# The music that new generations listen to: preferences and stereotypes

# La música que escuchan las nuevas generaciones: preferencias y estereotipos

Roberto CREMADES-ANDREU, PhD. Associate Professor. Universidad Complutense de Madrid (rcremade@ucm.es). Carlos LAGE-GÓMEZ, PhD. Associate Professor. Universidad Complutense de Madrid (calage@ucm.es). Arantza CAMPOLLO-URKIZA, PhD. Teaching Fellow. Universidad Complutense de Madrid (arancamp@ucm.es). David J. HARGREAVES, PhD. Emeritus Professor. University of Roehampton, U.K. (d.j.hargreaves@icloud.com).

#### Abstract:

For young people, music is not just meaningful as an object of aesthetic consumption; it also has a social function to which they attribute different values that influence their identity and social relations. Thus, the aim of this article is to evaluate how their musical preferences are structured and what differences exist by gender and age range, as well as studying what stereotypes they associate with the styles they listen to most in comparison with these variables. To do so, an updated and adapted version of the questionnaire by Cremades et al. (2010) was used. This was answered by 1020 adolescents from a district of the city of Madrid: 540 female (52.9%) and 480 male (47.1%) aged between 12 and 20. The results reveal which styles of popular urban music young people prefer, with older ones listening to a wider range of styles than the younger ones, and female respondents favouring mainstream music and Latin music. The stereotypes they most associate with their preferences are "generation", "personality", and "behaviour", something that is related to the development of the adolescent's own identity. Therefore, starting from knowledge of the meaning young people attribute to music, it is necessary for music lessons to improve their listening and critical capacities, as a way of creating competent listeners, with sufficient musical and social knowledge of the music they prefer.

**Keywords:** musical preferences, sociocultural stereotypes, adolescence, new generations.

#### Resumen:

Para los jóvenes, la música no solo es un objeto de consumo estético; también cumple una función social, a la que atribuyen diversos valores que influencian su identidad y sus relaciones sociales. Así, el objetivo de este artículo es evaluar cómo se estructuran sus preferencias musicales y qué diferencias existen en función del género y del rango de edad, además de estudiar qué estereotipos asocian a los estilos que más escuchan según dichas variables. Para ello, se utilizó un cuestionario actualizado y adaptado de Cremades et al. (2010), al que respondieron 1020 jóvenes adolescentes de un distrito de la ciudad de Madrid: 540 mujeres (52.9 %) y 480 hombres (47.1 %) de entre 12 y 20 años. Los resultados ponen de manifiesto qué estilos de música popular urbana prefieren los jóvenes. Asimismo, que los de mayor edad escuchan un rango más amplio de estilos y que las mujeres se decantan por las tendencias musicales y la música latina. Respecto a los estereotipos, «generación», «personalidad» y «comportamiento» son los que más asocian a sus preferencias, lo cual se relaciona con el desarrollo de la propia identidad del adolescente. Como conclusión, creemos que, a partir del conocimiento sobre el significado que le dan los jóvenes a la música, es preciso potenciar su escucha y capacidad crítica desde el aula de música, como una forma de construir oyentes competentes, con conocimientos musicales y sociales suficientes de la música que prefieren.

**Palabras clave:** preferencias musicales, estereotipos socioculturales, adolescencia, nuevas generaciones.

Date of reception of the original: 2023-10-08.

Date of approval: 2023-11-05.

Please, cite this article as follows: Cremades-Andreu, R., Lage-Gómez, C., Campollo-Urkiza, A., & Hargreaves, D. J. (2024). The music that new generations listen to: preferences and stereotypes [La música que escuchan las nuevas generaciones: preferencias y estereotipos]. Revista Española de Pedagogía, 82 (287), 23-36. https://doi.org/10.22550/2174-0909.3925



#### 1. Introduction

Music can be considered as one of the main reference points for young people in cognitive terms (comprehension of musical elements and their structure), emotional terms (the feelings it conveys), and social terms (social acceptance of individual musical taste), as every day they are exposed to sound stimuli that influence their intellectual, social, and personal development (Hallam, 2010). Different authors (Hargreaves et al., 2012; Evans & McPherson, 2017; Symonds et al., 2017) have studied the effects that the approach to certain musical styles has on the individual, how they relate through them, and what value they place on the musical experience.

Hargreaves et al. (2006) proposed a reciprocal feedback model that explained how the individual processes and relates to music. This model considers not only the musical elements and the choice that the listener makes of what to listen to but also the setting in which it occurs (what the authors call the *listening* situation), as, in it, the listener can express and share his or her musical preferences with other people. In the same vein, Megías and Rodríguez (2003) had already pointed out that listening to any type of music is a personal and voluntary act in which, beyond the perception of musical elements (such as rhythm, melody, or lyrics), the listener associates listening with different aspects that are personal (memories, feelings, or emotions), but which, at the same time, unite them and they like to share. These ideas point towards the close relationship created between the person, the music, and the social context. That is, young people identify with music for what it contributes to their lives, giving a meaning more related to its social function (Bonneville-Roussy & Rust, 2018; Hargreaves et al., 2015; MacDonald et al., 2017; Morrison, 2017).

This social function becomes more relevant in adolescence, a period of change when individuals find themselves searching for self-affirmation of their personality and identity (McLean & Thorne, 2003). On this changing path, peers constitute the reference group that influences an individual's development, given that a vision of one's own identity can be projected through the group (Knifsend & Juvonen, 2014). With the peer group, they share musical preferences, as well as particular values, cultural patterns, habits, lifestyles, fashions, or stereotypes, among others (DeWall et al., 2011; Lonsdale & North, 2017; Marín-Liébana et al., 2021; Reeves et al., 2015).

DeNora (2017) states that identity formation could be regarded as a dynamic construct in constant change. Such construct creates new spaces for social grouping through different external agents, among which the internet is the medium most followed by young people (Pedrero-Esteban et al., 2019). In fact, the media influence of platforms, social networks, and apps such as Spotify has increased their dominance in shaping the musical preferences of present generations, something that has involved a reduction in their range of listening (Werner, 2020). On the opposing side, the styles of music they hear in music lessons are the ones they rate lowest. These lessons often still encourage listening to musical styles that differ greatly not only from current sounds, but also from the social meanings music has for new generations. Therefore, music teachers should focus their content on fostering critical thinking about the music that young people prefer in order to favour the development of their musical identity by expanding the range of musical styles they listen to (Thomas, 2016).

