is the preference for Unpretentious music.

Thus, the overall findings from the ANOVA depicts that for the music listeners who differ with respect to the five dimensions of personality,

as explained by OCEAN (openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism) model the preference for the different kinds of music using the MUSIC model (Mellow, Unpretentious, Sophisticated, Intense and Contemporary) is also different.

## LIMITATIONS AND THE FUTURE RESEARCH SCOPE

The selection of the songs was limited to the Bollywood music industry only, though the results supported the existing literature as proposed by Rentfrow, P.J., Gosling, & S.D. (2003). The research does not incorporate different age groups for drawing conclusions as the sample surveyed was limited only to 20-28 aged people. Thus future research can be expanded keeping in consideration all the age groups in India along with the overview of Hollywood, Tollywood, Punjwood, etcetera with a larger sample size.

## REFERENCES

- McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, 4-5.
- KPMG. (2015). *FICCI-KPMG Indian Media and Entertainment Industry Report 2015*. kpmg.
- Costa, T. P., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Normal personality assessment in clinical practice: The NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(5), 853-863.
- Rentfrow, P. J., & Gosling, S. D. (2003). The do re mi's of everyday life: The structure and personality correlates of music preferences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1236-1256.
- LeBlanc, A., Jin, Y. C., & Crary, L. S. (1999). Effect of Age, Country, and Gender on Music Listening Preferences. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, No. 141, The 17th International Society for Music Education: ISME Research Seminar*, 72-76.
- Gosling, P. J. (2003). The do re mi's of everyday life: The structure and personality correlates of music preferences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(6), 1236-1256.
- Delsing, M. J., Bogt, T. F., & Meeus, R. C. (2008). Adolescents' Music Preferences and Personality Characteristics. *European Journal of Personality, Eur. J. Pers.* 22, 109-130.



- Bogt, T. F., Delsing, M. J., Zalk, M. v., & Meeus, P. G. (2011). Intergenerational continuity of taste: Parental and adolescent music preferences. *Social Forces*, 90(1), 297-319.
- Rentfrow, P. J., Goldberg, L. R., & Levitin, D. J. (2011). The structure of musical preferences: A Five-factor model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100(6), 1139-1157.
- Lewis, B. E., & Schmidt, C. P. (1991). Listeners' response to music as a function of personality type. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 39(4), 311-321.
- Upadhyay, D. D., Shukla, D. R., & Chakraborty, M. A. (2016, December). Factor structure of music preference scale and its relation to personality. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 43(1), 104-113.
- North, A. C., Hargreaves, D. J., & O'Neil, S. A. (2000). The importance of music to adolescents. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70, 255-272.
- Arnett, J. (1991). Adolescents and heavy metal music: From the mouths of metalheads. *Youth and Society*, 23(1), 76-98.
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Swami, V., Furnham, A., & Maakip, I. (2009). The big five personality traits and uses of music: A replication in Malaysia using structural equation modeling. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 30(1), 20-27.
- Tekman, H. G. (2009). Music preference as signs of who we are: Personality and social factors. In P.-S. Eerola (Ed.), *7th Triennial Conference of European Society for the Cognitive Science of Muslim*.
- Zweigenhaft, R. L. (2008). A Do Re Mi Encore. *A Closer Look at the Personality Correlates of Music Preferences*, 29, 45-55.
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Fagan, P., & Furnham, A. (2010). Personality and uses of music as predictors of preferences for music consensually classified as happy, sad, complex, and social. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 4(4), 205-213.

Copyright of OPUS: HR Journal is the property of Publishing India Group and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.