#### 2. About musical preferences

Research into musical preferences is a line that has been brought up to date with new studies in different national and international contexts. In a study carried out with a sample of British adolescents (n=278), Hargreaves et al. (1995) used a list of twelve musical styles that were analysed according to age and gender variables. The styles included were rap, house, reggae, blues, heavy metal, jazz, classical, country, pop, folk, opera, and rock. In their conclusions, they note that age significantly shapes the approach to styles of music known as popular at the expense of serious music. In addition, women preferred a wide variety of styles and were closer to serious music than men, who were more focussed on popular music.

Rentfrow and Gosling (2003), in the United States, designed a short test of musical preferences (STOMP) comprising a list of fourteen musical styles, which was answered on a seven-point Likert scale (1 = Not at all, 7 = A great deal). The exploratory factor analysis grouped these styles into four dimensions: (1) reflective-complex (blues, jazz, classical, and folk), (2) intense-rebellious (rock, alternative, and heavy metal), (3) upbeat-conventional (country, soundtracks, religious, and pop), and (4) energetic-rhythmic (rap/hip-hop, soul/funk, electronic/dance). To design the questionnaire, they drew up an initial list of eighty styles and sub-styles with the help of a panel of five experts. They then performed a pilot



study with thirty participants. Of these, only 7% knew all of the sub-styles included in the study, while 97% knew all of the styles, and so it was decided that the test would solely comprise the most listened-to styles.

Following this model, Colley (2008), with a sample of young British people, centred her analysis on identifying these dimensions, but went a step further and grouped them by gender. Accordingly, she obtained four dimensions for women: sophisticated (comprising classical, blues, jazz, opera), heavy (rock, heavy metal), rebellious (rap, reggae), and mainstream (chart pop, folk, country); and four for males: sophisticated (classical, blues, jazz, opera), traditional (folk, country), heavy (heavy metal, rock), and rebellious (reggae, rap).

Later on, Rentfrow et al. (2011) identified five dimensions: (1) mellow (pop and R&B), (2) unpretentious (country and rock and roll), (3) sophisticated (classical and jazz), (4) intense (heavy metal and punk), and (5) contemporary (rap and electronic). Lorenzo-Quiles et al. (2021) used this classification, which they adapted by including Brazilian styles in a sample of 940 young Brazilians aged between 14 and 20.

In Spain, one of the first studies on musical tastes centred on adolescents and young people was the one by Megías and Rodríguez (2003). The sample included 1900 participants from around the country aged between 15 and 24. The questionnaire had various sections, one of which contained a list of the following musical styles: pop, dance, Latin, singer-songwriters, electronic music, balladeers, rumba, flamenco, rock and roll, hip-hop/rap, alternative rock, grunge, indie-rock, indie-pop, alternative pop, traditional or regional music, reggae, ska, ethnic, heavy metal, classical, progressive rock, punk, new age, jazz, and folk. The last eight styles were the ones of which young people were least aware. According to the authors, the principal listening styles brought together styles close to pop, which are the ones that took the top places in sales lists and chart hits. On the next step were those that were listened to in nightclubs, while the styles that young people listened to least were the ones adult generations preferred. The questionnaire also included a section on stereotypes associated with music, from which the authors concluded that the group of young people used them as a way of forming groups and, at the same, distinguishing between peers.

This review underlines the difficulty of examining musical styles as a single unit of analysis in order to classify them, and also considers the current difficulty of categorising songs into a specific genre. Following this argument, Pedrero-Esteban et al. (2019) focused on the problem of categorising popular urban music owing to its current distinctive features. It is a composite audio experience using advanced technologies capable of shaping all of the musical parameters of a recording (tone/voice, pitch/intonation, rhythm/speed) and that is spread through listening platforms, social networks, etc. This has involved a process of homogenisation that hinders a clear distinction between the different styles and sub-styles of this type of music.

#### 3. Stereotypes in music

According to Kurtz-Costes et al. (2014), stereotypes are defined as knowledge shared among particular social groups that might or might not reflect certain characteristics of this group with regards to nationality, race, social class, sex, age, and occupation, among other aspects. It is a way of labelling people according to determined values that categorise them ambiguously and, on many occasions, do not represent them.

In their relationship with music, stereotypes can become visible in external aspects that do not focus on musical characteristics, such as rhythm, melody, harmony, or tone (Susino & Schubert, 2019). Furthermore, it is important to note that, for young people, the agent with the biggest influence on how they listen to music is in the online setting. Through platforms, social networks, and user profiles, they are constantly exposed to stereotyped visions of their body image, how they dress, their gender, their personality, and their age, among others (Oberst et al., 2016). Far from contributing to an equal perspective, the basic aim of companies that operate on the internet is the commercialisation of cultural products to increase consumption and sales of their services. To do so, they study the recommendations of users, an algorithmic culture in which we are all trapped (Striphas, 2015). With regards to music, the main point of reference for listening via streaming among the youngest users is Spotify, an app that organise music in closed categories according to style, sex, race, social class, and nationality. Musical lists are not structured at random nor are they shaped exclusively by listeners' choices. Instead, they are manipulated by algorithms to make profits, without considering that they reinforce specific listening patterns that are embedded in or associated with particular stereotypes (Werner, 2020).

Regarding stereotypes relating to image and behaviour, Rentfrow and Gosling (2007) studied the



perceptions of fans of different musical styles. The people closest to classical music were perceived as friendly, industrious, introverted, intelligent, but physically unattractive. In contrast, fans of rap were perceived as extroverted and athletic, as well as being more likely to use drugs, a characteristic still associated with them today.

Reeves et al. (2015) studied stereotypes of social class associated with music. They concluded that people's socio-economic level determines their listening preference for more or less intellectual musical styles, creating a social hierarchy that highlights these stereotypes.

Moreover, it is also necessary to mention studies that have focussed on assessing the influence of music on personality development (Herrera et al., 2018). Račevska and Tadinac (2019) found positive correlations in the preference for reflective, complex, and intense musical styles, confirming that their influence is also apparent in our emotions and is associated with particular personality traits.

Nonetheless, the stereotypes that have been studied most in their association with musical preferences are those relating to gender (Dobrota et al., 2019; Rentfrow et al., 2011; Roulston & Misawa, 2011). For example, an affinity for musical styles such as rock has been associated with a form of cultural expression typical of masculine identity, while pop has been considered closer to feminine ideals (Lorenzo-Quiles et al., 2021). In this sense, Soares-Quadros et al. (2019) explained that women identify with styles that have emotional content, such as dance, or pop, while men prefer more vigorous, complex, and exciting styles, such as heavy metal; similar results to those obtained by Dobrota and Ercegovac (2015).

On the other hand, it is important to note that, beyond the musical taste reported by men or women, the sexualisation found in music videos from mainstream music continues to offer a vision that clearly objectifies women. Even in videos by female artists, their nakedness often contrasts with the dominant position of the man and these images can be very harmful for minors (Gutiérrez & Ubani, 2023). On the same line, Werner (2023) notes a majority presence of black, brown, and Latino masculinities performing styles such as rap, trap, and reggaeton in the charts of European countries. She also analyses the female image in different music videos by male and female artists. They contain a positive image of women, extolling their friendship, personal and

financial independence, professional skill, strengths, and understanding. However, at the same time, with commercial aims, they show them in revealing clothes, in stylish outfits, wearing expensive accessories, beautiful, desirable, and twerking, something that continues to transmit a sexualised image of women.

Following the review of literature relating to this work, its main aim is to establish a grouping based on the preference for musical styles that a cohort of young people from Madrid listen to the most. As secondary objectives, it seeks to study the differences between these dimensions by *age* and *gender* variables, and to evaluate the relationship between these musical styles and the sociocultural stereotypes that young people associate with them.

#### 4. Method

This article uses an *ex post facto* study following the designs found in the research works included in the literature review.

#### 4.1. Participants

The participants in this research were secondary-school students from a district located to the southeast of the city of Madrid ,where there are six publicly run schools and seven state-funded private and private ones. The sample comprised 1020 participants, 540 female (52.9%) and 480 male (47.1%), with ages ranging from 12 to 20 and a mean age of 15.18 years (SD=2.12). Owing to the spread of their ages, we decided to group them by cumulative percentage into four age ranges, that is: 12 to 13 years (n=237, 23.3%), 14 to 15 (n=332, 32.5%), 16 to 17 (n=301, 29.5%) and 18 to 20 (n=149, 14.6%). The groups of students in the sample were selected at random, choosing one class from each year in the secondary schools with the aim of them being representative of the group in question.

#### 4.2. Instrument

Taking into account the different questionnaires available to obtain information about musical preferences (Hargreaves et al., 1995; Rentfrow, et al., 2011), we used the "Music styles listening preference questionnaire" (Cremades et al., 2010), which we adapted to the characteristics of this study. To do so, the list of musical styles was updated and, at the same time, a section on sociocultural stereotypes was added. This list took shape around the styles to which the participants feel closest, with the aim of not dispersing the results in music listened to only by a small minority or by



nobody. The items on this instrument were answered using a five-point Likert scale (1 = Never, 5 = Always). The final questionnaire has a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .787. For content validity, we used the expert judgement technique, a process involving the participation of ten specialists and researchers in music education with extensive experience in this field, who reported on the pertinence and relevance of the prepared questionnaire.

#### 4.3. Process

Before carrying out the data collection for this study, we requested the agreement of the management teams of the participating centres and sought informed consent from the students and their families, who we notified of aspects such as the fact that they could abandon the study at any moment and that their anonymity would be preserved. The questionnaire was administered by the researchers in person so that its completion could be supervised. The students completed the

questionnaire in a session that lasted approximately twenty minutes.

#### 5. Results

The analyses centred on the musical styles with the highest mean scores in order not to disperse the results. Following the procedure of the studies cited in the theoretical review, we used an exploratory factor analysis so that, on the basis of the dimensions obtained, we could analyse the differences by the age range and gender of the participants using parametric tests. Finally, we applied a Pearson's correlation analysis to establish which stereotypes the participants in this study associate with the styles they listen to most.

# 5.1. Dimensions of musical preferences and their differences by age range and gender

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for the styles listened to most by the participants in this study.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the styles listened to most by participants.

| Musical styles   | n    | Minimum | Maximum | $ar{X}$ | σ     |
|------------------|------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Pop              | 1020 | 1       | 5       | 3.66    | 1.282 |
| Rap/Hip-hop      | 1020 | 1       | 5       | 3.35    | 1.220 |
| Reggaeton        | 1020 | 1       | 5       | 3.28    | 1.500 |
| Trap             | 1020 | 1       | 5       | 3.11    | 1.561 |
| Electronic music | 1020 | 1       | 5       | 2.82    | 1.359 |
| Rock and roll    | 1020 | 1       | 5       | 2.56    | 1.314 |
| Techno           | 1020 | 1       | 5       | 2.35    | 1.279 |
| Phonk            | 1020 | 1       | 5       | 2.29    | 1.244 |
| Bachata          | 1020 | 1       | 5       | 2.26    | 1.325 |
| Dance            | 1020 | 1       | 5       | 2.25    | 1.302 |
| Flamenco         | 1020 | 1       | 5       | 2.13    | 1.352 |
| Dembow           | 1020 | 1       | 5       | 2.12    | 1.214 |

Note: 1 =Never, 5 =Always.

As Table 1 shows, the styles with the highest scores were pop, rap, reggaeton, and trap, with the lowest figures being for dance, flamenco, and dembow. Taking these styles, we used the Bartlett test and the KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) measure, which gave a value of .71 (Bartlett's test of sphericity  $\chi^2 = 2965.32$ , p < .000).

This result was higher than the reference value of .6, thus indicating that this type of analysis is valid. So, we carried out a factor analysis using the principal components extraction method with Oblimin rotation, giving five factors that explained 69.57% of the total variance (see Table 2).



Table 2. Structure of musical preferences.

| Di  | Maria I stales   |      |  | Componer | nts  |      |
|---|--|------|--|----------|------|------|
| Dimensions  | Musical styles   | 1    | .876<br>.652<br>.464<br>.826<br>.647<br>.639 | 4        | 5    |      |
|   | Rap/Hip-hop  | .876 |  |          |      |      |
| Urban music   | Phonk  | .652 |  |          |      |      |
|   | Rap/Hip-hop       .876         Phonk       .652         Trap       .464         Dembow       .826         Bachata       .647         Reggaeton       .639         Pop       .777         Dance       .703         Flamenco |      |  |          |      |      |
|   | Dembow   |      | .826   |          |      |      |
| Latin music   | Bachata  |      | .647   |          |      |      |
|   | Reggaeton  |      | .639   |          |      |      |
| Na in the control of                                  | Pop  |      |  | .777     |      |      |
| Mainstream music                                      | Dance  |      |  | .703     |      |      |
| N 1.C .   | Flamenco   |      |  |          | .829 |      |
| Musical fusion  | Rock and roll  |      |  |          | .808 |      |
| m 1 1 . 1 .   | Techno   |      |  |          |      | .913 |
| Mainstream music  Musical fusion  Fechnological music | Electronic music   |      |  |          |      | .876 |

As Table 2 shows, each dimension comprises related musical styles and is named after the specific characteristics they share: (1) urban music: this includes rap/hip-hop and the sub-styles phonk and trap; (2) Latin music: this includes sub-styles of Latin origin such as dembow, bachata, and reggaeton; (3) mainstream music: including pop and dance, reference points in the charts; (4) musical fusion: combining

flamenco and rock and roll, which share processes of evolution with the fusion of diverse styles; and (5) technological music: which includes techno and electronic music.

We then performed an analysis of variance of the musical dimensions obtained according to the *age range* variable (see Table 3).

TABLE 3. ANOVA of musical dimensions by age range.

| Dimensions       | Age range   | n   | $ar{X}$ | σ    | ${m F}$ | p     | ${\eta_p}^2$ | Post hoc    |
|------------------|-------------|-----|---------|------|---------|-------|--------------|-------------|
|                  | 12 a 13 (1) | 238 | 2.70    | 1.01 |         |       |              |             |
| Urban music      | 14 a 15 (2) | 332 | 2.93    | .95  | 6 006   | .001* | 0.000        | 4 9 9 > 1   |
|                  | 16 a 17 (3) | 301 | 3.00    | .93  | 6.906   |       | 0.020        | 4, 3, 2 > 1 |
|                  | 18 a 20 (4) | 149 | 3.11    | 1.01 |         |       |              |             |
|                  | 12 a 13     | 238 | 2.43    | .96  |         | .90   |              |             |
| T atim manais    | 14 a 15     | 332 | 2.54    | 1.4  | 0.171   |       |              |             |
| Latin music      | 16 a 17     | 301 | 2.66    | 1.00 | 2.171   |       |              |             |
|                  | 18 a 20     | 149 | 2.58    | 1.09 |         |       |              |             |
|                  | 12 a 13     | 238 | 2.76    | 1.07 |         |       |              |             |
| 35.              | 14 a 15     | 332 | 2.98    | 1.08 | 0.501   | 0114  | 0.011        | 0 . 1       |
| Mainstream music | 16 a 17     | 301 | 3.04    | 1.03 | 3.701   | .011* | 0.011        | 3 > 1       |
|                  | 18 a 20     | 149 | 3.02    | .94  |         |       |              |             |



| vear                                       |                     |
|--|---------------------|
| 82   |                     |
| ⊐.   |                     |
| year 82, n. 287, January-April 2024, 23-36 | Revista Española de |
| Jar  | ä                   |
| านล  | Esk                 |
| <u>.</u>                                   | añ                  |
| br   | ol<br>a             |
| =:   | ð                   |
| 8  | <b>H</b>            |
| 2  | e                   |
|  | ç                   |
| Ņ  | Pedagogía           |
| Ψ  | 0                   |
| ω  | <u>~</u>            |
| O)   | a                   |

|                | 12 a 13               | 238    | 1.87  | .85   |             |       |       |             |
|----------------|-----------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|-------------|
| Musical fusion | 14 a 15               | 332    | 1.97  | .93   | 05.005      | 001*  | 0.060 | 4.0 . 1.0   |
| Musical fusion | 16 a 17 301 2.29 1.09 | 25.005 | .001* | 0.069 | 4, 3 > 1, 2 |       |       |             |
|                | 18 a 20               | 149    | 2.68  | 1.17  |             |       |       |             |
|                | 12 a 13               | 238    | 2.12  | 1.12  |             |       |       |             |
| Technological  | 14 a 15               | 332    | 2.55  | 1.18  | 00 750      | .000* |       | 4, 3, 2 > 1 |
| music          | 16 a 17               | 301    | 2.76  | 1.13  | 23.756      |       | 0.066 | 4 > 3, 2, 1 |
|                | 18 a 20               | 149    | 3.05  | 1.23  |             |       |       |             |

<sup>\*</sup>p ≤.05.

The results show statistically significant differences in "urban music", with a small effect  $(\eta_p^2 \approx 0.01)$ ; here the oldest students report listening to this type of music more than the students aged from 12 to 13 do. The same effect size was found for "mainstream music", with young people aged from 16 to 17 having higher averages than those aged 12 to 13. In the case of "musical fusion", the effect was higher  $(\eta_p^2 \approx 0.06)$ ,

with subjects aged 18 to 20 and 16 to 17 having upper means than those from lower ranges. The same thing happened with "technological music": the older respondents score higher than the younger ones, and those aged 18 to 20 score highest of all.

Next, we analysed gender differences in musical dimensions using Student's *t* test (see Table 4).

Table 4. Student's t test for musical dimensions by gender.

| Dimensions                  | Gender                                  | n   | $ar{X}$  | σ    | Levene's   | t test    | d   |
|-----------------------------|---|-----|----------|------|------------|-----------|-----|
| Urban music                 | Female                                  | 540 | 2.90     | .97  | F = .028   |           |     |
| Croun music                 | Male 480 2.95 .98 $p = .868$ $p = .399$ |     | p = .399 |      |            |           |     |
| Latin music                 | Female                                  | 540 | 2.77     | 1.06 | F = 16.733 |           | .46 |
| Latin music                 | Male                                    | 480 | 2.31     | .92  | p = .001   | p = .001* | .10 |
| Mainstream music            | Female                                  | 540 | 3.24     | 1.01 | F = .110   | t = 9.562 | .60 |
| Wanistream music            | Male                                    | 480 | 2.63     | .96  | p = .741   | p = .001* | .00 |
| Musical fusion              | Female                                  | 540 | 2.07     | 1.04 | F = .405   | t = 2.199 | .14 |
| Musical Tusion              | Male                                    | 480 | 2.22     | 1.05 | p = .525   | p = .028* | .14 |
| Markovski sila sila kanasis | Female                                  | 540 | 2.40     | 1.14 | F = .250   | t = 5.207 | 20  |
| Technological music         | Male                                    | 480 | 2.79     | 1.19 | p = .617   | p = .001* | .33 |

<sup>\*</sup>p ≤.05.

The results of the previous analysis were statistically significant for the last four dimensions. Women scored higher than men with regards to "Latin music" (with a small effect from 0.21 to 0.49) and "mainstream

music" (with a moderate effect from 0.50 to 0.70). In contrast, men gave "musical fusion" and "technological music" higher scores than women did, with a small effect.



## 5.2. Stereotypes associated with preference for musical styles

This section starts with an analysis of the descriptive statistics of the stereotypes associated with students' musical preferences.

In this table, higher scores indicate that students associate their musical preferences with the stereotypes that relate to their personality, generation, and behaviour. In contrast, stereotypes relating to gender had the lowest mean score.

To continue, we performed an analysis of variance of the stereotypes that participants associate with the dimensions by age range (see Table 6).

Table 5. Descriptive statistics for stereotypes associated with musical preferences.

| Stereotypes          | $\boldsymbol{n}$ | Minimum | Maximum | $ar{X}$ | $\sigma$ |
|----------------------|------------------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| Way of dressing      | 1020             | 1       | 5       | 2.36    | 1.229    |
| Behaviour            | 1020             | 1       | 5       | 2.65    | 1.249    |
| Personality          | 1020             | 1       | 5       | 3.19    | 1.332    |
| Generation           | 1019             | 1       | 5       | 3.09    | 1.434    |
| Gender               | 1020             | 1       | 5       | 1.65    | 1.110    |
| Physical appearance  | 1020             | 1       | 5       | 1.71    | 1.124    |
| Values               | 1020             | 1       | 5       | 2.46    | 1.413    |
| Relation with others | 1020             | 1       | 5       | 2.43    | 1.337    |

Note: 1 =Never, 5 =Always.

Table 6. ANOVA of stereotypes by age range.

| Stereotypes     | Age range    | n   | $ar{X}$ | σ    | $oldsymbol{F}$ | p     | ${m \eta_p}^2$ | Post hoc                              |      |             |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|---------|------|----------------|-------|----------------|---------------------------------------|------|-------------|
|                 | 12 to 13 (1) | 237 | 2.08    | 1.22 |                |       |                |                                       |      |             |
| Way of dressing | 14 to 15 (2) | 332 | 2.34    | 1.17 | 10.506         | .001* | .030           | 4, 3 > 1                              |      |             |
| way of dressing | 16 to 17 (3) | 301 | 2.39    | 1.26 | 10.506         | .001  | .030           | 4, 0 > 1                              |      |             |
|                 | 18 to 20 (4) | 149 | 2.79    | 1.21 |                |       |                |                                       |      |             |
|                 | 12 to 13     | 238 | 2.37    | 1.23 |                |       |                |                                       |      |             |
| Behaviour       | 14 to 15     | 332 | 2.68    | 1.22 | 7.811          | .001* | .023           | 122 \ 1                               |      |             |
| Dellaviour      | 16 to 17     | 301 | 2.69    | 1.26 | 7.011          | .001  | .001           | .011 .001                             | .025 | 4, 5, 2 > 1 |
|                 | 18 to 20     | 149 | 2.98    | 1.24 |                |       |                |                                       |      |             |
|                 | 12 to 13     | 238 | 2.84    | 1.45 |                |       |                |                                       |      |             |
| Personality     | 14 to 15     | 332 | 3.17    | 1.31 | 8.791          | .001* | .025           | 19951                                 |      |             |
| Personanty      | 16 to 17     | 301 | 3.35    | 1.24 | 8.791          |       | .020           | 4, 5, 2 > 1                           |      |             |
|                 | 18 to 20     | 149 | 3.43    | 1.27 |                |       |                | 4, 3, 2 > 1  4, 3, 2 > 1  4, 3, 2 > 1 |      |             |
|                 | 12 to 13     | 238 | 2.76    | 1.55 |                |       |                |                                       |      |             |
| Generation      | 14 to 15     | 332 | 3.14    | 1.46 | E 757          | 001*  | 017            | 490 > 1                               |      |             |
| Generation      | 16 to 17     | 301 | 3.23    | 1.31 | 5.757          | .001* | .017           | 4, 5, 2 > 1                           |      |             |
|                 | 18 to 20     | 149 | 3.21    | 1.37 |                |       |                |                                       |      |             |
|                 | 12 to 13     | 238 | 1.65    | 1.12 |                |       |                |                                       |      |             |
| Candan          | 14 to 15     | 332 | 1.68    | 1.14 | 170            | 610   |                |                                       |      |             |
| Gender          | 16 to 17     | 301 | 1.65    | 1.06 | .179           | .610  |                |                                       |      |             |
|                 | 18 to 20     | 149 | 1.60    | 1.14 |                |       |                |                                       |      |             |

| vear 82.    | Revista Española de Pedagogía |
|-------------|-------------------------------|
| ⊐<br>.``    | _                             |
| 287.        | ₹evis                         |
| Janua       | Revista Española de P         |
| dA-Vie      | pañola                        |
| r:: 20      | a de F                        |
| 24. 2       | edag                          |
| ώ<br>ω<br>Θ | ogía                          |
|             |                               |

|                     | 12 to 13 | 238 | 1.64 | 1.13 |        |       |      |             |
|---------------------|----------|-----|------|------|--------|-------|------|-------------|
| Physical appearance | 14 to 15 | 332 | 1.75 | 1.36 | 2.058  | .104  |      |             |
|                     | 16 to 17 | 301 | 1.63 | 1.02 | 2.000  | .104  |      |             |
|                     | 18 to 20 | 149 | 1.88 | 1.28 |        |       |      |             |
| W.1                 | 12 to 13 | 238 | 2.08 | 1.30 | 12.892 |       |      |             |
|                     | 14 to 15 | 332 | 2.43 | 1.37 |        | .001* | .037 | 4, 3, 2 > 1 |
| Values              | 16 to 17 | 301 | 2.56 | 1.39 |        |       |      | 4 > 3, 2    |
|                     | 18 to 20 | 149 | 2.96 | 1.57 |        |       |      |             |
|                     | 12 to 13 | 238 | 2.12 | 1.32 |        |       |      |             |
| Relation            | 14 to 15 | 332 | 2.42 | 1.31 | 7.050  | .001* | 000  | 4, 3, 2 > 1 |
| with others         | 16 to 17 | 301 | 2.50 | 1.28 | 7.959  | .001* | .023 | 4 > 2       |
|                     | 18 to 20 | 149 | 2.77 | 1.34 |        |       |      |             |
|                     |          |     |      |      |        |       |      |             |

 $p \le 05$ .

The results were significant for all of the stereotypes, except for the ones relating to "gender" and "physical appearance". Specifically, in the ones regarding "behaviour", "personality" and "generation", all of the age ranges older than 12 to 13 years have higher means, with a small effect size. With the same effect, students aged from 18 to 20 and from 16 to 17 scored higher than those aged 12 to 13 in "way of dressing". With regards to "values", respondents aged from 12 to

13 have the lowest means, while those aged from 18 to 20 score highest of all with a small effect. In the case of "relation with others", respondents aged from 12 to 13 scored lowest, with there also being larger differences for the 18 to 20 range compared to those aged from 14 to 15.

As in the previous section, we carried out an analysis using Student's *t* test to analyse gender stereotypes.

Table 7. Student's *t* test for gender stereotypes.

| Stereotypes         | Gender | n   | X    | $\sigma$ | Levene's  | t test       | d   |
|---------------------|--------|-----|------|----------|-----------|--------------|-----|
| Wood of duagain a   | Female | 540 | 2.35 | 1.21     | F = .657  | t = .216     |     |
| Way of dressing     | Male   | 480 | 2.37 | 1.25     | p = .418  | p = .829     |     |
| D.1                 | Female | 540 | 2.65 | 1.25     | F = .118  | t = .030     |     |
| Behaviour           | Male   | 480 | 2.65 | 1.24     | p = .732  | p = .976     |     |
| D                   | Female | 540 | 3.31 | 1.33     | F = 2.034 | t = -3.214   | 00  |
| Personality         | Male   | 480 | 3.04 | 1.32     | p = .154  | p = .001*    | .20 |
| Generation          | Female | 540 | 3.25 | 1.41     | F = .009  | t = -3.714   | .23 |
|                     | Male   | 480 | 2.91 | 1.45     | p = .925  | $p = .001^*$ | .20 |
| G 1                 | Female | 540 | 1.59 | 1.06     | F = 7.950 | t = 1.901    |     |
| Gender              | Male   | 480 | 1.72 | 1.61     | p = .005  | p = .058     |     |
| Dl                  | Female | 540 | 1.67 | 1.07     | F = 4.675 | t = 1.159    |     |
| Physical appearance | Male   | 480 | 1.75 | 1.19     | p = .031  | p = .247     |     |
| \$7-1               | Female | 540 | 2.42 | 1.38     | F = 3.421 | t = 1.016    |     |
| Values              | Male   | 480 | 2.51 | 1.45     | p = .065  | p = .310     |     |
| Relation            | Female | 540 | 2.40 | 1.31     | F = 2.207 | t = .717     |     |
| with others         | Male   | 480 | 2.46 | 1.37     | p = .138  | p = .473     |     |

 $p \le 05$ .



The previous analysis found significant differences for personality and generation, with a small effect size; specifically, female respondents scored higher than male ones. Finally, we performed a Pearson's correlation coefficient analysis between the musical styles from Table 1 and the sociocultural stereotypes included in this study, the results of which are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Pearson's correlation analysis of preferred styles and stereotypes.

| 36 1 1 . 1       |    | Stereotypes |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |  |  |
|------------------|----|-------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|--|
| Musical style    | es | WD          | В      | P     | GZ    | G     | PA    | V     | R     |  |  |
| Pop              | r  | 037         | .088*  | .155* | .197* | .086* | 008   | .102* | .098* |  |  |
| Rap/Hip-hop      | r  | .244*       | .172*  | .130* | .112* | .023  | .130* | .119* | .136* |  |  |
| Reggaeton        | r  | 049         | 115*   | 127*  | .339* | .092* | .082* | 197*  | 021   |  |  |
| Trap             | r  | .116*       | 019    | 058   | .306* | 029   | .092* | 158*  | .005  |  |  |
| Electronic music | r  | .121*       | .211*  | .174* | .101* | .049  | .137* | .137* | .122* |  |  |
| Rock and roll    | r  | .135*       | .179*  | .199* | 133*  | 029   | .030  | .294* | .107* |  |  |
| Techno           | r  | .107*       | .162*  | .160* | .132* | .072* | .164* | .155* | .109* |  |  |
| Phonk            | r  | .210*       | .175** | .171* | .072* | .067* | .118* | .145* | .131* |  |  |
| Bachata          | r  | .047        | .034   | .044  | .245* | .098* | .099* | 026   | .068* |  |  |
| Dance            | r  | .140*       | .136*  | .175* | .147* | .015  | .067* | .114* | .092* |  |  |
| Flamenco         | r  | .249*       | .184*  | .171* | 090*  | 015   | .091* | .272* | .153* |  |  |
| Dembow           | r  | .035        | 017    | 034   | .120* | .045  | .076* | 010   | 009   |  |  |

\*n < 05

Note: WD = way of dressing, B = behaviour, P = personality, GZ = generation, G = gender, PA = physical appearance, V = values, R = relation with others.

The results in Table 8 were statistically significant for most of the variables analysed, although, using the values of Cohen, the effect size was not large  $(r \ge .50)$ . We should note the moderate size  $(.30 \le r < .50)$  for reggaeton and trap with the "generation stereotype", which, also with a small size, was obtained for bachata and pop. With a small effect, it is also necessary to mention rap, phonk, and flamenco with "way of dressing"; rap, electronic music, phonk, and flamenco with "behaviour"; rock and roll with "personality"; and, finally, rock and roll, flamenco, and reggaeton with "values", although, in this last case, the relationship is negative.

#### 6. Discussion and conclusions

The results of this study show that the styles that participants listen to the most are confined to a very small circle within popular urban music. This is one feature that differs from previous studies, where a wider range of listening is displayed (Cremades et al., 2010), and it highlights, even more if possible, the importance of the social factor and the shaping of the identity of young people at present (Bonneville-Roussy & Rust, 2018). In this way, the data obtained classify musical styles around the following dimensions:

(1) Urban music: rap originated and evolved in the outlying neighbourhoods of the big cities, with sub-styles such as trap and phonk. This last sub-style



distances itself from more commercial sounds in search of more DIY productions. Trap is much simpler than rap, and centres more on experimenting with sound effects, always giving voice to the everyday reality of life in neighbourhoods (Werner, 2023).

- (2) Latin music: this includes dembow, reggaeton, and bachata, styles that are all danceable music. The first two of them also share a sexualised vision of the woman, who dances sensually guided by the man (Oberst et al., 2016).
- (3) Technological music: Techno and electronic music are based on experimental use of advanced technological tools to provide a futuristic image.
- (4) Mainstream music: even though their musical characteristics are different, pop and dance are what adolescents listen to most from the charts, in line with the arguments of Gutiérrez and Ubani (2023).
- (5) Musical fusion: this includes two different styles, namely rock and roll and flamenco, which perhaps share the musical mixing of fusion with other styles. Furthermore, their followers identify themselves with an image, a way of dressing, and a strong personality (Morrison, 2017).

Equally, in this grouping, the difficulties deriving from the fact that artists increasingly compose songs that fuse elements of different styles has been considered, coinciding with the ideas of Pedrero-Esteban et al. (2019). Thus, in this case, this classification has grouped styles that include exclusively musical aspects as well as social ones.

The data obtained according to differences by age range shows that older students have a broader range of listening than younger ones, with the "musical fusion" dimension standing out in their listening. This could perhaps be explained by access to this type of music, that can be shared in contexts and spaces for young adults. This access would also explain why they listen to "technological music" more, which, along with "urban music" and "mainstream music", makes up the majority of the sonic landscape of adolescents (Cremades et al., 2010).

By gender, and in line with previous studies (Lorenzo et al., 2021; Soares-Quadros, et al., 2019), women prefer the dimensions of "Latin music" and "mainstream music" owing to their more danceable character, and

because of the meaning of following the trends of the moment. Meanwhile, men listen more to the styles of "musical fusion" and "technological music", which have a strong identity component, with particular aesthetics associated in the way of dressing or in the personality of their listeners.

In relation to the association of their musical preferences with stereotypes, the most cited were those of "personality", "generation", and "behaviour". Something that can be explained in that these, in particular personality, are the ones that most concern adolescents in accordance with the ideas of McLean and Thorne (2003). In contrast, despite the studies that show the continued existence of gender stereotypes (Wener, 2023), participants in this study appear not to see that they are present in their musical preferences. With regards to age range, and as in the case of gender, the older students seem to be more aware of the presence of stereotypes in music. With the exception of the "gender" and "physical appearance" stereotypes, they identify those of "behaviour", "personality", "generation", and "way of dressing" as stereotypes explicitly present in the dissemination of music that they prefer, above all through music videos, as Gutiérrez and Ubani note (2023). With regards to gender, female respondents associate the music they listen to with their "personality" and "generation", perhaps because it awakens the emotions with which they identify more (Račevska & Tadinac, 2019). All of this has been reflected in the close relationship between musical styles and stereotypes, which leads us to confirm the previous arguments. For example, the correlations between reggaeton and trap with the stereotype of "generation" make clearly apparent that both styles are present and have greater following in the present generation (Werner, 2023). This correlation also appears between styles such as rap, phonk, and flamenco with the "way of dressing", a stereotype related to the particular aesthetic of rappers (Rentfrow & Gosling, 2007).

All of this evidence shows that the participants in this study are aware of some of the stereotypes present in their musical preferences, which proves the transcendent role of urban popular music. This perspective casts light on the pertinence of establishing this type of music as a generative core on which to base a transversal approach to a wide variety of topics relating to music education in secondary school. In this sense, it is also advisable to analyse gender stereotypes of this type of music on platforms or in music vide-



os. The aim is to provide students with the necessary tools to recognise them and break with the prejudices present in this field as a way of building a more inclusive musical identity.

## **Funding:**

This work was funded by the "State R&D&I programme aimed at challenges for society" through the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the Spanish Ministry for Science and Innovation, and the State Research Agency. Reference: RTI2018-096532-A-I00.

#### References

- Bonneville-Roussy, A., y Rust, J. (2018). Age trends in musical preferences in adulthood: 2. Sources of social influences as determinants of preferences. *Musicae Scientiae*, 22 (2), 175-195. https://doi.org/10.1177/1029864917704016
- Colley, A. (2008). Young people's musical taste: Relationship with gender and gender-related traits. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38 (8), 2039-2055. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00379.x
- Cremades, R., Lorenzo, O., y Herrera, L. (2010). Musical tastes of secondary school students' with different cultural backgrounds: A study in the Spanish North African city of Melilla. *Musicae Scientiae*, 14 (1), 121-141. https://doi.org/10.1177/102986491001400105
- DeNora, T. (2017). Music-ecology and everyday action. Creating, changing, and contesting identities. En R. MacDonald, D. J. Hargreaves and D. Miell (Eds.), *Handbook of musical identities* (pp. 46-62). Oxford University Press.
- DeWall, C. N., Pond, R. S., Campbell, W. K., y Twenge, J. M. (2011). Tuning in to psychological change: Linguistic markers of psychological traits and emotions over time in popular U.S. song lyrics. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 5 (3), 200-207. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023195
- Dobrota, S., y Ercegovac, I. R. (2015). The relationship between music preferences of different mode and tempo and personality traits-implications for music pedagogy. *Music Education Reserach*, 17 (2), 234-247. https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2014.93 3790
- Dobrota, S., Ercegovac, I. R., y Habe, K. (2019). Gender differences in musical taste: The mediating role of functions of music. Društvena istraživanja, 28 (4), 567-586. https://doi.org/10.5559/di.28.4.01
- Evans, P. A., y McPherson, G. E. (2017). Processes of musical identity consolidation during adolescence. En R. MacDonald, D.
  J. Hargreaves, y D. Miell (Eds.), Oxford handbook of musical identities (pp. 213-231). Oxford University Press.
- Gutiérrez, M., y Ubani, C. (2023). Un marco conceptual de la cosificación sexual de las mujeres en videos musicales [A conceptual framework of the sexual objectification of women in music videos]. Feminismo/s, (42), 27-60. https://doi.org/10.14198/fem.2023.42.02

- Hallam, S. (2010). The power of music: Its impact on the intellectual, social and personal development of children and young people. *International Journal of Music Education*, 28 (3), 269-289. https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761410370658
- Hargreaves, D. J., Comber, C., y Colley, A. (1995). Musical likes and dislikes: The effects of age, gender, and training in British secondary school pupils. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 43 (3), 242-250. https://doi.org/10.2307/3345639
- Hargreaves, D. J., MacDonald, R., y Miell, D. (2012). Musical identities mediate musical development. En G. E. McPherson, y F.
  G. Welch (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of music education* (pp. 125-142). Oxford University Press.
- Hargreaves, D. J., North, A. C., y Tarrant, M. (2006). Musical preference and taste in childhood and adolescence. En G. E. McPherson (Ed.), *The child as musician: A handbook of musi*cal development (pp. 135-154). Oxford University Press.
- Hargreaves, D., North, A., y Tarrant, M. (2015). How and why do musical preferences change in childhood and adolescence? En G. E. McPherson (Ed.), The child as musician: A handbook of musical development [El niño como músico: manual de desarrollo musical] (2.ª ed.) (pp. 303-322). Oxford University Press.
- Herrera, L., Soares-Quadros Jr., J. F., y Lorenzo, O. (2018). Music preferences and personality in Brazilians. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1488. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01488
- Knifsend, C. A., y Juvonen J. (2014). Social identity complexity, cross-ethnic friendships, and intergroup attitudes in urban middle schools. *Child Development*, 85 (2), 709-721. https://doi. org/10.1111/cdev.12157
- Kurtz-Costes, B., Copping, K. E., Rowley, S. J., y Kinlaw, C. R. (2014). Gender and age differences in awareness and endorsement of gender stereotypes about academic abilities. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 29 (4), 603-618. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-014-0216-7
- Lonsdale, A. J., y North, A. C. (2017). Self-to-stereotype matching and musical taste: Is there a link between self-to-stereotype similarity and self-rated music-genre preferences? *Phycology of music*, *45* (3), 307-320. https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735616656789
- Lorenzo-Quiles, O., Soares-Quadros, J. F. Jr., y Abril, J. E. (2021). Musical preferences of Brazilian high school students [Preferencias musicales de los estudiantes de secundaria brasileños]. *PLoS ONE*, 16 (6), e0253353. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0253353
- MacDonald, R., Hargreaves, D. J., y Miell, D. (Eds.) (2017). *Hand-book of musical identities*. Oxford University Press.
- Marín-Liébana, P., Blasco, J. S., y Botella, A. M. (2021). Las preferencias musicales de los estudiantes: hacia un reconocimiento de sus identidades culturales [Students' musical preferences: towards recognition of their cultural identities]. *Vivat Academia. Revista de Comunicación*, (154), 43-67. http://doi.org/10.15178/va.2021.154.e1236
- McLean, K. C., y Thorne, A. (2003). Late adolescents' self-defining memories about relationships. *Developmental Psychology*, 39 (4), 635-645. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.39.4.635.
- Megías, I., y Rodríguez, E. (2003). Jóvenes entre sonidos: hábitos, gustos y referentes musicales [Young people among sounds: habits, tastes and musical references]. FAD (Fundación de Ayuda contra la Drogadicción).
- Morrison, M. D. (2017). The sound(s) of subjection: Constructing American popular music and racial identity through black-sound. Women & Performance: a journal of feminist theory, 27 (1), 13-24. https://doi.org/10.1080/0740770X.2017.1282120



- Oberst, U., Chamarro, A., y Renau, V. (2016). Gender stereotypes 2.0: Self-representations of adolescents on Facebook. Comunicar. 24 (48), 81-90. https://doi.org/10.3916/C48-2016-08
- Pedrero-Esteban, L., Barrios-Rubio, A., y Medina-Ávila, V. (2019). Teenagers, smartphones and digital audio consumption in the age of Spotify. Comunicar, 27 (60), 103-112. https://doi. org/10.3916/C60-2019-10
- Račevska, E., y Tadinac, M. (2019). Intelligence, music preferences, and uses of music from the perspective of evolutionary psychology. Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences, 13 (2), 101-110. https://doi.org/10.1037/ebs0000124
- Reeves, A., Gilbert, E., v Holman, D. (2015). Class dis-identification, cultural stereotypes, and music preferences: experimental evidence from the UK. Poetics, 50, 44-61. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.poetic.2015.01.002
- Rentfrow, P. J., y 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, 84 (6), 1236-1256. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.6.1236
- Rentfrow, P. J., y Gosling, S. D. (2007). The content and validity of music-genre stereotypes among college students. Psychology of Music, 35 (2), 306-326. https://doi.org/10.1177 %2F0305735607070382
- Rentfrow, P. J., Goldberg, L. R., y Levitin, D. J. (2011). The structure of musical preferences: A five-factor model. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100 (6), 1139-1157. https:// doi.org/10.1037/a0022406
- Roulston, K., y Misawa, M. (2011). Music teachers' constructions of gender in elementary education. Music Education Research, 13 (1), 3-28. https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2011.553275
- Soares-Quadros, J. F. Jr., Lorenzo, O., Herrera, L., y Araújo Santos, N. S. (2019). Gender and religion as factors of individual differences in musical preference. Musicae Scientiae, 23 (4), 525-539. https://doi.org/10.1177/1029864918774834
- Striphas, T. (2015). Algorithmic culture. European Journal of Cultural Studies, 18 (4-5), 395-412. https://doi. org/10.1177/1367549415577392
- Susino, M., y Schubert, E. (2019). Cultural stereotyping of emotional responses to music genre. Psychology of Music, 47 (3), 342-357. https://doi.org/10.1177 %2F0305735618755886
- Symonds, J. E., Hargreaves, J. J., y Long, M. (2017). Music in identity in adolescence across school transition. En R. MacDonald, D. J. Hargreaves, y D. Miell (Eds.), Oxford handbook of musical identities (pp. 510-526). Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, K. S. (2016). Music preferences and the adolescent brain: A review of literature. Update: Applications of Research in Music Education, 35 (1), 47-53. https://doi. org/10.1177/8755123315576534
- Werner, A. (2020). Organizing music, organizing gender: algorithmic culture and Spotify recommendations. Popular Communication, 18 (1), 78-90. https://doi.org/10.1080/15405702.2020.17
- Werner, A. (2023). Feminism and gender politics in mediated popular music. Bloomsbury Academic.

# Authors' biographies

**Roberto Cremades-Andreu.** Doctor of Education. Associate Professor in the Department of Language, Art and Physical Education Teaching, and he holds the position of vice-dean for Research and Postgraduate Study in the Faculty of Education at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid (UCM). His research activity is in the field of music education, with a special interest in analysing the social and psychological perspective of music, as well as in the training of teachers in the European Higher Education Area. Principal investigator and team member in various research (Comenius, I+D+i, AECID, art. 83) and teaching innovation projects. Head of the Music Education from a Social and Psychological Perspective consolidated research group (UCM).



https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9930-1609

Carlos Lage-Gómez. Doctor of Education. Civil servant on sabbatical from the body of secondary school teachers in the music specialism. He has been a coordinator and teacher in the Gifted Students Programme of the Community of Madrid. He is currently an Associate Professor in the Department of Language, Art and Physical Education Teaching at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid. Visiting researcher at the University of Cambridge, at the University of Eastern Finland and at the Haut École Pédagogique in Vaud (Lausanne, Switzerland). He is author of various articles published in high-impact journals and editorials.



https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7264-7725

Arantza Campollo-Urkiza. Doctor of Education, licentiate degree in History and Musical Sciences, piano diploma, master's in Managing Educational Centres. She is currently a professor of practice in the Department of Language, Art and Physical Education Teaching at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, as well as a specialist music teacher in secondary education. Her principal lines of research centre on disciplinary teaching, with a special focus on music education and its contribution to key competences, and music education from a social and psychological perspective. She has given a number of conference papers and lectures on both subjects. She has also published works in academic journals and high-quality books.



https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6005-0091

David Hargreaves. Emeritus Professor at the University of Roehampton (London). He previously held posts in the faculties of Psychology and Education at the universities of Leicester and Durham and the Open University. He has also been visiting professor at the universities of Gothenburg (Sweden) and Curtin



Revista Española de Pedagogía year 82, n. 287, January-April 2024, 23-36 (Australia). He is a chartered psychologist and a fellow of the British Psychological Society. He was the editor of *Psychology of Music* (1989-1996) and chair of the research commission of the International Society for Music Education (ISME) (1994-1996). He is currently a member of the editorial boards of ten

psychology, music, and education journals. In recent years, he has spoken about his research at international conferences, and is the most cited author in the field.



https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2726-7229

